



This is a repository copy of *The Institute for the Comparative History of the Literatures and Languages of the West and East (ILlaZV)*.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:

<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/194770/>

Version: Published Version

Book Section:

Brandist, C. orcid.org/0000-0002-8119-9693 (2022) The Institute for the Comparative History of the Literatures and Languages of the West and East (ILlaZV). In: Mrugalski, M., Schahadat, S. and Wutsdorff, I., (eds.) Central and Eastern European Literary Theory and the West. De Gruyter Reference . De Gruyter , pp. 152-163. ISBN 9783110378726

<https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110400304-009>

Reuse

This article is distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs (CC BY-NC-ND) licence. This licence only allows you to download this work and share it with others as long as you credit the authors, but you can't change the article in any way or use it commercially. More information and the full terms of the licence here: <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/>

Takedown

If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing eprints@whiterose.ac.uk including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.



eprints@whiterose.ac.uk
<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/>

Craig Brandist

The Institute for the Comparative History of the Literatures and Languages of the West and East (ILlaZV)

The Institute for the Comparative History of the Literatures and Languages of the West and East (Nauchno-issledovatel'skii institut sravnitel'noi istorii literatur i iazykov Zapada i Vostoka, ILlaZV) was an important research institute in Leningrad throughout the 1920s. It was originally founded as the Aleksandr Veselovskii Institute (Institut im. A.N. Veselovskogo), which was organised by the Slavist Nikolai Derzhavin (1877–1953) within Petrograd University in 1921, and was renamed ILlaZV in 1923. It changed its name again to the State Institute for Discursive Culture (Gosudarstvennyi institut rechevoi kul'tury, GIRK) in 1930, and after a series of further reorganisations was merged into the philology faculty of Leningrad (now St Petersburg) State University, which still exists today. Here the acronym ILlaZV will be used throughout.

The heyday of the institute spans the period between the end of the Russian Civil War (1918–1921) and the so-called 'Great Break' that coincided with Stalin's launch of the first Five Year Plan (1928, but especially from 1929). At this time there was a parallel structure of Party and state institutions, with the latter maintaining considerable autonomy from the ideas of the governing Party. Nevertheless, the institutes were clearly framed by government policy and the availability of funds for certain kinds of research had significant effects on the work carried out. This is, however, hardly something that was peculiar to the USSR, though it might be noted that autonomy narrowed in the period in question. While beginning work under the auspices of the Faculty of Social Sciences of Petrograd (later Leningrad) University, the institute came under the administrative and budgetary controls of the Russian Association of Scientific Research Institutes in the Social Sciences (Rossiiskaia assotsiatsiia nauchno-issledovatel'skikh institutov obshchestvennykh nauk, RANION), formally in May 1927 but in practice to an increasing extent from 1925. RANION had originally been formed in October 1921 to administer the institutes of history, scientific philosophy, economics, Soviet law, linguistics and the history of literature, archaeology and art studies, and experimental psychology within Moscow State University (MGU). In 1924, RANION and the institutes it coordinated were separated from the MGU's Social Sciences Faculty and it gradually incorporated several more scientific institutes from Moscow and Leningrad including institutes for the study of the ethnic and national cultures of the east of the USSR, material culture (GAIMK), Marxism, and art scholarship (GAKhN).

In March 1926 the Presidium of RANION instructed ILlAZV to develop a Marxist seminar for postgraduates (*aspiranty*), more firmly link its linguistic work with national minorities and literary work with the requirements of practical life (RGALI [SPb] 288/1/15/49-49ob). From May 1927 the institute's production plan and the composition of its governing college had to be approved by RANION. The institute's plan and work had to be reflected in the work of all its sections and members and themes had to have "a scientific-topical character both from the point of view of the theory and methodology of science and from the point of view of the interests of socialist construction" (GARF A-4655/1/94/5-7ob). The sphere for research activity within this remit remained quite broad, however. As Zinder and Stroeva note:

A characteristic feature of the time was an urge to derive something of directly practical usefulness from all research. And the field for activity in this sense was vast: in the first place the majority of languages were essentially unstudied and had no written form, the national language policy of the fledgling Soviet state introduced the study of a native language and in a native language; there was the spread of the literary language among the laboring masses: worker-correspondents, peasant correspondents, agitators and propagandists; a method of teaching foreign European languages widely took root among the masses, a method that had to be decisively distinguished from the "method of the governess" (L.V. Shcherba). New types of grant were created in connection with all these tasks. (Zinder and Stroeva 1999, 207)

The institute was particularly important in that it brought together a range of prominent scholars working in areas of linguistics and literary studies and organized them into what were then radically new collective research projects. From these projects emerged a range of intellectual trends and texts that were to have a considerable impact on the future development of linguistic and literary scholarship. Perhaps the clearest statement of the focus of the institute's research was as follows:

- 1) Problems of international and intra-national linguistic and literary exchange on the basis of the socio-economic, political and general cultural interaction of peoples and countries.
 - a) The interaction of linguistic units (national and class languages, ethnic and social dialects and so on);
 - b) International literary exchange in connection with the social development of peoples and countries that are in literary interaction.
- 2) The study of the languages and the oral art (*tvorchestvo*) of the contemporary city, village and the national minorities of the USSR, along with the peoples bordering East and West on the basis of their socio-economic, political and general-cultural development. (RGALI [SPb] 288/1/39/1ob)

A number of observations can be made about this. Firstly, it combined an evolutionary approach to discursive phenomena with attention to issues of the diffusion of linguistic and literary innovations. It thus broke out of the dominant paradigms in European philology of the time, which either traced the internal evolution of societies and cultures in time or sought to trace the spread of lexical units and literary motifs across space. At the same time there was no strict division between the methods of linguistic and literary analysis since the category of ‘verbal art’ (*slovesnoe tvorchestvo*) pertained both to oral and written phenomena. Relations between regional and sociological dialects and the national language on the one hand, and between folklore and literature on the other were seen as being different dimensions of a single research problematic. Linguistic and literary scholars thus worked in close connection, with individual scholars often publishing in areas that we would not define as linguistics and literary studies.

A sense of this can be gained from the early structure of the institution. In 1923 there were three general sections and four regional sections: 1) The Theory and Methodology of Literature; 2) General Linguistics; 3) Modern and Recent Literatures; 4) The Romano-Germanic World; 5) The Slavic-Greek world and the Near East; 6) The Central-Asian, Indian, and Far Eastern World; 7) The Ancient Irano-Hellenic World (RGALI [SPb] 288/1/13/10). While 1 and 2 were aimed at establishing the methodologies of specific disciplines, 4, 5, 6 and 7 were only defined regionally, encouraging cross-fertilization between disciplines. Meanwhile 3 encouraged literary studies across regions. The structure of the institution underwent many changes throughout the decade, but this stress on comparative history was retained, as was reflected in the very name of the institute.

As the original name of the institute suggests, the legacy of Aleksandr Veselovskii, one of the founders of comparative literature, was powerfully present and the Romance scholar and Veselovskii’s senior student Vladimir Shishmarev (1875–1957) played a leading role in the work of the literary section. Indeed, in some respects the original institute was a recomposition of Veselovskii’s Neo-philological Society, which brought together linguists, literary scholars and orientologists at St Petersburg University, but in very different, post-revolutionary conditions. One of the earliest projects was to publish the work of Veselovskii, and a number of the senior scholars at the institute had, in one way or another, been involved in the Society and their subsequent research grew out of its shared concerns with the nature of ‘verbal art’. Veselovskii’s search for constitutive features of literature as such, which transcended national languages and traditions, were taken up by Russian formalist theorists at a neighboring institute, the Russian (later State) Institute for the History of the Arts (Gosudarstvennyi institut istorii iskusstv, GII), while his concerns with the rise of poetic forms from earlier states of ‘verbal art’ such as myth and folklore were taken up by literary historians

and those seeking to develop sociological approaches to literature at a number of different institutions. ILlAZV was particularly interesting because it was here that exchanges between those seeking to develop the different trends took place within common research projects.

The staff of the institute included such notable and varied scholars as the controversial linguist and orientologist Nikolai Marr, the biblical scholar Izrail Frank-Kamenetskii, the classicist Ol'ga Freidenberg, the formalist literary critics Boris Tomashevskii (1890–1957) and Boris Èikhenbaum (1886–1959), and the linguist students of Jan Baudouin de Courtenay (1845–1929), Lev Shcherba (1880–1944), and Lev Iakubinskii (1892–1943), and the literary scholar and germanist Viktor Zhirmunskii (1891–1971). The institute also hosted the art historian Ieremiia Ioffe and members of what is now generally (and not unproblematically) known as the Bakhtin Circle: Pavel Medvedev and Valentin Voloshinov. As well as publishing a series of significant monographs and collections, the institute also published a journal *Iazyk i literatura* (*Language and Literature*).

1 Terminology

Given the centrality of the notion of ‘verbal art’ here, it is worth pausing to consider terminology since translation between Russian and English of related terms proves very problematic. The Russian *slovo* means ‘word’ but not only the individual lexical unit – it corresponds better to the Greek term *logos*, meaning both word and logic, way of thinking. It may therefore be translated by the term ‘discourse’ in certain cases, though this emphatically does not correspond to the term that has come to be associated with the French philosopher Michel Foucault. It has the general sense of language in use whether oral or written. Unfortunately the term *rech'*, meaning speech, may also be translated as ‘discourse’ in this sense since it may correspond to communication in speech, writing or even gestures. Some of the work at ILlAZV is therefore better considered as a forerunner of communication studies, which incorporated both literary studies and linguistics into a wider discipline along with performance studies and social theory.

2 The *living word*

One of the most interesting projects pursued in the linguistic section of the institute was concerning the so-called ‘living word’ (*zhivoe slovo*), meaning primarily oral speech, or at least language as used in concrete situations. The idea of the

living word was in contrast to the printed word (*pechatnoe slovo*), and had some history behind it, not least because the dichotomy between ‘living’ and ‘printed’ word had been mapped onto the dialectic of agitation and propaganda that had been developed in Lenin’s 1902 book *Chto delat’?* (*What Is To Be Done?*), and which achieved canonical status after his death. Research on the ‘living word’ had initially been established at the short-lived Institute of the Living Word (Institut zhivogo slova, IZhS) in 1919, which aimed to teach the masses to speak publicly and to bring about a situation in which there was an ‘equality of speech’ based on the principle of Athenian democracy, *Isegoria*. The performative dimensions of language were of special interest at this institute, and it was closely associated with performance and theatre studies. Many of the figures who participated in the IZhS ended up as researchers at ILIaZV. This included the formalists and students of Baudouin de Courtenay, as well as the philosopher of the Symbolist movement Konstantin Ėrberg. In the meantime the oratory section of the IZhS morphed into courses in public speech and then, in the 1930s, into the Volodarskii Institute of Agitation, with a narrow focus on training Party functionaries and managers. The term “agitation” had by this time been severed from all connections to deliberation and democracy.

One of the earliest projects at ILIaZV was on the speech of the recently deceased leader Lenin, which resulted in a number of fine essays by, *inter alia*, Viktor Shklovskii, Iurii Tynianov, Ėikhenbaum, Iakubinskii and Grigorii Vinokur. These were published in the journal *Lef* in 1924. After this a Laboratory of Public Discourse (*rech’*) was established to analyze recordings of ‘masters of the living word,’ ranging from certain speeches of Lenin, Trotskii and Lunacharskii to performances of poets such as Maiakovskii and Esenin. The laboratory also surveyed various theoretical approaches to public discourse, only some of which was published as a result of changes in the structure of the institution and in the wider socio-political environment. The notable exception is Konstantin Ėrberg’s article “O formakh rechevoi kommunikatsii” (1929, “On the Forms of Speech Communication”), which critically surveys works on the social functions of language by French linguists like Michel Bréal, Charles Bally and Antoine Meillet and their Soviet followers Rozalia O. Shor and Mikhail N. Peterson. For Ėrberg all functions of language are communicative functions and ‘social facts’ that may be ordered in an ascending line from the most passive to the most active:

1) *nominative*, 2) *interrogative* and 3) *informational* deal only with thoughts. 4) *Aesthetic* deals with thoughts and emotions. 5) *Imperative* transmits the speaker’s decisions of the will, emotions and thoughts. (Ėrberg 1929, 178)

This fledgling communicative theory was developed in a much more thorough way in a number of articles that still languish in Ėrberg’s archive. Here the simple

division for discourse into oral and written forms of communication is questioned on a number of bases, one of which is the spread of electronic media and the consequent transformation of any notion of ‘mass listener.’ Much more significant were patterns of potential interaction between speakers and the effects this has on the structure of communication. This leads to a more elaborate and sophisticated categorization of types of public discourse, on which see Brandist (2007).

In the last years of the Institute Iakubinskii developed the idea that forms of public discourse had typical forms, or generic qualities, and while they are more likely to be written than forms of conversational speech, this distinction is by no means absolute. With the rise of capitalism “public discourse begins to ‘flourish’ in parliament and at court, in higher education institutes and at public lectures, at rallies and congresses; even the square becomes its platform”:

Parliamentary discourse, a diplomat’s address to a conference, a statement in a dispute or at a rally, a political speech, the discourse of a lawyer or prosecutor, agitational speech on the street etc. etc. These are genres of public discourse characteristic of capitalism as opposed to feudalism, regardless of the fact that we find their embryos under feudalism. Capitalism speaks publicly incalculably more and in a different way than feudalism. Public speaking under feudalism is narrowly specialized, limited by the narrow domains of sociality; public speaking under capitalism pretends to universality; it wants to be as universal a form as conversational language... In accumulating the various genres of oral public discourse, capitalist sociality also accumulates corresponding written genres. (Iakubinskii 1930, 89–90)

While capitalism develops a wide variety of genres of public discourse and aims to transform them into universal forms of verbal interaction adopted by all members of a particular society, it simultaneously restricts them to those genres. This necessarily leads to an unequal distribution of linguistic resources within a society and, consequently, the idea of having a common unified language shared by all classes remains a myth, for the conflict created by the class-structure of a capitalist society sets limits to the unifying tendencies (Iakubinskii 1930, 92). This is something that was to be taken up by Mikhail Bakhtin in his widely received essays on the novel of the 1930s.

3 Voloshinov, *Marxism and the Philosophy of Language*, 1929

The concerns of the linguistic section of the Institute made their way into what is now one of the best-known works to emerge from the Institute, Valentin Voloshinov’s 1929 monograph *Marksizm i filosofiiia iazyka* (1929, *Marxism and the*

Philosophy of Language). Significantly, however, Voloshinov worked in the literature section of the institute, and the work straddles the two areas. Apart from an early, critical work on Freudianism in the USSR, Voloshinov's work came out of a project to construct a 'sociological poetics' at ILIaZV, and he was originally planning a work on that very subject (see the draft in Brandist 2008, 190–195). Starting from the idea that speaking is a type of acting, as discussed by the philosophers of language Anton Marty and Karl Bühler, Voloshinov began, in an article of 1926, by distinguishing between the word (*slovo*) in life and in poetry, showing how in the former meaning is derived both from linguistic context and social situation, while in the latter it is derived only from linguistic context. This he later developed into an argument that language and ideology are co-extensive in his monograph. Here Voloshinov took issue with two theories of language: a) that of Saussure, which, like many others at the time, he understood to be based on the idea that language is a stable, normative system of signs (Saussure actually argued linguistics views language from the synchronic *point of view*), and b) the Romantic idea that language is the expression of an individual, pre-linguistic meaning (the works of Benedetto Croce and Karl Vossler are held up as examples of this position). Voloshinov argues that language exists only in the exchange of utterances (dialogue), oral or written, and that social evaluation and forms of inter-subjective interaction are registered in the way in which language is employed in these social acts. For Voloshinov there is a constant struggle over definitions of certain important words, such as 'freedom,' 'democracy' and the like, and that the ruling class aims to impose its own definition as a 'neutral' standard. This struggle between socially specific perspectives is, furthermore, registered in all concrete discursive acts and can be detected in their stylistic structure. This notion allowed him to maintain that there is continuity between everyday forms of verbal exchange and more crafted and finalized forms of artistic utterance, while not erasing the distinction.

Voloshinov's work appeared just as the political situation was changing fundamentally, as a result of Stalin's so-called 'revolution from above,' and even though a second edition appeared in 1930 it was soon buried beneath partisan criticism and then largely forgotten until the 1970s when it appeared in English translation, and was then translated into a number of other European languages. Unfortunately, many of these translations were not very rigorous. Perhaps most problematic was Marina Yaguello's flawed 1977 French translation, the problems of which were compounded when it, rather than the Russian original, was made the basis of the first translations into Italian and Portuguese. This led to many problems conveying the main concepts developed in the work. Important terminological distinctions were obscured, while the philosophical resonance of certain ideas was lost. This led to a range of wayward interpretations in which the differences between Voloshinov's theoretical perspective and that of the French

structuralist and poststructuralist thinkers of the late twentieth century was effaced. These kinds of problems were to multiply when Bakhtin's works on the novel began to appear in translation in the 1980s.

4 Sociological poetics

The project out of which Voloshinov's book emerged proved to be a very productive one. It was initially led by Shishmarev, but it was perhaps the head of the Institute's literary section Vasiliĭ Desnitskii who shaped the research project most energetically. Desnitskii had been a Party member at the time of the 1905 Revolution, and was associated with the early attempts to promote proletarian culture led by Aleksandr Bogdanov, Anatolii Lunacharskii and Maksim Gor'kii, but he was now the Dean of the Philology Faculty at the Herzen Institute, from where he recruited a number of young scholars for the project. Voloshinov was one such scholar, and Desnitskii supervised his research work. Other recruits were the literary scholar and member of the Bakhtin Circle Pavel Medvedev, and the art scholar Ieremiia Ioffe. In 1926, Voloshinov and Medvedev produced critiques of the work of Pavel Sakulin (Medvedev 1926; Voloshinov 1926), the Moscow-based literary scholar, who sought to develop a sociological method in literary studies (Sakulin 1925), because they thought he had failed to construct a 'synthetic' approach to literary studies that could account for the complex elements of literary phenomena and present a fully-rounded account of the process of literary development. While having identified the necessary goal of creating a unified methodology for such a study, Sakulin had fallen back into the very dualism he tried to overcome. 'Immanent' and 'causal' factors were still separated so that formal and stylistic analyses proceeded apart from considerations of the social factors that shaped literature. Stylistic factors, they argued, need to be viewed as the manifestation of social evaluations.

Like Zhirmunskii, Sakulin did, however, provide erudite overviews and critical discussions of the work of a number of important German literary scholars who, they felt, made progress in the sociological study of literary form. One such figure was Oskar Walzel, who brought the methodologies of German art scholarship to bear on literary texts. Trends within literary history, including generic and stylistic features, were now viewed as embodiments of the worldview of authors and their social environment. Walzel's works were translated into Russian and he visited Moscow and Leningrad at the end of the 1920s. It was, however, Ioffe who produced the first sustained attempt to provide a unified methodology for the sociological study of style. In his 1927 book *Kul'tura i stil* (1927, *Culture and Style*)

Ioffe argued that the separation of form and content can only ever be an abstract conception since they are but two aspects of a single phenomenon. Expounding a monistic perspective, Ioffe argued that it would make more sense to consider “formed content” or “contentual [*soderzhatel'naia*] form” as dimensions of a particular social worldview or “mental set” [*ustanovka*]. The ‘social’ is thus the very fabric of the aesthetic object, and style is but a manifestation of social thought. The history of the arts should therefore be considered as a unity with the history of forms of social thought, with each different sphere manifesting, in specific ways, the same historically defined and socially articulated worldviews.

Another major product of the project was Pavel Medvedev’s 1928 book *Formal’nyi metod v literaturovedenii* (1928, *The Formal Method in Literary Scholarship*). This has quite often been read as a critique of Russian formalism but, as the book’s subtitle suggests, it is primarily *A Critical Introduction to Sociological Poetics* (*Kriticheskoe vvedeniie v sotsiologicheskuiu poëtiku*). It appeared in the wake of a prominent discussion about formalism at the Institute, at which there were acrimonious exchanges between some of the polemical formalists and certain rather doctrinaire Marxists. Desnitskii, who chaired the discussion, brought proceedings to a close with a vote in which the formalists were a minority. Medvedev’s book gave the formalists significant credit for seeking to specify the object domain of literary studies, but held that the way they had gone about achieving this specification, based on the opposition of literary and everyday language, was seriously flawed. After summarizing the problems with the formalist case, Medvedev went on to outline a positive programme in which the specificity of the literary domain would be related to other spheres of social discourse. The formalists had themselves begun to move in this direction, most notably in Iurii Tynianov’s essay “O literaturnoi èvoliutsii” (1929, “On Literary Evolution”), but Medvedev focused on the formalists’ earlier and more polemical pronouncements in order to draw a contrast between the ‘formal’ and ‘sociological’ methods. Literary scholarship would not become one of a number of so-called ‘sciences of ideologies,’ which corresponded to the academic disciplines of the social sciences and humanities then in the process of formation. This programme drew heavily on the German neo-Kantian philosophy, phenomenology, and the thinkers who had been popularized in Russia by Zhirmunskii and Sakulin. The history of literature, Medvedev argued, needs to be understood as a dialectic of ‘intrinsic’ and ‘extrinsic’ factors, with ideological phenomena from various parts of the social world being incorporated into literary works where they acquire an ‘aesthetic validity’ and, in turn, influencing other spheres. The ‘essence’ of the ideological structure may now become perceptible.

There is little doubt that the project proved to be extremely productive of new approaches and laid the foundations for a non-reductive, sociological approach to literature. The changing political and institutional situation was, however, to limit

the further development and influence of this work for a number of decades. Nevertheless, the new approach did exert a significant influence on Mikhail Bakhtin, who recast his early phenomenological approach to author-hero relations in the terms of sociological poetics. Voloshinov and Medvedev helped Bakhtin who, at the time, was unable to work at an institute for health reasons, to publish his resulting monograph, *Problemy tvorchestva Dostoevskogo* (1929, *Problems of Dostoevsky's Art*) in the project's series of monographs.

5 Semantic palaeontology

Ioffe's idea of the unitary process of intellectual and stylistic development in many respects reformulated the German idealist notion of the becoming of mind or spirit (*Geist*) in various concrete manifestations. However, it also focused on changing forms of labour and socio-economic stages of historical development. This corresponded to Nikolai Marr's notion of the 'single glottogonic process' through which all languages progress, punctuated by shifts in the relations of production. Forms of thought, of language, of art and literature are, in Ioffe's analysis, but aspects of a single monistic process of development. Each has its own specificities and immanent features, but they nevertheless constitute aspects on one single process. Ioffe avoided mechanical correlations between styles, historical periods and intellectual movements by arguing that any given cultural phenomenon combined various layers, where survivals of earlier stages were deposited in a given work or style. They constituted modes of life that had undergone modernization, semantic phenomena that had undergone a historically conditioned reworking.

It was Izrail' Frank-Kamenetskii and Ol'ga Freidenberg who worked out the philosophical and methodological implications for literary studies in a project to update Veselovskii's 'poetics of plot' (Veselovskii 2004 [1897–1906], 493–596) according to contemporary thought. The project aimed

to place the traditional comparative study of plots on the soil of primordial, ancient and medieval sociality: the reason behind the migration of plots lies in the convergence of the social structures of those peoples from which and with which they are transferred; alongside this an independent birth of plots on the basis of convergent social conditions of life is also possible. In the most ancient periods the group works in connection with [Marr's] Japhetic Theory. (RGALI (SPb) 288/1/27/11ob.)

The methodological principles were developed in Frank-Kamenetskii's 1929 article "Pervobytnoe myshlenie v svete iafeticheskoi teorii i filosofii" (1929, "Primordial thinking in the light of Japhetic Theory and Philosophy") that was published in the Institute's journal. Here we find strong parallels made between Ernst

Cassirer's work on "mythical thinking" and the role of the symbol in the history of social consciousness, with Marr's semantic palaeontology. For Frank-Kamenetskii, "Marr's theory of the single glottogonic process" posed a new task for those studying metaphor and plot, "the problem of the derivation and transformation of folkloric motifs from the shifts of successive stages of development of society and worldview" (SPF ARAN 77/1 (1934)/21/64). While the specificities of a national culture need to be recognised, they now needed to be viewed as the result of historical development, with each culture "passing through the same stages, but complicated in each particular region by the specific conditions of space and time and authentically completed through interactions and influences" (Frank-Kamenetskii 1935, 113). The deepening division between mental and manual labour and the rise of class society leads mythical plot forms to become 'rationalized,' first into forms of folklore and ultimately into poetic or literary forms.

It was not until 1932 that this resulted in a full-scale collective study in which the Mediaeval romance *Tristan and Isolda* was subject to paleontological analysis until the various manifestations of the same plot and metaphors, in a wide variety of different cultures, were traced back to the myth of the Afro-Eurasian goddess Ishtar (Marr 1932). Behind the tale of forbidden love, the personification of cosmic forces was revealed. This constituted something of a collective manifesto for literary palaeontological semantics, and throughout the 1930s Frank-Kamenetskii and Freidenberg produced a number of valuable studies of biblical myths, ancient Indian literature and the Greek classics. Such focus on the remote past was of little concern to the cultural bureaucrats of the time and proceeded with relatively little interference in a number of institutes in the 1930s. It also exerted a significant influence on Zhirmunskii's work in comparative literature and on Mikhail Bakhtin's work on the so-called 'chronotope' and on 'carnival,' in which ancient structures of plot and the characters therein reappear at various stages of literary history, but always in a new form. (See also Galin Tihanov's chapter on semantic paleontology in this volume.)

6 Closure

ILlAZV (by now GIRK) became a victim of the wholesale restructuring of the scientific field at the beginning of the 1930s. After a considerable period of uncertainty both sections were incorporated into a Leningrad Institute of History, Philosophy, Literature and Linguistics (LIFLI) before being absorbed into the Philology Faculty of Leningrad University in 1937. Many of the directions of research developed at ILlAZV influenced future developments, but the specific dynamic that led to much path-breaking research in the 1920s was unfortunately lost.

References

- Bakhtin, Mikhail Mikhailovich. *Problemy tvorchestva Dostoevskogo*. Leningrad: Priboi, 1929.
- Brandist, Craig. “The Word Made Self: Russian Writings on Language.” *Slavonic and East European Review* 85/3 (2007): 569–571.
- Brandist, Craig. “Sociological Linguistics in Leningrad: The Institute for the Comparative History of the Languages and Literatures of the West and East (ILIAZV) 1921–33.” *Russian Literature* 63.2–4 (2008): 171–200.
- Érberg, K. A. “O formakh rechevoi kommunikatsii. K voprosu o iazykovykh funktsiiakh.” *Iazyk i literatura* 3 (1929): 156–179.
- Frank-Kamenetskii, Izrail' G. “Pervobytnoe myshlenie v svete iafeticheskoi teorii i filosofii.” *Iazyk i literatura* 3 (1929): 70–155.
- Frank-Kamenetskii, Izrail' G. “Akademik N.Ia. Marr.” *Front nauki i tekhniki* 1 (1935): 109–114.
- Iakubinskii, Lev P. “Klassovyi sostav sovremennnogo russkogo iazyka: iazyk krest'ianstva. Stat'ia chetvertaia.” *Literaturnaia ucheba* 4 (1930): 80–92.
- Ioffe, Ieremiiia I. *Kul'tura i stil'*. Leningrad: Priboi, 1927.
- Lenin, Vladimir Il'ich [N. Lenin]. *Chto delat'?' Naibolevshie voprosy nashego dvizheniia*. Stuttgart: Verlag von J. H. W. Dietz Nachf., 1902.
- Marr, Nikolai Ia. (ed.). *Tristan i Izol'da: Ot geroini liubvi feodal'noi Evropy do bogini matriarkhal'noi Afrevrazii. Kollektivnyj trud Sektora semantiki mifa i fol'klora*. Leningrad: Izd. AN SSSR, 1932.
- Medvedev, Pavel N. “Sotsiologizm bez sotsiologii (o metodologicheskikh rabotakh P.N. Sakulina).” *Zvezda* 2 (1926): 267–71.
- Medvedev, Pavel N. *Formal'nyi metod v literaturovedenii: kriticheskoe vvedeniie v sotsiologicheskuiu poetiku*. Leningrad: Priboi, 1928.
- Sakulin, Pavel Nikolaevich. *Nauka o literature-ee itogi i perspektivy: Sotsiologicheskii metod v literaturovedenii*. Moscow: Mir, 1925.
- Tynianov, Iurii. “O literaturnoi evoliutsii.” Iurii Tynianov, *Arkhaisty i novatory*. Leningrad: Priboi, 1929. 30–47.
- Veselovskii, Aleksandr N. *Istoricheskaiia poetika [1897–1906]*. Moscow: URSS, 2004.
- Voloshinov, Valentin N. “Slovo v zhizni i slovo v poezii.” *Zvezda* 6 (1926): 244–67.
- Voloshinov, Valentin N. *Marksizm i filosofiiia iazyka: Osnovnye problemy sotsiologicheskogo metoda v nauke o iazyke*. Leningrad: Priboi, 1929.
- Zinder, Lev Rafailovich, and Tatiana V. Stroeva. “Institut rechevoi kul'tury i sovetskoe iazykoznanie 20-30-kh godov.” *Iazyk i rechevaia deiatel'nost'* 2 (1999): 206–211.

Archival materials

- Gosudarstvennyi arkhiv rossiiskoi federatsii. GARF (Moscow)
Fond #A–4655 Rossiiskaia assotsiatsiia nauchno-issledovatel'skikh institutov obshcheshvennykh nauk (RANION).
- Rossiiskii gosudarstvennyi arkhiv literatury i iskusstva. RGALI (St Petersburg)
Fond #288 Nauchno-issledovatel'skii institut sravnitel'noi istorii literatur i iazykov Zapada i Vostoka (ILIAZV).
- Sankt Peterburgskii filial arkhiva rossiiskoi akademii nauk. PFA RAN (St Petersburg)
Fond #77 Institut iazykla i myshleniia im. N.Ia. Marra.