

n.º 26

TINKUY

Boletín de Investigación y Debate



Tinkuy

Boletín de Investigación y Debate
n.º 26
Agosto-Diciembre 2021
ISSN 1913-0481

Département de littératures et de langues du monde
Faculté des arts et de sciences
Université de Montréal

Correo electrónico: revista.tinkuy@gmail.com
https://llm.umontreal.ca/recherche/publications.html

Fundador

Juan Carlos Godenzzi

Director

Luis Fernando Rubio

Director de redacción

Óscar Zabala

Consejo consultivo (Université de Montréal)

Anahí Alba de la Fuente
Ana Belén Martín Sevillano
Olga Nedvyga
Enrique Pato

Coordinador del número

Óscar Zabala

Diseño

Carolina Barbosa Luna

Corrección y estilo

David Arias
Eduardo González
Anahí Martínez
Óscar Zabala

Traducción

Daphné Morin
Margot Olivera
Cassandra Portugais-Hoyos

Comité editorial

David Arias
Eduardo González
Anahí Martínez
Daphné Morin
Jacqueline Avila Alvarez
Luis Rubio
Óscar Zabala

Comité científico

Carola Mick (Université de Paris, Ceped), Azucena Palacios (Universidad Autónoma de Madrid), Guillermo Soto (Universidad de Chile), Aldo Olate (Universidad de la Frontera, Temuco), Marleen Haboud (Pontificia Universidad Católica del Ecuador), Angelita Martínez (Universidad Nacional de la Plata, Argentina), Adriana Speranza (Universidad Nacional de Moreno, Argentina), Catherine Poupeney-Hart (Université de Montréal), Nicolas Beauclair (Université de Montréal), Ana María Davis (Universidad de Sevilla), Philipp Dankel (Universität Basel), Felipe Hasler (Universidad de Chile), Mauro Mendoza (Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México), Jéssica Romero (Pontificia Universidad Católica del Perú), Rocío Caravedo (Pontificia Universidad Católica del Perú), Álvaro Ezcurra (Pontificia Universidad Católica del Perú), Laura Morgenthaler-Garcia (Ruhr Universität Bochum), Ricardo Andrade (University of Pennsylvania), Raúl Bendezú Araujo (Freie Universität Berlin), Piero Costa (Universidad de Verona), Adrián Freja de la Hoz (Universidad Tecnológica y Pedagógica de Tunja [UPTC]), Iván Vicente Padilla Chasing (Universidad Nacional de Colombia), Juan David Escobar (Universidad Nacional de Colombia), Marco Antonio Lovón (Universidad Nacional Mayor de San Marcos), Andrés Napurí (Universidad Nacional Mayor de San Marcos), Liz Moreno Chuquen (Universidad del estado de Idaho)



Boletín de Investigación y Debate

n.º 26
Agosto-Diciembre 2021

El contenido de esta revista cuenta con una licencia de Creative Commons de “reconocimiento, no comercial”, Internacional 4.0 que puede consultarse en <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>



Genera, differentiae and ideologies. An approach to the Aristotelian definition from an ideological analysis and Natural Semantic Metalanguage¹

Piero Costa

pierorenato.costaleon@univr.it

Università di Verona/ Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona

Abstract

With a mostly theoretical purpose of bringing together different research concerns seldom addressed together, this paper aims to explore to what extent the detection and examination of textual traces of some ideological conditionings in lexicographic definitions can be potentiated with the help of both the more traditional conception of lexicographic definition as an Aristotelian structure of *genus + differentiae* and the descriptive tools developed within the frame of Natural Semantic Metalanguage (NSM). In this sense, and by applying an analysis capable of simultaneously focusing on NSM's primes and a set of textual *loci* especially salient in order to detect the lexicographer's ideological standpoints (Rodríguez Barcia, "La realidad relativa" 30-31), this paper basically takes a set of terms whose definitions in nineteenth-century Spanish dictionaries, according to previous remarks by Rodríguez Barcia ("La realidad relativa"), could be considered as ideologically marked (*i.e.*, not neutral), in order to discuss the extent to which lexicographic *genera* and *differentiae* might be understood as either frequent or infrequent textual/conceptual recipients of ideological biases.

Keywords: *lexicography, ideology, Aristotelian definition, genera, differentiae, Natural Semantic Metalanguage*

Resumen

Con un afán sobre todo teórico de congregar perspectivas raramente abordadas de forma conjunta, este artículo se propone explorar de qué manera la detección y análisis de huellas verbales de condicionamientos ideológicos en la definición lexicográfica puede verse potenciada a la luz de clasificaciones tradicionales como la de la definición aristotélica (es decir, género próximo + diferencia específica) y las herramientas analíticas desarrolladas en el marco de la Metalengua Semántica Natural (NSM, por las siglas en inglés para *Natural Semantic Metalanguage*). En este sentido, y a través de un análisis efectuado, en paralelo, sobre la base de los primitivos semánticos (*semantic primes*) de la NSM y la atención puesta a los espacios textuales particularmente propicios para dar con rastros de las ideologías de los lexicógrafos (Rodríguez Barcia, "La realidad relativa" 30-31), la presente contribución se dedicará a analizar una serie de voces cuyas definiciones en diccionarios del siglo XIX, de acuerdo con las observaciones de Rodríguez Barcia ("La realidad relativa"), habrían de considerarse como ideológicamente marcadas (en tanto no resultan por ser de ninguna forma neutras). Dados estos propósitos, se busca incentivar la discusión en torno de hasta qué punto puede entenderse las partes de la definición aristotélica como capaces de alojar determinados condicionamientos ideológicos.

Palabras clave: *lexicografía, ideología, definición aristotélica, género próximo, diferencia específica, Metalengua Semántica Natural*

Résumé

Avec un objectif principalement théorique de rassembler différentes perspectives rarement abordées ensemble, cet article vise à explorer dans quelle mesure la détection et l'analyse de traces verbales de certains conditionnements idéologiques dans des définitions lexicographiques peuvent être renforcées avec l'aide de conceptions plus traditionnelles comme celle de la définition aristotélicienne (c'est-à-dire, genre prochain + différence spécifique) et des outils analytiques développés dans le cadre de la Métalangue Sémantique Naturelle (NSM, pour le sigle en anglais de *Natural Semantic Metalanguage*). Dans cette optique, et en appliquant une analyse capable de se concentrer simultanément sur les primes sémantiques du NSM et sur un ensemble de lieux textuels particulièrement propices à la présence de prises de position idéologiques du lexicographe (Rodríguez Barcia, « La realidad relativa », 30-31), cet article étudie un ensemble de termes dont les définitions dans des dictionnaires espagnols du XIX^e siècle, selon les remarques précédentes de Rodríguez Barcia (« La realidad relativa »), pourraient être considérées comme idéologiquement marquées (c'est-à-dire qu'elles ne sont pas neutres), afin d'examiner la mesure dans laquelle les parties de la définition aristotélicienne peuvent être comprises comme des destinataires textuels et conceptuels de biais idéologiques.

Mots clés : *lexicographie, idéologie, définition aristotélicienne, genre prochain, différence spécifique, Métalangue Sémantique Naturelle*

Cómo citar (MLA): Costa, Piero. "Genera, differentiae and ideologies. An approach to the Aristotelian definition from an ideological analysis and Natural Semantic Metalanguage". *Tinkuy. Boletín de Investigación y Debate*, no. 26, 2021, págs. 96 - 121

ISSN 1913-0481



¹ I must thank the comments on the earliest drafts of this paper by professor Paolo Frassi (Università degli Studi di Verona) and the anonymous reviewers of the journal, which have helped me both explore a number of aspects not originally considered and elaborate on more extensively some ideas initially stated in the text.

1. Introduction

The present article is aimed at bringing together two topics which have been largely studied but barely, nevertheless, jointly addressed through a single perspective: the expression of ideologies in dictionary-making, on the one hand, and, on the other, the structuring of the Aristotelian definition based on their *genus* and *differentiae* constituents. Given this aim of jointly addressing both topics from a sufficiently broad perspective, capable enough of dealing with those two aspects, what this paper concretely aims for is to offer a tentative exploration on how the aforementioned *genus* and *differentiae* can act as conceptual elements and/or textual slots in which a number of ideologies can both be manifested and, consequently, recognised through a posterior, “post-publishing” textual analysis.

In this sense, in the following pages a study of a set of ideologically marked lexicographic definitions in Spanish dictionaries will be reported, with the interest of determining to what extent the *genus + differentiae* structure that characterises the Aristotelian definition tends and helps to host, as a matter of fact, those marked ideologies and can thus be considered as responsible for the transmission of a set of worldviews that, as part of the approach to the meanings, definitions sometimes end up evoking, either admittedly or inadvertently. To carry out this study, not only has an approach interested in bringing together the ideological dimension of dictionaries and the classical Aristotelian definition’s structure been taken: from a methodological point of view, the interest in semantic primes developed by the studies of Natural Semantic Metalanguage (NSM) since the early seventies (Geeraerts 128) has been also considered. Consequently, on the basis of a set of semantic primes stated and used for semantic analysis within the NSM’s proposal, the textual and metalexigraphic approach carried out for this article takes advantage of classifications already available, in order to report trends with which ideologies are expressed and also recognisable, as part of an *a posteriori* analysis, in a set of Spanish lexicographic definitions.

With this paper, and on the basis of the considerations stated above, it is pursued the goal of contributing to the studies on the role of ideology in the elaboration of dictionaries, by both insisting on the fruitfulness of continually warning about the importance of this socio-cognitive dimension (*i.e.*, ideology) in dictionary-making and by considering that, despite the consolidated trends with which they have been addressed in lexicographic and Critical Discourse Analysis studies (*vid.*, for instance, Benson for English and, for Spanish, San Vicente, Garriga and Lombardini and Rodríguez Barcia, “El análisis ideológico”), it is worth suggesting alternative paths and analytic perspectives that can act as points of encounter and dialogue with parallelly existing developments in different semantic surveys, such as the ones of NSM mentioned above and the most classical theories on the Aristotelian definition. It is likewise expected that, by considering the ideological dimension of lexicographic definitions, the *genus + differentiae* Aristotelian scheme can be regarded not a simple neutral metalinguistic approach to the description of meanings, but, as well, as a tool/structure through which, either voluntarily or inadvertently, the lexicographers’ ideologies end up being expressed in part of the dictionary.

On the basis, then, of what has been said above, the paper presented here has the following structure: first of all, some general brief considerations on the relation between ideology and lexicographic definition will be offered. This section aims to evidence the social genesis and role of lexicography, in order to show its extralinguistic dimension and the need, as well, to gather enough efforts to contribute, from linguistic grounds, to the visibility of the socio-cognitive implications of dictionary-making, particularly in the definition. A second section will be dedicated to the way in which some preceding studies have attempted to address ideology in the lexicographic definition and, more precisely, recognise concrete patterns and structures in which, according to those studies, ideologies end up emerging. The intention pursued with this second part of the paper is therefore to recognise some previous contributions to the goal of determining specific textual structures and formulas where to identify the manifestation of particular ideologies, in a similar fashion to the already mentioned central interest of this paper, to explore the emergence of the latter in the Aristotelian lexicographic scheme.

After having recognised these preceding contributions, it is then turn to introduce, in a third section, some basic remarks on the NSM and, more specifically, a set of the semantic primes it has proposed and worked with. The interest with which this paper approaches to the semantic distribution of linguistic contents relies on its usefulness at the moment of identifying the parts of the Aristotelian definition (*i.e.*, the *genus* or the *differentiae*) and the semantic elements in which ideologies tend to be hosted more frequently. All these considerations made, it will be then time to carry out some analysis in a group of lexicographic definitions retrieved from Spanish dictionaries, with the purpose of taking the article’s major aims to the ground of concrete demonstration. Given the fact that the lexicographic definitions to be analysed here have not been gathered as the result of a truly original research, but, instead, of a set of lexicographic definitions already collected by Rodríguez Barcia (“La realidad relativa”), it is necessary to point out here that this paper is strongly focused upon taking its own theoretical perspectives towards a lexicographic corpus already put under scrutiny by previous works, despite the partially different objectives with which they have been examined in the aforementioned Rodríguez Barcia’s book (“La realidad relativa”). It is because of this very reason that, by taking advantage of an already selected group of definitions considered as “ideologically marked” by the latter, the survey hereby reported pretends to take its analyses into further considerations. On the basis of those findings, a final section of this text will be consequently dedicated to some concluding remarks regarding the approach through which it is hereby intended to bring closer, just as reported at the beginning of this introduction, a number of perspectives on ideologies, dictionaries and lexicographic definitions.

2. The social and cognitive b(i)ases of lexicographic discourse: the role and emergence of ideology in the lexicographic definition

It is widely known that the main purpose of the lexicographic activity is to provide the readers with the most effective approach to every lexical unit’s meaning that the lexicographers’ semantic analytic skills can effectively offer. In this sense, it is undeniable that the principal aim of the dictionary’s article is, at least to a large extent, semantic-based. Because of this, and within the latter, the target of the definition, as part of that definition, is to reveal, through a number of cognitive and textual strategies, the linguistic content of the

lexical unit appearing in the entry. There is a vast number of ways to convey the meaning the lexicographer has in mind, and the definition must thus ideally be the closest approach to the explanation or the evocation of that meaning. The lexicographic definition has, as a result, a largely linguistic goal, which is evidently the meaning.

This does not exclude, however, that, in the practice, and as part of the hermeneutic effort done by the lexicographers, a number of contextualised interpretative biases which help her/him have access to a sufficient understanding of the term are likely to take part, as well, of the actual verbalising of such a meaning in the definition. Because of this reason, ideologies, on the one hand, act as points of reference from which lexicographers conceive meanings and concepts and, on the other hand, end up appearing sometimes in the verbal “matter” with which the definition is made up of.

Due to these considerations, and given that ideologies can be understood as “*the basis of the social representations shared by members of a group*” (Van Dijk 8), emerging in “*everyday social practices*” (6) and allowing “*people, as group members, to organize the multitude of social beliefs [...] and to act accordingly*” (8), it shall be taken into consideration that ideology is involved in the process of the elaboration of the definition in at least, according to Gutiérrez Cuadrado (51-58), two different dimensions. This scholar claims, as a matter of fact, that “*the dictionary hosts different ideological layers, distributed at least in two levels: the level concerning the primary or object language and the metalanguage’s level*” (43). Given thus that “*linguistic usage carries per se ideology*” (57), there is a first ideological level, “*the one corresponding to the general language usage*” (57), more semantically/conceptually based than exclusively lexicographic. We can recall hereby, for example, the Spanish expression *trabajar como un negro* [lit. “to work like a Black person”], meaning ‘to work in an excessive and/or unhealthy amount’. The social perspectives and epistemologies in which that expression has acquired the aforementioned meaning are evidently linked to a social ideology in which the fact of assuming the attribution of excessive workloads to Black-skinned people is a normalised situation and has thus acquired the status of a socially shared sign, with a meaning that can be shaped like this on the basis of that socially shared phenomenon. It shall be observed, however, that under no circumstance can the slightest evocation to this ideology in a lexicographic definition exclusively be owed nor attributed to the lexicographer(s) nor to a reduced number of speakers of the speech community: the cognitive set of beliefs allowing for that meaning (and, therefore, its representation through the lexicographic definition) is socially shared and acknowledged to a wide enough extent by the community. It is thus in this common ground in which the meaning/concept evoked by the expression *trabajar como un negro* acquires significance for the speech community (at least in a particular time period) and can consequently be part of the meaningful pieces of the language’s system, despite the eventual degree to which that ideology may obviously be contested by some groups and members of the (speech) community.

It is thus in this sense that ideologies might be recognised at a starting point when shaping concepts and meanings, and then, in consequence, taking part of the subsequent lexicographic activity. If ideologies shape and determine meanings (the one of expressions such as *trabajar como un negro*, but, as well, of *mountain, green, white, pain*, etc.), they lay at the bottom of the semantic quest for any meaning, and, therefore,

emerge as a by-product, as well, in the lexicographic exercise of wondering about meanings, despite not being, obviously, the aim of the lexicographic activity to bring up this ideological base. Let’s also consider that, in a similar fashion, the definition of any entry related, for instance, to Catholicism (such as *holy spirit, Pentecost, Lent*) or Judaism (such as *bar mitzvah* or *Hanukkah*) implies, at least to some extent, the consideration of some ideology or set of socially shared beliefs, in which the meaning/concept takes place, *i.e.*, in this case, Catholic and Jewish ideologies (or sets of beliefs). We can thus reaffirm that the first ideological level has a more conceptual than purely lexicographic nature, although it is, nevertheless, intertwined, as well, with the lexicographic phenomena, in the sense that, when exploring the meanings, some insights on the social ideologies yielding them would eventually emerge and might be detected (deliberate or inadvertently) by the lexicographer(s) –or by the dictionary readers–.

There is, however, another ideological dimension playing a more evident and decisive role in the lexicographic activity and which goes beyond the purely semantic social base of any meaning: this one is, in fact, more directly –although not exclusively– related to the text formulated in the definition. Let’s take this time, for example, the first part of the definition of *cholo* offered by Juan de Arona (pseudonym of Pedro Paz Soldán y Unanue (1839-1895), considered the first Peruvian lexicographer) in his *Diccionario de peruanismos. Ensayo filológico* (1883-1884): “*One of the many castes that infest Peru [...]*”. In this specific case, for instance, the description provided to the readers contains, in the usage of the verb *to infest*, traces of a racist approach, which, most probably, stems from a racist ideology according to which there are more and less “constructive” races for each society’s progress. This perspective, however, is not necessarily part of the meaning shared by the speech community whose lexicon is under scrutiny. As a matter of fact, the lexical choices made by Arona in his definition (especially that one of *to infest*) reveal his own ideological perspective, and thus add up an ideological shade that does not necessarily belong to the shared set of knowledge in which the term *cholo* and its meaning were born.

These ideological aspects, then, constitute what Gutiérrez Cuadrado situates in a different, second layer. He affirms, in fact, that this one does not depend “*on general language usage but on the point of view of lexicographers*” (58). It is there, through the expression of those specific ideologies, that lexicographers “*can add up [...] negative or positive connotations that are neither general nor common to the speakers*” (51). This second layer is therefore more directly related to the way in which every meaning (and the set of extralinguistic referents they evoke) is represented in the texts proposed to the readers by lexicographers. It is, in this sense, not strictly based on semantic grounds, but on ideological interpreting devices through which the lexicographer makes her/his way through, to deliver her/his understanding every meaning, introducing, nevertheless (and maybe inadvertently), “*added values*”, in the sense of not totally shared ideologies, perspectives or viewpoints. This ideological “*interference*” might be manifested and also detected in the text we are faced with, and it is thus through an *a posteriori* analysis applied to the different parts of the article (and, among them, the definition, of course) that this second ideological layer can be detected.

This second ideological level might be, nevertheless, avoided, especially to the eyes of the most contemporary “*proactive*” lexicographic practices (*lexicografía proactiva* in Rodríguez Barcia, “*Introducción*”

67), which, every time more aware of the dictionaries' readers, should search, as much as possible, for a set of neutrality standards according to which ideologies exclusively due to the lexicographers perspectives (*i.e.*, not necessarily shared by the most of the speech community whose semantic knowledge is being described) shall be kept out of dictionaries. This thus implies the quest for textual results (both in the definition and the rest of the lexicographic article) capable of evoking the maximum degree of shared, inter-subjective aspects of each meaning. This purpose of providing definitions with considerable levels of neutrality/objectivity is sometimes certainly fuzzy, and difficult to achieve, but it still may be understood as an ideal to be pursued, not to be forgotten amidst the lexicographic activity, so that the description of the meaning to be shown in every lexicographic article portrays the most faithful approach to the knowledge owned by the speech community (Costa León 38). Let's recall here, for instance, the suggestion by Lara (43-44) that a definition with an considerably degree of accuracy for the Spanish word *aspirina* (*aspirin* in English) should preferably align more with (I) than with (II), given its linguistic objectiveness: the contents of the former definition are closer to the meaning mostly shared and held in mind by the members of the different Spanish speech communities, regardless the ideologies and interests of lexicographers when eventually conferring more relevance to purely scientific perspectives than to social aspects equally involved (and maybe even more involved) with the linguistic configuration of the world.

- (I) "substance, generally with the shape of a white pill or tablet, used to mitigate a person's pain or fever" ["sustancia, generalmente en forma de pastilla o comprimido de color blanco, que sirve para aminorar un dolor o disminuir la fiebre de una persona"]. (Lara 44)
- (II) "crystallization of acetylsalicylic acid, with both antipyretic and analgesic properties" ["cristalización de ácido acetil-salicílico, que tiene propiedades antitérmicas y analgésicas"]. (Lara 43-44)

It is therefore this second layer the one the rest of this paper is mainly interested in. The ideologies that the following survey will attempt to recognize and deconstruct within definitions will be, from now on, the ones that can be detected as added up in this second level and, therefore, any textual trace in which a hint of this type of ideological conditioning of the lexicographic work can be detected (for instance, the usage of the verb *to infest* in the Arona's definition of *cholo*) will be terminologically treated, from now on, as an *ideological mark*. It shall still be admitted, nevertheless, that there is a wider and deeper network of ideologies involved in the task of understanding the meanings put under scrutiny in the following pages: it is thus undeniable that a wider world of ideological conditionings could be explored for every part of the lexicographic article, but this research will take advantage of the fact that the ideologies stated as Gutiérrez Cuadrado in the second level are more commonly and concretely tied to concrete lexical choices and textual structures of the definitions and, in consequence, seem to correspond more directly to our interest of bringing together the ideological realm hereby stated and the textual analysis of *genus* and *differentiae* as part of the Aristotelian lexicographic definition.

3. Towards the recognition of the ideology in lexicographic structures: a brief review of preceding studies

Given the interest in the concrete textual spaces in which the presence of a set of ideologies can be detected and the purpose of suggesting a way of establishing ties between this type of metalexigraphic anal-

ysis and the Aristotelian definition's structure, and before proceeding to a practical analytic exercise capable of exploring this paper's principal aim (*i.e.*, the possibility of determining ways in which the Aristotelian definition scheme can effectively host and, at the same time, reveal the expression of ideology), let's consider some preceding work in which the expression of ideology has been attached to concrete textual sections of the lexicographic article, in order to evaluate to what extent this survey's proposal is dependent on and can actually take advantage of previous insights, related to the one pursued hereby. Let's thus list a set of trends in which there have been some attempts to systematically link ideological analyses with lexicographic textual structures. This section finds its need in the fact that, although the already existing literature on the determining role of ideology in dictionary-making is increasing at such a promising pace, the need for a more text-based methodology for the ideological analysis of dictionaries is, to a large extent, still a pending task, a task in which this paper's interest aims in fact to incorporate.

On the basis of the bibliographical research carried out for this study, it shall be considered here that there are, at least, three trends within which to attach the expression of certain ideologies to concrete textual parts of the lexicographic definitions. These consist of different discourse analysis's approaches to the lexicographic definition and, more broadly, the lexicographic article in general; and the difference between lays upon the type or nature of linguistic and conceptual categories involved.

Let's start, then, with the textual analysis carried out by Benson to the 1989's edition of the *Oxford English Dictionary* (OED2). In his study, this author analyses the way in which a number of China-native or China-related words incorporated into the English lexicon and, obviously, the OED2 are treated in the latter; he affirms, on the basis of his findings, that the contents and ideological nuances displayed in the definitions are constrained by the semiotic structures the lexicographers take as points of reference (Benson 177). This implies that an aspect that lies at the bottom of the ideological lexicographic analysis is the either purely linguistic or the encyclopaedic perspective from which the very task of defining departs. It is because of this that he states that "[t]he perspective from which words are predominantly defined becomes the semiotic 'centre' of the dictionary, the central perspective from which knowledge is produced and the world is defined as a world encoded in words and their meanings. [...] It is in this sense that ethnocentrism operates within the semiotic structures of the dictionary itself" (177). The way in which ideologies determine the lexicographic work, therefore, depends, according to Benson, on the type of semiotic approach to the words and linguistic and extralinguistic phenomena.

As a result of this, he goes on to identify "three basic semiotic forms of the dictionary definition that I will call 'synonym', 'genus-differentia' and 'encyclopedic'" (Benson 167). These lexicographic formulae help the analyst detecting different ideological perspectives on the basis of both (i) the information that is presented and considered either necessary or not to be mentioned and (ii) the either lexical or encyclopaedic approach adopted by the lexicographers. For instance, when analysing the OED2's definition for *Boxer* ("A member of a Chinese secret society organized in the late nineteenth century, whose primary aim was to save the Chinese empire (and was consequently anti-dynastic); the movement inspired the attack on foreigners in Peking in 1900"), he says that, by following a 'encyclopedic' approach, and not just keeping a strict 'genus-differentia'

formula, “the *OED2* provides considerably more information than is strictly needed. [...] the dictionary states that the Boxer movement was ‘anti-foreign’ and that ‘the movement inspired the attack on foreigners in Peking in 1900’” (168). The format followed by the definition and the type of lexical or encyclopaedic² semiotic approach adopted by the lexicographers allow thus for the recognition of a group of ideologies taking part of the task of defining.

In relation to the ‘genus-differentia’ definitions reported by Benson he also says the following:

The genus-differentia form of definition is illustrated by *t'ing* [“In China: a small open pavilion, esp. in which one may rest or enjoy the landscape”], where the genus proximum is ‘pavilion’ and the differentia specifica is ‘small open’. The definition of *t'ing* also includes an additional clause (‘esp. in which one may rest or enjoy the landscape’) adding information that is salient but not essential to the differentia specifica. (Benson 167)

All this so far considered it may seem that the *differentia* is not usually, according to the author, responsible for the expression of “unnecessary”, non-neutral ideological viewpoints. We may even take that impression by observing that “[t]he definition of *t'ing* is both lexical and encyclopedic in that it minimally defines the word, but also adds information about the denotatum, which is superfluous to the minimal definition of the word” (167), and which, in the example provided, remains away from the *differentia*’s part of it.

His analysis, nevertheless, additionally includes types of concrete linguistic and conceptual structures in which particular cultural and ideological conditionings can be recognised; and some of them can, as a matter of fact, take part of either the *genus* or the *differentiae*. Therefore, categories such as “substances, plants or animals used as food or as food ingredients” *versus* “directly consumable foods or dishes”, on the one hand, and, on the other, “foods consumed in China, or by Chinese people”, in contrast to “Chinese foods or Chinese dishes” (171), sometimes reveal the distribution of ideologically-marked content either in the *genus* (for instance, substances, plants, animals, dishes but also “Chinese foods”) or the *differentia* (such as “foods consumed in China, or by Chinese people”). These specific structures retrieved from textual analyses set an interesting path for the recognition of textual *loci* where to claim the presence of determined ideological conditionings.

Benson provides us, then, with a first approach in which this survey finds very supportive contributions. The way in which he recognises conceptual elements and clauses which may end up, as a matter of fact, revealing some particular ideology with which the definition must have been built up is doubtlessly useful. His most significant contribution for the interests of this proposal might possibly be the recognition that not only is the detection of ideologies subjected to grammatical and conceptual structures, but, as well, definitory lexicographic formulae and the form in which some ideological claims can be more frequently hosted in some of them than in other. In the framework of the Spanish metalexigraphic studies, nevertheless, another two trends provide us with additional systematic discursive analytical procedures through which ideologies can be verbally detected in dictionaries (and, among them, evidently, in definitions).

² “A definition can be considered ‘lexical’ or ‘encyclopedic’ to the extent that it is concerned with the word or its denotatum”. (Benson 167)

Let’s begin, then, by Forgas Berdet and Herrera Rodrigo’s study on the ideologies they identify in the elaboration of definitions included in the 1992’s edition of the *Diccionario de la lengua española*. Using a vast set of examples retrieved from this dictionary, and on the basis of their understanding of Kerbrat-Orecchioni’s survey on the features and scope of the enunciation (*l’énunciation* in French), the authors propose a classification of word types in which the voice of the lexicographer and her/his own ideology tends to be more visible. Their list is thus composed by the following groups and sub-groups: (i) pronouns and personal verb suffixes, (ii) demonstrative adjectives and pronouns, (iii) possessive adjectives, (iv) temporal adjectives, (v) spatial adjectives, and (vi) *subjetivemes*, understood as discursive units with which the producer of the discourse establishes or recognises her/himself as the evaluative source of a statement (Kerbrat-Orecchioni 93)³. This last group is subdivided in (a) evaluative nouns, (b) evaluative adjectives, (c) evaluative verbs, (d) subjectively-determined adverbs, (e) linking units expressing some value judgement and (f) comparative constructions.

According thus to Forgas Berdet and Herrera Rodrigo, an attentive discourse analysis of the lexicographic text, with some special focus on the aforementioned set of textual spaces in which the ideology of the lexicographers tends to emerge, will probably provide us with fruitful evidence from which further analysis of ideologies and worldviews can be carried out. Let’s consider, for instance, that they detect the adherence to classical Greco-Roman artistic trends on the lexicographers’ perspective when highlighting the dative pronoun “nos” [“us”] inside the following definition of *antiguo* in the 1992’s edition of the *Diccionario de la lengua española*: “Cualquiera de los modelos, principalmente escultóricos, que nos legó el arte griego y romano” [“Any of the models, especially the sculptural ones, that the Greek and Roman art left us”]. The dative pronoun, categorised by them inside (i), reveals the individual or, at least, not totally shared ideology the writer adds up to the definition. Inside the group of (vi) *subjetivemes*, we can similarly detect the presence of (c) an evaluative verb in the same year edition’s definition of *socialismo* which slightly reveal a reactionary, or, at least, cautious, political point of view: “Movimiento político que intenta establecer, con diversos matices, este sistema” [“Political movement that tries to establish, with different shades, this system”].

Although their proposal addresses a similar interest to Benson’s in what regards the search for concrete linguistic constructions with which lexicographers’ ideologies are manifested in definitions, and may even be more systematic and exhaustive, it does not contemplate, at least to the same extent, the combination of reflections on both the different types of definition formulae and the view of the entry in either linguistic or encyclopaedic terms. Their proposal, nevertheless, is doubtlessly useful in the recognition of clauses and structures particularly permeated by the lexicographer’s own ideology.

A third and final preceding contribution to the major purpose of this paper comes from the research done by Rodríguez Barcia (“La realidad relativa”). In her wide study of the role of a set of ideologies present in the dictionary-making by the Real Academia Española since its first dictionary, *Diccionario de Autoridades* (1726-1739), until the 2001’s edition of the *Diccionario de la lengua española*, she takes as a methodological

³ It must be considered, anyway, that the status of *subjetivemes* as discursive units that can be inserted within the programme of Critical Discourse Analysis (another field of interest about to be introduced in the following pages) may still be disputed and subjected to criticism. This is, therefore, an aspect whose discussion we might insist on delving into in further occasions.

stand, in order to analyse the way a set the words related to religious, moral, political and social realities are represented in the dictionaries, to examine that nomenclature in the aforementioned dictionaries on the basis of the following scheme (“La realidad relativa” 30-31):

1. Macrostructure

- 1.1. Preliminary warnings, notes to the reader
- 1.2. Prologue
- 1.3. Lemmatization and entries’ typography

2. Microstructure

- 2.1. Ordering of the meanings
- 2.2. First utterance of the definition
 - 2.2.1. Diastratic and diaphasic usage marks
 - 2.2.2. Semantic shift’s label
- 2.3. Second utterance of the definition
 - 2.3.1. Selection of the hypernym, in the Aristotelian or hypernymic definitions
 - 2.3.2. Semantic restrictions
 - 2.3.3. Involvement of the self-perspective (usage of first person plural possessives, declined verbs in the same person, etc.)
 - 2.3.4. Selection of synonyms and antonyms, in the synonymic and antonymic definitions
 - 2.3.5. Usage of rhetoric resources (comparisons, metaphors...)
 - 2.3.6. Value judgements and added marginal comments
 - 2.3.7. Lexical choices within the definition
- 2.4. Secondary developments of the second utterance of the definition
 - 2.4.1. Selection of tendentious encyclopaedic information
 - 2.4.2. Presence of connotative semes or virtuememes (in Spanish *virtuema*)
- 2.5. Lemma’s textualisations
 - 2.5.1. Authorities selected
 - 2.5.2. Examples selected
 - 2.5.3. Selection and explanation of proverbs.

This matrix has been proposed as “a methodology for the ideological analysis” which pretends to “determine the *common places* within the general scheme of the lexicographic repertoires in which it will be possible to find traces, resources and strategies that reveal certain subjectivity by the writers or that imply a biased vision or a privative hierarchy of reality” (Rodríguez Barcia, “El análisis ideológico” 145-146). We can

therefore say that the matrix through which the author analyses the nomenclatures of her interest (*i.e.*, terms describing religious, moral, political and social realities) is considerably wide and exhaustive and addresses different types of discourse traditions in which ideologies can actually emerge⁴. Let’s contrast, for instance, the type of discourse of 1.2 with the one of 2.2.1; the task of finding ideological conditionings in each of them follows different strategies and specific analytic procedures.

We can say, therefore, that Rodríguez Barcia’s (“La realidad relativa”) proposal can be even considered a part of a wider research programme in the search for the concrete textual emergence of lexicographers’ ideologies in the whole of the dictionary. Along with her admitted commitment to push Forgas Berdet’s (*vid.* Forgas Berdet and Herrera Rodrigo for instance) studies on lexicography and ideology further, she claims for the integration of her research on the emergency of ideologies in concrete textual traces (for instance, the constant intervention of Catholic views on what is good and, furthermore, true, like, for example, in the definition for *hechicería* in the *Diccionario de la lengua española*’s 2001 edition –by highlighting the adjective “supersticioso” inside “Arte supersticioso de hechizar” [“Superticious art of spelling”]⁵–) with the developments done by the different branches of Critical Discourse Analysis:

[...] the lexicographic discourse is susceptible of being put under the scope of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) –or Critical Discourse Studies– given that the dictionary [...] can manifest determined ideologies and, therefore, reveal relations of power and social domination on the basis of the position held by the utterer in relation to the message and to the potential addressees. It is thus evident the importance that lexicographic repertoires have as a type of discourse through which a certain type of worldview and relations of power or thought control [...] can be projected. (Rodríguez Barcia, “El análisis ideológico” 152)

She even proceeds to highlight the efforts through which different studies can be framed within a sub-branch labelled as Critical Lexicographic Discourse Analysis: “[i]f in Critical Discourse Analysis the point of departure is the relations between discourse and society, Critical Lexicographic Discourse Analysis (CLDA) implies, in an analogous fashion, the understanding of the existing relation between lexicographic discourse and society, *i.e.*, between dictionary and society” (“El análisis ideológico” 153). According thus to the author, “CLDA contributes to understand better the relations between discourse and society” (154). Her proposal thus inherits and integrates a number of methodological procedures boosted, among others, by Critical Discourse Analysis.

As already, but briefly, suggested before, it is undeniable that this third proposal has considerably clear coincidences and overlaps with the interest in the evaluative enunciation developed by Forgas Berdet and Herrera Rodrigo; and, just as these authors, displays as well an interest in the definition, as can be seen in 2.3 and 2.4. Let’s consider, then, that Rodríguez Barcia affirms that “[t]he second utterance is nothing but the definition itself, so this part is the most sensitive to the insertion of ideologically marked elements. We can find those elements especially in the marginal and evaluative comments by the writer of the dictionary, and in the lexical choices used for defining” (“La realidad relativa” 32). This means that, despite ideologies may be reflected in

⁴ She also warns, nevertheless, the following: “the analysis methodology is set to adapt to every type of dictionary, although it is evident that it will turn up to be more productive in monolingual, general, synchronic dictionaries, ordered by a semasiological criterion” (“El análisis ideológico” 146)

⁵ Retrieved from Rodríguez Barcia (“El análisis ideológico” 151).

parts of the first utterance, *i.e.*, the one containing the usage marks (“It is [...] representative the absence of the mark *Rel.* (or even *Rel. + cat., jud.*, etc.) in a vast number of definitions belonging to the religious realm and that are taken as known and shared by all the readers, be it like that or not in reality” (Rodríguez Barcia, “El análisis ideológico” 148)), a larger set of ideological marks can be found since the beginning of the second utterance, the one belonging to the definition⁶.

Because of this, she claims, as an example, that a subtle but effective ideologically marked mechanism “would be the selection of the hypernym, which will previously include the entry in a wider category, conditioning thus its meaning from the beginning” (32). An example regarding this issue is provided by her attention drawn to the way in which *activista* is defined in the different editions of the *Diccionario de la lengua española* (“La realidad relativa” 234). For instance, in the 1984’s edition, we can find as a definition for *activista* “Agitador político, miembro que en un grupo o partido interviene activamente en la propaganda o practica la acción directa” [“Political agitator, member of a group or party who is active in propaganda or practices direct action”], where the word *agitador*, when interpreted as an hypernym, reveals a conservative ideology, according to which an activist is immediately conceived within the set of political manipulative figures.

We can thus find in Rodríguez Barcia’s (“La realidad relativa”) proposal to detect ideological claims in the dictionary a typology which turns out to be quite as precise as the one displayed by Forgas Berdet and Herrera Rodrigo; in this sense, it is as text-grounded as the latter, but, in addition to this, shows as well a concrete interest in the ideologised usage of hypernyms, like the one of “agitator” within, *activista*, briefly explored above. With this last concern, Rodríguez Barcia’s (“La realidad relativa”) survey bridges the gap with Benson’s interest for the incorporation of the formal structure of the definition to the ideological analysis and can thus shed light to the purported objective of this paper of identifying the ways in which the Aristotelian scheme of *genus + differentiae* is likely to host and reveal the ideological conditionings of the lexicographers’ interpretation.

From now on, therefore, this paper will assume that, in concordance to what has been suggested by Rodríguez Barcia (“La realidad relativa”), the scrutiny of the lexical choices with which the *genus* is expressed –and the *differentiae*, perhaps, as well– can guide, at least in part, the ideological analysis of lexicographic definitions. The recognition of the concrete lexical choices, and the conceptualisation that lies behind those lexical choices, becomes now, in consequence, a necessary task; and, in order to take this interest through a solid methodology of semantic labels with which to describe the lexicographic descriptions put into scrutiny, this survey will make use from now on of the tools developed by the Natural Semantic Metalanguage (NSM), in order to report the ideological conditionings detected in the *genus* and *differentiae* of lexicographic definitions.

4. The Natural Semantic Metalanguage (NSM) and its role in the constitution of the lexicographic definition

Let’s start this section by recalling one of the main claims of the Natural Semantic Metalanguage’s (NSM) framework: the set of concepts identified as semantic primitives assumes their universal character, in

the sense that they “are expressed in all languages” (Geeraerts 128). NSM applies thus for the universality of a set of concepts, “allegedly active in the language user’s mind any time a words is uttered” (137), both to understand the content involved in the vocabulary of every language and the semantic operations behind them, on the one hand, and, on the other, at the moment of describing that content inside a unitary framework, in which the purported basic primes/concepts are, regardless the language, precise, discrete and uniform (132). This is the reason why the classes and items proposed within NSM might be constantly applied to the semantics of any language, with the variability basically falling upon the lexical forms every language ends up codifying and the semantic operations and the trajectories of combinations that go beyond those universal primitives.

Let’s take, for instance, the concern with which Roberts attempts to define the denonym *German*, or, in general, any denonym:

Germans (*Danes, Russians, etc.*)

- a. many people of one kind
- b. many people of this kind live in a place of one kind at some time
- c. people can say what this place is with the word: *Germany* (*Denmark, Russia, etc.*)
- d. many people of this kind lived in this place for a long time before this time
- e. people can think that these people are like part of this place. (207)

Despite the language-internal variability through which, at the end, English lexically codifies *German* (or any other demonym) and the way in which the conceptual elements end up combining in order to give birth to a particular meaning in a particular language, the semantic descriptive apparatus that is used by NSM to grasp those meanings is firmly set in a reduced and purportedly universal list of classes and items, which is based –by the moment– upon the following list:

substantives: I, YOU, SOMEONE/PERSON, SOMETHING, THING, PEOPLE, BODY

relational substantives: KIND, PART

determiners: THIS, THE SAME, OTHER/ELSE

quantifiers: ONE, TWO, MUCH/MANY, SOME, ALL

evaluators: GOOD, BAD

descriptors: BIG, SMALL

mental/experiential predicates: THINK, KNOW, WANT, FEEL, SEE, HEAR

speech: SAY, WORDS, TRUE

actions, events, movement, contact: DO, HAPPEN, MOVE, TOUCH

location, existence, possession, specification: BE (SOMEWHERE), THERE IS/EXIST, HAVE, BE (SOMEONE/SOMETHING)

life and death: LIVE, DIE

time: WHEN/TIME, NOW, BEFORE, AFTER, A LONG TIME, A SHORT TIME, MOMENT

space: WHERE/PLACE, HERE, ABOVE, BELOW, FAR, NEAR, SIDE, INSIDE

⁶ Like the usage of “supertitious” just recently mentioned for the definition of *hechicería*.

logical concepts: NOT, MAYBE, CAN, BECAUSE, IF

augmentor, intensifier: VERY, MORE

similarity: LIKE. (Geeraerts 128-129)

The value thus of NSM's semantic primes resides upon the fact that, with a reduced set of conceptual elements and the subsequent combination of them, it is attempted to describe a vast number of semantic realities particularly displayed by every language, as, for instance, in the example retrieved from Roberts, in which the task of defining what *demonym* means in English is carried out through the apparatus of NSM.

It shall be said, however, that the ontological universality of the semantic primes may eventually be contested by more cultural-dependant claims on semantics and, more broadly, on the contextual conditionings of knowledge. This is, therefore, an aspect of NSM very likely to face criticism, and, in addition to this, the existence of sceptical objections to the procedural usefulness of the current set of semantic primes must be also taken into consideration: "even with the current set of 60-odd primitives, there are doubts about their universal lexicalization" (Geeraerts 133), for example, with primes such as HAVE, whose existence is eventually contested in Quechua languages (*vid.*, for instance, Myler).

However, despite the degree of scepticism towards the ontological character of NSM's primes and eventual criticism to the fact that "the methodological basis for identifying semantic primitives is not yet as firm as the Natural Semantic Metalanguage approach would have it" (Geeraerts 134), the path offered by NSM's conceptual tools can doubtlessly be seen as a highly valuable contribution in order to understand the categories with which entries are lexicographically defined in dictionaries. Let's take, in this sense, Wierzbicka's suggestion of not solely relying on NSM but to incorporate it, anyway, along with other lexicographic techniques, in the core of lexicographic duties: she is "not suggesting that the Natural Semantic Metalanguage [...] should be used, unaltered, as a lexicographic metalanguage, but only that it can be used as the core of a lexicographic metalanguage" (Wierzbicka 282; footnote 2), and still be complemented by additional (meta) lexicographic descriptive resources. NSM's primes may thus be used in combination with additional (meta) lexicographic verbal devices in order to convey a meaning, in the way in which, for instance, the *Oxford Australian Junior Dictionary* defines *wicked* as "very bad" (reported by Wierzbicka 279), *i.e.*, using, in this case, a minimal set of elements available at the NSM's inventory of primes.

This shows that NSM's primes can be used to build up lexicographic definitions. But it is also worth wondering whether that inventory can be used, at least up to some extent, *a posteriori*, in the analysis of already written and published dictionaries, in order to find traces of those primes (or, at least, paraphrases or approximations to those primes) taking part of definitions. In the case this possibility is feasible, then the research carried out throughout this paper finds a *raison d'être*: although the vast majority of the Spanish lexicography has certainly not been developed following the model of the NSM's description, an *a posteriori* recognition of some traditional textual metalexicographic structures which run parallel to the metalexicographic procedures pursued and suggested by the NSM's *agenda* will be considered hereby as a signal of the possibility of applying the latter's primes in the detection of ideological textual traces, at least to some extent,

in the sense that the notion carried by those primes (either expressed in the same way they are expressed by the NSM or in a similar fashion) may have been leading part of the lexicographic activity, even before the instauration of NSM.

It is, therefore, on the basis of the methodological contributions with which the NSM's primes can offer a descriptive apparatus for an *a posteriori* recognition of ideologically biased textual traces inside the definition that the former will be an important part of the textual analysis to be carried out further. From now on, however, and after all these considerations both at the level of the phenomenon of interest (sections 2 and 3) and on methodological grounds (section 4), the following part of the paper will briefly report some findings retrieved from Spanish dictionaries, with the aim of taking all the aspects discussed so far to the realm of actual data and to finally explore to what extent the Aristotelian definition is capable of hosting and revealing the lexicographer's ideologies and of expressing it through primes somehow present in the lexicographic definitions.

5. A brief exploration of ideologies in *genera* and *differentiae* in a set of Spanish lexicographic definitions

This section of the paper is evidently dedicated to the practical and concrete analytic efforts with which it is pretended to explore whether and to what extent the Aristotelian definition's structure of *genus* + *differentiae* can host and help us detect explicit ideologically-marked utterances (*i.e.*, utterances where the lexicographer's own perspective is recognisable). In order to carry out this activity, a set of lexicographic definitions will be taken into consideration and put under scrutiny, to evaluate to what extent this paper's proposal can be, as a matter of fact, feasible. Before introducing the corresponding analysis, nevertheless, some brief general methodological claims must be offered.

5.1. Methodological and analytical considerations: selection of the data

The first approach with which the survey hereby reported has faced the lexicographic information involved the attentive reading of the definitions of the ten nineteenth century's editions of the *Diccionario de la lengua española* analysed by Rodríguez Barcia ("La realidad relativa" 105-192). The decision of taking this author's selected nomenclature instead of going *ex novo* for the search of ideologically salient definitions directly in the Real Academia Española's sources finds its justification in the fact that, as Rodríguez Barcia's study is concerned with both the emergence of ideology in the dictionary and, in analytic grounds, proposing a "a scheme [...] to systematically analyse the presence of ideological traces within the lexicographic structure" ("La realidad relativa" 30), the set of definition she examines, besides the appropriateness implied for her own research, can provide us, as well, with a considerable amount of data in which this paper's purposes (similar to those of Rodríguez Barcia) can meet and satisfy its own data's needs. This means, therefore, the same group of lexicographic definitions will be used, this time, in order to contribute with wider perspectives to the task of ideology detection in lexicographic production. This does not deny that further research can and, as a matter of fact, shall be done with additional individual lexicographic research. It is expected, nevertheless, that the material already explored by the Spanish scholar can provides us with sufficiently fruitful materials to analyse. In a similar fashion, the time range hereby considered (*i.e.*, the nineteenth-century dictionaries) finds

its justification in the sense that, in order to work with just a sample of the “ideologically marked” definitions examined by Rodríguez Barcia (“La realidad relativa”), a chronological subset has been chosen for this paper⁷.

Following, then, the revision of the nineteenth century’s definitions addressed by Rodríguez Barcia, the 25 with –according to our interpreting criteria– more salient ideological textual traces (or *ideological marks*) attributed to the lexicographers’ own perspectives have been selected and revised; that is to say, the 25 definitions in which the lexicographers’ own worldview, to our analytical criteria, more likely reveals her/his/their individualised intervention, far away from the very statement of contents with a more socially shared status. It must be said that this selection has been carried out without paying special, *a priori* attention to the conceptual domain of the entries, given the fact that the major interest as for the entries’ selection has been the salience of ideological marks in the definitory text, not their conceptual domain. An *a posteriori* recap has lead us to report, however, that fourteen definitions belong to the realm of religion, eight correspond to the domain of social behaviours, two to the realm of politics (*jacobino*, *-a* and *monarquía*) and one to ethnic groups (*gitano*, *-a* ‘gypsy’).

The list of these 25 definitions –and their translation to English– is show below in the table 1, separated according to their conceptual domain and with the information of every definition’s year.

Table 1
Lexicographic definitions analysed for this survey

Entry	Year	Definition
Religious domain		
1	1803	<i>El idólatra, o pagano que no reconoce ni da culto á el verdadero Dios.</i> [The idolater or Pagan that does not recognise nor worship the true God]
2	1803	<i>La figura de alguna falsa deidad á que se da adoracion.</i> [The figurine of some false divinity to whom homage is rendered]
3	1803	<i>La adoracion que se da á los ídolos y falsas divinidades.</i> [Worship offered to idols and false divinities]
4	1803	<i>El que profesa la secta de Mahoma, y lo que pertenece á él, ó á ella.</i> [Someone that professes the cult of Muhammad and whatever related to him/her]
5	1803	<i>La secta y doctrina de los puritanos.</i> [The cult and doctrine of the Puritans]

6	<i>Virgen</i>	1817	<i>Por antonomasia se entiende María Santísima nuestra Señora madre de Dios, que habiendo concebido sin obra de varon, fue VIRGEN antes y despues del parto.</i> [It is understood <i>par excellence</i> Holy Mary our Lady mother of God, who, having conceived without any man, was <i>virgin</i> before and after delivery]
7	<i>Tolerantismo</i>	1832	<i>Opinion de los que creen que debe permitirse en qualquier estado el uso libre de toda creencia religiosa.</i> [Opinion of those who believe that the freedom of every religious belief shall be admitted in any Sate]
8	<i>Ateismo</i>	1837	<i>Opinion impía de los que niegan la existencia de Dios.</i> [Ungodly opinion of the ones that deny the existence of God]
9	<i>Prosélito</i>	1837	<i>El gentil, mahometano, ó sectario convertido á la verdadera religion.</i> [The Pagan, Mohammedan or sectarian converted to the true religion]
10	<i>Redentor, -a</i>	1837	<i>Por excelencia se entiende nuestro Señor Jesucristo, que con su preciosísima sangre redimió á todo el género humano, y le sacó de la esclavitud del demonio.</i> [It is understood <i>par excellence</i> Jesus Christ our Lord, who, with his precious blood redeemed all the Human kind and took him away from the demon’s slavery]
11	<i>Religión</i>	1837	<i>Virtud moral con que adoramos á Dios.</i> [Moral virtue with which we worship God]
12	<i>Jesucristo</i>	1869	<i>Nombre sacrosanto de nuestro Redentor el Hijo de Dios hecho hombre.</i> [Sacrosanct name of our Redeemer the Son of God made man]
13	<i>Religión</i>	1869	<i>Virtud moral que nos mueve y dispone para dar á Dios el culto que le es debido.</i> [Moral virtue that moves and disposes us in order to worship God properly]
14	<i>Dios</i>	1899	<i>Nombre sagrado del Supremo Ser, Criador del universo, que lo conserva y rige por su providencia.</i> [Sacred name of the Supreme Being, Creator of the universe and who conserves and governs it by virtue of his providence]

⁷ It is necessary to recall here that Rodríguez Barcia’s survey (“La realidad relativa”) analyses a definitely wider number of definitions that can be traced back to the eighteenth until the beginnings of the twenty-first century.

Social behaviours and identities		
15	<i>Idolatría</i>	1803 <i>Amor excesivo y desordenado de alguna persona, ó cosa.</i> [Excessive and disordered love for a person or thing]
16	<i>Putá</i>	1817 <i>La muger ruin que hace comercio de su cuerpo.</i> [The evil woman that exploits her body]
17	<i>Ramera</i>	1817 <i>La muger que hace ganancia de su cuerpo, entregada vilmente al público vicio de la sensualidad por el interés.</i> [The woman that makes a profit out of her body, vilely surrendered to the public vice of the sensuality for interest]
18	<i>Castidad</i>	1822 <i>La virtud que se opone á los afectos carnales.</i> [The virtue opposed to the carnal affections]
19	<i>Libertinaje</i>	1832 <i>Desenfreno en las obras ó en las palabras.</i> [Debauchery on the word or the making]
20	<i>Pureza</i>	1837 <i>Castidad, especialmente la virginal.</i> [Chastity, especially the virginal one]
21	<i>Francmasonería</i>	1843 <i>Asociacion clandestina, en que se usan varios símbolos tomados de la albañilería, como la escuadra, niveles etc.</i> [Clandestine association, in which many symbols taken from masonry, such as the angle, the level, etc., are used]
22	<i>Honor</i>	1869 <i>Carácter moral, que resulta del religioso cumplimiento de los deberes impuestos por la sociedad ó la opinión.</i> [Moral attitude resulting from the religious commitment to the duties imposed by the society or the opinion]

Politics

23	<i>Jacobino, -a</i>	1884 <i>Dícese del individuo del partido más demagógico y sanguinario de Francia en tiempo de la Revolución, y de este mismo partido, llamado así á causa de haber celebrado sus reuniones en un convento de dominicanos, á quienes vulgarmente se daba en aquel país el nombre de jacobinos, por la calle de San Jacobo, donde tuvieron en París su primera casa.</i> [It is used to refer to the individual belonging to the most demagogical and sanguinary party from France in times of the Revolution, and from this party, called like this by virtue of having hosted their meetings in a convent of Dominicans, to whom the name of <i>Jacobins</i> was given in that
----	---------------------	---

24	<i>Monarquía</i>	1884 <i>Forma de gobierno en que el poder supremo reside en el príncipe con arreglo á determinadas leyes.</i> [Form of government in which the supreme power resides in the Prince in compliance to some laws]
----	------------------	---

Ethnic groups

25	<i>Gitano, -a</i>	1822 <i>Cierta raza de gentes errantes y sin domicilio fijo, que se cree ser descendientes de los egipcios.</i> [Certain race of wandering people without permanent residence, which is believed to be descendant of the ancient Egyptians]
----	-------------------	--

As part of the procedure of ideological analysis, textual marks more possibly responsible for the expression of a determined ideology (for instance, the usage of “cult” in the definition of *mahometano, -a* in (4) reveals the hegemonically Christian perspective from which the definition was written and according to which Muslim beliefs can be reduced and degraded to the category of a “cult”, given that, for the enunciator of the utterance, Islam may not be the true nor the right religion) have been detected in each definition and consequently classified according to their position either at the *genus*, the *differentia*, or even outside both of them, constituting other type of textual trace⁸. The purpose of this classification is to determine how the ideologically-marked textual evidence of our definitions appears, as a matter of fact, within the space of the Aristotelian formula or outside of it.

Before proceeding now to show and discuss the findings of the data gathering and analysis, it must be finally recalled here that the focus put upon the relation between ideology and language addresses what in the section 2 has been considered as part of a second level in which ideology intertwines with lexicographic definitions. This means that, despite recognising that ideologies, understood as worldviews that yield and make a number of perspectives possible, are responsible of the shared social base of knowledge in which meanings are born (and which would be the first ideological level determining meanings and, in consequence, the lexicographic work of going for those meanings⁹), our focus is set upon a different type of ideological conditioning: not the one determining meaningfulness in general but, more precisely, the added shades that strictly correspond to the lexicographers’ individual perspectives, which do not belong to the common base

⁸ Let’s recall, for instance, that Benson (167) recognises the existence of ‘genus-differentia’ definitions with ideologically marked representations of China’s reality, but also insists on the incorporation of encyclopaedic information that not necessarily falls upon the classification of the *genus* nor the *differentiae*. As a matter of fact, the ideologically highly marked information of “with his precious blood redeemed all the Human kind and took him away from the demon’s slavery” when talking about Jesus Christ as a redeemer and saviour inside the definition for *Redentor, -a* in (10) reveals a Christian providentialist perspective, rooted in the familiarity to the Christian theology, playing a role in the utterance of that information, despite not being a textual mark attached to the *genus + differentiae* scheme.

⁹ We can ultimately consider that the classification of entries according to their conceptual domains may possibly be a way of addressing the first ideological level, although this is an aspect that will not be further explored in this paper.

of linguistic knowledge. It is this type of ideological presence that will be searched for in the lexicographic definitions, in concrete textual structures that reflect those biases. Let's thus conclude this sub-section with Rodríguez Barcia's ("La realidad relativa") observation that "there are two basic types of conditionings deriving from the historical context and which carry ideological implications: on the one hand, the ones that do not belong to the idiosyncrasy of the writer or the writing team and, on the other hand, the ones precisely stemming from that idiosyncrasy of the ones in charge of the work" (278).

5.2. An ideologically-driven analysis of the lexicographic definition: bridging the gap for the scrutiny of the Aristotelian scheme and the NSM's primes

Let's start, then, by presenting a general recount of the survey's analysis in the table 2, so we can therefore go more in depth through some concrete cases and discussions.

Table 2
General recount of the ideological marks detected in the survey's definitions, according to their position in the text and the usage of NSM's semantic primes

Position of the ideological textual marks in the lexicographic definition					Textual marks interpreted as NSM's semantic primes
genus		differentia			
7		16			6
2		6			} Textual marks interpreted as NSM's semantic primes
Possession marks	Experiential predicates	Possession marks	Primary substantives	Evaluators	
2	1	1	2	2	

Prior to detailed explanations and the reference to concrete textual analyses, let's take some time to understand, in general terms, what the Table 2 reports. On the basis of the purpose of detecting "evident" textual traces of the interference of the lexicographers' own ideologies amid the lexicographic definition, the survey carried out on the 25 selected definitions has provided us with 29 ideological marks (stated pages above as the textual loci in which the presence of the lexicographers and their individualised and "ideologised" interpretation of a socially shared meaning can be noticed). Six of them have been detected in a part of the definition that remains outside the classical Aristotelian scheme of *genus + differentiae* (and which usually introduces encyclopaedic information). The remaining 23 marks, considered to be inside the Aristotelian definition's structure, have been identified in such a way that, according to the analysis carried out, seven of them might be classified as manifestation of a *genus*, whereas the remaining 16, the *differentia(e)* or, at least, the nuclear part of it/them. Complementarily to these observations, and guided by the purpose of conducting an *a posteriori* interpretation of those ideological marks on the basis of an approach capable of taking the NSM's semantic primes as useful descriptive labels, an additional attempt has been done in order to classify our ideological marks, whenever it was likely, as manifestations of the conceptual elements constantly categorised

by that framework. As a result of this effort, two *genera* have been recognised as manifestations of NSM's semantic primes and six *differentiae*, as well, as likely manifestations of them.

In this sense, and just as observed from the general recap stated above, textual evidences of concrete ideological conditionings have been detected inside the Aristotelian scheme, both at the *genus* and the section for the *differentiae*, although not exclusively there: the analysis has allowed us discover information such as "vilely surrendered to the public vice of the sensuality for interest" in the definition for *ramera* in (17).

(17) [The woman that makes a profit out of her body], [vilely surrendered to the public vice of the sensuality for interest]

The highlighted fragment reveals an ideologised shade added up to the more strictly Aristotelian scheme constituted by "The woman that makes a profit out of her body". It adds up information which ultimately stems from a moralist set of values, attached here after the comma, on the apparent need of signalling the way in which the *ramera*'s way of doing contravenes essential moral values of the lexicographer's worldview. In this sense, the analysis carried out to the 25 definitions selected for this research has allowed us detect, in the worst of the cases, 6 definitions with ideological marks that, as outsiders to the Aristotelian scheme, reveal the presence of the lexicographer's own ideologies. With regard to this first set of textual marks, it must be also observed, however, that, despite the eventual recognition of semantic primes in some of the lexical pieces that take part of them, it has not been possible to identify primary concepts responsible for the general ideological accent those marks end up adding.

On the other hand, inside the Aristotelian scheme, this research has been able to identify 23 ideological marks. It is interesting to find out that the majority of the ideological marks this analysis has been faced with are kept inside the *genus + differentiae* structure, although we must consider the possibility that the fact of having the most of them within that structure may not necessarily always be the case for every nomenclature subjected to study. It feels, therefore, necessary to develop further research on the presence of textual marks of the lexicographer's own ideology both inside the Aristotelian scheme and outside of it, with the purpose of weighing in, with a larger corpus of evidence, whether the *genus + differentiae* structure is particularly susceptible of hosting that type of content or, on the contrary, ideologically-marked utterances tend to appear more often in other parts/structures of the lexicographic definition.

Regardless these aspects to be further considered and discussed, it must be reported here that, among those 23 textual marks carrying with ideologically salient information within the Aristotelian structure, 7 have been detected as (part of) the *genus*, whereas the remaining 16 are hosted inside the *differentiae* proposed for every term. A noteworthy ideologically marked *genus* that can be recalled here is the one at the definition of *prosélito*:

(9) The Pagan, Mohammedan or sectarian converted to the true religion.

The lexical choices used here as *genera* reveal a Christian-centered perspective, according to which Pagans and Mohammedans are part of the prototypical population groups likely to be converted to the true

religion, which would probably be Christianity. Another reading of that definition also implies that the Mohammedans do not profess a true religion, perception probably emerging from the eyes of a Christian-centered vision which degrades Islam as a false religion, and maybe even a set of heretic beliefs and practices. It is equally interesting to notice, as well, that the *differentia* manifested in (9), “converted to the true religion”, shows, in “the true religion”, another ideological claim.

It is, in fact, through evaluative adjectives like *true* that the lexicographer’s ideologies often appear in definitions’ *differentiae*. Another remarkable case is the one detected in *gentil*, in (1), where the *differentia* is expressed by “that does not recognise nor worship the true God”.

(1) The idolater or Pagan that does not recognise nor worship the true God

That “true God” may possibly be the one of Christians (and maybe just the one of Catholics). This must not overshadow, nevertheless, that ideological claims may also emerge within the *differentia* as nouns, as already observed for *mahometano*, -a, in (4), where “cult” reveals the Christian-centered status of Christianity and the truth value attributed to its epistemology, in contrast to what is said in relation to Islam.

It must be reported here, then, that, as a general trend, ideological marks detected as (part of) the *genus* usually belong to the set of evaluative nouns; *i.e.*, one of the categories proposed by Forgas Berdet and Herrera Rodrigo –in this paper, catalogued as (vi; a)–. Given that most of the entries taken for this survey are lexically categorised as nouns, it is perfectly understandable that the corresponding *genera* end up being, as well, nouns. Attention must be drawn now, however, to the fact, among those seven cases, only two of them can certainly be classified as NSM’s semantic primes. Let’s consider, for instance, the definition for *Virgen*, in (6):

(6) It is understood *par excellence* Holy Mary our Lady mother of God, who, having conceived without any man, was *virgin* before and after delivery.

The inclusion of a possessive such as *our* in “Holy Mary our Lady mother of God” seems to appeal to the resource of a possessive conceptual element hosted within the NSM’s framework.

In a similar fashion, neither are NSM’s primes majoritarian in the ideologically salient *differentiae* detected. Still, it shall be recognised that, as a general trend, that reference to true and false beliefs, in a way that get close enough (although not necessarily the same concept) to the semantic evaluator primes of GOOD and BAD, are recurrent, just like in the example of “true religion” examined in (9) as part of the *prosélito*’s definition. A couple of cases, however, in which a manifestation of the BAD evaluator inside the *differentia* has been detected correspond to the definition of *idolatría* in (15), with “disordered” and *puta* in (16), with “evil”.

(15) Excessive and disordered love for a person or thing

(16) The evil woman that exploits her body.

The reference to religious figures is as well recurrent in the ideological conditioning of *differentiae*, such as, for instance, the unnecessary –and evidently Catholic-dependant– utterance of the “religious” com-

mitment in the definition of *honor*.

(22) Moral attitude resulting from the religious commitment to the duties imposed by the society or the opinion

Sometime those religious (and ideologically marked) references get close enough, as well, to NSM’s primes such as possessives, just like “our” in *Jesucristo*’s definition:

(12) Sacrosanct name of our Redeemer the Son of God¹⁰ made man,

or personal pronouns, like “us” in the following *religión*’s definition:

(13) Moral virtue that moves and disposes us in order to worship God properly.

Let’s finally make a couple of additional observations in this paper’s section. The first one concerns the role of the semiotic approach to the lexicographic definition and every entry and the extent and forms in which this aspect can determine the explicit expression ideologies in the definition. Taking thus the observation by Benson (167) on the continuum between lexical and encyclopaedic definitions as a starting point, it must be mentioned here that the ideologically-marked textual traces that have been detected outside the Aristotelian definition structure (like the ones in (10) and (17), for instance) usually respond to a more encyclopaedic vision, in the sense that they tend to reveal features that less likely may be considered essential for the meaning. It is true, nevertheless, that, despite the undeniable possibility that many of the ideological “interferences” discovered within the *genus* + *differentiae* scheme may also stem from ideological shades exclusively attributed to the lexicographers’ point of view, it is anyway quite evident that the contents added up through “extra-Aristotelian” slots depend on a characterisation of the extralinguistic referent (either physical or merely ethereal) the lexicographers must have thought of.

A final detail that must be also mentioned here is that, although the majority of entries put into scrutiny belong to the conceptual domain of religious practices and notions, a religious-oriented ideology seems to filter even in notions that may be easily conceptualised quite away from religious grounds and religious perspectives. Let’s recall, for instance, the definition of *honor* in (22): there is no semantic need to incorporate to the definitory text the “religious commitment”, and, nevertheless, the lexicographer(s) in charge of that definition reveal, therefore, like that the cognitive bases from which her/his/their own understanding of the term has arisen. The extensively pervasive Christian-based ideology has been, in fact, detected in the four

10 Let’s not dismiss, however, the possibility that, regardless the ideological (either deliberate or unconscious) motivations behind use of a possessive structure –that could certainly be avoided because of its multiple implications–, the whole noun phrase “our Redeemer the Son of God” (*nuestro Redentor el Hijo de Dios* in Spanish) is uttered in concordance with a concrete discourse tradition, according to which religious epithets are highly frequent. We cannot dismiss here, in consequence, the role of discourse traditions as part of the linguistic repertoire displayed at the moment of explaining a meaning in the lexicographic definition, especially considering the following Kabatek’s observation: “[i]t is understood by Discourse Tradition [...] the repetition of a text, text form or a particular way of writing or speaking, which acquires the value of a proper sign (and which can thus become meaningful). It can be formed in relation to any expressive finality or with any element whose content repetition binds utterances with traditions” (159). On the basis of these considerations, we can also identify in the definition for *Virgen* analysed above the discourse tradition of epithets for religious figures taking place in “Holy Mary our Lady mother of God” (*María Santísima nuestra Señora madre de Dios* in the Spanish text).

conceptual domains considered and the corresponding ideological marks have continuously been detected as part of the *differentiae*.

6. Some concluding thoughts

Before taking this paper to an end, some final and general thoughts are hereby considered necessary. Let's begin, then, by reiterating the need, held throughout the article, for a common platform in which both the interest in the formal structures of the lexicographic definition and the ideological dimension of the latter can effectively meet. A wider research agenda, however, is needed, with further studies and the exploration of the ideological intervention in the whole of the dictionary. In this sense, this paper has attempted to draw attention to the possibilities for ideology-expression in the definition and, more concretely, within the Aristotelian structure, structure that has, as a matter of fact, been studied from ideological grounds in the preceding works cited¹¹, despite not being for those scholars their only (nor possibly principal) focus. It has thus been intended with this survey to insist on the results the attention paid to the structuring and materialisation of the *genus + differentiae* scheme from an ideological scope can report.

It must be finally mentioned here, as well, that, although the NSM's semantic primes have somehow been included in some of the preceding proposals, especially Rodríguez Barcia ("La realidad relativa") and, to some extent, in some of the categories stated by Forgas Berdet and Herrera Rodrigo, the fact not all of the ideological marks identified fall into the primes proposed by NSM, show us that broader and combined metalexigraphic analytic procedures and tools need to be taken to the ideological scrutiny. This evidently means that a broader inventory than the one proposed by the NSM's primes is crucial and favourable¹², but, along with this and beyond structural patterns in which ideologies can be identified, a contextualised reading and critical reading of every definition is something that must be always kept in mind, in order to determine if a concrete textual element effectively constitutes an ideology mark or not. The ultimate goal, in this sense, is not to forget, but to insist on the value and need of approximating classical instruments used to describe the lexicographic task, such as, in fact, the Aristotelian definition's structure, to socially-oriented concerns they inevitably take part of.

¹¹ Let's not forget, for instance, Rodríguez Barcia's ("La realidad relativa") suggestion to detect ideological claims in 2.3 (the second utterance of the definition) and 2.4 (the secondary developments of that second utterance), and, more especially, her interest in the "selection of the hypernym, in the Aristotelian or hypernymic definitions" (in 2.3.1), as well as the "involvement of the self-perspective (usage of first person plural possessives, declined verbs in the same person, etc.)" (in 2.3.3), the "value judgements and added marginal comments" (in 2.3.6), the "lexical choices within the definition" (in 2.3.7), the "selection of tendentious encyclopaedic information" (in 2.4.1), and the "the presence of connotative semes or virtuememes" (in 2.4.2).

¹² Although it is simultaneously true that the inventory of semantic primes established within the framework of NSM is, under no circumstances, a closed and untouchable list. As a matter of fact, "[t]he definitional practice of the Natural Semantic Metalanguage framework leaves room for many different basic vocabularies" (Geeraerts 133).

References

- Benson, Phil. *Ethnocentrism and the English Dictionary*. Routledge, 2001.
- Costa León, Piero Renato. *La subjetividad en la definición lexicográfica: un análisis textual de tres vocablos andinos en los diccionarios de la Real Academia Española*. Bachelor of Arts Thesis in Lingüística Hispánica. Lima: Pontificia Universidad Católica del Perú, 2016.
- Dijk, Teun A. Van. *Ideology. A Multidisciplinary Approach*. SAGE Publications, 1998.
- Forgas Berdet, Esther and Herrera Rodrigo, María. "Diccionario y discurso: la emergencia de los fenómenos enunciativos". *Lengua, discurso, texto: I simposio internacional de análisis del discurso*, coordinated by José Jesús de Bustos de Tovar. Visor, 2000, págs. 1035-1048.
- Geeraerts, Dirk. *Theories of Lexical Semantics*. Oxford University Press, 2010.
- Gutiérrez Cuadrado, Juan. "Ideología y lexicografía". *Ideolex. Estudios de lexicografía e ideología*, coordinated by Félix San Vicente; Cecilio Garriga and Hugo E. Lombardini. Polimétrica, 2011, págs. 25-66.
- Kabatek, Johannes. "Tradiciones discursivas y cambio lingüístico". *Lexis*, vol. 29, no. 2, 2005, págs. 151-177.
- Kerbrat-Orecchioni, Catherine. *La enunciación. De la subjetividad en el lenguaje*. Translated by Gladys Anfora and Emma Gregores. Edicjal, 1997.
- Lara, Luis Fernando. *De la definición lexicográfica*. El Colegio de México, 2004.
- Myler, Neil. "Variation in the syntax and semantics of predicative possession in Quechua". In KEOUGH, Megan et al. (editors). *Proceedings of the Workshop on Structure and Constituency in the Languages of the Americas 21*, edited by Megan Keough et al. University of British Columbia Working Papers in Linguistics, 2018, págs. 154-168.
- Roberts, Michael. "The semantics of demonyms in English: *Germans, Queenslanders, and Londoners*". *The Semantic of Nouns*, edited by Ye Zhengdao. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017, págs. 205-220.
- Rodríguez Barcia, Susana. *La realidad relativa: evolución ideológica en el trabajo lexicográfico de la Real Academia Española (1726-2006)*. Universidade de Vigo, Servicio de Publicacións, 2008.
- Rodríguez Barcia, Susana. "El análisis ideológico del discurso lexicográfico: una propuesta metodológica aplicada a diccionarios monolingües del español". *Verba (Anuario Galego de Filoloxía)*, vol. 39, 2012, págs. 135-159.
- Rodríguez Barcia, Susana. *Introducción a la lexicografía*. Síntesis, 2016.
- San Vicente, Félix; Garriga, Cecilio and Lombardini, Hugo E (coordinators). *Ideolex. Estudios de lexicografía e ideología*. Polimétrica, 2011.
- Wierzbicka, Anna. *Semantics. Primes and Universals*. Oxford University Press, 1996.

Fecha de recepción: 12/05/2021

Fecha de aprobación: 16/07/2021



Tinkuy
Boletín de Investigación y Debate
Universidad de Montreal
n° 26 (2021)



TINKUY