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I am writing this preface in a dual capacity: as the author of the book and as its translator into English. The original publication entitled Sovremennaja sociolingvistika. Teorija, problemy i metody (Moscow: Nauka) appeared in 1976. The translation in all essentials faithfully reproduces the original text. In working on the translation, however, I deemed it necessary to add to the book a bibliographic index, an index of names and an index of subjects. Also, as the author, I could not resist the temptation of somewhat updating the text. Therefore, some publications which have appeared since 1976 have been included in the bibliography and referred to in the text. I have likewise replaced some illustrative examples, totally untranslatable into English, by examples from English sources.

The relatively young age of sociolinguistics has, fortunately, prevented this discipline from becoming too rigid. In touching upon its complex and multidimensional problems far be it from me to lay any claim to their final solution. My only hope is to stimulate some further thinking and thus promote a further discussion.

A. D. Švejcer
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INTRODUCTION

As early as the mid-60s sociolinguistic studies made considerable headway in many countries of the world. Recent years have seen a still more rapid development of this discipline. There has been a sizeable increase in the number of monographs, readers, conferences and symposia discussing both the general theoretical problems of sociolinguistics and some of its aspects. Problems of sociolinguistics figured prominently both at the 11th International Linguistic Congress (Bologna, 1972) and at the 8th World Sociological Congress (Toronto, 1974).

At the same time there have also been qualitative changes in the development of sociolinguistics. While in 1967 the well-known American linguist W. Bright, the editor of Language, wrote that sociolinguistics had experienced a rapid growth but at the same time was still in its infancy (Bright 1967, 185), now there is every reason to claim that sociolinguistics is coming of age. The present stage in the development of this trend is characterized by the abandonment of purely descriptive studies, as well as accidental and fragmentary observations, and by the elaboration of a systemic approach to data and truly interdisciplinary studies based on an organic blend of linguistic and sociological methods applied at a high professional level (Fishman 1971b, 10).

This does not mean, of course, that sociolinguistics has passed its formative stage. Heated debates are still going on about the subject-matter of sociolinguistics. A number of fundamental problems have not been resolved, among them the nature of causal relationships between social and linguistic phenomena. Even the conceptual framework of sociolinguistics is still in the stage of elaboration. There is no unanimity in the interpretation of many basic concepts. And yet it should be recognized that in many countries of the world sociolinguistics has been gaining respectability. An increasing number of scholars, not content with the narrow structuralist approach to linguistic analysis, go beyond "micro-linguistic" studies in an effort to explore language in its social context. The development of sociolinguistics and the resultant inclusion of the social dimension in linguistic analysis make it possible to gain deeper insights into the very nature of language and to reveal more fully the conditions of its functioning and the dynamics of its development, thus casting new light on the ontological picture of language as a social phenomenon.
As distinct from some countries where sociolinguistics actually started from scratch, the revival of interest in sociolinguistic problems in our country was, in fact, the renewal and continuation of a tradition going back to the earliest period in the history of Soviet linguistics when E. D. Polivanov, V. M. Žirmunskij, B. A. Larin, M. V. Sergievskij, L. P. Jakubinskij, K. N. Deržavin and other prominent Soviet linguists laid the foundation of a new trend which became, in the words of M. M. Guxman, “the first experiment in developing a Marxist sociolinguistics” (Guxman 1972).

Soviet linguists are still pioneering the study of the fundamental problems of sociolinguistics, in the perfection of its theoretical apparatus, in raising new basic issues and in exploring many topical sociolinguistic problems. Taking a Marxist view of the links between language and society, Soviet scholars have made a number of major contributions to sociolinguistics (Desnickaja 1969; Dešeriev 1969a,b; Avrorin 1975; Nikolsky 1976; Krysin & Šmelev 1976; Dešeriev 1977; Beloded 1977; Jarceva & Guxman 1977; Nikolsky 1977, etc.).

At the same time Soviet scholars are following with keen interest the development of sociolinguistics abroad. In evaluating the studies of foreign sociolinguists in terms of Marxist sociology, they criticize whatever is basically unacceptable to them, and, at the same time, seek to utilize the achievements of foreign science which promote the further progress of sociolinguistics, the elaboration of its theory and methods, and the study of its problems.

Different as they are in their initial philosophical positions, various sociolinguistics schools in many countries of the world supplement each other in a number of respects.

The focal areas of studies in various countries include, as a rule, different sociolinguistic problems and different aspects of these problems. This, in turn, could not fail to determine the theoretical interests of sociolinguists in these countries. It is no coincidence, therefore, that the most vital sociolinguistic problems for the U.S.S.R. have always been the problems of multilingualism and bilingualism, the relationship between ethnic languages and the language of inter-ethnic communication, linguistic engineering, and language policy. At the same time for a number of western countries problems of the social stratification of language are of paramount importance, while for the sociolinguists of the developing countries the major problems are those involved in the formation and development of national literary languages, the choice of a language as a medium of nationwide communication.
At the same time, there is unquestionably a "common core" of sociolinguistic theory and problems. This includes, above all, basic problems of a general philosophical character involved in the definition of the initial premises of sociolinguistic theory. There is a considerable overlap between the problem of language in society and the problem of language and thought. This necessitates the concerted elaboration of these fundamental philosophical problems of linguistics. Sociolinguistic theory is being developed at the crossroads of linguistics, on the one hand, and sociology, sociopsychology and ethnography, on the other. Therefore, to develop successfully sociolinguistics must choose a proper sociopsychological and ethnographic orientation.

The "common core" of different sociolinguistic schools includes also a number of theoretical problems involved in the elaboration of the conceptual framework of this discipline, a clear-cut definition of the very subject-matter of sociolinguistics and its relation to other disciplines, both linguistic and non-linguistic, various attempts at modelling sociocommunicative processes and the development of a metalanguage of sociolinguistic studies.

It includes also a number of general problems of sociolinguistics, such as the social differentiation of language, the sociolinguistic aspects of bilingualism and diglossia, the typology of linguistic situations, language engineering, national and standard languages and their social functions, etc.

Still urgent to the sociolinguists of all countries and all trends is the problem of developing their own methodology and the application of research methods developed by other disciplines to sociolinguistics.

The above-mentioned problems constitute the major thrust of this book.

In essence this book continues the dialogue initiated in the Problems of the Sociology of Language in Contemporary American Linguistics (Švejcer 1971). It carries on the discussion of a number of basic philosophical and theoretical problems of sociolinguistics raised in this critique of the studies of American sociolinguists. At the same time, this book is not merely a summary of studies by a certain sociolinguistic school or even several schools. The main goal of the author is to elucidate a number of major philosophical and theoretical questions, fundamental problems of sociolinguistics and methods of sociolinguistic analysis. The book concentrates on the key issues of sociolinguistics. In his treatment of these matters the author made use of sociolinguistic explorations by a number of Soviet and foreign scholars as well as his own studies. The book is both critical and exploratory. The author hopes that it will stimulate further progress of the present-day scientific discussion of the topical issues of sociolinguistics.
In presenting and analyzing certain viewpoints, the author does not confine himself to their evaluation but seeks to present some arguments for his preference of one view or another or to put forward and justify his own approach to the problem under discussion. In other words, the aims of the book are both that of a critical essay on the present stage of the development of sociolinguistics and that of an independent theoretical study.
CHAPTER I

Philosophical foundations of contemporary Sociolinguistics

1. Marxist Sociology and Sociolinguistic Theory

As is known, the evaluation of any scientific-theoretical trend is inconceivable without due regard for its philosophical orientation. One can hardly overestimate the role of philosophical guidelines in the development of sociolinguistics, a scientific discipline, directly connected with the study, evaluation and analysis of social phenomena and trends. It is therefore advisable to begin an analysis of contemporary sociolinguistic studies with the examination of their sociophilosophical principles which to a great extent predetermine their theoretical orientation and analytical procedures.

It is the Marxist theory of society, the theory of social interaction elaborated by Marxist sociology and the fundamental theses of Marxism on language as a social phenomenon that constitute the philosophical foundation of the sociolinguistic theories being developed by Soviet scholars and scholars from Socialist countries.

In one of his last writings the late Academician V. M. Žirmunskij recalled that “Marxism views language as a social phenomenon in its two dialectically interrelated aspects — as “the most important medium of human communication” (Lenin) and as an expression of thought (according to Marx, as “the immediate reality of thought”). As any social phenomenon in a class society, language reflects in its development the processes of the class differentiation of society, the processes of class struggle” (Žirmunskij 1969, 5).

The well-known theses of Marxist philosophy on the dialectical unity of the two main functions of languages — the communicative, or the function of communication, and the expressive or the function of expressing thought, underlie not only sociolinguistic analysis but also linguistics generally. At the same time, it is Marxist sociology based on the laws and categories of historical materialism that constitutes the philosophical foundation of sociolinguistics being developed in the U.S.S.R. and other socialist countries.

Orientation towards the Marxist theory of society has determined the development of Soviet linguistics since its inception and constituted its salient philosophical feature. In the above-cited article, “At the Dawn of Soviet Socio-
M. M. Guxman points out that the late '20s and the next decade were characterized by the heightened interest of Soviet linguists in sociological problems, largely due to a study of the classics of Marxism-Leninism and, most notably, their statements on language and familiarity with P. Lafargue's *La langue française avant et après la révolution* (1894) (Guxman 1972, 2).

Organic links with sociology form the basis of any contemporary sociolinguistic trend. But Soviet sociolinguistics is characterized by a clear-cut orientation toward Marxist sociology, based on the theory of the classics of Marxism. This is precisely the line of demarcation between Marxist sociolinguistics and sociolinguistics oriented towards bourgeois positivist sociology. According to R. Grosse and A. Neubert (GDR), "a scientific sociolinguistics can only be based on the Marxist theory of society" (Grosse and Neubert 1970, 3).

At the same time, it should be remembered that Marxist sociology, towards which Soviet sociolinguists and their colleagues from socialist countries are oriented, is a "partisan science openly opposed in its philosophical positions to pseudo-nonpartisanship and suprapartisanship of bourgeois sociologists" and that "there is a fundamental and clear-cut boundary between materialistic sociology and positivistic sociology, initiated by A. Comte -- the polarity of their social, political and theoretical positions and the irreconcilability of the idealistic and materialistic interpretation of history" (Osipov 1970, 19).

Soviet sociolinguistics is based on the materialistic interpretation of history, developed by K. Marx and F. Engels and providing, according to V. I. Lenin, the first opportunity of creating a scientific sociology, because it was only the reduction of social relations to relations of production and of the latter to productive forces that could be used as a solid basis to describe the development of social formations as a natural historical process (V. I. Lenin, Vol. 1, 138).

It is precisely this theory of the development of social relations rather than the positivistic sociology of A. Comte and H. Spencer, the precursor of contemporary neopositivistic theories of society, that provides the key to the solution of the complex and multifaceted problem of language in society. The theory of national language, based on the writings of K. Marx on the formation of nations characterized by "the concentration of dialects into a single national language due to economic and political concentration" (Marx and Engels, Vol. 3, 427) provides the best example of a successful application of the basic principles of Marxist sociological theory to sociolinguistic problems.

Due regard for socio-historical conditions of language development, analyzed in terms of historical materialism, underlies the Soviet linguists' conception of
the relationship between the language of an ethnic group and the language of a
nation, the connection between a nation-wide language and its territorial
dialects and the distribution of dialects of closely related languages (Filin 1968,
18–19; Jarceva 1969, 3–4).

Analyzing the trends of the functioning of language in society, Soviet socio­
linguists draw upon the theory of social interaction elaborated by the classics of
Marxism, and the ideas first put forward by them and being developed by con­
temporary Marxist sociology concerning the interaction of various aspects of
social life with the determinate role of economic structure. As will be shown
later, disregard for or misunderstanding of these principles adversely affects the
writings of many sociolinguists oriented towards neopositivistic sociology. At
the same time Soviet scholars are fully aware of the fact pointed out by F.
Engels that the specific result of a social process does not follow automatically
from economic conditions and is a result of the social interaction of people,
"of the confrontation of a multitude of individual wills" (Marx and Engels,
Vol. 37, 395).

The data of sociological studies, based on Marxist philosophical principles
are a solid foundation for Marxist sociolinguistics. It is essential to take into
account the data, related to all levels of sociological theory, distinguished
in Marxist sociology — the sociophilosopical level investigating the dialectics
of social life, the level of general sociological theory, i.e. the level of historical
materialism, the theory of social structure and the theory of various social
systems and organisms (Osipov 1970, 18).

In other words, exploring language in its social context, Soviet sociolinguists
proceed from a Marxist analysis of social relations, the mechanisms of their
functioning, the social structure of society, the system of its institutions and or­
ganizations.

It also well-known that the growing attraction of Marxist ideas in our time is
manifested, among other things, in the fact that many progressive scientists in
the West more and more frequently turn to the classics of Marxism in search of
a reliable philosophical foundation for their studies. Characteristically, one of
the most serious theorists of contemporary American sociolinguistics, Dell
Hymes, in his polemics with Chomsky, who presents man as a certain abstract
generating device, writes: "Indeed a sociolinguistic critique of the conception
of language made explicit in Cartesian linguistics is markedly parallel to the
critique by Marx of Feuerbach from whom he learned, but whose limitations he
had to transcend" (Hymes 1974, 121).
The choice of this quotation is not accidental. Marx’s words, characterizing the limitations of Feuerbach’s world outlook, fully reveal the philosophical vulnerability of contemporary linguistic theories, seeking to model language in abstraction from its social environment. Dell Hymes criticizes Chomsky and his followers for whom man is an abstract speaker-listener, divorced from the social sphere. In this connection he finds some interesting analogies to Marx’s critique of classical economics. He sees the role of sociolinguistics as “that of seeking to transcend a longstanding ‘alienation’ of language and knowledge about language. On this view, language and linguistics often stand to human life in a relation parallel to that of goods and economics, as analyzed in the first book of *Das Kapital*. Marx’s comments on “fetishism of commodities”, analysis of a human power and creation made to stand over against man, and understood in categories divorcing it from its roots in social life, could be applied *mutatis mutandis* to language” (Hymes 1974, 85).

It should be pointed out that Hymes’s repeated and pertinent references to the writings of Marx and the use of some arguments from the theoretical arsenal of Marxism make his critique of generativistic ideas all the more convincing.

We shall examine in more detail the polemics of sociolinguists with the Chomskyan school. At this point, however, it is important to note the vitality demonstrated by the ideas of Marxism in the elaboration of the philosophical principles of sociolinguistics and their impact not only on the scholars of socialist countries but also on many scholars in the West.

Needless to say, this section does not lay claim to an outline of the Marxist principles of sociolinguistics. Its aim is merely to stress the importance of Marxist philosophical orientation for the elaboration of sociolinguistic problems. As to the concrete propositions of the philosophy and theory of Marxist-oriented sociolinguistics, this is largely the subject-matter of the book as a whole, including the following sections of Chapter I.

2. Behaviouristic model of speech behaviour

The philosophical orientation of sociolinguists, developing the theoretical principles of the discipline in terms of Marxist sociology, stands out in bold relief as compared to the orientation of those sociolinguistic schools which proceed from a subjective- and objective-idealistic interpretation of social processes.

Instructive in this respect is the experience of American sociolinguistics which took shape as a research trend relatively recently (in the early 60s), but has
already become widely known outside the United States, notably in Western Europe.

The renewal of interest in sociolinguistic problems was, needless to say, connected with the demands of modern society for which the problems of language policy and language engineering as well as other practical aspects of sociolinguistics are becoming ever more vital. At the same time, the emergence and formation of sociolinguistics in the United States and a number of West European countries was directly associated with the crisis of structural linguistics which had prevailed there for decades.

Sociolinguists have critically re-examined a number of theoretical postulates of structural linguistics, including the postulate on the autonomy of linguistics, as well as on the analysis of language solely in terms of intralinguistic relations. The study of the social functions of language called for joint efforts with such social sciences as sociology, social psychology, ethnography, anthropology, etc.

At the same time, there is some continuity between American and many West European sociolinguists and their predecessors, including American descriptivists. This continuity is especially marked in the general philosophical orientation of these trends, and their sometimes intentional and sometimes unintentional dedication to the philosophical postulates of positivism.

It will be recalled that the formation and development of descriptive linguistics were considerably influenced by the philosophical principles of positivism and especially by the behaviourist S–R theory that reduces the entire diversity of socially determined forms of human behaviour to stereotyped responses to environmental stimuli. This philosophical orientation found its expression as early as in the works of L. Bloomfield, the founder of descriptivism. A somewhat modified and perfected version of the behaviourist S–R model, based to a large extent on the ideas of the American scholars B. F. Skinner, underlies the three-volume monograph of the well-known American linguist Kenneth L. Pike on the structure of human behaviour (Pike 1967).

Pike’s point of departure is that any goal-oriented human behaviour is structured and that the types and forms of human behaviour with all their diversity are characterized by certain invariants.

Analyzing acts of social interaction as behavioural events, Pike considers it necessary to distinguish, on the one hand, the physical substratum or external manifestation of such an event, and, the responses it causes in other individuals, on the other. While the physical substratum of a behavioural event is characterized by continuity (for instance, the slurred pronunciation of the English phrase “I know John” or the continuous movement of the conductor’s baton),
human responses to one's own behaviour and the behaviour of others segment the continuum of a behavioural event into discrete units. Discrete behavioural units are known as *emes* or *emic units* (in language behaviour such units include phonemes and morphemes).

It is therefore clear that an emic analysis of human behaviour is based on the examination of behavioural events in terms of the responses they cause in other participants of these events.

One of the basic principles of Pike's theory is the principle of correlating *point* and *class*. The *point* is the place where substitution is possible (for instance the substitution of words in phrases “shut the door” and “shut the drawer” or a series of interchangeable movements, possible at a given moment in football). A series of variants, possible and acceptable at a certain point, form an emic class.

Units of goal-oriented behaviour, intuitively isolated by participants of a behavioural event, are called *behaviouremes*. According to Pike's theory, any human behaviour, verbal and nonverbal, is reduced to the following central formula:

\[ U = \frac{F}{D} M, \]

where \( U \) is an emic unit, and \( F, D \) and \( M \) are three characteristics or dimensions of human behaviour: \( M \) is the manifestation mode, a hierarchic segmented structuring of the physical substratum of any behavioural event, \( F \) is the feature mode, determined by identification-contrastive components of the unit, and \( D \) is the distribution mode.

It follows from the foregoing that Pike's theory is an attempt to extend the analytical principles developed by descriptivists, in particular, the distributional model to any sociocommunicative activity. Characteristically, meaning as such is actually excluded from consideration.

In other words, the “unified” theory of human behaviour is characterized by the same underestimation of semantics as the linguistic theory of the “anti-mentalist” behaviourist-oriented descriptivism.

It is noteworthy that the author illustrates the main propositions of his theory by more or less similar examples of stereotyped rigidly rule-governed and, consequently, largely predictable behaviour — for example, a game of football, a recital of a poem, a wedding ceremony, etc. This is apparently due to the limitations of the philosophical basis used by the scholar. Indeed, the use of language in a social situation, where the choice of linguistic resources is not so
rigidly rule-governed and where the process of verbal communication is more "creative", is actually left out.

It is therefore legitimate to raise the following questions: to what extent are these elementary processes, associated with responses to environmental stimuli, typical of language or, for that matter, human behaviour and to what extent is Pike's theory helpful for the cognition of these processes? It would seem that even assuming that Pike's picture of language use embraces not marginal but typical phenomena, determining the very essence of verbal processes (and such an assumption is clearly unrealistic), it must be recognized that "the unified theory of human behaviour" is reduced to a very arbitrary and abstract classification pattern.

Pike's model is a kind of synthesis of neobehaviourist theories of verbal activity and neobehaviourist ideas in sociology and social psychology. The behaviourist views of the nature of speech activity have been subjected to a detailed critical analysis by Soviet psycholinguists who pointed out that, according to these views, man's speech behaviour is reduced to adaptation to the environment (Leont'ev 1967, 23–25). The same mechanistic approach permeates behaviourist sociology. Here again, as Soviet scholars correctly point out, we find attempts to explain everything by the universal S—R formula, while the individual, group and environment are presented as stereotyped and automated elements of a universal relationship (Kuz'min, 1967, 7–9).

It is not surprising that Pike's theory did not find a large following. Its most tangible result was the extension of "emic" terminology to social anthropology and anthropological linguistics. This does not mean, of course, that Pike's above-mentioned studies have no merits whatsoever. For instance, one cannot but agree with Pike when he insists on the examination of any sociocultural fact "from the inside", in terms of a given sociocultural system (emic approach) without any false analogies to externally similar phenomena of another system (etic approach), just as it is wrong to equate externally similar but functionally heterogeneous linguistic phenomena.

Cf., for example, the contrast between palatalized and non-palatalized [1] in English where it is phonologically irrelevant and in Russian, where it is phonological, or the functional differences between gestures, as for instance head movements for yes or no among Russians and Bulgarians (Jakobson 1970, 284–285). The idea is perhaps not novel but undoubtedly correct.

Meanwhile Pike's studies did have some (albeit indirect) influence on the subsequent studies of some foreign sociolinguists.
The fact that overcoming the behaviourist tradition is by no means a painless process is demonstrated, among other things, in the recent publication by the New Zealand sociolinguist J. Pride (Pride 1971, Chapter 10). The author quotes N. Chomsky as saying that the study of language in context (including the context of a social situation) is useless because it is only in rare and uninteresting cases that the situational context determines what is said even in probabilistic terms.

Of course, Chomsky is wrong when he regards the situational approach to the study of language as a revival of the behaviourist tradition and the negation of the "creative" aspects of verbal activity. In fact, when we speak of the determinant role of the speech situation or any social factors characterizing it, we do not mean that the determining relation between the social factors and the verbal processes is expressed in stereotyped responses to environmental stimuli. It is much more complex than that.

First of all, it should be noted that the concept of a speech situation in itself calls for a differential approach. We shall examine it in detail below. At this point we shall merely refer to the apt distinction made by the Soviet scholars E. M. Vereščagin and V. G. Kostomarov between two types of speech situation — standard (or stable) and variable (Vereščagin and Kostomarov, 1973, 95—102).

In standard situations man's activities are rigidly rule-governed both in regard to speech behaviour and non-verbal behaviour. This includes some forms of professional activity, ritual forms of communication (for example, physical training commands, standard phrases at a wedding ceremony, etc.). Variable speech situations are characterized by a wider range of linguistic resources, determined by varying social and personal relationships between the participants of a communicative event.

Needless to say, these two types of situations are polar cases with many intermediate variants.

The choice of linguistic resources, including stylistic means, is determined by a multitude of social factors which sometimes reinforce each other and sometimes operate in the opposite direction. It is a complicated and multifaceted process, not reducible to the S—R formula.

At the same time, an echo of the behaviourist tradition is heard in a number of contemporary sociolinguistic publications abroad. Sometimes it is expressed in overemphasizing rigidly rule-governed social situations, stereotyped and ritual forms of communication, and sometimes in attempts to formalize relations between the social structure and language in terms of a simple correlation of
independent and dependent variables without any analysis of causal relations between them. Present-day neobehaviourist theories are also reflected in some sociolinguistic models of communicative behaviour. It should be noted that, while criticizing narrow behaviouristic views of their predecessors, American sociolinguists and their West European followers remain to a great extent true to a positivistic orientation (Švejcer 1971, 24—30).

3. Social Anthropology and Sociolinguistics

The formation of the philosophical positions of sociolinguistics abroad was greatly influenced by so-called "social (or cultural) anthropology" whose subject-matter is man as a social entity with his cultural heritage. It is not our aim to evaluate this school which tackles problems similar to those tackled in our research practice by ethnography or rather ethnosociology.

This trend is characterized by a long-established view of language as a component of culture. This view, developed in the writings of F. Boas, E. Sapir, B. Malinowski, B. Whorf, C. Kluckhohn and other scholars, is based on extremely broad and sometimes not identical concepts of culture. Thus, according to one of the founders of this movement, F. Boas, culture embraces all non-biological aspects of human life (Hymes 1964, 12). In other words, culture, according to this view, is everything that distinguishes man from an animal. This idea was formulated in no uncertain terms by a prominent representative of social anthropology, A. L. Kroeber. According to him, when we need a general concept for everything that is common to all human groups and distinguishes man from other species of the animal kingdom, we use the term "culture" without hesitation (Kroeber 1964, XVII). At the same time, other definitions seek to clarify this concept and make it more specific. For instance, H. Hoijer, referring to E. Taylor, defines "culture" as a complex whole that includes knowledge, beliefs, art, morals, law, customs and any other abilities and habits acquired by man as a member of society (Hoijer 1964, 455).

In this interpretation culture becomes a broad concept including both elements of social structure and language.

This view is also held by W. H. Goodenough, who believes that an adequate definition of culture must be ultimately based on the operations used in describing individual cultures. Since the elaboration of such operations is still in a very early stage, we cannot answer precisely what we mean when we talk about culture. Therefore Goodenough gives just a working definition, according to which culture consists of what it is necessary to know and of what it is necessary
to believe in order to act in a manner acceptable to members of a given society and, at the same time, act in any role which any member of this society finds acceptable to himself (Goodenough 1964, 36). Thus, as distinct from biological heritage, culture is a product of cognition, a certain sum of knowledge in the broadest sense of the term. Culture, Goodenough says, is not a material phenomenon. It is not things, people, behaviour or emotions. Culture is a model of interpreting what people say and what they do, of social structures and processes. For a man who has assimilated a certain culture its specific manifestations (artifacts) are symbols, representing certain cultural forms or models. Hence the conclusion that a description of culture cannot be reduced to a mere catalogue of facts being observed — behavioural, social, psychological and other phenomena. It is necessary to construct a theory of conceptual models, represented by these facts.

As a basis for this theory Goodenough proposes structural linguistics. Just as phenomena, belonging to the sphere of culture, are symbols representing certain forms or models, he says, so linguistic facts also constitute symbols of conceptual forms (for instance, a sound or “phone” is a material representation of phoneme).

Indeed, he argues, we can define language in the same terms in which we have defined culture. It consists of what it is necessary to know in order to communicate with its speakers as adequately as they communicate with each other in a way which they consider acceptable to themselves (Goodenough 1964, 37).

It is clear from the foregoing that the above definitions of culture are far from identical. For Hoijer culture is a complex whole consisting of numerous manifestations while, according to Goodenough, culture is an abstract construct comprising not artifacts or human activity but their conceptual models, and the manifestations of culture are merely symbols of certain models or forms.

In the Marxist science of society, culture, as a whole, is divided into its material and spiritual aspects. Material culture is viewed as a totality of physical and tangible artifacts of man’s work and spiritual culture as production, distribution and consumption of spiritual values (Fedoseev 1964, 34).

In their above-mentioned book E. M. Vereščagin and V. G. Kostomarov sum up the various points of view, expressed by Soviet scholars, philosophers, historians and psychologists with regard to various aspects of culture and formulate the following definition: “Culture as a social phenomenon is a totality of material and spiritual values, accumulated or being accumulated by a certain community. Culture is a product of social activity of human groups, it has a
historical genesis and, finally, it plays a decisive role in the formation of a single individual” (Vereščagin and Kostomarov 1973, 35).

As to the view of culture as a totality of non-biological aspects of human life, Soviet scholars make an important clarification in this connection. Thus the well-known Soviet psychologist A. N. Leont’ev links the concept of culture not merely with the non-biological activity of a human being, but with a social activity. Culture, in other words, is produced not by specific (in a biological sense), hereditary or individual experience, but by socio-historical experience (Leont’ev 1968, 51).

Indeed, F. Boas’s purely negativistic definition is too vague and can hardly satisfy us. It is true that A. N. Leont’ev’s above formulation does not lay claim to a definition of culture. As E. M. Vereščagin and V. G. Kostomarov correctly point out in their above-mentioned book, it is a preamble to such a definition for it clearly indicates the area where such a definition is to be sought.

It is clear from the foregoing that the concept of culture underlying Hoijer’s above definition can hardly be accepted. Serious objections may be raised not so much to the list of components of culture as to the interpretation of culture as a totality of abilities and habits.

Finally, the structuralist definition of culture, proposed by W. Goodenough, merits a special examination. This definition is characterized by “dematerialization” of culture, by reducing it to a relational framework and to the interpretation of the specific manifestations of culture merely as signs, forming a sign system.

As a complex and manifold phenomenon, culture can be examined in many aspects, including semiotics (Stepanov, Ju. 1971, 32–46). This does not mean, however, that culture can be reduced to a set of relations and that a satisfactory description can fully ignore the material aspect of its elements. It appears that Goodenough’s definition is based on the same subjective-idealist and anti-substantialist relativistic views as characterize structuralism in bourgeois linguistics (Panfilov 1971, 14).

Let us examine in more detail the most essential aspect of the problem — the relationship of the concepts language and culture. Socioanthropologists have no doubts on this score: language, in their view, is related to culture as a part to the whole.

Indeed, if culture is the totality of nonbiological aspects of human life and if culture is what distinguishes man from animal, in this case there is no doubt that language as a social phenomenon, specific to human groups, should be
viewed as a component of culture, although fundamentally different from its other elements. On the other hand, if we follow the behaviourist tradition in viewing both culture and language as a set of habits, we shall inevitably reach the conclusion that language is not only one of the components of culture, but its organic part, basically non-distinct from its other parts.

The same conclusion is reached by scholars who take into account solely the formal, structural aspect of language and culture and who reduce both to a sum of knowledge, related to behavioural norms.

The weakness of such conceptions lies in the fact that their authors either proceed from an excessively vague undifferentiated interpretation of language and culture or, on the contrary, exceedingly restrict both concepts in line with certain philosophical orientations.

The problem of the relationship of language and culture is debated among Soviet scholars. This was demonstrated, among other things, by the conference held in Ufa in 1973 on the subject "The development of languages and cultures of the peoples of the U.S.S.R. in their interrelation and interaction".

For instance, in the paper by V. A. Avrorin we find the following assertion: "Language is not the form or an element of culture. It is a special social phenomenon, associated equally with many aspects of social life, with many manifestations of human activity. Language is not a form of the products of social activity but a means of forming and conveying thoughts, of accumulating experience and knowledge, without which social progress is impossible, particularly progress in the field of culture" (Avrorin 1973a, 5).

At the same time, in other papers, a different view was expressed according to which language was regarded as the form or as a component of culture (Xanazarov 1973, 9–11; Panfilov 1973, 13).

Let us try to somewhat clarify this complex and still unresolved question. It seems that the question of the relationship between language and culture can hardly be answered in a simplistic manner. It was pointed out earlier that culture is a manifold and multifaceted phenomenon.

The multifaceted character of this concept was stressed, in particular, by E. S. Markarjan, the author of theoretical studies of culture, who points out that the concept of culture is related in its various aspects to three spheres of conscious human activity: 1) to the interaction of man and nature where specific manifestations of culture are embodied in the creation and use of work and production tools; 2) to the interaction of people with one another where the conscious character of their activity is manifested in the development of various institutions,
norms and attitudes, governing the behaviour of individuals and 3) to the perception by man of the environment, both logical-conceptual and emotional, creatively reproduced in the products of spiritual activity (philosophy, science and art) (Markarjan 1969, 85). Hence it follows that if we limit ourselves to the examination of spiritual culture, we must conclude that this concept includes most diverse spiritual values — it is the field of creative art (pictorial art, architecture, music, choreography and belles lettres), national customs and traditions, a certain set of views and conceptions as well as behavioural norms of national and social communities. Equally multifaceted is language. It is known that language is an important medium of human communication and the immediate reality of thought as well as a means of emotional influence, a special semiotic system and one of the elements of the identification and consolidation of a nation.

This is precisely the reason why the relationship of language and culture calls for a strictly differential approach. First of all, it is necessary to make the following important clarification. We should clearly indicate whether we mean the relation of language and culture as a whole or the relation of any aspects or components of language and culture to each other. Besides, in answering the question whether language is a component of culture, it is necessary to have in mind that this may actually imply two possibilities: 1) language may be viewed as one of the components of a certain not necessarily homogeneous totality, called culture and 2) language and culture may form a single homogenous whole. Apparently, an answer to the question whether language is part of culture should be based on the major categories of historical materialism, characterizing social phenomena.

As is known, language cannot be regarded either as an element of the basis or as an element of the superstructure. But as P. N. Fedoseev points out, the basis and the superstructure, in whose relationship the basis is, in the final analysis, the determining factor, though it, in turn, is influenced to some extent by the superstructure, do not cover the totality of social phenomena. Historical materialism makes use of a broader category — the category of material and spiritual culture which covers the entire realm of social relations (P. N. Fedoseev 1964, 34).

It follows from the foregoing that as a social phenomenon language is by definition part of culture and should be regarded as one of its components.

This view is radically different from that of social and cultural anthropologists who regard language and culture as a part and a whole. After all, what character-
izes the conception of Goodenough and like-minded scholars it that they view
language not merely as part of culture but as its organic part which is in isomor­
phic relations to culture as a whole.

While including language among social phenomena, within the framework of
culture, historical materialism, far from ignoring essential differences between
language and other social phenomena, strongly emphasizes them. Indeed, as
P. N. Fedoseev writes, "language not only serves spiritual culture but is directly
related to production, and serves work and production processes. Further, it is
directly related to social relations and serves them; it is a tool of communication,
a weapon of struggle and, therefore, is part and parcel of the social sphere.
Besides, language has its ideal and material aspects. But it should still be recogniz­
ed that language is essentially a phenomenon of spiritual culture" (Fedoseev
1964, 34).

As to the relations between language and various components of culture, it
cannot be denied that they are indeed far from homogeneous.

One cannot but agree with V. A. Avrorin who points out that there are areas
of culture which "can easily get along in their external manifestation without
the aid of language (for instance, pictorial art, architecture, music, choreography
and athletic games)" (Avrorin 1973a, 5).

At the same time, other components and specific manifestations of culture
are closely related to language. For instance, in belles-lettres language is one of
the elements of its form. It should be noted, of course, that language is not the
only embodiment of the form of literary works. As V. Z. Panfilov points out,
"literary works retain some of their specific national flavour in translation into
another language" (Panfilov 1975, 12).

Form is regarded in Marxist philosophy as a mode of the existence of content,
its internal organization and structure without which content does not exist, and
from this point of view "artistic images, language, plot, composition, etc., con­
stitute the internal form which gives expression to the ideological content and
without which the content does not exist" (Osnovy 1958, 281).

Apparently, several clarifications are in order at this point: when we speak of
language as one of the elements of form in a literary work, we actually mean not
language in general but just one of its aspects, namely its style as a system of
goal-directed selection of linguistic devices, in accordance with the ideological-
aesthetic principles of the artist, trend or epoch.

Let us examine other aspects of language and culture. We saw that in some of
the above definitions of language and culture both are incorrectly reduced to
their behavioural aspects. Thus for Goodenough both culture and language are connected solely with certain behavioural norms. Some elements of the correlated categories are presented as categories *in toto*. In fact, they refer not to culture generally and not even to the norms of social behaviour generally but merely to the norms of communicative behaviour. On the other hand, it follows from the above that language is reduced by Goodenough merely to the norms of verbal activity. V. A. Zvegincev seems to be right in viewing speech as one of the components of communicative behaviour and not of social behaviour in general (Zvegincev 1968, 44). This is demonstrated, among other things, by the functional parallelism, frequently found between linguistic and non-linguistic communicative devices. One of those who noted this phenomenon was the Soviet psycholinguist A. A. Leont’ev who pointed to the possibility of an equivalent substitution of non-linguistic devices for language in certain forms of speech (Leont’ev 1968, 108).

The reduction of language and culture to their behavioural aspects is typical not only of Goodenough. This is, in fact, one of the philosophical traditions of social (or cultural) anthropology as a whole, a tradition which still has a considerable following in contemporary sociolinguistics abroad. In its perhaps most categorical form the idea of the primacy of the behavioural aspect in the study of language and culture was expressed by one of the most prominent representatives of social anthropology, B. Malinowski, (Malinowski 1948) who considerably influenced the elaboration of sociolinguistic problems, primarily in Great Britain and, to some extent, in the U.S.A. In his programmatic article “The Dilemma of Contemporary Linguistics” (Malinowski 1964, 63—65) he put forward the view that language is one of the forms of human behaviour, possibly the most important one. In his view, all studies of verbal activity should be oriented towards sociology, and linguistics should become part of the general theory of culture. If the primary and most important function of speech is the pragmatic function, connected with the direction and control of human activity and its coordination, no other study of speech, apart from its study in the “context of a situation” is justifiable. B. Malinowski calls for the abandonment of the Saussurian dichotomy *langue-parole*, because language, in his view, is merely the general norm of man’s verbal activity. The science of language should become an empirical science of speech behaviour, viewed in the context of man’s practical activities. According to B. Malinowski, speech is a habit, and a standardized activity of a human organism.

We shall not examine in detail B. Malinowski’s clearly untenable attempt to make language and speech behaviour the only subject of linguistic studies. It is
known that the problem of langue and parole is one of the most controversial problems of linguistics (for details see Šaradzenidze 1971). And yet, as V. M. Solncev correctly points out, “this division itself, prepared by the development of scientific thought and characterizing two phenomena — a means of communication and its use, is one of the basic propositions of contemporary linguistics” (Solncev 1971, 142). As was pointed out in the previous section, the proposal to study speech in a situational context is perfectly sound. One cannot fail to notice, however, the clearly behaviourist flavour of Malinowski’s conception. For instance, the emphasis in his theory on the standardized character of speech behaviour, and the interpretation of speech as a set of habits and a form of adaptation to the environment cannot escape notice.

It should also be noted that emphasizing a stereotyped and rule-governed character of verbal activity is typical also of many writings of British linguists, followers of B. Malinowski, notably the most prominent of them, J. R. Firth, who wrote that most of the bilateral acts of speech communication in our everyday life are stereotyped and are very rigidly determined by our culture. The problem of the context of situation is, in J. R. Firth’s view, the central problem of “sociological linguistics”, and in his paper devoted to sociolinguistic problems he seeks to isolate and classify typical situational contexts within a cultural context and types of linguistic functions corresponding to certain situations (Firth 1964, 66–70). J. R. Firth’s attention is focused on the linguistic aspects of social roles and various types of situations while the approach he proposes to the study of behaviour in the situational context and, ultimately, in the context of culture is further developed in the theoretical studies of the American scholar D. Hymes devoted to the so-called “ethnography of speaking” (Hymes 1962, 1964a,b, 1972b, 1974).

One of the basic principles of the approach proposed in these studies to the analysis of language is the principle of the inseparable unity of linguistic form and its functional use in a verbal and non-verbal context. Hymes’ conception is close to the “means — end” model based on the views of European linguists and, in particular, to the views of J. Firth and other English linguists developing the ideas of B. Malinowski. In Hymes’ view, the problems of the functional use of language are among the central problems of sociolinguistics.

The methodological orientation of D. Hymes and some other American sociolinguists implies a certain shift of emphasis and, at the same time, the reconsideration of some postulates of linguistic analysis. Thus, for example, the scholars’ attention should be centered not on linguistic structure or system but on
the structure of speech. The point of departure for analysis is not the linguistic code but the speech community or another social context. On the whole, the author asserts the primacy of speech over language, of function over structure, of context over message, it being understood that the interrelation of these categories should be taken into account.

Hymes proposes a program for a comprehensive study of the communicative system used by the society, a program which presupposes joint efforts of sociolinguists, psycholinguists and ethnographers.

This program has many valuable and positive aspects. Special mention should be made of the well-founded proposal for the development of a general theory concerning the place of language in social life that would include not only sociolinguistics but also psycholinguistics as its components.

At the same time, Hymes's studies, just as the above-mentioned studies of socioanthropologists, are characterized by overemphasizing the behaviourial aspects of sociolinguistic problems. This is due, among other things, to a certain influence of symbolic-interactionist theory which equates social interaction with communicative behaviour, discussed in detail below.

According to Hymes' theory, sociolinguistics explores speech behaviour in terms of relationships between the situation, participants, topic and functions of a speech act and the relations of participants to all the above-mentioned components. In other words, the problems of sociolinguistics are reduced to those of speech behaviour.

One may agree with A. A. Leont'ev when he says that social factors are directly applied not to language but to the totality of specific speech situations (Leont'ev 1968). But while exerting direct influence on speech, social factors are, in the final analysis, also reflected in language, in its system or structure. It is therefore hardly correct to assign a marginal role to a study of the impact of social factors on language. One cannot fail to agree with R. A. Budagov who considers the study of the way the social nature of language determines the functioning of its system the major goal of sociolinguistics (Budagov 1974).

Apparently, the enthusiasm for the problems of verbal activity is a reaction of sociolinguists to the linguistic tradition followed by various linguistic schools from descriptivists to generativists who have treated speech merely as the initial data of analysis. The orientation of linguistic studies to speech and verbal activity is unquestionably a valuable contribution of sociolinguistics, psycholinguistics and other contemporary scientific trends that have proved beyond any doubt that the explication of the patterns of verbal activity may also be a worthy object
of linguistic analysis. This does not mean, however, that one should jump to the
other extreme and exclude from consideration the influence of social factors on
language and its structure or underestimate the importance of this problem.

Indeed, the possibilities of studying language in its social context were very
limited as long as linguistics viewed language as a homogeneous and monolithic
structure. However, the conception of language as a “system of systems”, first
proposed by the Prague Linguistic Circle and further developed by Soviet lin-
guists (see, for instance, Avanesov and Orlova 1965) provides ample opportuni-
ties for an analysis and description of socially conditioned variability at the level
of language, its system and units. According to this conception, language in its
spatial projection is “a system of specific systems”. These specific systems (or
microsystems) are not external in relation to each other but are closely inter-
twined. They are “the same” in terms of some features and “not the same” in
terms of others. The totality of microsystems forms a macrosystem (“a system
of systems”), characterized both by features common to the macrosystem as a
whole, and features distinguishing some microsystems from others.

The above, in our view, applies not only to language in its spatial dimension
but also to language in its social variability as a totality of subsystems related to
certain social communities. It might be helpful in this connection to use the
conception of language as a totality of overlapping specific systems, welded
together by “a common core” and opposed to each other in their marked ele-
ments (Švejcer 1978, 19–21).

Global descriptions and contrastive studies of socially determined structures,
such as, for instance, the structures of social dialects, are as important to socio-
linguistics as the study of the impact of social factors on verbal activity. At any
rate, one aspect of sociolinguistic problems does not rule out the other but, on
the contrary, supplements it.

We have discussed in detail the views of various socioanthropologists because
this trend has exerted considerable influence on the formation and development
of sociolinguistics abroad. It would be unfair to deny the unquestionable con-
tribution of this trend to the study of a number of sociolinguistic problems. Of
course, after all, it was within social (or cultural) anthropology that so-called
anthropological (or ethno-) linguistics was developed for which the problems of
language in culture and language in society have always played an extremely
important role. Many of the above-mentioned theses, such as, for instance, the
proposition about the patterning of verbal behaviour as one of the forms of
social behaviour were first formulated in the works of the most prominent re-
presentative of anthropological linguistics, E. Sapir (Sapir 1951), and further
developed in the studies of his followers, such as C. Kluckhohn (Kluckhohn 1954).

Sapir’s theoretical views continue to influence both socioanthropological and sociolinguistic studies and, in essence, serve as a connecting link between these trends.

It should not be forgotten, at the same time, that it was within this trend that B. Whorf’s well-known theory of *linguistic relativity* was first evolved, a theory that still continues to influence to some extent many sociolinguists abroad and finds its reflection in, among other things, the so-called theory of isomorphism of linguistic and sociocultural systems which will be examined in the following section.

4. The Theory of Isomorphism of Linguistic and Sociocultural Systems

The idea of isomorphism of linguistic and sociocultural systems is the keynote of the above-mentioned studies by K. Pike of a unified model of human behaviour and the writings of many socioanthropologists and anthropological linguists. It is precisely the assumption of such isomorphism that enables the proponents of this idea to develop a metalanguage for the description of linguistic and social structures in the same terms. The initial premise of the theory of isomorphism is that isomorphic relations exist not between the linguistic matter and, say, material artifacts of culture, but between those conceptual models that underlie any human behaviour, including linguistic behaviour.

The theory of isomorphism of language and sociocultural systems has already been analyzed in the scientific literature, especially in connection with a critique of the above-mentioned theory of linguistic relativity. Thus, V. N. Jarceva has pinpointed the links between this theory and the view of culture as a totality of generalized forms, modelling behavioural types, a view firmly established in socioanthropology and going back to E. Sapir (Jarceva 1968, 41–43).

The most elaborate version of the theory of isomorphism in the modelling of language, the structure of thought and social structure was produced by B. Whorf who, following E. Sapir, assigned an important role to language in the cognition of reality and believed that the linguistic norms of society presuppose a certain form of expressing reality, thus modelling it in a certain way. Hence the conclusion concerning the determination of human behaviour by purely linguistic factors and the leading role of language in the clarification of cultural and behavioural norms (Brutjan 1968; Ermolaeva 1960).
There is an impressive array of writings, criticizing Whorf's idealistic views and similar ideas of the Neo-Humboldtians (Panfilov 1975, 11–13; Neubert 1962). Therefore, there is no need to subject them to a detailed analysis. It is more important to examine the contemporary versions of the theory of isomorphism, reflected to this day in the writings of a number of foreign scholars. Of particular interest in this connection is the essay by A. D. Grimshaw, "Sociolinguistics", one of the sections of which is entitled "The Case for Isomorphism" (Grimshaw 1971). The author's attention is centred on one of the key philosophical problems of sociolinguistics — the problem of causal relations between the social structure and language. He distinguishes among three fundamentally different approaches to the solution of this problem:

1) Viewing language as a source, cause or independent variable (a position, corresponding to the theoretical conception of B. Whorf);

2) Viewing social structure as a determinant in relation to language (a view shared by many scholars and, Grimshaw admits, confirmed by numerous examples);

3) Viewing language and social structure as determined by a third factor, whether it be human nature, the structure of the human brain or the character of human thinking (a conception corresponding to N. Chomsky's philosophical position).

After reviewing the contemporary sociolinguistic literature (primarily American), the conclusion is drawn about lack of unanimity on the subject, inasmuch as some authors regard speech activity as a reflex of social structure, others assign to social structure the determinant role in relation to speech activity and still others prefer to speak of a co-relation of linguistic and social structures without any attempt at establishing causal links between them.

A. D. Grimshaw concludes that the greatest theoretical potential is inherent in a fourth conception according to which language and social structure are characterized by a relation of co-determination or mutual embeddedness.

The co-determination theory is an attempt at a compromise solution of the problem of language in society with due regard to both the Whorfian hypothesis and the theory of language differentiation under the impact of social factors. In other words, causal relations between language and social structures are a two-way street: social structure, of course, may determine language, but language, for its part, may also determine social structure. Since language is an organic part of the process of social interaction, there arise prerequisites for the description of language and social structure as a single structurally homogeneous whole, analyzed in the same terms.
A legitimate question arises: what is it that the author means by social structure? Grimshaw admits that he uses the term in different meanings: more frequently in the sense of a norm of social behaviour but sometimes in the sense of differential distribution of power. It may be easily seen that this interpretation is a far cry from the Marxist-Leninist theory of social structure which singles out its primary (class) level, based on several criteria (the relation of ownership, place in the social division of labour, the mode of acquisition and size of the acquired share of public wealth) and the secondary level, forming a finer grid, superimposed on the class structure and including intraclass, intermediate, border-line and vertical social strata (the sociopsychological and sociopolitical structures being regarded as derivatives of class structure) (Galkin 1972, 63).

In other words, the theory of isomorphism is characterized by an actual substitution of concepts: it is supposed to examine the relations between language and society while, in fact, it deals with the norms of social and speech behaviour.

Let us examine in further detail the proposition concerning the co-determination of language and social structure. The influence of social factors on language is sufficiently well known and has been described in detail in the linguistic literature. Interesting in this respect are the comments of Ju. D. Dešeriev based on the first experiment in language engineering in the U.S.S.R. and throwing light on the mechanism of determination of linguistic structure by social factors (Dešeriev 1968, 56). Dešeriev's conclusion that the influence of social factors on language is implemented in its fullest, most comprehensive and concentrated form through the medium of the expansion and development of its social functions is reminiscent of some interesting observations by Soviet linguists, who in the '20s and '30s were elaborating the problem of the social determination of language and, in particular, L. P. Jakubinskij who established a link between the intensive development of complex sentences and the emergence and development of a writing system (Jakubinskij 1953, 266). Needless to say, the latter was associated with the development of the social functions of language, the expansion of the social domain of its use. On the other hand, the restriction of the social functions of a language is not only reflected in its structure but may finally oust it from social communication. Such was, for instance, the fate of many immigrant languages in the United States, where the Americanization of ethnic minorities and the resultant restriction of the domain of the minority languages has led not only to their considerable deformation under the influence of the dominant English language but has frequently driven them into disuse in the third and sometimes in the second immigrant generation (Fishman 1966; Haugen 1972, 1).
As G. V. Stepanov metaphorically put it, "languages die differently. Some languages die like trees, standing, with the death of the community and culture. Others die while giving life to new languages, but there are also languages, such as Sephardic, which die of sclerosis, as a result of the withering away of their functional elements, both extrasystemic and intrasystemic" (Stepanov, 1976, 44).

At this point, however, it is more important to answer the following question: is there any inverse determinant relation between language and social structure, and if so, what is the mechanism of its implementation?

It seems that there are some rational elements in Grimshaw's theory. If we formulate the question more specifically and relate it not to the social class structure of the society but to the norms of social behaviour (which is in most cases what Grimshaw has in mind), it should be recognized that a certain relationship between language and these norms does exist.

In this connection V. Z. Panfilov's views concerning the relations between language, thought, culture and behaviour merit attention. "Apparently, the background level of the cognition of reality, to some extent embodied in language", V. Z. Panfilov says, "cannot fail to exert some influence on the subsequent stages of man's cognitive activity and on the approach of the acquirer of knowledge to the objects of reality, in particular, with reference to the categorization of the world in language" (Panfilov 1975, 12). And then he goes on to say that "while exerting certain (but not decisive) influence on thought, language cannot fail to exert some influence on culture and behaviour, imparting to them a certain specific (ethnic) flavour" (Panfilov 1975, 13). It would be wrong to deny altogether any influence of language on the perception of the world, on culture and behaviour. But, as it is correctly emphasized in the above-mentioned article, this influence is not decisive.

The way the norms of language use may have a certain influence on the norms of behaviour is illustrated by D. Hymes in one of his papers (Hymes 1966). In his observations on the communicative behaviour of Indians, speakers of Wishram Chinook, D. Hymes reaches the conclusion that the social norms of that Indian tribe prescribe what the author calls a serious attitude to language, and expectation of undesirable consequences from its careless use. This fact, among other things, influences the distribution of social situations between verbal and non-verbal communication channels. Characteristically, according to Hymes's observations, the Indians of that tribe do not use language for what B. Malinowski called "phatic communion", i.e. communication for the sake of the maintenance of contact.
For example, the guest does not find it necessary to fill long pauses in the conversation with words: the phatic function is performed by the visit itself.

On the basis of his observations Hymes comes to the conclusion about the existence of the so-called "functional relativity" of language: in a multilingual situation the distribution of functions between languages varies in different communities while the nomenclature of communicative functions, performed with the aid of language, varies as well: as a result, what is expressed by language in one society may be expressed by a gesture, ritual or a dance in another. Closely connected with non-verbal forms of communication, language cannot fail to exert some influence upon them.

But the influence of language makes itself felt not only in behavioural norms. Indeed, language can be not only a passive object, influenced by certain social factors, but it can, for its own part, become one of the social factors, having some influence on social processes (Dešeriev 1973, 7). While stressing the importance of language as a factor of national consolidation, F. Engels pointed out that it was precisely the linguistic groups that served as a basis for the formation of national states in Europe and the development of ethnic groups into nations (Marx and Engels, Vol. 21, 410).

On the other hand, as A. T. Baziev and M. I. Isaev point out, "as a nation-forming factor, language also plays the role of a distinctive feature. An awareness of the linguistic homogeneity of a community as well as a foreign-language environment cannot fail at certain stages of national-ethnic development to exert a consolidating influence. At the primary stages of ethnic development external linguistic dissociation cannot but weld together a monolingual community living in the same territory and united by economic life" (Baziev & Isaev 1973, 87–88).

Language undoubtedly plays an important role helping to cement, identify and differentiate not only nations but also other ethnic communities (tribes, ethnic groups, etc.) as well as social groups. Thus in contemporary society and, in particular, in a society, divided into antagonistic classes and social groups, there exists a widely ramified system of social and professional jargons, lexical subsystems which, among other things, perform integrating and differential functions. Characterizing the functioning of these subsystems in modern American English, S. Flexner says: "In our language we are constantly recreating our image in our own minds and in the minds of others. Part of this image, as mentioned above, is created by using sub-group cant and jargon in the dominant society; part of it is created by our choice of both standard and slang words."
A sub-group vocabulary shows that we have a group to which we “belong” and in which we are “somebody” (Flexner 1975, X—XI). In other words, slang assumes the role of a social symbol, a symbol of belonging to a certain socio-economic, professional, age, racial or any other group and a symbol of its opposition to other groups. It is no coincidence that slang abounds in words with a derogatory connotation, symbolizing a negative attitude to outsiders (for example, in U.S. slang boob, creep, dope, drip, droop, jerk, goof, kookie, sap, simp, square, weird, straight, lame, Mister Charlie).

It should be noted, however, that in attributing a determinant role to language, the author of the above-mentioned paper, A. Grimshaw, actually substitutes one concept for another. When he says that “language defines social structures” (Grimshaw 1971, 98), he uses the English verb to define which, as distinguished from the verb to determine, means “to describe exactly, to set, mark, or show the limits, etc.” rather than “be the cause of, control, etc.”. As it singles out or delineates the components of social structure, serving as their marker or indicator, language unquestionably influences the processes of social interaction. In performing these functions, however, language does not assume the same role in relation to its social environment as social factors do in relation to language. Social factors do play the role of primary determinants in relation to language while language may be an active social factor without possessing causal priority in relation to social structure.

In other words, the co-determination hypothesis is not a more potent argument in support of the theory of isomorphism than the Whorf hypothesis.

The only empirical data cited by A. D. Grimshaw in support of the hypothesis concerning the isomorphism of linguistic and social structures are based on the writings of the American ethnographer J. L. Fischer and the British psychologist B. Bernstein (Fisher 1966, Bernstein 1966).

J. L. Fischer's study is a contrastive analysis of linguistic and sociocultural systems based on his observations of the population of two Micronesian islands, Truk and Ponape.

Formerly united within a single community with a single language, the inhabitants of these islands have been separated for centuries which has resulted in a certain divergence, both sociocultural (in particular, in the norms of social behaviour) and linguistic. Fischer’s observations, however, are fragmentary and atomistic. He maintains that a more differentiated linguistic structure corresponds to a more differentiated social structure. This thesis, however, is not supported by the data of his linguistic analysis which embraces isolated syntactic
phenomena (the structure of noun phrases) abstracted from the context of the language system without any attempt whatsoever to review any differences in the semantic structure (Šejcer 1969). Bernstein’s writings have exerted conspicuous influence on Western sociolinguistics, notably American and West-European. Bernstein formulated the hypothesis about the existence of two speech codes, elaborated and restricted, differing from each other in that the former is characterized by lower predictability and preference for more complex syntactic structures, while the latter favours elementary syntactic structures and is characterized by a high degree of predictability. Bernstein attempts to establish one-to-one relations between the dichotomy of these codes and the class structure of society which he reduces to the opposition middle class: working class. The restricted code, he maintains, is the code of the working class or, at any rate, its lower strata, a code oriented towards the maintenance of social contact and the expression of social solidarity, while the elaborated code is the code of the middle class and, possibly, the upper strata of the working class, a code oriented towards self-expression and interpersonal communication.

Imbued with “class chauvinism”, Bernstein’s ideas were subjected to well-founded and convincing criticism in the literature. For example, M. Coulthard questions the application of the code theory to the phenomena described by Bernstein (Coulthard 1969). Indeed, differences between the elaborated code and the restricted code are not qualitative but quantitative (a higher or lower degree of predictability, more or less complex syntactic structures). The very term “code” is misused by Bernstein for he actually refers not to different code systems but to quantitative varieties of the same system.

But that is not the main point. What is more important is that Bernstein’s main thesis concerning the direct correlation of these “communicative codes” with the social structure of society seems to be extremely vulnerable. This was pinpointed, for instance, by the West German scholar D. Wunderlich as he summarized the discussion of the Bernstein theory. The theory of two communicative codes, formulated simultaneously in terms of communication theory, psychology and sociology, does not necessarily imply, in Wunderlich’s opinion, the existence of direct links between the codes and social strata or classes while the notions of elaborated and restricted code do not amount to a typical speech behaviour of a certain class (Wunderlich 1971, 308).

Even more unambiguous is the stance, taken by the well-known American sociolinguist W. Labov who proved beyond any doubt that the assertion that the so-called “lower classes” used more restricted and stereotyped verbal resources,
fit only for the maintenance of social contact but not for individual self-expression, is groundless and does not correspond to the reality (Labov 1973a).

The fact that certain social situations involve the predominant use in speech of ready-made and predictable formulas, clichés, etc. while others are characterized by a less restricted and more “creative” use of language is beyond any doubt. However Bernstein’s attempt to link his “codes” not so much with the situation as with the social status and, ultimately, with the class structure of society is clearly unfounded. The most serious objections should be raised to Bernstein’s claim that the speech of the working class and the middle class differs in the degree of using the restricted and elaborated codes.

In fact, members of different social groups have a sufficient command of the speech resources of their native language and can use it effectively enough in situations where their verbal activity takes place. It is true, however, that in a capitalist society there are great differences in the very repertoire of the speech situations available to certain social strata. The differences in speech behaviour revealed by Bernstein are related to social structure only through the medium of speech situations (Cazden 1972).

In other words, the data cited in support of the hypothesis concerning the isomorphism of social and linguistic structures are neither reliable nor convincing. But — more important — these arguments clearly miss the point. For isomorphic relations between systems exist only when “each element of the first system corresponds to just one element of the second and each operation (relation) in one system corresponds to an operation (relation) in the other, and vice versa” (Filosofskij slovar’ 1968, 107).

Yet, as was shown above, neither Grimshaw nor other proponents of the theory of isomorphism succeeded in proving the existence of one-to-one relations between linguistic, social and cultural systems.

The theory of isomorphism is also refuted by the data of empirical sociolinguistic studies. Thus, in a study devoted to social factors affecting the use of Russian pronouns, P. Friedrich shows that the single linguistic opposition ty/vy corresponds not to a single but to several social and sociodemographic relations (relative age, sex, genealogical distance, relations of power, association with a single social group, etc.) (Friedrich 1972).

Meanwhile, the theory of isomorphism largely determines the philosophical and theoretical orientation and research procedures of a number of sociolinguistic, sociological and ethnographic trends abroad. Special emphasis is placed on the thesis concerning the possibility of describing linguistic and social struc-
tures in the same terms and on the basis of a single metalanguage. The latter is in most cases the language of structural linguistics, for which the well-known French anthropologist C. Lévi-Strauss predicted the same renovating role in the social sciences as the role of nuclear physics in the natural sciences (Lévi-Strauss 1966, 33).

According to Lévi-Strauss, in studying kinship systems (and other sociocultural systems), the sociologist finds himself in exactly the same position as the linguist; like phonemes, the kinship terms perform the function of a signifier and, just as phonemes, they acquire this function solely due to their unification within systems; like phonological systems, the kinship systems are produced by the mind at the level of unconscious perception and, finally, the existence of certain common, repetitive features of kinship systems in the most diverse ethnic communities, separated by enormous distances, suggests that there are some common trends behind the directly observable phenomena.

Numerous critiques of the semiotic theory of social sciences elaborated by C. Lévi-Strauss have appeared in the literature. For instance, Ju. S. Stepanov pointed out that within a single theory this author combines an existentialist philosophical basis and a structuralist methodology, founded on entirely different philosophical principles. In an effort to overcome this organic contradiction, inherent in the very philosophical bases of his theory, Lévi-Strauss seeks to distinguish between the level of observation and the level of experiment in order to reconcile the individual and concrete character of his cultural-anthropological observations with the abstract-universal character of his structural analysis. Yet, as Ju. S. Stepanov points out, Lévi-Strauss has failed to overcome this contradiction in his writings (Stepanov 1971, 38–40).

Some studies of individual socio-ethnographic problems apply elements of transformational analysis, IC (immediate constituent) analysis and other linguistic methods. G. Williams, the author of the article “Linguistic Reflections of Cultural Systems”, views S. Lamb’s stratificational model of language as a theoretical bridge between linguistic and ethnographic studies (Williams 1966; Lamb 1965).

Just as Lévi-Strauss used the phoneme as a universal unit, Williams assigned the role of such a unit to the sememe, the constituent of the sememic stratum, postulated by S. Lamb. In his view, Lamb created prerequisites for “cultural grammars” which will be far more complex than the grammars of natural languages and will embrace merely some fragments of culture, but this, according to Williams, means only that “culture as a whole” is, at best, a “useful fiction”.
However, the very list of publications, where formalized methods of linguistic analysis are extended to sociocultural systems, testifies to a somewhat biased selection of the objects of analysis. These are mainly descriptions of kinship systems, the so-called “folk taxonomies”, rituals and other phenomena with the most clear-cut features of systemic organization.

The low explanatory power of universal structural models of language, culture and society is another argument that refutes the theory of isomorphism. This was eloquently stated by the well-known American linguist H. W. Hoenigswald who took exception to the legend according to which linguistics had surpassed other social sciences in descriptive precision. The gain in the degree of formalization was, possibly, made at the expense of penetration into the subject. The extension of linguistic concepts to “other parts” of culture is by no means a simple problem. According to Hoenigswald, the best examples are usually those based on far-fetched analogies. Perhaps language is part of culture, but it does not follow that it is its typical part (Hoenigswald 1966, 17).

While disagreeing with the proponents of the hypothesis of isomorphism, one cannot fail to admit that they are right in criticizing the supporters of the purely correlational approach to the study of linguistic and social phenomena. This approach confines itself to a mere correlation of linguistic and social phenomena without trying to reveal causal relations between them. It is no coincidence that the goal of sociolinguistics, proclaimed in *Sociolinguistics* (Bright (ed.) 1966), the programmatic document of American sociolinguists, is a study of co-variance of linguistic and social structures rather than a study of causal relations between them, described as a possible but not a mandatory task.

This conception finds theoretical justification in the writings of the well-known American sociolinguist J. Fishman who considers the problem of causal priority in relations between linguistic and social phenomena irrelevant to “life as it continues round about us” and suggests that relations between social structure and language should be treated as those between “equal partners rather than one or the other of them being ‘boss’ and ‘giving orders’ to the other” (Fishman 1971a, 353). It seems that refusal to study causal relations between language and society stems from the positivistic tradition, firmly established in America’s scientific and cultural life and treating the category of causality as one of the “metaphysical pseudoproblems”, not subject to empirical verification (Neubert 1962, 40).

The views of contemporary neopositivists with regard to causality are, as is known, an outgrowth of the idealistic conceptions of Hume, who considered causality merely a customary association of sensations, and of Kant, who
believed that causality existed merely as an \textit{a priori} innate category of the mind whereas experience did not furnish us with causal relations (Osnovy . . . 1958, 196–197).

While rejecting the indeterminist theories of modern idealists, Marxist dialectics views causality as one of the forms of universal regular associations of phenomena. Revealing the causes of phenomena being studied forms the basis of scientific knowledge. "To understand individual phenomena", Engels wrote, "we must remove them from universal association and view them in isolation; in that case the successive movements would appear before us, one as the cause and the other as the effect" (Engels 1965, 184).

At the same time, Marxist theory clearly defines the correlation between the concepts of cause and effect, showing that the cause-and-effect relations are characterized by interaction: while producing an effect, the cause is, in turn, influenced by it. "What is here and now the cause becomes there and then the effect, and vice versa" (Engels 1957, 22). In a study of these interacting factors, science cannot fail to take into account their unequal importance, while seeking to find the determinant forces and factors in a system of interacting ones.

What is wrong with the "co-determination" theory is, in our view, that it actually equates the impact of social processes on language and the influence of language on social processes. It is the goal of Marxist-oriented sociolinguistics to reveal among these interacting forces the determinant ones. There can hardly be any doubt that it is the impact of social factors on language that constitutes such a determinant force.

5. Symbolic-Interactionist Sociology and Its Influence on Sociolinguistics

Contemporary Western sociolinguistics was considerably influenced by the writings of Western sociologists and, in the first place, symbolic-interactionism, founded by G. H. Mead (Mead 1964; C. Wright Mills 1939; Blumer 1969). The most salient feature of this trend is the conception according to which a social relation is essentially a certain symbol characterized by universality for interacting individuals and groups. Hence the leading role assigned by symbolic interactionists to language as the most important symbolic system ensuring social interaction, as a categorization system of man's environment and his inner world and as the main tool of socialization, i.e. the individual's integration in the social environment.
Symbolic interactionists' studies have been criticized by sociolinguists abroad mainly for lack of a serious and sufficiently competent analysis of linguistic data (Hymes 1968). At the same time, the basic philosophical positions of the symbolic interactionist school have, in fact, never been questioned. In Soviet sociological literature we find a serious critique of this trend in terms of its general orientation (Zvezdkina 1968). It was noted, in particular, that behaviourist ideas have exerted some influence on the theoretical views of G. H. Mead and his followers, that their theory reduces social interaction to semantic relationships (the sign vs. the significatum) and the socialisation of an individual to the learning of sign systems used by the community and that activity in this theory is idealistically interpreted as that of individual consciousness while material-productive activity is completely excluded from consideration.

At the same time, ideas of the symbolic interactionist school and, in particular, the small group theory, developed under its influence, are being actively used by many sociolinguists abroad in their research practice.

Among studies applying small group theory to an analysis of sociolinguistic phenomena, special mention should be made of those by the American sociolinguist J. J. Gumperz (Gumperz 1964, 1965, 1966, 1971).

Gumperz criticizes attempts of some sociolinguists to seek in the imitation of the prestigious the only reason for all phenomena involved in the social differentiation of language and in socially determined language changes.

He sees the remedy in avoiding altogether such hardly definable concepts as "social prestige" and "class". He proposes analytical procedures similar to the small group studies, frequently practiced in contemporary Western sociology and social psychology and using small groups as the basic units of analysis.

It should be noted that as a result of his empirical sociolinguistic studies it became possible to reveal a number of interesting trends characterizing socially determined speech activity within small groups. These include, among other things, his observations regarding the "verbal repertoire" as the totality of all linguistic forms used by a language community in the course of social interaction. Deserving of a serious study are his ideas about the need to distinguish between two types of variability, interpersonal (or dialectal), determined by differences between speakers of various socioterritorial dialects, and intrapersonal, characterizing the dependence of individual speech behaviour on the social situation.

Generally promising, though still in the initial stage, are the attempts of some sociolinguists to take into account the informal structure of small groups in analyzing the social determinants of their verbal activity (Levine and Crockett
Particularly interesting, though still requiring further confirmation, is the idea that within the same community the speech behaviour of members of informal groups is characterized by a far greater degree of uniformity than the speech behaviour of randomly selected individuals and that this phenomenon (at least partially) is due to interaction and interpersonal influences within these groups.

In other words, small groups and their verbal activity are a sufficiently interesting and insightful object of sociolinguistic analysis. It should not be forgotten that a sociolinguistic study of small groups was explicitly proposed by the Soviet linguist E. D. Polivanov as far back as the early '30s long before this problem aroused the interest of American and West-European sociolinguists. In formulating this goal, E. D. Polivanov indicated that within individual closely integrated groups closer and more specific “co-operative associations” (i.e. relations of social interaction) are revealed than within large communities and that these associations determine a high degree of identity of the linguistic associative systems (Polivanov 1931, 55—56).

It should be pointed out, however, that such analysis can only be effective if it relies on a broad sociolinguistic context and if small groups are viewed not in isolation, but against the background of the societal structure as a whole, with the use of macrosociological data. This was perfectly clear to E. D. Polivanov who wrote that the existence of close “cooperative associations” within individual groups can only be revealed against the background of previously established co-operative associations within a large community.

It is therefore difficult to accept J. J. Gumperz’s proposal of the microsociological approach as an alternative to the macrosociological one. In fact, knowledge of macrosociological factors becomes inevitable even in studies oriented towards small group sociology.

In fact, the study of the macrosociological context cannot be completely avoided by Gumperz himself. Thus, for example, introducing the distinction between open and closed networks, he takes into account whether or not their members have more or less regular contacts beyond their communities. What is more, it follows from his analysis that links of a certain group with the outside world are a feature closely related to the community’s class structure and, in fact, derived from it.

Nor can one accept the view that a small group is the basic unit of any sociolinguistic analysis. This idea is directly connected with the concept of a small group as a microcosm of the large society, firmly established among symbolic
interactionists and some other Western sociologists (Parsons 1968). One cannot but agree with E. F. Zvezdkina, the author of the above-mentioned dissertation, when she says that viewing the small group as a unique model of the society at large has an adverse effect on the studies of the small group itself (Zvezdkina 1968, 8–9). Nor can small groups be regarded as an elementary cell, quite sufficient to reveal the impact of social factors on language. The microsociology of language can be a valuable supplement to macrosociological analysis but cannot replace it. It can be effective given a solid macrosociological basis. This basis is provided by Marxist sociology which, as mentioned above, regards such social structures as derived from class structure.

It cannot be denied, on the other hand, that symbolic interactionism has put forward a great number of interesting ideas which, on an entirely different philosophical basis, were fruitfully developed in Marxist sociology. They include role theory, successfully developed on a Marxist basis in studies by I. F. Kon, A. Krečmar and other Soviet sociologists (Kon 1967; Krečmar 1970).

Thus in Krečmar’s article we find an interesting attempt to use the concept of a social role for transition from a systemic analysis of the society to a systemic analysis of the individual. Within the conceptual framework proposed by this author, the concepts of “social function” and “social role” are regarded as reflecting two aspects of social activity, objective or depersonalized and personal or subjective. Corresponding to the former aspect is the concept of a “social function” (social activity, viewed in terms of its significance to any sociohistorical community as an expression of a social need), and to the latter, “the social role” (the realization mode of social activity through an individual’s specific behaviour). The social role of a teacher, for example, is the behaviour required to perform the relevant social function. It involves the teaching of pupils according to a certain plan, filling out school forms, etc. Running ahead a little bit, we may add that it also involves a certain mode of speech behaviour, a certain selection of linguistic resources in accordance with the “teacher-pupil” situation. The concept of a role is closely connected with the social norms of the society and with social consciousness. After all, the role prescriptions are nothing but social norms, viewed in terms of their significance to individual behaviour. As distinguished from non-Marxist sociology, viewing social norms of individual behaviour as something inherent in culture and not concerned with their genesis, Marxist sociological theory derives these norms ultimately from the productive relations underlying the social structure.

In other words, in Marxist sociology the concept of a social role reflects the mechanism of the social determination of an individual and makes it possible to correlate the objective conditions of the social activity of a sociohistorical com-
munity with their reflection in the consciousness of the community, with individual consciousness and the individual's real-life social behaviour. Such an interpretation of a social role is radically different from the conception of the American sociologist G. H. Mead and existentialist-oriented West-European sociologists, which reduces the causality of social phenomena to the psychological motivation of individual activities.

Thus the behavioural aspect of a sociocultural system appears in this case not as a self-sufficient entity but in organic connection with social consciousness and, in the final analysis, with the system of productive relations underlying the society's class structure. In this interpretation the social role of an individual is determined by his social function.

Marxist role theory has a direct output into sociolinguistics. It makes it possible to build a theoretical bridge from a microsociological analysis of verbal activity to a macrosociological analysis of links between language structure and the social structure of the society. The conceptual system of the theory is extensively used by E. F. Tarasov (Tarasov 1972, 1973) to elaborate a sociological theory of verbal activity. Applications of role theory to the description of a linguistic situation are indicated by L. B. Nikolsky (Nikolsky 1974a, 63). An interesting application of role theory to studies of functional styles is proposed and implemented by K. A. Dolinin with special reference to French stylistics (Dolinin 1978).

We shall examine below more specifically some aspects of role theory in connection with some theoretical problems of sociolinguistics. At this point it should be noted that while disagreeing with symbolic interactionists when they reduce the entire problem of man's social behaviour to the problem of communicative behaviour on the basis of the neobehaviourist theory of social interaction that regards the structure of social relations as a structure of communication and symbolic interaction among people (for a critique of this conception see Parygin 1967, 30–39), Soviet sociolinguists, just as Soviet sociologists, seek to make use of the rational elements contained in that theory. These elements include, among other things, the idea of social symbolism, understood as a "cultural mechanism based on the use of symbolic forms of behaviour for the adjustment of social relations" (Basin, Krasnov 1971, 164). Reflecting the adaptation of an individual to the social environment and the social situation, speech, as Ch. Bally put it, is an important fact of social symbolism (Bally 1961, 256). The concept of social symbolism may be successfully applied to sociolinguistic studies, provided, of course, it is placed in its proper perspective in a broad sociological context.
6. Ethnomethodology and its relation to sociolinguistics

Another major sociolinguistic trend, interacting with a number of foreign sociolinguistic schools and exerting a certain amount of influence upon them, is ethnomethodology.

As may be seen from its very name, it is closely associated with ethnography and, to some extent, uses an ethnographic approach to a study of social phenomena. Ethnomethodology shares with social anthropology the interpretation of culture as a certain sum of knowledge (see the above definition of culture by Goodenough). However, as distinct from many social anthropologists, the ethnomethodologists treat culture not merely as a sum of knowledge, but as knowledge of a certain set of rules of interpreting social phenomena common to a given community.

The ethnomethodologists are not satisfied with a sociometric approach, widely used in modern sociology, inasmuch as, in their view, this approach fails to take into account the relations between the scholars’ categories and those intuitive categories which are applied by the members of the community in interpreting the phenomena of their social environment.

The focal area of ethnomethodological research is everyday human activity, including verbal communication. As defined by the founder of this trend, Harold Garfinkel, ethnomethodology is concerned with a “study of the rational properties of practical actions as contingent ongoing accomplishments of organized artful practices of everyday life” (Garfinkel 1971, 309). This somewhat vague formulation calls for some clarification. The rational aspects of everyday life are understood as the practical logic and the ideas of common sense which underlie the interpretation of any actions, including speech behaviour, by community members. The main goal of a researcher is the explication of the methods used by community members to interpret the meaning of the actions (hence the second component of the name “ethnomethodology”).

The theoretical platform of ethnomethodology is largely based on phenomenology, one of the trends of contemporary idealistic philosophy, going back to the writings of E. Husserl and widely applied in a somewhat modified shape by present-day Western sociologists (see, for example, Schutz 1967; for a critique of phenomenology, see N. V. Motrošilova 1968). It is precisely the influence of phenomenology that accounts for the fact that the social categories, subject to analysis in ethnomethodology, are categories of interpreting reality, i.e. categories of perception.
In phenomenological sociology there is a widely held view according to which the social world around us is perceived solely through the structures of ready-made knowledge controlling individuals, while the process of socialization is reduced to the learning of ready-made knowledge. The clarification made in this connection by ethnomethodologists (their theory deals not with ready-made knowledge of certain phenomena of reality but with "ready-made" procedures or methods of their interpretation) can hardly be viewed as an essential departure from the basic postulates of phenomenology.

According to the editors of the above-cited Directions in Sociolinguistics, the common ground between ethnomethodology and sociolinguistics is insistence that a simple semantic, or referential, perspective is inadequate to explaining intelligibility, that intelligibility depends upon the way in which something is said, inseparable from what is being said, that the number and kinds of ways of speaking are problematic and to be discovered and that analysis begins with the data of speech events themselves (Gumperz and Hymes 1972, 303–307).

The fact that ethnomethodologists turn to linguistic material is not surprising at all. For, after all, Husserl, the founder of phenomenological philosophy, regarded thoughts, embodied in linguistic expressions, as the primary object of analysis. Just as Husserl viewed speech utterances as the "first layer" of thought, concealing the "meaning" and "objective content" of the utterance, determined by ready-made knowledge and ready-made thinking formulas, the ethnomethodologists view speech utterances as the initial data for the extraction of social categories determined by interpretation models.

Some sociologists draw a parallel between this approach of ethnomethodologists the study of speech data and N. Chomsky's generative theory deriving, as is known, deep structures from an analysis of actual speech utterances (surface structures) used as the initial data of analysis (Cicourel 1970).

This approach finds a sympathetic response among certain sociolinguists who see promise in the ethnomethodologists' attempts to extract social categories directly from speech data. This, in their view, makes it possible to examine linguistic and social categories not as separate entities subject to correlational analysis but within the framework of a single theoretical model (Gumperz 1972a, 217; Blom and Gumperz 1972, 432).

The impact of Chomsky's ideas on sociolinguistics abroad will be examined in detail below. At this point it should be noted that the analogy between Chomsky's generative model and the conception of the ethnomethodologists seems to be far-fetched. First of all, it should be noted that for Chomsky the
initial data is speech alone, abstracted from its social context, while for ethnmethodologists the interpretation of speech is impossible without due regard for the previous experience of the individuals participating in communicative events, or without taking into account their knowledge of the social institutions and norms of their environment.

This knowledge or, to use Garfinkel’s terminology, “background expectation”, determines the interpretation of any action, including speech events. In other words, they use as their source material not only speech data, as Chomsky does in his generative model, but also extralinguistic data regarding social structures and social situations.

It is significant that the meanings they study are “situated meanings”. However, true to the principles of phenomenological philosophy, they, as one of the reviewers of H. Garfinkel’s *Ethnomethodological Studies* puts it, see the situation only as it is viewed by the acting individual and see the world only through his eyes (*Review Symposium* 1968, 128).

It does not follow from the foregoing that the subjective categories used by members of a linguistic community should be excluded from consideration. On the contrary, these categories unquestionably merit attention. Sociolinguistics has reconsidered the postulate of structural linguistics according to which the informants’ value judgements in regard to their own language (in Bloomfield’s terminology, “secondary and tertiary reactions”) were usually disregarded. It became clear that the speakers’ subjective value judgements reflect the value orientation of a linguistic community and are in themselves one of the essential elements of a linguistic situation.

Marxist sociological theory regards value orientation as “a system of knowledge and experience consolidated as a stable regulator of behaviour” (Krečmar 1970, 85–87). This concept is part of the conceptual series characterizing the subjective personal aspect of social activity and is related to the total system of cultural values. The concepts reflecting the subjective and objective aspects of social activity mutually complement each other and form a single organic whole.

In sociolinguistic analysis this sociological principle is extremely important for it makes it possible to reveal the influence of social factors on the individual. Therefore, what is wrong with the ethnomethodological theory is not the intention it proclaims to distinguish between the researcher’s categories, reflecting objective reality, and the subjective categories of the actor, but the reduction of social categories to the categories of perception, the isolation of social categories from the class structure of society and from the system of productive relations.
Ethnomethodology shares with phenomenologically oriented bourgeois sociology the trend to view social relations not in their reality but as individual "sensations" and to elevate to the rank of theory what is very close to an everyday notion of society (cf. the "common sense" rationalism of Garfinkel and his followers) (Motrošilova 1963, 146).

It is noteworthy that the philosophical conception of ethnomethodologists is somewhat reminiscent of L. Wittgenstein's "ordinary language philosophy" (Wittgenstein 1953). This was noted by the West-German scholar W. Wilgden in his paper at the 8th World Sociological Congress. In his opinion, the theoretical platform of the ethnomethodologists is much closer to Wittgenstein's philosophy than J. R. Searle's speech act theory expressly oriented toward this philosophy (Searle 1969). This is manifested, among other things, in the fact that Searle devotes his empirical study of speech almost exclusively to an analysis of meanings, explicated in speech, whereas ethnomethodology, following Wittgenstein, considers language a very imperfect realization of thought (for a critique of L. Wittgenstein's conception, see Panfilov 1971, 16—17). Just as Wittgenstein sought the meaning of words in various contexts of their use, the ethnomethodologists seek to derive the meaning of a linguistic expression from its functional use in a certain sociocultural context.

Here is an example cited in one of Garfinkel's studies:

**Husband:**

Dana succeeded in putting a penny in a parking meter to-day without being picked up.

**Wife:**

Did you take him to the record store?

This afternoon as I was bringing Dana, our four year-old son, home from the nursery school, he succeeded in reaching high enough to put a penny in a parking meter when we parked in a meter zone, whereas before he had always had to be picked up to reach that high.

Since he put a penny in a meter that means that you stopped while he was with you. I know that you stopped at the record store either on the way to get him, or on the way back. Was it on the way back, so that he was with you or did you stop there on the way
In the above passage from a conversation between a husband and his wife the left-hand column reproduces the actual record of the conversation, while the right-hand column contains the glosses revealing the actual meaning of what was said for the participants of the communicative event.

Linguists have long been aware that in any natural language there is a confrontation of two trends — the trend toward explication and the trend toward implication (Skrebnev 1971, 15—16). Needless to say, the degree of explication or implication may vary depending on the amount of “background knowledge” shared by the participants of the speech act. It is also known that colloquial speech, extremely sensitive to the situational context, is largely elliptical, since many elements of the communication given in the situation do not receive any verbal expression (Zemskaja 1973, 19).

And yet it would be wrong to believe that the above linguistic expressions are meaningless in themselves and that they acquire a meaning only in a situation. The speech situation specifies and supplements the meaning of a linguistic expression, making it clear, but this does not mean that linguistic expressions in themselves are an imperfect realization of thought. After all, what must be explicated in any event is what is not part of the background knowledge, shared by the partners, and what is not compensated for by the situation.

The above example shows that the ethnomethodologists use the concept “the meaning of an utterance” in a somewhat undifferentiated manner, including in it not only the elements omitted in speech as apparent from the speech-act situation, but also those which, in their opinion, should be part of the “background knowledge” of the partners and which make their mutual understanding possible.

One of the weaknesses of ethnomethodology (and, for that matter, of many bourgeois sociological trends) is empiricism. It is fitting to recall in this connection K. Marx’s words: “Crude empiricism becomes false metaphysics and scholastics which makes strenuous efforts to derive irrefutable empirical phenomena directly by means of a simple formal abstraction from a general law or in order to adjust them artfully to this law” (Marx and Engels. Works, Vol. 26, p. 164). The explicit empirical orientation of ethnomethodology is clear to sociolinguists, including those who, on the whole, are sympathetic towards the basic postulates of ethnomethodology. Thus the editors of Directions in Sociolinguistics, while making an
essentially favourable assessment of ethnomethodology, note, at the same time, its "extreme empiricism" and lack of a single and clearly defined conceptual system (Gumperz and Hymes 1972, 306).

At the same time, the ethnomethodologists have produced some interesting empirical studies. Their observations of spontaneous conversations in certain situations merit attention. For instance, in his experimental study of sequencing in conversation openings E. Schegloff discovered that question-answer sequences in certain speech situations, for example, in telephone conversations, are rule-governed.

Schegloff’s experiment demonstrated that a violation of these rules prevents mutual understanding between partners in a communicative event.

Thus, for instance, question-answer sequences in a telephone conversation may be as follows: 1) the answering party speaks first (Hello; yeah; Macy’s shoe department; Dr. Brown’s office; Plaza 1-5000); 2) the response of the calling party may include an appellation (Hello, Bill); 3) the reply of the calling party frequently includes an element of self-identification (for instance, this is —, my name is —); 4) the calling party is usually the first to propose the topic of the conversation (Schegloff 1972).

The ethnomethodologists have collected some insightful data for a linguistic and, especially, psycholinguistic study of verbal communication. Yet there is a paradoxical situation: although ethnomethodology is one of the trends in sociology, it is the sociological aspect of its studies that appears to be least informative. And this is no coincidence, for in their studies social interaction between communicants is viewed in complete isolation from the social structure of society. Typical in this respect is the paper by H. Sacks analyzing stories told by children (Sacks 1972). The author is interested in some elementary rules of unambiguous semantic interpretation of the text.

Thus it is clear to everyone from the sequence of sentences in a child’s story (The baby cried. The mommy picked it up) that the reference is to the child’s mother, though the text does not express it verbally (it says “the mommy” and not “its mommy”). These sentences are interpreted by means of so-called "categorization devices" and contextual analysis. The word baby is included in the category family (baby — daddy — mommy) and not, say, in the category age (baby — child … — adult) which, needless to say, is facilitated by the contextual juxtaposition of the words baby and mommy.

Without trying to assess this hypothesis, let us merely indicate that in this analysis the social environment is restricted to the social microcosm (family,
immediate milieu), available to the child’s perception. And yet this analysis of spontaneous conversations, a study of the sequencing and semantic structure of actual speech utterances produced in the course of verbal communication, as well as the rules of their structuring and interpretation are of unquestionable interest to sociolinguistics. But it is essential that these studies should have a sound methodological basis and that the speech data they use should be viewed in a broad sociological perspective with due regard not only for the microcontext of the situation but also for the social macrocontext, including the fundamental social structures from which the social norms of verbal activity are ultimately derived.

7. Sociolinguistics and generative grammar

Special mention should made of the influence exerted on certain sociolinguistic trends by the ideas of N. Chomsky’s generative grammar, which enjoyed considerable popularity among American and many West European linguists. In the not-too-distant past some Western sociolinguists, disappointed with the narrow behaviouristic orientation of some linguistic (for instance, descriptivist) and sociological studies, decided to turn to Chomsky’s “mentalistic” conception, viewing it as nearly the only alternative to behaviourism. This view was expressed by the New Zealand sociologist J. B. Pride, among others, who felt that the antibehaviourist orientation of Chomsky’s school is much closer to the sociolinguists than the “antimentalism” of his descriptivist predecessors (Pride 1971).

It should be noted, however, that this view is not shared by many leading Western sociolinguists who subject the philosophic and linguistic views of Chomsky and his followers to convincing criticism. For instance, one cannot but agree with D. Hymes who, evaluating generative grammar from the standpoint of sociolinguistics, points out that as regards a study of the social nature of language, Chomsky’s model does not depart from the structuralist precedent. What is more, it is even regressive, because it completely excluded from consideration the heterogeneity of the speech community, the various roles of speakers, stylistic and social meanings (Hymes 1972).

Indeed, many of the general principles proclaimed by Chomsky and his followers are not only alien to the theoretical platform of sociolinguists, but are diametrically opposite to it. Let us examine, for instance, the following initial postulate of transformational grammar:

“Linguistic theory is concerned primarily with an ideal speaker-listener, in a completely homogeneous speech community, who knows its language perfectly
and is unaffected by such grammatically irrelevant conditions as memory limitations, distractions, shifts of attention and interest, and errors (random or characteristic) in applying his knowledge of the language in actual performance” (Chomsky 1965, 3).

This proposition clearly runs counter to the basic orientation of sociolinguistics toward the study of language in a social context, toward an analysis of language variability, determined by the heterogeneity of language communities and toward the explication of trends determining the variability of verbal activity under the influence of social factors. It is therefore not accidental that in evaluating such an orientation of linguistic theory, Hymes said that “there is a body of linguistic data and problems that would be left without theoretical insight, if such a limited conception of linguistic theory were to remain unchallenged” (Hymes 1972, 270).

Polemics with Chomsky’s theoretical views figure prominently in Hymes’ On communicative Competence (Hymes 1972a) and Foundations in Sociolinguistics (Hymes, 1974).

D. Hymes is right in criticizing Chomsky for ignoring not only the social stratification of language, but also its stylistic differentiation.

On the one hand, it would seem that Chomsky can hardly be guilty of linguistic isolationism, a trend, so typical of his descriptivist predecessors, who did their utmost to fence themselves off from related sciences. And, at the same time, Chomsky shows surprising inconsistency. While advocating the restoration of links between linguistics, on the one hand, and psychology and philosophy, on the other (even treating linguistics as part of cognitive psychology), he excludes from consideration those aspects of linguistics which are related to the disciplines studying man's social nature.

Paradoxically enough, “Chomsky’s “Cartesian” linguistics seems a cogent, thoroughly thought-out perfection of the impulse to the autonomy of language that spurred so much of structural linguistics” (Hymes 1974, 121).

Facts demonstrate that heterogeneity in one form or another is always inherent in any speech community. Needless to say, any scholar is entitled to simplify the object of his analysis, abstracting it from some of its features. However, an attempt to treat this idealized object as the only one worth examining in linguistic theory arouses serious objections.

Sociolinguists and especially Hymes offer convincing evidence of Chomsky’s reductionism, based on terminological metonymy, treating a part as the whole. “In effect”, Hymes says, “Cartesian linguistics reduces “competence” to know-
Sociolinguists are right in criticizing N. Chomsky for underestimating the theoretical importance of studying verbal activity or, in Chomsky's terms, *performance*, regarded merely as initial data to reveal the underlying *competence*. According to W. Labov, the view widely held by generativists that natural everyday speech is chaotic, disjointed and ungrammatical is "a myth with no basis in actual fact" (Labov 1972, 203). In fact, sociolinguistic studies have convincingly demonstrated that the idea that natural speech is chaotic comes from disregarding the social context.

And, at the same time, generativist theory has exerted some influence on some sociolinguistic trends abroad. This influence makes itself felt in research methods, among other things, which will be discussed in further detail below. A number of sociolinguists use in their studies some procedures of transformational analysis. Thus, W. Labov in his study of socially determined variability of certain morphological and phonological phenomena in Black English uses (albeit in a somewhat modified shape) the technique of phonological analysis, developed by Chomsky and Halle (Labov 1972). Such influence, however, does not affect the basic philosophic principles of sociolinguistics. For, after all, one can use a specific research technique proposed by certain scholars without sharing their general theoretical orientation.

Chomsky's influence, however, is sometimes expressed in the fact (and this seems to be more important) that, while criticizing his theoretical stance, some sociolinguists frequently remain within his conceptual system or "epistemological paradigm" (T. S. Kuhn's term) (Kuhn 1970). This applies, in the first place, to the *competence: performance* dichotomy. Many sociolinguists see the main weakness of this opposition, used by Chomsky and his followers, in its narrow and limited character. "In an effort to extend some of the general principles of formal grammatical analysis (the principles of generative grammar ... A. Š.) to the study of speech as a form of social interaction," says J. Gumperz in one of his essays, "sociolinguists have advanced the concept of communicative competence. Whereas linguistic competence (in Chomsky's grammar — A. Š.) covers the speaker's ability to produce grammatically correct sentences, communicative competence describes his ability to select from the totality of grammatically correct expressions available to him forms which appropriately reflect the social norms governing behaviour in specific encounters" (J. Gumperz 1972, 205).
In other words, an attempt is being made to extend the concept developed in generativist theory to sociolinguistic data. In so doing, however, the sociolinguists essentially modify this concept. First of all, the competence described by J. J. Gumperz, D. Hymes and other sociolinguists, unlike Chomsky’s linguistic competence, is not an innate ability. It is formed as a result of the individual’s interaction with his social environment. “The acquisition of such competency, Hymes writes, is of course fed by social experience, needs, and motives” (Hymes 1972a, 278).

It must be admitted that the modification by sociolinguists of the concept of competence is essential. Following Descartes, who considered the main concepts and principles of logic and mathematics to be innate and not originating from experience, Chomsky views linguistic competence as man’s innate ability, independent of his social experience.

In opposition to this theoretical orientation, sociolinguists view “communicative competence” in its social context. What is more, the very concept of competence, essentially reexamined, now includes four parameters (grammaticality, feasibility, appropriateness, and occurrence).

The first parameter roughly coincides with the one used in generative grammar. Feasibility is determined, in the main, by some psychological factors influencing speech (memory limitations, effects of nesting, branching, etc.). Appropriateness relates the occurrence to the context of the situation. And, finally, occurrence characterizes the linguistic form in terms of the probabilities of its use.

What is competence then? It is factit knowledge, knowhow (abilities), and value judgements (value orientation).

“We have then to account for the fact”, Hymes says, “that a normal child acquires knowledge of sentences not only as grammatical but also as appropriate . . . In short, a child becomes able to accomplish a repertoire of speech acts, to take part in speech events, and to evaluate their accomplishment by others. This competence, moreover, is integral with attitudes, values, and motivations concerning language, its features and uses” (Hymes 1972, 277–278).

A similar attempt to apply to sociolinguistics the conceptual system of generative grammar was made by the West-German scholar H. Steger who postulates the existence of social competence, including the knowledge of the norms of social behaviour, including speech behaviour, and mediating between the realm of social norms and the realm of linguistic signs (Steger 1971).
It remains somewhat unclear to what extent it is legitimate to include within the same category heterogeneous concepts related both to the objective aspect of verbal communication and to its subjective aspect. In fact, the limitations imposed by the scope of human memory on the depth of syntactic structures exist independently of the communicants' knowledge or intentions, whereas the attitudes associated with their value orientation exist in the speakers' minds. It seems that while essentially correcting the concept of competence, Hymes and other Western scholars were unable to eliminate completely the intrinsic contradictions of this category. Hockett's comment that Chomsky confuses such concepts as knowledge, on the one hand, and ability and habit on the other, applies to this case, too (Hockett 1970, 62–63).

Nevertheless, the idea that knowledge of the social norms of language use is as important in language acquisition as knowledge of grammatical rules is of paramount importance to sociolinguistics. To translate these principles into practice it is necessary to dissociate oneself even more vigorously from philosophical principles, alien to the very essence of sociolinguistics.

A Chomskian orientation makes itself felt in the wide use by many sociolinguists of the concept rule. The use of this concept in sociolinguistics involves serious difficulties. First of all, the effect of social factors on language cannot be reduced to clearly defined rules, mandatory or even optional, if we mean by rules explicit algorithms of behaviour. Usually linguistic reflexes of social factors are manifested in the relative frequency of competing socially marked linguistic forms. Thus, for instance, according to Labov's data, socially determined variations of competing pronunciation norms, as, for example, garden /gardən/ /gaːdən/ implies that in some situations one of these norms is more frequently realized than in others, and not that certain social situations strictly prescribe unconditional orientation to one of these norms (Labov 1966). In other words, these are probabilistic trends rather than rules of the yes or no type.

At this point it is appropriate to recall C. Hockett's words concerning the use of the term rule in generative grammar: "If one believes that a human language is governed by well-defined rules, then the rule terminology one uses is not synonymous with any older terminology of linguistics, and one is justified in rejecting the older manner of talking about language in terms of "habit", "pattern", "analogy", and the like. But if one believes, as I do . . ., that the rules for a human language are ill-defined, then the whole rule terminology becomes a bad one" (Hockett 1968, 87).
But the real issue is, of course, not terminological. As will be shown below, it involves confusion of subjective (conscious) and objective aspects of verbal communication and a clearly one-sided treatment of the effect of social factors on speech.

Another reason why the basic principles of the generativist theory are unacceptable to sociolinguistics is that they are based on a dualistic philosophy. It has already been pointed out in the literature that the orientation of Chomsky and his followers to the Cartesian theory is not very consistent and is based on a somewhat loose interpretation of the philosophic principles of rationalism (Zvegincev 1973, 72–78; for a critique of the Cartesian principles of Chomsky’s theory, see Kurmanbaev 1974). However seriously Chomsky modifies the Cartesian principles, he remains unquestionably true to them in one respect: he has not departed at all from their dualistic basis. This was demonstrated, among other things, by the admission of the philosophic interpreter of the generativist theory, J. J. Katz, who defined the mentalism underlying Chomsky’s theory as one of the forms of psycho-physical dualism (Katz 1964, 124).

A critique of the dualistic principles of Chomsky’s theory and the Cartesian conceptions in sociology and sociolinguistics is the main thrust of a paper by the West German sociologist R. Grathoff (Grathoff 1974). In Grathoff’s opinion, Cartesian dualism finds its expression in Chomsky’s philosophic conception according to which the mind of the ideal speaker-listener, locked in a Cartesian cage, exists independently of the outside world, including the social world. It is typical of the sociologists who adhere to similar idealistic principles to reduce social phenomena to psychological ones. This approach characterizes, in Grathoff’s opinion, both traditional role theory and the microsociolinguistics, based on it. The “role” in that theory mediates between the autonomous individual mind and the social world. Just as Chomsky’s theory idealizes the man possessing “linguistic competence”, so traditional role theory constructs an ideal performer of a social role, knowing his “role prescriptions”.

To remedy the situation where the researcher finds himself between the “Scylla of dualism” and the “Charybdis of empiricism” Grathoff proposes the revival of some principles of pragmatic philosophy and the use of the research procedures of ethnomethodologists criticizing role theory. It seems that while correctly pointing to the vulnerability of the philosophic and sociological stance of contemporary “Neo-Cartesians”, Grathoff was unable to show the way out of the philosophical impasse. And, of course, it is not role theory that is to blame. As mentioned above, with all its weaknesses, this theory, placed on a sound
philosophical basis, may prove sufficiently effective as a tool (of course, not the only one) to gain insights into social and sociolinguistic reality.

In evaluating any sociological theory or model, we cannot fail to take into account its philosophical basis. Neither pragmatism, nor phenomenology, towards which the ethnomethodologists are oriented, can provide a reliable philosophical basis for the development of sociolinguistics. Nor can the “Neo-Cartesian mentalism” of Chomsky and his followers, as was shown above.

As was indicated in the first section of this Chapter, the philosophic basis of Marxist sociolinguistics is historical materialism which reveals the most general trends of social development. At the same time, one cannot but agree with L. B. Nikolsky who believes that it does not follow from a general orientation towards historical materialism that the general propositions of the Marxist theory of society can be directly applied, without due regard for mediating factors, to explain sociolinguistic phenomena. In fact, sociolinguistics deals with many phenomena and processes which are only indirectly stimulated by the general laws of social development. For example, the honorifics formed in the feudal period in a number of oriental languages do not disappear after the emergence of another social system, speech behaviour is determined not only by class or social group but also by age, education, sex, occupation, etc., professional vocabulary arises out of the social division of labour within any social system, etc. (Nikolsky 1974a, 66).

The establishment of direct links between the basic class structures and language without due regard for the intermediate, mediating stages has repeatedly led to a simplistic treatment of the problem of language in society. Such oversimplified concepts of the mechanism of the social determination of language formed the basis of the once-popular theory of “class languages” as well as Bernstein’s contemporary theory of “elaborated” and “restricted” codes.

The problem of the social determination of language remains to this day the basic philosophical issue of sociolinguistics. As we discussed in the preceding sections the various sociolinguistic, anthropological and philosophical trends that have exerted some influence on the philosophical orientation of various schools of contemporary sociolinguistics, we examined several aspects of this problem, such as the relation of linguistic and social structures, the nature of causal relations between them, language and culture, language and nation, social reflexes in language and speech, etc. The development of a clear-cut position on this fundamental issue is a prerequisite for the successful development of sociolinguistics.
CHAPTER II

THEORETICAL PROBLEMS OF SOCIOLINGUISTICS

The problems discussed in this chapter constitute the specific theory of sociolinguistics. They include the subject-matter of sociolinguistics, its conceptual system, its relation to semiotics and stylistics. Needless to say, these problems do not cover the entire range of issues comprising sociolinguistic theory. Furthermore, the author does not lay claim to an exhaustive treatment of any of these problems in particular. This task is hardly feasible at the present stage of the development of sociolinguistics. The author hopes that this chapter would contribute to a more precise formulation of some topical issues in sociolinguistic theory and stimulate their discussion, without which the development of sociolinguistics as a scientific discipline is inconceivable.

1. The Subject-Matter of Sociolinguistics

A precise definition of the subject-matter of research is, as is known, the primary indispensable condition for the very existence of any scientific discipline. The solution of this problem is closely connected with the definition of the place of this discipline among others, the explication of its goals as well as the spelling out of its problems or area of research.

The problem of the relations between language and society has aroused the interest of linguists in different periods and is, of course, not novel. But sociolinguistics as a special discipline is relatively young, and the above-mentioned questions involved in the definition of its subject-matter are still being debated. First of all, there seems to be a lack of unanimity on the very status of sociolinguistics. For instance, the view was expressed that the term sociolinguistics designates just an area of interdisciplinary research rather than a separate discipline. This view has been repeatedly expressed by D. Hymes who believes that, like its predecessors, ethnolinguistics and psycholinguistics, sociolinguistics is one of the directions of joint research where linguists join hands with representatives of other sciences, ethnographers, psychologists, sociologists, etc. According to Hymes, the new hyphenated term arose not out of the emergence of a new discipline but out of the identity of interests of related sciences around problems that concern lin-
guistics, on the one hand, and anthropology, psychology and sociology, on the other.

What is more, Hymes believes, as linguistics fully recognizes the social and cultural aspects of its area of research and other social sciences recognize the close links between their area of research and theory and linguistics, the term sociolinguistics will become redundant (Hymes 1972b, 40—41).

It seems that even if the sociolinguistic aspects of linguistics and other social sciences are granted full recognition within the appropriate disciplines and become their integral part, sociolinguistics will not become a mere totality of the overlapping areas of linguistics, sociology and other sciences. After all, in order to determine the status of a research area, it is necessary to find out, first of all, whether this area has its own clearly defined subject-matter, its own theory and conceptual system and its own specific research techniques.

It is, in our view, a salient feature of contemporary sociolinguistics that it aims not merely at joining together mechanically the relevant parts of linguistics and sociology but at welding them together on the basis of a single theory, a single understanding of the object and goals of research, a single conceptual system and a single set of research procedures. The point is that the social factors affecting the development and functioning of language have been in the focus of many linguistic schools and trends just as language as a reflection of social processes has long attracted the attention of sociologists, ethnographers and other scholars. Yet in exploring these problems, scholars, as a rule, did not go beyond their respective disciplines. The development of science nowadays is characterized by an intricate interplay of two closely related processes — the process of differentiation, involved in the further specialization of scientific knowledge and the process of integration involved in the emergence of new hyphenated disciplines at the crossroads of various sciences. The formation of sociolinguistics at the crossroads of linguistics, sociology and other social sciences reflects, in Juri Dešeriev's opinion, the same integrationist trends that have led to the formation of such new disciplines, as, for instance, physical chemistry or chemical physics on the borderline between physics and chemistry (Dešeriev 1973, 5). Very convincing arguments in favour of recognizing the interdisciplinary status of sociolinguistics are offered by the Czech sociolinguist J. Kraus (Kraus 1974).

Below we shall describe in further details the present stage in the development of the theory and method of sociolinguistics. Running ahead a little bit, we can say at this point that the above-mentioned integration of sociological and linguistic research within a single theory and a single conceptual system is far from com-
completed. Although sociolinguistics is coming of age, it has not yet reached full maturity.

Debates are going on about the interdisciplinary status of sociolinguistics. Sometimes the view is expressed that the recent period was characterized by overemphasizing the interdisciplinary character of sociolinguistic research, whereas practical experience demonstrates that interdisciplinary studies are not a one-way street, and the interests of linguists and sociologists cannot always be easily reconciled (Kachru 1974, 262). At the same time, many scholars view sociolinguistics as part of linguistics. This view is held by V. A. Avrorin, among others, who defines sociolinguistics as "a special, relatively independent direction within the science of language" (Avrorin 1975, 16).

It is sometimes suggested that a theoretical or empirical study should be regarded as being within the terms of reference of one of the two disciplines—sociolinguistics, part of linguistics, or the sociology of language, part of sociology, depending on the particular aspects of language in society that are emphasized in it (linguistic or sociological). This view is put forward, for instance, by R. Grosse and A. Neubert in their programmatic article "Theses of Marxist Sociolinguistics" (Grosse and Neubert 1970, 3–4). The authors maintain that relations between language and society may be viewed in either direction, just as in semiotics the pragmatic relation linguistic sign – man $R(Z,M)$ is considered reversible. If one proceeds from linguistic facts or linguistic signs, it is the sociolinguistic aspect of analysis. If the point of departure is social conditions or social relations, the study is concerned with the inverted pragmatic relation $R' (M,Z)$ or the linguosociological aspect of analysis (for a different interpretation of linguosociology, see Nikolsky 1974b). The sociolinguistic approach concentrates on socially relevant variants of linguistic signs or sign clusters and determines their place in the diasystem in order to analyze on that basis their use by certain social groups in certain communicative situations and with certain communicative goals. As to the linguosociological approach, the point of departure is, on the contrary, a sociological category (such as a social group, the social role of an individual, community attitudes, etc), from which the research proceeds to linguistic phenomena, characterizing these categories.

Hence the dichotomy proposed by the authors of sociolinguistics and the sociology of language (or linguosociology).

According to Grosse and Neubert, sociolinguistics is part of linguistics, inasmuch as the analysis is based on the language system, whereas the sociology of language, on the contrary, proceeds from the social system and should therefore be regarded as a sociological discipline.
The basic proposition advanced by Grosse and Neubert is certainly true: there are two perspectives of analysing sociolinguistic data — from social to linguistic categories and from linguistic to social categories. This, however, hardly implies that the choice of either aspect of analyzing the data will in itself predetermine the character of research and will make it possible to label it unconditionally as linguistic or sociological. Thus, for instance, on the basis of their criteria of distinguishing between sociolinguistics and sociology of language, the authors place in the category of sociological studies the well-known essay by the linguist W. Labov on the stratification of American English in New York City (Labov 1966). Yet it seems that Labov's study is of the utmost interest precisely from a linguistic viewpoint, for the author uses sociological information merely as initial data.

Incidentally, the opposite direction of sociological analysis (from language to a social category) does not in itself guarantee a predominantly sociological character of research. This is convincingly demonstrated by J. B. Pride (Pride 1973) who cites as an example the essays by J. Rubin and P. Friedrich (Rubin 1962; Friedrich 1966). The former is a study of bilingualism in Paraguay and the latter reveals the trends underlying the use of personal pronouns in 19th century Russian. As distinguished from Labov's work, these studies proceed from a certain set of linguistic data for which social and sociopsychological correlates are established. Their direction “from linguistics to sociology”, however, does not detract from the linguistic significance of these studies. Developing the idea put forward by J. B. Pride, it could be pointed out that whether or not a given study is predominantly linguistic or sociological depends more on its content than on what constitutes its point of departure and its end product.

It is still more important that the partitioning of the zone of interrelations of linguistic and social phenomena between these two disciplines, belonging to linguistics and sociology respectively, runs counter to the goal proclaimed, as was mentioned above, by sociolinguistics as an interdisciplinary trend. Drawing a line of demarcation between sociolinguistics and the sociology of language, in fact, deprives both these disciplines of their interdisciplinary status and prevents them from examining the entire set of problems pertaining to the social determination of language on the basis of a single theory.

The above applies to a certain extent to the inclusion of sociolinguistic subject matter within the terms of reference of sociolinguistics and the sociology of language on the basis of the criteria proposed by L. B. Nikolsky (Nikolsky 1974b). According to his point of view, the difference between sociolinguistics and lin-
guosociology lies in the fact that the former studies the reflection in language of certain social phenomena and trends while the latter views language as one of the active social factors shaping social trends. In other words, in L. B. Nikolsky's opinion, the above differentiation does not merely amount to two different aspects of examining the same reversible relations, as maintained by R. Grosse and A. Neubert.

These are rather differences characterizing the very subject of sociolinguistic studies. It was mentioned earlier that language in sociolinguistics is not merely a passive reflection of social processes and phenomena. In a number of instances language acts as one of the social factors influencing certain phenomena of social life.

In calling our attention to this important fact, L. B. Nikolsky notes an essential conceptual difference which, unquestionably, should find its reflection in sociolinguistic theory.

If this differentiation affected the subject matter of a single discipline or a single interdisciplinary field, L. B. Nikolsky's conception would have been, in our view, quite acceptable. However, according to this conception, two correctly distinguished types of relations between language and its social environment (language as a reflection of the social environment and language as a social factor) are divided between different disciplines, linguistics and sociology, for sociolinguistics is treated as part of linguistics and linguosociology as part of sociology. This seems to erect an interdisciplinary barrier preventing the integration of linguistic and sociological studies of the problems that lie at the crossroads of these disciplines.

It is true that these relations between language and the social world do exist, but they are closely interrelated. A national language which arises from national integration exerts, for its part, some influence on integrationist trends. A comprehensive picture of such interrelations can only be formed on the basis of a single theory which can be worked out within a single discipline.

The very *raison d'être* of interdisciplinary efforts lies in the fact that they make it possible to see what cannot be seen from the vantage point of just one of the interacting disciplines. A synthesis of two approaches, linguistic and sociological, provides deeper insights into phenomena where the interests of linguistics and sociology overlap.

A somewhat different view is held by the American sociologist J. Fishman who believes that sociolinguistics is related to the sociology of language as a part to a whole.
According to Fishman, sociolinguistics deals merely with "societally patterned variation in language usage", whereas the sociology of language is oriented towards broader social issues and is concerned with "societally patterned behaviours pertaining to language maintenance and language shift, language nationalism and language planning, etc." (Fishman 1971b, 8–9).

It seems that the motivation behind Fishman’s differentiation between sociolinguistics and the sociology of language is as follows: during the recent period the term “sociolinguistics” in American linguistics has been actually associated with a microlevel analysis of socially conditioned verbal activity while a macro-level analysis aroused primarily the interest of sociologists. Attempts to integrate micro- and macrolevel approaches to a sociological analysis of language within a single discipline (regardless of its name) are in themselves commendable. In Fishman’s definition, however, there is no reference to a common feature shared by “the sociology of language” and “sociolinguistics” as one of its parts. For the former is concerned with “the variation of behaviour” and latter with “variation of language usage”. What is more, in this distribution of areas of concern between sociolinguistics and the sociology of language there are a number of serious omissions.

Finally, it is claimed that the sociology of language is concerned with broader social issues than sociolinguistics. From the above list of problems, however, it is not clear how sociolinguistics fits into this broader “macrolevel” area. It may be noted that in Fishman’s theory a situational analysis of verbal activity and the concept of a domain of speech behaviour provide a connecting link between micro- and macrolevel approaches to sociolinguistic data for they make it possible to reveal general norms of speech behaviour (Fishman 1972, 28). Yet general social norms of speech behaviour are by no means the only aspect of a macro-level sociolinguistic analysis and, perhaps, not the most important one (Śwejcer 1970). Fishman’s desire to integrate sociolinguistic problems within a single interdisciplinary field is not fully realized in his classification pattern and not always consistently enough.

It should be noted that a one-sided interpretation of the goals of sociolinguistics and isolation of merely one of its aspects characterize many definitions of the subject-matter of sociolinguistics. We have already quoted the definition of W. Bright who limited the goals of sociolinguistics to a description of “covariance” of linguistic and social structures (Bright 1966a, 11). The emphasis laid in certain sociolinguistic schools and, in particular, in American sociolinguistics on the problem of variation is perfectly understandable. To a certain extent it is a reac-
tion to attempts, typical of some varieties of structuralism and, particularly, descriptive linguistics, to view language as a homogeneous and monolithic structure. It is true that sociolinguistic studies make it possible to analyze linguistic units not only as elements of invariant structures but also as variables functionally dependent on independent variables, characterizing social structures. This does not mean, however, that the problem of invariants is irrelevant to a sociolinguistic description. It is hardly possible to describe any socially marked language subsystems (for instance, social or occupational dialects) without due regard for their invariant features.

A more acceptable and, undoubtedly, more precise formula was proposed by O. S. Akhmanova and A. N. Marčenko who define sociolinguistics in the most general terms as "a branch of linguistics that studies causal relations between language and facts of social life" (Akhmanova, Marčenko 1971, 2).

Even this formula, however, is neither final nor comprehensive because, according to the authors themselves, the problem of the essence and content of sociolinguistics has not yet been clearly and unambiguously raised, let alone resolved.

A number of essays catalogue different interpretations of the term "sociolinguistics" without a single unifying definition of this concept. Thus, for instance, the West-German scholar D. Wunderlich (Wunderlich 1971, 315–316) proposes four different definitions of sociolinguistics differing from one another in the scope and character of its field. The broadest interpretation of sociolinguistics proceeds from the assumption of the integrity of communication and links together its social and individual aspects. An attempt should be made within this discipline to link the theory of society and the theory of language based on it with the theory of small-group communication and, ultimately, with a linguistic analysis of individual speech. Besides, there is another broad variety of sociolinguistics that deals merely with the social factors that directly affect an individual speech event, the social differentiation of society being used as a frame of reference, related to some parameters of variation in speech behaviour (such as the situation, role, topic, etc). According to a more restricted interpretation of sociolinguistics, the goal of this discipline is a study of links between certain types of speech codes and various sociological parameters. Finally, there is still another restricted interpretation of sociolinguistics, based on a correlation of speech behaviour with sociological parameters, characterizing the status, occupation, etc. of speakers and, ultimately, the social situation as well.
It should be noted, however, that even the broadest interpretation of sociolinguistics proposed by Wunderlich is too restricted. Just as the other definitions, it is oriented merely towards verbal communication and essentially reflects the theoretical principles of the sociolinguistic schools that assert the primacy of speech relative to language (cf. the preceding chapter).

Entirely different is the distinction between a broad and narrow interpretation of the sociolinguistic study of language drawn by B. N. Golovin, who singles out, at least, seven planes of differentiation: according to territory (local dialects), according to the material implementation of a speech event (written and oral "forms of a common language"), according to the structure of a speech event (monologue and dialogue varieties of a common language), according to the types of community activity (functional style), according to social groups and social strata (social and occupational varieties), according to genres of discourse (genre varieties), according to the speaker (personal varieties) (Golovin 1969, 344–347).

According to B. N. Golovin, sociolinguistics (he prefers the term "the sociology of language") in the broad sense is concerned with the interpretation of the totality of language stratifications and the entire system of its varieties, for these stratifications and varieties are, in the final analysis, determined not by internal structural factors but by different types of community influence upon language.

At the same time, according to B. N. Golovin there may be a more restricted interpretation of the subject-matter and goals of the "sociology of language" (or sociolinguistics). The primary object of studies in this case is the stratification of language and its functioning at the level of social groups and social strata. A tentative list of questions, suggested in this connection, roughly delineates the subject-matter and goals of the "sociology of language" in a narrow sense. These questions pertain to age, social-class and occupational differences in the functioning of language and the elements of its structure, social differentiation of language in former historical epochs, differences determined by individual psychology and by the social setting of communication.

It seems that the list of questions proposed by B. N. Golovin as the subject-matter of sociolinguistics, on the one hand, goes beyond its terms of reference, and, on the other, does not include some important aspects of sociolinguistic studies. The list of problems to be studied by sociolinguistics (or the sociology language) in the broad sense of the term includes many that are not directly related to sociolinguistics. Thus, for instance, the problem of territorial dialects is part of dialectology and linguistic geography. It is true that this problem is
closely intertwined with sociolinguistic topics. After all, a territorial dialect may, at the same time, be a social dialect (for example, Cockney is a territorial dialect of London as well as a social dialect of lower urban strata). Yet territorial and social differentiation of language constitute different dimensions of language variation (Žirmunskij 1968, 25).

Problems of written and oral speech, monologue and dialogue discourse, genres and individual variants are not as such part of the subject-matter of sociolinguistics either. All these problems fall within the domains of stylistics and partly psycholinguistics. B. N. Golovin considers them part of sociolinguistics on the ground that in all the above cases variation is determined by the influence of the community rather than by interstructural factors. But in that case the subject-matter of sociolinguistics would have to be extended ad infinitum. It will be recalled that intersystemic relations arise not only under the influence of interstructural factors, but also to a great extent as a result of certain social influences.

On the other hand, all the problems included in the subject-matter of sociolinguistics in the restricted sense of the term do, in fact, constitute the subject of sociolinguistics (with the possible exception of speech variation determined by individual psychology, which comes within the purview of psycholinguistics). On the other hand, the list of questions referred to sociolinguistics is clearly incomplete. One has the impression that the problems of sociolinguistics proper are reduced to social differentiation of language within monolingual communities. There is no reference, for instance, to the broad range of problems involved in social differentiation of bilingual communities. Furthermore, the definition proposed does not cover all the sociolinguistic problems that go beyond the social differentiation of language and speech.

The restriction of the subject-matter of sociolinguistics to the social differentiation of language characterizes many attempts to define the subject of sociolinguistics. For instance, Academician V. M. Žirmunskij in his above cited essay “Marxism and Sociolinguistics” says: “Sociolinguistics in the narrow sense of the term is concerned with two interrelated groups of problems: 1) social differentiation of language within a class society at a certain stage of its historical development (for a given community in a given historical epoch); 2) social development of language, its history as a social (socially differentiated) phenomenon”.

V. M. Žirmunskij considers this division largely conventional, based on the opposition of synchronic and diachronic aspects of language study. In other
words, according to this definition, the subject of sociolinguistics includes synchro
chronic and diachronic studies of the social differentiation of language (Žirmunskij 1969, 14).

This definition contains many valuable and useful elements but, at the same
time, it is characterized by one-sided orientation towards one of the problems of
sociolinguistics, indeed an extremely important problem, but not the only one.
There is every reason to believe that the one-sided character of this interpreta-
tion of the subject of sociolinguistics was to some extent clear to the author himself.
It is significant that he applies the above definition to “sociolinguistics in the nar-
row sense of the term”. Furthermore, as he lists in this essay the problems con-
stituting the subject-matter of sociolinguistics, he names, among other things,
some which clearly go beyond his definition (for instance, the problems of
language policy and language engineering).

In the above-mentioned essay by O. S. Akhmanova and A. N. Marčenko
(Akhmanova, Marčenko 1971, 5—9) three major directions of sociolinguistic
studies are singled out:

1) sociolinguistics in the broad sense, drawing on data from most diverse lan-
guages, mostly outside “average West-European culture” and intended to re-
fect the influence on speech of such factors as the social situation of com-
munication, social status, age, education, etc. (this direction includes, among
other things, “the ethnography of communication”, elaborated by D. Hymes
— see above);

2) sociolinguistics as a science of “language existence” (the term “language exis-
tence” is used in Japanese linguistics where it applies to a view of language as
a goal-directed human activity and one of the forms of human existence —
Konrad 1959; Neverov 1963);

3) sociolinguistics as a branch of linguistics, concerned with the establish-
ment of consistent correlations between microlinguistic phenomena and the facts of
social life within a given community.

It should be noted that the second direction fundamentally differs from the
first. While the first direction is focused on deviations from the ideal forms of
national language, that is on such problems as bilingualism, diglossia, various
types of linguistic interference, i.e. on problems involved in the social differentia-
tion of language, the second is centered on the “cultivation” of the common
national language and its development into the most adequate medium of intra-
national communication.
As to the third direction, its fundamental philosophical problem is, according to the prominent follower of the traditions of the French sociological school M. Cohen, the possibility of establishing correlations between certain social facts and phenomena and linguistic processes (Cohen 1970, 5—8). This includes, among other things, semantic studies by A. Meillet who believed that lexical items having a certain meaning for closed social groups acquire a broader meaning when used outside these groups (for instance, French *arriver* which meant ‘to moor’ among seamen, acquired the meaning ‘to arrive’ in the nation-wide language) (Meillet 1936), A. Haudricourt’s hypothesis, according to which the growing complexity of social relations may lead to the reduction of the number of phonological oppositions (Haudricourt 1959, 42—43), etc.

It seems that each of the above directions is perfectly legitimate (it should be noted, however, that the first and third directions are so close to each other in their problems that they, in fact, amount to two different varieties of the same direction of research). Yet one cannot agree with those who reduce the entire subject-matter of sociolinguistics to just one of the above directions. Therefore, one can understand the objections of R. A. Budagov to the inclusion in sociolinguistics of only the so-called “special cases”, such as bilingualism and social dialects.

“It so happens”, R. A. Budagov says, “that sociolinguistics is more concerned with special cases and a special linguistic situation (for instance, bilingualism) than with language in its basic functions. It is true that special cases are also very interesting and instructive (for instance, the above-mentioned bilingualism and social dialects), and yet their relative importance in science is much smaller than that of the problem of national language in its development and functioning (Budagov 1974, 102).

Perhaps, the most comprehensive description of the subject-matter of sociolinguistics may be found in the above-mentioned essay by L. B. Nikolsky “On the Subject of Sociolinguistics” (Nikolsky 1974a, 62—64). According to L. B. Nikolsky, the subject-matter of sociolinguistics includes, first of all, the broad range of problems pertaining to the language situation. They involve, in particular, a study of various spontaneous linguistic interactions of languages and dialects, the formation of supradialectal forms of speech, language standardization and the establishment of the national standard language. Studied in the context of the language situation are also bilingualism and diglossia.

The subject-matter of sociolinguistics also includes the problems involved in language policy and, in particular, deliberate efforts towards the standardization
of language by society and the creation of national standard languages, codification processes, term coinage, etc. The problem of verbal behaviour is studied in sociolinguistics against the backdrop of the sociofunctional distribution of languages or their varieties in a given society. A study of verbal behaviour is aimed at ascertaining the sociolinguistic norm. Both in the field of verbal behaviour and in the field of language policy sociolinguistics is primarily concerned with the choice of communication media.

The attention of the sociolinguist is centered on the reflection of social factors in the language situation or in the language system and also on the way these factors determine the use of languages or a language by the society or the individual. While agreeing in principle with this statement, it should be added that inasmuch as, in our opinion, sociolinguistics is interested not only in the determinant influence of the society on language but also in the totality of bilateral relations between language and society, questions involved in the role of language as an active social factor should also be included in the problems of sociolinguistic research.

The most comprehensive of the existing definitions of the subject of sociolinguistics is probably the one proposed by Ju. D. Dešeriev in his article “Social Linguistics”, where the subject of sociolinguistics is described as a study of the general and particularly socially determined patterns of the functioning, development and interaction of languages. In other words, the sociological aspect of language study embraces the totality of problems associated with all specifically linguistic phenomena determined by the development of society, with its impact on the interaction of languages in general and the interaction of linguistic elements in the functioning of each specific language (Dešeriev 1973, 7).

While adopting this definition as a basis, it seems desirable to clarify some of its aspects. First of all, the definition of the subject of sociolinguistics should reflect the above-mentioned bilateral character of relations between language and society. The term “functioning of language” is usually associated with its functional use. A definition of the subject of sociolinguistics should emphasize that the area of sociolinguistic studies includes both the influence of social factors on the functional use of language in the course of verbal communication, the impact of these factors on the very structure of language, and their reflection in language structure.

This involves a study of not only the relations between language and objective social factors, such as various elements of the social structure, but also the reflection in language and verbal activity of subjective social factors, such as social attitudes and social values.
On the basis of this interpretation of the subject of sociolinguistics, we shall examine in the following sections of this chapter some problems of sociolinguistic theory — the conceptual framework of sociolinguistics and its relation to semiotics and stylistics.

2. On the conceptual framework of sociolinguistics

It is well known that the development of any scientific discipline depends for its success, among other things, on the elaboration of its conceptual framework. What is required is not only the clarification of the basic concepts used in scientific procedures but also the spelling out of the systemic relations between these concepts and the structure of the conceptual series constituting various aspects of the conceptual framework.

The above fully applies to sociolinguistics, a relatively young discipline, still afflicted with such "growing pains" as a proliferation of polysemantic terms, sometimes duplicating each other and requiring standardization.

At the present stage in the development of sociolinguistic theory it is hardly possible to provide exhaustive answers to all questions arising in connection with the elaboration of the conceptual system of sociolinguistics, particularly if it is not limited to the microsociological analysis of a speech event and is oriented towards the broad and multi-faceted problems involved in the socially determined patterns of the functioning, development and interaction of languages (Dešeriev 1973, 7).

An attempt will be made below to define and establish the interrelations between some key concepts of sociolinguistics. The selection of these concepts was based on a thematic principle: they are all related to the problem of socially determined variation of language, one of the central problems of sociolinguistics. At the same time, some of these concepts are of a more general character and are widely used in examining other sociolinguistic problems. The fragment of the conceptual system of sociolinguistics proposed below does not lay claim to being the final solution of all the complex issues that arise in trying to define the concepts constituting this system.

A dual, social and, at the same time, linguistic character is a salient feature of sociolinguistic categories. This seems only natural in view of the fact that at any level of sociolinguistic analysis linguistic facts are examined in a social context, whether it be the microcontext of a small social group or the macrocontext of a class, nation etc., while social facts are analyzed with due regard to their correlations with linguistic phenomena. A sociolinguistic category may be based on
different phenomena: these may be either elements of the social structure, characterized by certain linguistic correlates, or sociologically relevant elements of linguistic structures.

In the sociolinguistic literature a language (speech) community is frequently regarded as a basic unit of sociolinguistic analysis. At the same time, the terms language unity (jazykovaja obščnost’) and speech unity (rečevaja obščnost’) have recently gained some popularity in our literature. These terms are generally used as synonyms. In so doing, the concepts community and unity, on the one hand, and language and speech, on the other, are actually equated. As a result, essential ontological differences between the respective phenomena as well as differences in the mode or aspect of their analysis seem to be disregarded.

There seem to be sufficient reasons for the differentiation of these concepts. Distinction between them may be drawn in two planes. In the first place, one should distinguish between a community and unity. A community is generally understood as a certain grouping of people, held together by certain forms of social interaction, including communicative interaction. As distinct from communities, concrete interacting groups, unities may be regarded as any social or sociodemographic groupings of individuals, not necessarily implying social interaction among them and isolated by researcher on the basis of the identity of any feature (for instance, age, sex, education, etc.). Secondly, one should bear in mind the langue/parole dichotomy, extremely important to sociolinguistic studies and determining the distinction between language and speech communities (or unities) (Fig. 1).

A number of sociolinguistic studies use the above concepts without taking into account the entire aggregate of their constituent features. For instance, J. J. Gumperz in one of his early essays defines a linguistic community as “a social group which may be either monolingual or multilingual, held together by frequency of social interaction patterns and set off from the surrounding areas by weaknesses in the lines of communication” (Gumperz 1971, 101).

We have already made some critical comments on this definition (Štejcer 1973, 136). In particular, lack of clarity concerning some criteria cannot escape attention. How should one understand such criteria as “frequency of social interaction” or “weaknesses in the lines of communication”? The above definition seems to reveal a strong bias towards sociology, ignoring the linguistic features of a language community. Yet the concept of a language or speech community should be applied not to any social group but only to one which may be characterized by a certain aggregate of linguistic features.
In one of his subsequent essays, J. J. Gumperz gives a different definition in an effort to take into account both social and linguistic features of this concept: “Any human aggregate characterized by regular and frequent interaction by means of a shared body of verbal signs and set off from similar aggregates by significant differences in language usage” (Gumperz 1971, 114). This is evidently a definition of a speech, rather than language, community, since its distinctive features pertain only to language usage.

On the basis of the foregoing, a language community may be defined as a totality of socially interacting individuals who reveal a certain identity of linguistic features and a speech community as a group, differing from others not in the inventory of linguistic units but in their use in speech. Similarly, a speech unity should be defined as a grouping of individuals, based on some shared social or sociodemographic features and revealing a shared body of speech patterns, i.e., patterns of language usage, while a language unity is a similar grouping, revealing a shared body of language features, — a shared inventory of linguistic units, a common language system, etc.

Let us illustrate this distinction by specific examples. In an article by L. P. Krysin on the results of a mass sociolinguistic survey by the Russian Language Institute of the U.S.S.R. Academy of Sciences in 1970 (Krysin 1973a), most interesting data are cited on the dependence of the distribution of norm-sanctioned language variants on the social characteristics of speakers. The informants, interviewed by researchers, were divided into several groups.

All these groups correspond to the above definition of a unity because they were isolated not on the basis of actual social interaction, observed among their members, but on the basis of identity of certain sociodemographic features (age, education, association with a social stratum). As to the linguistic features of these groups, both differential and integrating, the data contained in the article seem to indicate that they pertain not to the linguistic units themselves or their inventory and not even to the variants of these units but to quantitative indices characterizing the use of these variants in speech (for instance, phonetic and morphological variants of the same word, as le [sn’] ik and le [s’n’] ik (forester), plotnickij and plotničij (carpenter’s). In other words, they constitute different speech unities.

Needless to say, the identity of speech characteristics observed in the above sociodemographic categories of informants may in itself result from prolonged social interaction within certain speech communities (for instance, peer groups).
However, the existence or lack of sociocommunicative links was not regarded in this study as a relevant feature.

At the same time, sociolinguistic analysis may be centred on the verbal activities of groups isolated on the basis of stable sociocommunicative links, i.e. concrete speech communities. For instance, in studying the verbal behaviour of the East Side population in New York, W. Labov (Labov 1966) found that they employed shared patterns of the functional use of language, reflecting stable communicative links within the community surveyed. J. J. Gumperz (Gumperz 1966) focused his observations on the population of a village in Northern Norway, forming a single speech community, whose members reveal similar patterns of using a single repertoire of linguistic resources and, in particular, of switching from the standard language to the local dialect.

Examples of language communities are communities of language, dialect and subdialect speakers, and examples of language unities are social and sociodemographic categories of the population in a multilingual country, characterized by both social and linguistic features. For instance an essay by V. A. Černyšev, devoted to the linguistic situation in India (Černyšev 1968, 211), singles out a special category of the Indian population, using English (a linguistic feature) and, at the same time, revealing shared social characteristics ("a restricted group of officials, European-educated intellectuals, big and medium businessmen"). According to the above definition, this category constitutes a language unity.

Speech and language communities may be characterized by a hierarchic structure. Thus the primary unit of analysis in Gumperz’s above-mentioned study is a small group in a Norwegian village. These small groups, in turn, form "open and closed networks". The difference between them is as follows: the former includes individuals whose social contacts are not limited to the speech community, while the latter those who do not go beyond the sociocommunicative relationships within the community. This division proves to be linguistically relevant because it is related to certain distinctive features in the informants’ verbal behaviour. A similar hierarchy is observed in language communities. Thus, for instance, a hierarchic series of micro- and macrosystems of Russian dialects and subdialects corresponds to the hierarchic series of language communities (communities of sub-dialect, dialect and language speakers) using these systems (Avanesov and Orlova, 1965).

In a number of instances the same sociolinguistic unit (for instance, the community of speakers of a subdialect or dialect) may be viewed both as a language and as a speech community, depending on whether the object of analysis is the
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linguistic structure of the communicative system, used by the community, or the realization of this structure in speech.

The next question to be considered is the relationship between the above sociolinguistic categories and some social and socioethnographic categories. The above-mentioned review of the book by the New Zealand sociolinguist J. Pride pointed out that the concepts of a language or speech community could not be equated with such units as the state (see the essays of the West German sociolinguist H. Kloss) or the nation (see the essays of the American sociolinguists C. A. Ferguson and W. A. Stewart) (Śwejec 1973, 136). The reduction of the concept of a language or speech community to just one social unit does not meet the goals of sociolinguistic analysis.

The concept of a language or speech community should be sufficiently universal and comprehensive and cover both large and small social groups.

The term speech community should be neutral in relation to two features — the size and basis of unification. This may be a small group, whose members are held together by interaction within just one social function, a tribe or a clan and, at the same time, a modern society with its complex system of social functions and role relations (Fishman 1971c).

The same applies to language communities. The absence of one-to-one relations between language communities, on the one hand, and social units, on the other, may be illustrated by many examples. The same state entity may correspond to more than one language community. Within such a state entity, as Canada, there exist, as is known, several language unities, and the formula “a single language — a single state” is not valid for that country. Nor are there one-to-one relations between such concepts as language community and nation. This is stressed, in particular, by A. T. Baziev and M. I. Isaev (Baziev & Isaev 1973, 76–89) who, noting the paramount importance of linguistic features in defining a nation, point out, at the same time, that “complete coincidence of language and nation boundaries is out of the question”. They cite several convincing examples with regard to languages of the peoples of the U.S.S.R., showing the non-identity of the concepts of nation and language community. Thus, for instance, the Tadjik nation includes not only Tadjiks but a number of other language communities, including Pamir ethnic groups.

The Mordvinian nation includes two different language communities. Each of them is oriented towards a standard language of its own (Erzja and Mokša).

Lack of one-to-one relations between the concepts of language and speech community, on the one hand, and nation and ethnic group, on the other, does
not at all indicate that these concepts are completely unrelated to each other. On the contrary, they are closely linked to each other, which is demonstrated, among other things, by the use of the linguistic criterion in defining nations and other socioethnic categories.

Any language or speech community is characterized by a single sociocommunicative system. The need for such a concept is due to the fact that in the linguistic literature there is no general category denoting the totality of linguistic systems and subsystems (different languages in a bilingual situation, a dialect and a standard language in diglossia, etc.) used by a language or a speech community. The greatest contribution towards introducing such a concept was made J. J. Gumperz. However, his term verbal or linguistic repertoire denotes just "the totality of linguistic resources (i.e. including both invariant forms and variables) available to members of particular communities" (Gumperz and Hymes 1972, 20—21). The introduction of the concept sociocommunicative system instead of verbal repertoire is not a mere renaming of a term. The point is that Gumperz's term does not seem to indicate that this is not a mere totality of linguistic resources from which the speakers select those appropriate to a given social situation, but a systemic entity.

At the same time, if we proceed from the assumption that a system is an integral object, comprising elements mutually related to one another, it may be easily seen that this totality does answer the definition. In fact, there are relations of functional complementation between components of a sociocommunicative system, i.e., linguistic systems and subsystems, used by a language or speech community (languages, dialects, jargons, argot, etc.). In other words, performing various social roles in the society, these systems and subsystems are in complementary distribution to one another. A relation of functional complementation amounts to a socially determined distribution of linguistic systems and subsystems coexisting within a language community according to the domains of their use (written communication, every-day communication, etc.) and social functions (science, culture, education, religion) (Dešeriev 1966, 90—98), on the one hand, and according to social situations, on the other.

Relations of functional complementation exist between the components of any sociocommunicative systems, whether they be functional-stylistic subsystems of a monolingual sociocommunicative system or a standard language and a territorial dialect in diglossia or, finally, different languages forming a bilingual communicative system in a bilingual situation.
Functional parallelism between the interaction of different language systems in a bilingual situation and interaction of subsystems of the same language in a monolingual situation has been repeatedly noted by researchers. This phenomenon was described, for instance, by T. S. Kogotkova in a study of diglossia among the speakers of a Russian dialect who, in addition to a local dialect, have some knowledge of Standard Russian (Kogotkova 1972). This situation is characterized, among other things, by the coexistence of synonyms, such as the standard velosiped and the dialect dvuxkoljaska 'bicycle' or the standard tabletka, piljuja and the dialect pyšečka, konfetka 'pill'. It is significant that the author describes this phenomenon as "dialect-standard bilingualism".

As L. P. Krysin correctly points out, the distribution of functions among the coexisting subsystems of the same language (i.e. the relation of functional complementation) characterizes the functioning of not only such historically and socially discrete subsystems of a national language as dialects and the literary standard. It is also observed when the speakers use, for instance, different varieties of the standard: codified (bookish) and colloquial (Krysin 1973b). The choice of these varieties is determined by the situation. For instance, the reduced form tol'ko [ˈtoka], common to colloquial Russian speech, may be replaced by the so-called "full" pronunciation [ˈtol'ka] when the situation and role relations change.

Systemic relations between the components of sociocommunicative systems are manifested not only in their functional complementation but also in their hierarchic relations. It should be noted that these systemic relations are determined not by intrastructural relations but by social factors that influence not only the distribution of these components according to the domains of their use, social functions and social situations but also their social hierarchy. As a rule, there is direct dependence between the social hierarchy of the sociocommunicative system components and their functional distribution: components characterized by higher social prestige are predominant in the domain of written communication and in social situations with more formal and more strictly rule-governed relations between communicants. There are, however, some exceptions to this rule. Cf., for example, the fact, cited by Gumperz in his above-mentioned essay: a local dialect enjoys an equally high social prestige as the coexisting variety of the standard language (Gumperz 1966).

Just like the concepts of a language and speech community, the concept of a sociocommunicative system is neutral in relation to the size and basis of association of the community members using the system. In case the community
is the nation as a whole the sociocommunicative system is the entire national language, a systemically organized totality of the linguistic resources from the standard language to the territorial and social dialects. At the same time, the sociocommunicative systems of small groups may also be the object of sociolinguistic analysis. The set of components of a sociocommunicative system depends on the range of its functions and the social situations it covers.

One of the goals of sociolinguistics is the isolation of the social and functional characteristics of sociocommunicative system components. It is necessary, among other things, to reveal the distribution of social functions among the system components as well as their availability to the various sections of a given society.

Noting the varying degree of availability of sociocommunicative system components, J. Fishman considers the opposition of the so-called “traditional” and “industrial” societies to be most important for analyzing this phenomenon (Fishman 1971, 21–22). In some “traditional” societies (for instance, in societies with a caste social structure), the use of sociocommunicative system components (Fishman uses the term “verbal repertoire”) is rigidly rule-governed. The structure of the sociocommunicative system reflects the rigid social stratification of the society and the availability of the system components is strictly limited. In a modern “industrial society” with its relatively high social mobility sociocommunicative system components are available to broader segments of the population. The availability of the system components reflects the availability of social roles.

This thesis graphically reflects the class positions of American sociologists, who use the concept of “industrial society” regardless of whether the society in question is socialist or capitalist. The empirical data of sociolinguistic studies, including the studies of American scholars devoted to the language of the Black ghetto (so-called Black English) (Dillard 1972; Labov 1972a) are at variance with the thesis concerning the growing availability of sociocommunicative system components in capitalist society.

It was pointed out earlier that the conceptual system proposed in this chapter is relevant to one of the central issues of sociolinguistics, the problem of socially determined variation of language.

It should be noted that social variation of language and speech is characterized by two dimensions—stratificational and situational.

Stratificational variation is directly related to the social structure of society. It is this type of variation that one usually has in mind in referring to the social
differentiation of language. It is no coincidence that in the distinction between
the broad and restricted interpretation of the subject matter of the sociology of
language (cf. the preceding section) proposed by B. N. Golovin, the subject of
sociolinguistic analysis in the restricted sense is defined precisely as “the stratifi-
cation of language and its functioning observed at the level of social groups and
social strata”, i.e., in other words, the stratificational variation of language and
speech.

While stratificational variation finds its expression in the language and speech
differences revealed between representatives of different social strata and social
groups, situational variation is manifested in the preferential use of some linguistic
resources — certain units or entire systems or subsystems (language, dialect,
functional style) — depending on the social situation.

The dual nature of the social variation of language and speech was most
comprehensively reflected in the essay by W. Labov devoted to the stratification
of English in New York City (Labov 1966). His study revealed a “regular pat-
tern” of two types of speech differentiation which are described as “social” and
“stylistic”. On the one hand, Labov established certain links with the social
structure of the community: informants with a lower social status more fre-
quently used in the same speech contexts substandard forms than informants
from higher strata of the urban society. On the other hand, among all informants
there was a marked growth of standard forms in more formal contexts than in
the context of causal every-day communication.

This seems to call for some clarification. What Labov refers to as “stylistic
variation” is, in fact, also social variation, for it actually amounts to the pro-
portion of standard and substandard forms in various social situations (cf., for
instance, a casual conversation within the family and a conversation with an of-
ficial). Therefore, it seems to be more precise, in our view, to refer to two types
of social variation related to the social structure of a given society and to dif-
ferent social situations, respectively.

Stratificational and situational variation are closely interrelated. Differences
determined by the social structure are superimposed on differences determined
by the social situation. As a result, the pattern of situational variation common
to a given community may be realized in a different manner in different social
groups. For instance, according to W. Labov’s data, the speech of informants
from higher social strata was characterized by a more frequent use of “prestigious
forms” in all situations apart from those that call for a deliberate orientation to
a formal speech style. In these situations "lower middle class" informants use prestigious forms even more frequently than the reference group (hypercorrect use).

For a student of the social differentiation of language due regard for the interrelation between two types of social variation of language and speech (stratificational and situational) is the prerequisite for an effective analysis. Disregard for this interrelation leads to the distortion of objective data. This is demonstrated, in particular, by the above-mentioned theory of B. Bernstein who reaches the conclusion that representatives of so-called "lower classes" use more restricted and stereotyped verbal resources than the "middle class" (Bernstein 1966). One of the reasons for this erroneous conclusion was that Bernstein, as was pointed out above, actually excluded from consideration the situational variation of speech.

The so-called sociolinguistic variables constitute the basic operational unit for the sociolinguistic analysis of language and speech variation. These variables are actually any language and speech correlates of stratificational and situational variation. Both linguistic units and their variants may form sociolinguistic variables. Thus in the study by P. Friedrich devoted to the socially determined variation of Russian forms of address, the Russian pronouns ты and вы constitute sociolinguistic variables (Friedrich 1972). W. Labov, who explored sociolinguistic variables using phonological data (Labov 1966), revealed in the speech of his informants variations in the pronunciation of certain lexemes that went beyond the articulatory range of individual phonemes. Thus the vowel in bad could coincide with the vowel in bat but could also coincide with the vowel in bear and beer. It seemed that several phonemes merged within a single articulatory range.

In the absence of any phonetic grounds for the isolation of clear-cut articulatory peaks within this range, Labov considers empirically invalid any attempt to regard such variation as oscillation between one discrete system and another. Such variants should be regarded as variables within the same system.

In Labov's opinion, the discreteness of phonological systems is an artifact of a linguist's abstraction, based on the study of one or, at best, several informants and ignoring speech variation. A profound study of variation in speech behaviour within the same community should be aimed at the isolation of both phonemes and variables. While phones are characterized by sound forms grouped around certain articulatory peaks, variables are determined by a reference point and scale of magnitudes changing in a certain direction. The magnitude within
these scales is determined by social factors just as the phonetic realization of allophones is determined by their phonic environment.

It should be added that in certain situations sociolinguistic variables may embrace entire linguistic systems (codes) whose choice is sometimes determined by the same social factors as the choice of linguistic units or their variants. The so-called code switching which frequently occurs in the speech of bilinguals is nothing but the communicants' reaction to a changing social situation of the speech event. Characteristics of this phenomenon will be discussed in detail below. At this point it should be noted that socially relevant in such cases is not the choice of any specific linguistic unit but the preference of one code to another under the impact of certain social factors.

To reveal the mechanism of selecting sociolinguistic variables it is essential to distinguish between the status of participants in communicative events, on the one hand, and their role relations, on the other. In the sociolinguistic literature abroad the terms status and role are sometimes not differentiated.

It seems advisable, however, to use them not as terminological doublets but as two interrelated terms, belonging to different conceptual series. In that case the term status could be included in the conceptual series associated with the stratificational variation of language, and the term role in the series associated with situational variation. The term status would be determined by the totality of the informants' permanent social characteristics, their place in the social structure of society. The status is determined with due regard for such features as class or social group membership, occupation, education, etc. At the same time role relations are relations between participants in a communicative event, determined by the social situation and varying with it.

In the course of social interaction each person has to play a more or less extensive repertoire of social roles and enter into different role relations (for instance, boss — subordinate, teacher — pupil, father — son, husband — wife, friend — friend, etc.). The change of roles essentially alters the situation determining the relations between communicants, and is reflected in the selection of linguistic resources (sociolinguistic variables).

Code switching in response to changing role relations can take place within the same communicative event (Fishman 1971c). Depending on the aspect of their relations relevant to the present stage of the speech event, the communicants may reexamine their role relations, expressing their decision in the appropriate selection of linguistic resources (for instance, switching from the local dialect to the standard language or from one language to another).
The following question may be asked at this point: is it possible to present a complete catalogue of roles and what is the principle underlying their isolation? The point is that, as distinct from other categories, considered above, the concepts of status and role are not specific to sociolinguistics, but are general sociological concepts, applied to sociolinguistic research. The salient feature of these concepts, when used in sociolinguistics, is their correlation with sociolinguistic variables. Hence not all social roles are relevant to sociolinguistics but only those that have explicit language or speech correlates. Thus, among the ten components which, according to P. Friedrich, determined the choice of ty or vy in 19th-century Russian, there were some that could affect role relations (for instance, geneological distance, relative age, relative authority, etc.). Needless to say, catalogues of role relations, relevant to sociolinguistic analysis, vary from society to society and from culture to culture.

The same applies to types of status. Some of them may be specific to certain sociocultural systems (for instance, caste) and some may exist in different cultures but only in some of them may have explicit language or speech correlates. Thus, according to some English linguists, British English is characterized by sociolinguistic correlates of association with the upper class. This gives rise to the oppositions of socially marked units characteristic of the upper class (U) and not characteristic to the upper class (non-U). For instance, lunch (U) — dinner (non-U), dinner (U) — supper (non-U) (Ross 1954). At the same time in other sociocultural systems association with the upper class may not be signalled by special sociolinguistic variables.

In addition to role relations sociolinguistic analysis takes into account such a component of the social situation as the setting or locale. Just as the character and range of role relations vary from one sociocultural system to another, the relevance of the setting (locale) to the choice of sociolinguistic variables may be determined by a sociocultural system and be specific to it. Cf., for example, speech events, occurring in church, in a court, university classroom, etc. In a number of instances the patterns of situational variation are determined by a combination of such elements of the social situation as the setting and role relations. For example, in English the form of address Your Honour is used in the setting “court-room” and is an indicator of role relations “defence counsel-judge” or “prosecutor-judge”.

The use of the last name as a form of address is characterized by the combination of such social situation parameters as the setting: English universities,
role relations: "colleague — colleague"; the setting: English public school, role relations: "pupil — pupil" (Ervin-Tripp 1972, 230).

An analysis of sociolinguistic variables testifies to the fact that they fall into two categories which could be termed stratificational variables and stratificational-situational variables. Stratificational variables exist only in one dimension — stratificational, reflecting the heterogeneous structure of society. They are characterized by variable quantitative and qualitative indices in different social, sociodemographic or occupational groups of the population surveyed, but, at the same time, remain constant in spite of the variation of social situation components. At the same time, other variables vary in two planes simultaneously — stratificational and situational.

This differentiation of sociolinguistic variables corresponds to some extent to the one proposed by W. Labov (Labov 1971), who distinguishes between sociolinguistic indicators and sociolinguistic markers. A sociolinguistic indicator is, for instance, the vowel in the English words boy, toy, etc., revealing a different degree of elevation among informants belonging to different social groups, and, at the same time, showing stability in a changing social situation. As to the social markers, they are illustrated by such examples as different phonetic realizations of the initial consonant in thin, thick in the initial consonant in then, there. Among the realizations of these variables there is one regarded as a "prestigious variant", more frequently found in the upper social groups and, at the same time, corresponding to more formal role relations in the situational plane.

The use of the term stratificational variable instead of social indicator and stratificational-situational variable instead of social marker would indicate more precisely the place of these phenomena with respect to the dimensions of social variation and also determine their position in the appropriate conceptual series forming the overall conceptual system of sociolinguistics. It is clear from the foregoing that, as distinct from stratificational variables, stratificational-situational variables are associated with certain subjective attitudes towards the linguistic forms opposed to each other. These may be described as social attitudes because they are manifested in different social evaluations, expressed, among other things, in the selection of competing forms depending on the parameters of the communicative event. It may be easily seen that this is based on the linguistic norm determining the rules and patterns of selecting linguistic variants (for details on the social-evaluative character of the linguistic norm as a regulator of language variability, see V. N. Jarceva 1969, 149–210).
As time goes on, certain social values are assigned to the competing forms, and stratificational variables become stratificational-situational, i.e. they become sensitive to a changing social situation. This is one of the types of linguistic change. Apart from a situation where competing stratificational and situational variables coexist with each other, there may be another where one of the variables is completely supplanted. When one of the sociocommunicative systems is supplanted by another (for instance, a dialect system by a standard language system), the first to disappear are those elements of the system being supplanted which reveal stratificational-situational variation, inasmuch as their use is characterized by deliberate orientation towards certain social values.

Thus, Academician V. M. Žirmunskij (Žirmunskij 1968, 26—27), in characterizing the supplanting of some German dialects by Standard German and the formation of the so-called “semidialects” (Halbmundarten), noted that from a linguistic point of view the semidialect differs from the dialect in a more or less consistent elimination of the dialects’ “primary” features, i.e., features representing the most significant (and, consequently, the most conspicuous) deviations from the standard.

The data cited by V. M. Žirmunskij were not subjected to a differential analysis to reveal stratificational and situational variation, but still there are some reasons to believe that there is some connection between “primary” and “secondary” features of dialect systems, on the one hand, and stratificational-situational and stratificational variables, on the other. The fact is that the features revealing simultaneous variation in stratificational and situational planes, as a rule, are the most conspicuous and most clearly perceptible ones and therefore constitute the differential elements of the coexisting sociocommunicative systems, most susceptible to social control. It is precisely for this reason that they are most sensitive to changes in the social situation and therefore are the first to lose ground under the impact of more prestigious forms.

It is clear from the foregoing that a sociolinguistic analysis of language and speech variation has two aspects — objective and subjective. The objective aspect includes observational data concerning sociolinguistic variables and the social differentiation of language and speech. The subjective aspect includes data characterizing the value orientation of the language or speech community members regarding the selection of sociolinguistic variables, whether they be some competing linguistic forms or entire language systems and subsystems (languages, dialects, jargons, etc.). It should be remembered that in sociology value orientation is described as orientation towards certain norms of selection and selection criteria (Ljubimova 1970, 72).
Values associated with the selection of sociolinguistic variables and based on the notions of the appropriateness or inappropriateness of certain variables in certain social situations are sometimes clustered together. To characterize language or speech communities some sociolinguistic studies use the concept of value clusters, totalities of social values of speech or language communities, realized in selecting sociolinguistic variables.

Thus a study of Spanish-English bilingualism among the Puerto-Rican population of New York (Greenfield 1968) advanced a hypothesis according to which among the Puerto-Ricans who know Spanish and English equally well Spanish is primarily associated with the family and friends, i.e. with the value cluster “intimacy” whereas English is associated with religion, work, i.e. with the value cluster “status”. An attempt was made in the course of this study to determine by interviewing informants a social situation, typical of each domain of verbal behaviour (for instance, domain: work, interlocutor: employer, setting: place of work). As a result of an experimental study it was revealed that in case the communication domain was represented by a typical situation, the hypothesis concerning the connection between the variables (Spanish and English) used by the community and certain value clusters was completely confirmed. In other words, the concepts of social value and value orientation in sociolinguistics are closely related to the social situation of language use.

By way of summing up it should be noted that the conceptual system of sociolinguistic studies devoted to socially determined variation of language is a complex multidimensional subsystem comprising several overlapping conceptual series, based on such dichotomies as langue/parole, stratificational variation/situational variation and objective indices/subjective indices. The scheme proposed, as was mentioned earlier, does not represent a fully elaborated conceptual system, but nevertheless contains a number of basic concepts relative to socially determined variability of language and speech and points out some directions for their further elaboration.

3. Sociolinguistics and semiotics

The next sections of this chapter will deal with problems involved in relations between sociolinguistics and a number of other disciplines. The list of disciplines closely related to sociolinguistics and relevant to sociolinguistic analysis is, of course, not limited to those mentioned in these sections. Yet it seems that incomplete as it may be, an analysis of external relations of sociolinguistics would
make it possible to more precisely define the subject-matter of its theory and its conceptual basis.

It is advisable to begin the examination of these questions with the relation between sociolinguistics and semiotics. This question is particularly important, because in studying the general properties of sign systems, semiotics occupies a central position among a number of sciences, including linguistics, on the one hand, and sociology, ethnography and psychology, on the other (Stepanov Ju. 1971), i.e. sciences, on whose interaction sociolinguistics is based.

The elaboration of the problems involved in the relations between sociolinguistics and semiotics is still in its initial stage. Therefore, the examination of this question in this chapter is somewhat fragmentary and in a number of cases strictly preliminary.

As is well known, semiotics distinguishes among three main aspects of sign systems — syntactics, studying relations between signs, semantics, studying relations between the sign and the referent, and pragmatics, studying relations between the sign and its user.

The most obvious are the relations between sociolinguistics and pragmatics. The existence of close links between sociolinguistic and pragmatic analysis was stressed, in particular, by the West-German scholar H. Steger (Steger 1971). One of the sections of his essay is entitled “Pragmalinguistics and Sociolinguistics”. Steger applies the term “pragmalinguistics” to a direction of empirical semiotic studies examining linguistic data from a pragmatic viewpoint. Steger points to common postulates in pragmalinguistics and sociolinguistics. In his opinion, both directions arise from the need to explicate the specific features of the functional use of polyvalent linguistic signs in natural languages. It is the common goal of sociolinguistics and pragmalinguistics to establish the patterns and conditions underlying the use and combinatorics of linguistic signs, depending on the extralinguistic situation with due regard for the roles of communicants and the topic of communication. The study of discourse and its structure is given top priority.

Pragmalinguistic studies are characterized by the exploration of the systemic and functional properties of language on the basis of specific texts in relation to the “speaker/listener”. What these studies have in common with sociolinguistics is the taking into consideration of extralinguistic factors placed under the heading of a speech situation. Yet they differ from sociolinguistic studies in the absence of a differential analysis of all social and sociopsychological factors affecting verbal activity (Wunderlich 1968). Pragmalinguistics is characterized by
an effort to extend or modify the existing grammatical models and to elaborate
the metalanguage of pragmatics, based on modal logic, extending it to natural
languages (Montague 1970).

According to Steger, both directions are so closely intertwined that it appears
difficult in some cases to draw a clear line of demarcation between sociolin-
guistic and pragmalinguistic studies (Dieckman 1969 — an essay considered by
Steger pragmalinguistic in name only but actually sociolinguistic).

The fact that the interests of sociolinguistics and pragmalinguistics partly
overlap is beyond any doubt. Yet there is no need to overemphasize the identity
of interests of these disciplines. It was pointed out above that pragmalinguistics
examines sign systems of natural languages in their relation to the “speaker/
listener”, i.e. to the man using these systems, not necessarily to the social man
and, still less, to a language or speech community. Hence the most fundamental
difference between pragmatic and sociolinguistic analysis of language and speech
phenomena is the absence in a pragmatic analysis of an explicit social orientation.

Problems involved in the relation of sociolinguistics to semiotics are treated to
some extent in the above-mentioned essay by R. Grosse and A. Neubert (GDR)
“The Theses of Marxist Sociolinguistics” (Grosse and Neubert 1970). The essay
points out that the partial overlap between the goals of sociolinguistics and lin-
guistic pragmatics is due to the fact that both disciplines, in the authors’ opinion,
are intended to analyse the functioning of language in social life. Referring to
the well-known theoretical study by the German scholar G. Klaus, devoted to an
epistemological and pragmatic analysis of language (Klaus 1963), R. Grosse and
A. Neubert say that the “power of a word” is formed not somewhere outside
society but is based on certain combinations of social factors. A systemic des-
cription of communicative situations and communicative events is one of the
joint goals of sociolinguistics and pragmatics.

The authors conclude that sociolinguistics is an important component of prag-
matics, though, in studying the structure of “subcodes” (social and regional
dialects) it invades also some other aspects of semiotics.

According to the authors, sociolinguistics elaborates the most important
foundations of pragmatics required for the understanding of pragmatic categories
(such as effectiveness, usefulness, etc.), associated with sign usage. It is pre-
cisely in the light of pragmatic theory that the data of sociolinguistic research
acquire particular importance for the control of social processes as well as for
their forecasting. On the other hand, pragmatic interpretation cannot be consi-
dered complete without due regard for sociolinguistic data. In this connection
the authors attach particular importance to applied sociolinguistic studies devoted to the optimization of sociocommunicative processes as well as to the exposure of reactionary language policies and various manipulations in regard to public opinion on the part of state-monopoly imperialist circles.

Sociolinguistics and pragmatics use the data of stylistics which, for its part, in describing systems of stylistic functions takes into account the influence of sublanguages (territorial and social dialects). According to R. Grosse and A. Neubert, the system of functional styles is a linguistic correlate of the typology of texts which pragmatics seeks to create with the aid of the theory of designators, prescriptors and formators. "Marxist-Leninist pragmatics", they say, "should draw not only on the data of social sciences but also on the results of linguistic (stylistic and sociolinguistic) studies".

On the whole, the picture of relations between sociolinguistics, on the one hand, and semiotics (chiefly pragmatics), on the other, appears to be sufficiently valid. It should be noted, however, that the essay by R. Grosse and A. Neubert is mainly a programme of activities, realized so far only in part. Among other things, GDR scholars have completed a number of interesting studies to expose various manipulations in regard to language by capitalist propaganda. These include studies of language use in the 1972 Bundestag electoral campaign (Ginschel, Petermann 1972). Considerable headway was made by Czechoslovak linguists in elaborating the typology of texts on the basis of an integrated pragmatic-sociolinguistic approach (Kraus & Vašek 1967).

Many of these problems have just been sketched and still require a serious analysis and elaboration. This applies, incidentally, to semiotics generally which still has to live up to expectations inasmuch as "at present it is still a draft programme of broad-scale research where many things are still unclear — boundaries, principles and methods" (Zvegincev 1973, 215).

Some of the propositions in the "Theses" call for clarification. We characterized sociolinguistics in the preceding section as an interdiscipline with a conceptual system of its own and its own approach to linguistic and nonlinguistic phenomena. From this point of view, one can hardly agree with the above-mentioned statement by the authors of the "Theses" that sociolinguistics is part of pragmatics even with the reservation concerning its relevance to other aspects of semiotics. It seems that sociolinguistics could be considered part of semiotics if it were interested in language only as a sign system. Yet, as follows from the preceding sections of this book, such an interpretation of the nature of language is clearly one-sided and does not correspond to the broad sociolinguistic perspective of examining linguistic facts.
Yet for some aspects of sociolinguistics co-operation with semiotics could be fruitful and could produce interesting results. Needless to say, co-operation of sociolinguistics with semiotics should be placed on a sound theoretical basis.

Among the few theoretical studies of the common problems of semiotics and sociolinguistics one should name the essay by W. Neumann (GDR) devoted to a number of problems involved in a general description of linguistic signs and, in particular, the problem of their social determination (Neumann 1973).

This essay calls our attention to the fact that the relations of a sign to its reflection in the minds of senders and receivers, participants in a communicative event (in Klaus's terminology "sigmatic relations") may be not completely identical.

Association with different social groups, different social strata and different social systems may affect the perception of signals representing certain signs. W. Neumann cites as an example the signal (sound cluster) Bauer ("peasant"). The semantic interpretation of this signal may depend on the social experience of the communicant, determined, in turn, by a number of social factors, including association with different sociohistorical entities. Thus for one of the communicants this verbal sign is associated with one who owns a small piece of land and tills the land independently or with the aid of hired farm-labourers, and, for the other, with a member of an agricultural production cooperative with specialized teams, using up-to-date industrial methods of land cultivation. But even when for both communicants the sign has a common denotatum, i.e. is related to the same segment of reality, its significance may vary depending on the ideological attitudes of the communicants.

Thus, for instance, the word Bauer in the phrase Die Bauern der LPG beginnen gemeinsam die Frühjahrbestellung ("peasants from an agricultural production cooperative jointly begin their spring agricultural work") may denote "a member of an agricultural cooperative" for both communicants, and at the same time, for a carrier of socialist ideology this concept is associated with the emancipation of farmers and the elimination of their material and spiritual backwardness with the aid of the working class, and for a carrier of capitalist ideology, with the restriction of private ownership and the loss of seeming independence, etc. Lastly, even when the social-class and ideological characteristics of the communicants coincide, the interpretation of verbal signs may be affected by differences in social experience arising out of differences in their specific social status.
In his essay Neumann relies on the functional approach to language theoretically substantiated in the essays by W. Schmidt and defined by the latter as a pragmatic approach, including semantic and stylistic aspects and taking into account, at the same time, the determining influence of social and psychological factors (Schmidt 1969, 233). Disagreeing with G. Klaus who, in his view, excessively isolates from one another the four aspects of semiotics (syntactic, semantic, sigmatic and pragmatic), Neumann emphasizes that these aspects form a dialectic unity. Referring to essays by W. Hartung he stresses that all these aspects are based on the social determination of language and on its communicative function. As to the sigmatic sign relation $R(\Sigma, A)$, i.e. the relation of the sign $\Sigma$ to the reflection of the object $O$ in the mind $A$, it is closely related to the pragmatic relation $R(\Sigma, M)$, i.e. the relation of the sign $\Sigma$ to man $M$, for $A$ is part of $M$. The relation $R(\Sigma, M)$ implies the relation among $A$, $O$, and $M$. The way from $O$ to $A$, i.e. from the actual object to its reflection in the mind includes also all subjective elements of the process of cognition arising from the experience acquired by man as an individual and as a member of a certain social group.

The social determination of linguistic signs is expressed in, among other things, their normative aspect — in the rules of using signs and relating them to certain clusters of semantic features.

According to author, the conventionality of relations between the linguistic sign and its denotatum is socially determined in its character. Social practice may sanction changes in the relations between the sign and its conceptual correlate in case such changes meet naming requirements. As a result of a rupture of social relations between communicants or groups of communicants, or lack of common social attitudes and communicative intentions a situation may arise where the conventional relation between the sign and the denotatum acquires the diametrically opposed character. This situation finds a somewhat hyperbolic reflection in a poem by Bertold Brecht (Das Lied vom Klassenfeind):

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Das Wort wird nicht gefunden} \\
\text{Das uns beide jemals vereint;} \\
\text{Der Regen fließt von oben nach unten} \\
\text{Und du bist mein Klassenfeind.}
\end{align*}
\]

In his essay Neumann distinguishes between language signs and communication signs, forming a dialectical unity (Neumann 1973, 39). In this dialectical unity the communicative signs are a variable element, directly influenced by social factors and, as was mentioned above, capable of modifying, under certain
conditions, the linguistic signs themselves, because a linguistic sign, on the one hand, is associated with the rules of generation and semantic interpretation of classes of similar or complementary signals, and, on the other, reflects the use of signals in the course of communication.

A number of propositions in Neumann's essay are relevant to sociolinguistics. Yet many of his views concerning the social determination of linguistic signs are related not so much to sociolinguistics as to linguistics generally. Even linguistic schools that examine linguistic systems in abstraction from extralinguistic factors and trends assume that linguistic signs, relations between the signs and their denotata and relations between the signs themselves are socially determined, although sometimes they substitute a study of an idiolect for a study of language (Svejcer 1971, 13). Yet such trends, viewed in the essay as socially determined differences in the use and semantic interpretation of linguistic signs, are part of the subject-matter of sociolinguistics.

First of all, let us examine so-called "social meaning", a concept, frequently used in sociolinguistics abroad. In some studies this term is not sufficiently differentiated and denotes practically all the elements in the plane of content that go beyond a semantic relation, i.e. the relation between the sign and the object. Sometimes there is no precise differentiation between stylistic and social meanings.

A more acceptable definition of a social meaning or social significance is made by J. J. Gumperz in one of his essays: "Most discussions of pragmatics", he says, "ordinarily do not distinguish between individual intent and interpersonal significance of usage pattern, although it is evident that without such a distinction it would be impossible to explain the fact that the same message may indicate praise in some instances and disapproval in others. Effective communication requires that speakers and audiences agree both on the meaning of words and on the social import or values attached to choice of expression... We will use the term social significance, or social meaning, to refer to the social value implied when an utterance is used in a certain context" (Gumperz 1972b, 417).

It should be stressed at this point that a social value is acquired, as it is clear from the above quotation, not by the linguistic item itself but by the fact of its choice. A similar feature of a stylistic meaning or connotation was aptly characterized by Ju. S. Stepanov, who, after citing as an example the use of the word mòrd¾a ("snout", "muzzle") in the meaning of "face", notes that, on the one hand, this verbal sign is related to explicit culture, because it is clear to anyone that the denotatum of this sign is a human face rather than an animal's snout,
and, on the other, it is part of "implicit culture, because what becomes a sign here, and this should be stressed, is not the word mόrda in a new meaning . . ., but the very fact of choosing one word out of two; the rejection of the word licό ("face") is as important as the use of the word mόrda" (Stepanov 1971, 94–95).

In other words, the sign character of the choice is not in itself a distinctive feature of social meaning. The latter is characterized by the fact that the choice is based on the opposition of social values. Thus, according to some authors (Lakoff 1973; Flexner 1960), some lexical items are characterized by differential use depending on the sex of the speaker. Social inequality of men and women finds its expression in the opposition of social values implanted in childhood: boys should "talk rough" and girls should "talk like a lady". Here are some typical words used by women to express admiration and their neutral equivalents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neutral vocabulary</th>
<th>&quot;Female&quot; vocabulary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>great</td>
<td>adorable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>terrific</td>
<td>charming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cool</td>
<td>sweet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>neat</td>
<td>lovely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>divine</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A confrontation of social values finds its expression, among other things, in the fact that men deliberately avoid words preferred by women. Incidentally this opposition of social meanings varies from one social group to another. For instance, the use of "female" vocabulary is observed in the upper classes of the British society, and in the U.S.A. among professors and clergy, particularly those who deliberately follow the British norm.

In other words, the opposition of verbal signs is associated with the opposition of social values, while the choice of a sign acquires a social significance. Social meanings are characterized by the fact that while reflecting the pragmatic relation sign : man, they, at the same time, reproduce the extralinguistic social relation man : man (in fact, a kind of metonymic transference is taking place: social attitudes in relation to men, communities, and unities, using certain linguistic signs or sign systems, are transferred to the signs themselves or to entire systems.

An interesting example of the transference of social attitudes from the communities, using communicative systems, to the communicative systems themselves is cited by J. J. Gumperz in his essay "Social Meaning in Linguistic Struc-
In describing the linguistic situation in Hemnesberget, a village in Northern Norway, Gumperz notes that among the villagers there is a strong sense of solidarity, loyalty to the local traditions and local culture. The local dialect is an important marker of a common culture. Residents of neighbouring settlements are outsiders, and this attitude towards them is transferred to their dialects and subdialects.

Traditionally in Northern Norway local communities have been always separated from the landowning commercial and administrative elite. Since it is this elite that uses Standard Norwegian, the latter is associated with social inequality. Therefore he who uses the standard variety, giving up the local dialect, thus stresses the social distance between his communication partner and himself and shows disrespect for local culture. To use Standard Norwegian with other local residents is to *snakk fint* "put on airs". At the same time, for the local elite and migrants from other parts of Norway the local dialect is associated with lack of education and lack of polish.

A similar phenomenon is observed when members of some social groups prefer jargon and argot to standard forms. For instance, to some youth groups in the U.S.A. Standard English symbolizes the Establishment while the teenagers' slang is associated with group solidarity, with revolt against squares, lames and straights — in a word, against all who are pro-Establishment and follow Establishment norms (Flexner 1960, XII).

It is therefore clear that social meanings have one more distinctive feature which may be described as relativity.

In examining the semiotic law relative to the range of the symbolic character of a semiotic system, Yu. S. Stepanov notes that the symbolic character of a system depends to some extent on the position of the observer, i.e. on whether or not he uses the system, is a participant or just an observer or both (Stepanov 1971, 108). The same applies to social values.

It was pointed out above that the local dialect and Standard Norwegian are evaluated in a different manner by local residents, using primarily the local dialect, and the local elite preferring the standard variety. In characterizing the contemporary status of dialects in England, English linguists M. A. K. Halliday, A. McIntosh and P. Strevens cite a number of widely held negative judgements concerning urban and rural dialects of Modern English (such as "rough", "careless", "broken English"), with this essential reservation: "such views seem to be most general among speakers of mildly regional varieties of Standard English" (Halliday 1973, 33).
Negative judgements in regard to sociocommunicative systems are typical of observers rather than participants. An interesting example is cited in this connection by G. A. Grierson, an English linguist who studied the linguistic situation in India in the '20s. In the south of the Punjab there is a well-known dialect called "Jangaly" from its being spoken in the "Jungle" or unirrigated country bordering on Bikaner. But Jangaly also means "boorish". As a result of local inquiries not a single person was found who admitted that he spoke "Jangaly". "Oh yes, we know Jangaly very well, — you will find it a little further on, — not here". "You go a little further on and get the same reply and pursue your will-o' -the-wisp till he lands you in the Rajputana desert, where there is no one to speak any language at all" (Gumperz 1971, 3).

One of the few exceptions to this rule is an example cited by Labov (Labov 1966), who studied the speech of New Yorkers who negatively evaluated their own dialect. It seems that such assessments are based on negative value judgements in relation to one's own community and lack of "local patriotism".

In their above-mentioned essay M. A. K. Halliday and his co-authors consider such judgements pseudoscientific. Needless to say, such judgements are subjective, but this doesn't mean that they should be disregarded.

So far we have discussed meanings which in semiotics are regarded as part of pragmatics. At the same time, sociolinguistic data convincingly demonstrate the above thesis on the close dialectic unity of all aspects of semiotics. For instance, reference has been made to the possibility of different semantic interpretations of a verbal sign depending on the informants' social characteristics. Close interconnexion of pragmatic and semantic relations finds its expression in the impact of social factors on the variation of both denotational and connotational meanings of the same linguistic signs as well as the synonymy of signs.

Semantic divergence is observed, among other things, in case an essentially identical linguistic system is used by different communities, living in different social conditions. Differences in the social environment and in the government or political system find their expression in a different interpretation of the denotational meaning of the same verbal sign. Let us cite several examples of such differences between American and British English.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lexical unit</th>
<th>In British English</th>
<th>In American English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public school</td>
<td>A private secondary boarding school</td>
<td>A state-supported secondary school</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In an antagonistic society conflicts between social groups are attended by a confrontation of social values, sometimes expressed in the semantic divergence of verbal signs. These are ordinarily socially marked units of specialized jargons of certain social groups. Indicative in this respect are the data of a linguistic survey of American prison inmates, both Black and white (Fishman 1971c, 102–103). Racial conflicts in America find a unique reflection in the lexicon where differences in social values and social attitudes between white and Black inmates were embodied in divergences, affecting both the denotational meaning of respective items and certain elements (primarily evaluative) of their connotation. For instance, according to the survey data, the expression *free thinker* among Black inmates means "a white who treats Blacks as his equals", and among whites "a Black of a non-violent type, who does not insist on equal rights". White inmates also use in the same meaning such jargonisms as *sander* and *smoke blower* which to Blacks mean "a Negro, who admits the superiority of Whites and kowtows to them".

Differences in social values find some expression in connotational variations of lexical items that have the same denotatum. Thus to denote "a Black, fighting for his rights" Black inmates use either the jargonism *free speaker* or the stylistically neutral items *civil rights man* and *equal rights man*. The last two items are also used by whites. At the same time, they use in this meaning a series of jargonisms with a strong pejorative connotation: *civil rights Nigger, Mau preacher* and *pale hater*.
The above examples illustrate differences involved in divergent social evaluations of the denotata themselves. These divergencies are manifested not only in different interpretations of the same linguistic signs but also in the synonymy of signs, i.e. in the existence of a series of linguistic signs with different connotations but the same denotational meaning. The fact that different social values are attached to some denotata justifies certain generalizations regarding the linguistic reflexes of value clusters in different sociocommunicative systems or in different components of the these systems. Thus students of American slang trace in it negative attitudes to value clusters *morality, virtue* and *intellect*. This is expressed, among other things, in so-called “synonymic attraction” (the term proposed by S. Ullman for a concentration of the most numerous synonymic groups around concepts of utmost concern to the community — Ullman 1963). Characteristically, one of the most numerous synonymic groups in U.S. slang comprises items with the meaning “drunk”: boozed up, gassed, high, tanked, potted, stinking, soused, etc. (Wentworth & Flexner, 652–653).

Also numerous are synonymic groups and semantic fields of slangisms associated with the concepts of sex and violence.

The above examples clearly indicate the existence of socially determined connotational differences in socially marked linguistic signs — lexical items, belonging to jargons, argots and other socially restricted components of sociocommunicative systems. It is not at all clear whether similar differences exist in words belonging to the common lexical core and not marked socially. This problem was investigated by D. Heise in his experimental work (Heise 1967).

The experiment was based on a sample of the 1000 most frequent English words. Their connotation was determined with the aid of the semantic differential instrument, comprising the following binary scales: good — bad, pleasant — unpleasant, active — passive, strong — weak, rational — emotional, etc. Using these scales, each informant had to evaluate 50 words. The informants' evaluations were converted into quantitative indices, and the averaged data were then correlated with the social status of the informants.

The correlation of the quantitative indices of word connotations with the social characteristics of the informants led to the conclusion that word connotation does not exhibit any essential variations in persons belonging to different social stata.

The negative result of the experiment is in full agreement with the working hypothesis advanced by the researcher. According to this hypothesis, mass interaction among society members prevents essential differences in the con-
notation of lexical items in persons belonging to different social groups. In Heise's opinion, the major device for settling the conflict between language and social attitudes is the differential use of synonyms. For example, the words used by a young slum-dweller with a derogatory connotation are not *policeman* or *officer* (these words are as neutral for him as for other users of English), but their slang synonyms *cop, fuzz* or *the Man*.

Heise's proposition cannot be regarded as proved beyond any doubt. Heise himself admits that the statistical validity of his experiment is not so great. The major weakness of his hypothesis is that the assumption concerning the absence of socially determined differences in connotation is extended unconditionally to the entire lexicon regardless of its social stratification. The experiment was based upon words which are not part of the specialized vocabulary of social dialects and are devoid of social markedness. As regards the socially marked lexical items, they are characterized precisely by their use within social groups rather than in the course of mass interaction among members of the society at large. These items show variability both in their denotational and connotational meanings (cf. *square* 'fair, honest' and 'conventional, conforming').

The problem of socially determined variability of syntactic relations, i.e., relations between signs, has been explored to a still lesser extent than the remaining semiotic problems of sociolinguistics. The problem was raised in general terms by S. Ervin-Tripp in her study of so-called "sociolinguistic rules", among which she singles out co-occurrence rules which determine the predictibility of linguistic signs used together (Ervin-Tripp 1971).

Co-occurrence rules are of two types: horizontal and vertical. The former imply predictibility in time. They involve the patterns underlying the sequencing of text elements. The latter are related to the realization of the same text element at different levels of linguistic structure. For example, given a certain syntactic form, one can use only certain lexical items with a certain phonetic realization.

Ervin-Tripp cites a hypothetical example of a text where both types of rules are violated: *How's it going, Your Eminence? Centrifuging OK? Also have you been analyzin' whatch' unnertook to achieve?*

Violations of horizontal co-occurrence rules may be expressed in the parallel use of incompatible units of the same level: in the lexicon it is manifested in the parallel use of scientific and slang terms, familiar expressions, such as *How's it going?* and honorifics, such as *Your Eminence*, in syntax purely colloquial elliptic forms coexist with formal speech patterns (cf. *Centrifuging OK?* and *Have...*).
you been analyzing?). Violations of vertical co-occurrence are expressed, among other things, in the fact that in the colloquial phrase How's it going? the suffix -ing is used instead of the colloquial -in', whereas the bookish analyze acquires the form analyzing'.

In terms of stylistics this phenomenon is described as "a confusion of styles". In terms of sociolinguistics it is a violation of the rules governing the selection of situational variables and determined by the social situation.

S. Ervin-Tripp's observations regarding the sociolinguistic aspects of the co-occurrence of linguistic signs are, on the whole, strictly preliminary. The relation of sociolinguistics to syntactics, just as many other problems involved in the relations between sociolinguistics and semiotics, is still in the exploratory stage.

The social information carried by linguistic signs functioning as sociolinguistic variables, is, in fact, a phenomenon of social symbolism, defined as "a cultural mechanism, based on the use of symbolic forms of behaviour with a view to regulating social relations" (Basin & Krasnov 1971, 164). The preference of a single linguistic unit or an entire system to another symbolizes the identity of social norms in a speech community based on the same interpretation of the social information transmitted in this manner.

The above thesis concerning the non-isomorphic character of relations between linguistic and social structures finds its expression in the asymmetry between the plane of expression and the plane of content of sociolinguistic variables. In fact, we find here the same relations of homonymy and synonymy as in any other relations between the signifier and the significatum. Thus the variation of linguistic systems in a bilingual situation may be at the same time associated with such social categories as status, role and attitude. The same sociolinguistic variable (for example, the variation of the Russian pronouns ty and vy) may be associated with such social referents as status, role relations, relative age, kinship, etc. (Friedrich 1972). Relations of intimacy and social solidarity may be expressed by using the first name, the pronoun ty, low colloquial vocabulary and various paralinguistic devices.

4. Sociolinguistics and Stylistics

Quite a number of examples have been cited above showing that the domains of sociolinguistics and stylistics largely overlap. Needless to say, stylistics as "a theoretical description of expressive linguistic devices in the broadest sense of the term" (Budagov 1967, 101) and sociolinguistics, investigating the inter-
relations between language and society, have their own specific goals and their own specific ways of examining linguistic material. Yet it should be noted that the areas investigated by each of these disciplines are partly co-extensive. The similarity of some of the goals of sociolinguistics and stylistics and the need for close cooperation between them have been stressed in the scientific literature (Akhmanova 1966; Aznaurova 1974, 6). It should be added that a study of some problems traditionally included in the domain of stylistics is not only an integral part of sociolinguistic research but constitutes a salient feature of some sociolinguistic schools. This is true, among other things, of the Prague school, which, according to Kraus, is specifically concerned with one such problem, i.e. the problem of standard language and functional styles (Kraus 1974, 29–30). It should be pointed out that this is also one of the major concerns of Soviet linguists (Jarceva 1969; Konrad 1960; Guxman, Semenjuk 1969).

This section will be limited to some sociolinguistic aspects of the problem of linguistic norm, functional style and text linguistics.

The concept of a linguistic norm as governing the selection of linguistic resources is one of the central concepts of stylistics. At the same time, it should be stressed that there are many unclear and sometimes conflicting views in connection with this concept. First of all, it should be pointed out that the concepts of a linguistic norm and a standard norm are not clearly differentiated. As a result, the concept of the norm is frequently associated with the standard language alone, while other components of a national language, including territorial and social dialects, are described as extranormative.

It seems that if the norm is defined as a set of collectively perceived rules of selecting linguistic resources, i.e. the rules underlying verbal realizations of a linguistic system, such rules are indispensable to any linguistic system or sub-system, including that of a dialect.

It is necessary to reexamine radically the view held to this day concerning the monolithic or homogeneous character of the norm. One of the reasons for this misconception is the fact that in many studies the exploration of language was replaced by the exploration of a codified standard language which led not only to the confusion of a standard norm and a linguistic norm, but also to the non-differentiation of the norm and the codified norm.

Yet the need to distinguish between these non-identical concepts was stressed as far back as the 30s by the Czech linguist B. Hávranek (Hávranek 1932) who pointed out quite correctly that the folk (i.e. dialect) language has its own norm, though it is not codified. It was unquestionably one of the achievements of the
Prague school that it recognized the variability of the language norm, including the norm of a standard language, as an organic part of its general theoretical conception and its view of language as a “system of systems” (Vachek 1964).

The linguistic systems isolated by Soviet linguists within the standard language are the codified standard language (CSL) and colloquial speech (CS), very close to each other in some sectors of the system and very distant in others. The existence of a special CS system leads to the conclusion that it has its own set of norms. The CS norms are characterized, in the first place, by their uncodified character and, secondly, by their greater variability as compared to the CSL norms. Furthermore, there are essential differences in the type of variability between the CSL and CS norms. The former are characterized by variable series with clear-cut functional differentiation of variable units, and the latter by the absence of a precise functional differentiation between elements of variable series (Zemskaja 1973, 17–30).

The comment by M. V. Panov concerning the character of dialect norms fully applies to CS: “Of course, in dialects there are also boundaries between what is good and common in speech and what is absurd and unacceptable. Yet the range of acceptability is very wide; the synonymy of units and patterns is extremely great; the use of one or another, or still another expression turns out to be functionally undifferentiated” (Panov 1962, 4).

The concepts of acceptability or correctness of a linguistic expression are closely connected, as was demonstrated above, with social evaluation, and the norm itself with the value orientation of a linguistic or speech community. For instance, the variability of Standard English finds its expression in partial divergences of its literary norms, in orientation towards different standards and, subjectively, in at times conflicting value judgements concerning the same linguistic phenomena.

This may be illustrated by divergences between the American and British varieties of Standard English.

For example, in the U.S.A. the Past Tense form of the verb eat (ate) is usually pronounced /eit/ while the pronunciation /et/ is viewed as a violation of the standard norm (“countrified”), whereas in Britain, as is known, the standard form is /et/ rather than /eit/, regarded as substandard (“as though people learnt the word from seeing it spelt”) (Marcwardt & Quirk 1964, 15).

Contrastive experimental studies of American and British intonation ascertained that American reciters considered the intonation of British English “manneristic” and “theatrical” (Grafova 1971).
Such stereotypes frequently underlie the conflict of social values associated in the speakers' minds with the choice of variant forms. Such conflicts sometimes arise in the course of communication between the users of American and British English. Thus, according to H. Whitehall, speakers of American and British English, in communicating with one another, concentrate on such "linguistic shibboleths" as, for instance, the evaluation of "broad a" as aesthetic or an "affectation" and of a dropped preconsonantal r as socially acceptable or unacceptable, etc. "To the primary matter of language, which is the symbolization of experience, he (the speaker) adds a secondary symbolization, built up during the last two hundred years from confused notions of propriety, aesthetics, snobbery, subconscious fear, national pride, and personal egotism" (Whitehall 1958, XXV-XXVI).

Within the standard language, norm variability, as was pointed out above, is characterized by a relatively small range, while a totally different picture emerges in comparing the standard norm, on the one hand, and the dialect norm, on the other. This may be illustrated by differences between Standard English, on the one hand, and Black English, the social dialect of the US Blacks. An asterisk marks the sentences, sanctioned by the standard norm but rejected by the dialect norm:

You done ate.
*You've already eaten.
Ain't you eat yet?
You eat yet?
Didn't you eat yet?
You ate, didn't you?

*You've eaten, haven't you?
He ate, didn't he?
*He's eaten, hasn't he?
He been eating, ain't he?
*He's been eating, hasn't he?

(Loflin 1969).

It is clear from the above examples that the dialect norm consistently rejects one of the common grammatical forms of Standard English (have + Participle II). At the same time, many of the forms sanctioned by the dialect norm are rejected by the standard norm.

The social determination of the linguistic norm has been convincingly demonstrated in studies of Soviet linguists. Thus N. N. Semenjuk uses the concept of "elastic stability", elaborated by Czech linguists in relation to the standard language, to analyze the standardization process that affected the development of Standard German in the 18th century against the backdrop of social and cultural-historical trends [Semenjuk 1973].
This problem is treated on the basis of contemporary data by B. I. Vaksman who demonstrated in his sociolinguistic study (Vaksman 1974) the dependence of linguistic trends characterizing the formation of lexical norms in Modern Moldavian on a number of objective and subjective social factors (such as the education system, cultural institutions, mass media, on the one hand, and language policy and language engineering on the other), determined, in the final analysis, by the socio-political structure of the society and the state.

One of the factors determining the formation of the norm is, as B. I. Vaksman's study reveals, the linguistic situation. For instance, the development of the norms of Standard Moldavian is influenced by such features of the linguistic situation as the predominence of the rural population, its migration to cities, the "ruralization" of the standard language under the influence of the supradialectal koine as well as Moldavian-Russian bilingualism.

The determining role of social factors in the formation of the norm has been discussed in detail in the scientific literature.

We shall examine below another sociolinguistic aspect of the linguistic norm, the problem of its social variability.

In discussing the conceptual framework of sociolinguistics, we indicated two basic aspects of social variability of language, stratificational and situational. The stratificational variability of the linguistic norm amounts to different rules of selecting linguistic resources within such components of the national language as the standard language, on the one hand, and social and socioterritorial dialects, on the other.

The above example of grammatical differences between Standard American English and Black English is a specific case of the stratificational variability of the linguistic norm.

The situational variability of the norm is sometimes associated with the stylistic differentiation of language and with the opposition of different language styles. Yet the relation between the style and the social situation still calls for clarification. In Soviet linguistics "style" is generally defined as "a socially recognized, functionally determined and internally integrated totality of techniques of using, selecting and combining verbal communication facilities within the domain of a national language, related to similar modes of expression which are used for different purposes and which perform different functions in the nation's sociocommunicative practice" (Vinogradov 1955, 73).

Yet the taxonomies of functional styles, used in various studies, are based on somewhat different principles. For example, E. A. Zemskaja distinguishes such
styles of Standard Russian as high (bookish), neutral (medial) and low (colloquial). At the same time, I. R. Gal’perin lists such styles as the style of belles-lettres, the publicistic style, the newspaper style, the style of scientific writings and the official style (Zemskaja 1973, 25; Gal’perin 1971). These are obviously taxonomies based on entirely different principles, although meeting, on the whole, the above definition of style.

The problem of the isolation and classification of linguistic styles is extremely complicated and, naturally, goes beyond the present study. Suffice it to say that the difficulties involved in solving this problem stem from the complexity and multifariousness of the stylistic differentiation of language. From the point of view of sociolinguistics it is essential that different conceptual series related to the concept of style seem to reflect different types of the social variability of language. It is important to distinguish in sociolinguistic analysis between two types of variation in the techniques of using, selecting and combining verbal communication facilities: variations determined by the use of these facilities in different domains of social activity and variations determined by the social situation.

The domain of social activity is closely related to the social situation and may be viewed as a generic term in relation to it. In sociolinguistics a communicatively relevant domain of social activity is referred to as “a domain of communicative activity” or (in terms of American sociolinguistics) “a domain of language behaviour” (Fishman 1972, 15—53). These domains are socioecological contexts of language use, sanctioned by social norms. The nomenclature of domains is determined by a detailed study of the sociocultural dynamics of the community at a certain period of its history. These domains may include, for instance, family, school, church, literature, press, army, courts and government offices. Needless to say, the list of domains and the distribution of sociocommunicative system components among them are determined by the sociocultural system.

In Soviet sociolinguistic literature the communicative domain is sometimes organically included in the concept of social function developed by J. D. Dešeriev and defined as “a function, performed by language as a major communication medium in different spheres of human activity” (Dešeriev 1973, 15—33).

The relation between the system of functional styles and the domains of human activity may be tabulated as follows on the basis of I. R. Gal’perin’s classification of Modern English functional styles:
As may be seen from this list, not every domain has a functional style of its own. Sometimes the same style may serve different, albeit related, sociocommunicative domains. For instance, the official style may be used not only in the domain of administrative management but also in jurisprudence, commerce, etc. In other words, there are no one-to-one relations between functional styles, on the one hand, and the nomenclature of communicative domains, just as there are no such relations between any elements of social structures and their linguistic counterparts. The nomenclature of styles and their relation to communicative domains vary from society to society and from culture to culture.

The non-identity of the nomenclature of functional styles in different linguistic communities and in the same community at different stages of its development is self-explanatory. A linguistic counterpart of the communicative domain, the functional style, is related in the final analysis to the speech situations arising in the social practice of the community. It is precisely for this reason that the role model of verbal activity may well be applied to an analysis of the functional-stylistic variation of language. This was convincingly demonstrated by K. A. Dolinin who pointed out that “functional styles are nothing but generalized speech genres, i.e. the speech norms of producing broad categories of texts in which generalized social roles are embodied, such as those of a scientist, an administrator, a poet, a politician, a journalist, etc. These norms, just as any norms of speech behaviour, are determined by role expectations and role prescriptions which the society imposes on speakers (writers) (Dolinin 1978).

In diglossia a special language variety may serve as an analogue of a functional style, filling the same slot in the matrix of a sociocommunicative system. Thus in a number of Arab countries classical Arabic is used in the domain of religion, journalism and poetry while in the domain of every-day communication the local dialect is used. Sometimes a special language is assigned to a specialized communicative domain (for instance, Latin, formerly used in European countries as
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a language of science and culture, or Latin, Old-Church Slavonic and Arabic, used in a number of countries in the domain of religion).

In the bilingual situations the coexistence of two languages forming a sociocommunicative system is characterized, as a rule, by a special pattern of the assignment of these languages to communicative domains. This pattern is similar to that of the functional styles in a monolingual society. For instance, according to J. P. Rona, among the bilingual population of Paraguay Guarani is used in the domain of everyday communication whereas in education and in formal communication they use Spanish (Rona 1966).

According to Y. D. Dešeriev, there are languages with maximal and minimal social functions among the languages of the world. Minimal social functions are performed by so-called “family” (“household”) languages, used mainly in everyday communication, in oral folklore, in religious and folk rites. At the same time, in bilingual situations widespread in our country, users of these languages, members of small ethnic groups, have access to the achievements of world culture through the medium of Russian or the national language of the U.S.S.R. constituent republic. In these sociocommunicative systems such functional styles, as the style of scientific writings, the publicistic style and the style of official communication, are usually represented in the language of interethnic communication or the regional lingua franca, coexisting with the native language of the community.

The situational variability of the norm is sometimes linked with the stylistic differentiation of language, with the opposition of different language styles. Thus W. Labov’s “contextual styles” (Labov 1971, 173) actually reproduce the variation of social situations — from a situation characterized by a relaxed atmosphere and informal relations between communication partners to a situation of formal communication.

As distinct from functional styles related to the communicative domain as a generalized type of speech situation, so-called “contextual styles” are related directly to a specific situation with its role structure.

Labov’s interview programme envisaged the following typical contexts: A — an atmosphere of casual communication; B — an atmosphere of interview the purpose of which (a study of the informant’s speech) is known to the latter who is therefore aware of the need to watch his language, i.e. follow the CSL norm to a greater extent; C — the reading of a coherent text, containing diagnostic sociolinguistic variables; D — the reading of minimal pairs. The latter context is introduced only when the maximum approximation to the standard norm is
required. In other words, the interview situation varied, covering the entire spectrum of “contextual styles”, from casual to formal and “proper”.

This variation of the experimental situation was actually intended to simulate a changing social situation with different role relations between communication partners and a different setting of the communicative act.

There are different taxonomies of contextual styles. Thus, W. Labov distinguishes between the style of careful speech and the style of casual speech. A more detailed scale is proposed by M. Joos who lists five styles: 1) intimate, 2) casual, 3) consultative, 4) formal and 5) frozen (Joos 1968, 188).

The use of language in different social situations may be represented as a continuum of transition from situations characterized by purely informal relations between communication partners and an extremely informal atmosphere of the communicative act to situations with strictly formal relations between the partners and a similarly formal atmosphere. The establishment of discrete levels in this continuum is not simple. It seems advisable to use a three-level scale (informal — neutral — formal). The choice of these levels is determined by the fact that, according to a number of studies, it is these situational features that prove decisive for a situational variation of the norm. For instance, E. A. Zemskaja and her co-authors (Zemskaja 1973, 9—11), analyzing a situationally determined choice between CSL (codified standard language) and colloquial speech (CS), conclude that out of the three components of the situation taken into account (relations between partners, intent and setting) the basic parameter is relations. A change in this parameter (formal/informal relations) affects the choice of CS or CSL-by the speaker. As to the “intent”, it has a lower weight because only one of its aspects is relevant (an intent to engage in formal or informal communication). The setting is the weakest parameter. As in the case of intent, only one of its aspects is relevant (conditions affecting the informality of the setting).

It may be seen from the above that all the parameters relevant to a choice between CSL and CS reflect somehow the opposition of the situational features “formal/informal”. This opposition characterizes both the types of role relations and an intent to engage in a certain type of a communicative act as well as the setting of the communicative act itself. The type of role relations plays a dominant role.

Essentially the same scale underlies W. Labov’s contextual styles, simulating different types of role relations between communication partners. It is essential that the above analysis of colloquial Russian speech and Labov’s studies are
concerned not with any individual role relations but with certain features of these relations to which contextual styles prove to be sensitive.

The notion of a contextual style is closely associated with that of a sociocommunicative system. Depending on the language situation, linguistic realizations of a contextual style may be components of a standard language, as, for instance, in Zemskaja’s study where the colloquial speech used in informal style is opposed to the codified standard language used in the official style (the neutral style has no permanent realization), or the dyad “standard language/dialect” (as, for instance, in the above-mentioned study by J. Gumperz of the language situation in Northern Norway (Gumperz 1971, 165—174) or, finally, the triad “dialect — semidialect — standard language” which seems to underlie the sociolinguistic variables analyzed by W. Labov with reference to the speech of New Yorkers.

A similar role in bilingualism may be performed by different languages. Thus, according to E. Haugen who studied the speech of Norwegian immigrants in the U.S.A., many of them switched from Norwegian to English when talking to strangers. Thus English was used both in the official and neutral contextual styles. Only in an informal style with intimate relations between communication partners did they use Norwegian (Haugen 1972, 17).

Within the conceptual framework elaborated by the British linguist M. A. K. Halliday, the category of tenor is used instead of contextual style. Tenor, which refers to the interrelations among the participants (status and role relationships), is part of a triad which also includes the field of discourse, which refers to the ongoing activity and the particular purposes that the use of language is serving within the context of that activity and the mode, covering the channel, key and genre of discourse (Halliday 1978, 62—64).

In addition to the norm, usage or collective language use is another stylistic concept particularly relevant to sociolinguistics. As T. G. Vinokur (Vinokur 1974, 4—8) points out, a study of usage confronts the researcher with a number of specific problems of sociolinguistics and, in particular, with the problem of the typology of the interrelations among the participants of a communicative event as they affect their speech. The social specification of the formula “adressor — message — addressee” makes it possible to reveal the causes of the stylistic diversity of usage.

Since stylistics, like sociolinguistics, is interested in the variation of linguistic resources and the factors determining their choice in the course of communication, the area where their interests overlap to the greatest extent is text
linguistics, where the text itself is regarded as one of the elements of verbal communication. Of particular interest in terms of the interactions of these disciplines is the sociocommunicative analysis of the text.

The sociocommunicative analysis of the text is based on the assumption that the text is not only a structural-semantic, but also a stylistic unity. Special emphasis is laid on the variation of text characteristics under the influence of role relations between the participants of the communicative event, topic and communication channel (oral or written speech, mass media, etc.).

Easily available as they are, written texts have occupied a marginal place in sociolinguistic research. Yet it is precisely in written communication that the stylistic unity of a text acquires the most clear-cut form. Violations of this unity are generally regarded as deviations from the norm, as, for instance, in this passage from a school composition cited by M. A. K. Halliday: “It was all up with Lear, who couldn’t take any more of it” (Halliday, McIntosh and Strevens 1973, 19–20) where colloquial speech is used in an improper stylistic context, and in the parody on The House that Jack Built cited in the same article: “... that disturbed the equanimity of the domesticated feline animal that exterminated the noxious rodent that masticated the farinaceous produce deposited in the domiciliary edifice erected by Master John”.

Russian and English newspaper texts are characterized by some common features determined by a specific channel of communication: both represent written communication addressed to a mass audience and oriented mainly towards the norms of a bookish variety of the standard language.

A number of features specific to both English and Russian newspaper texts are due to the functions they share: the informative function, concerned with the transmission of information and the expressive function, concerned with the evaluation of things and events and a desire to exert some influence on the reader. These functions are reflected in some common linguistic features: in a broad stylistic range — from purely bookish to purely colloquial elements — in a peculiar synthesis of expressiveness and standardization, in the abundance of neologisms and clichés, in a preference for compressed structures and in some similar rules of text structuring (for data characterizing the language of the Soviet press, see Kostomarov 1971).

Yet Russian and English newspaper texts reveal a number of fundamental differences both in sociocommunicative orientation, determining the choice of linguistic devices, and in their functional parameters.
For example, in a Russian text sociopragmatic orientation towards the addressee is manifested mainly in a differential selection of linguistic devices depending on the orientation of the newspaper towards certain age and professional groups. Cf., for example, the language and style of a newspaper, such as *Medicinskij rabotnik* (The Health Worker), intended for a narrow professional group of readers, or the specific choice of linguistic devices in *Pionerskaja pravda*, intended for children. In addition to the same differences, an English newspaper text is also characterized by variation in the use of linguistic devices depending on orientation towards various social strata. Cf. the following examples of texts from the American newspapers *New York Times* and *Daily News*:

**The New York Times**

For decades, architects in this country and abroad have been designing and building homes that, depending upon the climate, could be heated wholly or in large part by the sun... To hasten wider use of solar energy in residential construction and to get serious research under way on its application in industrial and commercial use, the House of Representatives is considering today a bill to establish a $50-million, five-year demonstration program.

**Daily News**

Our only regret is that some radical step wasn't taken a long time ago and made to stick... Philadelphia has recently clapped a similar no-parking order on its business area... Plenty of people, at first, will be trying to chip holes in the no-parking rule for their own private benefit. We imagine more than one motorist will try to slip something to the nearest cop for letting him park awhile where he shouldn't.

Cf. a pronounced orientation towards codified standard English in the *New York Times*, intended mainly for educated readers and the low colloquial vocabulary and phraseology of the *Daily News*, oriented towards the man-in-the street (to make something stick, to clap an order, to chip holes, to slip something to the cop).

With all their similarities, Russian and English newspaper texts reveal essential differences in the principle of selecting linguistic devices determined, in the final analysis, by differences in the correlation of sociocommunicative factors affecting the process of text production and its end product. For instance, the English news item is characterized by an extremely low degree of the author's involvement, i.e. his explicitly stated attitude to the events described. This feature of
English-language news items is determined by a deliberate orientation towards a dispassionate manner of presentation and the abandonment of any value judgements. As the Czech authors S. Haškovec and J. First convincingly demonstrated, the claim of capitalist media, including the British and American press, to an objective transmission of information is completely unfounded. In fact, the text of news items devoid of any explicit evaluation expresses the authors’ position with sufficient clarity. This is achieved by selecting the topics of news items, by highlighting certain aspects of the situation described, by selecting the material for the lead and by its formulation (Haškovec & First 1972, 24—36).

In additional to the above-mentioned composition techniques, Western newsmen employ some linguistic devices of an implicit evaluation of events of facts in news items. As N. V. Romanovskaja’s study showed (Romanovskaja 1974), a major role in an implicit characterization and evaluation of the subject in the situation described is played by the selection of appropriate verbs. For instance, the preference of the verb *to flop* to the verb *to fail* in the phrase “the first major project flopped” is an indirect expression of the author’s derogatory attitude to the project and to its sponsors.

At the same time, in the corresponding Russian texts the author’s position is explicitly indicated, which is manifested in, among other things, the use of emotive and evaluative vocabulary:

> “Fascism has cast a dark shadow over Chile, as mothers and widows wail for their murdered sons and husbands. Patriots are dying in prison dungeons and concentration camps while the list of martyrs of the military junta is growing every day. The criminals flout the appeal of the international community for an end to terror and repression” (*Izvestija*, August 24, 1974).

Differences in the rules of formal and semantic structuring of the text may be illustrated by a news item. They affect mainly the structures of such components of the text as the headline and the lead. On the whole, the structuring of these components is more rigid in an English-language newspaper text. For instance, an English-language headline is usually more detailed. It includes the most essential (in the author’s opinion) elements of information. Cf., for example, *Libya Expected to Nationalize All Foreign Oil Firms’ Assets; France, Rest of EEC Are Split Over Stance in Energy Talks*. This appears to be a compressed version of the news item.

As distinguished from the Russian news item, the English-language news item is characterized by the following semantic structure: the lead is a brief summary of the item while the rest is a more detailed exposition of the story.

A comparison of different types and genres of newspaper texts, including those oriented towards different categories of readers, shows that the choice of linguistic devices and stylistic tonality of the text reveal in a number of instances a functional dependence on the topic of the story and on the type of speech-act relations between the participants of the communicative event. The dependence of linguistic devices on the topic is demonstrated, among other things, by a conspicuously lower tonality of the sports column as compared to other varieties of newspaper texts. Cf. the following examples from the *International Herald Tribune* (February 13, 1974):

The younger generation could be pardoned for asking "Bill who?" when the guy who started the position of middle linebacker was voted into the Pro Football Hall of Fame last week.

When you're only 6 feet in the NBA, you better be cocky.

He looms as the NBA's rookie of the year.

Cf. typical colloquialisms Bill who?, guy, cocky and rookie.

Sometimes the role relations between the author and his hypothetical reader play a decisive role in the choice of situational variables. Thus a Russian newspaper text addressed to teenagers is characterized by the use of ty 'you' as a form of address:

To uninitiated spectators who, their heads thrown back, watch ty (you) with admiration from the ground, the flight looks like a promenade in the air. They do not know how many hours ty (you) have spent at the flight simulator or how painstakingly the flight instructor has been sweating ty (you) . . . " (*Izvestija*, August 26, 1974).

There is every reason to assume that the mass media simulate to some extent the verbal behaviour of a person, selecting his linguistic resources, depending on certain parameters of the social situation. Typical in this respect is the style of advertising in the U.S. press, based on a pattern of intimate and confidential relations between participants in a communicative event. This style is characterized by elliptic colloquial structures (Homeward bound? Drop around), deliberate departure from the norms of codified Standard English (Winston tastes good like a cigarette should), slang (Turn on before you turn in) and other markers of such role relationships. Needless to say, such reflexes of role relationships are
combined with orientation to certain norms of written communication deter­
mined by the channel and the tradition of the functional style.
In other words, the major crossroads of sociolinguistics and stylistics are the
problems of norm, usage, functional and contextual styles, and text linguistics.
CHAPTER III

Some Problems of Sociolinguistics

In the preceding chapter we discussed some general problems of sociolinguistic theory: the subject matter of sociolinguistics, its conceptual system and its relation to other disciplines. This chapter will be limited to the examination of some specific problems currently being studied by Soviet and foreign sociolinguists — the problem of bilingualism and diglossia, the typology of linguistic situations and the problem of language policy and language planning. It seems, however, that the examination of these three fundamental problems of sociolinguistics will make it possible to pursue the discussion of a number of general issues raised in the preceding chapter and indicate some ways of applying sociolinguistic theory to the solution of specific sociolinguistic problems.

1. Bilingualism and Diglossia

When we discussed in the preceding chapter the conceptual system of sociolinguistics, we pointed out the essential similarity between a number of sociolinguistic aspects of bilingualism and diglossia. Therefore, it seems advisable to examine these phenomena in the same section as a single sociolinguistic problem.

Since there is no consensus in the literature concerning the interpretation of the terms bilingualism and diglossia, some clarification would be in order to show what we mean by these terms.

The point is that the term bilingualism and the related terms monolingualism and multilingualism are sometimes used in regard to the society or the nation as a whole and are sometimes applied to an individual with a command of one, two or several languages.

The German scholar H. Kloss draws a distinction between national monolingualism, bilingualism and multilingualism, on the one hand, and individual monolingualism, bilingualism and multilingualism, on the other (Kloss 1967).

National monolingualism may well be combined with individual bilingualism or multilingualism. Thus, for example, the population of Malta is basically a monolingual community whose native language is Maltese (a dialect of Arabic). At the same time, many residents of the island know a second language (Italian or English).
On the other hand, national bilingualism or multilingualism is sometimes combined with individual monolingualism. This may be illustrated by the case of Switzerland which is a multilingual nation. At the same time, the bulk of the Swiss population is monolingual.

Different interpretations of the term bilingualism and related concepts reflect, in our view, the objective difficulties that arise from an analysis of this complex and multifaceted phenomenon, attracting the attention of different disciplines. It is therefore possible to examine bilingualism from different angles. Thus, Ju. D. Dešeriev and I. F. Protčenko consider purely linguistic, sociolinguistic, psychological and pedagogical aspects of bilingualism the major aspects of its analysis (Dešeriev and Protčenko 1972, 28). Among these aspects the sociolinguistic aspect has a special role to play because bilingualism is primarily a sociolinguistic phenomenon in which social and linguistic elements are closely intertwined.

In terms of sociolinguistics analysis should be limited to bilingualism as a social phenomenon. Individual bilingualism may be of some interest to sociolinguistics merely as a specific realization of social bilingualism. A sociolinguistic definition of bilingualism is impossible without any reference to a bilingual speech community. Therefore U. Weinreich’s definition of bilingualism as a practice of an alternate use of two languages (Weinreich 1959, 18) is not sufficiently precise from this point of view. It seems that in terms of sociolinguistics bilingualism is the coexistence of two languages within the same speech community, using these languages in the appropriate communicative domains, depending on the social situation and other parameters of the communicative event.

To use the terminology introduced in the preceding chapter, both languages, serving a single speech community, form a single sociocommunicative system and are in functional complementation to each other. The relationship between these languages and the preference of one or the other in certain communicative domains or social situations are determined by social norms and social values shared by the community.

It follows that the bilingualism of a community (of any community and not only a nation) must imply the individual bilingualism of its members. From this point of view the situation in Switzerland cannot be placed within the category of bilingualism or multilingualism, because the bulk of the population falls into a number of monolingual communities. Yet bilingualism (and multilingualism) do imply the existence of a single sociocommunicative system and a single speech
community, characterized by the use of functionally complementary languages in accordance with a single pattern.

As to the Maltese situation, it apparently amounts to the coexistence of different speech communities with Arabic-Italian or Arabic-English bilingualism within the same language community. In other words, community bilingualism in this case involves the bilingualism of community members.

The reverse is not necessarily true: individual bilingualism does not necessarily imply the bilingualism of the speech community. However, as was pointed out above, such bilingualism can hardly be an object of sociolinguistic analysis because it is not embodied in the sociocommunicative system used by the community.

The term "diglossia" also calls for some clarification. It was introduced by C. A. Ferguson who defined it in a strictly limited sense as two or more varieties of the same language, used by some speakers under various circumstances or, to be more precise, two language varieties, coexisting in the community, each playing a certain role (Ferguson 1971, 1). The examples cited by Ferguson leave no doubt as to what precisely this term implies. Among other things, diglossia includes a situation where, for instance, the speakers of Italian or Persian use a local dialect at home or among friends and switch to the standard language when communicating with speakers of other dialects or in public speaking. The same term is applied to the situation in Baghdad where Christian Arabs use the so-called "Christian" Arabic dialect among fellow-Christians and the common Baghdad dialect ("Moslem Arabic") in a mixed group.

At the same time, in a number of other studies the term diglossia has acquired a different meaning. For example, in J. A. Fishman's writings the opposition diglossia - bilingualism is used in an entirely different sense: bilingualism pertains to an individual ability while diglossia is used to denote the social distribution of functions; bilingualism is an individual psychological phenomenon while diglossia is a sociological concept (Fishman 1971c, 72—90).

The difference drawn by Fishman between bilingualism and diglossia is somewhat similar to the differentiation of individual bilingualism and national bilingualism made by H. Kloss (see above). For instance, the situation in some African countries where the rural and recently urbanized population knows just one language is described as "diglossia without bilingualism" because the existence of "national diglossia" does not imply in itself widespread bilingualism. At the same time, a situation where immigrants use their native language in intragroup
communication while the society as a whole does not use it is characterized as “bilingualism without diglossia”.

There are, however, close organic links between the social nature of bilingualism and its individual manifestations.

We find more acceptable the original interpretation of the concept diglossia proposed by Ferguson. For sociolinguistics both diglossia and bilingualism are primarily social phenomena fundamentally similar to each other. Bilingualism implies the interaction of two coexisting languages while diglossia is the interaction of two coexisting varieties of the same language. On the basis of the above definition of bilingualism we can define diglossia as the coexistence of two varieties of the same language (the standard language and the local dialect, two different dialects, etc.) within the same speech community, using these languages in the appropriate communicative domains depending on the social situation and other parameters of the communicative event.

There may be two approaches to a study of bilingualism and diglossia as sociolinguistic phenomena. The first approach (we may call it “static”) amounts to establishing the correlation between two interacting languages or two varieties of the same language in a certain sociohistorical context. This approach is characterized by the intention to reveal the distribution of social functions and communicative domains between the languages and varieties of the same language coexisting within the community and to find out the role played by each of them in the life of the society to ascertain the dependence of the distribution of bilingualism on the social structure and the status of each of the languages.

In his above-mentioned essay H. Kloss points out the following parameters determining the relationships among languages in a multilingual society: the official status of languages, the scope of their use, the character and degree of individual bilingualism, the social prestige of each language, and the genetic distance between them.

This list, however, is far from complete. In reality the factors determining the relationships between the interacting languages (and language varieties) in a bilingual situation or in diglossia are far more complex and diverse. For instance, in an article on Spanish-Indian bilingualism in Mexico A. R. Diebold points to the dependence of the degree and type of bilingualism on the process of acculturation (Diebold 1964). Among the factors determining the relationship between Spanish and the local Indian language Huawe the author singles out the domain of these languages (it is the local language that serves as the medium of
everyday communication and is used within the family), the economic and political dependence of the local Indian population on the outside world and its low mobility.

In characterizing the status of languages coexisting in a bilingual situation, it is necessary to distinguish between their official and actual status in the society. The social inequality among the nations comprising a multinational state finds its expression in, among other things, the relative status of the languages of these nations. Speakers of the dominant language are, as a rule, monolingual whereas bilingualism is more widespread among the speakers of other languages, subordinate to the former. Such a situation exists, for example, in Canada where bilingualism is much more widespread among the French Canadians and where, according to an ironic observation by E. Haugen, the English-speaking Canadians are ardent supporters of bilingualism because it means that the French would study English. In characterizing the social roots of bilingualism in the capitalist world, E. Haugen points out that if we cast a glance at the countries where bilingualism has become a national problem, we shall see that this is usually due to the refusal of the subordinate social group to submit to the will of the dominant group that imposes its language on it. The balance of power between the conqueror and the vanquished, between the indigenous population and the immigrants, between the upper and lower classes — this is what gave rise to bilingualism in its usual sense (Haugen 1972, 308–309).

This relationship between the dominant language and the other languages determines their relative social prestige. It is no coincidence that the French-speaking Belgians refer to bilingualism occasionally found among the speakers of the dominant language as *bilinguisme de concession* and to the bilingualism of the speakers of subordinate languages as *bilinguisme de promotion* (Coulon 1962).

Entirely different from the situation in the capitalist world is the bilingual situation in the socialist community and primarily in the multinational U.S.S.R. where “the objective progress of Soviet society give rise to the development of bilingualism (as a rule, it is a good command of Russian as the language of interethnic communication in addition to one’s native language). The development of bilingualism meets the interests of all the peoples of the U.S.S.R. for it expresses the democratic nature of the Soviet nationality policy” (Bagramov 1971). In Soviet society forcing any language on the speakers of other languages is out of the question. This would run counter to the basic principles of the Leninist
national policy. The growth of bilingualism in the U.S.S.R. with Russian as a second language is based on a voluntary study of Russian in addition to one’s native language and is determined by the objective need of each nation and ethnic group for an exchange of experience and assimilation of the achievements of all the other peoples of the U.S.S.R. and of world culture (Dešeriev & Protčenko 1972, 41; Baziev & Isaev 1973, 198).

The static approach to the study of bilingualism may be extended to a study of diglossia subject to some modification. This approach may be used, among other things, to establish an overall picture of the relationship between certain varieties of the same language (for example, the standard language and a local dialect) and the distribution of their social functions. The relation between the spread of diglossia and the social structure assumes considerable importance. The significance of this problem was stressed by Academician V. M. Žirmunskij who pointed to a universal diglossia among the speakers of contemporary German “semi-dialects” (Halbmundarten) (Žirmunskij 1969, 22—24).

In describing the dialect and semi-dialect situations V. M. Žirmunskij actually defined the social basis of diglossia in a contemporary capitalist society. According to field observations, the peasant language disintegrated just as the peasantry itself disintegrated under the impact of developing capitalist relations. The rich peasants gravitate toward the city, assimilate its cultural fashions and seek to use the “language of the educated”. At the same time, the proletarianization of the village, seasonal and permanent migration to the city in search of jobs — all this contributes to the development of similar trends among the other sections of the peasantry. This gives rise to social conditions for the spread of a semi-dialect with its characteristically broad range of fluctuation between two poles — the dialect proper and the standard language in its colloquial form. This leads to one of the most widespread varieties of diglossia of the dialect-standard language type.

The relationship between the standard language and a dialect coexisting within the same speech communities varies from district to district. Thus, as distinct from the areas which have preserved an agrarian structure, in the areas of total industrialization (in the Ruhr district and the industrial district of Saxony) the old local dialect has been completely supplanted by the semi-dialect. Another factor contributing to the development of diglossia is the distance from the dialect area to the centres of language standardization (Cf. the spread of dialect-standard language diglossia in Austria, Switzerland and Luxemburg).
The prestigious imitation of urban speech by wealthy peasants noted by V. M. Žirmunskij testifies to the existence of certain links between the standard language-dialect diglossia and social mobility. A similar phenomenon with regard to Black English is noted by J. L. Dillard (Dillard 1972, 239; Labov 1965; Stewart 1964). In addition, according to Dillard, there are direct links between the degree of diglossia and the age composition of the population. The dialect features come out in bold relief especially among the preschool children. As the child grows older, it is more and more exposed to the influence of the dominant culture, including the colloquial and written varieties of the standard language. Finally, a direct connection has been observed between the status of informants and the type of diglossia: the higher their social status, the less frequent the Black English forms in their speech.

As distinct from bilingualism, diglossia does not disappear completely even at the highest levels of the social hierarchy. Among the educated the standard language-dialect diglossia gives way to a diglossia involving the interaction of the standard language and slang or the interaction of different forms of the standard language. The existence of special forms of diglossia of the codified standard language-colloquial standard language type was noted by L. P. Krysin (Krysin 1973b, 60–61).

Just as the study of bilingualism, the analysis of diglossia requires due regard for a broad social context. While in the capitalist world diglossia, just as bilingualism, reflects a structure of a society based on inequality, in the socialist community this phenomenon is of a fundamentally different character. The development of the socialist system of public education leads to an increasingly wider spread of the diglossia of the codified standard language-colloquial standard language type. Furthermore, the links of diglossia with the structure of society have substantially changed. This is due, among other things, to the fact that the democratization of public education in the socialist community considerably broadens the social basis of the standard language. In the early 20th century the intelligentsia alone were considered the genuine users of standard Russian, whereas now, according to the authors of the collective monograph *Russian According to a Mass Survey*, Standard Russian is used not only by the intelligentsia but also by blue-collar workers with a secondary education, by numerous white-collar workers with a secondary education and also by university and technical college students (Krysin 1974, 24).

In addition to the static approach to the study of diglossia and bilingualism, another approach is possible which may be described as dynamic (or functional).
As distinguished from the static approach, this approach is based on revealing the very mechanism of interaction among the components of the sociocommunicative system under the influence of social factors. Just the first steps have been taken in this direction. In the study of bilingualism the essays by J. Gumperz, based on a dynamic approach, and in the study of diglossia W. Labov's essays, based on the same approach, merit attention (Gumperz 1971; Labov 1966; Labov 1972a; Labov 1972b).

According to Gumperz, sociolinguistic studies of bilingualism have been focused on the linguistic aspects of this problem. After finding out that members of the speech community use alternately two different grammatical systems, researchers proceed to study the conditions in which the alternants are used either by questionnaires and interviews or by counting the relevant forms in speech samples. In so doing, the researchers proceed from the assumption that the presence or absence of a certain alternant signals some essential data on the communicants themselves and the social parameters of the communicative event.

In Soviet sociolinguistic literature the explication of a dynamic (functional) approach to an analysis of bilingualism may be found in one of the essays by E. F. Tarasov who proposes a model of a communicative event that may be used as a basis for a sociolinguistic study of bilingualism (Tarasov 1973, 68–73). From this point of view, bilingualism appears not as a certain cluster of relations between two interacting languages, but as a certain form of verbal behaviour. The sociolinguistic model of a communicative event proposed by Tarasov is of heuristic value as an explanatory model making it possible to establish certain correlations between the verbal behaviour of bilingual communicants and the social components of a communicative event.

The subject of sociolinguistic studies in this case includes not so much the linguistic aspects of verbal behaviour (it is assumed that speech events have already been described in linguistic terms) as the relations between verbal behaviour and the structure of social interaction between communicants that determine this verbal behaviour. The model used to describe the verbal behaviour of bilinguals reflects not personal but social relationships between the communicants while the communicative event appears as part of a vast network of social relations, and in each specific communicative event the communicants appear not merely as individuals but as social types.

Therefore the model of a communicative event proposed for the study of bilingualism should be based on the concepts of the sociological theory of a person, the theory of social groups and the theory of social interaction. What is
meant by the theory of social interaction is not its symbolic-interactionist variety (see above), but the conceptual system based on the sociologization of L. S. Vygotskij's theory of activity in terms of Marxist role theory.

It is precisely Marxist role theory, elaborated by I. S. Kon, A. Krečmar and others (Kon 1969; Krečmar 1970) that, in E. F. Tarasov's opinion, could be used as a basis for a sociolinguistic model of bilingual verbal activity. Verbal activity could thus be analyzed in terms of such concepts as social position (the place of an individual in a certain social system), and role prescription (role expectation), containing the rules of role playing, determined, among other things, by the individual's social position, etc. (Tarasov 1973). One of the arguments in favour of using role theory to describe the bilingual's verbal activity is the fact that it is precisely role switching in a communicative event (i.e. the integration of a communicative event within a different system of social relationships) that may explain an unmotivated (in terms of the internal conditions of a communicative event) change of language ("code switching") by bilinguals within the same communicative event.

The role model does in fact explain certain cases of code switching in bilingualism and diglossia. However, the orientation of a sociolinguistic model of bilingual verbal behaviour exclusively towards role theory would be clearly one-sided. The point is that among the social determinants of bilingual verbal behaviour there are, apart from role relations, such important social factors as social status, social attitudes and orientation towards certain social values. The interpretation of verbal activity in bilingualism and diglossia is impossible without due regard for such components of a communicative event as topic, setting, communication channel (oral or written communication, mass media, etc. (Švejcer 1971, 26–27). It is only by taking into account the totality of these determinants of verbal behaviour in their interaction that one can explain certain aspects of bilingual verbal activity, including code switching in the course of communication.

Finally, one should also bear in mind the important fact noted by J. Gumperz that, in addition to the cases when the use of linguistic variants in bilingualism and diglossia is more or less rigidly determined and is therefore quite predictable, there are others when the use of several alternants is acceptable. Yet even in these not so rigidly determined instances the use of language is by no means chaotic, for it is based on its own patterns of variant choice, including those that could be described as expressive use.
A comprehensive analysis of verbal activity in bilingualism and diglossia should, in our view, take into account both the possibility of a relatively rigid determination of code selection and of a greater freedom of choice. It should be borne in mind that not all the cases of code switching can be explained even with due regard for all the social and sociopsychological determinants of verbal behaviour in their entirety. In addition to the cases of expressive language use, noted by Gumperz, there may be those which may be regarded as errors, deviations from the norm, rule violations, etc.

We shall make an attempt below to subject to a sociolinguistic analysis a specific instance of bilingualism in its sociohistorical context. It is Russian-French bilingualism in the early 19th century, as reflected in Tolstoy’s War and Peace. There is no doubt whatsoever that the novel by Tolstoy with his profound knowledge of the epoch and a sense of identification with it recreates a realistic picture of Russian-French bilingualism, one of the typical elements in the lives and behaviour of its characters.

As Academician V. V. Vinogradov put it, in War and Peace L. N. Tolstoy realistically reproduced the Russian-French language of the fashionable society. The Gallicisms in the novel characterize the life style and cultural norms of the milieu, especially St. Petersburg’s aristocratic circles. They are reproduced by the author in a satirical vein. Characteristically, the footnote translations of the French dialogue abound in phraseological and syntactic Gallicisms (for example, “Genoa and Lucca have become ne bolše kak (no more than) [ne sont plus que] estates of the Bonapartes”). The author deliberately exaggerates the French flavour, laying bare these calques from the French (Vinogradov 1938, 406–407).

It should be noted that our observations are strictly preliminary and somewhat fragmentary. Tolstoy’s novel may and should become an object of a more profound and more systematic analysis which would make it possible to reveal the entire mechanism of interaction between Russian and French in the speech of its characters.

Let us examine in general outline the sociocultural and historical background against which the situation described in the novel was developing.

“The upper nobility”, V. O. Ključevskij wrote, “educated its children at home; the first tutors were Germans who were succeeded during the reign of Elizabeth by the French. Those were the French tutors, so well-known in the history of our education” (Ključevskij 1958, 168–169). Under their influence in the mid-18th century there emerged two interesting types that became conspicuous during the reign of Elizabeth and were ridiculed in Sumarokov’s comedy Monstres:
Coquettes and Petimetres, fashionable French-educated ladies and gentlemen who had nothing but scorn for things Russian.

But France was not only the epitome of good manners for the Russian nobility. "The influence of the French literature of the Enlightenment, V. O. Ključevskij pointed out, was infused on a grand scale into the Russian nobility throughout Catherine's reign (Ključevskij 1958, 174). The educational monopoly of the French tutor was preserved in aristocratic families.

In the late 18th century there began an exodus to Russia of French émigrés forced to abandon their homeland. New tutors of young Russian noblemen appeared on the scene: the free-thinking tutor was replaced by the reactionary Catholic priest.

Characterizing the social attitudes of the Russian aristocracy in regard to French, Academician V. V. Vinogradov said: "For the upper Russian society in the 18th century the ideal of speechways was the French salon of the pre-revolutionary epoch" (Vinogradov 1938, 173).

The influence of French culture and the French language on the nobility and, in particular, the aristocratic society was preserved after the Patriotic War. Typical of the sentiments of those Russian noblemen who tried to get rid of French orientation was the poem written in 1814 by Aksakov, who felt disappointed in his hopes that "we shall be ashamed of imitation and will turn to Russian for emulation" and complained that "though victorious, we are mentally in bondage and curse the French in their own language" (Ključevskij 1958, 247).

This is how V. O. Ključevskij defines the difference between the generation of Russian noblemen described by Leo Tolstoy in his novel and their fathers: "Their fathers were Russians who passionately wanted to be French; the sons were French-educated who passionately wanted to be Russians" (Ključevskij 1958, 249).

Such are, in brief, the sociocultural facts that exerted some influence on the development and spread of Russian-French bilingualism. Let us examine some of its specific features as reflected in the speech of War and Peace characters.

In Tolstoy's novel the language choice in the speech of the characters is, as a rule, strictly motivated. It is largely based on "code switching". At the same time, there are some embedded foreign elements, Russian lexemes and phrases in a French text or French lexemes and phrases in a Russian environment. Let us examine some of them;

"God knows, cher amie! Those rich people and grandees are so selfish (quoted from L. N. Tolstoy, Voina i mir, Moscow, 1957, 62)."
“Ma foi, he said, tomorrow we shall see everything on the battlefield” (336).

Such embedded elements are usually set phrases, appelations like mon cher, cher ami or introductory phrases like ma foi which do not carry the basic information. At the same time, they perform a certain social function: sometimes these are courtesy formulas, determined by the social etiquette and by the social situation, and sometimes these French expressions play the role of social identifiers, serving as markers of the communicants’ association with fashionable society, a symbol of their social identity just as Spanish elements, embedded in the English speech of contemporary Chicanos indicate their ethnic identity and perform the function of their ethnic identifiers (Gumperz 1971, 318).

In fact, embedded French elements of the above type occur in the Russian speech of Russian-French bilinguals only when they communicate with people of a more or less equal social status. Characteristically, they do not occur not only in communication with lower classes but also in situations where there is a considerable social distance between the communicants.

A different function is performed by embedded Russian phrases in French speech. They are more frequently used to fill denotational or expressive gaps, i.e. in cases when the speaker cannot find the French equivalent for the Russian lexeme conveying the same notion or the same expressive-stylistic overtones: on dit, le pravoslavnoje (the Russian Orthodox) est terrible pour le pillage (201).

Here the speaker is clearly unable to find the French equivalent for the Russian pravoslavnoje (abridged from pravoslavnoje vojsko, the Russian Orthodox army), an equivalent that would not only cover the same notion but would also carry the same ironical connotation in this context.

However, embedded foreign phrases cannot be regarded as code switching, inasmuch as they perform an obviously auxiliary role and do not serve as the basic medium of transmitting information.

In the case of embedded foreign elements, isolated linguistic units (lexemes), set phrases, etc., are used as sociolinguistic variables, while in code switching the function of sociolinguistic variables is performed by entire codes, i.e. different language systems. Social information in that case is carried not by an isolated linguistic sign, but by the very fact of preferring one code to another.

Let us examine the following episode:

“Bien faite et la beauté du diable”, said the man and, on seeing Rostov, fell silent and frowned:

“What do you want? A petition?”
"Qu'est ce que c'est?", asked somebody from another room.
"Encore un petitionnaire", answered the man with suspenders”.
"Tell him to come later”. He's coming out. Let's get going”.
"Not now, tomorrow. Too late" (525).

The first remark is a fragment of an intimate conversation between two aides of Alexander I. The conversation is in French, signalling both the role relations of the speakers (apparently friends, possibly from the same regiment) and their social status (both belong to the beau monde). Nikolaj Rostov, who entered the room, interrupted their conversation. Switching to Russian (What do you want?) testifies to an entirely different type of role relation (official – petitioner) and, at the same time, is a reaction to the uncertain social status of the stranger. Then comes an exchange of remarks in French. Switching to French underscores the social barrier between the officers and the stranger. And, finally, the remark *Tell him...* addressed not only to the fellow officer, but also to the stranger, is in Russian.

Considerable influence on code switching is exerted by the topic and the communicative domain. This reflects the distribution of communicative domains and, consequently, of social functions between the languages interacting in a bilingual situation.

Associated with the Royal Court and fashionable society, French is more frequently used by the War and Peace characters when the conversation revolves around the topics usually discussed by the Court. In such cases the topic component becomes “stronger” than other components of the communicative event (for instance, role relations, setting and status). For example, “the Little Princess” (Andrej Bolkonskij’s wife) discusses the Court news in French in her father-in-law's house, although her interlocutor (the old Prince) obviously prefers Russian. In response to his father's request to inform him of the plans of military operations, Prince Andrej starts talking in Russian (this is the language he generally uses when speaking to his father), “at first reluctantly, but then warming up more and more in the middle of the story and lapsing into French by force of habit”. This seems to be a reaction to the topic developed by the Prince during the years he had spent at the Court.

It is apparently the rejection of everything associated with the Royal Court and the renunciation of its spiritual and social values that explains why the old Prince Bolkonskij uses French only when speaking to milie Bourienne, i.e. when it is inevitable.
Formerly one of St. Petersburg's Upper Ten, the old Prince Bolkonskij found himself out of favour and extended his dislike for the Court and fashionable society to the language which symbolized Court life for him.

Quite a different case was Prince Vasilij Kuragin who "spoke that refined French which our grandfathers not only spoke, but in which they thought" (6). It is not surprising that French dominated in nearly all situations in the speech of this "man, who had grown old in the beau monde and at the Court".

Prince Vasilij and the old Prince Bolkonskij are poles apart, and one should look in between for an average pattern of relations between Russian and French among the Russian nobility in the early 19th century and social attitudes towards these languages.

There are close interrelations between the social determinants governing the verbal behaviour of bilinguals. For example, the social values and social attitudes in relation to the codes used in a bilingual situation frequently determine the character of speech situations, the role relations associated with them, and when the use of a certain code is acceptable. The cluster of social values (good manners, civility, refinement) which, as follows from the above brief historical survey, was associated in Russia in the late 18th and the early 19th centuries with French culture was extended to the French language. It is no coincidence that in the situations and role relations where these values receded into the background or ceased to be relevant Russian dominated. It is precisely for this reason that French turned out to be inappropriate in quarrels, sharp squabbles and other episodes in which the interlocutors discarded surface polish and tried to insult and humiliate each other:

"You...you...are a scoundrel. I am challenging you to a duel", he said and got up, pushing the chair aside (400).

"A disgusting woman!", the Princess cried out, suddenly rushing at Anna Mikhajlovna and gripping the portfolio (110).

Similarly French gives way to Russian during an intimate conversation, when conventions of the fashionable society become irrelevant for the interlocutors. Thus in the salon of Anna Pavlovna Scherer, Pierre and Prince Andrej converse in French, but during a candid face-to-face conversation they naturally switch to Russian. The Russian language seems to be associated with the cluster of values opposed to the beau monde conventions — with simplicity, candour, sincerity and spontaneity.

In terms of the value orientation of the society portrayed by Tolstoy, the Russian lower-class vernacular was the antipode of the refined French speech of
the smart set. The contrast of values associated with these language systems largely underlies the humorous effect, achieved by L. Tolstoy in portraying Shinshin:

“Well, my dear Sir, mon très honorable Alphons Karlovich”, Shinshin said, laughing and combining — as he was wont to do — the most common Russian folk expressions with refined French phrases.

“Vous comptez vous faire des rentes sur l'état, do you want to line your pockets running your company? (76).

“A German can thresh grain even on the head of an axe, comme dit le proverbe . . .” (= a German can use anything for his benefit) (77).

“Connaissez-vous le proverbe: why didn’t you stay at home, Eryoma, grinding your spindles?” (= why didn’t you mind your own business?), Shinshin said, wrinkling his nose and smiling.

“Cela nous convient à merveille” (82).

It should be noted that some attitudes in relation to French or rather in relation to the very fact of its use have been retained to this day, though, needless to say, Russian-French bilingualism as a social phenomenon associated with social stratification, has long become a thing of the past. Cf. the use of a similar satirical device based on a contrast of conflicting values in a novel by the Strugatsky brothers, depicting a certain Doctor of Science Vybegalo, whose speech is a queer combination of French phrases, on the one hand, and Russian dialect and substandard expressions, on the other:

“Give ma a buzz, mon cher. And if he starts biting you, slap him on the kisser, don’t hesitate. C’est la vie. (A. und B. Strugatsky, Monday begins on Saturday, Moscow, 1965, 81).

The above examples demonstrate an obvious violation of co-occurrence rules. The co-occurrence of French phrases and the Russian vernacular is equivalent in its effect to the so-called “confusion of styles” in a monolingual text.

In addition to the above cases, where the choice of a code is determined by the combined effect of the social or sociopsychological determinants of a communicative event, there are also cases which may well be described as expressive code switching. For example:

He summoned Pierre and told him: “Mon cher, si vous vous conduisez ici, comme à Pétersbourg, vous finirez très mal, c'est tout ce que je vous dis. The count is seriously ill! You should not see him at all (98--99).

“And what do they say about me?”, Pierre said, his face breaking into a carefree merry smile.
"What am I? Je suis un bâtard". And he suddenly turned purple. It was clear that he made a great effort to say it (40).

In both examples code switching performs an expressive function and is used to emphasize a certain part of the utterance. It should be noted that this function is not performed by any particular code (i.e. Russian or French), but by the very fact of code switching. In the first instance, French in Prince Vasilij's speech forms the stylistically neutral background, against which a sudden switching to Russian acquires a particular expressive force. In the second instance the reverse is the case. A French phrase is included in the Russian text for contrastive emphasis. The word bâtard serves as an additional source of expression. Such code switching is sometimes called "metaphoric" (Gumperz 1971, 343). Indeed, a foreign-language expression, as may be seen from the above examples, is placed in an unusual context, just as a verbal metaphor is used in an unusual contextual environment.

Similar trends are revealed in analysing the dynamic aspect of diglossia, i.e. in studying it in terms of sociolinguistic variables determined by the parameters of the communicative event. The determinants in this case include likewise social roles, status, topic, communicative domain and more often than not certain combinations of these factors, sometimes reinforcing each other and sometimes operating in the opposite direction. We shall cite some examples from the book by John Fowles, The Magus (Triad/Panther 1977). One of the characters, Mitford, a former army captain (1), uses slang to minimize the social distance between himself and the narrator, an Oxonian and a brigadeer's son (2). The narrator, for his part, keeps his social distance by refusing to switch to a more informal register. His speech shows no deviations from Standard English and reveals no markers of solidarity or intimate relationship. In this case we witness an asymmetrical code-switching pattern somewhat similar to the asymmetrical ty/vy (Friedrich 1972). Dialogue sample:

"They speak English?" (1).

"Most of 'em speak Frog. There's the Greek chap who teaches English with you. Cocky little bastard". (2)

"No talent on the island?" (1).

"Nix, old boy. Women are about the ugliest in the Aegean". (2). (pp. 44-45).

"But I thought he did something rather fine during the resistance" (1).

"Not on your nelly. Actually he did a deal with the Germans" (2).

"What's it matter? (1).
... "All damned absurd..." Bit browned off at the school" (2) (pp. 611—612).

As may be seen from the above examples, Mitford's speech is interspersed with such slang expressions as Frog, cocky, nix, not on your nelly, browned off, etc. It is significant that the narrator does not conceal his ironical attitude to Mitford's speech: "He had tried hard to acquire the triune personality of the philhellene in fashion — gentleman, scholar, thug — but he spoke with a second-hand accent and the clipped, sparse prep-schoolisms of a Viscount Montgomery (p. 43).

In this case the relative status of communicants proves to be stronger than role expectations. Mitford's former military status lingers on both in his appearance and in his speech. "He had a dark young-officer moustache which he kept on touching, and he wore a dark-blue blazer, with a regimental tie. He reeked mufti..." (p. 43). Cf. his use of military jargon: "Not my type. Rather marked the other for my area of ops" (p. 611).

"O.K., we go to bed at eleven, I sit round waiting for zero-hour".

"Operation Midnight Swim was going to be cancelled for a more important exercise." (p. 613).

As distinct from bilingualism, when the linguistic codes themselves, used in different social situations, are the sociolinguistic variables, in diglossia, where the boundaries between the varieties of the same code are sometimes blurred, some elements of linguistic subsystems frequently become sociolinguistic variables. In the above example the situational variables are lexemes, set phrases and some syntactic patterns (an abundance of elliptical sentences), etc.

Just as in bilingualism, in diglossia the above-mentioned "expressive switching" may sometimes take place. Cf. the following typical examples of expressive switching from Standard English to Black English from Gumperz 1971, 327:

(1) You can tell me how your mother worked twenty hours a day and I can sit here and cry. I mean I can cry and I can feel for you. But as long as I don't get up and make sure that I and my children don't go through the same, I ain't did nothing for you, brother. That's what I am talking about.

(2) Now Michael is making a point that everything that happens in the house affects all the kids. It does. And Michael and you makin' a point, too. Kids suppos' to learn how to avoid these things. But let me tell you. We're all in here. We talkin' but you see.

In the first example switching to Black English is indicated by the double negative in the phrase I ain't did nothing and in the second by copula deletion
in the phrases *you makin' a point, kids suppose' to learn, we talkin'*. The swit­
ching is aimed at the emphatic emphases of the appropriate segments of the text. Both examples are excerpts from a conversation between a Black social worker with a command of Standard English and a group of Black teenagers, native to Black English.

By way of summing up it should be noted that a comprehensive description of the social aspects of bilingualism and diglossia can only be obtained by combining a static approach aimed at revealing the relations between the coexisting and interacting languages and dialects, and a dynamic approach oriented towards analyzing the effect of social and sociopsychological factors on verbal activity. One of the major aspects of the dynamic approach to the study of bilingualism and diglossia is the establishment of the hierarchy of these factors with due regard for the relative "strength" of each of them in any particular situation. An effective sociolinguistic analysis of bilingualism and diglossia (including a synchronic analysis) is hardly possible if it disregards the sociohistorical conditions of their development.

2. Typology of language situations

It is advisable to begin this section with definitions. What is a language situa­
tion? Linguists define it in different ways. According to C. A. Ferguson, the term *language situation* applies to the overall configuration of language use at a certain time and at a certain place and includes such data as the number and type of languages used in the area, the number of speakers as well as the circumstances in which they use them and the attitudes and opinions concerning these languages among community members (Ferguson 1971, 157). A somewhat different definition of a language situation may be found in (Nikolsky 1967): "the interrelation of functionally stratified idioms changes in time and under the influence of the society and language policy. It is therefore a certain process. This process falls into a number of states. Each of these states is what may be called a "language situation" " (Nikolsky 1967, 126).

Later on L. B. Nikolsky somewhat modified his definition, using the concept of "forms of language existence" (standard language, territorial and social dialects, occupational jargons, etc.). In a monolingual society a language situation is defined as a system of functionally distributed forms of language existence related to the continuum of language communication, while in a multilingual society it is defined as a similar system where, instead of different forms of existen-
ce of a single language, functional distribution applies to various languages, which may have functional "ranks" of interethnic, regional and local communication media, serve the elite or the broad masses (Nikolsky 1974, 62). A similar interpretation of language situation may be found in Avrorin (1973b), where the language situation is defined as the functional aspect of language, i.e. the character of functioning of various language existence forms, determined by social conditions, and their interaction with other languages in all spheres of life of a specific ethnic community.

If we compare Nikolsky's definitions with Ferguson's, it may seem that Ferguson's definition is more detailed and more concrete, for it actually includes a list of the constituent features of a language situation. Yet this is not really the case, for a list does not in itself constitute a definition. A definition should reveal the most essential distinctive features. In this respect the two definitions by L. B. Nikolsky (and they, in our view, do not exclude, but mutually complement each other) have an unquestionable advantage: they reflect more precisely the most essential features of the concept.

Indeed, an overall configuration of language use is a vague and unclear formula, and even the list of specific problems involved in a study of a language situation does not make the concept sufficiently clear.

There is another advantage to L. B. Nikolsky's definitions: they may be applied both to a multilingual and monolingual society, whereas Ferguson in his definitions implies different languages only.

According to Nikolsky's definition, the terms language state and language situation are synonymous.

Yet G. V. Stepanov draws a distinction between these terms. According to his definition, a language state (jazykovoje sostojanie, cf. the French l'etat de langue) is a paradigmatic set of elements forming the functional system of a language (dialects, standard languages, national varieties), interacting or not interacting with one another, while a language situation is the relation of a language or its part to other languages or parts of the same language manifested in various spatial and social interactions (i.e. syntagmatically) (Stepanov 1976, 317). Both the language state and the language situation form the structural basis of the external (functional) language system. The essential merit of Stepanov's model is that it extends to sociolinguistics the dichotomy of paradigmatics and syntagmatics, well established in linguistics proper, and lays the foundation for the integration of interactionist (syntagmatic) and static (paradigmatic) analysis of language situations.
In defining a language situation there is a need for a generic concept which would embrace both a language and any of its varieties (standard language, dialect, subdialect, etc.) serving the community. Some authors use the term *idiom*, defined by D. Brozovič as "general, qualitatively and hierarchically neutral, i.e. having no specific meaning" (Brozovič 1967, 3—5).

Further on we shall apply the conceptual system proposed in the preceding chapter in connection with an analysis of the conceptual framework of sociolinguistics. The most general concept that could be used as a basis for the definition of the language situation is that of a sociocommunicative system, including the totality of language systems and subsystems used by the community. Various dialects and subdialects used by the community in a monolingual situation, as well as different languages forming a sociocommunicative system in a bilingual or multilingual situation, are components of a sociocommunicative system or sociocommunicative subsystems.

In defining a language situation we can use as a basis L. B. Nikolsky's formulation which, in our view, could be somewhat extended by including some additional features in it. First of all, it seems that a language situation could be interpreted not only as a sociofunctional distribution, but also as a hierarchy of sociocommunicative systems and their components (subsystems).

Besides the definition should point to the subjective aspect of the language situation. In discussing the conceptual framework of sociolinguistics we pointed out that a sociolinguistic analysis of language and speech variation has two aspects: objective, which includes objective data concerning the social differentiation of language and subjective, including the value orientation of language community members. It seems that the reference in C. A. Ferguson's definition to the attitude of community members to the languages (and, we shall add, subsystems of the same language) coexisting in the area should be part of the definition of a language situation.

In other words, in most general terms a language situation may be defined as a pattern of sociofunctional distribution and hierarchy of sociocommunicative systems and subsystems, coexisting and interacting within a political-administrative unit or cultural area during a certain period as well as the social attitudes of language and speech community members to these systems and subsystems.

A description of language situations is one of the urgent problems of sociolinguistics. The solution of this problem, as L. B. Nikolsky correctly pointed out, is of great practical significance, since it makes it possible to reveal the basis and character of the nation's language policy and evaluate the prospects of a certain
political line in relation to language as well as to predict the trends of the nation’s language life (Nikolsky 1967, 125).

In order to solve this problem it is necessary, first of all, to develop a single metalanguage for the typological description of language situations. One of the first attempts to elaborate a metalanguage of language situation typology was made by W. Stewart in his *Outline of Linguistic Typology for Describing Multilingualism* (Stewart 1962). He singles out four language features that affect social attitudes to languages:

I. Historicity, i.e. the formation of language in the course of its development in its development in the conditions of its natural functioning, its links with a national and ethnic tradition.

II. Standardization, i.e. the existence of codified grammatical and lexical language norms.

III. Vitality, determined by the existence of a community for which this language is native.

IV. Homogeneity, determined by the fact that the basic lexicon of the language and its grammatical structure go back to a single, earlier stage of its development.

On the basis of these parameters Stewart developed the following language typology:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Features</th>
<th>Language type</th>
<th>Symbol</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I II III IV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ + + + -</td>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ + - +</td>
<td>Classical</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ - + +</td>
<td>Vernacular</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ - + -</td>
<td>Creole</td>
<td>K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ - - -</td>
<td>Pidgin</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Standard (S) and classical (C) languages enjoy the highest prestige. Their codified norms, based on literary standards, ensure considerable homogeneity in their functional use. A standard language may be illustrated by English in the oral and written speech of the educated and a classical language by literary Arabic. The difference between classical and standard languages lies in the fact that classical languages are not native to their users. Vernacular languages (V) which lack codified norms usually enjoy lesser prestige than standard and classical languages. This category includes, among other things, the tribal languages of Africa and America as well as idioms close to the standard, but having no codified grammars or lexicons of their own (for instance, the Yorkshire dialect of English or colloquial Arabic in Egypt).

The creole languages (K) and Pidgins (P) are formed as auxiliary languages of broad communication in certain types of social and language contacts by drawing on grammatical and lexical material from different sources. A Pidgin is an earlier stage in the formation of such a language when it is used merely as a second language, while a Creole language represents a later stage when it becomes a native language to a considerable part of the population. A Pidgin that has become a Creole language is, for instance, Neomelanesian (or “Melanesian Pidgin”).

Another typological feature used to describe a language situation is the function performed by a language as a medium of communication. Stewart singles out the following functions: official (o), the use of language in political and state administration, group (g), the use of language within an ethnic or sociocultural group, wide communication (w), the use of language as a lingua franca for cross-language communication within a nation; educational (e), the use of a language, other than official, as a medium of instruction within the education system; literary (l), the use of a language, other than official, in belles-lettres or science; religious (r), the use of a language in religious rites, technical (t), the use of a language to provide access to international scientific and technical literature.

Moreover, Stewart’s typology envisages diglossia between language systems. To designate diglossia a tilda is used. A higher prestige language appears first: language A ~ language B. It should be pointed out that Stewart’s typology draws no distinction as a matter of principle between languages and varieties of the same language. In both cases the term language is used.

It may be seen from the above that the most essential feature of W. Stewart’s sociolinguistic typology is the functional differentiation of language systems. Stewart uses two indices: the type and function of a language system. Taxonomies based on merely one or two features are inevitably one-sided and therefore
cannot provide a comprehensive description of language situations. Since a comparison of these situations reveals a fairly wide spectrum of distinctive features, it is necessary to work out a multi-aspectual and multidimensional scale that could at least reflect the most essential features determining the relationships and hierarchy of sociocommunicative systems and subsystems within the area.

This is precisely the aim of the multi-aspectual taxonomy proposed by Ferguson and representing a further development of the classification principles elaborated by Stewart. This taxonomy, including entire segments from Stewart's classification, will be further referred to as the Stewart-Ferguson typology. It is intended for a description of diverse situations and therefore merits a detailed examination.

First of all, it should be borne in mind that the Stewart-Ferguson taxonomy includes a series of subgroups, for each of which there is a group of indices characterizing certain language systems and the relation between them. Abbreviations of these indices are indicated in parentheses.

Needless to say, not all language systems and subsystems may be reflected in a sociolinguistic typology. The role of some of them in the process of communication between members of society is so marginal that they may well be disregarded in describing a language situation. Those that really determine the language situation may be subdivided into the following categories, depending on their sociocommunicative role: major languages (L maj), minor languages (L min) and special languages (L spec).

Major languages include those that are native to at least 25% of the population or languages whose speakers exceed 1 million, official languages or languages so widely used in instruction that they are spoken by at least 50% of secondary school graduates. A major language may meet just one of the above-mentioned conditions. For instance, Quechua in Bolivia is spoken by approximately one third of the population, but it is not an official language of the country. On the other hand, Irish is one of the official languages of Ireland, but it is spoken by considerably less than 25% of the population.

Minor languages include those spoken by 5 to 25% of the population or at least 100,000 (for example, Basque in Spain).

Extremely diverse is the group of special languages, including languages widely used in religious rites, for instance, Pali in Ceylon, in belles-lettres (for instance, "classical" Chinese on Taiwan), those taught as a special discipline in
most of the secondary schools (for example, French in Spain) and widely spoken by a certain age group (Japanese on Taiwan).

On the basis of the above taxonomy the language situation may be reduced to a simple formula. For example, in Spain there are two major languages (Spanish, the official language, widely used in communication throughout the country, and Catalanian, native to 5 million in the North-East, one minor language, Basque, spoken by about 800,000 in the North and two special languages, Latin (the language of the Catholic church) and French, studied in secondary schools. All these facts may be summed up in the following formula: 5L = 2L maj + 1L min + 2L spec.

In Ferguson's opinion this formula may be considered adequate in case it is supplemented by information concerning the types and functions of the relevant languages. This information is contained in Stewart's typology, included in the Stewart-Ferguson taxonomy in a somewhat modified shape.

Ferguson takes into consideration the function of international communication (i), associated with the use of language outside the country, and the function (s), associated with the study of the language as one of the school disciplines.

In other words, the complete formula of the language situation in Spain would be:

5L = 2L maj (So, Sg) + 1L min (Vg) + 2L spec (Cr, Ss).

This formula should be read as follows: the language situation in the country is characterized by the existence of five languages, of which there are two major languages (one is a standard language, performing an official function, and the other a standard language in a group function), one minor language (vernacular in a group function) and two special languages (a classic language, used in religious rites, and a standard language, studied at schools).

In other words, the above classification seems to make it possible to describe in a concise manner the language situation with the aid of a series of alphabetical and digital indices.

And yet the Stewart-Ferguson typology has a number of essential weaknesses that have attracted the attention of Soviet sociolinguists (Švejcer 1970, 40–46; Švejcer 1971, 74–80; Katagoščina 1972, 70–72). First of all, it seems that some of the concepts postulated are based on a mechanical combination of heterogeneous features. This includes such categories as major languages, minor languages and special languages. Indeed, the division of languages into major and minor
ones is based on a somewhat arbitrary combination of quantitative and qualitative criteria. For example, the same category (major languages) includes such languages, entirely different in the scope of their social functions, as, say, Spanish and Catalonian in Spain and Irish in Ireland. It is not clear on what basis the performance by a language of the functions of an official language is equated in its social significance to a certain number of its speakers.

Another essential weakness of this typology is that it takes into account merely the official status of a language, but not its actual status in society. For instance, it is clear from the above-mentioned formula for Spain that two of the languages used in the country are major, but it is not at all clear that one of them (Spanish) plays a dominant role in all the domains of social life. It is true that the formula indicates that Spanish alone has the status of an official language, but this is clearly insufficient.

Another more serious miscalculation of this taxonomy is that it fails to take into account the social hierarchy of the language systems described, limiting itself merely to their functional hierarchy (vernacular, language of wide communication, etc.). Yet the problem of the social hierarchy of language systems cannot be solved without due regard for the hierarchy of language or speech communities using these systems. As a key concept in this connection one can use the concept of nation in its Marxist interpretation, which is the point of intersection of two conceptual series: the series including the social categories within a nation (from a small group to the nation as a whole) and the series including ethnosocial categories (people, ethnic group, tribe). The use of the former conceptual series makes it possible to clarify the hierarchy of such systems as argot, subdialect, dialect, dialect group and national language. The latter conceptual series underlies the differentiation of such concepts as national language, language of an ethnic group, and the people’s language.

In this connection one may disagree with D. Brozović, who in his interesting article on the typology of standard languages (Brozović 1967, 9) cited above expresses some doubts about the possibility of taking into account in this typology such concepts as the language of an ethnic group, a people’s language and the language of a nation, because in sociology there is no reliable and terminologically precise system of concepts making possible a precise differentiation of such categories as an ethnic group, people and nation and their correlation with linguistic categories.

In Marxist sociology such concepts as tribe, ethnic group and nation are viewed, as is known, in a historical context and associated with certain socio-
economic formations. The most essential features of these concepts revealed in the writings of K. Marx, F. Engels and V. I. Lenin were reflected in the system of their linguistic correlates developed by Soviet linguists and, in particular, in such a category, widely used in our sociolinguistic literature, as *national language* (Filin 1970, 141). Needless to say, the boundaries between different types of ethnic communities (tribe and ethnic group, ethnic group and nation), as A. T. Baziev and M. I. Isaev correctly point out in their above-mentioned book (Baziev & Isaev 1973, 29) are somewhat flexible and relative, and for this reason the term *people* is frequently used in the literature as a generic concept to denote any ethnic community. This does not mean, however, that in elaborating sociolinguistic typologies one can avoid correlations with the basic socioethnic categories. It is far from irrelevant to a sociolinguist whether the language in question is the language of a tribe, an ethnic group, or a nation.

It is typical of the above taxonomy that its authors fail to raise the question of social hierarchy not only in regard to different types of languages, but also in regard to varieties of the same language. As was mentioned above, the term *language* is used not only in regard to the national language, but also in regard to its dialects.

Soviet linguists contributed to sociolinguistics the concept of a national language, based on a Marxist interpretation of a nation and viewed not as a timeless category, but as a historical one, arising in the conditions of economic and political concentration characterizing the development of nations (Žirmunskij 1968, 27). The fundamental unity of a national language does not imply its complete homogeneity. Soviet scholars regard a national language as a "system of systems". Its polar varieties are the standard language with its numerous functional-stylistic ramifications, written and oral forms, and the dialect language in its socioterritorial variation (Avanesov, and Orlova 1965).

There are several fundamental differences between the standard language as the apex of the national language and the dialect. These differences involve the very forms of the existence of these language systems. The standard language is characterized by a complex interaction of its written and oral forms, while dialects essentially gravitate towards oral speech. The standard language is characterized by a diversity of its functional domains. It is the language of culture, science, journalism and belles-lettres. As for the dialects, they are mainly used in everyday communication. As distinct from the dialect, the standard language is characterized by a codified norm. The sociocommunicative role of the standard
language is much broader than that of the dialect. As a supradialectal form, it serves not only as a medium of communication among standard language speakers, but is frequently used for interdialect communication.

Hence the legitimate conclusion about the dominant role of the standard language in the national language structure and about the standard language, closely associated with the popular colloquial language and having a broad social basis and wide communicative functions, as the most essential qualitative feature of the national language (Guxman 1960).

As is known, standard languages existed even in the prenational epoch, although their sociocommunicative role was different. It is therefore advisable to include in the sociolinguistic typology of language situations the term national standard language to denote the standard language forming the functional nucleus of the national language.

Moreover, the conceptual system of sociolinguistic typology should be supplemented by such categories as national language variant and standard language variant, first elaborated by Soviet linguists (Riesel 1962; Stepanov 1963; Švejcer 1963; Domašenev 1967; Švejcer 1978). A standard language variant is a variety of the standard language limited to a certain national area (for instance, Standard English in the U.S.A, Standard German in Austria, Standard French in Canada, Standard Spanish in Argentina, etc.). A standard language variant is related to the dialects found in the same area in exactly the same way as the standard language is related to the dialects within the language serving a single nation. It follows that between standard language variants and dialects there are close bilateral relations of the same character as are generally observed between the standard language and dialects (i.e., on the one hand, the intrusion of the standard language into dialect speech, and, on the other, the “promotion” of certain dialect features and their penetration into the standard language).

The totality of the standard language variant and the dialects and semidialects used by the nation forms the national language variant just as in a language situation where a language serves a single nation a similar combination forms a national language.

By way of summing up let us try to single out the parameters that could underlie the typology of language situations.

First of all, there is the social status of the language, variant, dialect, etc., i.e. their position in relation to the other idioms used by the society. As was indicated above, it is necessary to distinguish between the official (legal) status and the
actual status of a language system. The former is determined by the legally sanctioned position of the language or its variety, while the latter by the totality of characteristics which may serve to indicate its actual position in the society (the number of speakers as compared to other language communities, their sociodemographic characteristics, the range of functional use, bilingualism or diglossia among its users, the actual implementation of its official status). Sometimes the official status of a language corresponds to its actual status. For instance, in the U.S.A. the official status of English fully corresponds to its actual dominant position. At the same time, in Finland, where officially Finnish and Swedish are equal to each other, the language situation is characterized by the Finnish language acquiring the primary role. This is, among other things, demonstrated by the fact that it is precisely among the Swedish population that bilingualism is more widespread (Eliseev 1972). The actual status of language systems may be characterized in terms of relations between them (equality, subordination, independence, dependence, etc.).

Extremely important are the parameters associated with the scope and character of social functions. It seems possible to use several conceptual series reflecting different aspects of this problem. According to Ju. D. Dešeriev, the scope of social functions is determined by the use of a sociocommunicative system in different domains of human activity (Dešeriev 1973, 21—24). A different view was held by V. A. Avrorin, who insisted on a more precise differentiation of the social functions of language and the domains of its use (Avrorin 1970, 7—8).

In describing a language situation one must take into account the sociocommunicative role of each language system and subsystem functioning within a politico-administrative unit. The sociocommunicative role determines the scope of the functioning of each system (of a language, variant or dialect) inside or outside the language or speech community. The concept of a language of wide communication, used by Stewart in his typology, is not sufficiently differentiated and actually equates regional languages and languages of international communication. It is advisable to use the conceptual series including such categories as medium of local communication, medium of regional communication and medium of international communication. In some cases the same language system may simultaneously reveal several features. Thus Russian, a medium of interethnic communication for the peoples of the U.S.S.R., is simultaneously a medium of international communication. Tadjik is a medium of local communication for
Tadjiks as well as a medium of regional communication for the small ethnic groups of the Pamir area.

Of special interest in this respect is the concept of an intermediary language, i.e. a language used for communication by a heterolinguistic population. It is helpful to differentiate this concept, as V. A. Černyšev does (Černyšev 1968, 208—211) on the one hand, he singles out macrointermediary languages, serving all or the basic strata of a heterolinguistic population in all or most important communication domains, and, on the other, microintermediary languages, serving relatively small population groups only in certain relatively narrow communicative domains. In Černyšev’s opinion, in regard to most multinational countries of Asia and Africa, with perhaps such rare exceptions as Bahasa Indonesia, one can safely say that they have not yet developed a macrointermediary language, such as Russian in the U.S.S.R., but have several microintermediary languages (for example, English, Hindi and Sanskrit in India).

Ju. D. Dešeriev correctly points out the connection between the communicative role of languages and the scope of the functions they perform. In his classification the widest range of social functions is performed by languages of international and interethnic communication (Dešeriev 1968, 78—80). Yet there appears to be no rigid one-to-one relation between the range of social functions and the sociocommunicative role. After all, the media of international communication may also include such artificial languages as Esperanto, used in a relatively narrow domain, and even dead languages, such as Latin. Besides, it should be borne in mind that a language of international communication may have just one specific function (cf. the use of French in diplomacy in pre-war Europe).

The group of parameters characterizing the social functions of language includes those which reflect its so-called symbolic functions — P. Garvin’s term (Garvin 1964, 521). These are some functions performed by language in exerting some influence on social life. It was pointed out in Chapter I that language is not only a passive reflection of social processes, but may be also viewed as an active social factor, influencing society. This implied, among other things, those symbolic functions which P. Garvin attributes to the standard language: unifying, separating and prestigious. The unifying function is performed by the standard language in uniting speakers of various dialects within a single community oriented toward the standard. The separating function singles out the community and opposes it to other communities. The prestigious function is determined by the social prestige of the standard language speakers.
Needless to say, the unifying role of the national standard language is extremely great. It is well known that the areas of closely related languages in some cases form a continuum (for example, Russian and Byelorussian, Polish and Czech, German and Dutch). In such cases orientation towards a certain standard language in addition to cultural-historical orientation frequently plays a major role in the ethnic self-identification of a certain community. As to the separating function, it is closely connected with the unifying function. In fact, one function presupposes the other. The unification of an ethnic group presupposes its separation from others.

At the same time, it is hardly possible to examine the prestigious function in the same series as the unifying and separating functions. After all, the unifying and separating functions actually reflect the feedback between language and society, while the concept of social prestige reflects the attitudes of the community in relation to the language and the value orientation underlying these attitudes. In other words, in using this concept, the researcher analyses the subjective aspect of the language situation. In addition to the functional hierarchy determined by the range of functions of a sociocommunicative system or subsystem, and the social hierarchy, determined by social status, it is advisable to construct prestigious hierarchies, taking into account the prestigious rank of each system coexisting in the area. In so doing one should distinguish between the prestige of a language or a dialect from the viewpoint of its speakers, on the one hand, and its prestige from the viewpoint of the speakers of other languages and dialects, on the other. These notions, as a rule, are not identical. For example, in the above-mentioned essays by Gumperz (Gumperz 1971) it is pointed out that among the speakers of Ranamål, a Norwegian dialect, this dialect enjoys a prestige equal to that of the standard language Bokmål, while for the Bokmål speakers the prestige of the standard language is much higher. On the other hand, there are cases when social evaluation of the same language system from within and from without turn out to be identical (Labov 1966).

It is also necessary to take into consideration whether the language system has the appropriate forms of written and oral speech. It is advisable in this connection to make use of the division of languages, long established in Soviet linguistics, into traditionally alphabetical, neoalphabetical and unalphabetical. This classification, as the above material demonstrates, is directly related, on the one hand, to the range of social functions of sociocommunicative systems or subsystems (the range of the social functions of unalphabetical languages is, naturally, more restricted), and, on the other, to still another group of parameters,
relevant to sociolinguistic typology — *to the cluster of functional-stylistic characteristics*. The latter comprises the totality of functional styles inherent in a language, variant or dialect. Some functional styles (for example, the language of science, belles-lettres, news media, etc.) depend for their existence on the written channel of communication.

In contemporary society the *language norm* or rather the extent of norm elaboration is an important indicator of language viability. It is particularly important to take into account the degree of norm standardization at different structural levels characterizing norm stability and, in the final analysis, the referential function of the national standard language or one of its variants. For example, the British variety of Standard English is characterized by a relatively high degree of standardization of its norm at all levels, while in American and Australian English there is a high degree of norm variation at the phonological level due to the coexistence of two (in Australian English) and several (in American English) parallel microsystems.

Although the very concept of a language situation is associated with a certain synchronic cross-section, a typological description of a language situation would be incomplete without any reference to certain trends of development characterizing the relationships among languages, variants and dialects in their dynamics. For instance, it seems to be essential to the situation in Nigeria that the urban dialect of Kano became the basic standard form of Hausa and is supplanting other dialects (Laptuxin 1965, 120). The situation in the English-speaking countries is characterized by the expansion of American English into other English-language areas which is manifested, among other things, in the accelerated infiltration of Americanisms into other varieties of English.

It should be borne in mind that the existence of each language situation is predetermined by many factors: linguistic, cultural-historical, demographic, geographic, economic, sociohistorical and political (primarily, by the language policy carried out by the state in solving national-language problems) (Arutjunjan et al 1972, 231). Due regard for the entire diversity of these factors which directly and indirectly influence the linguistic situation, seems to be quite indispensable. Needless to say, not all of them may be reduced to a simple set of indices, as in the Stewart-Ferguson formula. After all, a linguistic situation is formed not by a mere sum of certain elements. What is necessary is a study of the diverse determinants of the language situation in their interaction. Therefore reductionism, on which this formula is based, inevitably involves the loss of some valuable information.
It seems that at the present stage of the theoretical elaboration of the language situation problem it is important to equip the researchers with an extremely detailed scale of clearly and unambiguously defined indices, making it possible not only to describe a certain specific language situation, but also to obtain comparable data as a result of describing several situations. The elaboration of such a scale is one of the urgent problems of sociolinguistics.

3. Language policy and language engineering

This section is organically connected with the preceding one. After all, a language policy is not only one of the major factors forming a language situation, but also one of its essential aspects. At the same time, there are many unresolved controversial problems in the theory of language policy. First of all, it is necessary to clarify the very concept of language policy, to determine its relation to such concepts as language engineering and language planning. As M. I. Isaev correctly points out (Isaev 1973, 21—22), it is advisable to differentiate these terms, although they denote concepts very close to each other.

In the studies where these terms appear as synonyms they are generally used in the sense of a deliberate and goal-directed influence on language. Yet the validity of such usage arouses serious doubts. For instance, N. A. Katagoščina sees the main weakness of this definition in the fact that it does not make it clear whether "influence on language" implies influence on it as a functional entity or influence on language as a structural entity (Katagoščina 1974, 34—40). Since language policy is a variety of policy in general, and the latter usually implies not any activity, but that of a certain subject (the government or some social group, party, class, etc.), the concept of language policy should be restricted with respect to its subject.

This is precisely what V. A. Avrorin does in defining language policy as follows: "A system of measures of deliberately regulating influence on the functional aspect of language and through its medium — to a certain extent — also on its structure represents the language policy of a certain social class, party or state" (Avrorin 1970, 10). It seems that this essentially acceptable definition should be supplemented by a reference to the fact that language policy is part of the overall policy of a state, social group, party or class, i.e. the activity, carried out by them in their own interest to promote their political goals.

A more restricted interpretation of language policy underlies this definition by N. A. Katagoščina: "Language policy implies a deliberate and goal-oriented
influence on language as a functional entity by measures taken in a centralized manner on a nationwide scale . . . in a certain language situation” (Katagoščina 1974, 34–40). This definition seems to lose sight of attempts at deliberate and goal-oriented influence on language, not coming from government bodies, not centralized or mandatory, but, at the same time, part of a policy of certain social forces, parties, classes, etc.

For example, analyzing the language situation in Norway, where a language conflict arising from the competition of two standard languages developed into a burning political problem, it is necessary to take into account not only the official language policy of the Norwegian government, but also the struggle of various political parties and social sections of the population for the solution of the language problem (Haugen 1966). There are sufficient reasons, therefore, to use the term language policy not only with respect to centralized measures taken by the state, but also with respect to the activity of any social forces — parties, social movements, and classes in accordance with their general political goals.

“In the conditions of the multinational state, such as the Soviet Union”, V. A. Avrorin says, “a language policy regulating the functioning of many individual languages is one of the major components of the nationalities policy. This is the place assigned to it in the writings of V. I. Lenin and in the programmatic documents of the Communist Party” (Avrorin 1970, 12). The language policy carried out in the Soviet Union embodies the Leninist principles of the nationalities’ policy: equality of nations, consistent democratism, and internationalism promoting the interests of the working people and the goals of social progress. At the same time, in certain situations a language policy may be not only part of the nationalities policy of a certain state, class or party, but also part of their political line in relation to other states or to other classes and parties within the same state.

The use of a language policy as part of the national foreign policy may be illustrated by the broad-scale activity subsidized by the U.S. government and U.S. dominated groups to disseminate English outside the English-speaking world, to maintain and expand its positions in the developing countries. It is significant that the study of the role of second languages in Asia, Africa and Latin America, undertaken by the Center of Applied Linguistics in Washington (in 1959–1961), was financed by the U.S. Government, among others, through its International Development Administration in view of its interest in some of the basic problems involved in the programs of aid in the study of English as a foreign language in a number of countries (Ferguson 1962, V). There is hardly any need to prove that
such aid is far from disinterested, but is part of a certain foreign policy line aimed at the maintenance and expansion of the U.S. positions in the so-called Third World.

One can cite many examples of a language policy carried out as part of the general political line of a certain state, class or party in a nationally homogeneous country. The object of this policy is not some nations or ethnic groups, but certain classes or social groups. Typical in this respect are situations associated with diglossia. For example, in Norway, where the language situation is characterized by the coexistence of two standard languages and a number of local dialects, the decision to set up a language commission taken by the Storting in 1951, aroused the furious opposition of the Conservative Party. The policy of this party was motivated by the fact that the Storting set the Language Commission the goal of contributing to the rapprochement of the two standard languages on the basis of Norwegian folk speech. It is precisely the orientation towards folk speech that aroused the strong opposition of a party protecting the interest of the urban bourgeoisie (Haugen 1972, 138).

In other words, a language policy is always an organic part of a certain political line, whether it be the domestic policy vis-a-vis some classes or social groups in a nationally homogeneous state or a foreign policy vis-a-vis some countries or groups of countries, or, finally, the nationalities policy in a multinational state.

Let us discuss one more aspect of the above definitions of language policy. These definitions emphasize that they deal with influence on the functional aspect of language or on language as a functional unit.

According to V. A. Avrorin, the functional aspect of language includes its "specific functions" (the function of communicating and receiving knowledge, ideological and aesthetic influence, management of work or other social processes, attempts at magic influence on occult forces, verbal control of domestic animals and mechanisms), arising from the most general function of language, i.e. its communicative function. This aspect also includes the forms of language existence (a colloquial everyday language with its division into territorial and social dialects, a standard language in its oral and written varieties, a supradialectal koine, a language of interethnic communication, a special cult language, an auxiliary artificial language) and the domains of language use.

Deliberate influence on the structural aspect of language is generally accomplished through education, literature, theater, oral propaganda and other channels of mass communication, i.e., in the final analysis, through the factors and conditions directly linked with the functional aspects of language. “In other
words”, V. A. Avrorin says, conscious will influences the structure of language only through its functional aspect, and although this influence grows as time goes on, still, as compared to spontaneous development, it is strictly limited, and its limits can hardly be exceeded in a natural language” (Avrorin 1970, 9).

One cannot but agree with the statement that the direct causes of a language policy are usually associated with the functional aspect of language, with its functioning in society, with its sociocommunicative functions and with the domain of its use. However, the solution of these problems is hardly possible without some influence on language structure. V. A. Avrorin is unquestionably right when he assigns a decisive role in the development of language structure to objective factors, not depending on man’s will. At the same time, one can hardly deny the possibility, in principle, of deliberate regulating activity aimed directly at language structure. Such deliberate and goal-directed influence on language as a structural entity, associated with the establishment of universally obligatory norms (pronouncing, orthographic, grammatical and lexical), the codification of word usage, the creation and perfection of terminology, the introduction and propagation of universally obligatory language norms is mentioned by N. A. Katagoščina, among others, who includes in her conceptual system such activity in language codification (Katagoščina 1974, 37).

Many examples of such influence are provided by the history of the languages of the peoples of the U.S.S.R. The goal of creating standard languages for preliterate peoples could not be resolved without deliberate intervention in spontaneous language processes. Thus, for instance, as D. A. Suseeva points out, “expanded functions of the Kalmyk language resulted in an enriched lexicon, changes in morphology, word-formation and syntax. In other words, as in other languages, the expanded social functions of the Kalmyk language resulted in internal structural changes” (Suseeva 1972, 260).

Several examples of deliberate regulation of language processes by society are cited by Ju. D. Dešeriev: “The dialectal basis of neoalphabetical and traditionally alphabetical languages that changed their dialect orientation during the Soviet period was established by a deliberate selection of a dialect or a group of dialects. At the same time, basic phonetic, morphological, syntactic and lexicosemantic features of developing standard languages were deliberately selected” (Dešeriev 1968, 50–60).

Nevertheless, one cannot but agree with the conclusion that the deliberate influence on language structure by society is possible only within certain limits. Disregard for this extremely important proposition results in serious metho-
dological errors which may be illustrated, in particular, by the voluntaristic theory of language control, developed by V. Tauli in his book *Introduction to a Theory of Language Planning* (Tauli 1968). In his book V. Tauli outlines a normative theory, examining the goals, principles, methods and strategy of language planning, defined as methodological activity for the adjustment and perfection of the existing languages and for the creation of new regional, national or international languages. The author seeks to formulate an ideal solution to language problems, based on an ideal norm, meeting three demands (clarity, economy and aesthetics).

In evaluating V. Tauli’s theory of language planning one must agree with the view of the Swedish scholar B. H. Jernudd and the Indian scholar J. Das Gupta who believe that an emphasis on abstract ideals testifies to a misunderstanding of the activity involved in planning language development for any community; the search for a golden rule of language development reveals a trend toward utopian solutions in language policy, while it is forgotten that these solutions are usually a compromise character and meet the community’s demands (Jernudd & Das Gupta, 1971, 198). V. Tauli’s abstract-idealistic theory is based on an oversimplified concept of language as an instrument that can be altered, improved and created anew at will. Criticizing this concept, E. Haugen correctly points out that in describing language as a tool or an instrument, linguists are merely using a metaphor without revealing a number of essential features of language (Haugen 1971, 281). In fact, the voluntaristic theories of language policy ignore a number of important aspects of language: its complex character and the stability of its systems, different susceptibility of its levels to outside influence, and the redundancy and “illogicality” of a natural language.

The history of language policy demonstrates that all successful attempts at deliberate intervention in language development by society were made with due regard for both the internal trends of language development and the social factors affecting language functioning.

By way of summing up we may define language policy as a system of measures of deliberate influence on the functional aspect of language and — within certain limits — on its structure carried out by the state, class, party or any social movement, measures which are part of their overall policy and meet their goals.

A language policy may be either constructive or destructive. A constructive language policy is aimed at the expansion of the functions of languages, the domain of their use and their sociocommunicative role, at the creation and development of standard languages, etc. A classical example of such a policy is the
language policy pursued by the Soviet Communist Party and the Soviet Government and aimed at “guaranteeing in the future the free development of the languages of the peoples of the U.S.S.R., complete freedom for each citizen of the U.S.S.R. to speak and bring up his children and have them educated in any language without any privileges, restrictions or coercion as to the use of any languages” (the Programme of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, 115).

A destructive language policy may be illustrated by the language policy of Tsarism, part and parcel of its nationalities policy, aimed, as V. I. Lenin aptly put it, at destroying among the national minorities any rudiments of statehood, at “crippling their culture, restraining their language, keeping them in ignorance and, ultimately, possibly Russifying them” (Lenin, Complete Works, Vol. 23, 150).

A distinction should also be drawn between a centralized and uncentralized language policy. A centralized language policy is generally pursued by the state and envisages a system of mandatory measures. Such features are revealed by the language policy pursued in the U.S.S.R. Uncentralized is the policy of local government bodies, not mandatory outside their jurisdiction, as well as the policy of certain parties and social movements, not enjoying government support. Cf., for example, the programme of the so-called Gaelic League that campaigned, within the Irish national liberation movement for the revival of the Irish language and its development into a national language.

As may be seen from the above material, it is necessary to distinguish between varieties of language policy, depending on the types of language situation: first, a language policy in a monolingual state, second, a language policy within a multilingual state and, third, a language policy outside the state.

Finally, among the parameters characterizing a language policy we could mention those proposed by L. B. Nikolsky, whose taxonomy is based on the opposition of the following features: retrospective (oriented towards the maintenance of the existing language situation and opposition to changes), prospective (oriented towards changes in the existing language situation), democratic (meeting the interests of the broad masses), antidemocratic (meeting the interests of the elite), internationalist (meeting the interests of all ethnic groups), nationalist (meeting the interests of just one ethnic group). (Nikolsky 1976, 117–119).

The above list of various types of language policy does not claim to be comprehensive. It seems, however, that due regard for the above-mentioned features makes it possible to determine the basic types of language policy depending on its goals, conditions of implementation, and some qualitative characteristics.
As was mentioned at the beginning of this section, the concept of *language policy* should not be confused with the concept of *language engineering*. The attempt to differentiate the concepts in the above-mentioned book by A. T. Baziev and M. I. Isaev seems to be essentially valid. “It seems advisable”, these authors write, “to differentiate the use of these two sociolinguistic terms by coming back to the original direct meaning of *language policy* as the language aspect of the party-government policy on the problem of nationalities. As to the practical implementation of this policy and the associated theoretical problems, they should be referred to as *language engineering* (Baziev, Isaev 1973, 136).

While agreeing in principle with such differentiation, one could somewhat amend it. First of all, as was emphasized above, a language policy may be associated not only with the problem of nationalities, but also with other problems tackled by the state, class, party, social movement, etc. Based on its usage in Soviet linguistics where it has always been associated with the expansion of the social functions of languages, with the improvement and growth of their terminological systems, the creation and codification of standard languages, etc., the term *language engineering* should be applied only to the implementation of a constructive and prospective language policy. In other words, language engineering is one of the elements of language policy. The concepts of *language engineering* and *language policy* are related to each other as a part to a whole.

As to the term *language planning*, it denotes a broader concept than language policy and actually includes any deliberate and goal-directed influence on language. In E. Haugen’s opinion, language planning includes any forms of this activity, whether it is official or unofficial, whether it is carried out by individuals or official organization. Thus the agents of language planning may be not only the state, party or social movement, but even individuals or groups of individuals, whose normative activity exerts some influence on the development and functioning of language. Widely known, for example, is the significant role, played in stabilizing the lexical norms of English in the 18th century by S. Johnson, the author of the first normative dictionary of English, on which many other lexicographers relied. (Jarceva 1969, 194). In the United States a similar role was played by N. Webster, the author of the first normative dictionary of American English. One can cite many other examples of the activity of individuals, linguists, men of letters and public figures who made a considerable contribution to the development and codification of the standard language in their countries. Moreover, as is known, the functioning of any national standard language presup-
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poses the continuous activity of experts (grammarians, lexicographers, dialectologists) in stabilizing and codifying language norms.

As any planning, language planning is oriented towards the solution of problems and is characterized by the definition and evaluation of alternatives to guarantee an optimal decision. Language planning as a decision process includes several stages: 1) evaluation of the cluster of sociolinguistic data forming the background situation, 2) the elaboration of the program of activity setting out the goal and indicating the strategy and procedure for the implementation of the goal and 3) evaluation of the final results.

Speaking of the problems of language planning, E. Haugen distinguishes between the problems associated with the form and those associated with the function, i.e. the problems of language structure and the problems of its functional use. Depending on the character of the language problem, the tactics and procedure for its solution are determined. Thus, for example, problems associated with the form are characterized by normalization, reduced, first of all, to the selection of competing language forms or entire systems (when the problem involves the selection of the standard) and their codification. As to the problems of functional language use, the initial stage amounts to the elaboration of a certain function, and the final stage to its propagation (Haugen 1966; Haugen 1969).

The content of language planning, as any other type of planning, may be characterized in terms of the problem and the appropriate process. Thus the problem of code selection (for example, the selection of the official language) corresponds to the process of formulation of the official language policy, the problem of code stabilization to codification with the aid of dictionaries, grammars, orthographic guide-books, the problem of expanding the functional range of the code to the elaboration of terminological systems and thesauruses, the problem of differentiation of code varieties to the cultivation of these varieties with the aid of style-books, by subsidizing literary activity, etc. More typical of the developing countries are such types of planning as the elaboration of the official policy with a view to code selection and the expansion of code functions, while more developed countries are more concerned with the cultivation of code varieties (styles, genres, etc.) (Fishman 1973, 23–24).

Language planning must be based on scientific forecasts. In other words, the outcome of any language policy or strategy must be specifically indicated before any activity is undertaken. Inasmuch as forecasting involves a certain percentage of uncertainty or risk due to unknown outcomes or to those that may be predic-
tated only with a limited degree of probability, plans are subject to re-examination and modification, as new, heretofore unknown factors are revealed.

Yu. D. Deseriev singles out the following five aspects of forecasting language development, subject to evaluation in language planning: 1) the major development trends of the world's languages, 2) the destinies of individual languages, 3) the development of the social functions of languages, 4) the structural development of languages and 5) the basic trends of interaction between languages (Deseriev 1970).

The principles of planning and forecasting have been widely used in the course of language engineering in the U.S.S.R. In particular, it was necessary to take into account not only the contemporary state of the social functions of a language, but also the long-range prospects in determining the dialect basis of a neoalphabetic language. Needless to say, not all the processes could be foreseen in advance. One of the advantages of the Soviet system of language planning has always been its flexibility, its ability to promptly respond to the changes in the language situation and in the socioeconomic conditions.

Some general views, expressed in the sociological literature in regard to social forecasting in general may well apply to sociolinguistic forecasting. Pertinent in this connection is the opinion of E. A. Arab-Ogly who believes that such unquestionably valuable methods of scientific forecasting as extrapolation, analogies and modelling, however perfect they may be in themselves, cannot guarantee one hundred percent validity of forecasting and that any social forecasting is stochastic and probabilistic and is reduced to a "fan of alternatives" confronting the society (Arab-Ogly 1973). It should be emphasized that irrespective of whether a certain area of language planning is part of the official policy of the state, class or social movement, the relation of the problems of language planning to ideology and ideological confrontation seems to be sufficiently clear. Yet some foreign scholars believe that gaining deeper insights into language planning will equally contribute to nationalistic and internationalistic trends in the society. It is necessary, in their opinion, to contribute to the deepening of such knowledge, not excluding the knowledge that may seem "undesirable" to the scholar himself from the standpoint of his ideology. The question as to which ideology would stand to gain by some research in language planning and language policy is, they believe, a matter of chance ("Can language be planned?", 1971, XVIII).

Needless to say, there are no taboos for science. Yet an appeal to a non-class and non-party position for scholars concerned with the problems of language
planning and language policy is clearly untenable. It seems that of all the aspects of sociolinguistics it is precisely in this area that ideological confrontation is most acute and most obvious. This is demonstrated, among other things, by attempts of some anti-Communist ideologues to misinterpret the problems of language engineering in the U.S.S.R., to downgrade the importance of Soviet language policy and to distort the facts of cross-fertilization of the languages of the U.S.S.R. (Isayev & Gobeti 1971).

Unfortunately, some fabrications of this type sometimes penetrate into respectable sociolinguistic monographs. For instance, the American sociolinguist J. A. Fishman considered it possible to include in a book he had edited an article by E. R. Goodman “World State and World Language” (Goodman 1968). The author of this article attributes to the Soviet Union a sinister plan of destroying national languages and replacing them by a single world language (in all probability, Russian) in order to contribute to the transformation of the entire world into a single Soviet state.

Needless to say, Goodman’s article is an example of anti-Communism at its crudest. Yet this is by no means the only instance when the discussion of problems associated with language policy and language engineering is used by some Western sociologists as an apologia for the capitalist system and for attacks (albeit veiled) on the achievements of the socialist system. Sometimes the intention is to compromise the Soviet experience in solving language problems.

For instance, in one of his publications J. A. Fishman, referring to the limited value of the experience of developed countries in language engineering for developing countries, actually equates imperialist powers with the Soviet Union.

In the same article Fishman singles out the following goals confronting, in his opinion, the developing countries in language and non-language planning: development, modernization and Westernization, i.e. Western-style readjustment. Development both in language and in the non-language sphere is, in his opinion, “rational maximization”. As far as language is concerned, it is primarily the development of its entire lexical system, mainly on the native basis. Modernization in the non-language sphere is the popularization of national unity, access to social mobility, and the rapid propagation of innovations and status symbols. As to language, modernization involves ever more rapid propagation of the national literary standard, greater access to all its varieties and rapid propagation of linguistic innovations and status markers. Westernization is development based on the Western model, and in the non-language sphere it involves an ever
greater trend toward the propagation of supralocal values and supralocal identification. The material form of implementing this trend is borrowed from "predic- table" (i.e. Western) sources. In regard to language, Westernization involves even more far-reaching changes than modernization: changes in the writing system, the restructuring of traditional honorifics and in the lexicon the development of units, mutually translatable in relation to the "prestigious" (i.e. Western) languages (Fishman 1973, 23–34).

Apparently problems of language planning figure prominently in the elabora- tion of the scientific basis of U.S. policy vis-a-vis the Third World. Characteristically, these problems were examined by a special language planning research group financed by the Ford Foundation at the University of Hawaii. It seems that the language policy and language planning recommendations addressed by some Western scholars to the developing countries, are in themselves a specific language policy or "metapolicy" whose direct objects is not language but the language policy of other countries.

At the same time in the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America the Soviet experience of tackling the language problem as part of the problem of nationalities is growing increasingly attractive. The Leninist language policy with its underlying principles of the equality of languages and language pluralism is winning more and more supporters in these countries. Soviet sociolinguists have done a considerable amount of work in summing up the experience of language engineering in the U.S.S.R. It is necessary to make this experience available to the peoples of foreign, primarily developing, countries (Nikolsky 1972).
CHAPTER IV

Methods of Sociolinguistic Studies

Contemporary methods of sociolinguistic studies are based on an organic combination of sociolinguistic research procedures proper with the procedures used in other branches of linguistics as well as in sociology, ethnography and social psychology. Even when sociolinguistics borrows methods from other disciplines, these methods are essentially modified with due regard for the specific nature of the object of observation. The methods used in sociolinguistics are divided into two major groups:

a) methods of obtaining sociolinguistics data;
b) methods of sociolinguistic analysis.

The first group includes different methods of observation, interview, experiments, etc., which in their totality may be described as field observation techniques. The second group includes the procedures applied by sociolinguists in analysing the source data obtained in the course of field study. Needless to say, both types of methods are determined by the task of research, the type of material, the working hypothesis put forward by the sociolinguist, etc.

Let us examine in detail both types of research methods.

1. Methods of Obtaining Sociolinguistic Data

The problem of obtaining initial data is one of the most complex problems of sociolinguistic research. The point is that a study of the determinant role of social factors in relation to language requires that the researchers should take into account a considerable number of stratificational and situationable variables, different from one another in the character of relations they reveal both to language and to one another.

The gist of the problem was pinpointed by W. Labov who described one of the most complex aspects of field studies as the observer's paradox. (Labov 1972b, 208). This paradox amounts to the following: it is the aim of research to find out how people talk when they are not an object of systematic observation; however, in order to obtain such data systematic observation is necessary. The fact is that systematic observation in itself produces a speech situation af-
fecting the style register, causing the informants to strive for "correct" speech and stimulating a far greater orientation towards the standard than is usually found in everyday communication.

One of the methods of obtaining data common to sociology and sociolinguistics is by means of a questionnaire. According to UNESCO, this method is used in nine out of ten empirical sociological studies (Zaitseva 1970, 266). A questionnaire consists of a series of questions logically connected with one another and with the central problem of research. According to M. I. Zaitseva (ibid. 268), ideally each item (question) of the questionnaire is in itself a hypothesis or part of it.

A number of serious problems arise in sociolinguistic analysis when using a questionnaire in connection with the validity of information obtained by this method. These problems have long been discussed in sociology and social psychology and acquire an even more topical character in sociolinguistics. Indeed, when using a questionnaire the observers' paradox comes out in bold relief. There is a great danger of the informant adjusting to the norms and expectations of the questioner. To avoid this danger or, at least, to reduce it to a minimum it is necessary to devote due attention to the tactics of questioning, the formulation and sequence of questions in the questionnaire. And yet no questionnaires can fully replace observation of the real-life verbal activity of informants in an atmosphere close to natural.

Why is it then that the questionnaire still remains one of the most widely used tools of sociolinguistic surveys? The advantage of this method is unquestionably its mass character. The fact is that a direct observation of individual informants or small groups is not always sufficiently representative. Sometimes it is difficult to eliminate what is typical of this particular informant or this group alone and unambiguously distinguish between normative behaviour and individual deviation from the norm.

Of considerable interest are the methods of collecting data applied by a group of members of the Institute of the Russian Language, the U.S.S.R. Academy of Sciences, who carried out a mass survey of Standard Russian speakers (Krys in 1974). The researchers put forward the hypothesis that the use of language variants depends on the social characteristics of the speakers. They investigated variant forms of Standard Russian, differing from each other in their stylistic connotation (bookish, neutral and colloquial) and in the relative frequency of their use: sox – sóxnul ('became dry'), křéjserí – křéjserá ('cruisers'), etc.
The choice of a language variant was related to the following social features:
age, education and place where education was received, social status, place
where one spent one’s childhood, place of longest residence, regularity of lis-
tening to the radio or watching TV, social status of parents and their place of
birth, etc. The method used corresponded to what is known in sociology as a
sample questionnaire survey without direct contact. However, due to the specific
type of sociolinguistic goals the questionnaire used in the survey differs sub-
stantially from the sociological ones both in the character and type of questions
and in a more diversified strategy. The main difference, as the researchers cor-
rectly assume, was determined by the need to obtain information on the in-
formant’s speech rather than on any substantive concepts.

The survey was based on a sociological questionnaire comprising the above-
mentioned social features, and a linguistic one, i.e. a series of questions on lan-
guage variants on a certain level of language structure.

In their content the questions in the linguistic part were concerned with lan-
guage facts. Such questions guarantee the objective character of data much bet-
ter than questions eliciting the informant’s opinion on the basis of loosely de-
fined categories (cf., for example, “Do you have a good command of such and
such a language?”). The most common types of questions used in the question-
naire were the so-called “questions with a fan of alternatives”, i.e. questions,
asking the respondent to choose from a series of alternatives. For example,
choosing the most appropriate word from those listed (deleting the rest):

Artel’ proizvodit . . . stekol.
(protir, protirku, protiranje)
(‘The cooperative association performs the polishing of glass panes’).

In order to guarantee the stability of replies, questions concerning the same
language phenomena were sometimes duplicated in a different formulation:

How do you pronounce: zver’ or z’ver’(beast)?

Cf. zver’ zvat’ (beast, call). In which word do you pronounce the soft z? (un-
derline{derline} this word; if there is no difference in pronunciation, underline both).

And, finally, wide use was made of diverisonary assignments aimed at
diverting the respondents’ attention from the genuine aim of the experiment
and, consequently, from a deliberate orientation towards “correct” speech. For
instance, in the morphological questionnaire the respondent had to fill not only
those gaps in the text that were of some interest to the researcher, but also the
gaps unimportant to him. As regards accent variations, stress symbols had to be
put not only in the keywords, but in all the words in the sentence. In the research­
erer’s opinion, the psychological danger inherent in a different ability to con­trol one’s own speech as well as in the orientation towards prestigious forms was
removed to some extent by the flexible strategy of the questionnaire survey and,
in particular, by the system of cross-, control and diverting questions, while the
mass character of the replies compensated for the variation caused by the psycho­
logical differences between the respondents.

At the same time, in many instances the goal of the study calls for the system­
ic observation of the informants with the use of tape recording. This method
was used, in particular, by the authors of the book Colloquial Russian (Zemskaja
1973, 34—39), who collected their data by recording spontaneous speech. The
authors also confronted a number of problems involved in the “observer’s para­
dox”; it was necessary to record spontaneous speech without the distortions caused
by the “tape recorder effect”. It was noted in the book that most valuable were
the recordings made without the informant’s knowledge (for instance when the
informants grew so accustomed to the microphone that they ceased to notice it).

To eliminate the microphone effect the authors tried to create a relaxed and
unconstrained atmosphere between themselves and the informants. Otherwise
the recording was not made. Particular attention was devoted to the appropriate
selection of informants. In nearly all the cases the informants were selected from
among the friends of the researchers or the friends or acquaintances of their
relatives and friends. Recordings were made in familiar surroundings (not in a
recording studio or somebody else’s home).

A direct conversation between the researcher and the informant (what is
known in sociology as an interview) could be one of the forms of such observa­
tion. However, the technique of these observations in sociolinguistics has a num­
ber of specific features determined by the aim of research. After all, both ques­
tionnaires and interviews in sociology are aimed at obtaining substantive infor­
mation on social phenomena by eliciting it from the informants’ statement
(Novikov 1970), whereas in sociolinguistics similar research techniques are used
primarily in order to obtain objective data characterizing the informant’s speech.
This accounts for some essential differences between these methods in sociology
and sociolinguistics. For example, from the viewpoint of sociologists it would be
quite ineffective to strive for a friendly atmosphere in the course of interviewing
(it is necessary to keep a certain distance between the interviewer and those
interviewed) (Novikov 1970, 264). At the same time, in sociolinguistic studies,
as was pointed out above, it is frequently necessary to create a perfectly relaxed atmosphere, free from any constraints.

Observations of the informants' verbal activity should rule out or at least reduce to a minimum the observer's influence on their verbal behaviour. Of considerable interest in this respect is so-called participant observation, where the observer acts not as an interviewer but as one of the direct participants in the communicative event. This method proves to be most effective in studying socially conditioned patterns of verbal behaviour in small groups whose members are united by informal relations. It was used, in particular, by J. J. Gumperz in his study of topically determined code switching in diglossia. Instead of interviewing the informants the researcher himself joined in their conversation. The observation was controlled: all variables determining verbal behaviour were held constant, except one — the topic of the conversation which varied periodically in order to reveal the effect of the topic on the selection of socially marked variants (Gumperz 1966).

Similar methods were used by W. Labov in studying the verbal behaviour of teenage peer groups in Black ghettos of New York. He made use of some methods of long-term participant observation. It was somewhat helpful that his studies were conducted by an assistant, originally from Harlem, who had a perfect command of the local dialect and was fully aware of the psychological and sociocultural background of the peer groups. Of decisive import, however, was another factor — the structure of informal relations within the group. The fact that an informal group met with its own leaders in customary surroundings (in the so-called "day care centres") to participate in a communicative event helped to produce a relaxed atmosphere and apparently proved to be stronger than the countereffect of a microphone or the presence of a stranger. The speech of each teenager was recorded on a separate track with the aid of a pendant-type microphone. The use of videotape made it possible to record not only speech, but also paralinguistic signs (facial expressions and gestures used by the participants in the communicative event) (Labov 1972a).

Considerable attention is devoted to the elaboration of the program and tactics of an interview. For example, Labov's program was so constructed as to reveal the differences between contextual styles — from casual to strictly formal. In order to stimulate excited speech and divert the informants' attention from orientation toward the prestigious standard the researcher asked him to recall an episode when his life was in danger. It was also assumed that samples of spontaneous casual speech could be elicited by recording the informant's
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remarks to a third person (wife or children), his conversation with the interviewer outside the formal interview, children’s folklore (counting-out rhymes, teasing rhymes, etc.) (Labov 1966). Then came (in the order of approximation to the formal register and growing orientation toward the prestigious standard) an interview, the aim of which (a study of the informant’s speech) was announced to the informant, reading a text, containing diagnostic phonological contrasts, reading word lists and, finally, reading minimal pairs.

Other researchers used a more simplified technique of interviewing informants. For example, Levine and Crockett, in their study of postvocalic /r/, took into account only two styles of pronunciation (the reading of separate sentences and the reading of word lists). R. Shuy, W. Wolfram and W. Riley conducted a study of urban dialects by comparing three speech styles — conversational (narrative), brief remarks and reading (Shuy, Wolfram and Riley 1966).

Observation may be concerned not only with the objective aspect of the informant’s verbal activity, but also with its subjective aspect associated with value orientations or social attitudes in regard to the competing codes or individual sociolinguistic variables. This aspect of sociolinguistic studies is represented in, among other things, the above-mentioned Colloquial Russian (Zemskaja 1973) where most interesting experimental data are cited. Informants were asked at first to fill in a questionnaire and, among other things, to reply whether they believed that educated people could say in a casual conversation принеси мне во что завернуть’ (literally “bring me in what to wrap”), у тебя есть’ чем писать’? (literally “have you with what to write?’” = have you anything to write with?), etc. and then to listen to the same phrases, pronounced with a casual intonation, and reply to the same question. Most of the informants rejected the phrases in writing and accepted those pronounced orally. Furthermore, in many questionnaires the researchers noted: “but says so himself”, “precisely the same phrases were recorded from this informant”, etc.

Similar conclusions were reached by W. Labov when he noted that the social stratification of language exists in two dimensions — the social differentiation of language and the social evaluation of variation. A considerable part of his study of the social stratification of English in New York City is devoted to the subjective-evaluative aspects of social variation of language. In order to reveal the subjective aspect of the social differentiation of language special experiments were designed. Of particular interest were attempts to reveal the informants’ ability to relate certain linguistic features to social and ethnic variables and to determine the sociopsychological stereotypes underlying this process. For this purpose
socioethnic identification tests were applied: on hearing taped "typical" speech samples, containing socioethnic markers, the respondents had to determine the social and ethnic background of the speakers (Brown 1969).

To test the informants' social attitudes to certain codes the respondents were asked to listen to the recording of the same persons speaking in different languages or dialects. In expressing certain value judgments in regard to the speakers the respondents automatically extended to them their attitudes toward the language (Lambert 1967).

The informants' attitudes to stable sociolinguistic variables could be revealed also with the aid of the so-called "self-evaluation test" in the course of which, on hearing the recording of several samples of socially marked speech, the respondents had to determine which of these samples resembled their own speech to the greatest extent. The results of the test were very stable: as a rule the informants chose not the samples actually resembling their own speech, but those corresponding to the greatest extent to their notions of the prestigious standard.

It appears from the foregoing that these methods to some extent supplement each other. Therefore the use in an empirical study of a combination of several methods of collecting sociolinguistic data rather than just one considerably increases the validity of sociolinguistic analysis. In combining different methods of field studies it is necessary, first of all, to take into consideration the character of the object being studied. This is precisely what A. N. Baskakov and V. J. Mixal'čenko do in studying bilingualism in Azerbaidjan and Lithuania (Baskakov 1972; Mixal'čenko 1972). In view of the diversity of the goals involved in a study of the intensity and extent of second language use, these authors reach the conclusion that a profound and versatile study of bilingualism can only be made by a consecutive use of several methods including a social experiment, questionnaire, interviewing, recording bilingual speech, collection of written data, observation of bilingual verbal activity in different situations, etc.

Among the above procedures of data collection one can single out, on the one hand, those related to controlled observation and, on the other, those related to uncontrolled observation. Controlled observation was mentioned above: it includes all the instances when the observer controls the progress of the experiment, altering the variables affecting the object of observation. Uncontrolled observation covers all the cases when verbal communication unfolds before the observer in a natural real-life situation. There is no observer's paradox here. Yet the possibilities of uncontrolled observations are clearly limited, because the researcher is unable in such cases to direct the experiment.
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Of uncontrolled character are, for instance, V. J. Mixal'čenko's observations of verbal activity in public places (at meetings, in a store, street, place of work, library, post-office, etc.). This also includes the conversations in stores, smoking-rooms, cafeterias, fashion houses, city transport, etc., recorded by the authors of Colloquial Russian. Also uncontrolled were the "anonymous observations" of verbal behaviour conducted by W. Labov in New York. With the aid of a concealed microphone the researcher recorded the speech of teenagers playing in the street, of people in a cafe, etc. The weakness of such observations from the point of view of the basic goals of sociolinguistic studies is that the researcher in this case has no precise data to characterize the informant's social background (these characteristics are established approximately on the basis of visual impressions).

Nevertheless, observations of the informant's verbal behaviour in natural conditions make it possible to reveal the extent to which the interview situation affects the validity of data.

Depending on their aims observations may be subdivided into exploratory, control and basic. Exploratory observations precede the basic experiment and are used to work out the initial hypothesis and the program of field research. Control observations are used to test the experimental data and to make allowance for any distortions. For example, in Labov's above-mentioned study the main research, based on controlled observation, was preceded by exploratory interviews with clerks of three department stores in New York. In the course of these brief interviews the interviewer posed as a customer and asked questions replies to which involved the use of certain phonological variables. This exploratory study made it possible to formulate a working hypothesis concerning the character of correlation between the social characteristics of informants and the values of the phonological variable. As to the control observations, they are intended to rule out the distorting effect of extraneous factors on the results of the experiment.

Recently wide use has been made of direct observation of spontaneous conversations with the subsequent interpretation of their content with the aid of informants. Thus in one of his studies J. J. Gumperz recorded conversation between two Chicanos. The conversation was in English with periodic switching to Spanish. Then the text of the conversation was divided into episodes centered around some topic, and the episodes were divided into passages. Then the researcher together with each speaker tried to analyse the place of each passage in the discourse structure and determine "the social meaning" of code-switching. The method of substitution was used: the phrase containing code switching, was
replaced by a phrase in the other language in order to reveal the functional and semantic role of switching.

2. Methods of Sociolinguistic Analysis

To process the data obtained in field studies certain varieties of correlational analysis are most frequently used. As is known, this analysis is used to study interrelations between certain variables, dependent and independent. Typical of sociolinguistics are correlations where certain social parameters, stratificational and situational, are independent variables while linguistic phenomena are dependent variables.

The researcher’s attention is focused not only on cases of complete (functional) dependence between correlates, but also on those of incomplete dependence.

Correlational analysis as a method of mathematical statistics should not be confused with the so-called “correlational” approach to a study of relations between language and society referred to in Chapter I. It should be remembered that the “correlational” approach to sociolinguistic phenomena is based on revealing the so-called “co-variance” of linguistic and social features. The problem of causal relations between the phenomena is actually excluded from consideration. At the same time, correlational analysis as a branch of mathematical statistics is characterized by the intention not only to establish interrelations between certain indices, but also to find the cause of the interrelations, i.e. causal dependences.

One of the most interesting methods of correlational analysis to process sociolinguistic data was used in the aforementioned study of Russian based on a mass survey (Krysin 1974) and employing the following procedure: dependences were described according to the quantitative distribution of variants separately for each social cross-section: age, education, social status, territorial characteristic, etc., with substantive (sociolinguistic) comments; this procedure involved the use of tabular data, graphs of dependences, some mathematical-statistical criteria; social features were then described in terms of their range and effect on the distribution of linguistic variants.

It is assumed that the wider the range of a social feature, the greater the number is of linguistic variants to which it is relevant; the effect of a feature is directly proportional to the magnitude of frequency differences of linguistic variants (i.e. in terms of the relation of the number of persons who prefer this variant to the entire sample of this social groups) for groups singled out according to this feature.
A range magnitude (D) is measured in terms of the relations of the number of variant features, the use of which depends on the informant’s social characteristics, to the total number of variant features of this type or this level of linguistic structure. The effect magnitude (F) is measured in terms of the relation of the mean variation range, characterizing the quantitative distribution of variant features in social groups to the mean frequency of the feature. It is calculated according to this formula:

$$F_y = \frac{\bar{R}_x}{\bar{P}_x},$$

where $F_y$ is the effect of a certain social feature $y$ (for example, age) on the use of variants of this type (for example variant genitive singular forms of masculine nouns with the inflexion $u$: sâxaru, kipjatkú . . .), $\bar{R}_x$ is the mean variation range characterizing the social distribution of lexemes where the variant feature $x$ is realized, and $\bar{P}_x$ is the mean frequency of the phenomenon (Krysin 1974, 36–37).

Among other things, the survey established that, according to the range of phonetic phenomena, social features come in this order: 1) territorial, 2) social status, 3) age, 4) family influence, 5) education, 6) influence of the radio, and, according to their effect on phonetic features, in this order: 1) territorial, 2) age, 3) social status, 4) education and 5) influence of the radio.

The survey is not limited to the establishment of certain quantitative patterns. Its sociolinguistic commentary includes as a rule, an evaluation of the character of causal relations between social features and the associated linguistic variants. Thus, pointing to a wide range of phonetic phenomena covered by the territorial feature, as well as to the considerable effect of this feature, the survey indicates that this is in all probability due to the formation of local varieties of standard pronunciation under the influence of the dialect environment (Krysin 1974, 116–117).

At attempt to establish causal relations on the basis of quantitative data was made, in particular, in the aforementioned study by L. Levine and H. Crockett, who analyzed the socially determined variability of speech in one of the communities of the North Carolina Piedmont (Levine and Crockett 1967). The direct object of their observations was the use of /t/ in the postvocal position. To quantify their data they used the variable $R$, the relation between the total number of /t/ occurrences and the potentially possible number, multiplied by 100.
After the informants were classified according to the R-index, they obtained the distribution of the values of this variable from 0 to 100 both for the reading of sentences (a style, approximating spontaneous speech) and the reading of separate words (a style, approximating formal speech). The distribution of these indices (Fig. 2) testifies to lack of normal distribution around mean values. An analysis of the data obtained both for the reading of sentences and the reading of individual words demonstrated that the probability of such frequency being observed at the normal population distribution is much lower than 1/1000. In other words, the speech community can in no way be described as an intermediate one, characterized by mean R values. On the contrary, the histogram showed in the drawing with dips in mid-ranges seems to suggest that there are two norms in the community: the high R norm and the low R (r-less) norm.

For further analysis of the relation between the social situations and the informant’s verbal behaviour the latter were grouped into quintiles according to R-indices. The authors analyzed the relation between the R-index of the quintile and different sociodemographic variables in the situations examined. The data of their analysis were tabulated. As a result, they obtained multiple correlations, based on the interrelations of three rows of variables: sociodemographic, situational and linguistic.

The analysis showed that the group of college-educated informants included a disproportionately large number of persons with both maximal and minimal R-values. A similar phenomenon was revealed in examining the relation between quintile R values and the occupation category. The predominance of the top group (intellectuals) was revealed in quintiles with the maximal and minimal R values. This indicated a curvilinear relation between the social status, measured by the above parameters, and the R-index, a high education level and occupational prestige being related both to maximal and minimal R-indices. Hence the conclusion that both pronunciation types (with postvocalic /r/ and without it) are sanctioned by the social norms of the speech community. Among the highest status informants there is observed a sharp polarization of the pronunciation norms.

In analyzing the causes of this phenomenon, the authors advance a hypothesis concerning the existence in the community of two reference groups, oriented either toward the national norm with postvocalic /r/ or toward the r-less norm of the southern states. These groups set an example for others and influence their verbal behaviour. A final confirmation of this hypothesis would require, Levine and Crockett believe, the use of additional data.
Fig. 2  Number of informants

![Diagram showing the number of informants with different R-index values.](image-url)
This seems to be quite true. It should be borne in mind, however, that one can hardly equate the influence of the so-called *reference groups* and the impact of the national norm through such channels as the education system and mass media. The limitations of a methodological approach oriented exclusively towards small-group theory make themselves felt in the analytical procedures (Labov 1970).

Attempts have been made to combine quantitative methods of analysis with the methods of generative grammar. For example, W. Labov introduced the concept of a *variable rule*, which is supposed to combine elements of generative grammar and the probabilistic model underlying a statistical analysis of verbal behaviour (Labov 1972b, 230–232). In so doing Labov develops the concept of an *optional rule*, proposed by Chomsky and Halle, and applies it to socially conditioned variability of speech. The rule is formalized on the basis of the Chomsky-Halle notation except that it includes variables enclosed in parantheses. Here is, for example, the variable rule of retroflex /r/ vocalization in a New York East Side community in this notation:

\[
/ + \text{cen} / \rightarrow (\text{/cons/}) / \text{/cons/} \rightarrow \sim V.
\]

The rule reads as follows: "The central segment /r/ variably loses its consonantal character after a vowel or a glide, unless it is directly followed by a vowel". The probabilistic character of this pattern is reflected in the magnitude, which denotes the percentage of actual rule applications in relation to the potentially possible ones. This magnitude is determined according to the formula:

\[
= 1 - K_0,
\]

where \( K_0 \), including the constraints affecting the application of this rule, is a function of the socioeconomic class (SEC) and speech style:

\[
K_0 = f(\text{SEC, style}) = a(\text{SEC}) + b(\text{style}) + c.
\]

A similar picture is observed in the variation of other socially marked elements of phonological and morphological systems.

Later on H. J. Cedergren and D. Sankoff (1974) analyzed Labov's model from a probabilistic point of view and proposed some statistical methods based on Labov's original concept. They formulated three probabilistic models: the *additive model*, the *multiplicative non-application probabilities model* and the *multiplicative applicative application probabilities model*. According to the additive model, in the contextual environment consisting of features a, j, \ldots, k the
probability that the rule will apply is

\[ p = p_0 + p_i + p_j + \ldots + p_k \]

where \( p_0 \) is a constant input parameter, and \( p_i, p_j, \ldots, p_k \) are the effects of the features \( i, j, \ldots, k \), respectively. Each feature may be a particular phonological or syntactic condition or may represent the tendencies of a particular speaker, social group, or social variable.

The multiplicative non-application probabilities model reads:

\[ (1 - p) = (1 - p_0)(1 - p_i)(1 - p_j) \ldots (1 - p_k), \]

where it is required that \( p_0, p_i, \ldots, p_k \) should all be probabilities constrained to the interval between 0 and 1.

According to the multiplicative application probabilities model,

\[ p = p_0 \times p_i \times p_j \times \ldots \times p_k, \]

where it is required that \( p_0, p_i, \ldots, p_k \) should all be probabilities.

According to P. Rousseau and D. Sankoff, the problem which turned out to be one of the greatest drawbacks associated with the use of variable rules was how to decide for a given data set which of the models should be chosen, since there was no test reliable enough to do it automatically (Rousseau, Sankoff 1978, 62).

In order to make up for the deficiencies of variable rules (ad hoc programming, problems with the test of fit and the choice of models) the entire problem was reexamined and a single new model was proposed to replace the previous three:

\[ \left( \frac{p}{1-p} \right) = \left( \frac{p_0}{1-p_0} \right) \times \left( \frac{p_i}{1-p_i} \right) \times \left( \frac{p_j}{1-p_j} \right) \times \ldots \times \left( \frac{p_k}{1-p_k} \right). \]

This model has several advantages: it is symmetric with respect to application probabilities and non-application probabilities, unlike (2) and (3); like (2) and (3), the \( p_i \) are probabilities leading to interpretations impossible in the additive model (1).

It also takes care of the problems of fit and choice, because when the \( p_i \) are close to 1, it is reduced to model (2), when they are close to 0, it is reduced to model (3), and it behaves like the additive model when all the \( p_i \) have intermediate values (around 1/2). (Rousseau, Sankoff 1978, 62).

This model, known as the logistic model, has some unquestionable advantages. Yet its probabilistic interpretation involved some problems, and although a pro-
procedure was proposed to deal with those (Rousseau, Sankoff 1978, 63–64), the interpretations proposed have not yet proved to be of any great use in practice.

A program has been launched to implement an algorithm for estimating the parameters of the logistic model. Yet many of the original problems still remain, and work on variable rules is far from completed.

Without questioning the value of Labov’s observation regarding the mechanism of the influence of social factors on the choice of linguistic variants, one cannot but notice some vulnerability of the theoretical conception underlying the variable rules. In Chapter I we pointed to the uncertainty and contradictory character of some concepts borrowed by sociolinguists from generativist theory. Suffice it to say that the proponents of variable rule theory clearly confuse two aspects of verbal communication, subjective and objective. After all, so-called variable rules are derived from objective quantitative data characterizing the verbal activity of speech community members. Yet they are identified with linguistic competence, i.e. with a certain amount of knowledge pertaining to the subjective aspect of communication. But the objective statistical characteristics of verbal activity are by no means identical with the speakers’ subjective attitude.

Inasmuch as the social determinants of verbal activity are a set of variables, part of each contributing to a certain specific choice and the rest constraining it, one can hardly speak of the complete predictability of choice in each particular case. Therefore G. Sankoff is right when he points out that the predictive power of “sociolinguistic rules”, including variable rules, is very limited, and that these rules are mainly interpretive (G. Sankoff 1972).

Another weakness of variable rules was pinpointed by P. Kay who showed that none of the proposed variable rule models accounted for the interaction of speaker and linguistic constraint. In other words, it is postulated in the theory of community grammar, on which the variable rules are based, that linguistic constraints are shared throughout the community which, as synchronic studies have demonstrated, is often not the case. Therefore P. Kay reaches the conclusion that the theoretical utility of variable rules in modelling the normal heterogeneity of speech communities would appear limited, since the heterogeneity frequently entails interaction of linguistic and social constraints. Nevertheless, variable rules are a valuable statistical device for the analysis of the differential strengths of linguistic and social variables in determining linguistic behaviour in homogeneous and stable sections of speech communities, although they do not
furnish an adequate model of speech communities in which linguistic heterogeneity is part of an ongoing linguistic change (Kay 1978, 82).

Attempts have been made to account for the heterogeneity of speech communities and linguistic change by using so-called *implicational scaling*. One of the first to use this method was C.-J. N. Bailey, who pointed out the existence of implicational relations underlying the choice of linguistic variables (Bailey 1969). His model is based on wave theory and reflects the spread of a linguistic innovation through a speech continuum. R. T. Bell proposes a somewhat simplified implicational scale illustrating some features of English in North-Western England: 1) the use of happen /'appen/ instead of the standard *perhaps* or *maybe*; 2) the use of /u/ instead of /ə/ in *but*, etc. The following scale illustrates the use of these features by three informants A, B, C:

Bailey’s Wave Illustrated

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A and C are predictable in the choice of variants. A, who uses both 1 and 2, may be clearly defined as a speaker of the broad variety of the local dialect. C, on the other hand, is apparently a standard language speaker. The single-valued choice made by 1 and 2 seems to suggest some of the socioeconomic and demographic characteristics of these two speakers. On the other hand, B, who rejects the broad variant 1, but retains the regional 2, is apparently a speaker of a modified regional variety of Standard English (Bell 1976).

The advantages of the implicational model lie in its ability to reflect an ongoing linguistic change, to bridge the gap between synchronic and diachronic models and to reveal implicational links not only within the same structural level but also across levels.

An attempt has been made to combine the implicational approach with generative models. This is done by constructing implicational scales where the dialect continuum is presented as a hierarchy of so-called isolects, each of which differs from the adjacent one in a change in just one transformational rule. There are no fundamental qualitative or quantitative differences between the isolects. Their speakers are those who use the same set of rules, generating the same surface structures, indicated on the scale’s horizontal line. The fact that some of the isolects have many more speakers than others seems irrelevant, as
the number of speakers cannot be regarded as a distinctive feature of the system. Some of the isolects are unquestionably more stable than others. But this fact does not seem essential to the authors of grammars based on implicational scaling. Their goal is to explicate the rules of generating theoretically equivalent isolects presumably in the chronological order of their formation as a result of the propagation of a linguistic change wave.

What is proposed, in other words, is a transformation model of language variation, based on the assumption that synchronic variation reflects a diachronic change, and therefore each synchronic section is characterized by the fact that a change in a rule has extended to only part of the language speakers.

In implicational scales many isolects are represented by just 1–2 speakers. The concept of a language community is actually ignored by the authors of this model. Characteristically, one of the proponents of the implicational approach, D. Bickerton, admits that this approach can hardly be regarded as informative from the sociological point of view (Bickerton 1973).

One can hardly agree with those critics of variable rules who seek to present implicational scales as an alternative to Labov’s models. One cannot but agree with Labov, who believes that, in denying the existence of dialects, used by relatively homogeneous communities, underestimating the role of social factors limiting the freedom of variation of linguistic units and — we shall add — hypothesizing the rules of generative grammar, the proponents of implicational scaling actually revive the approach traditional for American linguistics and based on a study of individuals rather than communities, an approach oriented towards “free idiolects” (Labov 1973b).

As is known, traditional descriptivist studies underestimated the variability and heterogeneity of linguistic structure. Implicational modelling, on the other hand, tends to overemphasize these aspects of language. Paradoxically enough, these two trends that seem to be diametrically opposed to each other lead to similar disregard for the social nature of language.

Meanwhile implicational scaling may serve a very useful purpose if it is not regarded as an alternative to other models but as complementing them. It seems that in a sense implicational scaling and variable rules do complement each other and to some extent make up for each other’s deficiencies. The variable rule model is based on a static concept of a relatively homogeneous speech community using a single community grammar while implicational scaling is based on a dynamic approach, emphasizing heterogeneity and variation. Unfortunately, it is still unclear to what extent these two models are mutually convertible.
P. Kay cites some data according to which some implicational studies (for example, Bickerton’s Guyanese Creole Complementizer data) can be fitted very well by the logistic model. However, it is pointed out that implicational scales with large numbers of rows and columns are inimical to variable rule analysis (Kay 1978, 81).

On the other hand, it seems that some of the earlier models of language variation may well be applied to a study of socially determined heterogeneous language structure. One of these is the common core model (Hockett 1959), viewing the dialect continuum as a set of intersecting microsystems with a common core. Based on this model is a contrastive approach making it possible to compare sociocommunicative subsystems (for example, one social dialect with another or a social dialect with a standard language) not as objects external to each other, but as components of the same microsystem, welded together by a single core (for details see Švejcer 1978).

Let us examine some aspects of this method with special reference to socially determined lexico-semantic differences between elements of social dialects and standard vocabulary. A contrastive analysis of such differences may be divided into two main stages. First of all, it is necessary to examine the main types of oppositions, singled out in comparing individual lexical items. This will make it possible to pass on to the next stage of analysis, i.e. trying to find out how differences between individual elements of the lexico-semantic system affect other elements linked to the former by intrasystemic relations.

In determining the main types of differences revealed at the lexico-semantic level, it is necessary to take into account the plane in which the units in question reveal their differences and the plane of the common features that form the basis of their comparison (the plane of expression or the plane of content). The items identical in the plane of expression but differing from each other in the plane of content are referred to as lexico-semantic divergents, while the items, differing from each other in the plane of expression but identical in the plane of content are lexico-semantic analogues.

In the so-called general slang of American English the man is a “policeman” while in the ethnosocial dialect of American Blacks (“Black English”) it is “a white man; boss”; in the jargon of drug addicts it is a “drug pusher”, while in the group (or corporate — V. D. Bondaletov’s term (Bondaletov 1974) jargon of musicians it is a “band leader”. In other words, it is a multiple correlation of lexico-semantic divergents, each of which is a lexico-semantic variant (sememe) of the same word.
As an example of a group of analogues we may cite the standard \textit{policeman} and its slang and social jargon equivalents \textit{pig}, \textit{big John}, \textit{cop}, \textit{fuzz}, \textit{the Man}, \textit{blue boy}. \textit{Pig} in this meaning is simultaneously part of youth slang and underworld argot. \textit{Big John} is a jargonism, used by drug addicts. \textit{Blue boy} and \textit{cop} are elements of general slang while \textit{fuzz} is a jargonism, current mainly among the declassé.

As is known, the term of an opposition to which a certain feature is ascribed, is a marked term. Since a social feature underlies the above oppositions, we can speak of oppositions, comprising one, two or several socially marked terms.

The concept of a social feature calls for some clarification. With respect to two types of social variations dealt with in the section devoted to the conceptual system of sociolinguistics, we can speak of two types of social markedness, stratificational and situational, respectively. Thus, in terms of stratificational variation, the sememes “white man”, “boss”, “drug pusher”, “band leader” are all socially marked terms of divergent oppositions inasmuch as they are associated with certain social or socioethnic groups. At the same time, the sememe “policeman” is neutral in terms of stratificational features, as general slang does not serve as a marker of any social stratum. Nor are such terms of analogue oppositions as \textit{cop} and \textit{blue boy} specific to any particular group. All these items may be regarded as stratificationally unmarked terms of divergent and analogue oppositions.

One and the same item (sememe or lexeme) may be unmarked in terms of stratificational variations and marked in terms of situational variation of language. For example, the divergent \textit{the Man} (“policeman”) and its analogues \textit{cop} and \textit{blue boy}, elements of general slang, are associated with certain situations and may therefore be regarded as situationally marked terms of the corresponding oppositions.

One should distinguish between unilaterally and bilaterally marked oppositions. For example, the opposition of two divergents \textit{pig} \textsubscript{1} “domestic animal” and \textit{pig} \textsubscript{2} “policeman” is characterized by unilateral markedness, as the only socially marked term is \textit{pig} \textsubscript{2}. At the same time the analogue opposition \textit{pig/big John} is bilaterally marked (both terms are socially marked).

Proceeding from oppositions of individual items to an analysis of the structural consequences (U. Weinreich’s term — Weinreich 1954) of lexico-semantic variations, it is necessary to examine, first of all, conjugate analogue and divergent oppositions or \textit{analogue-divergent strings} (Svejcer 1978, 168–171). Let us come back to the aforementioned divergent opposition \textit{the Man} “policeman” /
the Man "white man", two sememes of the same lexeme. Each term of this opposition enters into analogue relations with other lexical units. For example, the Man\(^1\) enters into the same group of analogues with the above-mentioned pig, blue boy, big John, cop, fuzz, while the Man\(^2\) is part of the analogue group comprising whitey and pale face (ethnosocial dialect of Blacks) as well as paddy and patty (ethnosocial dialect of Blacks and Chicanos). Thus around the lexeme the Man there arises an analogue-divergent string, comprising stratificationally and situationally marked elements:

\[
\text{the Man}^1 = \text{pig, blue boy, big John, cop, fuzz} \quad \text{the Man}^2 = \text{whitey, pale face, patty, paddy}
\]

In a number of cases it is advisable to conduct a contrastive analysis in terms of entire semantic fields in order to reveal systemic relations between the lexicons of social dialects. For example, analysis may center on the U.S. slang semantic field formed on the basis of the semantic invariant expression of approval: beat, the cat's pajamas, drooly, gas, George, smooth, super, way out, hot, gone, cool, hep, hip, in, far out, freaky, groovy, out of sight. A synchronic analysis of such a field would show, among other things, the co-existence within a certain period of special slang markers of association with different age groups. The fact that a contemporary American uses in his speech such slang terms as for instance, the cat's pajamas (the slang of the 1920s) or cool (the slang of the 1950s) is a marker of association with certain age groups. Such stratificationally marked elements may serve as indicators of the sociodemographic variation of language. At the same time, a diachronic analysis of such a field may provide an interesting feature of a chronological sequence of reference "subcultures" whose jargon during a certain period most intensively penetrated general slang. Thus the slang term cool from the jazz musicians' jargon penetrated the student and youth slang in the 1950s and then general slang. The slang term freaky gained wide currency in the 1960s with other lexical items borrowed from the hippie jargon.

The above contrastive method does not lay any claim to universality. The range of its application is determined by its goal: to reveal the relationship between the distinctive and common elements of the microsystems, determine their common core and the proportion of distinctive elements. Nor can there be any claims to universality for any of the above-mentioned methods of sociolinguistic analysis. Like the methods of field research, the methods of data processing mutually complement one another. It seems that the most effective results
may be obtained by a combined use of these methods with due regard for the specific nature of the material being studied and the goals of research.

* * *

The present stage of the development of sociolinguistics is characterized, in the first place, by the integration of a linguistic and sociological approach to the study of language in society. Developing at the crossroads of linguistics, sociology and other social sciences, sociolinguistics imperatively demands joint efforts of these disciplines to elaborate a single methodological and theoretical basis, conceptual system and research procedures that will make it possible to fully reveal both the mechanism of the social determination of language and the role of language in social life. An attempt to use within a single theory both the achievements of linguistics and the achievements of linguistics and the achievements of Marxist sociology, based on historical materialism, is a salient feature of Marxist sociolinguistics. Development of sociolinguistic studies in the Soviet Union presupposes, at the same time, continuity with respect to the solid sociological tradition of Soviet linguistics.

As distinguished from some trends in sociolinguistics abroad, limited to an analysis of verbal behaviour and reducing the social context of language to the microcontext of small groups and interpersonal relations, Soviet sociolinguistics views language as a multi-faceted and multi-aspectual phenomenon which can only be studied on the basis of a broad social context without losing sight of the sociolinguistic problems involved in small group sociology and the sociology of an individual. Revealing the character of causal relations between language and social structure rather than merely describing functional links between them is a prerequisite for a successful sociolinguistic analysis.

The development of a theory organically combining linguistic and sociological approaches to an analysis of linguistic phenomena still remains a task for the future, not completely realized. Yet the urgency of this task is so great that there is a pressing need now for generalizing studies summing up the work done and mapping out the prospects for the future. This is precisely the goal of this book which summarizes the experience of the study of sociolinguistic problems both in this country and abroad and sketches some approaches to their solution.
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