Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences, Vol. 42(3), 261–277 Summer 2006
Published online in Wiley Interscience (www.interscience.wiley.com). DOI 10.1002 /jhbs.20172

THE RISE OF SOVIET SOCIOLINGUISTICS FROM THE ASHES OF *VÖLKERPSYCHOLOGIE*

CRAIG BRANDIST

Nineteenth-century Russian philology was dominated by an approach derived from German *Völkerpsychologie*. Language and social consciousness were viewed as embodiments of "national-popular psychology." The shortcomings of this approach were becoming apparent at the end of the prerevolutionary period, but it was only in the 1920s that the hegemony of *Völkerpsychologie* was decisively challenged. *Völkerpsychologie* was attacked in the name of "objective psychology," and concrete studies of the relationship between language and social structure were carried out. By the end of the 1920s, *völkerpsychologische* ideas were subsumed into a new and progressive form of sociological linguistics. © 2006 Wiley Periodicals, Inc.

Among the many understudied but significant intellectual consequences of the Bolshevik Revolution was the rise of an incipient but theoretically sophisticated form of sociolinguistics in Russia, many decades before the appearance of a similar movement in the West. While the importation of sociological concepts into language science was by no means unique to Russia, the specific conditions brought about by the Revolution gave the fusion of linguistic and social sciences a particularly acute inflection there,[1] and sociological perspectives from the rest of Europe were swiftly and critically assimilated in the light of indigenous linguistic traditions. As Desnitskaia (1981) argued, those traditions had emerged from the sharp debates over the formation of the Russian national, "literary" language from Church Slavonic, common parlance, and foreign borrowings that dominated much intellectual life from the mid-eighteenth to the mid-nineteenth centuries. As linguistic science arose in nineteenth-century Russia, the social origin of the elements of the "literary" language was at the forefront of scholars' attention, and this question was given a particular ideological sharpness in the articles of the "civic critics" in the middle of the century. Thus, Vissarion Belinsky could write in the 1840s that each social estate possesses specific linguistic traits and that the spirit of disunity in Russia is such that if one found oneself in the "chance company" of various social groups, "you might think you were present at the distribution of tongues" (1963, p. 3). The Russian novel also focused attention on the stylistic and ideological variety of extra-literary language, linking this variety to that of particular social groups, and the writer's own ideological position often emerged in relation to those styles. With academic linguistic and literary studies still fused into a unitary discipline of philology, it was impossible for linguists not to be acutely aware of the social dimensions of language. What prerevolutionary linguistics lacked, however, was a developed social theory, and so this pervasive proto-sociologism was locked within a philosophical

1. For an overview of this, see Brandist (2003).

CRAIG BRANDIST *is a reader in cultural theory and intellectual history in the Bakhtin Centre and Department of Russian and Slavonic Studies at the University of Sheffield, U.K. He is the author of* Carnival Culture and the Soviet Modernist Novel *(1996) and* The Bakhtin Circle: Philosophy, Politics and Culture *(2002) and the coeditor of three volumes, most notably* The Bakhtin Circle: In the Master's Absence *(with David Shepherd and Galin Tihanov, 2004). He is currently the director of the British Arts and Humanities Research Council (AHRC)–funded research project "The Rise of Sociological Linguistics in the Soviet Union, 1917–1938: Institutions, Ideas, and Agendas."*

perspective governed by the concept of *Völkerpsychologie*.[2] The present article examines how Soviet linguistics extricated itself from *Völkerpsychologie* but nevertheless remained marked by its concerns and orientations.

The Establishment of *Völkerpsychologie* in Russia

The first generation of Soviet linguists had generally been trained by philologists and linguists who were steeped in the psychology of Moritz Lazarus (1824–1903) and Haymann Steinthal (1823–1899) or their successor, Wilhelm Wundt (1832–1920). The term coined only in 1851 (Lazarus, 1851) and the concept theoretically elaborated in 1860 (Lazarus & Steinthal, 1860), *Völkerpsychologie* found a ready audience among Russian philologists almost immediately. Accepting the *völkerpsychologische* notion that language is primarily a "psycho-physical activity," a "'linguistic continuum' unfolding in time and space through the linguistic activity of the totality of individuals that make up society" (Amirova, Ol´khovikov, & Rozhdestvenskii, 1975, p. 373), the prominent Russian philologist Aleksandr Potebnia (1835–1891) referred enthusiastically to Steinthal's 1858 book on the origin of language in which the laws of both individual psychology and *Völkerpsychologie* are shown to govern the relationship between thought and language. The influence of this book was clear as early as 1862, in Potebnia's book *Thought and Language* (Potebnia, 1862/1993). Potebnia and another important Russian philologist, Aleksandr Veselovskii (1838–1906), attended Steinthal's lectures in Berlin in 1862–1863, and a year later, a Russian translation of Steinthal and Lazarus (1860) appeared in the journal *Philological Notes* (*Filologicheskie zapiski*) (Shteintal´ & Latsarus, 1864). Potebnia and Veselovskii went on to publish in the organ of the *Völkerpsychologie* movement, the *Journal for Völkerpsychologie and Linguistics* (*Zeitschrift für Völkerpsychologie und Sprachwissenschaft*) (Toporkov, 1997, pp. 338–339), and apply the principles of the new discipline in their works (see especially Berezin, 1976, pp. 9–39; Potebnia, 1895/1993; Veselovskii, 1959; Zhirmunskii, 1939).

This early version of *Völkerpsychologie* was given even wider exposure in Russia in 1867, when tsarist censors fought an ultimately unsuccessful battle to stop the publication of the Russian translation of Wundt's 1863 *Lectures on the Human and Animal Soul* (*Vorlesungen über die Menschen- und Tierseele*), where the work of Lazarus and Steinthal is showcased, and most of the second half of the book is given over to "topics then being addressed in the pages of the new *Zeitschrift für Völkerpsychologie*" (Danziger, 1983, p. 306).[3] In the 1870s and 1880s, the main thrust of philological studies in Russian academic institutions was within ethnographic and cultural history, with linguistic research often arising as a by-product. Inspired by the success of German Romantic researchers such as the Grimm brothers, Russian philologists combined investigations into folklore and oral literature with theoretical reflection on myth, and the central principle of *Völkerpsychologie*, that the common activity of individuals gives rise to objective cultural forms that in turn produce the individual psychological subjects who engage in common activity, found a ready audience

2. This was generally rendered in Russian as *psikhologiia narodov*, the psychology of nations (or peoples, since the Russian *narod* signifies the people-nation as opposed to *natsiia*, the nation state), though the influential philosopher Gustav Shpet (1927/1989) subsequently suggested *etnicheskaia psikhologiia*, ethnic psychology, would be more appropriate. The English translations are no less problematic, with the customary "folk psychology" quite inappropriate and the rather better alternative "cultural psychology" not having achieved wide currency. In the present article, we will retain the German original.

3. On the struggle over Wundt's book and its aftermath, see Joravsky (1989, pp. 92–104). On the youthful version of *Völkerpsychologie* upheld by Wundt here but later repudiated, see Jahoda (1993, pp. 172–174).

among philologists. These foundational works of Russian philology established the German movement as the methodological foundation of Russian linguistic thought.

VÖLKERPSYCHOLOGIE #1 AND #2

In 1865, Lazarus noted that the fundamental principle of *Völkerpsychologie* is that "[w]herever several people live together it is a necessary result of their companionship that there develops an objective mental content which then becomes the content, norm and organ of their further subjective activity" (Danziger, 1983, p. 305). The relationship between individual psychological activity and the cultural artifacts produced thereby is presented as a dialectical process, but there were severe limits on the extent to which this account could become a study of the sociological interaction of individuals and social groups, since language, mythology, and custom were held to form a *Volksgeist*, or "objective spirit" of the *Volk*, an "inner activity common to all individuals" (Lazarus & Steinthal, 1860, p. 29). At worst, the *Volksgeist* became a mystical substance, a hypostatized *Volksseele*, which barred the way to further sociological analyses of language and culture,[4] but countervailing tendencies repeatedly at least raised the issue of relations between social groups within a single nation.

This inability to theorize interaction may be a reflection of the influence of the associative psychology of Johann Herbart (1776–1841), which viewed psychology as the "mechanics of the mind." Ideas here interact rather like physical particles in physics, making up independent substances through "apperception," the "process by which a presentation mass assimilates new material or works smaller into larger systems" (Nerlich, 1992, p. 57). In the work of Lazarus and Steinthal, this process of apperception was operating in language, and especially in myth, the "verbal form that is the apperception of nature and man, the image of contemplation at a certain stage in the development of the *Volksseele*" (Shteintal & Latsarus, 1864, p. 35). It was rejection of this Herbartian basis for *Völkerpsychologie* that most clearly distinguished Wundt's thought from that of his predecessors. While Wundt retained Herbart's term, *apperception*, he gave it a different sense, using it to denote the link between apperception and Volksseele. Apperception now became a voluntary *act* in which old mental contents are brought into a new synthesis. *Volksseele* in Wundt's work was but "a convenient way of referring on the one hand to general psychological processes that emerge from the reciprocity (*Wechselwirkung*) between individuals and on the other to the mental products resulting from it such as language and myths" (Nerlich & Clarke, 1998, p. 182).[5] The relative autonomy of such "products" from the individual physiological lives that can be investigated experimentally, and the fact that products are encountered by the individual as "ready made" for their participation, meant that there was a distinction in principle between physiological psychology and *Völkerpsychologie*.

Steinthal combined the ideas of Wilhelm von Humboldt and Herbart in an attempt to classify languages and myths according to their structures and correlated these with various levels of civilization. This correlation was readily accepted by Russian philologists, although Potebnia and others demonstrated an interest in the details of the historical mutations of grammatical form and the modes of thought hidden within them that was quite distinct from Steinthal's subordination of grammar to (psycho)logic (Katsnel´son, 1985/2001, p. 797).

4. It seems Lazarus was chiefly responsible for this way of thinking, while Steinthal was much more careful to reject such hypostatization. On this, see Kalmar (1987, p. 681).

5. Wundt was certainly not clear or unambiguous about this issue, however. On the controversy over the status of *Volksseele*, see Jahoda (1993, p. 182)

Wundt's approach left linguists much more uncomfortable, however, and some contested his linguistic ideas. Whereas Steinthal had imposed a psychological interpretation of linguistic data from without, leaving the practice of linguists relatively undisturbed while providing a psychological underpinning for their empirical observations, Wundt intervened directly in topical linguistic debates over such matters as semantic change and the definition of the sentence (Nerlich & Clarke, 1998, pp. 187–188), with the aim of subordinating linguistics to psychology. In essence, Wundt took the then-pervasive view of language as a "psycho-physical activity" to an extreme, focusing on "the various types and forms of ideas that language could express, given the psychological make-up of man" and downplaying the significance of "the actual linguistic means which various languages use to express these ideas" (Amsterdamska, 1987, p. 224). Thus, even those linguists who were not prepared to challenge the definition of language as "psycho-physical activity" were compelled to resist the Wundtian reduction of linguistics to a technical support for psychology.

Völkerpsychologie thus both stimulated and limited a sociological perspective on linguistic phenomena. On the positive side, it looked at language as a crucial and inseparable part of social life, specifically of culture, the *Volksgeist*. This *Volksgeist* is the "law-governed behavior and development of inner activity" of a *Volk*, and this is itself but a variety of "group spirit," *Gestamtheitgeist*, or "objective spirit," *objektive Geist*. There may be such *Geister* of "religious communities, of social estates, of scientific and artistic schools and others indeed" (Kalmar, 1987, p. 675). This approach clearly promised to facilitate the investigation of the principle of unity behind specific social dialects and, at the very least, raised the problem of the relationship between these dialects and the national language. On the negative side, however, this potential was undermined by the inability of theorists to subject social interaction to investigation and a related inclination to view the *Geist* of the national group as a prototype for all the others (Danziger, 1983, pp. 310–311). These negative features would be overcome only after the Revolution.

Russian Linguistics on the Eve of the Revolution

Two important schools of linguistics emerged in Russia in the late nineteenth century, both bearing the unmistakable marks of *Völkerpsychologie*: the Moscow School of Filipp Fortunatov (1848–1914) and Aleksei Shakhmatov (1864–1920) and the Kazan´ school of Jan Baudouin de Courtenay (1845–1929) and Mikol´aj Kruszewski (1851–1887). The Moscow School strove to bring mathematical rigor to linguistics, with close attention paid to formal questions; however, in the latter part of his career, Shakhmatov became increasingly concerned with psychological and social factors and turned his attention to syntax. For Shakhmatov, psychology studies the laws of individual thought, while syntax studies the norms of the verbal expression of thought; where psychology deals with individual thinking and generalizes from observations of the spiritual life of individuals, syntax deals with the norms worked out in a particular medium that are obligatory for all speakers who want to be listened to and understood. The functioning of language in society is now determined by the interplay between psychological and linguistic laws, with "social" limited to the factors that are common to all individuals involved (Bezlepkin, 2002, p. 125). As Grigorii Vinokur (1925, p. 14) noted, when Shakhmatov speaks about the language of a society, a people, and the like, it is "only as a combination of languages of individuals who engage in certain relations thanks to the unity of their common origin." This is a typical *völkerpsychologische* position. Like Potebnia before him, then, Shakhmatov insisted that the study of linguistic form is more than a technical support for psychology but nevertheless accepted the idea that linguistic structures

are, and should be studied as, the products of general psychological laws, the realm of *Völkerpsychologie*. Shakhmatov thus praised Wundt for revealing "the psychological processes that gave rise to language and its further development" but reproached him for paying too little attention to the concrete history of the languages of "cultured peoples" as found in their cultural "monuments," and for basing his observations on the languages of "primitive" peoples (quoted in Berezin, 1976, p. 166).

Practical linguistic research soon began to expose the limits of *Völkerpsychologie* as a theoretical basis for the theory of language, however. In 1899, Shakhmatov initiated a project for the systematic description of the dialects of Russian (Shakhmatov, 1899) and was also the main organizing force behind the establishment of the Moscow Dialectology Commission of the Russian Academy of Sciences, which began work in 1904 and led to the production of the first dialect map of Russian in 1915 (Durnovo, Sokolov, & Ushakov, 1915). Language as a synchronic system came to the forefront of this research as Russian scholars began to draw upon the work of dialect geographers such as Georg Wenker in Germany and Jules Gilliéron in France. At around the same time, the influence of French sociological linguistics began to be felt in Russia, and its main representative, Antoine Meillet, even became a corresponding member of the Russian Academy of Sciences in 1906, the very moment when his famous work on the social causes of semantic changes (Meillet, 1905–1906/1926) was appearing in Durkheim's *Année Sociologique* (Shcherba, 1966, p. 97). By 1916, Shakhmatov's investigations into the formation of the Russian language and his dialectological research had led to many insights into the sociological dimensions of language formation. He could thus argue that the growth and spread of the Moscow dialect into an urban koine that ultimately was to become the Russian language was due to the growth of the cities, the trade of goods and the formation of a stable ruling class (Desnitskaia, 1981, pp. 80–81). All this proto-sociological analysis nevertheless remained within the framework of a study of the formation of the national language as an aspect of the formation of a national psychology.

The Kazan´ (later Petersburg) School was even more closely integrated into the tradition of *Völkerpsychologie*. In a survey of linguistics written at the beginning of the twentieth century, Baudouin de Courtenay noted that there was a movement away from the philological approach to language, and that linguistics was moving nearer to "other sciences that are more closely related" (Boduen de Kurtene, 1904/1963c, p. 110). Psychology was one of the most significant of these sciences, and Baudouin de Courtenay's pupil Stanisl´aw Szober noted immediately after his teacher's death that Steinthal had exerted a strong influence on Baudouin de Courtenay. Several other commentators have since commented upon Baudouin de Courtenay's debt to Steinthal. Amirova et al. (1975, p. 373) convincingly argue that Baudouin de Courtenay adopted Steinthal's notion of language as a "linguistic continuum" in opposition to Schleicher's notion of language as organism. For Baudouin de Courtenay, as for Steinthal (1864, pp. 68–69), "Language exists only in individual brains, only in souls, only in the psyche of individuals or individual persons who comprise a given language community" (1904/1963b, p. 71).[6] Sharadzenidze (1980, p. 30) goes as far as to argue that Baudouin de Courtenay remained a follower of Steinthal to the end, adopting his "general linguistic conceptions together with Herbartian associative psychology and *Völkerpsychologie*." There is certainly evidence for this. Baudouin de Courtenay's 1903 encyclopedia article on linguistics argues, "The originally metaphysical character of this branch of science has receded more and more behind the psychological treatment of language (Steinthal, Lazarus, & others), which

6. For a list of references for Steinthal's criticisms of Schleicher, see Kalmar (1987, p. 282, n. 49).

today receives more and more adherents and which will gradually, in agreement with the psychic basis of the human language, become the sole trend in linguistics" (quoted in Koerner, 1973, p. 145, n. 8). The Herbartian aspect of Baudouin de Courtenay's work is clear in another encyclopedia article of the following year, where he argues that language, understood as the "capacity to speak . . . can be reduced to the capacity to associate (combine) extra-linguistic presentations [*predstavleniia*] (presentations of meaning in general), with presentations of certain movements of the organism itself, which have an effect upon one's own or another's senses [*chuvstva*]" (1904/1963b, p. 70).[7]

Baudouin de Courtenay maintained a personal friendship and long-standing correspondence with Meillet as well as a correspondence with Saussure and he occupied a position somewhere between *Völkerpsychologie* and the positions of his two French interlocutors: sociological and structural linguistics, respectively. His closeness to Meillet was visible in the significant amount of attention he paid to the social stratification of language according to regional, socioeconomic, religious, and other factors (Leont´ev, 1966). On the one hand, he saw languages as stratified "horizontally" according to national (*narodnye*), territorial, and ethnographic features, and marked by differences of pronunciation. On the other hand, languages were stratified "vertically" according to education, profession, and social class, with language used in different ways as expressions of varying worldviews (Boduen de Kurtene, 1908/1963a). Baudouin de Courtenay was here clearly adapting Humboldtian principles of language as worldview to sociological investigation in a way that had not previously been attempted. Baudouin de Courtenay also argued that, looking at a given language over time, one can discern centripetal and centrifugal forces at work and social regularities in language change. Because he theorized language in this way, Baudouin de Courtenay was the most significant prerevolutionary sociological thinker about language; nevertheless, like Shakhmatov's, his sociological reflections were always subordinated to psychology. As he notes toward the end of his 1904 article: "Language does not exist and change arbitrarily, according to some caprice, but according to permanent laws—not according to [neo-Grammarian] 'sound-laws,' for such laws do not and could not exist in language, but according to psychological and sociological laws, which is why we identify sociology with what is known as the psychology of nations (*Völkerpsychologie*)" (1904/1963b, p. 94).[8] This preponderance of *Völkerpsychologie* in Baudouin de Courtenay's thought led Meillet, a rather more orthodox sociologist, to note in a letter to Baudouin de Courtenay, "I am inclined to reproach you for paying too much attention to the *psychological* side to the detriment of the *physiological* side and the *sociological* side, which, in my opinion, are at least as important" (Leont´ev, 1966, p. 331).

The same recourse to *Völkerpsychologie* also prevented Baudouin de Courtenay from developing his many insights into a structural theory of the phoneme. As early as 1870, Baudouin de Courtenay distinguished between language "in potentia" (*iazyk*) and language "in actu" (*rech´*) in the same way as Saussure was to distinguish between *langue* and *parole*. He explicitly assigned the phoneme to *langue*. Baudouin de Courtenay and Kruszewski were soon presenting path-breaking work on the phoneme as a functional concept, with their focus

7. Here and elsewhere, Baudouin de Courtenay, like Krushevskii, used *predstavlenie* in the sense of Herbart's *Vorstellung*. Thus, psychological association is repeatedly termed the "combination of associations" [*soedinenie predstavlenii*], on which, see Boduen de Kurtene (1888/1963d, pp. 184–186).

8. This notion of sociology as the child of *Völkerpsychologie* was also common in Germany at this time. Lazarus Schweiger won the Moritz Lazarus Prize of 1899 for a study of *Völkerpsychologie* and sociology in which the former was said to constitute an "initial stage" of the latter. On this and the debt of the early sociologist Georg Simmel to Steinthal and Lazarus, see Frisby (1984, p. 122).

firmly on the relations between sound and meaning. However, following Kruszewski's early death, Baudouin de Courtenay retreated from this autonomous study of phonetics and sought a bridge between phonetics and psychology that he called "psychophonetics." The *völkerpsychologische* idea that language is a "psycho-physical activity" that underlies the perspective on language developed by the neogrammarians reasserted itself in his later works, and "'individual psychic processes' are considered as the only reality of language, while its social aspect is branded a pure fiction, devoid of objective existence, or an artificial product" (Jakobson, 1971, p. 419; see also Amsterdamska, 1987, pp. 258–259; Loia, 1929, pp. 133–138). The full development of sociolinguistics demanded a break with the psychological heritage of the nineteenth century.

The Fall of *Völkerpsychologie*

In the very first years after the Revolution, *Völkerpsychologie* retained its hegemony in Soviet linguistics and psychology. As the publishing industry began to recover after the devastation of the Civil War, the prerevolutionary agenda of the psychology of language remained. The republication of the works of Potebnia began in 1922, starting with *Thought and Language* and continuing with the publication of P. A. Buzuk's Potebnian *Essays on the Psychology of Language* (Peterson, 1928, pp. 207–208).[9] Wundt's influence remained strong in psychology, especially while his follower and former student Georgii Chelpanov (1862–1936) remained the head of the first Institute of Psychology in Russia. Chelpanov had founded perhaps the best-staffed and best-equipped psychology laboratory in Europe at the time and sought to maintain the Wundtian link between psychology and philosophy (Kozulin, 1985). Indeed, one of the first books (re)published after the Revolution was the seventh edition of Chelpanov's *Introduction to Philosophy* (1918), in which Wundt is given a prominent place, and this occurred despite a serious paper shortage. Chelpanov's senior assistant and ultimate successor Konstantin Kornilov (1879–1957) had also proclaimed himself a follower of Wundt, and the leading Bolshevik Nikolai Bukharin (1888–1938) cited Wundt as an authority on psychology in his influential textbook of Marxist sociology in 1921 (Joravsky, 1989, pp. 208, 223). It was Wundt's rationale for *Völkerpsychologie* that Bukharin discussed most enthusiastically (Bukharin, 1921/1926, p. 95), but while Bukharin's book gained authority toward the end of the 1920s, Wundt's influence received a decisive blow when Kornilov replaced Chelpanov and launched a drive for a "Marxist reconstruction" of psychology in 1924.

Kornilov's path to power was forged in a struggle against Chelpanov, whose subjective idealism he repeatedly raised as a target. In the process, Kornilov also sharply distinguished himself from Wundt and set a trend for consigning *Völkerpsychologie* to the idealist dustbin. Psychology soon divided into two camps: (a) subjective, or *geisteswissenschaftliche*, psychology, associated with Dilthey and *Völkerpsychologie*, and (b) objective psychology, which included such varied trends as American behaviorism, Pavlov's "reflexology" and Gestalt psychology. The envisaged "Marxist psychology" was generally held to be a new variety of the second trend, and so the first became a set of propositions against which the new Soviet psychology should define itself.[10] This directly impinged on linguistic theory when in Leningrad

9. It may be significant that the second "reworked and supplemented" edition (Buzuk, 1924) was retitled *Fundamental Problems of Linguistics*, thus shifting attention away from the psychological paradigm.

10. The most important direct result of the trend inaugurated by Kornilov's ascent was the work of L. S. Vygotskii and his followers A.R. Luria and A.N. Leont′ev. On this connection, see Van der Veer and Valsiner (1991, pp. 112–140). Vygotskii's *Thinking and Speech* (1934) marks the most mature form of his psycholinguistics and cultural-historical approach to psychology.

in 1927 Sergei Dobrogaev organized a research laboratory on the physiology of speech at the Nauchno-issledovatel´skii institut sravnitel´noi istorii literatur i iazykov Zapada i Vostoka (ILIaZV, the Scientific Research Institute for the Comparative History of the Literature and Languages of the West and East; from 1930, the Gosudarstvennyi institut rechevoi kul´tury [GIRK], the State Institute for Discursive Culture). One of the laboratory's stated aims was "the experimental study of the basic physiological laws of human discursive behavior as an anatomical-physiological and social phenomenon" (TsGALI f. 288 op. 1 d. 39 l.80). In a programmatic paper, Dobrogaev (1929) argued that, together, sociological linguistics and a Pavlovian physiology of speech would bring the reign of "subjective psychologism" to an end. Within the sociological approach, the dominance of the "psychology of nations" (*psikhologiia narodov*), the usual Russian rendering of *Völkerpsychologie*, was now to be replaced by that of the psychology of classes, and under the new conditions, the nation could no longer be held to be the prototype of other social groups.

One of the most important factors in turning the academic community against Wundtian ideas was, however, not the rise of a sociological theory or a Pavlovian theory of reflexes but the replacement of *Völkerpsychologie* with the "antipsychologistic" psychology that derived from Brentano's act psychology and Husserl's phenomenology as the basis for psychological reflections on language. Central to this development were the accounts of dialogic speech acts developed by Anton Marty (1908) and Karl Bühler[11] that were developed in conscious opposition to the "monologic" theories of Wundt (and, to some extent, Husserl). Crucial in this reorientation was the replacement of Wundt's *Volksseele* with "the other" so that social interaction was made the "seat" of linguistic phenomena (Nerlich & Clarke, 1998, p. 189). This replacement also provided a bridge to the intersubjective linguistics of Michel Bréal, for whom the addressee is the central orientation, and from there to Antoine Meillet who, as Mounin notes, adopted Breal's sociological orientation and, thanks to his contacts with Emile Durkheim, gave it a "more formally theoretical character" (Mounin, 1972, p. 62). Records of research seminars held at the most significant early Soviet institutions that dealt with the theory of language show that the works of Marty and Bühler were regularly debated (Freiberger-Sheikholeslami, 1982; Poleva, 2000; Ushakov, 2001; RGALI f.941, d.14, l.24-5), and many important and influential Soviet works that emerged in the 1920s resulted from the selective assimilation of the new psychological and linguistic ideas. Among the most influential was Gustav Shpet's attempt to recast, according to a phenomenological agenda, the Humboldtian notion of the inner form of language, which had been absorbed into *Völkerpsychologie* by Humboldt's student Steinthal, and into Russian linguistics by Potebnia. Marty's notion of the "inner form of the word," resulting from the divergence of etymological and pragmatic meaning as a speaker aims to evoke a meaning in the hearer's mind, was particularly productive here. Meanwhile, Peterson championed the ideas of Meillet at the Moscow Institute of Language and Literature—for example, in his article about Meillet and Saussure in *Pechat´ i revoliutsiia*, one of the most influential journals of the time (Peterson, 1923).

The fall of *Völkerpsychologie* from its position of authority thus resulted from a three-pronged attack on the legacy of Wundt. In the first place, the shift within psychology toward "objectivist" trends such as behaviorism, Gestalt psychology, and the reflexology of the Pavlov school played a role similar to the "positivist repudiation" of Wundt that Kurt Danziger (1979) has noted in Western psychology. Secondly, *Völkerpsychologie* suf-

11. Bühler's approach was developed in several works, beginning with his review of Marty (1908) and culminating in his elaborated *Theory of Language* of 1934 (Bühler, 1934/1990).

fered a "linguistic repudiation" that followed from the works of Marty and Bühler, as discussed by Nerlich and Clarke (1998). Finally, there was a "sociological repudiation" that resulted from the dual influence of Durkheimian sociology and Marxism. As Robert Farr notes (1996, pp. 41–44), Durkheim's strict division between the object domains of psychology and sociology on the basis of a distinction between individual and collective representations was particularly important in sealing the fate of *Völkerpsychologie* in the social sciences. Although Durkheim's own work, which was clearly based on neo-Kantian ideas, was suspect to most Soviet Marxists, the influence of Durkheimian ideas permeated Soviet scholarship through the work of two of his students, Meillet and Lucien Lévy-Bruhl. Another sociological repudiation of *Völkerpsychologie* that was particularly influential in the early Soviet period was that of Georg Simmel (Frisby, 1984), whose concentration on "forms of sociation" and relations between subjective and objective culture was readily and widely assimilated.

These important developments have, however, been overshadowed by the noisy dictatorship exercised in Soviet linguistics between 1931 and 1950 by the followers of Nikolai Marr (1864–1934). Combining *völkerpsychologische* notions of the psycho-physical nature of language with Lévy-Bruhl's work on "primitive consciousness" and superficially Marxist tenets,[12] Marr argued 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. This was combined with outlandish ideas about the derivation of all languages from four primary elements and the denial of the reality of families of languages. While these ideas achieved official recognition as "Marxism in linguistics" in 1931 and maintained this status until Stalin denounced the trend in June 1950, it remained only one theory among others throughout the 1920s and, to a significant extent, was paid only lip service by many linguists in the 1930s and 1940s. Furthermore, whole areas of linguistic study remained outside Marr's one-sidedly genetic approach to language, which concentrated on the distant past and unverifiable future of language development. An exploration of the relationship between *Völkerpsychologie* and Marrism requires separate treatment and must here be left aside.[13]

The Sociological Repudiation of *Völkerpsychologie*

Hostility toward psychologism was initially stronger among the intellectual heirs of the Moscow Linguistic School than among the Petrograd (later Leningrad) linguists. This hostility was most likely due to the greater (initial) involvement of the Moscow linguists in dialectological research. The Moscow Linguistic Circle (MLC) was formed in 1915 as an initiative of certain students of the leading members of the Moscow Dialectology Commission (MDC), Ushakov and Durnovo, and the two groups remained in close contact (Barankova, 1999, p. 363). Indeed, Grigorii Vinokur was for a time personally involved in both groups (Tseitlin, 1965, pp. 12–13), while Roman Jakobson sought to combine descriptive and historical dialectology in an analysis of the way in which linguistic changes in the Moscow region could be explained by the cultural and political role of Moscow. While Matejka (1987, p. 309) is certainly correct in noting how the MLC's dialectological

12. It is important to note, however, that the influence of Wundt is also evident in Marr's work on the rise of spoken language from a primordial "gesture language."

13. On the history of Marrism, see Alpatov (2004); on the shifting ideas of Marr, see Thomas (1957). On the relationship of Marrism and *Völkerpsychologie*, see Brandist (2005).

research led to sociological concerns, its members' prerevolutionary work shows no significant advance over Shakhmatov's work of 1916, and may indeed be largely derivative of it. The sociological potential of dialectological research was realized only after 1917, when the climate of opinion shifted decisively from *Völkerpsychologie* to sociological explanation; the work of Saussure came to the attention of researchers, and attempts to update the study of language began in earnest. It was only in 1926–1927 that members of the MLC, now working at the Moscow Institute of Language and Literature, finally began systematically to delineate a sociological approach to language.

In *The Culture of Language* (1925), Vinokur sought to bury Russian linguistics' nineteenth-century heritage of psychologism by championing Saussure's synchronic linguistics as a necessary precondition for the pursuit of a theoretically coherent language policy. Rozaliia Shor's *Language and Society* (1926) and Mikhail Peterson's "Language as a Social Phenomenon" (1927) were similar attempts to bring Soviet linguistics up to date by drawing on the insights of Saussure, Meillet, and Vendryes. The popularity of these French thinkers among Soviet linguists was such that Russian translations of their main works appeared in the 1930s despite the dominance of Marrism by that time.[14] Shor presents her work as an attempt to make Western European ideas about language and society accessible to a Soviet audience, but she nevertheless attempts to link "social dialects" to the group psychologies that arise from the complexities of economic production in contemporary society. Relations of production finally attain explanatory primacy in this analysis, showing that Marxist principles had made their way through to linguistic study. In his attempt to delineate a methodology for understanding language as a social phenomenon, Peterson admitted that the MDC had recognized the social dimension of language only "by accident," as it were, and followed Meillet in connecting the functional analysis of language to Durkheim's account of social functions. As one might expect from this Durkheimian approach, however, here we have a general sociological analysis and the primacy of productive relations is not invoked. In each case, the focus of study had shifted from what Baudouin de Courtenay had called the horizontal to the vertical stratification of language.

In Petrograd (later Leningrad), where the influence of Baudouin de Courtenay was more pronounced, the impact of the Saussurean revolution in linguistics was less immediate. In the first years after the Revolution, the work of the Petrograd formalists continued to bear the marks of Baudouin de Courtenay's psychologism, and indeed they never completely liberated themselves from it.[15] The first applications of the functional model of language use were here limited to distinguishing between poetic and prose language in a way that still drew on Potebnia. The identified functions of language soon proliferated, however, and found sociological applications now that "the other" had come to the forefront of philosophical concerns. In the work of Lev Iakubinskii (1923/1986), a student of Baudouin de Courtenay and Shakhmatov and for a time a member of the OPOIaZ group

14. Meillet was even highly praised by Loia (1929, pp. 206–209, 211) in a collection edited by Marr in 1929. For an outstanding discussion of the reception of French linguistic ideas among Soviet scholars, see Desnitskaia (1991).

15. This may explain the relative openness of the Leningrad (as opposed to the Moscow) linguists to Marrist ideas in which the stage of a language's development and the mentality of its speakers were identified on the basis that both are superstructures that have arisen on the economic base. It should be noted that Baudouin de Courtenay was among the many linguists, such as Hugo Schuchardt, who respected Marr's early work on Japhetic languages and indeed corresponded with him. It may also, however, explain why it is from this quarter that the most principled opposition to Marrism arose in the person of Polivanov, since the two thinkers competed for the same ground.

of Petrograd formalists, the functional approach to language is developed into a sustained analysis of different types of dialogue and monologue, the former being regarded as "natural," while the latter is artificial and correlated with authority. This conception was later passed on to Valentin Voloshinov, who developed what is now known as the "Bakhtinian" account of dialogue, by combining Iakubinskii's insights into functional types of utterance with the "organon model" of the speech act developed by Bühler (Brandist, 2004). Dialogue, the discursive embodiment of intersubjective interaction, now becomes the inner form of language and culture. The notion that language embodies a worldview and that dialogue is a meeting of worldviews in the creative process of cultural production is carried over into the work of the Bakhtin Circle, the members of which were never able to establish an institutional foundation for their often-sophisticated accounts of culture.

The earliest OPOIaZ works on poetics remained rooted in Baudouin de Courtenay's psychophonetics, but gradually the sociological imperative began to dominate, and Baudouin de Courtenay's two students Iakubinskii and Evgenii Polivanov defected from the group and began to link their work to Marxist social theory and the practical tasks of Soviet language policy.[16] While both thinkers had a common starting point and pattern of development, the theories that they developed were quite distinct. As Leont´ev (1961, p. 117) notes:

> Polivanov followed Baudouin in viewing language as a function of individual linguistic thinking; the fact of the existence of a common language is conditional on the commonality of socioeconomic conditions. Iakubinskii similarly held that "language is a variety of human behavior," but "human behavior is a psychological (biological) fact, as a manifestation of the human organism, and a *sociological* fact since such behavior depends on the combined life of this organism with other organisms in conditions of *interaction*." But if, for Iakubinskii, the well-tested influence of [Pavlov's] reflexology appears to be present, with all factors conditioning the discursive process equally, Polivanov considers the social factor definitive and—most importantly—does not enclose his "commonality of the apperceptive mass within the limits of a given environment"; he views discourse [*rech´*] as a "process of labor (as well as having the most serious socioeconomic functions)," that is, an activity that is social by its very *nature*.

In each case, then, Baudouin de Courtenay's *völkerpsychologische* view of language as a dynamic process and "spatio-temporal continuum" remains, but the continuing potency of the Herbartian psychology varies. Iakubinskii's 1923 article on dialogic discourse, which is the source of most original citations within the above quotation, resounds with a distinctly Herbartian tone, though this diminished significantly as Iakubinskii's ideas developed throughout the decade. Both Iakubinskii and Polivanov nevertheless remained insulated from the worst excesses of sociological reductionism that plagued Soviet linguistics in the 1930s by Baudouin de Courtenay's insistence on the fundamental distinction between the internal and external histories of a language. Thus, by the early 1930s, Iakubinskii had rooted all the varying functions of language in two core functions: language as means of intercourse and as ideology. But he insisted that, while they are distinct, language always appears in both functions, and the contradiction between these functions, which is determined

16. It should be noted that, while a member of OPOIaZ, Polivanov, and indeed Viktor Zhirmunskii, also attended MLC meetings (Tseitlin, 1965, p. 14), the experience of which undoubtedly contributed to their later interest in dialectology. Loia also thanks Iakubinskii for his support in an outspoken attack on the subjective-idealist followers of Baudouin de Courtenay in a paper presented at ILIaZV as early as May 1926 (1929, p. 133).

by socioeconomic circumstances, acts as the "inner motor" of a language's development (Ivanov & Iakubinskii, 1932, p. 62). Polivanov similarly distinguished between "the technical laws of linguistic development" and extra-linguistic economic and political factors that interact and serve as just such an "inner motor." Thus, "social change does not affect the direction (that is, the final result) of some separate historico-phonetic process. . . . For factors of a social (economic-political) character there is a much wider arena of action: on these [factors] may depend a radical question: will a given evolution in the language of a given collective come to be or not?" (Leont´ev, 1961, p. 118).

Over the course of the 1920s, a series of developments transformed the work of the Petrograd linguists, with several ideas coming together to form, at best, a successful synthesis and, at worst, an interesting syncresis of the ideas they inherited. One important dimension was the turn from poetics narrowly considered to the analysis of public discourse (*publichnaia rech´*) in general. This new emphasis was particularly apparent in 1924, when several former OPOIaZ members came together to analyze the language and style of the works of Lenin in the journal *Lef*. By 1926, Iakubinskii had established a collective research project to build on this research at ILIaZV. The focus had now widened to encompass "contemporary Russian political public discourse on both the material of the greatest orators of the All-Union Communist Party and mass public discourse." Two problems were presented for particular attention: "1) grammatical and lexical 'correctness' in conditions of mass public discourse; and 2) questions of the devices [*priemy*] of discursive dialectics" (TsGALI f.288, op. 1, d. 39, l. 4).[17]

These developments happened to coincide with consolidation of the policy of "socialism in one country" and the "Lenin Levy," by which the Party systematically engineered a bureaucracy that could ultimately act as a ruling class within a single Soviet state and exercise hegemony over the disparate nationalities and social groups that had become detached from central leadership as a result of the destruction of the imperial bureaucracy. By the late 1920s, several notable linguists had analyzed the linguistic consequences of the collapse of imperial authority, with a breakdown of communication between national and social groups starkly documented. A variety of possible solutions to this problem were advanced,[18] but as the Soviet bureaucracy became a ruling class that acted in accordance with its own distinct economic and social interests, and as economic crisis loomed, the danger of linguistic fragmentation was increasingly viewed by the bureaucracy as the most threatening prospect.

The ultimate results of Iakubinskii's project included an edited volume on *The Practice of Oratorical Speech* [*rech´*] (Kreps & Erberg, 1931) and a series of articles in Gor´kii's journal *Literaturnaia ucheba* in 1930–1931, republished in book form as Ivanov and Iakubinskii (1932), in which the emerging conventions of the bureaucratic public discourse were presented as the factual linguistic outcome of the Revolution. The language of the political leadership was presented as the hegemonic language of the new society, as Iakubinskii continued to adhere to one of the goals of ILIaZV set out in the institute's "production plan" of 1925–1926: "the scientific study of questions raised by state re-

17. This project complemented one led by V. A. Desnitskii, but pursued in collaboration with Iakubinskii et al., to collate "the utterances on language and literature" from the "classics of Marxism and dialectical materialism" (TsGALI f. 288, op. 1, d. 39, l. 1; l. 4, l. 6). The volumes resulting from these projects were subsequently published several times.

18. This is particularly well documented in Gorham (2003), where special attention is given to the debates about Soviet public discourse.

quirements" (TsGALI f. 288, op. 1, d. 16, l. 2), even if now narrowed in accordance with the policy of "socialism in one country."[19]

Although Iakubinskii's argument fitted in with the political priorities of the time, it was far from the exercise in crude propaganda that a brief sketch suggests.[20] The drive to spread literacy and to carry out research into the crisis of communication between social groups gave a new relevance and inflection to studies of social dialectology, and the students of Baudouin de Courtenay were particularly well placed to develop such an analysis. Baudouin de Courtenay's most senior student, Lev Shcherba, had conducted dialectological research since shortly before the Revolution, and his research was continued by his assistant Boris Larin, who, while remaining close to Baudouin de Courtenay's ideas, was particularly outward-looking in his search for intellectual guidance. Viktor Zhirmunskii, who worked simultaneously in the Romano-German philology section of ILIaZV and on the institute's "commission to study the languages and ethnic cultures of the national minorities of the south and west of the USSR" (TsGALI f. 288, op. 1, d. 39, l. 6; l. 73), also shifted his focus of attention from literature to dialectology at this time. Through these figures, and through cross-fertilization with ideas of the Moscow Linguistic Circle, the influence of dialect geography, especially that of Jules Gilliéron in France and Ferdinand Wrede in Germany, became particularly apparent, and from this research a fully sociological study of language emerged. As Desnitskaia notes, "the method of linguistic geography" led dialectology increasingly to acquire "the character of a sociological discipline," because such a method demanded a "historical explanation of the extralinguistic causes of the isolation of a dialect and the concrete interpretation of the boundaries and spread of a dialectal phenomenon projected on the map of a linguistic territory" (1970, p. 354). We find two simultaneous applications of the methodology of linguistic geography at this time when Larin led a pioneering research project into the language of the city and Zhirmunskii traveled to Germany in 1927 "to familiarize myself with the latest methods of collecting and studying dialectological and folkloric material." Zhirmunskii worked with the two leading dialect geographers at Marburg University, Wrede and Theodor Frings, the former offering to publish a monograph by the Russian on the dialects of German colonies in the U.S.S.R. (TsGALI f. 288, op. 1, d.2 9 l. 83). Frings's work on the link between dialectal boundaries and those of feudal estates was particularly attractive to Zhirmunskii: his 1936 book *National Language and Social Dialects* clearly set out the sociological implications of dialect geography. After the fall of Marrism, when Soviet scholarship once again opened up to the work of Western linguists, Zhirmunskii (1955) was able to popularize the work of his German mentors by publishing a collection of translations.

While not himself involved in dialectological research, Iakubinskii contributed crucial theoretical insights into the ILIaZV projects, and his work was an important contribution to topical debates about the relationship between dialects (both social and regional) and the national language as both an accomplished fact and a political project. These debates were particularly topical in the 1920s, when ambitious projects to construct written forms and national standards for the many hitherto marginalized and undeveloped languages of the former Russian Empire that lacked either were under way. To posit a standard form of a language without resorting to imperial methods meant choosing between dialects in dialogue with the "progressive national intelligentsias" of a region. With N. F. Iakovlev, Polivanov was the most

19. It is also notable that in 1927–1928 the focus of the Institute's work narrowed to "the study of the languages and oral cultures of the contemporary city, village, and national minorities of the U.S.S.R., and also the neighboring peoples of the West and East on the basis of their socioeconomic, political, and general-cultural development" (TsGALI f. 288, op. 1, d. 39, l. 1b).

20. For evaluations, see Desnitskaia (1974) and Brandist (2003).

prominent linguist in this project, and it was Polivanov who, in 1929, set out an "immediate program of sociological linguistics" in seven basic subdivisions:

(1) Definition of language as a sociohistorical fact. Strictly speaking, the combination of linguist and Marxist in one person already presupposes a solution to this problem. But, nevertheless, a formulation is still necessary. Thus, this is only the first necessary step and no more.
(2) Description of languages and dialects from the sociological point of view. First of all, of course, a methodology is needed (with new concepts on the order of social group dialects, etc.)
(3) Evaluative analysis of the given language as an instrument of intercourse.
(4) Study of the causal connections between socioeconomic and linguistic phenomena.
(5) Evaluative analysis of language (and its separate aspects) as a means of the struggle for existence.
(6) A general typological scheme of the evolution of language in connection with the history of culture.
(7) Applied questions of sociological linguistics: language policy. (Polivanov, 1929/1974, pp. 177–178)

Polivanov outlined this sociolinguistic program, quite extraordinarily forward-looking in its day, on the eve of a fundamental transformation of Soviet policy and of the unsuccessful battle with Marrism that would cost him his professional—and ultimately also his biological—life. In this program, we see the culmination of what we might, to borrow a Hegelian term, call the "sublation" (*aufhebung*) of *Völkerpsychologie* in sociological linguistics. In and through the various "repudiations" of *Völkerpsychologie*, the idea was simultaneously cancelled, transformed, and preserved in a higher form. Soviet sociolinguistics truly had risen from the ashes of *Völkerpsychologie*.

There is, however, a coda. The consolidation of this scientific progress required the consolidation of the democratic and anti-imperialist gains that the early years of the Revolution had made possible. This was not to be. With the practical implementation of "socialism in one country" in the First Five Year Plan and the drift back toward an imperial language policy, the institutional base of the new paradigm was compromised, along with the relative autonomy of the field of linguistic science. Thus began a conditional regression of Soviet sociological linguistics in the form of the coronation of Marrism as the officially sanctioned "Marxism in linguistics." With the consolidation of Marr's one-sidedly genetic analysis as the only officially sanctioned approach to language, several of the most important advances made in the 1920s were obscured. Theoretical investigations into the social functions of language were replaced by narrowly instrumental applications in such fields as management training, while appeals to language as ideology overshadowed study of the communicative dimensions of language. The complexities of this conditional regression in linguistic science are no less significant or worthy of historical examination, but they extend beyond the present study.

Research Note

Research for this article was carried out as part of the project "The Rise of Sociological Linguistics in the Soviet Union, 1917–1938: Institutions, Ideas, and Agendas," hosted by the Bakhtin Centre and Department of Russian and Slavonic Studies at the University of Sheffield, U.K., and funded by the British Arts and Humanities Research Council.

References

Archival Sources

(References to fond/opis/delo/list)
Tsentralnyi gosudarstvennyi arkhiv literatury i iskusstva (TsGALI), St. Petersburg. fond #288, ILIaZV.
Rossiskii gosudarstvennyi arkhiv literatury i iskusstva (RGALI), Moscow, fond #941, GAKhN.

Alpatov, V. M. (2004). Istoriia odnogo mifa: Marr i marrizm (2nd ed.). Moscow: URSS.

Amirova, T. A., Ol´khovikov, B. A., & Rozhdestvenskii, Yu. V. (1975). Ocherki po istorii lingvisitiki. Moscow: Vostochnaia literatura.

Amsterdamska, O. (1987). Schools of thought: The development of linguistics from Bopp to Saussure. Dortrecht: Reidel.

Barankova, G. S. (1999). K istorii moskovskogo lingvisticheskogo kruzhka: materialy iz rukopisnogo otdela instituta russkogo iazyka. In S. I. Gidin & N. N. Rozanova (Eds.), Iazyk. Kul´tura. Gumanitarnoe znanie. Nauchnoe issledovnie G.O. Vinokura i sovremennost´ (pp. 359–389). Moscow: Nauchnyi mir.

Belinsky, V. (1963). Thoughts and notes on Russian literature. In R. E. Matlaw (Ed.), Belinsky, Chernyshevsky and Dobrolyubov: Selected criticism (pp. 3–32). New York: Dutton.

Berezin, F. M. (1976). Russkoe iazykoznanie kontsa XIX–nachala XXv. Moscow: Nauka.

Bezlepkin, N. I. (2002). Filosofiia iazyka v Rossii. St. Petersburg: Iskusstvo.

Boduen de Kurtene, I. A. (J. N. Baudouin de Courtenay). (1963a). Blatnaia muzyka. In I. A. Boduen de Kurtene, Izbrannye trudy po obshchemu iazykoznaniiu (Vol. II, pp. 161–162). Moscow: Akademiia nauk. (Original work published 1908)

Boduen de Kurtene, I. A. (J. N. Baudouin de Courtenay). (1963b). Iazyk i iazyki. In I. A. Boduen de Kurtene, Izbrannye trudy po obshchemu iazykoznaniiu (Vol. II, pp. 67–95). Moscow: Akademiia nauk. (Original work published 1904)

Boduen de Kurtene, I. A. (J. N. Baudouin de Courtenay). (1963c). Iazykoznanie. In I. A. Boduen de Kurtene, Izbrannye trudy po obshchemu iazykoznaniiu (Vol. II, pp. 96–117). Moscow: Akademiia nauk. (Original work published 1904)

Boduen de Kurtene, I. A. (J. N. Baudouin de Courtenay). (1963d). Nikolai Krushevskii, ego zhizn´ i nauchnye trudy. In I. A. Boduen de Kurtene, Izbrannye trudy po obshchemu iazykoznaniiu (Vol. I, pp. 146–202). Moscow: Akademiia nauk. (Original work published 1888)

Brandist, C. (2003). The origins of Soviet sociolinguistics. Journal of Sociolinguistics, 7(2), 213–231.

Brandist, C. (2004). Voloshinov's dilemma: On the philosophical roots of the dialogic theory of the utterance. In C. Brandist, D. Shepherd, & G. Tihanov (Eds.), The Bakhtin circle: In the master's absence (pp. 97–124). Manchester, UK: Manchester University Press.

Brandist, C. (2005). Le marrisme et l'heritage dela Völkerpsychologie dans la linguistique sovietique. Cahiers de l'ILSL, 20, 39–56.

Bühler, K. (1990). Theory of language: The representational function of language. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins. (Original work published 1934)

Bukharin, N. (1926). Historical materialism: A system of sociology. London: Allan & Unwin. (Original work published 1921)

Buzuk, P. A. (1924). Osnovnye voprosy iazykoznaniia (2nd ed.) Moscow: V. V. Dumnov.

Chelpanov, G. (1918). Vvedenie v filosofiiu (7th ed.) Moscow and Petrograd: V. V. Dumnov.

Danziger, K. (1979). The positivist repudiation of Wundt. Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences. 15, 205–230.

Danziger, K. (1983). Origins and basic principles of Wundt's Völkerpsychologie. British Journal of Social Psychology, 22, 303–313.

Desnitskaia, A. V. (1970). Ob istoricheskom soderzhanii poniatiia "dialekt". In F. P. Filin (Ed.), Leninizm i teoreticheskie problemy iazykoznaniia (pp. 346–371). Moscow: Nauka.

Desnitskaia, A. V. (1974). Kak sozdavalas´ teoriia natsional´nogo iazyka. In N. F. Belichkov (Ed.), Sovremennye problemy literaturovedeniia i iazykoznaniia (pp. 398–415). Moscow: Nauka.

Desnitskaia, A. V. (1981). O traditsiiakh sotsiologizma v russkom iazykoznanii. In R. I. Avanesov (Ed.), Teoriia iazyka, metody ego issledovaniia i prepodavaniia (pp. 79–87). Leningrad: Nauka.

Desnitskaia, A. V. (1991). Frantsuzskie lingvisty i sovetskoe iazykoznanie 1920-1930kh godov. Izvestiia akademii nauk SSSR: seriia literatury i iazyka, 50(5), 474–485.

Dobrogaev, S. M. (1929). Fiziologicheskii i sotsial´nyi elementy v uchenii o rechi cheloveka. Leningrad: ILIaZV.

Durnovo, N., Sokolov, N., & Ushakov, D. (1915). Opyt dialekticheskoi karty russkogo iazyka v evrope s priozheniem ocherka russkoi dialektologii. Moscow: Akademiia nauk.

Farr, R. M. (1996). The roots of modern social psychology. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.

Freiberger-Sheikholeslami, E. (1982). Forgotten pioneers of Soviet semiotics. In M. Herzfeld & M. Lenhart (Eds.), Semiotics 1980 (pp. 155–165). New York and London: Plenum Press.

Frisby, D. (1984). Georg Simmel and social psychology. Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences, 20, 107–127.
Gorham, M. (2003). Speaking in Soviet tongues: Language culture and the politics of voice in revolutionary Russia. DeKalb, IL: Northern Illinois University Press.
Iakubinskii, L.P. (1923/1986) 'O dialogicheskoi rechi'. In Iazyk i ego funktsionirovanie. Moscow: Nauka. 17-58.
Ivanov, A. M., & Iakubinskii, L. P. (1932). Ocherki po iazyku, Moscow and Leningrad: Khudozhestvennaia literatura.
Jahoda, G. (1993). Crossroads between culture and mind: Continuities and change in theories of human nature. New York: Harvester Wheatsheaf.
Jakobson, R. (1971). The Kazan´ School of Polish linguistics and its place in the international development of phonology. In Selected writings (Vol. 2, pp. 394–428). The Hague and Paris: Mouton.
Joravsky, D. (1989). Russian psychology: A critical history. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.
Kalmar, I. (1987). The Völkerpsychologie of Lazarus and Steinthal and the modern concept of culture. Journal of the History of Ideas, 48, 671–690.
Katsnel´son, S.D. (2001). Istoriia tipologicheskii uchenii. In Kategorii iazyka i myshleniia: iz nauchnogo naslediia (pp. 757–815). Moscow: Iazyki slavianskoi kul´tury. (Original work published 1985)
Koerner, E. F. K. (1973). Ferdinand de Saussure: Origin and development of his linguistic thought in Western studies of language. Braunschweig: Vieweg.
Kozulin, A. (1985). Georgy Chelpanov and the establishment of the Moscow Institute of Psychology. Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences, 21(1), 23–32.
Kreps, V. M., & Erberg, K. A. (1931). Praktika oratorskoi rechi. Leningrad: Institut agitatsii im.Vologarskogo.
Lazarus, M. (1851). Über den Begriff und die Möglichkeit einer Völkerpsychologie. Zeitschrift für Literatur, Kunst und Öffentlichkeitsleben, 1, 112–126.
Lazarus, M., & Steinthal, H. (1860). Einleitende Gedanken über Völkerpsychologie, als Einladung zu einer Zeitschrift für Völkerpsychologie und Sprachwissensschaft. Zeitschrift für Völkerpsychologie und Sprachwissenschaft, 1, 1–73.
Leont´ev, A. A. (1961). I.A. Boduen de Kurtene i peterburgskaia shkola russkoi lingvistiki. Voprosy iazykoznaniia, 4, 116–124.
Leont´ev, A. A. (1966). Boduen i frantsuzskaia lingvistika. Izvestiia akademii nauk SSSR, seriia literatury i iazyka, XXX, 4, 329–332.
Loia, L. V. (1929). Protiv sub´´ektivnogo idealizma v iazykovedenii. In N. Ia. Marr (Ed.), Iazykovedenie i materialism (pp. 131–214). Leningrad: Priboi.
Marty, A. (1908). Untersuchungen zur Grundlegung der allgemeinen Grammatik und Sprachphilosophie (Vol. 1). Halle: Max Niemeyer.
Matejka, L. (1987). Sociological concerns in the Moscow linguistic circle. In P. Krystyna (Ed.), Language, poetry and poetics: The generation of the 1890s: Jakobson, Trubetzkoy, Majakovskij (pp. 307–312). The Hague: Mouton.
Meillet, A. (1926). Comment les mots changent de sense. In A. Meillet. Linguistique historique et linguistique générale (pp. 230–271). Paris: Librarie ancienne honoré champion. (Original work published 1905–1906)
Mounin, G. (1972). La linguistique du XX-e siècle. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.
Nerlich, B. (1992). Semantic theories in Europe 1830–1930. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
Nerlich, B., & Clarke, D. (1998). The linguistic repudiation of Wundt. History of Psychology, 1(3), 179–204.
Peterson, M. N. (1923). Obshchaia lingvistika. Pechat´ i revoliutsiia, 6, 26–32.
Peterson, M. N. (1927). Iazyk kak sotsial´noe iavlenie. Uchenye zapiski instituta iazyka i literatury, 1. Moscow: Raniion.
Peterson, M. N. (1928). Iazykovedenie. In V. P. Volgin (Ed.), Obshchestvennye nauki v SSSR 1917–1927 (pp. 206–222). Moscow: Rabotnik prosveshcheniia.
Poleva, N. S. (2000). Vnutrenniaia forma khudozhestvennogo proizvedeniia kak predmet nauchnogo issledovaniia. In T. D. Martsinkovskaia (Ed.), Gustav Gustavovich Shpet: Arkhivnye materialy, vospominaniia, stat´i (pp. 304–319). Moscow: Smysl.
Polivanov, E. (1974). The sphere of immediate problems in contemporary linguistics. In Selected works: Articles on general linguistics (pp. 171–178). The Hague: Mouton. (Original work published 1929)
Potebnia, A. A. (1993). Mysl´ i iazyk. Kiev: Sinto. (Original work published 1862)
Potebnia, A. A. (1993). Iazyk i narodnost´. In Mysl´ i iazyk (pp. 158–185). Kiev: Sinto. (Original work published 1895)
Shakhmatov, A. (1899). K voprosu ob obrazovanii russkikh narechii i russkikh narodnostei. Zhurnal ministerstva narodnogo prosveshcheniia, 4, 324–384.
Sharadzenidze, T. S. (1980). Lingvisticheskaia teoriia I. A. Boduen de Kurtene i ee mesto v iazykoznanii XIX–XX vekov. Moscow: Nauka.
Shcherba, L. V. (1966). Pamiati A. Meillet. Voprosy iazykoznaniia, 3, 97–104.
Shor, R.O. (1926) Iazyk i obshchestvo. Moscow: Rabotnik prosveshcheniia.
Shpet, G. (1989). Vvedenie v etnicheskuiu psikhologiiu. In Sochineniia (pp. 475–574). Moscow: Pravda. (Original work published 1927)
Shteintal´, Kh. (Steinthal, H.), & Latsarus, M. (Lazarus, M.). (1864). Mysli o narodnoi psikhologii, Filologicheskie zapiski 1, 90–105; 3, 248–73.
Steinthal, H. (1858). Der Ursprung der Sprache. Berlin: Dummler.

Steinthal, H. (1864). Philologie, Geschichte und Psychologie in ihren gegenseitigen Beziehungen: Ein Vortrag gehalten in der Versammlung der Philologen zu Meissen 1863 in erweiternder Überarbeitung. Berlin: F. Dummler.
Thomas, L. (1957). The linguistic theories of N. Ia. Marr. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.
Toporkov, A. L. (1997). Teoria mifa v russkoi filologicheskoi nauke XIX veka. Moscow: Indrik.
Tseitlin, R. M. (1965). Grigorii Osipovich Vinokur. Moscow: Moskovskii Universitet.
Ushakov, D. N. (2001). Kratkii ocherk deiatel´nosti lingvisticheskoi sektsii nauchno-issledovatel´skogo instituta iazyka i literatury. In V. P. Neroznak (Ed.), Sumerki lingvistiki: Iz istorii otechestvennogo iazykoznaniia. Antologiia (pp. 71–77). Moscow: Academia.
Van der Veer, P., & Valsiner, P. (1991). Understanding Vygotsky: A quest for synthesis. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.
Veselovskii, A. N. (1959). Neizdannaia glava iz "Istoricheskoi poetiki" A. N. Veselovskogo. Russkaia literatura, 3, 89–123.
Vinokur, G. O. (1925). Kul´tura iazyka: ocherk lingvisticheskoi tekhnologii. Moscow: Rabotnik Prosveshcheniia.
Vygotskii, L.S. (1934) Myshlenie i rech´. Psikhologicheskie issledovaniia. Moscow-Leningrad: Gosudarstvennoe sotsial´no-ekonomicheskoe izdatel´stvo.
Zhirmunskii, V. M. (1939). Istoricheskaia poetika A.N. Veselovskogo i ee istochniki. Zapiski leningradskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta, 46, 3–19.
Zhirmunskii, V. M. (Ed.). (1955). Nemetskaia dialektografia. Moscow: Inostranaia literatura.