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Slavic Sociolinguistics in North America:
Lineage and Leading Edge*

Mark Richard Lauersdorf

Abstract: This article provides a general overview of North American research in Slavic sociolinguistics from the beginnings of the field at the start of the 1960s up to the present day. The work of North American scholars published in a selection of journals, series, and special collections, as well as in monographs and dissertations, is reviewed to illustrate the research trends and the overall coverage of languages and sociolinguistic subfields as Slavic sociolinguistics developed and matured in a North American context. This study is intended to serve as a historical backdrop for the new research presented in this volume, and it closes with a brief overview of the studies in this collection and their contribution to the further development of the field.

1. Introduction

Sociolinguistics as a distinct field of linguistic investigation in North America is generally considered to have come into being in the 1960s, nurtured by specialists from the areas of linguistic geography, dialectology, language contact, diachronic linguistics, multilingualism, and language planning, all interested in developing new theories and methods of linguistic research that would address in a principled and systematic way the socio-cultural embedding of language use, variation, and change.¹ This rough dating of the beginnings of sociolinguistics as an independent field of linguistic investigation is mirrored in the Linguistic bibliography/Bibliographie linguistique, where a specific

* I would like to thank my colleague at the University of Kentucky, Jeanmarie Roubier-Willoughby, and especially the coeditor of this volume, Curt Woolhiser, for their insightful comments and suggestions on an earlier draft of this article.

¹ For a series of first-person accounts of the genesis of the field of sociolinguistics in North American, see Paulston and Tucker 1997, including an extended first-person “brief history” of the field (Shuy 1997).

bibliographic subcategory for “Sociology of language/Sociologie du langage” debuted in the 1962 annual volume, replaced by the category heading “Sociolinguistics/Sociolinguistique” in 1969. In Linguistics and language behavior abstracts, which began appearing in 1967, the category “Sociolinguistics” is present already from volume 1, number 2.2 This is not to say that there was no work being done before this time that scholars today would acknowledge as having a sociolinguistic direction in its methodologies and analysis,3 but it is in the 1960s that the theoretical underpinnings of the discipline began to be elaborated in a systematic way.

In the intervening 50 years, the field has grown to include a broad range of theoretical positions, research methodologies, and areas of application; and sociolinguistic research on the Slavic languages has, over these same 50 years, covered much of that broad investigative range, producing a wealth of literature across the Slavic languages and sociolinguistic subfields. This article does not, therefore, attempt to provide an exhaustive historical recounting of all activity in Slavic sociolinguistics by North American scholars, but rather seeks, through a survey of major professional journals and series, research collections, scholarly monographs, and doctoral dissertations, to sketch in broad strokes the general tendencies and focal points in the North American tradition of Slavic sociolinguistics as a background for the contributions to this volume—that is, this article seeks to establish the general

2 Indicative of the vacillations in orientation and perceived affiliation in the early days of the field, the LLBA section on sociolinguistics is renamed “Sociology of language” in vol. 2, no. 1 (1966; despite the fact that the cover lists “Sociolinguistics”) and then is subsumed under the general category “Interpersonal behavior and communication” in vol. 6, no. 1 (1972), where it is again renamed “Sociolinguistics” in vol. 7, no. 1 (1973), emerging finally as an independent category “Sociolinguistics” again in vol. 11, no. 1 (1977).

3 Indeed, sociolinguistic currents are often traced back to at least the 19th century, with quotes reflecting the importance of sociological considerations in linguistic study coming from linguists as early as William Dwight Whitney (1827–94; see Whitney 1889: 404 as cited in Shuy 1997: 12). In the Slavic context, precursors to modern sociolinguistic investigation can be found already in the work of the Serbian linguist Radovan Košutić (1866–1941; see Košutić 1914 as discussed in Priestly and Starčević 1997) and in the work of the Russian linguists Evgenij D. Polivanov and Michael M. Peterson at the Institute of Language and Literature in Moscow and Lev P. Jakubinskij, Boris A. Larín, and Viktor M. Zirmunskij at the Institute of Discursive Culture in Leningrad in the 1920s and 1930s (see Brandist 2003).
lineage of Slavic sociolinguistics in North America, from which the leading edge of current research, as exemplified in the present collection, has grown and developed.\footnote{I use the notion “North American tradition of Slavic sociolinguistics” (and similar phrasings such as “North American scholars”, etc.) to include those scholars with an institutional home or research base in North America, i.e., researchers working within a U.S. and/or Canadian academic/scholarly context.}

2. Lineage

2.1. Slavic Sociolinguistics in Professional Journals and Series

Professional journals and series with their regular periodic publication schedules tend to give a fairly accurate picture of the research trends and the ongoing development of a discipline over time. We will therefore begin our look at the lineage of Slavic sociolinguistic research in North America with an investigation of the diachronic development of the field as mirrored in the research work published in the journals and series: Canadian Slavonic papers/Revue canadienne des slavistes (CSP, 1956–present), Slavic and east European journal (SEEJ, 1957–present), Canadian contributions to the International Congress of Slavists (CCICS, quinquennially 1958–present),\footnote{The \textit{Canadian contributions} appeared as separate volumes for the five Congresses 1958–78 (published under a variety of titles and editors: Bryner, St. Clair-Sobell, and Wainman 1958; Loziniski and Bryner 1963; Bryner, St. Clair-Sobell, and Wainman 1968; Folejewski et al. 1973; and Folejewski et al. 1978), but thereafter they appear as regular issues of the CSP immediately preceding the Congress every five years.} American contributions to the International Congress of Slavists (ACICS, quinquennially 1958–present), International journal of Slavic linguistics and poetics (IJSLP, 1959–2004), Folia slavica (FS, 1977–87), Journal of Slavic linguistics (JSL, 1993–present), and International journal of the sociology of language (IJSL, 1974–present), representing respectively the publishing organs of two large North American scholarly organizations for Slavic studies, the official records of the Canadian and American delegations to the International Congress of Slavists, three prominent journals of the North American Slavic linguistics community, and a leading international journal in sociolinguistics.\footnote{There are certainly many other venues in which North American Slavic sociolinguists have published their work, including the journals of individual Slavic language
It is significant for the timeline of our discussion that the first Slavic sociolinguistic articles in these publications appeared in 1958–59—i.e., at the very start of the period that we have noted as the beginnings of general sociolinguistic research in North America (Oinas 1958; Wainman 1958; Weinreich 1958; Kay 1959; Kreusler 1959; Ornstein 1959). Over the course of the 50 years since those first articles, at least 95 individual articles dealing with topics in Slavic sociolinguistics have appeared in the pages of these journals and series. The volumes from the 1960s show a relatively slow adoption of the new sociolinguistic methodologies among linguists specializing in the investigation of the Slavic languages. A significant upswing in the number of articles in Slavic sociolinguistics printed in these venues is visible in the 1970s, and there has been a steady flow of sociolinguistic publications appearing in their pages since, with an increase in research production visible starting in the 1990s, as the field of sociolinguistics took on increasing significance in the discipline of linguistics in general.

Thematic conferences on Slavic sociolinguistics have taken place in North America, the proceedings from which have from time to time been printed in some of the journals surveyed here. Those thematic conference proceedings, along with other special-focus issues, have caused occasional short-term spikes in Slavic sociolinguistic publica-

---

societies and institutes such as the *Journal of the Society for Slovene Studies* or the *Journal of Ukrainian Studies*; linguistics journals in Slavic-speaking countries, for example, *Naše reč* or *Južnoslovenski filolog*; interdisciplinary journals with a topical focus such as *Nationalities papers* or the *Canadian review of studies in nationalism/Revue canadienne des études sur le nationalisme*; linguistics journals in various areas of sociolinguistics like the *Journal of multilingual and multicultural development* and *Language problems and language planning*; or journals covering sociolinguistics in general like *Language in society* and the *Journal of sociolinguistics*, to name just a select few. As this article is not intended to be a complete bibliographical survey, but rather a general overview of the field, it was necessary to maintain certain restrictions in coverage that nonetheless provided sufficient coverage of the field to allow for tracking general trends and tendencies. For a thorough bibliographical treatment of the early decades of Slavic sociolinguistics through the year 1977 (with selected entries for the period 1978–80) see the three-volume work by Brang and Züllig (1981).

---

7 This number is based on personal inspection of the full publication runs of *CSP*, *CCICS*, *ACICS*, *IJSLP*, *FS*, and *IJSL*, the tables of contents of the full run of *JSL*, and the summary in Rappaport 2006 plus personal inspection of the volumes for 2006–08 for *SEEJ*. The number is, of course, not an absolute count, since certain articles that some might consider sociolinguistic in nature might be considered by others to belong more appropriately to another subfield of linguistics, and vice versa.
tion activity in these print venues. While it is difficult to claim that these concentrated activities resulted in any significant increase in overall research productivity or a change in the research patterns in Slavic sociolinguistics in North America, these special-focus issues do highlight trends in the work being done during given periods, and we will return to the matter of conference proceedings and special-focus issues subsequently (see section 2.2 below).

If we examine the individual\(^8\) sociolinguistic contributions to CSP, SEEJ, CCICS, ACICS, IJSLP, FS, JSL, and IJSL according to languages/language areas, we find the following:

a) There has long been a significant focus on the South Slavic languages among North American Slavists working in sociolinguistics, with Bosnian-Croatian-Montenegrin-Serbian (BCMS) and Slovene receiving the bulk of the attention. Bulgarian and Macedonian are also represented making the coverage of the larger South Slavic languages complete. Overall, 46 articles from North American scholars published in the journals and series in question were devoted to topics in South Slavic sociolinguistics (sometimes in combination with languages from East or West Slavic) and they are distributed across all five decades (1960s–2000s).\(^9\)

b) The East Slavic languages also have strong representation in North American sociolinguistic research published in these journals and series, with the largest portion of that work involving Russian. Ukrainian and Rusyn sociolinguistics are rep-

---

\(^8\) As previously mentioned, we are concentrating in this section on individual contributions to regular journal issues and are excluding, for the moment, thematic conference proceedings and special-focus journal issues published in these journals and series. Thematic groupings of papers that result from focused research activities and events provide a different, additional type of detail to the picture we are drawing and are therefore treated separately in the next section. This includes the “topics issues” of IJSL devoted to the sociolinguistics of specific languages or regions. Standard Fest-schriften (i.e., not thematically oriented) that have been published as issues of the journals under review have been included here in the discussion of individual contributions to regular journal issues (with one exception noted below in section 2.2).

\(^9\) The numbers for the three language branches will add up to more than the 95 total articles mentioned above due to the treatment of more than one language branch in several of the articles.
represented as well, and there is also one contribution on Belarusian in the periodicals surveyed. Overall, 38 studies by North American scholars focus on East Slavic languages and they are, like the South Slavic materials, distributed across the five past decades.

c) Relatively little sociolinguistic work has been done on the West Slavic languages compared to the numbers seen above for East and South Slavic. Overall, only 27 North American contributions to sociolinguistic research on West Slavic languages were identified in the journals and series under review. Sociolinguistic studies of the West Slavic languages appear slowly in these venues in the early decades—of the 27 sociolinguistic articles dealing with West Slavic only 12 were published before 1990 (Weinreich 1958, 1963; Raede 1967a, 1967b; Grabowska 1973; Grabowski 1978; Magner 1981b; Dostál 1982; Rothstein 1982; Zagórska-Brooks 1982; Mikoš 1985; Thomas 1988b). Even with these low numbers, the coverage of the larger West Slavic languages is nearly complete, with Czech, Polish, Slovak, and Sorbian all represented by multiple studies (with no articles, however, on Kashubian).

If we analyze these individual articles in terms of the sociolinguistic subfields represented, we see several topics receiving a large amount of attention among North American Slavists, and we note some slight shifts in emphasis and the rise of new topics over time. In the early decades (1960s, 1970s, and 1980s) the topics of language planning (including standard language development) and language contact

---

10 North American sociolinguistic research on Belarusian is not completely absent in journal publications, and has become more strongly represented in the last 10 years; see, for example, Woolhiser 2003, Brown 2007, and Brown 2008. In general, the sociolinguistic situation of Belarusian and Belarus really only started to generate significant interest among North American scholars after the breakup of the Soviet Union.

11 Since I am attempting to present observed overall tendencies in the sociolinguistic research represented in the individual articles, I have organized the topics covered into fairly broad categories. The content of the articles could be categorized into more narrowly defined subfields, but that would defeat the purpose of teasing out the global research trends. Individual articles could also, at times, be placed in multiple categories simultaneously. In these instances, I have attempted to place them in the category that best represents the overarching concept and methodology of the work.
phenomena dominated the discussions, with language variation (including prestige varieties) and minority language maintenance present as well:

- **Language Planning and Standard Language Development**

- **Language Contact Phenomena**

- **Language Variation and Prestige Varieties**

- **Minority Language Maintenance**
  Gerus-Tarnawecka 1978; Grabowska 1978; Tollefson 1981

While the fields of language planning and language contact have certainly continued to be topical, starting in the 1990s individual articles published in the journals and series under review show that Slavic sociolinguistic research in North America has begun to cover a much broader range of areas, including increases in work on language variation and language maintenance, and the introduction of such areas as discourse and pragmatics, gender linguistics, language and ethnicity/identity, and language education:

- **Language Planning and Standard Language Development**
• Language Contact Phenomena
  Milivojević 1990; Andrews, D. 1993; Rakusan 1993a; Thomas 1997; Levin 2003; Friedman, V. 2003-04; Toops 2006; Thomas 2008; Woolhiser 2008

• Language Variation and Prestige Varieties

• Minority Language Maintenance
  Hammer 1993b; Priestly 1997a; Eckert 2003; Priestly 2003; Schaarschmidt 2008

• Discourse and Pragmatics
  Mills 1993; Israeli 1996; Nedashkivska 2004; Fielder 2008

• Gender Linguistics
  Nedashkivska 2002

• Language and Ethnicity/Identity
  Greenberg, R. 1998; Mladenova 2003; Vakareliyska 2003

• Language Education
  Kramer 2004

2.2. Thematic Conference Proceedings and Special-Focus Collections

Thematic groupings of articles, in the form of either conference proceedings or special-focus collections, provide a synchronic snapshot of scholarly thinking and activity during specific periods in the development of a research field. They tend to show points of heightened emphasis or increased focus that surface from time to time in the general research stream, and are therefore worth looking at more closely as a separate phenomenon in the lineage of Slavic sociolinguistics in North America.

Tracing the chronology of such special issues we see that the general pattern of emphasis in South Slavic (especially BCMS) among North American scholars that was identified above is confirmed and reinforced by the relatively early and repeated appearance of conference proceedings volumes on specifically South Slavic sociolinguistic
topics. In 1976, the journal *General linguistics* published a double issue (16[2–3]) under the title “The dilemma of the melting pot: The case of the South Slavic languages” (Lencek and Magner 1976) which contained “Papers presented at the Michael Pupin Symposium, October 5–6, 1974—Sponsored by the School of International Affairs, Columbia University, New York”, including five by North American scholars (Albin 1976; Lencek 1976a; Magner 1976a; Paternost 1976; Ward 1976). Shortly thereafter, in 1978, *Folia slavica* published, as its vol. 1, no. 3, a conference proceedings issue entitled “Sociolinguistic problems in Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Romania, and Yugoslavia” (Schmalstieg and Magner 1978), presenting the “papers of a conference on sociolinguistics in eastern Europe held at the Pennsylvania State University, 24–26 October 1976”, where the North American contributions included four from South Slavic and two from West Slavic (South: Gribble 1978, Lencek 1978b, Magner 1978b, Naylor 1978; West: Fryščák 1978, Micklese 1978). While not officially focused on a sociolinguistic theme, the Festschrift in honor of Thomas F. Magner, published in 1984 as vol. 6, no. 3 of *Folia slavica* (Schmalstieg 1984), contained three sociolinguistic articles by North American Slavists (out of the 14 total articles),12 two of which are again focused on South Slavic issues, the third treating Slovak (South: Lencek 1984b, Paternost 1984; Slovak: Matejka 1984).

This general prominence of South Slavic languages in the sociolinguistic research of North American Slavists is also evidenced in other types of topical research collections beyond conference proceedings. In vol. 6, no. 1–3 of the *International review of Slavic linguistics*, a special triple-issue on “The Slavic languages in emigrant communities” (Sussex 1981), two of the four North American contributions dealt with South Slavic languages.13,14 In a “Special issue on the Soviet bloc” that appeared as vol. 16, no. 1–2 of the *Canadian review of studies in national-

---

12 Counting also the contributions by non-North American scholars, 6 of the 14 articles (nearly half of the articles in the Festschrift) were sociolinguistic in their approach, which is not at all surprising given Magner’s prominent work in the field.


This early and ongoing South Slavic emphasis is also traceable in the “topics issues” of the International journal of the sociology of language (IJSLO), which has long maintained a tradition of publishing thematically focused issues devoted to the sociolinguistics of specific languages or regions. The only Slavic languages/regions initially represented in IJSLO special issues were the Soviet Union (Kreindler 1982) and Yugoslavia (Magner 1985b), with the contributions to those issues coming nearly exclusively from Western scholars, including five North Americans in the Soviet Union issue and four in the Yugoslavia issue. The Soviet Union issue contained a focus article on “The changing status of Russian in the Soviet Union” with the North American contributions coming as response pieces to this focus article (Austerlitz 1982; Bilinsky 1982; Fierman 1982; Rakowska-Harmstone 1982; Vardys 1982). The Yugoslavia issue took the more customary shape of these IJSLO special issues and included articles discussing a range of sociolinguistic questions and representing the different languages from the region, with the general introduction and three of the languages/regions

---


16 In 1983, in a collection of papers on the theme of the Enlightenment in eastern Europe printed in the same journal (Zaeck 1983), the two essays that focused specifically on issues of language in the eastern European Enlightenment period both treated South Slavic situations: Lencek 1983a; Pribić 1983.

17 The only exception is a contribution from a scholar at the University of Zagreb in the issue on Yugoslavia.
being addressed by North Americans (Byron 1985; Friedman, V. 1985; Magner 1985a; Paternost 1985). Since the end of Communist rule in central and eastern Europe, there has been a steady stream of *ISL* “topics issues” on the Slavic languages and regions.\(^{18}\) While much of this work has been undertaken by in-country specialists, North American scholars have been represented in the same dominant South Slavic pattern we have been noting all along. Broken down by language, we see contributions from North Americans for Slovene (Greenberg, M. 1997a; Paternost 1997; Priestly 1997b; Tollefson 1997), Bulgarian (Angelov and Marshall 2006a), Macedonian (Friedman, V. 1998), and Rusyn (Magocsi 1996—as the sole East Slavic contribution from a North American).\(^{19}\)

The East Slavic languages (represented primarily by Russian) were noted in section 2.1 above as the second strongest area of language focus among North American Slavic sociolinguists. This position is reinforced in our examination of thematic conference proceedings and special-focus collections. We have already noted the early entry of the Soviet Union among the *ISL* “topics issues” in 1982 (Kreindler 1982). In the 1984 two-volume *Aspects of the Slavic language question* (Picchio and Goldblatt 1984), volume one is split among Church Slavonic, South Slavic, and West Slavic,\(^ {20}\) but the entire second volume is dedicated exclusively to East Slavic, counting nine articles overall, includ-

---

\(^{18}\) In chronological order: Poland (Janicki 1989); minority languages of central Europe (Gustavsson and Starý 1996); Slovenia (Greenberg, M. 1997b); Macedonia (Topolinijska 1998); Bulgaria (Videnov and Angelov 1999); Croatia (Filipović and Kalogjera 2001); Serbia (Radovanović and Major 2001); Czech Republic (Nekvapil and Čmejková 2003); Bulgaria (focus on minority language policy) (Angelov and Marshall 2006b); language contact between small and large Slavic languages (Martí and Nekvapil 2007). There has also been an *ISL* issue on Yiddish as “the fifteenth Slavic language” (Fishman 1991).

\(^{19}\) In addition to these Slavic language-/region-specific “topics issues”, Slavic sociolinguistic studies have also appeared in the non-thematic issues of *ISL* in recent years—the North American contributions include: Marshall, D. 1996; Magner 2001; Langman 2002; Tollefson 2002; Maxwell 2003b. These were included in the data represented in section 2.1 above.

\(^{20}\) In this volume we again see a South Slavic focus with five articles on South Slavic and only two on West Slavic—the North American contributions coming in the ratio of three to one (South: Banac 1984, Iovine 1984, Lencek 1984a; West: Svejkovský 1984). Additionally, there are two articles by North Americans on Church Slavic: Goldblatt 1984, Mathiesen 1984; and a methodological overview (Picchio 1984).
ing six North American contributions (Buck 1984; Gasparov 1984; Magocsi 1984a, 1984b; Pritsak 1984; Strumins’kyj 1984). The 1999 collection *Slavic gender linguistics* (Mills 1999b) contains seven articles on Russian material by North American scholars, with only one North American contribution on Polish, one comparing multiple languages, and a general introduction (for Russian, see Andrews, E. 1999, Grole 1999, Mills 1999c, Mozdzier 1999, Sharonov 1999, Yokoyama 1999, Zaitseva 1999; for Polish, see Christensen 1999; for comparative, see Janda 1999; and for the introduction, see Mills 1999a). In 2006 *JSL* published a complete special issue on “American Russian” (King and Polinsky 2006) that contained four sociolinguistics-oriented contributions by North American Slavists.\(^{21}\) Most recently, vol. 11, no. 5 (2008) of the *International journal of bilingual education and bilingualism* contained a special issue on “Multilingualism in post-Soviet countries” (Pavlenko 2008a) with three contributions from North American scholars, two of which involve East Slavic languages in the post-Soviet space.\(^{22}\) One special-focus collection that breaks the South Slavic-East Slavic pattern is the volume *Varieties of Czech: Studies in Czech sociolinguistics* (Eckert 1993c), containing eighteen articles, nine of which were authored by North American scholars (Brodská 1993; Bubeník 1993; Cummins 1993; Eckert 1993b; Hammer 1993a; Hrabik-Samal 1993; Kresin 1993; Rakusan 1993b; Townsend 1993; plus an extended introduction by Eckert (1993a)).

At this juncture it bears stating that, on the whole, there have long been more North American scholars involved in the study of the South Slavic (primarily BCMS) and East Slavic (primarily Russian) languages than in the investigation of the West Slavic languages, regardless of linguistic subfield concerned.\(^{23}\) It is therefore neither surprising nor, undoubtedly, a coincidence that we see a pattern of South and East Slavic language emphasis specifically in sociolinguistic research, mirroring the general patterns of language focus seen throughout Slavic

\[^{21}\text{Andrews, D. 2006; Kagan 2006; Polinsky 2006b; Schmitt 2006. The scope of this “American Russian” issue was ultimately enlarged to include a slightly broader diaspora.}\]

\[^{22}\text{Bilaniuk and Melnyk 2008; Pavlenko 2008b. The third North American contribution in this collection involves language and education in Moldova.}\]

\[^{23}\text{Indeed, Russian has always dominated the overall field of Slavic Studies in North America in essentially all of the disciplines concerned with the Slavic region.}\]
linguistics in North America. The general predominance of South and East Slavic languages in Slavic sociolinguistic research in North America can also be related in part to early differences that existed in prevailing socio-political currents in the Slavic-speaking countries under state socialism. These socio-political differences allowed certain research practices in some countries but inhibited them in others in the early decades of sociolinguistic research (through the 1980s). In the officially multilingual, multiethnic states of Yugoslavia and the USSR, the accompanying issues of language planning, language standardization, and language contact offered a broad range of sociolinguistic questions that could be addressed concerning the South and East Slavic languages in those states. As regards specifically Yugoslavia, by the 1970s there was more openness to outside researchers conducting linguistic fieldwork there than in the other Slavic-speaking countries at the time, and the vitality of regional language varieties and the interplay between them within the framework of language planning and language standardization promoted a strong tradition of research in dialectology and language variation within both the Yugoslav and the international research communities.24

Looking at the North American contributions to conference proceedings and special-focus collections by sociolinguistic subfield, we see that the early patterns of research emphasis lie in the same areas that were prominent in our analysis of the individual journal articles in section 2.1 and that were highlighted above as research areas most accessible to the scholars of Russian and BCMS leading the field in the early decades: language planning and standard language development; language contact phenomena; language variation and prestige varieties; minority language maintenance. The direction of development of North American Slavic sociolinguistic research beyond these initial foci (into discourse and pragmatics, gender linguistics, language and ethnicity/identity, language education) and the timing of that

24 This is in contrast with such socialist countries as the People's Republic of Poland and Bulgaria where the tendency during this same time period was for them to present themselves as ethnically and linguistically homogeneous, thus rendering investigation and discussion of such sociolinguistic issues as language contact and language variation more difficult. In terms of linguistic diversity and its recognition at an official level, Czechoslovakia perhaps occupied a middle ground between Poland/Bulgaria and Yugoslavia/USSR, but the political climate there did not readily allow for large-scale fieldwork by outside scholars until the late 1980s.
further development in the 1990s and 2000s that was observed in the survey of individual articles is also mirrored in our review of conference proceedings and thematic collections.

In the area of language planning and standard language development, there is a cluster of books devoted to the topic that appeared in the 1980s and that presented a treatment of it across all the larger Slavic languages: *The Slavic literary languages* (Schenker and Stankiewicz 1980),\(^{25}\) the aforementioned two-volume *Aspects of the Slavic language question* (Picchio and Goldblatt 1984), and the conference proceedings *The formation of the Slavonic literary languages: Proceedings of a conference held in memory of Robert Auty and Anne Pennington at Oxford, 6–11 July, 1981* (Stone and Worth 1985).\(^{26}\) Already several years earlier, the volume, *Slavic linguistics and language teaching: Selected papers in the humanities from the Banff ’74 International Conference* (Magnier 1976b), contained an entire section devoted to “Language codification”.\(^{27}\) Also among the collections devoted to language planning and containing North American contributions are the aforementioned early *IJSLS* issues on the Soviet Union (Kreindler 1982) and Yugoslavia (Magnier 1985b), as well as the *IJSLS* issue on Slovenia (Greenberg, M. 1997b), and the previously cited special issue on post-Soviet countries in the *International journal of bilingual education and bilingualism* (Pavlenko 2008a).

The area of minority language maintenance has also been the topic of complete collections, including the previously mentioned sets “The dilemma of the melting pot: The case of the South Slavic languages” (Lencek and Magnier 1976, special issue of *General linguistics*); “The Slavic languages in emigrant communities” (Sussex 1981, special issue of *International review of Slavic linguistics*); and “American Russian” (King and Polinsky 2006, special issue of *JSL*).\(^{28}\)

---


\(^{27}\) North American scholars represented were: Lencek 1976b; Perelman 1976; and Rothstein 1976.

\(^{28}\) Slavic languages in a situation of minority language maintenance in the United States were also treated in the overviews that attempted to give a general linguistic picture of the US. See Henzl 1981b in Ferguson and Heath 1981.
In the early collections (and even some of the later ones) not dedicated to a particular subfield, but rather organized around languages and regions, we often see discussions of most, if not all, of the four topics identified here as early North American focal points in Slavic sociolinguistic research. Such is the case with several of the collections already mentioned: “Sociolinguistic problems in Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Romania, and Yugoslavia” (Schmalstieg and Magner 1978, special issue of *Folia slavica*) which included language planning and language variation; the Magner Festschrift (Schmalstieg 1984, special issue of *Folia slavica*) which included standard language, language maintenance, and a survey of issues; and the two volumes on Yugoslavia by Bugarski and Hawkesworth (1992, 2004) which include language planning, language maintenance, and language variation. Perhaps the best example of full coverage of the early foci of research activity in a single collection is *Varieties of Czech: Studies in Czech sociolinguistics* (Eckert 1993) which is overtly organized into four sections: “Language norm and codification”, “Varieties of Czech in literature”, “Common Czech and Czech dialects”, and “Czech in contact with other languages”.

It seems safe to say that, with a relatively small number of Slavic linguists actively employing sociolinguistic research frameworks and methodologies in the first several decades of the field (from the 1960s into the early 1990s), the areas of research emphasis (in both subfield and language) that we see in the publications of the period are a direct reflection of the individual interests of those few scholars specifically engaged in Slavic sociolinguistic research. In addition, it is worth noting that the chronological patterns in subfield emphasis seen here follow, to some extent, the developments in the field of sociolinguistics in general, with Slavic sociolinguists at times being “early adopters”, and at times merely “fast followers”, in employing new theories and methodologies as they appeared. Further, as already mentioned above, re-

---

29 Broader discussion of the field of Slavic linguistics and the intellectual context(s) in which it developed goes beyond the scope of this article and belongs to a fuller history of the field. In brief it can be stated here that the low numbers of North American scholars engaged in Slavic sociolinguistic work before the early 1990s can perhaps be attributed in part to the dominance of structuralism followed by generativism as the guiding theoretical orientations of the major Slavic university programs during that period, as well as to the general lack of sociolinguistic research coming out of the Slavic-speaking countries under state socialism.
trictions imposed by the socio-political conditions in central and eastern Europe at that time also determined the presence and absence of certain sociolinguistic topics and methodologies (as well as certain languages) on Slavists’ research agendas.

Into the 1990s and 2000s, we begin to see, as discussed in section 2.1 and as could be anticipated from changes in conditions in central and eastern Europe, the appearance of collections on topics largely untreated previously. Consider, for example, the already-mentioned cluster on language and nationalism in the Canadian review of studies in nationalism/Revue canadienne des études sur le nationalisme 16, 1–2 (Thomas 1989b) and the collection Slavic gender linguistics (Mills 1999b), or the detailed investigations and descriptions of minority language situations throughout the region in Linguistic minorities in central and eastern Europe (Paulston and Peckham 1998). Indeed, we begin to see collections on topics that were previously “untreatable” in the sense that the socio-political conditions that now give rise to the topic did not exist previously. The volume When East met West: Sociolinguistics in the former Socialist bloc (Harlig and Plěh 1995) grew out of the conference “East European sociolinguistics: History and prospects” held in 1993 at Indiana University, and was designed to provide an overview of sociolinguistic research in the countries of central and eastern Europe as they came out of the socialist period, discussing what had and hadn’t been done (i.e., what was and wasn’t possible) under socialism and what was and wasn’t being done in the early post-1989 years. It is telling that at roughly the same time as Harlig and Plěh published their collection of articles on “emergent” sociolinguistic research in central and eastern Europe, the Polish series Najnowsze dzieje języków słowiańskich (“Most recent history of the Slavic languages”) began its publication run of 14 volumes on the current language picture in the Slavic languages. Authored by teams from the

32 Srpski jezik (Serbian; Radovanović 1996); Bălgarski ezik (Bulgarian; Dimitrova 1997); Russkij jazyk (Russian; Širjajev 1997); Serbsćina (Sorbian; Faska 1998); Český jazyk (Czech; Kořenský 1998); Slovenski jezik (Slovene; Vidovič-Muha 1998); Slovenský jazyk (Slovak; Bosák 1998); Hrvatski jezik (Croatian; Lončarić 1998); Belaruskaja mowa (Belarusian; Lukašanec, Prigodzič, and Sjameška 1998); Makedonski jazik (Macedonian; Minova-
Slavic-speaking countries concerned, these volumes generally give ample space to a wide variety of sociolinguistic questions in their overall treatment of each language—a historical first for many of the in-country linguistic traditions. The one volume of the fourteen to be edited and contributed to by a North American scholar, *Rusin’skyj jazyk* (“The Rusyn language”; Magocsi 2004), is a good example of the extent to which sociolinguistics is wrapped into the fabric of these volumes, the first three sections being entitled: “Istorico-etnografična i jazykova osnova”, “Literurnyj jazyk”, “Sociolinguističnyj aspekt” (“The historical-ethnographic and linguistic base”, “The standard language”, “The sociolinguistic aspect”, respectively).

2.3. Monographs on Slavic Sociolinguistics

In the early decades of the field, extended sociolinguistic studies of Slavic languages by North American scholars appeared in book form only on an occasional basis. Examples of such early monographic studies in Slavic sociolinguistics include: *Die ukrainische Schriftsprache, 1798–1965* (Shevelov 1966); *A Kashubian idiolect in the United States* (Perkowski 1969);33 *The speech of Yugoslav immigrants in San Pedro, California* (Albin and Alexander 1972); *The language question among the Subcarpathian Rusyns* (Magocsi 1979, re-issued 1987); *The structure and history of the Slovene language* (Lencek 1982);34 *The impact of the Illyrian Movement on the Croatian lexicon* (Thomas 1988a). Not surprisingly, we once again see the prominence of the South and East Slavic language branches in these early monographs, and we find the familiar early emphasis on the topics of language planning and standard language development; language contact phenomena; language variation and prestige varieties; minority language maintenance.

In the past two decades, books in Slavic sociolinguistics by North American scholars have begun appearing with relative frequency. In-

---

33 This work is primarily a synchronic linguistic description, but the author does make regular reference to instances of linguistic interference between the Kashubian idiolect documented and Polish, English, and German.

34 The final chapter (chapter 6, 251–93) is entitled “The history of contemporary standard Slovene and its sociolinguistic problems”.
Interestingly, and in parallel to the diversification that we saw above in individual journal articles and in thematic collections in the 1990s and 2000s, these recent monographs cover a broad range of languages (East: Belarusian, Russian, Ukrainian; West: Czech, Polish, Slovak; South: BCMS), and they explore an expanded variety of sociolinguistic subfields, with notable emphasis on issues of language and ethnicity/identity and with the addition of sociolinguistic commentary to a grammar/language textbook (Shevelov 1989; Hammerová and Ripka 1994; Comrie, Stone, and Polinsky 1996; Hannan 1996; Lauersdorf 1996; Ries 1997; Andrews, D. 1998; Laitin 1998; Smith 1998; Friedman, V. 1999; Alexander 2000; Collins 2001; Browne 2002; Gorham 2003; Grenoble 2003; Greenberg, R. 2004b; Bilaniuk 2005; Alexander 2006a; Eckert 2006).

3. Leading Edge

3.1. SLING2K

It is interesting to note that the conference “The future of Slavic linguistics in America” (also known as “SLING2K”) held at Indiana University in February of 2000 and organized around four major disciplinary sections and relevant subsections, did not have a main section or subsection devoted specifically to sociolinguistics. Slavic sociolinguistics is only discussed in brief ways in several of the position papers presented at the conference.

Alexander, in her remarks on dialectology (Alexander 2006b), mentions three areas where “[t]he field of sociolinguistics also has

---

35 The sections and subsections represented were: (i) Core subfields of traditional historical-comparative Slavistics (historical, philological, dialectology); (ii) Core subfields of formal/theoretical Slavistics (phonology, syntax–GB/minimalism, syntax–HPSG); (iii) Core subfields of content-oriented Slavistics (discourse, semiotics, cognitive); (iv) Core adjacent disciplines (acquisition, psycholinguistics, language teaching). See http://www.indiana.edu/~slavconf/SLING2K/program.html, last accessed on 10 June 2009.

36 All but three of the original position papers were subsequently published in Issue 8 (Fall 2006) of the online journal Glossos <http://www.seelrc.org/glossos/issues/8/> (Franks et al. 2006—issue title: “Slavic linguistics 2000: The future of Slavic linguistics in America”, last accessed 10 June 2009). Two of those that were not published remain available at the conference website: <http://www.indiana.edu/~slavconf/SLING2K/> (last accessed 10 June 2009).
clear connections with dialectology”: (i) “the history of the development of literary languages”, (ii) “the question of diglossia”, (iii) “dialects... defined either in terms of a particular population subgroup (such as a specific artisan guild, or a minority defined in religious or ethnic terms), or with reference to a specific urban area” (9–10), but she does not go into extensive detail in any of these areas since a full sociolinguistic discussion fell “outside the scope of the present survey” (10–11, fn. 11). Bethin’s contribution on phonology (Bethin 2006) gives sociolinguistics brief mention stating that “Work in phonology intersects with historical linguistics, dialectology, morphology, syntax, and phonetics, not to mention sociolinguistics, language acquisition, and language teaching” (1), but she does not elaborate “[s]ince these related fields (with the exception of phonetics) are discussed separately in this collection” (1)—which is unfortunately not the case for sociolinguists. Grenoble’s piece on discourse analysis (Grenoble 2006) mentions sociolinguistics only in a bibliographic footnote, stating that “[i]t is interesting, in this light, to compare the contents of several standard handbooks of discourse analysis. Brown and Yule (1986) focus heavily on pragmatics and information structure, while Schiffrin (1994) includes several chapters directly related to sociolinguistic methodologies (i.e., chapters on interactional sociolinguistics, ethnography, and variation analysis)...” (1, fn. 1). In her discussion of cognitive linguistics (Janda 2006), Janda, citing Kemmer, states that there are “areas ripe for exploration with cognitive concepts and methods” with the note that “[a]t the top of her [Kemmer’s] list is sociolinguistic variation...” (35). Janda then includes a brief discussion of select sociolinguistic topics. Finally, Polinsky’s contribution on language acquisition (Polinsky 2006a) regrets that acquisitionists and sociolinguists do not engage in professional dialogue: “the language of heritage speakers has chiefly been the province of sociolinguistic studies, and it is often hard to make two separate subfields within linguistics to talk to each other” (2) and “language attrition through which incomplete acquisition is manifested should not be considered the monopoly of sociolinguistic studies, which it has often been” (50).

Beyond these limited remarks, there is no further discussion of Slavic sociolinguistic research in North America in the papers from this conference. This is interesting and somewhat surprising given the clear increase in the volume and scope of scholarly activity in Slavic sociolinguistics in the decade preceding the conference (as we have
seen documented in the various publication venues examined here). This lack of attention to Slavic sociolinguistics at a meeting in 2000 dedicated to “The future of Slavic linguistics in America” is all the more interesting from our vantage point of roughly a decade later when we see the heightened productivity in Slavic sociolinguistic research that has occurred specifically among young scholars coming out of graduate programs in the years following that meeting. Here it is necessary to point out that the increase in the variety of sociolinguistic subfields represented in the last two decades of research has been accompanied by (and undoubtedly driven by) an expansion in the range of disciplines beyond Slavic linguistics involved in the production of this new work. In recent years, North American scholars from such fields as anthropology, education, general linguistics, history, and political science have increasingly contributed to research in Slavic sociolinguistics, and the academic departments in which these scholars work have increasingly become loci for the training of future specialists in Slavic sociolinguistics.

3.2. Recent Dissertations

I would like to provide a few notes here regarding recent dissertations written by Ph.D. students at North American universities. The dissertations produced within the last 10 years (since 1998) could be seen as indicators of the direction that the field of Slavic sociolinguistics will take in North America in the coming years. Interestingly, the distribution among the three language branches, East, West, and South Slavic, is far more heavily weighted toward the East Slavic languages than was seen in the historical overview above, the emphasis on the South Slavic group is no longer as strong, and research on West Slavic languages is increasingly represented. Regardless of overall numbers, within each of the three language branches we see a broad coverage of languages as follows:

Belarusian: Zejmis 2003; Brown 2004
Rusyn: Schwartz 2000
Polish: Vann 2000; Sztechmiler 2001; Abramowicz 2008
Czech: Dutkova 1998
Slovak: Maxwell 2003a
BCMS: Ford 2001
Bulgarian: Mileva 1998
Macedonian: Tankersley 1999
Slovene: Reindl 2005

The early areas of focus that were identified in our historical overview—language planning and standard language development; language contact phenomena; language variation and prestige varieties; minority language maintenance—are still the areas that we see most represented in the dissertations mentioned here. In the last 50 years, despite or, indeed, perhaps specifically because of the socio-political transformations that have taken place in the Slavic-speaking countries, these topics have lost none of their relevance, and this is reflected in the new work being done at U.S. and Canadian institutions by young scholars entering the field of Slavic sociolinguistics. The topics that we identified earlier as more recent entries into the field in North America—discourse and pragmatics, gender linguistics, language and ethnicity/identity, language education—are also increasingly represented in the dissertation research being done, often woven into the treatment of the more traditional topics.\(^{37}\) In the instance of “language and ethnicity/identity” a simple scan of the dissertation titles shows four that clearly deal with this topic (Bilaniuk 1998; Vann 2000; Shellhorn 2003; Zejmis 2003), in addition to those that do so without overtly naming it in the title.

3.3. The Contributions to this *JSL* Volume

The scholars whose work is assembled in this special volume of the *Journal of Slavic linguistics* represent both the lineage and the leading edge of Slavic sociolinguistics in North America. Many of our contributors have played a central role in shaping the research agendas constituting the lineage of the field and have brought it to its present state with their numerous contributions throughout the years, and all of our authors stand at the leading edge through their continued groundbreaking work as represented in this volume, and through their work with students representing the next generation of North American Slavic sociolinguists.

We see in the present volume a continuation of the recent trend toward broad representation of the Slavic languages in sociolinguistic research in North America, with articles on Bosnian, Bulgarian, Czech, Russian, Slovene, Ukrainian, and language contact in post-Soviet states, and with book reviews on Belarusian and Ukrainian. We also see in the present volume a blending of the older and newer areas of research that we noted in our look at the lineage of Slavic sociolinguistic work in North America. It bears stating that, despite the familiarity of some of the subfields represented, the new work presented here is, of course, not simply a rehashing of the theories, methodologies, or data of past decades. It is based on fresh fieldwork and analysis under new conditions in central and eastern Europe that provide access to communities, resources, and materials hitherto inaccessible to or simply unstudied by scholars. In addition, this work employs new theories and methodologies very much in stride with the current state-of-the-art in general sociolinguistics.

Ronelle Alexander and Vladimir Zhobov, in their article, “New conclusions on the ‘conclusive’ in Bulgarian”, take on a long-standing issue in the Bulgarian past tense verb system with a fresh set of speaker data. Through the analysis of new surveys of actual language use and variation across a range of native speakers of Bulgarian, they shed new light on the functional load of the past tense forms in question and place their results in contrast to the normative classifications and descriptions found in many existing accounts of these past tense verbal paradigms.

Eva Eckert and Kevin Hannan, in “Vernacular writing and a sociolinguistic change in the Texas Czech community”, use previously
unstudied textual evidence to trace the course of language maintenance and decline among the ethnic Czechs in Texas. Making use of newspaper writing, tombstone inscriptions, and community announcements never before analyzed, they map the interplay of standard Czech, Czech dialect, and borrowed English features as captured in the written record of the Texas Czech community.

Michael Gorham’s article, “Linguistic ideologies, economies, and technologies in the language culture of contemporary Russia (1987–2008)” puts forth a new theoretical and methodological framework for the study of language variation and change in contemporary Russian. He couches his framework in the notion of “language culture” and defines the concepts of “linguistic ideologies”, “economies of language”, and “technologies of language” as the operative parameters or forces that shape a language culture and therefore language variation and change.

Robert Greenberg, in his study, “Dialects, migrations, and ethnic rivalries: The case of Bosnia-Herzegovina”, gathers for analysis the most recent and ongoing shifts in Bosnia-Herzegovina’s linguistic map. He employs current theories from the social psychology of language and from linguistic anthropology to frame his examination of the interaction between dialect, ethnic identity, and politics in the context of language planning and standard language development in contemporary Bosnia-Herzegovina.

Alla Nedashkivska’s contribution, “Gender voices in electronic discourse: A forum in Ukrainian”, taps into the new linguistic space of technology-mediated communication. She undertakes a gender linguistic, discourse-oriented analysis of Ukrainian electronic discussion forums to test the often-assumed egalitarian nature of electronic communication, to identify potential Ukrainian genderlect features in electronic exchanges, and to determine possible discourse orientations of females vs. males in Ukrainian electronic communication.

Aneta Pavlenko, in “Language conflict in post-Soviet linguistic landscapes”, introduces the relatively new approach of “linguistic landscape” in the study of language and identity and language planning. Using data from several post-Soviet states, she provides a concise overview of the basic theoretical and methodological concepts of this new approach and then outlines an analytical framework for its use in studying the sociolinguistic situation in the post-Soviet region.
Tom Priestly, Meghan McKinnie, and Kate Hunter, in their piece “The contribution of language use, language attitudes, and language competence to minority language maintenance: A report from Austrian Carinthia”, take on a three-part analysis that few other quantitative studies of a minority language situation have attempted. Combining the three parameters of language use, language attitudes, and language competence in their survey work among Slovene speakers in Austrian Carinthia, they provide hard statistical evidence for the long-assumed correlations and interconnections among these three variables.

Finally, Tony Brown’s review of Mečkovskaia 2003 and Michael Flier’s review of Bilaniuk 2005 provide us with professional insights into the interplay of ethnic, linguistic, and political tensions and tendencies in the states of Belarus and Ukraine. Through their in-depth assessments of and commentary on these two recent books, Brown and Flier provide vignettes of the historical and contemporary sociolinguistic situations in Belarus and Ukraine while at the same time providing a critique of some of the most current sociolinguistic scholarship on these two countries.

It is hoped that through this collection of leading-edge research, the present volume, “North American contributions to Slavic sociolinguistics”, will serve not only as a report on the current state of the discipline, but also as a platform for future developments in the field.
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