

# SOCIOLOGICAL LINGUISTICS IN LENINGRAD: THE INSTITUTE FOR THE COMPARATIVE HISTORY OF THE LITERATURES AND LANGUAGES OF THE WEST AND EAST (ILJAZV) 1921-1933<sup>1</sup>

CRAIG BRANDIST

## Abstract

The Institute for the Comparative History of the Literatures and Languages of the West and East (ILJAZV) was the locus of pathbreaking work in the fields of linguistic and literary studies. The history of the formation, development and closure of the institute is related along with discussion of the most important genetic and functional trends of research carried out. Works of well-known scholars such as members of the Bakhtin Circle are set in their institutional framework, and the importance of institutional research projects is highlighted. The ways in which changing socio-political circumstances affected the institute are also discussed. In a supplement the plan of a book by V.N. Voloshinov is published.

Keywords: *Sociological Linguistics*; *ILJAZV*; *Voloshinov*

The development of linguistic ideas in the early Soviet Union has typically been studied with a focus on the work of specific individuals or ideological trends. Institutional questions are generally raised only when such issues as the restrictions of free inquiry are to be considered, while it is rarely asked whether the institutional structures of the time actually facilitated the work of those individuals. As Christopher Hutton (1999: 37) notes in his excellent

study *Linguistics and the Third Reich*, scholars too often simply assume there is an “organic wholeness, an authenticity of belief, to academic endeavour” and that this is threatened by the incursions of political power. While it is indeed of “considerable sociological interest” to investigate the pressures on academics in the early Soviet period, and light is often thrown on problems of interpretation, “we are in danger of invoking a counter-myth of the ‘normal situation’”. This is the notion of the disinterested professor, free from external pressures who pursues truth without fear or favour”. The result of this myth is that research into the Soviet intellectual scene has been considerably distorted and the exceptionality of certain figures such as Lev Vygotskij (1896-1934) or members of the Bakhtin Circle has been exaggerated. Indeed, there is still no general account of the fascinating and complex history of the institutes which dealt with the social sciences in Moscow and Leningrad in the 1920s and 1930s; this surely represents a curious situation when there is no shortage of histories of the Academy of Sciences or the development of physics in Russia. The current article is a modest step towards rectifying this problem, since it focuses on a single key Leningrad institution, which existed from 1921 until 1933, within which some of the most influential ideas of the Bakhtin Circle were developed and where various approaches coexisted within collective research projects. It will become apparent that the institutional framework was not only, or even chiefly, a restrictive straightjacket limiting the freedom of movement for individual researchers, but rather an enabling structure that stimulated, facilitated and oriented the research itself.

Like all academic researchers, Soviet scholars were not solely motivated by a disinterested search for truth, but were at least partially oriented toward the acquisition and accumulation of what Pierre Bourdieu (1930-2003) calls “symbolic capital”: authority, prestige, recognition, celebrity and the like. What is important for an analysis of intellectual labour in the period is the way in which this capital could be pursued within a specific institutional setting. Throughout most of the 1920s researchers seeking such rewards were compelled to produce works that could validly claim to be more accurate representations of the world than those of their rivals. In short, the institution channelled social competition in such a way that it resulted in epistemic progress. As Bourdieu notes, in the “scientific field”, “the struggle [for symbolic capital] takes place under the control of constitutive norms of the field and solely with the weapons approved within the field. The propositions engaged in this struggle recognise each other tacitly or explicitly as amenable to the test of coherence and the verdict of experiment” (2000: 111). Scientific authority prevailed over statutory authority in determining the distribution of scientific capital. Yet in Soviet Russia relations between the two forms of authority were particularly fraught in the various fields of the social sciences. As a new bureaucratic ruling class crystallised at the end of the 1920s, the existence of discourses claiming truth about the social world

was bound to make symbolic powers feel threatened. The bureaucracy increasingly wanted such discourses regulated and subordinated to the prerequisites of its own reproduction. As is generally the case, this external demand found supporters within the field, offering their ideological services to the dominant powers in the form of expert committees or “scientific ideologies”. Others retreated into a formalism that constituted a gilded cage in which they imprisoned themselves, free to say anything as long as they said nothing about anything essential, or said it in such a form that nothing would escape from the closed circle of the initiated.<sup>2</sup> In any case, the degree of autonomy of the field narrowed, along with the appeal of the various strategies adopted to negotiate scientific and statutory authority. It was changes within the larger socio-political environment that was gradually to shift the relations between the institute and its research activity and ultimately destroyed the institution as a whole.<sup>3</sup>

*The Institute for the Comparative History of the Literatures and Languages of the West and East*

That institution was originally founded as the Aleksandr Veselovskij Institute (*Institut im. A.N. Veselovskogo*), which was organised by the Slavist Nikolaj Deržavin (1877-1953) within Petrograd University in 1921. In 1923 a reorganisation of the institute and a change in its leadership (Deržavin was made director) was marked by a renaming of the institute as the Institute for the Comparative History of the Literatures and Languages of the West and East (*Naučno-issledovatel'skij institut sravnitel'noj istorii literatur i jazykov Zapada i Vostoka*, ILJaZV) and it is under this name that it is best remembered (GARF A-2307/9/231/81).<sup>4</sup> The institute nevertheless changed its name again to the State Institute for Discursive Culture (*Gosudarstvennyj institut rečevoj kul'tury*, GIRK) in 1930. Throughout the institute's existence several influential senior members of staff were in leading positions including the Formalist literary critics Boris Tomaševskij (1890-1957) and Boris Ėjchenbaum (1886-1959), the Romance scholar and senior student of Veselovskij Vladimir Šišmarev (1875-1957), the linguist students of Jan Baudouin de Courtenay (1845-1929), Lev Ščerba (1880-1944) and Lev Jakubinskij (1892-1943), and the literary scholar and Germanist Viktor Žirmunskij (1891-1971). This distinguished and formidable intellectual company in many ways acted as a counterweight to the excesses of a figure who, over the course of the 1920s, became the most influential linguist in Russia, Nikolaj Marr (1864-1934). Marr's influence at ILJaZV grew over the period of its existence, but as Michael Smith (1998: 90) correctly notes, a “balanced curriculum of General Linguistics, Indo-Europeanism and [Marr's] Japhetidology” was maintained. However, Smith's assertion that ILJaZV was

nevertheless a “Marrist” institution (1998: 90), and that as a consequence the Bachtin Circle were simply “clients of Marrism” (1998: 92) is mistaken. Marr even resigned as head of the linguistic section in February 1927 on the grounds that his ideas had inadequate support among members of staff (ARAN SPb 302/2/168/16-16ob). As we shall see, whole areas of study remained beyond the realms of Marr’s frequently fantastic and always one-sidedly genetic approach to language, and despite the occasional convergence with Marrism, it is here the Bachtin Circle’s linguist, Valentin Vološinov (1895-1936), was chiefly engaged.<sup>5</sup>

ILJaZV defined its orientation to be “comparative historical”, a considerably broader and more flexible term than Marr’s adopted term “paleontological”, and this testifies to an approach that was not distinctly Marrist. As the original name of the institution suggests, the original intellectual model was the literary historian Veselovskij (1838-1906), whose comparative-historical studies certainly influenced Marr (Šišmarev 1937; Thomas 1957: 114-116), but were broader as well as much more open and rigorous.<sup>6</sup> This was reflected in the Institute’s structure, which was, however, subject to almost continual revision. In 1923 there were three general sections and four regional sections: 1) The Theory and Methodology of Literature; 2) General Linguistics; 3) Modern and Recent Literatures; 4) The Romano-Germanic World; 5) The Slavic-Greek world and the Near East; 6) The Central-Asian, Indian, and Far Eastern World; 7) The Ancient Irano-Hellenic World (CGALI 288/1/13/10). The breadth of the Institute’s international coverage and the centrality of that internationalism is immediately apparent from this structure, but over time the official adoption of the theory of “socialism in one country” had considerable impact on the structure and projects carried out within the Institute, with the study of the languages and cultures of the various nationalities within the USSR being given a much more central role, and the terms West and East generally reinterpreted to refer to the more and less developed Soviet nations and cultures respectively. In the early stages, however, the institute set itself the task of renewing scientific methods through certain central projects: the description of manuscripts held in major libraries and newly nationalised collections; the composition of a wide range of new dictionaries and bibliographies; the publication of the works of Veselovskij (led by his student Šišmarev); the pursuit of laboratory work (such as Lev Ščerba’s experimental phonetics and Sergej Dobrogaev’s (1873-1952) work on speech disorders) and important textological work such as the study of Lenin’s language and style (led by Jakubinskij; CGALI 288/1/13/10-10ob, 29-29ob). In the field of methodology the rise of sociological approaches that had been systematically discouraged in the Tsarist academy and the dismantling of outdated psychologicistic approaches that had reigned in their stead were apparent, with attention turning away from the *Völker-*

*psychologen* Steinthal and Wundt and towards the works of Marx, Durkheim, Simmel and phenomenology.

In 1925 the institute defined its goals to be “a) the organisation of scientific research into the literatures and languages of the West and East; b) the study, from the scientific point of view, of questions arising from state requirements within the institute’s limits; c) the preparation of scientific workers according to that speciality; d) the popularisation of scientific knowledge within the field” (CGALI 288/1/16/2). The Institute now had only two sections, linguistic (directed by Marr and Jakubinskij) and literary (directed by Deržavin and N.V. Jakovlev (1891-1981); CGALI 288/1/16/ 84), with several subsections, each with its own “collective themes”. Certain members of staff participated in more than one theme across more than one subsection, or even section, and generally pursued their own individual projects within the larger collective projects. Within the General Linguistics subsection, which was directed by Marr, for instance, the collective theme was “The Theoretical and Methodological Study of the Interactions Between Linguistic Units”. These “units” were interpreted very broadly: “national and class languages; ethnic and social dialects; conversational and written languages; the languages of poetic creation; conventional languages; jargon and others”. Within this field individual themes included Marr’s “the evolution of linguistic norms with sociality”; N.V. Jušmanov’s (1896-1946) “Problems of Applied Linguistics” and Boris Larin (1893-1964) and Boris Engel’gardt’s (1887-1942) “Problems and Methods of Semantics” (CGALI 288/1/16/11ob). Larin also had other individual themes connected with other projects such as the aesthetics of language, Indian poetics and general dialectology (CGALI 288/1/16/18-18ob). At this time Nikolaj Marr’s Japhetidological subsection of the linguistic section pursued a collective project on numerical terms and individual projects on specific Caucasian languages, showing the ambivalence in Marr’s thinking at the time between Japhetic as a stage through which all languages pass and a distinct group of Caucasian languages. All this research took place alongside a subsection of Indo-European linguistics, led by Lev Ščerba (1880-1944), with traditional and experimental projects on the syntax and phonetics of specific languages (CGALI 288/1/16/11ob).

In the 1926-1927 academic year several significant structural changes were made, among which was the establishment of a “commission for the study of the national minorities of the south and west of the USSR” and of two laboratories dealing with the physiology of speech (*reč*’), directed by Dobrogaev (with a “circle of linguist-biomechanists”), and the other dealing with public discourse (*reč*’), initially directed by Jakubinskij (GARF A-4655/1/ 275/4-4ob, 103).<sup>7</sup> The former sought “to study experimentally the physiological basis of speech behaviour through the study of healthy and ailing subjects” (CGALI 288/1/39/2ob) while the latter had two groups, one “working with agitators of the VKP(b)”<sup>8</sup> and the “composition of a visual

scheme of discourse and discursive processes”<sup>9</sup> and involving the sound recording and analysis of agitational speech and the other dealing with “the errors of contemporary Russian discourse using materials from *rabkory*, wall-newspapers and the like” (GARF A-4655/1/275/4ob, 22). Two new research fellows were recruited to run the Laboratory of Public Discourse (LPD): Konstantin Sjunnerberg (generally known under the pseudonym Ėrberg (1871-1942)) and Vladimir Kreps (1903-84). The former had collaborated with the poets Aleksandr Blok and Andrej Belyj and the literary scholar Ivanov-Razumnik in the ultimately unsuccessful attempts to set up a Free Philosophical Academy (*Volfila*) under the auspices of the theatrical section (TEO) of Narkompros in 1918 (Zabolockaja 1996; CGA 2551/1/129/11-12) and had worked alongside Jakubinskij in the Institute of the Living Word (*Institut živogo slova*) which was established within the TEO in 1918 (*Zapiski* 1919) and its successors: the State Courses of Agitation and Discursive Techniques (*Goskursy agitacii i tehniki reči*) and the Volodarskij Communist Institute of Agitation (*Institut agitacii im. Volodarskogo*). Kreps was a graduate of the first institute and of the law faculty of Petersburg University and an instructor for the political section of the naval institute before working on the *Goskursy* and succeeding Jakubinskij as Director in 1926 (RGALI 2889/1/197/3). Sjunnerberg also worked at these institutes, as Professor and Dean of the Oratory section (CGAIPD 8720/1/3). The initial aim of the LPD was in accordance with the general early work of the institute: “the definition of terms and the classification of concepts within the field of public discourse” and the “compilation of a bibliography on questions of public discourse in Russian and foreign languages”. However, Kreps made sure that research remained linked to the practical tasks of agitation of the sort pursued in the Agitation Institute of which he was director, and the following year he was made director of the Laboratory when Jakubinskij ceded control to become director of the newly established office of contemporary Russian language (GARF A-4655/1/275/22, 104-105ob).

*The Russian Association of Scientific Research Institutes in the Social Sciences (RANION)*

These reorganisations of ILJaZV were brought about when the institute came under the administrative and budgetary controls of the Russian Association of Scientific Research Institutes in the Social Sciences (*Rossijskaja asociacija naučno-issledovatel'skich institutov obščestvennyh nauk*, RANION), formally in May 1927 but in practice to an increasing extent from 1925. RANION had originally been formed in October 1921 to administer the institutes of history, scientific philosophy, economics, Soviet law, linguistics and the history of literature, archaeology and art studies, and experimental psycho-

logy within Moscow State University (*Moskovskij gosudarstvennyj universitet*, MGU). In 1924, RANION and the institutes it coordinated were separated from the MGU's Social Sciences Faculty and it gradually incorporated several more scientific institutes from Moscow and Leningrad including institutes for the study of the ethnic and national cultures of the east of the USSR, material culture (GAIMK), Marxism, and art scholarship (GACHN). In March 1926 the Presidium of RANION instructed ILJaZV to develop a Marxist seminar for postgraduates, more firmly link its linguistic work with national minorities and literary work with the requirements of practical life (CGALI 288/1/15/49-49b). From May 1927 the institute's production plan and the composition of its governing college had to be approved by RANION. The institute's plan and work had to be reflected in the work of all its sections and members and themes had to have "a scientific-topical character both from the point of view of the theory and methodology of science and from the point of view of the interests of socialist construction" (GARF A-4655/1/94/5-7b). In December 1927 RANION required the structure of the institute be simplified into "a) a language section with a subsection of general linguistics, laboratories of public discourse and the physiology of speech and an office of contemporary Russian language; b) a literary section with a subsection of the methodology of literature and a bibliographical office". Each section's presidium could organise commissions and working groups according to concrete projects (CGALI 288/2/21/16).

The administrative measures taken by RANION did much to transform ILJaZV into an effective research institute, focused on contemporary problems and cutting-edge scientific research. RANION administered grants to further the study of, and develop written forms for, the languages of the former colonies of the Russian Empire, develop methods for teaching foreign languages and to study the social stratification of language while spreading literacy among the masses. The influence can also be seen in the work of other institutes, such as the Institute of Language and Literature (IJLa), where Evgenij Polivanov (1891-1938) led studies into social dialects and the development of Latin alphabets for the national minorities (GARF A-4655/1/324/16), and the Institute of Experimental Psychology in Moscow. Here not only do we find the well-known work of Vygotskij, Aleksandr Luria (1902-1977) and others on development of linguistic capacities in children, but also the pathbreaking empirical sociolinguistic research on the language of army recruits and the social determinants of linguistic taste in the form of I.N. Špil'rejn's (1891-1937) psychotechnics (Špil'rejn et al. 1928 and Špil'rejn 1929; GARF A-4655/1/94/152-3). At ILJaZV three themes were pursued in the work of both sections of the institute: 1) questions of the methodology of language and literature; 2) questions of international and internal-national linguistic and literary exchange on the basis of socio-economic, political and general-cultural interactions of peoples and countries; 3) the study of lan-

guages and the oral creation of the contemporary city, village and national minorities of the USSR and also the mixed peoples of the West and East on the basis of their socio-economic, political and general-cultural development. This had the effect of creating a certain parallelism between the work of each section: study of “the paleontology of speech” found a parallel in the paleontology of literary plots and devices; “the study of the interaction of linguistic units (national and class languages, ethnic and social dialects etc.)” found a parallel in the study of “international literary exchange in connection with the development of peoples and countries found in literary interaction”; the study of the language of the city and countryside, dialects and public discourse, found parallels in the rural and urban folklore and the rise of national literatures (CGALI 288/1/39/1).

The consequence of these reforms was that the general lines of the collective research projects were seen to have linguistic and literary aspects, and this fitted the profiles of many members of staff well. This was particularly true of Žirmunskij and Šišmarev, who worked on German and Romance languages and literatures respectively. Žirmunskij visited Germany for four months in the spring and summer of 1927 to familiarise himself with the latest techniques of collecting dialectological and folkloric material and to pursue archival and library research. His visits to Bonn, Marburg, Freiburg and Berlin gave him much material and he was able to use the experience in leading a project to study the language and culture of German colonies in Ukraine, and on the Volga, and Swedes in the Leningrad region of the USSR (CGALI 288/1/29/83). However, Žirmunskij simultaneously worked on the west European novel, specifically the comparative morphology of the German and English novel (CGALI 288/1/39/73). Šišmarev similarly studied the Moldavian, and remnants of Italian colonists in the south of the USSR while also working on the publication of the works of Veselovskij and studying French literature of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries (CGALI 288/1/39/73, 92). Here the formation of national languages from regional dialects and the rise of national literatures from myth and folklore became aspects of a single problem, and the theoretical conclusions of the study appeared in print in the early 1930s. Perhaps the most advanced version was Žirmunskij’s article ‘The Method of Social Geography (Dialectology and Folklore in the Light of Geographical Research)’, which appeared in the final issue of ILJaZV’s journal *Jazyk i literatura* in 1932. Here the work of French and German linguistic geographers such as Jules Gilliéron (1854-1926), Ferdinand Wrede (1863-1934) and Theodor Frings (1886-1968) were combined with social theory and the sociology of literature and folklore that had been developed at ILJaZV in the 1920s.



*Two Postgraduates: V.N. Vološinov and V.A. Gofman*

In this environment, postgraduate students did not find themselves restricted within compartmentalised disciplines. This can be seen from the careers of two students who enrolled on the institute's programme in the History of Russian Literature on 1st January 1927: Valentin Nikolaevič Vološinov and Viktor Abramovič Gofman (1899-1942) (CGALI 288/2/14/76). Vološinov served as secretary of the subsection of the methodology of literature, which was led by V.A. Desnickij (1878-1958) but worked within the collective theme of the theory of literature led by Šišmarev and Pavel Medvedev (1891-1938), and within that on sociological poetics led by Medvedev and Ieremija Ioffe (1888-1947). Subsequently sociological poetics became Vološinov's individual theme and Ioffe adopted the sociology of style in which he sought to synthesise the achievements of the sociology of art and Germanic formal art scholarship (See Ioffe 1927: 44-79). Vološinov's plan for a book on the sociology of style, which forms an appendix to this article, shows the way in which this drew upon the various other projects being pursued within the institute and how Vološinov's 1926 article on discourse in life and in poetry emerged from that project. It also anticipates what is the most mature output of the project on Sociological Poetics: Medvedev's book *The Formal Method in Literary Scholarship* of 1928. Vološinov's work on the methodology of literary scholarship, when focusing on patterns of reported discourse within a sociological paradigm, led him to produce what is now the best known study of the theory of language to emerge from the institute: *Marxism and the Philosophy of Language: Basic Problems of the Sociological Method in the Study of Language* (1929). The rarely cited subtitle makes the link with the collective project explicit, and comparison of the published (Vološinov 1995) and now translated (Vološinov 2004) drafts of the book with the final version show the passage from a literary to linguistic focus. At the beginning of the 1930s Vološinov was publishing articles on the theory of language alongside those of Jakubinskij, but was nevertheless still involved in literary scholarship, co-editing two planned edited volumes of the institute: *Classics of Aesthetics* (with the Marrist linguist Aleksandr Cholodovič (1906-77)) and *Contemporary Western-European Literary-Aesthetic Theories* (with the Marrist scholars Cholodovič, Izrail' Frank-Kameneckij (1880-1937), Mark Azadovskij (1888-1954) and Ol'ga Frejdenberg (1890-1955) (CGALI 288/1/41), and was speaking on "The Genre and Style of the Artistic Utterance" (ARAN SPb 827/3/93/50).

Much less well known is Gofman's parallel move from literary to linguistic problems. Gofman worked under the supervision of Boris Ėjchenbaum, studying the political poetry of early nineteenth-century Russia (GARF A-4655/2/478/ 13-14) and publishing articles on *skaz* (Gofman 1926) and the fundamental "principles of construction" in which the political se-

mantics and the genres of the political poetry of the epoch of the 1812 war and the Decembrists were discussed (GARF A-4655/2/478/5; Gofman 1929). Gofman nevertheless studied the history of Russian language and general linguistics and pursued a second specialism in the Laboratory of Public Discourse and the Institute of Agitation with Kreps and Sjunnerberg, resulting in papers on 'The Problem of Agitational Oratorical Discourse' and 'The Problem of Socio-Historical Analysis of Oratorical Discourse' at ILJaZV (GARF A-4655/2/478/ 6-8ob). This work continued into the early 1930s (ARAN SPb 302/2/67/19-21ob) resulting in an article in a collection published by the laboratory (1931) and the following year a monograph on the history and theory of oratorical discourse (1932).

Taking the work of Gofman and two members of the Bachtin Circle together, it becomes apparent the extent to which the agenda of that group of thinkers and much of its theoretical approach derived from the projects at ILJaZV. Though ostensibly working on literary matters, both Vološinov and Gofman move to questions of linguistic theory and the historical typology of discourse without entirely abandoning literary analysis or categories. Indeed, in a letter to the Academy of Sciences in October 1929 Jakubinskij noted that Vološinov's work on sociological poetics "unites both fundamental lines of the institute's research: literary and linguistic" (ARAN SPb 302/2/51/23). Both also draw extensively on Jakubinskij's work about dialogic discourse and the genres of public discourse, indeed Gofman's development of monologue and dialogue as analytical categories in his work of 1931 and 1932 anticipates the main lines of Bachtin's own usage in the mid 1930s. Thus Gofman argues that the adoption and use of classical rhetoric in the medieval world had a "monologic" character which became increasingly separated from both the language of the street and truly scientific discourse. This had become especially apparent by the early Renaissance, ultimately leading to the parodies of Rabelais (GARF A-4655/2/478/7). In the contemporary world the bourgeoisie similarly clothes its political and juridical public discourse in the monologic forms of the rhetoric of the classical world to mask its own interests that are distinct from and indeed antagonistic to those of the proletariat. The proletariat gradually learn to counter this through the development of its own orators, dialogising monologic forms and breaking down the boundaries between conversational language, scientific discourse and oratorical speech. One aspect of the social revolution is thus a revolution in the social functions of language, which Gofman skilfully analyses by weaving together studies of classical rhetoric, formalist literary theory, Jakubinskij's analysis of the dialogic functions of language and the empirical studies of oratory and public discourse then being developed in the Laboratory of Public Discourse at ILJaZV. Vološinov, meanwhile, incorporated some of the same sources with the insights of Brentanian psychology found in the work of the Austrian scholars Anton Marty and Karl Bühler.

Both Vološinov and Gofman are still numbered among the paid staff of GIRK as late as January 1932, both having achieved the position of senior researchers (ARAN SPb 827/3/94/45ob).

### *Functional and Genetic Study*

By the late 1920s the study of language at ILJaZV was varied in approach and producing some impressive results that are only now being taken seriously once more. The two main trends might be described as functional and genetic.

The first studied the literary, oratorical, scientific, conversational, juridical and psychological functions of language use within a general sociological framework that, in accordance with Marxist theory, regarded the relations of production as having explanatory primacy. There we find several variants, including Žirmunskij's and Larin's investigations into the varied functions of the national language and social dialects, Jakubinskij's investigations into the dialogic functions of discourse, Kreps's and Ėrberg's analyses of the varied functions of public discourse, Gofman's historical study of the changing functions of oratorical speech and Vološinov's analysis of the dialogic constitution of language and social consciousness. There were many more besides. This trend had roots in Baudouin de Courtenay's work on dialectology and argot, and in the work of Vladimir Dal', whose *Dictionary of the Living Russian Language* (1863-1866) Baudouin had edited. Lenin himself was an admirer of Dal's dictionary and had pressed for a new dictionary of contemporary Russian to be composed, which was taken up by scholars at IJaL, the sister institute of ILJaZV in Moscow (Lenin 1983: 258-259; GARF A-4655/1/324/9). While Baudouin's students were prominent figures at ILJaZV (Ščerba and Jakubinskij being particularly notable), the fact that several figures passed through the Institute of the Living Word made questions of the social functions of oratory central to their considerations. Faced with a new and challenging political environment where the hitherto illiterate and politically voiceless masses were to assume a leading role, and exposed to new linguistic, psychological and sociological ideas, these linguists pursued analyses in which the ancient "*genera dicendi* or *orationis*" could be "reinstated in an expanded horizon" (Bühler 1990: 65).<sup>10</sup>

The genetic trend was dominated by Marr and his now long discredited "New Theory of Language" according to which languages develop independently from a primordial gesture language, through a series of stages, with all languages cross-breeding until a unitary and qualitatively different type of language would be achieved on a global scale. As I have argued elsewhere (Brandist 2005), although Marr's theory was internally contradictory and eclectic, its main features were derived from the central tenets of *Völkerpsychologie*, with each language constituting a manifestation of collective

psychology. In the late 1920s, however, Marr linked his ideas to certain Marxist tenets, arguing that the stages of language development correspond to stages in the development of the forces and relations of production and that since relations of production have explanatory primacy, different classes speak different languages. At ILJaZV this resulted in such research projects as the paleontological analysis of numerical terms and the names of animals in languages that were held to have no familial relationships. It is notable that functional analysis of language use was almost totally alien to Marrism, which not only adopted a one-sidedly genetic analysis, but also focused its attention on the remote past rather than more recent historical periods (Kacnel'son 2001: 807). Marrism undoubtedly represented the leading linguistic trend at ILJaZV, with Marr himself a senior member of the governing college and a figure with significant influence with the Commissariat of Enlightenment. A meeting of the college of ILJaZV in October 1926 appears to have been gripped by something approaching panic when Marr communicated his intention to quit the college due to overwork in a number of institutions. Lev Ščerba, a figure quite hostile to Marrism, suggested approaching Marr with a proposal to reduce his workload, the non-Marrist Šišmarev noted Marr's exit would prove very difficult for the institute (CGALI 299/1/25/ 3-4), and a group of postgraduates prepared a statement noting the loss of Marr placed the institute in a dangerous position ideologically (CGALI 288/1/24/54-55). Fortunately for all concerned Marr withdrew his letter of resignation. Despite Marr's stature, however, non-Marrist linguistics flourished, with functional analysis, social dialectology and experimental phonetics proving particularly fruitful.

### *The Compromised Field*

Relations between scientific and statutory authority within the institute shifted fundamentally during the so-called "Great Break" or "Cultural Revolution" of 1928-1931. The intelligentsia's loyalty to the regime was opened up to serious question following the trial of the Šachty engineers in the spring of 1928 and the dualism between Party and State institutions was reconfigured as "party" positions within the cultural bureaucracy went on the advance. The boundaries and special zones that had existed until then were suddenly undermined (David-Fox 1999: 19).<sup>11</sup> The relationship between *Glavnauka*, the science administration of the Commissariat of Enlightenment, and the institutes that came within its orbit changed abruptly, and institutions like those under the RANION umbrella that involved many non-Marxist researchers came under increased pressure from the Communist Academy. The pressure was significant enough for the president of RANION, M.N. Pokrovskij (1868-1932), to agree to the liquidation of RANION's Institute of

History and to replace it with a new institute under the Communist Academy (Enteen 1976: 105). Proletarian and Party admissions to the institutes were demanded and an orientation of their work towards the immediate goals of industrialisation and collectivisation was required. By the summer of 1929 purge commissions were active throughout the “Soviet apparatus” and were seeking out ideologically hostile elements within the staff and student body of institutes. These activities were intensified when the OGPU became involved in the extensive purges of the Leningrad Academy of Sciences in the autumn of the same year (Levin 1988). At this time two centres of authority emerged within the linguistic section of ILJaZV, corresponding to the genetic and functional trends; one was the Marrist centre and the other the Laboratory of Public Discourse, where Kreps was by now the director. Interestingly, however, the adherents to the different orientations avoided direct competition at ILJaZV and the functional and genetic aspects of language study largely ploughed parallel furrows.

The position of Marrism within the institute was consolidated immediately after the now notorious discussion at the Communist Academy in Moscow in February 1929 when the brilliant Marxist linguist Evgenij Polivanov unsuccessfully challenged the Marrists’ claim that Marrism be recognised as “Marxism in linguistics”. Polivanov, a former student of Baudouin, had little difficulty in exposing the faults of Marr’s work, showing, contra Marr, that there was no direct connection between the concrete shape of a linguistic form and its “social substratum” and did so by adducing proof of similar languages being spoken by peoples at radically different levels of social and economic development. Polivanov had not, however, bargained for the fact that the scientific field was no longer significantly autonomous. The weapons he used, which were those approved by the linguistic field, were no longer as effective as appeals to statutory authority. The session of the Communist Academy was little more than an ideological joust for which Marr’s supporters were prepared, but not Polivanov (Polivanov 1991 [1929]). As Smith notes (1998: 88), the supporters, and then Marr himself, had been deliberately echoing Stalin’s nationality policy, promoting the thesis that the national languages of the Soviet Union were leading the world in a spiralling formula of “convergence and mergence” toward proletarian unity. All languages were locked into the “upward stream of historical time”, and while Marr considered all languages equal, in practice one language, Russian, was more equal than others. As language was supposed to develop through stages, reflecting the levels of economic development and undergoing a continual “crossbreeding”, the Russian language took on a leading role, forging unity and purpose from multiplicity and disorder. Marrism became the linguistic theory of socialism in one country and socialist construction, and a meeting of the presidium of RANION in October 1929 proposed renaming ILJaZV as the “N.Ja. Marr Institute of Discursive Culture” (*Institut rečevoj kul'tury im.*

*N.Ja. Marra*; GARF A-4655/1/278/1ob). Meanwhile, the linguistic section of IJaL, which Polivanov had directed, was made a branch of GIRK (GARF A-4655/1/389/64-8). Marr's authority within the institute was not unlimited, however, and it is clear that the RANION proposal faced some resistance from within the institute, for while the new title was readily accepted, Marr's name was never added. In contacts with RANION Deržavin enthusiastically embraced the new title for the institute, since the comparativist agenda suggested by the name ILJaZV no longer corresponded to the work of the institute as detailed in its most recent production plan, but he insisted this be kept separate from the issue of adopting Marr's name (GARF A-4655/1/129/49-49ob). Furthermore, it is striking the extent to which the same non-Marrist research projects on such issues as social and regional dialectology and the language of the city continued almost unchanged until the Institute closed in 1933 (GARF 827/3/97/62-68).

The next challenge to the dominance of Marrism was launched by the group Jazykfront at the Communist Academy in Moscow in October 1930, featuring the interventions of G.K. Danilov (1896-1937) and T.P. Lomtev (1906-1972) from IJaL who faced V.B. Aptekar' (1899-1937) and other Marrists. The debate soon arrived at GIRK where, Deržavin explained in an "explanatory note", the linguistic sector as a whole adopted a "sharply negative attitude" towards the challenge, and Aptekar's resolution was accepted. Indicative of just how seriously the threat to Marrism was taken in the institute, and the extent to which statutory had usurped scientific authority both within the institute and beyond, is the involvement of a figure of Jakubinskij's stature in the collective ideological assault on Jazykfront entitled *Against Bourgeois Contraband in Linguistics* (Bykovskij 1932). Support for Jazykfront was found among the postgraduates, especially from Jan Loja (1896-1969), who was transferred to another institute as a result, but open support did not spread much further. Both Danilov and Aptekar' spoke at the Laboratory of Public Discourse (ARAN SPb 827/3/93/32), but the policy of the institute had been set. It seems the members of Jazykfront recognised the essential contradiction between Marrism and functional analysis, and Danilov had written a well known book on the questions of oratory and public discourse that was central to the work of the Laboratory (Danilov et al. 1928). The group still held out some hope that Kreps would support their cause as late as May 1934, when they wrote asking for him to write an article on 'Public Discourse' for their journal *Revoljucija i jazyk* (RGALI 288/1/196/15). No such article (or indeed the issue of the journal) was published. Kreps, it seems, was careful not to bring the functional and genetic strands into open conflict and Marr recognised this when recommending Kreps for promotion in 1934: "There is no doubt that in his field Comrade Kreps is the most competent person known to me, understanding, as he does, that research into

the problems of his specialism is not height of theory, unlike that excuse for a 'theorist' of these problems, Danilov" (RGALI 288/1/218/11).

As the demand for the reorientation of scientific activity to serve the immediate demands of industrialisation and collectivisation required a sudden reorientation of research activity, the Laboratory of Public Discourse and its director Kreps, who had joined the Communist Party in 1927,<sup>12</sup> and was also the director of the Communist Institute of Agitation, was particularly well placed to mediate between the institute and RANION. It was therefore Kreps who presented the account of the Institute's activities to the presidium of RANION in 1929, and was singled out for praise for connecting the work of the laboratory with "practical cultural construction and work among the masses" (GARF A-4655/1/278/1). Kreps was shifting the focus of the Laboratory away from general theoretical questions about the categories and history of public discourse that worked in unison with laboratory methods and towards a much narrower focus on techniques of agitation among the masses. This is quite clear if we compare the accounts of the Laboratory's work in 1927-1928 and 1930-1931 respectively. In the first period Kreps and Ėrberg are pursuing quite distinct directions, the former working on "methods of work with agitators of the Communist Party (according to materials from agit-schools)" and "experimental work on the study of mass political speech" while the latter worked on the "establishment of terminology and the classification of concepts in the field of public discourse" (a sense of which can be gleaned from Ėrberg (1929), but the more definitive article 'On the Borders of Oratorical Discourse' remains unpublished (IRLI 474/1/21)) and a monograph on the "theory of oratorical discourse", as well as a series of monographs on the "orators of the revolution", which ranged from Robespierre to Lenin.<sup>13</sup> While the practical work of the laboratory among "agit-schools" and regional Party organisations was significant, the broader theoretical approach was no less prominent (GARF A-4655/1/275/116-116ob). By 1930-31, however, the broader theoretical issues are dwarfed by the practical work, now carried out by two "brigades", one dealing with "methods of oral agitation" and the other with the "history of agitation". The remnants of the previous, theoretically informed work was carried out by the latter "brigade", which pursued a collective project on "proletarian oratorical style" and which featured the work of Gofman (now a Senior Research Fellow) on "Lasalle's oratorical discursive tactics". The first "brigade", led by Kreps himself, pursued the theme of "oral agitation for production" [*pro-izvodstvennaja ustnaja agitacija*] and now significantly overshadowed the second brigade (ARAN SPb 872/3/97/70-71).

The work Kreps directed at GIRK now closely mirrored that of the Institute of Agitation, but "agitation" now meant something quite different to what it had meant for Plechanov and Lenin.<sup>14</sup> In the pre-revolutionary (and immediate postrevolutionary) period agitation had meant the predominantly

oral attempt “to present *a single idea* to the ‘masses’” through the presentation of “a fact that is most glaring and widely known to his audience” and in doing so “to rouse discontent and indignation among the masses” against some “crying injustice”. A more “complete explanation” is left “to the propagandist” who operates primarily through the written word (Lenin 1975 [1902]: 143). Propaganda and agitation were designed as dual aspects of a strategic and tactical discursive intervention in free assemblies (such as trade union meetings, campaign meetings, Soviets etc.) where various perspectives competed to win leadership in specific (generally limited) struggles, and to highlight the nature of that specific struggle as part of a wider socio-political struggle. To do this the agitator had to engage with the minds of those being persuaded, for it is they who, having listened to all sides and made up their minds, were to vote and take the decisions.<sup>15</sup> The audience is therefore involved in a collective learning process called the class struggle in which individuals become conscious of their interests and responsible for their decisions. “Agitation for production” in the Russia of the First Five Year Plan and after was quite different, more closely resembling management techniques in which workers are cajoled into carrying out decisions that have already been made and disciplined if they fail to do so. This was especially true following the campaign to “tighten up labour discipline” which began in January 1929, when the last vestige of workers’ decision-making in enterprises, the so-called “troika”, was abolished in favour of “one man management” (*edinonačalie*) (Reiman 1987: 110-112).<sup>16</sup> With this in mind a look at the course information for the Institute of Agitation for 1931-1932 reads like a remarkably modern series of courses in management techniques and communication studies designed for the civil service and manufacturing industries. The terminology may appear alien to today’s business schools, but there is no mistaking the nature of such disciplines as “The Practice of Agitation and Propaganda in Enterprises” and “Techniques of Mental Labour” (*Institut agitacii* 1931: 13-15) in this context. Intensive work with sound recordings and the methods and techniques of oral delivery along with laboratory work on techniques of persuasion also anticipated today’s systematisation of advertising techniques and “incentivisation”.

### *The End of ILJaZV-GIRK*

At the beginning of the 1930s, therefore, we have an all too recognisable division between applied and academic orientations coming into full view, the former pulling towards vocational training and management courses and the latter struggling to maintain a more universal theoretical perspective. The Marxist orientation on Stalin’s nationality policy and the work of figures like Jakubinskij who participated in the project to forge a new, unitary, Soviet



Russian language show, however, that this was no simple division between theory and practice. What was decisive in tearing the institute apart was the way in which political pressures came to bear on the division. As Stalin gave encouragement to bellicose advocates of proletarian culture to intimidate the intelligentsia and act against his opponents in the Party and government, a situation arose in which an appeal to statutory rather than scientific authority could prove decisive. Kreps understood this well, and at the end of 1930 he sent a letter, signed by a number of senior members of staff,<sup>17</sup> to the Purge Commission (*Komissija RKI po čistke apparata IRK*) that had just begun operating within the institute (ARAN SPb 302/1/48), complaining about weak ideological leadership in the institute and petitioning for the detaching of the literature section and the Marrist subsection of the linguistic section of GIRK and attaching them to the Leningrad branch of the Communist Academy, LOKA. What would remain would be

An institute [that] carries out scientific-research and scientific-practical work in the field of *applied* linguistics, directly serving the requirements of mass-cultural work (work set by Party and social organisations, assisting the practical work of agitators, propagandists, newspaper and magazine workers, worker correspondents [*rabkory*], pedagogues and lecturers, workers of juridical-punitive organs, workers for the restructuring of everyday life etc). (ARAN SPb 827/3/101/1-3)

Deržavin was willing to concede the loss of the literary section but wanted to retain an integral institute of linguistics in which “the problems of theoretical and applied linguistics must occupy an equally dominant place and reinforce each other” (ARAN SPb 827/3/101/4-7ob). The commission decided to transfer the literary section as recommended, repeating the transfer of the literature section of IJaL to the Communist Academy in 1929 (GARF A-4655/1/389/64-8) and to transfer the two laboratories to the Institute of Agitation (ARAN SPb 827/3/101/11-12). However, following appeals and negotiations, including a particularly impressive petition by Žirmunskij to Glavnauka (ARAN SPb 1001/2/112/51-3ob), a rump GIRK survived until the autumn of 1933, incorporating both reduced literary and linguistic sections led by Desnickij and Jakubinskij respectively before being absorbed into the Leningrad Institute of History, Philosophy, Literature and Linguistics (*Leningradskij institut istorii, filosofii, literatury i lingvistiki*, LIFLI) the semi-autonomous linguistic section of which was The Leningrad State Linguistic Institute (*Leningradskij gosudarstvennyj lingvističeskij institut*, LGLI), directed by Jakubinskij (ARAN SPb 302/1/91/45). In August 1937 the literary and linguistic faculties of LIFLI were merged into the philology faculty of Leningrad State University (CGALI 328/1/71/12).

### Conclusion

In the final year of GIRK's independent existence, the continuation of such scientifically valuable projects as research into regional and social dialects was set against work on such narrowly ideological projects as a collection to be called *Against the Theory and Practice of Trotskiism in Language* (*Protiv teorii i praktiki trockizma v jazyke*) which was directly "connected with a letter of Comrade Stalin" (ARAN SPb 827/3/97/82). The relative autonomy of a rump scientific field in one area of linguistics, in which considerable "assets" had been built up, was purchased by its complete collapse in another area of linguistic study. The struggle within the Party came into the Institute and now directly determined positions adopted by researchers.

From 1932 Stalin brought the "Cultural Revolution" to an end, and relative calm settled over the sphere of linguistics, but much damage had been done, much of the intelligentsia had been fragmented and certain avenues of study had been removed from scientific scrutiny and made the realm of narrow dogmatism. Thus, when the linguistic section of GIRK was reorganised as LGLI and absorbed into LIFLI, all the work on social dialects was excluded,<sup>18</sup> with the numerically powerful linguistic faculty divided according to traditionally defined language groups on the one hand and Ščerba's Laboratory of Experimental Phonetics on the other (CGALI 328/1/71/25). The "gilded cage" of formalism along with practical work in language teaching, the compilation of dictionaries and the codification of the national languages of the USSR provided attractive refuges for those unwilling to succumb to the stifling dominance of Marrism in linguistic theory. Marr's Institute of Language and Thought (*Institut jazyka i myšlenija*) was now the only institution able to deal directly with general linguistic questions and in studies of the languages of the USSR this meant the study of the social stratification of Soviet languages could pertain only to the past (Alpatov 2004: 107-111). Here linguistic theory was separated from any viable, applied linguistic practice, and the central feature that had generated such valuable and innovative work at ILJaZV-GIRK was lost for at least another thirty years.

## SUPPLEMENT

The following text is a previously unpublished plan of a book that was found in Vološinov's personal file from his time as a researcher and postgraduate at ILJaZV, and which is held in the St. Petersburg branch of the archive of the Russian Academy of Sciences. It supplements material from a similar file held in another archive which was published in *Dialog Karnaval Chronotop* (2, 1995, pp. 70-99) and translated in Brandist et al. (2004). It is preceded by a similar breakdown of *Frejdizm: kritičeskij očerk* (*Freudianism: A Critical Sketch*, 1927) and a brief account of his pedagogical activity in the 1925-1926 academic year, including two papers on 'The Thematic Structure of Lomonosov's Odes' and 'Puškin's Lenskij as a Parody of Sentimental Romanticism' that he delivered as a junior researcher at seminars. The text is of interest for several reasons. It anticipates work later developed by Medvedev in *Formal'nyj metod v literaturovedenii* (*The Formal Method in Literary Scholarship*, 1928) and Bakhtin in his later work on the novel, as well as Vološinov's own subsequent work on language. It also shows how all these themes were major aspects of the collective project on sociological poetics in which, *inter alia*, the phenomenological concerns of Bakhtin's early aesthetics were reformulated and rendered into discursive terms. In this regard one should note the use of the terms "architectonics", "author" and "hero", which have a different resonance here than in Bakhtin's early work. Also significant is the presence of concerns central to the Marrist projects at ILJaZV, but which do not find subsequent development in the later work of the Bakhtin Circle, such as the peculiarities of aboriginal languages, gestures and metaphors.

Later material held in the same file includes brief communications by Jakubinskij and Desnickij testifying to Vološinov's standing as a particularly talented graduate student, who knows French and German well, and is a mature Marxist.

АРАН (СПб) Ф. 302 Ленинградское отделение центрального института языка и письменности народов СССР (ЛОЦИЯП) оп. 2, ед. хр. 51, Волошинов, В.Н. (1925-1930). Лл. 14-15.

Отчет о работе в исслед. инст. при ун-те за 1925-26 год.

## Опыт социологической поэтики

### I

## Социология формы.

### Глава I. *Обзор современных направлений общего искусствоведения и поэтики в Западной Европе*

Методологический плюрализм. Разрыв теоретических и исторических дисциплин – основные недостатки этих направлений. Переоценка значения материала – формалистический уклон. Переоценка субъективного психологического момента.

### Глава II. *Современное состояние поэтики в СССР*

Критика психологической ориентации поэтики (Потебня и его школа). Критика лингвистической ориентации (разновидностей формального метода). Критика историко-культурного метода (эпигонов Веселовского). Критика воззрений проф. Сакулина.

### Глава III. *Слово в жизни*

Действительное жизненное высказывание, как конкретное социально-историческое явление. Языковое явление, как лингвистическая абстракция. Необходимость применения социальных и исторических категорий для понимания формальных сторон действительного высказывания. Внесловесная среда и ситуация высказывания определяют его форму и значение.

### Глава IV. *Анализ высказывания*

Несловесная (“подразумеваемая”) часть высказывания. Единый социальный кругозор высказывания. Пространственный, временной и ценностный компоненты этого кругозора. Высказывание, как продукт социального взаимодействия говорящих на основе общего кругозора. “Автор” высказывания; “соавторство” собеседника-слушателя, постановка “героя”.

## Глава V. Слово, как социальная оценка

Понятие экспрессивной интонации. Интонация и оценка. Интонационная и жестикуляционная метафоры. Вторичность семантической метафоры. Интонационная метафора и миф. Социальная атмосфера метафоры. Слово, как социальная оценка. Конденсация оценки художественно-формальной стороны высказывания.

## Глава VI. Отражение социального кругозора в формах языка и в структуре образа

Отражение социальных отношений между говорящими в морфологии и синтаксисе примитивных языков и исключительные формы множественного числа в австралийских языках. Разные значения слов “мы”, “другой” и проч. и их языковые отражения. Различные формы оптативных и императивных форм. Социальное положение говорящего и ранг слушающего определяют выбор конструкции. Образ и его социальная ориентация. Образ, как оживление или обновление социальной оценки в слове.

## Глава VII. Понятие стиля

Стиль, как совокупность словесных оценок. Социологический анализ основных мотивов стиля. Отражение социальной иерархии в ее статике и динамике — в лексике, в эпитетологии, в семантических сдвигах (метафорических, метонимических и др.). Единство стиля, как единство и выдержанность социальной оценочной позиции говорящего.

## Глава VIII. Социология жанра

Классификация жанровых форм с точки зрения постановки основных участников события творчества — автора, слушателя, героя. Материально-технические и социологические факторы жанра. Степень широты социального кругозора, определяющего жанр. Большие и малые (“камерные”) жанры. Степень широты социального кругозора и их отражение в структуре жанра. Архитектоника жанра и социально-политическая архитектоника. Эволюция поэтического жанра с XVII по XX века. Эволюция романа в XVII и XIX в. Эволюция лирических жанров.

## Глава IX. Итоги социологического анализа формы

Художественная форма, как система социальных оценок. Формообразующие и не образующие формы социальные оценки. Техника формы, обусловленная природой лингвистического материала. Гомологические

факторы формы (ритм). Проблема взаимоотношения формы и содержания. Форма, как оценка содержания. Социологические методы анализа содержания.

Глава X. *Классовый характер формообразующих оценок*

Формообразующая оценка, как константная существенная оценка. Случайные группировки не обладают художественно-творческими силами. Поверхностный и отвлеченный характер всех межклассовых и неклассовых оценок. “Национальное” искусство и классовое искусство.

ARAN (SPb) f. 302, Leningradskoe otделение central'nogo instituta jazyka i pis'mennosti narodov SSSR (LOCIIaP), op.1, ed. chr.51, V.N. Vološinov (1925-1930), ll. 14-15

Report on Work in the University Research Institute 1925-1926<sup>19</sup>

## An Essay in Sociological Poetics

### I

#### The Sociology of Style

##### Chapter I. *Survey of Contemporary Trends in General Art Scholarship and Poetics in Western Europe*

Methodological pluralism. The separation of theoretical and historical disciplines – fundamental shortcomings of these trends. Re-evaluation of the significance of material – formalist bias. Re-evaluation of the subjective psychological moment.

##### Chapter II. *The Contemporary State of Poetics in the USSR*

Critique of the psychological orientation in poetics (Potebnja and his school). Critique of the linguistic orientation (of varieties of the formal method). Critique of the historico-cultural method (the epigones of Veselovskij). Critique of the views of Prof. Sakulin.

##### Chapter III. *The Word in Life*

The actual utterance in life as a concrete socio-historical phenomenon. The language phenomenon as a linguistic abstraction. The necessity of applying social and historical categories in order to understand the formal aspects of the actual utterance. The extra-discursive environment and situation of the utterance determine its form and significance.

##### Chapter IV. *Analysis of the Utterance*

The non-verbal (“implicit”) part of the utterance. The unitary social purview of the utterance. The spatial, temporal and axiological components of this purview. The utterance as a product of the social interaction of speakers on the basis of a common purview. The “author” of the utterance; “co-authoring” by the interlocutor-listener, positing the “hero”.

### Chapter V. *The Word as Social Evaluation*

The concept of expressive intonation. Intonation and evaluation. Intonational and gesticulatory metaphors. The secondary status of the semantic metaphor. Intonational metaphor and myth. The social atmosphere of metaphor. The word as social evaluation. The condensation of evaluations in the artistic-formal aspect of the utterance.

### Chapter VI. *The Reflection of Social Purview in the Forms of Language and in the Structure of the Image*

The reflection of social relations between speakers in the morphology and syntax of primitive languages and the exceptional forms of the plural in Australian languages. The different meanings of the words “we”, “other” and so on, and their reflection in language. Different forms of optative and imperative forms. The social position of the speaker and the rank of the listener determine the choice of construction. The image and its social orientation. The image as animation or renovation of social evaluation in the word.

### Chapter VII. *The Concept of Style*

Style as aggregate of verbal evaluations. Sociological analysis of the fundamental motifs of style. The reflection of social hierarchy in the stasis and dynamics of that hierarchy – in lexis, in epithetology, in semantic shifts (metaphorical, metonymical and others). Unity of style as unity and consistency of the speaker’s social evaluative position.

### Chapter VIII. *Sociology of Genre*

Classification of generic form from the point of view of positing the fundamental participants in the event of creation – author, listener, hero. Material-technical and sociological factors of genre. The breadth of the social purview determining genre. Major and minor (“chamber”) genres. Breadth of social purview and its reflection in the structure of a genre. The architectonics of genre and socio-political architectonics. The evolution of poetic genre from the seventeenth to the twentieth century. The evolution of the novel in the seventeenth and nineteenth centuries. The evolution of lyric genres.

### Chapter IX. *Summing Up Sociological Analysis of Form*

Artistic form as a system of social evaluations. Forms of social evaluation that do and do not shape form. The technique of form conditioned by the nature of the linguistic material. The homological factors of form (rhythm).



The problem of the interrelationship of form and content. Form as evaluation of content. Sociological methods of analysis of content.

#### Chapter X. *The Class Character of Form-Shaping Evaluations*

Form-shaping evaluation as a constant, fundamental evaluation. Accidental groupings do not possess artistic-creative powers. The superficial and abstract character of all inter-class and non-class evaluations. "National" art and class art.

---

#### NOTES

- <sup>1</sup> This article was written as part of the project *The Rise of Sociological Linguistics in the Soviet Union, 1917–1938: Institutions, Ideas and Agendas*, funded by the British Arts and Humanities Research Council, and based in the Bakhtin Centre and Department of Russian and Slavonic Studies at the University of Sheffield, U.K.
- <sup>2</sup> On the principles being invoked here see Bourdieu (1981).
- <sup>3</sup> On the general structure of higher education in the years in question and how what, following Bourdieu, I am calling the "scientific field" existed as a protected zone, see David-Fox (1997).
- <sup>4</sup> The account of the institute's activities for 1922–1923 names the director of the institute as D.K. Petrov deputising for N.Ja. Marr who was abroad (GARF A-2307/9/231/38).
- <sup>5</sup> On the complex relation between Vološinov and Marrism see Lähtenmäki and Vasil'ev (2005).
- <sup>6</sup> This goes some way towards explaining the relative productivity of the work of literary scholars who worked within the Marrist paradigm such as Izrail' Frank-Kameneckij and Ol'ga Frejdenberg. On the complex relationship between Frejdenberg and Marrism see Moss (1994).
- <sup>7</sup> Detailed information about the work of the laboratory is held in Dobrogaev's personal archive (ARAN SPb 829/2/9: 829/2/10).
- <sup>8</sup> The All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks).
- <sup>9</sup> This was never published, however work was completed and a copy is held in Sjunnerberg's personal archive (IRLI f.474/d.19/l.l. 95, 131, 132).
- <sup>10</sup> The link with classical oratory was particularly stressed by the classicist and champion of the "third Renaissance" movement Faddej Zelinskij, who stressed the link between the tasks of the Institute of the Living Word and the classical tradition in his speech at the opening of the institute (*Zapiski* 1919: 6–9) and subsequently (Zelinskij 1922). By the time this is elaborated upon by

- 
- scholars at ILJaZV, however, Aristotelian rhetoric had been combined with two contemporary forms of Aristotelianism, the phenomenology of linguistic acts (of which Bühler was a prominent and influential representative) and Marxism. On the former see Smith (1994) and on the latter see McCarthy (1992).
- 11 On the wider implications of the Šachty trial and its place in the transformation of relations between the working class and the bureaucracy at this time see Reiman (1987). On its reverberations within the RANION Institute of History see Enteen (1976).
- 12 Archival documents show that Kreps volunteered for the Red Army at the age of 17 in 1920, conducted Komsomol and Party tasks from this time, joined the Komsomol in 1922 and became a candidate for party membership in 1925 (RGALI 2889/1/197/3).
- 13 An early example of such work is Deržavin (1927), though the study goes back to the early studies of Lenin's language by Jakubinskij and others.
- 14 The theoretical shift in the use of the term "agitation" occurred in a resolution on agitation and propaganda at the 13th Party Congress in 1924 (*KPSS* 1984: 261-263), and was seen to coincide with the new functions of the Party resulting from the "Lenin Levy", on the significance of which see Carr (1970: 193-246).
- 15 While the initial distinction between agitation and propaganda was developed by Plechanov, the notion of agitation was most fully developed in a pamphlet by Jewish socialists in Poland *On Agitation (Ob agitacii)* before being taken up by Lenin in the 1902 book *What Is To Be Done?* On this see Cliff (1986: 45-50).
- 16 It is notable that "one-man management" was also introduced into GIRK in 1931, when the ruling collegium was abolished (ARAN SPb 827/3/97/79).
- 17 It is not clear who signed this letter, but Deržavin was confident that it included Jakubinskij, who had been the first director of the Institute of Agitation (ARAN SPb 827/3/101/4).
- 18 Although Žirmunskij (1936) still published a major book on the question in the mid 1930s, this was possible only because it dealt primarily with Germanic material and did not pursue the question of the class stratification of language in the USSR.
- 19 Translated by Craig Brandist, with thanks to David Shepherd for his assistance.

## LITERATURE

- Alpatov, V.M.  
 2004 *Istorija odnogo mifa: Marr i marrizm*, second edition. Moskva.

- 
- Bourdieu, Pierre  
 1981 'The Specificity of the Scientific Field'. Charles C. Lemert (Ed.), *French Sociology: Rupture and Renewal Since 1968*. New York, 255-292.  
 2000 *Pascalian Meditations* (Trans. Richard Nice). Stanford.
- Brandist, C.  
 2005 'Le marrisme et l'héritage de la Völkerpsychologie dans la linguistique soviétique'. *Cahiers de L'ILSL*, 20, 39-56.
- Brandist, Craig, et al. (Eds.)  
 2004 *The Bakhtin Circle: In the Master's Absence*. Manchester, 223-250.
- Bühler, Karl  
 1990 [1934] *Theory of Language: The Representational Function of Language* (Trans. D.F. Goodwin). Amsterdam.
- Bykovskij, S.N.  
 1932 *Protiv buržuaznoj kontrabandy v jazykoznanii*. Leningrad.
- Carr, E.H.  
 1970 *Socialism in One Country 1924-1926*, Vol. 2, Harmondsworth.
- Cliff, Tony  
 1986 *Lenin: Building the Party 1893-1914*. London.
- Danilov, G.K., et al.  
 1928 *Technika oratorskoj reči*. Moskva.
- David-Fox, M.  
 1997 *Revolution of the Mind: Higher Learning Among the Bolsheviks, 1918-1929*. Ithaca and London.  
 1999 'What Is Cultural Revolution?'. *Russian Review*, 58 (2), 181-201.
- Deržavin, Konstantin  
 1927 'Bor'ba klassov i partii v jazyke Velikoj Francuzskoj Revoljucii'. *Jazyk i literatura*, II (1), 1-62.
- Enteen, George M.  
 1976 'Marxists versus Non-Marxists: Soviet Historiography in the 1920s'. *Slavic Review*, 35 (1), 91-110.
- Ėrberg, Konstantin  
 1929 'O formach rečevoj komunikacii (k voprosu o jazykovych funkcijach)'. *Jazyk i literatura*, III, 156-179.
- Gofman, V.A.  
 1926 'Fol'klornyj skaz Dalja'. B.M. Ėjchenbaum (Ed.), *Russkaja proza*. Leningrad, 232-261.  
 1929 'Ryleev – poet'. B.M. Ėjchenbaum and Ju.N. Tynjanov (Eds.), *Russkaja poëzija XIX veka*. Leningrad, 1-73.  
 1931 'Analiz oratorskich obrazcov'. V.M. Kreps and K.A. Ėrberg (Eds.), *Praktika oratorskoj reči*. Leningrad, 98-126.  
 1932 *Slovo oratora ( ritorika i politika)*. Leningrad.  
 1936 *Jazyk literatury*. Leningrad.

- 
- Hutton, Christopher  
1999 *Linguistics and the Third Reich: Mother-Tongue Fascism, Race, and the Science of Language*. London, New York.
- Ioffe, I.I.  
1927 *Kul'tura i stil': Sistema i principy sociologii iskusstv*. Leningrad.
- Kacnel'son, S.D.  
2001 'Istorija tipologičeskich učenij'. *Kategorii jazyka i myšlenija: iz naučnogo nasledija*. Moskva, 757-815.
- KPSS  
1984 *KPSS v rezoljucijach i rešenijach s"ezdov, konferencij, plenumov CK*, tom 3, 1922-25. Moskva.
- Lähtenmäki, M., Vasil'ev, N.L.  
2005 'Recepcija "novogo učenija o jazyke" N.Ja. Marra v rabotach V.N. Vološinova: iskrennost' ili kon"junktura?'. *Russian Linguistics*, 29 (1), 71-94.
- Lenin V.I.  
1975 'What is To Be Done?'. *Selected Works in Three Volumes*, Vol. 1. Moskva, 92-241.  
1983 *Lenin on Language*. Moskva.
- Levin, Aleksey E.,  
1988 'Expedient Catastrophe: A Reconsideration of the 1929 Crisis at the Soviet Academy of Science'. *Slavic Review*, 47 (2), 261-279.
- McCarthy, George E. (Ed.)  
1992 *Marx and Aristotle: Nineteenth-Century German Social Theory and Classical Antiquity*, Savage, Md.
- Medvedev, P.N.  
1928 *Formal'nyj metod v literaturovedenii: kritičeskoe vvedenie v sociologičeskiju poëtiku*. Leningrad.
- Moss, K.  
1994 'Byla li Ol'ga Frejdenberg Marristkoj?'. *Voprosy jazykoznanija*, 5, 98-106.
- Polivanov, E.D.  
1991 [1929] 'Iz materialov "Polivanovskoj" diskussii v kommunističeskoj akademii. Fevral', 1929 g. Archivnaja publikacija'. *Trudy po vostočnomu i obščemu jazykoznaniju*. Moskva, 508-586.
- Reiman, Michal  
1987 *The Birth of Stalinism: The USSR on the Eve of the 'Second Revolution'* (Trans. George Sanders). London.
- Šišmarev, V.F.  
1937 'N.Ja. Marr i A.N. Veselovskij'. *Jazyk i myšlenie*, VIII, 321-343.
- Smith, Barry  
1994 *Austrian Philosophy: The Legacy of Franz Brentano*, Chicago.
- Smith, Michael  
1998 *Language and Power in the Creation of the USSR 1917-1953*. Berlin and New York.

- 
- Špil'rejn, I.N.  
1929 'O peremene imen i familij'. *Psichotechnika i psihologija truda*, 4, 281-286.
- Špil'rejn, I.N., Rejtnynbarg, D.I., Neckij, G.O.  
1928 *Jazyk krasnoarmejsca: opyt issledovanija slovarja krasnoarmejsca moskovskogo garnizona*. Moskva.
- Thomas, L.  
1957 *The Linguistic Theories of N.Ia. Marr*. Berkeley and Los Angeles.
- Vološinov, V.N.  
1995 'Ličnoe delo V.N. Vološinova'. *Dialog. Karnaval. Chronotop*, 2, 70-99.  
2004 'Archival Materials'. Craig Brandist et al. (Eds.), *The Bakhtin Circle: In the Master's Absence*, Manchester, 223-250.
- Zabolockaja, A.E.  
1996 'Konst. Ėrberg v naučno-teoretičeskoj sekcii TEO Narkomprosa (1918-1919)'. *Minuvšee*, 20. Moskva-Sankt-Peterburg, 389-403.
- Zapiski*  
1919 *Zapiski instituta živogo slova*, 1. Petrograd.
- Zelinskij, F.F.  
1922 'Značenie oratorskogo iskusstva'. Konstantin Ėrberg (Ed.), *Iskusstvo i narod*. Petrograd, 169-176.
- Žirmunskij, V.M.  
1932 'Metodika social'noj geografii (dialektologija i fol'klor v svete geografičeskogo issledovanija)'. *Jazyk i literatura*, 8, 83-117.

## ARCHIVAL SOURCES

(References to fond/opis'/delo/list)

ARAN SPb: Archiv rossijskoj akademii nauk (St. Petersburg):

- f. 302 Leningradskoe otdelenie central'nogo instituta jazyka i pis'mennosti narodov SSSR (LOCIJaP);
- f. 829 S.M. Dobrogaev;
- f. 872 N.F. Deržavin;
- f. 1001 V.M. Žirmunskij.

GARF: Gosudarstvennyj archiv rossijskoj federacii (Moscow):

- f. A-2307 Glavnauka Narkomprosa;
- f. A-4655 Rossijskaja asociacija naučno-issledovatel'skich institutov obščestvennyh nauk.

IRLI: Institut ruskoj literatury (Puškinskij dom), (St. Petersburg):

- f. 474 K.A. Sjunnerberg (Ėrberg).

---

RGALI: Rossijskij gosudarstvennyj archiv literatury i iskusstv (Moscow):  
f. 2889 V.M. Kreps.

CGAIPD: Central'nyj gosudarstvennyj archiv istoriko-političeskich dokumentov (St. Petersburg):  
f. 8720 Institut agitacii im. Volodarskogo.

CGALI: Central'nyj gosudarstvennyj archiv literatury i iskusstv (St. Petersburg):  
f. 288 Naučno-issledovatel'skij institut sravnitel'noj istorii literatur i jazykov  
Zapada i Vostoka;  
f. 328 Leningradskij institut istorii, filosofii, literatury i lingvistiki.