

Anthropological History of Languages

Francisco Gimeno-Menéndez
University of Alicante

Summary

Acculturation was the empirical foundation of the anthropological history of humankind, integrating the history of languages, societies, and cultures. The hypothesis of the anthropological history of humankind as a succession of acculturations was more appropriate to linguistic, social, and cultural facts, and to the very continuity of history. Theories about the anthropological history of languages were countless, without considering that the essential problem was to study, starting from the terms of kinship, the most superficial and primitive phonological and syllabic structures, which led to a better understanding of the evolutionary chain, and began with inarticulate sounds, onomatopoeia and duplications. The primitive opposition between the nasal m- and the non-nasals p/t constituted the earliest indication of phonologization, that is, the systematic use of a sound effect to differentiate meanings. In all languages, there existed groups of lexemes that belonged to different primitive needs of expression, frequently of a childlike nature and constructed on the basis on the most general and fundamental phonological structure models: a nasal or plosive (m o p), along with a generally open vowel; that is, the simplest possible syllable structure repeated and indefinite number of times. Our working hypothesis on the anthropological history of languages has been a new project in historical sociolinguistics focused on a critical reconstruction of the emergence of languages that distinguished Homo sapiens society from animal groups. This approach is more closely aligned with an empirical application of primitive linguistic change (pre- and proto-linguistic), based on anthropological, sociological, and legal determinants. The anthropological history of languages emerged when Homo sapiens groups learned to use a sound complex in a specific situation as a conventional symbol for identification and recognition. The development of familial transmission of the mother tongue involved a process of social and cultural diffusion and acculturation. It was necessary a new anthropological history of languages that would try to appreciate the meaning of the facts, and would take as starting points and reference systems the positions adopted by the various cultures

Keywords: *Acculturation, historical sociolinguistics, anthropology and linguistics, languages in contact, terms of kinship, phonologization, syllabic structure.*

Date of Submission: 08-03-2026

Date of Acceptance: 18-03-2026

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 behavior in relation to the territory it occupied. The interest of geographers and economists in regional phenomena and analysis was strengthened in the field of medieval studies by the emergence of a series of notable French theses based on this type of framework (G. Fourquin, R. Fossier, P. Toubert, P. Bonnassie, and G. Bois).

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

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, (1988a, 1990: 138-44, 1995) pointed out that sociolinguistics was born from an anthropological commitment that ultimately viewed linguistics as a chapter of social and cultural anthropology (and of the psychology of knowledge). General sociolinguistics as an extension and revision of institutional disciplines (linguistics, sociology and anthropology) integrated a *sociology of language* and a *strict sociolinguistics*, as well as the *ethnography of communication* (see C. F. Hockett,

1958/1962; C. A. Ferguson, 1959; B. Malmberg, 1966; R. Jakobson, 1970; J. A. Fishman, 1964/1968, 1971; D. Hymes, 1971, 1974; H. López Morales, 2006; F. Gimeno, 1979, 1995, 2019, 2023, 2025b).

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

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

II. Historical Sociolinguistics

The hypothesis of the history of languages as a succession of paradigms was more suited to linguistic facts than to a mere replacement of models. One of the most consistently upheld principles in historical linguistics was the theory of the regularity of linguistic change. In the Neogrammatical model, phonological change and analogy constitute the two basic components of linguistic change. Phonological change operated independently of morphological, syntactic, and semantic function. Analogy dealt precisely with the relationship between phonological and morphological structure. In this sense, it was necessary to distinguish between two interpretations: a) an autonomous version based on the assumption of phonological regularity, and b) a grammatical version of linguistic change.

The hypothesis of the autonomy of linguistic levels was incompatible with the post-generative theory of grammatical change, but some European functionalists have not recognized this incompatibility. Furthermore, there was a twofold starting strategy in the investigation of linguistic change: 1) homogeneity, and 2) structured heterogeneity. According to this interpretation, the following models of linguistic change emerged: a1) neogrammatical; b1) dialectological; a2) functionalist; b2) pragmatic; a3) generative; and b3) historical sociolinguistic.

If all linguistic change implies ongoing variation (although not all variation implies change, see F. Gimeno, 2008a, 2008b), then homogeneous models of linguistic change (neogrammatical, functionalist, and generative) were unrealistic and inadequate. One success of diachronic functionalism was the recognition that the formation of the various Romance languages from the same Latin system challenged the past simplification of hypotheses based solely on linguistic systems, but this insight was relegated from its objectives and methodology. Syntactic, semantic, or phonological change implied grammatical change in the communicative competence of successive generational groups from different social groups within the speech community, through the reorganization of the vernacular with generational succession (see F. Gimeno, 2024).

2.1. There was scant information on the anthropological history of languages in *Prehistory and the beginnings of civilization*, within the *History of Humanity. Cultural and Scientific Development* (I, 107-13), sponsored by UNESCO (1963), suggested that the inheritance of mental forms most likely arose with a "blank check," although many could not accept this idea. The origin of languages remained obscure, and we did not know why or how this great invention began.

Our working hypothesis on the anthropological history of languages has been a new project of historical sociolinguistics on a critical reconstruction of the emergence of the languages that differentiated *Sapiens society* from animal groups, more closely aligned with an empirical application of primitive linguistic change (prelinguistic), based on anthropological, sociological, and legal determinants.

Despite the enigma of the anthropological history of languages, countless theories about their origins have been proposed, without considering that the essential problem was analyzing their most primitive forms and most general manifestations. The relationship between oral and written registers was crucial, as these represented social and situational varieties of languages, depending on whether they were used in the family or in educational domains, ultimately stemming from the semiotic system that constituted the culture.

2.2. In the precedents of the history of the written record, I. J. Gelb (1952: 47-53) alluded to the fact that just as languages were derived from the imitation of sounds, writing developed from drawings that imitated real objects or beings on rocks, from the earliest Paleolithic period to the present day, by means of petroglyphs (if they were drawn or painted) and petroglyphs (if they were carved or engraved), although from its earliest stages rather simple linear or geometric signs appeared.

Primitive drawings did not constitute writing because they were not part of a conventional system of signs. Writing was no more than 5,000 years old, if by writing we understand the means of expressing linguistic elements through conventional visible signs. At the root of all writing lay painting, not only because all present-day primitive writing systems possessed a pictorial character, but also because all the great Eastern systems (Sumerian, Egyptian, Hittite, Chinese, etc.) were originally authentic pictorial writing systems. Of course, all these writing systems possessed, from their earliest stages, signs that did not resemble paintings, but rather linear or geometric signs, which were the schematic result of the paintings themselves.

In our case, if *Homo habilis* in the Lower Paleolithic developed the precedent for written record-keeping by imitating the figures of real objects or beings, in the Upper Paleolithic *Homo sapiens* disseminated the precedent for oral record-keeping by materializing the lexeme *ma-ma*, based on the imitation of the nasal sound produced by an infant's sucking. Phonological differentiation was initially as uncertain and unstable as semantic differentiation, but the first distinctive phonological elements appeared with a simple syllabic structure, although a proper syntax did not yet exist.

The study of the most general and primitive phonological and syllabic structures led to a better understanding of the evolutionary chain, which began with inarticulate sounds, onomatopoeia, and duplications. The anthropological history of languages emerged when *Homo sapiens* society learned to use a sound complex in a specific situation, as a conventional symbol applied to a particular identification and recognition. The development of familial transmission of the mother tongue involved a process of social and cultural diffusion and acculturation, as well as the intrinsic relationships between languages, societies, and cultures. These are essential coordinates in current research on linguistic variation and change among different social groups within diverse speech communities (see U. Weinreich, W. Labov, and M. I. Herzog, 1968).

2.3. As a historical process of evolution and natural selection, the anthropological history of languages has always been of great interest to linguists, anthropologists, anatomists, neuroscientists, and paleontologists, who have always been interested in understanding when and how the sounds used in communication began to be articulated. One of the main characteristics that distinguished *Homo sapiens society* from animal groups was its capacity for speech. The oral record of languages was an excellent instrument for expression and communication of cognitive development in *Homo sapiens society*, within prehistoric speech communities. Biological inheritance consisted of a set of anatomical and physiological characteristics that facilitated the acquisition and use of languages, since we shared more than 98% of our genes with chimpanzees.

Cognitive control manifested itself with an increase in cortical areas (prefrontal and temporoparietal) and a reduction in the occipital lobe. These processes involved many phases and aroused the curiosity of numerous scientists. Double linguistic articulation was yet another application of human cognitive abilities, with the creation of distinctive signs without independent meaning (phonemes and intrinsic distinctive features) and signs with their own meaning (lexemes and morphemes). The samples discovered in Upper Paleolithic archaeological research allowed for the anthropological, sociological, and legal reconstruction of *Homo sapiens society* in prehistoric speech communities.

The most important contributions were expected from research on the general structure of languages, and from the emphasis on their most primitive forms and their most general manifestations. Furthermore, it was undeniable that the most primitive structures (phonological and syllabic) were the most superficial, serving as the foundation for the more complex ones. Languages were a hierarchical system, where the complex presupposed the simple; thus, for example, voiced consonants presupposed the existence of voiceless consonants, or closed syllables presupposed open syllables. Simple structures were those first acquired by children during their learning of adult languages, and the excellent contributions of C. F. Hockett (1958/1962), B. Malmberg (1966), and R. Jakobson (1962, 1970) stand out. In addition, we will discuss the contribution of generative syntax and the research on the appearance of the human chin and the mandibular morphology of *Homo sapiens*, chimpanzee and Neanderthal.

The innate nature of language was unique to mammals and birds. Animal language consisted of the set of signals used in communication between groups, as simple manifestations of specific behaviors, expressing emotional and evocative states, and, except in the cases of bees and dolphins, was not descriptive. Languages were one of the manifestations of human symbolic activity, representing things, ideas, and events through sounds, gestures, attitudes, behaviors, signs, or objects, which served as substitutes for those things.

This faculty was not unique to the human species; for example, Professor K. von Frisch demonstrated that bees could symbolize the duration of a flight and their orientation in relation to the sun through nature, rhythm, and direction of their movements within the hive. It was plausible that ants possessed a similar means of communication, given the advanced state of their social life, and it was likely that a good number of social animals had analogous modes of communication. However, languages differed from these more in their complex structure than in their vocal nature. Furthermore, languages were learned, not inherited like animal language. The problem of the anthropological history of languages became intertwined with that of the origins of humankind.

III. Anthropology And Linguistics

In his anthropological history of languages as social semiotics and the interpretation of meaning, sociologist M. A. K. Halliday (1978: 12–30) proposed a better understanding of languages as objects if we interpreted them considering the research of those for whom languages were an instrument for entirely different kinds of investigation. In this sense, we should proceed from the outside in, interpreting languages by reference to their place in the social process, in terms of the infinitely complex web of potential meanings that constituted cultures. There is no doubt that the human brain evolved to its present form through the process of communication among human beings, and this perspective was very important from an evolutionary point of view.

Instead of viewing the group as a collection of individuals and inherited roles, human beings, through language, were no longer seen merely as biological specimens, but rather as integrated into a complex network of relationships (society), where linguistic exchange determined their position and configuration as a component of a culture, as well as their ability to perform multiple roles simultaneously. Rather than having developed a series of concrete, universal models of language in their genetic makeup, what children possessed was the capacity to process certain highly abstract types of cognitive relationships that underpinned (among other things) the linguistic system. The specific properties of languages were not innate, and therefore children depended more on their environment (on the language they heard in their surroundings, along with the contexts in which it was used) for the successful acquisition of their native language.

3.1. In his article, R. Jakobson (1962) responded to the conclusion of the American anthropologist G. P. Murdock in a linguistic seminar held at the Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences (later published in *Anthropological Linguistics*, 1, 9, 1959, 1-5), on the familiar terms for parents in many languages. He collected 1,072 words and excluded forms like *dad* and *mom*, considering them to be possible loanwords. His conclusion was that the purpose of the research was simply to present the data that confirmed the hypothesis under investigation: a remarkable convergence in the structure of familiar terms for parents in all historically unrelated languages. And he wondered whether linguists, now that the facts had been established, might not “clarify the theoretical principles that accounted for them.”

R. Jakobson's response was that he agreed to contribute his article to the question. The child originated his infantile world within an alien world of adults, and his behavior was the result of an interaction between these two worlds. In the same way, the behavior of adults with regard to the rearing and education of children was a result of the interaction between both worlds. Some of these infantile forms transcended the boundaries of kindergartens and entered the general usage of adult society, thus forming a specific infantile section in the standard vocabulary. Specifically, adult language generally adopted infantile forms that designated each of the older members of the nuclear family. Frequently, these intimate and emotive words coexisted with terms exclusively related to adult kinship, which were more general and abstract. Thus, p. e.g., in English *mama* (*mamma, mammy, ma, mom, mommy*) and *papa* (*pap, pappy, pa, pop* or *dada, dad, daddy*) differed in their use of the normative terms *mother* and *father*.

In Proto-Indo-European, the learned designations for parents, *mater* and *pater*, were derived from infantile forms with the help of the suffix *-ter*, used for various kinship terms. These infantile inventions were accepted for broader communication in the child-adult verbal relationship only if they met the linguistic requirements of children, thus following the general pattern of any surface variants. Specifically, the phonological field of kinship terms proved to be “strictly limited.” The underlying principles of the successive stages in children's language acquisition allowed us to interpret and clarify the “parallels of language contrast” in the structure of such terms across all languages.

3.2. Consonant clusters appeared in no more than 1.1% of the 1,072 familiar terms tabulated by Murdock, and children's speech in its early stages did not use consonant clusters, but only combinations of consonants with vowels. Such combinations were almost constant in the lexeme's *mama-papa*, and purely vowel morphemes were exceptional: only three among the tabulated instances. Plosive and nasal consonants predominated in kinship terms. According to Murdock's tabulation, plosives and nasals approximated 85% of non-syllabic consonants. The exact proportion could not be established because all non-sibilant fricatives were grouped together with their corresponding plosives. Labials and dentals prevailed over velars and palatals. Over 76% of all tabulated terms included a labial or dental consonant, as opposed to over 10% with velars and palatals. Vowels, especially /a/, were overwhelmingly prevalent.

Thus, infant names for mother and father, as the first meaningful units to appear in infant speech, were based on the polarity between the optimal consonant (the stop) and the open vowel. The principle of maximum contrast applied to the common constituents of most terms, such as *mama* and *papa*. The order of these constituents, the sequence “consonant + vowel,” was almost obligatory. During the prelinguistic period of infant development, many pure syllables consisted of a vowel sound followed by a consonant articulation. The most

natural order of sound production was an opening of the mouth followed by its closing. However, syllable reduplication appeared as a resource in infant forms, particularly in kinship terms, and in the earliest word units in infant speech. Clearly, the reason for such duplication was explainable.

The most striking results of Murdock's research lay in the distribution of nasal and oral consonants among kinship terms: 55% of the terms designating 'mother' and only 15% of those pertaining to 'father' belonged to the nasal class (*m, n*). Thus, the traditional assertions that "the mother was usually designated with an *m*- form, and the father with a *p*-, *b*-, *t*-, or *d*- form received illustrative statistical corroboration." The terms *mama* and *papa* were therefore infantile lexemes, consistent with the evolutionary nature of infant speech, and neither their penetration into national languages nor their international diffusion invalidated their basic conformity. However, the complete exclusion of forms resembling *mama* and *papa* from Murdock's sample appeared to be strictly superfluous, unless the related languages clearly demonstrated their indigenous origin.

Furthermore, he recommended that the eminent anthropologist's interesting work deserved to be continued and developed, and that a broad field remained open for productive joint research by linguists, anthropologists, and experts in mental and behavioral developmental psychology. Subsequently, R. Jakobson himself (1979) revisited the topic of the emergence of languages, which required considering the transition from pre-human groups to society, a topic included in section VI.

IV. General Properties of Languages

In the Spanish translation of the fourth edition of his *Course in Modern Linguistics*, C. F. Hockett (1958/1962: 547-76) added Chapter LXIV on the investigation, using available data, of the relationship between languages and the position occupied by humankind in nature. He alluded to the fact that humans were the only species that possessed the faculty of language; no other living species could reasonably be credited with having had this faculty previously and then losing it later

4.1. During the Holocene period (approximately the last 30,000 years), *Homo sapiens* was the sole representative of the genus *Homo*. In the Pleistocene (from approximately 700,000 years ago to around 30,000 years ago), another species existed: *Homo neanderthalensis*, whose remains have been found in Europe, the Middle East, and Central Asia. Like *Homo sapiens*, it possessed an exceptionally large brain. However, humans were not the only animals capable of communication, and it was necessary to describe how languages differed from the various types of communicative behavior exhibited by other non-human or pre-human species.

Now, despite the variation shown by different languages in many aspects, they all shared (as communication systems) a series of basic characteristics or properties that were not found together in any of the known non-human communication systems, although some or others only occurred separately. The general properties of languages were the following fifteen: 1) *vocal-auditory pathway*, 2) *broadcast transmission and directed reception*, 3) *rapid evanescence*, 4) *interchangeability*, 5) *total feedback*, 6) *specialization*, 7) *semanticity*, 8) *arbitrariness*, 9) *discreteness*, 10) *displacement*, 11) *duality*, 12) *productivity*, 13) *cultural transmission*, 14) *prevarication*, and 15) *reflexivity*.

Moreover, he devised a table indicating whether each of these properties was also present in the communication systems of the animals described (the bee's dance, the stickleback's sexual behavior, the gull's feeding of its young, and the gibbon's cries) compared to languages and instrumental music, as a cultural tradition of the West. Almost all mammals (except the giraffe) produced vowel sounds. In general, then, the vocal-auditory pathway constituted (as opposed to other types of communication pathways, such as the kinetic-tactile-chemical pathway in bees, or auditory but not vocal in some insects) a characteristic unique to mammals. The mechanisms of sound production and perception in birds were so similar that they led to the application of the term vocal-auditory to birdsong as well. It was highly doubtful that the vocal-auditory system of any animal, except humans, made distinctive use of vowel timbre.

4.2. For an organism to participate in a communication system, the conventions of that system had to be established in some way within that organism. There were two mechanisms that made this possible. One was the *genetic* mechanism: an individual's genes, inherited from their parents, governed that individual's growth pattern and behavioral patterns. The other mechanism was cultural transmission. Humans, when born, did not speak any language. The language they later came to speak was the one used by the people around them, whether or not it was the language of their biological ancestors, and if it was not, this did not affect in the slightest the degree of skill with which they would eventually speak it, nor the time required to learn it. If, as occasionally happens, a child is raised in complete isolation or among animals, they do not learn any language.

From the above, three conclusions could be drawn: 1) human genes were not specific to the particularities of any language, but permissive of any and all; 2) human genes (and only human genes) were a necessary, but not sufficient, condition for the acquisition of a language; and 3) the role of genetics was not limited to being

passively permissive: the human phenotype also comprised a strong positive impulse towards participation in the communicative exchange of society, an impulse that could only be frustrated by the most complete isolation.

This was the limited role of genetics in language. Furthermore, the continuity of linguistic habits from generation to generation was primarily determined by the other mechanism mentioned: tradition. All traditional behavior was *learned*, but not all learned behavior was traditional. For it to be considered traditional, there had to be *instruction* from other individuals of the *same* species, imparted through behavior that was not determined exclusively or primarily by genetics, but rather had been *learned* from previous teachers.

4.3. Tradition (defined in this way) was obviously not a human prerogative. However, it seemed most likely that, at least in terrestrial mammals and birds, genetics and tradition operated in constant dialectical complementarity, with neither being the sole responsible mechanism. Tradition was transformed into *cultural* transmission when the use of symbols played a significant role in the transmission of traditional habits: the first thing acquired was the communication system of the speech community, and all subsequent learning, both of other systems and of the rest of the “culture,” was carried out not only through direct demonstration and experience, but also (to a large extent) in terms of the communication system.

For a communication system to function effectively in this way, it had to possess the properties of semanticity, arbitrariness (and consequently, discreteness), displacement, productivity, and probably, transmission by tradition. Defining cultural transmission and the essential features of a communication system that made it possible in the way we have done was tantamount to asserting that only *Homo sapiens*, as far as we know, possessed culture. Of the fifteen properties of languages, productivity, displacement, duality, and cultural transmission could be considered the essential or basic properties of any linguistic system, and without them, languages would not be truly distinguishable from hominoid communication in general. From an evolutionary perspective, it was reasonable to assume that these were the last properties to appear in a system already characterized by all the other non-derived properties.

Furthermore, he outlined the successive steps of evolutionary progress that led from proto hominoids to our first truly human ancestors. As soon as hominins had achieved upright posture, bipedalism, the use of hands for manipulating, carrying, and manufacturing tools, and languages, they had *transformed* into a society. These changes occurred approximately one million years ago. Subsequent brain growth, attested to by fossil remains, showed that the hominin brain grew steadily from about 750,000 years ago until about 40,000 years ago. Fossil evidence indicated that the human diaspora originated in East Africa, and humans exhibited surprisingly little racial diversity, a same striking lack of variety being revealed in certain aspects of their languages.

Almost every type of articulation that functioned in one language also appeared in several other languages, without any significant geographical correlation. Phonological systems showed far less variety than any linguist could easily invent. Such uniformity precluded the independent invention of duality and modern articulatory movements in two or more parts of the world: the fundamental developments must have occurred only once and then spread.

True diversity was found only in the most superficial aspects of languages, just as in other phases of human life where tradition (and not genetics) clearly represented the most important mechanism of cultural change and adaptation. Human evolution was thus completed before the diaspora, establishing a situation in which all subsequent change and adaptation could be affected within broad limits, traditionally and not genetically. The diversity of human races was so small that the languages and cultures of all speech communities (however distinct) were elaborations of a single inherited “common denominator.”

V. Primitive Language and Child's Language

Within the section on primitive and child languages, in his book *Language and Man: An Introduction to the General Problems of Linguistics*, B. Malmberg (1966: 149-81) alluded to the generally accepted hypothesis that human beings evolved from lower animals through a long process of selection and adaptation. This theory necessarily presupposed an evolution of the communication and contact possibilities of *Homo sapiens* society (and before it, of the various hominids), from a simpler means of expression to more complex forms. Simple structures were also the first ones acquired by children during their learning of adult languages. However, we sometimes find linguistic primitivism in certain types of words that, due to their phonetic structure, seem to have belonged to the most primitive layer of languages and the expressive needs of all humankind.

5.1. Thus, for example, he cited R. Jakobson's article (1962) on "Why *mama* and *papa*?" and presented us with the enormous range of terms for 'father' and 'mother' in all languages, identical or like our '*dad*' and '*mom*'. It might seem obvious that in some cases these lexemes must have been borrowed from one language to another. However, with a simple syllabic structure and sounds containing *p* and *m* respectively (sometimes also *t* and *n*), they appeared in so many places that their emergence without the explanation of borrowing had to be assumed, and they corresponded rather to a broader and more primitive characteristic.

Moreover, he cited a number of different languages (Sanskrit, Greek, Latin, English, German, Swedish, etc.) that contained morphemes of the lexemes in question. These lists showed that the examples "*papa*" and "*mama*" were not limited to the meanings of 'father' and 'mother,' but also appeared as designations for a series of concepts that shared the common characteristic of referring to the most basic needs and the most primitive vital manifestations of the child and the individual: the mother, food, sleep, natural needs, and so on.

Furthermore, it was important to remember that the semantic boundaries of the concepts the child possessed were not yet clear. For the infant, the concepts 'mother-food-breast' formed a complex of unidentified content to which an expressive labionasal sound (created in the very act of suckling) was linked, which gradually became a sign, thus, for example, in infant language, *mam-mam*, *nam-nam*, etc. The morpheme *ma(m)* thus became a sign of 'mother' (*ma-má*, *ma-dre*), of 'food' (cf. English *meat*, Swedish *mat*, French *manger*, etc.), of 'breast' (Latin *mamma*, Spanish *mama*, French *mamelle*, with a diminutive suffix).

In Indo-European languages, the infantile morphemes *pa-* and *ma-* (which appeared reduplicated in *papá* and *mamá*) were used to designate 'father' and 'mother'. From these, the normative lexemes *pater* and *mater* were formed by adding the suffix *-ter*, from both a phonological and syntactic-semantic point of view. From this came the Latin *pater* and *mater*, which in turn gave rise, for example, to *padre* and *madre* in Italian and Spanish, *père* and *mère* in French, and so on. The morpheme designating 'pater' appeared in Germanic languages with an initial *f* (English *father*, German *Vater*, Swedish *fader*, etc.), since the Indo-European *p* became *f* in these languages. This evolution caused the lexeme in question to lose all trace of its original infantile character. The same thing happened, in principle, with the evolved vocalism of 'mater' (English *mother*, German *Mutter* and Swedish *moder*), compared to that of the original lexeme.

Only 1.1% contained any consonant cluster. Exclusively vowel morphemes were also unusual. 76% of all terms contained a labial (*p - b - m*) or a dental (*t - d - n*), and 10% a velar or palatal (*k - g - n*), followed, in almost all cases, by a vowel. Thus, from the perspective of historical evolution, the naming of the unidentified semantic complex closest to the child was based almost entirely on the polarity between the optimal consonants (the plosives) and the open vowels. In the child's prelinguistic cooing, repetitions of elements of this type played a significant role (*ma-ma*, *pa-pa*, *na-na*, *ta-ta*, etc.).

5.2. Furthermore, the distribution of nasal and oral consonants among kinship terms showed that 55% of the terms designated the 'mother,' and only 15% of those relating to the 'father' belonged to the nasal class (*m, n*). There was, therefore, a clear tendency towards nasal consonants in the group of terms for the designation of the 'mother.' If we add to this the large number of formations with nasal consonants among the concepts of 'food,' 'breast,' and the like, the association between prelinguistic expressions with nasal consonants and this semantic field, so central to the young child, became clear, as did how the first fundamental phonetic distinctions and the first lexemes were created. In the prehistory of humankind, similar associations took place between unidentified expressive sounds and the most primitive needs and functions, and the first linguistic signs of society (not yet articulated) were of this type.

In this primitive lexical material, one could therefore discern an initial sign of differentiation between lexemes with and without nasal consonants. The nasal opening (with the soft palate lowered and air escaping through the nose) was the only possible opening when suckling. And lexemes with nasal consonants, more frequently than those without, had a reference to 'mother-suckling-food'. In all languages, there existed groups of lexemes that belonged to different primitive needs of expression, such as onomatopoeia and other imitative formations, frequently of a childlike nature and constructed based on the most general and fundamental phonological structure models: a nasal or plosive (*m* or *p*), along with a generally open vowel; that is, the simplest possible syllable structure repeated an indefinite number of times.

The widespread use of this type of lexemes in all languages was not due to kinship or vocabulary borrowing, but rather to the fact that they were simple structures underlying all languages, and to the primitive levels of human communication where these types arose, which exclusively employed these simple linguistic structures. The similarities depended solely on this and on the imitative nature of this type of lexemes, but they were not yet entirely arbitrary signs. The "*mam-mam-mam*" of a small child referring to food (and secondarily to the mother) was on the boundary between unstructured expressive sounds and the phonologically constructed linguistic sign. In expressive sounds, the primary distinguishing element was the nasal consonant, and the intermediate opening was, in principle, merely a consequence of it.

The primitive opposition between the nasal *m-* (*ma-ma-ma*) and the non-nasal *p/t* (*pa-pá*, *ta-tá*, etc.) constituted the earliest indication of phonologization, that is, the systematic use of a sound effect to differentiate meanings. Phonological differentiation was initially as uncertain and unstable as semantics (cf. the vacillations between nasal and non-nasal, as well as those between a series of related meanings: 'mother'-'breast', 'mother'-'woman', etc.). In the description of these primitive, pre- and proto-linguistic expressive means, it was quite clear that the best available knowledge was used as a point of reference.

VI. Relations Between Linguistics and the Social and Natural Sciences

In the relations between linguistics and the other sciences (social and natural), R. Jakobson (1970: 50-73) argued that the question about the origin of languages was excluded by the Neogrammarians, since languages were considered a physical result of supposed “phonetic laws”, but currently the appearance of languages had to be confronted with the transformations that marked the transition from pre-human groups to society.

6.1. When we moved from the anthropological sciences to biology, the different types of human communication were no longer just a small part of a much broader field of study, which we will call the modes and forms of communication used by the many living beings. We were faced with a crucial dichotomy: not only languages, but all the communication systems used by human beings (all of which involved the underlying role of languages) differed markedly from the communication systems used by animals that were not endowed with speech, because every communication system in humans was correlated with language, and in the overall network of human communication, language held the primary position.

Verbal signs were clearly distinguished from all types of animal messages by the following several essential properties: a) the power of imagination and creation inherent in languages; b) their capacity to handle abstractions and fictions, as well as to deal with objects and events distant in space and time, contrary to the here and now of animal signals; and c) the structural hierarchy of the constituent elements of languages, called “double articulation,” that is, the division between properly distinctive (phonological) units and meaningful (syntactic-semantic) units, and also a no less essential subdivision of the morphological system into lexemes and clauses. The number of distinct signals emitted by an animal was very limited, so that the totality of its different messages was equivalent to its code.

The transition from “zoo-semiotics” to human language was a major qualitative leap, contrary to the old behaviorist belief that there was a difference of degree, not of nature, between human languages and animal communication. However, the continuity of evolution could not be ignored, and a systematic comparison of human languages and other semiotic structures and activities with ethological data on the means of communication of all other species will allow for a more precise delimitation of these two domains, as well as a deeper study of their homologies and their equally important differences.

The traditional opposition between languages and animal communication, which was seen as an opposition between cultural and natural phenomena, was a clumsily exaggerated oversimplification. The *nature-nurture* dichotomy posed a problem of extreme complexity. The further down the scale of organized beings we descended, the more nature dominated over education, but even lower animals were capable of learning. The discovery of new cultural behaviors, both instrumental or technological and social, in chimpanzees and other higher primates, has challenged the entire problem of human cultural uniqueness and has allowed us to observe the continuum between non-human “para-culture” and human culture (see J. Sabater, 1978).

6.2. A child's language acquisition was also subject to the combined action of nature and nurture, and its innate character was the necessary basis for acculturation. However, the relationship between the two factors was reversed: in children, acquisition was the determining factor, while in animal offspring, it was heredity. A child could not begin to speak without contact with speakers, but as soon as this contact was established (whatever the language of their environment), they acquired it, provided they were no older than seven, whereas any other supplementary language could be learned during adolescence or adulthood (see L. Malson, 1964).

In other words, the learning of the initial communication system (by both humans and animals) was only possible between two chronological limits of maturation. The undeniable fact that the lexeme was a universal and exclusive property of humans demanded an in-depth study of the biological preconditions of languages. The research in question has increasingly studied divergent development, which was the opposite of the convergent trend in the diffusion of communication, and acted as a powerful counterweight to diffusion.

Over the past hundred years, a large number of important universal features have been discovered in the phonological and syntactic-semantic structure of languages (see R. Jakobson, C. G. M. Fant, and M. Halle, 1952). Among the countless languages of the world, it was evident that there was no particular variety whose structural characteristics were contrary to a child's innate ability to master them through progressive learning. Languages have been, as biologists have said, “species-specific.”

All children possessed innate tendencies to learn the spoken language of their family environment, and no existing phonological or syntactic-semantic rule exceeded the infant's capabilities. The question of whether the inherited ability to grasp, adapt, and appropriate the spoken language of adults implied the supposed innate nature of a universal grammar was entirely futile and belonged to pure speculation. It was evident that inherited and acquired structures were closely related, influencing and complementing one another.

6.3. Like any malleable social instrument that tends to maintain its dynamic equilibrium, languages have revealed their properties of self-regulation and self-direction. The rules of implication that have governed the

constitution of the mass of phonological and syntactic-semantic universals, and have underpinned the typology of languages, have been largely inherent in the internal logic of linguistic structures, and have not necessarily presupposed special "genetic instructions."

"The adaptive nature of communication", rightly emphasized by modern biologists, was evident in the behavior of higher and lower organisms that adapted to each other's ecological environment, or conversely, adapted that environment to their needs. One of the most impressive examples of the ability to make intense, continuous adjustments was that of the child learning their language through creative imitation, alongside their parents and other adults.

The beginner resorted to all the necessary methods for mastering the language: initial simplification by selecting the most accessible elements, a progressive degree of approximation to the complete code, experimentation with metalinguistic glosses, various forms of cooperation between teacher and student, as well as persistent demands for learning and instruction. All of this completely contradicted the naive references to "the absence of any need for language instruction," or to parents who had no means of explaining the language to their children. However, the question of genetic inheritance has arisen from the moment the very foundations of languages have been addressed.

6.4. The spectacular discoveries made fifty years ago in the field of molecular genetics were presented by the researchers themselves in terms borrowed from linguistics and information theory. The extraordinary degree of analogy between the genetic information system and that of verbal information fully justified the title of G. Beadle and M. Beadle's work (1966), *The Language of Life*: the deciphering of the DNA code revealed that we possessed a language far older than hieroglyphics, a language as old as life itself, a language that was the most alive of all. The latest work on the progressive deciphering of DNA showed the quadrilateral language inscribed in the nucleic acid molecules, which taught us that all genetic information was contained in coded molecular messages, that is, in its linear sequences of "code words" (*codons*).

The old notion of a gene (an integral structure likened to the beads of a rosary) was superseded by that of a sequence of four elements repeated by permutations. Since our letters were merely superficial variations of the phonological structure, it was more useful to directly compare the subunits of the genetic code with the minimal distinctive units (phonemes and intrinsic distinctive features). All information-transmitting systems, the genetic code and the verbal code, were thus the only ones founded on the use of discrete elements that (in themselves) were meaningless, but which served to constitute the minimal meaningful units (lexemes and morphemes), that is, entities endowed with a meaning inherent to them within the code in question.

The genetic code, the first manifestation of life, and languages, a universal attribute of humanity that enabled its crucial leap from genetics to civilization, were the two fundamental memories where information transmitted from ancestors to descendants was stored: molecular inheritance and verbal heritage, a necessary condition for cultural tradition. Furthermore, while biologists understood that the indispensable diversity of all individual organisms, far from being accidental, represented a universal and necessary phenomenon inherent to living beings, linguists, for their part, recognized the creative character of languages in the unlimited variability of individual speech and the infinite diversity of verbal messages. For linguistics, as for biology, stability and variability resided in the same structure and were mutually implicated.

6.5. Given that inheritance itself was essentially a form of communication, and that the universal architecture of the verbal code was certainly a molecular inheritance of all *Homo sapiens*, it was legitimate to ask whether the isomorphism of these two different codes (the genetic and the verbal) was explained by a simple convergence, due to similar needs, or whether the foundations of the manifest linguistic structures, superimposed on molecular communication, had not been modeled directly on the structural principles of the latter.

The molecular order of inheritance had no bearing on the various variables of the formal and semantic constitution of each language. However, individual speech had a certain aspect that allowed us to presume the possibility of a genetic endowment. In addition to the intentional information that took multiple forms, our speech carried with it inalienable and unalterable characteristics that originated primarily in the lower part of the vocal tract, located between the abdomen-diaphragm region and the pharynx.

Likewise, a link could be established between three universals in exclusively human phenomena:

- 1) The manufacture of secondary tools intended to construct other primary tools.
- 2) The appearance of purely distinctive phonological elements but used to construct meaningful units (morphemes and lexemes).
- 3) The incest taboo, decisively interpreted by anthropologists as the *sine qua non* condition of a more general exchange of sexual partners, and therefore of an expansion of kinship, as well as the conclusion of economic, cooperative, and defensive alliances.

These three innovations served to establish a solidarity among individuals that transcended the family, and materialized in the introduction of resources necessary for the foundation of society and its material, verbal, and

spiritual culture. The idea of secondary tools rested on a mediated and abstract principle, and their appearance in the three aspects mentioned must have been the most important stage in the transition from “animality” to a purely human spirit.

The rudiments of these three fundamentally similar attributes must have originated in the same interstadial paleontological period of Würm II-III (between 40,000 and 35,000 BC), and the oldest discovered utensil specimens (such as burins), intended for the manufacture of other tools, allowed us to conjecturally assign an era to the anthropological history of languages.

In particular, the fact that an articulated language was necessary to formulate the rules of incest (which inaugurated exogamy) allowed for a more precise determination of when languages appeared in the evolutionary chain. The distinctions between authorized consorts and individuals with whom union was prohibited as “incestuous” were governed by a system of naming that could only be applied by someone capable of using language. Furthermore, the importance of languages for the development and spread of toolmaking could be inferred.

VII. Evolution and Analysis of Generative Grammar

Regarding the anthropological history of languages, within the evolution and analysis of the generative syntax of Spanish, F. d'Introno (2001: 13-28, 375-8) stated that there were several theories, but they could be summarized in two:

- 1) Multiregional evolution: *Homo erectus* left Africa approximately one million years ago and spread throughout the world, where in each region the species that gave rise to modern humans developed, and
- 2) evolution of African Eve: after the departure of *Homo erectus*, there was another exodus from Africa, that of modern man who spread throughout the world.

7.1. In northern Spain, one of the world's richest regions in paleontological remains, there is evidence of the presence of *Homo* (*Homo antecessor*) from around 800,000 years ago (in Atapuerca), of Neanderthals from around 100,000 years ago, and of modern humans from around 40,000 years ago. From approximately 20,000 years ago, humans produced cave art (in the caves of Altamira and Busto Castillo) and artifacts, including musical instruments. The first theory of human genetic evolution suggested a gradual development from *Homo erectus* to modern humans. The second hypothesis pointed to a modest evolution before modern humans, followed by a change or revolution with the development of a gene for language.

Anatomical evidence showed that the human skull increased in size over time and was distinct from the skulls of chimpanzees and pre-*Homo erectus*, in which the occipital region was smaller and the frontal region larger. Broca's area was absent in chimpanzee skulls. In *Homo sapiens*, the larynx was closer to the nasal cavity in the first few months of life and then descended to its current position in the neck of an adult. This change allowed for the expansion of the oral and laryngeal cavities and a greater range of vocalizations.

Archaeological evidence showed that there was a qualitative and quantitative shift with *Homo sapiens* in social and technological development: art, music, religion, and languages. These changes became part of their genetic heritage. Biological evidence from mitochondrial DNA studies suggested that humans descended from a common woman who lived in Africa (the so-called African Eve). Classical genetic studies showed that there were two fundamental groups that diverged considerably: African and non-African.

The latter was later divided into Southeast Asian (which included Pacific Islanders) and North Eurasian (which included Caucasians, Northeast Asians, and Native Americans). This classification supported the idea that there were two groups of *Homo sapiens*: those who remained in Africa and those who left Africa, creating a non-African group that spread throughout the world and diversified into the various groups mentioned.

7.2. Linguistic evidence seemed to favor the hypothesis of an abrupt genetic change, and languages were probably the clearest feature of the cognitive difference of *Homo sapiens*, as a distinctive characteristic that differentiated it from other *Homo species* (hominids and primates). The empiricist hypothesis that the child was a *tabula rasa* who learned their language through imitation, generalization, and analogy was untenable; rather, it was the result of some innate linguistic principle.

Languages were part of our genetic code, which allowed us to acquire a language, that is, to develop a vocabulary (lexicon), form sentences with lexemes (syntax), pronounce lexemes and phrases (phonetics and phonology), understand lexemes and sentences (semantics) and recognize and generate sentences that were grammatical, as well as recognize and reject those that were ungrammatical (linguistic principles and conditions).

This knowledge, called linguistic competence, was achieved thanks to the innate capacity of languages and the data that stimulated linguistic development, allowing the selection, from among universal elements, features, rules, principles, and conditions, of those specific to the acquired language. Of course, this knowledge was accompanied by others, such as, for example, how and when each lexeme or sentence was used, and by a

series of other phenomena that were not directly deducible from universal grammar, which we could call exceptions.

7.3. From this perspective, the syntax of a language was the set of elements, features, rules, principles, and conditions, drawn from universal grammar, that determined how lexemes combined to form sentences. In the government and binding model, N. Chomsky (1982) proposed that the new generative syntax made it possible to reformulate the theory from a new perspective, since it presented itself as a highly articulated, modular system in which various subsystems of rules and, above all, principles cooperated to predict the form, structure, and interpretation of sentences.

In the minimalist model, N. Chomsky (1995) proposed that a theory about the faculty of languages should obey a principle of economy that avoids redundancies, derivations and superfluous derivational steps, or with symbols that do not have an impact on the interpretive *interface* systems.

However, many researchers have rejected the assumption of innate languages and universal grammar, since it was a mere fictional hypothesis inexplicable without a speech community that incorporated the sociocultural dimension of languages. Furthermore, there was a clear dismissal of the intrinsic relationships between language, society, and culture, and of acculturation as an empirical foundation for the anthropological history of languages (see W. Labov, 1972; H. López Morales, 1989; A. Cece and F. Gimeno, 2020; F. Gimeno and M.V. Gimeno, 2003; F. Gimeno, 1987, 1990, 2021, 2025a, 2025c).

VIII. Development of the Structures of the Oral Cavity

On the other hand, the accurate research of the anatomist A. Bermejo *et al.* (2019, 2021) proposed that the chin was one of the anatomical characteristics of the human being that (along with the lack of the superciliary arches of the frontal bone) best defined the *Sapiens* society, compared to the groups of chimpanzees, due to the appearance of the oral register by the persistent action of the “mentalis” muscle on the mandibular symphysis, in the context of the masticatory and phonatory process.

5.1. The morphology of the bony structure of the mouth was a determining factor in the freedom of movement of the tongue and lips. In their first article, 20 skulls and mandibles of adult *Homo sapiens* were compared with 12 skulls and mandibles of chimpanzees, in which 37 mandibular variables were measured. The conclusion was that there were anatomical differences between the mandibles of *Homo sapiens* and chimpanzees, and that these differences could be related to the development of the oral register in the former.

Subsequently, A. Bermejo *et al.* (2022) established a comparative and anatomical description of the fossil remains of the mandibles of eight Neanderthal individuals from the La Sima de Las Palomas (Torre Pacheco, Murcia), where seven anthropometric variables were measured to define their position in the development of the oral register. Their age ranged from 130,000 to 40,000 years.

The structures of the oral cavity in modern humans were conditioned during their development by three factors:

- 1) Bipedalism, which required changes in the relationship between the larynx, pharynx, and oral cavity.
- 2) Oral habits, in which the tongue acted as a mold to form the palate and occupy the palatal space.
- 3) Genetic factors.

The structure of the mandible had been linked to chewing and swallowing, but the function of speech may have had many more determining factors. The average values of the variables measured in the Neanderthal groups were closer to the Chimpanzee group than to the *Sapiens* society, who had all their variables with significant differences compared to those of the Chimpanzee and Neanderthal groups.

From an anatomical perspective, the three groups had to be arranged, with Chimpanzees and *Homo sapiens* at the extremes, and Neanderthals in between, though closer to Chimpanzees. The results obtained at the three levels (mandibular lingual cast, chin, and mandibular condyle) were surprisingly consistent. Although the tongue and its various tissues did not fossilize, the hard, mineralized structures surrounding it did, providing exquisite and precise information about its shape.

IX. Conclusions

1. The anthropological history of languages has consistently preoccupied linguists, anthropologists, anatomists, neuroscientists, and paleontologists, without considering that the essential problem was analyzing their most primitive forms and their most superficial manifestations, starting from the terms of kinship. One of the main characteristics that differentiated *Homo sapiens* society from animal groups was its acquisition of a sound complex in a specific situation, as a conventional symbol applied to a particular identification and recognition. The development of the familial transmission of the mother tongue involved a process of social and cultural diffusion and acculturation, as well as the intrinsic relationships between languages, societies, and cultures.

2. All languages and cultures of speech communities were the product of an inherited system, and human evolution was completed before the diaspora from Africa in successive waves. A child's language acquisition before the age of seven was also subject to the combined influence of nature and nurture. A child could not begin to speak without contact with speakers, but once this contact was established, they acquired the language, while any additional language could be learned during adolescence or adulthood. The social and cultural variation of languages was ancient and was found in the subsequent social and cultural diffusion of languages, with the proliferation of the most superficial variants (phonology and morphology), where all changes occurred within their traditions.

3. The first conclusion of the American anthropologist G.P. Murdock was that the purpose of his research was to present data confirming the hypothesis: a remarkable convergence in the structure of parental terms across all historically unrelated languages. The most striking results of his research lay in the distribution of nasal and oral consonants among kinship terms: 55% of the terms designating 'mother' and only 15% of those pertaining to 'father' belonged to the nasal class (*m*, *n*). The traditional statements that "the mother was usually designated with an *m*- form, and the father with a *p*-, *b*-, *t*-, or *d*- form received fundamental statistical corroboration." The terms '*mama*'- '*papa*' were thus infantile lexemes, consistent with the evolutionary nature of infant speech, and neither their penetration into national languages nor their international diffusion invalidated their basic conformity. However, the complete exclusion of forms resembling "*mama*" and "*papa*" from Murdock's sample was strictly superfluous, provided that related languages clearly demonstrated their indigenous origin.

4. B. Malmberg's response was more specific and aligned with empirical principles of early linguistic change, based on the vast prevalence of terms for 'father' and 'mother' in the world's languages. The appearance of a simple syllable structure with sounds containing '*m*' and '*p*' respectively in so many places indicated a very broad and primitive linguistic level. Furthermore, the lists showed that the terms '*papa*' and '*mama*' were not limited to the meanings of 'father' and 'mother,' but also appeared as designations for a series of concepts that shared the common characteristic of referring to the most basic needs and the most primitive vital manifestations of the child and the individual: the mother, food, sleep, bodily functions, and so on.

5. The primitive opposition between the nasal *m*- (*ma-ma*) and the non-nasal *p/t* (*pa-pa*, *ta-ta*, etc.) thus constituted the earliest indication of phonologization, that is, the systematic use of a sound effect to differentiate meanings. Our working hypothesis on the anthropological history of languages that differentiated society from animal groups, based on anthropological, sociological, and legal determinants, was confirmed and more closely aligned with an empirical application to primitive linguistic change (pre- and proto-linguistic). If in the Lower Paleolithic *Homo habilis* developed the precedent of written record in the imitation of figures of real objects or beings, in the Upper Paleolithic *Homo sapiens* disseminated the precedent of oral register in the materialization of *ma-ma*, based on the imitation of the nasal sound produced by the sucking of an infant.

6. Among exclusively human phenomena, R. Jakobson proposed three universals: 1) the manufacture of secondary tools intended to construct other primary tools; 2) the appearance of purely distinctive phonological elements, but used to construct meaningful units (morphemes and lexemes); and 3) the incest taboo, decisively interpreted by anthropologists as the *sine qua non* condition for a more general exchange of sexual partners, and therefore for an expansion of kinship, as well as the conclusion of economic, cooperative, and defensive alliances

7. These three innovations introduced purely auxiliary and secondary tools, which served to construct the tools necessary for the foundation of society and its material, verbal, and spiritual culture. The idea of secondary tools rested on a mediate and abstract principle, and their appearance in the three aspects mentioned must have been the most important stage in the transition to a purely human spirit. The rudiments of these three fundamentally similar attributes must have originated in the same interstadial period of Würm II-III (between 40,000 and 35,000 BCE), allowing us to assign a period to the anthropological history of languages.

8. The oldest of the seven Eastern writing systems was Sumerian, with evidence in southern Mesopotamia dating back to around 3100 BCE. Among all the numerous languages, it was evident that there was no variety whose structural characteristics were contrary to the child's innate tendency to master them through progressive learning. All children possessed innate tendencies to learn the spoken language of their family environment, and no existing phonological rule exceeded the infant's capabilities. It was clear that inherited and acquired structures were closely related, influencing and complementing one another.

9. Among other social and cultural developments, the greater brain development and refinement of *Homo sapiens* determined the formation of the human chin, the only mammal to possess one and the most significant

difference between humans and chimpanzees. The only mammal that obtained it and was the best difference between them and chimpanzees from a simple syllabic structure of the labiodental sound's /m/ and /p/, which must have evolved simultaneously with the cognitive development of the brain. The *Homo sapiens* were no longer merely a biological specimen but became integrated into society, where linguistic exchange determined its position and configuration as a component of a culture.

10. The most significant difference between the oral register of languages and animal communication lies in the intrinsic relationships between languages, societies, and cultures, even though we biologically share more than 98% of our genes with chimpanzees. Without the sociocultural component of the oral record of languages, it was impossible to establish a working hypothesis on the anthropological history of languages, based on anthropological, sociological and legal determinants.

References

- Ardener, E. et al. (comp), (1976), *Antropología social y lenguaje*, Buenos Aires, Paidós.
- Artola, M. (dir.), (1973-1976), *Historia de España Alfaguara*, 7 vols., Madrid, Alianza.
- Beadle, G. and Beadle, M. (1966), *The language of life: An introduction to the science of genetics*, Nueva York.
- Bermejo, A., Panchón-Ruiz, A. and Sánchez del Campo, F. (2019), "Homo sapiens, chimpanzees and the enigma of language", *Frontiers in Neuroscience*, 13, 558-65.
- Panchón-Ruiz, A. and Sánchez del Campo, F. (2021), "Hypothesis about the appearance of the vermilion border off the lips in Homo sapiens", *Translational Research in Anatomy*, 24, 101-5.
- Panchón-Ruiz, A. and Walker, M. (2022), "Neanderthal, Sapiens, and chimpanzees' mandibles: A comparative study in relation to articulated speech", *Archaeological and Anthropological Sciences*, 14, 116.
- Cece, A. and Gimeno, F. (2020), "El impacto de la globalización económica y del anglicismo léxico en los diarios económicos de Italia y España", in Gimeno, F. (coord.) (2020), 129-52.
- Chomsky, N. (1982), *La nueva sintaxis. Teoría de la rección y el ligamiento*, Barcelona, Paidós Comunicación, 1988.
- (1995), *El programa minimalista*, Barcelona, Ariel Lingüística, 1998.
- Dil, A. S. /ed.) (1972), *Language in socio-cultural change. Essays by J. A. Fishman*, Stanford, California, Stanford University Press.
- D'Introno, F. (2001), *Sintaxis generativa del español: evolución y análisis*, Madrid, Cátedra.
- Ferguson, C. A. (1959), "Diglossia", *Word*, 15, 325-50.
- 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 J. A. Fishman (ed.) (1971), I, 217-404.
- (ed.) (1971), *Advances in the sociology of language*, 2 vols., The Hague, Mouton.
- 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.
- et al. (1985), *Organización social del espacio en la España medieval, La Corona de Castilla en los siglos VIII a XV*, Barcelona, Ariel.
- Gelb, I. J. (1952), *Historia de la escritura*, 1st ed., Madrid, Alianza Universidad, 1987.
- 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 Española, 689-98.
- (1990), *Dialectología y sociolingüística españolas*, 2nd ed., Alicante, Universidad de Alicante, 1993.
- (1995), *Sociolingüística histórica (siglos X-XII)*, Madrid, Visor Libros.
- (2008a), "En torno a la comunidad de habla: la elisión de -s final", *Actas del VII Congreso Internacional de Historia de la Lengua Española* (Mérida, Yucatán), Madrid, Arco/Libros, I, 255-74.
- (2008b), "El cambio lingüístico estable. La elisión de -s final en español", *Revista Internacional de Lingüística Iberoamericana*, VI, 2 (12), 141-55.
- (2019), *Historia antropológica de los romances hispanos*, San Millán de la Cogolla, Cilengua.
- (2021), "La normalización escrita de la épica castellana" in Gimeno, F. (coord.) (2021), 13-107.
- (2023), "The sociocultural origin of the oral register of Languages", *IOSR-JHSS*, 28, 5, 4, 42-54.
- (2024), "Acculturation", *IOSR-JHSS*, 29, 11, 3, 17-32.
- (2025a), "Hispanic Acculturation" *IOSR-JHSS*, 30, 12, 2 95-121.
- (2025b), "Historical Sociolinguistics and acculturation", *IOSR-JHSS*, 30, 10, 4, 34-44.
- (2025c), *Historia antropológica de la frontera valenciano-castellana meridional*, Alicante, Universidad de Alicante.
- and Gimeno, M. V. (2003), *El desplazamiento lingüístico del español por el inglés*, Madrid, Cátedra.
- (coord.) (2020), *Lengua, sociedad y cultura. Estudios dedicados a A. Carcedo González*, Alicante, Universidad de Alicante.
- (coord.) (2021), *El Poema de Mio Cid. Nuevas revisiones críticas*, Alicante, Universidad de Alicante.
- Halliday, M. A. K. (1978), *El lenguaje como semiótica social. La interpretación social del lenguaje y del significado*, México, Fondo de Cultura Económica, 1982.
- Hockett, C. F. (1958/1962), *Curso de lingüística moderna*, 4th ed., Buenos Aires, Eudeba, 1971.
- Hymes, D. (1971), "Antropología social, sociolingüística y etnografía del habla", in Ardener, E. et al. (comp), (1976), 115-51.
- (1974), *Foundations in Sociolinguistics. An Ethnographic approach*, London, Tavistock Publications.
- 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.
- Fant, C. G. M. and Halle, M. (1952), *Preliminaries to speech analysis. The distinctive features and their correlations*, 10th ed., Cambridge, Massachusetts, MIT, 1972.

- Labov, W. (1972), *Modelos sociolingüísticos*, Madrid, Cátedra, 1983.
- 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.
- (2006), “Sociolingüística histórica”, *Actas del VI Congreso Internacional de Historia de la Lengua Española*, Madrid, Arco/ Libros, 2385-402.
- Malmberg, B. (1966), *La lengua y el hombre. Introducción a los problemas generales de la lingüística*, 2nd ed., Madrid, Istmo, 1972.
- Malson, L. (1964), *Les enfants sauvages – Mythe et réalité*, Paris.
- Murdock, G. P. (1959), “Cross-language parallels in parental kin terms”, *Anthropological Linguistics*, 1 (9), 1-5.
- Sabater, J. (1978), *El chimpancé y los orígenes de la cultura*, 3rd ed., Barcelona, Anthropos, 1992.
- UNESCO (patr.) (1963), “La mente”, in *Prehistoria y los comienzos de la civilización*, in *Historia de la Humanidad. Desarrollo cultural y científico*, Barcelona, Planeta, 1977, I, 107-13.
- Weinreich, U. (1953), *Languages in contact. Findings and problems*, 7th ed., 1970. Trad. cat. *Llengües en contacte*, Alzira, Bromera.
- Labov, W. and Herzog, M. I. (1968), “Empirical foundations for a theory of language change”, in Lehmann, W. P. and Malkiel, Y. (eds.) (1968), 95-195.