

Acculturation

Francisco Gimeno-Menéndez
University Of Alicante

Summary

The hypothesis of the history of humanity 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 assiduously upheld principles in historical linguistics was acculturation. There was no linguistic change without languages in contact, and both the history of languages in contact and linguistic change were part of acculturation, based on social and cultural diffusion, which implied the intrinsic relationship between linguistics, sociology and anthropology. From approximately 1970, the panorama of concern for space in the historiography relating to the Crown of Castile began to change. The entry of anthropology into history was one of the most significant historiographical data. The central idea of ecosystem and the key concept of acculturation were used by some Spanish historians, in order to offer a new interpretation of the behavior of Hispanic-Christian society. Our current working hypothesis has been an application of languages in contact, within a new project of anthropological history on the long process of formation of Hispanic Romance languages. In the history of humanity, the primary principle in the history of languages in contact and linguistic change was the acculturation of human groups.

Keywords: *Acculturation, anthropological history, historical sociolinguistics, linguistic change, languages in contact.*

Date of Submission: 24-10-2024

Date of Acceptance: 04-11-2024

I. Introduction

The hypothesis of the history of humanity 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 assiduously upheld principles in historical linguistics was acculturation. There was no linguistic change without languages in contact, and both the history of languages in contact and linguistic change were part of acculturation, based on social and cultural diffusion. It was not, therefore, a mere linguistic question, but also a social and cultural one. The primary principle in the history of languages in contact and linguistic change was the acculturation of human groups.

1.1. Within the anthropological history of the Hispanic Romance languages there was a linguistic and cultural continuity, based on the successive and diverse historical acculturations (Indo-European, Basque-Iberian, Phoenician-Greek, Roman, Christian, Germanic, Visigothic, Byzantine, Islamic, Castilian, Catalan-Aragonese, Hispanic 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, great contributions to historical linguistics were accumulated, which were far from being recognized by historians of the language.

The hypothesis of the autonomy of linguistic levels was incompatible with the postgenerative theory of grammatical change, but some European functionalists have not recognized this incompatibility. Moreover, there was a double starting strategy in the investigation of linguistic change: a) homogeneity, and b) structured heterogeneity. According to this interpretation, there were the following models of linguistic change: a1) neogrammarian; b1) dialectological; a2) functionalist; b2) pragmatic; a3) generative, and b3) historical sociolinguistic.

If all linguistic change implied ongoing variation (although not all variation implies change, see F. Gimeno, 2008a, 2008b), the homogeneous models of linguistic change (neogrammarian, functionalist and generative) were unrealistic and inadequate. However, a real success of diachronic functionalism was the recognition that the formation of the various Romance languages from the same Latin system questioned the past simplification of hypotheses based only on linguistic systems, but it was an intuition relegated from its objectives and methodology.

1.2. However, studies on language and cultural contact in Europe did not enjoy wide 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 cultural contact, and language transfer was a facet of social diffusion and acculturation. However, despite the increase in anthropological interest in contact problems, particularly in the United States of America after the First World War, studies on language contact and cultural contact did not enjoy wide coordination, nor had the relationship between the two fields of study been properly defined.

The problem of major interest in language transfer was the interaction of linguistic and social factors that promoted or impeded such transfer. Anthropologists investigating acculturation were forced to include linguistic evidence as indications of the total process of acculturation, whereas linguists needed the help of anthropology to describe and analyze those factors that governed language transfer and were actually within the domain of culture.

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

Acculturation, then, included 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 the reinterpretation within new groups, as well as the rejection of said elements. Gradually, the term *transculturation* has become less common compared to the more frequent term 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).

II. Principles of Linguistic Variation

Linguistic change and the diversity of languages responded to the languages and cultures of the different speech communities that were the result of an inherited product, and human evolution was completed before the African diaspora, in successive waves. 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, where all linguistic change was carried out within their traditions.

A child's acquisition of language was subject to the combined action of nature and education, just as its innate character was the necessary basis for acculturation. However, a child could not begin to speak if he did not have contact with speakers, but as soon as this contact was established (whatever the language of his environment) he acquired it, provided that he had not exceeded seven years of age (see R. Jakobson, 1962, 1970; C. F. Hockett, 1958/1962: 547-76; B. Malmberg, 1966; F. Gimeno, 2023).

2.1. In his analysis of the social basis of linguistic variation, W. Labov (1965) outlined three fundamental issues of ongoing change:

- a) The locus of social and situational variation played an important role in the ongoing change. Social variation included the linguistic features that characterized the different social groups of the speech community in a heterogeneous society (so, for example, the socioeconomic, generational, sexual group, etc.), while situational variation referred to the diversity of social processes, in which registers are determined by functional criteria of linguistic use, according to the communicative situation (formal or informal) (see W. Labov, 1970; H. López Morales, 1989).
- b) The level of abstraction of phonological and syntactic rules was far removed from the awareness of speakers and raised the question of what role social factors played in language learning. The impact of social factors on language was more related to the more superficial structures and their underlying forms (phonological, morphological and lexical) with higher performance and productivity, with respect to the lower variation in the less superficial (syntactic) rules (see W. Labov, 1982).
- c) The function of linguistic diversification was not immediately and obviously functional, as species diversification might be. Rather, we might (with good reason) regard language diversification as possibly dysfunctional, and that we would actually be better off if we all spoke a version of Post-Indo-European intelligible to all. However, I was inclined to think that the development of linguistic differences had a positive value in human cultural evolution, and that cultural pluralism might even be a necessary element in the human extension of biological evolution. And linguists themselves might be encouraged to consider more deeply the mechanisms of language differentiation, as well as the limiting conditions that formed the content of a universal grammar.

2.2. Among the internal factors of ongoing change, W. Labov (1994: 865-919) studied the general principles that would determine the internal variation of linguistic structures. It was no accident that the focus of attention was on phonetic change, since it might be the driving force most responsible for the continued metamorphoses of languages throughout recorded and unrecorded history. Nor was it accidental that the various chapters had successively become interested in grammatical problems of increasing abstraction, since any sustained pressure on the surface of a language would eventually resonate throughout the structure as a whole.

The working hypothesis was that we would be products of our own evolutionary history and that of the animal kingdom as a whole and that our efforts to understand language would be enriched by understanding this continuity with other populations of socially oriented animals. Regarding phonological and morphological variation, the functional hypothesis predicted a tendency for speakers to select one variant or another in a way that preserved information. Most of the results mentioned showed the opposite: that in the flow of speech one or another variant was selected without considering maximizing information. On the contrary, the main effects determining these choices would be mechanical: phonetic conditioning and simple repetition of the preceding structure.

So far, the results would favor the Neogrammarian view that language change was mechanical and phonetically determined. When a language changed, its ability to transform information would often be threatened, but in the long run, most languages would preserve their way of communicating information (more or less) in one way or another. Although speakers might not behave wisely and thoughtfully when selecting one variant or another, the system would react in some way.

Taken together, their investigations showed that the Neogrammarian characterization of linguistic structure was essentially correct. That structure was a largely mechanical system, beyond the reach of conscious recognition or adjustment by its users. There could be no doubt that language was designed to carry propositional information, as a result of an organization operating in the non-human species from which we evolved. It seemed strange, therefore, that we should not be free to adjust this system to its maximum efficiency for communicating information of this kind.

One possible explanation might be that the efficiency of language depended on its automaticity, and that a phonological or grammatical structure that was open to conscious inspection or manipulation would necessarily operate very slowly. Our efforts to consciously change language might therefore be confined to higher-level stylistic choices: the selection of words and the construction of phrases and sentences within a narrowly limited set of choices.

The general perspective presented would be more attractive to those who conceive of language as a social fact, rather than as a result of individual choice. Many recently proposed theories of language would explain linguistic structure as a result of the speaker's intentions to communicate meaning to the listener. There is a part of linguistic behavior that would be subject to conscious control, to deliberate choice, to purposeful and reflexive behavior. But it would not be a major part of the language faculty, and it would have relatively little bearing on the long-term evolution of linguistic structure.

It was no accident that the illustrations used to present probability matching were drawn from the behavior of other species of animals. He had proposed that abstract syntagmatic and paradigmatic relations were controlled by faculties that were shared with animals that were closely and distantly related to humans. We should not be surprised if we found that the systemic adjustments in the syntax and morphology of language were governed by the same cognitive faculty that governed the social behavior of wild ducks.

2.3. In the introduction to cognitive and cultural factors in linguistic variation, W. Labov (2010: 1-4) pointed out that cognitive factors were used in the narrowest sense, as factors influencing the acquisition of a linguistic system that conveyed information about states of affairs (i.e., more about what was said than about the manner of expression style). Furthermore, cognition was sensitive to the systematic variation in which the message was delivered, with information produced about the social characteristics of speakers and relationships with the recipient or audience.

Cultural factors were distinguished from other social factors by their generality or isolation from simple face-to-face acts of communication. Thus, for example, neighborhood, ethnicity, social network, and communities of practice could be considered social factors in linguistic variation on the transparency of the social processes responsible for the diffusion of ongoing change. At the same time, there was surprisingly no correlation with variation in the broader categories of gender and social class. Both were characterized as social or cultural factors based on what was commonly believed to be involved in the diffusion of these traits.

In his conclusion, W. Labov (2010: 367-75) presented a broad selection of factors responsible for linguistic variation and divergence. Cognitive and cultural factors were considered in the origin, development and motivation of linguistic variation, as well as whether they operated together, in alternation or in opposition in the course of variation.

No matter how these cultural factors were perceived and transmitted, their relationship to the cognitive processing of language forms was problematic. To the extent that they promoted and reinforced regional differentiation, they could be seen to interfere with the primary cognitive function of language, and make it difficult to understand what was being spoken across the border.

In the ongoing relationship to animal communication systems, language (as distinct from animal communication systems) enabled us to transfer information about distant times and places, and to use the information to solve the basic problems of life. No matter how cumbersome and clumsy or inefficient our language might be, it was reasonable to believe that it would serve the best purpose if it remained unchanged, as a common convention accessible to all.

Ongoing change is linked to (and opportunistically parasitic on) variation. Most students of linguistic variation accepted U. Weinreich's view *et al.* (1968) that the speech community displayed "orderly heterogeneity." Uniform patterns of social and stylistic stratification suggested that community members could make use of such variation to place speakers on scales of social distance and social power, and many experiments confirmed this view.

When the system changed, community members did not necessarily show the flexibility to adapt to what younger speakers were doing. Within the community, it must be the case that young people who participated in the increment of a sound change had some perception of the age vector involved, and adults could recognize the new forms used by their children. But it remained to be shown that this age sensitivity led to accurate interpretation of speech across generations. The incidence of misunderstanding is even greater across dialect boundaries.

The analogies with animal communication systems (ACS), which lacked sentence capabilities, are obvious:

- a) Local identity is analogous to territorial functions in birdsong and other ACS.
- b) The behavior of the reference group corresponds to mimicry in ACS.
- c) The development of cues for markers and the acquisition of style change is analogous to the dominance and submission cues in ACS.
- d) The gender differentiation of ongoing change, a nearly universal feature of community studies, may have some relation to sexual selection, but here the analogy is not clear.

2.4. This hypothesis is historically and anthropologically implausible and unacceptable, and the history of languages in contact and of linguistic change were both part of acculturation, based on social and cultural diffusion, which implied the intrinsic relationship between linguistics, sociology and anthropology. Unfortunately, W. Labov's internal proposal on the principles of the change in progress lacked an explanation of what is most specifically human, which separated us from the rest of the animal species: the symbolic attitudes from which our immense capacity for culture was derived.

It was not, therefore, a linguistic and social issue, but also a cultural one. Languages were excellent instruments of expression and social communication of the cognitive development of social groups, as well as of temporal, geographical and social variation within the various speech communities. Linguistic, social and cultural factors were directly related to the acculturation process of languages in contact and to linguistic change. Explanations that were limited to one or another element were simplifications and had to be based on the regularities observed in empirical studies on linguistic behavior and the dimensions of social multilingualism, within the historical, sociological, cultural and legal determinants of the speech community (see F. Gimeno, 1990, 2019).

The undeniable fact that the lexeme was a universal and exclusive property of man demanded a study of the most primitive and general surface structures (phonological and syllabic), which determined the precedent of the oral register of languages in the *ma-ma* materialization, starting from the imitation of the nasal sound produced by the sucking of the infant. Languages have been specific to human beings.

It would not be possible to examine the lexical differences between languages if we did not implicitly accept the notion that there is an underlying universal matrix of semantic features and a set of universal selection rules that establish the basic patterns of human cognition. Historians have been engaged in sociological and cultural research into how the different channels through which humans interpret and organize the material world will lead to an understanding of the underlying universals. Lexemes as surface phenomena are restricted to the specific grammars of each language.

All languages share the fundamental categories of each component (semantic, syntactic and phonological), together with the universal rules of semantic selection, syntactic ordering and phonological selection. Languages began to be differentiated by the specific rules of semantic selection, syntactic ordering and phonological selection, which generated the surface structures of each language. The acculturation of social groups under conditions of language contact involved the surface structures, with the generalization of the specific features of semantic selection, syntactic ordering and phonological selection. Each lexeme constituted a complex

of semantic features, and for this reason, an analysis of the lexicon of a language had to be considered as a surface realization of the semantic features.

It should also be mentioned that the lexicon of a language was agglomeration of semantic features combined in a hierarchical manner. For these reasons, according to R. J. Di Pietro (1971: 69-123), it was useful to examine the following different functions of semantic features and to determine:

- 1) How they affected the rules of realization of a language.
- 2) How they were projected into general syntactic categories.
- 3) How each language created its lexicon.

Each language, in its own specific way, made an extraction from the universal inventory of semantic features in order to constitute its own set of lexical units or idiomatic expressions. Semantic complexes are technically called *lexemes* and the totality of lexemes makes up the vocabulary of a language. Languages have different ways of grouping lexemes into general semantic categories, by means of semantic marking.

Each lexeme was to be considered as a set of semantic features generated by the secondary selection rules of the language in which it operated, and sensitive to the social and cultural communication needs of the speakers of that language. As hidden units underlying the lexemes, semantic features could not be observed directly. In order to come to an understanding of these features and the selection rules operating on them, an appropriate procedure had to be developed. Any postulate of universality of semantic features had to be formulated on a completely provisional basis, although the importance of the search for semantic universals was in no way diminished by procedural difficulties (see M. Banniard, 2023: 103-6; F. Gimeno, 2019: 343-51, 2024a, 2024b).

2.5. An efficient methodological premise of social multilingualism was the analysis of language maintenance and language shift, which was basically concerned with the relationship between the degree of stability (or substitution) in patterns of language use and the psychological, sociological and cultural processes that developed in multilingual communities for inter- or intra-community communication. These processes were variables associated with habitual language use, and the selection of these variables had to be made not only by impressions of what seemed to be the most relevant processes in a given multilingual situation, but also by more general theories about personal, social and cultural change. Indeed, one of the greatest challenges in this field had been to determine the circumstances in which linguistic and non-linguistic behavior changed concurrently, consecutively or independently, and to systematize these intuitive impressions (see J. A. Fishman, 1964/1968).

Many of the factors that were supposedly considered influential in language retention or language shift worked both ways, depending on the social and cultural context, or were found to be of no general significance when viewed from a broader perspective. Thus, for example, three generalizations were questionable:

- a) The preservation of the language was a function of belonging or loyalty to the group, particularly of expressions as ideologized as nationalism, within the current process of economic globalization and loss of political sovereignty.
- b) Urban residents were more inclined to language shift, and rural residents (more conservative and isolated) were less inclined to language shift.
- c) The most prestigious language displaced the less prestigious one.

It was therefore appropriate to establish a comparative analysis and a typology of contact situations between groups, which is essential in any search for intercultural and historical models (see F. Gimeno and M. V. Gimeno, 2003). Our current working hypothesis has been an application of languages in contact, within a new project of acculturation in anthropological history on the long process of formation of Hispanic romances.

III. Roman and Christian Acculturation

In the anthropological history of Hispanic romances there was a linguistic and cultural continuity, based on the successive and diverse historical acculturations (Indo-European, Basque-Iberian, Phoenician-Punic-Greek, Roman, Christian, Germanic, Visigothic, Byzantine, Islamic, Castilian, Catalan-Aragonese, Hispanic 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. Since approximately 1970, the panorama of concern for space in the historiography relating to the Crown of Castile began to change.

The entry of anthropology into history was one of the most significant historiographical events, and there was a deepening of the knowledge of the configuration of society, and especially of its behavior in relation to the occupied land. The interest of geographers and economists in the fact and regional analysis was strengthened in the field of medievalism by the appearance of a series of notable French theses, based on a framework of this type (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, in order to show a new perspective of the implications that the social organisation of space had during the Middle Ages in the Crown of Castile, and to offer a new

interpretation of the behavior of the Hispano-Christian society (see J. A. García de Cortázar, 1973, 1985; F. Gimeno, 1988, 1995).

3.1. In the sources of Spanish historical law, A. M. Barrero (1993: 231) stated that the conversion of the Iberian Peninsula into a Roman province (*Hispania*), following the military occupation of its territory by Rome and the dominion exercised by it over its inhabitants, meant a profound transformation, both in its political and social organization and in its ways of life, as well as in its law, due to the double process of Roman acculturation and legal administration to which they were subjected.

Both occurred in parallel and independently, since they were favoured by the need to provide the occupied territory with a military and administrative organisation that would allow the different peninsular peoples to coexist with the new occupants from Italy. However, the extension of *Roman citizenship* (that is, the law by which the natives of the city of Rome were governed) to those of the new province depended on discretionary decisions of the Roman authorities and the provincial magistrates.

Based on this action and the personal nature of Roman law, the full legal Romanization of Hispania was not officially achieved until the year 212, when the controversial emperor M. A. A. Bassiano (called Caracalla) granted Roman citizenship to all inhabitants of the empire by means of a constitution, although as far as the Iberian Peninsula was concerned it seemed that this measure did nothing more than ratify a de facto situation, since at that time practically all Hispanics had to be governed by Roman law.

That date of 212 served as a chronological limit to indicate the two well-differentiated stages that (from the point of view of the law in force in the peninsula) occurred during the long period of Roman domination: the first characterized by the plurality of coexisting legal systems, and the second by the full validity of Roman law as the general law of the entire empire, without prejudice to the Christian and Jewish populations also following their own systems in their spiritual life, and in the case of the latter also in those civil matters that (by agreement of the parties) were submitted to the arbitration judgment of their own authorities.

3.2. Between the 8th and 11th centuries, according to J. A. García de Cortázar (2004: 240-6), the Visigothicization and the preservation of the Visigothic reference in politics and culture constituted one of the characteristic elements of the Hispanic-Christian society in formation. The monasteries were its main focus of deposit and diffusion. In the eastern part of the Iberian Peninsula at the beginning of the 9th century, these centers were the object of the reforming concerns of a monk of Visigothic origin, Benedict of Aniano, who had the support of the Emperor Louis the Pious to establish it in the monasteries of the Frankish Empire. In this way, the Catalan monasteries (and to a lesser extent, the Aragonese and Navarrese) had to accept the rule of Saint Benedict, from the 820s.

Meanwhile, in the western region (from Castile to the Atlantic) the monastic rules of the Visigothic period continued in force. However, probably from the end of the 9th century, the monastic centers of Navarre and Aragon returned to the observance of those rules and to the liturgical practice of the Hispanic rite, as a further sign of their disengagement from the Carolingian empire. Thus, during the 10th century, with the exception of the Catalan counties, the rest of the Hispanic territory remained faithful to the tradition created by the Visigothic scholars, especially Isidore of Seville.

The preserved evidence of this awareness of continuity depended on the vicissitudes of history, so there was no coincidence between documents of different types. However, it was in the eastern territories and in the border area between Castile and Navarre, where the most explicit evidence of the Hispano-Christian desire to collect the Hispano-Gothic tradition was generated.

The Albeldense and Emilianense codes were its culminating manifestation, in which the texts that constituted the legal bases (both ecclesiastical and civil) of the Visigoth kingdom were copied together: the conciliar canons of the *Collectio Canonum* and the *Liber Iudiciorum*. In all the peninsular areas, the years 711 to 850 were characterized by the political and cultural strengthening of the respective structures resulting from the Muslim invasion.

3.3. At the beginning of the 2nd century, J. A. García de Cortázar (2012: 13-56) referred to the creation of a clergy made up of the bishop, the priests and the deacons, who accumulated privileges and functions. From the middle of the 3rd century and especially from the year 313, a growing number of Christian faithful sought in monasticism the way to fulfill their desires for perfection. In principle, the monk was the person who withdrew from the world to advance in the spiritual life. The first known manifestations of Christian monasticism date from the end of the 3rd century and the eastern Mediterranean, and it presented three modalities from its beginnings and throughout its history: anchoritism or eremitism, the *laura* and the cenobitic community.

The first type was the individual hermitage, who dedicated his life to prayer, manual labour and penitence in absolute solitude. The second type of *laura* was a kind of colony of hermits who broke their absolute solitude only at certain times on Saturday and Sunday, when they met in the church, situated in the centre of the colony of

hermitages, in order to pray together and celebrate the Eucharist. The third type of monasticism was cenobitic, which required living in community.

These Eastern monastic experiences were soon known and rapidly spread throughout the West. The two features that marked the differences between Eastern and Western monasticism were the interpretation of the ascetic exercise and the social projection of the monk. In effect, the monks of the West accepted the Eastern models, but they softened their practices a century before the rule of Saint Benedict definitively imprinted that character. In addition, Western monasticism was characterized by the greater social projection of the monks, and decidedly opted for cenobitism, although it left hardly any traces of the *laura*, and provided few examples of anchorites. The cult of the saints, with pilgrimages to their tombs, allowed the bishops to give a different meaning to those pagan practices, while Christianizing the burial rites and the consideration of the deceased.

From the year 313, the definitive visibility of Christianity led to the church-institution definitively gaining ground on the church-community, during the 4th-6th centuries. In those three hundred years, the most relevant features of history were three: the continuity of the clerical structure, the strengthening of the monarchical episcopate and the consolidation of the primacy of the bishop of Rome. The progressive affirmation of a more ritual religion recognized by the State favored the differences between clergy and lay people becoming increasingly evident. The former maintained the previous structure in two orders: the superior of the presbyters and deacons, and the inferior of the subdeacons, exorcists, ostiaries and readers. In both cases, it was an urban clergy.

For the training of the former, some bishops had small centres where they acquired knowledge of the rudiments of pastoral and liturgical responsibilities, as well as those of the administration of parish finances and the organisation of charitable institutions. This urban image was truncated in the rural order, where the spread of Christianity progressed slowly. Private churches on the large estates of large Christian landowners began to dominate the landscape, until the 11th century.

Furthermore, it is worth highlighting the transcendental legacy of Jerome (347-420), disciple of the Greek grammarian Donatus and author of the *Vulgate* (commissioned by Pope Damasus), with the revision of the ancient Greek translation of the *Vetus Latina*, based on the translation of the Hebrew text of the Bible. At the threshold of the Middle Ages, his figure as a philologist and historian (as well as a hermit and cenobite) came to summarize what was to be the history of Christian acculturation over the next thousand years: a history of monasteries and codices, texts and copyists, who translated, revised and constructed a universe in which written standardization permanently maintained a leading role (see J. A. García de Cortázar, 2016; F. Gimeno, 2019: 166-77).

3.4. With regard to the sources of provincial law in the Iberian Peninsula, A. M. Barrero (1993: 232-46) proposed that (in addition to the differences of all kinds between Rome and the provinces) the principle of personality of Roman law, on the one hand, and its high level of technical and scientific development (compared to indigenous legal systems), on the other, made it impossible to impose the law of the metropolis on the provinces. However did not prevent them from being provided with their own organization, which involved the establishment of general rules for all their inhabitants (whatever their origin), and thus gave rise to a provincial law distinct from Roman law (although emanating from its authorities and formulated in accordance with the system of sources of Roman law): custom and its interpretation by jurists (*mores* and *iura*), laws (*leges*), dictated by the competent institutions and authorities, and the edicts of magistrates (*ius honorarium*).

The organization of the Iberian Peninsula and its legal system were very similar to those of other provinces of the empire. The term “law” appeared as a contrast to the term *ius*, meaning ‘the disposition of the city in matters of common interest’, but it was maintained with an analogous meaning in the term “laws”, which designated the provisions issued by the public bodies of the city, as opposed to the term “law”, which designated the doctrine of jurists or jurisprudence. The distinction was maintained in the first part of the Visigothic period, to disappear later. In Rome itself, the law was considered as “written reason”, and in this sense it acquired the meaning of “written law” as opposed to custom, the difference between which was lost between the Visigoths and the High Middle Ages, although it was recovered from the Late Middle Ages to the present day.

From the destruction of the city of Rome (476) until the year 711, initially as allies of the empire and then as sole holders of political power after its fall, the Visigoth kings were the protagonists for almost three centuries of the history of most of the territory of Hispania, which became a kingdom independent of any other authority, whose dominion was gradually extended to the entire peninsula. By virtue of a pact of recognition of the imperial authority and the commitment acquired to defend the territory ceded by the emperor, the first Visigoth kings exercised their authority as authentic governors, and created Visigoth law, with the dictation of norms to regulate the new situations born of the distribution of lands and the coexistence of the two peoples (Visigoths and Romans), which entailed important variations in the new legal system, although the legal texts promulgated reflected the Roman legal tradition and practice. From then on, the kings were responsible for legislating in a general manner for all their subjects, by creating authentic codes that replaced those of the imperial era (see A. M. Barrero and M. L. Alonso, 1989).

3.5. The first schools were preserved in the monasteries. The monks were the teachers, and the schools were attended by future monks and some young nobles. From the 12th century onwards, the cities took over from the monasteries. The encouragement of the monarchs to the role of the monasteries (as poles of colonization) constituted a historiographical topic, according to which the kings had used the possibilities of organization of the territory and control of the population that the monasteries offered in the process of reconquest and repopulation. J. A. García de Cortázar (1969: 119-36) applied this working hypothesis to his study of the monastery of San Millán de la Cogolla, and attributed to its condition on the border between the kingdom of Navarre and the county of Castile the abundant donations (both Navarrese and Castilian) that the monastery received during the 10th century, which would have served (among other things) to encourage the process of colonization in La Rioja, recently occupied by the Christians. Later, given the growing conviction that the colonizing effort had been developed earlier by peasant communities, J. A. García de Cortázar (1988: 17-54) defined the role of San Millán and other monasteries as that of feudal organizers of a territory that had previously been colonized by peasant communities.

In early medieval society, even though it was possible to formalize legal acts orally, the writing of the document was necessary to prove the right to something (for example, the ownership of land). Initially, while medieval Latin was the familiar variety, documents were always written in this variety, but also later due to the difficulty of transcribing an oral Romance variety or in regions of another language (Basque). However, from the second half of the 8th century until the middle of the 12th century, we find examples and hybrid texts (Romance and medieval Latin), where there was a transition between the varieties involved, in a long process of written standardization of Hispanic Romance.

We must remember that this was a mere label for a clear process of linguistic transfer between the two varieties (Romance and Medieval Latin, without forgetting at times the non-Romance vernacular involved, Basque) that intervened in the multilingual competence of the scribe. It is true that this research also involved necessary risks, and precautions and caution had to be maximum, but not to the point that descriptive and autonomous discussions of linguistic change on the Latin compilation of early medieval Riojan glossaries prevented us from seeing and understanding the social multilingualism of mixed manuscripts (as well as the implicit planning of the romance), through regulating the multiple variables (linguistic, social and cultural) and the superficial variants of the texts (see C. García Turza and J. García Turza, 1997, 2000, 2004; C. García Turza, 2011; F. Gimeno and C. García Turza, 2010).

The greater Romanesque tradition of glosses and legal texts and the appearance of the *Oaths of Strasbourg* (842) thus revealed the very background of the acculturation of the history of law in determining the sociological and legal function of the Romances, which was not due to Christianity, but to the previous acculturation of Roman law, as well as to the existence of a multicultural Romanesque-Germanic community in the kingdom of the Franks.

3.6. The Visigoths under King Eurico (466-484) began to have the institutions of the laws written down, since before they were governed by custom, and later Leovigildo thoroughly revised some of Eurico's laws, correcting some and removing several superfluous ones, as well as adding many others that were missing. The *Codex revisus* of Leovigildo (573-586) opened a new cycle similar to the previous one, with the official validity of a written law of royal origin, based on Roman acculturation, whose updating became insufficient with the passage of time, to the point that a new work of a compilation nature became necessary.

Furthermore, the clear political intention of the king's actions should be highlighted, through which (having strengthened his authority at home after the submission of Baetica and the Suebian kingdom) he sought to affirm his kingdom against the imperial power of Byzantium, present in the southeast of the peninsula. Only two of the codes have come down to us today, and they have been preserved in their entirety with the corresponding laws of promulgation, so that (in addition to their content) there is also evidence of their authorship, date and circumstances in which they were formed: the so-called *Lex Romana Visigothorum*, commonly known as the *Breviary of Alaric* (484-507) and the *Liber Iudiciorum* in its various versions.

Both the *Code of Euric* and the *Breviary of Alaric* compiled current Roman law, but they did not offer any similarity in content, since the former compiled practical law (i.e. vulgar Roman law), and the latter was a selection of official law texts, usually accompanied by their interpretation. The mere difference in their content did not seem to researchers to be a sufficient reason to justify the preparation of these legal texts successively (and in a relatively short period of time), or to explain their possible simultaneous validity, which gave rise to the formulation of different theories.

The new compilation, the *Liber Iudiciorum*, was promulgated by Recesvinto (654), after its revision by the VIII Council of Toledo, and expressly prohibited the application of the laws of other peoples (specifically the Roman ones), as well as ordering the judges to act in accordance with its content, and failing that to go to the king for a ruling. The orientation of its content was in tune with the new circumstances of a society in the process of feudalization, in which the old public-based relationships continually gave way to the appearance of private ties and particular solidarities.

On the other hand, Christianity had a body of doctrine made up of dogmatic and legal norms that were binding on its followers, and its expansion from the 4th century onwards (as a result of the freedom of confession decreed by the Emperor Constantine) it forced the Church to face its inevitable organic and institutional development by establishing its own legal system composed of provisions dictated by its highest authorities: pontiffs and bishops gathered in ecumenical and provincial councils.

The national churches determined the formation of collections, which indistinctly included the canons of one or more councils, together with the papal epistles. The *Collectio Canonum*, commonly known as *Hispana*, was compiled by Isidore of Seville between 633 and 636 and was considered the best of its time. Its significance was similar to that of the *Liber Iudiciorum* in the secular order, and its validity also continued into the early Middle Ages.

3.7. The great significance of Roman acculturation was well known, through the configuration of the Italic group (within the Indo-European family) and the basis of the Romance languages, although it was not the model of classical Latin and the written register, but the oral register, which was manifested both in the vocabulary and in the surface structure (morphological and phonological). *Romance language* was the literal translation of the Latin term *lingua romana*, which appeared in the second paragraph of canon 17 of the Council of Tours (813), where priests were recommended to preach in the oral register (popular Romance language), so that they could be understood by the faithful.

However, it was not the “birth certificate” of the Romance languages, as has been said, but the Church became bilingual, and was the bearer of literary Latin, at the same time as the popular Romance languages. The clerics who recorded their sermons in Romance gave these popular languages their first literary form. But as soon as the Romance languages began to be used literary, it happened that they fell in turn under the acculturation of the literary Latin of the time and its grammatical and rhetorical norms. It was to this influence that the literary Romance languages of the Middle Ages and the Modern Age owed their development as carriers of acculturation, especially in the erudite Latinisms of Romance vocabulary and syntax (see H. Lausberg (1956/1962, I: 105-6; F. Gimeno, 2019: 233-8).

Since F. Diez, there have been various attempts to delimit and classify the Romance languages, based on different criteria (historical, linguistic, political or literary). C. Tagliavini (1949/1969: 478) took into account the geographical distribution from east to west, and divided the Neo-Latin varieties into the following groups:

- a) Balcano-Romanesque (Romanian and Dalmatian, although it stopped being spoken at the end of the 19th century).
- b) Italo-Roman (Italian, Sardinian and Rhaeto-Roman).
- c) Gallo-Romanesque (French, Franco-Provençal, Provençal and Catalan).
- d) Ibero-Roman (Spanish, Galician and Portuguese).

Throughout the Roman Empire, the following elements played a decisive role in Roman acculturation: Roman administration, military garrisons (in connection with them, the granting of citizenship rights to provincial graduates), Roman culture in urban centres and schools (especially in Spain and Gaul), trade and rural colonisation.

In the flowering of medieval Christianity in the 13th century, the Church was present everywhere, and the same currents of thought circulated from one end of the West to the other through Latin, the common language of liturgy, science and diplomacy, although Greek was its main source throughout all periods of its history. Christianity undertook great common enterprises: universities, crusades and the construction of great cathedrals. The Roman Church at the Council of Trent (1545-1563) declared itself in favour of preserving Latin.

The acceptance of Latin by all the inhabitants of the provinces was a process that developed without any kind of coercion, and represented the profound impact of Roman acculturation on the political, social, commercial and cultural penetration of the empire. Nor was there a conscious will on the part of the inhabitants of the provinces to preserve their mother tongue, except in the conservative strongholds. However, linguistic conservation and language shift implied a linguistic awareness and attitude (positive or negative, respectively) (see F. Gimeno, 2016a).

IV. Origin of the Romances

The first written manifestations and the oldest historical-linguistic testimonies of the oral formation process of the Romance languages were the loss and readjustment of the casual Latin inflection, from the 1st century AD (with the syntactic calque of the Semitic word order), and the glosses (especially legal ones, from the 3rd century), that is, superficial variants (morphological and lexical) of the pre-Romance derivation in colloquial and Christian Latin in contact with the pre-Roman vernaculars. The historical sociolinguistic analysis of the early medieval glossaries constituted one of the most valuable means of understanding and reconstructing the process of written standardization of the Romance languages, as the first examples of the temporal, geographical, social and situational differentiation of medieval Latin (see F. Gimeno, 2016b, 2019: 299-307).

4.1. Based on the polarization of vocabulary and the morphological and syntactical split, H. Lüdtké (1968: 247-57) characterized the social situation from the time of Augustus to that of Charlemagne as diglossia (see C. A. Ferguson, 1959). It reflected the incipient separation of Latin between the colloquial register and the

standard variety, and the increasing distance between the two varieties. With the Carolingian cultural reform (in favor of a clear differentiation between Romance and Medieval Latin and the written fixation of Western Romance), the previous diglossia disappeared and a new bilingual situation was created, characterized by the Latin/Romance dualism.

This occurred first in France, the Spanish Marches and northern Italy, and then, in imitation of the former, in other Romance countries. However, the written standardization of the Western Romance languages came after the period of its materialization in the neighboring Celtic and Germanic varieties, which began with Gothic in the 4th century, and was based on the fact that in non-Romance-speaking communities the written fixation of the different varieties represented an important means of expressing high culture. And, in imitation of their neighbors, the different Romance social groups decided to consider the possibility of the written standardization of their new varieties.

The decision of the Council of Tours (813) that sermons should be translated orally into the vernacular (whether Romance or not) led to the production of written specimens also in these varieties. Gradually, an incipient literature developed in the French or Occitan varieties, which were the oldest Romance varieties. During the 11th and 12th centuries, medieval Latin was not only the official language but also the highest-ranking literary variety, in the same way as Greek in the Eastern Roman Empire, or Arabic and Hebrew in the Iberian Peninsula.

Among these traditionally recognized languages and the other Romance languages, the *langue d'oïl* and the *langue d'oc* reached a sort of intermediate position at the end of the 11th century and especially during the 12th century. In particular, at the end of the 11th century, the same northern location and the different degree of Romanisation of the lands of the *langue d'oïl* allowed the appearance of the epic poem *Chanson de Roland*, while troubadour poetry emerged in Occitan.

4.2. Later, through a pragmatic-descriptive approach to the texts, H. Lüdtke (2005) offered us an encyclopedic compendium on the formation of Romance languages, which compiled the various lines of research that followed one another in the field of Romance linguistics. He even mentioned the term variation, and integrated the contribution of historical sociolinguistics. Linguistic communication (observed in speech acts) was the only manifestation of language that was given to us empirically, and the study of linguistic change would be feasible, as a result of the pragmatic performance of countless speech acts of the speaker.

The universal and inevitable linguistic change would rather result from the variation and choice made by the speaker at each moment of his performance. This choice would concern him precisely at two distinct stages of the speech act: when he chooses meanings, and when he goes on to express them through signifiers, with the regulation of the corresponding phonic output. The processes of linguistic change thus generated would, therefore, be of two types, in accordance with the levels of language (semantic/lexical/syntactic and phonic).

However, in the face of descriptive, qualitative and autonomous hypotheses of linguistic change, we had to assume that syntactic, semantic or phonological change implied a grammatical change in the communicative competences of successive generational and social groups in the speech community, through the reorganization of the vernacular. The grammars of the different social groups in the speech community (vernacular and standard, depending on the domains of use) and the very concept of 'speech community' (and not the idiolect) were the fundamental focus of sociolinguistic research (see U. Weinreich, W. Labov and M. I. Herzog, 1968: 187-8; J. A. Fishman, 1971: 237-58; W. Labov, 2001: 71-2; F. Gimeno, 2004, 2008a: 255-60, 2024a).

4.3 On the origin of the Romance languages, H. Lausberg (1956/1962, I: 51-94) wrote that it was a phenomenon due, on the one hand, to the loosening of the external ties of the Roman Empire and the weakening of its cultural vitality, and on the other hand, to the new formation of "national" speech communities (which emerged later), which independently assimilated and revived Roman acculturation. A thorough study of the Romance languages revealed numerous pre-Roman elements, which had infiltrated and amalgamated with the respective Romance languages throughout history. Not only in terms of the impressive influence on the lexicon, but also various influences on the phonology and syntax of the Romance languages had to be taken into account, although we hardly knew more than the name of most of the pre-Roman varieties, and it was difficult to determine the period when they disappeared.

In the 1st century BC, all the pre-Roman languages were still alive (with the exception of the Mediterranean varieties in Italy). It is possible that Gaulish had survived longer than any other language (in some parts of Switzerland perhaps until the 5th century). The pre-Roman languages that had survived to the present day in their peripheral pockets in Romania were: Basque in the western Pyrenees and the Basque Country, Albanian in Albania and Greek in the southern extremities of Calabria (Bova near Reggio) and Apulia (near Otranto).

Medieval Latin had one fundamental characteristic: it was a written register (and sometimes even oral), when what was generally spoken was not Latin. It was, therefore, a language learned in monastic and episcopal schools, from the moment when the mother tongue of the different social groups was no longer Latin, but a different variety.

It was not easy to determine when medieval Latin ceased to be a vernacular variety of communication in the West (for some, the 6th or 7th century, and for others at the very beginning of the 8th century).

The linguistic awareness of Romance arose in the Gallo-Romanesque-Frankish contact in the kingdom of the Franks, from the first half of the 8th century onwards, and was fostered by the bilingual Gallo-Romanesque-Frankish awareness of a multicultural Romance-Germanic community, less tied to Roman acculturation. In general, the linguistic awareness was less clear and resolved in the Romance context than in the Germanic one, due to the lesser differentiation between medieval Latin and the Romance languages. The Romance world emerged from Gallo-Romanesque-Frankish contact in northern Gaul.

4.4. The real reason for the transition from the relative unity of colloquial Latin to the plurality of neo-Latin varieties, according to C. Tagliavini (1949/1969: 363-4), was the concomitant influence of the three factors adduced by several authors (G. Gröber, C. Merlo and W. von Wartburg):

- a) The chronological discrepancy of the colonization of the various *provinces* or regions.
- b) The difference of pre-Roman languages.
- c) The divergent influences exerted over the centuries by peoples who superimposed themselves on the different social groups of the Romance-speaking communities.

There were, therefore, many causes for the formation of the romances and their progressive differentiation. As the bonds of unity weakened with the collapse of the Western Roman Empire, faced with the pressure of the Germanic peoples, we would witness a struggle between the old centripetal force and new centrifugal forces, and the new neo-Latin world would emerge. The reconstruction of the oral register (considerably different from the written one) of the various romances in the period of origins was sometimes impossible.

Even if we could determine with sufficient accuracy the oldest testimonies of each of the romances, we would necessarily have to limit ourselves to the examination of written documents, which were always later than the formation of the romances as vernaculars. After the fall of the Western Roman Empire, Latin became the official language of the Christian Church, and continued to be written and spoken (more the former than the latter). The literary models were always the classical ones, and the greatest effort for medieval writers was to handle a language that was no longer spoken (at least, in the domain of familiar use).

Later, J. Herman (1975/1997: 137-47) argued that the end of the history of Latin ended with the 7th century and the first decades of the 8th century. During the first half of the 8th century, structural changes in the language in Gaul produced a communicative break between the mother tongue used by everyone and the Latin inherited from texts. However, this date would not necessarily be common to all Romanized territories, and would depend on the particularities of the evolution of the linguistic system in the different regions. Thus, for example, in Italy, the first evidence of a conscious differentiation between the regional language and the written practice of Latin came only from the second half of the 10th century.

The differences in the date of the origin of the Romance languages were probably due to factors that were still to be determined. Thus, it was likely that the early and radical character of certain developments in the variety of ancient Gaul (for example, the generalized drop of vowels in the final syllable—except for *a*—that occurred in Gallo-Romance between the 7th and 8th centuries) contributed to accelerating the transition in this region. The mechanism of the evolution of Latin towards the Romance stage and the interaction of “external” and “internal” factors were far from being revealed, and from being described with the desired precision and rigor.

Furthermore, it was possible to point out, already in the imperial period, the internal diversity (geographical, social and situational) of Latin in the various regions of the empire. There were very solid reasons to suppose that Latin, from the time of the empire, had regional varieties, which affected above all the pronunciation and perhaps certain morphological elements, and in the later periods of its evolution it even had dialects. In a certain way, the different Romance varieties represented the medieval dialects of Latin: there was no solution of continuity.

Just as there are no rigid geographical boundaries between particular languages, the chronological boundaries between successive phases of the language were a fiction of our mind, and there were intermediate or transitional varieties (see R. Penny, 2000: 45-56; F. Gimeno and E. Martínez Olmos, 2010). The process of transformation from Latin to Romance was therefore related to the linguistic diversification of Romania (due to the various historical, sociological, cultural and legal circumstances) and to the slow and continuous process of linguistic and social variation.

4.5. On the origin of the Romance languages, J. J. de Bustos Tovar (2004: 258-68) believed that it would be a macroprocess that would lead to the dismemberment of Latin, as a result of the evolutionary interaction that affected all the components of the original system. There were two phenomena that decisively intervened in the initiation of changes that took centuries to be consummated. The first was the emergence of Christianity, which brought a new conception of the world in all its breadth.

The second was the invasion of the Germanic peoples, who (although already Romanized for the most part) destroyed the political and cultural unity of the Roman world and gave rise to large population movements

and new territorial divisions, as well as to an impoverishment of classical culture. Nevertheless, Roman culture survived as a model well into the 7th century, and the use of Latin as the only language of communication. Strictly speaking, the proto-Romances were the set of evolutionary tendencies, whose existence was necessary to assume in order to explain their generalization in the period of origins, in the different peninsular romances, until the 8th century.

According to this author, there are two types of causes in the evolution of languages: internal and external. The first arose from the fact that the language was a system open to a tendency towards restructuring, with the production of a dynamic of change that did not quite reach a stable equilibrium. This happened, for example, when the Latin velar consonants, in contact with a palatal vowel, began an articulatory shift until they formed a new correlation bundle, based on palatality and not on velarity. The social and cultural factors (which favoured the disappearance of a language and its language shift by others derived from it) were always related to major historical crises, since these caused ruptures in the internal cohesion of all the elements that determined social, political and cultural unity.

However, the distinction between “internal” and “external” factors was one of the most discussed issues of diachronic functionalist theory in the last century (see F. Gimeno, 1995: 39-53), even though this functionalism recognized that the formation of the various Romance languages, from the same Latin system, questioned the past simplification of hypotheses based solely on linguistic systems .

Among the limitations of this functionalism were, on the one hand, the marginalization of anthropological, sociological and legal history, with the impact on the determinism of the system (which implied an inadmissible opposition between linguistic structure and cultural tradition), and on the other, the perception that the results of the contact of some Romance languages had not produced important modifications of the phonological and syntactic structure (under the influence of social factors), without realizing that it was a limitation of its objectives and methodology.

4.6. Regarding the peculiar position of French in western Romania (starting from the circumstances of the Frankish Germanic invasion), W. von Wartburg (1950: 131-40) claimed to have proven the existence of a Franco-Gallo-Romance bilingualism in northern Gaul, from the time of the Merovingian king Clovis (5th century) until at least the 9th century, and in certain regions even later. Within the linguistic and cultural transfers of the Franks and Burgundians in Gaul, total Germanization occurred in the north, and became less intense from north to south, where there was not only a numerically smaller invasion and a second less powerful invasion, but also the fact that neo-Romanization (which had already begun in the 6th century in bilingual northern Gaul) reached them later and more slowly.

In this mutual relationship, Frankish policy was deliberately and from the very beginning oriented towards creating a situation of equality between the Roman and Germanic groups and towards attracting both peoples in equal proportion to cooperation in the tasks of government. Thus, a leading group with linguistic and cultural transfers arose in the country, in which the Germanic element initially still dominated, and this was decisive for the linguistic destiny of northern Gaul, since these transfers spread to the Gallo-Roman and Frankish populations.

Thus, it was the Franks who gave Merovingian Latin, north of the Loire, the essential features through which it came to have the first relevant peculiarities that were to transform it into Old French (and the distinction between Occitan and Ibero-Romance), with the subsequent language shift of Germanic (Frankish) in the 10th century. Medieval Latin began to cease to be vernacular from the first half of the 8th century in northern Gaul, and this social situation of strict diglossia was fostered by Gallo-Romance-Frankish contact, less linked to the Latin-Roman tradition.

V. Basque-Iberian Acculturation

Regarding the languages of pre-Roman Hispania, R. Lapesa (1942/1981: 20-47) alluded to the fact that in the time of Augustus the Greek geographer Strabo stated that there was a diversity of languages among the natives of the Spanish peninsula. This assertion was fully corroborated by the studies carried out in the last century on the inscriptions on tombstones and ancient coins. At the dawn of historical times, peoples with a common language that survives in present-day Basque were established on both sides of the Pyrenees.

Along the coast of Levante and neighboring regions, perhaps as a remnant of a previous, broader domain, the culture of the Iberians of probably North African origin extended: it was to them that the peninsula owed its name of Iberia, which was given to it by Greek writers. Iberian writing offered few difficulties for its reading, thanks to the fact that M. Gómez-Moreno discovered in it a combination of syllabic signs, like those of the Cretan and Cypriot graphic systems, with signs representing phonemes, like those of the Phoenician and Greek alphabets. While the Basque region preserved its language, the rest of the peninsula accepted Latin as its own language, forgetting its primitive languages, but we find pre-Roman linguistic transfers both in Spanish phonology and in Spanish morphology and lexicon of pre-Roman origin (see F. Gimeno, 2019: 87-166).

5.1. The Roman acculturation of the northern half of the Iberian Peninsula began in the Ebro basin, along which the Romans laid out the main trade routes that linked the capital of Tarraconensis, on the Mediterranean coast, with the interior of the country. In parallel with this early Romanization, the various native languages were blurred in favor of Latin. Roman acculturation increased from T. Sempronius Gracchus, the founder of Gracchuris (today Alfaro), in 184 BC, until the dismemberment of the Empire in the face of the onslaught of the Germanic peoples.

La Rioja was probably the region in the north of the Peninsula that was most affected by the earliest and fastest Roman acculturation. The ancient onomastics of this area do not offer Basque names, but Latin ones. As for the relations between Basque and Latin, throughout antiquity and the Middle Ages, we must admit that, in the stage of Romanization of northern Hispania, many Latin words used by Roman colonists and legionaries passed directly into the Basque language. Later, other, already evolved, words were taken from the Romance languages spoken in the territories adjacent to the Basque Country (see S. Segura and J. M. Etxebarria, 1996: 11-2).

Furthermore, regarding the Basque-Iberian acculturation in the Romance languages, M. T. Echenique (2004) offered various considerations on the Basque-Romance contact, since Basque as a pre-Romance language was the only Paleo-Hispanic language to survive the acculturation of the Iberian Peninsula. First, it coexisted with Latin (from which it received numerous lexical transfers, as well as other syntactical ones), and then with the Romance languages (mainly with Riojan, Aragonese, Navarrese, Occitan-Gascon and later with French), in whose contacts the transfers that the Romance languages influenced on Basque were undoubtedly more effective than the other way around, without having implied the displacement of the Basque language, within a situation of extensive diglossia (see F. Gimeno and M. V. Gimeno, 2003: 31-48; F. Gimeno, coord., 2020).

Likewise, regarding the oral formation process of the Riojan vocalism, the author explained that it came from Baque-Latin bilingualism and the formation of the proto-Romance variants. In effect, this process was inseparable from the close proximity and contact with the reality of the Basque language, and at the beginning of the 10th century the entire west of the province of Logroño (from the Najerilla river) spoke Basque and Riojan, just as it is well known that in the 13th century Basque was still spoken in the valley of Ojacastró .

5.2. In the mid-10th century, the Basque glosses of the *Glosas Emilianenses* assumed that in a place near San Millán de la Cogolla there coexisted (in addition to Basque and Riojan) medieval Latin (as the language of Christian worship and official documents), the Occitan of the Frankish immigrants together with its very marked Gascon variety (both used in very distinct official documents) and Hebrew, as well as the Mozarabic of the immigrants from the south. The Basque-Romance contact therefore occurred in a multicultural context of social multilingualism, less linked to Roman acculturation.

In the reconstruction of the Basque language, a system of five oral vowels with three degrees of opening could be observed, without any trace of the opposition of quantity. The Riojan vowel system (as well as that of Aragonese and Asturian, which presented an identical system to that of the Basque language) had, consequently, its origin in the Basque-Romance bilingualism of the different social groups within the Basque-speaking community, and not in the Hispanic Latin vowel system of the Pyrenean area and surrounding Hispanic areas. These Riojan-speaking groups consolidated the Romance diphthongization of the two open stressed vowels of colloquial Latin (*e* and *o*), although this diphthongization existed in other Romance languages, but in none of them did the diphthongs completely replace the two open vowels (see M. T. Echenique, 1983, 2013; F. Gimeno, 2019: 102-6, 2024b).

VI. Conclusions

1. The hypothesis of the history of humanity 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 assiduously upheld principles in historical linguistics was acculturation. There was no linguistic change without languages in contact, and both the history of languages in contact and linguistic change were part of acculturation, based on social and cultural diffusion, which implied the intrinsic relationship between linguistics, sociology and anthropology.

2. Acculturation was the name given to all cultural events that resulted from the acquisition, modification or reinterpretation of a culture, as well as the reception and assimilation of cultural elements from one social group by another, with adaptation to a new sociocultural context. The term acculturation was widely accepted among American anthropologists in the late 19th century, in order to refer to the changes that occurred when social groups with different cultural traditions came together.

3. From about 1970, the panorama of concern for space in the historiography relating to the Crown of Castile began to change. The entry of anthropology into history was one of the most significant historiographical events. The central idea of ecosystem and the key concept of acculturation were used by some Spanish historians, in order to offer a new interpretation of the behavior of Hispanic-Christian society. Our current working

hypothesis was confirmed through of the long process of Roman, Christian and Basque-Iberian acculturation. In the history of humanity, the primary principle in the history of languages in contact and linguistic change was the acculturation of human groups

4. Within the anthropological history of the Hispanic romances there was a linguistic and cultural continuity, based on the successive and diverse historical acculturations (Indo-European, Basque-Iberian, Fenno-Punic-Greek, Roman, Christian, Germanic, Visigoth, Byzantine, Islamic, Castilian, Catalan-Aragonese, Hispanic 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.

5. Linguistic change and the diversity of languages responded to the languages and cultures of the different speech communities that were the result of an inherited product, and human evolution was completed before the African diaspora, in successive waves. 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, where all linguistic change was carried out within their traditions. Languages were excellent instruments of expression and communication of the cognitive development of social groups in the anthropological history of humanity, and they had to be considered within the biological process of childhood acquisition of languages. Such acquisition was subject to the combined action of nature and education, just as its innate character was the necessary basis for acculturation.

6. In the internal factors of language variation, W. Labov (1994) proposed general principles that would determine the internal evolution of language structures, and would respond to products of our own evolutionary history and that of the animal kingdom as a whole. Our efforts to understand language would be enriched by understanding this continuity with other populations of socially oriented animals. Furthermore, the results would favor the neogrammarian view that language change was mechanical and phonetically determined. The systemic readjustments in the syntax and morphology of language would be governed by the same cognitive faculty that governed the social behavior of wild ducks.

7. In the introduction to cognitive and cultural factors in linguistic variation, W. Labov (2010) presented a broad selection of factors responsible for linguistic variation and divergence. Cognitive and cultural factors were considered in the origin, development and motivation of linguistic variation, as well as whether they operated together, in alternation or in opposition in the course of variation. In the relation of ongoing change to animal communication systems, language (as distinct from animal communication systems) allowed us to transfer information about distant times and places, and to use the information to solve basic life problems. The analogies with animal communication systems (ACS), which lacked sentential capabilities, were obvious:

- a) Local identity is analogous to territorial functions in birdsong and other ACS.
- b) The behavior of the reference group corresponds to mimicry in ACS.
- c) The development of cues for markers and the acquisition of style change is analogous to the dominance and submission cues in ACS.
- d) The gender differentiation of ongoing change, a nearly universal feature of community studies, may have some relation to sexual selection, but here the analogy is not clear.

8. From a historical and anthropological point of view, this hypothesis was implausible and unacceptable, and both the history of languages in contact and of linguistic change were part of acculturation, based on social and cultural diffusion, which implied the intrinsic relationship between linguistics, sociology and anthropology. Unfortunately, W. Labov's proposal on the internal principles and cognitive and cultural factors of linguistic change lacked an explanation of what is most specifically human, which separated us from the rest of the animal species: the symbolic attitudes from which our immense capacity for culture was derived.

9. It was not only a linguistic and social issue, but also a cultural one. Languages were excellent instruments of temporal, geographical and social variation within the various speech communities. Linguistic, social and cultural factors were directly related to the acculturation process of languages in contact and to linguistic change. Explanations that were limited to one or another element were simplifications and had to be based on the regularities observed in empirical studies on linguistic behavior and the dimensions of social multilingualism, within the historical, sociological, cultural and legal determinants of the speech community. It would not be possible to examine lexical differences among languages if we did not implicitly accept the notion that there existed an underlying universal matrix of semantic features and a set of universal rules of semantic selection, syntactic ordering, and phonological selection that established the basic patterns of human cognition. Languages were specific to human beings.

10. All languages share the fundamental categories of each component (semantic, syntactic and phonological), together with the universal rules of semantic selection, syntactic ordering and phonological selection. Languages began to be differentiated by the specific rules of semantic selection, syntactic ordering and phonological selection, which generated the surface structures of each language. The acculturation of social groups under conditions of language contact involved the surface structures, with the generalization of the specific features. Each lexeme constituted a complex of semantic features, and for this reason, an analysis of the lexicon of a language had to be considered as a superficial realization of the semantic features.

11. In the sources of Spanish historical law, A. M. Barrero (1993) argued that the conversion of the Iberian Peninsula into a Roman province (*Hispania*), following the military occupation of its territory by Rome and the dominion exercised by it over its inhabitants, meant a profound transformation, both in its political and social organization and in its ways of life, as well as in its law, due to the double process of Roman acculturation and legal administration to which they were subjected. Both occurred in parallel and independently, since they were favored by the need to provide the occupied territory with a military and administrative organization, which would allow the coexistence of the different peninsular peoples with the new occupants from Italy. However, the extension of *Roman citizenship* to those of the new province depended on discretionary decisions of the Roman authorities and the provincial magistrates.

12. In the history of Christian acculturation, the transcendental legacy of Jerome (347-420) should be highlighted. He was a disciple of the Greek grammarian Donatus and author of the *Vulgate*, with his revision of the ancient Greek translation of the *Vetus Latina*, based on the translation of the Hebrew text of the Bible. At the threshold of the Middle Ages, his figure as a philologist and historian came to summarize what was to be the history of the following thousand years: a history of monasteries and codices, texts and copyists, who translated, revised and constructed a universe in which written standardization permanently maintained a leading role.

13. The greater Romanesque tradition of glosses and legal texts and the appearance of the *Oaths of Strasbourg* (842) thus revealed the very background of the acculturation of the history of law in determining the sociological and legal function of the Romances, which was not due to Christianity, but to the previous acculturation of Roman law, as well as to the existence of a multicultural Romance-Germanic community in the kingdom of the Franks.

14. The great significance of Roman acculturation was well known, through the configuration of the Italic group (within the Indo-European family) and the basis of the Romance languages, although it was not the model of classical Latin and the written register, but the oral register, which was manifested both in the vocabulary and in the surface structure (morphological and phonological). *Romance language* was the literal translation of the Latin term *lingua romana*, which appeared in the second paragraph of canon 17 of the Council of Tours (813), where priests were recommended to preach in the oral register (popular Romance language), so that they could be understood by the faithful.

15. In the flowering of medieval Christianity in the 13th century, the Church was present everywhere, and the same currents of thought circulated from one end of the West to the other through Latin, the common language of liturgy, science and diplomacy, although Greek was its principal source throughout all periods of its history. Christianity undertook great common enterprises: universities, crusades and the construction of great cathedrals. The Roman Church at the Council of Trent (1545-1563) declared itself in favor of preserving Latin.

16. The linguistic awareness of Romance arose in the Gallo-Romanesque-Frankish contact in the kingdom of the Franks, from the first half of the 8th century onwards, and was fostered by the bilingual Gallo-Romanesque-Frankish awareness of a multicultural Romance-Germanic community, less tied to Roman acculturation. In general, the linguistic awareness was less clear and resolved in the Romance context than in the Germanic one, due to the lesser differentiation between medieval Latin and the Romance languages. The Romance world emerged from Gallo-Romanesque-Frankish contact in northern Gaul.

17. Furthermore, on the Basque-Iberian acculturation in the Romance languages, M. T. Echenique (2004) offered various considerations on the Basque-Romance contact, since Basque as a pre-Romance language was the only Paleo-Hispanic language to survive the acculturation of the Iberian Peninsula. First, it coexisted with Latin, and then with the Romance languages, in whose contacts the transfers that the Romance languages influenced on Basque were undoubtedly more effective than the other way around, without having implied the displacement of the Basque language, within a situation of broad diglossia. Likewise, on the process of oral formation of the Riojan vocalism, said author explained that it came from Basque-Latin bilingualism and the

formation of the proto-Romance variants. Indeed, this process was inseparable from the proximity and with the reality of the Basque language, and at the beginning of the 10th century the entire west of the province of Logroño spoke Basque and Riojan.

References

- 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.
- Banniard, M. (2023), “La génesis de las lenguas románicas en el siglo XXI: la sociolingüística en diacronía larga (V-IX ss)”, In García Turza, C. (dir.) (2023), 87-130.
- Barrero, A. M. (1993), “Las fuentes del derecho histórico español”, In Artola, M. (dir.) (1988-1993), VII, 229-335.
- y Alonso, M. L. (1989), *Textos de derecho local español en la Edad Media. Catálogo de fueros y costums municipales*, Madrid, CSIC.
- Bustos Tovar, J. J. de (2004), “La escisión latín-romance. El nacimiento de las lenguas románicas”, In Cano, R. (coord.) (2004), 257-90.
- Cano, R. (coord.) (2004), *Historia de la lengua española*, 2ª ed., Barcelona, Ariel, 2013.
- Casanova, E. (ed.) (2010), *Els altres parlars valencians. I Jornada de parlars valencians de base castellano-aragonesa*, València, Denes.
- Dil, A. S. (ed.) (1972), *Language in sociocultural change. Essays by J. A. Fishman*, Stanford, California, Stanford University Press.
- Di Prieto, R. J. (1971), *Estructuras lingüísticas en contraste*, Madrid, Gredos, 1986.
- Echenique, M. T. (1983), *Historia lingüística vasco-románica*, 2ª ed., Madrid, Paraninfo, 1987.
- (2004), “La lengua vasca en la historia lingüística hispánica”, In Cano, R. (coord.) (2004), 59-80.
- (2013), “Dialectos románicos y dialectos vascos en contacto en la protohistoria hispánica”, *Aemilianense*, 3, 23-45.
- Ferguson, C. A. (1959), “Diglossia”, *Word*, 15, 325-40.
- Fishman, J. A. (1964/1968), “Language maintenance and language shift as a field of inquiry: Revisited”, In Dil, A. S. (ed.) (1972), 76-134.
- (1971), “The sociology of language: An interdisciplinary social science approach to language in society”, In Fishman, J. A. (ed.) (1971), I, 217-404.
- (ed.) (1971), *Advances in the sociology of language*, 2 vols., The Hague, Mouton.
- García de Cortázar, J. A. (1969), *El dominio del monasterio de San Millán de la Cogolla (siglos X al XIII). Introducción a la historia rural de Castilla altomedieval*, Salamanca, Universidad de Salamanca.
- (1973), *La época medieval*, In Artola, M. (dir.) (1973-1976), II, 2ª 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.
- (1988), *La sociedad rural en la España medieval*, Madrid, Siglo XXI.
- (2004), “Resistencia frente al Islam, reconquista y repoblación en los reinos cristianos (años 711-1212)”, In Cano, R. (coord.) (2004), 239-56.
- (2012), *Historia religiosa del Occidente medieval (años 313-1464)*, Madrid, Ediciones Akal.
- (2016), “La difusión social de la nueva cosmología 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.
- García Turza, C. (2011), *Los primitivos romances hispánicos. Nuevas aportaciones desde los glosarios visigóticos*, San Millán de la Cogolla, Cilengua.
- and García Turza, J. (1997), *Fuentes españolas altomedievales. El código Em. 46 de la Real Academia de la Historia, primer diccionario enciclopédico de la península ibérica*, Ed. and est., Logroño, RAH y Fundación Caja Rioja.
- and García Turza, J. (2000), “El glosario latino del código Em. 24 de la RAH”, in *Investigación humanística y científica en La Rioja. Homenaje a J. L. Fernández Sevilla y M. Balmaseda*, Logroño, IER, 107-35.
- and García Turza, J. (2004), *Fuentes españolas altomedievales. El código Em. 31 de la RAH*, Ed. And est., Logroño, FCR.
- (dir.) (2023), *Las Glosas Emilianenses y Silenses. Los textos latinos*, Madrid, San Millán de la Cogolla, Fundación San Millán de la Cogolla.
- Gimeno, F. (1988), “Sociolingüística histórica”, *Actas del XVIII Congreso Internacional de Linguistique et de Philologie Romanes*, V, Tübingen, M. Niemeyer, 111-20.
- (1990), *Dialectología y sociolingüística españolas*, 2nd. ed., Alicante, Universidad de Alicante, 1993.
- (1995), *Sociolingüística histórica (siglos X-XII)*, Madrid, Visor Libros.
- (2004), “Situaciones sociolingüísticas dispares en el proceso de formación de las lenguas romances”, *Aemilianense*, I, 171-223.
- (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, 2006), I, Madrid, Arco/Libros, 255-74.
- (2008b), “El cambio lingüístico estable. La elisión de -s final en español”, *Revista Internacional de Lingüística Iberoamericana*, VI, 2 (12), 141-55.
- (2016a), “Historia social de los protorromances hispanos”, In Terrado, J. y Sabaté, F. (eds.) (2016), 15-42.
- (2016b), “Variación y cambio del latín al romance: el calco sintáctico del orden semítico de palabras”, *Aemilianense, IV (Homenaje al prof. C. García Turza)*, 291-365.
- (2019), *Historia antropológica de los romances hispanos*, San Millán de la Cogolla, Cilengua.
- (2023), “The sociocultural origin of the oral register of Languages”, *IOSR JHSS*, 28, 5, 4, 42-54.
- (2024a), “Sociological and legal keys to the formation of Hispanic Romances”, *IOSR-JHSS*, 29, 3, 7, 60-79.
- (2024b), “Anthropology history of first Hispanic Romance text”, *IOSR-JHSS*, 29, 5, 7, 11-29.
- (2024c), “Language change and languages in contact”, *IOSR-JHSS*, 29, 10, 2, 35-49.
- (coord.) (2020), *Lengua, sociedad y cultura. Estudios dedicados a Alberto Carcerdo González*, Alicante, Universidad de Alicante and University of Turku.
- and García Turza, C. (2010), “La función social de los protorromances hispanos”, *Aemilianense*, II, 127-202.
- and Gimeno, M. V. (2003), *El desplazamiento lingüístico del español por el inglés*, Madrid, Cátedra.
- and Martínez Olmos, E. (2010), “La transición graduada de la frontera catalano-castellana meridional”, In Casanova, E. (ed.) (2010), 269-87.
- Herman, J. (1975/1997), *El latín vulgar*, Barcelona, Ariel.

- Hockett, C. F. (1958/1962), *A course in modern linguistics*, New York. Trad. española *Curso de lingüística moderna*, 4th. ed., Buenos Aires, Eudeba, 1971.
- 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.
- Labov, W. (1965), “Sobre el mecanismo del cambio lingüístico”, In Labov, W. (1972), 209-34.
- (1970), “El estudio de la lengua en su contexto social”, In Labov, W. (1972), 235-324.
- (1972), *Modelos sociolingüísticos*, Madrid, Cátedra, 1983.
- (1982), “Building on empirical foundations”, In Lehmann, W. P. and Malkiel, Y. (eds.) (1982), 17-92.
- (1994), *Principios del cambio lingüístico. 1. Factores internos*, 2 vols., Madrid, Gredos, 1996.
- (2001), *Principios del cambio lingüístico. 2. Factores sociales*, 2 vols., Madrid, Gredos, 2006.
- (2010), *Principles of linguistic change. 3. Cognitive and cultural factors*, Oxford, Wiley-Blackwell.
- Lapesa, R. (1942/1981), *Historia de la lengua española*, 9th. ed., Madrid, Gredos.
- Lausberg, H. (1956/1962), *Lingüística románica*, 2 vols., Madrid, Gredos, 1970/1973.
- Lehmann, W. P. and Malkiel, Y. (eds.) (1968), *Directions for historical linguistics: A symposium*, Austin, University of Texas Press.
- and Malkiel, Y. (eds.) (1982), *Perspectives on historical linguistics*, Amsterdam, J. Benjamins.
- López Morales, H. (1989), *Sociolingüística*, 3rd. ed., Madrid, Gredos, 2004.
- Lüdtke, H. (1968), *Historia del léxico románico*, Madrid, Gredos, 1974.
- (2005), *Der Ursprung der romanischen Sprachen. Eine Geschichte der sprachlichen Kommunikation*, Kiel, Westensee-Verl.
- Malmberg, B. (1966), *La lengua y el hombre. Introducción a los problemas generales de la lingüística*, 2nd. ed., Madrid, Istmo, 1972.
- Penny, R. (2000), *Variación y cambio en español*, Madrid, Gredos, 2004.
- Segura, S. y Etxebarria, J. M. (1996), *Del latín al euskara*, Bilbao, Universidad de Deusto.
- Tagliavini, C. (1949/1969), *Orígenes de las lenguas neolatinas. Introducción a la filología románica*, 5th. ed., México, Fondo de Cultura Económica, 1973.
- Terrado, J. y Sabaté, F. (eds.) (2016), *El naixement de la consciència lingüística a l'Edat Mitjana*, Lleida, Pagès Editors.
- Wartburg, W. von (1950), *La fragmentación lingüística de la Rumania*, 2nd. ed., Madrid, Gredos.
- Weinreich, U. (1953), *Languages in contact. Findings and problems*, 7th. ed., 1970. Transl. 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.