



Linguistic ideology and the 'correct' use of language in Camilo Ortúzar's *Diccionario manual de locuciones viciosas* (1893)

Megan Geraghty

To cite this article: Megan Geraghty (2017) Linguistic ideology and the 'correct' use of language in Camilo Ortúzar's *Diccionario manual de locuciones viciosas* (1893), *Language & History*, 60:2, 129-145, DOI: [10.1080/17597536.2017.1316937](https://doi.org/10.1080/17597536.2017.1316937)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/17597536.2017.1316937>



Published online: 14 Sep 2017.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 19



View related articles [↗](#)



View Crossmark data [↗](#)



Linguistic ideology and the ‘correct’ use of language in Camilo Ortúzar’s *Diccionario manual de locuciones viciosas* (1893)*

Megan Geraghty

Department of Linguistics, Universidad de Chile, Santiago, Chile

ABSTRACT

The present study describes the beliefs and attitudes which undergird the Chilean priest Camilo Ortúzar’s notions of correct and incorrect language use in his *Diccionario manual de locuciones viciosas* (1893), and how those beliefs and attitudes are situated within the broader context of late nineteenth-century Chilean metalinguistic thought. The analysis is performed using a variety of content-oriented analytical tools, chief among them the discourse-historical approach to critical discourse analysis. The beliefs we find present in the dictionary are then summarised, and shown to be largely consistent with the prevailing hegemonic ideological beliefs surrounding language use in nineteenth century Chile.

KEYWORDS

Linguistic ideologies; standard language ideologies; Chilean dictionaries; normative dictionaries; linguistic prescriptivism

Introduction

As the Latin American nations gained political independence from Spain during the first half of the nineteenth century, they also gained control over the language, and over the processes of linguistic planning (Del Valle & Gabriel-Stheeman 2002). The newly founded Republic of Chile was certainly no exception, and so, following its independence in 1810, the country saw the rise of linguistic-ideological debates which proliferated with special intensity during the political period known to Chilean history as the Conservative Republic¹ (1830–1861). The primary issue revolved around whether to maintain the pro-peninsular variety of their former colonisers as the model of proper language use of the Spanish language, or whether to assume the local Chilean vernacular as a model of use and as a symbol of the new nation. Within this debate, two primary positions emerged, the unionist and the separatist positions (Quesada Pacheco 2002). The first was characterised by a desire to maintain the peninsular variety as a model for the Latin American nations, for the sake of mutual intelligibility throughout the continent, a situation considered desirable for political and economic reasons, and also in recognition of Chile’s (and particularly the Creole elite of Chile’s) not insignificant

CONTACT Megan Geraghty  mlgeraghty1@gmail.com

The present article is a revised version of the Master in Linguistics thesis ‘Lenguaje y Religión: Ideología lingüística en el *Diccionario manual de locuciones viciosas* y de correcciones de lenguaje (1893) de Camilo Ortúzar’ (Geraghty 2016) presented in the Department of Philosophy and Language at the University of Chile.

¹The ‘Conservative Republic’ refers to the period of Chilean history (1830–1861) marked by a conservative political regime brought about by the military victory of conservative forces over liberal forces at the end of the Chilean Civil War of 1829–1830, and the rise to power of the Chilean trader and conservative politician Diego Portales whose influence assured the post-war election of a conservative president (Collier 2003: 3).

Spanish cultural inheritance. On the other hand, the separatist position was characterised by a desire for total independence from Spain, in political, cultural, and also linguistic terms, which would imply the exaltation of differential language and the local variety. In terms of the cultural models of linguistic standardisation proposed by Geeraerts (2003 [2006]), we can roughly equate the unionist position to *rationalism*, for its emphasis on the language as a tool of communication and mutual understanding, and the separatist position to *romanticism*, for its emphasis on language as an expression of national identity (Rojas 2015a, 96).

Despite initial debates between these two ideological factions, by the middle of the nineteenth century, the unionist/rationalist model had achieved hegemonic status in Chilean metalinguistic thought, thanks in large part to the influence of the largely unionist/rationalist ideas of Venezuelan intellectual Andrés Bello (1781–1865), who, after resettling in Chile, played a crucial role in the formation of many Chilean institutions, including playing a leading role in the formation of Chile's legal code. Eventually serving as rector of the University of Chile, he authored his famous *Gramática de la lengua castellana* (1847) and left an intellectual legacy that would have a lasting impact on Chile's metalinguistic consciousness.

The hegemony of the unionist/rationalist position can be seen in the resulting ideological homogeneity found among the normative dictionaries produced by Chilean lexicographers of the second half of the nineteenth century and first quarter of the twentieth century which, following the linguistic periodisation of Cartagena (2002: 60), we may refer to as the dictionaries of the standardisation period of Chilean Spanish (1842–1938). The *Diccionario manual de locuciones viciosas y de correcciones de lenguaje: con indicación del valor de algunas palabras y ciertas nociones gramaticales* (from this point forward the DMLV), written by the Salesian priest Camilo Ortúzar, published in 1893, and the object of the present study, is the second dictionary of this corpus, having been preceded in publication by *Diccionario de Chilenismos* (1875) written by Zorobabel Rodríguez, and followed by *Voces usadas en Chile* (1900) written by Aníbal Echeverría y Reyes, and the *Diccionario de Chilenismos y de otras voces y locuciones viciosas* (1901–1918) written by Antonio Manuel Román.

The purpose of these dictionaries was precisely to promote the unionist ideal of a pan-Hispanic pro-peninsular norm. Unapologetically normative, the texts aim to inform readers about what is correct linguistic behaviour, and what is not, and influence said conduct in favour of the desired norm. The prescriptivism of these dictionaries causes them to depart significantly from modern expectations of lexicographical works. Matus (1994), in his periodisation of Chilean lexicography, notes that these so called 'pre-scientific' dictionaries are characterised by their normative and purist tendencies, their pro-peninsular bias and deference to the linguistic authority of the Real Academia Española, and their authors' lack of formal lexicographical formation as conceived by modern standards. Becerra, Castro, and Garrido (2007) and Chávez (2009), who also studied the DMLV as part of the overall corpus, focused above all in identifying and explaining its typology, macrostructure, and irregular lemmatisation, the prescriptive content of its articles, the inconsistent application of its own criteria for the admissibility of a word or phrase, and its at times hyperbolic purism, noting how these features are inconsistent with the techniques and theory of modern lexicography.

Indeed the standardisation period dictionaries have only begun to be studied within the framework of linguistic ideology (see Avilés & Rojas 2014; Rojas 2015a, 2015b; Rojas & Avilés 2012, 2014, 2015). In these studies, it has been noted that the authors of these dictionaries demonstrate a high degree of uniformity in the interests (such as education), goals (such as linguistic unity in the American continent), and beliefs (such as their belief

regarding what is correct use) that they share regarding the Spanish language (Rojas 2015b). According to Rojas (ibid), these authors, all members of the Chilean Creole elite, can be said to form a ‘discourse community’, (in the sense of Watts 2008) formed on the basis of a historically grounded version of the *standard language ideology* (Milroy 2001; Milroy & Milroy 1999). The ideologies which undergird the DMLV, however, have yet to be the object of a specific monographic study which attends to the whole of the work, its paratextual elements as well as totality of its lexicographical articles, a situation which the present article seeks to remedy. The purpose of the present article, then, is to provide a study of the beliefs, attitudes, and linguistic ideologies, specifically those that undergird Ortúzar’s assessments of correctness and incorrectness regarding language use in the DMLV, and their discursive manifestations, and, furthermore, to contextualise these ideas within the broader scope of late nineteenth century Chilean metalinguistic thought, particularly Ortúzar’s relationship to the hegemonic discourse community of his day.

Linguistic ideology and attitude

Linguistic ideologies

In accordance with the definition accepted in modern linguistic anthropology, by *linguistic ideology* we understand a set of beliefs and conceptions regarding language, either explicitly stated or implicitly manifested in communicative practices, which serve to rationalise the linguistic use of a given community. These ideologies often respond to the political and economic interests of the group that hold them (Kroskrity 2010: 192).

In the present study, the ideologies that we analyse constitute an individual manifestation of linguistic ideologies that exist at the level of a group or society. We understand that any individual member of a group may express the ideologies of that group to a greater or lesser extent, depending on certain factors. On one hand, the subjects may, through their socialisation and education, acquire ideologies more or less completely (Van Dijk 1998: 30), and have a greater or lesser degree of awareness (Kroskrity 2010: 192). In addition, an individual may be (and probably is) a member of multiple groups, and as such may apply multiple ideologies to his cognitive models of everyday occurrences, which may result in apparent internal ideological discrepancies (Van Dijk 1998: 150). Finally, a subject’s ideologies may or may not be reflected in their practices and discourse, or they may be applied in a non-uniform manner.

While, the ideologies themselves are ideational entities, their application to language takes on more concrete forms, such as a (in this case amateur) lexicographer’s attitudes towards the linguistic phenomena that he describes. An attitude, according to Eagly and Chaiken, is ‘a psychological tendency that is expressed by evaluating a particular entity with some degree of favor or disfavor’ (apud Albarracín et al. 2005: 4). According to Maio and Haddock (2004), an attitude is comprised of three elements: a *cognitive* element that encompasses beliefs and thoughts regarding an object, an *affective* element that includes the emotions associated with an object, and a *behavioural* element connected with a subject’s behaviours towards an object, and his experiences with the object in the past. Attitudes differ from ideologies in terms of their level of abstraction, as they can be considered to be a more concrete entity (Maio et al. 2006). On an even more concrete level, we can locate the textual expressions of these attitudes and ideologies in discourse practices.

Linguistic ideologies, in addition to being expressed through attitudes, tend to be justified by argumentation and rationalisation applied *post hoc* (Milroy 2001: 535–36). Just as we have understood that the acquisition of ideologies occurs to a greater or lesser extent among individual subjects in a group, in a similar fashion, we expect that justifications and rationalisations for the ideological position that Ortúzar assumes will also represent, to a greater or lesser extent, the typical rationalisations and justifications of the cultural group or groups to which he belonged. In the case of the present study, we expect that these rationalisations will be based on rationalist principals.

As mentioned in Section ‘Introduction’, the hegemonic linguistic discourse community of late 19th century Chile was based on a historical version of the *standard language ideology* (Milroy 2001; Milroy & Milroy 1999), one of the prominent linguistic ideologies of languages with writing systems. This ideology can be summed up as the belief that languages exist in a standard form. According to Milroy, subjects who speak these languages can be said to live in ‘standard language cultures’ (Milroy 2001: 530). Within these cultures, there are certain recurring beliefs, like the belief that there is one ‘canonical’ form of a standard language (Milroy 2001: 535). Those who hold this belief will tend to believe that where two variants exist, one is correct and the other incorrect. Another prevalent belief is that education is necessary to achieve correct language use, even for the native speaker. Milroy (2001) also notes that the ‘standard’ variety tends to be a prestigious variety. This prestige is not an intrinsic property of the variety itself, but rather prestige is obtained by a variety when its *speakers* are in some way prestigious. This element was reflected during the time of Ortúzar by a preference for upper-class vernaculars and a pro-peninsular bias, as at that time Spain did, and indeed arguably still does, exercise a cultural hegemony over its former colonies (Del Valle & Gabriel-Stheeman 2002).

Corpus and methodology

Corpus

The corpus of the present study corresponds to the DMLV’s 5244 lexicographical articles distributed over 320 pages, as well as the dictionary’s paratextual elements (the prologue, pages V–XXII, and a letter regarding the dictionary written by Columbian philologist and lexicographer Rufino José Cuervo). In this study, we are working with the first and only edition of the DMLV published by *Imprenta Salesiana* in 1893. Thanks to the Salesian order’s international network, this dictionary enjoyed more widespread distribution throughout Europe and the Americas than did the other Chilean standardisation period dictionaries (Chávez 2009: 135).

Its author, Camilo Ortúzar Montt, according to his biographer, Francesia (1899), was born in Chile in 1848 to a well-to-do family of Spanish origin. He studied at the seminary of Santiago, and was ordained a priest in 1872. In 1877, he became Vice Rector of the seminary of Valparaíso. During the War of the Pacific (1879–1883), he served as a navy chaplain, and after the war’s end, was sent to serve in the formerly Peruvian, newly occupied region of Tarapacá. He later travelled to Europe, where he joined the Salesian order, receiving the distinction of being the first Chilean Salesian. He spent the rest of his life dedicated to teaching the Spanish language to future missionaries to the Americas, and to writing. In addition to editing the Salesian bulletin, he also worked on a version of *Don Quixote*, removing and replacing what he considered to be poor language use, as well as writing the

DMLV, his only known foray into lexicography as such. Ortúzar died in Nice, France, in 1895, only 2 years after the DMLV's publication, at the age of 47.

The dictionary itself is aimed not only at semantic clarification and correction, but also, as its name implies, contains grammatical, syntactical, and phonological commentaries, as well as orthographical corrections. The work is somewhat unique within the corpus of Chilean standardisation period dictionaries, in that, while it is dedicated to the Chilean people (Ortúzar Montt 1893: XX), it is more general in nature, not limiting itself to addressing only Chilenisms or Chilean Spanish, but rather addressing variant language from many regions, both in America and Spain. The work also contains a significant quantity of standard variety articles marked as correct, some of which provide no additional information or commentary whatsoever, as well as non-standard language articles marked as incorrect which offer only a single-word definition intended as a standard language replacement. Both of these article types emphasise the dictionary's normative intent.

Methodology

In order to perform the present analysis, we have adopted a qualitative, descriptive approach. The analytical tools used in said analysis are quite diverse, as we believe that the complex and multifaceted nature of discourse-ideological manifestations necessitates an eclectic approach. In accordance with Arnoux (2008), we understand that a prescriptive dictionary, such as the DMLV, must be considered as a form of *discourse*, and, therefore, content-oriented discourse analytical tools (Preston 1994) figure prominently in our analysis, as is common in studies of linguistic ideologies. As our primary means of analysis, we employ the discourse-historical approach to critical discourse analysis (Reisigl & Wodak 2009). This analytical method recognises so-called 'discourse strategies' which are defined as linguistic practices, with a greater or lesser degree of intentionality, which are employed in order to achieve a social goal, whether political, psychological or linguistic. These strategies exist at various levels of organisation and abstraction (2009: 94). From the myriad possible strategies, the authors highlight five in particular: nomination, predication, argumentation, perspectivisation and intensification/mitigation.

In addition to the above, we also use other analytical tools, including Irvine and Gal's (2000) semiotic-ideological processes, the formulation of *erasure* and *iconization* being of particular relevance to the present study. According to these authors, erasure is the process by which 'ideology, in simplifying the sociolinguistic field, renders some persons or activities (or sociolinguistic phenomena) invisible. Facts that are inconsistent with the ideological scheme either go unnoticed or are explained away' (2000: 38). Thus, linguistic behaviours that suffer erasure are indicative of Ortúzar's belief in the lack of compatibility with correct language use. The process of iconisation, on the other hand,

involves a transformation of the sign relationship between linguistic features (or varieties) and the social images with which they are linked. Linguistic features that index social groups or activities appear to be iconic representations of them, as if linguistic features somehow depicted or displayed a social group's inherent nature or essence. (Irvine & Gal 2000: 37)

Iconisation will play a role in strengthening Ortúzar's arguments of correctness or incorrectness as we shall see further on.

Ideological analysis of the DMLV

Two of the most obvious and ubiquitous beliefs regarding language use in the DMLV, which we wish not to take for granted as they constitute its *raison d'être* are quite simply (1) the belief that there is a correct and incorrect way in which to write and speak the Spanish language (correct being that which corresponded to the accepted supraregional standard), and that (2) speaking and writing correctly is not a spontaneous occurrence in the native speaker but rather the fruit of proper linguistic education. The purpose of the DMLV is, then, to provide a resource for 'la juventud estudiosa [the studious youth]' (Ortúzar Montt 1893: XXI) in order to help them avoid falling into linguistic error. In this section, we will examine the structural, diastatic, diatopic, and diachronic constraints which Ortúzar establishes around 'correct' language use, and the discursive mechanisms which through which these constraints are explicitly and implicitly established.

Structural constraints on correct language use

Structural purity in language use is very much a theme of the DMLV, and perhaps the most important principle for Ortúzar in determining the admissibility or inadmissibility of a given lemma or word form. By structure, we refer to the language's grammatical, phonological, and orthographical 'rules'. In this section, we will examine these three areas (in addition to the impact of structural beliefs on the lexicon), the beliefs which Ortúzar expresses regarding each one, and the way in which these beliefs are expressed discursively in the DMLV.

Ortúzar's beliefs regarding grammar are best exemplified by a quotation from the distinguished Spanish grammarian and lexicographer Vicente Salvá,² which is reproduced in the DMLV's prologue:

El uso es libre, mas por lo mismo que es libre, ha de preceder á sus determinaciones ó fallos, un motivo, un fundamento; y en las lenguas cultivadas, ese fundamento ha de ser su origen y su modo de formación, su historia, que no pueden repudiar, su pasado, que las liga con su estado presente, y su fijación gramatical, con la cual no se debe ir jugando y haciéndose el veleidoso, por cuanto una lengua ya fijada contrae obligaciones y deberes respecto de los escritos y de las literaturas anteriores, y tiene consideraciones que guardar á las generaciones sucesivas, en beneficio de éstas, de la literatura patria, y de la conservación y pureza de la misma lengua. [[language] Usage is free, and for this very reason, choices and decisions [made by speakers] have to be preceded by a motive, a foundation; in the cultivated languages, this foundation must be their origin and manner of formation, their history which they cannot repudiate, their past which joins them with their present state, and the cementing of their grammars, with which one should not play nor be capricious, because an already solidified language carries with it certain obligations and duties with respect to the previous writings and literature, and it has considerations which it must preserve for the benefit of future generations, that of the national literature, and that of the conservation and purity of that same language.]. (cited from Ortúzar Montt 1893: XX, emphasis is ours)³

Ortúzar certainly considers Spanish to be one such language, its grammar already determined, and thus a closed system that cannot admit modification. For Ortúzar, then,

²Vicente Salvá (1786–1849) was author of the *Gramática de la lengua castellana* (1835), which, according to Azorín Fernández and Baquero Mesa (1994–1995), is one of the works most representative of the prevailing Spanish grammatical thought of its time, along with the grammar of the Real Academia Española. Salvá's *Nuevo Diccionario de la Lengua Castellana* (1846) was also an immensely popular and influential work. Ortúzar praises this dictionary in the DMLV's prologue for its faithful representation of the language use of the learned/cultured class (1893: XXI). Salvá is the second most cited author in the DMLV, after the Real Academia Española.

³All translations from Spanish into English are the author's, unless otherwise indicated.

grammatical correctness will centre on not introducing innovations. The grammatical corrections provided by Ortúzar in the DMLV generally involve verb conjugation, grammatical gender, or prepositional regimen, as exemplified in the following entries (Note that the examples from the DMLV provided in this article are reproduced using the same font effects and spelling as in the original document. Ortúzar uses all capital letters for words or expressions he considers to be correct/acceptable, and bold lettering for those he considers incorrect/unacceptable):

ACAECER conj. c. agradecer, y sólo en las terceras personas de singular y plural. [ACAECER conjugate like agradecer, and only in the third person singular and plural.]. (Ortúzar Montt 1893: 7)

Apotiosis. Apoteosis (del gr. *apoteosis*). Siempre ha sido femenino, y pierden la brújula los que caen en la tentación de hacerlo masculino. [**Apotiosis**. Apoteosis (from Greek. *apoteosis*). It has always been feminine and those who fall into the temptation of making it masculine have lost their bearings.]. (Ortúzar Montt 1893: 35)

Dracma (Un). Una dracma. [Dracma (A). A dracma.]. (Ortúzar Montt 1893: 128)

Mediante á. ¿Qué Cireneo es ese? Suprímase la preposición si se quiere hablar en español. *Mediante á mis ruegos; mediante á Dios*. [**Mediante á**. What Cyrenian⁴ is this? Omit the preposition if you wish to speak in Spanish. *Mediante á mis ruegos; mediante á Dios*.]. (Ortúzar Montt 1893: 208)

Note in the case of ‘apotiosis’ Ortúzar makes an appeal to the history of the language with the phrase ‘siempre ha sido femenino [it has always been feminine]’, while in the final example, we see clear evidence of Ortúzar’s purist attitude towards structural delimitations of the Spanish language. A variant which does not fall within Spanish’s typical historical prepositional regime is, quite simply, not Spanish.

Regarding the orthographical structure of the Spanish language, Ortúzar unsurprisingly, given his reverence for the language’s structure and history, shows deference to the etymology of the words in question, considering as most correct those spellings which most closely follow typical patterns of transition from the source languages into Spanish. When correcting a deviant spelling, he often provides the reader with the word’s original Latin or Greek form in order to support his assertion, as in the following examples:

Tiberiades. Tiberiade, que todos los nombres propios griegos en *iade, iades* son esdrújulos. (Cuervo). [**Tiberiades**. Tiberiade, as all Greek proper nouns ending in *iade, iades* are proparoxytone (have stress on the antepenultimate syllable). (Cuervo).]. (Ortúzar Montt 1893: 304)

Escabar. Excabar. (del lat. *excavare*) [**Escabar**. Excabar. (from Latin *excavare*).]. (Ortúzar Montt 1893: 141)

Even in those cases where Ortúzar chooses to side with a spelling which does not conform to normal etymological transformation, but is promulgated by the Real Academia Española, he will often nevertheless express his negative attitude towards the non-etymological spelling with mitigation mechanisms, such as the phrases ‘no obstante [despite]’ and ‘si bien debería escribirse ... [if indeed it should be written ...]’ as in the examples below:

⁴We believe that ‘Cyrenian’ in this case is a reference to Simon of Cyrene, the man who, in the Bible, the Romans compel to help Jesus carry his cross. In this sense we might understand the word to mean ‘helper’, although in this case a most unwelcome one, referring to the addition of the preposition ‘d’.

Agusar. Aguzar, no obstante su etimología, del lat. *agusare* [**Agusar.** Aguzar, despite its etymology, from Latin *agusare*]. (Ortúzar Montt 1893: 19)

Biscocho. Bizcocho, si bien debiera escribirse del primer modo, en atención á su etimología, del lat. *bis coctus*. [**Biscocho.** Bizcocho, if indeed it should be written in the first way, given its etymology, from Latin *bis coctus*]. (Ortúzar Montt 1893: 55)

Ortúzar's adherence to the etymological orthography is also significant in that it implies a rejection of the Chilean orthographical reform made official in Chile in 1844 and which remained the law of the land until 1927. In this respect, he differs significantly from the work of his predecessor in the genre of standardisation period dictionaries, Zorobabel Rodríguez, who in his *Diccionario de chilenismos* (1875) indeed opts for the Chilean orthography (for example, writing *jente* instead of the traditional *gente* (1875: 269)). The reform, based on a proposal by Andrés Bello, sought to bring the language closer to the elusive ideal of a 1:1 correspondence between grapheme and phoneme by reducing the graphical representation of certain phonemes to one letter only and suppressing the graphical representation of silent consonants and vowels, among other adjustments (see Arnoux 2006). Ortúzar's rejection of the Chile's orthographical innovation is in many ways unsurprising, as the reform was exclusive to Chile, and the DMLV was written for a more general audience, not just for the Chilean populace, as evidenced by its initial publication in Europe, its widespread distribution, and its inclusion of regionalisms from all parts of the Spanish-speaking world. However, the reform is not just implicitly rejected through Ortúzar's use of standard orthography, but rather explicitly argued against based on rationalist principles of intelligibility and Ortúzar's respect for the past and tradition of the language. According to Ortúzar, this innovation would 'inutilizar, o dejar casi ilegibles, los manuscritos e impresos antiguos [render old manuscripts and printed texts useless or almost unreadable]' (1893: 169–170) and that by reducing certain phonemes to single graphemes, 'se destruyen no pocas etimologías [not a few etymologies are destroyed]' (1893: 190).

On a phonological level, Ortúzar displays, first, a belief that there is in fact a single 'correct' pronunciation, and, secondly, a belief that the habitual pronunciation of the people of Castile corresponds to the most correct pronunciation, both beliefs evidenced by the following citations:

C. El sonido suave de esta letra, según la Academia, es idéntico al de la *z*, como *cebo*, *cifra* al igual de *zeugma*, *zizigia*. No se obedece á esta regla en América, donde de ordinario se da á la *c* suave el sonido de la *s*. [C. The soft sound of this letter, according to the Academia, is identical to the *z*, thus *cebo*, *cifra* the same as *zeugma*, *zizigia*. This rule is not obeyed in America, where ordinarily the soft *c* is given the sound of the *s*]. (Ortúzar Montt 1893: 61)

D. Se ha dicho, nota la Academia, ser modelo de pronunciación la de la gente culta de Castilla. Esta regla, no obstante, padece excepción respecto de la *d*, que á fin de vocablo suena impropriamente en labios castellanos como *z*: [...] [D. It has been said, notes the Academia, that the cultured people of Castile are models of pronunciation. Nevertheless, this rule has an exception with regard to the *d*, which at the end of the word sounds improperly on Castilian lips like a *z*: [...]]. (Ortúzar Montt 1893: 106)

In the case of 'C', we can see a clearly normative approach to pronunciation, and subsequent rejection of the *seseo* phenomenon in the Americas as a deviant mode of pronunciation. The pronunciation of *c* like *z* is considered to be a phonological rule that is not obeyed. Ortúzar takes a similarly negative attitude towards the phenomenon of *yeísmo*, the pronunciation of the *ll* like the *y*, which he also considers to a 'vicio de pronunciación

[pronunciation vice]' (1893: 200). Ortúzar's treatment of these phenomena, commonplace in American varieties, reveal his preference for peninsular pronunciations, in particular the Castilian variety. In the second example above, Ortúzar, in accordance with the Real Academia Española, holds up Castilian pronunciation as a model of correct pronunciation despite the exception created by that variety's weakening of the /d/ in word final position.

Ortúzar's adherence to, and reverence for, the history and structure of the Spanish language also has repercussions on what is considered acceptable lexicon in the DMLV. On the one hand, Ortúzar imposes structural criteria on the formation of neologisms and regionalisms, namely that they should be 'de procedencia y formación legítima [of legitimate origin and formation]' (Ortúzar Montt 1893: XI). These two cases will be examined further in Sections 'Diastratic constraints on correct language' and 'Diatopic constraints on correct language use'.

On the other hand, the structural criteria will also affect the lexicon in the form of the almost universal censure of loanwords, which, by Ortúzar's structural requirements, fall outside the clearly delimited boundaries of the Spanish language. They are only deemed admissible if they have been thoroughly integrated and spring from denominative necessity, a rare case in the DMLV. While, the dictionary contains a variety of censured loanwords, primary from English, Italian, Latin and French, it is the lexicon proceeding from the last of these which is most severely condemned, and whose use triggers Ortúzar's sternest reprimands.

The source of Ortúzar's vehement insistence that French loanwords have no place in correct Spanish language use can be traced to the high level of prestige that the French language enjoyed during this period. Indeed, French loanwords appear prolifically in the lexicons of the other European languages during this time (Lázaro Carreter 1949: 156). In Spain, it had become a trend to send children to France for their education, if resources permitted (Martinell 1984), and in Chile, the French language was known and spoken among the upper classes (González Errázuriz 2003). So generalised was the interpolation of French loanwords into Spanish, that it led Ortúzar to lament in the DMLV's prologue that 'en materia de galicismos, todos pecamos [in the matter of Gallicisms, we all sin]' (1893: X). This situation was, for Ortúzar, grievous, as he feared the French language's great prestige and prominence threatened the prestige of the Spanish language, and that it might cause the great classics of Spanish literature to be forgotten in favour of French literature. Ortúzar also appears to object to the interpolation of Gallicisms on the basis that this practice equates to putting on airs.

The following articles from the DMLV demonstrate the force of Ortúzar's opposition to mixing French loanwords in Spanish conversation:

Avalancha. Galicismo perjudicial á juicio de Cuervo, y anatematizado expresamente por la Academia. (*Gramát.*). Dígase alud, lurte, lud. [**Avalancha.** Detrimental Gallicism by Cuervo's judgement, and expressly anathematized by the Academia. (*Grammar*). Rather, say alud, lurte, lud.] (Ortúzar Montt 1893: 46)

Etiqueta, por rótulo, rotulata, tarjeta, inscripción, es desatino, dice Baralt,⁵ que los pisaverdes repiten, que los tontos aplauden, y que la imprenta reproduce en honra y gloria del idioma francés. [**Etiqueta,** for rótulo, rotulata, tarjeta, inscripción is nonsense, says Baralt, which the dandies repeat, the fools applaud, and the press reproduces for the honour and glory of the French language.]. (Ortúzar Montt 1893: 147)

⁵Rafael María Baralt (1810–1860), the Venezuelan intellectual and author of the *Diccionario de Galicismos* (1855), is the fourth most cited language authority in the DMLV, behind the Royal Spanish Academy, Vicente Salvá, and Rufino J. Cuervo.

Finanzas. Hacienda pública, rentas del Estado ó fiscales, erario, tesoro público. Es voz exótica como las dos anteriores. Baralt no la juzga necesaria, ni por ningún concepto aceptable, y la Academia (*Gramat.* pág. 280) observa que pertenece á la bárbara irrupción, cada vez más creciente, de galicismos que atosiga nuestra lengua [**Finanzas.** Public estate, income of the state or taxes, public funds, public treasury. It is an exotic word like the two previous. Baralt does not judge it necessary, nor is it by any concept acceptable, and the Academia (*Gramat.* pg. 280) observes that it belongs to the barbarous invasion, increasingly expanding, of Gallicisms that plague our language.]. (Ortúzar Montt 1893: 155–56)

Soaré, Suaré. del fr. *soirée*, sarao, tertulia, reunión, es una impertinente cuando risible afectación de importancia, que á nada conduce, dice Baralt. [**Soaré, Suaré.** from French *Soirée*, sarao, tertulia, reunión, it is an impertinent if laughable feigning of importance, which leads nowhere, says Baralt.]. (Ortúzar Montt 1893: 291)

The above examples are rich with discourse strategies which clearly indicate the negative attitude which Ortúzar harbours for this class of loanwords: nominations such like ‘desatino [nonsense]’, ‘irrupción [invasion]’, and ‘afectación de importancia [feigning of importance]’, adjectival predicates such as ‘perjudicial [detrimental]’, ‘bárbaro [barbarous]’, ‘risible [laughable]’, and ‘impertinente [impertinent]’, and verbal predications such as ‘anatematizado [anathematized]’. The second and fourth examples, **Etiqueta** and **Soaré** also employ the semiotic-ideological process of *iconization* (Section ‘Methodology’) through which it equates those who use these words to dandies, fools, and the anti-patriotic in the former case, and to the self-important and prideful in the latter case. Such iconisation constitutes a form of social coercion which supports Ortúzar’s evaluation of incorrectness.

Diastratic constraints on correct language

In Ortúzar’s own words, language use is the ‘dueño y señor en materia de lenguaje [master and lord in matters of language]’ (1893: XIX) but what is ‘correct’ use is guided by certain diastratic constraints. Following in the thought of Andrés Bello, Ortúzar elevates the *consensus eruditorum*, a concept traced back to Quintilian, and resurrected by Bello in the context of the standardisation processes of nineteenth century Chile, as a chief determiner of what is correct and what is not. According to this principle, correct speech is basically equivalent to the form of language employed by educated speakers, thus Ortúzar writes, ‘Es necesario, pues, atender no á prácticas individuales ni al uso abusivo del vulgo, sino al de los letrados [It is necessary, therefore, to attend not to the abusive use of the masses, but rather to that of the learned]’ (1893: XIX). In this sense, we can say that the more popular lexicon of the period suffered *erasure* (Section ‘Methodology’) within lexicographical writing, as vulgar lexicon would, by this principle, automatically be denied the distinction of ‘correctness’.

Evidence that a word belongs to the variety spoken by the learned and cultured class is supplied by the other dictionaries cited as sources in the DMVL, most notably the *Diccionario de la Lengua Castellana*, 12.^a ed. (Real Academia Española 1884), *Nuevo Diccionario de la Lengua Castellana* (Salvá 1846), and *Diccionario de Construcción y Régimen* (Cuervo 1872), and also by the authors cited as models of language use, notably Cervantes, Luis de Granada, and Juan Valera in the case of the DMLV.⁶ The former group serve as guarantors of a word’s use in the prestigious variety, as Ortúzar affirms that these texts are based on the general use of the learned class and on literary study, while the model authors serve as primary evidence of said usage.

⁶For a complete list of authors cited as models in the DMLV see Geraghty (2016, Appendix B).

Once again, to strengthen his evaluation of incorrectness for words which he considers to be outside of the diastatic delimitations of correct language use, Ortúzar employs the semiotic-ideological process of iconisation (see Section ‘Methodology’) to link the use of certain words with a lack education, or culture, as can be seen in the following examples:

For lack of education:

Desapercibido. Ignorado, inadvertido, es galicismo el más desatinado, que arguye supina ignorancia y puede considerarse como delito grave contra la lengua, en concepto de Baralt, *Véase Gramati. de la Acad.* pág. 282. Véase APERCIBIR. [**Desapercibido.** Ignorado, inadvertido, it is a most nonsensical Gallicism which betrays total ignorance and can be considered as a grave crime against the language, according to Baralt.]. (Ortúzar Montt 1893: 115)

For lack of culture:

Mayencia por maguncia, es barbarismo de arrabaleros. [**Mayencia** for maguncia, is a barbarism of the lower classes]. (Ortúzar Montt 1893: 206)

Diatopic constraints on correct language use

Throughout the DMLV, Ortúzar shows a general preference for the Castilian variety of Spanish, consistent with the prevailing opinion of his time that this manner of speaking was the variety worthy of promotion and cultivation as the pan-Hispanic standard. As we have already seen in Section ‘Structural constraints on correct language use’, Ortúzar shows a clear preference for Castilian pronunciation, and as we will see in this section, Ortúzar’s propeninsular bias also affects his evaluation of lexical items as being either correct or incorrect. From the very first sentence of the prologue, Ortúzar reveals his disdain for Latin American vernaculars, saying:

Se nos tilda á los hispano-americanos de hablar cierta jerigonza y de ser como contrabandistas del idioma español; tantas son las locuciones viciosas que tienden entre nosotros á convertirlo en un revuelto farrago, ya que no en miserable dialectos [We, Hispanic Americans, are often labeled as speaking gibberish and smuggling contraband in the Spanish language; so great is the number of depraved expressions used among us that they tend to convert the language into a jumbled mess, if not miserable dialects.]. (Ortúzar Montt 1893: V)

This negative view of Spanish lexicon originating in the Americas is reinforced throughout the work by the near universal censure of regionalisms and Americanisms, despite the tolerance he proposes for certain cases of differential language in the prologue. Therein, Ortúzar lays out his criteria for the acceptance of differential lexicon in each case. Provincialisms, which Ortúzar defines as ‘giros propios y privativos de una provincia ó territorio [expressions typical of and exclusive to a province or territory]’ (1893: XVI), according to Ortúzar’s explicit statement, are generally inadmissible except in the case where there is no Castilian variety word equivalent (*ibid.*). However, even this is often not enough to save a word from censure, and thus the following words are deemed unacceptable, despite Ortúzar’s inability to produce a Castilian variety synonym:

Ahuesarse. *Chil.* formado de *hueso*, cosa inútil, de poco precio y mala calidad. Quedar una cosa arrumbada. [**Ahuesarse.** *Chil.* formed from *hueso*, useless thing, cheap and of poor quality. To be left discarded.]. (Ortúzar Montt 1893: 19)

Mingaco. *Chil.* Llámase así, según D. Zorobabel Rodríguez, el trabajo hecho por una reunión de individuos que podríamos llamar *voluntariados*, que no cobran sueldo, convierten su tarea en una especie de fiesta, y reciben siempre del interesado en la faena, ración de comida y de aguardiente, *chicha* ú otro licor, y á veces también alguna parte de los frutos. [**Mingaco,** *Chil.* According to D. Zorobabel Rodríguez, thus is called the work done by a group of individuals,

who we may call volunteers, who do not charge a fee, converting their work into a type of festivity and they always receive a ration of food and, maize liquor, or another liquor from the one who benefits from their labour, and sometimes they also receive part of the fruits [of their labour.]. (Ortúzar Montt 1893: 212)

All in all, there are only two regionalisms marked as admissible in the DMLV, a Chilenism, *bochán* [stubble from a grain field], and an Argentinian regionalism, *arrear* [to capture wild cattle].

Regarding Americanisms, which are defined as those words used, ‘en casi toda la América [in almost all of America]’ or in, ‘más de una república [more than one republic]’ (1893: XVII), Ortúzar lays down some criteria for the acceptability of these expressions. First, there must be no Castilian variety equivalent. Secondly, they must be derived from a structurally ‘pure’ source (preferably Latin, Greek or Spanish), and thirdly, they must be used throughout the Americas, so as not to be an impediment to mutual intelligibility (an Americanism, by Ortúzar’s definition, ought to automatically comply with this third criterion). Given these criteria, one would expect a great number of Americanisms to be accepted, but this is not the case. There is one Americanism accepted in the DMLV (*Indiada*), and a great many others which are not, although they seemingly comply with his own criteria, as in the following examples which Ortúzar marks as incorrect with bold lettering:

Cachafaz. *Amer.* Persona desbaratada, pícara y sin vergüenza. [**Cachafaz.** *Amer.* Person of dissolute life, shameless person, scoundrel.]. (Ortúzar Montt 1893: 62)

Humita ó umita. *Amer.* **Cachapa** en Venezuela: manjar compuesto de maíz rallado y algunas especias, que envuelto á veces en las hojas de la mazorca se cuece en agua ó se asa en el rescoldo. [**Humita ó umita.** *Amer.* **Cachapa** in Venezuela: delicacy made of ground corn and some spices, which sometimes, wrapped in corn husks, is cooked in water or cooked in embers.]. Ortúzar Montt 1893: 179)

Rodeo. *Amer.* El acto de encerrar el ganado caballar ó vacuno en un lugar del que ya no puede salir. [**Rodeo.** *Amer.* The act of enclosing equine or bovine livestock in a place from which they cannot leave.]. (Ortúzar Montt 1893: 277)

In addition to his rejection of variant American language, chief among Ortúzar’s expressions of his belief in the superiority of peninsular Spanish is his ideological alignment with the Real Academia Española. The RAE was founded in 1713 with the intention of discerning the errors that were corrupting the Spanish language and promoting correct language use through the creation of a dictionary (Lázaro Carreter 1949: 203–04). This battle against the ‘errors’ proliferating in the eighteenth century was largely a response to the language’s perceived decay and decline in greatness in the previous century’s baroque literature (*ibid.*). Since its establishment, the RAE had carried out its lexicographical work with virtually no competition until an extra-academic corpus of dictionaries began to emerge, starting in 1825 with the work of Nuñez de Taboada (Azorín Fernández & Baquero Mesa 1994–1995). This corpus, making no claims to supplant the dictionary produced by the RAE, rather took the most recent edition of the dictionary available as a foundation on which to add words or suggest corrections. In Ortúzar’s time (an arguably still today), the RAE’s dictionary was considered to be the dictionary par excellence, and thus Ortúzar often refers to the edition of 1884 (the most recent release before the DMLV) as the ‘official’ dictionary, or simply ‘the dictionary’.

Finally, there is also the case of Ortúzar’s very obvious preference for Spanish authors. Of the 70 authors cited in the DMLV as models of correct language use, 63 are Spanish – a full 90%.

Diachronic constraints

Ortúzar, in another display of alignment with the prevailing beliefs of his day, has a clear bias towards the language used during the Golden Age of Spanish literature (roughly the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries), a bias which is once again manifested both explicitly and implicitly. In the prologue, Ortúzar holds up the language of this period as a model whose perfection his contemporaries ought to strive to imitate. He states:

Para expresar con verdad y gracia el pensamiento, para que éste refleje con toda exactitud y brille con el lucimiento y esplendor que alcanzó el lenguaje en su época de gloria, es necesario conocer el significado propio de los términos y distinguir las buenas de las malas locuciones [To express thought with truth and grace so that it is reflected with exactitude and shines with the lucidity and splendour that the language achieved in its age of glory, it is necessary to know the proper meaning of terms and distinguish between the good and the bad expressions.]. (1893: X–XI)

He also demonstrates his preference for the authors of the Golden Age once again through the authors he upholds as authoritative models of correct use. Of the 70 authors cited as models of language use, 36 are golden Age authors (51%).

Also of diachronic relevance is his treatment of the ‘arcaísmo ridículo [ridiculous archaism]’ and the ‘neologismo infundado [the unfounded neologism]’, ‘dos escollos [two pitfalls]’ which, according to Ortúzar, ‘deben evitarse especialmente para hablar con pureza el castellano [ought to be especially avoided in order to speak the Spanish language with purity]’ (1893: XI). Ortúzar is willing to admit neologisms, however, if they comply with the criteria of being structurally pure, of originating from denominative necessity, and of not introducing an ambiguity by giving a new meaning to an already existing word-form. Although Ortúzar states that a neologism does not need to appear in the Real Academia’s dictionary to be considered acceptable, as the Real Academia only considers words of a certain longevity, he nevertheless clearly wants to see that a word has already been accepted by some authority, as in the following case:

INSURRECCIONAL. neol. Lo que es propio de la insurrección ó pertenece á ella. Lo trae el Dicc. de Salvá; falta en el de la Academia. [INSURRECCIONAL. *neol.* That which corresponds to an insurrection or belongs to it. Salvá’s Dict. contains the word; it is missing from that of the Academia]. (Ortúzar Montt 1893: 187)

Regarding the archaism, Ortúzar is willing to admit as correct archaisms which have come back into general use, however, he generally respects the judgement of the Real Academia in these cases, although not without expressing his disagreement in the form of mitigation. In the example below Ortúzar provides a commentary which refutes the antiquated label given to this word by the RAE in its 1884 dictionary (RAE 1884: 243) (the most recent edition at the time of the DMLV’s writing):

Cincuentenario. *Ant.* Vuelve á estar en uso para significar la fiesta que se celebra al cumplirse cincuenta años de un hecho ó circunstancia notable [Cincuentenario. *Archaism.* It has come back into use to mean the party which is celebrated on the fiftieth anniversary of some deed or notable circumstance]. (Ortúzar Montt 1893: 74–5)

Conclusion

By means of conclusion, Table 1 summarises in our own words the beliefs regarding language correctness in the DMLV.

Table 1. Summary of beliefs.

 Propositional summary of Ortúzar's beliefs regarding 'correct use' of the Spanish language

- There is a correct way to speak and write the Spanish language
 - Linguistic 'correctness' is not an innate quality of the native speaker, but rather must be learned
 - The grammar of the Spanish language exists in a fixed form and ought to be respected
 - The correct spelling of a word is that which corresponds to its etymology
 - The Real Academia Española is the ultimate authority on the Spanish language
 - The habitual Castilian mode of pronunciation of Spanish is the most correct
 - The correct way to speak the Spanish language corresponds to the variety used by the learned/cultured class
 - Regionalisms and Americanisms ought to be avoided
 - Loanwords ought to be avoided
 - Neologisms ought to be avoided unless properly formed and springing from denominative necessity
 - Archaisms ought to be avoided
-

On the whole, the beliefs regarding the Spanish language in the DMLV presented above are largely consistent with the hegemonic current of Chilean metalinguistic thought during the late nineteenth century, thus we can assert that Ortúzar can be considered a member of the discourse community described in Section 'Introduction'. He shares with this group the goal of promulgating a pro-peninsular variety as the standard, an interest in linguistic education (as evidenced by the dictionary's existence), and beliefs regarding language correctness as in Table 1 (that there is a correct form, that the pro-peninsular form should be promulgated, that grammatical structures are generally fixed, that words falling outside the normal delimitations of the language must comply with certain criteria to be considered correct – a form of moderate purism (see Thomas 1991), the belief that correct speech is that of the upper/learned classes etc.), many of which are part of the Andrés Bello's intellectual legacy. Nevertheless, there are certainly some important discrepancies between Ortúzar's beliefs and practices regarding the language, and the more typical beliefs of this group.

First, there is the discrepancy between Ortúzar's stated openness to accepting Americanisms in the prologue, and his actual treatment of them in the dictionary's articles. As discussed in Section 'Diatopic constraints on correct language use', although in the prologue he, in theory, allows for the Americanisms which comply with certain standards, in the articles themselves he proves to be a great deal more purist than what the prologue would imply. We believe that this discrepancy can be taken as an indication of the strength of the hegemony of the prevailing Chilean metalinguistic thought of that time. Although Ortúzar's actual conduct in deeming certain words correct or incorrect reflects a more rigorously purist attitude, he seems to nevertheless feel obliged to subscribe to the prevailing tendency of the day, through a reproduction of the hegemonic beliefs regarding language use in his prologue.

Another discrepancy occurs with his treatment of Gallicisms, though this time between Ortúzar's conduct in the dictionary, and the prevailing opinion of the period. In the DMLV, Ortúzar censures Gallicisms with great vehemence, despite Cuervo's apparent urging to be more accepting of these loanwords in his paratextual letter to Ortúzar which appears at the end of the prologue:

Respecto á neologismos y galicismos, sospecho que la Academia corregiría algunos que son inútiles; pero el hallarse empleados en su obra misma demuestra lo muy usados que son, y es argumento de que acaso no dista el día en que á nadie se le ocurra pensar si son viejo ó nuevos. Eso sucede con vocablos que hace años se llamaban hasta bárbaros, y hoy nadie sabe su bastardo origen. [Regarding neologisms and Gallicisms, I suspect that the Academia would correct some that are useless, but that they are found in its very own work shows how very

used they are, and it can be argued that perhaps the day is not far off when it will not occur to anybody to think about whether they are old or new. This has occurred with words that years ago were called barbarous, and whose bastard origin is today unknown]. (Ortúzar Montt 1893, *Carta de Rufino José Cuervo* XXVI)

Faced with this attitude of resignation and acceptance from such prominent figures such as Rufino José Cuervo, Ortúzar nevertheless presents a strong resistance against the influx of Gallicisms, reserving his strongest censure, and greatest insults for this class of loanwords.

Finally, as discussed in ‘Structural constraints on correct language use’, there is the issue of orthography, which Ortúzar believes should be reflective of etymology. Despite the difference presented here between the current of Chilean metalinguistic thought of this period and Ortúzar’s more conservative approach, they are nevertheless ideologically similar in that both orthographical positions are argued on the basis of rationalist principles, the Chilean reform as a facilitator of alphabetisation and therefore communication and participation, and the etymological form as preserving the legibility of past literature, and therefore also a tool of communication and unity.

Despite the differences discussed above, it is nevertheless clear that Ortúzar is still very much a product of the environment of metalinguistic thought in which he received his academic formation, and that his individual manifestation of linguistic ideology largely coincides with the hegemonic ideology of the day, a historical version of the standard language ideology, coloured with the intellectual legacy of Andrés Bello, and promulgated through a discourse community of Chilean Creole elite.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author.

Funding

This study was conducted with support of the project [FONDECYT Regular 1150127] *Ideas lingüísticas en los debates sobre léxico y ortografía en Chile (1875–1927)*, funded by CONICYT.

Notes on contributor

Megan Geraghty has a Masters degree in Linguistics from the University of Chile. Her research interests include historical sociolinguistics, language ideology and the politics of language.

References

- Albarracín, Dolores, Mark P. Zanna, Blair T. Johnson, and G. Tarcan Kumkale. 2005. Attitudes: Introduction and scope. In *The handbook of attitudes*, ed. Dolores Albarracín, Blair T. Johnson, and Mark P. Zanna, 3–19. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Arnoux, Elvira. 2006. Marcar la nación en la lengua: la reforma ortográfica chilena (1843–1844). *Ámbitos* 16: 41–53.
- Arnoux, Elvira. 2008. *Los discursos sobre la nación y el lenguaje en la formación del Estado (Chile, 1842–1862)*. *Estudio glotopolítico*. Buenos Aires: Santiago Arcos.
- Avilés, Tania, and Darío Rojas. 2014. Argumentación y estandarización lingüística: creencias normativas en el *Diccionario de chilenismos* (1875) de Zorobabel Rodríguez. *Revista Signos. Estudios de Lingüística* 85: 142–63.

- Azorín Fernández, Dolores, and Rosario Baquero Mesa. 1994–1995. De la teoría a la práctica lexicográfica: El 'Nuevo diccionario de la lengua castellana de Vicente Salvá. *ELUA* 10: 9–20.
- Becerra, Yanira, Verena Castro, and Claudio Garrido. 2007. Tres repertorios léxicos diferenciales del español de Chile en el s. XIX. Un estudio metalexicográfico. Undergraduate Thesis, Universidad de Chile.
- Cartagena, Nelson. 2002. *Apuntes para la historia del español de Chile. Cuadernos de la Academia Chilena de la lengua*. Ediciones Rumbos.
- Chávez, Soledad. 2009. Diccionarios del español de Chile en su fase precientífica: un estudio metalexicográfico. Master's diss., Universidad de Chile.
- Collier, Simon. 2003. *The making of a republic, 1830–1865: Politics and ideas*. Cambridge: University Press.
- Del Valle, José, and Luis Gabriel-Stheeman. 2002. Nationalism, *hispanismo*, and monoglossic culture. In *The battle over Spanish between 1800 and 2000*, ed. José del Valle and Luis Gabriel-Stheeman, 15–33. New York: Routledge.
- Francesia, Juan B. 1899. *Biografía de Don Camilo Ortúzar*. Santiago: Escuela Tipográfica Salesiana.
- Geeraerts, Dirk. [2003] 2006. Cultural models of linguistic standardization. In *Words and other wonders. Papers on lexical and semantic topics*, 272–306. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Geraghty, Megan. 2016. Lenguaje y religión: Ideología lingüística en el Diccionario manual de locuciones viciosas y de correcciones de lenguaje (1893) de Camilo Ortúzar. Master's diss., Universidad de Chile.
- Errázuriz González, Francisco Javier. 2003. *Aquellos años franceses*. Santiago: Taurus.
- Irvine, Judith, and Susan Gal. 2000. Language ideology and linguistic differentiation. In *Regimes of language: Ideologies, politics, and identities*, ed. Paul V. Kroskrity, 35–84. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kroskrity, Paul V. 2010. Language ideologies – Evolving perspectives. In *Society and language use*, ed. Jürgen Jaspers, Jan-Ola Östman, and Jef Verschueren, 192–211. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Lázaro Carreter, Fernando. 1949. *Las ideas lingüísticas en España durante el siglo XVIII*. Madrid: CSIC.
- Maio, Gregory R., and Geoffrey Haddock. 2004. Theories of attitude: Creating a witches' brew. In *Contemporary perspectives on the psychology of attitudes*, ed. Geoffrey Haddock and Gregory R. Maio, 9–33. Hove: Psychology Press.
- Maio, Gregory R., James M. Olson, Mark M. Bernard, and Michelle A. Luke. 2006. Ideologies, values, attitudes, and behavior. In *Handbook of social psychology*, ed. John Delamater, 283–308. New York: Springer.
- Martinell, Emma. 1984. Posturas adoptadas hacia los galicismos introducidos en el castellano en el siglo XVIII. *Revista de Filología de la Universidad de la Laguna* 3: 101–28.
- Matus, Alfredo. 1994. Períodos de la lexicografía diferencial del español de Chile. In *Actas del X Congreso de la Asociación de Academias de la Lengua Española*, 189–99. Madrid: RAE/Espasa Calpe.
- Milroy, James. 2001. Language ideologies and the consequences of standardization. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 5, no. 4: 530–55.
- Milroy, James, and Leslie Milroy. 1999. *Authority in language: Investigating standard english*. London: Routledge.
- Ortúzar Montt, Camilo. 1893. *Diccionario Manual de locuciones viciosas y de correcciones de lenguaje: con indicación del valor de algunas palabras y ciertas nociones gramaticales*. Santiago: Imprenta Salesiana.
- Preston, Dennis R. 1994. Content-oriented discourse analysis and folk linguistics. *Language Sciences* 16, no. 2: 285–30.
- Quesada Pacheco, Miguel Ángel. 2002. *El español de América: historia de un concepto. El español de América*. 2.^a ed., 15–39. Cartago: Editorial Tecnológica de Costa Rica.
- Reisigl, Martin, and Ruth Wodak. 2009. The Discourse Historical Approach. In *Methods of critical discourse analysis*. 2nd ed., ed. Ruth Wodak, and Michael Meyer, 87–121. Los Angeles, CA: Sage Publishing.
- RAE. 1884. *Diccionario de la lengua castellana por la Real Academia Española*. Duodécima edición. Madrid: Imprenta de D. Gregorio Hernando.
- Rodríguez, Zorobabel. 1875. *Boletín de filología*. Santiago: El Independiente.

- Rojas, Darío. 2015a. Ideologías y actitudes lingüísticas en el Chile hispanohablante de la segunda mitad del siglo XIX. PhD diss., Universidad de Valladolid.
- Rojas, Darío. 2015b. El *Diccionario de chilenismos* (1875) de Zorobabel Rodríguez: ideologías lingüísticas e intertextualidad. *Revista de Humanidades* 32: 82–116.
- Rojas, Darío, and Tania Avilés. 2012. La recepción de *Voces usadas en Chile* (1900) de Aníbal Echeverría y Reyes entre sus contemporáneos. *Boletín de Filología* XLVII, no. 2: 149–75.
- Rojas, Darío, and Tania Avilés. 2014. Ideologías lingüísticas en la fraseología del español de Chile: dos momentos, una concepción del lenguaje. *Onomázein* 1, no. 29: 64–77.
- Rojas, Darío, and Tania Avilés. 2015. Ideologías lingüísticas en un debate del siglo XIX chileno: los comentaristas del *Diccionario de chilenismos* de Zorobabel Rodríguez. *Linguas e Instrumentos Lingüísticos* 35: 53–72.
- Thomas, George. 1991. *Linguistic Purism*. London: Longman Publishing Group.
- Van Dijk, Teun. 1998. *Ideology: A multidisciplinary approach*. London: Sage.
- Watts, Richard J. 2008. Grammar writers in eighteenth-century Britain: A community of practice or a discourse community? In *Grammars, grammarians and grammar writing*, ed. Ingrid Tieken-Boon van Ostade, 37–56. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.