IOSR Journal Of Humanities And Social Science (IOSR-JHSS)
Volume 30, Issue 3, Series 5 (March, 2025) 46-60
e-ISSN: 2279-0837, p-ISSN: 2279-0845.
www.iosrjournals.org

Castilian Acculturation

Francisco Gimeno-Menéndez
University Of Alicante

Summary
Acculturation was an essential feature of human history. Acculturation has been used to describe all cultural events resulting from the acquisition, modification, or reinterpretation of a culture, particularly the reception and assimilation of cultural elements specific to one social group by another. The term "acculturation" became widely accepted among American anthropologists in the late 19th century to refer to the changes that occurred when social groups with different cultural traditions united. The Spanish American annexation under the Tratado de Tordesillas (1494) effectively implied Castilian acculturation through the political, economic, and legal institutions of the State, and was slow to develop. The incidental nature of the incorporation of the Indies into the Corona de Castilla, by virtue of the concession by Papa Alejandro VI to the Reyes Católicos, determined that their legal configuration and organization were not achieved through the creation of a " novo " law for them, but rather through the transplantation of the Castilian legal system. The need to adapt the principles and standards of the latter to a different reality led to the formation of a law specific to the Indies, to regulate the many situations not covered by the former. There was no linguistic substitution of indigenous languages by Castilian, but rather various language planning. Guaraní, as the current co-official language with Spanish in Paraguay, has represented the best example of Castilian acculturation.

Keywords: *Acculturation, historical sociolinguistics, Castilianization, General language, Council of the Indies, Language planning.*

Date of Submission: 13-03-2025 Date of Acceptance: 23-03-2025

I. Introduction

The entry of anthropology into medieval history was one of the most significant historiographical developments in the last third of the last century. Indeed (since 1970), there was an enrichment of perspectives and a deepening of knowledge about the configuration of society, and especially its behavior in relation to the occupied territory. 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. He 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 came later, and could be dated to the end of the last century. F. Gimeno (1988, 1990: 138-44) showed that sociolinguistics was born from an anthropological commitment that ultimately considered linguistics as a chapter of social and cultural anthropology (and the psychology of knowledge). General sociolinguistics, as an extension and revision of institutional disciplines (linguistics, sociology, and anthropology), integrated a *sociology of language* and a *strict sociolinguistics*, as well as the *ethnography of communication* (see C. A. Ferguson, 1959; J. A. Fishman, 1971; D. Hymes, 1974; F. Gimeno, 2019: 182-96).

Studies on language contact and culture contact in Europe did not enjoy widespread coordination, although the precursors were European (W. Leopold, E. Haugen and U. Weinreich). U. Weinreich (1953: 37-40) commented that for some anthropologist language contact was nothing more than an aspect of culture contact, and language transfer was a facet of social diffusion and acculturation. However, despite the increase in anthropological interest in problems of contact, particularly in the United States of America after the First World War, studies on language contact and culture contact did not enjoy widespread coordination, nor was the relationship between the two fields of study properly defined.

The most important issue in language transfer was the interaction of social and cultural factors that promoted or impeded such transfer. Anthropologists investigating acculturation were forced to include linguistic evidence as an indication of the overall process of acculturation, while linguists needed the help of anthropology to describe and analyze those factors that governed language transfer and were truly within the scope of culture.

Within the broader sociocultural framework of languages in contact, U. Weinreich (1953: 236-43) described language substitution as the displacement of the habitual use of one language by that of another. Language substitution, which involved changes in the social and cultural functions of a language, had to be distinguished from language change, which considered the process of transformation of the structure of the language over time, space, society and situation (see F. Gimeno and M. V. Gimeno, 2003: 24-64, 101-35).

The hypothesis of human history as a succession of acculturations was more appropriate to linguistic, social, and cultural facts and to the continuity of history itself. One of the most consistently upheld principles in historical linguistics was acculturation. There was no linguistic change without languages in contact, and both the history of linguistic change and language substitution were part of acculturation, stemming from social and cultural diffusion. It was not, therefore, merely a linguistic issue, but also a social and cultural one. The overriding principle of the history of linguistic change and language substitution was the acculturation of social groups.

1.2. Our working hypothesis has been that within the anthropological history of the Spanish language there was a linguistic and cultural continuity, based on the successive and diverse historical acculturations (Indo-European, Basque-Iberian, Pheno-Punic-Greek, Roman, Christian, Germanic, Visigothic, Byzantine, Islamic, Aragonese-Catalan, Castilian and Anglo-Saxon), with the linguistic and cultural transfers that implied the social and cultural mixing of these groups, and the adaptation to a new sociocultural context.

During the second half of the last century, major contributions to historical linguistics were accumulated, which were far from being recognized by historians of language, and which have represented great successes and technical applications in the face of decontextualized purposes and hitherto inexplicable events. The only viable solution was the intrinsic relationship between language, society, and culture. Acculturation has been an essential characteristic of human history (see F. Gimeno, 2019, 2024a, 2024b).

The association between structure and homogeneity was a false assumption, since linguistic structure included the orderly differentiation of social groups and registers, through rules governing variation within the speech community. Moreover, a “structured heterogeneity” of language was proposed, and maternal dominance implied the control of such heterogeneous structures (see U. Weinreich, W. Labov and M. I. Herzog, 1968: 187-8; F. Gimeno, 1990: 79-87).

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

II. Acculturation

Acculturation referred to all cultural events resulting from the acquisition, modification, or reinterpretation of a culture, particularly the reception and assimilation of cultural elements specific to one social group by another, with adaptation to a new sociocultural context. The term *acculturation* became widely accepted among American anthropologists in the late 19th century to refer to the changes that occurred when social groups with different cultural traditions united, and there was no distinction between whether it should be applied to the results or the processes of cultural change.

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

2.1. An anthropological investigation of the history of language proposed the deduction of linguistic variables and the social and cultural factors of the past, and verified them empirically in the present. Historical sociolinguistics faced the need to materialize the most plausible working hypotheses on the historical, sociological and cultural reconstruction of the processes of oral formation and written standardization of Romance languages, based on empirical principles for a grammatical theory of linguistic change. In accordance with these foundations, it has gone beyond the descriptive contributions of historical pragmatics, based on the functionalist analysis of stable discursive traditions of written texts (see B. Frank and J. Hartmann, 1997; D. Jacob and J. Kabatek, 2001; F. Gimeno, 1988, 1995).

The autonomous version of linguistic change advocated by the Neogrammarians was unacceptable in our time, and the phonological rules of historical-comparative linguistics were simplifications of linguistic change. This was especially true when we considered the geographical and social differentiation of language, within its own "structured heterogeneity," and variability as part of the communicative competence of the various generational and social groups that coexisted within the speech community. Only in this way was it possible for the social history of language to become a true reality, with the necessary complementarity between homogeneity and heterogeneity. Moreover, both linguistic change and the change underway were neither mechanical nor merely phonologically determined.

Innovations were ongoing linguistic variations and changes that could only be fully and completely understood and explained in relation to social and cultural factors, and not in linguistic characteristics for their social and cultural justification. Languages were excellent instruments of expression and communication of the cognitive development of social groups within a speech community. Linguistic change was never a problem, nor even a complex matter of oral or written traditions, but a process in which the successive generational replacement of different social groups and diverse cultures was directly involved. The analysis and delimitation of the complex relationships between linguistic variables and social and cultural factors, as well as the historical, sociological, cultural and legal determinants of the various Romance-speaking communities, was fundamental (see B. Malmberg, 1966: 207-22; F. Gimeno, 1995: 39-53, 2019: 343-51).

Faced with a partial diachrony of the various linguistic levels (and even, descriptively, of all of them) of the Romance languages, we should nowadays assume an anthropological history of the communicative competences of successive generations and social groups, within the various Romance-speaking communities (see H. López Morales, 1989, 2006; F. Gimeno, 1995: 27-39). The qualitative and autonomous descriptions of linguistic change in the Latin compilation of early medieval Riojan glossaries prevented us from understanding the social multilingualism of hybrid manuscripts, by regulating the linguistic variables and (social and cultural) factors of the texts.

In this sense, synchronic monolingual description techniques were insufficient and inadequate in themselves for the analysis of linguistic variation in these manuscripts, and the study of the sociological, cultural and legal changes that determined the written standardization of the romances. Only in this way have we revised the hypotheses of historical dialectology and diachronic functionalism that prevailed throughout the last century, and we offer new research on the anthropological history of the formation of Hispanic Romance languages.

2.2. There were many acculturation processes that took place through language. M. Alvar (1996: 13-8) noted that Castilian to the new reality of America that conditioned it, and Castilian served as an instrument to save cultures doomed to disappear. Not only because of the trauma of annexation, but language was the prodigious instrument that allowed the spread of civilizations that otherwise would have had very little impact in America, such as the Taíno. The Castilian aided the mutual communication of the aboriginal peoples, thanks to the designation of a general language: Castilian and the Castilian established arts, lexicons, and confessionals with a multitude of issues that today we call anthropological.

Two different reasons, but with similar meaning: the language of Castile was the instrument that in both cases fulfilled a singular purpose. Today, more than five hundred years later, that language unites Spanish speakers from both continents, and language continues to be what unites us beyond skin color, religious beliefs, social structures, or political orders. Unity was there, in the miracle of understanding, and variety was the other wonder of the particularity that enriched what was united.

But the Spanish of America followed its own history, and the language became more Indianized as knowledge of reality advanced. The Castilian language needed a process of acculturation, and it became mestizo, because only through mestizaje could the old, valid, and the new reality be preserved. In a process repeated a thousand times, the language had adapted to the needs of a new society and culture, and had been enriched. In contact with other cultures, the language underwent exchanges and was modified: Castilian acculturation changed the previous situation, and America lives on in it, mestizo and irreversible, motivated by history. There wasn't just one Spanish from Spain and another from America, but many Castilians on both sides of the ocean. There wasn't one "best language," but rather a language for each and every one to us all, and we created the system of systems that was general Castilian.

2.3. The history of Castilian in the New World was primarily the history of Spanish, and we would be wrong to consider the American magnitude of the language limited to an episodic phenomenon of transplantation, as if it continued unchanged over the course of history. Regarding the spread of Castilian in the Indies, J. L. Rivarola (2004: 799-800) argued that the American transplant 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 geographic and

social space, but also a new mental space, within which the signs of a new linguistic identity were slowly, difficultly, and sometimes contradictorily forged.

As is well known, in the late 15th and early 16th centuries, certain changes were in the process of consolidation or expansion that affected the various linguistic subsystems and led to a more or less profound restructuring of the language. While the Iberian Peninsula had achieved relative linguistic unity with the expansion of Castilian, the latter had not been immune to internal differentiation related to the chronology of that expansion and its contact with related varieties. For now, it is clear that a bifurcation between a northern-central system and a southern one had been emerging for some time. Thus, a language in the process of unitary consolidation reached America, but as a complete and total Castilian, albeit still with large margins of internal variation.

Indeed, the historical-demographic research carried out by P. Boyd Bowman (1976), and aimed at determining 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 in the majority, especially in the first decades, which coincides with the Andalusian linguistic matrix of the later Hispanic-American linguistic identity.

A cumulative count covering the entire 16th century shows 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 that could be considered speakers of southern varieties totaled just over 18,000 individuals, the three remaining cities that could be considered speakers of non-southern varieties totaled just over 9,000 individuals. However, the regional and social components of the first strata of Castilian acculturation were undoubtedly reinforced or weakened depending on the nature of subsequent migratory overlaps. In this way, the linguistic physiognomy of the regions was configured and the foundations for continued evolution were laid. This meant that the Castilian transplanted to America underwent a process of *patrimonial restructuring*.

Judging by the textual evidence, indigenisms were generally introduced in a confrontational manner, either alongside the Hispanic synonym or parasynonym, or provided with a periphrasis relative to the referent in question. Of course, oral usage could involve different modalities and rhythms of adaptation, and this was justified by the novelty of the material and the environment. The oldest and most established indigenisms were soon integrated into a usage that dispensed with metalinguistic markers, and they gradually increased in number as the range of languages with which they came into contact expanded.

The adoption of indigenous loanwords into Castilian resulted from language contact. However, this contact did not necessarily imply, in all cases, extensive acculturation processes among the human groups involved. Thus, in the case of the loanwords most abundantly and rapidly adopted by Castilian in the first decades of acculturation, namely Taíno loanwords, a large-scale Castilianization of the indigenous population cannot be postulated, as they appear to have disappeared in a relatively short period of time.

2.4. Historians had accepted without discussion that the 16th century was significant as a stage in which the relationship between the European and American environments was consolidated. This process of *creolization*, achieved in all domains and obtained with the purpose of acculturation, began in the Antilles, whose geographical location served as a basis for the annexation of the continent. M. Vaquero (1996) alluded to the fact that the Antillean islands were unique destination points in the first years of acculturation, which would end up developing a mobile and transit society as opposed to definitive settlements.

Considering the majority presence of Andalusians during the first stage of acculturation, in which Andalusian women also represented 67% of the transplanted female population, it should come as no surprise that the first linguistic leveling was of a southern peninsular nature. If we also recall the importance of trade during this initial period, there was no doubt that *majority* and *prestige* acted as conditioning factors for Antillean leveling, since 49% of Andalusians were traders and merchants. These data allow us to accept that Andalusianism acted as a leveling mechanism, resulting in the first creolization of Castilian in America (see D. Catalán, 1958; R. Menéndez Pidal, 1962; R. Lapesa, 1963).

The Antillean standard spread to the American continent, where it coexisted with speech patterns originating from the central and northern peninsula, arriving with subsequent waves of migration. In this second phase, therefore, and without forgetting the native presence, the creolized people of the Antilles shared their space with those arriving directly from the Peninsula, a situation that made possible the coexistence of the first standard (a product of the first Andalusian leveling) with the second, northern peninsular standard, arriving with direct migrations. The subsequent development of Latin American linguistic modalities confirmed that the coexistence of standards included a continuous transfer of users from one to the other, in a process that could have been extremely slow, and whose final result depended, in each territory, on many other specific factors. However, it should not be overlooked that the *seseo*, brought to the American continent with the Antillean-Andalusian standard, eventually established itself as 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 Castilian of this area was based on a simplified and creolized system, developed since the 16th century by contact between different African ethnic groups and Peninsular Castilian, or by contact between Castilian and a Portuguese-based proto-language used in the Caribbean by Africans. This hypothesis assumed a sociolinguistic situation in the colonial Castilian Antilles that which existed in the French or Saxon Caribbean (favorable to the development of creole languages), but without convincing documentary support.

Current Antillean Spanish (after five centuries of adaptations, adoptions, and influences) presents dialectal characteristics that allow it to be described as an insular Caribbean modality, with an Andalusian-Canarian base, 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 Puerto Rico's special political situation, Spanish is the mother tongue in all three countries, conditioned by the sociocultural factors specific to each one, and without having produced the development of any creole language, in the manner of French-based *creoles* (Haiti, Martinique) or Saxon (English-speaking, Virgin Islands).

2.5. Latin America is a dialectal mosaic. In his "General Features" of Latin America, H. López Morales (1996) argued that fortunately, the days when important Hispanic American intellectuals expressed concern about the unity of the Spanish language on the continent are definitely over. Hispanic cultural unity was preserved, and the basis of this ever-renewed Hispanism was the language, although this does not mean that we are dealing with a homogeneous language. If Spanish is a dialectal diasystem, a huge part of it is found on American soil, which is home to approximately 90 percent of all the world's Spanish speakers.

The factors that once led to these differences appear to be the same ones that the history of languages has long taught us: diverse dialectal origins of the colonizers, a diversity of aboriginal languages, notable isolation between the founding nuclei, the absence of leveling language policies, among other lesser factors. Regarding the indigenous influence, it is necessary to clarify some points. Perhaps this influence is already mentioned too frequently, but two very distinct phenomena must be delineated: the influence of the indigenous mother tongue on the Spanish of bilingual speakers whose command of the learned language does not reach satisfactory levels of competence, and the influence of indigenous elements on monolingual speakers of Spanish from the various speech communities.

Examples of the first case multiply as studies on languages in contact increase. Morphosyntax, vocabulary, and phonetics all exhibit, depending on the case, more or less eloquent examples of linguistic transfer. In reality, one cannot speak here of an "indigenous influence" on American Spanish. The influence is limited to cases of grammatical transgressions in Spanish, due primarily to imperfect learning processes. However, in those situations where the indigenous presence is found in the Spanish of monolinguals, or even in that of balanced bilinguals, then we are indeed witnessing a genuine linguistic influence of one language on another.

Regarding the latter, the American continent presents a very diverse gradation, ranging from the Antilles, where this presence is limited to a few lexical elements, to countries like Peru and Bolivia, where, for well-known sociohistorical reasons, the influence is considerably greater, although we cannot precisely define it. In any case, the indigenous influence that American Spanish may have today is generally quite weak. The bibliography on this set of dialectal zones that constitutes American Spanish, already impressive in its number, highlights 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 Corona de Castilla, according to A. M. Barrero (1993: 271-4), by virtue of the donation by Papa Alejandro VI to the Reyes Católicos and their successors in the kingdoms of León and Castilla of the discovered and undiscovered lands, determined that their legal configuration and organization was not carried out from the creation of a "ex novo" law for them, but rather through the transplantation of the Castilian legal system. The need to adapt the principles and norms of the latter to a different reality was what gave rise to the formation (as a special or *municipal* law of Castilian) of a law specific to the Indies (the "*indiano*"), 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 force in its entirety with a general character, until in 1614 the application of the new legislation to the Indies was reduced to the provisions that expressly established it and received the transfer to the Council of the Indies, or to those instances in which it was obliged by punctual referral of the Indian norms.

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

broadest sense as any provision emanating from a specific authority, and therefore, the Indian normative system appeared to be integrated by:

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 also very limited, number of pragmatic laws, since, by nature, they were provisions of higher rank ("as made and promulgated in Cortes") on matters of general interest, as was also their validity, they proved to be little suitable for the organization of domains as vast and diverse as the Indies. Among these pragmatic laws, the *Leyes Nuevas* on the good treatment of the Indians promulgated by Carlos I in 1542 and 1543 stood out for their special significance.
3) The A*sientos* or *Capitulaciones* established by the Crown with private individuals requesting a license to discover or settle, which established the conditions and method of carrying out the enterprise. Difficult to define in terms of their legal nature (contractual, privileged?), these legal texts were used until the middle of the 16th century, and these situations, which were much less frequent, were subsequently regulated in general terms by the "Ordenanzas de descubrimientos y nuevas poblaciones" promulgated by Felipe II in 1573.
4) The governing mandates issued by the king and the Consejo de Indias to the American institutions and authorities, in the form of provisions, decrees, ordinances, instructions, and royal letters. Designed to resolve a wide variety of issues, these types of provisions constituted the majority of Indian laws, and were characterized by their extreme casuistry and particularism, since they were not usually issued with a general scope, but rather, when submitted to a specific authority, their application was limited to that authority's domain of action.
5) The government provisions and ordinances issued by the American authorities (viceroys, governors, audiences, consulates, municipalities, etc.) on their own initiative acquired the rank of royal provisions when approved by the sovereign, while if this was not the case, their application was conditioned by their adequacy to the royal laws and those of Castile. The distance from the metropolis, the convenience of direct knowledge of the situations to be regulated, the need on occasions to find immediate solutions greatly encouraged the initiative of the Indian authorities, giving rise to copious legislation fully differentiated from that formed in Spain, which integrated what had agreed to be called *Derecho indiano criollo*.

3.2. In the eyes of the Castilian monarchs, with no other knowledge of the American reality than that derived from indirect and often mediated information, this broad and diverse legislative baggage appeared complete and sufficient, and as a singular law, it filled the gaps in the common law of the kingdom, which was also fully in force in the new lands. Therefore, it was not considered necessary or appropriate to accommodate other sources of law within the system, since when 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 in 1555, this was not due to a legal insufficiency, but in response to the difficulties of the native population (with a lower cultural level) in knowing and understanding the royal laws.

However, the American authorities did not see it this way, and did not hesitate to recognize the existence of a judicial practice arising from the need to adapt the rules to reality, nor to accept the increasingly intense development of custom, which made it possible to fill both the absence of rules and the void that arose when, because they were inadequate to specific circumstances, their application was ignored by resorting, very common in the Indies, to the Castilian principle of "obey but do not comply."

Another serious difficulty arising from the legalistic nature of the Indian system (casuism and particularism), which the peninsular and Indian authorities had to face, was that of ensuring knowledge of the law, a prerequisite and essential condition for its compliance. To this end, in accordance with the criteria of the time and without prejudice to a series of measures for immediate application, such as the mandatory printing of the pragmatics, the publication of the laws (their conservation and inventory) and the creation of tables or indexes of the same that had to be displayed in the most crowded places in the population centers, efforts were directed towards the creation of a compilation to be promulgated generally.

3.3. The first initiatives, which arose on both sides of the Atlantic and were unconnected, led to the drafting of several projects in the last decades of the 16th century. Some were unsuccessful, such as that of Ovando, whose Code, undoubtedly the most complete and perfect, only a few of its titles were promulgated as ordinances (those of the Council in 1571, the aforementioned ones on discoveries and new populations, those on royal patronage in 1574, etc.). Others were successfully completed, such as the *Cedulario del oidor de la audiencia novo -hispana* (Vasco de Puga), published in Mexico in 1563, and the "four volumes of printed cedulas"

(in 1596), compiled in their entirety and in systematic order at the request of the Council by its official of the chamber of justice, Diego de Encinas.

Seven years later, in 1603, the Council once again, and this time definitively, addressed the compilation tasks that had lasted almost the entire century and in which various prestigious jurists participated simultaneously or successively. Among them were Solórzano Pereira, León Pinelo, and, finally, Jiménez de Paniagua, who did not hesitate to report unfavorably 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 was finally promulgated with general scope by King Carlos II in 1680.

Such a long and laborious process resulted in an aging work, which would soon be overtaken by the abundant reformist legislation of the Bourbons, and in need of constant correction and updating. This was carried out initially through legal and literary work, and from 1740 through its additions in successive editions. Only in 1776, at the instigation of the all-powerful minister José de Gálvez, did Carlos III order the creation of a *Nuevo Código* which, despite the fact that its first book had been promulgated, ended up being a new frustrated project, both due to the dynamics of the compilation tasks and due to political events.

IV. Castilian Acculturation

In the Hispanization of America (Castilian and Indigenous Languages since 1492), A. Rosenblat (1963) wrote that the process of Hispanization (which began on October 12, 1492) was not over after four hundred and seventy years, but that knowledge of the path taken was important. The Indian or Castilian interpreter represented the first stage, that of approximation. Undoubtedly, the stable forms of coexistence were more important, and of these three in particular: work, interbreeding, and catechization. However, the latter worried the Almirante from the outset, since it appeared as a fundamental condition of Castilia's rights in the bulls of Papa Alejandro VI (1493), in the Tratado de Tordesillas (June 7, 1494) signed between the representatives of Juan II of Portugal and those of the Reyes Católicos, and as a supreme objective in the Instructions of the Reyes Católicos.

4.1. From his first letters (November 2 and 12, 1492), Cristóbal Colón spoke of Christianization. On November 27, he announced that he would have people from his household learn the Indian language, and that efforts would be made to make all the new towns Christian. The Royal Instructions from the entire early period included the teaching of Castilian as part of catechization. On Columbus's second voyage, the King and Queen sent Father Boyl, a man they trusted completely, for whom they had obtained a papal bull with extraordinary powers. He was accompanied by other religious men, charged with transmitting the things of Catholic faith to the Indians in our language, "trying to instruct them in it as best as possible." The Royal Instruction of 1503 stipulated that the Indians should be grouped into villages ("to be indoctrinated as free people that they are, and not as servants") and that in each of them there should be a church and a chaplain, who should instruct the children and teach them to read and write, cross themselves and confess, and the prayers were usually taught in Latin (the Paternoster, the Hail Mary, the Creed and the Salve Regina).

Castilian was the general instrument of catechization, and it is known that Friar Alonso del Espinar, upon returning to the Isla Española (Haiti) in 1512, brought with him 2,000 primers provided by the House of Trade of the Indies. Teaching Castilian at that time implied teaching Latin: a Royal Decree of 1513 stipulated that the children of the caciques of the Española should receive *gramática* instruction (that is, Latin language and literature) from the bachelor Hernán Xuárez, and for this purpose he was given twenty copies of Nebrija's *Art*. Through various means, a familiar relationship was established between Castilians and Indians, "the languages of both mingling," said Pedro Mártir.

The Castilianization of the Antillean islands was rapid, perhaps too rapid, and so profound that none of the islands colonized by the Castilian produced a mixed language. It is well known that the Antillean Indian quickly became extinct in the face of new social conditions, decimated by epidemics and diseases for which they lacked defenses or absorbed by the dissolving action of miscegenation. In truth, contrary to what was believed, small indigenous groups (entirely Castilianized) still existed until the end of the last century, in Cuba and Santo Domingo, and it is not difficult today to recognize the indigenous heritage in a large part of the Antillean population. And even in his Castilian, in which hundreds of words survived, many of which (*maíz*, *batata*, *ají*, *maní*, *cacique*, *canoa*, *piragua*, *hamaca*, *huracán*, *carey*, *tiburón*, *tabaco*) enriched the Castilian language. In any case, Castilianization ultimately meant the disappearance of the Antillean Indian.

4.2. The same thing happened along almost the entire American coast and in much of the interior. The impressive diversity of languages (the so-called linguistic atomization of the Americas) favored the imposition of Castilian, the only truly general language. But where small groups of Castilian settlers encountered dense indigenous populations, culturally, socially, and politically cohesive, 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 plateaus of Mexico and Central America, or those of Peru, Ecuador, and Bolivia. Or, in very

special circumstances, the coexistence between Castilian and Guaraní in the lands of Paraguay and in the old Jesuit missions of the Rio de la Plata.

The conquest would, in fact, imply Castilianization, through the political, economic, and legal institutions of the State, and it had to be slow. The colonial regime was superimposed on indigenous society, which generally continued to maintain its old molds (the Royal Charters, since 1512, maintained the privileges of "the natural lords"). But the annexation ultimately had only a 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 presented as a slow, multi-generational undertaking, but rather immediate and radical. Conquest and Christianization would be one and the same.

However, there was no Spanish American conquest, but rather annexation by virtue of the Tratado de Tordesillas (1494), which effectively implied Castilian acculturation through the political, economic, and legal institutions of the Corona de Castilla. Acculturation was an essential characteristic of human history, and the overriding principle of the history of linguistic change and language substitution was the acculturation of social groups.

In anthropological history of the Spanish language, there was a linguistic and cultural continuity, based on the successive and diverse historical acculturations (Indo-European, Basque-Iberian, Pheno-Punic-Greek, Roman, Christian, Germanic, Visigothic, Byzantine, Islamic, Aragonese-Catalan, Castilian and Anglo-Saxon), with the linguistic and cultural transfers that implied the social and cultural mixing of the various groups and the adaptation to a new sociocultural context. (see J. A. García de Cortázar, 1973, 2012, 2016; F. Gimeno 2016a, 2016b, 2019; F. Gimeno (coord.) 2020).

4.3. The founding of the Church in America was the responsibility of the mendicant orders. The missionaries understood that this situation could not continue, since it was not feasible to violently Castilianize the Indians, much less wait for them to become Castilianized through the slow action of centuries. It was necessary to approach the mountains, and for the missionaries to learn the languages of the Indians as quickly as possible in order to preach to them in their own languages, hear their confessions, and administer the sacraments in their own languages, and to indoctrinate and elevate them to the Christian faith through them.

The Castilian language was not essential to be a Christian. Hence the missionary zeal in which Franciscans, Dominicans, and Augustinians (later joined by the Jesuits and other orders) competed to learn 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 colonizer thus subordinated himself, generally ignored the fate of the Castilian language.

From the very beginning, Friar Bartolomé de Olmedo delivered eloquent sermons, which interpreters translated for the Indians. Throughout the early period, preaching was done through interpreters or sign language. When the first Franciscans arrived in Tlaxcala in 1524 and encountered a large crowd of Indians on market day, Fray Mendieta said that since they could not speak to them, "by signs (like mutes) they pointed to the sky, trying to make them understand that they had come to show them the treasures and grandeurs that lay on high." Confessions were necessarily conducted with the help of interpreters.

The missionaries devoted themselves to learning indigenous languages as an extension of their religious apostolate. With the master key of language, they had to penetrate the mysterious and fearsome world of the Indians, learn their customs, understand their mentality, decipher their feelings and thoughts, describe their history, their life. 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 Indians, to facilitate their catechization, to combat their rites and superstitions, and discover whether these were disguised behind an apparent Christianization.

To know their languages, to study their grammar, to translate prayers, sermons, catechisms, and sacred texts into them, not out of linguistic zeal, incomprehensible at the time, but as an indispensable instrument for spreading the sacred word to new lands and new souls. The very early introduction of the printing press in Mexico (in 1539) by Bishop Fray Juan de Zumárraga, a Franciscan priest, 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 document in Lima was also a trilingual document, in Castilian, Quechua, and Aymara. The friars devoted themselves diligently to linguistic work, which seemed to them a pressing need. And they alternated missionary work with teaching languages to other friars. To this end, they developed art, vocabulary, doctrines, confessionals, and translated gospels, epistles, sermons, homilies, and lives of saints. Even parish registers and tax books were written in the indigenous language.

4.4. Most monks in Nueva España learned Náhuatl. Others learned Mixtec, Zapotec, Huastec, Chontal, Otomi, Totonac, Tarascan, etc. The Dominicans devoted themselves to this work, encouraged by their Papa Pío

V. Among the Augustinians, the study of languages was mandatory, and the congregation practiced ten different languages in Mexico. The Franciscans had a group of notable linguists. It is said that Fray Andrés de Olmos preached in at least ten languages (he left grammars for Totonac, Tepehua, Huastec, and Náhuatl, the latter considered the best of its time). It was quite common in three languages.

The diversity of indigenous languages exasperated the religious leaders, who saw it as an obstacle to their work. They quickly realized the need to adopt an auxiliary language, and between the Castilian of the colonists (spoken by a few) and the Náhuatl of the indigenous people (spoken by the majority), which became a kind of *lingua franca* of the Aztec Empire, they chose Náhuatl. Viceroy Luis de Velasco addressed King Philip II on September 30, 1558, informing him that Fray Francisco de Toral, provincial of the Franciscans, who had just visited Nueva Galicia, requested the founding of a school in Guadalajara to bring together young people from different regions and teach Náhuatl 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 at the same time), also tried to incorporate all the Indians into the dominant language, which from the beginning was called, with greater or lesser justification, "the general language." The same thing happened in Perú.

Felipe II consecrated the area in his Royal Decree of September 19, 1580 and ordered that chairs of the "general language of the Indians" be established in the universities of Lima and Mexico City, and in the cities where there was a Royal Audience. He also ordered that the prelates of the Indies not ordain a priest or grant licenses to clerics or religious who did not know the "general language" of the Indians of the province. The monks devoted themselves with such zeal to spreading the "general language" that by 1584, Náhuatl was spoken from Zacatecas to Nicaragua. Thus, the paradoxical situation arose that under Castilian rule, Náhuatl reached an expansion that it had not seen during the period of greatest splendor of the Aztec Empire, thanks to the work of Castilian missionaries.

Quechua also reached its greatest expansion and new glory (both theatrical and poetic) under Castilian rule. Aymara gradually lost its status as a "general language," and at its expense and that of other languages, Quechua spread throughout various parts of Peru. Similarly, missionaries spread Cuzco Quechua, beginning in the 16th century, throughout much of Ecuador, southern Colombia, and the Upper Amazon. The same happened with the Muisca or Chibcha language of the Colombian plateau (in 1619, F. Bernardo de Lugo published his *Gramática en la lengua general del Nuevo Reino llamado Mosca* in Madrid, and later with the Tupi-Guarani of the Jesuit missions, which became the general language of Paraguay, much of the River Plate coast, Rio Grande do Sul, and much of Brazil.

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 the 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 general language removed the Indians from the isolation of their tribe and incorporated them into a larger community, more open 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 spread throughout the Americas as part of religious instruction. By the early 17th century, the Jesuits at the Caxica mission in Nueva Granada had taught more than forty boys who read Romance and Latin, and they celebrated Mass, sang, and prayed in both Castilian and indigenous languages. From the earliest times, there were prominent Indians who incorporated themselves into Castilian culture: Hernando de Alvarado Tezozómoc, a descendant of the kings of México (grandson of Moctezuma), author of a *Crónica Mexicana*, in a Castilian that was sometimes stammered or incorrect, but always agile and colorful. And in Perú, the Inca Titu Cusi Yupanqui, baptized as Diego de Castro, and others. They were testimonies of the acculturation—perfect in some cases, imperfect in others—of the Castilian language and culture from the very beginning by privileged sectors. But the bulk of the population remained immersed in their indigenous language.

4.5. However, there was something more important. Given the initial results from the Isla Española, the Monarchs recommended to the authorities that they concentrate the Indians in villages or keep them in their towns. This was a concern of the missionaries throughout the continent, and they had the support of viceroys, captains-general, and bishops. Grouping them in villages favored indoctrination, as well as material protection (agriculture and gardening, livestock and poultry raising, and artisanal activities) and health care (the creation of indigenous hospitals). Legislation prohibited the entry of Castilians, Blacks, mulattoes, and mestizos, and thus, in every way, a barrier was created between Castilians and Indians. The friars preferred to keep the Indians 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 the Castilian language, and this concern was also widespread among the secular clergy in various parts of the Americas. 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

languages of the Indians), who were not, according to them, the most appropriate for the task, was not insignificant.

In this sense, the Council drafted the Royal Decree of July 3, 1596, which became part of the *Recopilación de leyes de Indias* and was the doctrine of the Castilian monarchy until 1770 (it was the triumph of the theologians over the jurists). A series of documents and memorials proved that the results were very meager. The missionaries were few 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 saw widespread Jesuit expansion, but in the 18th century, it spread throughout Europe, and a new spirit hostile to it erupted in Spain with the Bourbon monarchs.

Education tended to become secularized and a national enterprise, run by the State. There was talk of revitalizing teaching and new methods, as well as cultivating the Castilian language (even at the expense of Latin). Suddenly, in 1767, more than 2,600 members of the Society of Jesus were violently removed from their editorial offices and colleges throughout the American dominions. This was the first major measure taken by the Castilian State against indigenous languages.

4.6. The reaction soon took on a more specific character. The initiative originated in Mexico and was led by Archbishop F. A. Lorenzana, who later became Cardinal of Toledo and Inquisitor General of the Peninsula. On June 25, 1769, the archbishop addressed King Carlos III and explained the impossibility of teaching Christian doctrine to the natives, given their lack of interest in learning Castilian. He pointed out that if our language had been taught to the Indians 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 each town in the Americas, since the bishops, "the first shepherds," did not understand them. Neither he nor his predecessors considered giving preference in parishes to priests who knew languages. If only Mexican was spoken in his diocese, it would be understandable to provide parish priests in that language, but if there were also a series of different languages, it would be disorganized.

The Archbishop distinguished between the Castilian and native clergy, and when the latter knew the indigenous language, he always spoke it and held Castilian in low regard. 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 often happened that a less worthy cleric, of low birth and perhaps of worse morals, would obtain, by knowing a language, a parish "that should have been the reward of a more decorated individual." In just a few years, Castilian-speaking priests had succeeded in getting the Indians to confess and understand Christian doctrine in Castilian.

His arguments undoubtedly impressed Carlos III, who ordered a gathering of all the relevant information. He also the letter from the Viceroy of México, Marquis of Croix, dated June 27, 1769, and a report from the prosecutors of the Council of the Indies, dated February 17, 1770. He issued his famous Aranjuez Decree on May 10, 1770. He ordered all royal and ecclesiastical authorities in his dominions in America and the Philippines "to achieve, once and for all, the extinction of the different languages used in these dominions, and to establish only Castilian as the spoken language."

Absolutism, represented by Felipe II, had been liberal in matters of language: "it did not seem appropriate to force them to abandon their natural language." "Liberalism," represented by Carlos III, was absolutist in matters of language: "that the different languages become extinct and only Castilian is spoken." The ideals of the Enlightenment imposed on the Indians, with complete rigor, the "enlightenment" of the Castilian language. It was the triumph of the jurists over the theologians. In contrast to the old missionary, catechizing attitude, the political imperatives of the State were making their way. And they were expressed as an aspiration for unity: one weight, one measure, one currency, one language.

4.7. The Royal Decree of Carlos 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 Indian villages, was as illusory as the previous ones. Castilian power lacked the resources for such a violent and radical Castilianization. How could the school in the 18th century accomplish a task of such magnitude? It did, however, succeed in interrupting the teaching of indigenous languages, preventing the printing of books in these languages, extinguishing indigenous culture as a public activity, and relegating it to the underground. Chairs of indigenous languages disappeared from universities, and their reestablishment in our time has required considerable effort, driven by the response of new interests (ethnographic and linguistic).

There was no shortage of opposing voices (that of Fray Pedro José Parras, in his *Gobierno de los regulares de América*, Madrid, 1733), who considered such a violent Castilianization impossible and even harmful (not even in the Peninsula had the Galicians, Biscayans, Catalans and Valencians been able to abandon their own language). The colonial authorities (Audiencias, governors and cabidos) adopted repressive measures,

and attempted to eradicate indigenous languages and even prohibit their use by the owners of estates and country houses, parents and even children.

This did not achieve Castilianization. The independent republics inherited several population groups who lived on the margins of public life, and the vast majority of whom neither spoke nor understood Castilian. In 1810, in the Spanish American domain there were some three million white Castilians and Creoles, many of them mestizos, dispersed throughout the continent, and about nine million Native Americans, concentrated in large rural areas. The Creole authorities, in a frank reaction, proclaimed the emancipation of the Native Americans in manifestos printed in the languages of the Native Americans themselves.

Now we can ask ourselves whether the Monarchy's missionary policy and linguistic liberalism 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 do today. It's helpful to have a concrete idea of the problem. Cortés entered Mexico with 607 men, and with those who joined him, he reached 1,141 men, immersed in a population we have estimated at four and a half million inhabitants (some speak of ten and fifteen million). Was it possible to think of a rapid Castlianization through schooling? It's evident that in those circumstances, schooling action had to be slow, weak, and even illusory.

4.8. The Castilianizing action of mestizaje was undoubtedly more effective. The colonization of the vast American continent by the small groups of settlers arriving from the Iberian Peninsula would have been completely impossible without the immediate formation of a dynamic generation of mestizos, who participated in the annexation and settlement of new lands and served as the initial conglomerate of the new cities, serving as a bridge to the vast and sometimes distant indigenous population. Without them, Castilianization would not have been possible either.

The indigenous population in 1810 constituted, at least in México, Guatemala, Perú, Ecuador, and Bolivia, the majority of the population. When Castilian domination, which had ensured a constant influx of new Castilians contingents throughout the colonial period, ended, many believed (especially in the case of Mexico) that a progressive and general Indianization would occur. An analysis of the data over these 150 years revealed just the opposite. In 1810, there were approximately 1,230,000 whites, 1,800,000 mestizos, and 3,700,000 Indians in México. In 1960, there were only three million speakers of indigenous languages in México (of whom two million were already bilingual), out of a population of 35 million.

It was evident that Castilianization was taking place, not through the work of the school, which performed a complementary role and then had an infinitely greater reach, but through the overwhelming action of demographic and social development. Castilianization has thus been progressive and rapid. The indigenous problem was fundamentally a language problem, as well as a serious social and economic one. The extent of their interbreeding (in the middle of the last century) was their Castilian acculturation. In 1960, there were an estimated 15 million Indians throughout Latin America, and less than half of them spoke their indigenous languages, and certainly less than a third (five million) did not know Castilian.

Latin America was a mosaic of languages and dialects, and its extreme fragmentation was fundamentally detrimental, the spread of Quechua (in Argentina, Bolivia, Perú, Ecuador, and as far south as Colombia) and Guaraní. Quechua was the most widely spread indigenous language in Latin America, with some six million speakers, who were otherwise very dialectally distinct, and of whom four million also spoke Castilian. The current, highly commendable trend of educating Native Americans in their own language and teaching them to read in their indigenous language (which began in Mexico and spread to the Peruvian jungle) meant that Native Americans learned to read Castilian very early, paradoxically favoring their Castilianization.

However, the Castilian language did not prevail throughout Spanish American, and there was no linguistic substitution of indigenous languages. However, there was a Castilian acculturation, stemming from social and cultural diffusion, with linguistic and cultural transfers that involved the social and cultural fusion of social groups and adaptation to a new sociocultural context. The only solution, therefore, was the intrinsic relationship between language, society, and culture. The overriding principle of the history of linguistic change and language substitution was the acculturation of social groups.

4.9. The case of Paraguay is unique in Spanish American: the entire country speaks Guaraní. There are no longer any Native Americans (except for about 40,000 jungle natives). This astonishing fact was attributed to the action of the old Jesuit missions. The Jesuits won over the Native Americans by preaching to them in Guaraní: in 1750, they had 30 villages (*reductions*), with about 150,000 Native Americans. It was a closed world (there was even talk of the Jesuit Kingdom of Paraguay), which was often in conflict, even fighting bloody battles, with the authorities of Asunción. The missions existed this way for about 150 years, until 1767, peacefully run by a small number of religious men (they never reached 500, including those who served in the houses and schools in the cities).

The civil authorities violently reproached them for keeping the Indians outside the scope of Castilian law. The Jesuits undoubtedly contributed to the preservation of Guaraní in Paraguay (although most of their missions and their Indians were within the jurisdiction of Buenos Aires, and a significant portion were also in Brazil and Santa Cruz de la Sierra). But the spread of Guaraní throughout Paraguay (including Asunción, so hostile to the missions) was due to the peculiar nature of Paraguayan acculturation. The country's almost complete isolation throughout the 19th century and part of the 20th century, its confinement to the heart of the continent, and its extremely limited immigration also greatly contributed to this.

Be that as it may, today everyone speaks Guaraní, even the children of immigrants, a fairly Castilianized Guaraní. And almost everyone speaks a somewhat Guaranized Castilian. Guaraní is the second official language, but Spanish prevails in school and university education and in public life. And it is, without a doubt, the link that unites Paraguay with the community of Latin American countries. The world today is moving towards universality, and for the 18 states that have Spanish as their official language and another 3 states as a co-official language, universality consists of being an active part of a language community that has 496 million speakers.

The economic power of Spanish lies in its numbers. The group of potential Spanish users worldwide exceeds 599 million (7,5% of the global population). Spanish is the world's second most spoken language, after Chinese, and the fourth most spoken language globally, after Hindi/Urdu, Chinese, and English (see F. Gimeno, 2023a, 2023b).

Castilianization, previously slow, was now occurring at a dizzying pace. The penetration of Castilian has reached a depth in recent generations that has astonished geographers and travelers, and a growing Castilianization is in the indigenous languages themselves. However, since 1492, indigenous languages incorporated a series of elements into our American Spanish: intonation, articulatory features, suffixes, names of flora and fauna, and of material and spiritual life. In bilingual regions, even syntactical templates. Their study constituted one of the most fascinating chapters in Latin American linguistics. Nowhere in Latin America has a creole language emerged, such as French in Haiti, Portuguese in Curaçao, or English in Guyana. Not only was Latin America profoundly Castilianized, but today it is becoming (in the case of Argentina and México) the most powerful site of Hispanicization in the world.

V. Language Planning

The Corona de Castilla did not maintain the same language policy in Spanish America throughout the entire period, but rather implemented various measures, and three fundamental stages were distinguished. A. Herranz (1996: 29-130) identified two periods: 1) Colonial (1502-1820), and 2) Independent (1821-1995). Regarding the former, he distinguished the following policies:

A) Establishment of a monolingual Castilian policy (1502-1569), designed by the Reyes Católicos and continued by King Carlos I. It was based on the idea that "all natives of America were required to learn Castilian."
B) The establishment of a multilingual policy (1570-1769) marked a significant change, requiring priests and friars to learn indigenous languages in order to indoctrinate and evangelize them in their native tongue. Indigenous peoples were free to learn Castilian.
C) Establishment of a monolingual Castilian policy (1770-1820), initiated by King Carlos III, which represented a return to the monolingual Castilian policy of the first stage.

5.1. The first stage was characterized by a lightning-fast annexation of the great cultures (Aztec and Quechua), and was surprising due to the swift decision of the Reyes Católicos to implement a minimum of Royal Decrees and other documents outlining the broad outlines of a language planning based on the compulsory learning of Castilian for all natives of the Indies. This early legislation could only have been implemented due to Castile's long experience with the reconquered Arab communities, and this policy was initiated by King Fernando III and King Alfonso X.

The Reyes Católicos received the title granted to them by Papa Alejandro VI in 1494 and were the architects of a comprehensive policy based on national unity around Castile. This policy encompassed military, religious, cultural, and linguistic aspects. Queen Isabel entrusted the reform of the clergy and religious orders to her confessor, Archbishop F. Jiménez de Cisneros. This reform, initiated with the mendicant orders, represented a return to the lost austerity and discipline and a boost to the Christian evangelization of Arabs and Jews. The queen's language planning combined the study of classical languages with the "Castilianization" of the annexed regions. Castilian became the official language of the kingdom, which all subjects were required to speak. In this way, Christianization and Castilianization would be inextricably linked until the reign of Felipe II.

For the work of Castilianization, the queen counted on the invaluable participation of erudito latinista E. A. de Nebrija, author of the *Gramática castellana* (1492), la primera de las lenguas románicas que se hablaban en Europa, y de la fijación explícita de su ortografía en su obra Reglas de ortografía castellana (1516) (see M.

T. Echenique, 2013). En el "Prólogo" de la primera, he clearly explained his reasons for writing it. The first was to give consistency, uniformity, and simplicity to Castilian. The second was pedagogical in nature, and the third explained that grammar could be used to understand of the Castilian legal system. Consistent with this language planning, which had brought so much success to Castile on the Peninsula and in the recently conquered Canary Islands, it was transferred to America with minor variations.

5.2. The second stage examined the background and effects of the pressure exerted by bishops and religious leaders on Carlos I and Felipe II, culminating in the recognition of Náhuatl as the language of evangelization in 1570. The variety of languages posed new problems for the religious orders, and it was impossible to learn them all. Sometimes, a friar had villages in the same parish where two or three languages were spoken. The Franciscans began to pressure the Crown to officially declare Náhuatl as *the general lingua* or *franca* for the evangelization of the Native Americans of Nueva España, as it was the most widely spoken language in México and Central America, and they had developed excellent dictionaries and grammars. Thus, Fray Rodrigo de la Cruz, in response to the Royal Decree of 1550, described the task of teaching Castilian to the Native Americans as useless and proposed that everyone learn Náhuatl. The Royal Decree of 1570 initiated Felipe II's multilingual policy by establishing two official languages: Castilian for the administration and officials, and Náhuatl for the Christianization of the Indians of this vast region of America.

The language planning of the Habsburgs was summarized in the Royal Decree of July 3, 1596, drawn up by the Council. It maintained, on the one hand, the mandate that the doctrinaires learn the language of the peoples they administered, and on the other, freed the Indians to learn Castilian. With this Royal Decree, Felipe II changed the language policy of the Reyes Católicos and Carlos I. Castilian became the official language of the Castilians and the indigenous elite. Indigenous languages were used for the Christianization of the Indians and for everyday use by religious leaders (especially mestizos) and the Indian population. Castilian was the language of Castilianization and indigenous languages were the language of Christianization. Ultimately, this planning proposed a social multilingualism, which was, in fact, a reality. Castilian remained the official language of the Empire, but it was believed that the indigenous people would learn it gradually and voluntarily.

This multilingual planning would remain in place until 1770, when Carlos III returned to the monolingual Castilian policy. Felipe II's successors would only try to solve the daily problems of its implementation. Felipe III issued Royal Decrees in 1599, 1603, 1618 and 1619, insisting on mandatory learning of indigenous languages for teachers of the doctrine who wished to run parishes in Indian villages. In 1612, he ordered the establishment of "retreat houses" for maidens who wished to be educated virtuously, and, contradicting his own legislation, he ordered that the only language spoken in boarding schools would be Castilian.

5.3. In the third stage, Carlos III issued a Royal Decree in 1770 that marked a radical change in the language planning applied by his predecessors, the Habsburgs. The sole language of the empire was to be Castilian. The enumeration of all administrative and political offices of the Crown, as well as of the Church and the town councils, 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 dominions be extinguished, and that only Castilian be spoken." Not only was it proposed that Castilian be spoken (an aspiration that the Habsburgs had also held), but the languages of the Indigenous peoples should be extinguished.

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 speaking of indigenous languages and ordered the establishment of schools in Indian villages for the learning of Castilian. In the decree of December 3, 1803, addressed to the Governor of Nuevo México, it could be seen how he extended the prohibition on speaking any language other than Castilian to include monasteries, convents, and official procedures. In order to have a legal instrument with which to penalize Indian authorities who did not comply with this mandate, they will be charged with noncompliance in the residency trial.

What were the reasons that Carlos III had for this turn? During the last reigns of the Habsburgs, there was a notable increase in the number of decrees, ordinances, and reports reminding the priests and authorities of the need to accelerate the learning of Castilian among indigenous peoples and the creation of schools in Indian villages as the ideal instrument for this purpose. During this period of the Habsburgs, voices against their multilingual policy in America were constantly heard. The accession to the throne of Carlo III, the reformer and the first king of the Bourbon monarchy, together with the triumph in Europe of the absolutist ideas of Castilianization and the pressure of some archbishops and bishops (such as the one in Mexico), were exploited by the Council of the Indies and the king.

VI. Conclusions

1. Acculturation was an essential feature of human history. Acculturation refers to all cultural events resulting from the acquisition, modification, or reinterpretation of a culture, particularly the reception and assimilation of cultural elements specific to one social group by another, with adaptation to a new sociocultural context. The term acculturation became widely accepted among American anthropologists in the late 19th century to refer to the changes that occur when social groups with different cultural traditions merge.

2. Our main working hypothesis was that within the anthropological history of the Spanish language, there was a linguistic and cultural continuity, based on successive and diverse historical acculturations (Indo-European, Basque-Iberian, Pheno-Punic-Greek, Roman, Christian, Germanic, Visigothic, Byzantine, Islamic, Aragonese-Catalan, Castilian, and Anglo-Saxon), with the linguistic and cultural transfers that implied the social and cultural interbreeding of these groups and their adaptation to a new sociocultural context. One of the most consistently upheld principles in historical linguistics was acculturation. The Castilian language did not prevail throughout Spanish American, and there was no linguistic substitution of indigenous languages, but rather a Castilian acculturation that has confirmed the working hypothesis.

3. The accessory nature of the incorporation of the Indies into the Corona de Castilla, by virtue of the concession by Papa Alejandro VI to the Reyes Católicos and their successors in the kingdoms of León and Castile of the discovered and undiscovered lands, determined that their legal configuration and organization would not be carried out from the creation of a "ex novo" law for them, but rather through the transplantation of the Castilian legal system. The need to adapt the principles and norms of the latter to a different reality was what gave rise to the formation of a law specific to the Indies (the "*indiano*"), to regulate the multiple situations not contemplated by the former.

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

5. Current Antillean Spanish (after five centuries of adaptations, adoptions, and influences) presented dialectal characteristics that allowed it to be described as an insular Caribbean modality, with an Andalusian-Canarian base, 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 Puerto Rico's special political situation, Spanish is the mother tongue in all three countries, conditioned by the sociocultural factors specific to each one, and without having produced the development of any creole language, in the manner of French-based *creoles* (Haiti, Martinique) or Saxon (English-speaking Virgin Islands).

6. The missionaries devoted themselves to learning indigenous languages as an extension of their religious apostolate. With the master key of language, they had to penetrate the mysterious and fearsome world of the Indians, learn their customs, understand their mentality, decipher their feelings and thoughts, describe their history, their life. Not out of abstract scientific pursuit, but to better understand the Indians, to facilitate their catechization, to combat their rites and superstitions, and discover whether these were hidden behind an apparent Christianization. The very early introduction of the printing press in México (in 1539) by Bishop Fray Juan de Zumárraga, a Franciscan priest, responded to the same evangelical need, and the oldest known Mexican printed work was indeed a *Breve y más enjundiosa doctrina christiana en lengua mexicana y castellana*.

7. Latin America was a mosaic of languages and dialects, and its extreme fragmentation was fundamentally detrimental, the spread of Quechua (in Argentina, Bolivia, Perú, Ecuador, and as far south as Colombia) and Guaraní. Quechua was the most widely spread indigenous language in Latin America, with some six million speakers, who were otherwise very dialectally distinct, and of whom four million also spoke Castilian. The current, highly commendable trend of educating Native Americans in their own language and teaching them to read in their indigenous language (which began in México and spread to the Peruvian jungle) meant that Native Americans learned to read Castilian very early, paradoxically favoring their Castilianization.

8. Paraguay is unique in Latin America, as the entire country speaks Guaraní. There are no longer any Native Americans (except for about 40,000 jungle natives). This astonishing fact was attributed to the work of the old Jesuit missions. The Jesuits won over the Native Americans by preaching to them in Guaraní: in 1750, they had 30 villages, with about 150,000 Native Americans. It was a closed world (there was even talk of the Jesuit Kingdom of Paraguay), which was often in conflict, even fighting bloody battles, with the authorities of Asunción. The missions operated this way for about 150 years, until 1767, peacefully run by a small number of religious leaders. Guaraní is the second official language, but Spanish prevails in school and university teaching and in public life. And it is, without a doubt, the link that unites Paraguay with the community of Spanish-American countries. Today's world is moving toward universality, and for the 18 states that have Spanish as their official language and three others as a co-official language, universality consists of being an active part of a language community that has 496 million speakers.

9. The Crown of Castile did not maintain the same language planning in Latin America throughout the entire period, but rather had various actions, and three fundamental stages were distinguished:

a) Establishment of a monolingual Castilian policy (1502-1569), designed by the Reyes Católicos and continued by King Carlos I. It was based on the idea that "all natives of America were required to learn Castilian."
b) Establishment of a multilingual planning (1570-1769) marked a significant change, requiring priests and friars to learn indigenous languages in order to indoctrinate and evangelize them in their native tongue. Indigenous peoples were free to learn Castilian.
c) Establishment of a monolingual Castilian policy (1770-1820), initiated by King Carlos III, which represented a return to the monolingual Castilian policy of the first stage.

References

Alvar, M. (1996), "Introducción", in Alvar, M. (dir.) (1996), 3-18.
— (dir.) (1996), *Manual de dialectología hispánica. El español de América*, Madrid, Ariel.
Artola, M. (dir.) (1973-1976), *Historia de España Alfaguara*, 7 vols., Madrid, Alianza.,
— (dir.) (1988-1993), *Enciclopedia de historia de España*, 7 vols., Madrid, Alianza.
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 Indias until 1600", *Hispanic American Historial 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.
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. (1971), "The sociology of language: An interdisciplinary social science approach to language in socciety", in Fishman, J. A. (ed.) (1971), I, 217-404.
— (ed) (1971), *Advances in the sociology of language*, 2 vols., The Hague, Mouton.
Frank, B. and Hartmann, J. (1997), *Inventaire systématique des premiers documents des langues romanes*, 5 vols., Tübingen, Narr.
García de Cortázar, J. A. (1973), *La época medieval*, in Artola, M. (dir.) (1973-1976), II, 2nd ed., Madrid, 1974.
— (1985), "Introducción: espacio, sociedad y organización medievales en nuestra tradición historiográfica), in García de Cortázar, J. A. *et al.* (1985), 11-42.
— (2012), *Historia religiosa del Occidente medieval (años 313-1464)*, Madrid, Ediciones Akal.
— (2016), "La difusión social de la nueva cosmovisión cristiana en los siglos I al IV", *Aemilianense IV (Homenaje al prof. C. García Turza)*, 235-67.
— *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. (1988), "Sociolingüística histórica", *Actas del XVIIIe Congrés International 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.
— (2016a), "Historia social de los protorromances hispanos", in Terrado, J. and Sabaté, F. (eds.) (2016), 15-42.
— (2016b), "Variación y cambio del latín al romance: el calco sintáctico del orden semítico de palabras", *Aemilianense, IV*, 291-365.
— (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, 13-26.
— (2024a), "Linguistic change and languages in contact", *IOSR-JHSS*, 29, 10, 2, 35-49.
— (2024b), "Acculturation", *IOSR-JHSS*, 29, 11, 3, 17-32.
— (2024c), "Basque-Iberian acculturation", *IOSR-JHSS*, 30, 2, 2, 31-45.
— (coord.) (2020), *Lengua, sociedad y cultura. Estudios dedicados a Alberto Carcedo González*, Alicante, Universidad de Alicante and University of Turku.
— and Gimeno, M. V. (2003), *El desplazamiento lingüístico del español por el inglés*, Madrid, Cátedra.

Herranz, A. (1996), *Estado, sociedad y lenguaje. La política lingüística en Honduras*, Tegucigalpa, Guaymuras.
Jacob, D. and Kabatek, J. (2001), "Introducción: lengua, texto y cambio lingüístico en la Edad Media iberorrománica", in Jacob, D. and Kabatek, J. (eds.) (2001), VII- XVIII.
— and Kabatek, J. (eds.) (2001), *Lengua medieval y traducciones discursivas en la Península Ibérica: descripción gramatical, pragmática histórica, metodología*, Frankfurt am Main, Vervuert.
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. (1989), *Sociolingüística*, 3rd ed., Madrid, Gredos.2004.
— (1996), "Rasgos generales", in Alvar, M. (dir.) (1996) 19-27.
— (2006), "Sociolingüística histórica", *Actas del VI Congreso Internacional de Historia de la Lengua Española*, III, Madrid, A Arco/Libros, 2385-402.
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.
— (1966), *La lengua y el hombre. Introducción a los problemas generales de la lingüística*, 2nd ed., Madrid, Istmo, 1972.
Menéndez Pidal, R. (1962), "Sevilla frente a Madrid", in *Homenaje a André Martinet*, La Laguna, Universidad de La Laguna, III, 99-165.
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
Terrado, J. and Sabaté, F. (eds.) (2016), *El naixement de la consciència lingüística a l'Edat Mitjana*, Lleida, Pagès Editors.
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.