

# *Anglicisms in the Academy Dictionary: «No pasarán»<sup>1</sup>*

Chris PRATT  
Universidad Complutense de Madrid

## ABSTRACT

All modern languages are having to face the challenge of what to do with the way contemporary English is affecting their language. This paper deals with the way Spanish is currently handling this problem. I take as my basic text latest work by Spanish Academician, Emilio Lorenzo, which offers ample theoretical and practical data. These are examined and commented on in considerable detail. This work is also considered as a reflection of the attitudes of Spanish linguistic authorities, especially the Real Academia Española, which shows itself to be a reactionary backward-looking body, incapable of incorporating much indispensable English vocabulary into Spanish.

Anglo-Hispanic lexicography has come on in leaps and bounds in the last five years, with both Collins and Oxford University Press producing outstanding bilingual dictionaries. One of the major challenges to such dictionaries, and indeed monolingual dictionaries of all languages, is the vexed question of what to do with anglicisms. More specifically, what criteria of acceptance to adopt in the case of anglicisms the structure of which (orthography, morphology, stress-pattern) clashes with that of native vocabulary.

If we leave aside non-European languages, the question can best be posed from an etymological perspective. There are three separate cases. Firstly, in languages which share the mixed Germano-Romance background of English (one thinks primarily of German and Dutch here), few problems are created at any linguistic level by the introduction of anglicisms. Secondly, for

other, relatively unromanicised Germanic languages (e.g., Norwegian, Icelandic), anglicisms based on good old-fashioned Anglo-Saxon stock pose few problems – the Romance stock could prove more problematic. The third case, which I shall consider here, is the case of anglicisms in a typical Romance language, Spanish, especially regarding the acceptance and acceptability of that Anglo-Saxon stock. Neologisms coined in English on Classical roots, plus semantic anglicism (calque and loan translation) pose fewer problems; indeed, only the trained linguistic eye will spot that any outside interference has occurred at all, something which Spanish lexicographers are most unwilling to do.

Having spent the best part of thirty years examining the case of Anglicism in Spanish, I am spurred to record these my latest thoughts on the subject by the publication in 1996 of Emilio Lorenzo's book, *Anglicismos Hispánicos* (Gredos, 1996, 710 pages) in which we can observe how one of Spain's most distinguished philologists and linguists, and member of the *Real Academia Española*, approaches the very question posed in my opening paragraph.

There is no doubt that Emilio Lorenzo (hereinafter EL) is the doyen of Spanish anglicism studies. Ever since the 1955 publication of his seminal article, he has produced dozens of learned articles in linguistic journals, perceptive, witty and elegant pieces in the *ABC* newspaper on a host of linguistic topics, including the influence of English on Spanish, as well as countless publications on a wealth of subjects related to Germanic and Romance languages and literatures. It was with considerable excitement and impatience that those of us who worked with him in the English Department of the Universidad Complutense and/or shared his passion for anglicisms knew that he was working in his retirement on a project to bring together all the notes made over a lifetime's dedication to the subject. *Anglicismos Hispánicos* is the realisation of that project. I shall first offer a detailed critique of this work, followed by an analysis of what it tells us of the workings of the *Real Academia Española*, and their attitudes to anglicism.

At 710 pages it is a weighty tome indeed: there is an *Introducción* (pp. 11-40), an *Explicación* (pp. 41-80), plus 4 chapters: I *Antecedentes* (pp. 81-108), II *Préstamos* (pp. 109-482), III *Calcos* (pp. 483-614), and IV *Sintaxis*; the work closes with a bibliography (643-656) and two indices (pp. 657-710).

As an aside, the introduction to chapter II is not, in fact, an introduction to this subject at all, but rather explains the role played by EL in getting certain etyma for the new Academy Dictionary (21st edition) revised, plus the following advanced apology for the lack of structural unity within the lists, and certain overlapping: «En lo posible, hemos tratado de mantener la coherencia con frecuentes remisiones entrecruzadas que, a la larga, quedan fundadas en el índice de palabras, el cual funcionará, esperamos que eficazmente, como un diccionario más.» (p. 110). So, we have been warned.

This seemingly logical organisation of material is more apparent than

real. In fact, on two major counts, it is quite haphazard. Firstly, there is an unfortunate mixture of theory and praxis; or rather, EL has inserted a lot of the very admirable theoretical discussion throughout the work, with some inexplicable duplication (see below); this means that we are given, for example, a list of *préstamos* without being told the all-important difference between them and *calcos*; worse still, they are actually defined twice in different terms, and in the wrong place.

It is the introduction to Chapter III which really confuses us. EL begins by explaining, with his usual rigour, concision and accuracy, what a calque is (pp. 483-488). Then it all goes wrong: quite unexpectedly, we have a section on *préstamos* (pp. 488-489), which quite obviously should have been the introduction to Chapter II, since it then continues by explaining what *calco semántico* is (pp. 490-492), but in bold, as though it had not been mentioned before, but it had.

Yet all of this is superfluous anyway, since both kinds of anglicisms (and others) had already been explained in Ch. I *Antecedentes*, which is EL's 1955 article, plus various notes already published (1966, 1979). If we add to this that theoretical considerations are contained in the *Introducción* and the *Explicación*, we must inevitably conclude that, for whatever reason (editorial pressures of time? incorrect pagination?), there is inexplicable and unnecessary duplication of theoretical material throughout this book.

A strict examination of the main lists reveals equally lax classificatory criteria. Anyone who has tried to classify and analyse anglicism knows how difficult it is. Modern loans based on Classical roots are a permanent headache, while it is often difficult to decide whether affixed neologisms are absolute neologisms in Spanish, or whether the new element is merely the affix. One should therefore be tolerant if certain terms one expects under one heading are in fact found under another. Nevertheless, there are serious drawbacks in the lists EL has finally left us.

What we have, in fact, is four different lists – five if we include the list in the index (pp. 667-708) which EL rightly says is the only reliable one. I rather suspect that editorial pressures have not allowed EL to organise the material in the best way. In the *explicación*, which is a total misnomer, there are in fact two embedded lists which should have been included in the main ones of *préstamos* and *calcos*: a critique of the anglicisms dealt with firstly in the *Manual del Español Urgente* (no date given – we are told that there have been 10 editions) (pp. 48-59), published by the EFE news agency, a sombre hatchet-job on the already beheaded; and secondly the *Diccionario de palabras y frases extranjeras* by Arturo del Hoyo (1995). Neither of these lists is divided into *préstamos* and *calcos*, it should be noted, with the material merely listed alphabetically.

The two main lists themselves are so intertwined, however, that one must seriously question their usefulness. EL defines the calque (pp. 484) as a word

already existing in Spanish which then acquires the meaning of a cognate (i.e. both terms derive from a common root); or else Spanish translates derived or compound forms («loan translations»). This should mean that the list of *préstamos* ought to contain what have been variously called «crude» anglicisms, or «patent» anglicisms (i.e., based on obviously Anglo-Saxon roots), plus those classical-based neologisms for which documentation proving their status of anglicism is wanting, deficient, or ambiguous. Those pre-existing Spanish words which acquire new meanings from English cognates, or neological forms which obviously translate English originals (from Anglo-Saxon or classical simplexes) should be found in *calcos*.

This division is not adhered to at all. In the *préstamo* list, as early as the letter «a», we find anglicisms which are patently calques of one form or another: *agujero negro*, *anticongelante*, *antifricción*, *antitanque*, *atracción universal*, and *audiencia*. It is not an exaggeration to say that the number of forms classified under the wrong list runs to hundreds rather than dozens. Fortunately, this error is not repeated in the *calcos* section. The solution for future editions (and this work will surely be reprinted many times) would be either to incorporate into the main body the items in the two small lists currently in the *Explicación*, or to abandon the *préstamo/calco* lists altogether, and just have one alphabetical list, which I would personally advocate, since one cannot merely look up any given form in the body of the book, because it could be in any one of four lists.

If the internal structure of this book is deficient, the contents is a model of philological clarity, insight and often brilliance. It is, in fact, both a tribute to and superb exponent of a concept which is common in Spain<sup>2</sup>, «modern philology», something of a misnomer or negation in terms, in most British Universities at least, where philology, where it still exists, is considered by definition a diachronic discipline, and has been replaced *en masse* by the term linguistics, owing to the presupposition, correctly held, of an ignorance of Latin by University students. This book would be ideal for most contemporary Spanish courses with a sociolinguistic component or credit, always assuming, of course, that the students can actually read a linguistics book in Spanish. For such students, I would recommend, *inter alia*, entries such as *broker*, *quark*, and *pudding*.

This should not be taken to mean, however, that this work is not of interest to the serious philologist – far from it; throughout its pages there are excellent entries which, together, make up a dazzling *tour de force* of philological expertise. For example, EL is the first linguist that I know of who has explained to my satisfaction the etymon of LSD. The obvious-looking «*Lysergic Acid Diethylamide*», which we had been given to understand was the root, does not quite work: that would have given \**LAD*. EL's expertise in German provides the missing link: «*Lysergsäurediäthylamid*», not found

in any English dictionary which I have consulted. I particularly enjoyed other good entries such as *pamela*, *snob*, and *tifón*.

EL is laudably up-to-date with contemporary Spanish and English; I was particularly impressed with the accuracy of the data of the following entries: *Acid House*, *Aqualung* (how many septuagenarian philologists know that this is the name of a trendy disco in Madrid?), *CD-Rom*, *zapping*, *realidad virtual*, *políticamente correcto* (a concept he acknowledges was made known to him by his old friend, Colin Smith, in a letter dated 5<sup>th</sup> December, 1992), *multi-media*, *estado del arte*, *eslabón perdido*, *comida rápida*, *paquete [de medidas]*, *letal*, *after-hours*, *cyber-*, *drag-queen*, *fanzine*, *grunge*, *light*, *megastore*, *módem*, *mountain bike*, *new age*, *outplacement*, *outsourcing*, *paruka*, *micropeeling*, *piercing*, *pin*, various derivatives of *punk*, *randomizado*, *reality show*, *road movie*, *rockódromo*, *serial killer*, ... If I might pre-empt later comments, I should like to mention here that not one of the above is in the main Academy dictionary.

EL is excellent on trade-names, acronyms, and the like, often helped by the French Robert *Dictionnaire des Anglicismes* (1990), which he generously acknowledges. He establishes the trade-mark status of *ping-pong*, *letraset*, *flipper*, *mecano*, *moviola*, *PAL*, *pianola*, *gramola*, *vitrola*, *plexiglas*, *walkman*, amongst many others.

A truly British sense of humour permeates this excellent work. A few of the best examples are *bikini*, *algal*, *relax*, and *detective*; while discussing *full-time* (p. 219), he says the following: «En el campo de la enseñanza universitaria, lo que se entiende hoy por “dedicación exclusiva” merecería un buen trabajo de “investigative reporting”. Yo no podría explicarlo». His criticisms of the Academy can be quite withering: of *mísil*, he mentions their failure to include the intermediary of English *missile*, «acercando así a los romanos a las últimas conquistas armamentistas de la guerra moderna» (p. 298).

Given such a wealth of reliable data, it must surely be churlish to point out missing entries. I would mention just a handful here, since reference to them is implicit under other entries: under *shock/shocking* (p. 394), for example, there is no mention of *chocante*; similarly, one seeks in vain the well-documented *cederón* under *CD-ROM* (p. 152); one would expect some reference to *culebrón* under *soap-opera* (p. 408).

Finally, I have found a tiny number of errors of fact and *errata*. EL is wrong when he states that *pyjamas* in English is used with a singular verb (p. 69). The term *glamoroso* is not a native Spanish coining (p. 224), but a direct calque of English *glamorous*. There is a duplication of information in the *blouque* and *bloc* entries (pp. 129-130). The name of the British fashion-designer responsible for the mini-skirt is Mary Quant (not Quaint - p. 296). The car EL knew as Morris Minor in 1949 is not the Mini, designed by Assegoni over a decade later (p. 269). I thought it surprising to find no mention of *vaqueros* or *tejanos* under the *blue-jeans* entry (p. 130), until I realised that both appeared under that of *jean* (p. 256); this is poor cross-referencing.

Obviously, expert commentary invites critical reply; the following are just a few remarks regarding entries which I either disagree with or find interesting or controversial for one reason or another. I shall take the items in the order in which they appear in the book.

Under the *rollon* rubric (p. 57), EL mentions the roll-on roll-off ferries, but fails to mention the new usage regarding both liquid detergents, now on sale in Spain with a «roll-on» ball to get the liquid directly in the area of the stain, and roll-on deodorants, quite new in Spain, but at least 40 years old in English-speaking countries.

One cannot agree with either EL or his source (Arturo del Hoyo) that English *tour-operator* should be translated as *agente de viajes* (p. 78), since they have entirely different functions: those in the know about the travel business will confirm that the former is the person or company that organises the itinerary, charters the planes, etc; in a word, (s)he is the *mayorista*; the latter is the *minorista* who actually sells the products to the public. The term universally used is «*(o)juroperator*».

EL perpetuates the myth (p. 118) that *autocar* is an English word, although it is not in any of the dictionaries. In American English, there is a handful of words in which the root «*auto*» does have the role of a stump-word, standing for the whole of «*automobile*» (e.g., «*autocade*»); however even in that variant, in the mass of compounds containing the root *auto-* the meaning is invariably «*self*». British English is even stricter, and avoids such Americanisms as «*automotive*», preferring the preposed noun «*car*» for adjectival uses. One wonders what «*autocar*» would mean in English, which has always used «*coach*», as in London's famous Victoria Coach Station.

Years ago I asked for help regarding the term «*baby*» (pronounced [bábi], not [béibi]) and I had hoped that EL (p.119) might have had something on this article of clothing, a kind of cotton overall buttoned at the front, usually blue-striped, worn by kindergarten-aged children to protect the designer-label garb lurking underneath. Sadly he fails to mention it. I repeat my S.O.S.

Under the *box* entry (p. 120), there is no mention of the plural *boxes* as a term of motor-racing; this would be yet another of those false anglicisms (EL is very good on these, and recognises the invaluable help of the *Robert Dictionnaire des Anglicismes*), since English refers to the area where racing-cars are serviced with the speed and precision of a military operation as «*the pits*». This pseudo-anglicism has taken hold in Germany too, but with the meaning of «*loud-speakers*», in Spanish *baffles* – another baffling pseudo-anglicism, presumably from «*wafflers*».

In *camping*, EL appears not to understand the difference between the anglicism and the Spanish word *acampada* (p. 147); there is mention of the former being regulated by law, the latter organised by common sense; he also quotes Vox as giving a definitive clue when it defines *camping* as *terreno destinado a la campada, dotado de un mínimo de servicios*. I think that the part

which interests EL (the last phrase) is a red-herring 3: *camping* is a place to camp, i.e., a camp-site, while *acampada* is the activity.

Under the *dinosaurio* entry (p. 185), EL refers to an interview with Felipe González in *Time*, Oct. 1989; EL states: «*El texto sería inglés*». I think not. Ex-president González, whose English never got beyond the rudimentary, would have given the interview *in Spanish* (i.e., he will have used *dinosaurio*, which *Time* will have translated as *dinosaur*); therefore we cannot conclude that *dinosaurio* is an anglicism – if anything the reverse. And as I revise this article (late July, 1997), more proof of this hypothesis comes from various articles in the press on the current demise of the Mexican PRI, in which the old guard is invariably referred to precisely as «*dinosaurios*».

EL does not comment on his source's comment that *drive* in tennis should be *golpe natural* rather than *derechazo* (p. 195); both are wrong, since it implies they are on the forehand, whereas *drive* in English (and Spanish) can be fore-hand and back-hand for right- and left-handed players.

DRAE's new definition of *ejecutivo* (p. 202) is hardly earth-shattering; however, when EL states that the noun function has affected the adjective, quoting *director e.* and *secretario e.*, is he aware that these two expressions are, in fact, obvious calques based on their English equivalents?

EL makes no comment on the plural form *gais* (p. 222), the now usual form of the plural, contaminating the singular itself (most often *gai*). It is surprising, to say the least, that a form which is absolutely regular in Spanish, *gay*, should be replaced by one which is patently not. Spanish does not allow the diphthong «*-ai*» in final position, (*viz. hay, ¡ay!*), or in fact any vowel plus «*i*» (*viz. rey, grey...*, *voy, soy...*, plus numerous Latin American words ending in «*-uy*»). This makes the two forms *gai* and *gais* highly irregular, and perhaps worthy of a note to this effect.

Although EL is uncannily up-to-date in his data (up to 1995, when, one supposes, the book went to press), he fails to mention the new *ayudante/asis-tente* as a substitute for «*linier*», meaning «*linesman*» (p. 274). This change [«*assistant (referee)*» in English] was obviously decreed from on high (by FIFA?) in the last couple of years, since the term became standard in football commentaries in English at the same time; EL must have just missed it.

I suspect that the origins of «*lingo*» in English are more complex than EL suggests (p. 274), with its early dating (17th C). With its ultimate etymon almost certainly Portuguese («*lingoa*»), it smacks of those words carried across the world by sailors speaking pidgins and creoles, and would immediately have felt at home alongside the underworld jargon of the world's largest port at the time, London.

I still stick to my guns over *lúdico* as a *semantic* anglicism if used in Spanish in its English sense of «absurd or incongruous *to the point of laughter* (my italics)», i.e. = «risible/irrisorio», though this false friend has caused me to look again at «*lúdic(r)o*», which I think needs a lot more study. To my great

surprise, *lúdico* is not even in *DUE*, or even the erratic *DEM*. I would now tentatively suggest that *lúdico* is a simple and quite recent (1960s) Gallicism (from *ludique*), and that *lúdico* is an semantic anglicism only if used in place of *risible/irrisorio*.

As for *marcapasos*, EL states correctly that it is not a *calco literal* (which would have given a ridiculous *\*hacepasos*), the original *maker* having given way, brilliantly, but fortuitously, to *marcar*. The case is similar to *cash register* (giving *caja registradora*, thus totally misunderstanding the original) and *aire acondicionado* (ditto).

EL is so vague on *off-shore* that it is not clear what he thinks it means or refers to. In financial and economic circles, it concerns the placing of funds, investments, etc in companies which, for tax purposes, do not belong to the country where the investor has his tax domicile. The reference is to a number of specific islands just off the coast of Great Britain (like Jersey, Isle of Man) or the US (e.g., Bermuda), so-called tax-havens. By the way, is *paraíso fiscal* (not in EL's list of *calcos plurimembres*) a misreading of «tax heaven»??

It is surprising that EL should not have found the correct etymon of *penicilina*. It would be a source of some embarrassment that the author of this paper, an ex Fellow of The Queen's College, Oxford University (*alma mater* of Lord Florey and others) should not know the penicilline story. The name was invented by Dr Alexander Fleming, who accidentally spilt some liquid on some fungi he was cultivating. The rest is history.

EL, in common with just about all Spaniards, appears not to know what a «role-game» is. A British reader will be alarmed by his one-liner: «Se le llama *Rol* a un peligroso juego de adolescentes» (p. 377). The tell-tale «juego del *Rol*» (my italics) shows that Spaniards have understood this concept as a game in which someone plays out a specific role (*ergo* the article), usually something violent, in real life, like the young drug-addicts who lived out their violent fantasies on a vagrant sleeping on a park bench in Madrid recently, with all reports referring to the *juego del rol*. This is not what the original game is at all; in the eighties, youngsters bought board games («Masters of the Universe» was the most popular) in which each player was assigned a role in a fantasy, usually tenebrous world, and had to fulfill certain missions. In Spanish, *juego de rol* would be appropriate.

EL does not find the game *seveleven* in any English dictionary, despite its appearance in various Spanish-speaking countries (p. 389); this is not surprising, since its English name is *craps*, of obscure origin in English.

Under the *sex* entry, there is a passing reference to *sexahólico*, which EL finds strange as a Spanish coining (p. 390). It is not a Spanish coining, and seems to show that the ultra-modern English «-aholic» psuedo-suffix seems to have had some adepts in Spanish; I have seen more than once the coining *trabajahólico*, and expect to see *\*chocohólico* before too long. The substantivisation of *sexy* is well-documented, but EL makes no mention of the [in English]



hilarious *Sexy Shop* – there is one in the Calle Orense, part of the infamous area of dubious catacombs under the AZCA centre in Madrid's mini-Manhattan.

The form *skay* remains to be solved (p. 401). I recall a University colleague from the Complutense German department, María Teresa Zurdo, telling me over 25 years ago that she thought the etymon was a German acronymic trade-mark SKAY (something like \**S*ynthetische *K*Autschuk *I*ndustrie), which I have never heard verified. No English dictionary I have consulted contains anything like \**scay* or \**skay*, and if German \*SKAY is the etymon, an English intermediary is not even necessary on phonetic grounds.

As a practising bridge player, I can help EL with *slam* (p. 403); it concerns the number of tricks won: all 13 is a *grand slam*, while 12 constitutes a *small slam*. This explains the tennis connotation: the *grand slam* is winning all of the so-called *Big Four* (US Open, French Open, Australian Open, and Wimbledon) in one season or calendar year.

EL fails to look up *slip* (pp. 404-405) in an English dictionary. The multi-lingual history of underwear (e.g., *slip*, *panty/panties*, *short(s)*, *legging(s)*, *boxer(s)*, etc.) has, sadly, yet to be written, but it is as complex as the area of clothes in general (e.g., *pamela*, *vest(e)*, *top*, *cardigan*, *americana/chaqueta*, *polo(-neck)*, *pullover* (German pullunder!., etc.). It would seem that one culture invents a given article of clothing, then the word gets collared (sorry) by another language to be applied to something slightly and even totally different. In the case of *slip*, the reference in the Oxford Bilingual «Your slip is showing», alluding to a *petticoat*, recalls the [now very dated] spooneristic joke concerning an impresario whose latest show was doing very badly: «Sir, your show is slipping». So where does French (*bra*)*slip* come in to refer to what in GB English are (*under*)*pants* (US, *shorts*)? Also, both *slip-on* and *slip-over* are kinds of pull-overs in English...

I would beg to differ over *snack-bar* and *bar de tapas* (p. 407). It would no doubt amuse EL to know that London and many other large (and not so large) British cities and towns are teeming with *tapa(s) bars* [*sic!*!], a rather pallid imitation of the real thing. I suspect that any snack-bars left in Spain are rather dowdy, sad places in the provinces, with plastic chairs and octogenarian waiters in stained white coats, still offering, no doubt *platos combinados*, made for tourists in the sixties, with gawdy photos (even paintings!) of frankfurters, fried eggs, [what passes for] bacon and chips, etc. Good-bye snack bar, hello tapas bar. As a colophon, I am fascinated by the most recent developments in the linguistics of the latest late-night scene, with bars (often nameless), with the legend *bar de copas*, *copas y amigos*, *after(-hours)*, etc.

With his fine sense of humour, EL will be delighted to know the etymon of the anglicism *tándem* (p. 440). It is an excellent case of how a given loanword can only be explained by an intermediary language. The passengers who sit in front of each other on a special «bicycle» could be said to sit «at

length» – and here comes the terrible Latin pun: *tandem* is regularly translated into English precisely by that phrase «at length». Thus a bicycle where the passengers sit «at length» became a «tandem» bicycle... Thus the intermediary of English is indispensable to explain this loan.

EL is excellent on the prefix «tele-», providing useful data on registered trade-marks (p. 443). He fails to mention, however, the anglicising use of «tele-» as a stump-word reduction of «tele-(vision)», as in *televidente*, a formation obviously based on «viewer».

I must take exception to EL's comments on what I had said (Pratt 1980: 140) about *tetramotor*, classifying it as an anglicism; EL states : «...esta voz ...debe muy poco al inglés, lengua que la desconoce, pues traduce la voz española por "four-engine plane (aircraft)".» (p. 447). I maintain the process is the other way round: Spanish has taken the Anglo-Saxon compound adjective «four-engine(d)», and translated it with classical roots (via French?). This is a typical Spanish loan-word problem, with *French* turning patent anglicisms into Classical-based ones, such as «rear-view mirror» becoming «espejo *retrovisor*». In my terminology, this is a Gallicism in terms of language of immediate etymon, and an anglicism in terms of ultimate etymon.

EL is right that there is considerable confusion in Spanish between *trail* and *trial*, as in *trail bike*. What he may not realise (p. 453) is that there is an added confusion in English with the word *bike*, which is often used to refer to a motor-bike, as in *bikers*, who are, to say the least, motorised. Thus in English, a *mountain-bike* is a pedal, non-motorised bicycle, whereas a *trial-bike* is motorised.

Perhaps the most important contribution of this work, however, is what it does not purport to do at all: the insights it gives us into the workings of the Academy itself, or rather, the way the Academy thinks as we approach the twenty-first century. At one level, EL is highly critical of his masters, especially on the vexed question of etymological principles. He explains in some detail (p. 109) that he had to explain even to Lapesa that if both *dársena* and *arsenal* are derived directly from Italian, without mentioning Arabic, their relation with *atarazana* would remain hidden; as a result he was allowed, in the A-D section only, to mention intermediary languages.

In a nutshell, that is the main classificatory problem of anglicisms based on Classical roots: has English intervened or not in the process of a neologism being coined in Spanish. On many occasions, it patently has, and EL finds his excellent work pointing out the intermediary frustrated time and time again by the Academy's refusal to accept his etymological suggestions, given their general antipathy towards recording intermediary languages – thus giving rise to the Romans inventing intercontinental missiles!!

To quote but a few examples, EL shows how the graph *Berquelio* managed to disguise the all-important link with Berkeley. All kinds of inventions and concepts, clearly not invented by Spaniards or in Spanish, are derived

time and time again from Greek and Latin roots, even when we know perfectly well the inventors: *teléfono*, *logaritmo*, *televisión* [sic!], *monitor*, *panóptico*, *estenografía*, *penicilina*... The lack of specific mention of Bell, Taylor, Willis, Baird, Neper, or Fleming, is a mockery of etymological rigour and a blatant attempt to minimise the influence of foreign culture(s) on Spain. This kind of chicanery in the 1990s is an intellectual insult, and a snub from the Spanish Academy to all those Europeans who have endowed Spain with the linguistic, intellectual, scientific, and cultural material enabling them to be part of modern Europe. It should be pointed out that EL is firmly opposed to the Academy on the this question.

If all this sounds strong stuff, the data provided by *Anglicismos Hispánicos* give us more than enough grounds to stand ours. The blatant refusal of the Academy to accept the intermediary of other languages (usually French and English) can in fact be justified on the grounds that they are giving **ultimate** etyma, and have no time/interest in stating all intermediary stages. However, a deeper look into the Academy's workings, as revealed throughout the pages of *Anglicismos Hispánicos*, and *DRAE passim* shows that their attitude is the mere tip of a far more sinister iceberg. The Academy is always benevolent towards Graeco- Latin based neologism for reasons obvious: such terms are easily adaptable to Spanish patterns. Yet the acid-test comes when the Academy is faced by the flood of Germanic-based vocabulary. It is here we see their true colours : «*No pasarán*».

On some occasions, patent anglicisms are accepted, provided hispanisation of the offending form is possible. This hispanisation requires the removal of the unacceptable linguistic traits, usually orthographic. The problem is that the resulting forms, like *ofsete*, and *pete* look ridiculous, and are never adopted by the Spanish-speaking community, who are quite prepared to use the English form unchanged.

The stubborn refusal to accept anglicisms with non-Spanish graphs, and insist on adapting them to Spanish patterns, can lead to serious in-the-foot shooting: when Spanish accepted «clown» as *clon* (a form never used by anyone), what could it do when «clone» came along? Had the Academy accepted *clown* in the first place...

If a form cannot be hispanised, there are two stratagems to prevent the acceptance of what I refer to as patent anglicisms. One solution is procrastination of the Ostrich Syndrome variety: if we wait long enough, it will go away. This gives rise to some absolutely ridiculous situations. Firstly, some words have waited in the wings for literally more than 100 years!! Anglicisms such as *panfleto*, *macadán*, *abiogénesis*, spent over 100 years between being first mooted for entry and final acceptance.

This ludicrous delay brings about unfortunate consequences. It is standard practice to study the dates of first documentation of neologisms in order to draw wider sociolinguistic references – one can do this with English and

French at least. However, if we were to study the dates of admission of some anglicisms into *DRAE*, we would certainly draw some disastrous sociolinguistic conclusions. We might conclude that the charleston took 50 years to reach Spain, or that Spaniards have just started to send telegrams by cable, since the words *charleston* and *cablear* were included in *DRAE* only in 1992. Listen to the lame excuse EL offers regarding the recent inclusion of *charleston*: «Gracias a la evocación... de los llamados “felices veinte”, el charleston... ha tenido cierto resurgir...» (p. 172); but, by the same token, one would expect *boogie-woogie* to be in as well. No way. «La desaparición de boogie-woogie “baile... de los años 40” justifica la función del *DMILE* [the manual dictionary] como sala de espera hasta el ingreso definitivo. Hoy es voz desusada». (p. 134). As for *cake-walk*, fashionable a full century ago, this word has just entered the same dictionary which removed *boogie-woogie*. It is clear that with such wildly inconsistent, inaccurate, and unreliable criteria of selection, the Academy dictionary will never be able to be used by researchers interested in tracing accurately the chronology of Spanish social, let alone linguistic, history. This is a serious indictment indeed.

The reference made above to the *DMILE* is important. This is the second delaying tactic. Words are «parked» there in a kind of linguistic limbo until they are either dropped (and therefore never «officially» existed in Spanish), or finally included in *DRAE*, often decades too late to be of any relevance or use, as *cablear* or *charleston* mentioned above. We can conclude this from entries such as *hippy*: «...aunque no ha entrado en el *DRAE*, si se conserva vivo, acabará por ser admitido» (p. 239). How can it seriously be suggested that a term referring uniquely to a specific, relatively short period of time some 30 years ago might «keep itself alive»? This reactionary attitude guarantees that the *DRAE* will never be a serious work of reference containing every word that has ever been used by serious writers, which is what it should be. Should it not assist those wanting to know of usages thirty years ago? In other words, even if «hippy» does not stand the test of time (i.e. up to a century?), there will be no record of it ever having been used by Spaniards in Spanish – and Heaven help us if we needed help with Gallicisms used by Galdós...

A further clue to Academy «thinking» (if such it can be called) can be seen in the *lunch* entry: «El *DRAE*'92 sigue desconociendo el término, pero el *DMILE* ya lo incluye con corchetes para no comprometerse» (p. 279). This means there is an even more sophisticated limbo: the smaller dictionary accepts words in *brackets*, which appears to mean «this-word-won't-go-away-we-don't-sanction-its-use-and-we-don't-like-it». What beggars belief, however, is the very concept of «comprometerse», which few lexicographers of modern western languages would even begin to understand.

The conclusions cannot be more obvious. 1. The supreme lexical authority of Spanish, the *DRAE*, sees itself as the guardian of the some kind of linguistic purity and correctness; 2. The Academy is somehow fearful of burning

its fingers, vide the alarming reference to «comprometerse» above, by showing leniency to intruders; 3. The Academy does not consider it has a duty to include all linguistic forms currently used and understood by cultured Spanish-speakers, within the usual diachronic, diatopic and diastratic parameters of usage.

The bottom line to all this is that the Academy simply refuse to recognise, either in the *DMILE* or the main dictionary, literally hundreds, probably now perhaps thousands, of anglicisms which Spaniards of all walks of life understand and use on a daily basis. The Academy is thus doing a total disservice to the Spanish language and its people.

EL offers many examples of rejection of anglicisms based on orthographic grounds. And if on some occasions EL is harsh on His Master's Voice, some of his comments reflect the Academy's position totally uncritically: of *copyright*, he states: «Con esta grafía no creo que la acepte la Academia» (p. 164); the word *test* brings a similar reaction: «resultaría de difícil incorporación al DRAE el anglicismo "test" con semejante grafía.» (p. 446); and of *dock* we read: «La Academia se resiste, probablemente porque no se ha propuesto una grafía aceptable, a incluir dock». (p. 188). The gripe even extends to morphology, as one can see in *lunch* (p. 279): «lunch es acaso uno de los "anglicismos" más populares y peor adaptados del español tanto fonética como morfológicamente. Ya hemos comentado, desde 1952 .. [sic!!]».

Indeed, a brief list of the words the full Academy dictionary has failed to include, doubtless on the grounds of unacceptable orthography, reads like a brief check-list of modern living: *boom*, *scout*, *clown/clon*, *copyright*, *dolby*, *donut*, *ferry-boat*, *hardware*, *handicap*, *hippy*, *hobby*, *holding*, *jazz*, *joint venture*, *kart*, *kayak*, *ketchup*, *kit*, *know-how*, *lifting*, *living*, *lunch*, *macadán*, *musical*, *panfleto*, *panty*, *sheriff*, *snow-board*, plus those mentioned earlier.

There are occasional signs of sanity which actually stand out because of the contrast with the normally puristic approach in general; *puzzle* gets in with *zz* (why not one «z»?), *sandwich* is in (1992!!) with two unacceptable graphs and an unacceptable morph (why not \**sangüiche*? – they've been trying to get us all to drink *güisqui* for decades...).

One thing which appears not to have occurred to the Academy is that the adoption of the so-called «crude» anglicism can and actually does have advantages: the insistence on translating or adapting the Germanic-based anglicism can impede international understanding; if we suppose that the word *boom* is universally, or at least widely, recognised, Spain's insistence on the use of «auge repentino», for example, actually masks or hinders multi-lingual comprehension – it is doubtful whether a German or an Italian would recognise *escáner* or *güisqui*, for instance. The great advantage of using the original graph is that, rather like written Chinese, all users recognise it, even though they pronounce it in a different way, or with foreign phonemes.

So, as we approach the millennium, what can we say about the future of

the Spanish language as reflected by those officially responsible for it? My view is pessimistic in the extreme. The world is advancing (or at least moving) at a pace we could scarcely conceive even a decade ago. We now really do have a global village, thanks to the most recent technological and communicational advances such as e-mail, multimedia and especially internet. Voices of alarm have already been sounded in Spain, complaining that English will become even more preponderant than ever. This greater influence is logical and irreversible. As a spokesman [*sic*] for the radical gay group, Queer Nation, stated succinctly a year or so ago: «We're here. We're queer. Get used to it».

What the Spanish language requires in these circumstances is a body which is **descriptive** not **proscriptive**. Two basic facts should encourage the Academy to take a less retrograde attitude. Firstly, from a negative, but practical point of view, the speed of events means that by the time an anglicism (or any new term for that matter) has appeared and flown across cyberspace, it is common currency; expediency demands that the form should be accepted *tal cual* – there is literally no time to go through any kind of deliberation process, certainly not the century the Academy has required on previous occasions.

Secondly, experience has shown that you cannot legislate against linguistic change (*pace* Mussolini, Franco, and Giscard d'Estaing). If Spain is to take its rightful place in the Europe of the next millennium, it will need to be able to communicate as an equal. Most new linguistic developments are going to take place in English, so Spanish must move with, not against the tide. So far, the *Real Academia Española* has proved that it is totally unequal to the task of helping Spanish meet these challenges. I will leave the Academy, and the patient reader with one last thought, formulated a good thirty years ago by MacLuhan: when Latin finally became aware of itself and produced a grammar, it purified itself out of existence.

#### NOTES

<sup>1</sup> It is with great sadness that I learn of the death of Professor Colin Smith, the doyen of British lexicographers of Spanish, coming as it does so soon after that of Joan Coromines, whose original *DCELC* (plus its later revamping with Pascual) is still the greatest etymological work in Spanish. Colin Smith's erudition was as great as his generosity both personal and academic; his kindness in acknowledging my contribution to *The Collins Spanish Dictionary*, which was merely a couple of chats over a pint at a conference, and a subsequent exchange of notes, was typical; I still remain in his debt even by dedicating this article to him – what a shame he did not live to review this book himself.

<sup>2</sup> The concept of *filología moderna* will forever be associated with the name of Emilio Lorenzo, who founded both the first English department in Spain, plus the first journal given over to linguistic themes, called *Filología Moderna*, which he edited for many years.

<sup>3</sup> Anglicisms ending in «-ing» are practically worthy of an article in themselves. Some of the

trickier ones, such as *camping*, *dancing*, and a few others can be explained by realising that a sign must have been involved at some stage: this would mean «this activity can be done here», and is later confused in the foreign language with «this is a place where such-and-such can be done». EL himself has an interest inventory of forms ending in «-ing» (p. 251). To add to the ever-growing list, I should like to mention but two which are absolute neologisms as I write these lines (spring, 1997): in the Language Faculty building on the Complutense campus, they have just installed waste-paper baskets in the shape of soft-drink cans – the legend reads: «*Haz latíng. Es lo más naturab*»; secondly, a current TV ad for a soft drink urges the viewer: «Haz vueling».

Departamento de Filología Inglesa  
 Facultad de Filología  
 Universidad Complutense  
 28040 Madrid  
 Fax: 34 1 394 54 78

#### REFERENCES

- Agencia EFE (10 editions; no date given), *Manual del español urgente*. Madrid.
- Alonso, M. (1972), *Diccionario del español moderno*, 4<sup>th</sup> ed. Madrid: Aguilar.
- The Collins Spanish Dictionary* (1992), ed. Colin Smith, 3<sup>rd</sup> edition Grijalbo Barcelona. Harper-Collins Glasgow-New York.
- Corominas J. (1954-1957), *Diccionario crítico etimológico de la lengua castellana*, 4 vols. Madrid: Gredos.
- Diccionario Oxford Español-Inglés Inglés español* (1994), Oxford-New York-Madrid: Oxford University Press.
- Hoyo, A. del (1995), *Diccionario de palabras y frases extranjeras en el español moderno*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Madrid: Aguilar.
- Lorenzo, E. (1980), *El anglicismo en 1955* in *El español de hoy, lengua en ebullición*, 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. Madrid: Gredos.
- Moliner, M. (1966-1967), *Diccionario del uso del español*, 2 vols. Madrid: Gredos.
- Pratt, C. (1980), *El anglicismo en el español contemporáneo peninsular*. Madrid: Gredos.
- Pratt, C. (1992), *The status of loan-words in modern monolingual dictionaries in Eurolex '90. Actas del IV Congreso Internacional*, Barcelona: Bibliograf.
- Real Academia Española (1992), *Diccionario de la lengua española*, XXI edición, Madrid: Espasa-Calpe.
- Real Academia Español (1989), *Diccionario Manual Ilustrado de la lengua española* (no edition quoted), Madrid: Espasa-Calpe.
- Rey-Debove, J. and Gagnon, G. (1990), *Dictionnaire des Anglicismes*. Paris: Dictionnaires Le Robert.