

Anthropological History of Castilian in the Indies

Francisco Gimeno-Menéndez
University Of Alicante

Summary

Acculturation was an essential feature of the anthropological history of humankind. Acculturation encompassed all cultural phenomena resulting from the acquisition, modification, or reinterpretation of a culture, particularly the reception and assimilation of cultural elements from one social group by another. 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. The annexation of Hispanoamérica under the Treaty of Tordesillas (1494) effectively implied Castilian acculturation through the political, economic, and legal institutions of the state, and it was a slow process. The secondary nature of the incorporation of the Indies into the Crown of Castile, by virtue of the concession granted by Pope Alexander VI to the Catholic Monarchs, meant that their legal configuration and organization were not achieved through the creation of a new legal system, but rather through the transplantation of the Castilian legal system. The need to adapt the principles and rules of this to a different reality was what led to the formation of a law specific to the Indies, for the regulation of the many situations not contemplated by that one. There was no language shift of indigenous languages by Castilian, but rather a confluence of acculturations, with social and cultural mixing. The anthropological history of Castilian in the Indies raises the need for a new history that takes as its starting point the positions adopted by the diverse cultures. Our specific working hypothesis assumed that the confluence of languages in the Indies was a clear example of various acculturations (indigenous and Spanish). Guaraní, as a current co-official language with Spanish in Paraguay, has represented the best example of the contact between languages and cultures.

Keywords: *Acculturation. Confluence of languages. Indigenous acculturation. Castilian acculturation. Emigration. Social and cultural mixing. General language. Council of the Indies. Language planning.*

Date of Submission: 19-07-2026

Date of Acceptance: 29-07-2026

I. Introduction

The integration of anthropology into medieval history was one of the most significant historiographical developments of the last third of the 20th century. Indeed (since 1970), there has been an enrichment of perspectives and a deepening of our understanding of the configuration of society, and especially of its behaviors in relation to the territory it occupied. In particular, J. A. García de Cortázar (1985) proposed starting from the conception of society and space as elements of a system, whose evolution occurred through the complexity of its social organization, and established the close connection between the formulas of economic reproduction and the structures of domination and social cohesion, as well as the system of values.

1.1. The introduction of anthropology (and medieval history) into the history of language was later and could be placed at the end of the last century. F. Gimeno, (1988, 1990: 138-44, 1995) pointed out that sociolinguistics was born from an anthropological commitment that ultimately viewed linguistics as a chapter of social and cultural anthropology (and of the psychology of knowledge).

General sociolinguistics as an extension and revision of institutional disciplines (linguistics, sociology and anthropology) integrated a *sociology of language* and a *strict sociolinguistics*, as well as the *ethnography of communication* (see E. Haugen, 1953/1969, 1973; C. F. Hockett, 1958/1962; C. A. Ferguson, 1959; B. Malmberg, 1966; R. Jakobson, 1970; J. A. Fishman, 1964/1968, 1971; D. Hymes, 1971, 1974; Y. Malkiel, 1976; Imhoff, B., 1999; F. Gimeno, 1979, 1987, 208, 2019, 2025e).

Studies on linguistic and cultural contact in Europe were not widely coordinated, although the forerunners were European (W. Leopold, E. Haugen, and U. Weinreich). U. Weinreich (1953: 37-40) commented that for some anthropologists, linguistic contact was nothing more than an aspect of cultural contact, and linguistic transfer was a facet of social diffusion and acculturation.

However, despite the increased anthropological interest in contact problems, particularly in the United States of America after the First World War, studies on linguistic contact and cultural contact did not enjoy widespread coordination, nor had the relationship between the two fields of study been properly defined.

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

II. Indigenous acculturation

Was many acculturation processes were carried out through language. M. Alvar (1996: 15-8) pointed out that Castilian acculturation adapted to the new reality of America that conditioned it (indigenous acculturation), and the Castilian language served as an instrument for preserving cultures. Not only because of the trauma of annexation, language was the prodigious instrument that allowed the diffusion of civilizations that otherwise would have had very little presence in America, such as the Taíno. The Castilians facilitated mutual communication among the indigenous peoples, thanks to the designation of a common language: Castilian and the Castilians established arts, lexicons, and confessionals, along with a multitude of other aspects that we now call anthropological.

2.1. Two different motives, but with similar significance: the Castilian language was the instrument that, in both cases, fulfilled a singular purpose. Today, more than five hundred years later, that language unites Spanish speakers of both continents, and it is still language that binds us together beyond skin color, religious beliefs, social structures, or political systems. Unity was there, in the miracle of understanding, and variety was the other wonder of particularity that enriched what was united.

The Spanish spoken in the Americas followed its own path, but it was impacted by indigenous acculturation as knowledge of the surrounding reality developed. The Castilian language required a process of indigenous acculturation, and it became a hybrid language, because only through this mixing could the old and the new be preserved and adapted to the new reality. In a process repeated countless times, the language had adapted to the needs of a new society and culture, and had been enriched.

Through contact with other cultures, the language underwent exchanges and modifications: Castilian acculturation changed the previous situation, and within it lives América, mestizo and irreversible, driven by history. There wasn't one Spanish from Spain and another from America, but rather many Spaniards on both sides of the ocean. There wasn't one "best language," but rather a language belonging to all of us, and we created the system of systems that was standard Spanish.

2.2. The history of Castilian in the New World was primarily the history of Castilian, and we would be wrong to consider the American magnitude of the language limited to an episodic phenomenon of transplantation, as if the course of history continued unchanged. In the diffusion of Castilian in the Indies, J. L. Rivarola (2004: 799-800) argued that the American transplantation produced a profound change that definitively involved the entire reality of the language, understood as a system of signs and functions, but also as a set of discursive traditions.

Moreover, the spread of Castilian in the New World created not only a new geographical and social space, but also a new mental and cultural space, within which the signs of a new linguistic identity were slowly, difficultly and sometimes contradictorily forged.

As is well known, at the end of the 15th and beginning of the 16th centuries, certain changes were underway that affected the various linguistic subsystems, leading to a more or less profound restructuring of the language. Although the Iberian Peninsula had achieved relative linguistic unity through the expansion of Castilian, it had not been immune to internal differentiation, related to the chronology of that expansion and its contact with neighboring varieties.

For now, it is clear that a bifurcation between a north-central and a southern system had been developing for some time. Thus, a language in the process of consolidating into a unified whole, but as complete and complete Castilian, passed to America, although still with considerable internal variation.

Indeed, the historical-demographic research carried out by P. Boyd Bowman (1976), and intended to determine the flows and origin of immigration, has shown for decades that, although almost all Spanish regions participated to a greater or lesser extent in the population of 16th-century America, the presence of Andalusians (36.9%) was strongly predominant, especially in the first decades, which coincides with the Andalusian linguistic matrix of the later Hispanic-American linguistic identity.

2.3. A cumulative count for the entire 16th century shows that during the first century in the Americas, almost half of the identified inhabitants (around 27,000 individuals) came from five provinces, in descending order: Seville, Badajoz, Toledo, Cáceres, and Valladolid. While the first two cities could be considered speakers of southern varieties, totaling slightly more than 18,000 individuals, the remaining three cities, which could be considered speakers of non-southern varieties, totaled just over 9,000 individuals.

However, the regional and social components of the first stages of Castilian acculturation were undoubtedly reinforced or weakened depending on the nature of subsequent migratory overlaps. In this way, the linguistic character of the regions was shaped, laying the foundations for continued evolution, and meaning that the Castilian language transplanted to América underwent a process of *patrimonial restructuring*.

Judging by the textual evidence, indigenous words were generally introduced in a confrontational manner, either alongside the synonymous Hispanic term or accompanied by a circumlocution related to the referent in question. Of course, oral usage could involve different forms and rhythms of adaptation, justified by the novelty of the subject matter and the context.

The oldest and most established indigenous terms were soon integrated into a usage that dispensed with metalinguistic markers and gradually increased as the horizon of languages with which it came into contact expanded.

2.4. The adoption of indigenous loanwords into Spanish resulted from a situation of language contact. This contact necessarily implied, in all cases, extensive processes of indigenous acculturation of the human groups involved.

Thus, in the case of the most abundant and rapidly adopted loanwords in Castilian during the first decades of indigenous acculturation (namely, Taíno loanwords), it was not possible to postulate a large-scale Castilian acculturation of the indigenous population, which seemed to have disappeared in a relatively short time.

Historians had accepted without question that the 16th century was significant as a stage in which the relationship between Castilian acculturation and indigenous acculturation was consolidated.

Creolization process, achieved in all areas and attained through contact between languages and cultures, began in the Antilles, whose geographical location served as a base for the annexation of the continent. M. Vaquero (1996) alluded to the fact that the Antillean islands were unique destination points in the early years of indigenous acculturation, which ended up developing a mobile and transient society as opposed to permanent settlements (see F. Gimeno and M. V. Gimeno, 2003; F. Gimeno, 2024a, 2024b, 2025a, 2025b, 2025c, 2026a, 2026b; F. Gimeno (coord.) 2020).

2.5. If we consider the majority presence of Andalusians during the first stage of Castilian acculturation, in which Andalusian women also represented 67% of the transplanted female population, it should not surprise us that the first linguistic leveling is of a southern peninsular character.

If we also consider the importance of trade in this initial period, there was no doubt that *majority status* and *prestige* acted as conditioning factors in the leveling of the Antilles, given that 49% of Andalusians were merchants and traders. This data suggests that Andalusian identity acted as a leveling force, resulting in the first indigenous acculturation of Castilian in the Américas (see D. Catalán, 1958; R. Menéndez Pidal, 1962; R. Lapesa, 1963; F. Abad, 1991; M. Torreblanca, 2010).

The Antillean norm passed to the American continent, and there it coexisted with the Castilian acculturation of emigrants from the central and northern peninsula, who arrived with the subsequent migratory waves.

In this second moment, therefore, and without forgetting the native presences, the indigenous acculturation of the Antilles shared the space with the arrivals directly from the Peninsula, a situation that made possible the coexistence of the first norm (product of the first Andalusian leveling) with the second northern peninsular one, which arrived with the direct migrations.

2.6. The subsequent development of indigenous acculturation confirmed that the coexistence of norms involved a continuous transfer of users from one to another, in a process that could be extremely slow, and whose outcome depended, in each territory, on many other specific factors. However, it should not be overlooked that *seseo*, brought to the American continent with the Antillean-Andalusian norm, ended up becoming the only general phonological feature in American Spanish.

In addition to Andalusianism, the so-called *Creole hypothesis* was proposed for the Caribbean, in which the indigenous acculturation of this area started from a simplified and creolized system, developed from the 16th century by contact between different African ethnicities and Peninsular Castilian, or by contact between Castilian and a protolanguage of Portuguese base used in the Caribbean by Africans.

This hypothesis assumed in the colonial Hispanic Antilles an indigenous acculturation similar to that which existed in the French or Saxon Caribbean (conducive to the development of creole languages), but without convincing documentary support.

The current Antillean Spanish (after five centuries of adaptations, adoptions and influences) presented sociolinguistic characteristics that allowed it to be described as an insular Caribbean indigenous acculturation, based on Andalusian-Canarian traditions, spoken in Cuba, the Dominican Republic and Puerto Rico.

Although the historical trajectory of these three territories has been different since the 20th century, and (despite the special political situation of Puerto Rico) Spanish is the mother tongue in the three countries mentioned, conditioned by the sociocultural factors of each one, and without having produced the development of any creole language, in the manner of the French-based *creoles* (Haiti, Martinique) or the Anglo-Saxon ones (Virgin Islands, English-speaking).

2.7. The anthropological history of Hispanoamérica was not a dialectal mosaic. In the “General Traits” of Hispanoamérica, H. López Morales (1996) stated that fortunately the times when important intellectuals of Hispanoamérica showed their concern about the unity of Spanish on the continent have definitively passed.

Castilian acculturation was preserved, and at the heart of this ever-renewing Hispanism lay language and culture, although this meant that we were not dealing with a homogeneous language. If Spanish is a diasystem, a huge part of it was located in the Americas, which were home to approximately ninety percent of all Spanish speakers in the world.

The factors that once gave rise to these differences appear to be the same ones that the history of languages and cultures has long revealed to us: the diverse cultural origins of the colonizers, the diversity of aboriginal languages, the outstanding isolation between the founding centers, the absence of leveling linguistic policies, among other less significant factors.

Regarding indigenous acculturation, it is necessary to specify a few points. Perhaps this influence has been discussed too frequently already, but two very distinct phenomena must be distinguished: the influence of the mother tongue on the Spanish of bilingual speakers, whose command of the learned language does not reach satisfactory levels of competence, and the indigenous influence on monolingual Spanish speakers from the various speech communities.

Examples of the first case multiplied as studies on languages in contact increased. Morphosyntax, lexicon, and phonetics all exhibited, depending on the case, more or less eloquent examples of linguistic transfer. In reality, one could not speak here of indigenous “influence” on American Spanish.

The influence was limited to cases of grammatical transgressions in Spanish, mainly due to imperfect learning processes. However, in those situations where the indigenous presence was found in the Spanish of monolinguals, or even in that of balanced bilinguals, then we were indeed witnessing genuine indigenous acculturation (see H. López Morales, 1983, 1989, 1998, 2008, 2012, (coord.) 2008).

With respect to the latter, the American continent presented a very diverse gradation, ranging from the Antilles, where this presence was reduced to a few lexical elements, to countries such as Perú and Bolivia, where, for well-known sociolinguistic reasons, indigenous acculturation was much greater, although it was not possible to delimit it precisely.

In any case, the indigenous acculturation that American Spanish might have today would be quite weak, generally speaking. The bibliography on this set of sociolinguistic zones that constitutes American Spanish (already impressive in number) emphasized lexical studies (especially lexicographical ones) and phonetic and phonological studies.

III. Legal system of sources in the Indies

The accessory nature of the incorporation of the Indies into the Crown of Castile, according to A. M. Barrero (1993: 271-4), by virtue of the donation by Pope Alexander VI to the Catholic Monarchs and their successors (in the kingdoms of León and Castile of the lands discovered and to be discovered), determined that its legal configuration and organization was not carried out from the creation of a law “ex novo” for them, but through the transplantation of the Castilian legal system.

The need to adapt the principles and rules of this to a different reality was what gave rise to the formation (as a special or *municipal* law of Castilian) of a law of its own to the Indies (the *Indian law*), for the regulation of the multiple situations not contemplated by the former (see A. M. Barrero and M. L. Alonso, 1989).

Castilian law was initially in full force and effect in general, until in 1614 the application of the new legislation to the Indies was reduced to the provisions that expressly established it and received the approval of the Council of the Indies, or to those instances in which it was obliged by specific reference of the Indian laws.

3.1. This being the origin of Indian law, its legal system of sources (like the Castilian of this period) was characterized by its pronounced legalism, since officially no other mode of normative production than the *law* was recognized, except in an exceptional way in relation to the indigenous world, which in fact did not prevent the necessary and frequent recourse to *custom* and *judicial practice*.

Hence, it was understood in its broadest sense as any provision emanating from a specific authority, and therefore, the Indian normative system appeared to be comprised of:

1) Some laws, very few, promulgated for the Indies by the king in the Castilian Courts, since they did not have this institution as their own.

2) A larger, though still very limited, number of pragmatic sanctions, since being by nature provisions of higher rank ("as made and promulgated in the Cortes") on matters of general interest, as was their validity, they proved ill-suited for the regulation of domains as vast and diverse as the Indies. Among these pragmatic sanctions, the *New Laws* on the good treatment of the Indians, promulgated by Charles V in 1542 and 1543, stand out for their special significance.

3) The *Asientos* or *Capitulations* established by the Crown with individuals requesting licenses to discover or settle, which stipulated the conditions and way the undertaking was carried out. Difficult to categorize in terms of their legal nature (contractual, privileged?), these legal texts were used until the mid-16th century. Subsequently, these much less frequent situations were regulated in general by the "Ordinances of Discoveries and New Settlements" promulgated by Philip II in 1573.

4) Governing mandates issued by the king and the Council of the Indies to American institutions and authorities, in the form of provisions, decrees, ordinances, instructions, and royal letters. Intended to resolve a wide variety of matters, these types of provisions constituted the majority of the laws of the Indies, characterized by their extreme casuistry and particularism, since they were not usually issued with general scope, but rather, being addressed to a specific authority, their application was limited to that authority's sphere of action.

5) Government provisions and ordinances issued by American authorities (viceroys, governors, audiencias, consulates, municipalities, etc.) on their own initiative acquired the status of royal decrees upon approval by the sovereign. If this approval was not obtained, their application was contingent upon their conformity with royal and Castilian laws. The distance from the metropolis, the advantage of direct knowledge of the situations to be regulated, and the occasional need for immediate solutions greatly encouraged the initiative of the Indies authorities, resulting in a copious body of legislation entirely distinct from that produced in Spain, which comprised what came to be known as *Creole Indian law*.

3.2. In the eyes of the Castilian monarchs, with no other knowledge of the indigenous reality than that derived from indirect and often mediated information, this broad and diverse legislative baggage appeared complete and sufficient, as its singular law came to fill the gaps in the common law of the kingdom, also in full force in the new lands.

Therefore, it was not considered necessary or appropriate to include other sources of law in the system, since when in 1555 the application of the old customs of the indigenous people or those newly established in relation to situations arising from the coexistence of the two communities was admitted, it was not due to a legal insufficiency, but in consideration of the difficulties of the indigenous population (of lower cultural level), for the knowledge and understanding of the royal laws.

However, the American authorities did not see it that way, and they readily acknowledged the existence of a judicial practice that arose from the need to adapt the rules to reality, nor did they accept the increasingly intense development of custom, which allowed them to compensate for both the absence of rules and the void that occurred when, because they were inadequate to certain circumstances, their application was ignored through the recourse, very common in the Indies, to the Castilian principle of "obeying but not complying".

Another serious difficulty arising from the legalistic nature of the Indian system (casuistry and particularism), which the peninsular and Indian authorities had to face, was that of ensuring knowledge of the law, a prior and inexcusable condition for its compliance.

To this end, in accordance with the criteria of the time and without prejudice to the implementation of a series of measures for immediate application, such as the mandatory printing of the pragmatic sanctions, the publication of the laws (their preservation and inventory) and the creation of tables or indexes of the same which were to be displayed in the most crowded places of the population centers, efforts were directed towards the formation of a compilation to be promulgated in a general manner.

3.3. The first initiatives, arising on both sides of the Atlantic without any connection to each other, led to the development of several projects in the last decades of the 16th century. Some, like Ovando's, were unsuccessful, of his Code, undoubtedly the most complete and perfect, only some of its titles were promulgated as ordinances (those of the Council in 1571, the ones concerning discoveries and new settlements, those of royal patronage in 1574, etc.). Others, such as the *Cedulario* of the Oidor of the Audiencia of New Hispana (Vasco de Puga), were successfully completed. This was published in Mexico in 1563, and the "four volumes of printed decrees" (in 1596) were compiled in their entirety and in a systematic order at the behest of the Council by its official of the court of justice, Diego de Encinas.

Seven years later, in 1603, the Council again addressed, this time definitively, the compilation tasks that lasted for almost the entire century and in which various jurists of recognized prestige participated simultaneously or successively.

Among others, Solórzano Pereira, León Pinelo and, finally, Jiménez de Paniagua, who did not hesitate to report unfavorably on it and claim authorship of the Compilation, despite making extensive use of a project by

Pinelo approved by the Council in 1636 (as the most recent research has shown), which could finally be promulgated with general scope by King Charles II in 1680.

This long and laborious process resulted in an aged work, which would soon be superseded by the abundant reformist legislation of the bourbons, and in need of constant correction and updating, which was carried out initially through legal-literary work, and from 1740 onwards through its addition in successive editions.

Only in 1776, at the behest of the all-powerful minister José de Gálvez, did Charles III order the formation of a *New Code* which, despite having been promulgated its first book, became, both due to the dynamics of the compilation tasks and the political events, a new frustrated project.

IV. Confluence of acculturations

In his work on the Hispanization of America (the Castilian language and indigenous languages since 1492), A. Rosenblat (1963) wrote that the process of Castilian acculturation (which began on October 12, 1492) had not ended after four hundred and seventy years, but that understanding the path traveled was important. The Indian or Castilian interpreter represented a first stage, that of approximation.

Undoubtedly, stable forms of coexistence were more important, and of these, three stood out above all: work, miscegenation, and catechization. However, the latter concerned the Admiral from the very beginning, as it appeared as a fundamental condition of Spain's rights in the papal bulls of Alexander VI (1493), in the Treaty of Tordesillas (June 7, 1494), signed between the representatives of John II of Portugal and those of the Catholic Monarchs, and as the supreme objective in the Instructions of the Catholic Monarchs.

4.1. From his first letters (November 2 and 12, 1492), Christopher Columbus spoke of Christianization. On November 27, he announced that he would have members of his household learn the language of the Indians and that he would endeavor to make all the new settlements Christians. The Royal Instructions from this early period included the teaching of Castilian as part of the catechization process.

On Columbus's second voyage, the monarchs sent Friar Boyl, a man they trusted implicitly, for whom they had obtained a papal bull granting extraordinary powers. He was accompanied by other religious figures, tasked with transmitting the tenets of the Catholic faith to the indigenous people in Castilian, "striving to instruct them in it as best as possible."

The Royal Instruction of 1503 stipulated that the Indians be grouped into towns ("to be instructed as free persons, and not as servants") and that each town have a church and a chaplain. The chaplain was to instruct the children and teach them to read and write, to make the sign of the cross and to confess, and prayers were usually taught in Latin (the Paternoster, the Ave Maria, the Credo, and the Salve Regina).

Castilian was the general instrument of catechization, and it was recorded that Friar Alonso del Espinar, upon returning to Hispaniola (Haiti) in 1512, carried 2,000 primers that had been provided to him by the House of Trade of the Indies.

The teaching of Castilian at that time implied the teaching of Latin: a Royal Decree of 1513 stipulated that the sons of the caciques of Hispaniola should receive instruction in *grammar* (that is, Latin language and literature) from the Bachelor Hernán Xuárez, and for this purpose, twenty copies of Nebrija's *Arte* were given to him. Through various means, a familiar relationship developed between Castilians and Indians, "with their languages mingling," as Pedro Mártir said.

4.2. The Castilian acculturation of the Antilles islands was rapid, perhaps too rapid, and so profound that a mixed language did not emerge on any of the islands colonized by the Castilians. It is well known that the Antillean Indian population quickly died out under the new social conditions, decimated by epidemics and diseases against which it had no immunity, or absorbed by the dissolving effect of miscegenation.

In truth, contrary to popular belief, small (entirely Castilianized) indigenous communities still existed until the end of the last century in Cuba and the Dominican Republic, and it is not difficult today to recognize the indigenous heritage in a large part of the Caribbean population. Even in their Castilian, hundreds of words survived, many of which (*maíz, batata, ají, maní, cacique, canoa, piragua, hamaca, huracán, carey, tiburón, tabaco*) enriched the Castilian language. Nevertheless, Castilian acculturation ultimately meant the disappearance of the Caribbean Indian.

In general, the same thing happened along almost the entire American coast and in much of the interior. The impressive diversity of languages and cultures (the so-called linguistic atomization of America) favored the imposition of Castilian, the only truly general language.

But where small groups of conquerors and Castilian settlers encountered dense indigenous populations with cultural, social, and political cohesion, the relationship between Castilian and indigenous languages was more complex, and the problems that arose in the early days have continued to this day.

Consider the plateau of México and Central América, or that of Perú, Ecuador, and Bolivia. Or, in very special circumstances, the coexistence of Castilian and Guaraní in the lands of Paraguay and in the old Jesuit missions of the Río de la Plata.

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

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

4.3. However, there was no Hispanic American conquest, but an annexation by virtue of the Treaty of Tordesillas (1494), which in fact implied the confluence of languages and cultures (indigenous and Castilian), through the political, economic and legal institutions of the Crown of Castile.

Furthermore, the confluence of acculturations was an essential characteristic of human history, and the fundamental principle in the history of languages in contact and of linguistic change and language shift was the acculturation of social groups. Therefore, there were no origins or deaths of languages, as social and cultural mixing and adaptation to a new sociocultural context were the norm.

The founding of the Church in Hispanoamérica was undertaken by the mendicant orders. The missionaries understood that this situation could not continue, since it was not feasible to force the indigenous people to become Hispanicized through violence, much less wait for them to do so gradually over centuries. It was necessary to go to the mountains, and for the missionaries to learn the indigenous languages as quickly as possible in order to preach to them in their own tongues, hear their confessions, administer the sacraments in their own languages, and instruct and elevate them to the Christian faith through these languages.

The Castilian language was not essential to being a Christian. Hence the missionary zeal in which Franciscans, Dominicans, and Augustinians (later joined by Jesuits and other orders) competed to learn the indigenous languages.

It was the essential condition for all effective evangelization, and the only way to win the minds and hearts of the Indians. The spiritual power to which the conqueror was thus subordinated would generally disregard the fate of the Castilian language, even though it was not a linguistic issue, but a cultural and anthropological one.

4.4. From the very beginning, Friar Bartolomé de Olmedo delivered eloquent sermons, which interpreters translated for the Indians. Throughout this early period, preaching was done through interpreters or by sign language.

When the first Franciscans arrived in Tlaxcala in 1524 and encountered a large crowd of Indians on market day, Friar Mendieta recounted that, since they could not speak to them, "they pointed to the sky with signs (like the mute), wanting to convey that they had come to show them the treasures and wonders that were up there." Confession was necessarily done with the help of interpreters.

The missionaries dedicated themselves to learning indigenous languages as an extension of their religious apostolate. With the master key of language, they had to penetrate the mysterious world of the Indians, learn their customs, understand their mentality, decipher their feelings and thoughts, and describe their history and their lives.

Not out of abstract scientific zeal (although a certain Renaissance aspiration for human knowledge could not be entirely ruled out), but to better understand the Indian, to facilitate his catechization, to combat his rites and superstitions and to discover if these were hidden discreetly behind an apparent Christianization.

To know their languages, to study the grammar of those languages, to translate into them the prayers, the sermons, the catechisms, the sacred texts, not for linguistic zeal, incomprehensible at the time, but as an indispensable instrument for the dissemination of the sacred word in new lands, in new souls.

The very early introduction of printing in Mexico (in 1539) by Bishop Fray Juan de Zumárraga, a Franciscan friar, responded to the same evangelizing need, and the oldest known Mexican printed work was indeed a *Breve y más enjundiosa doctrina christiana en lengua mexicana y castellana*.

The first printed work in Lima was also a trilingual doctrine, in Castilian, Quechua, and Aymara. The friars devoted themselves diligently to the linguistic work, which they saw as an urgent necessity.

They combined missionary work with teaching languages to other friars. To this end, they produced textbooks, vocabularies, doctrines, confessionals, and translated gospels, epistles, sermons, homilies, and lives of saints. Even parish registers and tribute books were written in indigenous languages.

4.5. Most of the monks in New Spain learned Nahuatl. Others learned Mixtec, Zapotec, Huastec, Chontal, Otomí, Totonac, Tarascan, etc. The Dominicans dedicated themselves to this work, encouraged by their Pope Pius V. Among the Augustinians, the study of languages was obligatory, and the congregation practiced ten different languages in México.

The Franciscans had a group of notable linguists. It is said that Friar Andrés de Olmos preached in ten languages (at least, he left grammars of Totonac, Tepehua, Huastec, and Nahuatl, the latter considered the best of its time). Speaking three languages was quite common.

The diversity of indigenous languages frustrated the religious orders, who saw it as an obstacle to their work. They quickly understood the need to adopt an auxiliary language, and between the Castilian of the colonists (spoken by few) and the Nahuatl of the indigenous people (spoken by the majority), which had become a kind of *lingua franca* of the Aztec Empire, they chose Nahuatl.

On September 30, 1558, Viceroy Don Luis de Velasco addressed King Philip II, informing him that Friar Francisco de Toral, provincial of the Franciscans, who had just visited New Galicia, requested that a college be founded in Guadalajara to gather young people from different regions and teach Nahuatl to all the Indians.

The Augustinians, who initially used different languages (in church they gathered the Indians by language, and different friars delivered the sermon to them simultaneously), also tried to incorporate all the Indians into the dominant language, called from the beginning, with varying degrees of justification, "la lengua general." The same thing happened in Perú.

4.6. Philip II enshrined the term in his Royal Decree of September 19, 1580, and ordered that in the universities of Lima and Mexico and in the cities where there was a Royal Audiencia, chairs of the "lengua general de los indios" be established, and that the prelates of the Indies should not ordain a priest or give a license to a cleric or religious who did not know "la lengua general" of the Indians of the province.

The monks devoted themselves so ardently to spreading "la lengua general," that by 1584 Nahuatl was spoken from Zacatecas to Nicaragua. Thus arose the paradoxical situation that under Castilian rule it achieved an expansion it had not seen during the height of the Aztec Empire, and this was thanks to the work of the Castilian missionaries.

Quechua also reached its greatest expansion and new laurels (theatrical and poetic) under Castilian rule. Aymara gradually lost its status as a "lengua general," and at its expense, and at the expense of other languages, Quechua spread throughout various parts of Perú. Similarly, missionaries propagated Cuzco Quechua, from the 16th century onward, throughout much of Ecuador, southern Colombia, and the Upper Amazon.

The same thing happened with the Muisca or Chibcha language of the Colombian plateau (in 1619, the *Gramática en la lengua general del Nuevo Reino llamado Mosca*, by F. Bernardo de Lugo, was published in Madrid), and later with the Tupi-Guaraní of the Jesuit missions, which became the lengua general of Paraguay, much of the Río de la Plata coast, Río Grande del Sur, and much of Brasil.

4.7. There was a certain resistance on the part of the Indians, deliberate or unconscious, to learning the Castilian language. There was also a greater affinity between their particular language and the general indigenous language. But, above all, the Indians learned another indigenous language more easily because they learned it through direct contact with other Indians.

In any case, the lengua general brought the Indians out of the isolation of their tribes and incorporated them into a larger community, one more receptive to Castilian acculturation. However, it should not be assumed that the missionaries abandoned or neglected the indigenous languages, which continued to be cultivated until the 18th century.

Latin was taught throughout the Hispanoamérica as part of religious instruction. By the early 17th century, the Jesuits at the Caxica mission in New Granada had instructed more than forty boys who could read Romance language and Latin, and who celebrated Mass, sang, and prayed in both Castilian and indigenous languages.

From the earliest times, there were eminent Indians who were incorporated into Castilian acculturation: Hernando de Alvarado Tezozómoc, descendant of the kings of México (grandson of Moctezuma), author of a *Crónica Mexicana*, in a Castilian that was sometimes halting or incorrect, but always agile and colorful.

And in Perú, the Inca Titu Cusi Yupanqui, baptized with the name Diego de Castro, and others, were testaments to Castilian acculturation (perfect in some cases, imperfect in others) from the very beginning among privileged sectors. But most of the population maintained their indigenous language.

4.8. However, there was something more important. Given the initial results on Hispaniola, the monarchs recommended to the authorities that the indigenous people be concentrated in villages or kept in their existing towns. This was a concern shared by missionaries throughout the continent, and they had the support of viceroys, captains general, and bishops.

The grouping in villages favored indoctrination, and material protection (agriculture and garden crops, livestock and poultry farming, artisan activity) and health care (creation of indigenous hospitals).

The legislation prohibited the entry of Castilians, Black people, mulattos, and mestizos into these communities, thus creating a barrier between Castilians and Indigenous people along all roads. The friars preferred to keep the Indigenous people in their communities and protect them from harmful and disintegrating contact with the rest of the population. And to defend them, they faced persecution, slander, hatred, and imprisonment.

This did not mean ignoring Castilian acculturation, and this concern was also widespread among the secular clergy in various parts of America. Among the reasons that motivated the Council of the Indies, the fear that indoctrination would fall into the hands of Creoles and mestizos (due to their greater fluency in the indigenous languages), who were not, in their view, the most suitable for this task, was not insignificant.

4.9. In this vein, the Council drafted the Royal Decree of July 3, 1596, which was incorporated into the *Recopilación de leyes de Indias* and became the doctrine of the Castilian monarchy until 1770 (a triumph of theologians over jurists). A series of documents and memorials proved that the results were meager. The missionaries were few in number and could not dedicate themselves to such a vast undertaking as teaching Castilian to the dispersed indigenous population.

The difficulties seemed insurmountable, and new times were approaching to confront them. The first sign was the expulsion of the Jesuits. They had begun their American journey at the end of the 16th century (1568-1572). The 17th century was one of broad Jesuit expansion, but in the 18th century, a new spirit, hostile to them, spread throughout Europe and burst into Spain with the Bourbon Kings.

Education was becoming secularized and transformed into a national enterprise, under the control of the State. There was talk of reforming teaching methods and promoting the Castilian language (even at the expense of Latin). Suddenly, in 1767, more than 2,600 members of the Society of Jesus were forcibly removed from their offices and schools throughout the American territories. This was the first major measure taken by the Castilian State against indigenous languages.

4.10. The reaction quickly took on a more specific character. The initiative came from México, spearheaded by Archbishop F. A. Lorenzana, who later became Cardinal of Toledo and Inquisitor General of the Iberian Peninsula. On June 25, 1769, this archbishop addressed King Charles III, explaining the impossibility of teaching the natives Christian doctrine due to their lack of interest in learning the Castilian language. Had the Indians been taught our language from the beginning of the annexation, it would have become widespread in less than half a century.

He maintained that it was a mistake to think that parish priests should be fluent in the language of every indigenous group in the Americas, since the bishops, "the first shepherds," did not understand them. He argued that neither he nor his predecessors had considered giving preference in parishes to priests who knew foreign languages. And that if only Nahuatl were spoken in his diocese, it would be understandable to provide priests who spoke that language, but if there were also several other languages, it would create chaos.

The archbishop distinguished between the Castilian and indigenous clergy, and the latter, when he knew the native language, always spoke in it, looking down on Castilian. He taught doctrine in his own language, often with errors, "because it was very difficult or almost impossible to explain the dogmas of our holy Catholic faith well in another language."

And it so happened that a clergyman of lesser merit, of humble birth and perhaps of worse character, obtained, simply by knowing a language, a parish "that should have been the prize of a more distinguished individual." And that priests who spoke Castilian had managed in just a few years to get the Indians to confess and learn Christian doctrine in Castilian.

4.11. Undoubtedly, his arguments impressed Charles III, who ordered that all the background information on the matter be gathered. He also considered the letter from the Viceroy of México, the Marquis de Croix, dated June 27, 1769, and a report from the prosecutors of the Council of the Indies, dated February 17, 1770.

And he issued his famous Royal Decree of Aranjuez on May 10, 1770. He ordered all the royal and ecclesiastical authorities of his dominions in America and the Philippines "to ensure that the different languages used in these dominions are extinguished and only Castilian is spoken."

Absolutism, as represented by Philip II, had been liberal regarding language: "it did not seem appropriate to compel them to abandon their indigenous language." "Liberalism," as represented by Charles III, was absolutist regarding language: "let the different languages become extinct and only Castilian be spoken."

The ideals of the Enlightenment imposed the "enlightenment" of the Castilian language upon the indigenous people with absolute rigor. It was the triumph of jurists over theologians. The political imperatives of

the State were gaining ground against the old missionary, catechizing approach. And they were presented as an aspiration for unity: one weight, one measure, one currency, one language.

The Royal Decree of Charles III, supplemented by another of November 5, 1782, addressed to the civil and ecclesiastical authorities of the Indies, for the provision of teachers to teach Castilian in the indigenous villages, was as illusory as its predecessors. Castilian power lacked the resources for such a violent and radical Castilianization.

How could schools in the 18th century accomplish such a task? They did, however, manage to disrupt the teaching of Indigenous languages, prevent the printing of books in these languages, suppress Indigenous culture as a public activity, and relegate it to the shadows. Chairs of Indigenous languages disappeared from universities, and their reestablishment in our time has been a difficult process, requiring considerable effort and the emergence of new (anthropological and sociolinguistic) interests.

4.12. There were not a lack of opposing voices (that of Friar Pedro José Parras, in his *Gobierno de los regulares de America*, Madrid, 1733), who considered such a violent Castilianization impossible and even harmful (not even in the Peninsula had it been possible to get the Galicians, Biscayans, Catalans and Valencians to abandon their own language).

The colonial authorities (Audiencias, governors and cabildos) adopted repressive measures and tried to eradicate indigenous languages and even prohibit their use by the owners of haciendas and country houses, fathers and mothers and even children.

This did not achieve Castilianization. The independent republics inherited large segments of the population who lived on the margins of public life, and the vast majority of whom neither spoke nor understood the Castilian language.

In 1810, the Hispano American territories comprised approximately three million white Castilians and Creoles, many of them of mixed ancestry, scattered throughout the continent, and about nine million Indigenous people, concentrated in large rural areas. In open reaction, the Creole authorities proclaimed the emancipation of the Indigenous population in manifestos printed in the Indigenous languages themselves.

Now we can ask ourselves if the missionary policy and linguistic liberalism of the Monarchy were a mistake, as the royal advisors themselves believed, as the jurists (Matienzo or Solórzano Pereira) maintained, as the Enlightenment believed and as many still believe today.

It is important to have a clear understanding of the problem. Cortés entered Mexico with 607 men, and with those who joined him, his force grew to 1,141, immersed in a population estimated at four and a half million inhabitants (some say ten or fifteen million). Was it possible to expect rapid Castilianization through schooling? Clearly, under those circumstances, schooling had to be slow, weak, and even illusory.

4.13. Undoubtedly, the Castilianizing effect of miscegenation was even more effective. The colonization of the vast American continent by small groups of settlers from the Iberian Peninsula would have been entirely impossible without the immediate formation of a dynamic generation of mestizos who participated in the annexation and settlement of new lands, formed the initial core of the new cities, and served as a bridge to the vast and sometimes distant indigenous population. Without them, Castilianization would not have been possible either.

In 1810, the indigenous population constituted, at least in México, Guatemala, Perú, Ecuador, and Bolivia, most of the population. When Castilian rule, which had ensured a constant influx of new Castilian contingents throughout the colonial period, came to an end, many believed (especially in the case of Mexico) that a gradual and widespread acculturation of the indigenous population would occur.

Analysis of the data over these 150 years revealed the opposite. In 1810, there were approximately 1,230,000 whites, 1,800,000 mestizos, and 3,700,000 indigenous people in México. By 1960, there were only three million speakers of indigenous languages in México (two million of whom were bilingual), out of a population of 35 million.

It was clear that Castilian acculturation was occurring not through the school system, which played a complementary role and had a far greater reach, but rather through the overwhelming force of demographic and social development. Castilian acculturation was thus both gradual and rapid.

4.14. The indigenous problem was not fundamentally a problem of language, but a serious social, cultural, and economic problem. The extent of their mixed heritage (in the mid-20th century) was determined by their acculturation with Castilian. In 1960, there were an estimated 15 million indigenous people throughout Hispanoamérica, and less than half of them spoke their indigenous languages, and certainly less than a third (five million) did not know Castilian.

Hispanoamérica was not a mosaic of languages and dialects, and its extreme fragmentation was fundamentally detrimental, except for the spread of Quechua (in Argentina, Bolivia, Perú, Ecuador, and as far

south as Colombia) and Guaraní. Quechua was the most widely spoken indigenous language in Hispanoamérica, with some six million speakers, who were otherwise very culturally distinct, and of whom four million also spoke Castilian.

The current, and quite plausible, trend of educating Indians in their own language and teaching them to read in their indigenous language (started in México and spread to the jungle of Perú), meant that the Indian learned to read in Castilian very early on and paradoxically favored his Castilian acculturation.

However, the Castilian language did not become dominant throughout Hispanoamérica, and there was no complete language shift of indigenous languages. Instead, there was a significant confluence of cultures resulting from social and cultural diffusion, with linguistic and cultural transfers that led to the social and cultural mixing of social groups. This also reflected the intrinsic relationship between language, society, and culture.

4.15. The case of Paraguay is unique in Hispanoamérica: the entire country speaks Guaraní. There are no longer any indigenous people (except for about 40,000 living in the jungle). Such an astonishing fact was attributed to the work of the old Jesuit missions. The Jesuits won over the indigenous people by preaching in Guaraní: by 1750 they had 30 settlements (*reducciones*), with about 150,000 indigenous people.

It was a closed world (some even spoke of the Jesuit Kingdom of Paraguay), which was often in conflict, even waging bloody battles, with the authorities in Asunción. The missions lived like this for about 150 years, until 1767, peacefully governed by a small number of religious men (never reaching 500, including those who ran the houses and schools in the cities).

Civil authorities violently reproached them for keeping the Indians outside the bounds of Castilian law. Undoubtedly, the Jesuits contributed to the preservation of the Guaraní language in Paraguay (although most of their missions and their indigenous people were under the jurisdiction of Buenos Aires, and a significant portion were also in Brasil and Santa Cruz de la Sierra).

But the spread of Guaraní throughout Paraguay (including Asunción, so hostile to the missions) was due to the unique nature of indigenous acculturation. This was also greatly aided by the country's near-complete isolation throughout the 19th and part of the 20th centuries, its location in the heart of the continent, and its very limited immigration.

However, that may be, today everyone speaks Guaraní even the children of immigrants, a Guaraní that is quite influenced by Castilian. And almost everyone speaks a Castilian that is to some extent indigenous. Guaraní is the second official language, but Spanish prevails in school and university education and in public life. And it is undoubtedly the link that unites Paraguay with the community of Hispanic American countries.

4.16. The current world is part of an economic, social, cultural and political globalization, and for the 18 states that have Spanish as an official language and another 4 states as a co-official language, the relevance lies in being an active part of a linguistic community that has 630 million Spanish speakers, behind Hindi/Urdu, Chinese and global English (see F. Gimeno, 2023 a, 2023b).

Castilian acculturation, once slow, is now occurring at a dizzying pace. The penetration of Castilian in recent generations had a depth that had astonished geographers and travelers, and was reflected in the indigenous languages themselves, showing a growing Castilianization.

However, since 1492, indigenous acculturation has incorporated a series of elements into the Spanish of the Americas: intonation, articulatory features, suffixes, names of flora and fauna and of material and spiritual life, as well as the fundamental chapter of its anthropological history. In bilingual regions, this even includes syntactic-semantic transfers.

Its study and analysis constitute one of the most fascinating chapters in Hispano American sociolinguistics. Nowhere in Hispano América has a creole language emerged, like those that French has given rise to in Haiti, Portuguese to in Curaçao, or English to in Guyana. Not only is Hispano América deeply Castilianized, but it is becoming today (in the case of Argentina and México) the most powerful field of Hispanization in the world.

V. Language planning

The Crown of Castile did not maintain the same linguistic policy in Hispanoamérica throughout the entire period; rather, it implemented diverse actions, and three main stages can be distinguished. A. Herranz (1996: 29-130) identified two periods: 1) Colonial (1502-1820), and 2) Independent (1821-1995). Regarding the first period, he differentiated the following policies:

- a) Establishment of a Castilian monolingual planning (1502-1569), designed by the Catholic Monarchs and continued by King Charles V. It was based on the idea that "all natives of América should learn Castilian by obligation."

- b) The establishment of a multilingual planning (1570-1769) marked a significant shift, requiring priests and friars to learn indigenous languages to indoctrinate and evangelize the people in their native tongues. Indigenous people were free to learn Spanish.
- c) Establishment of a Castilian monolingual planning (1770-1820), initiated by King Charles III, which represented a return to the Castilian monolingual planning of the first stage.

5.1. The first stage was characterized by the rapid annexation of the great Aztec and Quechua cultures and was surprising for the swift decision of the Catholic Monarchs to implement a minimum of Royal Decrees and other documents outlining the main features of a linguistic planning based on the mandatory learning of Castilian for all native inhabitants of the Indies. This early legislation was only possible due to Castile's extensive experience with the reconquered Arab communities, and this policy was initiated by King Ferdinand III.

The Catholic Monarchs received the title bestowed upon them by Pope Alexander VI in 1494, and they were the architects of a comprehensive policy based on national unity centered around Castile. This policy encompassed military, religious, cultural, and linguistic aspects. Queen Isabella entrusted the reform of the clergy and religious orders to her confessor, Archbishop Francisco Jiménez de Cisneros. This reform, which began with the mendicant orders, brought about a return to lost austerity and discipline and a renewed impetus for the Christian evangelization of Arabs and Jews.

The queen's linguistic planning combined the study of classical languages with the "Castilianization" of the annexed regions. Castilian became the official language of the kingdom, which all its subjects were required to speak. In this way, Christianization and Castilianization were linked until the reign of Philip II.

For the work of Castilianization, the queen had the invaluable participation of the Latinist E. A. de Nebrija, author of the *Gramática de la lengua castellana* (1492), the first of the Romance languages spoken in Europe, and of the explicit fixing of its orthography in his work *Reglas de ortografía castellana* (1516) (see M. T. Echenique, 2013).

In the "Prólogo" to the first edition, he clearly explained his reasons for writing it. The first was to give Castilian stability, uniformity, and simplicity. The second was pedagogical in nature, and the third explained that the grammar could be used to understand the Castilian legal system. Following this plan, which had brought Castile so much success on the Iberian Peninsula and in the newly conquered Canary Islands, they transferred it to America with minor variations.

5.2. The second stage examined the background and effects of the pressure exerted by bishops and missionaries on Charles V and Philip II, which culminated in the recognition of Nahuatl as the language of evangelization in 1570. The variety of languages presented new challenges for the religious orders, as it was impossible to learn them all. Sometimes, a friar in the same parish was responsible for villages where two or three languages were spoken. The Franciscans began to pressure the Crown to officially recognize Nahuatl as the *general* or *lingua franca* for the evangelization of the indigenous peoples of New Castile, its widespread use in México and Central America, and because they had produced excellent dictionaries and grammars.

Thus, in response to the Royal Decree of 1550, Friar Rodrigo de la Cruz deemed the task of teaching Castilian to the Indians useless and proposed that everyone learn Nahuatl. The Royal Decree of 1570 initiated Philip II's multilingual planning by establishing two official languages: Castilian for administration and officials, and Nahuatl for the Christianization of the Indians of the vast region of Hispanoamérica.

The Habsburgs' language planning was summarized in the Royal Decree of July 3, 1596, drafted by the Council of the Indies. This decree maintained the mandate that missionaries learn the language of the people they administered, while simultaneously allowing the indigenous population to learn Castilian at their own discretion. With this Royal Decree, Philip II reversed the linguistic policies of the Catholic Monarchs and Charles V.

Castilian remained the official language of the Castilians and the indigenous elite. Indigenous languages were relegated to the Christianization of the indigenous population and their everyday use by religious (especially mestizos) and the general indigenous population. Castilian was the language of Castilian acculturation, while indigenous languages were the language of indigenous acculturation. Essentially, this plan proposed a social multilingualism, which was, in fact, a reality. Castilian continued to be the official language of the state, but it was assumed that the indigenous people would learn it gradually and voluntarily.

This multilingual planning remained in place until 1770, when Charles III reverted to a monolingual Castilian planning. Philip II's successors focused solely on resolving the day-to-day problems of its implementation. Philip III issued Royal Decrees in 1599, 1603, 1618, and 1619, emphasizing the mandatory learning of indigenous languages by those who wished to serve as parish priests in indigenous villages. In 1612, he ordered the establishment of "houses of retreat" for young women who wished to receive a virtuous education, and, contradicting his own legislation, decreed that the only language spoken in these boarding schools should be Castilian.

5.3. In the third stage, Charles III issued a Royal Decree in 1770 that brought about a radical change in the language planning implemented by his predecessors, the Habsburgs. The sole language of the empire was to be Castilian. The enumeration of all administrative and political positions of the Crown, as well as those of the Church and the cathedral chapters, was not accidental, because the king wanted to list all the offices so that his mandate (to uphold, fulfill, and execute) would be faithfully obeyed by all those who held them without delay.

The mandate was clear and precise: “that the different languages used in my domains be extinguished, and that only Castilian be spoken.” It not only proposed that Castilian be spoken (an aspiration also shared by the Habsburgs), but that the languages of the indigenous peoples be eradicated.

In the Royal Decrees of November 28, 1772, November 24, 1774, and October 3, 1803, as well as in the provisions of March 7, 1777, he reiterated more specifically the mandate not to allow the native languages to be spoken and ordered that schools be created in the Indian villages so that they could learn Castilian.

The decree of December 3, 1803, addressed to the Governor of New México, extended the prohibition against speaking any language other than Castilian to monasteries, convents, and official procedures. To have a legal instrument with which to penalize the colonial authorities who failed to comply with this mandate, they would be held accountable for non-compliance in the residencia trial.

What were the reasons that Charles III had for making this Copernican shift? In the last reigns of the Habsburgs, there was a notable increase in the number of decrees, ordinances and reports reminding the parish priests and authorities of the need to accelerate the learning of Castilian among the indigenous people and the creation of schools in the indigenous villages as the ideal instrument for this purpose.

During the Habsburg period, voices against their multilingual plan in the Americas were never silenced. With the accession of Charles III (reformer and first Bourbon king) and the pressure from some archbishops and bishops (such as the one in México), the triumph in Europe of absolutist ideas of Castilian acculturation was exploited by the Council of the Indies and the king.

VI. Conclusions

1. Acculturation was an essential characteristic of the anthropological history of humankind. Acculturation refers to all cultural phenomena resulting from the acquisition, modification, or reinterpretation of a culture, particularly the reception and assimilation of cultural elements from one social group by another, with adaptation to a new sociocultural context. The term acculturation was widely accepted among American anthropologists in the late 19th century to describe the changes that occurred when social groups with different cultural traditions came together. The annexation of Hispanoamérica under the Treaty of Tordesillas (1494) effectively implied Castilian acculturation through the political, economic, and legal institutions of the state, and this process was slow. The need to adapt the state's principles and norms to a different reality led to the development of a distinct legal system for the Indies to regulate the many situations not covered by the existing legal framework. The anthropological history of Castilian in the Indies raises the need for a new history that takes as its starting point the positions adopted by the various cultures. Our specific working hypothesis assumed that the confluence of languages in the Indies was a clear example of various acculturations (indigenous and Castilian).

2. There was no language shift of indigenous languages, but rather a confluence of acculturations (indigenous and Castilian), with social and cultural mixing. Guaraní, as a current co-official language with Spanish in Paraguay, represents the best example of this confluence of acculturations and has confirmed the working hypothesis. The incidental nature of the incorporation of the Indies into the Crown of Castile, by virtue of the donation from Pope Alexander VI to the Catholic Monarchs and their successors in the kingdoms of León and Castile of the lands discovered and yet to be discovered, determined that their legal configuration and organization were not carried out through the creation of a new legal system for them, but rather through the transplantation of the Castilian legal system. The need to adapt the principles and norms of this system to a different reality gave rise to the formation of a specific law for the Indies (el *indiano*), for the regulation of the many situations not covered by the former.

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

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

5. The missionaries dedicated themselves to learning indigenous languages as an extension of their religious apostolate. With the master key of language, they had to penetrate indigenous acculturation, understand their customs, comprehend their mentality, decipher their feelings and thoughts, and describe their history and their lives. This was not driven by an abstract scientific zeal, but rather by the desire to better understand the indigenous people, to facilitate their catechization, to combat their rites and superstitions, and to discover if these were subtly concealed behind an apparent Christianization. The very early introduction of printing to México (in 1539) by Bishop Fray Juan de Zumárraga, a Franciscan friar, responded to the same evangelizing need, and the oldest known Mexican printed work was indeed a *Breve y más enjundiosa doctrina christiana en lengua mexicana y castellana*.

6. Hispanoamérica was not a mosaic of languages and dialects, and its extreme fragmentation was fundamentally detrimental, with the exception of the spread of Quechua (in Argentina, Bolivia, Perú, Ecuador, and as far south as Colombia) and Guaraní. Quechua was the most widely spoken indigenous language in Hispanoamérica, with some six million speakers, who were also highly differentiated dialectally, and of whom four million also spoke Castilian. The current, and quite commendable, trend of educating indigenous people in their own languages and teaching them to read in their native tongues (a trend that began in México and spread to the Peruvian jungle) meant that indigenous people learned to read Castilian very early on, paradoxically facilitating their Castilian acculturation.

7. The case of Paraguay is unique in Hispanoamérica, since the entire country speaks Guaraní. There are no longer any indigenous people (except for some 40,000 living in the jungle). This astonishing fact was attributed to the work of the old Jesuit missions. The Jesuits won over the indigenous people by preaching to them in Guaraní: by 1750, they had 30 towns with some 150,000 indigenous inhabitants. It was a closed world (some even spoke of the Jesuit Kingdom of Paraguay), which was often in conflict, even engaging in bloody battles, with the authorities in Asunción. The missions operated in this way for about 150 years, until 1767, peacefully governed by a small number of religious figures. Guaraní is the second official language, but Spanish prevails in schools and universities and in public life. And it is undoubtedly the link that unites Paraguay with the community of Hispano-American's countries. The world today is moving towards universality, and for the 18 states that have Spanish as an official language and another 4 states as a co-official language, universality consists of being an active part of a linguistic community that has 630 million speakers.

8. The Crown of Castile did not maintain the same language planning in Hispanoamérica throughout the entire period, but rather had various actions, and fundamentally three stages can be distinguished:

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

9. The first stage was characterized by the rapid assimilation of the great Aztec and Quechua cultures and was surprising for the swift decision of the Catholic Monarchs to implement a minimum of Royal Decrees and other documents outlining the main principles of a language planning based on the mandatory learning of Castilian for all native inhabitants of the Indies. For the task of Castilianization, the queen relied on the invaluable participation of the Latin scholar E. A. de Nebrija, author of the *Gramática castellana* (1492), the first grammar of the Romance languages spoken in Europe, and of the explicit standardization of its orthography in his work *Reglas de ortografía castellana* (1516). In the "Prólogo" to the former, he clearly explained his reasons for writing it. The primary reason was to give Castilian stability, uniformity, and simplicity. The second was of a pedagogical nature, and the third explained that grammar could be used for knowledge of the Castilian legal system.

References

- Abad, F. (1991), "Historiografía del concepto de "español atlántico", in *Actas del del III Congreso Internacional del Español de América*, Valladolid, Junta de Castilla y León, I, 155-63.
- Alvar, M. (1996), "Introducción", in Alvar, M. (dir.) (1996), 3-18.
- (dir.) (1996), *Manual de dialectología hispánica. El español de América*, Barcelona, Ariel.
- Ardener, E. et al. (eds.) (1971), *Antropología social y lenguaje*, Buenos Aires, Paidós, 1976.
- Artola, M. (dir.) (1988-1993), *Enciclopedia de historia de España*, 7 vols., Madrid, Alianza.
- Barrero, A. M. (1993), "Las fuentes del derecho histórico español", in Artola, M. (dir.) (1988-1993), VII, 229-335.
- and Alonso, M. L. (1989), *Textos de derecho local español en la Edad Media. Catálogo de fueros y costums municipales*, Madrid, CSIC.
- Boyd Bowman, P. (1976), "Patterns of Spanish Emigration to the Indies until 1600", *Hispanic American Historical Review*, 56/4, 580-604.
- Cano, R. (coord.) (2004), *Historia de la lengua española*, 2nd ed., Barcelona, Ariel, 2013.
- Catalán, D. (1958), "Génesis del español atlántico", *Revista de Historia Canaria*, XXIV, 233-42.
- (ed.) (1962), *Estructuralismo e historia: miscelánea homenaje a A. Martinet*, III, La Laguna, Universidad de la Laguna.
- Dil, A. S. (ed.) (1972), *Language in sociocultural change. Essays by J. A. Fishman*, Stanford, California, Stanford University Press.
- 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.
- and Satorre, F. J. (eds.) (2013), *Historia de la pronunciación de la lengua castellana*, Valencia, Tirant Humanidades.
- Ferguson, C. A. (1959), "Diglossia", *Word*, 15, 325-40.
- Fishman, J. A. (1964/1968), "Language maintenance and language shift as a field of inquiry: Revisited", in Dil, A. S. (ed.) (1972), 76-134.
- (1971), "The sociology of language: An interdisciplinary social science approach to language in society", in Fishman, J. A. (ed.) (1971), I, 217-404.
- (ed.) (1971), *Advances in the sociology of language*, 2 vols., The Hague, Mouton.
- García de Cortázar, J. A. (1985), "Introducción: espacio, sociedad y organización medievales en nuestra tradición historiográfica", in García de Cortázar, J. A. et al. (1985), 11-42.
- et al. (1985), *Organización social del espacio en la España medieval. La Corona de Castilla en los siglos VIII a XV*, Barcelona, Ariel.
- Gimeno, F. (1979), "Sociolingüística: un modelo teórico", *Boletín de la Academia Puertorriqueña de la Lengua Española*, 7,1, 125-68.
- (1987), "A propósito de comunidad de habla: "The social dimension of Dialectology" de J. P. Rona", *Actas del I Congreso Internacional sobre el español de América* (San Juan de Puerto Rico, 1982), Madrid, Boletín de la Academia Puertorriqueña de la Lengua, 689-98.
- (1988), "Sociolingüística histórica", *Actas del XVIII Congreso Internacional de Linguistique et de Philologie Romanes*, V, Tübingen, M. Niemeyer, 111-20.
- (1990), *Dialectología y sociolingüística españolas*, 2nd ed., Alicante, Universidad de Alicante, 1993.
- (1995), *Sociolingüística histórica (siglos X-XII)*, Madrid, Visor Libros
- (2008), "La respuesta de la lengua española ante la globalización económica y el anglicismo léxico" (Tordesillas, 25-29 de octubre de 2005), *Actas del VI Congreso Internacional de "El español de América"*, Valladolid, Diputación de Valladolid, 251-68.
- (2019), *Historia antropológica de los romances hispanos*, San Millán de la Cogolla, Centro Internacional de la Lengua Española.

- (2023a), "Present and near future of Spanish", *IOSR-JHSS*, 28, 11, 2, 11-24.
- (2023b), "The Spanish of the United States of America", *IOSR-JHSS*, 28, 12, 1, 13-29.
- (2024a), "Linguistic change and languages in contact", *IOSR-JHSS*, 29, 10, 2, 35-49.
- (2024b), "Acculturation", *IOSR-JHSS*, 29, 11, 3, 17-32.
- (2025a), "Castilian acculturation", *IOSR-JHSS*, 30, 3, 5, 46-60.
- (2025b), "Anglo-Saxon acculturation", *IOSR-JHSS*, 30, 4, 6, 41-57.
- (2025c), "Medieval Castilian acculturation", *IOSR-JHSS*, 30, 7, 1, 38-51.
- (2025d), *Historia antropológica de la frontera valenciano-castellana meridional*, Alicante, Universidad de Alicante.
- (2025e), "Historical Sociolinguistics and acculturation", *IOSR-JHSS*, 30, 10, 4, 34-44.
- (2026a), "Anthropological History of Medieval Castile", *IOSR-JHSS*, 31, 5, 1, 42-64.
- (2026b), "Anthropological History of Spanish of America", *IOSR-JHSS*, 31, 5, 5, 16-31.
- and Gimeno, M. V. (2003), *El desplazamiento lingüístico del español por el inglés*, Madrid, Cátedra.
- (coord.) (2020), *Lengua, sociedad y cultura. Estudios dedicados a Alberto Carcedo González*, Alicante, Universidad de Alicante and University of Turku.
- Goebl, H. *et al.* (eds.) (1996/1997), *Contact Linguistics. An International Handbook of Contemporary Research*, 2 vols., Berlin, Walter de Gruyter.
- Haugen, E. (1953/1969), *The Norwegian language in America. A study in bilingual behavior*, 2nd ed., 2 vols., Bloomington, Indiana University Press, 1969.
- (1973), "Bilingualism, language contact, and immigrant languages in the United States: A research report 1956-1970", in Sebeok, T. A. (ed.) (1973), 505-91.
- Herranz, A. (1996), *Estado, sociedad y lenguaje. La política lingüística en Honduras*, Tegucigalpa, Guaymuras.
- Hockett, C. F. (1958/1962), *Curso de lingüística moderna*, 4th ed., Buenos Aires, Eudeba, 1971.
- Hymes, D. (1971), "La sociolingüística y la etnografía del habla", in Ardener, E. *et al.* (eds.) (1971), 115-51.
- (1974), *Foundations in sociolinguistics. An ethnography approach*, London, Tavistock.
- Imhoff, B. J. (1999), "Review of F. Gimeno Menéndez, *Sociolingüística histórica (Siglos X -XII)*", *Southwest Journal of Linguistics*, 18, 1: 132-4.
- Jakobson, R. (1962), "Why 'mama' and 'papa'?", in *Selected Writings*, I, Paris - The Hague, 538-45.
- (1970), "Relaciones entre la ciencia del lenguaje y las otras ciencias", in Jakobson, R. (1976), 11-82.
- (1976), *Nuevos ensayos de lingüística general*, México, Siglo XXI.
- Lapesa, R. (1963), "El andaluz y el español de América", in *Presente y futuro de la lengua española*, Madrid, OFINES, II, 173-82.
- Lehmann, W. P. and Malkiel, Y. (eds.) (1968), *Directions for historical linguistics: A symposium*, Austin, University of Texas Press.
- López Morales, H. (1983), *Estratificación social del español de Puerto Rico*, UNAM.
- (1989), *Sociolingüística*, 3rd ed., Madrid, Gredos, 2004.
- (1996), "Rasgos generales", in Alvar, M. (dir.) (1996) 19-27.
- (1998), *La aventura del español en América*, Madrid, Espasa Calpe.
- (2008), "Introducción: presencia histórica de lo hispano", in López Morales, H. (coord.) (2008), 31.

- (2012), *La lengua española en el mundo actual*, Valencia, Aduana Vieja.
- (coord.) (2008), *Enciclopedia del español en los Estados Unidos*, Madrid, Instituto Cervantes.
- Malkiel, Y. (1976), "From Romance Philology through dialect geography to sociolinguistics", *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 9, 59-84.
- Malmberg, B. (1963), "Tradición hispánica e influencia indígena en la fonética hispanoamericana", in *Presente y futuro de la lengua española*, Madrid, OFINES, II, 227-43.
- Menéndez Pidal, R. ((1962), "Sevilla frente a Madrid", in Catalán, D. (ed.) (1962), III, 99-165.
- Nebrija, A de (1492), *Gramática de la lengua castellana*, Est. and edn. A. Quilis, Madrid, Editora Regional, 1980.
- Rivarola, J. L. (2004), "La difusión del español en el Nuevo Mundo", in Cano, R. (coord.) (2004), 799-823.
- Rosenblat, A. (1963), "La hispanización de América. El castellano y las lenguas indígenas desde 1492", in *Presente y futuro de la lengua española*, Madrid, OFINES, II, 189-216.
- Sebeok, T. A. (ed.) (1973), *Current trends in linguistics. Linguistics in North America*, The Hague-Paris, Mouton.
- Torreblanca, M. (2010), "Orígenes del sistema grafo-fonológico del castellano medieval", *Aemilianense*, II, 291-333.
- Vaquero, M. (1996), "Antillas", in Alvar, M. (dir.) (1996), 51-67.
- Weinreich, U. (1953), *Languages in contact. Findings and problems*, 7th ed., 1970. Trad. cat. *Llengües en contacte*, Alzira, Bromera, 1996.
- , Labov, W. and Herzog, M. I. (1968), "Empirical foundation for a theory of language change", in Lehmann, W. P. and Malkiel, Y. (eds.) (1968), 95-195.