

**Language, Race, and Identity in Pedro Henríquez Ureña's Dominican Oeuvre:
A Study on Language Ideologies**

by

Juan R. Valdez

A dissertation submitted to the Graduate Faculty in Hispanic and
Luso-Brazilian Literatures and Languages in partial fulfillment for the
degree of Doctor of Philosophy, The City University of New York

2008

UMI Number: 3325450

Copyright 2008 by
Valdez, Juan R.

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleed-through, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

The logo for UMI (University Microfilms International) consists of the letters "UMI" in a bold, serif font, with a registered trademark symbol (®) to the upper right of the "I".

UMI Microform 3325450
Copyright 2008 by ProQuest LLC
All rights reserved. This microform edition is protected against
unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code.

ProQuest LLC
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346

© 2008 Juan R. Valdez

All rights reserved.

THE CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK

This manuscript has been read and accepted for the Graduate Faculty in Hispanic and Luso-Brazilian Literatures and Languages in satisfaction of the dissertation requirement for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Date

José Del Valle
Chair of Examining Committee

Date

Lía Schwartz
Executive Officer

Supervisory Committee:

José Del Valle
Ricardo Otheguy
Isaías Lerner

ABSTRACT

Language, Race, and Identity in Pedro Henríquez Ureña's Dominican Oeuvre:
A Study on Language Ideologies

by

Juan R. Valdez

Adviser: José Del Valle

In this dissertation, I have advanced an analysis of the complex interaction between the apparently ideologically neutral vision of Dominican Spanish produced by Pedro Henríquez Ureña and contemporary discourses of national identity in which race was a central theme. This type of contextualization (inspired by the school of critical linguistic historiography and language ideological research discussed in chapter two) is necessary if we are to fully understand the meaning and implications of the linguistic component of the great Dominican intellectual's oeuvre. As he engaged in the study of Spanish in Dominican Republic, he unquestionably made a major contribution to Dominican historiography and Spanish America's linguistic history. However, it is crucial to understand that, in the process, he also engaged in the erasure of certain aspects of that reality and in the production of an iconic representation of Dominican Spanish consistent with what the dominant intellectual tradition viewed as the most important component of its national culture: Hispanicness.

DEDICATION

En memoria de mi querida madre, Melba.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

I am grateful to José del Valle. The development and completion of this work would not have been possible without his crucial guidance, intellectual stimulation, and tireless encouragement. At different stages, the distinguished members of my committee, Ricardo Otheguy and Isaías Lerner, stimulated me with profoundly critical questions and reminded me of the importance of integrating my own vital experience while conducting research. Like *Don Pedro*, I also thank *los maestros y los sabios*: Bonnie Urciouli, who first introduced me to language in context, the work of Peirce, and to “the budding semiotician” in me, Carol Rupprecht, Eugenio Suárez Galbán, Rick Werner, and all the teachers who over the course of my education generously shared their wisdom, lent me their ears, and allowed me more than a word: Gregory M. Hodge, Antonio Giménes, Ana Celia Zentella, Guadalupe Valdés, and Julio Ramos. Thanks to my friends who at some point provided some form of assistance or camaraderie: Louis, one cool cat, the solidarious Marco Aponte, Rafay Salim, Franklin Figueroa, and Paul Nissler. Amir Farooq made some of my most mundane tasks a delight with daily conversations about politics, travel, and weather. I am most grateful to my better half, Kathy, for her material and moral support and endless supply of cheerfulness from beginning to end.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Introduction and Literature Review	1
1.1 A brief biographical sketch of Pedro Henríquez Ureña	6
1.2 Previous studies on Henríquez Ureña	12
1.2.1 The advocate of “americanismo”	13
1.2.2 Henríquez Ureña, as seen by the Dominican intelligentsia	16
1.2.3 Exile and politics: Henríquez Ureña as an outsider	18
1.2.4 Pedro Henríquez Ureña as a linguist	22
1.2.4.1 Pedro Henríquez Ureña and American Spanish.....	26
1.2.4.2 Dominican Spanish and Dominican linguists.....	28
1.2.5 Critical approaches to Pedro Henríquez Ureña.....	34
1.3 Knowledge and ideology	38
1.4 Filling the gap: a language ideological approach.....	41
II. Theoretical Framework: Linguistic Ideologies and the History of Linguistic Ideas.....	45
2.1 The concept of ideology and its history	45
2.2 Critical approaches	51
2.3 Discourse and power	54
2.4 Ideology and language.....	56
2.5 The concept of “language ideologies” in linguistic anthropology.....	61
2.5.1 The iconicity of language	66
2.5.2 Linguistic differentiation and language representations	70
2.6 Language and nationalism	73
2.7 The politics of language and Hispanic sociolinguistics	76
2.8 Linguistic historiography.....	82
2.9 The history of linguistic ideas.....	86
2.10 Summary.....	91
III. The Cultural and Political Context: Nationalism, and <i>Hispanoamericanismo</i> in the Dominican Republic.....	93
3.1 Intellectuals and the State in Latin America.....	94
3.2 Hostos, Positivism, and the discourse of ‘Progress’ in Santo Domingo	99
3.3 Nation-building in the Dominican Republic in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries ..	105
3.3.1 U.S. occupation.....	113
3.4 National identity and race in Latin America and the Dominican Republic	116
3.5 Pedro Henríquez Ureña’s <i>dominicanidad</i>	119
3.6 <i>Hispanoamericanismo</i> and Pedro Henríquez Ureña	130
IV. The Intellectual Context: Henríquez Ureña in Hispanic Linguistics	142
4.1 Andrés Bello and national grammars	144
4.2 Caribbean lexicography.....	148
4.3 Cuervo and the foundations of Latin American philology	151
4.4 Lenz and Hanssen in Chile	156
4.5 Ramón Menéndez Pidal and linguistic <i>hispanismo</i>	159
4.5.1 <i>Centro de Estudios Históricos</i>	164

4.5.2	Henríquez Ureña at the <i>Centro</i>	167
4.6	Amado Alonso and the <i>Instituto de Filología de Buenos Aires</i>	173
4.6.1	Linguistic polemics in Buenos Aires	176
4.7	Key questions in Hispanic linguistics	182
4.7.1	Fragmentation of Spanish.....	182
4.7.2	Substrate influences.....	183
4.7.3	The peculiarities of American Spanish	183
4.7.4	<i>Andalucismo</i> debate.....	184
4.8	Henríquez Ureña’s linguistic production.....	189
4.8.1	Spanish in the Dominican Republic	199
V.	Pedro Henríquez Ureña and the Whitening of Dominican identity	205
5.1	Iconization as a metalinguistic device in Henríquez Ureña’s linguistic texts	206
5.2	Archaic Spanish and the Dominican speech community	212
5.3	Archaic lexicon	219
5.4	Archaic syntax	223
5.5	Dominicans’ Spanish pronunciation	227
5.6	Spanish, Hispanicness and the whitening of Dominican identity.....	232
5.7	Erasure of blackness.....	236
5.8	Contesting Africanist hypotheses.....	240
5.8.1	Fernando Ortiz	241
5.8.2	Larrazábal Blanco	244
5.9	Summary.....	250
VI.	Conclusion	254
	BIBLIOGRAPHY	263

I. Introduction and Literature Review

The purpose of this study is to approach Pedro Henríquez Ureña's linguistic work on Dominican Spanish¹ by situating it in the intellectual climate and political context in which it emerged. I argue that, in Henríquez Ureña's linguistic writings, Spanish stands as a discursive site where issues related to the nation's identity and racial composition are debated. Specifically, I analyze the two main semiotic strategies ("iconization" and "erasure") that Henríquez Ureña employs throughout his description of Spanish in the Dominican Republic and the manner in which they are related to the construction of Dominican national identity.

In Dominican scholarship there is a classic historiographical theory to which we can tentatively refer as "the theory of firstness." This theory proposes that most Dominican social phenomena can be explained with reference to the first permanent European settlement in the New World and its subsequent development. Keeping with this view, some Dominican scholars designate Christopher Columbus's *Diary* as the first expression of Dominican letters: "el diario de Colón contiene las páginas con que tenemos derecho a abrir nuestra historia literaria" (Henríquez Ureña, La Cultura y las letras 204). It is a theory that goes beyond simply utilizing history and memory in order to understand the present; it seeks instead to reconfigure the present and the future on the basis of the model offered by a reconstructed and uncontested past.

Traditionally, Dominican intellectuals have systematically tried to apply this theory to a wide range of phenomena including the status and history of Spanish in the Dominican Republic:

¹ I am in no way committing myself to the reification of a well delineated entity called "Dominican Spanish." I use this category simply to refer to phenomena associated with the use of Spanish in the Dominican Republic in order to avoid any ambiguity and because of stylistic convenience. The same apply to my use of the category of "American Spanish."

Con Anacaona, Caonabo y Enriquillo desapareció su “lengua pulida y suave” para Colón “la más dulce del mundo.” Y así como desaparecen las estrellas cuya luz escasa parece diluirse en los primeros tintes la aurora—según la bella expresión de Zorilla de San Martín—así desaparecieron los idiomas primitivos de América ante el espléndido día de la lengua española, ya convertida en instrumento nacional [...] Y eran precisamente los tiempos en que la lengua española comenzaba a organizarse; a tener normas; a ser precisa en vez de vacilante; a hacer más honda la transición de la Edad Media al esplendor del Renacimiento [...] El español quedó desde entonces como único idioma de la Isla, frente al cual sólo subsistian, en nuestra toponimia, voces indígenas de las cuales huelga señalar ejemplos y escasas voces africanas [...] (Rodríguez Demorizi, “Vicisitudes de la lengua” 14-16).

Rodríguez Demorizi also wrote:

Pues con razón decía Leibnitz que la sabiduría común de una nación, viva en el fondo de su conciencia lingüística, sólo podía ser desentrañada en su vivo hablar, en la función lingüística misma. Y aquí sabiduría equivale a alma; y por consiguiente esa función lingüística sería en nosotros la relevación del ancho y luminosos espejo del alma dominicana, cuyo más vivo reflejo es la palabra, la voz, el sentido y el acento que nos llegaron de España (“Vicisitudes de la lengua” 23).

Both Manuel Núñez (1990) and Rodríguez Demorizi (1943) begin their reflections on the status of Dominican Spanish by describing the Spaniards’ first struggles with the indigenous groups, in particular, their attempt to maintain what Núñez and Rodríguez Demorizi refer to as “linguistic order.” In varying fashion, both authors utilize the “firstness” theory to argue that in the

Dominican Republic Spanish is above all a homogeneous entity that both diachronically and synchronically reflects the nature, past, and present of the nation.

These authors belong to the Dominican scholarly tradition which has produced a number of foundational texts about language, race, and identity that significantly contributed to the homogenizing ideologies of Dominican national identity (Gabriel García 1979, Lugo 1952, Peña Batlle 1968). They argue that Spanish was imposed quickly, thus creating a linguistically homogeneous colony. For example, narrating the monumental history of Spanish and the Dominican nation, the late President Joaquin Balaguer (1991) stated:

Se afirma que la subsistencia de la isla Española, la predilecta de Colón, es un milagro que sólo se explica por la tremenda vitalidad de nuestra raza y por la persistencia dentro del ámbito biográfico que ocupamos del idioma español, base de nuestro ser nacional durante la Colonia, todavía hoy principal soporte de nuestras estructuras como nación independiente (“Discurso”).

Consistently, these intellectuals identify the start of Dominican history with the arrival of the Spanish language. In other words, with Spanish, the Spaniards planted the seeds of the Dominican nation. Consequently, its quick spread and dominance established the homogeneity that will characterize the country throughout its history and to the present.

In contrast with the simplifying and commonly held belief that the Dominican Republic is a monolingual Spanish-speaking country, recent linguistic research has produced a more nuanced view of this territory as a complex speech community with a number of vibrant contact zones (Hymes 1967, Gumperz 1968, Pratt 1999, Silverstein 1998). While phonological and morphosyntactic variation is well attested in the literature (Alba 2004, Jiménez Sabater 1975, Núñez Cedeño 1980, Toribio 2000 and 2005), there is a remarkable absence of recognition of the

fact that the sociolinguistic complexity of the community is not simply the result of intralingual variation. The fact is that, while Spanish is certainly dominant in the Dominican Republic, there are speakers of languages other than Spanish and a considerable number of people whose sociolinguistic competence is better characterized as a complex multilingual and multidialectal repertoire, especially in areas such as the Samaná Province, a peninsula located in the northeastern region of the country.

In Samaná, for example, we find speakers of English, descendants of African-American ex-slaves, invited to the country by Haitian president Boyer in 1824, and descendants of English-speaking West Indians who migrated to the Dominican Republic in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries (González Tapia and Benavides 1981, Inoa 1999, Poplack and Tagliamonte 2001). We also find Dominicans who speak a variety of Haitian Creole (“Patois”) and a large number of Haitian immigrants who are bilingual in varying degrees (Lipski 1994, Ortiz López 2006). In light of this dynamic sociolinguistic setting, we wonder what happens to speakers who are caught between, what Toribio (2000) calls, “the unifying and separatist functions of the Dominican vernacular” (“Nosotros somos dominicanos” 252).

While members of the middle and upper classes stigmatize the Dominican vernacular for diverging phonologically from what they regard as the standard variety, most Dominicans esteem the lexical regionalisms and peculiar grammatical constructions that identify speakers as “Dominicans” (Toribio, “Nosotros somos dominicanos” 258-260). Some Dominican public figures and intellectuals that fit what Bolinger (1980), Cameron (1985), and Milroy and Milroy (1999) described as “language mavens” frequently complain about Dominican’s many levels of “incorrect” speech and their use of slang (“vainismo” and “cosismo”) as well as their “absorption” of anglicisms and abandonment of “Castilian” (Guerra Carbuccia 2007, Núñez del

Risco 2007). Meanwhile, a large number of Dominican speakers perform these speech acts as the practices that position them within the complex Dominican networks of social interaction and that most markedly and proudly distinguish them from other national groups.² In this context, speakers as well as researchers of Spanish in the Dominican Republic are faced with many baffling questions about what constitutes typical and “normal” linguistic practice in their community. In such a scenario, language, intertwined with sociopolitical positions and processes as well as racial, ethnic, and national identities, becomes an ideal object of study for the sociolinguist. While the interplay of language and identity in the Dominican context has not been sufficiently studied (Fernández 1984), one can distinguish three kinds of positions among Dominican sociolinguists with respect to this subject. Some have rebuked Dominican speakers for diverging from the panhispanic norm (González Tirado 1987), while others insist on the need for more theoretically sound ways to approach the question (Alba 1984). There are also those who sometimes adopt an ambiguous perspective, straddling the line between scientific descriptivism and purist prescriptivism (Martínez Valdez 2000, Manuel Núñez 2000 and 2004a). While fully aware of the complexity of speech phenomena and the shortcomings of the Dominican public education system, these analysts seemingly expect Dominican speakers to unilaterally control the conditions of variation; in other words, to singlehandedly prevent the spread of loanwords, neologism, popular jargon, etcetera. Among the most prominent Dominican intellectuals to have dealt with language and national identity is the one whose writings on Spanish constitute the object of this study: Pedro Henríquez Ureña.

² Dominican linguist Nexcy de León (2000) put it in the following terms: “si bien es cierto que el país ha sufrido múltiples tropiezos en el proceso de su configuración sociocultural, no es menos cierto que pese a las determinaciones de las estructuras políticas que inciden en ella, la lengua ha constituido su propia variedad lingüística en República Dominicana, a tal punto que se habla de español dominicano” (69).

1.1 A brief biographical sketch of Pedro Henríquez Ureña

Pedro Henríquez Ureña (1884-1946) was a key figure not just in the intellectual history of the Dominican Republic but in Latin American history as a whole. Essayist, critic, philologist, linguist, historian, humanist, and educator, he taught, and worked in the United States, Mexico, Argentina, Spain, and the Dominican Republic. Literature and patriotism (inherited from his mother Salomé) and science and worldly cosmopolitanism (through his father Francisco) are four elements that are relevant to understanding Henríquez Ureña's intellectual development.

The distinguished Henríquez and Ureña families' rise to social prominence coincided with the beginning of historically significant social changes. Once united, they became one of the most intellectually elite, culturally prominent and celebrated families in Santo Domingo. Pedro's father, Francisco Henríquez y Carvajal (1859-1935), a doctor, lawyer, essayist, and diplomat, became the country's provisional President (1916-1917) after a long and active participation in Dominican politics. Even before Francisco achieved fame in Dominican scientific, intellectual, and political circles, his wife, Salomé Ureña (1850-1897), was already a celebrated national poet. Later, as a disciple of Eugenio María de Hostos (1839-1903), she became a pioneering educator. Hostos, a Latin American social philosopher, educator, and writer, as we will discuss shortly, was an immensely influential person in Dominican history in general, and particularly exercised great influence on the thinking of several of the Henríquez Ureña generations. Henríquez Ureña's intellectual lineage also included his maternal grandfather, Nicolás Ureña de Mendoza (1822-1875), lawyer, politician, and poet, who founded the newspaper *El Progreso* (1853). His uncle, Federico Henríquez y Carvajal, publisher and writer, became famous for his pro-Cuban and Puerto Rican independence campaigns and friendships with the Cuban independence leader José Martí (1853-1895) and his Puerto Rican counterpart, Ramón E. Betances (1827-1898). He

was the editor of *Letras y Ciencias* (1892-1899) a leading publication in Santo Domingo that was essential reading material for young Pedro and his siblings (Max Henríquez Ureña 23).

In the Santo Domingo of the 1880s, the Henríquez Ureña home was the hub of political and intellectual activity. Henríquez Ureña's parents were actively involved in their children's intellectual development. Their mistrust of Dominican parochial schools persuaded them, avowed positivists, to confine the children's education to their home environment, which already housed the "Instituto de Señoritas," (1891) Salomé's school for women and teacher training center (Henríquez Ureña, Memorias 32). Benefiting from his mother's effective instructional methods and also his own diligent application and inquisitiveness, young Pedro quickly learned to read and took his home studies very seriously.³ His mother facilitated some of his first literary activities. From the beginning, Salomé became young Pedro's spiritual guide: "mi madre había llegado a ser para mí la guía espiritual consultada a cada minuto" (Henríquez Ureña, Memorias 43). According to his biographers, the twelve years he spent next to her had a direct and decisive influence in Henríquez Ureña's personal and academic development (Mateo 2001, Piña-Contreras 2001).

His father, on the other hand, would have a more indirect influence. His brother, Max Henríquez Ureña (1885-1968), who became an important intellectual in his own right, wrote: "desde el primer momento comprendimos Pedro y yo que en él teníamos un guía y un mentor de gran autoridad, cuya voz magistral nos producía honda impresión" (17). Although a very busy person and absent from their home for many years at a time, his father, "the man of science," imparted specific instructions as to the content and methods of his children's education and

³ In a letter to his absent father, Salomé revealed her own amazement over the child's early achievements: "no sé lo que es lo que hay en este niño, pero tiene algo de extraordinario. Las construcciones de Kindergarten son para él lo más fácil [...] ¡Y pensar que este niño no tiene más que cinco años y que nadie se ha propuesto enseñarlo!" (Familia Henríquez Ureña 170).

would send them the most up-to-date science books from Paris. After Salomé's death in 1897, despite young Pedro's constant inclination towards literary studies, Francisco Henríquez y Carvajal was very adamant that Pedro study science. This insistence resulted in a personal conflict⁴ between father and son, which would eventually resolve itself thanks to Pedro's taste for erudition. Together, mother and father as well as the other distinguished members of the family, planted the seeds of a broad ranging intellect, but more importantly passed down a whole series of values and ideas inherited from the Enlightenment ideology characteristic of the foundational phase of Latin America.

The Henríquez Ureña home often hosted readings, discussions, and debates. For young Pedro, there were plenty of role models, some of whom became his intellectual interlocutors (Henríquez Ureña, Memorias 41). As their interest in literary affairs grew, Pedro and his brother Max began to produce publications of their own: "El periódico se llamó "La Patria" (1896) (Henríquez Ureña, Memorias 40). This rudimentary literary journal about Dominican poetry and literary criticism received praise from some of their parents' distinguished guests and marked the beginning of a distinguished intellectual career.

Henríquez Ureña's professional career began in Santo Domingo at the turn of the century. He was selected as the most talented of young Dominican intellectuals not only by his peers but also the established intelligentsia. According to Deschamps (1906):

Sigue a esta generación un concurso notable de jóvenes intelectuales, que si algunos de ellos no han definido aun su personalidad literaria, han reservado todos el dominio de la

⁴ Henríquez Ureña describes this conflict in his *Memorias*: "si mi madre hubiera vivido, todos estos problemas los habría sometido a su criterio; pero mi padre estaba siempre ocupado, y las horas que dedicaba a nosotros las ocupaba en darnos lecciones científicas; y además veía con disgusto mi retraimiento y mi afición exclusivamente literaria, que me hacía descuidar la ciencia. Por esa razón, mi vida fue haciéndose bastante triste, empobrecida por el recuerdo de la muerte y por la poca aprobación que encontraban mis tendencias" (49).

facultad propia de los cerebros organizados para la actividad intelectual. Hay entre ellos quienes son, no meramente promesas, sino elementos eficaces ya al enaltecimiento de la cultura patria. Preside ese concurso no obstante uno de los más jóvenes, Pedro Henríquez Ureña, consagrado por el voto de propios y extraños como literato y como crítico (255-256).

Shortly after this intellectual coronation, political conflict caused the family to leave the Dominican Republic and become dispersed. Henríquez Ureña stayed in New York (1901-1904) while his family went to live in exile in Cuba. Henríquez Ureña briefly visited them in Cuba, where he published his first book, *Ensayos críticos* (1905), a collection that includes essays on Dominican poets, Hostos, and Rodó, as well as D'Annunzio, Wilde, and Shaw. According to Piña-Contreras, this event marks Henríquez Ureña's temporary exodus from the family's prevailing sphere of influence (348).

Henríquez Ureña arrived in Mexico at the beginning of 1906. After a brief stay in the city of Veracruz, he settled in Mexico City, where he worked as a newspaper editor and began to establish relations with the Mexican intelligentsia, consisting of young and promising writers and artists. His intellectual acumen and activities quickly earned him the respect and affection of his peers and the nickname "Socrates." Among the group of young Mexican intellectuals, he immediately connected with Alfonso Reyes (1889-1959), his most cherished colleague and friend.

One of the most intensely productive stages of Henríquez Ureña's career, from 1906 to 1914, coincided with a period of cultural and political upheaval in Mexico. Henríquez Ureña joined a group of young intellectuals who began to work on a movement that became known as the "Cultural Revolution" (1910-1920), the preamble to the Mexican Revolution. They affiliated

through the “Ateneo de la Juventud de México” (1909) and, amidst the revolutionary violence and ideological fervor, sought to dismantle the *Científicos*’s⁵ institutional network and their monopoly on education. The *Ateneo*’s founding members included Alfonso Reyes, Antonio Caso (1883-1946), José Vasconcelos (1882-1959), and Henríquez Ureña. Amidst a swarm of intellectual activity and growing political insecurity, Henríquez Ureña published another book, *Horas de estudio*⁶ (1910). Henríquez Ureña tried to abstain from getting directly involved in political matters, but his relationships with members of different political factions and the strong emotional ties to Alfonso Reyes forced him to proceed with extreme caution. Henríquez Ureña endured some personal economic hardships during these times.⁷ As the revolutionary situation in Mexico grew more violent, the physical dangers for people like Henríquez Ureña became even more palpable when, in 1913, Alfonso Reyes’ father, General Bernardo Reyes, was assassinated. In 1914, Henríquez Ureña left Mexico and, after another brief stay in Cuba, returned to the United States where he worked as a journalist and held other jobs.

After traveling and working in the United States, Spain, and Mexico again, he settled down in Argentina. In 1924, he arrived in Buenos Aires with his wife Isabel and his first-born daughter Natacha. That same year, he joined the faculty of the “Colegio Nacional de la

⁵ This group was made up of a circle of European-educated intellectuals from Mexico City. They were called “Científicos” because of their strict subscription to Comte’s scientific positivism.

⁶ This book, a record of his own intellectual evolution up to this point, was published in Paris and received the following praise from the renowned Spanish literary historian Menéndez Pelayo: “[...] me complazco en reconocer que todo ello está sinceramente pensado y sobriamente escrito, con una gravedad y decoro que se echan de menos en la actual generación [...] la exquisita educación intelectual comenzada desde la infancia y robustecida con el trato de los mejores libros (cited in Henríquez Ureña de Hito 47).

⁷ He was also the object of personal attacks by some local journalists: “me han atacado cambiando mi nombre por el de ‘Menox,’ por contraposición al de mi hermano Max” (Henríquez Ureña, *Memorias* 158). He attributed these initial attacks to the insecurities of those who envied his prestigious position within the *Ateneo*: “en particular, me han informado que Núñez y Domínguez está resentido porque no se le invitó al *Ateneo*, y, atribuyéndome la omisión, me insultó al hablar en *El Heraldo* de la fundación la sociedad, llamándome *Menox* y escritor *haitiano* (Henríquez Ureña, *Memorias* 158, emphasis in the original). Henríquez Ureña’s mulatto profile was the object of racist attacks first in Mexico and later in Argentina (Mateo 191-2, Torres-Saillant 1101, Díaz Quiñones, “Pedro Henríquez Ureña: Modernidad, diáspora” 69). By the use of the term “haitiano,” his attackers targeted his national origin and mulatto profile.

Universidad de la Plata” and became involved in a series of academic projects and new intellectual endeavors. It is during this period of his life that he began to amass his linguistic and philological oeuvre. In 1931, he briefly fulfilled his wish of returning to Dominican soil, assuming the role of the national superintendent of education in Santo Domingo. However, frustrated with the limitations of his position as well as disillusioned with the Dominican political landscape, he returned to Buenos Aires and continued teaching, investigating, writing, and publishing until his sudden death aboard a train in 1946.

Alfonso Reyes described our intellectual debt to Henríquez Ureña:

Lo que en el desarrollo del humanismo clásico, en el cultivo de la buena tradición española y en la formación del sentido crítico se debe a Pedro Henríquez Ureña, es incalculable. Educador por temperamento, despierta el espíritu de aquellos con quienes dialoga. Enseña a oír, a ver, y a pensar. Él ha suscitado una tendencia de cultura y un anhelo de seriedad que es el mejor premio de quienes lo siguen (cited in Krauze 20).

Samuel Ramos (1946), another Mexican disciple, added: “Henríquez Ureña dio el ejemplo de cómo un hombre de América debe asimilar el espíritu europeo sin destacarse. Educado en el campo general de las humanidades, cultivó profesionalmente las letras españolas, pero haciendo converger su interés en el estudio de la vida lingüística y literaria de nuestro continente” (265).

The flood of panegyrics following Henríquez Ureña’s death is vast. It culminates in the year of his centenary with a homage, the two-volume *El libro jubilar de Pedro Henríquez Ureña*, edited by Julio Jaime Julia (1984). These texts reveal the high degree to which many Latin American intellectuals and scholars revered Henríquez Ureña for his vast contributions to our knowledge and understanding of Latin America’s cultural, linguistic, and literary history.

1.2 Previous studies on Henríquez Ureña

Henríquez Ureña and his work has been the object of numerous studies, most of them, naturally, laudatory. For over half a century, a host of researchers, who can be described as former friends, former colleagues, admirers, and students have produced an extensive body of literature on Henríquez Ureña, which, although informative, mostly celebrates his charismatic personality and serious commitment to teaching. Zuleta Álvarez (2000) has characterized this literature in the following terms:

En el estudio de la crítica de la obra de Pedro Henríquez Ureña, hay que tener en cuenta que su presencia personal, su figura humana de escritor, profesor, periodista, literario y protagonista de importantes episodios de la vida cultural y política de Hispanoamérica, se mezcla y se superpone con su obra escrita. Es decir, que las referencias que la crítica ha hecho a su producción intelectual caminan paralelamente a los juicios que su personalidad provoca en quienes lo conocieron y trataron (“La recepción crítica” 495).

Henríquez Ureña scholars can be divided into the following five groups: i) Latin American literary critics and intellectual historians; ii) Dominican historiographers; iii) Hispanic linguists, most of whom highlight his roles in the “andalucismo” debate and in developing dialectology as a field of inquiry in Latin America; iv) Dominican linguists who utilize and revise some of his data on Dominican Spanish; and v) a small but diverse group of scholars who, in varying degrees, problematize Henríquez Ureña’s work. Despite this specialization on different facets of his work, Henríquez Ureña’s oeuvre has not been appropriately contextualized (Sarlo 2000) and such lack of contextualization is most evident in the studies that approach his linguistic production (Pérez Guerra 2004).

Often classified by the country of their origin, Henríquez Ureña specialists are far from homogeneous. However, their different theoretical concerns and ideological attitudes sometimes intersect. We can attribute to them the following five basic characterizations of Henríquez Ureña: i) as the primary advocate of a school of thought known as “*americanismo*,” ii) as an exemplar of patriotism and Dominicanness; iii) as an exiled intellectual; iv) as a linguist whose unique approach to Spanish in the Americas resulted in a wealth of dialectal observations; and v) as an intellectual whose rich and complex oeuvre demands critical attention.

1.2.1 The advocate of “americanismo”

The view of Henríquez Ureña as the primary advocate of “americanismo” is mostly adopted by Latin American literary critics (Álvarez 1981, Carilla 1981, Febres 1989, Gutiérrez Girardot 1978, Zuleta Álvarez 1999). To them, Henríquez Ureña represents one of the greatest Latin American intellectuals of the twentieth century, comparable to nineteenth century intellectuals such as Bello, Sarmiento, Martí and Hostos, who had a profound vision of the originality and value of Latin American culture. The significance of Henríquez Ureña’s work, according to these specific scholars, resides in his search for the essence of Hispanic-American culture and its Hispanic roots. Zuleta Álvarez notes that, according to critics such as Castro Leal (1946): “la unidad de la [obra de Henríquez Ureña] provenía de su búsqueda de la encarnación del espíritu en la cultura hispanoamericana, donde la raíz hispánica revestía una importancia esencial” (“La recepción crítica” 522). Scholars such as Gutiérrez Girardot, another admirer of Henríquez Ureña, affirm that Henríquez Ureña’s oeuvre constitutes “una amplificación del horizonte histórico-espiritual y cultural que permitiera trazar con nitidez el proceso de Nuestra

América ‘en busca de su expresión’” (“El ensayo” 204). Zuleta Álvarez summarized Gutiérrez Girardot’s views on Henríquez Ureña along the following lines:

La obra del dominicano, insistía [Gutiérrez Girardot], era ni más ni menos que una historia social de la literatura de la América hispánica: un modelo coherente de lo que hoy se entiende por esta disciplina, es decir, una relación dialéctica entre sociedad, literatura y vida literaria donde lo americano va deviniendo a partir de la base hispánica. La aspiración a la utopía era, en realidad, la búsqueda de la unidad de América. Un camino en el cual se unen lo particular, lo nacional y lo continental, las letras y la sociedad en que se producen, la tradición y la innovación, el pasado, el presente y el futuro. Ruta que conduce a una sociedad nueva donde se realicen plenamente la sociedad y el hombre (“La recepción crítica” 530).

Above all, “Americanists” find in Henríquez Ureña’s oeuvre the best effort to combine knowledge of literature, history, and society in order to design, from the Hispanic base, the instruments and the proper continental vision that would lead to unity, solidarity, progress, and prosperity in Latin America.

The studies that emphasize Henríquez Ureña’s “americanismo” are best illustrated by the words of the Dominican essayist Soledad Álvarez (1981):

Aspiramos a una aproximación al pensamiento americanista de Pedro Henríquez Ureña. La Magna patria, como llamó a nuestra América, además de evidente en su obra, constituyó una preocupación central en el pensador dominicano, a quien la muerte sorprendió en el momento en que evolucionaba hacia ideas americanistas más cercanas a las actuales interpretaciones de nuestra realidad (“La magna patria” 11).

Soledad Álvarez explains Henríquez Ureña's *americanismo* as a continuum between conceptualizations of Latin America's history and culture expressed by progressives such as Simon Bolivar and José Martí and Marxist thinkers such as Mariátegui ("La magna patria" 79). Gutiérrez Girardot expressed similar ideas: "el *ethos* científico y político de Pedro Henríquez Ureña, su visión bolivariana, martiana, radicalmente utópico-continental, pero históricamente fundada de Nuestra América" ("La historiografía literaria de Pedro Henríquez Ureña" 67). These scholars situate Henríquez Ureña (the man and his work) within the paradigm of revolutionary thinking that was aimed at liberating and empowering Latin America. Pitol (2002) best summarizes how scholars regularly identify Henríquez Ureña's character and work with a series of Latin American ideals:

A Henríquez Ureña se le identifica con el ideal americano, hispanoamericano concretamente convertido en utopía: la utopía de América. Fue ese uno de los ejes centrales de su vida intelectual y a esa causa apasionante aproximó a Alfonso Reyes, a Ernesto Sábato, a Ezequiel Martínez Estrada, a Enrique Anderson Imbert, a buena parte de sus amigos y discípulos. También, a través de la distancia física a dos jóvenes, convertidos después en excepcionales ensayistas, quienes siguieron con fervor su lección y la continuaron: el venezolano Mariano Picón Salas y el colombiano Rafael Gutiérrez Girardot [...] (91).

In general, Henríquez Ureña scholars regard his oeuvre as one of the pillars of contemporary Latin American thought. Their primary concern, evident from their writings, has been ensuring his international recognition as an intellectual authority and his extraordinary effort in the description and interpretation of Latin American realities.

1.2.2 Henríquez Ureña, as seen by the Dominican intelligentsia

The second perspective is comprised of Dominican intellectuals who believe that Henríquez Ureña's life and oeuvre were dedicated to the glorification of his nation. For example, Rodríguez Demorizi (1947) and Lara (1975 and 1982) suggest that Henríquez Ureña's "dominicanismo" trumps his "americanismo." Consequently, no greater homage can be paid to the "premier man of letters of the Dominican Republic" than the proper appraisal of his "*dominicanidad*" (Rodríguez Demorizi, Breve Panegírico 5). According to Rodríguez Demorizi:

No el elogio del sabio, ni la grandilocuente apología del virtuoso, sino el sencillo encomio de la férvida dominicanidad de Pedro Henríquez Ureña, ha de ser el homenaje más caro al espíritu que ya mora en la excelsa mansión de los justos. Porque en su vida consagrada al humanismo, en lo hondo de sus inagotables ansias de sabiduría, por encima de su alto magisterio y de sus devociones estéticas, estaba su amor de patria amada con orgullo por sus glorias, querida con pena por sus vicisitudes ("Dominicanidad de Pedro Henríquez Ureña" 562).

Lara (1982) echoed this sentiment when he wrote: "Henríquez Ureña fue un gran patriota y un gran americanista. Su americanismo, sin embargo, nunca opacó su dominicanismo. Fue un buen dominicano, nunca cambió su nacionalidad. Murió dominicano" (Sobre Pedro Henríquez Ureña 17). Lara (1975) remarked: "su americanismo no fue la base de su don único" (Pedro Henríquez Ureña 232). With a few exceptions (Soledad Álvarez 2000, Jimenes Grullón 1969, Piña-Contreras 2001), Dominican scholars tend to see Henríquez Ureña as a messianic figure that, through his work, particularly his work as a teacher, and personality, instilled in others a passionate love for local cultures in Latin America which he particularly exemplified through his

Dominican oeuvre (especially his classic texts, *El español en Santo Domingo* and *La cultura y las letras coloniales en Santo Domingo*). Pérez y Pérez (1984) claims that:

Desde este punto de vista la peregrinación de Pedro Henríquez Ureña por los caminos de América vendría a responder a uno de los caracteres distintivos de la historia cultural de su país. Ahora al hacerse partícipe de una continuidad semejante, Pedro Henríquez Ureña no olvida nunca los valores de su tierra nativa y trata de enaltecerlos en todo momento, y entonces ese apego inalterable a las cosas propias, ese nacionalismo cultural, imprime a la totalidad de su obra y que le unge hoy con la proceridad dentro del pensamiento y las letras de origen hispánico (361).

According to the view adopted by most Dominican analysts, Henríquez Ureña's entire oeuvre has to be understood in relation to his departure from and his longing to return to his birthplace, Santo Domingo. There is the belief that his oeuvre constitutes an attempt to recreate what he left behind: the glories, ideals, symbols, and values of a nation built by generations steeped in Hispanic tradition.

Piña-Contreras and Soledad Álvarez are two Dominican scholars who marginally diverge from this line of thinking. Soledad Álvarez, on the one hand, begins by noting:

La dominicanidad de Pedro Henríquez Ureña se reafirma en el peregrinaje que fue su vida, paradoja que quizás sólo pueda ser entendida en toda su significación por los dominicanos y por quienes, como nosotros, han conocido esa tradición a la que se refiere Don Emilio Rodríguez Demorizi a propósito de Henríquez Ureña: la de los ciudadanos ilustres que arrastrados por las desdichas del país han ido a otras playas a erigirse en forjadores de cultura (625).

Here she echoes Rodríguez Demorizi (1947). However, she does not stop there. She does not make Henríquez Ureña's life and work a simple function of his national and biological kinship to one of the most enlightened and patriotic Dominican families. She goes on to discuss the specific sociohistorical factors that allowed Henríquez Ureña to achieve distinction and popularity among the analysts of Latin American and Dominican cultures. Similarly, Piña-Contreras, concentrating on details about his childhood and adolescence, explores in more detail the familial conditions and relationships that shaped Henríquez Ureña's character and perception as a Dominican citizen and as a budding intellectual. Therefore, these two authors only slightly depart from the tradition that maintained that Henríquez Ureña's entire oeuvre can be explained by virtue of his nationality and patriotism.

1.2.3 Exile and politics: Henríquez Ureña as an outsider

Studies that take into account Henríquez Ureña's status as an outsider, forced into exile in Mexico, the United States, Spain, and Argentina comprise the third perspective on Henríquez Ureña. This is a view that is increasingly attracting the attention of more Henríquez Ureña scholars⁸ and leading to what Arcadio Díaz Quiñones (1994) called "la renovación de Henríquez Ureña" ("Pedro Henríquez Ureña: modernidad" 65). This trend originated with the Mexican historian Enrique Krauze (1985). In his analysis of Henríquez Ureña's intellectual development and vision, Krauze paid careful attention to the relation between Henríquez Ureña's personal circumstances abroad and the pervasive image throughout Henríquez Ureña's work of a paradise lost incarnated by the "privileged" history of his native country. Krauze wrote: "en la conciencia

⁸ See, for example, Leila Guerreiro's "Pedro Henríquez Ureña: el eterno extranjero" (2003) and Victoria Núñez's dissertation (2006), "Unpacking the suitcases they carried: narratives of Dominican and Puerto Rican migrations to the northeastern United States" (Pura Belpre, Pedro Henríquez Ureña, Antonia Pantoja, Junot Díaz, Angie Cruz).

de Henríquez Ureña existió siempre la imagen de un paraíso perdido. La isla antillana donde nació había sido la novedad del Nuevo Mundo, la “cosa más hermosa” [...] “verde y fertilísima” en palabras de Colón, quien la bautizó como ‘La Española’” (12). Krauze found an intricate connection between Henríquez Ureña’s utopian vision, elaborated in his multiple texts, and his condition as an exiled intellectual from the Dominican Republic. According to Krauze: “fue el escepticismo, la errante melancolía de sus orígenes, lo que rasgó sus utopías” (23). Furthermore, contrary to critics who insisted on Henríquez Ureña’s apolitical nature, Krauze believed that it is precisely this condition of exile that shaped his political attitudes and motivated his political writings which appeared in several Latin American newspapers. While Néstor Rodríguez recently (2007) commented on Henríquez Ureña’s political profile, the Latin American historian Halperin Donghi (1999) brought attention to some of his lesser known political affiliations: “no es irrelevante mencionar que durante toda su vida este humanista discreto y mesurado mantuvo con la experiencia soviética una solidaridad menos ruidosamente proclamada pero no menos firme que la de Ingenieros” (115-116).

Previously, there was a tendency among some scholars to focus on the question of whether Henríquez Ureña could be classified as a philosopher. For instance, the Argentinian critic Pucciarelli (1984) claimed that:

Si es forzoso que, como quiere Coleridge, los hombres hayan de nacer platónicos o aristotélicos, Henríquez Ureña pertenece a la clase de los primeros por derecho de nacimiento. Y seguramente este linaje original explica su avidez por la belleza y su pasión por la justicia” (42).

These scholars were inclined to believe that the best way to fully appreciate Henríquez Ureña’s significance as an intellectual was by deriving his thought from philosophical issues and Platonic

ideas regarding the importance of reason in human affairs. Ernesto Sábato (1964) used the same metaphor:

Se ha dicho que se nace platónico o aristotélico. En tal caso, él nació platónico, y su temperamento lo llevó a buscar una síntesis de la ciencia y el arte, tal como en cierto modo puede afirmarse de aquella filosofía [...] Fue un espíritu de síntesis, que ansiaba armonizar el mundo de la razón con el de la inspiración irracional, el universo de la ciencia con el de la creación artística (“El significado de Pedro Henríquez Ureña”).

This frequent association of Henríquez Ureña with philosophical currents neglects his intervention in political matters. Defining the position against this philosophical tendency, Liliana Weinberg (2002) said:

Si entendemos que releer la obra de Pedro Henríquez Ureña en el marco de un congreso de filosofía implica preguntarse por el talante estrictamente filosófico de sus reflexiones y decidir si era o no filósofo en el sentido profesionalizante que hoy atribuimos al término, podemos desembocar en un callejón sin salida y en una polémica tan infinita como estéril (1).

Weinberg centered on the relationship between exile and what others (Anderson Imbert 2001, Pérez de la Cruz 2003, Pucciarelli 1984) have labeled “philosophical thought” in Henríquez Ureña’s oeuvre. She found that Henríquez Ureña was torn between the centripetal force emanating from the intellectual elite to which he belonged and the centrifugal force of alienating exile. As a result of this tension, he sought to root his life, personality, studies, and vision in the world of high culture (Weinberg 2).

The image of Henríquez Ureña as member of an exiled diaspora is also the point of departure for Díaz Quiñones's studies (1994 and 2007): "Henríquez Ureña fue un intelectual sin Estado firme" ("Henríquez Ureña: la tradición" 168). He proposes a reading of Henríquez Ureña's Hispanic-American oeuvre that takes into account exile as a persistent condition, the elaboration of culture as a type of order, and the redefinition of the colonial experience as a response to separatist nationalisms. Díaz Quiñones raises some important questions with respect to the relationship between modernity, diaspora, and the construction of identities: i) how was Henríquez Ureña affected by his condition as a marginal, displaced figure, ultimately considered an outsider, in the countries where he lived and worked?; ii) what effect did the racial prejudice he encountered in Mexico and the United States have on his intellectual development?; and iii) was his exclusion of Afro-Caribbean cultures a product of his effort to fully belong to a specific group and find a place for people of his intellectual pedigree in universal (i.e., European) culture? While exploring these and other similar questions, Díaz Quiñones finds an Henríquez Ureña who experienced the tension of being an "outsider" and who proceeded to build traditions between what he perceived as the opposing forces of order and anarchy. "Henríquez Ureña era un protagonista marginal que quería ocupar un lugar central" (Díaz Quiñones, *Henríquez Ureña: modernidad* 79). Furthermore, with respect to the Dominican author's cultural representations, Díaz Quiñones (2007) notes:

Era un proyecto que admitía tradiciones múltiples, siempre que pudieran ser integradas a la cultura letrada, la cual no era el caso del incómodo mundo afrocaribeño, un fantasma que problematiza sus textos. Con esa exclusión emergía dolorosamente el desasosiego de la identidad nacional, y acaso—con resonancias profundas y amargas—el problema de su propia identidad ("Henríquez Ureña: la tradición" 252).

There is in Díaz Quiñones's studies a general attempt to identify the various contexts or different perspectives surrounding Henríquez Ureña's intellectual enterprises. Díaz Quiñones examines the Dominican author's major cultural texts as well as a few of his linguistic texts in relation to the construction of a Dominican national tradition, the condition of the exiled intellectual in the modern world, and the practice of modernity defined in terms of order as an alternative to anarchy.

1.2.4 Pedro Henríquez Ureña as a linguist

Henríquez Ureña's visions of Latin America, his patriotic feelings towards his homeland, and the personal circumstances surrounding his elaboration of the texts in which he expressed his corresponding thoughts and feelings have been abundantly studied. In stark contrast, his linguistic production has received much less attention. Still, there is a number of scholars who have tackled Henríquez Ureña's linguistic texts (such as, for example, Ghiano (1976) in the prologue to the Argentinean edition of Henríquez Ureña's *Observaciones sobre el español en América*), examining their relationship to the rest of his cultural and historiographical production and often taking positions for or against the Dominican's views on American Spanish.

Along with Cuervo, Henríquez Ureña is considered to be, especially by Latin American dialectologists, the founder of this linguistic discipline in Latin America (Álvarez Martínez 1998 and Vaquero 1997). For instance, Lope Blanch (1989) notes: "otra actividad en que el filólogo dominicano actuó como precursor fue la de determinar el origen regional, dialectal, de los conquistadores y colonizadores del Nuevo Mundo" ("Pedro Henríquez Ureña, precursor" 37). In addition to explaining his theories on American Spanish, Hispanic linguists have been concerned with vindicating Henríquez Ureña's reputation as a linguist. There has never been consensus

among scholars as to whether to label him a linguist or a philologist. Scholars such as Lope Blanch are ambivalent:

Me he inclinado a dedicar estas torpes páginas a hacer algunos comentarios sobre la extraordinaria labor hecha por el filólogo dominicano en su momento como iniciador de la moderna dialectología hispanoamericana. De la dialectología he dicho, como bien se había dicho ya anteriormente en muchas ocasiones. Pero, en realidad, debería decir de la filología hispanoamericana, dando al término *filología* su amplio y generoso significado original de ciencia que estudia el espíritu de un pueblo a través de sus manifestaciones lingüísticas—tanto populares o folklóricas cuanto literarias—dentro del marco histórico que las explica y condiciona. Verdadero filólogo fue Henríquez Ureña—como lo fue Menéndez Pidal—al dirigir su esfuerzo científico a los tres dominios de la verdadera filología: el lingüístico, el literario y el histórico (“Pedro Henríquez Ureña, precursor” 34).

On the other hand, other Hispanic linguists have contested the opinion that Henríquez Ureña’s language studies are fundamentally philological in nature. The Dominican linguist González Tapia (1998), for example, dedicated an entire book to proving that Henríquez Ureña was, first and foremost, a linguist.

González Tapia’s book, *El pensamiento Lingüístico de Pedro Henríquez Ureña*, is the only full-length study Henríquez Ureña’s linguistic production. In the first chapter, González Tapia presents his main thesis: “contrario a la opinión de que Pedro Henríquez Ureña fue un gran filólogo, o que sus trabajos sobre la lengua son fundamentalmente filológicos, sostenemos que Don Pedro fue primariamente un lingüista y que, por tanto, sus estudios sobre la lengua son medularmente lingüísticos” (*El pensamiento lingüístico* 13). According to González Tapia, the

majority of scholars who discuss Henríquez Ureña's language studies tend to situate them within the practice of philology. He attributes this tendency to the nineteenth-century tradition of believing that philology was capable of encapsulating everything that has to do with language through the analysis of written texts. This notion, in varying degrees, still persists today (El pensamiento lingüístico 24-25). Yet, González Tapia reminds us that the object of Henríquez Ureña's language studies proper was oral speech, as exemplified in *El español en Santo Domingo* (El pensamiento lingüístico 28). Furthermore, the author maintains that Henríquez Ureña can be perfectly situated in the field of structural dialectology because he approached the study of dialects from a structuralist point of view (El pensamiento lingüístico 29).

González Tapia classifies Henríquez Ureña's entire linguistic production into the following four categories: i) dialectological-sociolinguistic; ii) lexico-semantic; iii) linguistic theory; and iv) applied linguistics. The author provides a chronological commentary and brief analyses of Henríquez Ureña's contributions to each field. Text by text, González Tapia broadly reviews Henríquez Ureña's data, highlighting his major arguments or claims and, in some cases, raising some questions as to their validity. In the same swift manner, González Tapia sums up Henríquez Ureña's position on African substrate influences and gives his own evaluation:

Finalmente, Henríquez Ureña toca de nuevo el problema de la posible influencia indígena y africana en el español dominicano, en este caso en el aspecto fonético [...] En torno a la influencia africana sólo reconoce como fenómeno de importancia el cambio de y o ll en ñ, es decir la nasalización de estos dos fonemas: yapa/ñapa. Sin embargo, afirma que la nasalización no resulta sistemática, ni es necesariamente africana ya que también existe en España (Salamanca): yugo/ñugo, pellizcar/peñizcar [...] En fin, observa que "sólo la supresión completa de s final me parece, en Santo Domingo, revelar influencia

africana, perpetuada a graves de los siglos” [...] Esta hipótesis de la “tradición negra” a que Henríquez Ureña atribuye la supresión total de la s final de sílaba parece poco convincente ante la realidad de que el fenómeno también existe, como el mismo lo reconoce en otros lugares (El pensamiento lingüístico 116-117).

With respect to this and other major assertions of Henríquez Ureña on Dominican Spanish, González Tapia contends that the author’s wide generalizations were a result of the impressionistic and subjective methodology that was the prevalent practice at the time. This practice consisted of generalizing a particular fact without sufficient empirical or statistical evidence. According to González Tapia: “un par de palabras pronunciadas por un hablante aislado era suficiente para hacer afirmaciones definitivas y rotundas sobre las características de un dialecto determinado o para justificar un fenómeno lingüístico dado” (El pensamiento lingüístico 76). He characterizes this methodology as “linguistic impressionism.” Weber de Kurlat (1984), following Lope Blanch, expressed a similar idea with respect to these methodological limitations: “trabajo, por cierto, sumamente valioso, cuyas limitaciones no dependen del autor sino, como es lógico, del estado embrionario en que se hallaba la lingüística hispanoamericana en aquel tiempo” (“Henríquez Ureña en el Instituto” 270). Accordingly, González Tapia continues: “a pesar de estas observaciones y otras más que por el momento nos reservamos, este excelente estudio [“El idioma español y la historia política en Santo Domingo” (1937)] de don Pedro nos presenta un cuadro más real que ficticio, más objetivo que subjetivo acerca del español dominicano de su época” (El pensamiento lingüístico 102). He concludes by pointing out that Henríquez Ureña’s notion of linguistic purism and his views on the role of Spanish in the emergence of the Dominican state were somewhat misguided and influenced by traditional, and possibly racist, views (El pensamiento lingüístico 168-170). This is a pertinent

but brief observation which I address in this dissertation, particularly in chapters three and five. Apart from that, González Tapia does not provide a full discussion of some of the contradictions that Henríquez Ureña incurred. He writes:

Fuera de algunas expresiones descompuestas de este tipo, desde el punto de vista científico, sobre el papel de la cultura y el español dominicanos, Henríquez Ureña sorprende por la lucidez de su pensamiento lingüístico que, en sentido general, revela una comprensión que como él mismo expresa “en ninguna otra disciplina cuesta tanto esfuerzo desterrar” un error o quebrantar la venerable rutina “de que se lamentaba Bello” (El pensamiento lingüístico 169).

In short, González Tapia’s study constitutes a brief chronological commentary of Henríquez Ureña’s linguistic texts. He provides a general synthesis of the Henríquez Ureña’s major linguistic descriptions and assertions in order to reject the classification of Henríquez Ureña as a philologist. González Tapia insists that his work must be classified within a particular strand of modern linguistics: structural dialectology.

1.2.4.1 Pedro Henríquez Ureña and American Spanish

Within the field of Latin American dialectology, Álvarez Martínez (1998) and Vaquero (1997) are two other researchers that have attempted to cement Henríquez Ureña’s reputation as a pioneer dialectologist and theoretician of American Spanish. Álvarez Martínez believes that his linguistic work has not been properly taken into account (177). She notes: “Observaciones sobre el español de América” se ha considerado siempre como trabajo pionero en la dialectología hispanoamericana. En él se establece por primera vez no sólo una posible división en zonas de la

América hispana, sino también se plantea el cuestionado andalucismo del español de América” (178). Vaquero is even more emphatic when underscoring Henríquez Ureña’s contributions to Spanish linguistics:

Los trabajos de Pedro Henríquez Ureña, a partir de 1921, plantean por primera vez, ya sea sin concesiones o con carácter provisional, los problemas del español de América que han seguido debatiéndose hasta nuestros días: la uniformidad frente a la variación, la base andaluza en sus orígenes frente al desarrollo paralelo de los fenómenos compartidos; las causas externas de los rasgos representativos frente a las causas internas de la evolución, esto es frente a las tendencias sistemáticas (280).

Similarly, Lope Blanch (1951) acknowledges Henríquez Ureña’s pioneering work: “lo importante es que Henríquez Ureña abrió la puerta a tan necesaria clase de investigaciones, poniendo a la vez en la picota la simplificadora idea de la unidad del español americano” (“Henríquez Ureña, precursor” 36). However, he also recognizes that Henríquez Ureña’s efforts to create a dialectal division of Spanish into five zones were met with criticism (Kany 1951).

Lope Blanch states:

Que lo menos encomiable del esfuerzo hecho hace más de medio siglo por Henríquez Ureña radica, de un lado, en la generosidad con que juzgaba el estado de los conocimientos filológicos sobre el español de América alcanzado en su tiempo—insuficiente, sin duda, para “acometer trabajos de conjunto,” como era el de la delimitación de las zonas dialectales—y, de otro lado, el hecho de haber incurrido en generalizaciones simplificadoras—él que se declaraba enemigo de toda generalización—, como la de suponer influencias tan decisivas en la acción de esas cinco lenguas generales

de sustrato sobre el español americano (“Pedro Henríquez Ureña y las zonas dialectales” 50).

Lope Blanch’s acknowledgement of the limitations of Henríquez Ureña’s dialectal division notwithstanding, Hispanic linguists locate Henríquez Ureña’s linguistic ideas within the school of thought that postulates a diverse yet unified speech community grounded in the Spanish language. In this regard, they resemble the group of scholars who focus on Henríquez Ureña’s account of America as a cultural unit. Vaquero concludes:

En los momentos críticos de la emancipación, e inmediatamente después, en los regidos por la búsqueda de la identidad, tanto [Cuervo] como [Henríquez Ureña] defendieron sus ideas y su patriotismo a ultranza dentro de lo hispánico, dentro del legado que, por ser hispánicos, habían heredado en la tradición común: las conexiones entre lengua y cultura siempre han sido distintivo de lo hispánico, con raíces romanísticas, sin necesidad de buscar otras influencias, de escuela o de moda (281-282).

Álvarez Martínez and Vaquero situate Henríquez Ureña’s linguistic work within the collaborative effort to scientifically prove Spanish America as a cultural and linguistic unit derived from a Hispanic base. In general, these Hispanic linguists concentrate on Henríquez Ureña’s dialectal observations and dialectological arguments that allow them to establish, advance, or question the concept of “American Spanish.”

1.2.4.2 Dominican Spanish and Dominican linguists

Alba (1990), Jiménez Sabater (1975), González Tapia (1998), and Pérez Guerra (1992, 2002, and 2004) primarily represent the group of Dominican researchers who have attempted to

characterize Henríquez Ureña's work on Dominican Spanish. Pérez Guerra (2004) laments the scarcity of studies dedicated to Henríquez Ureña's linguistic production, especially in comparison to his literary and cultural work:

Si hacemos un acopio de los trabajos, de diversa índole, que han realizado numerosos intelectuales del mundo sobre el pensamiento americanista, la crítica literaria, la poesía, sus ensayos históricos, culturales, folklóricos, entre muchos otros dedicados a su inagotable creación, y los comparamos con los más representativos de su labor y su visión filológica y lingüística del idioma español, nos damos de inmediato cuenta que es exigua, nada profunda y muy poca conocida ("La obra lingüística" 60).

Like other analysts, Dominican researchers who focus on Henríquez Ureña's linguistic production generally hesitate to go beyond the exaltation of his contributions (Lara 1975 and 1982, Rosario Candelier 1990). Jiménez Sabater (1975) made a similar observation in reference to the prevalent attitude among Dominican analysts: "va siendo hora, por otra parte, de que nos sacudamos ya de esa actitud fetichista, típica de algunos intelectuales dominicanos interesados por el lenguaje, tan pronto se alude a la obra de algunos eruditos—magister dixit—que fueron otrora representantes señeros del talento nacional" (Más datos 176). In more recent decades, however, some have attempted to further explore Henríquez Ureña's perspective on Dominican Spanish. One of the first Dominican linguists who tried to scrutinize Henríquez Ureña's data on this topic was Jiménez Sabater (1975 and 1981). This linguist found some of Henríquez Ureña's characterizations of the Dominican speech community problematic and considered that Henríquez Ureña erroneously presumed that Dominican Republic had remained more isolated than any other country in the Hispanic world:

Si nos atenemos a los datos [léxicos] de Henríquez Ureña forzosamente deberíamos concluir pensando que la República Dominicana ha vivido mucho más aislada del resto del mundo que ningún otro país hispanoamericano, casi como si el tiempo se hubiese detenido para nosotros en algún lustro remoto (“Enfoques sociolingüísticos” 87).

For their part, Alba and Pérez Guerra have approached Henríquez Ureña’s classic *El Español de Santo Domingo* by explaining the value of the work as the first systematic coherent study of Spanish in the Dominican Republic: “una justa valoración de la obra de Pedro Henríquez Ureña obliga a reconocerle los múltiples méritos que la convierten en un clásico de la literatura dialectal hispanoamericana (Alba, “Pedro Henríquez Ureña” 196). These researchers also highlight how the author’s central idea, the linguistic archaism of Dominican Spanish, determines the overall structure of the text and each individual chapter as well as the collection and selection of data (Alba 197, Pérez Guerra 483): “todo ese abundante material sirve al autor para fundamentar su teoría del arcaísmo” (Alba, “Pedro Henríquez Ureña” 198). They have different opinions with respect to the currency in Dominican Spanish of the archaic lexemes collected by Henríquez Ureña. Alba believes that archaic lexemes do not constitute a distinctive feature of this dialect:

El supuesto uso de los arcaísmos recogidos por Pedro Henríquez Ureña no constituye un rasgo distintivo o exclusivo del español dominicano, a juzgar por las afirmaciones de Navarro Tomás (1974: 210-211) [...] Si bien esos arcaísmos pudieron estar vigentes en la década del 30, cuando se escribió “El Español en Santo Domingo,” en la actualidad una parte considerable de los mismos no forma parte siquiera del vocabulario pasivo de muchos dominicanos (“Pedro Henríquez Ureña” 212).

Moreover, Alba points out that the preservation of archaic forms is not exclusive of the Dominican Republic and can be found in other areas of Spanish-speaking Caribbean: “la conservación de formas arcaicas tampoco es una característica exclusiva de Santo Domingo, ya que las mismas se mantienen también en otros lugares, como Puerto Rico, España, etc.” (“Pedro Henríquez Ureña” 213). Alba provides a brief overview of the historical period in which Henríquez Ureña’s *El Español en Santo Domingo* emerged and ascribed its inaccuracies with respect to the features that Henríquez Ureña exclusively attributed to this dialect to the infancy of dialectology as a field of research. Alba also reiterates Hispanic linguists’ and philologists’ views regarding the immense value of Henríquez Ureña’s work in the field of dialectology and its limitations. In addition, Alba cites Henríquez Ureña’s prolonged absence from the Dominican Republic as a reason for the shortcomings of Henríquez Ureña’s research on Spanish in the Dominican Republic: “finalmente, y en honor a la verdad, no se puede perder de vista la época y la situación de alejamiento del país en que el autor escribió su obra. En tales circunstancias podría estar la explicación de muchos de los excusables aspectos que no se han considerado plenamente acordes con la realidad del habla actual de la República Dominicana” (“Pedro Henríquez Ureña” 214). Alba maintains: “es justo reconocer, asimismo que al pasar el balance final los reparos señalados aquí resultan insignificantes ante la inconmensurable riqueza de datos y el decisivo aporte de esta obra al estudio de la lengua dominicana” (“Pedro Henríquez Ureña” 214). According to this view, the empirical value and theoretical contribution of the work overshadow any problems inherent in the text.

Pérez Guerra (2004) also examined Henríquez Ureña’s other linguistic texts and highlighted their place in his intellectual production: “los estudios dedicados a la lengua ocupan, pues, un lugar especial en la producción intelectual de Henríquez Ureña” (“La producción de

tema lingüístico” 11). In this study, the primary focus is on the works that comprise his Latin American dialectology, his take on *la expresión americana*, and the defense of the autonomy of Spanish in the Americas (9). Pérez Guerra wrote: “los temas centrales de la producción lingüística de [Henríquez Ureña] giran en torno a la preocupación permanente de los estudios del filólogo: la unidad hispanoamericana” (17). In other words, the subject of Latin American unity is key to his linguistic production.

In contrast to Alba’s assessment of lexical archaisms in the Dominican Republic, Pérez Guerra (1992) accepts Henríquez Ureña’s characterization, in spite of what she calls his “methodological apriorism”:

Pese a todo ello considero que, incluso en el nivel léxico-semántico del que nos hemos ocupado hasta ahora, la posición teórica de Henríquez Ureña es básicamente correcta y que la caracterización arcaizante del vocabulario dominicano es aun vigente en lo fundamental a despecho de los fenómenos sociológicos que han tenido lugar, desde 1961, especialmente en la República Dominicana (“Aportación” 485).

Going beyond the lexico-semantic level, Pérez Guerra finds evidence in Dominican Spanish of archaic forms in the morpho-syntactic level such as double negation (“nadie no vino”) and the use of the indefinite article + possessive + noun (“un mi amigo”), among others (“Aportación” 487-489). While comparing Henríquez Ureña’s linguistic claims with similar cultural claims he made in his “La Antigua sociedad patriarcal de las Antillas: modalidades arcaicas de la vida en Santo Domingo durante el siglo XIX” (1932), Pérez Guerra affirms that Henríquez Ureña’s conclusions are also substantiated by some of the facts of nineteenth century Dominican history.

The debate still continues, but mostly along the lines of whether Henríquez Ureña was correct regarding the linguistic archaism of Spanish in the Dominican context and whether his conclusions are still valid today:

Es, desde luego, cierta (y no deja de ser un “descubrimiento del Mediterráneo”) la observación antes citada de Orlando Alba de que “la conservación de formas arcaicas [no] es una característica de Santo Domingo.” Pero es aun más cierta la consideración de que son, por una parte, la densidad relativa de los fenómenos de este tipo existente en cada área y, por otra, la extensión y vitalidad diatópica y diastrática los criterios fundamentales sobre los que debe asentarse la caracterización de una zona lingüística como más o menos próxima a una fisonomía mayoritariamente redentora de rasgos propios de etapas anteriores a la actual. En este sentido, parece evidente que las otras configuradoras del español dominicano superan en mucho las del mismo tipo que se encuentran, por ejemplo, en Puerto Rico (“Aportación” 490).

This debate must evolve and much more work is necessary in order to provide a fuller explanation of his linguistic ideas and conclusions with respect to Spanish in the Dominican Republic. The inquiry needs to go beyond questioning the validity of his claims or the currency of linguistic archaism in this dialect and move towards questions about the circumstances and ideological issues surrounding his characterization of the Dominican speech community. In fact, some scholars have suspected the need for problematizing the work of Henríquez Ureña. These are the ones who take the view that his work, while rich in many ways, demands critical attention.

1.2.5 Critical approaches to Pedro Henríquez Ureña

Jimenes Grullón (1903-1983), a historian and important Dominican political figure, was the first scholar to formally formulate the need for a more critical approach to Henríquez Ureña's work. He was the first Dominican analyst to go beyond rendering homage and to seriously take issue with several of Henríquez Ureña's arguments (1969):

Tanto en España como en nuestra América, el relieve intelectual de Pedro Henríquez Ureña es un hecho ampliamente reconocido. Pero al adentrarnos en lo que sobre él se ha escrito, nos encontramos a menudo con evaluaciones en las cuales los factores afectivos e ideológicos han primado sobre el juicio ecuánime y penetrante (11).

According to Jimenes Grullón, Henríquez Ureña was an excellent writer who cultivated skillfully the field of literary criticism and also excelled as a linguist and philologist: “fue en el campo de las letras, uno de los máximos investigadores con que cuenta nuestro idioma. Logró así transformar su cabeza en un riquísimo fichero” (12).

Jimenes Grullón examined Henríquez Ureña's oeuvre in order to assess his characterization of colonial history, the construction of Latin American identities, the role of the intellectual in Latin American history, and the sociocultural configuration of the Dominican Republic. Recognizing the intrinsic value of Henríquez Ureña's scholarship, Jimenes Grullón was not deterred from detecting the ideological underpinnings of some of Henríquez Ureña's representations: “pero no puede pasar inadvertido; pone de relieve algo sobre lo cual haremos insistencia luego: el exaltado hispanismo de Henríquez Ureña, base teórica sobre la cual levantó—como habrá de verse—su americanismo” (19). In addition, Jimenes Grullón notes that, while in many of his writings Henríquez Ureña advocated for universal justice, he alienated certain groups of people who did not fit into his description of Dominican realities, namely those

of African descent and low economic classes. Jimenes Grullón finds examples of this type of alienation in several of Henríquez Ureña's discussions on early colonial cultural processes:

Nos dice el escritor [Henríquez Ureña], que esta [música] no era "india...: su ascendencia era europea, aun cuando el nuevo ambiente y las nuevas costumbres no tardaron en modificarla y en darle un nuevo e inconfundible aroma." Aceptemos que la música europea pasara a nuestro Continente; mas ¿renunciaron acaso a las suyas el indio y el africano? Diríase que no. La enajenación hispanista lleva a Henríquez Ureña a esta afirmación tácita, pero bien real (24, ellipsis in the original).

According to Jimenes Grullón, this considerable process of alienation can be attributed not only to his "*hispanismo*" but also to Henríquez Ureña's concept of history: "lo dicho por Henríquez Ureña pone de manifiesto su tendencia a ver la historia como un proceso dirigido por la clase social privilegiada y sus figuras más notables; no como la obra del conjunto de la comunidad, movida ésta, en primera o última instancia, por la lucha de clases" (137). It is not surprising that Jimenes Grullón has made the most forceful statement in relation to the ideological dimension of Henríquez Ureña's oeuvre. This Marxist intellectual, founder of the Dominican socialist party (1961), sought to analyze many myths in his quest to dismantle, what he considered to be, within a classical Marxist framework, "the false consciousness"⁹ of Dominican society. Accordingly, he concluded: "Henríquez Ureña, impulsado por su fervor hispánico, perdió el sentido de la realidad" (22).

The linguists Guillermo Guitarte (1958) and Elvira Arnoux (2001) have also paid attention to the ideological dimension of a portion of Henríquez Ureña's linguistic work. Arnoux

⁹ Jimenes Grullón adhered to a strict traditional Marxist perspective on ideologies. As Eagleton (1991) noted, standard Marxist theory uncritically associates ideology with false consciousness elaborated by power structures working to mask their existence. I discuss this specific Marxist tradition of ideological studies in chapter two.

(2001) analyzed the secondary role he played in the polemic surrounding the appearance of his *Gramática Castellana* (1938), co-authored with Amado Alonso,¹⁰ in Argentina and the Spaniard's negative characterization of *Porteño* speech (*plebeyismo*). Arnoux's study is relevant because it highlights important, particularly political, linguistic debates that were taking place at the time when Henríquez Ureña was living, teaching, and writing in Buenos Aires. Arnoux characterized their collaborative effort to promote a Latin American identity that would be built over the Hispanic linguistic base. She referred to this endeavor in the following terms: "la perspectiva del político de la cultura que defiende 'la unidad espiritual del mundo hispánico' como forma de defender la identidad" ("Disciplinar desde la lengua" 72). Arnoux highlights the specific strategies used in their grammar and other linguistic texts to impose a specific order on students' linguistic practices as well as the ways that ordinary people should approach and think about the use of language. Arnoux's study introduces us to some of the specific language ideological issues that engaged Henríquez Ureña while he worked in the Buenos Aires of the 1930's.

Guitarte (1958) was the first scholar to coherently argue that Henríquez Ureña's important contributions to the emerging field of Spanish linguistics and his role in the "andalucismo" debate had to be problematized and understood in the precise context of their emergence. Guitarte emphasized the need to revise Henríquez Ureña's theoretical contributions using the critical tools of analysis that we have available today:

Creo que hoy se ha hecho evidente que tampoco el mundo de las ideas del Instituto de Filología [de Buenos Aires, del cual fueron figuras rectoras Amado Alonso y Pedro Henríquez Ureña], tal y como ha quedado representado en sus obras, resiste un examen

¹⁰ See chapter four for a discussion of this context.

realizado de acuerdo a las exigencias actuales y que, por ello, su vigencia dentro de nuestra vida ha terminado y debe iniciarse una nueva etapa. Entiéndase bien estas palabras: no quiero decir que las obras de Alonso y Henríquez Ureña hayan perimido, porque han aparecido nuevas técnicas o noticias que modifican el cuadro de conocimientos en que se movieron; claro que ha ocurrido esto, pero expresar simplemente un juicio de este tipo sería una superficialidad [...] lo que necesitamos ahora no es persistir en intentar resolver los problemas cuyos términos dieron ellos sino adquirir conciencia de nuestra nueva situación y, a partir de ella, plantear los problemas en nuestros propios términos (“Cuervo, Henríquez Ureña” [1983] 14).

Not only did Guitarte articulate the need to reconceptualize the work of scholars such as Henríquez Ureña, but he also insisted in the need to focus less on the particular solutions that they intrepidly advanced with respect to certain linguistic and cultural problems and pay more attention to the principles that guided their work.

Apart from this line of inquiry by Jimenes Grullón, Arnoux, and Guitarte, most attempts at criticism of Henríquez Ureña’s work have been rather genteel (Carilla, Pedro Henríquez Ureña: signo 1988). The criticism is generally limited to pointing out that Henríquez Ureña engaged in some contradictions in his analyses and interpretation of Latin American cultural and linguistic realities. They do not actually analyze these contradictions in depth or the specific circumstances surrounding them. For the most part, analysts neglect the task of reading Henríquez Ureña’s texts critically. Sarlo (1998) catalogues the implications and tasks that are involved in a critical analysis:

Leerlo supone un movimiento que se desplace en sentido contrario (es decir, contra el tiempo), deshaciendo lo que la retórica de una época imprime inevitablemente sobre los

textos. Leer contra el tiempo no significa practicar una piadosa interpretación arqueológica, siempre dispuesta a justificar las diferencias como efectos de la lejanía histórica o cultural. Más bien quisiera que signifique, en este caso, una puesta en paréntesis de esas marcas de escritura, para traducir algunas zonas de su discurso a nuestra problemática (880).

Over two decades ago, Soledad Álvarez (1981) pointed out several reasons why we needed critical approaches to the work of Henríquez Ureña:

Son muy pocos los trabajos de crítica que escudriñan a profundidad la obra del ensayista. Uno de los aspectos más aludidos ha sido justamente el de nuestro tema: el americanismo; pero, paradójicamente no hemos encontrado un análisis esclarecedor acerca de sus ideas sobre la América Latina. Con respecto a su antiimperialismo, la bibliografía es casi inexistente. El límite de nuestro trabajo resulta estrecho ante la diversidad de asuntos que toca la obra del dominicano (“La magna patria” 12).

Clearly, there is still a serious need for critical studies on Henríquez Ureña, especially with respect to his linguistic production. As noted by devoted admirers such as Soledad Álvarez, rarely do we find analyses or reflections of the problems and contradictions that are present in Henríquez Ureña’s cultural texts or, for that matter, his linguistic production.

1.3 Knowledge and ideology

The dominant tradition in Pedro Henríquez Ureña scholarship focuses on the reconstruction of his vision of Spanish America, labeled “americanismo.” Within this tradition, scholars mostly expound on the Dominican’s intellectual brilliance, wealth of knowledge, and

his effort to develop and defend high culture in Latin America. Among Dominican analysts, the tendency is to extol his *dominicanidad* or his symbolic value within the country's intellectual tradition and nationalism. With some exceptions, these trends are, in varying degrees, reproduced by those few analysts who focus on his linguistic work. Critically inclined analysts lament the limitations of highly evocative perspectives and the absence of detailed studies on Henríquez Ureña. Most studies attend to aspects of his personality and pedagogical practice and ignore the complexity of his ideas: “el límite de nuestro trabajo resulta indudablemente estrecho ante la diversidad de asuntos que toca la obra del dominicano” (Soledad Álvarez, *La magna patria* 12). Similarly, Zuleta Álvarez wrote: “pareciera, “como si la fuerza de su personalidad y sobre todo de su significación en el marco cultural de la vida hispanoamericana, se impusiera a toda pretensión de considerarlo sólo desde el punto de vista del sistema de sus ideas” (“La recepción crítica” 514). A survey of studies on Pedro Henríquez Ureña, such as the one developed in the present chapter, reveals a dearth of critical approaches to his work and leads us to agree with Zuleta Álvarez. To focus solely on Henríquez Ureña's *americanismo* or his role in the *andalucismo* debate profoundly limits our appreciation and understanding of his work. The most apparent limitation of the scholarship on Henríquez Ureña is the lack of studies that take into full consideration the significant impact of political and cultural ideology and context on his work. The few available critical approaches barely skim the surface of the ideological dimension of Henríquez Ureña's work. For the most part, Henríquez Ureña scholars believe that he was able to reject ideological forces and concentrate on a “spiritual-like” search for knowledge: “si Henríquez Ureña se encontraba—como no podía ser de otro modo—imbuido por la atmósfera ideológica de su tiempo, pudo y supo *rechazar la filosofía imperante y buscar en la rosa de los vientos donde soplaban el espíritu*” (Isacson 123, emphasis in the original). There is a tendency to

reduce the impact of ideological forces on Henríquez Ureña only to a preoccupation with philosophical problems of the “purely” epistemological kind. According to this perspective, ideology could not play a role in the intellectual activity of a man many consider incorruptible and impervious to politics of any kind. Nevertheless, as Jimenes Grullón and Guitarte argued, it is necessary to study Henríquez Ureña’s oeuvre without forgetting that even brilliant thinkers such as Henríquez Ureña must adapt and respond to external pressures which ultimately manifest themselves in their work. Yet, despite some very reflective studies on Henríquez Ureña’s array of ideas on Spanish America, the majority of studies on his *americanismo* tend to focus on the aesthetic dimension of his oeuvre, and ignore its ideological dimension.

A primary apprehension among Henríquez Ureña specialists is that criticism can lead to a denial and radical rejection of the scholar’s achievements. Additionally, there is the belief that the generational gap between Henríquez Ureña and us is now far too great for us to grasp the significance and implications of his work. Jean Franco (1978) expressed it in the following terms:

Indudablemente se ha abierto un abismo entre la generación nuestra y la de Pedro Henríquez Ureña. La idea de una corriente, de un hilo conductor humano que atraviesa todas las grandes obras, se ha sustituido con una actitud de rechazo radical de lo anterior, de ruptura con el pasado y de discontinuidad (818).

However, Franco believes that we can accept the task of demystifying our humanist predecessors without necessarily trying to invalidate them. Franco added:

No quiero terminar en una nota pesimista. Es evidente que sin el humanismo hubiera sido imposible la obra de Vasconcelos, de Reyes y de Henríquez Ureña y de muchos escritores latinoamericanos de la misma generación. Era el humanismo la forma en que

se concebían sus relaciones con la sociedad y la lógica que les permitía construir su pensamiento. Dedicarnos a la obra de reconstrucción del humanismo no quita a sus adeptos su importancia en la labor de formar una tradición crítica literaria en América Latina, ni significa que restamos utilidad a su trabajo (818).

As Franco suggests, there is a need to develop a critical distance with respect to the works of the previous generation of “men of letters.” This critical distance implies, first, acknowledging that it is insufficient to simply measure the quantity of knowledge that Henríquez Ureña accumulated and, second, understanding the conditions that allowed the acquisition and production of that knowledge in the first place.

1.4 Filling the gap: a language ideological approach

Some analysts attribute Henríquez Ureña’s problematic assumptions, with respect to language and identity, to dialectology’s relatively undeveloped methodology (“linguistic impressionism”) in the early twentieth century, while others contend that some of his questionable claims are simply “insignificant” when compared to his achievements. Krauze, Díaz Quiñones, Jimenes Grullón with their respective approaches (1969), and Guitarte and Arnoux with their metalinguistic approaches represent a major departure from this tradition. Their analyses emphasize the need to adopt a more critical attitude towards Henríquez Ureña’s ideas and they even survey some specific problems that are present in his texts. Yet the ideological implications and specific problems that are present in his texts have not been fully considered. By and large, studies that have dealt with Henríquez Ureña’s description of Spanish America as a cultural and linguistic unit say very little with respect to the specific strategies used by him in order to link language and identity in his construction of “Spanish America.” This is a

crucial limitation because it overlooks his *dominicanidad* and *hispanoamericanismo* as two key ideological sites which articulate his work's discursive and textual realization. In this dissertation, I propose a specific language ideological approach which overcomes this limitation. Like Jimenes Grullón and Guitarte, I maintain that ideology was a powerful force in Henríquez Ureña's work and thought. Contrary to Jimenes Grullón, I do not seek to simply identify which aspects of Latin American and Dominican cultural realities were distorted by Henríquez Ureña. Instead, I approach the problems of representation that surface in his work by examining specific semiotic and ideological processes as well as the degree to which these were triggered by the specific conditions of production.

González Tapia (1998) and Pérez Guerra (2004) compiled the most definitive list of Henríquez Ureña's linguistic works. In order to complete this analysis, I have selected the following corpus of his available linguistic texts:

1. 1919. "La lengua en Santo Domingo (rectificación al romanista Meyer-Lübke)." Revistas y libros. Madrid.
2. 1920. "El idioma castellano es tan popular en los bulevares de París como en Nueva York." La Prensa.
3. 1921. "En defensa de la Revista de Filología Española." Repertorio Americano II (14): 283-285.
4. 1921. "Observaciones sobre el español en América I." Revista de Filología Española VIII: 357-390.
5. 1923. "Breves nociones de filología." Panfilia I (3 & 4): 8-12.
6. 1925. "El supuesto andalucismo de América." Cuadernos del Instituto de Filología, Buenos Aires I (2): 117-22.
7. & Narciso Binayan. 1927. El libro del idioma. Lectura, gramática, composición, vocabulario (para quinto y sexto grados de las escuelas primarias de la Provincia de Buenos Aires). Buenos Aires: Editorial A. Kapelusz y Cía.
8. & Narciso Binayan. 1928. Guía para el uso de 'El libro del idioma.' Buenos Aires: Editorial A. Kapelusz y Cía.
9. 1930. "El lenguaje." Humanidades XXI: 107-125.

10. 1930. "Observaciones sobre el español en América II." Revista de Filología Española XVII: 277-284.
11. 1931. "Observaciones sobre el español en América III." Revista de Filología Española XVIII: 120-148.
12. 1932. "Sobre el problema del andalucismo dialectal de América" Biblioteca de Dialectología Hispanoamericana (Anexo I). Buenos Aires: IFBA.
13. 1933. "Prólogo a la obra 'palabras indígenas de la isla de Santo Domingo de Emiliano Tejera.'" La Nación. Buenos Aires.
14. 1934. Observaciones sobre el español en México." Investigaciones Lingüísticas II: 188-194.
15. 1934. "Comienzos del español en América." Cursos y Conferencias (La Plata) 12.
16. 1935. "Palabras antillanas en el diccionario de la Academia" Revista de Filología Española 22: 60-65.
17. 1936. "El español en México, los Estados Unidos y la América Central." Biblioteca de Dialectología Hispanoamericana (Tomo 4). Buenos Aires: IFBA.
18. 1937. "El idioma español y la historia política en Santo Domingo." Ponencia leída en el II Congreso Internacional de Historia de América del 5 al 14 de julio. Buenos Aires.
19. 1937. "El español en la zona del Mar Caribe." La Nación (1 de agosto). Buenos Aires.
20. 1937. "El español en México y sus vecindades." La Nación (5 de septiembre). Buenos Aires.
21. 1937. "Caribe." La Nación (19 de junio). Buenos Aires.
22. 1938. "Historia de palabras (batata)." La Nación (24 de julio). Buenos Aires.
23. 1938. "La planta enigmática (el aje)." La Nación (4 de septiembre). Buenos Aires.
24. 1938. & Amado Alonso. Gramática Castellana I & II. Buenos Aires: Losada.
25. 1939. "Ello." Revista de Filología Hispánica. 1 (3): 209-229.
26. 1941. El español en Santo Domingo. Santo Domingo: Taller.
27. 1944. "Reseña de Vicisitudes de la lengua española en Santo Domingo, por Emilio Rodríguez Demorizi." Revista de Filología Hispánica 6 (4): 409-410.

In order to fully understand Henríquez Ureña's linguistic production, I will argue that it is necessary to read it in several contexts: first, the context provided by the development of language studies in the Hispanic tradition, a tradition in which he grounded his own professional and intellectual development; second, in the context of the dialogue that he established between his linguistic production and the Dominican cultural and political field; third, in the context of

the complex and contested construction of Dominican and Latin American identities. Confronting these contexts allows us a better glimpse into the issues and challenges that he attempted to resolve. On the one hand, by affirming the autonomy of American Spanish, he attempted to demonstrate the cultural unity and independence of Latin America. On the other hand, adopting a radically different perspective, he classified Dominican Spanish within the northern Peninsular dialect continuum in order to settle the question of Dominican national identity. To one extent, it is perfectly clear that these linguistic representations respond to the sociopolitical circumstances which they attempt to articulate. However, less understood is the degree to which these linguistic representations, developed around the facts, naturalized these same sociopolitical circumstances under the cloak of science, thus constituting linguistic ideologies.

II. Theoretical Framework: Linguistic Ideologies and the History of Linguistic Ideas

2.1 The concept of ideology and its history

The concept of ideology and its epistemological status is a complex topic whose discussion involves many disciplines and theories. Terry Eagleton (1991), for example, provides sixteen definitions, which reflect the different epistemological attitudes and theoretical commitments of its proponents (1). Most of these definitions fall within two broad intellectual traditions: i) a philosophical tradition that deals with the falsity and truthfulness of ideas and relates them to matters of cognition, reality, illusion, distortion, and myth-making; and ii) a sociological tradition that deals with the functions of ideas in social life. Kathryn Woolard (1998), an anthropologist, explains that those that come from the philosophical tradition tend to highlight the representational-conceptual character of ideology (idea-ology) while those that come from the sociological tradition highlight issues of power and public and private conflict between social groups (id-ology) (“Language ideology as a field of research” 8). In this chapter, I briefly review this concept’s history, examine the major approaches to the concept, and highlight the main characteristics of ideological phenomena in order to produce the most appropriate conceptualization for the study of the ideological dimension of Henríquez Ureña’s linguistic oeuvre.

The historian Merino Medina (1987) pointed out that the concept of ideology had some antecedents in the work of Francis Bacon (1561-1626). Regarded as the originator of the phrase “knowledge is power,” Bacon advocated against what he called “idols,” or bad habits of the mind that distort human thinking and prevent people from acquiring accurate knowledge of natural phenomena (Bacon, The new organon 47-48, Russell 544). According to Bacon,

debunking these idols was an important step in eliminating inadequate knowledge that was tied up with special interest groups (e.g., the clergy):

Atheism leaves a man to sense, to philosophy, to natural piety, to laws, to reputation; all which may be guides to an outward moral virtue, though religion were not; but superstition dismounts all these, and erecteth an absolute monarchy, in the minds of men [...] The causes of superstition are: pleasing and sensual rites and ceremonies; excess of outward and pharasaical holiness; overgreat reverence of traditions, which cannot but load the church; the stratagems of prelates, for their own ambition and lucre (The essays or counsels 111).

Bacon's critique constituted an attempt to comprehend ecclesiastical views of nature and relate them to the social conditions in which they emerged and the specific interest groups who, because of their social positions, were able to impose their views and modes of thinking on the rest of society.

French Enlightenment philosophers (Holbach, Condillac, Helvetius, among others) picked up Bacon's ideas, which were generally about developing better methods for the study of nature, and tried to apply them to knowledge of society, its structure, inequalities, and injustices. Here is how Baron d'Holbach (1723-1789) framed the discussion:

La opinión pública nos sugiere a cada instante falsas visiones del honor y la gloria. Nos lleva a tener estimación no sólo por ventajas insignificantes, sino por acciones dañosas, favorecidas por el ejemplo, sacralizadas por el prejuicio, y cuyo carácter horrible no advertimos por causa del hábito. En efecto, por hábito nuestro entendimiento admite las concepciones más escandalosas y los prejuicios que atentan contra la sociedad que nos rodea [...] Las autoridades, por lo común, están interesadas en el mantenimiento de las

opiniones ya difundidas. Los prejuicios y errores que se consideran necesarios para conservar el poder de tales autoridades son mantenidos mediante la violencia, que sale a paso de cualquier excesiva inclinación por la crítica (cited in Merino Medina 18-19).

The goal of these philosophers was to develop methods of rational thinking and organization that could limit the arbitrary expansion and abuse of power. The scientist's task consisted of exposing social prejudice under the light of reason in order to reveal the nature of social institutions. They proposed to do this by seizing knowledge of humanity away from the monopoly of the ruling classes and applying the best scientific (i.e., rational) methods. It is in this context that the concept of ideology initially emerged (Merino Medina 21). Towards the end of the eighteenth century, Destutt de Tracy (1754-1836) coined the term "ideology" while attempting to establish a "science" for the systematic and empirical study of ideas. According to de Tracy, ideas had to be broken down into their original elements in order for "vous faire remarquer tout ce qui se passe en vous quand vous pensez, parlez, et raisonnez" (cited in van Dijk, Ideología y discurso 14). De Tracy considered the analysis of ideas the best method for achieving this task and progressively improving society and human life. Thus, the "ideologues"¹¹ objectives were not only theoretical but also political. Eventually, the anti-authoritarian position of the ideologues clashed with Napoleon Bonaparte, who had given up revolutionary idealism for absolutist pretensions. This political confrontation caused a rift between the ideologues and Napoleon, who had by then turned to conservative and religious groups for political support. Napoleon publicly attacked the ideologues accusing them of being deluded theoreticians, who were ignorant of the real issues and problems of the world of politics: "you ideologues destroy all illusions, and the age of illusions is for individuals as for peoples the age of happiness" (cited in Eagleton 67).

¹¹ This was the name given to the proponents of this theory.

Consequently, Napoleon successfully diverted attention away from the original meaning of the word ‘ideologue’ and infused it with negative connotations (Merino Medina 22). Nevertheless, the concept of ideology had begun to emerge as a theoretical instrument that articulates political conflict and class warfare in a social arena. We can see in the ideologues’ early formulations the basic lines of our current conceptualization of ideology as a discourse that naturalizes a context. In the case of Napoleon’s France, this context was the political status quo.

The point of departure for Marx and Engels (1845) was a reformulation of Napoleon’s condemnation of ideology, initially directed as an attack on their German contemporaries: to find “primary causes” in ideas was considered an error (Williams 58). Ideology became a polemical label for the kind of thinking that did not take into account material, social, and historical processes, including human consciousness. In broad terms, Marxism developed three accounts of the concept: i) a system of beliefs characteristic of a particular class or group; ii) a system of illusory beliefs—false ideas or false consciousness—which can be contrasted with true or scientific knowledge; and iii) the general process of the production of meanings and ideas (Williams 55). Contrary to common belief, it was Engels, and not Marx, who characterized ideological thinking as “false consciousness.” Marx’s approach to the concept of ideology was more complex and embedded in his general theory of alienation and consciousness (Eagleton 89). Nonetheless, according to the authors of *The German ideology* (1845), the production and reproduction of false consciousness took place in the struggle for class domination. In contrast to ideology, Marx and Engels opposed “science:”

Where speculation ends –in real life—there real, positive science begins: the representation of the practical activity, of the practical process of development of men, empty talk about consciousness ceases, and real knowledge has to take its place. When

reality is depicted, philosophy as an independent branch of activity loses its medium of existence (Marx and Engels 17).

The association of ideology with false consciousness and its opposition to the notion of “objective truth” became central to classic Marxism. In the process, this position produced some polemic reactions (Jones 2001). The classic Marxist view of ideology has been challenged over the years on a number of grounds by non-Marxists and Marxists alike. Williams (1977), for example, a Marxist himself, took issue with the view that what is not ideology is pure positive science or that pure positive knowledge is free of ideology (57). According to Williams, this position is excessively reductionist and overlooks the fact that thinking and imagining are from the beginning social processes (62). This last point is connected to a critical observation made by Mannheim (1954) that ideology was a reflection of all historical and social environments (Eagleton 109).

Presently, the term has acquired more acceptance and legitimacy due, in part, to interest in cognitive science. Van Dijk (1995) defined the concept:

As basic systems of social cognition [...] ideologies also have cognitive functions. We have already suggested that they organize, monitor, and control specific group attitudes. Possibly, ideologies also control the development, structure, and application of sociocultural knowledge (“Discourse analysis as ideology analysis” 19).

According to this cognitive perspective, we produce ideologies in our minds during our communication with members of our social group, starting with our family members and other close interlocutors. Essentially, cognitivists view ideologies as mental representations organized in form of schemas. Their main function is to provide the common ground that sustains daily group interaction and discourse.

From this perspective, ideologies share many similarities with what cognitivists generally regard as “knowledge.” Both are typically constructed and shaped by discourse and bound by the limits of human cognition. For van Dijk (2002), the difference between the two is that knowledge must not only be widely shared but must also pass tests that determine “the state of affairs” before it is accepted by a broader epistemic community (“Discourse, knowledge and ideology” 16). Ideology, on the other hand, does not have to be accepted beyond the level of the group. Thus, according to this perspective, the difference between ideology and knowledge is only a matter of how large is the community that shares the set of beliefs. From a cognitive perspective it is possible to study the diverse ideologies of various groups including feminists, racists, antiracists, fascists, environmentalists, and even sport fans in order to learn significant facts about mental phenomena. The question for cognitivists becomes the specific mental aspects of ideologies on which they should concentrate: the hidden?; the conscious? With regard to this quandary, George Lakoff declared to Pires de Oliveira (2001):

Any ideology is a conceptual system of a particular kind, including a moral system. However, ideologies have both conscious and unconscious aspects. If you ask someone with a political ideology what she believes, she will give a list of beliefs and perhaps some generalizations. A cognitive linguist, looking at what she says, will most likely pick out unconscious frames and metaphors lying behind her conscious beliefs. To me, that is the interesting part of ideologies—the hidden, unconscious part. It is there that cognitive linguists have a contribution to make (“Language and ideology: an interview with George Lakoff” 37).

Although cognitivists bring scientific legitimacy to the study of ideologies, their approach is generally limited to questions of the mind, perception, and subjective experience. For a broader

approach, more appropriate to the analysis intended in this dissertation, we must return to the debates and problems social scientists faced in trying to cope with and overcome its association with the notion of false consciousness.

2.2 Critical approaches

The notion of ideology has been productively used to explore a vast array of complex sociohistorical phenomena. First of all, Antonio Gramsci (1891-1937) exposed a serious flaw in the traditional Marxist understanding of ideology: the inability to see how ideology acted in a diffuse way. He advanced the notion of ‘hegemony,’ the State’s ability to govern, without force, through consent and ideology with the help of civil institutions that mediate between organizational and ideational processes (Phillips 1998). “Hegemony,” a broader category that in Gramsci’s work subsumes the concept of ideology, brings attention to the complex relationship between the leaders of a society and those that are led:

The methodological criterion on which our study must be based is the following: that the supremacy of a social group manifests itself in two ways, as “domination” and as “intellectual and moral leadership.” A social group dominates antagonistic groups, which it tends to “liquidate,” or to subjugate perhaps even by armed force; it leads kindred and allied groups. A social group can, and indeed must, already exercise “leadership” before winning governmental power (this is indeed one of the principal conditions for the winning of such power); it subsequently becomes dominant when it exercises power, but even if it holds it firmly in its grasp, it must continue to “lead” as well (Gramsci 57-58).

To Gramsci, cultural hegemony is what guarantees the ruling classes' power over other less powerful classes. It is achieved through control of a wide range of institutions, including the education system, religious organizations, and mass media that mediate between the economy and the State. They have agents who function as workers within the local economic system, but through these positions they also represent the State and gather support within a specific zone of "civil society" for the State's monopoly (Gramsci 245). With control of these cultural institutions that are interwoven with habitual daily practices, the dominant classes educate the subordinated groups to accept their rulers' supremacy and the ruling conditions as something natural and beneficial.

For Gramsci, ideology refers to the way groups articulate these power struggles at the level of signification. Accordingly, ideologies are psychologically and historically necessary: "they 'organize' human masses and create the terrain on which men move, acquire consciousness of their position, struggle, etc" (Gramsci 377). Gramsci reminds us that Marx emphasized the historical nature of ideologies:

The analysis of [Marx's] propositions tends, I think, to reinforce the *historical bloc* in which precisely material forces are the content and ideologies are the form, though this distinction between form and content has purely didactic value, since the material forces would be inconceivable historically without form and the ideologies would be individual fancies without the material forces (377).

The basic idea behind this reflection is that ideologies are grounded in specific situations which require the organization of knowledge, popular beliefs, and action. Therefore, the concept of ideology suits the analysis of belief systems that underlie certain social structures and articulate individual and collective behavior and consciousness.

The analyses of power relations show that ideology is not a theoretically null concept because it sheds light on recurring patterns of (political) thinking, for which there is concrete evidence in the concrete real world. Ideologies constitute thought practices intermeshed with and that inform material and observable practices and acts; they have both social and psychological manifestations that can be found in our actions and utterances. Gramsci tied the notions of ideology and hegemony to the investigation of language issues in a variety of ways. For example, in examining the tensions between Latin and vernaculars in medieval Italy, he explored how language as an object of discourse represents other extralinguistic events and processes:

Every time the question of language surfaces, in one way or another, it means that a series of other problems are coming to the fore: the formation and enlargement of the governing class, the need to establish more intimate and secure relationships between the governing groups and the national-popular mass, in other words to recognize the cultural hegemony (cited in Ives, 82).

To Gramsci, language and discussion about language constitute instruments of hegemony. Thus he considered and reflected upon language in his analysis of the Italian cultural climate and the debates on his country's national destiny (349). In these debates he found evidence of power relations operating through linguistic practice. Issues of differences among struggling social groups were reflected in speech and discourse on language. "Since this is the way things happen, great importance is assumed by the general question of language, that is the question of collectively attaining a single cultural climate" (Gramsci 349). In other words, the analyst must pay serious attention to language as a central constituent element of hegemony.

2.3 Discourse and power

Michel Foucault also reacted against the traditional Marxist model of ideology as a simplistic and negative process whereby individuals were deceived into using ideas which were not in their best interest. However, Marxism and notions of ideology were crucial for him in the development of his concept of discourse. In a sense, Foucault's work on discourse has been defined in dialogue with and in reaction to the definition of ideology (Mills 2004). Three issues stand out in this dialogue: i) the opposition of ideology to 'truth;' ii) 'the role of 'the subject;' and iii) the role of the economy in the determination of ideology.

As we saw above, students of ideologies often must wrestle with the notion that the position from which the theorist speaks is one of scientific critique—a position which has to stand outside of ideology (i.e., “false consciousness” and “imagined representation”). Foucault, however, thought it was impossible to speak from a position of “truth,” since one could only speak within the limits of what could be said at a particular time and place. Foucault referred to this combination of social, institutional, and discursive limits as “discursive frameworks.” According to Mills, “some of this knowledge will challenge dominant discourses and some will be complicit with them” (30). In any case, discursive limits are articulated by the effects of power.

Foucault insisted that in order to adequately understand historical processes it was necessary to abandon the notion of 'the individual subject' who is capable of resisting ideological pressures and controlling his or her actions. Instead, he proposed the study of the “micro-physics of power” (Discipline and Punish 26). While Foucault paid considerable attention to state control and power relationships based on economic imbalance, he did not see economic relations as a primary feature of ideological phenomena (in the traditional Marxist

sense). In his discussion of power, Foucault highlighted the complexity of the relation between socioeconomic positions and discourses: “in short this power is exercised rather than possessed; it is not the ‘privilege’ acquired or preserved, of the dominant class, but the overall effort of its strategic positions—an effect that is manifested and sometimes extended by the position of those who are dominated” (Discipline and Punish 26-27). He perceived the relation between economics, social structures and discourses as a complex interaction in which none of the constituent elements of the relations were necessarily dominant (Mills 32). He went against the assumption that in a relationship of dominance there is only a powerful participant and a powerless one who is duped into that position. In a sense, Foucault is essentially recasting the concept of ideology and moving away from the traditional Marxist view: “perhaps, too, we should abandon a whole tradition that allows us to imagine that knowledge can exist only where the power relations are suspended and that knowledge can develop only outside its injunctions, its demands and its interests” (Discipline and Punish 27). Foucault’s proposal has serious analytical implications: “we must cease once and for all to describe the effects of power in negative terms: it ‘excludes,’ it ‘represses,’ it ‘censors,’ it ‘abstracts,’ it ‘masks,’ it ‘conceals.’ In fact, power produces; it produces a reality; it produces domains of objects and rituals of truth” (Discipline and Punish 194).

Foucault’s preference for employing the term discourse was also tied to his desire to incorporate language into the analysis of the operations of power:

In appearance, speech may well be of little account, but the prohibitions surrounding it soon reveal its link with desire and power. This should not be very surprising, for psychoanalysis has already shown us that speech is not merely the medium which manifests—or dissembles—desire; it is also the object of desire. Similarly, historians

have constantly impressed upon us that speech is no mere verbalization of conflicts and systems of domination, but that it is the object of man's conflicts ("The discourse on language" 216).

Discourse, as an analytical category, brings attention to the fact that language is a crucial site in the articulation of society and relations of power.

2.4 Ideology and language

Pierre Bourdieu (1930-2002) was yet another author also interested in studying language as a site of conflict and struggle and as an instrument of political domination. For Bourdieu, the establishment of an official language (a product of the leading social classes and ruling elites) offers the clearest instance of the interplay of language use and politics. The imposition results in the incorporation of speech communities into a "unified linguistic market" which constitute a system of exchanges and relations in which the standard language or legitimate usage rules over class, regional, and ethnic dialects. Although the State plays a large role in the officialization of one language variety, the imposition of one language over others does not merely occur by State decree. Other social factors and mechanisms must also contribute:

Thus, the effects of domination which are correlated with the unification of the market are always exerted through a whole set of specific institutions and mechanisms, of which specifically linguistic policy of the State and even overt interventions of pressure groups form only the most superficial aspects (Bourdieu 50).

According to Bourdieu, the symbolic form of domination that underlies linguistic unification relies heavily on complicity and 'habitus.' The concept of 'habitus' refers to a series of

predispositions, attitudes, and modes of thinking based on past experience and associated with specific social conditions and relations of power. These predispositions constitute strategies in the mastery of social practice and make possible the achievement of diverse tasks. In other words, given a specific set of social conditions and political constraints, people will internalize and deploy certain habitual responses to certain events, situations, struggles, and challenges of social life (such as which linguistic code to use at any given moment). Thus, the establishment of the official language and the unification of the linguistic market is not just a matter of imposing the will of the State and the ruling elites. Those who appear to submit do play active roles in the process. According to Bourdieu, “all symbolic domination presupposes, on the part of those who submit to it, a form of complicity which is neither passive submission to external constraint nor a free adherence to values” (50-51). Complicitness and predispositions are developed and inculcated while speakers routinely encounter and attempt to solve problems related to the complex process of linguistic acquisition and practice (Bourdieu 51). Bourdieu’s notion of habitus complements Gramsci’s notion of hegemony or the view that the State predicates its very existence not on coercive power but on consensus, education, and the spread of popular beliefs that constitute ‘common sense.’

Both Gramsci and Bourdieu overcame the hurdle of seeing ideology as a product and not as process and of focusing too much on the particular notion of false consciousness. They contributed to an improved understanding of the complexity of ideological phenomena. Gramsci argued that ideology constitutes complex social phenomena and not just a kind of collective subjectivity therefore alerting us to the fact that a dominant ideology reflects not just the rulers’ world view but the specific relations between the dominant and the dominated classes in society as a whole, in which the resulting dominant ideology will contain hybrid elements from the

experiences of both classes. Likewise, Bourdieu expanded the scope of the concept of ideology in order to explore how power legitimates itself in a field of competitive social relations by tacit rather than explicit agreement. But more importantly, both authors gave serious consideration to the ideological functions of language in social life and historical processes in general. Gramsci viewed language as a specific type of consciousness:

At the limit it could be said that every speaking being has a personal language of his own that is his own particular way of thinking and feeling. Culture, at its various levels, unifies in a series of strata, to the extent that they come into contact with each other, a greater or lesser number of individuals who understand each other's mode of expression in differing degrees, etc. It is these historico-social distinctions and differences which are reflected in common language and produce those "obstacles" and "sources of error" which the pragmatists have talked about" (349).

In like manner, Bourdieu asserted:

Utterances are not only (save in exceptional circumstances) signs to be understood and deciphered; they are also signs of wealth, intended to be evaluated and appreciated, and *signs of authority*, intended to be believed and obeyed. Quite apart from the literary (and especially poetic) uses of language, it is rare in everyday life for language to function as a pure instrument of communication (67).

Words and utterances are ideological because they are exchanged in an environment characterized by conflicts related to issues of difference, distinctiveness, material or symbolic resources, obedience, and defiance (i.e., relations of power).

Mikhail Bakhtin (1895-1975) also discussed the complex socio-ideological dimension of language by going beyond traditional strictly formal linguistic concerns. For Bakhtin, the analysis of language in isolation was a problem. Language constitutes not a closed system but a complex system of polyphony and heteroglossia, synchronically and diachronically laden with all kinds of socioideological tensions. In other words, language is not simply an abstract mental structure. Its very nature and forms reflect the diversity and complexity of human activity and all the changes taking place in social life. Thus to investigate language is to explore social and ideological phenomena that involve tensions between the present and the past, different epochs, different social groups, theoretical currents, etcetera. Bakhtin expressed it in the following terms:

Every utterance participates in the “unitary language” (in its centripetal forces and tendencies) and at the same time partakes of social and historical heteroglossia (the centrifugal, stratifying forces). Such is the fleeting language of a day, of an epoch, a social group, a school and so forth. It is possible to give a concrete and detailed analysis of any utterance, once having exposed it as a contradiction-ridden, tension-filled unity of two embattled tendencies in the life of language (The dialogical imagination 273).

Bakhtin was particularly interested in the social character of linguistic activity because it spoke to issues particular to the science of language and to problems embodied in the traditional Marxist approach to the study of ideology. In *Marxism and the philosophy of language*, Bakhtin, under the pen name of Volosinov (1986), approached the linguistic sign as a fundamental and sensitive medium of social intercourse:

Every ideological sign is not only a reflection, a shadow, of reality, but is also a material segment of that reality. Every phenomenon functioning as an ideological sign has some kind of material embodiment, whether in sound, physical mass, color, movements of the

body, or the like. In this sense the reality of the sign is fully objective and lends itself to a unitary, monistic, objective method of study. A sign is a phenomenon of the external world. Both the sign itself and all the effects it produces (all those actions, reactions, and new signs it elicits in the surroundings social milieu) occur in outer experience (11).

The author continues:

All of the properties of the word we have examined—its semiotic purity, its ideological neutrality, its involvement in behavioral communication, its ability to become an inner word and, finally, its obligatory presence, as an accompanying phenomenon, in any conscious act—all these properties make the word the fundamental object of the study of ideologies (15).

The semiotic nature of ideology makes it possible to study these phenomena in relation to language, and, more specifically, in relation to concrete issues and problems engendered by the politics of language.

In sum, Bakhtin, along with Bourdieu, Foucault, and Gramsci, enriched our understanding of the interplay of language, society, politics, and history and laid the groundwork for the use of ideology as a crucial tool in the analysis of this interplay. Gramsci extended and enriched the notion of ideology with his introduction of the concept of hegemony. These authors problematized the classic understanding of ideology as false consciousness and of language as an instrument with which people are forced to believe ideas that are not true or in their best interest. Instead, as a result of their critical approach, we may view ideology as a form of discourse that produces and reproduces a hierarchy of truths, ideas, beliefs, images, and symbols, in order to naturalize, justify, legitimize, maintain, or challenge relations of power. In this new theoretical context, language is seen as inscribed in political and social reality and as an ideological site

where political and social struggles are worked out. Above all, these authors have argued that knowledge and consciousness are mediated by the social position and the social processes in which we are involved, and that language is central to social praxis and therefore to the development of knowledge and consciousness.

2.5 The concept of “language ideologies” in linguistic anthropology

Woolard (1998) identified four major interconnected strands of inquiry within the scholarly field known as “language ideologies,”: i) investigations of the socioculturally motivated beliefs people utilize to rationalize and justify language structure and language (Silverstein 1979, Bauman and Briggs 1990); ii) analyses of the underlying philosophies of language which bind particular speech communities together and shape their linguistic practices (Gumperz and Hymes 1974, Urciuoli 1991 and 1996); iii) research into the actual mechanisms through which ideas about language are produced, valorized, circulated, and exchanged (Irvine 1989); and iv) studies which focus on the status or values ascribed to particular linguistic systems, language varieties, the social identities associated with their users, and the interplay among different language groups (Gal 1987). Gal and Woolard (2001) defined language ideologies as “cultural conceptions of the nature, form and purpose of language, and communicative behavior as an enactment of a collective order” (1). Within Hispanic sociolinguistics, Del Valle (2007), following this line of thought, has provided the following definition:

Las ideologías lingüísticas son sistemas de ideas que articulan nociones generales del lenguaje, las lenguas, el habla y/o la comunicación con formaciones culturales, políticas y/o sociales específicas. Aunque pertenecen al ámbito de las ideas y se pueden concebir

como marcos cognitivos que ligan coherentemente el lenguaje con un orden extralingüístico, naturalizándolo y normalizándolo (van Dijk 1995), también hay que señalar que se producen y reproducen en el ámbito material de las prácticas lingüísticas y metalingüísticas, de entre las cuales presentan para nosotros interés especial las que exhiben un alto grado de institucionalización (“Glotopolítica, ideología y discurso” 19-20).

Linguistic ideology is therefore a concept around which anthropologists (Woolard, Schieffelin, and Kroskrity 1998), sociologists of language (Del Valle, Gabriel-Stheeman 2002 and 2004), and linguistic historians (Joseph and Taylor 1990) have converged.

Linguistic anthropologists embraced the concept of “linguistic ideology” as a result of their participation in debates about the need to incorporate a community’s own theory of speech as part of any serious ethnography. According to Woolard, they reacted to Franz Boaz’s (1858-1942) proposal that language is a cultural system whose primary structure has little to do with secondary rationalizations (“Language ideology as a field of inquiry” 11). In contrast to this point of view, anthropologists¹² advanced the view that “a grasp of language ideology is essential to understanding the evolution of linguistic structure” (Woolard, “Language ideology as a field of inquiry” 11). Woolard explains that ethnographers of speaking (Bauman 1983, Gumperz and Hymes 1972, Ochs and Schieffelin 1981) delved into metalinguistics and folk theories of language in order to determine connections between language beliefs, linguistic practices, and key cultural ideas about identity (“Language ideology as a field of inquiry” 14). These and other similar endeavors led them to focus more explicitly on the concept of linguistic ideology. This type of analysis is made possible by a conceptualization of language that triggers approaches

¹² These include Rosaldo (1982), Rumsey (1990), and Silverstein (1985).

that, as in the case of the authors discussed in the previous section, go beyond its formal material dimension. Combining knowledge of linguistic phenomena with social theories, linguistic anthropologists utilize their traditional skills in examining cultural conceptualizations of language and talk shared by members of a speech community and in relating them to their sociopolitical and economic positions and interests (Kroskrity 3).

There are various aspects of language ideologies that have been identified by its proponents. First of all, according to Kroskrity, language ideologies represent the perception of language and discourse that is constructed in the interest of a specific social group (8). One must be aware of the fact that language users do not always behave disinterestedly. As Irvine (1989) expressed, “talk isn’t cheap.” Signs, words, verbal activity, speech can and do function as commodities and valuable resources in several ways (Irvine, “When talk isn’t cheap.” 274). For example, in her study of Nahuatl language ideologies, Jane Hill (1998) found that talk and expressions about ‘respect’ and ‘honor’ in this speech community are implicitly and explicitly tied to native traditions and legitimate the political interests and social practices of distinct groups—the richer older men, the young men that hold jobs outside the community, and women. The main idea promoted by the group of male elders who defend the nostalgia-respect discourse is that the Nahuatl language (‘mexicano puro’ or Nahuatl without Spanish loanwords) and its most typical monolingual expressions are the most appropriate linguistic forms for certain types of social interaction in their community. At the same time, the group of women, which benefited from social and sociolinguistic change in the community, supports the new linguistic and social forms of interaction. Thus in this linguistic ideological scenario we find an example of a linguistic ideology that is grounded in social structure and relations and is connected to issues of power and inequality in a local system of production. This facet of language ideologies allows

linguistic anthropologists to relate linguistic practice in a given culture with the exercise of power and questions of social inequities.

Second, language ideologies are profitably conceived as multiple because of the multiplicity of meaningful social divisions (class, gender, elites, generations, and so on) within sociocultural groups that have the potential to produce divergent perspectives expressed as indices of group membership (Kroskrity 12). Thus, a characteristic of language ideologies within speech communities is “multisitedness” (Phillips 1998, Silverstein 1998). “Sites may be institutionalized, interactional rituals that are culturally familiar loci for the expression and/or explication of ideologies that indexically ground them in identities and relationships” (Kroskrity 19). Therefore, it is helpful when analyzing language ideologies to explore institutional settings as well as actual contexts where speech and talk about speech take place. For example, Del Valle (2005 and 2006) has paid a great deal of attention to the pronouncements and discourses that come out of the various agencies in charge of Spain’s language policy: the various autonomous governments, multinationals, Spanish Royal Academy, the Cervantes Institute, El PAÍS, among others. These diverse institutions have produced a body of ideas about Spanish and endowed the image of the language with certain new properties. According to their views Spanish is or has become a harmonious place of encounter, a global language, and an economic resource (Del Valle 2005: 12). Del Valle explores precisely where these ideas originate, who expresses them, and under which conditions. In his analysis of the language ideologies surrounding the discussion of ‘Spanglish’ and the linguistic practices of Latinos in the United States, multisitedness becomes apparent. Language ideologies range from what he characterizes as modernist (i.e., traditionalist, nationalist) to high modern (i.e., diasporic, globalist) (“US Latinos, la hispanofonía” 29). Examining the narratives of Latinos themselves, the testimonials of Latino

intellectuals, the analyses of Latino and non-Latino academics, the statements of politicians and advocates of language legislations, and the proposals of Spain's language policy agents, Del Valle found opposing ideas which reflect the diverse interests of these distinct groups ("US Latinos, la hispanofonía" 29). In this assortment of linguistic ideologies, one finds views of Spanglish as a type linguistic practice that is at odds with the image of the United States as a monolingual nation and the image of Spanglish as the artificial creation of disloyal intellectuals. When we approach language ideologies with the understanding that they are multiple, we are in a better position to identify the different sources and sites of contention in a society and among individuals.

Third, members may display varying degrees of awareness of local language ideologies (Kroskrity 18). People develop different degrees of awareness of ideologically grounded discourse depending on the role that they play in a given community and the linguistic level under scrutiny. The following statement of a Dominican woman interviewed by Toribio (2000) in the United States reflects one degree of awareness: "la cultura dominicana incluye mucho el idioma. Yo diría que ser dominicano y hablar [español] es importante, por no decir original. El dominicano que no hable [dominicano] puede sentirse igual de orgulloso, pero le falta algo" ("Nosotros somos dominicanos" 261). In this case the speaker, to some degree, is explicitly aware of the extent to which the Dominican vernacular is a strong indicator of Dominican national identity in the context of the immigrant community. However, as Kroskrity indicates, there are cases in which the ideology must be read from actual usage (18-19). For example, Vann's (1999) study of linguistic ideologies in Barcelona showed that the ideological preference for Catalan varied according to the degree of exposure to Spanish in school. The more Spanish the individual had been taught in school, the less she identified with Catalan identity. Yet, a host

of other factors may influence in ideological awareness of speakers in a given community (Blas Arroyo 375). Awareness is also determined by the language form or discursive phenomena that speakers are most likely to identify. According to Kroskrity, “nouns, our words for things, display an unavoidable referentiality that makes them more available for folk awareness and possible folk theorizing than, say a rule for marking “same subject” as part of verb morphology” (20-21). The challenge for the researcher lies in determining the degree to which ideologies are explicitly or implicitly expressed by speakers or members of a community. While the language ideologies of the State may be very explicit, the ideological arguments that underlie the analyses of linguistic scholars, for example, may be implicit. Therefore, we can expect to find evidence of language ideologies in a wide variety of sources and contexts.

Finally, members’ language ideologies mediate between social structures and forms of talk (Kroskrity 21). Language users articulate their sociocultural experience and linguistic resources by indexically linking their linguistic and discursive forms to features of their sociocultural experience. For a more detailed explanation of this complex aspect of language ideologies we must turn to semiotic theories of communication.

2.5.1 The iconicity of language

Although from quite different perspectives, both literary and linguistic studies identify iconicity as a fundamental principle in the organization of language and text (Johansson 1999, Simone 1995). Literary scholars explore iconicity and its manifestations through the analysis of metaphorical, iconographic, and mimetic devices in the production of texts and a great deal of their emphasis is on icons as aesthetic devices (Muller and Fischer 2003). Within linguistics,

most discussions of iconicity center on relationships between the linguistic sign and its referent. In its most basic formulation, “iconicity” refers to an isomorphic relation between linguistic form (a word, phrase, sentence, or grammatical distinction such as singular versus plural) and the semantic structure of a concept. For example, in the English sentence “Today I saw John” we might claim that there is a formal correspondence between the linear order of the elements and their semantic pattern. Thus, a direct object being closer to the verb (rather than the adverbial “today”), iconically reflects or diagrams a particular experience of the world. According to Haiman (1985), “the most evident and often-noted iconicity of language structure is the linearity of the linguistic sign, which iconically reflects the linearity of time and causation” (20).

Cognitive scientists explore iconic phenomena using different conceptual models and terminology. For example, Hawkins (1997) defines an iconographic reference as “one that constructs an image of the referent which is intended to evoke a strong emotional response to that referent” (“The social dimension” 141). Hawkins is referring to the use of emotionally charged words and imagery typically found in the speech of demagogues. As an example, he offers Hitler’s characterization of the Jews as “blood poisoning” which must be “removed from the national body” (31). Hawkins explains: “the effect of iconographic reference is to establish a powerful conceptual link between the referent and a particular value judgment” (32).

The concept of iconicity has a long tradition strongly associated to the model of semiotic communication developed by American philosopher Charles Sanders Peirce (1839-1914). In Peirce’s view, the icon is a particular sign which exhibits its object by virtue of similarity or physical resemblance:

An icon is a sign which stands for its object because as a thing perceived it excites an idea naturally allied to the idea that object would excite. Most icons, if not all, are

likenesses of their objects. A photograph is an icon, usually conveying a flood of information. A piece of mimicry may be an auditory icon. A diagram is a kind of icon particularly useful, because it suppresses a quantity of details, and so allows the mind more easily to think of their important features [...] Many diagrams resemble their objects not at all in looks; it is only in respect to the relations of their parts that their likeness consists (13).

Icons are related to two other kinds of signs: indexes and symbols. Indexes (such as “this,” “that,” “mine,” “yours,” “here,” “there,” “now,” and “then”) encode relations between objects and contexts. Peirce explained that an index stands for its object by virtue of a real connection that forces the mind to pay attention to that object. For example, a possessive pronoun acts as an index in two different ways: “first it indicates the possessor, and second, it has a modification which syntactically carries the attention to the word denoting the thing possessed” (15). In other words, a possessive pronoun points to an object and also highlights one element (a noun) in a syntactic relationship. The indexical sign and its referent are co-present in the context of the utterance, which is conditioned linguistically by the cognitive existence of a semantico-referential grammar and socioculturally by the local standards of relevance and meaning (Hanks, “Indexicality” 2001). Finally, a symbol is a sign that denotes an object solely by convention. It depends on abstract, semantico-referential values and, unlike icons and indexicals, does not convey meaning by virtue of physical similarities or of spatial and temporal contiguity (Silverstein, “Shifters” 27). Yet, to some degree, even sign-symbols incorporate iconicity¹³ (Peirce 17, Silverstein, “Shifters” 27). These three signs are related to one another and to the

¹³ “Let us take as an example of a symbol the word “loveth.” Associated with this word is an idea, which is the mental icon of a person loving another [...] “Loveth” occurs in a sentence [:] “Ezekiel loveth “Huldah.” Ezekiel and Huldah must contain indices; for without indices it is impossible to designate what one is talking about [...] Now the effect of the word “loveth” is that a pair of objects denoted by the pair of indices, Ezekiel and Huldah, is represented by the icon, or the image we have in our minds of a lover and his beloved” (Peirce 17).

general class of signs and are, therefore, crucial for the study of modes of signifying in general (Peirce 19).

These semiotic concepts are also crucial for researchers who study the social life of language. Within the field of linguistic anthropology, some researchers have further elaborated concepts such as index and icon in order to advance their study of language ideological phenomena (Bucholtz 2001). Silverstein (1976 and 1985) was one of the first scholars to adopt Peirce's explanation of meaning derived by indexical contiguity in order to investigate how language users tend to associate particular linguistic forms with specific kinds of speakers. He observed, for example, that in the native American Muskogean language there was a phonologically variable suffix –s that tended to be preserved only with the inflected verb forms of direct (not quoted) utterances spoken by socially female individuals (“Shifters” 30). Thus, although the referential value of the verb forms that take this suffix is not changed, the use of this index provides relevant information regarding the social category of the speaker. Woolard (2007) explains that “first-order indexicality involves the semiotic act of noticing” and “second-order indexicality brings ideology to bear on the relationship noticed” (“Why dis now?”). First-order indexicality, for example, is at work when everyday language users associate particular linguistic features with specific kinds of speakers and contexts. In these cases, language users pay attention to linguistic patterns in order to determine the meaning or the appropriateness of utterances. Ideology is not necessarily at work in these cases. However, ideology comes into play when language users specifically attribute values to these linguistic indexes in order to determine the speakers' membership status in a given speech community. At the second level, therefore, speakers rationalize, explain, naturalize, and ideologize the sociolinguistic associations (indexical relations) that they noticed at the first order (“Why dis now?”). Linguistic forms and

codes can become indexes that point to social identities and the typical activities of language users. While this is not news to sociolinguists, less is known about the specific processes by which speakers often register, rationalize, and justify such linguistic indexes and the linguistic ideologies that claim to explain the source and meaning of the linguistic differences (Irvine and Gal 37). Woolard affirms that the operation of indexicality is very similar to the semiotic and politically loaded process that we call “iconization” (“Why dis now?”). While analysts do not necessarily abandon the difference between the concepts of index and icon, they prefer to focus on their potential for explaining in concrete terms how cultural conceptions of language, linguistic forms, and communication interact with language structure and language use. In this regard, terminology is secondary. However, the difference in terms such as “iconicity” and “iconization” reflects a difference in focus: the former emphasizes a product while the latter emphasizes a process of mapping out social meaning and its conditions of production.

2.5.2 Linguistic differentiation and language representations

Judith Irvine and Susan Gal (2000) proposed three semiotic and ideological processes in the discursive construction of the social meaning of language and language forms: iconicity, fractal recursivity, and erasure. Firstly, they appropriate iconicity in order to account for processes by which some aspect of or feature in the linguistic repertoire of a given community is perceived as an iconic representation of its members, as if a linguistic feature inherently reflected the nature of a social group:

Iconization 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 a

linguistic feature depicted or displayed a social group's inherent nature or essence. The process entails the attribution of cause and immediate necessity to a connection (between linguistic features and social groups) that may be only historical, contingent, or conventional (37).

The authors offer as an example the iconization of click consonants among speakers of Nguni languages in southern Africa. Clicks were not originally part of the Nguni languages, but were acquired from Khoi languages via a process of lexical borrowing. They were borrowed in order to avoid, in the presence of particular interlocutors, native expressions that were deemed to be disrespectful. Thus usage of Khoi loanwords became iconically associated with respect and deference to people and their social positions. The result was a click-laden respect vocabulary that came out of the semiotic process of iconization (Irvine and Gal 39).

Iconicity works in tandem with fractal recursivity and erasure. Fractal recursivity is defined as "the projection of an opposition, salient at some level of relationship, onto some other level" (Irvine and Gal 38). For example, by means of the conspicuous click consonants viewed as icons of foreignness, speakers mobilized the contrast between Nguni and Khoi consonant repertoires to express social distance and difference within Nguni (Irvine and Gal 46).

Erasure is defined in the following terms:

The process in which ideology, in simplifying the sociolinguistic field, renders some people or activities (or sociolinguistic phenomena) invisible. Facts that are inconsistent with the ideological scheme either go unnoticed or get explained away. So, for example, a social group or language may be imagined as homogeneous, its internal variation disregarded. Because a linguistic ideology is a totalizing vision, elements that do not fit

its interpretive structure—that cannot be seen to fit—must be either ignored or transformed (38).

Irvine and Gal found ample evidence of erasure, iconization, and recursivity in the representations of Senegalese languages by nineteenth century European linguists and ethnographers whose work was heavily influenced by national and racial ideologies (47). These scholars encountered a complex, regional linguistic situation in which linguistic repertoires were inscribed in equally complex religious and political relationships. Assuming that a language ought to correspond to one territory, one nation, and one race, scholars studied which languages were spoken where in order to “disentangle the supposed history of conquests and represent legitimate territorial claims” (Irvine and Gal 53). Irvine and Gal explain how this language mapping project involved the three semiotic processes: i) the language map depicted the relationship ideologically that was supposed to obtain between language, population, and territory (iconization); ii) the map could only be drawn by tidying up the linguistic complexity, that is by removing multilingualism and variation from the picture (erasure); and iii) relationships between Europeans and Africans were the implicit model for a history of relationships within Africa itself (recursivity) (55).

Irvine and Gal’s analysis offers a model for studying the relationship between linguistic ideology and linguistic forms and has implications for a number of fields of inquiry: i) the historical fields of contact among peoples; ii) the interplay of ethnicity and linguistic practices; and iii) conceptions of language itself (72). Their analysis has also shed light on the degree to which ideas that were forged in earlier historical periods remain embedded in our analytical

frameworks¹⁴ and emphasize the importance of closely examining scholars' conceptions of language as they relate to categories of identity (76). It is not only speakers' theories about the nonarbitrariness of the sign that make a difference in the production, interpretation, and reporting of linguistic differentiation, but also the equally ideological descriptions of linguists (78).

By paying attention to semiotic and ideological processes such as iconization and erasure linguistic anthropologists examine the links between linguistic practices and social experience. We also learn how and to what degree ideational matters are inscribed in the lived relations of everyday life and that social life and its materiality are constituted through signifying practices such as linguistic communication. Accordingly, analysts utilize knowledge of these semiotic processes to advance the study of the material, cultural, economic, political, and social foundations and implications of language and discourses on language (Gal 1998, Irvine 1989).

2.6 Language and nationalism

The concept of language ideology has been very influential in studies on language and nationalism (Barbour 2002, Blommaert and Verchueren 1998, Del Valle and Gabriel-Stheeman 2004, Gal 2001, Joseph 2004). For instance, some researchers have focused on the idea, implicit in the majority of nationalist texts, that social differences are not desirable because they undo "natural" groupings and the national homogeneity that is necessary for democracies to exist. These undesirable "social differences" include linguistic differences. Blommaert and Verchueren characterized this language ideology as the dogma of homogeneity:

¹⁴ Consider the Dominican linguist Manuel Núñez's (2001 and 2007) recent claims that the first line of defense in harnessing the Dominican Republic's identity is language.

A view of society in which differences are seen as dangerous and centrifugal and in which the 'best' society is suggested to be one without intergroup differences. In other words, the ideal model of society is monolingual, monoethnic, monoreligious, monoideological Nationalism, interpreted as the struggle to keep a group as "pure" and homogeneous as possible, is considered to be a positive attitude within the dogma of homogeneity (194).

Thus, one primary area for language ideological research is the role that language plays in nation-building. Del Valle (2005) explained the basic conceptual structure of the ideology of linguistic nationalism in the following terms: "la estructura conceptual básica del nacionalismo lingüístico está formada por tres elementos: (a): una identidad grupal, o *cultura* (cívica o étnica) compartida, (b) posibilitada por una *lengua* común, (c) y circunscrita a un *territorio*" ("La lengua, patria común" 18, emphasis in the original).

Joseph Errington (2000) explored linguistic nationalism in his study of the modernization of Indonesian culture and its process of linguistic standardization. 'The New Order' regime in Indonesia selected a standardized dialect (Javanese) as the national language and as the main vehicle of their modernization project in a multilingual and multiethnic territory. Errington followed the ideological links between 'The New Order' nationalist program and the specific institutional proposals regarding the features and use of language and speech genres in the public domain ('exemplarism'). Despite the fact that the standardized dialect lacked many native speakers, it was utilized as a propagator of national ideology and a symbol of 'Indonesian-ness.' These processes within the Indonesian nationalist movement naturalized a whole order of ideas, including the idea that "language indicates nationality" (Errington, "Indonesian('s) authority" 209). According to Errington, in this context, schools became the primary institutional means of disseminating the standard language, the nationalist ideology, and the patterns of behavior that

the State expected of its citizens (“Indonesian(’s) authority” 211). Thus the diffusion and naturalization of linguistic ideas, in the context of national development, also aimed at producing certain effects on the linguistic behavior and other social practices of men and women in this community.

In many Latin American contexts, the nation has also been conceived as a culturally and linguistically homogeneous “organism” and as the most suitable vehicle for the diffusion of knowledge necessary to develop industry, commerce, and prosperity in a society (Arnoux and Luis 2003, Ashley 2002, Centeno Añeses 1999, Colom González 2005, Morris 1996, Roig 2005, Toribio 2000). Arnoux and Luis wrote in regard to nation-building:

Este proceso, que va a cristalizar en el siglo XIX, convoca fenómenos que se despliegan irregularmente, y con sus propias especificidades según los distintos países, y que se inscriben en variadas temporalidades. Pero, en todos los casos, se busca consolidar una lengua de Estado que se afirme en los sujetos desplazando, cuando sea necesario, la política de otras instituciones, fundamentalmente de la iglesia (8).

Especially since the nineteenth century, state functionaries, scholars, cultural elites, and other social agents who participate in national projects, more often than not, propose monolingualism and the Nation-State model as the only solution to most social problems. Although globalization and other transnational processes erode linguistic nationalism, we can still find tendencies to conceptualize language as a distinctive feature of “natural” groups and as the cause of divisions between groups. For example, the U.S. English Foundation insists on the image of the USA as a monolingual nation and the need of “preserving the unifying role of the English language” (Del Valle, “US Latinos, la hispanofonía” 36). This organization is committed to “keeping this nation unified through a common language” (www.usefoundation.org). Their

efforts include spreading the idea that only English can provide the best cultural framework for national unity, economic prosperity, and democracy. In the case of the Dominican Republic, Toribio (2000a) has documented the degree to which an idealized form of the Spanish language still stands as the representation of national identity, even among the Dominican diaspora. According to Toribio: “in this predilection for the northern Iberian variety and emphatic repudiations of the influences of Haitian Creole, Dominicans ignore a central axiom of linguistics—language variation is normal—and affirm their *hispanidad*, an historical obsession ” (“Language variation” 1142). In several statements, Toribio’s Dominican informants confirm the existence of a (dominant) national linguistic ideology. In other words, while there are a number of identity markers for Dominicans, language is given priority, especially in the construction of national identity.

2.7 The politics of language and Hispanic sociolinguistics

Within Hispanic sociolinguistics, language ideological phenomena have been approached, on the one hand, from a critical discourse analysis perspective (Berardi 2005), and on the other, from a historical and glottopolitical¹⁵ perspective (“Gltopolítica Histórica”). Scholars such as Arnoux (2003, 2006) and Del Valle (2002, 2004, 2005, 2007) have produced a body of research exploring the relationship between language and politics, the use of politicized language, and the history of politics and ideas about language in Spain and Latin America. On the one hand, their line of research departs from the same viewpoint that the relationship between language ideologies and language policies is a dialectic one. But while Del Valle is interested in

¹⁵ “Gltopolitical,” which is not used in the anglosaxon tradition (“politics of language”), refers to the concrete impact of language planning and language policies on linguistic behavior within a speech community. See Guespin and Marcellesi (2003) and the Rouen school.

historicizing language ideologies and thus exploring the institutional sites (especially those connected to the State) where they originate and the conditions that produced them, Arnoux primarily approaches them from the perspective of (textualist) discourse analysis. According to Arnoux (2007):

En relación con [intervenciones glotopolíticas] podemos considerar desde los instrumentos lingüísticos—gramáticas, diccionarios, retóricas, manuales de correspondencias, textos escolares, manuales de estilo—, discursos político-pedagógicos, ensayos, hasta todo el amplio espectro de los discursos sociales que permiten reconocer las prácticas lingüísticas: memorias, biografías, artículos periodísticos, entrevistas, textos de ficción, manuales de uso (Discursos sobre nación 11).

In Arnoux's exploration of archive materials or in Del Valle's analyses of recent language policies in Spain, they have found plenty of "ideologems" or ideas, slogans, metaphors that articulate more complex ideological systems. Del Valle (2007), citing Arnoux, provides the following definition: "término introducido por Marc Angenot (1982) para referirse a un tipo de "lugares comunes" que integran los sistemas ideológicos. Son postulados o máximas que funcionan como presupuestos del discurso y que pueden realizarse o no en superficies" (e.g., *español total, lengua policéntrica, patria común, lengua de encuentro o lengua mestiza*) ("Glotopolítica, ideología y discurso" 17). These labels are the product of ideological practices that assign various roles, functions, and values to the Spanish and the panhispanic speech community. In various contexts, the authors of these ideologems produce and reproduce messages which introduce, repeat, and exaggerate certain key phrases (e.g., "concordia," "encuentro," "cohesión") (Del Valle and Gabriel-Stheeman, "Lengua y mercado" 254). Both Del Valle and Arnoux are primarily concerned with the role that discourse on Spanish has played in

the construction of cultural, political, and social hierarchies in Spain and Latin America in different historical moments.

Del Valle, Gabriel-Stheeman and their collaborators (2002 and 2004) examined metalinguistic discourses as sites where the postcolonial relationship between Spain and Latin America was being debated. They centered on discourses on language by Hispanic intellectuals of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries that reveal a willingness and determination to intervene in linguistic matters. More specifically, in concrete statements about Spanish, its domains, speakers, status, and future, these authors uncovered efforts in the part of leading Hispanic-American intellectuals to rationalize, protect, promote, and, especially, control the institutional and symbolic power of Spanish. Such efforts, when analyzed in their proper contexts—that is, in light of the institutional settings from which they emerge and the contexts in which they operate— reveal intricate connections with political phenomena.

For example, Del Valle and Gabriel-Stheeman (2004b and 2004c) and Del Valle (2007) show that, during the last few decades, some Spanish cultural agents, business executives, and political figures, working within specific institutional settings (RAE, Instituto Cervantes, Congreso Internacional de la Lengua Española, Asociación para el Progreso del Español como Recurso Económico) actively engaged in the construction and promotion of a new image of the Spanish language as a sign of pan-Hispanic identity and cultural patrimony as well as the exploitation of its economic profitability. In Del Valle and Gabriel-Stheeman (2004c), the authors highlight the words of one of Spain's language agents—the head of *Asociación para el Progreso del Español como Recurso Económico*—that illustrate the articulation of a specific language ideology with concrete actions designed to impact in this case a specific speech community, Latinos in the United States: “si España se consigue colocar como referente de

identidad o como proveedor de señas de identidad con respecto a la comunidad hispanohablante de Estados Unidos, estaremos en una inmejorable situación para mejorar nuestras posiciones en aquel país” (“Lengua y mercado” 260). From the agents’ point of view, Spain’s socioeconomic positions can improve, with the proper intervention, by transforming Spain into a source of identity for U.S. Hispanics.

Glottopolitical analysis centers on the nature and operation of language and discourse in a context defined in predominantly sociopolitical terms. Arnoux asserts: “que analizar el discurso implica articularlo con lo social, entendido ya sea como situación de enunciación, institución, estructura social, condiciones de producción, esferas de la vida social o simplemente contexto” (Análisis del discurso 13). Similar to the anthropological approaches of Woolard, Gal, and Kroskrity, Arnoux and Del Valle investigate the linguistic ideologies surrounding Spanish and its political dimension, in relation to three central categories: i) its contextuality, or the discourse’s relation to a series of specific individual, cultural, social and political contexts; ii) its naturalizing function, or the normalizing effect on the extra-linguistic order (i.e., the Nation, the pan-Hispanic community); and iii) its institutionality, or its production and reproduction in institutional settings (i.e., language academies, party platforms, radio stations, classrooms, research institutions, etcetera) endowed with power and authority (Del Valle 2007).

Arnoux (2000 and 2007), working within the Discourse Analysis perspective,¹⁶ believes that language ideologies derive from wider ideological systems, but are readily accessible within the glottopolitical arena (Discursos sobre nación 13). She borrows this category from Guespin and Marcellesi (1986), who declared that:

¹⁶ I am particularly referring to the perspective established by the Rouen school in France.

Il désigne les diverses approches qu'une société a de l'action sur le langage, qu'elle en soit ou non conscient [...] *Glottopolitique* est nécessaire pour englober tous les faits de langage où l'action de la société revêt la forme du politique (7).

Considered a branch of applied linguistics that pays particular attention to issues of “language planning,” glottopolitical studies analyze language ideologies in relation to language policies as well as the specific interventions of agents aimed at impacting the public domains of language. These phenomena are then correlated with social positions in an inquiry into their roles in the production, reproduction, and transformation of power structures in local, national, regional, or global contexts. Because of the connection between language ideologies and other aspects of ideological systems Arnoux and Luis (2003) analyze a diverse corpus of materials including linguistic texts. In addition, they can analyze texts and discourses whose main subject is not necessarily language but which provide important clues as to the role of language in sociohistorical formations (e.g., historical texts that narrate the emergence of National States). Thus, from a glottopolitical perspective, analysts such as Arnoux apply the concept of language ideology in order to investigate the politically significant means by which social representations (particularly linguistic ones) are constructed and imposed in different institutional settings. A typical procedure includes examining archive materials from a specific country during a specific historical moment. According to Arnoux (2000):

Podemos incluir la glotopolítica, como campo que estudia las políticas lingüísticas y responde a demandas sociales respecto del planeamiento del lenguaje, dentro de las “disciplinas nuevas” aunque tenga una respetable trayectoria, cuyos antecedentes en el espacio universitario podemos ubicar en la década del 50 del siglo pasado (“La Glotopolítica”).

Arnoux, Luis, et al (2003) analyzed a series of ideas on the Spanish language, reflections on the origin of language, and the role of the intellectual in the production of discourse as products of theoretical and ideological options and strategies that were determined by historical circumstances. Arnoux and Luis, in particular, examined the pervasive influence of enlightenment thought (Jovellanos, Salvá, and Bello, among others) with its emphasis on rationality, order, and progress on the construction of the nation. The Spanish thinker and politician Gaspar Melchor de Jovellanos (1744-1811), for example, was a key figure in the adaptation of new historical currents and valued national traditions in Spain. He viewed language as an important site in the construction of the Spanish State, which, in his view, needed economic development, cultural homogenization, language standardization, the expansion of the education system, and greater communication with other European nations. This last particular feat required that citizens spoke foreign languages. As a result of this view, Jovellanos launched several education initiatives designed to increase knowledge of the national language, as well as French and English. He also produced grammatical texts that articulated theoretical positions within the Royal Spanish Academy with Enlightenment thought as found in the work of the French philosopher Étienne Condillac (1715-1780) (Arnoux, “El análisis del discurso en el pensamiento gramatical ilustrado” 67). Arnoux examined Jovellanos’s reformulation of Condillac and, particularly, the series of displacements, substitutions, omissions, and reordering of Condillac’s arguments. Jovellanos had to reformulate Condillac’s discourse because he was addressing it to a different audience, but also because of major theoretical and ideological differences between the two authors. According to Arnoux, Jovellanos sought educational and linguistic solutions to matters of State. Some of these solutions were modeled on Condillac, but others were adjusted and transformed in order to conform to monarchic rule and the

ecclesiastical apparatus that were trying to protect their interests in a changing world. Through Arnoux's ideological-discursive analysis we are able to appreciate how Jovellanos intervenes in glottopolitical matters of his time from a powerful yet vulnerable political position.

Thus, by closely examining these authors' discourses on language in relation to the sociopolitical circumstances that motivated and conditioned them, Arnoux and Luis (2003) were able to demonstrate the degree to which specific ideas about language were deployed for political purposes. While not necessarily identifying themselves as language ideological researchers, these authors apply the concept of language ideology in order to situate representations of language within specific political contexts and thus gain a better understanding of their historical significance.

2.8 Linguistic historiography

The analysis that I develop in this dissertation is situated between language ideological research and linguistic historiography. According to Koerner (1995), the three basic objectives of linguistic historiography are: i) the establishment of the "climate of opinion" in which the given linguistic theories of a period were advanced (to which he refers as the principle of contextualization); ii) the development of a historical and critical understanding of the linguistic texts in question (principle of immanence); and iii) an a final approximation with current conceptual frameworks and technical vocabulary (principle of adequation) (Professing linguistic historiography 17-18). First, building on Becker's (1932) original conceptualization, Koerner adopts the notion of "the climate of opinion" in order to analyze the intellectual environment in which certain linguistic ideas develop:

Linguistic ideas have never developed quite independently of other intellectual currents of the time; the *Zeitgeist* has always left its imprint on linguistic thinking. At times, the influence of the socio-economic and even political situation must be taken into account as well. For instance, the historiography of linguistics should be aware that the ‘natural order’ discussion in 18th-century France, intended to demonstrate French superiority, and not only linguistic superiority, took place in a political climate of autocratic rule and supremacy aspirations of France (Professing linguistic historiography 17).

Secondly, Koerner insists that the researcher must fully understand the ideas in question within the general theoretical framework in which they were originally embedded. Moreover, the specific terminology used in the texts must be analyzed internally. Finally and only after the first two principles have been satisfied, the researcher can attempt to approach the ideas and the texts in terms of the issues and problems that are relevant to us today. In other words, the present must find the most adequate means of entering into dialogue with the original historical context.

Throughout this endeavor, Koerner emphasizes the need to develop an appropriate framework, methodology, and epistemology:

It is important to realize [...] that because of the particular nature of the subject of investigation, namely, theories of language (as well as theories of linguistics) and their application as well as their evolution through time, historians of linguistics must find their own framework, their methodology and epistemology, and cannot expect to be able to apply methods and insights from other fields directly to their own subject of investigation (Professing linguistic historiography 4).

Although highly focused on practical and methodological considerations in establishing a historiography of linguistics, Koerner believes that the application of these principles can help

researchers in achieving an adequate understanding of the history of linguistic ideas and the establishment of linguistic myths within the field of language studies (Professing linguistic historiography 21).

Laurendeau (1990) also elaborated on the notion of climate of opinion, which he described in terms of a “theory of emergence.” Like Koerner, he wants to establish a methodology that can be applied to the study of linguistic ideas in their historical context (208). He contends that historians of linguistics typically describe the origin and developments of ideas as the result of the institutional clout of certain strong personalities. He finds one example of this approach in Chevalier and Encrevé’s (1984) description of interpretations of Saussure’s formalism and Meillet’s role in this context: “Meillet dominated linguistics in French universities until his death in 1936’s. Guillaume’s fate is an example of that domination. Nobody would have thought of appointing another linguist without Meillet’s approval. Once Meillet had spoken, everyone followed” (210). In contrast to this traditional approach to the history of linguistics, Laurendeau proposes a historicization of linguistics:

This *historicization* of linguistics, a subdivision of the *science of history*, is limited to the knowledge of the relations between the ideological and/or scientific reality of linguistics *and* the objective reality of *history*. This includes many things. Because knowledge is something more sophisticated than a simple tool (211).

Laurendeau argues that linguistics emerges and exists as the result of the tense interaction between practical knowledge about an empirical reality and the ideological conditions surrounding it:

This implies certain theoretical positions about history. Historical materialism provides the general framework for the *theory of emergence*. This theory sees in every school of

linguistics an indirect and relatively autonomous product of concrete socio-historical contexts, and tries to describe the *emergence* of a linguistic school, proceeding backwards from its established results towards the complex mix of its theoretical *and* material sources (212).

In the study of the emergence of schools of linguistics, the researcher's tasks include: i) identifying the sources of tension between science and ideology; and ii) recognizing how the tension manifests itself in texts that are products of socio-historical conditions. Laurendeau refers to these processes as "critique" and "hermeneutics," respectively:

We mean by *critique* a 'first-degree' reading that postulates the tension between science and ideology in every intellectual product, and that looks less for what-is-true-and-what-is-false than for the manifestations of the *struggle* between positions. Conversely, we mean by *hermeneutic* a 'second-degree' reading that does not look for *data* or *symbols*... but for clues of a socio-historical reality in the text. *The passage from a (dialectical) critique to a (materialistic) hermeneutic is the global method proposed by the theory of emergence* (215, emphasis in the original).

Laurendeau explains that a critique centers on the contents of the linguistic texts as a source of information, while a hermeneutical approach considers the texts as "a system of more or less intentional codings" to be analyzed with reference to specific cultural representations (215). In short, this linguistic historiographic approach seeks to understand linguistic ideas in relation to a specific intellectual context and the socio-historical ground in which they emerge.

2.9 The history of linguistic ideas

Since its inception as a legitimate scholarly field, linguists have sought to identify their practice as a science that explains language according to exclusively empirical criteria (i.e., scientific evidence, purely objective quantifiable facts, etcetera). The epistemological and ideological foundation of modern linguistics rest on the following statement by Saussure: “the true and unique object of linguistics is language studied in and for itself” (232). Accordingly, language is defined as an autonomous system of signs that express ideas and which should be studied separately from speaking as well as social and political phenomena (Saussure 15-16). As Harris (2001) points out, although this synchronic definition of language and linguistics liberated linguists from unnecessary theoretical, pedagogical, and normative commitments, it also meant that “students could become fully qualified academic linguists without bothering at all about the history of the language they were studying, even where historical materials were available” (193).¹⁷ As a result of this particular definition of the object, certain topics such as the relationship between language and nationality, language as a key historical site, language use as an instrument of exclusion, and language as a class, race, and gender-related phenomenon have been relegated to the margins.

Thus, whether he intended it or not, our intellectual debt to Saussure includes his delimitation of ‘langue’ and his apparent rejection of history—in the sense of the products of human affairs and material labor—as an obstacle to the scientific study of language. Crowley (1996), examining the arguments for and against approaches to language in history (i.e., the

¹⁷ It also meant the displacement from the academic space of those who were not adhering to the synchronic study of language, which was regarded by some interpreters of Saussure as the most legitimate, “even though it was actually directly contrary to the holistic letter and spirit of Saussurean synchrony” (Harris 193). In order to study the interrelated phenomena of language ideologies, we must abandon the traditional definitions ascribed to Saussure and the debates surrounding these complex issues as they are beyond the scope of this dissertation.

theories of Saussure and Bakhtin), argues against this view. He explains that, contrary to common belief, Saussure did not entirely fail to address historical questions but simply relegated ‘important matters’ of language and race, nation and political history to the realm of ‘external linguistics,’ while prioritizing the system of language as the focus of ‘General Linguistics,’ (23). According to Crowley, “there is no absolute rejection of history then, but a new positioning of the historical viewpoint in the field of linguistic study. There is evidence that it is a viewpoint which Saussure might have favored once the arduous task of clearing the ground for the science of language had been completed” (27). This evidence includes the following statement by Saussure in a letter to Meillet: “in the last analysis, only the picturesque side of language still holds my interest, what makes it different from all others, insofar as it belongs to a particular origin, the almost ethnographic side of language” (cited in Crowley 27).

Nevertheless, the underlying assumption for most modern linguists was that their research—as well as the linguistic phenomena they study—was immune to the sociopolitical world and cultural facts. Koerner (2001) affirms: “at least since the establishment of the so-called ‘Boppian paradigm’ of comparative-historical linguistics, historians of the field have succeeded in presenting us with the image of the field as objective, value-free, in one word ‘scientific’” (“Ideology in the 19th and 20th century linguistics” 255). In the pursuit of their task, linguists often forget, ignore, or even deny the degree to which their own cultural precepts, professional demands, and personal prejudices leak into their scientific investigations (Joseph and Taylor 1990, Newmeyer 1986). Therefore, within the field of language ideologies, a strain has emerged that focuses on two things: a) the circumstances in which historical matters are ignored in linguistic description; and b) the ideological pressures that permeate the study and descriptions of language at different periods; in other words, on the production and reproduction

of language ideologies that in specific institutional domains such as the well-established disciplines of linguistics and philology.

The studies included in Joseph and Taylor's *Ideologies of Language* (1990) offer excellent examples of this strain as they focused on the scientific ideologies of professional linguists. Taking note of ideas coming from history, politics, and race, they demonstrate the degree to which many different belief systems penetrate linguists' judgments about what constitutes a language, language change, grammar, language contact, language mixing, codeswitching, creolization, and language decay. For example, Paul Roberge (1990) explored Afrikaans linguistic scholarship in light of the subjects of race, racism, and politics in South Africa. He examined the intellectual roots of the prevailing purist and albocentric ideology in Afrikaans historical linguistics and found connections to the comparative paradigm that dominated Europe during the nineteenth and the early twentieth centuries. More concretely, he identified the ideological underpinnings of the fundamental descriptions of white Afrikaans-speaking linguists concerning the history of their language. A body of evidence shows that Afrikaans comprises a semicreolized variety of Dutch that emerged from contact between Europeans, the aboriginal Khoikhoi, and slaves of African and Asian origins. Nevertheless, certain white South African linguists have nullified such evidence. Roberge identified the historical determinants and the mechanisms by which Afrikaans language historians have proposed certain features of the language as symbols of racial purity. Afrikaans linguistics emerged in the struggle of white Afrikaners to maintain racial separation from black South Africans as well as linguistic separation from English. Furthermore, the National (political) party gave further impetus to the crystallization of these purist linguistic ideas by incorporating them as symbols and goals in their quest for political dominance (Roberge 131-132). Thus, the author

explains that Afrikaans scholars wrote the history of the language and perpetuated their scholarship as value-neutral at a time when miscegenation, Creoles, and mixed languages were taboo subjects in South Africa (133). In addition, Roberge demonstrated how the history of the Afrikaans language was written and rewritten to align with South African racial and nationalistic ideologies.

Another example of language ideological phenomena from the perspective of the history of linguistic ideas can be found in Del Valle's "Menéndez Pidal, national regeneration, and linguistic utopia" (2002). In this case, the author argues that Menéndez Pidal's philological and linguistic production can be read as a response to Spain's intellectual and cultural crisis, which reached its peak in 1898 when the last of the Spanish colonies in Latin America were lost. Menéndez Pidal believed that once a modern Hispanic community had been built Spain would regain its position of leadership. Del Valle observes that Menéndez Pidal's classic text *Manual de gramática histórica española* (1941) is consistent with neogrammarian doctrine in organization, methodology, and its conception of language change, a fact which attest to the scientific rigor of Menéndez Pidal's research activity. Yet in his linguistic theorization, language is equated with culture and nation and Castile's elite plays the key role. Menéndez Pidal (1950) wrote: "el dialecto castellano representa en todas esas características una nota diferencial frente a los demás dialectos de España, como una fuerza rebelde y discordante que surge en La Cantabria y regiones circunvecinas" (Orígenes 486). The military metaphor "fuerza rebelde" is interesting because, as Koerner (2002) remarks, military analogies are a common characteristic of ideologies ("Ideology, 'Resonanzbedarf,' and linguistic philological scholarship" 57). Del Valle (2002) concludes that for Menéndez Pidal: "the inherently superior qualities of the Castilian dialect explained its projection not only in time but also in space" ("Menéndez Pidal, national

regeneration” 99). According to Del Valle, Menéndez Pidal was indeed committed to an accurate description of the Spanish language and its history, but he did so in the broader context of his commitment to the construction of Spanish as “a spectacular icon: glorious symbol for the nation’s past and a sophisticated vehicle for its race towards a brilliant future” (“Menéndez Pidal, national regeneration” 100). Del Valle reaches this conclusion after a thorough and close reading of Menéndez Pidal’s popular texts and his historical-linguistic texts in the context of Spain’s political and intellectual crisis at the turn of the century. Once properly contextualized, these texts reveal the degree to which political ideas seep into the philologist’s conception of the state, past, and future of Spanish and the collective identities of Hispanophones. Thus, Del Valle was able to show the degree to which Menéndez Pidal’s linguistic descriptions were not value-free and how they emerged under specific cultural and political circumstances.

The relevance of these studies for our present purposes is that they constitute a scholarly tradition in which through historical contextualization of particular linguistic ideas we can identify the underlying ideologies of linguistics.¹⁸ In the process, we end up raising fundamental questions of power and authority in which language plays a central role and are able to explore a range of phenomena, including how certain linguistic ideas emerge in service of the linguistic self-image of certain groups of speakers.

¹⁸ Identifying their ideological roots does not necessarily challenge their scientific status. While a particular description may comply with the scientific protocols dominant at a given time and produce an accurate representation of a segment of reality, it may have origins and implications beyond the realm of what is strictly scientific.

2.10 Summary

Linguistic research grounded in the notion of language ideologies raises a number of questions relevant to the present study: What does the political dimension of language consist of? What roles does language play in politics and nation-building? How do languages and speakers of specific languages derive their symbolic power? How is language deployed in historical processes in general? Which variety best represents the language? Why? Who gets to decide? How do linguists approach historical and social variation? Under what circumstances would historical and social variation not be taken into account in linguistic description?

In addition, language ideologies research represents a theoretical and methodological position appropriate for the analysis at hand: first, it permits us to relate the linguistic practices of members of a speech community, their beliefs about language, and the descriptions of such practices and beliefs by experts to various social positions and interests; second, it invites an integrated study of linguistic and social phenomena usually taken up by different disciplines (Gal 318); finally, it gives us a gamut of theoretical-methodological resources (from sociolinguistics and linguistic historiography) that in this present project will enhance the analysis of Henríquez Ureña's linguistic work and his representations of Dominican national identity.

While language ideologies might be defined as conscious fabrications and distortions of a given linguistic reality by interested parties, most uses of this theoretical category have assumed a broader definition. The critical approaches to culture on which language ideological researchers have based their work (Bakhtin, Bourdieu, Foucault, and Gramsci) do not simply confront ideologies with objective reality. They locate ideologies in practices (discursive, institutional, social, and ritualistic) that tend to normalize and naturalize many aspects of social life, including linguistic behavior.

Building on these methodological principles established by Koerner and Laurendeau as well as the theoretical landscape described above, I propose a language ideological analysis and historiography of Henríquez Ureña's linguistic work. In order to understand his linguistic ideas and claims we have to explore the events, struggles, debates surrounding the language and culture he sought to represent. In trying to contextualize Henríquez Ureña's linguistic work, it is necessary to examine the interrelation of language and race, nation, political history, institutions, and literature in the Dominican Republic as well as in the broader Latin American context. In his work, we expect to find, among other things, the emergence of what Gramsci calls "the historical personality," or an active relationship between the intellectual and the sociocultural environment he or she is purporting to describe and modify (350). Hence it is necessary to study these intellectuals as speaking subjects themselves whose professional practice includes articulating the political functioning of their respective societies with certain forms of empirical knowledge and the construction of identities and collective consciousness in which language plays a crucial role.

III. The Cultural and Political Context: Nationalism, and *Hispanoamericanismo* in the Dominican Republic

This chapter explores the specific cultural and political circumstances surrounding Henríquez Ureña's contribution to the discursive elaboration of Dominican and Latin American identities. On the one hand, Henríquez Ureña's linguistic texts, especially those in which he affirmed the independent development of American Spanish cannot be fully understood without reference to the questions of Latin American identity that have preoccupied intellectuals from this continent. On the other hand, his insistence in embedding the Dominican variety of Spanish within the northern Peninsular dialect continuum acquires its fullest meaning if read against the backdrop of Dominican nation-building. In line with the theoretical framework laid out in the previous chapter, this type of historical contextualization is crucial for a proper understanding of the cultural and historical specificity of Henríquez Ureña's representations of language.

Although Spain's imperial adventures continued until well into the twentieth century in Africa with disastrous consequences, the onset of the nineteenth century marks the beginning of the end of Spanish colonialism and the emergence of Latin American independent states. Independence movements were hardly homogeneous, but they did share certain characteristics: calls for administrative reform, dissatisfaction with the distribution of wealth and power, and caste wars (Halperin Donghi 1998). These and other sociopolitical conditions led to numerous rebellions, the rejection of the principle of monarchy (royal and Catholic), the official adoption of various forms of liberal republicanism, and the emergence of independent states (Williamson 233). The second half of the nineteenth century saw the formation of modern Latin America export economies. The prolonged phase of neocolonialism encompasses the "national period" and post-independence Latin America. No longer controlled by the Spaniards and Portuguese,

the ensemble of productive resources was geared for external markets. Historians refer to this phase as ‘neocolonial’ because the ownership and control of the basic resources for exports were in the hands of foreign business interests (British and German) (Halperin Donghi, Historia contemporánea 276). Nevertheless, this economic trend was responsible for the industrialization and modernization of Latin America and the changing appearances of its major cities (Buenos Aires, Rio de Janeiro, São Paulo, Lima, Mexico City, and Caracas) where the educated classes were advancing new political ideas and absorbing secular and materialistic culture (Ángel Rama 1984, Halperin Donghi 2005, Williamson 1992). Thus, this neocolonial phase is one initial framework from which to approach certain aspects of the intellectual production and consciousness and debates on identity in Latin America (Fernández Retamar 1998). About 1880, while the rest of Latin America was undergoing the agitated phase of economic growth and crisis that consolidated the neocolonial order, the Dominican Republic remained economically stagnant, desperately clutching its colonial past. Meanwhile, in Cuba, still a Spanish colony, slavery had not been abolished but the struggle for independence had begun (just as it had in Puerto Rico). In the newly formed Dominican State, the ruling class struggled to institutionalize and maintain political independence.

3.1 Intellectuals and the State in Latin America

According to Julio Ramos (1989), in Latin America, the institutionalization of rational discourse through literature, art, and education was at odds with the practices of subaltern ethnic groups and traditional cultures.¹⁹ In some cases, the State sought to vanquish these groups from

¹⁹ This pattern of conflict can be found, for example, in the Dominican constitution: “el Estado combatirá los vicios sociales con medidas adecuadas y con el auxilio de las convenciones y organizaciones internacionales. Para la erradicación de tales vicios, se crearán centros y organismos especializados. Atendiendo a que las prerrogativas

the national landscape as they did not seem fit for modern society (56-57).²⁰ Some analysts, on the other hand, suggest that the construction of the nation took place at many levels (Martínez-Vergne 2005, Castro-Klaren and Chasteen 2003). Nonetheless, there is, in the foundation of Latin American republics, a discourse comprised of texts aimed at constructing modern subjectivity or creating the legality of the State and authority over its citizens (González Stephan 1995). One of the most appealing features of this modernization project, says González Stephan, “descansaba en la eficacia de la racionalidad, que implicaba una estrategia de uniformización o ‘mismificación’ a todo nivel en aras del mayor beneficio del Estado nacional” (28).

Enlightenment intellectuals or “letrados,” such as Andrés Bello²¹ (1781-1865) and Eugenio María de Hostos (1839-1903), played key roles in the realization of these State-formation and nation-building projects by disseminating positivist ideas and rationalizing and reordering the public sphere and public life (i.e., government, legislature, school system, and other public institutions) (Ramos 56).

According to Michel Baud (2005), the leading social and educated classes in Latin America attempted to build nations in the name of “progress.” This particular concept of progress was synonymous with the desire for rapid modernization and an obsesión with Western modernity (“Intelectuales, nación y modernidad” 933). Because the growth of the State, the economy, and the nation depended on it, education was immediately relevant to the operations of the State. Thus, intellectuals began to reflect on the role of the State in the modernization of society and their particular roles in contributing to this process. While they had hoped to function

reconocidas y garantizadas en el artículo precedente de esta Constitución suponen la existencia de un orden correlativo de responsabilidad jurídica y moral que obliga la conducta del hombre en sociedad, se declaran como deberes fundamentales los siguientes...” (Constitución de la República Dominicana 12).

²⁰ Of course, there was resistance to this form of organization and development, as Ramos observed in the work of Martí (234-237).

²¹ Andrés Bello, philologist, poet and law-maker, is a seminal figure whose work constitutes an important part of Latin American culture and history. See chapter four.

independently of politics, intellectuals were cognizant of the fact that they could not have any influence outside the realm of the State (Miller 1999). According to Gutiérrez Girardot (2001):

La interpretación didáctico-política de la historia es una necesidad del intelectual de lengua española, pues su relación con la realidad social es una relación existencial en el sentido de que sin la función didáctica carece de fundamento social para su configuración (El intelectual y la historia 30).

Therefore, intellectuals wavered between the need to preserve their intellectual and political independence and the need to be part of the State apparatus. In the nation-building project, they assumed various tasks, including the creation of a reading public, preparing a citizen body, and the formation of a national identity and national discourse:

Al pensador le toca el deber de presentar las pruebas de sus afirmaciones; y si afirma que esta sociedad en formación cuyos materiales de construcción no están siquiera preparados, puede llegar a ser digna de la Historia, no será por ceguedad de sentimiento, ni tampoco por credulidades de ilusión; será por el dominio racional de datos efectivos (Hostos, Páginas Dominicanas 40).

Consequently, intellectuals perceived themselves as essential to the development of basic functioning of the State as well as the organization of social life within the nation.

The discursive practice of writing was crucial to shaping, organizing, and expressing the collective aspirations and organization of society (Ángel Rama 1984, Julio Ramos 1989). As Sarmiento (1811-1888) ironically wrote, solving the state problem of organizing a society was only feasible through historical, sociological, geographical, philosophical, and juridical studies, the kind of work that was beyond the comprehension of dictators like Rosas (1837-1852) (198).

During the foundational period, writing was adopted as the adequate medium for bringing under control the disruptive (“barbarous”) elements of society and creating dispositions that were much more suitable for life in the newly independent states. There was already a precedent for this type of juridical, administrative, and discursive practices: the class of educated men (“letrados”) that for three hundred years had documented legal decisions, drafted government edicts, maintained Church records, and authored literature throughout Latin America (Ángel Rama 32). In the nineteenth century, the *letrados* and agents of the state produced laws, norms, books, manuals, catechisms, and similar discursive devices which would achieve the ultimate sociopolitical objectives by acting as a force of cohesion on the citizen body (González Stephan 22). In Henríquez Ureña’s words: “nuestra legislación tropezó repetidamente con los hechos sociales en nuestras sociedades anárquicas, pero a pesar de todos escepticismos tuvo un papel profético y fue gradualmente configurando la difícil masa de la realidad” (La corrientes 117). Consolidating the power of the State required the proliferation of institutions (i.e., workshops, schools, correction centers, orphanages, prisons, insane asylums) and discursive practices (i.e., constitutions, registers, censuses, maps, grammars, dictionaries, etiquette manuals). One of the main functions of constitutions and grammars, in particular, was the creation of the citizen body and the national identity—in the sense of a field of culturally and linguistically homogeneous groups of people best suited for a viable government. In its most basic formulation, governability was equated with homogeneity. For example, Hostos wrote:

El grupo que constituyen [las tres grandes Antillas] es tan homogéneo, que para ser en la historia los que son en la Geografía, les bastará organizarse según Naturaleza, obedecer la Naturaleza, constituir políticamente la clara nacionalidad que intrínsecamente constituyen (Páginas Dominicanas 88).

Therefore, during the foundational period, Latin American intellectuals articulated their functions and relationship to the State through specific discursive practices designed to sustain and justify their own existence (Rama 43). Although they could not easily eliminate the tension created by their vulnerable positions in society and in relation to the market, these writers accepted their place and function (as the voice of reason) in the emerging states (Ramos 204).

Henríquez Ureña observed:

En los países ya independientes, la literatura, en todas sus formas, conservó todas las funciones públicas que había cobrado con el movimiento de liberación. En medio de la anarquía, los hombres de letras estuvieron todos del lado de la justicia social, o al menos del lado de la organización política contra las fuerzas del desorden (Las corrientes 118).

In the case of post-independence Dominican intellectuals, as Martínez-Vergne (2005) points out: “they continued to rely on government appointments and do so even today, not only because their livelihood was “precarious” but also because the State was, after all, the medium through which some of their ideas could become a reality” (3). In addition, Martínez-Vergne declares:

Intuitively, maybe, Dominican intellectuals perceived the state as a political actor with whom they shared goals, and they promptly surmised the inchoate bourgeoisie had little to offer by way of ideas or economic support. They might have been correct in their assessment but ignored the dangers of becoming the co-opted supporters or ritual opponents of a strong state. Thus, the notion of an independent thinker, an impartial social critic by virtue of his isolation—Gramsci’s “traditional” intellectual—was a fiction. As if having no social base were not bad enough, Dominican intellectuals could easily become “the accomplices of the ruling group in the battle of hegemony (6).

In the Dominican Republic as well as in Latin America, we find a number of thinkers, educators, and writers who provided not only intellectual leadership but also developed the ideology that was necessary in the expansion of the State and the construction of the citizen body. In most cases, the ideology functioned as a discourse that attempted to naturalize specific types of social formations. The explanation of sociocultural phenomena is full of references to nature, as we noticed in Hostos's statement: "les bastará organizase según Naturaleza, obedecer la Naturaleza." In all, these writers did not see their practice so much as an intellectual occupation or even a form of livelihood as much as a career in nation-building; in Henríquez Ureña's words, "carrera de constructor de la nación".²²

3.2 Hostos, Positivism, and the discourse of 'Progress' in Santo Domingo

Hostos was extremely influential in the intellectual landscape and cultural scene of the Dominican Republic and he exerted an enormous influence over the Henríquez Ureña clan (1875, 1879-1888, 1899-1903). Although preoccupied with all the major problems that were affecting the Hispanic world, the most difficult and intense phase of Hostos's intellectual work was carried out in the Dominican Republic (Henríquez Ureña, "La sociología de Hostos, 33). He first arrived in 1875. That same year he founded several magazines ("Las Dos Antillas," "Las Tres Antillas," and "Los Antillanos"), where he proclaimed and discussed his ideas on Antillean independence and confederation, and analyzed Dominican socioeconomic and political events. With the support of General Gregorio Luperón²³ and the *Partido Azul*, Hostos established the "Escuela Normal de Santo Domingo" (1880) the birthplace of the so-called "Normalistas,"

²² See Henríquez Ureña's comments on Sarmiento (*Las corrientes* 137).

²³ Luperón (1839-1937) was one of the main leaders of the restoration movement and head of the liberal party.

considered a new class of Dominican intellectuals. This class was considered “new” because its members publicly sought to distinguish themselves from the previous generation such as Bonó and Billini, who opposed Hostos or were indifferent to him (Henríquez Ureña, “La sociología,” 34). This institute became Hostos’s laboratory for educational reforms and a platform for his political causes. In *La Normal* he trained a generation of Dominican men and women based on the most modern pedagogical methods available. During his second stay in the Dominican Republic (1879-1888), Francisco Henríquez y Carvajal and his brother Federico particularly helped Hostos. The liberal political climate made it possible for Hostos to reform Dominican schools and spread positivist ideas, but it also led to greater opposition from the conservative sectors of Dominican society that rejected Positivism and its ideology of Progress.

Positivism is the key to much of the social and political as well as intellectual history of Latin America in the second half of the nineteenth century. “Positivism” is the philosophical position that maintains that the only genuine knowledge is what can be obtained using the methods of science. It constitutes a broad segment of Latin American thought that is organically tied to the structures of power of the enlightened elites and, since the mid nineteenth century, has become the theoretical base for the development and modernization of society (Mateo 2001, Zea 1943). Positivism, first elaborated by Auguste Comte (1798-1857) and later developed by John Stuart Mill (1806-1873) and Herbert Spencer (1820-1903), was hailed by Latin-American intellectuals as the doctrine of progress that would overcome the deficiencies of Spanish imperialism and the tyranny of catholic theology. As interpreted by Spanish *krausistas*,²⁴

Hostos’s teachers, positivism opposed: evolution to creation, reason to revelation, experiment to

²⁴ *Krausismo* a philosophy based on the ideas of the German thinker Karl Christian Friedrich Krause (1781-1832), but developed in Spain mainly by Julián Sanz del Río (1814-1869) and Francisco Giner de los Ríos (1839-1915). Mixed with elements of Positivism, Spanish *krausismo* proposed that humans were a reflection of natural and spiritual harmony that must be realized in their free and rational will (Portolés 32). Hostos was a student of Sanz del Río in Spain.

dogma and rational discourse to traditional rhetoric (Hoetink 1982). Ever evolving, Positivism reflected an assortment of ideological manifestations throughout Latin America. However, it continued to be based on two basic principles: i) positive principles, which could be scientifically investigated, underlie social structures; and ii) human history was evolving towards a rational humanism, a process that, though inevitable, could be aided by education. Closer to Comte, Hostos's brand can be summarized through six fundamental sociological principles—Sociability, Work, Liberty, Progress, Self-Preservation and Civilization or The Law of the Ideal—which produce “the true social order” (Henríquez Ureña, “La sociología de Hostos” 45). Hostos understood society as a living organism made up of six organic parts: “The Individual,” “The Family,” “The Community,” “Religion,” “The Nation,” and “Humanity.” He affirmed: “la sociedad es una ley a la que el hombre nace sometido por la naturaleza, a cuyos preceptos está obligado a vivir sometido, en tal modo que, mejorando a cada paso su existencia, contribuye a desarrollar y mejorar la de la sociedad” (cited in Henríquez Ureña, “La sociología de Hostos” 45). As Henríquez Ureña (1905) suggests, Hostos promoted the view of science as a revolutionary and radical vehicle for organized action and for the improvement of society (“La sociología de Hostos” 45).

As the only independent State in the Hispanic Caribbean, Hostos enthusiastically viewed the Dominican Republic as the ideal place for him to experiment with liberal ideas, which he hoped to later try to implement in Puerto Rico and Cuba while promoting his vision of a free and unified Caribbean (Piña-Contreras 323). According to Henríquez Ureña, “[Hostos] se establece en la única Antilla libre, en Santo Domingo, y allí se dedica a formar antillanos para la confederación, la futura patria común, la que debiera construirse ‘con los fragmentos de patria que tenemos los hijos de estos suelos’” (“La sociología de Hostos” 53). Hostos dreamed of

turning the Dominican Republic into a model nation that would ignite nationalism all over the Caribbean.

Before Hostos's arrival in 1875, the country lacked anything akin to a humanistic tradition. While teaching and writing in Santo Domingo, Hostos amassed a corpus of texts through which he introduced rational discourse in the country.²⁵ With the support of *Partido Azul* liberals including General Gregorio Luperón, and members of *La Sociedad de Amigos*, such as Henríquez Ureña's parents, Hostos promoted rational thinking in the Dominican Republic as a school of thought and a form of social organization. In particular, positivist ideas became the artillery used in the fight against the influence of the Dominican clergy in society. Hostos's positivist project became indissolubly bound to the *Partido Azul*'s democratic and nationalistic project. Led by members of the Henríquez Ureña family, the new, young class of Dominican intellectuals converged around both projects in *La Sociedad*, and sought to create a system of education (“¡Escuela sin Dios!”) that would contribute, above all, to the development of reasoning among Dominicans and a rational Dominican society.

In 1880, Francisco Henríquez y Carvajal became the Secretary of President Monseñor Fernando Arturo de Meriño (1880-1882)²⁶ of the ruling *Partido Azul*. While promoting the “new science,” Henríquez Ureña's father, Francisco Henríquez Carvajal became a leader in the Dominican cultural revolution and, amidst the enthusiasm for the acceptance and expansion of positivist ideas, married Salomé Ureña, who also had a leading role in the ideological debates. Salomé ceased writing poetry and dedicated herself exclusively to disseminating Positivism and the education of women and her own children. This group of intellectuals collaborated with

²⁵ These texts, as Rosa (2003) points out, are quite problematic to read because of Hostos's tendency to contradict himself and adopt positions that are mutually exclusive (11).

²⁶ Although a conservative member of the clergy, Meriño, who was installed as President by the “Partido Liberal,” had initially given carte blanche to the Hostosian positivists and their reforms (Mateo 25).

Hostos, working within the Enlightenment paradigm whose key element was the opposition civilization and barbarism. Hostos maintained that:

El siglo no va a permitirnos seguir por donde vamos. Por donde vamos se llega a la barbarie corrompida, crapulosa, leprosa, lacerada, y nada más que con ver los antecedentes de ese siglo, se está viendo que él no puede permitirnos esa obra de corrupción y destrucción [...] Los que no puedan llegar a alguna parte, aunque no sea más que a ser dueños de si mismos en un rincón del espacio, que se civilicen. La orden del siglo es determinante: Civilización o muerte (Páginas Dominicanas 173-174).

In order to overcome or incorporate the barbarous elements of society, he advocated for, among other things, an education with “rational order in the curriculum,” and “a reasoned method in teaching” (Julio Ramos 43).

The year that Henríquez Ureña was born, Francisco Gregorio Billini (1884-1885) replaced General Ulises Heureaux,²⁷ who returned to power a few years later with a more repressive form of government (1886-1889). With its mistrust of positivist ideas about freedom and the like, Heureaux sought to repress and limit the work of the most active intellectuals. The dictator forced Hostos to leave the country.²⁸ Following Heureaux’s assassination in the

²⁷ In 1882, General Ulises Heureaux (1845-1889), a decisive figure in Dominican politics, rose to power. Heureaux, a black man of Haitian descent, was a soldier, initially a protégé of Gregorio Luperón, who later became President. His regime oversees an extended period of relative peace and economic growth. Although initially a liberal government, his regime became a dictatorship that catered to capitalist interests, the United States’ imperialist designs and the clergy’s hope for control of education. Once liberal intellectuals became aware of Heureaux’s attacks on positivist schools and the persistence of his dictatorship they immediately opposed him (Sang I, Hoetink 129).

²⁸ Unhappy with the regime and the political conditions, Francisco Henríquez y Carvajal went into exile in Haiti: “mi padre había resuelto, inconforme con el régimen del Presidente Ulises Heureaux dentro del cual él y sus mejores amigos eran objeto de continua vigilancia, emigrar a Cabo Haitiano, donde había encontrado, al visitarlo poco antes, campo favorable para el ejercicio de su profesión de médico” (Max Henríquez Ureña 24). While still in exile, Francisco Henríquez y Carvajal advised and supplied arms to a group of political allies, who, from the border city of Montecristi, were conspiring, initially without much success, to overthrow Heureaux and planning for a future government (Max Henríquez Ureña 28).

summer of 1889, Francisco Henríquez y Carvajal returned to his country from exile, as did his mentor Hostos, who wanted to resume his educational reforms before the onset of yet another dictatorship. Among those who contested Hostos's discourse in the Dominican Republic we find Pedro Francisco Bonó (1828-1906), who had a different proposal for social progress. As San Miguel (2005) indicates, this author, who preferred to distance himself from the Enlightenment ideology embraced by the Dominican intelligentsia, emphasized the social substratum of political processes and institutional life (12-15). He advanced the idea that the development of prosperity, democracy, and national identity depended more on the ability and creativity of the lower classes and not so much on the powerful socioeconomic institutions. In contrast Hostos declared: "para que la República convaleciera, era absolutamente indispensable establecer un orden racional en los estudios, un método razonado en la enseñanza, la influencia de un principio armonizador en el profesorado, y el ideal de un sistema, superior a todo otro, en el propósito mismo de la educación común" (Hostos, Obras completas 132). It was Hostos who laid the groundwork for several generations of Dominican intellectuals, writers, and teachers. Francisco Henríquez y Carvajal wrote: "su personalidad histórica flotará en Santo Domingo, como flota la de José de la Luz y Caballeros en Cuba. Su palabra perdurará en muchos puntos de Hispano-América, como en Santo Domingo, en Chile, en Puerto Rico, principalmente" (cited in Deschamps 319). With the building of academic institutions and the promotion of rational discourse, Hostos exerted an enormous influence over the Dominican intellectual landscape for well over half a century.

3.3 Nation-building in the Dominican Republic in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries

Three important elements in the Dominican Republic's political history in the nineteenth century are nation-building post Haitian rule (1809-1844), nation-building post Spanish annexation (1859-1865), and the impact of Cuban and Puerto Rican patriots such as Martí (1892 and 1895), Betances (1864, 1875), and Hostos. Dominican history and nationalism are intricately connected to the affairs of its neighbor, Haiti.²⁹ Dominican nationalism emerged in the nineteenth century along with the project of a Nation-State proposed by a group of young liberals led by Juan Pablo Duarte³⁰ (1813-1876). Dominicans had to separate from the political jurisdiction of Haiti, which, having gained its independence in 1804, retained control of Santo Domingo until 1844. Haitian military leaders pursued control of the eastern part of the island in order to unify Hispaniola under the banner of the Haitian State. Haitian leaders believed that they were legally entitled to the eastern territory. General Jacques Boyer (1776-1850) declared:

Este territorio no puede ya ser considerado como español, pues fue cedido a Francia por el tratado de Basilea y ningún tratado posterior ha abrogado semejante cesión hecha por el rey de España. De conformidad con este principio, que no puede ponerse en duda, los franceses que ocupaban esta parte no han de ser considerados ni como tropas españolas ni como cuerpos auxiliares de una potencia extranjera, pues todo es francés, así el territorio como las tropas y los habitantes (cited in Price-Mars 43-44).

²⁹ Jesús de Galíndez (1958) wrote about the complex Dominican-Haitian relations: "Cuando trabajaba en la Secretaría de Relaciones Exteriores de la República Dominicana tuve ocasión de comprobar que existía un cuarto muy reservado para el archivo especial de documentos referentes a Haití, cuya llave guardaba en persona el Oficial Mayor de la Secretaría. Este secreto en los archivos es prueba de lo delicadísimo que siempre es el tema de las relaciones entre la República Dominicana y Haití" (197).

³⁰ Juan Pablo Duarte, along with Francisco del Rosario Sánchez (1817-1861) and Ramón Matías Mella (1816-1864), is considered one of the founding fathers of the Dominican Republic.

Moreover, in the pursuit of unification, they claimed to have embodied the principles of Haiti's universal struggle for liberty of people of African origin against white oppressors of European origin (Price-Mars 1953, San Miguel 2005). Frank Knight (1990) described how "in the process of creating the new State, Haiti destroyed its white elite and promoted its African heritage as the proud, homogenizing symbol of the new state, a beacon for all black Americans" (220).

Therefore, in the ethnopolitical discourse of both states we find the opposing ideological symbols: black Saint-Domingue and white Santo Domingo. The drawn out process of independence from Haiti and the various military attempts of Haitian leaders between 1844 and 1855 to bring back the Dominican Republic under their rule gave rise to a nation-building ideology that produced a powerful element of self-identification in opposition to Haitians.

Subsequently, in the foundational and ancillary texts of the Dominican State, we find revealing statements about the Dominican nation and about what their authors consider to be two of its most basic and fundamental characteristics: race and language (San Miguel 9). As early as 1822, for example, years before independence, José Núñez de Cáceres (1776-1846), a local political leader and first hero of Dominican independence, in handing the keys to the city of Santo Domingo over to Haitian General Boyer, declared that the Haitian plan for the political unification of the island was bound to fail based on linguistic grounds:

Siempre ha sido de una grande influencia en los políticos para la constitución de los estados y para la transmutación de diferentes pueblos en uno solo, la diversidad de lenguaje, la práctica de una antigua legislación y el poder de las costumbres que han tomado raíz desde la infancia: la palabra es el instrumento de comunicación entre los hombres, y si no se entienden por el órgano de la voz, no hay comunicación; y ya veis aquí un muro de separación tan natural como insuperable, como puede serlo la

interposición material de los Alpes y de los Pirineos” (cited in Rodríguez Demorizi, “Vicisitudes de la lengua” 17).

According to Dominican historian Roberto Cassá (1998), Núñez de Cáceres uttered this statement aware that the colored Dominican majority favored annexation to Haiti (Cassá, Historia social (1) 154-155). However, even prior to Dominican independence (1844), in their struggle to maintain the political and cultural integrity of their territory, the Spanish authorities opposed Hispanic traditions to encroachment by other colonies. We can observe this, for example, in Antonio Sánchez Valverde’s *La idea del valor de la isla Española* (1785). In validating many of his claims before the Spanish Crown, the author describes the many splendors of the island’s colonial past, highlighting, in particular, the growing number of Spaniards in the population. He considered this group the essential element in the community’s *criollo* identity (San Miguel 10-11). According to Haitian historian Price-Mars, due to the racial ideology prevalent in the eastern Hispaniola, its inhabitants found it unacceptable that they be incorporated into a nationality that they considered infinitely inferior to their conditions as whites (80).

Cassá (1998) explains that the first phase of Dominican nationalism unfolded as some members of the miniscule and fragile bourgeoisie realized potential for growth and urgently sought the development of capitalism in Dominican territory (Historia social (2) 44). The realization of this phase, however, would be considerably delayed due to the fact that the bourgeoisie³¹ in the Dominican Republic, in the strict sense, did not stratify or consolidate for

³¹ Mártínez-Vergne (2005) contends that “no such class existed” in the Dominican Republic, however, Dominican historian Roberto Cassá (1998) asserted: “el Estado Dominicano desde su mismo inicio fue hegemonizado por el interés de clase dominante, por medio de una alianza entre burguesía comercial y las fracciones intermedias entre la pequeña burguesía y la burguesía. La primera mantenía la hegemonía económica, en tanto las segunda aseguraba la dominación sociopolítica” (Historia social y económica (2) 43-44).

many years (Franco Pichardo 8, González et al 9). However, after its independence from Haiti in 1844, the Dominican Republic was officially recognized as a State. For the next forty years, political independence and some favorable economic conditions contributed to a renewed interest in literary and artistic activity (Piña-Contreras 315) and in the idea of a Dominican Nation-State.³² After only a few years of political independence, with the consent of the most powerful local groups, and other European empires and its belief in its legal rights over the Spanish-speaking part of Hispaniola, Spain annexed the Dominican Republic in 1861. Pedro Santana (1801-1864), the first constitutional President, justified the annexation to Spain in the following terms:

Religión, idioma, creencias y costumbres todo aún conservamos con pureza no sin que haya faltado quien tratara de arrancarnos dones tan preciosos; y la nación que tanto nos legara es la misma que hoy nos abre sus brazos, cual amorosa madre que recobra a su hijo perdido en el naufragio en que se ve perecer a sus hermanos [...] La España nos protege, su pabellón nos cubre, sus armas se impondrán a los extraños, reconoce nuestras libertades y juntos las defenderemos formando un solo pueblo, una sola familia, como siempre lo fuimos (cited in Pierre-Charles 155).

The period of annexation (1859-1865) was characterized by a crackdown on religious liberties, masonry and other forms of civil association, the practice of common-law unions, and a return to previous Spanish despotic practices. Although Spanish diplomats promised never to reestablish slavery and grant more autonomy to Dominican governments, Spanish authorities

³² It was during these years that Nicolás Ureña de Mendoza, Henríquez Ureña's maternal grandfather, began to distinguish himself. In 1853, after serving as the editor of "La Española Libre" (1846), he founded another important newspaper, "El Progreso," a publication for the political, literary, and business sectors. As a journalist and later as a Senator, Nicolas's main preoccupation was national sovereignty and the fight against annexation to Spain. His political positions landed him in prison, where he was almost executed (Piña-Contreras 316).

basically recreated the previous colonial order. The Spanish rulers replaced the *criollo* administrators with *peninsulares* at every level and reinstated the old, racist caste system, which pegged Spaniards at the top of the social hierarchy, followed by white *criollos*, *mestizos*, and blacks, respectively. As Moya Pons (1995) points out, this attitude of white superiority had its effects on Dominicans themselves: “the lighter skinned people began to avoid contact with darker skinned friends for fear of being associated with them or of being considered inferior by the new, Spanish rulers” (207). The removal of Dominican civil and military leaders caused conflicts between Spaniards and Dominicans and created general discontent with the new administrative-political order. As a result the idea of a Nation-State became popular again. This time it was fueled by overall discontent among the population and economic conflicts between the new administrative class and previously ruling local class who had lost a considerable share of wealth and power (Cassá, Historia social (2) 81, Moya Pons 206-207).

The problem of Spanish annexation and the question of a Dominican State brought the Henríquez family (unheard of until then) to the public arena. Representatives from the rural masses, the commercial bourgeoisie, the political petit bourgeoisie, and foreign interests largely supported the war of restoration (1861-1865). The Germans, for example, who had significant control of the tobacco industry, contributed financially to the armed struggles (Cassá 1999). Following the war in 1866 and after regaining independence, there was a renewed sense of economic and political freedom and passionate pleas for national unity. From the Dominican Senate, Pedro’s grandfather Nicolás continued to articulate the cause of national sovereignty.

This same year (1866) “El Instituto Profesional” opened and replaced the “Colegio Buenaventura” as the leading school of professional education in Santo Domingo. Hostos collaborated in this institute as professor of public law and political economy. The *Instituto* also

housed a school of medicine and was the birthplace of the group of professionals who began to institutionalize “Dominican” culture by creating other necessary institutions for national life in the *fin de siècle* Dominican Republic. Both Federico and Francisco Henríquez y Carvajal played important roles in this prominent professional institute and ideological site where Hostos lectured. Although not a completely homogeneous group, several of these *fin de siècle* Dominican *letrados* were inextricably linked to the upper classes and power. Both conservative and liberal intellectuals converged on the tasks deemed necessary for the construction and consolidation of the nation (González et al 23-27). Some helped to create, unify, and expand the institutions necessary for national life, while others helped produce the body of symbols necessary for national consciousness. From cultural institutions, publications, such as “El Progreso” (1853), “Letras y Ciencias” (1892-1899), and literature, intellectuals took on a host of national issues including economic development, mass education, the constant threat of annexation, the perceived Haitian threat, and the political violence among the *caudillos* who wanted power and control of the government.³³

A few years later, the political situation became very unstable again and the economy was stagnant (Cassá, Historia social (2) 81). The *Partido Nacional Liberal*, or “El Partido Azul” as it was called to distinguish it from the Conservative Red party, was founded around 1857. In power from 1879-1886, *El Partido Azul* represented the interests of the tobacco cultivators and merchants of the wealthy Cibao region, while the Conservatives represented the great *latifundia* of the cattle ranchers and the woodcutting interests. The *Azul* party, a diverse group led by

³³ In 1866, inspired by the restoration war, Salomé began to publish her first poems. The constant themes of her poetry were patriotism, liberty and progress. Her poetry is directly linked to the epoch’s political events: “Desgarra, Patria mía, el manto que vilmente/Sobre tus hombros puso la bárbara crueldad/Levanta ya del polvo la ensangrentada frente/Y entona el himno santo de unión y libertad” (Salomé Ureña, “A la patria”).

military figures, such as General Gregorio Luperón,³⁴ became strongly associated with Dominican nationalism and the idea of creating a subjectivity apt to be governed: “la adecuación necesaria y posible de los ciudadanos a las condiciones impuestas o que las quieren imponer los gobiernos [...] La República Dominicana no tiene las condiciones necesarias para su autonomía bajo el estandarte democrático” (Luperón, cited in Pierre-Charles 133). Subsequently, a generation of Dominican intellectuals would begin the necessary work to overturn these conditions. The Henríquez and the Ureña families belonged to one sector of the *Azul* party, and were especially involved forging and promoting national and cultural institutions during the party’s political hegemony in the last two decades of the nineteenth century. (Moya Pons 222, Cassá, Historia social (2) 24).

In 1868, a group of Cuban exiles, escaping the war of independence, arrived in the country. With the support of the liberal government and other prominent local groups, they began to revive and transform the sugar industry in the Dominican Republic. Some historians affirm that the Cuban immigration in the city of Puerto Plata alone represented an increase in capital of “two million pesos strong;” the Cuban émigrés were greatly responsible for injecting more dynamism into the economy (Cassá, Historia social (2) 126, Moya Pons 260). Moreover, they founded political organizations such as “La Antillana” and the “Delegación Revolucionaria Cubana,” dedicated to the cause of Cuban independence and open to all its sympathizers. Thousands of Cubans devoted themselves to work, in the city or in the neighboring rural areas. At the same time, their leaders were conspiring against Spain (Hoetink 29). The local Dominican political climate, however, kept changing: the Buenaventura Baez government (1849-1853, 1856-1858, 1865-1866, 1868-1874) became a dictatorship and attempted to lease the Samaná

³⁴ Regarding Luperón’s nationalist profile, see Tolentino Dipp (2004).

peninsula to the United States. After Henríquez Ureña's grandfather (Nicolás Ureña) was forced into exile for publicly challenging this plan, his uncle Federico Henríquez y Carvajal took up the cause in *La Sociedad Cultural de Amigos del País*.

President Buenaventura Baez was a target of the intellectual debates held in *La Sociedad*, a Paris-styled intellectual salon that had sprung throughout Latin America (Piña-Contreras 319). Baez was president five times (1849-1853, 1856-1858, 1865-1866, 1868-1874, and 1876-1878) and constantly tried to have the country annexed first by France, then Spain, and finally the United States (Moya Pons 174). Through organizations such as *La Sociedad* and newspapers pro-restoration intellectuals carried out an intense campaign against the Baez dictatorship and disseminated the latest liberal ideas brought to the Dominican Republic by the most recent wave of immigration. Intellectuals that supported and identified with the *Azul* party's ideals of modernization, progress, rational government, and national sovereignty, such as Francisco Gregorio Billini (1844-1898), Mariano Cestero (1838-1909), José Gabriel García (1834-1910) and Pedro Francisco Bonó (1828-1906), among others, mounted a campaign against the inadequacy and tyranny of Baez's government. These intellectuals voiced and promoted the idea that the *Azules* represented the only option for the institutional modernization of the State; and as a result they helped to forge important political alliances between different social groups and economic interests. These and other similar sociopolitical ideas were taken up by *La Sociedad*, whose ideology can be summed up with Hostos's maxim *civilización o muerte* (Álvarez 2007, Henríquez Ureña, "La sociología de Hostos" 48). The members of *La Sociedad* were willing to stake their livelihood and reputation on this credo. Accordingly, they labored intensely in order to create modern institutions and spread the rational and progressive ideas that were necessary for life in a "civilized" modern society. Deschamps wrote:

‘Amigos del País’ ha realizado una labor honda de cultura. Entre mil cosas de utilidad nacional, efectuó la publicación de obras tan notables, y que tanto han elevado el concepto intelectual del país, como la voluminosa “Historia de Santo Domingo,” por D. Antonio del Monte y Tejada, las poesías de Salomé Ureña y las de Manuel Rodríguez Objio (265-266).

La Sociedad was a center for writers’ meetings and readings but it was also a discursive institution and a platform for the diffusion of a progressive ideology and Dominican nationalism. It was the target of political opposition and military aggression (Deschamps 266).

3.3.1 U.S. occupation

A strong nationalist movement emerged again during the United States military occupation (1916-1924). Almost immediately, the occupying forces took measures to prevent uprisings and to reorganize the socioeconomic and political life of the country (Moya Pons 322). These measures included: i) the prohibition of arms among Dominican civilians; ii) censorship of the press; iii) the building of infrastructure; iv) the creation of the Dominican National Guard aimed at suppressing future revolutionary movements; and v) the creation of a national primary public school system. During the course of the occupation the Dominican economy grew to levels never seen before, but Dominicans did not reap the benefits because all commerce was tied to the U.S. Resistance emerged in different sectors. In addition to producing the legal and moral arguments, nationalist intellectuals such as Américo Lugo³⁵ (1870-1952), Fabio Fiallo

³⁵ It must be noted that some of these authors of Dominican nationalism did not always succumb to the dogma of homogeneity and the firm opposition to Haiti. For example, Lugo (1908) declared: “cuando digo pueblo, de ningún modo me refiero solamente a Santo Domingo. También Haití es mi pueblo. El único título incontrovertible que tenemos a la carta de internacionalidad es la ocupación y señorío de una isla (“Discurso inaugural del Ateneo

(1866-1942), and Emiliano Tejera (1841-1923), among others, continuously agitated the people of Santo Domingo to rally behind their identity and language in opposition to U.S. occupation. In particular, some of these intellectuals urged Dominicans to defend against what they called the “Americanization” of Spanish (Moya Pons 329, Cassá, “Nación y estado” 121-123).

The occupation began the same year that Henríquez Ureña accepted a position as a lecturer in the University of Minnesota, the United States. In Minnesota, Henríquez Ureña taught a series of courses on language and literature, while pursuing and obtaining his doctorate. However, Henríquez Ureña’s success in North American academia was marred by the United States occupation of the Dominican Republic and its continued intervention in Latin America. Since 1914, as a foreign correspondent for the Havana daily “Heraldo de Cuba,” he had been evaluating United States policy in Latin America. The following are some of the more significant remarks Henríquez Ureña made in regard to the ensuing North American interventionism, particularly in the Caribbean:

Es generalmente conocida la especial situación de vigilancia y dominio norteamericanos, a que están sometidas las aduanas de Santo Domingo desde el tratado o “Convención” de 1907. Rossevelt se enorgullecía de esta obra de su gobierno. Los políticos republicanos la citaban como ejemplo del bienhechor influjo de los Estados Unidos en el Mar Caribe, y le atribuían misteriosas virtudes pacíficas. De 1912 para acá, sin embargo, hubo que atenuar el elogio de esas virtudes [...] (cited in Carilla, Pedro Henríquez Ureña: signo 88).

A few years later, at a conference at the University of Minnesota, he evaluated the Monroe Doctrine: “el mar Caribe es el punto principal de aplicación de la Doctrina Monroe. La Doctrina,

Dominicano” 254). These statements were pronounced while arguing in favor of a Caribbean confederation that would opposed U.S. imperialism.

tal como se concibe hoy, se aplica realmente hasta la línea ecuatorial; al sur apenas tiene aplicación” (Henríquez Ureña, cited in Carilla, Pedro Henríquez Ureña: signo 89). In addition, some dubious statements appeared in the American press that the Dominican Provisional President’s son allegedly preferred the United States over the Dominican Republic. In order to clarify his situation and some of his positions, Henríquez Ureña granted a few interviews to “The Minneapolis Journal:” In one such interview we read:

“Mr. Henríquez Ureña declared he was not a hyphenate. “I admire the United States and the people. You are a great and happy people; we of Santo Domingo are small and poor people, but my allegiance is entirely with my own country, I have been accused of preferring this country. I do not” (cited in Roggiano, Pedro Henríquez Ureña en los Estados Unidos 68).

While still in Minneapolis, Henríquez Ureña authored a series of significant articles related to U.S foreign policy: “Mexico and panamericanism,” and “The Dominican Republic—Another test of Mr. Wilson’s sincerity” (Roggiano, Pedro Henríquez Ureña en los Estados Unidos 72). At one point he joined a Dominican commission that was negotiating in Washington D.C. the terms of the occupation. Among the leaders of the commission was his father, the former President, who had been traveling throughout Latin America denouncing the occupation. Francisco Henríquez Carvajal had been a key figure in Dominican politics since the days of *La Sociedad*, where along with Salomé Ureña and his brother Federico he was directly involved in the development and diffusion of Hostos’s positivist doctrine in the Dominican Republic. The U.S. occupation was an emotional and very personal ordeal for Hénriquez Ureña.

3.4 National identity and race in Latin America and the Dominican Republic

It is impossible to comprehend the political and intellectual history of Latin America during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries without reflecting upon the Latin American elite's debate on the roots of the national entity. Their pursuit of modernity was fraught with tensions and contradictions. While there was a modernist ideology geared to progress and socioeconomic change, a nostalgic rhetoric revealed a conservative tendency that manifested itself particularly in the construction of Latin American identities. Oddly enough, we find the peasant ('jíbaro,' or 'gaucho') as a symbol of national identity in many Latin American countries such as Colombia, Venezuela as well as in Cuba, Puerto Rico, and the Dominican Republic. Thus, in the modernization of their societies, Latin American states focused their energies on the modernization and civilization of the rural masses. Many Latin American intellectuals had hoped that the benefits of modernization would resolve the question of race which linked white, Indian, and black, but they became disappointed when this did not occur. Therefore, issues of race played an important role in the discussions of national identity in Latin America and the Caribbean during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries (Baud 2005).

According to Telesforo García (1901), in their proposals, many Latin American intellectuals primarily conceptualized race, not necessarily as a social group of common ethnic origin, but as a psychological identity shared by collectivities that consciously or subconsciously converge around common goals. For example, anticipating Vasconcelos' "Raza Cómica" (1925), Hostos (1870) wrote:

Si el cholo, en el cual predominan las cualidades orgánicas de la raza india, la gran cualidad moral de esa noble raza, abatida pero no vencida por la conquistadora, abrumada pero no sometida por el coloniaje, desenvuelve la fuerza intelectual que ha recibido de la

raza europea, el cholo será un miembro útil, activo, inteligente de la sociedad peruana; mediador natural entre los elementos de las dos razas que representa, las atraerá, promoverá aún más activamente su fusión, y la raza intermedia que él anuncia, heroicamente pasiva como la india, activamente intelectual como la blanca [...] formará en las filas del progreso humano, y habrá reparado en providencial las iniquidades cometidas con una de sus razas madres (“El cholo”).

The merging of racial differences was, according to Hostos, something natural and necessary for achieving social cohesion and progress. Yet, not everyone was of the same opinion when it came to the relevance of race in the construction of identities. In contrast, José Martí rejected racial distinction and deemed the whole issue pointless due to the fact that race was too imprecise and too abstract as a theoretical category: “no hay odio de razas porque no hay razas. Los pensadores canijos, los pensadores de lámparas, enhebran y recalientan las razas de librería, que el viajero justo y el observador cordial buscan en vano en la justicia de la Naturaleza” (“Nuestra América”). According to Muteba Rahier (2004), the challenges that racial diversity posed to the liberal nation-building model, led to narratives of white supremacy and the concomitant concept of ‘whitening’ or ‘blanqueamiento’ (283). The notion of whitening was based on Positivist views of society as an organism that similar to biological organisms needed to evolve and rid itself of its ‘dysfunctional’ and ‘inferior’ organs (i.e., black and indigenous populations): “many Latin American intellectuals of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries shared the idea that race mixing between “superior” and “inferior” races was unnatural” (Muteba Rahier 283). The rejection of people of color as well as the rejection of popular culture was quite characteristic of the foundational period. Julio Ramos described it as:

Una época de circulación y dominio de representaciones de América Latina un cuerpo enfermo, contaminado por la impureza racial, por la sobrevivencia de etnias y culturas tradicionales supuestamente destinadas a desaparecer en el devenir del progreso y la modernidad (237).

Thus, for many intellectuals and members of the leading social classes, miscegenation had to be avoided in the discursive construction of the uniquely Latin American identities.

The situation was slightly different in the Dominican Republic, where ‘the problem of race’ was projected outwardly in the direction of Haiti. Baud tells us: “así, mientras una ola de antihispanismo barría el continente Americano, la elite dominicana, que basaba su posición en la posesión de la tierra y en su ascendencia española, retornaba a sus vínculos con la madre patria” (“Intelectuales, nación y modernidad” 935-936). Therefore, intellectuals such as Emiliano Tejera (1841-1923), scholar and minister of foreign affairs during the Ramón Cáceres administration (1905-1911), wrote profusely about the development of the Dominican character in relation to the undesired Haitians (Mártinez-Vergne 5). Dobal (1984) reports that:

Han sido planteadas diferentes posiciones. Básicamente sobre las influencias que, en nuestra peculiar idiosincrasia, han ejercido las distintas razas que se mezclan en nuestra sangre: blanca, negra, india... Las posiciones han sido siempre extremistas: predominio del factor blanco europeo, o vigencia de una tesis: los genes autóctonos determinan nuestro comportamiento [...] y cuando se habla de blancos, la directa referencia es ‘española,’ cuya idiosincrasia se evalúa altamente en la parte española de la isla, cualquiera que sea el matiz de la piel del individuo que habita en esta región (89).

Although with previous ideological antecedents, this dominant Dominican discourse on race originated in the context of the struggle for independence and nation-building that I described

earlier. The discourse emerged in order to support, justify, and legitimate the military and political efforts of the country's ruling class and intellectual and moral leadership, which includes the Church. Despite the fact that the Dominican Republic is a racially mixed country with large enclaves of Afro-Dominican communities, the Dominican Republic's historical process is characterized by a non-black and pro-white ideology that was instrumental in establishing the concept and symbolic value of *dominicanidad*. This concept of *dominicanidad* is firmly embedded in Hispanic tradition, culture, and, above all, language.

3.5 Pedro Henríquez Ureña's *dominicanidad*

El nombre de Pedro (así prefería que los llamáramos sus amigos) vincúlase también el nombre de América. Su destino preparó de algún modo esta vinculación; es verosímil sospechar que Pedro, al principio, engañó su nostalgia de la tierra dominicana suponiéndola una provincia de una patria mayor.

Borges³⁶

Like his predecessors before him, Henríquez Ureña saw his tasks as contributing to the full realization of the Dominican community by obtaining full access to two fundamental elements of (in this case Spanish) civilization: language and identity. Throughout this process he maintained a steadfast faith in the belief of his predecessors that the glories of progress are always achieved thanks to the will of a select few, the enlightened minority: “los hombres y mujeres de espíritu, los mejores [que] son los que deben orientar a los más” (*En la orilla* 15).

After 1901, Henríquez Ureña returned to the Dominican Republic only in two occasions: a few days in 1911 and for eighteenth months from 1931 to 1933. However, he remained

³⁶ Henríquez Ureña met Borges in Buenos Aires. Besides participating in literary and cultural polemics, these two authors developed a close friendship and collaborated in some publishing projects. Borges said: “yo tengo la impresión de que Pedro Henríquez Ureña (claro es absurdo decir eso), pero yo tengo la impresión de que él había leído todo; de que sabía todo” (cited in Álvarez Martínez 184).

emotionally, politically, and intellectually connected to his native land. Although he often expressed a remarkable nostalgia for his homeland, as Jorge Luis Borges observed, he was able to circumvent it through his belief in being part of the greater and beloved Hispanic community, or what Borges called “el sentimiento de americanidad o de hispanoamericanidad” (“Prólogo”). The idea of return to his fatherland (“La Patria”) continuously obsessed him, but the ever chaotic and repressive political climate with its perennial dictatorships prevented his return.

In 1926, in light of discussions about his possible return to Santo Domingo, Henríquez Ureña wrote to Américo Lugo, a prominent Dominican historian and architect of early twentieth century nationalism : “si fuera posible hallar allí trabajo para mis actividades y hogar cómodo y seguro para mi familia, me iría [...]” (cited in Carilla, Pedro Henríquez Ureña: signo 25). That same year, he wrote to Reyes:

Muchos no se lo figuran: yo vivo pensando en cómo podría regresar a Santo Domingo, y hasta Isabel, a quien le resulta poco interesante la Argentina, así lo querría [...] Pero, ¿qué quieres? Allí dominan siempre, desde hace años interminables los yanquilandeces, o los enemigos: y estos enemigos son del género estúpido, y no me dejarían servir de nada al país (Henríquez Ureña, Epistolario íntimo 288-9).

In 1931, thanks to his brother Max’s intervention and an invitation from the Trujillo regime, the frustrated hope of returning to his native country was temporarily relieved. He arrived in Santo Domingo in order to assume the role of the national superintendent of education. It is probable that, at this point, he was not well aware of the despotic and ruthless nature of the Trujillo dictatorship. Trained by the United States marines to maintain order after the occupation (1916-1924) and quickly rising to high rank, Rafael L. Trujillo (1891-1961) overthrew President Horacio Vásquez in 1930. The association with the Henríquez Ureña family offered Trujillo the

opportunity to seize two important attributes he most desired in relation to the public perception of his regime: intellectual pedigree and nationalistic pride (Mateo, Pedro Henríquez Ureña 245). Henríquez Ureña prudently fulfilled his duties despite many limitations that included the scarcity of resources and growing disillusionment with the local political atmosphere. He pursued a series of educational reforms, helped to establish the Humanities faculty at the *Universidad de Santo Domingo*, gave multiple lectures, and conducted research on Spanish in the Dominican Republic. After two years and a half under a totalitarian regime and mounting disillusionment, he left for Europe under the pretext of visiting his family, which he had sent to Paris months earlier. Soon after reuniting with them, he returned to Argentina where he continued to teach, investigate, write and publish until his sudden death aboard a train in 1946.

For Henríquez Ureña, the nineteenth century represents a bridge to the seventeenth century: “siempre digo a mis amigos que nací en el siglo XVII” (Henríquez Ureña, “La antigua sociedad” 503). With this statement, Henríquez Ureña expressed his fascination with the Dominican patriarchal society that was the object of many of his philological investigations: *La cultura y las letras coloniales en Santo Domingo* (1936), *La catedral* (1908), *Cultura Antigua de Santo Domingo (La Española)* (1910), *La antigua sociedad patriarcal de las Antillas: Modalidades arcaicas de la vida de Santo Domingo durante el Siglo XIX* (1925). In many ways, this patriarchal Dominican society emerged from the imagination of the *fin de siècle* Dominican Romantics (Félix María del Monte (1819-1899), Salomé Ureña, José Joaquín Pérez (1845-1900), Gastón Fernando Deligne (1861-1913), Arturo Pellerano Castro (1853-1916), among others), to whom Henríquez Ureña attributes Golden Age Spanish as their linguistic and literary model (ESD 90). But the Dominican Republic that Henríquez Ureña knew first hand was his parents’ fatherland, the *fin de siècle* country, where, in the face of poverty, political instability, fierce

competition among the military and commercial elites, and conflictive relations with Haiti, the educated classes were desperately fighting to institutionalize the ideology of Progress (Positivism), consolidate the Nation-State, legitimize the national identity founded on the Hispanic tradition. Henríquez Ureña's family became famous working and fighting to save this tradition. According to Durán (1994):

Este vínculo familiar de Pedro Henríquez Ureña es rico en sugerencias, pero no se remite únicamente al amor patrio—incuestionable en su devoción americana—, sino que se convierte en la apoyatura esencial que relaciona al escritor dominicano—hombre de nuestra época—, con el siglo XIX. Las ideas, categorías y orientaciones que adquirió bajo la tutela hogareña fueron un modelo excepcional para su formación y esta fue, por lo tanto, educación singular que habría de capacitarlo para la realización de su obra literaria y para su vida de probidad (Literatura y sociedad 11).

The climate of nation-building enthusiasm and patriotism is central to the intellectual climate in which Henríquez Ureña grew up. He devoted a huge portion of his work to the ideas and ideals championed by his family. This mixture of idealism and ideology included unconditional love for the foundations, traditions, and symbols of his homeland. These foundations included the formation of an exclusively Hispanic identity.

Núñez de Cáceres's statement regarding the perceived linguistic divide between Haiti and the Dominican Republic constitutes one of the first affirmations of the existence of national language, a language that was central to defining the Dominican Republic's national identity. Since the beginning of this phase of Dominican nationalism, Dominican intellectuals have semiotized language and made it one of the bases on which to build the nation, create a national consciousness, and enact a Dominican national identity. In 1912, language planners made

explicit the language policy of the State. A committee of public officials, led by prominent Senator Ramón Lovatón, persuaded the Dominican congress to officialize the Spanish language: “se declara idioma official de la República la lengua castellana” (cited in Rodríguez Demorizi, Lengua y Folklore 17). The words of Américo Lugo, who wrote profusely about Dominican nationalism, highlight the importance of language:

“[República Dominicana] en el fondo de su cultura, aunque todavía deficiente desde el punto de vista político, por el sentido práctico e ideal de la vida permanece siendo española, basada en la lengua, en el culto, en las costumbres, en la herencia, en la historia, en las tradiciones y recuerdos” (cited in Cassá, “Nación y Estado en el pensamiento de Américo Lugo” 123)

Historically, throughout the process of national development, the majority of Dominican intellectuals have maintained, to quote the conservative Dominican historian Peña Batlle, that “los dominicanos maduramos nuestra conciencia nacional luchando por no dejar de ser españoles” (cited in Fennema 213).

Almost invariably, many Dominican *letrados* have tied the question of national sovereignty to racial issues and relations with Haiti in their discussions of Dominican nationalism and identity, especially since the nineteenth century. Although not necessarily part of the rich Dominican upper classes, many *letrados* (poets, novelists, and historians) represented the educated elite who most helped to establish the hegemony of the political elites and the concept of Dominican identity, especially in the 1870s and 80s (Matos Moquete 1986, Vellejo 1995, Sommer 1991). Deschamps (1906) lamented that before the arrival of this generation (“los Galván, los Meriño, los Deligne”) the state of Dominican letters was quite deplorable. He linked such a state of affairs and its impact on the language to the break in relations with Spain: “las

causas principales de la adulteración y olvido con que casi todos nuestros escritores escriben el castellano, son la falta de numerosas relaciones con la antigua madre patria, el desapego de los clásicos y la preferencia que otorgamos a las obras francesas” (253-254). However, Salomé’s generation, propelled by the work of Hostos, changed all of that by reestablishing links with the classic tradition. Matos Moquete, in his discussion of the relationship between periods, authors, and texts, shows that even today the very concept of “Dominican literature” is subsumed by the discourse of the State:

Esas imágenes funcionan sobre la base de una reducción permanente de dos términos: “lo literario” equivale a “lo dominicano,” el último define al primero. Véase la portada de un libro “Historia de la literatura dominicana,” o “Antología de la literatura dominicana,” y en seguida se inicia la búsqueda lineal y causal de los rasgos característicos de la “literatura dominicana,” por los rasgos característicos de “lo dominicano” (La cultura de la lengua 46).

Matos Moquete argues that the authors themselves are partially responsible for establishing this type of literary historiography and ideology:

La literatura dominicana y los autores mismos han sido en parte responsables, como en toda América Latina, del reduccionismo que se ha operado en relación con las obras [...] Los autores mismos, considerándose investidos de una función social redentora han creído verdaderamente el papel revolucionario, transformador de la literatura (La cultura de la lengua 55).

Many *letrados*, aligning themselves with the dominant political forces, produced narratives and images of the nation’s history and social composition that reveal the following objectives: i) the whitening of Dominican society; ii) the promotion of cultural traits associated with the dominant

classes; and iii) the erasure of those associated with the popular classes. The subsequent generations of Dominican literary figures and literary historians would only intensify these particular discursive practices in service of the State and the ruling political forces. Matos Mosquete asserts: “se llega así a estatizar las relaciones de la literatura con lo político, haciendo que ella se convierta o en instrumento de Estado, o instrumento de la Historia, o lo que es lo mismo, en instrumento de la búsqueda de una supuesta identidad nacional” (La cultura de la lengua 62).

Analogous with other Latin American and Caribbean contexts, many Dominican *letrados* have also proposed social theories which view blacks and Haitians as “inferior races” that are obstacles to modernization and progress. Any discussion contrary to this civilization-barbarism dichotomy is deemed treasonous and unpatriotic. The concept of race, in this Dominican context, is carefully crafted to fit a specific view of the nation and becomes evident in the advice Henríquez Ureña gives to his brother Max regarding the revision of his book Los Estados Unidos y la República Dominicana (1919):

Agregar unas pocas páginas sobre Santo Domingo, explicando ligeramente la historia del país—con muy pocos detalles de *hechos*, pero bien claras las líneas fundamentales—y el carácter del pueblo, que nunca ha sido regresivo; de paso, como quien no contradice, rectificar el concepto usual de “pueblo de raza negra,” no olvidando que hay indios y no pocos mestizos (Familia Henríquez Ureña 181).

These statements are also partially motivated by another problem: the need to respond to the racism of the occupying North-American soldiers. As noted by Pierre-Charles (1985), these soldiers treated Santo Domingo as a conquered land inhabited by a few whites but mostly mulattoes and blacks whom they considered racially inferior (Gerard 143). In several of his own

texts, Henríquez Ureña would strongly object to the references of Dominicans as blacks that appeared in international publications.

During the resurgence of Dominican nationalism during U.S. occupation, Henríquez Ureña declared his absolute rejection of North American imperialism in several journalistic articles. He refocused his attention on Latin America's situation in relation to growing United States interference. In a series of newspaper reports (most of them published in "El Heraldo de Cuba," 1915-197) he consistently criticized United States foreign policy and in a few of his essays began to delineate *hispanoamericanismo* as a utopian cultural ideal and reformulate Dominican nationalism as an alternative to North American imperialism (Mateo, Pedro Henríquez Ureña 184). In "La República Dominicana" (1917), Henríquez Ureña remarked:

Los títulos de Santo Domingo no son principalmente geográficos; son más bien espirituales. *Santo Domingo es un fragmento de la gran familia hispánica*, que ha vivido precaria, pero propia, durante más de cuatro siglos; y que *luchará por persistir mientras habite en la tierra nativa el último descendiente de los colonizadores* (301-302, emphasis added).

Undoubtedly, Henríquez Ureña's ethnolinguistic construction finds its source in and provides continuities for the Enlightenment and cultural discourses elaborated by members of his own family and some of the founders of Dominican historiography.³⁷ It is in relation to these continuities that his understanding of Dominican nationalism emerges. According to Martínez-Vergne:

³⁷ José Gabriel García (1834-1910), Manuel de Jesús Galván (1834-1910), Federico García Godoy (1857-1924), and Américo Lugo (1870-1952).

Pedro Henríquez Ureña emphasized a longer intellectual process [of national development] that occurred throughout the nineteenth century among literate groups and the bourgeoisie, who professed the island's sovereignty as they fought for independence from Haiti and rejected foreign rule and its proponents (17-18).

Dominican nationalism emerges in the historical narratives, the foundational texts, and the analyses of Henríquez Ureña as a will to modernity, but also as an expression of faith in the idea of a Dominican nation-State, patriotism in the form of love for the Hispanic tradition, fear and loathing for Haitians, and indifference towards people of African descent. Consequently, adds Martínez-Vergne:

Dominicans, as other Hispanic-descent peoples of Latin America, had internalized the value of whiteness and even cultivated it vis-à-vis their neighbor Haiti. To accentuate this tendency, scientific racism had introduced the notion that progress and modernity depended on the appropriate racial mix. Given these circumstances, it was incumbent upon the intelligentsia to claim nationhood on the basis of racial unity by subsuming blackness into the discourse and by erasing it through white immigration (21).

Nineteenth century nation-building discourse, anti-Haitian rhetoric, and the anti-North American sentiment all converged into the Dominican nationalism of the 1920's and 30's, at the pinnacle of Henríquez Ureña's intellectual career. This particular brand of Dominican nationalism set forth a whole series of measures that Dominican leaders attempted to implement during the Horacio Vasquez (1860-1936) presidency (1924-1930). The expression and promotion of xenophobic ideas became more vociferous and aggressive during the Trujillo

regime³⁸ (1930-1961). Trujillo, his acolytes, and government officials were distressed by the number of Haitian immigrants in the country. They began projects to “Dominicanize” the border and force out as many Haitians as possible. In 1937, when some of these policies failed, Trujillo ordered the massacre of thousands of Haitians by the military (Mateo 2004). In order to distinguish dark-skin Dominicans from Haitians, a shibboleth test was applied, in which only those that could pronounce the flap (apicoalveolar) /r/ instead of the uvular /r/ (as in French) in the word ‘*perejil*’ would not perish (Toribio, “Language variation and linguistic enactment of identity” 267). This disastrous event drew heavy international criticism (Baud, “Intelectuales, nación y modernidad” 950). Jesús de Galíndez, a scholar from Spain who was tortured and killed at Trujillo’s orders (1958), described the series of events:

En 1936 parecía, pues, que la causa de los malentendidos entre la República Dominicana y Haití había desaparecido para siempre, y que una amistad siquiera oficial unía a sus dos Presidentes. Esa situación dura poco más de un año; y a fines de 1937 explota el suceso más grave que ha distanciado a los dos países en casi un siglo [...] La matanza parece ser que ocurrió los días 2, 3 y 5 de octubre de 1937. Pero sus primeras noticias no circularon por el mundo hasta casi tres semanas más tarde; en la República Dominicana fueron totalmente silenciadas por más de un mes [...] Su primera reacción es una nota de la Legación Dominicana que recoge el “New York Times” del 23 de octubre en que se hace pública una declaración conjunta del Encargado de la Secretaría de relaciones exteriores dominicana, Joaquín Balaguer hijo y del Ministro haitiano en Ciudad Trujillo Everemont Carrié, afirmando que las relaciones entre Haití y la República Dominicana “have not

³⁸ Mateo (2004) described the regime in the following terms: “un régimen de raiz autoritaria, unido en la fría indiferencia de la violencia, reflota en una idea de sí mismo que no es más que un ensueño. Trujillo se puede emparentar con la nobleza francesa, proclamar que todos los dominicanos son blancos hispánicos, confundirse en la perplejidad del don divino frente a las cosas meramente terrenales, y el pensmaineto tautológico lo consagra como el recuento mesiánico de la identidad nacional” (“Mito y cultura” 33).

been impaired” [...] Sin embargo, el escándalo ya había proporciones internacionales, las grandes agencias periodísticas habían enviado corresponsales a averiguar lo sucedido (197).

This period saw the consolidation of politically conservative forces and the militarization of Dominican culture (Galíndez 1984, Peguero 2004). The worst elements in the military, the bourgeois bureaucracy, the Jesuit wing of the Catholic Church, and one of the most powerful dictatorships in Latin America’s history converged in the exploitation and domination of the Dominican masses and legitimating absolute despotic rule (Cordero Michel 32-33). It was a very reactionary period in the life of the country. All over, it was a time of serious pessimism, which Henríquez Ureña, burrowing from Arquistain (1928), described as “la agonía antillana.” The Caribbean anxiety included the dictatorships, the fall of the sugar industry in Cuba, the U.S. colonization of Puerto Rico, and the migration of Anglophone and Francophone West Indian workers to the Hispanic Caribbean. While Arquistain lamented the politically bleak future of Puerto Rico,³⁹ Guerra Sánchez (1927) described the general sociopolitical outlook of the Caribbean in the following fatalistic terms: “la ley fatal de la decadencia antillana se cumplirá en ella, con irreparable daño para su pueblo y para todos los países del Caribe, que podían llegar a tener en Cuba un centro de bienhechora influencia en el campo del progreso social, agrícola, industrial, científico, como parecía ser el destino de la isla” (209).

It is in this general political climate that the instrumentalist and hegemonic approach to language and history became the standard practice for Dominican historians and philologists. Their practice authorized images of the language as representative of “*lo dominicano*” and “cultivated speech” that had to be protected from anglicisms, gallicisms (or rather Haitian

³⁹ “Pero lo más probable es que jamás haya en Puerto Rico un plebiscito para resolver su situación política” (Arquistain 97).

creolisms), barbarisms, and “deterioration” at the hands of the lower classes. As Matos Moquete argues, “en la relación lengua e historia, ésta se apoya en un instrumentalismo y en un elitismo que favorecen la lengua culta, erigida en norma, contra los usos que “deterioran,” incluyendo no sólo los barbarismos sino también los llamados niveles bajos (La cultura de la lengua 30). These sociolinguistic concerns intensified along with racial tension and the active policies of eradication of Haitians and increased European immigration pursued by the Trujillo government. In addition to *El español en Santo Domingo*, the year 1941 saw the publication of Emilio Jimenez’s *Del lenguaje dominicano* and Patín Maceo’s *Dominicanismos*. Further elaborating the ethnopolitical discourse of the State: “los temas favoritos en este tipo de discurso en el país son: la lengua es la patria, la lengua es el alma nacional, la lengua es la bandera o el escudo, la lengua es nuestro tesoro” (Matos Moquete 28). In the Dominican context, the discourse on language revolved around the issues of Dominican national identity and the demands of hegemonic forces, which were embedded in what Matos Moquete calls “the genealogical tree” of *Hispanismo* (La cultura de la lengua 28).

3.6 Hispanoamericanismo and Pedro Henríquez Ureña

The history and use of the term “hispanismo” (sometimes called “hispanoamericanismo,” “americanismo,” and “panhispanismo”) typically evoke ideological conflicts and extensive discussions of their sociopolitical origins. One of the most difficult questions to tackle in these discussions is whose *hispanismo* are we referring to? (Resina 2005, Schwartz 2002). The discourse on *hispanismo* began to develop after the independence of Latin American states in the 1820s. In his classic study, Frederick Pike (1971) defined *hispanismo* as “[the] unassailable faith in the existence of a transatlantic Hispanic family, community or ‘raza’ [...] A *raza* shaped more

by common culture, historical experiences, traditions and language than by blood or ethnic factors” (1). Carlos Rama (1982) also discussed the meanings of the categories of *hispanismo* and *americanismo* by comparing and contrasting the different political aspects of liberal and conservative thought that articulated cultural relations between Spain and Latin America.⁴⁰

Recently, Isidro Sepúlveda Muñoz (2005) opts for the term “hispanoamericanismo,” defined as:

Movimiento cuyo objetivo era la articulación de una comunidad transnacional sostenida en una identidad cultural basada en el idioma, la religión, la historia y las costumbres o usos sociales; comunidad imaginada que reunía a España con el conjunto de repúblicas americanas, otorgándole a la antigua metrópoli un puesto al menos de primogenitura, cunado no de ascendente, bajo la muy extendida expresión de Madre Patria (13).

In the latter half and of the nineteenth century and the first half of the twentieth century *Hispanoamericanismo*⁴¹ exhibits two major branches that converge on various ideas and proposals that centered on the historical and cultural bonds between Spain and the Spanish-speaking countries in America. On one hand, the Spanish branch, composed of Spanish conservative and liberal politicians and intellectuals, defends the formation of a transatlantic Spanish community or identity that justifies Spain’s cultural presence, commercial interests, and foreign policy in Latin America. They proposed a shared (idealized) identity of the Peninsular and American people, based on a cultural community comprised of historical, linguistic, philosophical, and religious elements that underlie the constitutions of the respective states and

⁴⁰ “En la generación que sigue al proceso de la independencia hispanoamericana se definen, a lo largo de un conflictual período que llega a 1866, las actitudes de americanismo de los españoles y las de hispanismo de los americanos. No se trata de dos únicas y contrapuestas versiones, porque el factor político divide a los europeos en dos inconciliables opiniones, y lo mismo pasa con los hispanoamericanos, pero en los tiempos revolucionarios los liberales son derrotados en España, mientras predominan allende los mares” (Carlos Rama 67).

⁴¹ It is also useful to distinguish the agents who are ideological proponents of these movements (“Hispanoamericanistas” who construct unitary visions for political purposes) from the people who specifically specialize in the study of language and literature in the Spanish-speaking world (“hispanistas” or “americanistas”). In the description of this and other related phenomena, I adopt Sepulveda’s terminology.

transcend the political divisions that followed the wars of independence. The American branch, on the other hand, was composed of various Latin American intellectuals who, preoccupied with resolving conflictive relations with Spain and the emergence of the United States as an imperial power, rejected or embraced cultural traditions and identities. It would be a mistake to define *hispanomaericanismo* in terms of this dichotomous relationship. The fact is, as Carlos Rama indicated, that there were different proponents of this political and cultural ideology in both Latin America and Spain, including liberal Spaniards who were pro-America, the government officials and public functionaries who refused to accept Spain's colonial losses, the rich and powerful *criollo* classes in Latin America who wanted a return to monarchic rule, and the Latin American progressives who desired a totally new political and sociocultural horizon, among others. Obviously, even within these groups, *hispanomaericanismo* engaged a wide array of individuals who, with different ideological attitudes, sought to define and construct Latin American identities in a variety of ways. Del Valle and Gabriel-Stheeman (2004), following Pike and Carlos Rama, propose that *hispanismo* generally consists of the following ideas: i) the existence of a unique Spanish culture, lifestyle, characteristics, traditions and values, all of them embodied in its language; ii) the idea that Spanish American culture is nothing but Spanish culture transplanted to the New World; and iii) the notion that Hispanic culture has an internal hierarchy in which Spain occupies a hegemonic position (24). Of particular interest to Del Valle and Gabriel-Stheeman is the manifestation of linguistic *hispanismo*.

Between 1885 and 1936, as Del Valle and Gabriel-Stheeman and their collaborators have shown (2004), philologists and intellectuals from both sides of the Atlantic were passionately debating ideas about the crucial role of the Spanish language in the construction of national identities, preserving the purity and the unity of the language, and the means for promoting the

language and culture. They were particularly preoccupied with developing ideas, some opposing, some complementary, about a panhispanic cultural community embodied by the Spanish language. In the vision of some intellectuals, Spanish became ideologized in such a way as to foster the spiritual (psychological) identity of all Spanish-speaking countries, naturally, with Spain as its focal point.

Hispanoamericanismo initially appears in Henríquez Ureña's work as a theoretical preoccupation and powerful ideological current when he arrived in New York under the profound influence of the Uruguayan essayist José Enrique Rodó (1872-1917).⁴² According to Henríquez Ureña:

Mis impresiones se atropellaban un poco, y yo las veía todas a través del prejuicio antiyanqui, que el *Ariel* (1900) de Rodó había reforzado en mí, gracias a su prestigio literario; no fue sino mucho después al cabo de un año, cuando comencé a penetrar en la verdadera vida, y a estimarla en su valer (Henríquez Ureña, Memorias 66).

The Spanish defeat of 1898 in Cuba and the manifestation of the power of the United States prompted the publication of Rodó's famous essay, *Ariel*. In it, the author calls for young Latin American intellectuals to reject the materialism of North America in favor of the Greco-Roman humanistic traditions of free thinking and self-improvement and to develop and concentrate on their own culture (Rodó). Henríquez Ureña admired Rodó as the best stylist and one of the first Latin American modernists, to whom he attributed the aesthetic renewal of language (Ensayos críticos 58). Henríquez Ureña's reading of *Ariel* awakened in him, as it did in other young Latin American intellectuals in the 1910's and 1920's, a desire for cultural affirmation, a search for

⁴² *Ariel* is a meditation on the nature of civilizations, in which Rodó contrasts two forms of society symbolized by Ariel and Caliban, characters from Shakespeare's *The Tempest* (1623). The latter represents the USA, a utilitarian society where the unguided appetites of the masses results in a new barbarism. Ariel, on the other hand, represents a civilization where an enlightened ruling elite subordinates material urges to reason and spiritual concerns.

national “essences,” and a preoccupation with defining Latin America’s cultural landscape or *hispanoamericanismo*.

Another area of concern for Henríquez Ureña, after reading *Ariel*, is language: “de hecho, la importancia de nuestro idioma no se toma en cuenta ni aun en Francia; y en el mundo anglosajón principia a generalizarse la idea de que “el castellano está moribundo” (Ensayos críticos 63). Language, in Henríquez Ureña’s reading of *Ariel*, is one of the main forces “capaz de unificar e iluminar los impulsos dispersos en el espíritu de la raza” (Ensayos críticos 63). Henríquez Ureña absorbed one of Rodó’s fundamental ideas: the transformation of our societies depended in the cultivation of knowledge and culture and not in the development of machinery and technology. In *Ariel* Henríquez Ureña found a specific plan of action that called for showcasing the Spanish language (“nuestro idioma”) and fighting against the (French and Anglo-Saxon) idea that Spanish was a dying language (Ensayos críticos, 63). Furthermore, Rodó reformulates in modernist terms the old civilization—barbarism opposition. Henríquez Ureña wrote: “hoy atraviesa Ariel con sus ingravidas alas el Atlántico y se detiene en la cabeza de un joven Próspero. Viene a ayudarle a triunfar Calibán, que pretende adueñarse de esta isla desierta de la civilización que se llama América” (Ensayos críticos, 58). Henríquez Ureña accepts the image of *Ariel*, as a symbol of the intellectual’s commitment to the development of civilization and the erasure of barbarism in the former colonies. According to Calvet (2005), paraphrasing Fernández Retamar: “En el fondo, la historia de los intelectuales colonizados es la historia de una opción siempre planteada entre la senda de Calibán y la de Ariel, entre el colaboracionismo y la insurrección” (270). Henríquez Ureña belongs to that generation of young intellectuals, inspired by Rodó, who wanted to portray the right image of Spanish in order to, first, help construct a cultural and linguistic whole and, then, secure and enjoy Latin America’s membership in

universal culture. For this important mission, Henríquez Ureña absorbed the lessons of generations of writers and scholars who exploited the political dimension of language and discourse:

En la batalla que libramos los idiomas modernos por ascender a la categoría de instrumentos sabios, aptos para el pensamiento filosófico, no bastó el florecimiento de las literaturas vernáculas para decidir el triunfo; fue necesario que los mismos escritores asumieran la defensa de los idiomas que manejaban, en el momento que éstos llegaban al principio de su madurez. Así en Italia, la defensa principia con Dante, con el *Elogio de la lengua vulgar*, y continúa hasta el siglo XVI. La influencia italiana produce en Francia, la *Defensa e ilustración de la lengua francesa*, del sagaz y fino Joachim du Bellay. Poco antes de Francia tuvo España sus defensores del idioma vernáculo. En primer lugar Pérez de Oliva,⁴³ quien, si no en disertaciones especiales, con su obra entera aboga por la preponderancia del romance. En segundo lugar, Juan de Valdés [...] su labor es directa sobre el propio idioma y no sobre modelos latinos (En la orilla 150-151).

While Henríquez Ureña did revise his concepts throughout his productive career, this particularly voluntaristic⁴⁴ conceptualization of language would play a key role in his representations of Spanish. Henríquez Ureña's *hispanoamericanismo* is an amalgam of the values and ideals inculcated by his family, experience gained from teaching and writing about Spanish literature and language in various settings, and his love for the intellectual history of Latin America and a "higher spiritual world." It first emerges out of a dialogue with Rodó and his opposition of Latin culture to Anglo-Saxon culture, Menéndez Pidal's vision of the Hispanic culture, and

⁴³ Hernán Pérez de Oliva (1494-1533) was a Spanish humanist and writer.

⁴⁴ "Linguistic voluntarism" is the view that linguistic acts will only be successful if individuals actively reject linguistic anarchy by submitting their linguistic freedom to the constraints of norms (see Taylor's (1990) definition and my discussion of linguistic voluntarism in chapter four of this dissertation).

Vasconcelos's *La raza cósmica*. Essentially, Henríquez Ureña's *hispanoamericanismo* maintains that, despite the obvious influences from Spain and the rest of Europe, Latin Americans constitute linguistically and culturally diverse groups. In this sense, he is a very unique type of *hispanoamericanista*.

Henríquez Ureña belonged to the movement that Leopoldo Zea (1943) called “generación asuntiva,” or the intellectual group (Martí, Rodó, Vasconcelos, Manuel Ugarte⁴⁵) that reacted against the search for identity carried out specifically by nineteenth century intellectuals who favored European or North American models. For Latin American *hispanoamericanistas* such as Reyes and Henríquez Ureña, searching for the specificity of Latin America, involved the following tasks: i) the reincorporation of Peninsular literature within a humanities framework that included other European literatures (namely French, German and English); ii) applying the new methods of Hispanic philology as developed by Menéndez Pelayo and Menéndez Pidal and his Madrid school to the study of language and culture; and iii) providing the proper historical framework in which to reevaluate and reformulate the question of Latin American identity, or what Henríquez Ureña refers to as “el problema de por qué los pueblos son como son” (Henríquez Ureña, letter to Reyes, cited in Henríquez Ureña de Hito 83).

In their search for answers to such question, the Latin American *hispanoamericanistas* turned their attention to the concepts of race and language. At the beginning of the twentieth century, however, adherence to racial discourse, heavily influenced by French biologists, was the rule more than the exception (Vargas 162). One of the most celebrated elaborations of the racial category was Vasconcelos's *La raza cósmica* (1925). In this essay, the author tried to oppose to growing United States hegemony and European racism his vision of Latin American “mestizaje,”

⁴⁵ Manuel Ugarte (1875-1951), Argentine author and member of the socialist party who spent many years working for the unity of Latin America.

or the construction, over the foundations of the Spanish legacy, of a new and improved cosmic race: “una raza hecha con el tesoro de todas las anteriores, la raza final, la raza cósmica” (Vasconcelos, “La raza cósmica” 78). Relying on Mendel’s (1822-1884) biological theories,⁴⁶ he rejected the supremacy of one race over another, and believed that it was crucial for the “Latin race” to triumph in the political and cultural struggle, because this group, in particular, was the most naturally inclined to mixing. Racial mixing was essential as the most certain means of bringing about the final and most improved “cosmic race.” This could only take place, suggested Vasconcelos, in Latin America with a population (of indigenous and European mixture) already prepared for the task.

Vasconcelos without hesitation exploited the emotional charge of this concept in the elaboration of their discourse on Latin American identities. As a result, his account of identity formation became extremely influential. Henríquez Ureña, on the other hand, was not so easily swayed by racial proposals in his own elaboration of *hispanoamericanismo*. Like Martí, Henríquez Ureña believed that the idea of a unified Latin America organized along racial lines was an erroneous oversimplification: “la raza,” denominada así, no ciertamente con exactitud científica, pero si con impulso de simplificación expresiva (“Raza y cultura,” 12). According to Henríquez Ureña, from an anthropological perspective, the racial proposal was not acceptable:

Desde el punto de vista de la ciencia antropológica, bien lejos está de constituir una raza la multicolor muchedumbre de pueblos que hablan nuestra lengua en el mundo, desde los Pirineos hasta los Andes y desde las Baleares y las Canarias hasta las Antillas y hasta las Filipinas [...] Pero el vocablo *raza* a pesar de su flagrante inexactitud ha adquirido para nosotros valor convencional [...] (“Raza y cultura” 12).

⁴⁶ The theories of Gregor Mendel explained the inheritance of traits according to particular laws.

This cultural view clearly contrasts, as we eventually notice, with the racialized one he adopted in his construction of Dominican national identity. Nonetheless, as far as his *hispanoamericanista* vision of the Latin American culture was concerned:

Lo que une y unifica a esta raza, no real sino ideal, es la comunidad de cultura, determinada de modo principal por la comunidad de idioma. Cada idioma lleva consigo su repertorio de tradiciones, de creencias, de actitudes ante la vida, que perduran sobreponiéndose a cambios, revoluciones y trastornos [...] Pertenece al imperio Romano, decía Sarmiento hablando de estos pueblos de América; pertenecemos a la Romanía, a la familia latina o, como dice la manoseada y discutida fórmula, a la raza latina; otra imagen de raza no real, sino ideal (“Raza y cultura” 13).

Certainly, Henríquez Ureña has Vasconcelos’s racial discourse in mind in his explanation of the social realities of Latin America. According to Henríquez Ureña, language was a more essential factor than race in the empirical foundation of a social reality (as well as the construction of what he called “The Great Fatherland,” Latin America’s “Magna Patria”). There is, in Henríquez Ureña’s discussion of language in his cultural texts, despite his acknowledgement of its heterogeneity, a basic belief in the unifying force of language that reflects “la unidad de su historia, la unidad de propósito en la vida política y en la vida intelectual [que] hacen de nuestra América una entidad, una Magna Patria, una agrupación de pueblos destinados a unirse cada día más y más” (“La utopía de América” 5). Also in his preference of language over race as the basis of Latin American identity, we find him slipping into one of several contradictions. With his insistence on language as an essential component of a cultural unit, he sides with Menéndez Pidal and other Peninsular *hispanoamericanistas*. However, Henríquez Ureña maintains a critical distance from them by insisting on the specific

American conditions of development of this essential (linguistic) component. He is reluctant to give up what he sees as Latin America's claim to "spiritual originality" and contribution to universal culture, *nuestra expresión*:

No hemos renunciado a escribir en español, y nuestro problema de la expresión original y propia comienza ahí. Cada idioma es una cristalización de modos de pensar y de sentir, y cuanto en él se escribe se baña en el color de su cristal. Nuestra expresión necesitará doble vigor para imponer su tonalidad sobre rojo y el gualda ("La utopía de América" 38).

Hispanoamericanistas such as Henríquez Ureña believed that it was possible and necessary to derive the idealized community from the language, but disagreed with the priority assigned to Peninsular Spanish in the construction of Latin American identity. For that reason he devoted a great deal of time and energy to a rigorous study of dialectal zones from Latin America and its specific linguistic features. In one of his classic linguistic works, "El supuesto andalucismo de América" (1925), he strongly rejected traditional accounts of American Spanish, held by linguists and philologists,⁴⁷ as a derivative of the Andalusian dialect. In this instance, he sought to create a vision of American Spanish removed from its Peninsular mold; a vision not so profoundly influenced by Peninsular tradition. This representation of American Spanish was a perfect fit for his *hispanoamericanismo*, or the view of a politically unified Latin America, immersed in, yet emancipated from Spanish culture.

Ironically, the case is not the same in Henríquez Ureña's particular depiction of national identity and Spanish in the Dominican Republic. In order to understand this dilemma, it is important to go back and reexamine the different nature of *hispanoamericanismo* in the

⁴⁷ Including his mentor Menéndez Pidal (see the next chapter).

Dominican Republic. It is possible to use the categories of “españolismo” or “hispanophilia” to distinguish the Dominican brand, but our adopted terminology and a basic description of its characteristics will suffice. Dominican *hispanoamericanismo* is a political and cultural ideology based on the concept of the Dominican national identity as pure, white, and Spanish.⁴⁸ While not all Dominicans accepted this self-image⁴⁹ and neocolonial status, this ideology became, and is still, dominant. Thus in Henríquez Ureña’s linguistic work we find the following seemingly divergent representations: i) American Spanish as the product of the independent will and collective effort of the American people (“antiandalucismo”); and ii) “El Español en Santo Domingo” as a Northern Castilian archaic dialect without the possibility of African influence (“arcaísmo”). Why did Henríquez Ureña abandon his complex *hispanoamericanismo* for the traditional *hispanismo* of the Dominican ruling class and the intellectual elite? To answer that question one must look at the political and cultural circumstances surrounding his native country as well as the political and cultural conditions surrounding intellectual production in Latin America, while exploring the complex interplay of Dominican nationalism and *hispanoamericanismo*.

In the Dominican Republic as well as in the broader Latin American context, for the historical and ideological reasons that we have discussed above, identity continuously emerges as a central question. In analyzing this question intellectuals felt that it was crucial to link identity to language. In the process, they not only formulated an identity but they also produced a particular vision of the language, which, under varying circumstances, they felt compelled to

⁴⁸ Carlos Rama noted: “un caso muy particular es el de la República Dominicana, que fue abandonada a Francia por España por el tratado de Basilea de 1795, y sufre ocupaciones francesas y haitianas y dos restauraciones del poder español entre 1809-1822 y 1861 a 1865. Esas ocupaciones tuvieron el apoyo del arzobispado y el clero español, que eran monárquicos, y ‘su objetivo era convertir a Santo Domingo en colonia de España porque, aparentemente, los dominicanos de la época todavía se veían a sí mismos como españoles,’ blancos y católicos” (111).

⁴⁹ The most commonly noted exception is the equally complicated *mulataje* discourse (“la comunidad mulata”) that promotes the categorical view of Dominicans as fully mixed racially (Pérez Cabral 1967).

defend and protect. Therefore, it is necessary to also situate Henríquez Ureña's linguistic production in the tradition of language studies in the Hispanic world. Of utmost importance for our purposes is the question of how exactly were these questions and issues dealt with by analysts in the tradition of language studies in Latin America. What dictated the terms of their approach?

IV. The Intellectual Context: Henríquez Ureña in Hispanic Linguistics

In order to fully understand the origins and implications of Henríquez Ureña's linguistic work, it is necessary to place it against the backdrop of the contributions made by the principal figures in language studies in the Hispanic world and to identify the distribution, circulation, and operation of fundamental ideas about language that informed his approach to linguistic matters. As indicated in chapter two, this analysis is grounded on the principles of linguistic historiography (Koerner 1995, Laurendeau 1990) according to which the historical emergence of a particular form of linguistic description cannot be solely interpreted by virtue of its factual rigor, but must also be understood in relation to the general goals and objectives of the linguists that established them as well as in relation to the cultural, political, and social contexts in which they were formulated. In this chapter, I situate Henríquez Ureña's linguistic studies in a particular intellectual context and climate of opinion and reveal the degree to which his work developed in dialogue with the specific linguistic, intellectual, and political circumstances.

In the nineteenth century, students of philology and historical grammar were laying the epistemological and methodological foundations for a science of language which gravitated more and more towards the natural sciences such as botany, chemistry, biology, comparative anatomy, paleontology, and geology: "the science of language is to be regarded as a modern one, as much so as geology and chemistry; it belongs, like them, to the nineteenth century" (Whitney 5). The nineteenth century American linguist William Dwight Whitney (1827-1894) thought that developments in the study of language were similar to developments in the natural sciences but not identical (Koerner, Professing linguistic historiography 65). Nonetheless, philologists such as the German August Schleicher (1821-1868), who wanted to prove that

languages could be studied scientifically, argued that they functioned like natural organisms, and began to develop a theory of language that emphasized its systematic character.

For these linguists, the interest in a language's systematic development was also directly linked with the Romantic preoccupation with determining the developmental process of national consciousness: "[the science of language] seeks to know what language is worth to the mind, and what has been its part in the development of our race. And less directly, it seeks to learn and set forth what it may of the history of human development, and of the history of the races, their movements and connections, so far as these are to be read in the facts of language" (Whitney 4). The relationship between national consciousness and language became a fundamental problem for nineteenth century historical linguistics (Kibbee 114).

The neogrammarian⁵⁰ model dominated Europe until the appearance of Saussure's *Cours* (1916). Saussure established what the scope of linguistics should be: i) to describe and trace the history of all observable languages; ii) to determine the universal forces and principles around which all languages develop; and iii) to delimit and define itself (6). The first works in Spanish linguistics were historical grammars mostly by German philologists (Diez 1882, Meyer-Lübke 1890) that included descriptions of Spanish. Subsequently, Ramón Menéndez Pidal (1904, 1926), working within Schleicher's paradigm, concentrated his efforts in establishing the study of the history of the Spanish language as a separate discipline (Portolés 45). However, in the nineteenth century, other scholars in the Hispanic world had already expressed serious interest in the scientific study of Spanish.

⁵⁰ Neogrammarians held that phonetic laws were similar to laws of nature (or the physical sciences) in their consistency of operation. Neogrammarian ideas, best represented by Hermann Paul's Principles of the history of language, first published in 1880, are seen by many in the twentieth century as the movement that started scientific linguistics in Europe (Anderson 194).

4.1 Andrés Bello and national grammars

At the time that Friedrich Diez (1794-1876) was developing the foundations of Romance philology in Germany, Andrés Bello (1781-1865) worked on his *Gramática castellana destinada al uso de los Americanos* (1847), arguably the first scientific study of Spanish (Malkiel, Linguistics and philology 15). The Venezuelan-born Andrés Bello, an exemplary figure in Latin American cultural history, is often considered the precursor of language studies in Latin America (Malkiel, Linguistics and philology 15). Bello spent twenty years in London where under difficult circumstances he forged personal and intellectual ties with several important Latin American and Spanish exiles and European thinkers such as James Mill (1773-1836) and Alexander von Humboldt (1769-1859), through whom he learned about Alexander's brother Wilhelm von Humboldt's (1767-1835) work on language. Bello's major works were in the fields of philology, literature, law, philosophy, and education and were mostly carried out during his life in Chile after 1829, which was a critical juncture in the history of this emerging South American country.

Bello conceived of his Grammar as an important tool for maintaining linguistic and cultural unity as well as civic order in and among the newly independent nations: “juzgo importante la conservación de la lengua de nuestros padres en su posible pureza, como un medio providencial de comunicación y un vínculo de fraternidad entre las varias naciones de origen español derramadas sobre los continentes” (Bello, Gramática 32). Bello wrote his Grammar in order to control and maintain language standards which would presumably curtail the danger of linguistic and cultural fragmentation. The standardization process consisted of selecting and using the (panhispanic) norm that most closely resembled the educated speech of Peninsular speakers instead of the “pernicious” regional forms (“ciertas prácticas viciosas de los

americanos”) (Bello, Gramática 31, Sánchez Méndez 134). The preference for a Peninsular norm is not explicitly stated, but it can be inferred from Bello’s writings. Moré (2004) argues: “es posible detectar su presencia y funcionamiento implícitos sobre todo en aquellos casos que el criterio sociocultural resulta inadecuado para cuestionar o autorizar el uso de determinada forma” (73-74). Consider the use of the verb “transar” in Chile, a practice which Bello disapproved because he believed it had no precedent in Peninsular Spanish: “no hay en Castellano” (Moré 74). Bello referred to the linguistic norm as: “lengua castellana [...] la que se habla en Castilla y que con las armas y las leyes de los castellanos pasó a la América, y es hoy el idioma común de los Estados hispanoamericanos” (Gramática 35). Bello selected and recommended the “lengua castellana,” naturally entrenched in the Castilian legal tradition and bolstered by power, as the national language for the new republics. Thus, in spite of putting the process of language standardization at the service of the new nations, Bello perpetuated colonial hierarchies.

During Bello’s time, the fear of linguistic fragmentation was intense and widespread: “Nuestra América producirá dentro de poco una confusión de idiomas, dialectos y jeringozas, el caos babilónico de la edad media; y diez pueblos perderán uno de sus vínculos más poderosos de fraternidad, uno de sus más preciosos instrumentos de correspondencia y comercio” (“Discurso de instalación de la Universidad” 315). Fearing the possibility that the Spanish language might fragment into multiple American dialects (as had occurred with Latin following the end of the Roman Empire), Bello specified the preservation of linguistic unity as the principal motivation behind his grammar (Bello, Gramática 33, Moré 67, Luis 141). Bello believed that the preservation of the unity of the Spanish language and national unity was directly related to an expansion of the linguistic code used by the leading class and educated people that could circumscribe the linguistic diversity and chaos of the newly independent states of Latin America:

Los lectores inteligentes que me honren leyéndola con alguna atención, verán el cuidado que he puesto en demarcar, por decirlo así, los linderos que respeta señalando el buen uso de nuestra lengua, en medio de la soltura y libertad de sus giros, señalando las corrupciones que más cunden hoy día, manifestando la esencial diferencia que existe entre las construcciones castellanas y las extranjeras que se les asemejan hasta cierto punto, y que solemos imitar sin el debido discernimiento (Gramática 33).

While insisting on the separation of Spanish and foreign modes of expressions, Bello was associating geographical and linguistic boundaries. This type of association played a large role in the work of those who were shaping ideological formations (i.e., the nation) in the context of Latin America.

Bello's *Gramática nacional* became the model and the inspiration for the next generation of scholars who participated in the debates over Latin America's linguistic reality. Following the appearance of Bello's *Gramática* there was a surge in the publication of provincial vocabularies in many Latin American countries: Juan de Arona's *Diccionario de peruanismos* (1861), Zorobabel Rodríguez's *Diccionario de chilenismos* (1875), Joaquim de Macedo Soares's *Diccionario brasileiro da lingua portuguesa* (1888), and Alberto Membreño's *Vocabulario de los pronvincialismos de Honduras* (1895), among others. According to Guitarte (1998), these dictionaries from the "pre-scientific" era are primarily the products of amateurs who shared the notion that American Spanish was corrupted in relation to the Spanish spoken by Spaniards ("Un concepto de la filología" 426). These dictionaries reflect the practice of lexicographers, amateur or not, who were only too eager to assist in the ideological tasks of nation-building, such as the standardization of the national language. This was done specifically through the legitimization of provincialisms and the defense of an orthography based on the particular local pronunciation.

Yet despite this separation from what was regarded as the Peninsular norm, these lexicographers, with varying degrees of success, tried to emulate Bello's reflections on language in the context of the modern Latin American states (Arnoux, (Discursos sobre nación 192-193). According to Henríquez Ureña:

In his Grammar of the Spanish tongue (1847) and in his Principles of orthology and metrics (1835), [Bello] established the study of language and of its verse on a basis of fact which had been obscured latterly by a blind adherence to Latin models, although the grammarians and prosodists of the fifteenth century, Nebrija and Encina, had originally taken the right road. Bello's Grammar is still, after nearly a hundred years the most complete synchronic description of our tongue and one of the best of any modern language (Henríquez Ureña, Literary currents⁵¹ 103).

Henríquez Ureña recognized Andrés Bello and Rufino José Cuervo, the two pioneers of language studies in Latin America, as the building blocks of "el saber hispanoamericano." This knowledge is a fundamental base on which Henríquez Ureña built his own representations of language and culture in the Latin American context and it is, therefore, no accident that *hispanoamericanismo* is the tradition with which he is most often associated⁵² (Vaquero 1997, Gutiérrez Girardot 2001).

⁵¹ This particular text was originally published in English and years later translated into Spanish by Diéz-Canedo in 1964 (Las corrientes literarias 107).

⁵² Amado Alonso (1896-1952) wrote: "con sus virtudes comunes y sus dotes peculiares, Bello, Cuervo y Henríquez Ureña son la honra de América en los estudios humanísticos; los tres, pares entre los grandes de otras tierras" ("Pedro Henríquez Ureña, Investigador" 357).

4.2 Caribbean lexicography

The appearance of the Cuban-Dominican Esteban Pichardo's *Diccionario Casi Razonado de Voces y Frases Cubanas* (1836) signaled the emergence of lexicography in Latin America and the Caribbean (Fernando A. Martínez 1968). According to Pichardo himself, "los efectos fueron asombrosos: en toda la Isla y ultra de ella el DICCIONARIO CUBANO adquirió celebridad: los parabienes se prodigaron; notabilidades literarias, campesinos, oficinistas, lexicógrafos, todos adoptaron y encomiaron la Obra" (1-2). The author was also pleased by the reception accorded to it by the *Real Academia Española*. To Carlos Rama (1982), its greatest achievement was the recording of new lexemes derived from local speech (126). According to Martínez (1968) the concept of a genuine record of local speech:

Inspires *Diccionario de Voces Cubanas* of Pichardo, which opens nineteenth century lexicography, and which springs from living experiences with the language and with different neighboring countries (Cuba, Santo Domingo, and Puerto Rico). It offers a direct testimony of lexical varieties, of their sources (terms from other languages), and their most marked changes in meaning (91).

The lexicographer's practice consisted of providing a broad view of the American world through its lexicon.⁵³ It included descriptions of a given region's flora, fauna, resources, and industries as well as the practices and customs of its inhabitants:

Da a conocer con alguna amplitud el significado de las Vozes, su origen y relaciones en todas aquellas materias de su propósito, bastante a facilitar la precisa instrucción sobre los vegetales, minería, aves, pezes cuadrúpedos, réptiles, botánica-médica, agricultura, ganadería, comercio mayor y menor, tráfico, pesas, medidas, modedas, industria, oficios,

⁵³ See Fernando A. Martínez (1968).

costumbres, usos, comidas juegos, música, bailes, diversiones, etc., etc., relativos únicamente al provincialismo (Pichardo 3).

In addition, these lexical corpora contained linguistic expressions that were presumably unique to a province, state, or country (e.g., *argentanismos*, *chilenismos*, *hondureñismos*, etcetera): “solamente en Puerto-Rico he oido esta voz—*Embullamiento* (Pichardo 2); El *Cajuil* de Sto. Domingo es nuestro *Marañon*” (Pichardo 7). Lexicographers such as Pichardo conceptualized regional dictionaries as more than simple compilations of provincialisms: “algunos piensan que el DICCIONARIO CUBANO se reduce a las palabras indígenas [...] Otros quisieran por lo contrario que se ampliase a Vozes de invención particular, o poco usadas y a la corrección de algunas, corrompidas solamente por el vulgo ínfimo. No, el DICCIONARIO PROVINCIAL comprende todas las palabras peculiares de la Isla de Cuba” (9). Regional lexicons became associated with distinct national territories and therefore a theoretical tool for explaining national cultures.

Among Henríquez Ureña’s contemporaries, we also find the Puerto Rican lexicographer Augusto Malaret (1878-1967), who significantly contributed to the spread of this type of studies not only in the Caribbean, but also in Latin America. While his *Diccionario de americanismos* (1925) was considered at one point the most complete lexical count of American Spanish (López Morales, “Introducción” 7), his *Diccionario de provincialismos de Puerto Rico* (first edition dates to 1917) was highly regarded as well. This work attempted to collect linguistic and folkloric material from remote corners of Puerto Rico. The result was a list of 3,209 lexical items used throughout the island (López Morales 7). *Diccionario* is organized around three central elements: the definition and status of lexical items within the academic establishment, information regarding certain grammatical contexts in which lexemes appear, and information

regarding lexemes's sociolinguistic variation, if any. These lexicographers' attitude towards sociolinguistic variation was complex. While some acknowledged that many of the so-called provincialisms were widely used throughout Latin America or were in fact archaic *hispanismos*, they tended to emphasize their local character. In some cases, they were not too receptive to their own local lexical variation. Regarding *afronegrismos*, for example, Malaret wrote (in his 1937 edition):

La contribución de la raza africana al lenguaje castellano en Puerto Rico es absolutamente negativa, sin que tengamos que recordar, por no ser de la índole de este estudio, sus errores de pronunciación. En Cuba se publican diccionarios de *afronegrismos*, en Santo Domingo se dejará sentir algo la influencia del patois de la vecina república de Haití; pero en Puerto Rico se pueden contar con los dedos los vocablos negros que han pasado a la conversación general: *calalú, guigambó, macandá, malanga, mandinga, ñame [...], baquiné, calambé, marinada, o mariyandá* (11).

Nonetheless, these lexicographers were devoted to compiling a proper inventory of *americanismos* and provincialisms and ensuring their preservation. In the process, some of them could not avoid adopting neologisms derived from new economic, cultural, and ideological conditions generated by independence and nation-building (Carlos Rama 116). Along with grammarians and philologists, lexicographers were shaping nationalism in Latin America.⁵⁴ The following remarks by the Peruvian Juan de Arona (1882) exemplify the degree to which lexicography was put at the service of the discursive construction of the nation:

Con el mismo espíritu de independencia, rebeldía y libertad que demostramos en todo, hemos sacudido también el yugo de otra tiranía, ortológica y prosódica; la que prescribe

⁵⁴ See, for example, Malaret's (1932) *Por mi patria y por mi idioma*.

trocar el diptongo *ue* en *o* en ciertos nombres derivados; y así sacamos de *buñuelo*, *buñuelero*, de *pañuelo*, *pañuelón*, de *suerte* (lotería), *suertero*, de *bueno*, *buenísimo*, de *pescuezo*, *pescuezón*, de *cuerpo*, *cuerpazo* (en lo de *pañuelón* por *pañolón* parece que nos acompañan algunos escritores peninsulares). Un pueblo que se ha salido con la suya rompiendo el rigor de la ley en lo civil, y el de la etiqueta en lo social, ¿se dejaría subyugar por la ultramarina gramática de Castilla? (22-23).

The basic idea shared by these Latin American lexicographers was that in adding American regionalisms to or correcting the ones already included in *Diccionario de la Real Academia Española (DRAE)* they were presenting and solidifying the foundations of their respective national identities.

4.3 Cuervo and the foundations of Latin American philology

At the end of the nineteenth century, following very closely the latest development in European linguistic research, Colombian philologist Rufino José Cuervo (1844-1911) began his studies reacting against the amateur lexicographers and ended up as one of the most eminent figures in Hispanic philology. Henríquez Ureña admired Cuervo's erudition and knowledge of the science of language: "la filología hispánica toca su cima, en el siglo XIX, con la obra del colombiano Rufino José Cuervo [...]; nadie, ni siquiera Bello, había conocido como él, hasta entonces, en Europa ni en América, la historia de nuestro idioma, la historia de cada palabra y de cada giro" (Henríquez Ureña, "La utopía de América" 276-277). In addition, Cuervo took

strong positions against Spanish neocolonial impulses, a fact which was of utmost relevance to the *andalucismo* debate.⁵⁵

Cuervo's desire to scientifically study language was so strong that he taught himself German in order to read Franz Bopp, the founder of scientific philology of the Indo-European languages.⁵⁶ Cuervo's philological work initially emerged as part of an effort to establish different categories of change in the meaning of words.⁵⁷ Cuervo's *Diccionario de construcción y régimen* (1866) established him as the leading authority on Spanish philology. His *Apuntaciones críticas sobre el lenguaje bogotano* (1872) combined on a comparative basis a first-hand study of the local language with far-reaching considerations of linguistic principles. More specifically, Cuervo explained the use and history of a large number of lexical items in Bogotá speech while reflecting on important phonetic, morphological, and syntactic phenomena. With *Apuntaciones*, Cuervo sought to contribute to the development of scientific studies in the region, thus, putting linguistic research at the service of his society.⁵⁸

⁵⁵ Among other things, Cuervo opposed Spanish intellectuals' attempts to continue their dominance of the public discourse on language. Based on this rejection, Henríquez Ureña sought to convince his contemporaries that Cuervo had formally expressed his views against *andalucismo*.

⁵⁶ In a letter to the German scholar Pott (1802-1887) Cuervo wrote: "apenas podía entender yo algo de alemán a fuerza de consultar el Diccionario, cuando hice venir de Europa la Gramática comparativa de Bopp y las Investigaciones Etimológicas de V. [August Friedrich Pott] (que me eran conocidas por el Diccionario griego de Liddell y Scott); de suerte que V. ha alimentado en mí la afición a los estudios filológicos, y a V. le debo mucho de lo poco que en este ramo se alcanza" (cited in Schütz 195).

⁵⁷ Cuervo's *Diccionario* begins: "la obra de que forman parte las páginas adjuntas no es un diccionario enciclopédico; tampoco es un diccionario general de la lengua castellana: comprende sólo aquellas palabras que ofrecen alguna particularidad sintáctica, ora por las combinaciones a que se prestan, ora por los cambios de oficio o funciones gramaticales de que son susceptibles, ora por el papel que desempeñan en el enlace de los términos y sentencias" (341).

⁵⁸ "Al publicar esta obra [Apuntaciones] por primera vez, me vi precisado a hacer ciertas concesiones a las circunstancias en que la compuse. Los estudios filológicos eran casi una novedad en mi patria; la literatura estaba poco menos que monopolizada por una escuela que no concebía nada superior a [Antonio de] Trueba, Fernán Caballero y otros así; y que miraba de mal ojo, si no ridiculizaba, los estudios clásicos o la aplicación a investigaciones científicas, ajenas de patrañas y curiosidades parroquiales. Para empeñar al público en la lectura de este libro, fue menester acudir a la maledicencia (si así puede decirse) criticando acá y allá a autores conocidos, así como al empleo de gracejos y otros expedientes que caerían mal en una obra exclusivamente científica; hubo necesidad de disculpas para el pecado de la erudición y hasta de rebatir los efugios de aquellos que por darla de grandes pensadores, se juzgaban exentos de la obligación a atender a la corrección de la forma" (Cuervo, Castellano)

The possible fragmentation of Spanish into multiple dialects is another central theme in Cuervo's work. Like Bello, Cuervo expressed a concern and shared the idea that in order to prevent the split it was necessary to reestablish a clear and prestigious linguistic authority. Cuervo was the first scholar to express distressed but coherent views on the subject. He saw the ever increasing appearance of regionalisms in works of literature, combined with the decreasing cultural influence of Spain, as indication of the linguistic fragmentation of Spanish in Latin America. According to Cuervo, three important factors played a role in this situation: i) the natural evolution of languages assisted by different climates and the practices of social and ethnic groups; ii) Spain's collapse as a unifying cultural and intellectual force; and iii) the lack of contact among Latin American countries (El castellano en América 205-206). He made reference to the historically parallel case of Latin: "estamos pues en vísperas (que en las vidas de los pueblos pueden ser bien largas) de quedar separados, como lo quedaron las hijas del imperio romano" (El castellano en América 206). The Colombian's views regarding this issue led to a polemic with the *hispanomaericanista* Juan Valera (1824-1905). The Spanish writer reacted acrimoniously to Cuervo's ideas, especially the idea that: "fuera de cuatro o cinco autores cuyas obras leemos los americanos con gusto y provecho, nuestra vida intelectual; se deriva de otras fuentes" (El castellano en América 206). Valera replied that essentially the stability of the language and its future was secured and guaranteed by the pride and loyalty of Spanish speakers everywhere to Spain and its colonial history (Del Valle, "Lingüística histórica" 95).

Valera's position, infused with the political and cultural anxieties of his days, anticipated what Del Valle (2004a) calls "la vision pidalina de la lengua" ("Lingüística histórica" 100) as

popular y castellano literario 736). Through satire and criticism, Cuervo tried to reach and then educate a local public that found literary and intellectual gossip more appealing than linguistic problems. Nevertheless, despite these publicity tactics, the author saw his *Apuntaciones* as a serious endeavor and commitment to the development of his national culture which, one way or another, needed the establishment of scientific disciplines and "scientific culture" (Guitarte, "El camino de Cuervo" 248).

well as the ideological spiraling of this subject in the *hispanoamericanismo* debates. Although Menéndez Pidal (1944) had admitted that Cuervo was indeed a linguistic authority, he believed that the Colombian was incorrect and attributed his fragmentation theories to old age (“La unidad del idioma” 7). This was, of course, a rhetorical strategy to discredit the Colombian philologist indirectly (Del Valle, “Menéndez Pidal 132”). Menéndez Pidal proposed to the subsequent generation of scholars that the unity of Spanish was firmly established. Throughout the debate with Valera, however, Cuervo demonstrated the breadth of his knowledge of the linguistic history of America and a determination to establish empirically based facts about linguistic phenomena. Yet the belief that defending the unity of Spanish was an intellectual responsibility counterbalanced his so-called linguistic pessimism. As the debate on the unity of Spanish continued, scholars such as Henríquez Ureña seriously took into account many of Cuervo’s ideas on the subject.

Characteristic of Cuervo’s linguistic thought is the assimilation of the dominant ideas in linguistics at the end of the nineteenth century. Well-versed in these prevalent linguistic ideas, he understood the evolving character of language as revealed by objective linguistic studies: “toda lengua vive en evolución perpetua, alterándose, enriqueciéndose o empobreciéndose, y cada época nos la muestra en una fase de tal evolución” (Castellano Popular 419). He also acknowledged the fact that linguistic evolution responded to historical circumstances:

No es esto solo: cada lengua varía más o menos según las comarcas en que domina y en cada una de ellas sigue su evolución propia: en la Península, no habla el natural de Castilla como el aragonés o el andaluz; ni en América el chileno como el mejicano o el colombiano [...] Las diferencias regionales pueden ser restos de un dialecto anterior a la extensión del dialecto que ha logrado la primacía literaria y política, como son muchas de

las particularidades del habla castellana en Aragón y Galicia; o bien provenir de evolución posterior al establecimiento de la lengua nacional, como las que cunden en otras regiones de España y en América. Al estudiar pues la lengua popular o literaria en cada región del dominio castellano deben discriminarse todas estas circunstancias a la luz de la historia política y literaria, para saber a cada paso dónde se ha efectuado la evolución y emplear en su esclarecimiento los criterios que explican la alteración del lenguaje (Castellano Popular 419).

While Cuervo had a broad conception of language change, he was also mindful of the academic tradition begun by scholars such as Bello which viewed as their intellectual responsibility to defend the concept of unity of the Spanish language (Del Valle, “Lingüística histórica” 102).

Cuervo wrote: “toda evolución se realiza por fuerza en todas partes, en España como en América, y si con sinceridad se desea mantener la unidad del habla literaria, única posible, tanto españoles como americanos han de poner de su parte para lograrlo” (Castellano en América 13).

Faced with the possible fragmentation of Spanish, Cuervo explored the possibilities of preserving linguistic unity. In Castellano en América (1901), he examined the history of American Spanish, its situation at the turn of the century, and its possible future, which he viewed with a certain degree of pessimism or, at least, skepticism.

Cuervo had enormous impact in the development of language studies in Latin America, professionally and ideologically. He is recognized as the founder of Latin American philology (Guitarte, “El camino de Cuervo” 2). His writings, which considerably evolved throughout his career, reflect a unique effort to approach linguistic matters in a scientific manner. In the analysis of the local speech of his native Bogotá, he uncovered archaic lexical forms that had been incorrectly classified as American neologisms. Cuervo came to the defense of Latin American

speakers who had been accused of corrupting the Spanish language, stating that historically Spaniards were responsible for bringing to America the linguistic practices that they then censored and ridiculed among Latin Americans. Over the years, as his professional and intellectual development expanded, his view of American Spanish evolved. Nevertheless, some of his lessons and opinions strongly resonated with successors like Henríquez Ureña, especially the idea of combining scientific endeavors with patriotic duties. Another significant suggestion that resonated strongly in Henríquez Ureña's representation of Latin American cultural identity is Cuervo's idea that, except for four or five exceptions, Latin America did not longer derive its intellectual inspiration from Spain (Cuervo, El Castellano en America 296).

4.4 Lenz and Hanssen in Chile

The foundation of linguistic studies in Latin America owes a great deal to intellectuals like Cuervo and Bello, but also to their most immediate successors (of foreign extraction), the German linguists working in Chile, Friedrich Hanssen (1857-1919) and Rudolph Lenz (1863-1938). Hanssen contributed with studies on the systematic historical phonology of Spanish as well as on Old Spanish conjugation, syntax, dialectology, metrics, and textual criticism. Lenz advanced phonetic studies as well as research in historical phonology. Contributions such as Lenz's and Hanssen's benefited language studies in Latin America by developing more modern methods, but, more importantly, by increasing the exchange of scholarly information between European and Hispanic language scholars (Malkiel, Linguistics and philology 17).

Lenz, an honorary Chilean who immigrated from Germany in 1890, thought that Bello's and Cuervo's proposal of developing a scientific, psychological, synchronic grammar needed more work. According to Hatzfeld (1947), Lenz tried to advance in Latin America the idea that

language study is not possible without a descriptive and experimental phonetics (352). He insisted that training in phonetics was absolutely necessary in order to analyze, describe, locate, imitate, and correctly pronounce the sounds of present languages and dialects (Hatzfeld 352). Lenz's *La oración y sus partes* (1920) is the culmination of efforts to modernize Bello and Cuervo. Other contributions by Lenz included: *El Español en Chile* (a collection of studies of Chilean Spanish published in Germany in 1891 and translated and edited by Amado Alonso in 1933), and *El diccionario etimológico de las voces chilenas derivadas de lenguas indígenas americanas* (1905-1910). Some of the issues considered by Lenz in *El Español en Chile* would become fundamental in the next phase of language studies. Of particular interest are his observations on how the phonetic analysis of speech can be utilized in the characterization of certain dialectal varieties and the specificity of certain national groups. In *El Español en Chile*, Lenz tried to demonstrate the scientific value of the study of popular speech. However, the main focus of this work was the influence of *araucano* in the pronunciation of Spanish in Chile and the following key question: "¿los americanos que hoy hablan español son descendientes de españoles, de indios o de otros pueblos, o bien mestizos de razas diversas?" (224).

While Cuervo (1876) elaborated the concept of the (linguistic) "base" of American Spanish, Lenz (1893) was the one who formalized it (Guitarte, "Un concepto de filología" 417). For Lenz the concept was enmeshed with other neogrammarian concepts such as pre-literary speech, Vulgar Latin, original language, primary form, nation, etcetera, but he thought that this linguistic base was equivalent to the popular Spanish brought to America by Spanish colonizers. But Cuervo's conceptualization was different. For the Colombian, the concept meant a particular dialect or the midpoint between educated speech and common everyday speech (Guitarte, "Un concepto de filología" 424). While a relatively simpler concept in Cuervo, in

Lenz's work it is more complex. Lenz equated the concept of "the linguistic base of Spanish" with the notion of "popular Spanish." "Popular speech" ("el habla del pueblo") is a type of speech that, unlike written classical Spanish, primarily represents the essence of a social group (i.e., the nation). Lenz's concept was laden with the Romantic meanings associated with folklore, nationalism, and the German tradition represented by Herder:

Es evidente que el desarrollo del lenguaje popular en la América Española sólo se podrá estudiar en forma perfecta cuando en todos los países se hayan recogido todas las palabras que usa el pueblo, como ya se ha principiado a hacer en la Argentina y el Uruguay, y cuando se hayan hecho estudios detallados como el de la fonética, morfología y sintaxis de los diferentes dialectos vulgares [...] No pierdo la esperanza de que alguno de mis antiguos alumnos del Instituto Pedagógico tome la iniciativa de juntar colaboradores para la confección del diccionario del habla popular chilena. Es una tarea patriótica nacional. ¡Y cuándo no ha tenido éxito el que trabaja sobre la base del patriotismo chileno! (El español en Chile 10).

Lenz's linguistic nationalism had ethnolinguistic implications for his investigations: "más adelante he de explicar cómo, a mi entender, en Chile y la Argentina son factores etnológicos los responsables por la aspiración de la -s" (El Español en Chile 223). Lenz's (Romantic) views on the concept of the linguistic base, nonetheless, led to an important discussion on the conditions of development of American Spanish. Guitarte highlighted the significance of the concept:

El éxito que alcanzó muestra que, con todo, Lenz tocó un punto fundamental y la "base" pasó a formar parte del acervo de nociones de filología hispanoamericana. He aquí cómo me figuro el problema al que apunta. El español de América es una lengua transplantada

al otro lado del Océano y no puede explicarse como una simple extensión geográfica de dialectos, según el modelo que la Reconquista planteó en España. A América la lengua fue traída por un puñado de hablantes que se mantenían en contacto con la Península por ciertas líneas de comunicación, no ya por convivencia. Así, la diversidad de circunstancias históricas y el consiguiente proceso de aculturación hicieron que el español del Nuevo Mundo no prolongara tal cual el que había quedado en la Península, sino que lo hiciera por medio de una *base* propia formada en América (“Un concepto de la filología” 423-424).

Lenz’s work contributed to the increased sophistication of language studies in Latin America. During the next phase of development in Hispanic philology, scholars picked up his important theoretical concept of “base” in order to further elaborate it and use it for various purposes such as developing a polygenetic theory of American Spanish (Alonso 1933 and 1953, Henríquez Ureña 1921 and 1940).

4.5 Ramón Menéndez Pidal and linguistic *hispanismo*

The decline in German prestige after the First World War and the emergence of Menéndez Pidal’s Madrid school of philology reflected a change in the intellectual climate surrounding research on Spanish. In an essay written in 1914, Henríquez Ureña described “Don Ramón Menéndez Pidal” as a model researcher⁵⁹ (“el modelo de investigador sobrio”) (En la orilla 88). The Spaniard Menéndez Pidal (1869-1968) was a decisive figure whose philological and linguistic work was crucial in the development of Romance and Hispanic philology in the twentieth century. He took it upon himself to bridge the gap between the old tradition of Spanish

⁵⁹ “Ya, en realidad, he llegado a encontrar mi ideal de vida: una vida como la de Don Ramón Menéndez Pidal, como la de Rodó” (Henríquez Ureña, “Letter to Reyes,” cited in Barcia 128).

philology and the (then) new science of Romance linguistics (Malkiel, “Filología española” 100). His major contributions included *Manual elemental de gramática histórica española* (1904) and *Orígenes del español* (1926), which as Henríquez Ureña (1922) asserts were (and still are) the point of departure for every student of the history of the Spanish language (En la orilla 88).

In *Manual*, using data from the *leonés* dialect, Menéndez Pidal anticipated what became more explicit in *Orígenes*,⁶⁰ an integrated view of linguistic change that rendered the neogrammarian and dialectological perspectives compatible. According to Del Valle (1997), “en el *Manual*, estudio de orientación claramente neogramática, incorporó datos procedentes del leonés anunciando tímidamente una de las grandes contribuciones de sus *Orígenes*, a saber la integración de la concepción del cambio de los neogramáticos y de los dialectólogos (“La historificación de la lingüística” 183). The general organization of the book, the proposed methodology, and the author’s conception of language change were highly consistent with neogrammarian doctrine, or language science.⁶¹ In the *Manual*’s chapters II and III, Menéndez Pidal presents the linear phonetic changes that operated in the transformation of the standard Castilian form of Spanish from Latin. Despite dedicating one chapter (IV) to sporadic changes, the emphasis in the analysis and description is on the regularity of the phonetic changes: “en aquello que tiene de más regular, de más repetido y constante en la primitiva evolución de cada sonido latino hacia su correspondiente castellano” (Menéndez Pidal, Manual 143). The

⁶⁰ According to Menéndez Pidal: “Un cambio fonético, o sintáctico, o léxico no suele ser nunca obra exclusiva de las tres o cuatros generaciones en que, de un modo arbitrario, se considera dividida la población convivente, sino que es producto de una idea o un gusto tradicional que persiste a través de muchas generaciones de hablantes. La duración del cambio fonético suele ser extraordinariamente larga, multiseccular por lo mismo que la tradición que hay que vencer es la más fuerte de todas, como arraigada en la inmensa repetición cotidiana del acto colectivo del lenguaje (Orígenes 112).

⁶¹ However, as Portolés points out, in his combination of philological and linguistic studies, Menéndez Pidal expressed a conception of language, “mucho más espiritualista que la de un neogramático” (31). But this “spiritualism” is more manifest in *Orígenes*.

prominence of regularity principles and the use of analogy to explain language change reflect a strict adherence to theoretical and methodological principles proposed by neogrammarians. Menéndez Pidal's *Manual* made the case—to Spanish readers—that Spanish could and should be studied scientifically. But, as Del Valle (1997) argues, it also contributed to a vision of the language in which the heterogeneity of its past is absorbed by the consolidation of a homogeneous standard (“La historicación lingüística” 186). According to Menéndez Pidal, “el castellano, por servir de instrumento a una literatura más importante que la de otras regiones de España, y sobre todo por haber absorbido en sí otros dos romances principales hablados en la Península (el leonés y el navarro-aragonés), recibe más propiamente el nombre de lengua española (Manual 2). The author adds: “este idioma hispano-romano, continuado en su natural evolución, es el mismo que aparece constituido ya como lengua literaria en el Poema del Cid, el mismo que perfeccionó Alfonso el Sabio, y sustancialmente, el mismo que escribió Cervantes” (Menéndez Pidal, Manual 8). In these statements we observe the emergence of a monumental image of Spanish grounded on a number of old linguistic documents as well as on the canon of *hispanismo*: El Cid, Alfonso el Sabio, and Cervantes.

Menéndez Pidal's *Orígenes* is a rigorous study of the political and linguistic history of Spain from the fall of the Visigothic monarchy in 711 to the end of the eleventh century. In *Orígenes*, Menéndez Pidal is no longer completely bound by the neogrammarian model:

La geografía dialectal moderna nos ha revelado el principio de que cada palabra tiene su historia aparte, por donde se quiere concluir que no existen leyes fonéticas, sino historias de palabras. El estudio de la cronología en los documentos nos revela lo mismo: que cada palabra tiene su historia; pero nos dice, además, que la suma de historia de cada una de esas palabras nos da la historia de la constitución de una ley fonética (Orígenes 93).

Menéndez Pidal further explained:

Todos los cambios fonéticos pueden llamarse espontáneos y naturales, pues se fundan en la fisiología y psicología de los sonidos, que son muy semejantes para todos los hombres, semejantes son los órganos fónicos, semejantes las asimilaciones, las disimilaciones equivalencias y demás principios inductores, pero cada cambio tiene en cada país una causa particular y una historia propia que es deber de la lingüística indagar (Orígenes 302).

History, as Menéndez Pidal saw it, corresponded with his concept of tradition, which constrains collective action and causes linguistic changes to yield one unique result (Portolés 61). His investigations centered on those particular language forms that contributed to sustain or support his theory of tradition and cultural latency (“el estado latente”). As a result, certain dialects and geographical areas acquired greater relevance in his attempt to reconstruct the origin and development of Spanish since the middle ages. López Sánchez (2006) suggests that:

En este sentido pueden entenderse los artículos en la RFE [Revista de Filología Española] sobre el dialecto judeo-español en Europa oriental o los *arcaísmos fonéticos* y dialectales conservados en determinadas zonas de Castilla. Por otro lado, hay que destacar los esfuerzos por definir un grupo dialectal compacto iberorrománico, cuyos límites geográficos se corresponderían con los de la Península Ibérica. Dicha unidad se basaba en los rasgos de parentesco entre el portugués, el castellano, el catalán y otros dialectos peninsulares, que a su vez podían justificar una unidad tradicional en lo político. La contribución más esencial fueron dos artículos de Amado Alonso en 1926 sobre la subagrupación románica del catalán y, por supuesto, el proyecto ALPI [Atlas Lingüístico de la Península Ibérica] (336).

Although mindful of evolutionary conditions and language contact phenomena,⁶² Menéndez Pidal considered tradition as the spiritual nucleus that binds the history of the Spanish language and literature and allows for the uniform characterization of some of its most unique features. According to Menéndez Pidal, the Castilian temperament and its unique features best represent this tradition and history of Spanish: “Castilla muestra un gusto acústico más certero, escogiendo desde muy temprano, y con más decidida iniciativa, las formas más eufónicas de estos sonidos vocálicos” (*Orígenes* 486). Del Valle (2004) argues that, for Menéndez Pidal, the old documents, philologically scrutinized in *Orígenes*, offered proof of Castile’s destiny as the leading sociopolitical force in the history of Spain (“Menéndez Pidal, la regeneración nacional” 122). Menéndez Pidal wrote: “ciertos países muestran una orientación más espontánea hacia la estabilización más decididamente que otros, Castilla se adelanta a todos los dialectos hermanos” (*Orígenes* 529). Proving this Castilian manifest destiny was important to Menéndez Pidal for a number of reasons, but primarily, as Del Valle points out: i) to forge a positive image of Spain, the Spanish language, Spanish identity, and the civilization it had created over the centuries; and ii) to neutralize the possible spread of fragmentation theory proposed by individuals like Cuervo and Bello (“Menéndez Pidal, national regeneration” 81). Therefore, besides helping to stream into the Hispanic world some of the most intensely debated linguistic theories from Europe, *Manual* and *Orígenes* also articulated the interplay between theory and the ideological context. Del Valle (1997 and 2002) shows how Menéndez Pidal’s linguistic work (i.e., his description of the history of Spanish) is part of a project of constructing an image of the language, of the Spanish nation, and most relevant to *hispanoamericanismo*, of Spanish civilization, while establishing the canon of *hispanismo*.

⁶² “Insiste Pidal, hay que añadir las contribuciones léxicas de los pueblos que, a lo largo de la historia, entraron en contacto con ‘el pueblo español,’ así como de los otros romances peninsulares, y, por supuesto, del vasco” (Del Valle, “La historificación lingüística” 187).

4.5.1 *Centro de Estudios Históricos*

Through his scholarly research, textual production, and various institutional roles Menéndez Pidal had tremendous impact on generations of scholars. He was the Professor of Romance philology at the University of Madrid (1899-1939) and also director of the “Centro de Estudios Históricos” (1910-1936). Through this particular institution he created a school of research, brought together a community of intellectuals and created a dialogue with his contemporaries. In this institution he also designed programs, courses, research projects, methodology, and publications that contributed to the development of some of Spain’s most renowned intellectuals in the twentieth century. The *Centro de Estudios Históricos* in Madrid was the specific site where these scientific and patriotic efforts began to take shape (López Sánchez 2006). Created by the government agency “La Junta para la Ampliación de Estudios,” the *Centro*’s operations included: i) the advancement of philological research; ii) active participation in field research; iii) the training of a select group of students in methodology; iv) participation in scholarly conferences; v) the creation of a specialized library; and vi) the establishment of relations with analogous institutions abroad (López Sánchez 45).

From the school’s inception, philological research received priority. For example, Menéndez Pidal encouraged Amado Alonso, who began translating into Spanish Wilhelm Meyer-Lübke’s *Romance etymological dictionary* in the 1920’s, to challenge the German scholar’s classification of the Catalan language. The main issue of contention was whether certain Catalan phonetic features were wrongly attributed to substrate effects. According to Guitarte (1958), this controversy agitated the philological community in the 1920’s and it involved more than strict scientific considerations (“Cuervo, Henríquez Ureña” 365). The

discussion evaded the issue of how language contact phenomena created the type of linguistic continuum in this part of Europe that makes it possible to describe Catalan as a Gallo-Romance language, and Provençal as an Ibero-Romance language. Instead, both the German and the Spanish philologists insisted on pointing out the most radical grammatical differences between Catalan and Provençal. According to Guitarte, the problem originated from the then too common distinction between important and marginal European countries (“Cuervo, Henríquez Ureña” 365). Guitarte argues that Meyer-Lübke tried to classify Catalan as a Gallo-Romance language believing that in doing so this speech community could claim the prestige of Provençal literature and the association with a European political powerhouse (France) (“Cuervo, Henríquez Ureña” 365). Amado Alonso objected to these claims:

Por el origen común del sustrato, el provenzal se junta con el francés en oposición (con distingos) a las otras lenguas romances; pero por la totalidad de su historia y por el conjunto de su constitución el provenzal forma familia con el italiano, el catalán, el castellano y el portugués en frente del francés” (Estudios lingüísticos: temas españoles 104-105).

Although theoretical issues were part of it, this controversy was also motivated by political and nationalistic concerns. In the identification and classification of these dialects, Catalan was assigned both a synchronic and political role as a buffer zone between Provençal and Spanish. The European cultural scale with which the Romanist operated assigned more social prestige to French language and tradition. The Hispanists sought to overturn this scale and reassert the status of Spanish.

Among the *Centro*'s other crowning achievements, we find *Revista de Filología Española* (1914), a most successful journal which published some original works by its

members and affiliates, such as Navarro Tomás's *Manual de pronunciación Española* (1918), and translations of very important European linguistic texts, such as Meyer-Lübke's *Introducción a la lingüística romance* (1901). Through the edition and translation of Romance philology texts Menéndez Pidal and his group were able to bring Hispanic philology up to date and adequately respond to trends in general linguistics. Since its inception, the *Revista* won international recognition for the high quality of its scholarship (Hess 8). Menéndez Pidal and his collaborators were also able to disseminate linguistic and cultural ideas and gain a legion of followers and supporters in Spain and abroad.

Menéndez Pidal also organized the *Centro*'s summer institute which offered courses and seminars to foreigners dedicated to the teaching of Spanish. Menéndez Pidal referred to this program as a landmark event in the history of *hispanoamericanismo* (Pérez Pascual 129). Not only did the leading writers, philosophers, and philologists of Spain participate in the summer institute, but a select number of disciples, who were destined for academic posts in universities abroad, became lecturers or professors: Dámaso Alonso (Cambridge), Federico de Onís (Columbia), Antonio García Solalinde (Wisconsin), Samuel Gili Gaya (Middlebury), and others (Pérez Pascual 130). Gutiérrez Cuadrado (2007) referred to this project as the spread of linguistic *hispanismo*. In this climate, Menéndez Pidal carried out and promoted studies in the fields of Spanish literary tradition, the history of Spanish, and dialectology. Such studies provided Spanish intellectuals with opportunities to minimize the negative effects of the internal national crisis while simultaneously reaffirming the international image of Spain as a center of panhispanic civilization. In a letter to Unamuno, Menéndez Pidal wrote (1912):

Usted cree que como mejor se sirve a la cultura patria es *estando en puesto*, es decir, explicando su cátedra; y yo creo que como mejor sirvo hoy (y dentro de la ley) a la

cultura de mi patria es *reventándome* a trabajar en el Centro de Estudios Históricos, para poder construir un pedazo de la historia de España que mañana he de enseñar en la Universidad y que aunque me vuelva loco no podré enseñarla si no existe [...] Por eso creo que el Centro de Estudios Históricos, organismo oficial tanto como cualquiera de las Universidades, puede hacer y *ha hecho* ya por la cultura española más que lo que todas las Universidades juntas han hecho en los últimos tres siglos (cited in Pérez Pascual 133, emphasis in Pérez Pascual).

The *Centro*'s nation-building mission, of which Menéndez Pidal was fully aware, was what guaranteed the doctrinal orthodoxy (López Sánchez 15).⁶³ Among all of them there was a strong commitment to the task of developing scientific studies in Spain for the greater glory of the nation.

4.5.2 **Henríquez Ureña at the *Centro***

At the *Centro*, Menéndez Pidal created a school of philology with his first group of disciples, including Tomás Navarro Tomás, Federico de Onís and Américo Castro. By 1916 the Mexican Alfonso Reyes had also joined. Under his supervision and intellectual and moral authority, Menéndez Pidal was able to consolidate his role as founder of the Madrid school of philology, *La escuela de filología de Madrid*, which came to be recognized as such around the year 1925 (Malkiel, "Filología española" 113-114). Although not a homogeneous group, this school was bound by its members' absolute respect for its founder, a norm which characterized the behavior of the *Centro*'s researchers and prevented any form of criticism or departure from

⁶³ Menéndez Pidal himself described the *Centro*'s particular achievement: "era un ambiente de trabajo alegre porque se sabía bien orientado. Sus primeros resultados saltaban a la vista: publicaciones que inmediatamente ganaban la estimación de los mejores en España y en el extranjero" (cited in Pérez Pascual 123).

the school's fundamental doctrine (Portolés 112). While this is true, it is also true that Menéndez Pidal encouraged his students to pursue the study of new fields and endorsed new intellectual enterprises such as, for example, Henríquez Ureña's study of irregular verse, *La versificación irregular en la poesía castellana* (1920).⁶⁴

It was after the start of this friendship and professional relationship with Menéndez Pidal that Henríquez Ureña began to sharpen his concept of a Hispanic-American culture, or "la familia ibérica" forged in the speech community (Zuleta Álvarez, Pedro Henríquez Ureña 131). Contact between Henríquez Ureña and Menéndez Pidal first started in 1913.⁶⁵ Prior to his travels and studies in Spain, the Dominican intellectual was very familiar with Menéndez Pidal's philological and cultural work. Both scholars finally met in 1917 during Henríquez Ureña's first visit to Madrid. By then Menéndez Pidal was well-established as the leading scholar in philological and linguistic studies in the Hispanic world. For a while, Henríquez Ureña considered the possibility of relocating to Madrid. This city offered him the prospect of working along with a team of highly regarded intellectuals and reuniting with his closest friend, Alfonso Reyes; but, according to his biographers (Mateo 2001, Zuleta Álvarez 1996) the idea of earning only a minimal salary, along with fewer possibilities for professional advancement in Spain, discouraged him. On the other hand, Alfonso Reyes himself suggested that it was a personal crisis that prevented his friend and colleague from remaining in Spain.⁶⁶ Krauze suggests that Henríquez Ureña could not fathom how to overcome his marginal status as a Caribbean in

⁶⁴ Notably, the Spanish poet Enrique Diez Canedo (1897-1944) found it quite remarkable that such a "revolutionary" book was published by a conservative institution like the Centro (De Lara 201).

⁶⁵ Henríquez Ureña had charged his brother Max with dispatching certain manuscripts and publications to Menéndez Pidal.

⁶⁶ Reyes wrote: "Me ha quedado un recuerdo muy doloroso de Pedro. Estuvo aquí como envuelto en un sonambulismo constante [...] ¿Qué hacemos con él? Aquí se le han hecho las insinuaciones de que se venga a trabajar a España. Son pocas las posibilidades, pero podrían buscarse. Lo que hay es que el se negaba todo con una especie de horror" (Letter to Julio Torri, cited in Krauze 16).

European soil.⁶⁷ Unable to adapt to Spain, he returned to Minnesota in order to complete his doctorate and fulfill his teaching duties at the university.

In 1919, Henríquez Ureña was invited again to Spain. This time he remained in Madrid for a year in order to study and work at the *Centro de Estudios Históricos* under the sponsorship of Menéndez Pidal. At the Centro Henríquez Ureña worked as one of the editors of the *Revista* and cultivated friendships with Américo Castro and Navarro Tomás. Very little has been written about this substantially important period in Henríquez Ureña's intellectual and scholarly development. However, it is clear that editing and publishing his doctoral dissertation, *La versificación*, was one of his most important tasks. The book's prologue was written by Menéndez Pidal, an honor which helped to establish Henríquez Ureña's reputation as a scholar and as one of the original thinkers in the Hispanic world (Mateo, Pedro Henríquez Ureña 175; Alonso, "Presencia de Pedro" 358). During this second visit to Spain he also worked as one of the editors of the *Revista de Filología Española*. When the *Revista* was publicly criticized in Latin America, Henríquez Ureña came to its defense:

Pero no creo que pruebe, como piensa el Señor Sanín Cano,⁶⁸ que la *Revista de Filología Española* se proponga "desconceptuar a los escritores americanos... cerrarles el paso a las obras que ellos producen," ni "hacer creer que los españoles de América están echando a perder el castellano," ni muchos menos que los redactores de la Real Academia, "cet étonnant Dictionnaire de la Academie –como dice Paul Groussac,⁶⁹ si no me equivoco— dont chaque nouvelle édition fait regretter l'antérieure" [...] En Madrid es un secreto a

⁶⁷ Henríquez Ureña wrote: "hay veces en que [España] nos da la ilusión de haber entrado en el camino de su vida nueva y poderosa; otras veces, cuando la vemos "en el comienzo del camino," clavada siempre allí la inmóvil planta, le deseamos un cataclismo regenerador como el de Rusia. O el de México" (En la orilla 8).

⁶⁸ Baldomero Sanín Cano (1861-1957) was a professor, journalist, diplomat and member of the Colombian Language Academy who criticized the *RAE*.

⁶⁹ Paul Groussac (1848-1929) was a French-born Argentine writer, literary critic, historian, librarian, education official and director of Argentina's national library.

voces que don Ramón Menéndez Pidal, con ser académico, no tiene ni asume responsabilidad alguna en los diccionarios hasta hoy publicados por la Academia. Es posible que en lo adelante intervenga en ellos: si así fuere, los efectos de su colaboración se advertirían en seguida; se echará a ver de la mano del hombre de ciencia, entre otras cosas, en el intento de hacer sistemática la admisión de los americanismos, ahora totalmente anárquica en manos de la Academia, por simple ignorancia de cómo se deben hacer los diccionarios (“En defensa de la Revista” 57).

In this defense, Henríquez Ureña was really waging battle on two fronts: i) the Spanish Royal Academy’s rejection of americanisms; and ii) Latin Americans’ distrust towards Spanish scholarship and intellectuals like Menéndez Pidal. Henríquez Ureña asserted:

Si se examinan las colecciones de la *Revista de Filología Española*, se verá que en sus páginas no se cita a la Academia con autoridad, sí en cambio, a Bello y a Cuervo. Y la *Revista*, lejos de cerrar la puerta a los escritores de América, cuenta a uno de ellos entre sus redactores de número, el mexicano Alfonso Reyes, y a otros tres, por lo menos, en la breve lista de sus colaboradores (“En defensa de la Revista” 58).

These comments reveal Henríquez Ureña’s admiration for Menéndez Pidal and his work and faith in the development of *hispanoamericanismo*. Henríquez Ureña strongly supported projects such as the *Revista* as a medium for advancing, in the Hispanic world, the study of language phenomena and understanding its diverse forms. Moreover, he believed that Menéndez Pidal, like Bello and Cuervo, was genuinely interested in the varieties of Spanish in the Americas. For that reason, he suggested to Latin American writers “que hagan llegar siempre a manos de Menéndez Pidal tanto las obras que sean estudios de lengua o de literatura como las que recojan, en forma poética, novelesca o dramática, la lengua popular” (“En defensa de la Revista” 59). To

Henríquez Ureña, the Spaniard's philological research was fundamental and needed to be incorporated for a proper account of linguistic *hispanoamericanismo*.

According to Febres (1989), “la visión de España de Henríquez Ureña es inseparable de la figura de Menéndez Pidal” (1). It was through Menéndez Pidal's inspirational and imposing philological monuments and theories that Henríquez Ureña then forged his vision of language, culture, and Spain. Both scholars also shared similarities in methodology (Pérez Guerra, “La producción de tema lingüístico” 16). Like Menéndez Pidal, Henríquez Ureña found in literature the documentary base on which to reconstruct the history of Spanish and Hispanic civilization in the Latin American and Dominican contexts. They saw philology as a powerful means of combining studies on language, cultural history, and national identities. They both understood the history of language as well as literary history as part of a much greater historiographical project, documenting the most essential expressions of the past and preserving them as a road map for the future. We can appreciate Henríquez Ureña's interest in and admiration for Menéndez Pidal and his work in *En la orilla: Mi España* (published in Mexico in 1922). Several passages in this book are dedicated to the appraisal and defense of the Madrid school, which, declared Henríquez Ureña, “encabeza Menéndez Pidal, hombres de disciplina perfecta y saber acrisolado” (Henríquez Ureña, *Obra Crítica* 212-213). To Henríquez Ureña, Menéndez Pidal and his group represented an elite group of intellectuals, “la nueva generación,” that reaffirmed his old belief (“arcaica creencia”) that culture saves nations (*En la orilla* 19). As López Sánchez (2006) indicated, we find many points of connection between Menéndez Pidal's theoretical and methodological principles and Henríquez Ureña's initial linguistic investigations (“Observaciones sobre el español en America, 1921). According to López Sánchez:

Estas investigaciones respondían al afán por profundizar en los rasgos arcaicos de la lengua española y fundamentar los conceptos de tradicionalidad y estado latente de Menéndez Pidal. Las variantes dialectales como fuente para la historia de la lengua determinaron los trabajos de Pedro Henríquez Ureña sobre el español en América, realizados bajo la dirección de Amado Alonso para el Instituto de Filología en Buenos Aires (337).

It was Menéndez Pidal, to paraphrase Gutiérrez Cuadrado (2007), who established the canon of linguistic Hispanism and organized its diffusion. In addition, Menéndez Pidal provided the theoretical base on which other Hispanic linguists began their studies of Spanish. For example, in Henríquez Ureña own account of Dominican Spanish we find traces of Menéndez Pidal's descriptive and explicatory statements on how the imposition of Castilian hegemony and the preservation of some linguistic archaisms were crucial to the development of Spanish in Iberia: “en nuestro período de lucha por la hegemonía castellana, algunos arcaísmos, como la conservación de la vocal post- o protónica, se usaban todavía mucho en todas partes; hasta en Castilla en la primera mitad del siglo XII se arcaiza con voces de la lengua culta escrita, con *poblato* ‘poblado’ [...]” (Orígenes 511-512). Also consider: “la expresión nueva, aun después de muy generalizada, no tiene fuerza para anular la expresión antigua que pugna por vivir en al memoria de los hablantes” (Orígenes 517). Menéndez Pidal established a strict correlation between maintaining a political hegemony and the survival and spread of linguistic archaisms. We can clearly hear echoes of Menéndez Pidal in Henríquez Ureña's (1938) description of the evolution of the word *patata* in Spain:

¿Cuándo empezó la papa a usurpar el nombre *patata*? Muy temprano, a juzgar por otros idiomas, (como el inglés a fines del siglo XVI): la semejanza de raíces y tubérculos lo

explica. En España, la coexistencia de dos formas, una con *b* y otra con *p*, autorizó una diferenciación de concepto, aplicándose cada forma a distinto objeto; y la adopción del nombre patata para la solanácea pudo realizarse a favor de la homofonía parcial (inicial) con *papa* [...] La propaganda de Parmentier surte efecto. Y, como ocurre tantas veces en casos de escisión en el español, *Castilla la gran disidente dominadora, introduce la innovación* (“Papa y batata: historia de dos palabras” 140, emphasis added).

As in Menéndez Pidal’s linguistic description in *Orígenes*, the researcher links the development of a particular linguistic form with the Castilian temperament. The personal beliefs, which emanated from careful reflection and collaboration with prestigious figures such as Menéndez Pidal, would also guide Henríquez Ureña’s initial and subsequent approach to matters of language and culture in the contexts of Latin America and the Dominican Republic. To an extent, Menéndez Pidal was successful in engaging the Spanish and Latin American intellectual elite in what Del Valle (2002) calls the project of constructing a *modern* Hispanic community (“Menéndez Pidal, national regeneration” 98). *Hispanomamericanistas* from both sides of the Atlantic, working within different institutions and disagreeing with respect to the panhispanic community’s hierarchical structure, became involved in this project. During the course of the project, a number of polemic cultural and linguistic issues took center stage including the fear of the possible linguistic fragmentation of Spanish.

4.6 Amado Alonso and the *Instituto de Filología de Buenos Aires*

The *Instituto de Filología de Buenos Aires*, modeled on Madrid’s *Centro*, was founded in 1923. Menéndez Pidal and Ricardo Rojas, the Dean of the University of Buenos Aires, had created the initial vision for the institute. Américo Castro was the *Instituto*’s first director,

however, after a brief period stepped aside and recommended the young Amado Alonso. In time, Amado Alonso and his collaborators transformed it into an internationally renowned center of research that was up-to-date with the trends in linguistics. In his inaugural address, Rojas alluded to one of the *Instituto*'s primary objectives: to resolve the controversy between Peninsular and American dialects of Spanish (Weber de Kurlat 1). Although following the spirit of its model, under the directorship of Amado Alonso (1927-1946), the *Instituto* developed its own image and character and rose to unprecedented international prominence as a center for Hispanic studies (Hatzfeld 347, Polo 144). Malkiel attributed the *Instituto*'s success to Amado Alonso's "unique" personal charisma and effective management style⁷⁰ (Linguistics and Philology 19). Amado Alonso had trained in instrumental phonetics at Hamburg, and was well-versed in historical grammar and dialectology. He brought to Argentina the nascent structural-functional linguistic theories of the time, by introducing and translating into Spanish fundamental texts like Saussure's *Cours*, Karl Vossler's (1872-1949) *Philosophy of language*, and Charles Bally's (1865-1947) *Le langage et la vie* (1913).

Amado Alonso (1944) understood the profound differences between the old school of linguistics represented by Schleicher and the new trends represented by Saussure's work:

Saussure rechaza [...] la concepción naturalista de la lengua como un organismo de vida autónoma y de crecimiento y evolución internos; pero su positivismo le hizo suplantarse esta concepción por otra mecanicista en la que la lengua es un sistema igualmente autónomo, ajeno al habla, fuera del alcance de sus hablantes y que funciona como una mecánica sideral." ("Prólogo al Curso de lingüística general").

⁷⁰ "A. Alonso typified, to the Argentine intelligentsia, the progressive, versatile, new-styled philologist, where the straight-classicist Hanssen had been a mouthpiece for cumbersome, old-style philology and Lenz had represented the stringent line of unadulterated linguistic inquiry (slightly reminiscent in his unyielding austerity of L. Bloomfield)" (Malkiel, Linguistics and Philology 19).

Amado Alonso conceptualized these differences from a point of view that was opposed to positivism. A few decades of reaction against positivism prompted an evaluation of the limits of the two theories under consideration (Potolés 99-100, Menéndez 1). While Saussure's expressed a view of language as a system that should be studied as a self-contained structure ("langue") and separate from individual expression (parole), Amado Alonso, following Vossler's school of "linguistic idealism," emphasized the need to conceptualize language as a product of individual creation which hinges on the life of a community: "el espíritu de la comunidad interviene como el gusto nacionalmente fijado y tradicionalmente coherente, que orienta, acepta y rechaza las creaciones individuales" (Amado Alonso, "Prefacio" 12). Jordan (1970) explains the difference between the two linguistic schools of thought. While positivist linguists were dividing up grammar into phonology, morphology, syntax, etcetera, for a more convenient and systematic study of language, idealists thought that it was the "spirit" of language that constitutes and integrates the sounds and words of sentences (Jordan 86-87). On one hand, positivists conceptualized linguistic research as an end in itself. On the other, idealists were preoccupied with determining relations of causality between the facts of language (Jordan 86). This latter conceptualization of language became very influential among the new generation of linguists in Buenos Aires and to a certain extent determined their approach to the study of language.⁷¹

Amado Alonso's best-known associate during these years was Henríquez Ureña. Through this association Henríquez Ureña acquired first-hand knowledge of some of these latest trends in linguistics. With the collaboration of important figures such as Lenz, Amado Alonso and Henríquez Ureña carried out an important project that marked the inauguration of Latin

⁷¹ "Partiendo de ahí, pero sólo partiendo de ahí, podrá luego la lingüística coleccionar y estudiar cuantos productos o formas comunmente fijadas quiera. Y como en ninguna ocasión del espíritu individual tan eminentemente como en la poesía, ahí, en las obras del arte de la palabra, buscará de preferencia el lingüista sus materiales de estudio" (Amado Alonso, "Prefacio" 12).

American dialectology: a series of language studies entitled “*Biblioteca de Dialectología Hispanoamericana*.” In the first volume, Amado Alonso expressed one of their main objectives: “se propone reunir los dispersos estudios de orientación dialectológica que se han publicado sobre el español popular en América y añadir otros nuevos” (BDH I 5-6, cited in Lenz, El español en Chile 11). The program for dialectological research that was developed at IFBA might have been a response to new trends in linguistics, but it was still guided by the desire to develop solutions to old problems in Hispanic linguistics.

4.6.1 Linguistic polemics in Buenos Aires

The fear of linguistic fragmentation provoked interest in some of the lesser known characteristics of American Spanish and a vigilant attitude among some scholars: “de no fomentarse la reflexión sobre el idioma, de seguir las personas inteligentes examinando estas cuestiones sin otro apoyo que el del impulso sentimental, acabarían las generaciones jóvenes por inventar el mito de la argentinidad del lenguaje hablado junto al Plata” (Castro, “Introducción”). In Buenos Aires, Amado Alonso⁷² (1935) and Américo Castro (1941) had become alarmed by the peculiarities of local speech (“Porteño”) and its incorporation of neologisms in the context of intense immigration (Alonso, El problema 11, Castro, La peculiaridad lingüística 9-10). These peculiarities included, for example, “voseo” or the use of “vos” as a second person singular pronoun and its corresponding verbal forms (*cantás, tenés, vivís*), “lleísmo” or the articulation of the “ll” and “y” consonants as fricative sibilants as opposed to a glide or an affricate, and the use of local jargon (*pibe* [niño], *escaracho* [cara fea]) and hybrid forms (*apoliyar* [dormir], *junar*

⁷² “El problema de la lengua general en Buenos Aires es el mismo que el de todas partes: el de la inserción del hablar culto local en las normas cultas generales” (Amado Alonso, El problema 87).

[mirar], *morfar* [comer]) (Castro, La peculiaridad lingüística 100-101).⁷³ Amado Alonso contended that “el conflicto de la expresión literaria está en la Argentina especialmente agudizado, en buena parte, al menos, porque muchos jóvenes de vocación poética ceden a la comezón de escribir antes de haberse familiarizado lo bastante con la tradición especial de la lengua literaria” (El problema 30). He also declared: “lo que hago aquí es tratar de llegar a fallas genéricas de nuestros escritores que escriben mal, directamente, para perseguir el conocimiento teórico del problema: en qué consiste ese mal escribir y a qué obedece; e indirectamente para un fin práctico: la propuesta de la solución del conflicto” (El problema 48). For his part, Américo Castro had manifested some of his apprehensions as early as 1924: “lo más grave es que el lenguaje familiar y vulgar se viera invadido por una jerga inmigratoria del tipo de la “lingua franca” de las escalas de levante, formada por el detrito de dialectos incultos, como el genovés o el caló hispano-portugués” (“Introducción”). Again, in 1941, Castro complained about the absence of hierarchical values associated to literary traditions that could regulate linguistic practices in Argentina and put a halt to foreign influences. Both Castro and Amado Alonso attributed the linguistic irregularities, or what they called “el desbarajuste lingüístico” in Buenos Aires to: i) the plebeian tendencies of the period; ii) a break from linguistic (and literary) tradition in Spanish America; iii) the slow rise of Argentina’s stock as a colony; and iv) the massive influx of immigrants (Castro, La peculiaridad lingüística 24, Alonso, El problema 40-41).

Castro and Amado Alonso particularly focused on the young and innovative generation of Argentine writers, whom they made partly responsible as the source and for the spread of irregularities in Buenos Aires speech. Amidst several ideological conflicts with different cultural

⁷³ See also Gobello and Amuchastegui (1998).

groups, many of these local writers and intellectuals were indeed emphasizing the uniqueness of Spanish in Argentina: “nosotros escribimos mal, tal vez, porque nuestra aspiración no consiste en llegar a escribir bien. Somos desliñados: lo sabemos. Sucios. Espontáneos. Pero nos hacemos entender hasta por el vigilante de la esquina... ¿Quién entiende lo que dice *Martín Fierro*? *Proa*. ¿Y lo que dice *Proa*? Lo entiende *Martín Fierro*” (“Los Pensadores,” cited in King 27). Their argument was first elaborated by Luciano Abeille (1900) in his controversial book *El idioma nacional de los argentinos* and based on the following convictions: i) every autonomous nation is entitled to its own language; ii) the national language must be based on a strictly Argentinian model (i.e., the *gaucho*); and iii) Buenos Aires or *Porteño* speech, as the repository of democratic values and the revolutionary Argentinian character, must spread throughout the country (Abeille 1900). In contrast, some Spanish (and Argentinean) intellectuals argued that such ideas contradicted the actual sociolinguistic landscape in Argentina and undermined social cohesiveness (Capdevilla 1928, Costa Álvarez 1928).

The Spaniards’ linguistic apprehensions and the Argentineans’ linguistic nationalism roused the attention of local observers like Jorge Luís Borges (1928, 1961) who maintained a relatively objective position throughout this controversy:

¿Qué zanja insuperable hay entre el español de los españoles y el de nuestra conversacion argentina? Yo les respondo que ninguna, venturosamente para la entendibilidad general de nuestro decir. Un matiz de diferenciación, sí lo hay: matiz que es lo bastante nítido para que en él oigamos la patria. No pienso aquí en los algunos miles de palabras que los peninsulares no entienden. Pienso en el ambiente distinto de nuestra voz, en la valoración irónica o cariñosa que damos a determinadas palabras, en su temperatura no igual. No hemos variado el significado intrínseco de las palabras, pero sí su connotación. Esa

divergencia, nula en la prosa argumentativa o en la didáctica, es grande en lo que mira a las emociones. Nuestra discusión será hispana, pero nuestro verso, nuestro humorismo, ya son de aquí (El idioma de los argentinos 186).

To Borges, the so-called linguistic differences that alarmed the Spaniards and invigorated the Argentineans were not formal but simply stylistic. In his “Las alarmas del doctor Américo Castro” (1961), Borges responded with an insightful reflection on the use of the word *problema* in relation to language. Borges declared that the so-called linguistic problems affecting certain speech communities were the invention of language professionals who needed to justify their means of subsistence by telling others how to conduct their linguistic practice. Borges wrote: “no adolecemos de dialectos, aunque sí de institutos dialectológicos. Esas corporaciones viven de reprobación las sucesivas jerigonzas que inventan” (“Las alarmas” 37). We can infer from Borges’s admonition that the chief preoccupation of those Spanish linguists working in Buenos Aires in the 1930s was the preservation of a particular linguistic norm. According to Amado Alonso, “cuando faltan normas y principios no hay cultura, hay, en el sentido más estricto de la palabra, barbarie” (Problema 75). While Castro and Alonso displayed different attitudes in Buenos Aires, they converged on some explanations. According to Amado Alonso:

Lo que pone a Buenos Aires en desventaja frente al resto de Hispano-América (incluyendo España) es su increíble crecimiento por aluvión, y su condición de campamento colosal, en cuya vorágine, la pequeña minoría que mantiene la tradición de la lengua culta está desperdigada y apenas tenida en cuenta (El problema de la lengua 139).

Castro remarked:

Es innegable que todo fue y es del modo que Alonso lo dice. Por mi parte sólo desearía coordinar funcionalmente los elementos de tan buena demostración. Estimo, por ejemplo, que el desquiciamiento introducido por los inmigrantes se debe menos a su presión numérica y a su acción mecánica que a la manera de ser del país que los acoge y la previa idea aportada por el extranjero, tan torrencialmente vertido sobre las imágenes del Plata (25).

Thus, according to this view, the absence of ideal speakers in Buenos Aires was directly related to the lack of a hierarchical social structure in Argentina (27). Arnoux (2001) observed that in these views we can find echoes of Enlightenment thought as it had been formulated by Bello (“Disciplinar desde la lengua” 53). And in fact, Amado Alonso preferred to be identified with Bello rather than with his Iberian colleagues and mentors. A century earlier, Bello had described language (“un sistema ordenado”) as a constituent of orderly and prosperous (civilized) societies and national states. Amado Alonso and Henríquez Ureña, to different degrees, were still working within the tradition of grammarians, philologist, and linguists who believed that it was possible to discipline the mind (and society) by rationalizing linguistic phenomena, regimenting language, preserving the norm, and rejecting illegitimate uses.

Viewing the situation from this perspective, Amado Alonso suggested possible ways to approach these linguistic issues. Among them was restoring linguistic hierarchy:

Ya sabemos que esa actitud ultraacadémica de los preceptistas ha sido muy útil para contener la otra actitud extrema, de pura anarquía e incuria. Pero es lástima que no se haya sabido o podido mantener siempre de un modo más estrictamente culto y consciente, salvando un prejuicio a todas luces falso, la idea de que la corriente del idioma fluye del embalse—Academia—hacia el manantial—el uso común— [...] La

Academia es la mayor autoridad y el órgano más adecuado para *juzgar y reconocer* cuando una forma es de uso correcto” (El problema 43, emphasis in the original).

The Academy represented the social institution most suited for sanctioning language use. In a series of statements, Amado Alonso suggested that the best way to contend with linguistic anarchy was a return to a previous linguistic order,⁷⁴ akin to when courtly norms or the metropolis would presumably regulate sociolinguistic patterns. Adhering to previously established linguistic norms, albeit archaic, offered the best possibility for the transmission and continuity of the most adequate means of expressions or, in Amado Alonso’s own words, “la tradición especial de la lengua literaria” (Alonso, El Problema 25-31). Similar proposals would be considered in the discussion of the particular language “problems” of Spanish America, even with respect to questions of substrate influences in different dialects of Spanish.

The polemic regarding the peculiarities and status of Spanish in Buenos Aires is one particular context which gives meaning to Henríquez Ureña’s work. In fact, some of his own data was utilized to support some of the polemicists’ glottopolitical arguments: “quienes conocen el español hablado en América no ignoran que el *vos* en lugar del *tú* fue muy general, y subsiste todavía en muchas partes, aunque cediendo terreno, y evitándose su uso entre personas cultas. Pedro Henríquez Ureña analizó tal fenómeno, histórica y geográficamente, en la *Revista de Filología Española* (1921), ampliando lo dicho por R. J. Cuervo en sus *Apuntaciones*” (Castro 29). Henríquez Ureña did in fact discuss the development and distribution of *voseo*, however, it was within the context of his initial *antiandalucismo* stance (“Observaciones I” 87). Thus, Castro slightly mischaracterized Henríquez Ureña’s description of *voseo*. With his respective studies, the Dominican sought to shed light on many of these linguistic issues but

⁷⁴ “Siempre reconoceremos en los arcaísmos usados en la literatura una razón de tradición, de transmisión, de continuidad” (Alonso, El problema de la lengua 26).

cautioned about the problem of generalizing too much with insufficient data (“Observaciones I” 61).

4.7 Key questions in Hispanic linguistics

Having reviewed the contributions and concerns of some of the principal figures in Hispanic linguistics and philology, we may single out the following as the central themes in the development of the discipline: i) the unity or possible fragmentation of Spanish; ii) substratum influences in American Spanish; iii) the peculiarities and status of American Spanish; and iv) the question of the origins of Spanish (Andalusian versus polygenetic). In most cases, each of these key questions emerged in the work of Hispanic linguists who were articulating nationalism and *hispanoamericanismo*.

4.7.1 Fragmentation of Spanish

As discussed earlier, the fragmentation debate consisted of a preoccupation by scholars with preserving the existing unity of Spanish. For Cuervo, Spain’s loss of power and influence over the Hispanic nations, Latin Americans’ disregard for Spanish literature and preference for French and English literary trends, the lack of consensus among Latin American and Spanish intellectuals, the lack of a panhispanic linguistic norm, and the evolving nature of language represented obstacles to the preservation of the relative unity. Whether desired or not, Cuervo emphasized the linguistic conditions of Spanish in the Americas that would lead to fragmentation, for which there was an historical antecedent (the split of Latin). However, intellectuals such as Valera and Menéndez Pidal rejected his reasoning, claiming, among other

things, that the correct image of the Spanish language, the Spanish nation, and the Hispanic community would preserve the linguistic unity.

4.7.2 Substrate influences

After Lenz formulated his thesis of Spanish with Araucanian sounds in Chile, some linguists set out to refute or establish the limits of his statement (Wagner 1924, Alonso 1939, Malmberg 1947, Rosenblat 1954). Rosenblat for example studied the distribution of population (Indian, black, white, and mestizos) in the different regions of Latin America in order to determine the degree of acculturation and possible substrate influence. The Romance philologist Max Leopold Wagner⁷⁵ admitted that many of the Auracanian phonetic features described by Lenz were in fact Hispanic in origin. However, he maintained that there were some exceptions: the pronunciation of /r-/, the prepalatal articulation of the cluster /tr/, and the alveolar pronunciation of /d, t, n, s/ when in contact with /r/. Wagner went on to propose that there were influences in the lexicon from indigenous Caribbean languages. In contrast, Alonso declared that all these supposed substrate features could be explained within the system of Spanish (“Examen de la teoría” 284-289). This tendency among Hispanic philologists to question or reject the validity of substratum theory dated back to the controversy on the classification of Catalan.

4.7.3 The peculiarities of American Spanish

“The problem of language,” as formulated by Alonso in the Buenos Aires context, delineates an object, that is, it focuses on certain aspects of language that were connected with aspects of social structure. Obviously, scholars like Amado Alonso, Castro, and Henríquez Ureña

⁷⁵ Wagner (1880-1952) was born and trained in Munich as a Romance philologist.

were interested in understanding theoretical issues and finding scientific solutions to sociolinguistic problems. For example, they sought to develop effective strategies and texts for teachers who were responsible for providing their students with tools that they needed (i.e., metalinguistic knowledge, plus knowledge of standard Spanish) in order to be successful in their communities. However, they were also eager to participate in and settle particular conflicts in favor of a certain sociopolitical order, specific communities, and particular interests. In Amado Alonso's and Castro's discussion of Buenos Aires speech, we observe their specific attempts to settle local and international linguistic conflicts in order to: i) banish the idea of a national language, other than traditional Spanish; ii) determine who should control the linguistic (literary) market in Argentina; iii) control the spread of Buenos Aires speech along the River Plate region (Montevideo, Uruguay); and iv) prevent linguistic fragmentation as well as the spread of fragmentation theory.

4.7.4 *Andalucismo* debate

The question of the alleged Andalusian character of American Spanish is closely associated with the figure of Henríquez Ureña. The *andalucismo* debate began over opposing views on the origin and development of Spanish in the New World (Danesi 1977, Del Valle 1998, Guitarte 1958, Izzo 1984). The traditional view proposed that American Spanish was a continuation of Spanish from Andalucía and not of the slightly different northern Peninsular varieties. As evidence, *andalucistas* pointed out that like Andalusians many American speakers of Spanish i) merged the palatal consonants /ll/ and /y/; ii) merged syllable-final /l/ and /rr/; iii) abandoned the distinction between /s/ and /θ/ in favor of /s/ and iv) aspirated syllable-final /s/. Presumably, these similarities were the result of the predominance of Andalusian settlers in

America. But to the defenders of the diversity of “American Spanish,” only a minority of settlers came from Andalucía. Furthermore, they argued that the features in question developed independently within each linguistic subsystem. This polemic reached its zenith in the 1920’s and 1930’s with Henríquez Ureña’s and Alonso’s contributions which were developed over both linguistic and ideological grounds.

Among his most important linguistic work is “El supuesto andalucismo de América (1925), which was preceded by “Observaciones sobre el Español en América” (1921). These two articles were part of the well-known polemic sustained with Wagner on the genesis of American Spanish. Wagner, in his 1920 article (“El español en America y el latín vulgar”), began by reformulating the question that had been already raised by Cuervo: to what extent is it possible to equate the split of Latin into the family of Romance languages to the allegedly possible rupture of Spanish into semi-autonomous varieties? Pioneers such as Hanssen, Menéndez Pidal,⁷⁶ and Navarro Tomás had not yet expressed formal views on the subject but were inclined in favor of highlighting unity by focusing on the strong mutual affinity of Andalusian and American dialects of Spanish and the supposed Andalusian demographic predominance in the New World (Henríquez Ureña, “El supuesto andalucismo 97). However, these authors were only able to provide mostly incidental and impressionistic statements. Cuervo (1901) had stated his belief in the equal demographic representation of all sections of Spain in the colonization of America. Wagner and the *andalucistas* claimed that American Spanish was an Andalusian dialect of Spanish.

⁷⁶ While Menéndez Pidal had expressed some idea regarding the subject in his *Gramática*, he formally expressed his views in “Sevilla frente a Madrid” (1941): “Así el español ultramarino recibió un marcado tinte andaluz al aceptar la simplificación fonológica del ceceo-seseo surgida en el reino de Sevilla” (134-135).

Henríquez Ureña and Amado Alonso, on the other hand, objected to the *andalucista* claim on philological and demographic grounds and advanced what came to be known as “la teoría poligénica,” the belief that Spanish in the Americas developed its characteristics as a result of specifically American conditions of development. Amado Alonso attempted to provide the linguistic evidence in support of Henríquez Ureña’s argument. He claimed that although Spanish settlers brought an emergent *seseo* to America, the phenomenon developed amidst new social conditions and independently of the Peninsular linguistic norm. Henríquez Ureña utilized the available demographic evidence to show that the Spaniards who settled in America were from different points of origin and not predominantly from Andalusia. He concluded:

Ante tanta diversidad fracasa una de las generalizaciones más frecuentes: el andalucismo de América; tal andalucismo, donde existe—es sobre todo en las tierras bajas—puede estimarse como desarrollo paralelo y no necesariamente como influencia del sur de España. La idea del andalucismo se insinúa por simple inadvertencia, y donde menos se espera; por ejemplo: “propia de Andalucía y por lo tanto de América,” en R. Menéndez Pidal, *Gramática Histórica*, p. 87 (bastaría suprimir el “por lo tanto”) (“Observaciones sobre el Español de América” 62).

In response to Henríquez Ureña’s argument, Wagner refined the *andalucista* hypothesis by proposing that all of southern Spain provided the speech forms in question to Spanish America. Henríquez Ureña countered that mere similarity between two dialects did not necessarily imply the descent of one from the other. In order to demolish what he called “la fábrica del andalucismo dialectal de América,” the Dominican dialectologist repeatedly tried to make his case on the authority of Cuervo and reiterated the Colombian’s famous phrase: “toda la Península dio su contingente a la población de América” (Castellano en América 215). The basic

idea behind Henríquez Ureña's reformulation of Cuervo's phrase is that the Spaniards brought a number of varieties of Spanish to America that subsequently developed because of new conditions and mixing among the settlers ("por el medio y luego por las mezclas"). However, as Guitarte points out, Cuervo's statement, read in its proper context, does not constitute an absolute rejection of the *andalucista* hypothesis, as Henríquez Ureña argued ("Cuervo, Henríquez Ureña" 377). Guitarte observed that in El castellano en America Cuervo gave an account of the colonizers' diverse origins in order to simply show that many of them did not bring the Spanish spoken in Castile as their native language and not to necessarily make a case against *andalucismo* ("Cuervo, Henríquez Ureña" 376). In fact, Cuervo did not have such a rigid concept of American Spanish. To him, the Spanish variety spoken by Americans was the result of language leveling, a koine: "sobre la base de los términos generales de todos entendidos y con el rasero de la lengua oficial y administrativa, aunque predominando *ocasionalmente* algunos términos locales *sí era notable el contingente* de alguna provincia Española" (Cuervo, El castellano en América 553). Nevertheless, in several subsequent publications, Henríquez Ureña continued to mischaracterize the Colombian philologist's position insisting that he had settled the question: "Cuervo sintetizó con irreprochable exactitud los hechos" (Henríquez Ureña, "Observaciones III" 123). The Dominican pressed on, advancing the misconception that Cuervo had settled the question in favor of the *antiandalucistas* and meticulously assembled every piece of information that could be extracted from the early colonial chroniclers to prove Cuervo right. Many respected philologists such as Kuhn, Malmberg, and Silva Neto accepted the *antiandalucista* position and eventually even Wagner came to embrace it (Guitarte, "Cuervo, Henríquez Ureña" 372). Henríquez Ureña concluded that the Andalusians were not predominant

during colonial times, and as a result they could not have imposed their dialect in America: “constituimos los hispanoamericanos grupos regionales diversos” (*Seis ensayos* 422).

Guitarte⁷⁷ points out that Henríquez Ureña’s insistence on Cuervo’s alleged conclusion stems from an affective predisposition on the part of the Dominican. His position with respect to this linguistic debate was relatively consistent with his devotion towards his nineteenth century intellectual forefathers from Latin America. While this is true, we must also remember that at this juncture Henríquez Ureña was working closely collaborating with the *Ateneo* group which tried to establish the intellectual independence and unique character of Latin America (Del Valle, “Dialectología” 136; Guitarte, “Cuervo, Henríquez Ureña” 393). Henríquez Ureña’s position in this debate was also consistent with the ideas and beliefs held by the modernist proponents of the original character of Latin America vis-a-vis those who postulated Spain as the principal source of culture and tradition in America: “nosotros estaremos a la defensa de la cultura” (Reyes, “Letter to Henríquez Ureña” 180). At a time when many Europeans and North Americans could not even fathom the concept of an autonomous Latin American culture while others tended to mythify it, *Ateneistas* such as Alfonso Reyes and Henríquez Ureña dedicated a major portion of their work to establishing and expanding Latin American culture. In this discussion, it is important to also keep in mind the significance of figures such as Cuervo and Bello for Latin American intellectuals such as Henríquez Ureña. The Dominican found in the work of Bello, for example, the expression of a uniquely Latin American desire for cultural and intellectual independence:

⁷⁷ According to Guitarte, “un estudioso de la jerarquía del ilustre dominicano no comete errores por simple inadvertencia; si ha ocurrido en el caso que me preocupa una distorsión del pensamiento de Cuervo, ello se ha debido a que el rechazo del andalucismo del nuevo mundo tenía para Henríquez Ureña un carácter afectivo lo suficientemente fuerte como para impedirle distinguir entre la interpretación propia que había adoptado ante la cuestión el filólogo colombiano” (“Cuervo, Henríquez Ureña” 388).

En una época, de duda y esperanza, cuando la independencia política aun no se había logrado por completo, los pueblos de la América hispánica se declararon intelectualmente mayores de edad, volvieron los ojos a su propia vida y se lanzaron en busca de su propia expresión. Nuestra poesía, nuestra literatura habían de reflejar la voz auténtica, nuestra propia personalidad. Europa era vieja; aquí había una vida nueva, un nuevo mundo para la libertad, para la iniciativa y la canción. Tales eran la intención y el significado de la gran oda, la primera de las *Silvas americanas*, que Andrés Bello publicó en 1823 (Corrientes literarias 9).

To Henríquez Ureña, Bello, Hostos, and Cuervo symbolized “apóstoles genuinos de nuestra América,” symbols of the highest form of intellectual achievement in Latin America. Bearing this in mind, Henríquez Ureña likely felt compelled to prove Cuervo right, at all cost, even with respect to claims that he wrongly attributed to the Colombian philologist. Henríquez Ureña’s participation in this debate demonstrates the degree to which certain ideological *hispanoamericanista* positions and more specifically an intellectual climate determined the direction and outcome of some of Henríquez Ureña’s linguistic investigations.

4.8 Henríquez Ureña’s linguistic production

Henríquez Ureña’s association with Amado Alonso and the *Instituto de Filología* resulted in a series of publications that constitute the bulk of the Dominican’s linguistic and philological oeuvre. However, his contributions to language studies had already begun by the time he was at the *Centro* in Madrid.⁷⁸ Although for the purpose of this dissertation I have classified his linguistic production into two major categories (American Spanish and Dominican Spanish), the

⁷⁸ See the complete list at the end of chapter one.

major linguistic issues of each text always intersect with the central themes of linguistic *hispanoamericanismo*.

Interestingly enough, when Meyer-Lübke was making a case for substratum influence, proposing a classification of the Dominican dialect of Spanish as a creole, one of the first scholars to take issue with this specific proposal was Henríquez Ureña (1919). “La lengua en Santo Domingo: rectificación a Meyer-Lübke” (1901), was in fact his first official foray into linguistic polemics:

D. Américo Castro, en su versión castellana, que lleva el título de *Introducción al estudio de la lingüística romance* (Madrid, 1914: v págs. 37-38), traduce: “Así se encuentra... negro-español en Santo Domingo y la Trinidad.” La última afirmación es totalmente errónea, por lo menos en lo que toca a Santo Domingo. No corresponde a los hechos: no se halla en ningún libro que yo conozca; y sólo me la explico como derivación mecánica de la afirmación precedente, relativa a Haití. La rectificación me parece necesaria, no sólo por la autoridad de que goza el libro de Meyer-Lübke, sino porque el error hubiera podido ser la causa de la omisión que hace de Santo Domingo el catedrático de Harvard, Mr. Ford, al mencionar las regiones americanas de habla española en su reciente y notable libro *Main Currents of Spanish Literature* (Nueva York 1919) (Henríquez Ureña, “La lengua en Santo Domingo”⁴⁹).

Henríquez Ureña refuted the claim in the strongest possible terms and added there was no documentary source for it:

No se halla, por ejemplo, en ninguno de los trabajos que cita Meyer-Lübke en su libro: ni siquiera, como podía suponerse, en el de F. A. Coelho sobre *Dialectos románicos*, ou

neolatinos na Africa, Asia e América 1881. El error proviene tal vez de Baist⁷⁹ “Die spanische Sprache,” en el *Grundriss d. romanischen Philologie* de Grober” (“La lengua en Santo Domingo” 49).

Henríquez Ureña wanted to prevent the identification of the Dominican speech community with Creole languages which were typically associated with “low cultures.” In discussions regarding Creoles, this was almost always the immediate concern. For example, Lenz (1928) wrote:

He dicho que el papiamento es una lengua de alta cultura, i en esto aventaja, en cuanto alcanzan mis conocimientos, a todas las demás lenguas criollas, que son sólo medios de comunicación formados por la necesidad de entenderse entre grupos de personas de los cuales el uno suele ser un pueblo de baja cultura, negros, malayos, culís de la India i de la China, i el otro una nación europea, portugueses, españoles, ingleses, franceses, holandeses, etc (El papiamento 13).

Interest in Creole languages emerged at the end of the nineteenth century and the beginning of the twentieth century as the disciplines of folklore and philology converged. Some scholars have observed how tension began to invade certain quarters of the scientific community as some European linguists began to use the category of race as a descriptive tool (Bachmann Forthcoming). There was considerable debate regarding the extent to which researchers could determine African influences on Atlantic Creole languages. The positions ranged from the claim that there was no relevant influence besides a few lexical items to the contrary opinion that Creole languages clearly exhibited strictly African grammars (Bachmann 3). Henríquez Ureña

⁷⁹ F. A. Coelho was Portugal’s pioneer linguist who conducted research on Asian Portuguese creoles. He also outlined Portuguese phonology in “Sobre a lingua Portuguesa” (1871) and “A lingua Portuguesa: Nocoos de Glotologia Geral e Especial Portuguesa” (1881). Gottfried Baist (1853-1920) was a Hispanic philologist from Germany. His monumental Spanish historical grammar was published by the Romance scholar Gustav Grober (1844-1911).

adopted the former position. He repeatedly refuted the identification of Dominican Spanish with these low social prestige Creole languages.

As noticed in both the Catalan controversy and the Spanish Creole discussion, the image of Spanish became a major concern among Spanish and Latin American philologists, who wanted to change the negative views of their countries held by Europeans and North Americans.⁸⁰ There was also a change in their intellectual attitude. By then, they no longer looked to greater Europe for scholarly authority. In fact, they felt it was their task to improve the Romanists' vision and theories of the Spanish-speaking world. According to Malkiel (1962), language studies had advanced so much in the Hispanic world that Hispanic researchers no longer felt compelled to simply adopt foreign theories and methodologies but were developing creative alternatives which they deemed more suitable for the realities of the Hispanic world ("Filología Española" 114). Through many of these debates Hispanists had come to form a close intellectual fellowship and were asserting their theoretical views. As they acquired better knowledge about the dialectal reality of the Spanish-speaking world, Hispanic scholars felt that it was time to abandon or at least reconsider substratum theory. The focus in research began to shift to specific phenomena (seseo, yeísmo, the leveling of liquids /r/ and /l/, etcetera) (Sánchez Méndez 20) and other theories (*andalucismo*, *antiandalucismo*).

While the majority of Henríquez Ureña's texts are not strictly theoretical, his article "El Lenguaje" (1930) shows that he was familiar with the latest trends in linguistics and knew the importance of a sound theoretical-methodological apparatus. For example, in his discussion of Saussure he emphasized the value of focusing on the systematicity of language:

⁸⁰ "Lo de que exista un idioma criollo en esta zona es falso, y el señor Henríquez Ureña hace notar el error en que incurriera Meyer-Lüke al atribuirle a Santo Domingo un dialecto negro español" (Malaret, Vocabulario de Puerto Rico 11).

El estudio sistemático del lenguaje, como fenómeno natural, es ciencia—vale decir disciplina constituida como coordinación de definiciones rigurosas y principios sujetos a demostración alrededor de una especie sola de fenómenos—al igual de la biología, la química o la física” (“El Lenguaje” 105).

Even with the new linguistic trends and concepts at his disposal, Henríquez Ureña was adamant about not forgetting the old lessons from “los maestros y los sabios.” The effort to maintain solidarity ties with the old Madrid school is evident in the same article: “como trabajo fundamental, publicado en la *Revista*, merece recordarse uno del director, don Ramón Menéndez Pidal, *Sobre geografía folklórica: ensayo de un método*” (107). While he certainly was able to elaborate key concepts and hone his skills as a language researcher during his tenure at the IFBA, many different sources, experiences, and people had contributed to his development as a linguist.

Between 1938 and 1939, Alonso and Henríquez Ureña published Gramática Castellana, Volumes I and II, two landmark texts that helped cement a tradition of language teaching in Argentina and South America in the twentieth century. Specifically directed to language teachers and presented as a product of the latest advances in linguistics, the authors were also careful to frame their Grammar within the tradition of Bello:

Los autores del presente manual se complacen en declarar a sus colegas del profesorado que solamente dan cabida aquí a los resultados de la Lingüística moderna, cuando puedan tenerse seguros y sean fáciles de exponer, y especialmente a los que coinciden, por lo menos, en su orientación, con los que obtuvo hace un siglo Andrés Bello (Gramática Castellana 7).

They expressed their objective in the following terms: “en suma la finalidad de esta enseñanza es que el alumno aprenda a hablar y a escribir su propia lengua con corrección, con fidelidad al pensamiento y con eficacia” (Gramática Castellana 18). These texts were a commercial and pedagogical success. Even though they were well received by intellectuals such as Borges, they still contributed to the linguistic polemic in Buenos Aires. As we indicated previously, local intellectual figures reacted against the negative characterization of Buenos Aires speech (Arnoux, “Disciplinar desde la lengua” 55). It appears that Henríquez Ureña’s role in the controversy was less prominent than Amado Alonso’s (Arnoux, “Disciplinar desde la lengua,” 54). While the Dominican was also moved by the same glottopolitical concerns, he was more constrained in his description of the linguistic realities of the Buenos Aires of the 1920’s and 1930’s:

Estúdiense la situación en [...] la Argentina. En corto número sobreviven los indios con sus lenguas, pertenecientes a familias varias [...] Al menos, se dirán, el español es uno: efectivamente, ningún dialecto de España ha sido trasplantado a América; sólo el castellano es lengua común. Este español, admiten todos ha sufrido alteraciones: unas por evolución espontánea (así las mezclas del “vos” y el “tú” y las formas verbales que les corresponden); otras bajo la influencia de idiomas indígenas, primero en el orden del vocabulario, y de idiomas extraños después, a graves de los libros o por contacto con el inmigrante; galicismos como “marrón” o “locatorio” o “es prohibido;” italianismos como “yeta” o “pálpito” o “voy del médico” (sólo de uso plebeyo) o bien “otro que...” (“El Lenguaje” 112-113).

In this particular case, Henríquez Ureña was more mindful of the interplay of diatopic, diastratic, and diaphasic variation and language contact situations, and more sensitive to the complexity of linguistic phenomena:

En la ciudad de Buenos Aires se encontraran capas superpuestas, como en Madrid, hasta llegar a los barrios bilingües donde el español se contamina de napolitano o de yiddisch, y al barrio de la Boca, centro de irradiación de la lengua lunfarda, cuya influencia se extiende a toda el habla vulgar y se infiltra, en gotas, hasta el habla culta (“El Lenguaje” 113).

Yet, as Arnoux (2001) argues, *Gramática Castellana, El Problema de la lengua en América* and Henríquez Ureña’s pedagogical manual *El libro del idioma* (1927), outline a pedagogical and glottopolitical⁸¹ program. This program aimed at: i) regulating people’s reflections on language and language use; ii) controlling the interplay of intellect and emotion; and iii) persuading the public as to the value of linguistic unity and homogeneity in the culturally diverse Hispanic world (Arnoux, “Disciplinar desde la lengua” 53). In other words, these researchers were engaged in language planning. In these Grammars and manuals, Arnoux argues, these scholars sought to create effective strategies as well as rational and logical discourse on language that would enable students, teachers, writers, and speakers to better deal with “the problem of language,” or as Amado Alonso saw it, “la profusión y, sobre todo, la extensión y la impunidad de las faltas” (*El Problema* 72). In Amado Alonso’s view, language professionals had to intervene and develop ways to approach these diverging linguistic practices in the context of Buenos Aires. Obviously, Henríquez Ureña was very much attuned to all these sociolinguistic matters and sought to make his contribution.

⁸¹ For a complete description and analysis, see Arnoux’s (2001) “Disciplinar desde la lengua.”

In Henríquez Ureña's research on the history of American Spanish we find the following central themes: *andalucismo* versus *poligénesis*, the dialectal zones of Spanish America, and the indigenous element as a determining factor in the American speech communities (Pérez Guerra, "La producción" 17). In his treatment of these subjects we can delineate a sociopolitical conception of language. In other words, Henríquez Ureña viewed the linguistic sign as intricately connected to the extralinguistic environment in which social and political forces had an enormous impact. Pérez Guerra (2004) made a similar observation: "a Pedro Henríquez Ureña, fiel hispanoamericano en formación y actitudes, le preocupa más el fenómeno estudiado que el marco teórico o los métodos de trabajo, lo cual explica que en el estudio de la lengua incluya lo "extralingüístico como garantía a una explicación más satisfactoria de los hechos" ("La producción" 16). What was the nature of the extralinguistic environment which Henríquez Ureña used to explain linguistic facts? Throughout his entire linguistic work, the most important determining extralinguistic factor is high culture; more specifically, it is the leading sociopolitical force in the history of a society. This concept of the linguistic form and view of language in history was prevalent among these language researchers in the Buenos Aires of the 1920's and 30's. It is illustrated in Alonso's discussion of the social groups that are most able to intervene and solve important language problems ("grandes solucionadores de problemas de expresión"), in which an argument is made in favor of the group with most cultural capital, "un pequeño círculo de personas, reducido primero a los profesionales de las letras o de las ciencias y a los espíritus más dotados" (El problema 32, 68). According to Alonso, this social group is not only intellectually prepared ("mentalmente privilegiado") for these tasks, but they also exhibit the only appropriate attitude towards sociolinguistic phenomena. In other words, they have a proper sense of the norm ("el sentido de la norma"). In such a social landscape, docile speakers

must allow this specialized group to operate unperturbed in the various linguistic domains. These were Amado Alonso's exact words:

La condición previa es, pues, la existencia actuante en el campo social de ese grupo cultural de extensión variable, para cuyos individuos la representación inherente a tal elemento literario sea un acto normal de pensamiento. Pero esto no basta. La existencia de este núcleo de cultos no sólo tiene que ser actuante, sino eficaz, lo cual traslada la cuestión fuera de ellos. La segunda condición para la generalización de literarismos es cierta porosidad receptiva en las zonas sociales que circundan cada vez más distanciadamente al grupo social mentalmente privilegiado. Esta porosidad no es otra cosa que docilidad, entendido a la latina, *enseñabilidad*, la cual es mera manifestación externa de una actitud íntima especial ante el fenómeno social del lenguaje: el sentido de la norma (El problema 68-69).

This explanation reveals a specific language attitude on the part of the language specialist. This attitude, repeated and reformulated in various contexts, became their linguistic ideology, according to which language was also understood as a primary instrument in the symbolic domination of subordinate groups: “los modos de decir de un hombre culto son para los demás normas en cuanto son normales en el grupo social dirigente” (El problema 73). Initially, these previous statements simply suggest that linguistic norm-setters can and should exert their influence over the practices of speakers. However, after further scrutiny and comparisons with other reflections on language, we observe the recurrence of certain principles (normality, educability, character, loyalty, effectiveness) that can be applied to language use and many related forms of social practice and which require the active leadership of the dominant group as

well as the proper recognition by the dominated groups. Henríquez Ureña (1930) had expressed similar ideas when he wrote:

Pero en el lenguaje no hay solo evolución, hay persistencia. Para el que habla, la lengua es un sistema fijo, estricto: el medio social que lo rodea lo impone y cada hombre habla según su medio. Cuando la sociedad se desarrolla en poder y en cultura, la lengua de las clases dominantes se difunde, se multiplica, se convierte en motivo de atención pública; la escritura ayuda a fijarla. Por fin se escriben gramáticas que ayuden a fijar las formas que se consideran “mejores” y la enseñanza del estado las impone: se hace de la lengua culta una cuestión oficial (“El lenguaje” 115).

Again, read in isolation, Henríquez Ureña’s reflection appears as the simple formulation of the sociolinguistic processes by which particular language forms are subject to selection, codification, and standardization. But when read in the context in which these language discourses emerged (e.g., in the context of linguistic polemics in Buenos Aires), we learn how they go beyond the realm of language. Consider the following statement from Henríquez Ureña and his Argentinean colleague Narciso Binayan (1928) regarding the need to reject students’ choice of discourse topics and use of certain language forms:

El niño, al escribir sobre ellos, no puede sino repetir lugares comunes o frases que haya escuchado en su casa o en la escuela y que repite con una dosis de conciencia muy cercana a la que impone el loro en sus parloteos. Con ser bastante graves las consecuencias que de esto se derivan para la buena o mala redacción, son más graves aun las deplorables consecuencias que tienen para la educación del carácter. Note el maestro que tales errores vendrán a constituir un curso de insinceridad con que se legalizará el

sistema de mentiras que continuamente trata de invadir la vida de relación del niño (Guía para el uso, cited in Arnoux, “Disciplinar desde la lengua” 68).

These prevalent ideas represent the intellectual context and climate of opinion in which Amado Alonso, Castro, and Henríquez Ureña established their specific line of research, which was sociological in orientation. This linguistic idealism was represented by Croce (1866-1952) and Vossler, but also by Bartoli (1873-1946), Gramsci’s teacher. While explaining language change, Bartoli employed notions of prestige and imitation, which were crucial to the development of Gramsci’s concept of hegemony (Ives 87). Henríquez Ureña had this crucial role of history and social tradition in mind when he argued for the archaic nature of the lexicon and syntax of Dominican Spanish (“El idioma español” 239). Notably, Henríquez Ureña tries to explain the preservation of archaic Spanish in the Dominican Republic with reference to the four conditions that Amado Alonso attributed to the deterioration of Buenos Aires. In the Buenos Aires context, as we indicated earlier, these conditions included: i) the plebeian tendencies of the period; ii) a break from linguistic (and literary) tradition in Spanish America; iii) the slow rise of Argentina’s stock as a colony; and iv) the massive influx of immigrants. Henríquez Ureña argues that it is the opposite conditions that are responsible for the Dominican Republic’s presumably privileged sociolinguistic situation.

4.8.1 Spanish in the Dominican Republic

It is during this Argentine period (1935-1941) that Henríquez Ureña composed his classic text *El Español en Santo Domingo* (ESD from here on) and published it in the *IFBA’s Biblioteca de Dialectología Hispanoamericana*. This text is partially a compilation of previous studies (1919, 1933, 1937, and 1939) as well as a major description of the different components of the

Dominican dialect and his views regarding the community's sociolinguistic configuration. At the time Henríquez Ureña was heavily influenced by Spanish scholars, specially Amado Alonso, and their particular approach to language. For example, we can find traces of this influence in one of Henríquez Ureña's evaluations of Dominican Spanish in ESD (chapter three):

Hasta hace poco, el sabor castellano del español de Santo Domingo tenía en el habla culta, peculiar señorío, mezcla de grandeza y sencillez. Este señorío no se permitía nunca el desgarró con que matiza su habla el habitante de ciudades activas o vivaces, como Madrid, o, en la zona del Caribe, La Habana. No existía la tendencia vulgarista en el habla, esta tendencia que constituye uno de los más curiosos problemas de todas las lenguas de civilización en el siglo XX: dominaba el tono culto. Pero sin afectación. Este matiz señorial llevaba consigo el uso normal, sin remilgos, de todo el vocabulario [...] (46-47).

These statements against the vulgar tendencies in popular speech are directly related to the particular voluntaristic conceptualization of language that he shared with people like Castro and Amado Alonso:

Voluntarism takes language to be voluntary acts performed by individual agents, agents who themselves bear the responsibility for the success of their linguistic acts. The voluntarist may argue, therefore, that linguistic acts will only be successful if individual agents submit their linguistic freedom to the constraints of norms: the prescriptive rules of linguistic 'authorities' are notorious examples of such norms (Taylor, "Which is to be master" 9).

Central to Amado Alonso's and Castro's linguistic voluntarism is the idea of language as a cohesive unit that can be controlled and shaped by powerful social institutions and the strong

will of some individuals: “los centros de vida más poderosos son los que dan el tono” (Alonso, *El problema* 101).⁸² This conception of language determined the types of studies conducted by these scholars and some of their most powerfully held beliefs. Not surprisingly, Henríquez Ureña attributed the preservation of Peninsular Spanish in the Dominican Republic to “the, obviously visible, social predominance of the families with Spanish ancestry” (“el predominio social, nunca eclipsado de las familias de abolenos españoles”) (ESD 47). The view of language as a hierarchical structure reemerges in Henríquez Ureña’s linguistic oeuvre, especially in ESD. It looms large over his description of the Dominican speech community in which he persistently associates the survival and continuity of archaic speech with the willful dominance of a Dominican social group that is also presumed to be white and directly descended from Spaniards.

ESD was composed in conjunction with the parallel study *La cultura y las letras coloniales en Santo Domingo* (1936) and Henríquez Ureña advised that both texts should be read together:

El presente trabajo, cuyo tema es la historia de la cultura literaria en el país de América donde primero se implantó la civilización europea, se enlaza con el que se estudia el español que allí se habla. Quienes lean el estudio sobre el idioma español en Santo Domingo que constituye el tomo V de la *Biblioteca de [la] Dialectología Hispanoamericana*, encontrarán en el presente trabajo sobre la cultura y las letras muchos datos que ayudan a explicar los caracteres del habla local: el matiz culto y la tendencia

⁸² According to Pitolés, “Alonso, dentro de los múltiples estudios que precisaba la gramática española, orienta su labor hacia aquellos problemas que permiten al hablante una mayor libertad para configurar los matices—los artículos, los diminutivos o las construcciones con verbos de movimiento—a los que posibilitan una explicación estilística” (187).

conservadora, en la clase dirigente, deben mucho a la actividad de las universidades y a la vida literaria de los siglos XVI, XVII y XVIII (199).

Both texts illuminate each other. In ESD, we find Henríquez Ureña returning to the theoretical and ideological concern of the Hispanic language researchers: “the vulgarization (or fragmentation) of language” (ESD 35). In his approach to this “most curious linguistic problem,” in the Dominican context, Henríquez Ureña drew from the body of concepts and techniques learned in the various schools where he studied and worked. In addition to the prevalent voluntaristic conceptualization of language, he was also profoundly influenced by the ideological currents (Dominican nationalism, *hispanoamericanismo*, *antihaitianismo*, and the State’s ethno-political discourse) prevalent among Dominican historiographers and members of his own family. As discussed in chapter three, the historically complex notions of identity, culture, language, and race that are peculiar to the Dominican Republic and that were bequeathed to Henríquez Ureña by his family weighed significantly on his description of the Dominican dialect.

In sum, the body of concepts, hypotheses, proposals, affirmations, rejections, and contradictions in relation to Spanish, along with the evolution of his linguistic thought, places him at the threshold of structural linguistics. Like early structuralists, Henríquez Ureña explored the relationships between fundamental principles of language and literature upon which structural (mental, social, cultural) networks are built. However, in the study of linguistic phenomena Henríquez Ureña also drew from the vast experience he gained from teaching, working, and living in so many different settings and from his participation in hotly contested debates; particularly the debates regarding the construction of the Hispanic community and the image of the Spanish language. Henríquez Ureña drew from the general climate of opinion

established by all these different linguistic, intellectual, and political currents, which I have described. It is necessary to situate Henríquez Ureña's linguistic work within the tradition of language studies in the Hispanic world, in order to understand his representations of Spanish in the Latin American and Dominican contexts. It is within this tradition that central sociolinguistic and ideological issues surrounding the use and status of Spanish in local and international contexts emerge. His approach to these sociolinguistic issues clearly reflects positions in the ideological matrix comprised by this tradition. ESD is no exception.

The main thesis of ESD, presented and developed in chapter five, is very straightforward: the vocabulary and syntax of Spanish in the Dominican Republic is “the most archaic” in the American continent:

Mi tesis principal es que el español de Santo Domingo lo caracteriza su aire antiguo, que en ocasiones llega al arcaísmo. Para demostrarlo he reunido ejemplos—muy fáciles de encontrar de palabras, giros, frases proverbiales y refranes [...] En suma: gran número de expresiones tradicionales que corren normalmente en Santo Domingo no se oyen ya en la mayor parte del mundo hispánico, aunque se encuentren aquí y allá aisladas y sueltas. Cada una de esas expresiones, si se toma por si sola, existe en tal o cual lugar; pero ninguna región conserva tantas como Santo Domingo (7).

This thesis statement seems simple enough because, at first sight, we seem to be dealing with a factually based claim which is therefore either true or false. However, my analysis seeks to understand the interrelatedness of linguistic description and ideologies of national identity in the Dominican context and the specific semiotic processes that articulate both phenomena. I focus therefore on the complex interaction between the apparently scientific and ideologically neutral vision of Dominican Spanish that he produced and contemporary discourses of national identity

in which race was a central theme. In Henríquez Ureña's studies of the Dominican dialect of Spanish, linguistic forms become iconically linked to racial and cultural categories, and in the process, an image of the nation emerges, a linguistic ideology that mirrors the white Hispanic identity that has dominated the discursive construction of the Dominican Republic since its historical emergence as an independent nation.

V. Pedro Henríquez Ureña and the Whitening of Dominican identity

Nothing is *vital* for science; nothing can be. Its accepted propositions, therefore, are but opinions at most; and the whole list is provisional. The scientific man is not in the least wedded to his conclusions. He risks nothing upon them. He stands ready to abandon one or all as soon as experience opposes them. Some of them, I grant he is in the habit of calling *established truths*.

Charles S. Peirce

La realidad es mayor que la descrita.

Pedro Henríquez Ureña

In this chapter I present an analysis of Henríquez Ureña's characterization of Spanish in the Dominican Republic, which I argue revolves around two themes: the archaic nature of its lexicon and the scarcity of features of African origin. Through his focus on these themes, Henríquez Ureña produced an image of what he regarded as the standard Dominican dialect of Spanish in which its formal similarities with northern Peninsular varieties were highlighted and its consistency with the Spanish (Castilian⁸³ and Andalusian) base was affirmed. Spanish in the Dominican Republic is indeed a complex linguistic entity and as such a number of different approaches to its study could be emphasized. And in fact other scholars, contemporaries of Henríquez Ureña, chose to focus on or at least further investigate other aspects of Dominican Spanish (such as its African elements), or its uniqueness, (as some Argentineans⁸⁴ were doing). In this chapter, in keeping with the approach to linguistic historiography and methodology outlined in chapter two, my focus will be less on the accuracy or inaccuracy of these alternative

⁸³ At the time Henríquez Ureña was writing, the term *castellano* was used to designate the entire Spanish language and not, as we do today, simply referring to a subset of the language (see Alonso's (1938) *Castellano, español, idioma nacional*). In most cases Henríquez Ureña's use of *castellano* can be translated as "Spanish," except in a few instances when he is specifically distinguishing northern from southern Peninsular varieties.

⁸⁴ As we discussed in the previous chapter, a group of Argentinean intellectuals had elaborated a theory of linguistic nationalism based on the unique Argentinean character and the popular Buenos Aires speech (Abeille 1900).

approaches and more on the intriguing question of *why* Henríquez Ureña chose to emphasize those particular features (archaisms and non-Africanness) and not others.

As the previous chapters have indicated, our analysis requires that we place the author in the precise historical context in which his work was being produced and Dominican identity was being constructed and reconstructed. The following cultural and racial categories and hierarchies are central to the present discussion: *hispanismo* versus *americanismo*, *hispanoamericanismo* versus *latinoamericanismo*, *blackness* versus *whiteness*, *dominicanness* versus *haitianness*.

5.1 Iconization as a metalinguistic device in Henríquez Ureña's linguistic texts

In Henríquez Ureña's linguistic texts we find several examples of indexical iconicity. At first glance, these passages appear to contain simple descriptions of linguistic forms and usage, but upon further scrutiny we observe that they also aim to reflect social and cultural categories, especially of racial and ethnic identity. In other words, Henríquez Ureña's descriptions highlight linguistic patterns while at the same time marking and pointing to racial and national boundaries. The following statement regarding the speech of the descendants of African slaves, originally made by Pichardo but often repeated by Henríquez Ureña, offers an example:

En seguida Van Name cita observaciones del dominicano Esteban Pichardo, autor del primer libro sobre regionalismos de América; según él, los negros nacidos en África y llevados a Cuba mutilaban y corrompían el español; pero sus descendientes nacidos en la isla lo hablaban bien, "como blancos del país, de su nacimiento o vecindad" ("Observaciones sobre el español en América" 65).

Addison Van Name (1868) was a scholar whose text “Contributions to Creole Grammar” has been said to represent the beginning of the scientific study of Creole languages. His reference to Pichardo lends more credibility to the line of argument pursued by Henríquez Ureña. But what we wish to highlight in this previous statement is the process by which the particular deployment of linguistic forms is used to determine membership in or distance from a racial group, region, or national identity.

The process of iconization as a metalinguistic and descriptive device appears very early in Henríquez Ureña’s linguistic oeuvre. The first example is found in one of the last paragraphs of his correction of Meyer-Lübke’s assertion of the existence of a black dialect in Santo Domingo (1919). In this case, Henríquez Ureña described syllable-final consonant deletion as the most characteristic phonetic feature of Caribbean dialects of Spanish: “el fenómeno fonético más característico de la sección hispanoamericana del Mar Caribe es la relajación—que puede llegar a producir alteración o pérdida—de las consonantes colocadas al final de sílaba” (“La lengua en Santo Domingo” 50). While opening with a general linguistic description, he subsequently elaborates his explanation with more details: “ha podido atribuirse el recrudescimiento del fenómeno, en esta sección de América, a la influencia andaluza, o al clima cálido, o la presencia de los negros. Es verdad que en los negros incultos el fenómeno se acentúa; pero no es fácil decidir si por ser ellos incultos o por ser negros” (“La lengua en Santo Domingo” 51). At first he approaches the question hypothetically, but in the process of forming an argument he begins to indexically link the selected linguistic phenomena with categories of identity:

En Santo Domingo, el hombre de raza africana está ya tan lejos de sus orígenes, que los habitantes de la capital lo pintan generalmente, si procede de los campos, no pronunciando necesariamente peor que el hombre de ciudad, sino empleando palabras

arcaicas: Dende que lo vide hasta agora... / Rato ha que esta oscuro / Ansina mesmo lo truje” (“La lengua en Santo Domingo” 51).

As we can see, he argues that the weakening of syllable-final consonants in the Dominican Republic cannot be attributed to people of African descent because its occurrence is conditioned by social factors and not race. But, in addition, he also argues against the possible African origins of syllable-final weakening by affirming that black Dominicans are often linguistically characterized by Dominican speakers as “rustic,” and “archaic.” For Henríquez Ureña, as we soon learn from the relevant historical context, “rustic” and “archaic” are discursively connected with “white.” He makes this association explicit in ESD’s chapter nine and also in earlier discussions of black speakers of Spanish, as in the earlier reference to Van Name and Pichardo. More importantly, however, Henríquez Ureña supports his linguistic reasoning in “La lengua en Santo Domingo” with reference to extralinguistic factors: the social images derived from the political and ideological landscape of the Dominican Republic at the turn of the century:

Causas diversas contribuyeron a mantener *la pureza del castellano en Santo Domingo*. Una fue *el predominio social, nunca eclipsado de las familias de abolengos españoles*. Otra fue la cultura: durante la época colonial, Santo Domingo tuvo escuelas, Universidades (una fundada en el siglo XVI y otra en el siglo XVIII), conventos, arzobispados, Real Audiencia, Imprenta (desde el siglo XVIII), arte dramático Pomposamente, se llamó a sí misma la ciudad capital “Atenas del Nuevo Mundo.” Y durante cuatro siglos, sin interrupción, se ha escrito allí literatura (“La lengua en Santo Domingo” 51, emphasis added).

Here he establishes an immediate connection between language and social structure: one of the principal causes of the existence of “pure” Peninsular speech in the country is the social

predominance of Spanish families. In this text (as well as in ESD and in *La cultura y las letras coloniales*) he explicitly refers to the components of the social structure that underlie Spanish and its history in the Dominican Republic: family structure, social class, religion, and high culture. The link to ethnicity is initially elaborated by contrasting the Dominican sociolinguistic landscape with that of Haiti's: "predomina en ella la raza negra, y la lengua hablada por la mayoría es un dialecto derivado del francés: los haitianos lo llaman "patois" o "créole." La otra nación, Santo Domingo, fue colonia española [...]" ("La lengua en Santo Domingo" 50). This is a distinction that Henríquez Ureña makes repeatedly, as, for example, in his famous article on dialectal zonification: "las tres antillas españolas (Cuba, Puerto Rico y la República Dominicana, la antigua parte española de Santo Domingo)" ("Observaciones I" 63); "precisamente el español de la República Dominicana, tanto el popular como el culto, se aparta de sus orígenes europeos mucho menos que el de otros países de América" ("Observaciones I" 65).

We find evidence of the process of iconization at work in several of Henríquez Ureña's linguistic writings, especially in passages in which he directly associates a linguistic feature with a social image or social activity that is not value-free. We find another example in some of his later linguistic publications (1938) where he analyses the evolution of and the confusion surrounding the indigenous word "aje" [sweet potato] and the African word "ñame" [yam] in the Spanish-speaking world and expresses causal connections with social patterns:

Para la observación práctica de los indios, de los españoles luego, el aje se diferencia de la batata en calidad como alimento. Cuando se difunde el ñame de Guinea, se le asocia con el aje como tipo inferior de comida: la batata se considera como manjar fino, semejante a "gentiles mazapanes" mientras que el aje se recomienda para los indígenas sometidos, como en la *Relación* atribuida a Las Casas, y el ñame como "buen

mantenimiento” para los esclavos negros [...] La semejanza entre el empleo del aje y del ñame empujaba hacia la confusión: ni los señores, poco interesados en comer aje ni ñame, se preocuparían de distinguirlos bien, ni los siervos recién llegados de África o los pocos indios que sobrevivieron a la conquista eran capaces de establecer distinciones lingüísticas en castellano (“El enigma del aje” 194-195).

The use and development of the loanwords in Spanish reflects the consumption patterns as well as the social hierarchies among Spaniards, Indians, and Africans. Furthermore, he claims that the confusion surrounding the use of the terms stems from the fact that the early colonial settlers did not care to establish a semantic distinction for items that they were not interested in consuming and the indigenous and African peoples were not linguistically equipped to do so in Spanish. The explicatory validity and accuracy of this description is not under question here. We can accept the sociolinguistic fact that at any place and time social patterns correlate with linguistic variables. However, what attracts our attention is the process by which the words *aje* and *ñame* become iconically attached to cultural categories. Notably, the ideological character of the text rests in the fact that Henríquez Ureña does not expressly acknowledge that power differentials among these groups intervened in the borrowing and adaptation of these words. The process is presented as a natural occurrence.

At times, Henríquez Ureña’s iconization originates in authors that he uses as evidentiary sources. For example, in section three of this article he presents the colonial chronicler Oviedo’s treatment of the word *ñame*:

Ñame es una fructa extrangera e no natural de aquestas Indias, la cual se ha traydo a esta nuestra Isla Española e a otras partes destas Indias: e vino con esta mala casta de los negros, e es muy provechosa e buen mantenimiento para los negros, de los cuales hay

más de los que algunos avrén menester, por sus rebeliones [...] Estos ñames quieren parecer ajes pero no son tales [...] es... de poca estima [...] para sustento de esclavos y gente de servicio (cited in “El enigma del aje” 183, 195, orthography in the original).

Oviedo established the history of *ñame* by briefly explaining its introduction in the Caribbean island by Africans. He described the role and function that the vegetable played in the community, while emphasizing the Africans’ low status within the caste system and warning his readers that this group represented a threat. It is within this cultural scale of inferiority versus superiority that Oviedo tried to account for the categorical and linguistic differences between *aje* and *ñame*. Building on Oviedo’s discussion, Henríquez Ureña concludes that speakers could not overcome the linguistic confusion and, as a result, the inferior word *ñame* displaced the word *aje* and became dominant (“El enigma del aje 195”). These passages reveal reflections on language and linguistic forms closely related to iconic images that are the result of ideological and social evaluations of groups and their situations. As evident in these lexico-semantic studies, Henríquez Ureña’s diachronic understanding of Spanish relied substantially on data from the history of colonial immigration and settlement provided by Oviedo,⁸⁵ Las Casas, and other colonial chroniclers.

One of the first instances of iconization of Spanish as loyalty to the Hispanic tradition in the Dominican Republic appears in the first few pages of ESD in the form of anecdotal evidence: “el poeta García Lorca me contaba que, viajando con rumbo a España conoció en el barco a un dominicano, antiguo secretario de algún presidente. ‘¡Hablaban un castellano estupendo! Al llegar a España ¿sabe lo que hizo? Besó la tierra. Y Adolfo Salazar y yo, que lo veíamos, ¡a los lagrimones!’” (ESD 46). Here the focus of the observation is not so much on linguistic form as

⁸⁵ “Oviedo afirma que ‘este nombre caribe no quiere decir sino bravo, u osado, o esforzado’” (Oviedo, cited in Henríquez Ureña, “Caribe” 214).

much as it is on style and distinctiveness. The anecdote illustrates how the Spanish spoken by the Dominican traveler in this instance represents a unique variety of the language that surpasses the social, linguistic, and aesthetic expectations of the famous Spanish poet. To Henríquez Ureña, the Dominican's wonderful speech, defined and reported by Lorca and coupled with the speaker's subsequent actions (kissing the Spanish ground), also stands as a sign for the love, loyalty, and kinship Dominicans manifest towards Spain.

Iconization operates even in some cases where linguistic forms function as sign-vehicles for sociohistorical meanings and evaluations. One example can be found in his description of an adverbial comparative phrase in the chapter on morphology: “!Más malo que Toussaint!: entre el pueblo ha quedado el nombre del gran libertador de Haití como símbolo de los grandes padecimientos del Santo Domingo español a principios del siglo XIX” (ESD 178). For many Dominicans, the image of Haiti, as we know from the discussion in chapter three, plays a crucial role in the definition of nation, language, and, as we can see here, even adverbial phrases. Nonetheless, for more in-depth analysis of the degree to which the semiotic-ideological processes of iconization and erasure operate in Henríquez Ureña, we must turn to the synchronic and diachronic analyses of Dominican Spanish found in his texts, especially in ESD.

5.2 Archaic Spanish and the Dominican speech community

In the text's brief prologue, Henríquez Ureña lays out the main tasks he wants to accomplish in ESD: i) prove that Spanish in the Dominican Republic is the most archaic dialect in the continent and a relatively unevolved dialect of Peninsular Spanish; ii) correct the Dominican Brito's representation of Spanish in his *Diccionario de criollismos* as a radically distinct rural dialect of Spanish; and iii) obtain a record of the archaic speech before it begins to

“naturally erode” (ESD 8). Chapters one through four provide a glimpse of the Dominican Republic in the context of the Caribbean region and an outline of important historical events that shaped the Dominican speech community: i) early colonial settlement; ii) the foundation of cities; iii) the early status of the Dominican Republic as a site of colonial power; and iv) the sociolinguistic configuration. This last aspect, the sociolinguistic configuration of the Dominican Republic, is described along the following lines:

El territorio de la actual República Dominicana se divide, a su vez, en regiones con rasgos propios en el habla. La población era, y es, principalmente rural: en poblados de más de dos mil habitantes sólo viven alrededor de doscientos mil—menos del catorce por ciento del total del millón y medio. *La lengua de las ciudades es uniforme en todo el país, como lo harían esperar los caracteres generales del habla culta.* En el habla rural se señalan divisiones: la principal, la del norte y sur, dos regiones que hasta fines del siglo XIX estuvieron poco relacionadas [...] Ahora, las excelentes carreteras de automóviles, y hasta el aeroplano, ponen en fácil contacto las principales regiones del país. *En el norte, El Cibao, “la gran vega” de los descubridores constituye conjunto homogéneo* [...] Allí, junto a fuertes rasgos arcaicos, se advierten fuertes avances espontáneos de variación dialectal. El hecho fonético saliente es el paso de la *r* y la *l* a *i* en final de sílaba (comer > *comei*, papel > *papei*). En el vocabulario hay singularidades de forma y de significado. *Las zonas costeñas septentrionales de Montecristi y Puerto Plata participan muy poco de los caracteres del Cibao.* En la provincia de Montecristi, la frontera con la República de Haití, “la línea,” según comúnmente se la llama, recibe elementos léxicos del patois criollo de los haitianos. Igual cosa sucede, en mayor o menor escala, en toda la frontera entre las dos pequeñas naciones, de norte a sur; si en la

“línea noroeste” se hace particularmente visible es porque aquella porción fronteriza es la más poblada. *A las costas de la bahía de Samaná tampoco se extiende el tinte cibaño:* influyen, en cambio, el francés criollo y el inglés de pequeños grupos extranjeros establecidos allí desde mediados del siglo XIX. En el sur las únicas regiones que ofrecen rasgos peculiares son, al occidente, la frontera con Haití, y al oriente los campos del Seibo, que coinciden con el Cibao en la vocalización de la *l* y la *r* (ESD 37-39, emphasis added).

This introduction to the Dominican linguistic situation, while broad, highlights the main varieties of which Henríquez Ureña has to account, emphasizes the existing routes and modes of communication as well as the trends of demographic change, sketches the sociolinguist configuration, and identifies certain language contact zones. In this section, we also find the formulation of a number of dichotomies (for example, diversity versus homogeneity, variation versus tradition) that will be crucial to the full understanding to the text’s implications.

Chapter two begins with a brief introduction to the main thesis and situates the Dominican Republic speech community in relation to Latin America and a particular historical context:

Santo Domingo, como toda la zona del mar Caribe, se distingue por el sabor fuertemente castellano de su vocabulario y de su sintaxis, en combinación con una fonética que se asemeja más a la andaluza que a la castellana. La zona coincide, en la base castiza de su léxico y su construcción, con Lima y Bogotá, ciudades que en la zona andina representan el grado sumo del sabor castellano, en divergencia con vastas regiones de los propios países a que pertenecen. Hay en Santo Domingo muchos rasgos arcaicos. Pueden

atribuirse, en parte, al hecho de haber sido la isla la primera región de América donde se asentaron los españoles (ESD 41).

In this previous example, Henríquez Ureña clearly opposes “castellano” to “andaluz.” Thus, Dominican Spanish is characterized first and foremost for its Castilian flavor, which, it must be emphasized, is established by focusing on its lexicon and syntax. The author compares this variety synchronically with the Spanish of Bogotá and Lima, conservative dialects that enjoy greater prestige throughout Latin America. Through this association, he distances Dominican Spanish from its Caribbean counterparts which, still today, occupy lower positions in the hierarchy of Spanish regional dialects (Bajarkman 1989, Zentella 2002). The emphasis on lexical and syntactic archaisms is a necessary part of the discourse that links the deployment of such linguistic forms to the expression of loyalty to Spain as opposed to Haiti or the U.S. and the cultural and linguistic heterogeneity and heteronomy that they potentially represent. After establishing this connection, Henríquez Ureña provides an initial diachronic explanation in support of his theory about the archaic nature of Spanish in the Dominican Republic:

Así ocurre con el español de Santo Domingo: el núcleo de población, relativamente numeroso, que se formó durante los quince años siguientes al Descubrimiento, estableció la base lingüística. A este fondo inicial se sumaban las incesantes aportaciones de los *noveles*, de los *chapetones*; pero debieron de persistir muchos rasgos del habla de los primeros pobladores, de los viejos *baquianos*, como se llamaban ellos a sí mismos, con palabra indígena. Así se explica la supervivencia en Santo Domingo de palabras o formas medievales que en siglo XVI eran arcaicas o al menos obsoletas, como el pronombre *ge*, los sustantivos *conocencia* o *confissión* o *cris*, los verbos *catar*, *creder*, *veder* y *crebar*, los adverbios *aína* y *atanto* (ESD 41).

In order to establish the significance of the initial colonial settlement in Santo Domingo, Henríquez Ureña draws on a conception of base that assumes the existence of an initial group of Spanish settlers that, with a few exceptions, exhibit no major regional, social, or dialectal differences.⁸⁶ He draws an image of the speech community that has resisted change because of a most important cultural characteristic, which from his cultural descriptions we learn is, loyalty to Spain and Hispanic tradition. After deploying his main argument, Henríquez Ureña provides further support for his theory with a reference to Cuervo:

Sobre el papel de Santo Domingo en la historia lingüística de América escribe Cuervo:

“Puede decirse que la Española fue en América el campo de aclimatación donde empezó la lengua castellana a acomodarse a las nuevas necesidades. Como en esta isla ordinariamente hacían escala y se formaban o reforzaban las expediciones sucesivas, iban éstas llevando a cada parte el caudal lingüístico acopiado, que después seguían aumentando o acomodando en los nuevos países conquistados [...] (ESD 41).

Hispaniola, as the first Spanish colony in the New World, was a central point of communication between Spain and America and key site in the establishment of linguistic norms. Henríquez Ureña offers Cuervo’s characterization as supporting evidence of the preservation of an archaic variety that was established during the early stages of colonization in Hispaniola.

As stated above, chapters one through four draw a sketch of the historical circumstances that, according to Henríquez Ureña, explain the archaic nature of Spanish in the Dominican Republic. In accordance with tradition in Dominican historiography, he includes colonial heritage, intellectual tradition, the presence of powerful institutions, and linguistic pride among

⁸⁶ This conceptualization of base is different than the one operating in his descriptions of Spanish in the Americas (See “Observaciones I” 61-62).

the most relevant historical factors that contributed to the initial configuration and subsequent development of the Dominican speech community: “sabor de antigua herencia, del pasado colonial, con su fuerte tradición universitaria, con su tradición de arzobispos eminentes e oidores doctos. Mientras Santo Domingo fue capital del Mar Caribe, el orgullo de sus privilegios daba tono señorial al habla” (ESD 47). Furthermore, Henríquez Ureña maintains that resistance to, first, Haitian domination and, second, U.S. occupation, led to the preservation and dominance Hispanic cultural and linguistic tradition (i.e., archaic Spanish):

Cuando la indiferencia de la metrópoli dejó caer el país en manos extranjeras, no se resignó: durante cincuenta, durante setenta años luchó para conservar su carácter de pueblo hispánico, sus tradiciones de cultura española [...] proclamada su difícil independencia en 1821, e invadida por la franco-africana Haití en 1822, opuso a aquel pueblo de idioma distinto una larga resistencia pasiva y por fin, en 1844, la resistencia activa con que recobró la independencia; en 1861 se reincorpora a España; ensayo destinado a fracasar (terminó en 1865), pero especie de acto ritual que ponía fin al contacto con *pueblos de raíz espiritual distinta*. Así, si el orgullo exaltaba el sentimiento del idioma en los siglos coloniales, ahora la defensa desesperada lo mantenía vivo. Y este *sentimiento de desesperada defensa persiste ahora: en el período de 1916 a 1922*, durante la invasión que emprende el gobierno de los Estados Unidos, sin motivos ni derechos. Santo Domingo se defiende como cien años antes, resistiendo la influencia del idioma extranjero, *viendo en el español su única arma, su único escudo, dentro y fuera del país* (ESD 47-48, emphasis added).

According to Henríquez Ureña, in spite of the fact that Spain abandoned the eastern part of Hispaniola, its inhabitants resisted relinquishing Spanish and Hispanic tradition. The last

statement, in this particular historical context, reveals a peculiar militarization and nationalization of the language consistent with formulas of Dominican national discourse and national imaginary. Nevertheless, subsequent isolation from Spain and the constant threat of foreign invasion spurred the leading Dominican social classes to preserve their Hispanic cultural and linguistic tradition until the twentieth century:

Uno de los signos del influjo de la cultura colonial en el habla está en el uso regular del pronombre tú y de las formas verbales que lo acompañan, como en Méjico y gran parte del Perú, en la zona donde irradia la cultura de Lima [...] Otro signo es la persistencia del futuro de subjuntivo (*hablare, hubiere*): en Santo Domingo sobrevive entre la gente culta, y se emplea sin ningún esfuerzo, particularmente al escribir (ESD 48-49).

In his linguistic and cultural analyses of Dominican society, we find many references to “persistence” and “survival.” As we explained in chapter three, Henríquez Ureña is providing this account at a time when serious tensions arose between the Dominican and Haitian governments and also at a time of intense Anglo-Caribbean immigration in the country. Thus upon reflecting on the country’s sociolinguistic history he poses one of the questions that most troubled Dominican intellectuals and politicians in the 1930’s: “¿se aflojará este sentimiento defensivo, en el contacto del proletariado con la reciente inmigración antillana?” (ESD 48). His initial answer to this question is not reassuring: “no sabemos si la energía que el pueblo opuso a las invasiones violentas se aflojará frente a la penetración pacífica” (ESD 48). Although he expressed doubt with respect to the restructuring of Dominican society at the turn of the century, his work on the history of Spanish and Hispanic culture provides proof of Dominicans’ ability to preserve their national identity in the face of adverse conditions. Thus, the vision of this uncertain future provides a sense of the purpose, motivation, and conditions behind the

theoretical and methodological processes of his work. Against the backdrop of the U.S. occupation and the perceived Haitian threat, he was compelled to address the interaction of language and race, the two most important subjects in the construction of national identity in the Dominican Republic.

5.3 Archaic lexicon

As indicated above, the lexicon becomes the first linguistic dimension and discursive site in which Henríquez Ureña begins his sociolinguistic study of Dominicans. Chapter five of ESD begins with the main argument:

Dadas las peculiaridades del país, el español de Santo Domingo tiene matiz antiguo en su vocabulario. A fines del siglo XIX, aun entre gentes cultas se oían, y en gran parte todavía se oyen expresiones arcaicas o que están convirtiéndose en arcaicas dentro del español general. Muchas subsisten en diversas regiones de España o de América, pero creo que en ninguno podrá formarse vocabulario de palabras obsoletas u obsolescentes que iguale en número al de Santo Domingo (ESD 55-56).

Thus, the archaic nature of the Dominican lexicon is manifest in the widespread use of words and expressions that have become obsolete in other Spanish varieties. His documentary base is built on lexical forms that he collected mostly from written texts but also from oral speech. At times, in order to confirm their status as archaisms, he cross-references these forms with words that appear in the standard Spanish dictionaries, *Diccionario histórico de la lengua española* (1934) and *Tesoro de la lengua castellana o española* de Sebastian Covarrubias Orozco (1611),

among others. In cases in which the archaic nature of these words is well-known, he simply reproduces them:

Las citas de fuentes antiguas están hechas sobre las que he tenido a mano de modo inmediato; desde luego, podrían multiplicarse indefinidamente. Para muchas palabras he creído innecesario dar pruebas de antigüedad, porque son bien conocidas: arcaísmos léxicos como *catar*, *boto*, *brasil*, *galano*, *dizque*, *aína*, o arcaísmo de forma como *celebro*, *mesmo*, *atanto*, *cuasi*, *dende* (ESD 55).

The following lexical entries provide a snapshot of the descriptive approach in which his argument is grounded:

- (i) *acalenturado* ‘febril’ (v. *Rebusco de voces castizas*; citas de Fray Alonso de Cabrera y Pérez Galdós en el *Dicc. hist.*) (ESD 57).
- (ii) *Catar* ‘mirar.’ “cate usted” = ‘mire usted qué cosa;’ “cátalo ahí” (ya ha dejado de usarse entre la gente culta); lo oí mucho en boca de ancianos a fines del siglo XIX y persiste entre campesinos, según el *Diccionario de Brito*; en el lenguaje gauchesco de la Argentina aparece todavía en Ascasubi; pero Gonzalo Correas, 176, ya lo daba como verbo anticuado a principios del siglo XVII (ESD 60).

Among the list of words provided in his description of the lexicon in chapter five we also find: *aguaje*; *apearse*; *arandelas*, *bregar*; *despacharse*; *dilatarse*; *gambado*; *guayar*; *prieto*; *privar en*; *rapapolvo*; *tíguere*; *tostón*; *vagamundo*. His lexicographical procedure involves: i) cataloging the lexemes in alphabetical order; ii) attributing a semantically archaic meaning; and iii) documenting the occurrence of these words in Renaissance and Golden Age Spanish literature and among late nineteenth century Dominican writers, or rural speakers. These

descriptions appear under the following headings: “voces del habla culta” (ESD), “formas populares,” “formas rurales,” and “formas literarias” (ESD 57-69, 76-81, 81-88, 90-94). He introduces the popular archaic variants in the middle of chapter five: “quedan relegadas a las clases humildes expresiones como *abusión* [...] *aguaitar* [...] *alabancioso* (ESD 71-75, 76-81). These forms are examples of archaisms that, although they may or may not have been attested in other Hispanic dialects, represent the character of the Dominican lexicon.

Throughout his description of the lexicon Henríquez Ureña selects a series of words documented in the Dominican context, many of them quite archaic indeed, and he attributes to these words the meaning given to them by the original Spanish colonizers: “*atajo* o *hatajo* ‘recua,’ ‘caterva’ (está en Cieza de León, *La crónica del Perú*, I, cap. 9, en Alonso de Zuazo, *Colección de Ovalle*” (ESD 59). Alonso de Zuazo (1466-1539), a native of Segovia (according to Las Casas), was a Spanish lawyer, judge, and governor in New Spain under Hernán Cortés and in Santo Domingo (1524-1528 and 1531-1533). Another example is *tostón*, which is found in the writings of Cristóbal de Llerena (circa 1540-1606), a playwright and a hospital chaplain in Santo Domingo. It is reasonable to think that recourse to Peninsular documents from the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries was the only option available to someone demonstrating archaic Spanish structure, but colonial documentation also provided the most appropriate ethnographic lens for the ethnolinguistic discourse that Henríquez Ureña was framing.

The opening paragraph of chapter six repeats the main argument laid out in previous pages and highlights the antiquity of a long list of proverbs and set phrases. Henríquez Ureña claimed that these proverbs and phrases were current in Dominican Spanish:

Las frases hechas de tipo tradicional son millares: unas son ya arcaicas, otras sobreviven en el español de todas partes. Muchas de ellas figuran en la colección de refranes y frases

proverbiales, del siglo XV, que ha sido atribuida al Marqués de Santillana, en el *Diálogo de la lengua*, de Juan de Valdés, escrito hacia 1535, en los *Refranes o proverbios en castellano*, del Comendador Hernán Núñez de Guzmán, siglo XVI, y en el voluminoso *Vocabulario de refranes y frases proverbiales*, del Maestro Gonzalo Correas, siglo XVII (ESD 95).

Chapter six is a record of traditional linguistic folklore in Santo Domingo in which the author draws a strong connection between archaic speech, the northern Peninsular dialects, and a Dominican social group (peasants). In the Dominican national imaginary, the rural population is thought to represent Dominicaness and was traditionally represented as predominantly white (Baud 1995). Henríquez Ureña first makes a note of rural speakers' custom of transmitting traditional proverbs and set phrases, a practice which, in the broader context of his argument, highlights the relationship and proximity to Spanish in Spain:

Otro rasgo arcaico es la conservación de los refranes, los cuentos, las oraciones, los ensalmos, los romances, los cantares, los juegos, los chistes, las adivinanzas. El refranero es vastísimo, y a fines del siglo pasado lo era mucho más: las nuevas generaciones son menos aficionadas al refrán que “los viejos.” Pero el campesino, por lo menos, los conserva en abundancia y lo aumenta. Recuerdo muchos refranes tradicionales que figuran en la colección del siglo XV, en la de Correas, en el *Diálogo de la lengua* o en el *Quijote*: naturalmente, presentan muchas variaciones de forma y a veces alteraciones de significado. [A caballo dado no se le mira el colmillo (*Refranes del siglo XIV*; Correas)] (ESD 108).

The old proverbs, which flourished in Spain in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, are not only abundantly preserved but they are also augmented by the Dominican rural population. What is

remarkable here is Henríquez Ureña's emphasis on how widespread the *refranes* are in the Dominican Republic and how they are linked to the prestigious Golden Age Spanish and the archive of Hispanic culture. For every entry there is a reference which documents its source in Spanish tradition and dispels any notion of its unknown origins. The description of this and other related phenomena often includes references to its genealogy: "el cantar, a diferencia del romance, sí tiene larga descendencia local, y existe, como en toda América, el improvisador campesino y la disputa o *porfía* entre improvisadores" (ESD 116). In sum, Henríquez Ureña describes the Dominican lexicon as archaic, and through this feature, emphasizes how much it resembles a Peninsular variety spoken in, for example, the sixteenth century: "la exclamación *!Ofrézcome!* existía ya en el siglo XVI: v. *La Eufemia* de Lope de Rueda" (ESD 118). In the process of presenting this information, he indexically links this feature to social groups (i.e., Dominicans, Hispanics, Spaniards, educated class, rural speakers) and activities (i.e., speaking, uttering proverbs, writing, singing, playing word games, etcetera) which reflect the nature of Dominican Spanish and its proximity to Peninsular dialects of Spanish.

5.4 Archaic syntax

Henríquez Ureña's description of Dominican syntax is considerably shorter and limited in scope: "la sintaxis es la usual del español. La concordancia sólo presenta las irregularidades, antiguas en español, que se deben al sentido o a la proximidad: 'la gente que estábamos allí;' 'un reburujón de gente salían corriendo;' 'se pesca el tiburón y muchos carites'" (ESD 225). He found very little variation in the syntax and morphology of the Dominican variety with respect to

general Spanish. However, in ESD as well as in an article entitled “Ello” (1939), Henríquez Ureña highlights the existence of archaic features such as the non-referential pronoun “ello.”⁸⁷

Following Hinzelin and Kaiser (2006), I provide the following summary of Henríquez Ureña’s explanation of the other uses of “ello” in the Dominican context. According to Henríquez Ureña it is used as a concessive or an evasive response:

- (i) Ello veremos.
- (ii) Ello, quizás no viene.
- (iii) ¿Es usted verde, azul o rojo? [names of political parties]—Ello, yo le diré; yo soy santiaguero.

It is used to signify hesitation, probability, or acceptance:

- (iv) ¿Vas al pueblo?—Ello [= eso dependerá].
- (v) ¿Quiere bailar?—Ello [sí, ya que me invita].
- (vi) Ello. Así parece (Source: Cañas y bueyes)

It is also used in emphatic assertions:

- (vii) Ello sí; Ello no.

According to Henríquez Ureña, these uses were extant for modern standard varieties of Spanish but were prevalent in Santo Domingo. He observes that *ello* appears frequently in Dominican Spanish as well as in other Hispanic dialects, but emphasizes its use in certain Dominican constructions that are atypical in the other contemporary dialects (ESD 226-228). His characterization of this phenomenon is quite broad and generally limited to description of actual usage and explanation of its syntactico-semantic functions:

Interesante, la supervivencia de *ello* como sujeto impersonal y además en papel de expletivo, como mero fósil lingüístico. Como encabezamiento mecanizado de oración

⁸⁷ Toribio (2000) calls this linguistic phenomenon “the most intriguing and telling characteristic of the dialect” (254). Some analysts have focused on this phenomenon as a syntactic feature that characterizes innovation in Spanish in the Dominican Republic (Jiménez Sabater 1975, González Tapia 2001, Pérez-Leroux 1999).

(comenzó como sujeto innecesario, en frases en que se podía prescindir de él, como “ello es así,” y después se hizo sujeto impersonal, innecesario en castellano, semejante al usual en francés, alemán, inglés: “it is good to be there;” Ello es fácil llegar (ESD 226).

In tracing its history, he finds a relatively uninterrupted diachronic transmission of the phenomenon until the twentieth century. By then, he thinks that, with the exception of the (fossilized) Dominican variant, *ello* begins to disappear from everyday use and sound archaic:

Después de largos siglos de usarse sin interrupción, desde los comienzos del idioma, *ello* ha comenzado a desaparecer de la lengua hablada. Empieza a sonar arcaico. El habla tiende a sustituirlo, y en parte lo ha sustituido ya, con *eso*, o con sustantivos como *el caso* o *la cosa*: “el caso es que...,” “la cosa es que,” donde antes sonaba “ello es que...” (“Ello” 209).

Ello subsiste como elemento mecanizado en determinados esquemas de construcción, pero ya no es sujeto, ni siquiera sujeto impersonal: de su función pronominal solo le queda el lugar en la oración, pero su papel se reduce ahora a dar énfasis. Subsiste como fósil lingüístico (“Ello” 223).

While his description of this phenomenon in his 1939 article is more detailed and explanatory, in ESD, it is subsumed by his demonstration of Dominican archaic Spanish. In fact, in both works, there is a tendency to focus on the fact that similarities exist between contemporary Dominican and Peninsular uses of *ello* in previous centuries:

Ello aparece además como fósil lingüístico; en España servía, o sirve, sólo para dar énfasis: Ello has de casarte (siglo xvii); “Ello yo le vi” (siglo XVIII) [...] “La suma de

dinero que montó al cabo del año. Ello fue mucho dinero” (Quevedo, *El Buscón* VI) [...] “Esto, Inés, ello se alaba” (en *La cena*, de Alcázar) (ESD 227-229).

The repeated comparison of Dominican “ello” with the Peninsular Spanish variants from the seventeenth and the eighteenth centuries alerts us to the fact that Henríquez Ureña attempts to establish a solid connection between the archaic Spanish spoken in the Dominican Republic and the variety spoken in Spain.

Other prominent syntactic features described by Henríquez Ureña included infinitives and gerunds with pre-posed subjects: “al yo venir;” “sin tú decir nada;” and “en yo llegando” (ESD 230-231). He embedded the description of these and other linguistic forms within his argument in support of a distinctly archaic speech:

Subsiste en el habla el pronombre enclítico en indicativo y subjuntivo (ya mencionado como rasgo peculiarmente tradicional). En narración: “Llega y dícele;” “Clávale las espuelas al caballo y sale corriendo.” Es frecuente esta estructura, de que da buen ejemplo Cervantes en la *Señora Cornelia*: “Déjola encerrada y vengo a poner paz” (ESD 228-229).

The occurrence of clitic pronouns in indicative and subjunctive construction is another phenomenon which is accounted for in previous stages of Spanish. Henríquez Ureña also noted the incidence of preposed subject pronouns in infinitival phrases as well as gerunds:

Colocación del pronombre sujeto con infinitivo: “al yo venir” alterna con “al venir yo;” “sin tú decir nada;” en canción de hacia 1870: “al yo ceñir su talle.” Con gerundio: “en yo llegando” alterna con “en llegando yo,” que es más frecuente; en el romance

tradicional de *Hilo de oro*: “Yo jugando al ajedrez, / por un camino me han dicho / Lindas hijas tiene el rey.” Con participio: “después de tú ido” (ESD 230).

To Henríquez Ureña, the tendency to place subject pronouns before infinitives and gerunds also has its origins in Spanish syntax, in which it was common to find these and other related phenomena:

Doble gerundio no era raro en los siglos de oro—se halla en Santa Teresa o en Quevedo, pongo por caso—y hoy mismo se atreven a usarlo escritores muy dueños de su idioma, como la Pardo Bazán, pero no la mayoría [...] Es curioso que el uso adjetival de *ardiendo* o *hirviendo* estaba ya extendido: “lámpara ardiendo” [...] persisten tipos antiguos de oración desiderativa: “!tomara yo morirme!;” era tan usual el *tomara* que se reducía a *tomaa* o *tomá* (ESD 232).

Henríquez Ureña argues that the syntax of Dominican Spanish exhibits very little variation from other dialects. Yet he pays most attention to those Dominican syntactic forms which are rare in other contemporary dialects but commonly found in Santa Teresa, Quevedo, Cervantes, and other Spanish writers. Thus he firmly grounds Dominican syntax in its Castilian base by emphasizing its archaic origin.

5.5 Dominicans’ Spanish pronunciation

ESD includes three chapters (9-11) which examine the Dominican pronunciation of Spanish: “el sistema fonético,” “variaciones fonéticas,” and “semejanzas con la fonética andaluza.” Chapter nine begins with a reformulation of his main thesis: “el vocabulario y la sintaxis del español son, en Santo Domingo, de fuerte tinte castellano; pero la fonética, queda

dicho, tiene semejanzas con la andaluza” (ESD 136). Regarding the phonology of Spanish in the Dominican context, Henríquez Ureña proposes three basic ideas: i) Dominicans’ pronunciation, just like in the rest of the Hispanic Caribbean, is remarkably similar to Andalusian pronunciation; ii) high class speech is manifestly different from lower class speech; and iii) with the possible exception of /-s/ deletion, there are no indigenous or African substrate influences. While these ideas may be uncontroversial (the Andalusian origin of *yeísmo*, *seseo*, and /-s/ deletion or aspiration (Alba, Henríquez Ureña y ESD 203)), in Henríquez Ureña’s elaboration of some details, he introduces associations with racial and cultural categories and thus his statements acquire meanings that take us beyond the realm of language. One example involves the vocalization of liquids characteristic of the *Cibaeño* dialect in the Northern Dominican Republic:

La *l* y la *r* pueden vocalizarse en *i*: comer > *comei*; porque > *poique*; Isabel > *Isabeil*; sueldo > *sueido*; conmigo > *cornigo* > *coimigo*; abandonado > *abaldonado* > *abaidonao*. Donde ocurre este cambio, se dan poco los demás; las regiones que ocupa son las de los campos del Cibao, en el norte, particularmente en las proximidades de Santiago de los Caballeros y de San Francisco de Macorís, sin llegar a las regiones costeras de Puerto Plata y Montecristi; en el sudeste, además, los campos del Seibo. El fenómeno existe entre los jíbaros o campesinos de Puerto Rico, generalmente blancos. Esteban Pichardo, en el prólogo de su *Diccionario de voces cubanas*, lo señala en Cuba entre los negros curros (ESD 149).

As we can see, he starts with a simple description in which he highlights what happens to postvocalic /r/ and /l/ and contrasts linguistic forms such as “comer” and “porque” with [komei] and [poike]. However, directly following this description is an association to “campesinos

cibaeños,” “jíbaros puertorriqueños blancos,” and “negros cubanos.” For the purposes of this chapter, we must highlight the following: “el fenómeno existe entre los jíbaros o campesinos de Puerto Rico, *generalmente blancos*” (ESD 149, emphasis added). In this case, Henríquez Ureña attaches to a particular feature a social and ethnolinguistic identity that is, above all, white.

While addressing the details of some of these phonological phenomena under the heading “Indios y negros” in chapter twelve, Henríquez Ureña writes:

No creo que se pueda plantear el problema de influencia indígena en la fonética del español de Santo Domingo en vista de la desaparición de las lenguas nativas en el siglo XVI. Queda el problema de la influencia africana. Es costumbre señalar como característica de los negros, al hablar español en América la conversión de *r* o *rr* en *l* (así en Cuba), y al revés—caso extraño—la conversión de *l* en *r*, como el leonés de España. Ni lo uno ni lo otro se oye en Santo Domingo: los pocos casos de *r > l* son palabras donde el cambio se había realizado ya en España o donde se imita el modelo español o hay repercusión o disimilación (*clin*, *celebro*, arcaísmos; crisis > *clises*, tipo *clin*; *climinal*, dilación; *cumblera*, disimilación); la confusión de *r* y *l* en un fonema intermedio *sólo ocurre en posición final de sílaba y tiene su exacto paralelo en Andalucía* (ESD 168, emphasis added).

In describing this process of lateralization of intervocalic [r] which results in the pronunciation of “cerebro” as [selebro], the author rejects any suggestion of this feature’s African origins and reverts again to drawing parallels to Peninsular Spanish. He proposes that the feature was an innovation that emerged in Spain. In addition, Henríquez Ureña discusses once more Pichardo’s assumptions with respect to this phenomenon and its possible African origin. Pichardo, indeed, had attributed some phonetic features to the Cuban “bozales:” “los negros criollos hablan como

blancos del país de su nacimiento o vecindad; aunque en la Habana y Matanzas algunos de los que se titulan Curros, usan la *i* por la *r* y la *l*. v.g. “*poique ei niño puee considerai que es mejoí dinero que papeí*” (12). In his example, Pichardo contrasts the pronunciation of African-born, second language learners of Spanish (“bozales”) to that of Cuban-born blacks (“negros criollos”) and concludes that there are major differences. Yet, despite these differences Pichardo acknowledges that, with the exception of a few words that need translation, this *bozal* speech is mutually intelligible with Spanish (11). Henríquez Ureña’s reformulation, in contrast, augments the linguistic divide between these speech communities:

Esteban Pichardo, en el Prólogo de su *Diccionario... de voces cubanas*, atribuye a los negros bozales, es decir, recién traídos de África (pero no a los negros criollos, que ‘hablan como los blancos del país’), ‘un castellano desfigurado, chapurrado, sin concordancia, número, declinación, ni conjugación, sin *r* fuerte, ni *d* final, frecuentemente trocadas la *ll* por la *ñ*, la *e* por la *i*, la *g* por la *v*, etc.; en fin, una jerga más confusa mientras más reciente la inmigración’ (ESD 168).

Having established these linguistic divides and cultural barriers between what we could call native speakers of these dialects (both white and non-white) and the African-born speakers, Henríquez Ureña does not seriously consider the possible African origins of these phonological phenomena. Besides being rare, *bozal* features are not found among native blacks, whose speech iconically reflects the linguistic patterns of white speech (“hablan como blancos del país” (ESD 168).

After discarding the case for the African origin of rhotic and lateral merging, he weighs the possibility that nasalization (e.g., *yapa* > *ñapa*) is a phenomenon produced by African

influences. He concludes that the phenomenon is unlikely to have an African origin since it is also found in Spain where African influence would be difficult to explain:

El cambio de *y* o *ll* en *ñ* tiene más importancia: *yapa* > *ñapa* y demás formas [...] Pero la nasalización no resulta sistemática, ni es fenómeno necesariamente africano; existe en España: ejemplos de Salamanca, recogidos por Lamano, *yugo* > *ñugo*, *morcella* > *morceña*, *pelliscar* > *peñiscar*, *cencellada* > *cenceñada*, *parpalla* > *parpañá*, *velludo* (viudo) > *veñudo* *algaya* o *argaya* > *argaña*, forma que ya estaba en Lope de Vega, *El vaquero de Moraña*: “trigo dulce y sin argaña” (ESD 168-169).

Henríquez Ureña considers nasalization in this context an unsystematic feature of Dominican Spanish, viewing it as a consequence of phonological change that had already occurred within the northern Peninsular dialect continuum. This view contrasts with some of his conclusions regarding indigenous substrate influences in American Spanish:

La influencia de las lenguas aborígenes en el español de América no me parece desvirtuada cuando se demuestra que el fenómeno al cual se atribuye origen indígena existe en regiones aisladas de España. ¿Causas diferentes no producen efectos semejantes? Las posibilidades de evolución de cada fonema se mueven dentro de límites estrechos, y las coincidencias son frecuentes. Y si el fenómeno que se da en el Perú se da también en Murcia, ¿hay más lógica en explicarlo como murcianismo que como quechuismo? Sólo cuando el fenómeno está ampliamente extendido en España cabe dudar de su origen local en América” (“Observaciones II” 120).

Therefore, his position on nasalization in the Dominican dialect of Spanish is relatively consistent with one particular conceptualization of linguistic variation and change, according to which the possibilities of evolution for each phoneme are highly constrained by the linguistic

system. In other words, phonetic change in the Dominican context is strictly limited to changes within the Spanish dialect continuum. Yet, it contradicts his view with respect to the nature of American Spanish and the influence of substrate and local conditions. This is a remarkable contradiction, but an understandable one in light of his overall arguments regarding the relationship between archaic Spanish in the Dominican context and the Hispanization of Dominicans, the ideological nature of his language representations, and the operation of processes such as iconization and erasure. His highly restrictive view of language change in the present context is consistent with his view on the similarity of Dominican pronunciation to Andalusian pronunciation.

5.6 Spanish, Hispanicness and the whitening of Dominican identity

Thus far we have restricted our discussion to Henríquez Ureña's descriptive account of the lexicon, phonology, and syntax of Dominican Spanish but now we turn to an analysis of its implications. Therefore, we must integrate his analysis of Dominican history into his linguistic description. As Alba (1990) and Pérez Guerra (1992) indicated, Henríquez Ureña's central argument (the linguistic archaism of Spanish in the Dominican context) determines the collection and selection of data in ESD. His treatment of the word *tostón* is a case in point. While Henríquez Ureña introduces its modern meaning, "a slice of fried plantain" (quite different from its sixteenth century referent, a type of a coin), he chooses to emphasize the persistence of the original meaning in order to, once again, link present Dominican lexicon to its Spanish roots: "*tostón*: 'rueda frita de banana verde' (se daba este nombre en el siglo XVI a una moneda, en Santo Domingo, según el entremés de Cristóbal de Llerena)" (ESD 67). In contrast to the more descriptive and synchronic approach used by his compatriot and contemporary, the lexicographer

and language purist Patín Maceo in his book *Dominicanismos* (1941), Henríquez Ureña adopts a lexicographic strategy in which he insistently connects typically Dominican words to their Spanish Golden Age origin. In some cases, he points out that the lexeme in question is in fact a sociolinguistic or dialectal variable, but ends up only highlighting the prestige variant: “*Crineja* o *crizneja* (en el habla popular *clineja*) ‘mechón de pelo’ (Las Casas, *Apologética*, cap. 121, escribe *crisneja*)” (ESD 57). In contrast, in the case of the word *aguaje*, he neglects to mention its other meaning in Dominican popular speech: “the act of feigning.” Thus the popular lexicon is obscured because of the need to take into account the archaic lexicon which, in the context of the construction of Dominican national identity, has more sociolinguistic prestige and pragmatic significance.

As we noted above, his characterization of the dialect revolves around two central themes (i.e., the archaic nature of the lexicon and the scarcity of features of African origin). He articulates both with his specific concept of Dominican national identity which emerges throughout his Dominican linguistic and cultural oeuvre: “quienes lean el estudio sobre el idioma español encontrarán en [*La cultura y las letras*] muchos datos que ayudan a explicar los caracteres del habla local” (*La cultura y las letras* 199). The archaic Dominican lexicon, syntax, and Andalusian phonology are linked to the idea of a single cultural identity that is Hispanic and implicitly white: “la raza negra nunca ha predominado allí y la lengua castellana se conserva pura (Henríquez Ureña, “La lengua en Santo Domingo” 50). His principal conclusions with respect to Dominican Spanish as they appear in several of his cultural and linguistic texts are grounded in this pair of ideas: blacks never had a considerable presence in the country and the Dominican variety of Spanish remains pure and close to its origins:

Y es que allí sólo hubo importación sistemática de esclavos durante la primera mitad del siglo XVI; después no hubo recursos para traerlos en gran número [...] No hay noticias de que a la isla llegaran, durante los siglos XVII y XVIII, cargamentos de África como los que se llevaban a colonias prosperas. En el siglo XIX, mucho menos (ESD 132).

According to Henríquez Ureña, the Spanish settlers initially brought only a small number of African slaves to Hispaniola. Thus the shortage of blacks not only implies the numerical superiority of whites in the island's demographic development but also the lack of any African cultural trait: "el elemento africano no ha aportado contribución ninguna distintiva" (Henríquez Ureña, "La lengua en Santo Domingo" 50). In addition, a specific sociopolitical order or what he calls "patriarchal society"⁸⁸ contributed to the Hispanization of Dominicans and their cultural practices: "[En Santo Domingo] se avecindaron representantes de poderosas familias castellanas, con "blasones de Mendozas, Manriques y Guzmanes" (La cultura y las letras coloniales 202); "aquella sociedad tenia caracteres patriarcales no sólo por su tranquilidad, sino porque las familias se agrupaban numerosas en torno de un jefe" ("La antigua sociedad patriarcal" 506). Colonial society in Hispaniola was structured on the basis of these powerful family units whose members had control of the Church, the government, and the education system:

Santo Domingo conservó tradiciones de primacía y de señorío que se mantuvieron largo tiempo en la iglesia, en la administración política y en la enseñanza universitaria. De estas tradiciones, la que duró hasta el siglo XIX fue la de la cultura. Su vigor se prueba en el extraordinario influjo de los dominicanos que emigraron a Cuba después de 1795:

⁸⁸ "A la antigua ciudad de tipo colonial que conocí correspondía una vida arcaica de tipo patriarcal. Ese fue el tipo de vida que existió en todas las Antillas españolas en el siglo XVIII y que en Santo Domingo se prolongó, según se ve, hasta fines del siglo XIX" (Henríquez Ureña, "La antigua sociedad patriarcal" 504)

Manuel de la Cruz, el historiador de letras cubanas los llama civilizadores [...] (La cultura y las letras coloniales 201-202).

In this society, the transmission of Hispanic culture was so strong that it attracted people seeking an education from other parts of the continent (Henríquez Ureña, La cultura y las letras coloniales 202); and later when Dominicans settled in other countries they significantly shaped the local culture (as the Pichardos did, for example, in Cuba). Henríquez Ureña maintains that this homogeneous culture and Hispanic identity developed relatively uncontested: “había pocas pretensiones sociales. Aunque entre los hombres que fundaron familias en los orígenes de la colonia hubo buen número que provenían de solares ilustres o por lo menos hidalgos (Heredia, Mendoza, Guzmán, Del Monte, Oviedo y tantos otros), la gradual nivelación de la riqueza, unida al fondo democrático del espíritu español, fue borrando las grandes diferencias” (“La antigua sociedad patriarcal” 507). In light of this demographically and predominantly Spanish Dominican society, Henríquez Ureña argues that, Spanish developed free from extra-Hispanic influences (ESD 250). It is against this historical and cultural background of Dominican society, that Dominican Spanish—its lexicon, syntax, and phonology—acquires the special meanings that index these social groups (i.e., the direct descendants of Spaniards as well as the few descendants of Africans) and their practices. Thus, in ESD, the ideas of an archaic lexicon and the demographic absence of blacks become icons representing the specificity of Dominican society and discursively whiten the national identity.

In Henríquez Ureña’s characterization, the distinctive features of Dominican Spanish (i.e., the archaic lexicon and syntax) are linked to categories of identity (the original Spanish colonizers and their white Hispanic descendants). But even more directly than his description of the lexicon, his discussion of the laterization of intervocalic /r/ and the reverse process (the

replacement of /l/ by /r/) among Dominican blacks (on page 168), minimizes the scope of the phenomenon⁸⁹ (we might refer to this as a pseudoerasure), locates it within the Hispanic linguistic tradition, and finally affirms the whitening of the black Dominican through the acquisition of white Dominicans' speech. In order to articulate Spanish and social groups in the Dominican Republic, Henríquez Ureña draws from these racial and cultural categories and proposes that there is a majority of purely archaic speakers in the Dominican Republic who are predominantly white. This is the fundamental idea that emerges out of the historical, cultural, and linguistic descriptions appearing in Henríquez Ureña's Dominican linguistic and cultural studies.

5.7 Erasure of blackness

“Y desde el principio buena parte de los esclavos no venían directamente de África: consta que venían de España, donde habían sido comprados a los portugueses; estaban ya hispanizados. Caso curioso: los primeros esclavos no eran todos negros; se trajeron también esclavos blancos a América” (Henríquez Ureña, ESD 132-133). While acknowledging the fact that slaves were brought to Hispaniola, Henríquez Ureña claims that a substantial amount did not come directly from Africa but from Spain and suggests that they should have therefore undergone a process of acculturation in which they adopted the beliefs and practices of Spaniards. Furthermore, some slaves were in fact not just whitened Africans but actually were white Europeans. According to his reasoning, Dominicans, including the few black ones, are to be culturally and linguistically characterized by their non-Africanness:

⁸⁹ The replacement of /-l/ by [-r] (rotacism) is quite spread in the southern region of the Dominican Republic (Jiménez Sabater, Mas datos 104).

El negro de Santo Domingo raras veces era puro en el siglo XIX: caso semejante al de Puerto Rico. Si fuera se creía muy africanizado el país, y muchas geografías así lo indican, es por la contigüidad de Haití, la antigua Saint-Domingue: confusión difícil de disipar. Es significativo que las letras, y la cultura dominicana en general, estuviesen en manos de criollos de origen europeo o con mezcla de sangre india: los Heredia, Núñez de Cáceres, Dávila, Fernández de Castro [...] (ESD 134).

These assertions are part of the historical and cultural reasoning underlying Henríquez Ureña's major linguistic arguments with respect to Spanish in the Dominican Republic.

We find instances of erasure and iconization in Henríquez Ureña's early work on the Dominican dialect of Spanish. For example, in "La lengua en Santo Domingo," he claims:

La raza negra nunca ha predominado allí y la lengua castellana se conserva pura. Nunca ha existido, ni existe, dialecto negro en la República. Al contrario: Santo Domingo pertenece a la sección de América donde la lengua se mantiene más cercana a sus orígenes castellanos. (430).

This is a remarkable minimization, if not a total erasure, of African heritage as a component of Dominican identity. But especially significant for our purpose are the presence and operation of mechanisms through which a particular linguistic ideology of national identity is produced and reproduced. The conjunction that links, on one hand, "The black race has never predominated" and, on other, "the Spanish language remains pure," does not establish a literal cause-effect relation between the two; however, the discursive disposition of these two statements clearly realizes the iconization of language that I have been presenting: blackness and "Spanish origins," are placed in opposite ends of the ethnolinguistic framework in which Dominican identity is embedded. This discursive construction is consistent with the non-black ideology of national

identity held by a large number of Dominican intellectuals and social agents. As we discussed in chapter three, members of the Dominican powerful educated classes have discursively constructed and monopolized national consciousness in the Dominican Republic. They have produced and reproduced a vision of the Dominican Republic as a nation defined solely by Hispanic tradition—measured in degrees of linguistic purity and whiteness. Naturally, in order for this vision to be consistent, dependable, and rational, its authors had to reject everything that complicated it including Haitianness, Africanness, and blackness. Therefore, erasure became a crucial component in the work of intellectuals such as Henríquez Ureña who had to draw up the cultural and linguistic image of Dominicans.

We notice erasure in ESD in the scarcity of pages dedicated to the issue of African influence in Santo Domingo. Chapter eight (“Elementos exóticos”) contains seven pages and chapter twelve (“Indios y negros”) only four pages. In contrast, the “arcaísmo” explanation extends over two long chapters (sixty-six pages) and spills into numerous other pages. In addition, in instances in which Henríquez Ureña encounters a potential African substrate influence (Dominican diminutives formed with *-ningo*) he declines to investigate it further. Instead, he provides an explanation of diminutives with the following caveat: “pero hay muchos casos en Santo Domingo, como en Castilla, sobre todo de monosílabos o bien de disílabos con diptongos” (ESD 193). While the comparison between a series of diminutives from the Dominican and Peninsular varieties is allotted one paragraph, the ambiguous and passing reflection on Afro-Dominican diminutives is limited to a single sentence: “diminutivo campesino (¿Africanoide?) es *-ningo*, *-ninga*: *blandiningo*, *chininingo*, *poquiningo*, *cerquininga*” (ESD 193). More emphasis is given to the archaic diminutives and the alternative forms are de-emphasized.

Noticeably absent from this chapter on syntax is any discussion regarding another prominent syntactic feature of Dominican Spanish: double negation. As Lipski (2005) noted, double negation (*nosotros no vamos no*) is “overwhelmingly present in the vernacular speech of the Dominican Republic” (*A history of Afro-Hispanic language* 258). Meggenney (1990) and Schwegler (1996) have studied the phenomenon in areas containing heavy Afro-American presence, including the Dominican Republic. Jiménez Sabater (1975) made the following observations: “aunque no constituye auténticamente una irregularidad conviene indicar un uso sintáctico muy típico del habla dominicana. Me refiero a las oraciones negativas con doble afirmación—y en menor grado a las dobles afirmativas con doble afirmación—tales como: *yo no voy mañana, no; Pedro no es bruto, no; Ellos no están aquí, no; Yo si me quedo, sí*” (*Más datos* 170). Jiménez Sabater attributes the semantic function of emphasis to this syntactic structure. According to Alba (2006), utterances with preverbal and postverbal negative markers (“yo no sé decirle, no”) constitute “una construcción sintáctica que tiene un gran valor identificador del español dominicano, ya que no se ha documentado en ningún otro país de habla hispánica” (*Como hablamos los dominicanos* 143). Alba proposes that this stigmatized construction is very common in the popular speech of low socioeconomic groups and frequently heard in spontaneous conversation (*Como hablamos los dominicanos* 143).

Schwegler (1996) states that double negation is a phenomenon which we can trace to Bantu languages. Lipski provides an example of the corresponding structure in the Kikongo language: *ke... ko: ke + besumba + ko* [they do not buy] (“A new perspective on Afro-Dominican Spanish”). Moscoso Puello (1936) had already documented it in his novel *Cañas y bueyes*: “*no son poquito, no*. Lo que pasa e que son mucho grupo. El Pato, José, machito, esos son lo jefe. Pero el cabeza es José. Un día le dijien que cerquininga había una fuerza del

Gobierno y se desparramán” (45, emphasis added).⁹⁰ Although he selected and highlighted numerous speech samples from this novel, Henríquez Ureña did not detect this phenomenon. In the absence of any documented Peninsular antecedent or counterpart, this peculiar syntactic phenomenon disappears from his description of Dominican Spanish. Erasure was such a prevalent process in the representation of the Dominican dialect of Spanish that he minimized and ignored some complex linguistic phenomena. In addition, it motivated his polemic intervention against other scholars who were trying to investigate the African-Dominican or Afro-Hispanic connection.

5.8 Contesting Africanist hypotheses

In chapter two we considered the fact that, within any community, language ideologies are multiple and often in competition (Kroskrity 2000). In ESD, we perceive the presence of a dominant nationalistic and linguistic ideology as well as other competing ideologies. Specifically, in chapter eight, Henríquez Ureña makes the reader aware of the existence of diverging views on the topic of African substrate influences. He polemically debates some of the ideas and hypotheses of his contemporaries such as the Cuban Fernando Ortiz (1881-1969) and the Dominican Carlos Larrazábal Blanco (1894-1989), questioning their theories of African influence in Cuba and the Dominican Republic (ESD 130).

⁹⁰ A constant source of reference for Henríquez Ureña as well as other researchers, *Cañas y bueyes* is a novel about the sugar industry and the exploitation of the Dominican worker. For many researchers it is rich source of speech samples from many of the varieties in the Dominican Republic (Henríquez Ureña 1941, Larrazábal Blanco 1975, Lipski 2005).

5.8.1 Fernando Ortiz

The Cuban anthropologist and ethnomusicologist Fernando Ortiz pioneered the study of African cultures in America. He had a different view of the possibilities for research in this field. For example, regarding the work of scholars such as Pichardo and Wiener, Ortiz wrote:

Esta opinión [de Wiener⁹¹] y la de Pichardo, habían de bastar para estudiar el vocablo [conuco], en consideración a un vocabulario de afronegrismos reales o supuestos, si recientemente no se hubiese publicado un curioso e interesante libro de erudición muy nutrida aunque a veces festinada, de deducciones originales, pero aventuradas no pocas de ellas, en el cual se sostiene que *conuco* es voz africana. Y la seriedad del autor, Leo Wiener, profesor de Harvard, obliga a no despreciarla, aunque recibamos su creencia lexicográfica, en este concreto caso, no en otros muy acuciosamente analizados, como inconcluyente; no obstante reconocer que las raíces africanas pudieron influenciar y codeterminar el vocablo criollo, y, sobre todo, darle fijeza y variedad semántica (Glosario 141-142).

Ortiz helped found the journals “Revista Bimestre Cubana,” “Archivos del Folklore de Cuba,” and “Estudios Afrocubanos.” Since the publication of his first book, *Los negros brujos* (1906), Ortiz engaged in the study of not only the Afro-Cuban population and its contribution to Cuban society and history (“La cubanidad y los negros” (1939) 4-15) but also the linguistic development of this population. In an article entitled “Los afronegrismos de nuestro lenguaje,” published in 1922 in *Revista Bimestre*, Ortiz shed some light on Cuba’s sociolinguistic configuration and history: “¿Cuál debía ser esta *lingua franca* de las plantaciones? No podía ser

⁹¹ Leo Wiener was an important philologist and professor of Slavic languages at Harvard who, in his book *Africa and the discovery of America* (1920), advanced the controversial idea that Africans reached America before Europeans and thought that he had correctly identified certain lexemes in the Americas that derived from African languages.

otra que el castellano, aunque hablado con grandes imperfecciones, con acento bozalón primero, después como criollos, y nunca como en Castilla” (98). Ortiz acknowledged the predominance of Spanish and the overall scarcity of African linguistic forms in Cuban speech, but went on to lament the lack of general interest in this subject by Cuban scholars:

Todo esto aparte de que nadie tuvo en Cuba verdadero interés en conocer los lenguajes negros, acaso porque aquí, como en el resto del mundo hasta hace pocos años, era opinión común que el habla de negros era una jeringoza sin importancia, formada por un puñado de vocablos; que era, simplemente en términos que hace cerca de 2000 años dijera Plinio, *stridor non vox*. Pero también por apatía colonial, por el menosprecio en que fueron abandonadas todas las cosas de los esclavos, y porque la religión no tuvo aquí los pacientes misioneros que en el continente (“Los afronegrismos de nuestro lenguaje” 99).

Ortiz found it troubling that scholars did not explore the contributions of Africans in America. In Cuba, he encouraged scholars to break away from this paradigm and investigate African linguistic heritage. In this regard, Ortiz’s perspective on the subject of African influence stands in sharp contrast to Henríquez Ureña’s position: “y jamás ha cesado la influencia étnica de gentes melánicas en Cuba; desde el África durante siglos y como esclavos; luego desde las islas vecinas, sobre todo de Jamaica y de Haití, en aproximada servidumbre” (“La cubanidad y los negros” 7). Ortiz specifically acknowledges the demographic impact of people of African descent in Cuba due to the Atlantic slave trade and immigration from the nearby islands of Jamaica and Haiti. One of the works in which he tried to remedy the lack of scholarship on people of African descent was *El glosario de afronegrismos* (1924). In this text’s prologue he wrote:

La influencia de África en el vocabulario propio de los latinoamericanos ha sido siempre reconocida y en todos los léxicos y estudios lexicográficos de alguna amplitud y análisis se han dado ejemplos de voces traídas por los esclavos. Pero un examen directo de ese aspecto de la lingüística de estas naciones hispanoparlantes no se ha hecho todavía. El tema es tentador y es propósito de este libro abrir trocha en la fronda lingüística latinoamericana para que aquellos hombres de ciencia consagrados a tan difíciles estudios, como son los relacionados al lenguaje, puedan hallar acopio de materiales y alguna que otra orientación, trazada empíricamente más que con la brújula de una técnica especial de que carecemos (13).

He affirmed that there was widespread recognition of the lexical influence of Africans in the diverse Latin American dialects of Spanish and hoped that properly trained language scholars would pay more serious attention to these speech phenomena.

In contrast, Henríquez Ureña overlooked the need to reconsider some of the gaps in knowledge due to the scarcity of Afrohispanic studies. His contention was that:

El voluminoso *Glosario de afronegrismos* contiene, en realidad pocas palabras de origen africano seguro: el mayor número de las indiscutibles representan procedencias, bailes u objetos de uso muy especial; en todo lo demás, rara vez hay otras cosas que suposiciones; pero el autor estudia largamente todas las hipótesis y posibilidades, aun las más descabelladas, para aceptarlas, rechazarlas o dejar juicio suspenso. La gran masa de este vocabulario es desconocido en Santo Domingo: *abayuncar, afió, anaquille, apobanga, aronga*, para citar sólo vocablos de la letra A; nombres de procedencias como *ábalo, abaya, acocué, achantí, augunga, apapá, arará* (ESD 132).

In his chapter on africanisms, Henríquez Ureña does not consider or include the following words from Ortiz's *Glosario* in the context of Dominican Spanish: 'bejuco' (follaje-Cibao-batata), 'bemba', 'buche' (bloat), 'burundanga' ("hablar de cosas que nos son buenas; eso es burundanga"), 'cafre', 'carabela', 'cicote' (mal olor de pie), 'cocotal' (cocotazo), 'cocoricamo', 'cuaba', 'culeco' (gallina está culeca; cro-cro), 'cundango', 'chibirico' ("una gente muy metía; mala conducta"), 'chivo', 'embromar', 'fo', 'fuñir', 'guarapo' (guarapo e caña, vagazo cosa con acido), 'guineo', 'jabado' ("mal lavado; un colorcito por aquí; el cielo con muchas nubes blancas"), 'mabí', 'macuto' ("para cargar cosas; de cana"), 'mengano' ("los guineos?"), 'mondongo', 'monigote', 'ñañara' ("muchos naciños"), 'ñapa', 'taita', 'totuma' ("hinchazón"), 'yuca', 'zangano' ("gente que no estudia"), and 'zape' ("se les dice a los gatos"). Most of these words were not integrated into ESD's chapter on africanisms because, according to the author, they were unheard of in the Dominican context. However, in recent fieldwork, I recorded all these words as part of the active vocabulary of an eighty-year old informant from Santo Domingo (Valdez 2007).⁹² Unlike Ortiz, Henríquez Ureña did not seek to explore those aspects of Dominican Spanish that diverged from its Peninsular base. We observe the same sharp contrast when we compare his work to that of his compatriot Larrazábal Blanco.

5.8.2 Larrazábal Blanco

Larrazábal Blanco is another scholar whose work on the subject has been influential. Henríquez Ureña's commentary on his work is limited to a few statements in two footnotes. For example, in footnote number four in chapter eight, he writes: "D. Carlos Larrazábal Blanco trata el tema en su *Vocabulario de afronegrismos*, en la revista *Analectas*, de Santo Domingo, 1 de

⁹² See also the most recent edition of the *Diccionario de cultura y folklore dominicano* (2005).

febrero de 1935” (ESD 131). A contemporary of Henríquez Ureña, Larrazábal Blanco was born to Venezuelan parents in Santo Domingo. A graduate of Hostos’s *Escuela Normal*, he went on to become a historian and a member of the Dominican Academy of History as well as the Dominican Academy of the Spanish Language. Like Henríquez Ureña, he spent many years living abroad. His exile was the result of deportation by the Trujillo regime which claimed that he was a foreigner and not a Dominican citizen (Mateo, Mito y cultura 99).

The stark contrast between his approach to the study of Dominican history and Henríquez Ureña’s is borne in this statement from his article “Papeles de Familia” (1945): “no son sólo los reyes, los obispos, los presidentes y generales los que hacen historia en sus obligadas funciones oficiales, sino también la hace el hombre común, el padre de familia, historia que nos puede esclarecer los hábitos y costumbres del pasado” (13). With these words, he heralded the beginning of the study of the practice of everyday life in the Dominican Republic and through his work inspired the Afro-Dominican research that proliferated after the fall of Trujillo. Although he had been researching and lecturing on Dominican history since the 1930’s, his master work was not published until 1967: Los negros y la esclavitud en Santo Domingo. This text is considered a landmark in Afro-Dominican studies (Moreta Castillo 2003, 168). According to Larrazábal Blanco:

Dentro del cuadro de la cultura hispana que ha dominado el panorama de la vida espiritual de la colonia dos recuadros habrá que distinguir, el cultural afro-hispano y el cultural afro-francés. El trasfondo afro-francés de la cultura popular dominicana nace, necesariamente del simple contacto fronterizo, que cuando es vivo y de presión, como en este caso, no puede rehuirse. Factor importante fue la continua afluencia de esclavos fugitivos de la colonia francesa, que en varios casos permanecieron y hasta fundaron

núcleos de población [...] Ambos fondos, el hispano y el francés, a través de toda clase de convivencias que diluyeron el uno en el otro para contribuir en mucho al aspecto afro-dominicano actual. Visiblemente existen diferencias notables entre lo negro puramente haitiano y lo puramente dominicano. No hay que esforzar la mente para la comprensión cabal de estas diferencias entre las cuales intervienen causas sociales, políticas, culturales (Los negros y la esclavitud en Santo Domingo 180-181).

In addition to the role that Spaniards and their descendants played in the development of Dominican society, Larrazábal Blanco highlights contributions from Afro-Hispanic groups and Haitians. The author does not reduce the Haitian contribution to the border contact zones, but explains that it can be found throughout the Dominican territory and throughout different periods in the island's history.

In the same discussion, Larrazábal Blanco makes the following declaration: “las diferencias culturales entre pueblos hay que estudiarlas comparando las masas y no las elites cuando se desean aplicar en su conjunto [...]” (181). This statement sheds light on the different theoretical and methodological approach and attitude between the two scholars. One selects a broader empirical base with which to work, while the other opts for a narrower scope. In the final section of Larrazábal Blanco's text (“Influencias haitianas”), he makes statements that were extremely rare among prior generations of Dominican historiographers and scholars:

La influencia haitiana ha continuado después de la Independencia y pervive aun. No sólo esto ocurre en la Frontera sino en todo el país, tanto en los campos como en las aldeas y ciudades [...] Los haitianos menos transculturados que los “cocolos” y de más fuerza espiritual en el sentido de sus ritos, penetran más en la sociedad e influyen en ella. Como muestra de la existencia actual de la práctica de los haitianos en materia de artilugios de la

brujería y de sus ritos vodúísticos transcribimos a renglón seguido interesante pasaje de *Cañas y Bueyes*, novela del Dr. Moscoso Puello (182-183).

He proposes the existence of a process of Dominican-Haitian transculturation. In addition, his statement raises another interesting point of comparison: how the analyses of the same source of data yield different results. Larrazábal Blanco, as Lipski (2005) noted, was careful not to generalize too much from the data extracted from literary sources such as the novel *Cañas y bueyes*. According to Larrazábal Blanco: “la existencia de voces criollas haitianas en nuestros cuentos no debe ser índice de su origen afro, como pudiera suponerse” (191). Henríquez Ureña’s investigations, in contrast, rely heavily on data from literary texts, some of which do not incorporate unusual words, idioms, or slang.

In chapter eight of ESD, Henríquez Ureña also cites *Cañas y bueyes* in reference to the arrival of migrant workers from Haiti and the English speaking West Indies:

Esta invasión está *ennegreciendo* rápidamente el país: se calcula que hay más de doscientos mil inmigrantes de origen antillano; la población total del país apenas alcanza a millón y medio de habitantes. La interesante novela de Francisco Eugenio Moscoso Puello, *Cañas y bueyes*, Santo Domingo 1936, pinta aspectos de esta invasión [...] Ahora se ha extendido a Santo Domingo la reciente boga de la poesía de temas negros en las Antillas, que florece en Cuba y Puerto Rico con las obras de Luís Pales Matos [...] Alejo Carpentier, Nicolás Guillén, [y otros] [...] Produce los Doce poemas negros de Manuel Cabral (Santo Domingo, 1935): los negros de sus poemas son principalmente haitianos o cocolos de las islas inglesas, porque los nativos de Santo Domingo tienen costumbres menos pintorescas [...] Las viejas y deliciosas Criollas de Arturo Pellerano Castro son realmente criollas: hablan siempre de mujeres blancas y trigueñas (ESD 133).

This passage, while not strictly dealing with linguistic matters, nonetheless reveals the powerful presence, in Henríquez Ureña's vision of the Dominican Republic, of an ideology of national identity in which, in keeping with the prevalent misconceptions of the time, racial hierarchies were reproduced and blackness erased. Although Henríquez Ureña does not define the word "trigueña" in this text, it is clear that he is referring to women of mixed race with light skin as opposed to darker skin mulatas. His writings reflect his hierarchy of female beauty. In *Memorias* (1909) he wrote: "y cuyas hijas [de haitianos ricos], educadas en Europa, suplen con la multitud de sus *accomplishments*, sus frecuentes deficiencias en el orden físico" (54). In contrast: "las hijas del dueño de la casa me parecieron, a poco, mejor dotadas que sus primas: eran tipos más finos, casi todas rubias" (Henríquez Ureña, *Memorias* 56). To Henríquez Ureña, blackness was foreign, a thing of *cocolos* and Haitians, and not part of what Larrazábal Blanco called "el aspecto afro-dominicano actual" (*Los negros y la esclavitud en Santo Domingo* 181).

At the end of chapter sixteen (on Dominican toponyms) Henríquez Ureña continues to make his case against African substrate influences: "la toponimia de origen africano es excepcional: Biafara, Bran (sabana de Juan Bran, Pedro Bran), Can, Egombe" (ESD 213). He resumes his polemic with Larrazábal Blanco and places the burden of proof on the africanist researcher: "habría que probar que de aquella región [África, en la Costa del Cabo] vinieron negros a Santo Domingo y que se establecieron en la que es hoy provincia Duarte" (ESD 213-214). And, as it happens consistently throughout ESD, the measure of proof is often times whether the term in question has a Hispanic antecedent or appears in a source such as Las Casas: "no puede concederse atención a la coincidencia con el nombre de la tribu *Amina* (¿palabra llana o esdrújula?), porque consta que el nombre es indio, según el testimonio irrecusable de Las

casas, Apologética, cap 6 (Ágmina)” (ESD 214). In the same discussion there is one instance in which Henríquez Ureña does concede that certain toponyms might be African in origin:

Biafara, arroyo y lugarejo: si parece convincente la etimología, porque el Sr. Larrazábal demuestra que en los siglos XVI y XVII existieron en Santo Domingo negros biafaras, que llevaban el nombre de la tribu como apellido [...] *Bran* como apellido de negros procedentes de tribus de igual nombre [...] *Camú*: semejaza con demasiado distante con *Gami* (¿palabra llana?), que es ‘inundación’ en malinque; el Sr. Larrazábal se limita a señalarla, pero cita el testimonio de Las Casas, que obliga a abandonar la pista africana; *Can*, lugar: *ka* o *kan* es ‘aldea’ en lenguas africanas, y consta que en Santo Domingo se llamaba *can*, por lo menos en el siglo XVIII, a los campamentos negros. En suma: quedan cuatro nombres en que el origen africano es seguro o muy probable y dos en que es posible (ESD 214).

He concludes that we can accept, with some degree of certainty, only four Afro-Dominican toponyms. Henríquez Ureña’s elegant rebuff of Larrazabal Blanco’s linguistic and toponymic analysis notwithstanding, we observe the reductive process of data on African expressions that we have been referring to as erasure. Although in this discussion Henríquez Ureña lends some veracity to Larrazábal Blanco’s findings, we observe Henriquez Urena’s insistence that the proof is too minimal to overturn his own judgment or Las Casas’s opinion (“que obliga a abandonar la pista africana”). By comparing and contrasting the theoretical attitude and research of Ortiz and Larrazábal Blanco with that of Henríquez Ureña, we find more evidence of erasure in Henríquez Ureña’s linguistic description.

5.9 Summary

Henríquez Ureña reached five major conclusions with respect to the Dominican speech community. First, since there are few differences between educated and popular speech, Dominican Spanish is highly homogeneous. Second, the pronunciation is similar to Andalusian Spanish. Third, it is characterized by the preservation of lexical and syntactic archaisms, which, fourth, due to a process of linguistic fossilization, are markedly Castilian. Finally, Dominican Spanish is characterized the absence of africanisms (ESD 250). What led him to these conclusions? Part of the answer can be found in ESD where specific linguistic forms are described within the context of a specifically Hispanic literary tradition. However, for the rest of the answer one must turn to the ideological context where the link between specific language forms, on one hand, and social hierarchies and cultural and racial categories, on the other, is not as obvious. Henríquez Ureña's characterization of Dominican Spanish must be considered in light of his affirmations in texts such as *La cultura y las letras* (1936) in which he links the forging of Dominican national consciousness to language maintenance in the struggle for independence from Haiti:

Todo hacía pensar que la civilización española había muerto en la isla predilecta del Descubridor. Pero no. Aquel pueblo no había muerto. Entre los que quedaron sobrevivió el espíritu tenaz de la familia hispánica. Los dominicanos jamás se mezclaron con los invasores. La desmedrada sociedad de la lengua castellana se reunía apartada, silenciosa, en aquel *cautiverio babilónico*, como decía la bachillera Dona Ana de Osorio (276).

In a review of Rodriguez Demorizi's (1944) book on the history of Spanish in the Dominican Republic (*Vicisitudes de la lengua española en Santo Domingo*), Henríquez Ureña highlights the following:

Conviven, durante breves años del siglo XVI, tres tipos de lenguas: la española, las indígenas, y las africanas de los esclavos negros, pero para 1600 ya sólo existe la española; cómo se formaron bibliotecas [...] Núñez de Cáceres y Duarte ven en la lengua española un elemento de defensa de la nacionalidad incipiente (el himno de guerra contra los haitianos, escrito por Félix María del Monte en 1844, decía: “¡Al arma, españoles!” el autor puso después: “¡Al arma, patriotas!”); cómo la efímera reanexión a España (1861-1865) fue “empresa defensiva de nuestra hispanidad... en vista del inminente peligro haitiano”; cómo, a la vez que se mantiene el idioma español, aparece en la literatura el matiz criollo, en los Cantos Dominicanos de Del Monte [...] (“Reseña de Vicisitudes” 499)

We must recognize the centrality of Hispanic tradition in Henríquez Ureña’s understanding of the Dominican Republic’s society and national consciousness. According to him, under the threat of cultural and linguistic extinction, Dominican *criollos* never allowed themselves to submit, collaborate, or mix with the invading Haitians (the only group of African ancestry in Hispaniola) and instead rallied around their Hispanicness and the Spanish language in order to defeat the forces of change. In this and other similar statements, we can identify the continuity between linguistic descriptions and ideologies of ethnic and national identity that, as I have shown in this chapter, characterizes Henríquez Ureña’s work. As we indicated before, the author himself alludes⁹³ explicitly to some of these discursive continuities: his own linguistic and cultural production and the emphasis on the preservation of linguistic and cultural homogeneity in the

⁹³ “Encontrarán en el presente trabajo [“La cultura y las letras”] sobre la cultura y las letras muchos datos que ayudan a explicar los caracteres del habla local: el matiz culto y la tendencia conservadora, en la clase dirigente” (La cultura y las letras 199).

Dominican Republic since its days as the first site of European settlement.⁹⁴ However, only a language ideological approach allows us to fully unveil the ideological character of the apparently “natural” descriptions that emerge in Henríquez Ureña’s linguistic production.

The case may be made that the absence of blacks and their linguistic practices in Henríquez Ureña’s ESD may be attributed to the fact that they were largely unmapped. This claim is only partially true. The fact is that, while describing the anthropology and ethnography of the country, Deschamps (1906) had declared:

La raza africana, a la inversa de la indígena, se propagó rápidamente, derivando sensibles ventajas físicas y morales de su cruzamiento con las razas europea y americana con las cuales se puso en inmediato contacto [...] En la actualidad se encuentra en la República Dominicana una parte no escasa que representa la raza africana, otra que ha nacido de cruzamiento con la raza española y otra que es esta última raza en toda su pureza (73-74).

Although Deschamps conforms to the myth of racial purity among the Spanish descendants, he acknowledged upfront the visible presence of Afro-Dominicans. Two decades before Deschamps recorded these observations, the poet Juan Antonio Alix (1833-1918) had observed the problem of racial erasure in Dominican society in his famous poem *El negro tras de la oreja* (1884).⁹⁵ Indeed, there was, at some level, an awareness and discussion of the existence of Afro-Dominicans and of the complex racial composition of their society.

⁹⁴ Henríquez Ureña also remarked: “con los trastornos de Santo Domingo, a partir de 1795, las tradiciones de familia decayeron: para colmo, los invasores haitianos, en 1822, con furor republicano, destruyeron a piqueta los escudos de armas que había sobre las puertas de las casas solariegas. Uno de los síntomas de decadencia fue la reducción de los apellidos dobles: los Fernández de Castro, quedaron en Castro; los Ramírez de Arellano, en Ramírez [...] En el siglo XIX reaparecen los apellidos dobles” (ESD 207).

⁹⁵ Alix’s poems are also well recognized for his imitations of regional Dominican dialects and Haitians’ pidginized Spanish (Lipski, *A history of Afro-Hispanic language* 149). The poem begins: “Como hoy la preocupación / a más de una gente abrumba / emplearé mi débil pluma / para darle una lección / pues esto en nuestra Nación, ni buen resultado deja / eso era en la España vieja / según desde chico escucho / ‘el negro tras de la oreja’” (29).

In Pedro Henríquez Ureña's linguistic work we can discern the presence of much more than plain and simple dialectology. It is evident that in his work linguistic varieties are associated to racial positions. His knowledge of the linguistic reality of the island was unquestionably unprecedented and his familiarity with the Spanish language and its history admirable. And yet his texts inevitably reveal a complex interaction between the apparently scientific and ideologically neutral vision of Dominican Spanish that he produced and contemporary discourses of national identity in which race was a central theme. In Henríquez Ureña's studies of Spanish in Santo Domingo, linguistic forms became iconically linked to social, racial, and cultural categories, and in their presence, an image of the nation emerged, a linguistic ideology that mirrors the white Hispanic identity that has dominated the discursive construction of the Dominican Republic since its historical emergence as an independent nation.

VI. Conclusion

A careful review of previous approaches to the work of Pedro Henríquez Ureña reveals the existence of both a discursive bias and a thematic gap. Firstly, we find that the charismatic image of *Don Pedro*, a protagonist of key episodes in Latin America's cultural history and a pioneer in many scholarly fields, looms large in efforts to produce a critical assessment of his work. Often unable to liberate the reading of his texts from the halo created by his well-deserved prestige, many scholars and kindred spirits have grounded the evaluation of his oeuvre on unbridled admiration and kind sentimentalism. Secondly, we notice that scarce attention has been paid to his linguistic production and even less has been made of its possible connection to cultural, political, and social phenomena current in the Dominican Republic and Latin America.

In chapter one, I showed how a number of scholars (Carilla 1981, Febres 1989, Gutiérrez Girardot 1978) have chosen to focus on his *hispanoamericanismo*, on his efforts to place knowledge of literature, history, and society at the service of unity, solidarity, progress, and economic prosperity in Latin America. I also pointed out how, in contrast, Dominican intellectuals (Rodríguez Demorizi 1947, Lara 1982, Vargas 1984) have tended to concentrate on Henríquez Ureña's devotion to the glorification of his beloved country. For these, his oeuvre constitutes an attempt to reconstruct what he left behind upon his departure: the glories, ideals, symbols, and values of a nation built by generations who primarily fought and labored for the preservation of Hispanic tradition. To most Dominican historians, therefore, every approach to his work should be grounded on a proper appraisal of his *dominicanidad*.

In turn, when we focus on how linguists have dealt with Henríquez Ureña's work, we find that they have tended to descriptively review his contributions to the main topics in Spanish

American dialectology and linguistic history: his description of Dominican Spanish, his proposed dialectal division of Latin America, and his role in elaborating the symbolic status of the language in both the Dominican Republic and in Latin America. While these treatments offer valuable discussions, they show little if any interest in examining the conditions of production of Henríquez Ureña's linguistic work and the guiding principles (both linguistic and cultural) whose identification would provide us with a fuller understanding of his oeuvre.

This void, which the present dissertation tries to fill, was in fact noticed by some scholars who, in contrast to the dominant trend, chose to focus on the ideological nature of his work underlining the need for critical approaches to Henríquez Ureña. Beatriz Sarlo (2000), for example, emphasized that “no se trata solamente de un elenco de temas, sino más bien, de la manera en que estos temas recorren tenazmente las formas más variadas de su intervención intelectual e ideológica” (881). Instead of simply reproducing inventories of topics, she recommended that we read Henríquez Ureña in context; that is, in light of the specific conditions of production of his oeuvre: “alguien cuya escritura no puede estar libre de las marcas originadas en las situaciones pragmáticas de enunciación” (881). Proposals set forth by specialists such as Sarlo are certainly encouraging. However, they tend to limit themselves to the analysis of the Dominican's cultural-literary texts leaving therefore a gap in our knowledge of his oeuvre: his linguistic production.

Henríquez Ureña's linguistic work is clearly located within a scholarly tradition characterized by the following topics: i) the unity or possible fragmentation of Spanish; ii) substratum influences; iii) the nature and status of the American varieties; and iv) the question of the origins (Andalusian versus polygenetic) of these varieties. During the first decades of the twentieth century, these themes were a privileged object of knowledge in the nascent field of

Hispanic linguistics and, as I argued in chapter four, often emerged and developed in the work of linguists as discursive sites where national and continental identities were produced and disputed. Henríquez Ureña was no exception; his linguistic production addressed these complex issues in terms relevant to both *hispanoamericanismo* and Dominican nationalism.

As discussed in chapter four, he devoted a great deal of time and energy to the history of Spanish in the Americas, to the study of dialectal zones and to the specific linguistic features of each (1921, 1925, 1930, 1931, 1932, 1934). In one of his classic articles, “El supuesto andalucismo de América” (1925), he firmly opposed traditional accounts of the history of Spanish in the Americas as a derivation from the Andalusian dialect. In this instance, it has been argued (Guitarte 1958), he was seeking to create a vision of Latin America’s linguistic history independent from the Peninsular mold; a vision of the American varieties of Spanish rooted in their Peninsular tradition but living a life of their own. This representation of American Spanish was perfectly consistent with his own version of *hispanoamericanismo*: a politically unified Latin America, immersed in, yet emancipated from Spanish culture. In his approaches to Latin American history, he was working in dialogue with a group of intellectuals who maintained that Spanish America had developed its particular characteristics right at the onset of colonization.

Henríquez Ureña was in fact a unique *hispanoamericanista*: he believed that it was possible and necessary to base the ideal Hispanic-American community in the common language, but was reluctant to accept the hierarchy that placed Peninsular Spanish at the top of the model for the construction of Latin American identity. Henríquez Ureña insisted in the autonomy of Latin America’s speech communities as a reflection of their cultural identity and intellectual independence:

En México como en toda la América de habla Española, el elemento primordial es el español: el *espíritu nacional* no es otra cosa que espíritu español modificado.

Modificado, primordialmente, por el medio, y luego por las mezclas: así lo prueba la unidad fundamental hispanoamericana, que la distingue de la familia española europea (hasta en signos externos, como la pronunciación), y que establece un parentesco mucho más cercano entre los pueblos más disímiles del Nuevo Mundo, que entre cualquiera de ellos y España (“Don Juan Ruiz de Alarcón” 16-17).

We see here that, in thinking of a Latin American identity, while acknowledging the Spanish legacy (“*espíritu español*”), he emphasized how that legacy was modified as a result of the new environment and the mixing of various peoples. However when producing a vision of the Dominican Republic, he focused instead on loyalty to the Spanish heritage and identified a process of cultural and linguistic development whereby a homogeneous Hispanic community emerged from the early stages of colonization.

In the Dominican context, he was working mostly in dialogue with Dominican intellectuals who believed that achieving progress and political independence required restoring the glories of the colonial past. Dominican nationalism emerged in the nineteenth century along with the project of a Nation-State originally proposed by liberal intellectuals such as Núñez de Cáceres and Juan Pablo Duarte, who fought and labored intensely in order to separate the Spanish-speaking part of Hispaniola from the political jurisdiction of Haiti. The complicated process of independence from Haiti and the various military attempts of Haitian leaders between 1844 and 1855 to bring back the Dominican Republic under their rule gave rise to a nation-building ideology that produced a powerful element of self-identification in opposition to Haitians. Dominican *hispanismo* emerged precisely in this context as a political and cultural

ideology based on the concept of the Dominican national identity as pure, white, and Spanish.

While not all Dominicans accepted this self-image and neocolonial status, this ideology became, and is still, dominant: only the Hispanic component is truly Dominican culture.

With respect to Dominican Spanish, Henríquez Ureña reached five major conclusions. First, it is a highly homogeneous variety: there are few differences between educated and popular speech. Second, the pronunciation is similar to Spanish in Andalucía. Third, it is characterized by the preservation of lexical and syntactic archaisms, which, fourth, in contrast to the Andalusian phonology, are markedly Castilian (i.e., derived from the northern Peninsular dialect continuum). Finally, and most crucial for the present analysis, Dominican Spanish is characterized by the absence of africanisms.

In articles, books, and lectures which he published between 1919 and 1944, he consistently maintained that the black race had never predominated in the Dominican Republic and that the Spanish spoken in the country remained pure: “la raza negra nunca ha predominado allí y la lengua castellana se conserva pura” (“La lengua en Santo Domingo” 50). For Henríquez Ureña, the only truly relevant component of Dominican identity is Hispanic heritage and, in his view, there had never been, nor there was, a black dialect spoken in the country: “nunca ha existido, ni existe, dialecto negro en la República [...] No ha habido allí influencias indígenas vigorosas, como en México y el Perú, donde la raza indígena ha persistido con enorme importancia numérica, no ha habido tampoco influencias extranjeras, pues el contacto con el francés de Haití y con el “patois” derivado puede considerarse nulo: la sección de Santo Domingo vive, en su gran mayoría, lejos de la frontera haitiana, y las relaciones entre los pueblos son muy pocas” (“La lengua en Santo Domingo” 50). On the contrary, Santo Domingo belongs to that segment of America where the language remains closer to its original roots: “Santo

Domingo pertenece a la sección de América donde la lengua se mantiene más cercana a sus orígenes castellanos y andaluces” (Henríquez Ureña, “La lengua en Santo Domingo” 50). His linguistic description of Dominican Spanish (1919, 1937, 1939, 1941, 1944) consistently emphasized its closeness to Peninsular varieties, and, crucially, minimized African influence: “el elemento africano no ha aportado contribución ninguna distintiva” (“La lengua en Santo Domingo” 50). This characterization of Dominican Spanish, as I illustrated in chapter five, was achieved by means of at least two semiotic processes, iconization and erasure, through which formal aspects of the language were discursively linked with the dominant cultural and racial categories in Dominican society.

In summary, in this dissertation, I have advanced an analysis of the complex interaction between the apparently ideologically neutral vision of Dominican Spanish produced by Henríquez Ureña and contemporary discourses of national identity in which race was a central theme. This type of contextualization (inspired by the school of critical linguistic historiography discussed in chapter two) is necessary if we are to fully understand the meaning and implications of the linguistic component of the great Dominican intellectual’s oeuvre. As he engaged in the study of Spanish in Santo Domingo, he unquestionably made a major contribution to Dominican historiography and Spanish America’s linguistic history. However, it is crucial to understand that, in the process, he also engaged in the erasure of certain aspects of that reality (“la realidad es mayor que la descrita”) and in the production of an iconic representation of Dominican Spanish consistent with what the dominant intellectual tradition viewed as the most important component of its national culture: Hispanicness.

There is still much to learn about such an impressive intellectual figure, about the intellectual development of an individual whose career embraced so many different fields of

knowledge. According to Gutiérrez Girardot (1978), it was not until 1945 that Henríquez Ureña achieved his “intellectual liberation” from Menéndez Pidal, Amado Alonso, and their brand of philology: “*Las corrientes* permiten suponer que Henríquez Ureña había llegado a un punto, en el que comenzaba a liberarse de aquello que justamente y con ceguera se ha elogiado en él: su pertenencia (real o putativa) a la corriente filológica representada por Menéndez Pidal y Amado Alonso [...]” (“Prólogo”). While this particular periodization is relative and questionable, the point is well taken. In *Las corrientes* there are clear signs that Henríquez Ureña’s sociocultural ideas and historical notions had evolved, particularly regarding issues of race and the changing intellectual climate:

Por aquel entonces, la América hispánica prestó seria consideración a teorías raciales emanadas de fuentes europeas, vestidas de lo que parecía atuendo científico. Ahora nuestra actitud es distinta. Un repaso realista a la verdadera situación de las muchas razas que se mezclan en la América hispánica nos ha llevado a una convicción simple y clara: que ninguna comunidad tendrá “problemas raciales” como no quiera creárselos ella misma [...] Ya hemos visto que los indios han conservado una parte importante de sus antiguas culturas, fundiéndola con la escasa porción de civilización europea que recibieron. También los negros trajeron consigo mucho de sus culturas tribales africanas. En ambos casos acostumbrábamos a considerar estas supervivencias como problemas; pensábamos que no lograríamos un desarrollo social perfecto mientras el indio y el negro no se “europeizaran” completamente, mientras no adoptaran las técnicas y hábitos que la revolución industrial obligó a Europa y a los Estados Unidos. Ahora tenemos una idea más justa (198-199).

After immersing himself for decades in the development of a theory of cultural and linguistic archaism that failed to account for black Dominicans and the cultural practices that resulted from their African ancestry and their unique historical experience, Henríquez Ureña seemed willing to challenge and reconsider convictions and ideas of the intellectual climate and ideological matrix from which his work had emerged. We are clearly facing a new stage in his ideological evolution. In *Las corrientes*, there are numerous references to issues of language, race and identity that reveal a more nuanced view of the cultural and linguistic history of Latin American societies and a willingness to accept new frameworks for discussing cultural differences and plurality.

Until recently, linguistics and anthropology were not well-established or properly developed disciplines in the Dominican Republic. Pérez Guerra (1989) referred to this situation as “el desarrollo (o total carencia) de la investigación sociológica, antropológica y lingüística en la República Dominicana” (“Africanismos lingüísticos” 358). The description of Dominican Spanish and its historical context was certainly hampered by discipline-internal problems related to the development of language studies in the country, but also by historical-ideological constraints such as the ones discussed in the previous chapters. In fact, the two identity frameworks to which I have referred as *dominicanidad* and *hispanoamericanismo* throughout this dissertation have acted as theoretical-epistemic filters that restricted the discovery and the discussion of facts and views related to a wide range of phenomena.

Since the 1970s, however, this situation has been favorably changing. In some intellectual contexts, we find reactions against those filters and new explorations of previously erased subjects (e.g., the complicity between some Dominican intellectuals and State politics or the plurality of Dominican culture). However, despite the emergence of new intellectual

frameworks, we still find a monopoly not only on institutions but also on objects of study, and discourses of language, race, and national identity (Odalís Pérez 2005). Just as the country's heteroglossic cultures, diverging points of views still succumb to the dogmas of homogeneity and essentialism which produce various forms of oppression and silence. In such a context, synchronic, diachronic, and language ideological studies can only help to improve the state of language studies and balance the intellectual climate and discourse in the Dominican Republic.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abeille, Luciano. [1900] 2005. Idioma nacional de los argentinos. Buenos Aires: Biblioteca Nacional.
- Abellán, José Luis & Ana Maria Barrenechea (Eds.). 2000. Pedro Henríquez Ureña: ensayos. Madrid: Alca XX.
- Agostini de del Río, Amelia. 1984. "El español en Santo Domingo." El libro jubilar de Pedro Henríquez Ureña (Tomos 1 y 2). Ed. Julio Jaime Julia. Santo Domingo: UNPHU.
- Alba, Orlando. 2004. Como hablamos los dominicanos: un enfoque sociolingüístico. Santo Domingo: Grupo León Jimenes.
- . 1990. "Pedro Henríquez Ureña y El Español en Santo Domingo." Estudios sobre el español dominicano. Santiago, Rep. Dom.: PUCMM.
- . 1984. "A propósito de la identidad lingüística dominicana." Eme Eme XII (72): 31-43.
- Alcántara Almánzar, José. 1980. Aspectos sociológicos en la obra de Pedro Henríquez Ureña. Santo Domingo: Museo del Hombre Dominicano.
- Alonso, Amado. [1946] 2001. "Pedro Henríquez Ureña, investigador." Presencia de Pedro Henríquez Ureña: escritos sobre el maestro. Ed. Jorge Tena Reyes & Tomás Castro Burdiez. Santo Domingo: Editorial Ciguapa.
- . 1945. "Prologo a la edición española." Curso de lingüística general de F. Saussure. Buenos Aires: Losada.
- . 1943. "Prefacio." Filosofía del lenguaje de K. Vossler. Buenos Aires: Losada.
- . 1940. "Rodolfo Lenz y la dialectología hispanoamericana." El español en Chile. Ed. Amado Alonso. Buenos Aires: Biblioteca de Dialectología Hispanoamericana
- . 1939. "Examen de la teoría indigenista de Rodolfo Lenz." RFH 1: 313-350.

- . 1938. Castellano, español, idioma nacional. Buenos Aires: Imprenta y Casa Editora Coni.
- . 1935. El problema de la lengua en América. Madrid: Espasa-Calpe.
- . [1935] 1951. Estudios lingüísticos: temas españoles. Madrid: Gredos.
- . 1932. “Propósito de la colección.” Introducción a la estilística romance (tomo 1). Buenos Aires: Instituto de Filología.
- . 1926. “La subagrupación de románica del catalán.” Revista de Filología Española XIII (cuaderno 1), enero-marzo de 1926.
- Alonso, Amado & Pedro Henríquez Ureña. 1938. Gramática Castellana I & II. Buenos Aires: Losada.
- Álvarez, Soledad. 2007. “La pasión dominicana de Pedro Henríquez Ureña.” Available on March 30, 2007 at <<http://www.cielonaranja.com/phu-alvarez.htm>>.
- . 2000. “La pasión dominicana de Pedro Henríquez Ureña.” Pedro Henríquez Ureña: ensayos. Ed. José Luis Abellán & Ana María Barrenechea. Madrid: Allca XX.
- . 1981. La Magna Patria de Pedro Henríquez Ureña. Santo Domingo: Editorial Taller.
- Álvarez Martínez, María Ángeles. 1998. “Pedro Henríquez Ureña y la dialectología hispanoamericana.” La Torre 3 (7-8): 177-185.
- Anderson, Benedict. 1983. Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origins and Spread of Nationalism. London & New York: Verso.
- Anderson, James. M. 2001. “Historical linguistics.” The linguistics encyclopedia. Ed. Kirsten Malmkjaer. London & New York: Routledge.
- Anderson Imbert, Enrique. 2001. “Notas sobre Pedro Henríquez Ureña.” Presencia de Pedro Henríquez Ureña: escritos sobre el maestro. Ed. Jorge Tena Reyes & Tomás Castro Burdiez. Santo Domingo: Editorial Ciguapa.
- . 1984. “La filosofía de Pedro Henríquez Ureña.” Revista Sur 355: 5-19.

- Andronis, Mary A. 2004. "Iconization, fractal recursivity, and erasure: Linguistic ideologies and Standardization in Quichua-speaking Ecuador." Texas Linguistics Forum 47: 263-269.
- Armas de Céspedes, Juan Ignacio. 1883. Orígenes del lenguaje criollo. La Habana: Imprenta de la Viuda de Soler.
- Arnoux, Elvira N. 2007. "Discursos sobre nación: Tesis doctoral." Diss. Universidade Da Coruña.
- . 2003. El análisis del discurso en el pensamiento gramatical ilustrado: Jovellanos lector de Condillac." El pensamiento ilustrado y el lenguaje. Ed. Elvira N. Arnoux & Carlos R Luís. Buenos Aires: Eudeba.
- . 2001. "Disciplinar desde la lengua: "La Gramática Castellana" de Amado Alonso y Pedro Henríquez Ureña." Homenaje a Ofelia Kovacci. Ed. Elvira N. de Arnoux & Ángela Di Tullio. Buenos Aires: Eudeba.
- . 2000. "La Glotopolítica: transformaciones de un campo disciplinario." Lenguajes: teorías y prácticas. Buenos Aires: Gobierno de la Ciudad de Buenos Aires, Instituto Superior del Profesorado.
- Arnoux, Elvira N. & Carlos R. Luís. 2003. El pensamiento ilustrado y el lenguaje. Buenos Aires: Eudeba.
- Arona, Juan de. [1882]. 1975. Diccionario de peruanismos (Tomos 1 & 2). Lima: Biblioteca Peruana.
- Arquistain, Luis. 1928. La agonía antillana: el imperialismo yanqui en el Caribe. Madrid: Espasa-Calpe.
- Ashley, Leonard R. N. 2002. "Language and identity in Cuba today." Geolinguistics 28: 22-33.
- Bachmann, Iris (Forthcoming). "Negertaaltje or Volkstaal: the Papiamentu language at the crossroads of philology, folklore and anthropology."
- Bacon, Francis. 1985. The essays or counsels. London: Penguin Books.

- . 1960. The new organon and related writings. Indianapolis & New York: The Bobbs-Merrill Company, Inc.
- Bailey, Benjamin. 2002. Language, race and negotiation of identity: a study of Dominican Americans. New York: LFB Scholarly Publishing.
- Bajarkman, Peter C. 1989. "Radical and conservative Hispanic dialects: Theoretical accounts and pedagogical implications." American Spanish pronunciation. Ed. P. Bajarkman & R. Hammond. Washington: Georgetown University Press.
- Bakhtin, Mikhail. 1981. The dialogic imagination. Ed. Michael Holquist. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Balaguer, Joaquín. 1991. "Discurso pronunciado por el Presidente de la República Dominicana Joaquín Balaguer, en ocasión de la Primera Cumbre Iberoamericana, Guadalajara, México." Available on May 3, 2008 at <<http://www.cip.cu/webcip/eventos/cumbre-ibero/cumbre1/discursos/>>.
- . 1983. La Isla al Revés: Haití y el Destino Dominicano. Santo Domingo: Librería Dominicana.
- Barbour, Stephen. 2000. "Nationalism, language, Europe." Language and nationalism in Europe. Ed. Stephen Barbour & Cathie Carmichael. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Barcia, Pedro Luís. 2006. Pedro Henríquez Ureña y la Argentina. Santo Domingo: Ediciones Ferilibro.
- Barrera Enderle, Victor. 2006. De la amistad literaria: ensayo sobre la genealogía de una amistad: Alfonso Reyes, Pedro Henríquez Ureña, 1906—1914. Mexico: Universidad Autónoma de Nuevo León.
- . 2005. "El relevo de una empresa pendiente: la independencia cultural en los "Seis ensayos en busca de nuestra expresión," de Pedro Henríquez Ureña." La otra invención: ensayos sobre crítica y literatura de América Latina. México: Consejo para la Cultura y las Artes de Nuevo León.

- Baud, Michel. 2005. "Intelectuales, nación y modernidad en la República Dominicana." Relatos de nación: la construcción de identidades en el mundo hispánico. Ed. Francisco Colom González. Madrid & Frankfurt: Iberoamericana & Vervuert.
- . 1995. Peasants and tobacco in the Dominican Republic. Knoxville: U. Tennessee.
- Bauman, Richard. 1983. Let your words be few: symbolisms of speaking and silence among seventeenth century Quakers. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Bauman, Richard & Charles Briggs. 1990. "Poetics and performance as critical perspectives on language and social life." Annual Review of Anthropology 19: 59-88.
- Becker, Carl Lotus [1932] 1971. The heavenly city of the eighteenth century philosophers. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Bello, Andrés. [1879] 2005. Discurso de instalación de la Universidad de Chile. Maracaibo, Venezuela: Universidad Católica Cecilio Acosta.
- . [1847] 2001. "Prólogo" Gramática de la lengua castellana destinada al uso de los americanos. Madrid: Editorial EDAF.
- . [1826] 1952. "la agricultura de la zona tórrida." Silvas Americanas. Caracas: Ministerio de Educación.
- Blake, Renee. 1996. "Barbadian Creole English: Insights into linguistic and social identity." Journal of Commonwealth and Postcolonial Studies 4: 37-54.
- Blommaert, Jan. 2005. Discourse: a critical introduction. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Blommaert, Jan & Jef Verschueren. 1998. "The role of language in European nationalist ideologies." Language ideologies: practice and theory. Ed. Bambi Schieffelin et al. New York & Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bolinger, D. 1980. Language, the loaded weapon. London: Longman.

- Bonner, Donna M. 2001. "Garifuna children's language shame: ethnic stereotypes, national affiliation, and transnational immigration as factors in language choice in Southern Belize." Language in Society 30: 81-96.
- Borges, Jorge Luís. 1961. "Las alarmas del doctor Américo Castro." Otras inquisiciones. Madrid: Alianza Editorial.
- . 1960. "Prólogo." Obra crítica. Ed. Emma Susana Sperantti Piñero. Mexico & Buenos Aires: Fondo de Cultura Económica.
- . 1928 El idioma de los argentinos. Buenos Aires: M. Gleizer.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. 1991. Language and symbolic power. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Bucholtz, Mary. 2001. "The whiteness of nerds: superstandard English and racial markedness." Journal of Linguistic Anthropology 11.1: 84-100.
- Cameron, Deborah. 1985. Verbal hygiene. London & New Cork: Routledge.
- Calvet, Louis-Jean. 2005. Lingüística y colonialismo: Breve tratado de glotofagia. Buenos Aires: Fondo de Cultura Económica.
- Capdevilla, Arturo. [1928] 1940. Babel y el castellano. Buenos Aires: Losada.
- Carilla, Emilio. 2001. "Pedro Henríquez Ureña y nosotros." Presencia de Pedro Henríquez Ureña: escritos sobre el maestro. Ed. Jorge Tena Reyes & Tomás Castro Burdiez. Santo Domingo: Editorial Ciguapa.
- . 1988. Pedro Henríquez Ureña, Signo de América. Santo Domingo: Publicaciones de La Universidad Nacional Pedro Henríquez Ureña.
- . 1981. "El tema esencial de Pedro Henríquez Ureña." Aula 36.
- . 1977. "Pedro Henríquez Ureña: Biografía comentada." Revista Internacional de Bibliografía XXVII (3): 227-239.

- . 1956. Pedro Henríquez Ureña: Tres estudios. Tucumán, Argentina: Universidad Nacional de Tucumán.
- Cassá, Roberto. 1999. “Nación y Estado en el pensamiento de Américo Lugo.” Política, identidad y pensamiento social en la República Dominicana (Siglos XIX y XX). Ed. Raymundo González et al. Madrid & Santo Domingo: Doce Calles/Academia de Ciencias de Dominicana.
- . 1998. Historia social y económica de la República Dominicana. Tomos 1 & 2. Santo Domingo: Editora alfa y Omega.
- Castro, Américo. 1941. La peculiaridad lingüística rioplatense y su sentido histórico. Buenos Aires: Losada.
- . 1923. “Introducción.” Boletín del Instituto de Filología 77
- Castro-Klaren, Sara & John Charles Chasteen. 2003. Reading and writing the nation in nineteenth century Latin America. Baltimore & London: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Catalán Menéndez-Pidal, Diego. 1974. Lingüística ibero-románica: crítica retrospectiva. Madrid: Gredos.
- . 1955. La escuela lingüística española y su concepción del lenguaje. Madrid: Gredos.
- Catañón, Adolfo. 2006. “Breves notas para la historia de una amistad: Pedro Henríquez Ureña en su correspondencia con Alfonso Reyes.” Revista de la Universidad de México 34. Available on May23, 2007 at <http://www.revistadelauniversidad.unam.mx/3406/pdfs/78_90.pdf>.
- Centeno Añeses, Carmen. 1999. “Lengua, identidad nacional, posmodernidad.” Revista de Estudios Hispánicos 26 (2): 217-237.
- Céspedes, Diógenes. 1989. “Salomé Ureña o la metrificacón de una ideología: el positivismo.” Salomé Ureña de Henríquez. Poesías completas. Santo Domingo: Ediciones de la Fundación Corripio, Inc.

- Chevalier, J. C. & P. Encrevé. 1984. "La creation des revues dans les années '60s." Langue française 63: 57-102.
- Clampitt-Dunlap, Sharon. 2000. "Nationalism and native language maintenance in Puerto Rico." International Journal of the Sociology of Language 142: 25-34.
- Colom González, Francisco. 2005. Relatos de nación: la construcción de las identidades nacionales en el mundo hispánico (Volumes 1 & 2). Madrid: Iberoamericana & Vervuert.
- Conn, Robert T. 2002. The politics of philology: Alfonso Reyes and the invention of the Latin American tradition. London: Associated University Presses.
- Cordero Michel, José. 1975. Análisis de la era de Trujillo: Informe sobre la República Dominicana, 1959. Santo Domingo: Editora de la UASD.
- Cornejo, Justino. 1984. "El español en Santo Domingo." El libro jubilar de Pedro Henríquez Ureña, (Tomos 1& 2). Ed. Julio Jaime Julia. Santo Domingo: UNPHU.
- Costa Álvarez, Arturo. 1928. El castellano en la Argentina. Buenos Aires: Talleres de la Escuela San Vicente de Paúl.
- Crowley, Tony. 1996. Language in history: theories and texts. London: Routledge.
- Cuervo, Rufino José. 1987. Obras (Tomo 1). Bogota: Instituto Caro y Cuervo.
- Danesi, Marcel 1977. "The case for andalucismo re-examined." Hispanic Review 45: 181-193.
- Deive, Carlos Esteban. 1999. Identidad y racismo en la República Dominicana. Santo Domingo: Editora Universitaria UASD.
- De León, Nexcy. 2000. "El uso de la lengua española en los medios de comunicación." Estado actual de los estudios lingüísticos y filológicos en la República Dominicana. Ed. Irene Pérez Guerra. Santo Domingo: Patronato de la Ciudad Colonial de Santo Domingo.

- Del Valle, José. 2007. "Glotopolítica, ideología y discurso: categorías para el estudio del estatus simbólico del español." La lengua, ¿patria común? Ideas e ideologías del español. Ed José del Valle. Madrid & Frankfurt: Iberoamericana & Vervuert.
- . 2006. "US Latinos, la hispanofonía, and the language ideologies of high modernity." Globalization and language in the Spanish-speaking world. Ed. Clare Mar-Moliero & Miranda Stewart. Hampshire: England: Palgrave Macmillan.
- . 2005. "La lengua, patria común: política lingüística, política exterior y el post-nacionalismo hispánico." Studies on Ibero-Romance Linguistics. Dedicated to Ralph Penny. Ed. Roger Wright & Meter Ricketts. Newark, Delaware: Juan de la Cuesta.
- . 2004. "Menéndez Pidal, la regeneración nacional y la utopía lingüística." La batalla del idioma: la intelectualidad hispánica ante la lengua. Ed. José del Valle y Luis Gabriel-Stheeman. Frankfurt y Madrid: Vervuert & Iberoamericana.
- . 2004a. "Lingüística histórica e historia cultural: notas sobre la polémica entre Rufino José Cuervo y Juan Valera." La batalla del idioma: la intelectualidad hispánica ante la lengua. Ed. José del Valle y Luis Gabriel-Stheeman. Frankfurt y Madrid: Vervuert & Iberoamericana.
- . 2002. "Menéndez Pidal, national regeneration, and linguistic utopia." La batalla del idioma: la intelectualidad hispánica ante la lengua. Ed. José Del Valle & Luis Gabriel-Stheeman. Madrid & Frankfurt: Iberoamericana/Vervuert.
- . 2000. "Monoglossic policies for a heteroglossic culture: misinterpreted multilingualism in Modern Galicia." Language and Communication 20: 105-132.
- . 1998. "Andalucismo, poligénesis y koineización: dialectología e ideología." Hispanic Review 66.2: 132-149.

- . 1997. "La historicación de la lingüística histórica: los orígenes de Ramón Menéndez Pidal." Historiographia Lingüística XXIV (1.2): 175-196.
- Del Valle, José & Luis Gabriel-Stheeman. 2004. La batalla del idioma: la intelectualidad hispánica ante la lengua. Frankfurt & Madrid: Vervuert & Iberoamericana.
- . 2004a. "Nacionalismo, hispanismo y cultura monoglósica." La batalla del idioma: la intelectualidad hispánica ante la lengua. Ed. José del Valle y Luis Gabriel-Stheeman. Frankfurt y Madrid: Vervuert & Iberoamericana.
- . 2004b. "Codo con codo: la comunidad hispánica y el espectáculo de la lengua." La batalla del idioma: la intelectualidad hispánica ante la lengua. Ed. José del Valle y Luis Gabriel-Stheeman. Frankfurt y Madrid: Vervuert & Iberoamericana.
- . 2004c. "Lengua y mercado: el español en la era de la globalización económica." La batalla del idioma: la intelectualidad hispánica ante la lengua. Ed. José del Valle y Luis Gabriel-Stheeman. Frankfurt y Madrid: Vervuert & Iberoamericana.
- . 2002. The battle over Spanish between 1800 and 2000: language ideologies and Hispanic intellectuals. Madrid & Frankfurt: Iberoamericana/Vervuert.
- Deschamps, Enrique. 1906. La República Dominicana: directorio y guía general. Barcelona.
- Díaz Quiñones, Arcadio. 2006. "Pedro Henríquez Ureña: la guerra y el exilio." Sobre los principios: la tradición y los intelectuales caribeños. Bernal, Argentina: Universidad Nacional de Quilmes Editorial.
- . 1994. "Pedro Henríquez Ureña: Modernidad, diáspora y construcción de identidades." Modernización e identidades sociales. Ed. Gilberto Giménez & Ricardo Pozas H. Mexico: Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México.
- Dobal, Carlos. 1984. "Hispanidad y dominicanidad." Eme Eme 12.71: 89-97.

- Durán, Diony. 2001. "Seis ensayos en busca de nuestra expresión" Presencia de Pedro Henríquez Ureña: escritos sobre el maestro. Ed. Jorge Tena Reyes & Tomás Castro Burdiez. Santo Domingo: Editorial Ciguapa.
- . 1998. "Sucronía y utopía: proyecto utópico de Pedro Henríquez Ureña. Available on July 12, 2007 at <http://www.cielonaranja.com/phu-dionyduran.htm#_ftn1>.
- . 1994. Literatura y sociedad en la obra de Pedro Henríquez Ureña. La Habana: Letras Cubanas.
- . 1992. La flecha de anhelo. Santo Domingo: Comisión Permanente de la Feria del Libro.
- Eagleton, Terry. 1991. Ideology: an introduction. London: Verso.
- Errington, Joseph. 2008. Linguistics in a colonial world: a story of language, meaning, and power. Malden, MA & London: Blackwell.
- . 2000. "Indonesian('s) authority." Regimes of language: ideologies, politics, and identities. Ed. Paul Kroskrity. Santa Fe: School of American Research Press.
- Estado Dominicano. 2002. Constitución de la República Dominicana. Santo Domingo.
- Familia Henríquez Ureña. 1996. Epistolario. Tomos I y II. Santo Domingo: Secretaría de Estado de Educación, Bellas Artes y Cultos.
- Favaloro, Rene G. 1994. Don Pedro y la Educación. Argentina: Centro Editor Fundación Favaloro.
- Febres, Laura. 2001. "América y Pedro Henríquez Ureña." Presencia de Pedro Henríquez Ureña: escritos sobre el maestro. Ed. Jorge Tena Reyes & Tomás Castro Burdiez. Santo Domingo: Editorial Ciguapa.
- . 1989. Pedro Henríquez Ureña, crítico de América. Caracas: Ediciones la Casa de Bello.
- Fennema, Meindert. 1999. "Hispanidad y la identidad nacional de Santo Domingo." Política, identidad y pensamiento social en la República Dominicana (Siglos XIX y XX). Ed. Raymundo González et al. Madrid & Santo Domingo: Doce Calles/Academia de Ciencias de Dominicana.

- Fernández, Félix. 1984. "La estructuración gramatical del español dominicano y la identidad de los dominicanos: una interpretación" Eme Eme XII (72): 45-59.
- Fernández Retamar, Roberto. 1998. Todo Calibán. Concepción, Chile: Cuadernos Atanea.
- Fonfrías, Ernesto Juan. 1984. "Pedro Henríquez Ureña: defensor de la lengua y de la patria." El libro jubilar de Pedro Henríquez Ureña (Tomos 1& 2). Ed. Julio Jaime Julia. Santo Domingo: UNPHU.
- Foucault, Michel. 1994. The order of things: an archeology of the human sciences. New York: Vintage.
- . 1994a. "The discourse on language." The archeology of knowledge and the discourse on language. New York: Basic Books.
- . 1972. The archeology of knowledge. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Franco Pichardo, Franklin. 1998. Los negros, los mulatos y la nación dominicana. Santo Domingo: La Trinitaria.
- . 1979. Santo Domingo: cultura, política, e ideología. Santo Domingo: Editora Nacional.
- Franco, Jean. [1978] 2000. "El humanismo de Pedro Henríquez Ureña." Pedro Henríquez Ureña: ensayos. Ed. José Luis Abellán & Ana Maria Barrenechea. Madrid: Allca XX.
- Freeden, Michael. 2003. Ideology: a very short introduction. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Gabriel García, José. 1979. Compendio de la historia dominicana (I & II). Santo Domingo: Editora de Santo Domingo.
- Gal, Susan. 2001. "Linguistic theories and national images in nineteenth century Hungary." Languages and publics: the making of authority. Ed. Susan Gal & Kathryn Woolard. Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing.
- . 1998. "Multiplicity and contention among language ideologies: a commentary." Language ideologies: practice and theory. Ed. Bambi Schieffelin et al. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- . 1987. "Codeswitching and consciousness in the European periphery." American Ethnologist 14: 637-653.
- Gal, Susan & Kathryn Woolard. 2001. "Constructing languages and publics: authority and representation." Languages Languages and publics: the making of authority. Ed. Susan Gal & Kathryn Woolard. Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing.
- Galíndez, Jesús de. 1984. La era de Trujillo: un estudio casuístico de dictadura hispanoamericana. Santo Domingo: Editora Taller.
- García, Telesforo. 1901. "La raza: Patria, raza y humanidad e iberoamericanismo." Revista Positiva, 12. Mexico.
- Gayoso, Lisandro. 1984. "El americanismo hispánico de Pedro Henríquez Ureña." El libro jubilar de Pedro Henríquez Ureña (Tomos 1 & 2). Ed. Julio Jaime Julia. Santo Domingo: UNPHU.
- Ghiano, Juan Carlos. 1976. "Pedro Henríquez Ureña, maestro de Nuestra América." Observaciones sobre el español en América y otros estudios filológicos. Ed. Juan Carlos Ghiano. Buenos Aires: Academia Argentina de Letras.
- Gobello, José & Irene Amuchastegui. 1998. Vocabulario ideológico del lunfardo. Buenos Aires: Corregidor.
- González, Raymundo et al. 1999. Política, identidad y pensamiento social en la República Dominicana (Siglos XIX y XX). Madrid & Santo Domingo: Doce Calles/Academia de Ciencias de Dominicana.
- González Stephan, Beatriz. 1995. "Las disciplinas escriturarias de la patria: constituciones, gramáticas y manuales." Estudios. Revista de Investigaciones Literarias 3 (5); 19-46.
- González Tapia, Carlisle. 2001. El habla campesina dominicana. Santo Domingo: Editora Universitaria.
- . 1998. El pensamiento Lingüístico de Pedro Henríquez Ureña. Santo Domingo: Ciudad Universitaria.

- González Tirado, Rafael. 1987. Lenguaje y nacionalismo. Santo Domingo: Editorial Gente.
- Garciadiego, Javier. 2006. "Los afanes universitarios de Pedro Henríquez Ureña: sus legados." Revista de la Universidad de México 34. Available on May23, 2007 at http://www.revistadelauniversidad.unam.mx/3406/pdfs/62_68.pdf.
- . 1996. Rudos contra científicos: La Universidad Nacional durante la Revolución mexicana. México: el Colegio de México.
- Gramsci, Antonio. 1971. Selections from the prison notebooks of Antonio Gramsci. Ed. Quintin Hoare & Geoffrey Nowell Smith. New York: International Publishers.
- Granados, Aimer & Carlos Marichal. 2004. Construcción de la identidades latinoamericanas: Ensayos de historia intelectual (siglos XIX y XX). México, D.F.: El Colegio de México.
- Guerra Carbuccia, Efraín. Oct. 10, 2007. "Los anglicismos." LISTIN DIARIO.
- Guerra Sánchez, Ramiro. [1927] 1961. Azúcar y población en las Antillas. La Habana: Imprenta Nacional de Cuba.
- Guerreiro, Leila. 2003. "Pedro Henríquez Ureña: el eterno extranjero." Available on July14, 2007 at http://www.libresa.com/perspectiva_phu_sexta_entrega_20030616.htm.
- Guespin, L. & J.B. Marcellesi. 2003. Pour la Glottopolitique. Glottopol 1: 7-31. Available on December 18, 2006 at <http://www.univ-rouen.fr/glottopol>.
- Guitarte, Guillermo. 1998. "Un concepto de la filología hispanoamericana: la base del español en América." La Torre (TE) 3 (7-8): 417-434.
- . 1983. "Cuervo, Henríquez Ureña y la polémica sobre el andalucismo de América." Siete estudios sobre el español de América. México: Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México.
- . 1983a. "El camino de Cuervo al español de América." Philologica Hispaniensia: in Honores Manuel Álvarez (I). Ed. Julio Fernández Sevilla et al. Madrid: Gredos.

- . 1958. "Cuervo, Henríquez Ureña y la polémica sobre el andalucismo de América." Vox Románica 17(1958): 363-416.
- Gutiérrez Cuadrado, Juan. 2007. "El hispanismo lingüístico." Ínsula 725: 4-9.
- Gutiérrez Girardot, Rafael. 2001 "El ensayo posmodernista: Pedro Henríquez Ureña." Presencia de Pedro Henríquez Ureña: escritos sobre el maestro. Ed. Jorge Tena Reyes & Tomás Castro Burdiez. Santo Domingo: Editorial Ciguapa.
- . 2001a. El intelectual y la historia. Caracas: Fondo Editorial La Nave Va.
- . 2000. "Pedro Henríquez Ureña y la historiografía latinoamericana." Pedro Henríquez Ureña: ensayos. Ed. José Luis Abellán & Ana Maria Barrenechea. Madrid: Allca XX.
- . 1986. "La historiografía latinoamericana de Pedro Henríquez Ureña: promesa y desafío." Aproximaciones: ensayos. Bogotá: Nueva Biblioteca Colombiana de Cultura.
- . 1978. "Prólogo." La utopía de América. Ed. Rafael Gutiérrez Girardot & Ángel Rama. Caracas: Biblioteca Ayacucho.
- Gumperz, John. 1968. "The speech community." International Encyclopedia of Social Sciences: 381-386.
- Gumperz, John & Dell Hymes. 1974. Directions in sociolinguistics: the ethnography of communication. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Haiman, John. 1985. Natural syntax; iconicity and erosion. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Halperin Donghi, Tulio. 2007. Personal interview (recorded in Berkeley, California). June 24, 2007.
- . [1999] 2007. Vida y muerte de la república verdadera: 1910-1930. Buenos Aires: Emece.
- . 1998. Historia contemporánea de América Latina. Madrid: Alianza Editorial.
- Hanks, William. 2001. "Indexicality." Key terms in language and culture. Ed. Alessandro Duranti. Malden, Massachusetts: Blackwell.

- Hatzfeld, Helmut. 1947. "Hispanic philology in Latin America." The Americas 3: 347-362.
- Hawkins, Bruce. 1997. "The social dimension of a cognitive grammar." Discourse and perspective in cognitive linguistics. Ed. W. A. Liebert et al. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Henríquez Ureña, Max. 2001. "Hermano y maestro." Presencia de Pedro Henríquez Ureña: escritos sobre el maestro. Ed. Jorge Tena Reyes & Tomás Castro Burdiez. Santo Domingo: Editorial Ciguapa.
- . 1919. Los Estados Unidos y la República Dominicana: la verdad de los hechos comprobada por datos y documentos oficiales. La Habana: Imprenta el Siglo XX.
- Henríquez Ureña, Pedro. 2004. Obras completas (tomos I-V). Santo Domingo: Editora Nacional.
- . 1976-1980. Obras Completas, 10 tomos. Ed. Juan Jacobo de Lara. Santo Domingo: Universidad Nacional Pedro Henríquez Ureña.
- . 1978. "Ariel de Rodó." La utopía de América. Ed. Rafael Gutiérrez Girardot & Ángel Rama. Caracas: Biblioteca Ayacucho.
- . 1978a. "Raza y cultura." La utopía de América. Ed. Rafael Gutiérrez Girardot & Ángel Rama. Caracas: Biblioteca Ayacucho.
- . 1967. Las corrientes literarias en la América Hispánica. México & Buenos Aires: Fondo de Cultura Económica.
- . 1945. Literary currents in Hispanic America. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- . [1944] 1988. "Reseña de 'Vicisitudes de la lengua española en Santo Domingo' por Emilio Rodríguez Demorizi." Obra Dominicana. Santo Domingo: Sociedad Dominicana de Bibliófilos Inc.
- . [1941] 1975. El español en Santo Domingo. Santo Domingo: Taller.
- . 1939. "Ello". *Revista de Filología Hispánica* 1.3: 209-229.

- . [1937] 2003. “El idioma español y la historia política en la República Dominicana,” Obras Completas (Tomo IV). Santo Domingo: Editora Universal.
- . [1936] 1988. “La cultura y las letras coloniales en Santo Domingo.” Obra Dominicana. Santo Domingo: Sociedad Dominicana de Bibliófilos Inc.
- . [1932] 1988. “La antigua sociedad patriarcal de las Antillas: modalidades arcaicas de la vida en Santo Domingo durante el siglo XIX.” Obra Dominicana. Santo Domingo: Sociedad Dominicana de Bibliófilos Inc.
- . [1930] 2003. “Comienzos del español en América.” Obras completas (tomo IV). Santo Domingo: Editora Universal.
- . [1930a] 2003. “El lenguaje.” Obras completas (tomo IV). Santo Domingo: Editora Universal.
- . [1928] 2003. “Seis ensayos en busca de nuestra expresión,” Obras completas (tomo V). Santo Domingo: Editora Universal.
- . [1925] 2003. “El supuesto andalucismo de América.” Obras completas (tomo IV). Santo Domingo: Editora Universal.
- . [1922] 1978. “La utopía en América.” La utopía en América. Ed. Rafael Gutiérrez Girardot & Ángel Rama. Caracas: Biblioteca Ayacucho.
- . 1922. En la orilla: mi España. México: Cultura.
- . [1921] 2003. Observaciones sobre el español en América. Obras completas (tomo IV). Santo Domingo: Editora Universal.
- . [1917] 2004. “La República Dominicana.” Obras completas (tomo V): escritos políticos, filosóficos y sociológicos. Ed. Manuel Núñez. Santo Domingo: Editora Nacional.
- . [1913] 1984. “Juan Ruiz de Alarcón.” Estudios mexicanos. Ed. José Luis Martínez. México: Fondo de Cultura Económica.

- . [1910] 2004. "Horas de estudio." Obras completas (tomo V): escritos políticos, filosóficos y sociológicos. Ed. Manuel Núñez. Santo Domingo: Editora Nacional.
- . [1909] 2000. Memorias, Diario, Notas de Viaje. Ed. Enrique Zuleta Álvarez. México: Fondo de Cultura Económica.
- . [1905] 2004. "La sociología de Hostos." Obras completas (tomo V): escritos políticos, filosóficos y sociológicos. Ed. Manuel Núñez. Santo Domingo: Editora Nacional.
- Henríquez Ureña, Pedro & Alfonso Reyes. 1981. Epistolario íntimo, 1906-1946. Ed Jacobo de Lara. Santo Domingo: UNPHU.
- Henríquez Ureña, Pedro & Narciso Binayan. 1928. Guía para el uso de "El libro del idioma". Buenos Aires: Editorial A. Kapelusz y Cía.
- Henríquez Ureña de Hito, Sonia. 1993. Pedro Henríquez Ureña: apuntes para una biografía. Mexico: Siglo XXI Editores.
- Hess, Steven. 1982. Ramón Menéndez Pidal. Boston: Twayne Publishers.
- Hinzelin, Marc-Olivier & Georg A. Káiser. 2006. "El pronombre 'ello' en el léxico del español dominicano." Lenguas en contacto y cambio léxico-gramatical en el Caribe: análisis de casos concretos-aspectos tipológicos-implicaciones teóricas. Ed. Wiltrud Mihatsch & Monika Sokol. Frankfurt.
- Hobsbawm, Eric J. 1990. Nations and nationalisms since 1780: programme, myth, reality. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hoetink, Harry. 1982. The Dominican people 1850-1900: notes for a historical sociology. Baltimore & London: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Hostos, Eugenio María de. 1979. Páginas dominicanas. Ed. Emilio Rodríguez Demorizi. Santo Domingo: Editora Taller.
- . 1939. Obras completas. La Habana: Cultural S.A.

---. [1870]. "El cholo." Available on April 4, 2007 at

<<http://www.ensayistas.org/antologia/XIXA/hostos/hostos2.htm>>.

Hymes, Dell. 1967. "Models of the interaction of language and social settings." Journal of Social Issues 23.2: 8-28.

Inoa, Orlando. 2002. Pedro Henríquez Ureña en Santo Domingo. Santo Domingo: Ediciones Ferilibro.

---. 1999. Azúcar: árabes, cocos y haitianos. Santo Domingo: Editora Cole.

Jordan, Iorgu. 1970. An introduction to romance linguistics: its schools and scholars. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Irvine, Judith. 2001. "Style as distinctiveness: the culture and ideology of linguistic differentiation" Style and sociolinguistic variation. Ed. Penelope Eckert & John Rickford. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

---. 1989. "When talk isn't cheap: language and political economy." American Ethnologist 16: 248-267.

Irvine, Judith & Susan Gal. 2000. "Language ideology and linguistic differentiation." Regimes of language: ideologies, politics and identities. Ed. Kroskrity, Paul V. Santa Fe, NM: School of American Research Press.

Isacson, José. 1986. "Pedro Henríquez Ureña y la conciencia intelectual iberoamericana." La Torre 134: 117-147

Ives, Peter. 2004. Language and hegemony in Gramsci (Reading Gramsci). London & Ann Arbor: Pluto Press.

Izzo, Herbert J. 1984. "Andalusia and America: the regional origins of New-World Spanish." Romanistas: Studies in Romance Linguistics 4: 109-131.

Jaime Julia, Julio. 1984. El libro jubilar de Pedro Henríquez Ureña (Tomos 1 & 2). Santo Domingo: UNPHU.

- Jimenes Grullón, Juan Isidro. 1969. Pedro Henríquez Ureña, realidad y mito y otro ensayo. Santo Domingo. Editorial Librería Dominicana.
- Jiménez Sabater, Maximiliano. 1981. "Enfoques sociolingüísticos sobre el español dominicano." Scriptura II (5): 85-92.
- . 1975. Más datos sobre el español dominicano de la República Dominicana. Santo Domingo: Intec.
- Johansson, Troles Degn et al. 1999. Iconicity: a fundamental problem in semiotics. Denmark: NSU Press.
- Jones, Peter E. 2001. "Cognitive linguistics and the Marxist approach to ideology." Language and ideology (volume II): theoretical cognitive approaches. Ed. René Dirven et al. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Joseph, John. 2004. Language and Identity. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Joseph, John & Talbot Taylor. 1990. Ideologies of language. London: Routledge.
- Kany, Charles. 1951. American Spanish syntax. Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- Kibbee, Douglas. 1999. "'The people and their language in the 19th century French linguistic thought.'" The emergence of the modern language sciences: studies on the transition from historical-comparative to structural linguistics in honour of E. F. Koerner (volume 1): historiographical perspectives. Ed. Sheila Embleton, J. Joseph, & Hans-Josef Niederehe. Philadelphia & Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- King, John. 1986. Sur: a study of the Argentine literary journal and its role in the development of a culture (1931-1970). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Knadler, Stephen. 2005. "Blanca from the block: Whiteness and the transnational latina body." Available on April 14, 2007 at <http://www.genders.org/g41/g41_knadler.html>.

- Knight, Franklin. 1990. The Caribbean: the genesis of a fragmented nationalism. New York & Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Koerner, Konrad. 2001. "Ideology in the 19th and 20th century linguistics." Language and ideology (volume II): theoretical cognitive approaches. Ed. René Dirven et al. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- . 1995. Professing linguistic historiography. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- . 1978. "Towards a historiography of linguistics: 19th and 20th century paradigms." Towards a historiography of linguistics: selected essays. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Krauze, Enrique. 1985. "El crítico errante: Pedro Henríquez Ureña." Vuelta 100 (Marzo 1985): 12-24.
- Kroskrity, Paul V. 2000. "Regimenting languages: language ideological perspectives." Regimes of language: ideologies, politics and identities. Ed. Kroskrity, Paul V. Santa Fe, NM: School of American Research Press.
- Lapesa, Rafael. 1969. "Don Ramón Menéndez Pidal: los trabajos y los días." Razón y Fe 856: 1-18.
- Lara, Juan Jacobo. 1982. Sobre Pedro Henríquez Ureña y otros ensayos. Santo Domingo: UNPHU.
- . 1975. Pedro Henríquez Ureña: su vida y su obra. Santo Domingo: UNPHU.
- Larrazábal, Blanco. 1998. Los negros y la esclavitud en Santo Domingo. Santo Domingo: La Trinitaria.
- . 1945. "Papeles de Familia." Clio 13: pages unavailable.
- Laurendeau, Paul. 1990. "Theory of emergence: towards a historical-materialistic approach to the history of linguistics." Ideologies of language. Ed. John Joseph & Talbot Taylor. London: Routledge.
- Leal, Luís. 2001. "Pedro Henríquez Ureña en México." Presencia de Pedro Henríquez Ureña: escritos sobre el maestro. Ed. Jorge Tena Reyes & Tomás Castro Burdiez. Santo Domingo: Editorial Ciguapa.

- Lenz, Rodolfo. 1940. El español en Chile. Ed. Amado Alonso & Raimundo Lida. Buenos Aires: Biblioteca de Dialectología Hispanoamericana.
- . 1928. El papiamento: la lengua criolla de Curazao. Santiago: Los Anales de La Universidad de Chile.
- . [1905-1910] 1980. El diccionario etimológico de las voces chilenas derivadas de lenguas indígenas americanas. Santiago, Chile: Universidad de Chile.
- Lipski, John. 2005. A history of Afro-Hispanic language. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- . 1994. "A new perspective on Afro-Dominican Spanish: the Haitian contribution." Available on October 25, 2006 at <<http://www.personal.psu.edu/faculty/j/m/jml34/afrodom.pdf>>.
- Lope Blanch, Juan M. 1989. "Pedro Henríquez Ureña, precursor." Estudios de lingüística hispanoamericana. México: Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México.
- . 1989a. "Henríquez Ureña y la delimitación de las zonas dialectales de Hispanoamérica." Estudios de lingüística hispanoamericana. México: Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México.
- López Estrada, Francisco. 2000. España y europeísmo de Pedro Henríquez Ureña. Pedro Henríquez Ureña: ensayos. Ed. José Luis Abellán & Ana María Barrenechea. Madrid: Allca XX.
- López Morales, Humberto. 1999. "Introducción." Vocabulario de Puerto Rico. Ed. H López Morales. Madrid: Arco Libros.
- López Sánchez, José María. 2006. Heterodoxos españoles: el Centro de Estudios Históricos, 1910-1936. Madrid: Marcial Pons Ediciones de Historia.
- Lugo, Américo. 1952. Historia de Santo Domingo desde el 1556 hasta 1608: edad media de la isla española. Ciudad Trujillo: Editorial Librería Dominicana.
- . [1908] 1993. "Discurso inaugural del ateneo dominicano." Obras escogidas 1. Santo Domingo: Ediciones de la Fundación Corripio.

- Luis, Carlos R. 2003. "Norma y nación: los galicismos en Salvá y Bello." El pensamiento ilustrado y el lenguaje. Ed. Elvira Arnoux & Carlos R. Luis. Buenos Aires: Eudeba.
- Maceo, Patín. [1941] 1947. Dominicanismos (2nd Edition). Ciudad Trujillo: Librería Dominicana.
- Malaret, Augusto. [1932] 1942. Por mi patria y por mi idioma. San Juan: Establecimientos de Cerón.
- . [1925] 1946. Diccionario de americanismos. Buenos Aires: Emecé.
- . [1917 & 1937] 1999. Vocabulario de Puerto Rico. Ed. H. López Morales. Madrid: Arco Libros.
- Malkiel, Yakov. 1972. Linguistics and philology in Spanish America: A survey (1925-1970). The Hague & Paris: Mouton.
- . 1962 "Filología española y lingüística general." Available on May 8, 2007 at <http://cvc.cervantes.es/obref/aih/pdf/01/aih_01_009.pdf>.
- Malmberg, B. 1947. "L'espangnol dans le Nouveau Monde." Studia Linguistica 1: 79-116.
- Malrieu, Jean Pierre. 1999. Evaluative semantics: cognition, language and ideology. London: Routledge.
- Manhheim, Karl. 1954. Ideology and Utopia. New York & London: Harcourt Brace & Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Martí, José. 1891. "Nuestra América." La Revista Ilustrada de Nueva York. Available on January 15, 2007 at <http://www.analitica.com/bitbiblioteca/jmarti/nuestra_america.asp>.
- Martínez, Fernando Antonio. 1968. "Lexicography." Current trends in linguistics IV: Ibero-American and Caribbean linguistics. Ed. Thomas Sebeok. The Hague & Paris: Mouton.
- Martínez, José Luis. 1984. Estudios mexicanos. México: Fondo de Cultura Económica.
- Martínez Valdez, Ciana. 2000. "El lenguaje elaborado y el lenguaje descuidado." Estado actual de los estudios lingüísticos y filológicos en la República Dominicana. Ed. Irene Pérez Guerra. Santo Domingo: Patronato de la Ciudad Colonial de Santo Domingo.

- Martínez-Vergne, Teresita. 2005. Nation and citizen in the Dominican Republic, 1880-1916. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press.
- Marx, Karl & Frederick Engels. [1845] 1964. The German ideology. Moscow: Progress Publishers
- Mateo, Andrés L. 2006. ¿Por qué vino Pedro Henríquez Ureña en 1931? Santo Domingo: Flirilegio Ediciones.
- . 2004. Mito y cultura en la era de Trujillo. Santo Domingo: Editora Manatí.
- . 2001. Pedro Henríquez Ureña: errancia y creación. Bogota: Taurus.
- Matos Moquete, Manuel. 2005. "Pedro Henríquez Ureña y la versificación fluctuante." Estudios translingüísticos. Santo Domingo: Editora Nacional
- . 1986. La cultura de la lengua. Santo Domingo: Biblioteca Nacional.
- Megenney, William. 1990. África en Santo Domingo: su herencia lingüística. Santo Domingo: Editorial Tiempo.
- Meliá, Bartolomeu. 2005. "El andamiaje lingüístico de la identidad paraguaya." Relatos de nación: la construcción de identidades en el mundo hispánico. Ed. Francisco Colom González. Madrid & Frankfurt: Iberoamericana & Vervuert.
- Menéndez Pidal, Ramón. 1944. La unidad del idioma. Madrid: Instituto Nacional del Libro.
- . [1926] 1964. Orígenes del español: estado lingüístico de la península ibérica hasta el siglo XI. Madrid: Espasa-Calpe.
- . [1920] 2003. "Prólogo." Pedro Henríquez Ureña: obras completas (tomo III). Santo Domingo: Editora Universal.
- . 1920a. "Prólogo." La versificación irregular en la poesía castellana. Madrid: Centro de Estudios Históricos.

- . [1904] 1925. Manual de gramática histórica española. Madrid: Librería General de Victoriano Suárez.
- Merino Medina, Augusto. 1987. El concepto de ideología. Chile: Editorial Universitaria.
- Miller, Nicola. 1999. In the shadow of the State: intellectuals and the quest for national identity in twentieth-century Spanish America. London: Verso.
- Milroy, J. & Milroy, L. 1999. Authority in language. London & New York: Routledge.
- Mills, Sara. 2004. Discourse. London: Routledge.
- Misak, Cheryl. 2004. The Cambridge companion to Peirce. Cambridge & New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Moré, Belford. 2004. "La construcción ideológica de una base empírica: selección y elaboración en la gramática de Andrés Bello." La batalla del idioma: la intelectualidad hispánica ante la lengua. Ed. José del Valle y Luis Gabriel-Stheeman. Frankfurt y Madrid: Vervuert & Iberoamericana.
- Moreta Castillo, Américo. 2003. "La obra histórica del profesor Lic. Carlos Larrazábal Blanco." Coloquios 2002. Ed. Varios Autores. Santo Domingo: Comisión Permanente de la Feria del Libro.
- Morínigo, Marcos. 2001. Pedro Henríquez Ureña y la lingüística indigenista. Presencia de Pedro Henríquez Ureña: escritos sobre el maestro. Ed. Jorge Tena Reyes & Tomás Castro Burdiez. Santo Domingo: Editorial Ciguapa.
- Morris, Nancy. 1995. Puerto Rico: culture, politics, and identity. Connecticut: Praeger Publishers.
- Moscoso Puello, Francisco. 1936. Cañas y bueyes. Santo Domingo: La Nación.
- Moya Pons, Frank. 1995. The Dominican Republic: a national history. New Rochelle, NY: Hispaniola Books.

- Muller, Wolfgang & Olga Fischer. 2003. "Introduction: from signing back to signs." From sign to signing: iconicity in language and literature 3. Ed. Wolfgang Muller & Olga Fischer. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Muteba Rahier, Jean. 2004. "The study of Latin-American "racial formations:" Different approaches and different contexts." Latin-American Research Review, Vol 39, no. 3: 282-293.
- Navarro Tomás. [1918] 1999. Manual de pronunciación española. Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas.
- Núñez Cedeño, Rafael. 1980. La fonología moderna y el español de Santo Domingo. Santo Domingo: Taller.
- Núñez del Risco, Yaqui. May 2, 2007. "A nivel." LISTIN DIARIO.
- Núñez, Manuel. 2004. "Las claves del pensamiento de Pedro Henríquez Ureña." Obras Completas. Tomo V: escritos políticos, filosóficos y sociológicos. Ed. Manuel Núñez. Santo Domingo: Editora Nacional.
- . 2004a. "La lengua española, compañera de la nación dominicana: Discurso de ingreso." Boletín de la Academia Dominicana de la Lengua 17: 137-195.
- . 2003. "La lengua española, compañera de la nación dominicana: discurso de ingreso" Boletín de la Academia Dominicana de la Lengua 17: 137-195.
- . 2000. "Uso del idioma en el periodismo dominicano." Estado actual de los estudios lingüísticos y filológicos en la República Dominicana. Ed. Irene Pérez Guerra. Santo Domingo: Patronato de la Ciudad Colonial de Santo Domingo.
- . 1990. "El estado y la lengua." El ocaso de la nación dominicana. Santo Domingo: Alfa y Omega.
- Núñez, Victoria. 2006. Unpacking the suitcases they carried: narratives of Dominican and Puerto Rican migrations to the northeastern United States (Pura Belpre, Pedro Henríquez Ureña, Antonia

- Pantoja, Junot Diaz, Angie Cruz). A Dissertation. Amherst, Massachussets: University of Massachusetts at Amherst.
- Ochs, Elinor & Bambi Schieffelin. 1981. "Language acquisition and socialization: three developmental stories and their implications." Culture theory: essays on mind, self and emotion. Ed. Richard Shweder & Robert Levine. Cambridge: Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Oliver, Amy. 1998. "Latin America, philosophy." Routledge Encyclopedia of Philosophy. Ed. Edward. Craig. London & New Cork: Routledge. Available on January 2, 2007 at <<http://www.rep.routledge.com/article/ZA009>>.
- Ortiz, Fernando. 1939. "La cubanidad y los negros." Estudios Afrocubanos 3: 3-15.
- . 1924. Glosario de afronegrismos. La Habana: Imprenta el Siglo XX.
- . [1921] 1975. Un catauro de cubanismos. La Habana: Editorial de Ciencias Sociales.
- Otheguy, Ricardo. 2004. "Single language and code-switching strategies in immigrant and heritage varieties:" Spanish subject personal pronouns in Toribio's cross-modal hypothesis." Bilingualism: Language and Cognition 2: 175-177.
- Paulino, Alejandro & Aquiles Castro. 2005. Diccionario de cultura y folklore dominicano. Santo Domingo: ABC Editorial.
- Peguero, Valentina. 2004. The militarization of culture in the Dominican Republic: from captains general to General Trujillo. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- Peirce, Charles Sanders. 1998. The Essential Peirce: selected philosophical writings (Volume 2). Ed. The Peirce Edition Project. Bloomington & Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.
- Peña Batlle, Manuel Arturo. 1968. "Ensayos históricos." Obras escogidas. Santo Domingo: Santo Domingo: Fundación Peña Batlle.

- Peñalver Castillo, Manuel. 1995. La escuela de Menéndez Pidal y la historiografía lingüística hispánica. Aproximación a su estudio. Almería: Universidad de Almería Servicio de Publicaciones.
- Pérez Cabral, Pedro Andres. 1967. La comunidad mulata: el caso socio-político de la República Dominicana. Caracas: Gráfica Americana.
- Pérez, Odalís G. 2005. "Los intelectuales y el poder político en República Dominicana." Los Intelectuales y el Poder: Coloquio. Ed. Guillermo Piña-Contreras. Santo Domingo: Universidad Apec.
- . 2002. La Ideología rota: el derrumbe del pensamiento pseudonacionalista dominicano. Santo Domingo: Editora Manatí.
- Pérez de la Cruz, Rosa Elena. 2003. "El concepto del hombre en el pensamiento de Pedro Henríquez Ureña." Cuadernos Americanos 5 (101): 72-88.
- Pérez Guerra, Irene. 2004. "La producción de tema lingüístico y filológico en la obra de Pedro Henríquez Ureña." Obras Completas. Tomo IV: Estudios lingüísticos y filológicos. Ed. Irene Pérez Guerra. Santo Domingo: Editora Nacional.
- . 2003. "La obra lingüística de Pedro Henríquez Ureña." Coloquios 2002. Ed. Varios Autores. Santo Domingo: Comisión Permanente de la Feria del Libro.
- . 2000. "Introducción." Estado actual de los estudios lingüísticos y filológicos en la República Dominicana. Ed. Irene Pérez Guerra. Santo Domingo: Patronato de la Ciudad Colonial de Santo Domingo.
- . 1992. "Aportación a un tema en debate en el Caribe hispánico: el arcaísmo del español dominicano." Actas del II Congreso Internacional de Historia de la Lengua Española 2: 483-490.
- . 1989. "Africanismos lingüísticos en la República Dominicana: Notas metodológicas." Estudios sobre español de América y lingüística afroamericana. Bogotá: Instituto Caro y Cuervo.

- Pérez Pascual, José Ignacio. 1998. Ramón Menéndez Pidal: ciencia y pasión. Valladolid, Spain: Junta de Castilla y León.
- Pérez y Pérez, Carlos Federico. 1984. "Nacionalismo y americanismo en Pedro Henríquez Ureña." El libro jubilar de Pedro Henríquez Ureña (Tomos 1 & 2). Ed. Julio Jaime Julia. Santo Domingo: UNPHU.
- Pérez-Leroux, Ana Teresa. 1999. "Innovación sintáctica en el español del Caribe y los principios de la gramática general." El Caribe hispánico: perspectivas lingüísticas actuales. Ed. Luis Ortiz López. Frankfurt & Madrid: Vervuert & Iberoamericana.
- Phillips, Susan. 1998. "Language ideologies in institutions of power: a commentary." Language ideologies: practice and theory. Ed. Bambi B. Schieffelin et al. New York & Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Pichardo, Esteban. [1836] 1985. Diccionario provincial casi razonado de voces frases cubanas. La Habana: Editorial de Ciencias Sociales
- Pierre-Charles, Gerard. 1985. El pensamiento sociopolítico moderno en el Caribe. México: Fondo de Cultura Económica.
- Pike, Fredrick. 1971. Hispanismo, 1898-1936: Spanish conservatives and liberals and their relations with Spanish America. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press.
- Piña-Contreras, Guillermo. 2001. "El universo familiar en la formación intelectual de Pedro Henríquez Ureña." Presencia de Pedro Henríquez Ureña: escritos sobre el maestro. Ed. Jorge Tena Reyes & Tomás Castro Burdiez. Santo Domingo: Editorial Ciguapa.
- Pires de Oliveira, Roberta. 2001. "Language and ideology: an interview with George Lakoff." Language and ideology (volume I): theoretical cognitive approaches. Ed. René Dirven et al. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

- Pitol, Sergio. 2002. "Pedro Henríquez Ureña visto por sus discípulos." De la realidad a la literatura. México: Ariel & Editorial Planeta Mexicana.
- Polo, José. 1986. Epistemología del lenguaje e historia lingüística: momentos de su desarrollo bibliográfico en el ámbito hispanohablante. Madrid: Gredos.
- Poplack, Shana & Sali Tagliamonte. 2001. "African Americans in the Samaná Peninsula." African American English in the diaspora. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Portolés, José. 1986. Medio siglo de filología española (1896-1952): Positivismo e idealismo. Madrid: Cátedra.
- Pratt, Mary Louise. 1999. "Arts of the contact zone." New ways of reading. Ed. David Bartholomae & A. Petrosky. New York: Bedford/St. Martins.
- Price-Mars, Jean. [1953] 2000. La República de Haití y la República Dominicana (tomos 1 y 2). Santo Domingo: Editora Taller.
- Pucciarelli, Eugenio. 1984. "Pedro Henríquez Ureña y la filosofía." Pedro Henríquez Ureña, humanista. Buenos Aires: Publicaciones del Centro de Estudios Filosóficos.
- Rama, Ángel. 1984. La ciudad letrada. Hanover, N. H.: Ediciones del Norte.
- Rama, Carlos. 1982. Historia de las relaciones culturales entre España y la América Latina: Siglo XXI. México: Fondo de Cultura Económica.
- Ramos, Julio. [1989] 2003. Desencuentros de la modernidad en América Latina: Literatura y política en el siglo XIX. México: Fondo de Cultura Económica.
- Ramos, Samuel. 1946. "Pedro Henríquez Ureña." Cuadernos Americanos, XXVIII (4).
- Resina, Joan. 2005. "Whose hispanism?" Ideologies of Hispanism. Ed. Mabel Moraña. Nashville, Tennessee: Vanderbilt University Press.
- Reyes, Alfonso. [1917] 1954. "El criticón." El suicida: libro de ensayos. Mexico: Tezontle.

- Reyes, Alfonso & Pedro Henríquez Ureña. [1907-1914] 1986. Correspondencia (1907-1914). Ed. José Luis Martínez. México: Fondo de Cultura Económica.
- Ricardo, Yolanda. 2003. Magisterio y creación: los Henríquez Ureña. Santo Domingo: Academia de Ciencias de la República Dominicana.
- Roberge, Paul T. 1990. "The ideological profile of Afrikaans historical linguistics." Ideologies of language. Ed. John Joseph & Talbot Taylor. London: Routledge.
- Rodó, José Enrique. 1991. Ariel. Madrid: Espasa Calpe.
- Rodríguez Demorizi, Emilio. 1981. Breve panegírico de Pedro Henríquez Ureña. Santo Domingo: Editora Taller.
- . 1975. "Vicisitudes de la lengua española en Santo Domingo." Lengua y folklore de Santo Domingo. Santo Domingo: UCMM.
- . [1947] 2001. "Dominicanidad de Pedro Henríquez Ureña." Presencia de Pedro Henríquez Ureña: escritos sobre el maestro. Ed. Jorge Tena Reyes & Tomás Castro Burdiez. Santo Domingo: Editorial Ciguapa.
- . 1939. Hostos en Santo Domingo (1). Ciudad Trujillo [Santo Domingo], Dominican Republic: Impresora J. R. Viuda Gracia Sucs.
- Rodríguez, Néstor 2007. "Pedro Henríquez Ureña el militante." Hoy 24 Noviembre 2007.
- Rodríguez, Zorobabel (1875) Diccionario de chilenismos Valparaíso: Ediciones Universitarias de Valparaíso.
- Roggiano, Alfredo. 1989. Pedro Henríquez Ureña en México. México: Facultad de Filosofía y Letras de la Universidad Autónoma de México.
- . 1961. Pedro Henríquez Ureña en los Estado Unidos. México: Editorial Cultura.

- Rosaldo, Michelle. 1982. "The things we do with words: Ilongot speech acts and speech act theory in philosophy." Language in Society 11: 203-237.
- Rosario Candelier, Bruno. 1990. "El estudio de la lengua": El español en Santo Domingo." Ensayos lingüísticos. Santo Domingo: P.U.C.M.M.
- Rosenblat, Angel. 2002. "El debatido andalucismo del español de América." El español de América Caracas: Ayacucho.
- . 1954. La población indígena y el mestizaje en América. Buenos Aires: Editorial Nova.
- . 1945. La población indígena de América desde 1492 hasta la actualidad. Buenos Aires: Institución Cultural Española.
- Rueda, Manuel. 1984. "Dominicanidad de Pedro Henríquez Ureña." Aula 49: 132-138.
- Rumsey, Allan. 1990. "Wording, meaning and linguistic ideology." American Anthropologist 92: 346-361.
- Sábato, Ernesto. 1964. "Significado de Pedro Henríquez Ureña." Available on July 1, 2007 at <<http://www.cielonaranja.com/phu-sabato.htm>>.
- Sagás, Ernesto. 2000. Race and politics in the Dominican Republic. Florida: Florida University Press.
- San Miguel, Pedro L. 2005. The imagined island: history, identity and utopia in Hispaniola. San Juan & Santo Domingo: Isla Negra & La Trinitaria.
- Sánchez Méndez, Juan. 2003. Historia de la lengua española en América. Valencia; Tirant lo Blanch.
- Sang, Mu-kien A. 1987. Ulises Heureaux: biografía de un dictador. Santo Domingo: Instituto Tecnológico de Santo Domingo.
- Sarlo, Beatriz. 2000. "Pedro Henríquez Ureña: lectura de una problemática." Pedro Henríquez Ureña: ensayos. Ed. José Luis Abellán & Ana Maria Barrenechea. Madrid: Allca XX.
- Sarmiento, Domingo Faustino. 2005. Facundo: civilización y barbarie. Madrid: Catedra.

- Saussure, Ferdinand. [1916] 1986. Course in general linguistics. New York: MacGraw Hill.
- Sepúlveda Muñoz, Isidro. 2005. El sueño de la Madre Patria: hispanoamericanismo y nacionalismo. Madrid: Marcial Pons.
- Schieffelin, Bambi B, Kathryn Woolard, and Paul V. Kroskrity. Language ideologies: practice and theory. New York & Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Schütz, Gunther. 1976. Epistolario de Rufino José Cuervo con filólogos de Alemania, Austria y Suiza y noticias de las demás relaciones de Cuervo con estos países y sus representantes. Bogotá: Instituto Caro y Cuervo.
- Schwartz, Lía. 2006. "De hispanismos, los siglos XVI y XVII, y el olvido de la historia." Available on June 28, 2006 at <<http://www.lehman.cuny.edu/ciberletras/v06/liaschwartz.html>>.
- Schwegler, Armin. 1996. "La doble negación dominicana y la génesis del español caribeño." Lingüística Hispánica: 247-317.
- Silverstein, Michael. 1998. "Monoglot 'standard' in American standardization and metaphors of linguistic hegemony." The matrix of language: contemporary linguistic anthropology. Ed. D. Brenneis & R. Macaulay. Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press.
- . 1985. "Language structure and the culture of gender: at the intersection of structure, usage and ideology." Semiotic mediation. Ed. Elizabeth Mertz & Richard Parmetier Orlando, Fla: Academic Press.
- . 1979. "Language structure and linguistic ideology." The elements: a parasession on linguistic units and levels. Ed. Paul Clyne et al. Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society.
- . 1976. "Shifters, linguistic categories, and cultural description." Meaning in anthropology. Ed. Keith Basso & Henry Selby. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.

- Simone, Raffaele. 1995. "Foreword: under the sign of Cratylus." Iconicity in language. Ed. Raffaele Simone. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Smith, Anthony. 2000. The nation in history: historiographical debates about ethnicity and nationalism. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Sommer, Doris. 1991. "Starting from scratch: late beginnings and early (t) races in Enriquillo, Cumandá, and Tabaré." Foundational fictions: the national romances of Latin America. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Taylor, Talbot. 1997. "Enculturating language." Theorizing language. Amsterdam: Pergamon.
- . 1990. "Which is to be master? The institutionalization of authority in the science of language." Ideologies of language. Ed. John Joseph & Talbot Taylor. London: Routledge.
- Tena Reyes, Jorge & Tomás Castro Burdiez (Eds.). 2001. Presencia de Pedro Henríquez Ureña: escritos sobre el maestro. Santo Domingo: Editorial Ciguapa.
- Thompson, John B. 1984. Studies in the theory of ideology. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Tolentino Dipp, Hugo. 2004. "Perfil nacionalista de Gregorio Luperón." Ensayos sobre la restauración. Ed. [Varios autores]. Santo Domingo: Editora Universitaria.
- Toribio Almeida, Jacqueline. 2005. Linguistic displays of identity among Dominicans in national and diasporic settlements." English and ethnicity. Ed. C. Davies & J. Brutt-Griffler. New York: Palgrave.
- . 2000. "Nosotros somos dominicanos: language and self-definition among Dominicans." Research on Spanish in the U.S. Ed. Ana Roca. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Press.
- . 2000a. "Language variation and the linguistic enactment of identity among Dominicans." Linguistics 38.5: 1133-1159.

- Torres Saillant, Silvio. 2000. "The Tribulations of Blackness: Stages in Dominican Racial identity." Callaloo 23.3: 1086-1111.
- Urciuoli, Bonnie. 1996. Exposing prejudice: Puerto Rican experiences of language, race, and class. Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press.
- . 1991. "The political topography of Spanish and English: the view from a New York Puerto Rican neighborhood." American Ethnologist 18: 295-310.
- Ureña, Salomé. 1959. "27 de febrero" Poesías Completas, Ciudad Trujillo [Santo Domingo]: Impresora Dominicana.
- Vann, Robert. 2002. "Linguistic ideology in Spain's ivory tower: not analyzing Catalan Spanish." Multilingua 21: 227-246.
- . 1999. "Language exposure in Catalonia: an example of indoctrinating linguistic ideology." Word 50 (2): 191-209.
- Van Dijk, Teun A. 2003. Ideología y discurso: una introducción multidisciplinaria. Barcelona: Ariel.
- . 2002. "Discourse, knowledge and ideology: reformulating old questions and proposing some new solutions." Communicating ideologies: Multidisciplinary perspectives on language, discourse and social practice. Ed. Martín Putz et al. Frankfurt & Berlin: Peter Lang
- . 1995. "Discourse analysis as ideology analysis." Language and peace. Ed. C. Shaffner & A. Wenden. Aldershot: Dartmouth.
- Valdez, Juan. 2007. "Interview with an eighty-year old female informant: data from ongoing fieldwork in the Dominican Republic."
- Vaquero, Maria. 1997. "El español en América como problema en el siglo XX." Revista de Estudios Hispánicos 24 (1) 273-286.

- Vargas, José Rafael. 1984. El nacionalismo de Pedro Henríquez Ureña. Santo Domingo: Editora de la UASD.
- Vargas, Manuel. 2004. "Biología y filosofía de la raza en México: Bulmes y Vasconcelos." Construcción de la identidades latinoamericanas: Ensayos de historia intelectual (siglos XIX y XX). Ed. Granados, Aimer & Carlos Marichal. México, D.F.: El Colegio de México.
- Vasconcelos, José. 2001. "Vivió entre amigos." Presencia de Pedro Henríquez Ureña: escritos sobre el maestro. Ed. Jorge Tena Reyes & Tomás Castro Burdiez. Santo Domingo: Editorial Ciguapa.
- . [1925] 1999. La raza cósmica. Costa Rica: Editorial Fundación-UNA.
- Vellejo, Catharina. 1995. "Beautiful lies: legitimation of the national identity in two series of Indianist poems of the Dominican Republic." The reordering of culture: Latin America, the Caribbean and Canada in the hood. Ed. Alvina Ruprecht & Cecilia Taiana. Canada: Carleton University Press.
- Volosinov V. N. 1986. Marxism and the philosophy of language. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University.
- Wagner, L. 1920. "El español de América y el latín vulgar." Cuadernos del Instituto de Filología de la Universidad de Buenos Aires 1: 45-110.
- Weber de Kurlat, Frida. 1984. "Pedro Henríquez Ureña en el Instituto de Filología de Buenos Aires." El libro jubilar de Pedro Henríquez Ureña (Tomos 1& 2). Ed. Julio Jaime Julia. Santo Domingo: UNPHU.
- . 1975. "Para la historia del Instituto de Filología y Literaturas Hispánicas 'Dr. Amado Alonso.'" Homenaje al Instituto de Filología y Literaturas Hispánicas "Dr. Amado Alonso" En su Cincuentenario 1923-1973. Ed. Melchora Romanos et al. Buenos Aires: Distribuidor F. G. Gambeiro.
- Weinberg, Liliana. 2002. "Pedro Henríquez Ureña: exilio y ensayo." Available on June 12, 2007 at <<http://www.ccydel.unam.mx/ensayo/pdf/fragmento/PHU%20Exilio%20ensayo.pdf>>.

- Whitney, William Dwight. [1875] 1979. The life and growth of language: an outline of linguistic science. New York: Dover Publications, Inc.
- Williams, Raymond. 1977. Marxism and literature. Oxford & New York: Oxford University Press.
- Williamson, Edwin. 1992. The Penguin history of Latin America. London: Penguin Books.
- Wimer, Javier. 2006. "Itinerario de Pedro Henríquez Ureña." Revista de la Universidad de México 34. Available on May23, 2007 at <<http://www.revistadelauniversidad.unam.mx/3406/pdfs/69-77.pdf>>.
- Woolard, Kathryn A. 2007. "Why dis now? Linguistic anthropological contributions to the explanation of sociolinguistic icons and change." Journal of Sociolinguistics x: xx-xx.
- . 1998. "Language ideology as a field of inquiry." Language ideologies: practice and theory. Ed. Bambi B. Schieffelin et al. New York & Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Zaiter Mejía, Josefina Alba. 1996. La identidad social y nacional en Dominicana: un análisis psico-social. Santo Domingo: Editora Taller.
- Zea, Leopoldo. 1943. El positivismo en México. México: el Colegio de México.
- Zentella, Ana Celia. 2002. "Spanish in New York." The multilingual apple: languages in New York City. Ed. Ofelia García & Joshua Fishman. New York & Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Zuleta, Emilia. [1984] 2000. "España en la comprensión de América de Henríquez Ureña." Pedro Henríquez Ureña: ensayos. Ed. José Luis Abellán & Ana Maria Barrenechea. Madrid: Allca XX.
- Zuleta Álvarez, Enrique. 2000. "La recepción crítica de la obra de Pedro Henríquez Ureña." Pedro Henríquez Ureña: ensayos. Ed. José Luis Abellán & Ana María Barrenechea. Madrid: Allca XX.
- . 1999. Literatura y sociedad: estudios sobre Pedro Henríquez Ureña. Buenos Aires: Ediciones Atril.
- . 1996. Pedro Henríquez Ureña y su tiempo. Buenos Aires: Catálogo.