Language Sciences 70 (2018) 26–36

Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

Language Sciences

journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/locate/langsci

Marxism, early Soviet sociolinguistics, and Gramsci's linguistic ideas

Alessandro Carlucci

Pembroke College, University of Oxford, St Aldate's, Oxford, OX11DW, UK

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:
Available online 15 June 2018

Keywords:
Gramsci
Marx
Multilingualism
Language contact and change
Language policy
History of linguistic ideas

ABSTRACT

In the last few decades, the relationship between linguistics and Marxism has given rise to an important debate among experts on the Italian political thinker and leader Antonio Gramsci (1891–1937). The paper summarises this debate in connection with recent research on Gramsci's intellectual biography, starting from his university training in historical linguistics as well as other sources for his early views on language (Section 2). Section 3 focuses on his subsequent encounter with sociological and applied linguistics in revolutionary Russia, where Marx was an oft-cited author. This historical review sets the ground for a reappraisal of Gramsci's Prison Notebooks, written during the last part of his life (Section 4), and of their contribution to the language sciences – which, I argue, is better understood if we reject the idea of a contrast between Gramsci's Marxism and his linguistic ideas (Section 5). Finally, a brief concluding section recapitulates the various aspects discussed, especially the role of Marxist and non-Marxist sources in shaping Gramsci's views and relevance to today's linguists.

1. Introduction

The international influence of Antonio Gramsci's ideas has continued to grow since the fall of the Berlin Wall and the collapse of the Soviet Union, in a way which finds very few parallels in the posthumous fortune of other Marxists – except perhaps for Karl Marx himself. In fact, it is not unreasonable to say that Gramsci's intellectual legacy is more influential today than it was thirty years ago, when his name was still strongly associated with the party he had helped to found – the Italian Communist Party – and with the European left more broadly. According to the online *Gramsci Bibliography*, more than 10,000 publications on Gramsci have appeared worldwide since 1989, including new editions and translations of his writings.[1] This figure corresponds to almost half of all the works published on Gramsci since 1922 (the total number now exceeding 20,000) and, statistically speaking, it means that since the fall of the Berlin Wall a new publication on or by Gramsci has appeared daily somewhere in the world. His influence ranges from literary criticism to the social sciences, from international relations to cultural studies, not to mention disciplinary fields where his legacy has traditionally played

E-mail address: alessandro.carlucci@mod-langs.ox.ac.uk.
URL: http://www.mod-langs.ox.ac.uk/carlucci, http://www.pmb.ox.ac.uk/fellows-staff/profiles/dr-alessandro-carlucci

[1] See *Bibliografia Gramsciana on line*. Ed. by Cammett, J.M., Giasi, F., Righi, M.L. (http://www.fondazionegramsci.org/bibliografia-gramsciana, last accessed 20/11/17).

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.langsci.2018.05.004
0388-0001/

a central role, such as political theory, philosophy and historiography. Although never entirely confined to left-wingers, appreciation for Gramsci's ideas has in recent years been expressed with increasing frequency by commentators and politicians on the right, too.[2]

In the fifth section of this article, I shall return to Gramsci's (more limited) influence on research in language and communication. Before we can appraise the contemporary relevance of Gramsci's ideas, it is essential to have a clear understanding of his ideas, and of their place within the Marxist tradition, based on biographical and philological evidence which has become fully available only in recent years. In this article, I endeavour to facilitate this understanding by discussing Franco Lo Piparo's ground-breaking book (Lo Piparo, 1979) and subsequent contributions on Gramsci's linguistic reflections, in the light of new material published in the decade 2007–2017. Lo Piparo's thesis revolves around two key points (see also Lo Piparo, 2010b). The first point is that Gramsci's 'reflections on language [*linguaggio*] and his linguistic culture were the generative mechanism of his originality and what renders him radically different from other Marxists' (Lo Piparo, 2010a [1987], p. 23). The second point is that Gramsci's lifelong interest in language was in contrast with his Marxist philosophical orientations and communist militancy. Gramsci's decisive sources of inspiration were 'Ascoli, Bartoli, Gilliéron, Meillet, Croce', who represented a 'tradition of liberal thought' (Lo Piparo, 2010c, p. 136)'.[3] These sources were so incompatible with Marx that, according to Lo Piparo's latest publications, Gramsci finally abandoned Marx's philosophical and political legacy, and during his years in prison he also cut his ties with the Italian party and broke away from the international communist movement (see especially Lo Piparo, 2012; also available in French: Lo Piparo, 2014).[4] This interpretation of the formation of Gramsci's linguistic ideas is significant because (as I shall explain again in the final section of this article) Lo Piparo boldly states what many other authors would seem to have assumed or implicitly suggested: namely, that the most vital and productive aspects of Gramsci's thought fall outside of Marx's influence. It is precisely for this reason that I have chosen Lo Piparo's work as an underlying point of comparison, even though I will not focus on his views with equal intensity in every section of this article.

The first two sections deal predominantly with Gramsci's intellectual trajectory during his youth (Section 2) and the years of his most intense involvement in the communist movement (Section 3). In the fourth section I consider how Marxist and non-Marxist sources shaped Gramsci's views during his imprisonment, when he jotted down the notes which after his death were collected to form his *Prison Notebooks* (Gramsci, 1975).[5] In the fifth section of this article, I survey the current presence of Gramscian ideas in linguistic research and I highlight their relevance with reference to a few case studies: it will emerge that the most fertile area for the use of Gramsci's ideas is currently provided by sociolinguistic and language policy debates on English as a global language. Finally, Section 6 will summarise my fundamental argument that Gramsci's views, and their relevance to linguistic disciplines, are best understood if we drop the idea of a contrast between linguistics and Marxist theory in Gramsci's life and work.

2. A Sardinian student in Turin

Antonio Gramsci (1891–1937) was born in Sardinia to a Sardinian mother and a father from Southern Italy. As a child he acquired both Italian and Sardinian, and this bilingual background would later feature as a deep and recurrent source of his interest in language. He studied historical linguistics at the University of Turin, especially Romance linguistics and dialectology. Despite being a very promising student,[6] around 1918 he dropped out of university as he became fully absorbed by political journalism and militancy. Soon after, he took on leading roles in the Italian and international working-class movement, before spending the last part of his life first as a political internee (December 1926–January 1927), then in prison (until November 1933) and finally in a clinic under police custody, due to his opposition to the Italian Fascist regime. The very last of his *Prison Notebooks* (i.e. Notebook 29, written in 1935) is entirely dedicated to language, which has led the already-mentioned philosopher of language, Franco Lo Piparo, to state quite compellingly that Gramsci 'was born and died a linguist' (Lo Piparo, 1979, p. 10).

[2] For instance, in 2013, the British Conservative Party cabinet minister, Michael Gove, explained how the Italian communist was a major influence on his educational policy.

[3] In this article, I do not go into the question of how appropriate the definition of 'liberal' is for authors such those mentioned by Lo Piparo; certainly, they were not followers of Marx.

[4] Among the many responses to Lo Piparo, see Gensini (2010[1980]), Rosiello (2010[1986]), Schirru (2008) and Carlucci (2015), but also Ives (2004), Boothman (2008a, b) and De Mauro (2010a[1991], b[1999]). Some of these experts on Gramsci's linguistic ideas (especially Rosiello and Ives) have subjected Lo Piparo's views to substantial and persuasive criticism. For instance, they have rejected Lo Piparo's argument that Gramsci's theory of 'hegemony' owes its conceptualisation entirely to late nineteenth and early twentieth century debates on the role of 'prestige' in language change. As a result, while it is generally agreed that Lo Piparo's stimulating approach continues to help our understanding of Gramsci's linguistic ideas, Lo Piparo's conclusions have, at least in part, ceased to be considered acceptable by most of the authors mentioned in this footnote.

[5] Written between 1929 and 1935, Gramsci's notes have been translated into several languages. The quotations included in this article are taken – albeit with significant adaptations – from the following English translations: Gramsci (1971, 1985, 1992–2007). A comprehensive discussion of Gramsci's prison notes on language is beyond the scope of the present article; however, readers are referred to the studies mentioned in footnote 4, and for the connections between Gramsci's linguistic ideas and other aspects of his thought, such as his ideas on translation and education, one can also see Borg et al. (2002), Boothman (2004), Mayo (2010), Ives and Lacorte (2010), Pizzolato and Holst (2017).

[6] Schirru (2011, 2015) has persuasively argued that, under the supervision of Matteo Bartoli, Gramsci was involved in research work linked to the preparation of Wilhelm Meyer-Lübke's *Romanisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch* (*REW*).

Gramsci's move from predominantly rural Sardinia to a city such as Turin, an industrial centre which attracted large masses of workers from various parts of Italy, is important for a whole series of reasons. His years in Turin were marked by his deep absorption of idealist philosophy (especially the writings of Benedetto Croce) as well as his first encounter with Marx's political philosophy, which was linked to Gramsci's interest in working-class politics.[7] At the same time, his interest in language was also fostered by direct experience of language contact, and of communicative difficulties which typically arise in situations of multi-layered linguistic and cultural diversity (Carlucci, 2014, pp. 34–50). For instance, once he had become actively involved in political organisation, he acted as a translator and mediator between the workers based in Turin and the Sardinian-speaking troops sent in to repress working-class protests. Given this historical and biographical context, it is hardly surprising to read what Gramsci himself tells us, in a passage written in 1918, about his attempt to combine historical linguistics and Marx's legacy in his dissertation (which he probably never completed): 'For my degree I am preparing a dissertation on the history of language, and I try to apply the critical methods of historical materialism to this research as well' (Gramsci, 1982, p. 612).

After Lo Piparo's first in-depth study, published in 1979, in recent years Gramsci's training in linguistic disciplines has received new attention. This attention has culminated in the publication of the notes stemming from professor Matteo Bartoli's 1912–13 course in linguistics, which the Sardinian student transcribed and edited at Bartoli's request (Gramsci, 2016). These notes are indeed quite interesting. For instance, they contain an early formulation of the solution that Bartoli – at the time a leading authority on Italo-Romance – proposed for one of the most debated problems in Romance diachronic phonology: the voicing of intervocalic stops in the early history of Tuscan dialects, and therefore in Italian. The diachronic outcomes of Latin intervocalic /p/, /t/ and /k/ are consistently voiced in Western Romance varieties, from Portuguese to the dialects of northern Italy; while in Eastern Romance, from Romanian to the dialects of southern Italy, those Latin voiceless consonants are generally preserved. In Italian, however, we find a puzzling coexistence of voiced and voiceless outcomes: for example *luogo* /'lwɔgo/ 'place' from Latin LŌCU(M), but *fuoco* /'fwɔko/ 'fire' from FŌCU(M). This was a typical test for the new methods of historical linguistics. Attempts at solving the puzzle promptly began in the second half of the nineteenth century, when Graziadio Isaia Ascoli and other influential scholars looked for exceptionless 'laws' which were expected to reveal the regularity of sound change, behind apparent irregularity. Namely, they focused on internal linguistic factors, such as phonetic context and word-stress, which could explain why certain Italian words were affected by voicing, while others were not. Despite their recent and much admired precedents in Indo-European and Germanic linguistics,[8] these attempts were ultimately unsuccessful in the case of Italian consonants. Acknowledging the failure of internalist explanations, Bartoli formulated an alternative explanation based on geographical factors, whereby words such as *luogo* should be regarded as lexical borrowings from northern Italian dialects or other Western varieties (see Gramsci, 2016, pp. 41–42, p. 131).

This is an early and influential example of contact explanations in modern historical linguistics,[9] which was in line with Bartoli's general approach to the then much-debated question of the 'causes of phonetic changes' (Saussure, 1959[1916], p. 147).[10] Bartoli's emphasis on contact as a cause of change will resurface as a distinctive feature of many of Gramsci's reflections on language in the *Prison Notebooks*. An example can be found in the following passage from Notebook 6, where Gramsci combines his own views on language change with Croce's ideas about parthenogenesis in cultural history (cf. Croce, 1926, pp. 241–242):

> In language too there is no parthenogenesis, language producing other language. Innovations occur through the interference of different cultures, and this happens in very different ways: it still occurs for whole masses of linguistic elements as well as happening in a molecular way (for example: as a "mass", Latin altered the Celtic language of the Gauls, while it influenced the Germanic language "molecularly", by lending it individual words and forms) (Gramsci, 1975, p. 739; Engl. trans. from Gramsci, 1985).

Bartoli's insights into dialect mixture and language contact, however, are not the only reason that made Gramsci's years in Turin particularly important for his intellectual trajectory. What makes them even more significant is the fact that, while being trained in historical linguistics, Gramsci was also exposed to the influence of a different approach to language, which was closer to what we could broadly refer to as 'logical positivism'. I am thinking of philosophers and mathematicians such as Giuseppe Peano and Giovanni Vailati. Gramsci will always remain sceptical towards their view that philosophical errors are ultimately caused by the semantic ambiguity and instability of natural languages. Accordingly, in the *Prison Notebooks*, Gramsci will justify his rejection of radical forms of corpus planning through reference not only to ineffective spelling reforms (some of which were being proposed when he was a student in Turin),[11] but also to the shortcomings of Esperanto and other artificial languages, such as Peano's *latino sine flexione*.

[7] As he was to recall in a letter of 6 March 1924: 'Then I came to know the working class of an industrial city, and I understood the real meaning of those writings by Marx which I had initially read out of intellectual curiosity' (Gramsci, 1992, p. 271).

[8] For accounts of how Grassmann ('Grassmann's Law') and Verner ('Verner's Law') explained the exceptions to 'Grimm's Law', and of how they influenced the development of historical linguistics, see Lehmann (1992, pp. 29–30, 151ff) and Seuren (1998, pp. 79–105).

[9] Bartoli's account was accepted most notably by Rohlfs (1966–1969), while a different approach to the historical problem of consonantal voicing would emerge decades later, especially in the wake of Weinrich (1958) and Contini (1960). See now Canalis (2014).

[10] The question remains an important one in historical linguistics (Loporcaro, 2010), with the enduring relevance of early twentieth-century debates being repeatedly highlighted, most notably, in Labov (1994–2010).

[11] See Gramsci (2016, p. 7) for evidence of his familiarity with reformed French spelling; see also Carlucci (2011a, 2014) for Italian spelling.

This scepticism, however, was not the only outcome of Gramsci's encounter with Peano's logico-mathematical school. This encounter had positive consequences, too (see Schirru, 2016, for a recent discussion). It made Gramsci familiar with up-to-date approaches to the practical benefits of international linguistic unification (especially in technical and scientific communication), which went beyond the traditional debates of linguists and literary authors on national linguistic unification (known as the *questione della lingua* 'language question' in the Italian tradition). Furthermore, these sources probably introduced Gramsci to a book which would remain a point of reference for much of his later thinking on language. The book in question is Michel Bréal's *Essay on Semantics* (Bréal, 1897), which was not a usual reference in the reading lists of Bartoli's courses or in those of other Italian historical linguists and dialectologists at the time: 'Turin's logicians and pragmatists […] were the first to discuss semantics in Italy and to pay crucial attention to the relationships between the semantics of ordinary, daily languages and the construction of the symbolic and scientific ones' (De Mauro, 2010b, p. 53).

3. Marx and early Soviet linguistics

As we have seen, Marx had a peripheral role in the early development of Gramsci's linguistic ideas. This peripherality might seem to support Lo Piparo's claim (on which I shall return in Section 4) that the 'primitive matrix' of those ideas should not be sought 'in Marx or in Lenin or in any other Marxist' (Lo Piparo, 2010a, p. 21). However, not only does Gramsci himself tell us that in 1918 his work on language was already influenced, to some extent, by his familiarity with Marx's philosophy (which he refers to as 'historical materialism', as we have seen above); but we should also bear in mind that the formation of Gramsci's linguistic ideas, which he would mainly develop in his *Prison Notebooks*, was not yet complete when he left Turin in 1922. In fact, his ideas were still to be decisively shaped by other encounters, this time with the advanced debates which animated theoretical, historical and, above all, applied linguistics in revolutionary Russia.

From June 1922 up until the end of November 1923, and again from March to April 1925, Gramsci lived in Russia and became indebted to early Soviet approaches, as Craig Brandist has argued through detailed comparisons between Gramsci's views and those of Soviet linguists and educationalists (see especially Brandist, 1996a, 1996b, 2012; see also Brandist and Chown, 2010, Carlucci, 2011b, Brandist, 2015, Restaneo, 2017). In this multinational state, where the Bolsheviks had recently staged a successful revolution and were striving to build a communist society, Marx was obviously a major source of inspiration. Gramsci's receptiveness to Soviet debates was facilitated by the fact that, before he arrived in Russia, he had already become familiar with the particular way in which Lenin and other Marxists had applied Marx's ideas in the field of language. While still in Turin, Gramsci was already interested in Soviet cultural and educational policies, and knew Lenin's views on questions of language and nationality (Carlucci, 2014, Ch. 2; cf. Lenin, 1983). For instance, in 1921 *L'Ordine Nuovo* (the paper of which Gramsci was editor in chief) praised the measures taken by the Bolsheviks to protect multilingualism and published a chapter from the second part of Bukharin and Preobrazhensky's book, *The ABC of Communism*, in which they illustrated the Leninist principles of Soviet language policy. In particular, in the chapter published in Italian by *L'Ordine Nuovo*, Bukharin and Preobrazhensky denounced linguistic discrimination as a form of oppression against weaker nationalities, or against colonies and economically dependent peoples (Bukharin and Preobrazhensky, 1969[1920], pp. 241–246).

Before stiffening up into dogmatic Marxism, which in the language sciences went by the name of Marrism,[12] Marx's ideas about social classes had a fecund impact on linguistics throughout the former Tsarist empire. As a result, especially in the relatively broad-minded intellectual environment of the early 1920s, a generation of young linguists and psychologists reached unprecedented levels of sophistication in the study of the social variation of language, which would only be reached again in the 1960s with the appearance of British sociology of education and North-American sociolinguistics (see especially Brandist, 2003). The replacement of 'bourgeois' linguistics with a new, allegedly 'proletarian' linguistics was yet to come. Many young linguists were not only intellectually brilliant; they were also committed revolutionaries (Smith, 1998; Brandist, 2003). They eagerly participated in the activities of Soviet institutions. And yet they did not present their linguistics as a radical departure from some of the trends which had recently emerged in western Europe. For instance, Evgenii Polivanov (one of Baudouin de Courtenay's most gifted students, and a Bolshevik as early as 1917) observed that the 'transfer of the centre of gravity to the sociological side of the study of language' (Polivanov, 1974a[1928], p. 58) had been underway since 1917, and that this search for a 'sociological linguistics' was not only a Soviet phenomenon: 'In the West one may name, for example, de Saussure (in his last book, published after the author's death), Vendryes, Meillet, Bally, Jespersen, Jordan, Vossler, Neumann, Wrede, Gilliéron, and others' (Polivanov, 1974b[1929], p. 176).

The classification and codification of Slavic and non-Slavic varieties, the choice of which varieties should be used in education, official communication and party life, and the standardisation of technical terminologies were all formidable tasks with obvious political implications. These implications were even more pressing in the context created by Lenin's unswerving insistence on the need to reverse the old Tsarist imposition of Russian – which for Lenin was not a viable means, but rather an obstacle, to the socialist goal of growing linguistic and cultural unification. Unsurprisingly, debates on language reached well beyond the circles of professional linguists. Lenin was not the only Marxist theoretician and political leader to contribute to debates on language, with arguments which would later be echoed in Gramsci's writings. The already-mentioned Nikolai

[12] After Nikolai Marr, whose peculiar 'new theory of language' enjoyed the status of official Marxist doctrine in linguistics for much of the period when Stalin was in power.

Bukharin wrote about language in his 1921 manual of Marxist sociology, *Historical Materialism*: *A System of Sociology*, which Gramsci would critically discuss in his *Prison Notebooks*.

Bukharin dealt, among other topics, with plans for a radical philosophical and political revision of ordinary language. Roman Jakobson would also recall these radical attempts: 'In the first years of the Russian revolution there were fanatic visionaries who argued in Soviet periodicals for […] the weeding out of such misleading expressions as *sunrise* or *sunset*', to which the great linguist objected that we 'use this Ptolemaic imagery without implying a rejection of Copernican doctrine' (Jakobson, 1959, p. 234). Bukharin similarly explained:

> When we say, for example, 'the sun has come up', 'the sun has gone down', of course we do not believe that the sun has actually 'come', or 'gone', as a man comes or goes, on two legs, but that was probably the original conception. Similarly, in the case of the word *law*, we may say that 'a law prevails', or 'applies', which by no means signifies that the two phenomena (cause and effect) involve any third invisible little god, lodged in the cause, reins in hand (Bukharin, 1926 [1921], p. 31).

The same defence of traditional ordinary language will also appear in Gramsci's *Prison Notebooks*: 'When I use the word *disaster* no one can accuse me of believing in astrology, and when I say "by Jove!" no one can assume that I am a worshipper of pagan divinities' (Gramsci, 1975, p. 1438). Likewise, 'even an atheist can speak of *dis-grace* without being thought to be a believer in predestination' (Gramsci, 1975, p. 1428).

Bukharin also rejected the idea that individuals can be autonomous objects of study. He wrote that if

> we examine each individual in his development, we shall find that at bottom he is filled with the influences of his environment, as the skin of a sausage is filled with sausage-meat. Man 'is trained' in the family, in the street, in the school. He speaks a language which is the product of social evolution; he thinks thoughts that have been devised by a whole series of preceding generations; he is surrounded by other persons with all their modes of life; he has before his eyes an entire system of life, which influences him second by second. Like a sponge he constantly absorbs new impressions. And thus he is 'formed' as an individual. Each individual at bottom is filled with a social content. The individual himself is a collection of concentrated social influences, united in a small unit (Bukharin, 1926[1921], p. 98).

He thus distanced himself from the emphasis on individual creativity and idiosyncrasy which, under the influence of Benedetto Croce, had been exported from idealist philosophy into linguistic research itself. Croce's influence on linguistic research was also discussed by Mikhail Bakhtin and Valentin Voloshinov, who criticised it as a form of 'individualistic subjectivism' (Vološinov, 1986[1929]). Unlike Croce, Bukharin focused on social classes – especially the subaltern classes, i.e. the rural peasantry and the urban proletariat (see esp. Bukharin, 1926[1921], p. 205). And so did Soviet linguists inspired by Marxist theory, who explored the connections between language change and the development of contemporary capitalism. These connections could be seen at work in 'mockery and linguistic parody', which, according to early Soviet scholarship, were most effective in convincing the peasantry of the necessity to abandon 'its old, local dialect' in favour of 'the new, urban language' (Brandist, 2015, p. 139). In 1930, the linguist Lev Iakubinskii summarised the findings of this line of investigation by writing that 'the history of the language of the peasantry under capitalism is the history of the active linguistic adaptation of the peasantry to the linguistic relations of capitalism' (quoted in Brandist, 2015, p. 139).

In the next section we will see how Gramsci inherited and reworked these points in his *Prison Notebooks*. But before we do, it is necessary to clarify that when Lo Piparo published his first work on Gramsci in 1979, few historical proofs of Gramsci's contact with Russian Marxist sources had been unearthed. Part of the evidence was locked up in Soviet archives, and part was still awaiting detailed philological recovery. The studies of Brandist and others were yet to appear. Moreover, it was generally believed that Gramsci had spent most of his first stay in Russia recovering from physical and mental exhaustion. He did spend some time in a sanatorium near Moscow, but we now know that even then Gramsci was much more active and more in contact with Soviet political and cultural life than was previously thought (see the new edition of his correspondence for those years: Gramsci, 2009, 2011). Having also learned some Russian, he was certainly capable of following the lively debates which characterised the politics of language during the early years of the Soviet federal state.

4. Linguistics and Marxism in the *Prison Notebooks*: contrast or cross-fertilisation?

When imprisonment forced Gramsci away from direct political action, he gathered together his linguistic reflections and began to write about language in a way in which he had not done since the late 1910s. In doing so he frequently returned to his early readings (Croce, Bartoli, Bréal) and this has led Lo Piparo to argue that non-Marxist sources exerted new levels of influence on Gramsci during the prison years and drove off the influence of Marxist theory, which had instead dominated the central part of his life (especially from 1922 to 1926). In this section I argue that Lo Piparo's thesis has various weaknesses both on a general historiographical and theoretical level, and on the more specific level of a close reading of particularly important passages in Gramsci's *Prison Notebooks*.

Lo Piparo bases his interpretation on the parallelism (which he discusses in great detail: see Lo Piparo, 1979, pp. 74–109) between traditional historical linguistics (or 'comparative philology' as it was usually referred to in the English-speaking

world) and the Marxism of the Second International, both of which sought to identify the endogenous laws of historical evolution – Marxists in the economy, linguists in 'historical grammar'. To an extent, it is true that the difficulties encountered by Marxism in its search for 'necessary laws, not susceptible to conscious regulation' (Laclau and Mouffe, 1985, p. 73), and with regard to its assumptions about the 'unity and homogeneity of social agents' (p. 76), were similar to the problems that historical linguistics also had to face. The internal fragmentation of speech communities and the role that speakers' conscious awareness plays in linguistic change were hotly debated and highly divisive topics between, roughly, the 1870s and the outbreak of the First World War. By emphasising the idealist character of Bartoli's response to these problems – in contrast to the positivism of the Neogrammarians – and the decisive influence that Bartoli's Neolinguistics had on Gramsci, Lo Piparo radically separates Gramsci's thought from the positivist Marxism of the Second International and from its Leninist developments in the Third International.

The polemics between Neolinguists and Neogrammarians, however, should not be overestimated. As far as these two schools are concerned, agreement on fundamental epistemological principles was stronger than disagreement over specific topics, including theoretical and methodological issues. The already-mentioned voicing of intervocalic stops in the history of Italian is a case in point. Contact explanations are certainly an alternative to regular diachronic evolution, but they do not shake the foundations of historical linguistics (see Bloomfield's account of the history of the comparative method, in Bloomfield, 1976[1933], Ch. 18). In Italian, words displaying intervocalic voicing, such as *luogo*, are less numerous than those preserving voiceless /p/, /t/ or /k/. The need to explain these cases of voicing rests precisely on the Neogrammarian assumption that sound change is regular and operates across the entire lexicon of a particular variety. Without this prediction, there would be no exceptions to explain. Arguing, as Bartoli did, that words such as *luogo* were borrowed from varieties spoken by other communities does not contradict, but in fact ultimately confirms, the usefulness of the Neogrammarian approach to linguistic change. More radical alternatives to this approach (such as the idea of gradual lexical diffusion, or of multiple phonetic realisations within the same speech community) were yet to come.

The affinities between Marxism and traditional historical linguistics should not be overstated, either. Such a parallelism is somewhat generic, and finds little support in Gramsci's writings. Gramsci certainly rejected positivist ideas about historical evolution (which to some extent still hindered Bukharin's thinking, according to the judgements expressed in the *Prison Notebooks*), especially the idea that the 'laws' of capitalist economic development will inevitably lead to the rise of the proletariat and the decline of the bourgeoisie. Yet, Gramsci considered these ideas to be typical of crude readings of some of Marx and Engels's political writings (such as the *Communist Manifesto*), not of what he regarded as the most vital aspects of Marx's philosophy (see Frosini, 2009). On the other hand, the methods of comparative philology are repeatedly defended in the *Prison Notebooks* (see especially Gramsci, 1975, pp. 364–367 and 408–409, on Etruscan). Gramsci rejects Croce's attacks on those methods, based on Croce's idealist downplaying of grammatical structures and on his conception of language as individual artistic creativity: 'the history of languages is the history of linguistic innovations, but these innovations are not individual (as in art); they are the innovations of an entire social community that has renewed its culture and "progressed" historically' (Gramsci, 1975, p. 738). Gramsci recognises that

> every speaking being has a personal language of his (or her) own, that is his own particular way of thinking and feeling. Culture, at its various levels, unifies in a series of strata, to the extent that they come into contact with each other, a greater or lesser number of individuals who understand each other's mode of expression in differing degrees, etc. It is these historico-social distinctions and differences which are reflected in common language […] (p. 1330).

Nonetheless, if every speaker or writer 'started using a personally arbitrary language, […] the situation would be described as Babel' (p. 2193).

The cross-fertilisation between Gramsci's linguistic interests and his Marxist emphasis on social stratification becomes all the more apparent if we look at his prison notes on themes which Soviet sources also dealt with, as seen in Section 3. Echoing Bukharin's Marxist manual, Gramsci wrote that every individual is influenced by 'the external environment' – that is, by 'one of the many social groups in which everyone is automatically involved from the moment of his entry into the conscious world' (Gramsci, 1975, p. 1375). And in his last notebook he focused specifically on linguistic influence:

> This is made up of the reciprocal monitoring, reciprocal teaching and reciprocal 'censorship' expressed in such questions as 'What did you mean to say?', 'What do you mean?', 'Make yourself clearer', etc., and in mimicry and teasing. This whole complex of actions and reactions come together to create a grammatical conformism, to establish 'norms' or judgements of correctness or incorrectness. But this 'spontaneous' expression of grammatical conformity is necessarily disconnected, discontinuous and limited to local social strata or local centres. (A peasant who moves to the city ends up conforming to urban speech through the pressure of the city environment. In the country, people try to imitate urban speech; the subaltern classes try to speak like the dominant classes and the intellectuals, etc.) (Gramsci, 1975, pp. 2342–2343).

Finally, it is interesting to return to the note on parthenogenesis in language (from Notebook 6), from which I have already quoted a few lines in Section 2. Those lines showed an interest in diatopic variation and the spatial diffusion of innovations, which was typical of the linguistics that Gramsci had studied under Bartoli. In the immediately following lines, however, Gramsci adds a different focus on diastratic variation and diffusion, in line with the innovative research agenda of early Soviet sociolinguistics: 'there can also be interference and a "molecular" influence within a single nation, between various strata,

etc.; a new ruling class brings about innovations as a "mass", but the jargons of various professions, of specific groups, innovate in a molecular way' (Gramsci, 1975, p. 739).

In sum, in Gramsci's *Prison Notebooks*, Marxist and non-Marxist sources of inspiration combined together much more than they conflicted with each other.

5. Marx and beyond: the current relevance of Gramsci's linguistic ideas

Having looked at Gramsci's linguistic ideas in some detail, we can now move on to their current relevance. Noam Chomsky has denied that 'Marxist philosophy, of whatever tendency, has made a substantial contribution' to the study of language (Chomsky, 1979, p. 74). Although in less dismissive terms, this judgement is essentially confirmed by Giulio Lepschy's survey (1985), which comprises a section on Gramsci. The judgement is probably true for those trends in current language studies which conceive of their object of study in purely internalist, formal terms. It is probably less true, however, for those trends which instead posit that not only the role of language in society, but also the way in which languages work and change, are best understood if we look at the actual way in which language is used by communities of speakers. From the point of view of the latter trends, early Soviet sociological linguistics and Gramsci's reflections on language may have been almost completely ignored,[13] but some tenets developed within this Marxist tradition would seem to have finally become widely accepted components of the study of language in use. For instance, it would be superfluous to add any comments to the self-evident consistency between Bukharin's and Gramsci's views and this well-known passage by William Labov:

> It is true enough that when we examine a community closely enough, it will inevitably appear that each individual's linguistic pattern differs in some respects from that of everyone else. Yet this unique object, the individual speaker, can only be understood as the product of a unique social history, and the intersection of the linguistic patterns of all the social groups and categories that define that individual. Linguistic analysis cannot recognize individual grammars or phonologies. Individual rules or constraints would have no interpretation and contribute nothing to acts of communication. In this sense, the individual does not exist as a linguistic object. However, each individual shows a personal profile of the comparative use of resources made available by the speech community (Labov, 1994–2010, vol. 2, p. 34).

At least historically, Gramsci's ideas are also relevant to the field of contact linguistics. His rudimentary distinction between 'mass' and 'molecular' influence can be seen as an early attempt at distinguishing between different types of contact, with their different linguistic outcomes. A similar distinction was introduced by Leonard Bloomfield (1976[1933]), who used the terms 'intimate contact' and 'cultural contact'. This basic opposition has subsequently been refined, but the two poles indicated by Gramsci, Bloomfield and others seem to remain valid today. Although more complex types and subtypes of contact situations have been empirically identified and theoretically defined (see esp. Thomason, 2004, 2010), contact linguists still distinguish between situations of prolonged bilingualism involving large numbers of young speakers who are still within the acquisition age, and, on the other hand, situations of less widespread bilingualism and limited interaction between the speakers of the varieties in contact. These two types of contact are expected to result in different linguistic outcomes. The exact reproduction of structural properties from the source into the recipient variety is usually held to be possible only with the first type of contact, while with the second type a less systematic influence is expected, mostly confined to lexis. This basic conceptual opposition is essentially retained in Labov's distinction between 'transmission' and 'diffusion' (see Labov, 1994–2010, vol. 3, pp. 303–375).

Obviously, not all developments in the history of contact linguistics have gone in a direction which is consistent with Gramsci's intuitions. In particular, while Gramsci conflated diastratic and diatopic influences under the same notion of contact, current scholarship reserves the term 'contact' for linguistic influences between diatopically defined varieties. As explained by Sarah Thomason:

> The initiation of variation and change must begin with an innovation in one or more speakers' speech, and the spread of that variant through a speech community is always a matter of transfer from speaker to speaker – i.e. via language, or at least dialect, contact. An innovation that remains confined to a single speaker cannot affect the language as a whole (Thomason, 2010, p. 32).

This premise suggests that, in a sense, change always involves contact, even when contact takes place within one speech community, between diastratic varieties of the same language. However, Thomason clarifies that 'it has long been traditional to posit contact explanations for linguistic variation and change only when two or more different languages are concerned' (p. 32).

In any case, the field where Gramsci's ideas are most relevant is that of the politics of language. In this field, Gramsci's ideas – and, indirectly, Marx's ideas – are not just pertinent to current debates, but also promising for future research. Peter Ives has shown this relevance in a series of publications on the spread of English as a global language (henceforth EGL), including the impact of this spread on the language policies of the European Union (EU). In the remainder of this section I will, for the most part, summarise the key points put forward by Ives (2009, 2015a, 2015b, 2015c) and other scholars who also refer to Gramsci (Sonntag, 2003; Gazzola, 2014; Carlucci, 2017). As far as the EU is concerned, however, we should bear

[13] As suggested in Brandist's works; see also Dell Hymes: 'That Gramsci studied philology has been noticed, but not turned to account' (Hymes, 1996, p. 97).

in mind that the role of English might change after the exit of the United Kingdom (with speculations about this change being already discussed in publications such as Modiano, 2017).

In the first volume of *Capital*, Marx spoke of 'the entanglement of all peoples in the net of the world-market' (Marx and Engels, 1996, p. 750) as a propitious historical development creating the conditions for the emergence of a socialist society. Later Marxists, such as Karl Kautsky and Gramsci himself, contemplated the possibility of one language acquiring so much cultural prestige and practical use as to relegate national languages to the role of regional dialects (Carlucci, 2014, pp. 114–115). Gramsci also argued that, when 'a European union' comes into existence, 'the word "nationalism" will have the same archaeological value as "municipalism" has today' (Gramsci, 1975, p. 748). In other words, Gramsci and other influential Marxists were not, in principle, against the prospect of linguistic unification.

More precisely, Gramsci did not believe that the spread of a language through which increasingly large numbers of people can communicate, should necessarily result in linguistic uniformity and impoverishment. A good command of the unitary language does not rule out the possibility of personal styles and usages, or of local variation in the way it is used (see e.g. Gramsci, 1975, p. 2343). Nor does the spread of such a language necessarily exclude the preservation of bilingualism or multilingualism. At least at the national level, Gramsci himself continued to use a regional language (Sardinian) alongside the Italian language throughout his life. In sum, Gramsci did not believe that the socialist goal of a culturally and linguistically unified humankind was incompatible with the survival – or even further flourishing – of diversity.

Yet, quite crucially, he maintained that unification requires certain historical conditions which cannot be sidestepped by the planning, however accurate, of rulers and experts. Genuine linguistic unification involves the creative contribution of ordinary speakers who will inevitably transform the unitary language; it cannot be obtained by imposing a pre-defined language to be learned and used as a neutral instrument of communication (see Gramsci, 1975, p. 1330 and pp. 2344–2346). It is worth recalling not only Gramsci's wariness of abstract plans for international communication (including his rejection of auxiliary languages, such as Esperanto) but also his receptiveness, on this point, to the views of Croce and especially Ascoli, who had been critical of the idea that Italy could be linguistically unified by simply adopting contemporary Florentine in education, official communication, and language policy in general. Moreover, these Italian sources were consistent with the Marxist language policies proposed by Lenin (which again confirms that there was often no irreconcilable contrast between Marxist and non-Marxist influences on Gramsci). Lenin wrote at length in favour of multilingualism and against imposed unification. By arguing that '[t]iny Switzerland has not lost anything, but has gained from having not one single official language, but three: German, French and Italian' (Lenin, 1968, p. 355), he foresaw some of the claims of those who do not want the EU to move towards an English-only policy (for instance, Grin, 2015, and Lacey, 2015, use the Swiss case to make a similar point). His suggestion to make provisions so that 'speeches in different languages' may be delivered 'in the common parliament' (Lenin, 1964, p. 21) sounds like a prediction of what happens in Strasbourg today. The language policy issues that emerged in the wake of the Russian revolution, and that remained at the centre of political and scholarly attention during the construction of the USSR, were not entirely dissimilar to the ones that the EU is facing today – although it was Russian, not English, to occupy the dominant position.

Influenced by these sources, Gramsci developed a balanced position on linguistic diversity and unification (which in a sense brings us back to the main inputs of his formative years as discussed in Section 2 – the attention to local diversity typical of Romance dialectology, and the universalism of artificial languages). Together with his Marxist take on class stratifications and power relations, Gramsci's position on diversity and unification is particularly helpful for revealing the shortcomings of some contemporary perspectives on EGL. For instance, Ives (2015b) persuasively argues that Gramsci's critique of abstract unification can be applied to the 'English as a Language Franca' movement (ELF), which presents the use of English as a practical choice but does not expose the economic and political factors that push so many individuals and governments to choose English. In the present historical context, moreover, this choice is in turn reinforcing unequal power relations by creating advantages for English-speaking countries (such as the possibility of saving on translation and foreign language learning) and especially for native speakers of particularly prestigious varieties of English. As far as non-native speakers are concerned, research on different EU countries has shown that knowledge of English is perceived as a tool to gain access to financial and social assets (employability, status, and so on); but in reality, a confident command of English is typically achieved by individuals who already had better access to financial and social assets, including relevant forms of education, technology and geographic mobility (Gazzola, 2014; Carlucci, 2017). All this would seem to vindicate Gramsci's warning that, when international languages 'are not the historical expression of adequate and necessary conditions, they become an element of social stratification and of the fossilization of certain strata' (Gramsci, 1975, p. 557).

Equally stimulating is the Gramscian critique that Ives has directed against poststructuralist views of English and other 'transnational' languages (see Ives, 2015c). Poststructuralist approaches typically condemn the notion of 'standard' language as irremediably prescriptive, and question the very existence of languages as separable systems (see Pennycook, 2010; Canagarajah, 2013; Garcia and Wei, 2014). As a result of the growing academic reputation of poststructuralist approaches, which has made them quite 'fashionable' in various research areas, 'languaging', 'translanguaging' and 'translingual practice' are often presented as the only legitimate objects of study – different in every individual speaker, and constantly changing. Instead, relatively homogeneous and independent languages (such as English or Italian) should be regarded as abstractions or, worse, as unacceptable simplifications. This move is aimed at fully valuing the heterogeneous resources which enrich the speech of every individual, regardless of its sociolinguistic status.

Ives's critique draws on Marxists' rejection of individualistic epistemology (see above: Sections 3 and 4), to which it is helpful to add Gramsci's specific views on the communicative insecurity of subaltern groups (see Carlucci, 2014, pp. 109–110).[14] A relevant case is that of late-nineteenth- and twentieth-century Italian migrants to English-speaking countries, and of their descendants. Future research may wish to use this case in order to contrast a Gramscian point of view with a 'trans-languaging' one. At least among the first generations, the typical linguistic resources of Italian migrants included active competence in their native dialect, passive competence in other dialects of Italy, and a growing command of English-influenced varieties (American Italian) and English itself, together with an often limited access to Italian. Their linguistic practices showed many examples of mixture and innovation, especially in the lexicon. However, a study framed in terms of 'translanguaging' easily runs the risk of sidelining the power imbalances which affect the mobility of people, and of their cultural and linguistic productions. In other words, a poststructuralist research agenda needs to guard itself against a form of consolatory ideology obscuring the power relations in which language contact is enmeshed. The risk becomes evident if we consider the communicative frustration and lack of confidence experienced by many speakers of low-prestige varieties in migration contexts, whose 'translanguaging' does not have the same status as that of 'standard' languages (see Vedovelli, 2011); or if we reflect on the fact that the many linguistic innovations brought to Italy by returning migrants have left virtually no trace on Italian as used and recognised by the Italian-speaking community at large (see Tosi, 2001, pp. 224–231). This sobering reality cannot be compensated for through the way in which we interpret it – it is rooted in power relations which only extreme forms of idealism could expect to change by simply changing our epistemological paradigms.

6. Concluding remarks

Lo Piparo's interpretation of the formation of Gramsci's linguistic ideas is significant because Lo Piparo boldly spells out what many others would seem to have assumed and implicitly suggested: namely, that the most vital and productive aspects of Gramsci's thought fall outside of Marx's influence. In particular, this implicit belief permeates the international Anglophone scholarship on language policy and language in society, including educational language policy and other applied branches. Here Gramsci is almost exclusively known as the theorist of 'hegemony' (see Carlucci, 2014, pp. 216–230), and this notion is understood as the creation of consensus through persuasion and ideological leadership, with little or no reference to Marxist notions of social stratification and economic power (see Blommaert et al., 2003 and Ives, forthcoming, for discussion).[15] A corollary of this interpretation is that, even if Gramsci's work may still be relevant to current perspectives on language and communication, Marx's is not.

In this article we have instead seen that Gramsci's views, as well as their relevance to research on language, are best understood if we drop Lo Piparo's idea of a contrast between linguistics and Marxism in Gramsci's thought. This is not to say that Gramsci did not go beyond Marx by developing the latter's input in an original way, or that research questions and methods have not changed since Gramsci's time. What I hope to have demonstrated is that approaches and debates inspired by Marx, especially the pioneering research agenda of early Soviet sociolinguistics, were key ingredients in the formation of Gramsci's stimulating and lasting ideas. Marxist debates combined with sociological approaches to historical linguistics (such as those of Bréal and Meillet, to mention two authors whose works were known to Gramsci) in a way which fostered Gramsci's attention to social variation, at a time when traditional linguists were almost exclusively concerned with geographical variation. As a result, Gramsci foreshadowed certain aspects of later sociolinguistics. He saw the outcomes of contact between different languages, as well as between varieties of the same language, as dependent on social stratifications and hierarchies of prestige and power. Moreover, by suggesting that these hierarchies and stratifications are in turn reinforced by speakers' unequal command of prestigious varieties, he also foreshadowed critical approaches to language policy and language in society.

References

Anderson, P., 1976. Considerations on Western Marxism. New Left Books, London.
Blommaert, J., Collins, J., Heller, M., Rampton, B., Slembrouck, S., Verschueren, J., 2003. Introduction. Pragmatics 13 (1), 1–10.
Bloomfield, L., 1976[1933]. Language. Allen & Unwin, London.
Boothman, D., 2004. Traducibilità e processi traduttivi. Un caso: A. Gramsci linguista. Guerra, Perugia.
Boothman, D., 2008a. The sources for Gramsci's concept of hegemony. Rethink. Marx. 20 (2), 201–215.
Boothman, D., 2008b. Political and linguistic sources for Gramsci's concept of hegemony. In: Howson, R., Smith, K. (Eds.), Hegemony: Studies in Consensus and Coercion. Routledge, New York.
Borg, C., Buttigieg, J., Mayo, P. (Eds.), 2002. Gramsci and Education. Rowman & Littlefield, Oxford.
Bourdieu, P., 1991. In: Thompson, J.B. (Ed.), Language and Symbolic Power. Polity, Cambridge. Trans. by Raymond, G., Adamson, M.
Brandist, C., 1996a. Gramsci, Bakhtin and the semiotics of hegemony. N. Left Rev. 216, 94–109.
Brandist, C., 1996b. The official and the popular in Gramsci and Bakhtin. Theory Cult. Soc. 13 (2), 59–74.
Brandist, C., 2003. The origins of Soviet sociolinguistics. J. Socioling. 7 (2), 213–231.
Brandist, C., 2012. The cultural and linguistic dimensions of hegemony: aspects of Gramsci's debt to early Soviet cultural policy. J. Romance Stud. 12 (3), 24–43.
Brandist, C., 2015. The Dimensions of Hegemony: Language, Culture and Politics in Revolutionary Russia. Brill, Leiden.

[14] In discussing the effects of this insecurity, Pierre Bourdieu (1991) occasionally referred to Gramsci's views.

[15] When Lo Piparo first developed his thesis, Anderson (1976) had already influentially suggested that Gramsci's thought was part of a general shift away from Marxist social and economic analysis, and towards the privileging of cultural analysis.

Brandist, C., Chown, K. (Eds.), 2010. Politics and the Theory of Language in the USSR, 1917–1938: The Birth of Sociological Linguistics. Anthem Press, London.
Bréal, M., 1897. Essai de sémantique (science des significations). Hachette, Paris.
Bukharin, N., 1926[1921]. Historical Materialism: A System of Sociology. Allen & Unwin, London.
Bukharin, N., Preobrazhensky, E., 1969[1920]. The ABC of Communism. Penguin, Harmondsworth.
Canagarajah, A., 2013. Translingual Practice: Global Englishes and Cosmopolitan Relations. Routledge, London.
Canalis, S., 2014. The voicing of intervocalic stops in old Tuscan and probabilistic sound change. Folia Linguist. Hist. 35, 55–100.
Carlucci, A., 2011a. Giambattista Vico. La 'filologia vivente'. In: D'Orsi, A. (Ed.), Il nostro Gramsci. Antonio Gramsci a colloquio con i protagonisti della storia d'Italia. Viella, Rome, pp. 49–57.
Carlucci, A., 2011b. Gramsci and the Cours de linguistique générale. Cah. Ferdinand Saussure 64, 27–48.
Carlucci, A., 2014. Gramsci and Languages: Unification, Diversity, Hegemony. Brill, Leiden.
Carlucci, A., 2015. Gramsci, language and pluralism. In: McNally, M. (Ed.), Antonio Gramsci. Palgrave, Basingstoke, pp. 106–122.
Carlucci, A., 2017. Language, education and European unification: perceptions and reality of global English in Italy. In: Pizzolato, N., Holst, J. (Eds.), Gramsci: A Pedagogy to Change the World. Springer, Berlin, pp. 127–148.
Chomsky, N., 1979. Language and Responsibility. Harvester Press, Hassocks.
Contini, G., 1960. Per un'interpretazione strutturale della cosiddetta gorgia toscana. Boletim Filolog. 19, 269–281.
Croce, B., 1926. Cultura e vita morale. Laterza, Bari.
De Mauro, T., 2010a[1991]. Some notes on Gramsci the linguist. In: Ives, P., Lacorte R. (Eds.), Gramsci, Language and Translation. Lexington Books, Lanham, MD, 255–266.
De Mauro, T., 2010b[1999]. Language from nature to history: more on Gramsci the linguist. In: Ives, P., Lacorte R. (Eds.), Gramsci, Language and Translation. Lexington Books, Lanham, MD, 51–62.
Frosini, F., 2009. Da Gramsci a Marx. Ideologia, verità e politica. DeriveApprodi, Rome.
García, O., Wei, L., 2014. Translanguaging: Language, Bilingualism and Education. Palgrave, Basingstoke.
Gazzola, M., 2014. Partecipazione, esclusione linguistica e traduzione. Una valutazione del regime linguistico dell'Unione Europea. Studi italiani linguistica teorica applicata 43 (2), 227–264.
Gensini, S., 2010[1980]. Linguistics and the political question of language. In: Ives, P., Lacorte, R. (Eds.), Gramsci, Language and Translation. Lexington Books, Lanham, MD, pp. 63–79.
Gramsci, A., 1971. In: Selections from the Prison Notebooks. Lawrence and Wishart, London. Ed. and trans. by Hoare, Q., Nowell-Smith, G.
Gramsci, A., 1975. In: Gerratana, V. (Ed.), Quaderni del carcere. Einaudi, Turin.
Gramsci, A., 1982. In: Caprioglio, S. (Ed.), La città futura (1917–1918). Einaudi, Turin.
Gramsci, A., 1985. In: Forgacs, D., Nowell-Smith, G. (Eds.), Selections from Cultural Writings. Lawrence and Wishart, London. Trans. by Boelhower, W.
Gramsci, A., 1992. In: Santucci, A.A. (Ed.), Lettere (1908–1926). Einaudi, Turin.
Gramsci, A., 1992–2007. In: Buttigieg, J.A. (Ed.), Prison Notebooks, vols. 1–3. Columbia University Press, New York.
Gramsci, A., 2009. In: Bidussa, D., et al. (Eds.), Epistolario. Gennaio 1906-dicembre 1922, vol. 1. Enciclopedia Italiana, Rome.
Gramsci, A., 2011. In: Giasi, F., Righi, M.L. (Eds.), Epistolario. Gennaio-novembre 1923, vol. 2. Enciclopedia Italiana, Rome.
Gramsci, A., 2016. In: Schirru, G. (Ed.), Appunti di glottologia (1912–1913). Un corso universitario di Matteo Bartoli. Enciclopedia Italiana, Rome.
Grin, F., 2015. The economics of English in Europe. In: Ricento, T. (Ed.), Language Policy and Political Economy: English in a Global Context. Oxford University Press, Oxford, pp. 119–144.
Hymes, D., 1996. Ethnography, Linguistics, Narrative Inequality: Toward an Understanding of Voice. Taylor and Francis, London.
Ives, P., 2004. Language and Hegemony in Gramsci. Pluto Press, London.
Ives, P., 2009. Global English, hegemony and education: lessons from Gramsci. Educ. Philos. Theory 41, 661–683.
Ives, P., 2015a. Global English and the limits of liberalism: confronting global capitalism and challenges to the nation-state. In: Ricento, T. (Ed.), Language Policy and Political Economy: English in a Global Context. Oxford University Press, Oxford, pp. 48–71.
Ives, P., 2015b. Language and collective identity: theorizing complexity. In: Späti, C. (Ed.), Language and Identity Politics. Berghahn, New York, pp. 17–37.
Ives, P., 2015c. Global English and inequality: contested grounds of linguistic power. In: Tupas, T. (Ed.), Unequal Englishes. Palgrave, London, pp. 74–94.
Ives, P., forthcoming. Gramsci e l'inglese globale. In: Egemonia e modernità. Il pensiero di Gramsci in Italia e nella cultura internazionale. Proceedings of the international conference, Rome, 18–20 May 2017.
Ives, P., Lacorte, R. (Eds.), 2010. Gramsci, Language and Translation. Lexington Books, Lanham, MD.
Jakobson, R., 1959. On linguistic aspects of translation. In: Brower, R. (Ed.), On Translation. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA, pp. 232–239.
Labov, W., 1994-2010. Principles of Linguistic Change, vols. 1–3. Blackwell, Oxford.
Lacey, J., 2015. Considerations on English as a global lingua Franca. Polit. Stud. Rev. 13, 363–372.
Laclau, E., Mouffe, C., 1985. Hegemony and Socialist Strategy: Towards a Radical Democratic Politics. Verso, London.
Lehmann, W.P., 1992. Historical Linguistics. Routledge, London.
Lenin, V., 1964. Collected Works, vol. 20. Progress Publishers, Moscow.
Lenin, V., 1968. Collected Works, vol. 19. Progress Publishers, Moscow.
Lenin, V., 1983. Lenin on Language. Raduga, Moscow.
Lepschy, G., 1985. Linguistics. In: Barański, Z.G., Short, J.R. (Eds.), Developing Contemporary Marxism. Macmillan, London, pp. 199–228.
Lo Piparo, F., 1979. Lingua, intellettuali, egemonia in Gramsci. Laterza, Bari.
Lo Piparo, F., 2010a. The linguistic roots of Gramsci's non-marxism. In: Ives, P., Lacorte, R. (Eds.), Gramsci, Language and Translation. Lexington Books, Lanham, MD, pp. 19–28.
Lo Piparo, F., 2010b. Gramsci and Wittgenstein: an intriguing connection. In: Capone, A. (Ed.), Perspectives on Language Use and Pragmatics. Lincom, Munich, pp. 285–319.
Lo Piparo, F., 2010c. Le radici linguistiche del liberalismo gramsciano. In: Polizzi, G. (Ed.), Tornare a Gramsci. Una cultura per l'Italia. Avverbi, Rome, pp. 127–138.
Lo Piparo, F., 2012. I due carceri di Gramsci. Donzelli, Rome.
Lo Piparo, F., 2014. Les deux prisons de Gramsci. Cnrs Éditions, Paris.
Loporcaro, M., 2010. Ascoli, Salvioni, Merlo. In: Convegno nel centenario della morte di Graziadio Isaia Ascoli. Scienze e Lettere, Rome, pp. 181–201.
Marx, K., Engels, F., 1996. Collected Works, vol. 35. Lawrence and Wishart, London.
Mayo, P. (Ed.), 2010. Gramsci and Educational Thought. Wiley-Blackwell, Chichester.
Modiano, M., 2017. English in a post-Brexit European Union. World Englishes 36, 313–327.
Pennycook, A., 2010. Language as a Local Practice. Routledge, London.
Pizzolato, N., Holst, J. (Eds.), 2017. Gramsci: A Pedagogy to Change the World. Springer, Berlin.
Polivanov, E. D., 1974a[1928]. Specific features of the last decade, 1917–1927, in the history of our linguistic thought. In: Selected Works: Articles on General Linguistics. Ed. by Leont'ev, A. A. Trans. by Armstrong, D. Mouton, The Hague, 57–61.
Polivanov, E.D., 1974b[1929]. The sphere of immediate problems in contemporary linguistics. In: Selected Works: Articles on General Linguistics. Ed. by Leont'ev, A. A. Trans. by Armstrong, D. Mouton, The Hague, 171–178.
Restaneo, P., 2017. Governing the word: Antonio Gramsci and Soviet linguistics on language policy. Lang. Hist. 60, 95–111.
Rohlfs, G., 1966-1969. Grammatica storica della lingua italiana e dei suoi dialetti, vols. 1–3. Einaudi, Turin.
Rosiello, L., 2010[1986]. Linguistics and marxism in the thought of Antonio Gramsci. In: Ives, P., Lacorte, R. (Eds.), Gramsci, Language and Translation. Lexington Books, Lanham, MD, pp. 29–49.

Saussure de, F., 1959. In: Bally, C., Sechehaye, A., Reidlinger, A. (Eds.), Course in General Linguistics. Philosophical Library, New York. Trans. by Baskin, W.
Schirru, G., 2008. La categoria di egemonia e il pensiero linguistico di Antonio Gramsci. In: D'Orsi, A. (Ed.), Egemonie. Dante and Descartes, Naples, pp. 397–444.
Schirru, G., 2011. Antonio Gramsci studente di linguistica. Studi Storici 52, 925–973.
Schirru, G., 2015. Antonio Gramsci collaboratore del 'Romanisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch' (con una cartolina inedita di Matteo Bartoli). Atti del Sodalizio Glottologico Milanese 10, 79–90.
Schirru, G., 2016. La grammatica dell'algebra. La riflessione dei matematici torinesi sul linguaggio verbale. In: Cospito, G. (Ed.), Sraffa e Wittgenstein a Cambridge. Scuola Normale Superiore, Pisa, pp. 167–200.
Seuren, P., 1998. Western Linguistics: An Historical Introduction. Blackwell, Oxford.
Smith, M., 1998. Language and Power in the Creation of the USSR 1917–1953. Mouton de Gruyter, New York.
Sonntag, S., 2003. The Local Politics of Global English: Case Studies in Linguistic Globalization. Lexington Books, Lanham, MD.
Thomason, S.G., 2004. Contact as a source of language change. In: Joseph, B.D., Janda, R.D. (Eds.), The Handbook of Historical Linguistics. Blackwell, Oxford, pp. 686–712.
Thomason, S.G., 2010. Contact explanations in linguistics. In: Hickey, R. (Ed.), The Handbook of Language Contact. Blackwell, Oxford, pp. 31–47.
Tosi, A., 2001. Language and Society in a Changing Italy. Multilingual Matters, Clevedon.
Vedovelli, M., 2011. Storia linguistica dell'emigrazione italiana nel mondo. Carocci, Rome.
Vološinov, V.N., 1986[1929]. Marxism and the Philosophy of Language. Trans. by Matejka, L., Titunik, I.R.. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA.
Weinrich, H., 1958. Phonologische Studien zur romanischen Sprachgeschichte. Aschendorff, Münster.