

**THIRTY COMMENTS ON EMILIO LORENZO'S
*EL OBSERVATORIO DE LA LENGUA***

DAVID L. GOLD
dovedleyzer@yahoo.com

El observatorio de la lengua, published privately (“edición no venal”) in Madrid in 2003, is divided into three parts: “I. Escritos de Emilio Lorenzo” (a reprinting of twenty of his publications), “II. Escritos sobre Emilio Lorenzo” (a reprinting of Esteban Pujals's “Emilio Lorenzo, ejemplo de profesor universitario”), “III. Recuerdo de Emilio Lorenzo” (eight appreciations, appearing here for the first time, by Juan Antonio Cebrián, Luis María Anson, Francisco A. Marcos Marín, José Antonio Pascual, Víctor García de la Concha, Valentín García Yebra, Antonio Prieto, and Javier Villán). In view of parts II and III, it is somewhat misleading to give only Lorenzo's name on the title page; and since the wording “N. del E.” appears in the book, there was an editor, presumably one of Emilio Lorenzo's sons, whose name should be indicated too.

Here are thirty comments on this valuable book about contemporary European Spanish. The first twenty-nine refer to passages written by Emilio Lorenzo and the last one to a passage by Esteban Pujals.

1. “los diccionarios de Oxford y Webster” (p. 19, first published in 1993).

Because the titles of many English dictionaries contain the word *Oxford* and many contain *Webster*, it is best to give specific titles.

2. “Una alumna [...] consultó el diccionario de Random House (*RHD*), muy actualizado y solvente (1987), y se encontró con la siguiente etimología” (p. 20, first published in 1993) of the English word *broker*: “ME *broco(u)r*, < AF *broc(o)ur*, *abrocour* middleman, wine merchant; cf. OPr *abrocador*, perh. based on Sp *albaroque* gift or drink concluding a transaction (< Ar *al-bur_k* the gift, gratuity), with *-ador* < L *ator-* -ATOR.”

Lorenzo goes on to say that a connection with Spanish *albaroque* is only a possibility. For the sake of completeness it should also be said that another

etymology has been proposed for the Anglo-French word, namely one that takes it back to Latin and thence to Celtic (see other dictionaries). If so, Spanish and Arabic are not involved.

3. «*An alyen that was callyd Arnold of Spayne that was a grocour of London*» (p. 23, first published in 1993).

Correct the misprint “grocour” to *brokour* (the misprint occurs either in *El observatorio de la lengua*, the 1993 publication, or both, but not in *Oxford English Dictionary*, where Lorenzo found the passage quoted).

4. “*Webster's Third New International (1961 [...] máxima autoridad lexicográfica americana*” (p. 26, first published in 1995).

Hyperbole should be avoided because no English dictionary published in the United States is in every respect better than all others and, in any case, “better” or “best” is not necessarily good. Words like “solvente” (see comment 2) and “fiable” (“Un diccionario muy fiable como el *Random House*” [p. 32, first published in 1995]) should be avoided too, especially when they are undeserved.

5. “[...] la para mí aceptable propuesta americana [...]” (p. 27, first published in 1995).

German syntax of that kind should be avoided in Spanish.

Spanish *americano* referring solely to the United States is an anglicism that should be avoided because it robs us of the traditional distinction between *americano* 'of the Western Hemisphere' and *norteamericano* 'of the United States'. Granted that since the United States constitutes only part of North America, *norteamericano* 'American' too is a misnomer, but it is less of a misnomer than *americano* 'American' and thus the lesser of two evils. In the passage quoted, therefore, the latter word is needed.

6. “Brindo a los sociólogos la fascinante tarea de averiguar por qué en español, más que en otras lenguas, se tiene a esquivar ese protagonismo que ofrece la democracia, y, en cambio, se expresa nuestro paso por la vida como una sucesión de vivencias que calificué, un poco pedantemente, hace años, como 'tangencialidad del acontecer', y que se manifiesta en copiosa fraseología [...] en la que evitando, como señalamos, el protagonismo, atribuimos a la fatalidad, a la fortuna o a la acción de otros lo que en rigor tiene como sujeto activo el hablante” (p. 38, first published in 1998).

Lorenzo goes on to give some examples, to which *olvidársele a uno* should be added (compare, for example, “se me olvidó decírselo” and “olvidé decírselo”).

7. “Choca, sin embargo, y se presta a conjeturas, por qué el acto en que el ser humano no tiene protagonismo activo sino pasivo, el acto de nacer, se exprese en español con un 'yo nací' cuando otras lenguas prefieren un 'fui nacido' (o 'parido')” (p. 39, first published in 1998).

The Latin verbal category of deponent verb did not survive into Spanish and, so far as I can tell, if a Spanish verb goes back to a Latin deponent verb, that Spanish verb is always active (thus, at least *nascor* > *nacer*, *admiror* > *admirar*, and *sequor* > *seguir*). Nothing, therefore, is unusual about *nacer*.

8. “Un hermoso verbo, 'desentenderse', hoy sustituido en el habla coloquial por el neologismo 'escaquearse', 'eludir un trabajo u obligación' cuya relación con los escaques del tablero de ajedrez se me escapa, ilustra bien esa actitud de renuncia a las obligaciones que muchos identifican con 'deberes' y oponen a los derechos tantas veces invocados por el hombre de hoy” (p. 40, first published in 1998). *Escaquearse*, which arose in Spanish military slang, alludes to the movement of the pieces on the chess board: thus, just as a piece moves from one square to another, a shirking soldier moves around in order to avoid some task.

9. “En español tenemos gran riqueza expresiva, matizada, para resaltar semejante rechazo de responsabilidades o indiferencia, desde el bíblico 'lavarse las manos', hasta [...]” (p. 40, first published in 1998). The Hebrew idiom *rachats benikayon kapay* 'wash one's hands in innocency', which appears twice in the Jewish Scriptures (Psalms 26:6 and 73:13), was the model for idioms in many Christian languages, including Spanish, that mean 'disclaim or renounce interest [in...], responsibility [for...], or further connection [with...]’.

10. “el profesor suizo Von Warburg” (p. 44, first published in 1998) and “por Von Wartburg” (p. 45, first published in 1998). The German family-name particle *von* always has a small *v* except when it is the first word of the sentence. We thus need *von* here. In contrast, Dutch and Afrikaans have both *van* and *Van*:

A. In the Netherlands, *van* is the usual spelling in Dutch family names and the word is disregarded for purposes of alphabetization.

B. In Belgium, *Van* is the usual spelling in Dutch family names and most but not all people take the word into account when alphabetizing.

C. In South Africa, Afrikaans *van, van der, van den, de, du, ten, ter* are the usual spellings except when they occur without given names or the initials of given names, in which case *Van, Van der, Van den, De, Du, Ten, and Ter* are used. If a title precedes, the spelling is likewise with a capital letter if given names or their initials are omitted, as in *Mnr. Van Biljon*. For purposes of alphabetization, all elements of the family name are taken into account, though sporadic attempts have been made to disregard those particles and consider only the chief element of the name.

I believe that when alphabetizing, one should consider the entire family name, thus, the particles too.

11. Speaking of the relatively little use which English makes of diminutive suffixes, Lorenzo says that “Tal vez esta insuficiencia explique la notable aceptación de diminutivos españoles en inglés, como *flotilla, vanilla, peccadillo, chinchilla, quesadilla, camarilla, mosquito, tortilla, mantilla*, casi todos, por supuesto, faltos de motivación, sin valor de diminutivo” (p. 46, first published in 1998). His explanation of the motivation for the borrowings is not convincing. Most English-speakers do not know Spanish. Of the few who do, only those with a professional interest in Spanish would stop to analyze the Spanish words morphologically, but the very few with a professional interest were not those who introduced the words. Indeed, since “casi todos [están] faltos de motivación [y no tienen] valor de diminutivo,” even most Spanish-speakers would not see them as synchronic diminutives. Furthermore, although English indeed makes less use of diminutive devices than Spanish does, English does have a few diminutive suffixes, so that if anglophones wanted a diminutive, they could form one. Rather, we have here the unmarked category of borrowing: importation of a concept accompanied by importation of the word which designates it.

12. “Todavía no me he podido explicar la función de este prefijo [*super*] combinado con apellidos: *Superlópez, Supergarcía*, salvo como exaltación de virtudes que desconozco” (p. 58, first published in 1998).

One possibility is that those family names are derived from nicknames bestowed on people who lived on a floor above the one on which people named *López* and *García* lived, but it is unlikely because Latin *super* probably did not survive as **super* anywhere on Spanish speech territory. Might, therefore, the family names have been taken from civil or ecclesiastical records in Latin in which certain people or families were recorded as being (whatever “being” means) **super López* or **super García*?

13. Speaking of diminutive suffixes in Spanish, Lorenzo mentions “-ico en Aragón y también en Costa Rica, donde se ha convertido en señal de identidad; sus naturales se llaman *ticos*” (p. 60, first published in 1998).

Spanish *-ico* in Aragon is of Aragonese origin. Spanish *-ico* is also found in Cuba.

The most frequent diminutive suffix in Judezmo is *-iko* ~ *-iku* and the language also has *-ito* ~ *-itu* and *-ino* ~ *-inu*, which are used less. At least one constraint on *-iko* ~ *-iku* is that the suffix is not added to bases whose stems end in /k/. Thus, *sarika* ~ *sarike* (a pet form of the Judezmo female given name *sara* 'Sarah') but *esxakito* ~ *isxakitu* (a pet form of the Judezmo male given name *esxak* ~ *isxak* 'Isaac'). At least in Salonika Judezmo, pet forms of male given names that end in *-iko* are applied only to youngsters and pet forms applied to adult males end in *-on* (stressed) or *-a_i* (penultimately stressed). For example, people named *davi* 'David' and *nisim* are called or referred to as *daviko* and *nisimiko* respectively when they are young and later as *davi_on* and *nisima_i*. At least in Salonika Judezmo, *-ito* and *-iko* may be combined, as in *bašitiko* 'very short person', the feminine form of which is *bašitika*.

Informal *tico* 'Costa Rican' had to have arisen among speakers of Spanish who did not use *-ico* (for only they would take notice of the suffix) and eventually Costa Ricans adopted it as an informal self-designation. Whether those speakers were living near Costa Rica (in Nicaragua, Panama, or both countries?) or were non-Costa-Ricans in Costa Rica is unclear.

In clippings, like *tico*, syllables rather than morphemes are usually retained because clippings are usually oral coinages and the average person hears syllables rather than analyzes a word into morphemes (and with non-monosyllabic, synchronically mono-morphemic words, the average speaker has no choice but to go by syllables). Consequently, we assume that *tico* was clipped from *momentico* in the frequent Costa Rican Spanish expression “¡Un momentico!,” the syllabification of which is /un mo men ti ko/ (contrast its morphemic structure: {un moment iko}).

14. “El problema que plantean los ortógrafos, algunos de ellos muy respetuosos con la tradición, pero enemigos de la k, letra que ahora defienden los 'okupas' y ciertas ortografías emergentes, es el de adaptar la k del griego al español pasando a la fuerza por el latín, que la respetó como sonido ante cualquier vocal, mas dejó que la deformaran sus herederas en la forma indicada” (p. 67).

In objective writing on language we do not expect to see the word *deformar* and its derivatives except when the change is deliberate (see comment 22).

15. “[...] en inglés antiguo *cwen* «mujer» se escindió en dos significados contrapuestos, el de *queen* «reina» y el de *quean* «ramera»” (p. 70, first published in 2001).

“[...] *quean* and *queen*, sometimes cited as extreme examples of elevation and degradation of the same word, are really from separate, though related, Old English forms, *cwene* and *cw n*” (Stuart Robertson, *The Development of Modern English*, second edition, revised by Frederic G. Cassidy. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1954, p. 253).

16. “En los últimos tiempos, el enfrentamiento, no mero contacto, de dos culturas claramente diferenciadas, la islámica y la cristiana-europea, ha dado lugar a vivas polémicas que revelan la falta de datos objetivos fiables a la hora de emitir juicios satisfactorios. Es el caso, por ejemplo, de *ben/bin/ibn*. Creo que quien tiene la culpa del conflicto ortográfico es el inglés [...]” (p. 75, first published in 2002).

We have here a contrast between *ibn*, which is Classical Arabic, and *ben ~ bin*, which is Modern Spoken Arabic. With respect to *ben ~ bin*, the allophonic realization of its vowel varies spatially. My impression is that its realization in Morocco, Algeria, Tunisia, Chad, Jordan, and the United Arab Emirates is such that it induces American English-speakers to choose to represent it by *e* and in Libya, the Arabian Peninsula except the United Arab Emirates, Zanzibar, Malaysia, Singapore, and Indonesia it is such that it induces them to represent it by *i*. A map showing the the various realizations would be useful. Whether Americans' use of both *ben* and *bin* has led to use of both those forms in Spanish (as Lorenzo believes) or, rather, Spanish-speakers have made those choices independently of English is an unanswered question. French usage, whatever it may be, is another possible influence on Spanish usage.

17. “También hay una vacilación al transliterar la onomástica rusa. En España hemos convivido con la alternancia *Gorbachov/Gorvachev*, como antes con la de *Jrushchov/Jrushchev*” (pp. 76-77, first published in 2002).

Here are some guidelines for romanizing non-Roman-letter personal names. Romanizing for purposes of research and romanizing for use in popular publications may yield different results. In research, we want either an exact transliteration or a phonetic, a phonemic, or a morphophonemic transcription and we do not hesitate to use special symbols if they are required, whereas when

writing for the general public, as in newspapers and magazines, we use only the letters of the language in which we are writing (thus, no special symbols); we strive to make the romanization as graphotactic as possible (thus, we try to avoid using symbols in positions in which they do not ordinarily occur in the language in which we are writing, so that, *inter alia*, we try to avoid combinations of symbols not ordinarily found in the language); and, by trying to make the romanization as graphotactic as possible, we try to suggest a pronunciation as phonotactic as possible in the language in which we are writing.

Let us apply those principles to one of the Russian family names which Lorenzo mentions:

A. The finally stressed Russian family name *Горбачев*, the base of which is a nickname meaning 'hunchback', can be transliterated as *Gorbačev* or as *Gorbačëv*. The single difference between the two transliterations is to be explained as follows: certain transliterators render Russian *e* always as *e* and certain transliterators render it as *e* when it stands for /je/ and as *ë* when it stands for /jo/. Since the family name in question has /jo/, the latter transliterators render the name as *Gorbačëv*.

B. The first segment of the name is /g/, which is always realized as [g] word-initially. Since Spanish word-initial /g/ is realized in certain positions as [g] (as in "Están en Guatemala") and in certain positions as [ɣ] (as in "Se fueron a Guatemala") and since Spanish has no way of indicating that word-initial /g/ is always to be pronounced [g] (because word-initial /g/ always has, as we have just seen, not one but two realizations), we will not be able to indicate in Spanish that the Russian name always has [g]. That should not disappoint us, for the SPANISH spelling of a RUSSIAN family name should not be a lesson in RUSSIAN PHONETICS.

C. The second segment is the morphophoneme {o}, the phoneme /a/, and the allophone [a]. Do we want to transliterate (if so, *o*) or to transcribe and if we want to transcribe, do we want a morphophonemic transcription (if so, *o*), a phonemic one (if so, *a*), or a phonetic one (if so, *a*)? So far, therefore, we have *Go-* and *Ga-*.

D. The third segment is /r/. We thus now have either *Gor-* or *Gar-*.

E. The fourth segment is the phoneme /b/ and the allophone [b]. Since /b/ after /r/ is always realized as [β] in Spanish (represented by *b* in certain words, like *árbol* 'tree', and by *v* in others, like *arveja* 'vetch'), the spelling of the language has no way of representing [b] in that position. We thus now have *Gorb-*, *Gorv-*, *Garb-*, and *Garv-*, and Spanish-speakers will render the fourth segment as [β].

F. The fifth segment is the phoneme /a/ and the allophone [a], which in Spanish are represented by *a*. Hence *Gorba-*, *Gorva-*, *Garba-*, and *Garva-*.

G. The sixth segment is the phoneme /č/, which in Spanish is represented by *ch*. Hence *Gorbach-*, *Gorvach-*, *Garbach-*, and *Garvach-*.

H. The seventh segment is /jo/, which in Spanish does not occur after /č/. We therefore have three possibilities here:

1. Transliterate the representation of the segment. If so, we have *e*.
2. Transcribe the segment. If so,
 - i. By *io* and thus expand the phonotactics and graphotactics of Spanish a bit.
 - ii. By *o* and thus stay within the phonotactics and graphotactics.

Hence *Gorbache-*, *Gorvache-*, *Garbache-*, *Garvache-*, *Gorbachio-*, *Gorvachio-*, *Garbachio-*, *Garvachio-*, *Gorbacho-*, *Gorvacho-*, *Garbacho-*, and *Garvacho-*.

I. The eighth segment is the morphophoneme {v}, the phoneme /v/, and the allophone [f]. Standard Spanish and most varieties of non-Standard Spanish do not have [v] at all. Spanish has word-final /b/ only in names of non-Spanish origin, like *Kiev* 'Kiev', and Spanish-speakers are likely to render that phoneme as [β] or as Ø in that position. Spanish has word-final /f/ only in names of non-Spanish origin, like *el Rif* 'Rif'. Hence *Gorbacheb*, *Gorvacheb*, *Garbacheb*, *Garvacheb*, *Gorbachiob*, *Gorvachiob*, *Garbachiob*, *Garvachiob*, *Gorbachob*, *Gorvachob*, *Garbachob*, *Garvachob*, *Gorbachev*, *Gorvachev*, *Garbachev*, *Garvachev*, *Gorbachiov*, *Gorvachiov*, *Garbachiov*, *Garvachiov*, *Gorbachov*, *Gorvachov*, *Garbachov*, *Garvachov*, *Gorbachef*, *Gorvachef*, *Garbachef*, *Garvachef*, *Gorbachiof*, *Gorvachiof*, *Garbachiof*, *Garvachiof*, *Gorbachof*, *Gorvachof*, *Garbachof*, and *Garvachof*.

J. If we want to stay within traditional Spanish phonotactics and graphotactics as far as possible, we should avoid *-io-* (see H.2.i), *-b* (see I), and *v* (see I). Hence *Gorbachef*, *Gorvachef*, *Garbachef*, *Garvachef*, *Gorbachof*, *Gorvachof*, *Garbachof*, and *Garvachof*. Although all are equally legitimate in principle, one should be chosen (on the basis of what criterion or criteria?) because orthographical variation should be reduced to a minimum. I have no idea which of the eight to recommend.

The foregoing shows that choosing the best Spanish spelling of a non-Spanish name, especially one in a non-Roman-letter language, cannot be left to the laity, which in this case includes employees of news agencies and the periodical press, who usually copy mechanically from other Roman-letter languages, now mostly English, without considering whether the spellings are the best for Spanish. To determine the best spellings, the Academy of the Spanish Language should establish a permanent committee made up of people versed in romanization; it should be advised by people expert in the spelling and pronunciation of personal and place names in various non-Roman-letter languages; it should issue lists of

recommended spellings periodically; and it should be ready to answer questions from the public as speedily as possible.

18. “A ignorancia de la historia se debe el tratar literalmente como *revolución de octubre* la que sus protagonistas y sucesores conmemoraban en noviembre de cada año [...]” (p. 77, first published in 2002).

It's not a matter of ignorance. The event in question, called *the Bolshevik Revolution* and *the October Revolution* in English, took place on 24-25 October 1917 according to the Julian Calendar (official in Russia at that time) or 6-7 November 1917 according to the Gregorian Calendar (adopted in the Soviet Union in 1918). Thus, the question arises whether to celebrate that event according to the Julian or the Gregorian Calendar. If you decide to follow the Gregorian Calendar, you celebrate it in November. Either way, the name *the October Revolution* has remained, just as *abisinio*, for example, has remained in Spanish to designate the fatigue cap with earflaps used in the Spanish navy during the Spanish Civil War even though the word alludes to the country no longer called *Abisinia* in Spanish.

19. “Un manual de estilo de cierta agencia condenaba tajantemente el uso de *Rusia* a favor de *Unión Soviética*. Luego, en noticia de la misma agencia, se recordaba que en la guerra ruso-japonesa (1904-5) la flota soviética (!!!) había perdido valiosos tesoros al hundirse parte de ella” (pp. 77-78, first published in 2002).

The vague manual should have said that the Soviet Union should be called not *Rusia* but *la Unión Soviética*.

Spanish requires (*¡¡¡!!!*). Likewise, “[...] ingeniero de ferrocarriles (*i*) [...]” (p. 164, first given orally, in 2002) should read “ingeniero de ferrocarriles (*¿?*).”

20. “[...] el uso del voseo, cada vez más extendida y admitido en Hispanoamérica [...]” (p. 82, first published in 2001).

My impression is the opposite of Lorenzo's: except in Argentina, the use of the second-person singular form *vos* is declining and prescriptivists still consider it less than elegant.

21. “[...] Girona y A Coruña [son los topónimos aceptados] en España” (p. 83, first published in 2001).

Girona is Catalan and *A Coruña* is Galician, the Spanish names of the cities in question being *Gerona* and *La Coruña*. Why use the non-Spanish names if the

Spanish ones are good? Do any Spanish prescriptivists agree with Lorenzo? Manuel Seco, the foremost, does not.

22. “Al mismo impulso diferenciador --el famoso hecho diferencial-- obedecen grafías antietimológicas en español como *cártel*, *Nóbel*, *Catalunya*, etc. y las deformaciones intencionadas reflejadas en los *okupas*, *la inteligentsia*, *txikito*, *Xunta*, etc.” (pp. 86-87, first published in 2001).

This being a mixed bag, the seven words have to be treated in different ways (and, in just two cases, as Lorenzo does):

Since *cártel* comes from British English *cartel*, which is penultimately stressed, the Spanish word is not unusual in pronunciation or spelling. Thus, nothing here is non-etymological.

Spanish *Nóbel* comes from English *Nobel* stressed on the penult (the English name is also stressed on the last syllable). Here, too, therefore, everything is expected and nothing is non-etymological.

Catalunya comes from Catalan *Catalunya* 'Catalonia'. Since the Spanish name of Catalonia is *Cataluña*, *Catalunya* is, like *Girona* and *A Coruña*, unneeded in Spanish.

Okupa indeed contains a deliberate misspelling (see comment 14, the goal of which is to be “different,” but *ocupa* is used too and it is the better spelling unless you want to represent /k/ always by *k* in Spanish -- which would be a good idea.

Inteligentsia 'intelligentsia' comes from Russian *intelligentsiya* 'idem', which has /c/ (represented by *ts* in that romanization of the Russian word), so that *ts* (representing /c/) in the Spanish word is not non-etymological, the purpose of using the digraph *ts* being to distinguish the word aurally and visually from Spanish *inteligencia*, which does not mean 'intelligentsia'.

The Galician name of the autonomous Galician government is *a Xunta de Galicia* and its Spanish name is *la Junta de Galicia*. Nothing justifies, therefore, the spelling *Xunta* in Spanish. See above on *Girona*, *A Coruña*, and *Catalunya* for other unneeded non-Spanish spellings in Spanish.

Txikito instead of *chiquito* is indeed a deliberate misspelling (*tx* representing /ç/ and *k* representing /k/ are Basque spellings).

23. “Como se ve, algunos son muy enrevesados y constituyen auténticos trabalenguas, que no vamos a aplaudir ni condenar, porque es arriesgado predecir si la comunidad lingüística los va a aceptar o rechazar” (p. 104, first published in 1995). “En este sentido debemos advertir que en los datos que vamos a manejar no

debe buscarse más que una exposición objetiva de hechos [...]” (p. 114, first published in 1995). “No soy el lector adecuado para juzgar si lo conseguido va a beneficiar al lector” (p. 130, first published in 1993). “No voy a repetir aquí lo que en el momento oportuno dos profesores de esta universidad, [...], expusieron en [...]” (first given orally, in 2002).

Overuse of *ir a* at the expense of the future tense is presumably an anglicism. The future indicative would be better in the passages quoted.

24. “El [sufijo inglés *-ing*] entra en un buen contingente de formas, llegadas al español directamente o a través del francés, como *smoking, dancing, leasing, camping, clearing, footing*, etc., que invitan a formas falsas analógicas como *foreing* [...]” (p. 111, first published in 1995).

If a Spanish word ending in *-ing* is of immediate French origin, it contains the French suffix *-ing*, not the English one so spelled.

“[...] como [...], etc.” is a frequent mistake in Spanish and the analogous mistake is committed by speakers of other languages too: if you begin an enumeration with *como*, you are implying that the enumeration is less than exhaustive and thus *etc.* is not needed. If you end an enumeration with *etc.*, you are implying that it is not exhaustive and thus do not need *como*. Consequently, use one or the other word but not both. Likewise, “por ejemplo [...], etc.” is tautologous.

“Falsas” is unjustifiedly condemnatory. Rather, Spanish *foreing* shows productive use of the Spanish suffix *-ing*.

25. “No hay término en la civilización urbana de Cuba --o de España-- que designe exactamente a la que significa el neologismo inglés *efficiency apartment* que agrupa en las columnas de clasificados ciertos apartamentos pequeños dotados de los adelantos que hacen fácil su mantenimiento” (p. 120, first published in 1994 and republished in 1996).

Although Spanish may not have a term which has both the denotation and connotation of *efficiency apartment* ~ *efficiency*, at least Argentine Spanish, as Lorenzo first pointed out in 1995, has one which is denotationally equivalent: *ámbito único* (p. 36).

Ease of maintenance is not a distinctive feature of *efficiency* ~ *efficiency apartment*. Rather, such an apartment typically consists either (1) of a bathroom and a combined bedroom, living room, and kitchenette, or (2) of a bathroom, kitchenette, and combined bedroom and living room.

Because the term *efficiency apartment* was coined no later than 1930, if you deem it a neologism, it is a somewhat older one.

26. In the used-car business in Spain, “se prefiere el eufemismo *preposeído* (< ing. *prepossessed*)” (p. 121, first published in 1994 and republished in 1996).

The model for *preposeído* was *pre-owned*, not *prepossessed*.

27. “En cuanto a la ortografía [del español estadounidense], se observa[...] *costa Californiana* (ing. *Californian coast*) [...]” (p. 126, first published in 1994 and republished in 1996).”

Capitalization of Spanish *californiano* is indeed due to English influence, but the model here was *California coast* (which is American English), not *Californian coast* (which is British English and thus not likely to influence Spanish in the United States). See David L. Gold, “English Morphological Variation of the Type *India ink* ~ *Indian ink*,” *Neophilologus: An international journal of modern and mediaeval language and literature*, vol. 88, no. 2, April 2004, pp. 275-297.

28. “[...] a los cinco/seis años [...]” (p. 149, first given orally, in 2002).

Why the inelegant slash if the traditional wording, “a los cinco o seis años,” is good?

29. “[...] la Filología Moderna alcanzó en España un prestigio, pese a cierto recelos de la ‘competencia’ que no pudimos ni soñar sus promotores” (p. 159, first given orally, in 2002).

Why *competencia* ‘competition’ (of English origin) if *concurrentia* (of French origin) is older, often used, and unproblematic?

30. “Las dificultades de interpretación del [*Cantar de los Nibelungos*] es una empresa que sólo puede llevar a buen término quien conozca el alto alemán antiguo como Emilio Lorenzo [...]” (p. 204, first published in 1986). The *Nibelungenlied* is in Middle, not Old, High German.