Literature and sociolinguistics. About *Hónglóumèng* (*Dream in the Red Chamber*)

Francisco García Marcos[1]

[1](*Linguistics, Universidad de Almería, Spain*)

ABSTRACT : *This paper considers the possibility of applying the models designed by the Ethnography of Speech to the analysis of literature. First, it reviews the asymmetric relationships that linguistics and Literary Science have maintained over the last century. Linguistics preferred to ignore literature completely. It had the purpose of avoiding any similarity with ancient Philology, from which it tried to differentiate itself. Literary Criticism, however, resorted to linguistically based models, which it applied without difficulty to its priorities of analysis. The situation began to change when M.A.K. Halliday proposed in 1978 the possibility of incorporating literature into the social research of languages. He understood that it had to be taken care of, as the maximum level of elaboration of the language of a society. What is certain is that, since then, the activity of linguistics in this direction has not been abundant either. Some sociolinguists have been among the few interested in developing this line of action. Here we propose to apply the SPEAKING model of speech ethnography and apply it to the analysis of Dream in the Red Pavilion, one of the great classics of world literature.*

KEYWORDS - *Sociolinguistics, Literary Criticism, Ethnography of Speech, Chinese literature*

I. INTRODUCTION

Linguistics needed to separate itself from Philology to establish its own disciplinary identity. This is a universal epistemological procedure that occurs in every scientific revolution, according to the Lakatian paradigm. New ways of approaching knowledge and analysis of a reality replace the previous ones. In the case of linguistics, moreover, it could only achieve a scientific status if it abandoned the auxiliary role it had played in the philological tradition. Within this tradition, languages were instruments used for the central objective of these investigations; that is, to enter into the discussion of historical, literary or, in general, cultural questions.

II. THE LITERARY QUESTION IN THE DISCIPLINARY DEFINITION OF LINGUISTICS

II.1 The precursors of the 19th century

There was awareness of all this before the explicit formulation of an independent linguistic model. This moment is usually specified around F. de Saussure and his emblematic *Cours de linguistiquegénérale* published by Bally and Sechehaye in 1916. Of course, it constituted a foundational reference that, in any case, did not arise by spontaneous generation either. Linguistics had been around for almost a century, with a high degree of disciplinary autonomy. It did so from the appearance of historical-comparative grammar, which was intensified by the emergence of neogrammarians.

At this point, the separation from other contiguous disciplines begins to be evident. It is true that Reynouard, Ampère, MilàiFontanals or Diez do not completely sever their ties with literature. On the contrary, his philology often delves into clearly literary issues. Milà was an accomplished expert on the romance novel and Ampère on medieval French literature. However, the main concerns of the grammarians in the first half of the nineteenth century focused on human language. Bopp, Schleicher, are concerned with comparing languages to go back to their most remote origins.

With the Neogrammarians, these distances are greatly intensified. They do so not only in practice, but also in the definition of their tasks. In 1888, Á. Ganivet defended a doctoral thesis on the Sanskrit language, explicitly ascribed to what were then the new Neogrammarians currents coming from Germany. The Granada-born author, an accomplished polyglot and author of strong prose in his literary production, demonstrates a deep knowledge of neo-graphic sources. In the name of these, he makes a vigorous defence of the new forms of studying language. Following Comte's positivist paradigm, he has to concentrate on his own facts. Examining them with empirical rigour and systematisation, disregarding other concerns that separate her from her nuclear objective, starting with literary temptations.

Immediately before the appearance of F. de Saussure and European structuralism, there were authors who focused exclusively on languages, language and ways of analysing it. Nor is it a question of providing an exhaustive list now. However, this includes J. Baouduin de Courtenay and Karczewski, Fortunatov and Porzeziñski, Madvig, Sweet and D. Jones, as well as contributions by Whitney and Gabelenz. Von Humbodlt had reflected on languages from a philosophical idiosyncrasy not very well adapted to the times he had lived in. But, in any case, it was also alien to mixtures with literature.

II.2 The position of De Saussure and K. Vossler

This is not an exhaustive data, but it is relevant. Some of the authors who dealt with language during the 19th century was already working autonomously, de facto separated from philological practice.

De Saussure does more than just shape these relatively scattered proposals. The *Cours* presents a complete epistemological model, meticulously conceived, that leaves no detail unresolved, to the point of explicitly inscribing it within a broader scientific paradigm. For this reason, it had an enormous transcendence, both within and outside linguistics itself. It allowed linguistics to reach full autonomy. It created a scientific model that was fully in force for more than half a century. But, in addition, it was the reference that other disciplines, also then emerging, followed. In this sense, special mention must be made of the anthropological adaptation made by Lévy-Strauss (1958)[1]. Of course, all this is the result of an extraordinary scientific programme, conceived and designed by De Saussure.

The linguistics that delimit F. de Saussure focus exclusively on the linguistic sign. He defines it as an arbitrary unit articulated around two major components, meaning and signifier. This is the hard core of his model. From it he will define the rest of the components and dyads that make up his theory. The elements, the positions, the syntagma and the paradigm, language and speech, synchrony and diachrony, are all components integrated within internal linguistics. This will explain the structured system that makes up a language. However, there is another part, external linguistics, which is reserved for describing speech.

Probably, De Saussure's interpreters and continuers went beyond the limits of the hierarchy of both components of Saussurian linguistics, giving prevalence to internal linguistics over external ones. From a strict and literal reading of the Cours, no such dichotomous and drastic consequences can be inferred. Naturally, presenting it in the previous terms was much better suited to the direction that structuralism will take from De Saussure onwards.

In any case, that is a discussion that goes beyond the objectives pursued here. However, neither in the internal nor the external sector was there any room for literature. The conviction that had been established during the 19th century about a radical autonomous study of language and languages was maintained. To abandon any mention of literature was to guarantee complete independence from philology.

Abandoning literature was a kind of epistemological school mark. Linguistic idealism had emerged in explicit opposition to the positivism extolled by Ganivet and theorized by De Saussure. Vossler, on the other hand, was firmly convinced that a knowledge of language made it possible to interpret the human spirit and even the very nature of history. This had its consequences. First of all, he developed his own model, linguistic idealism. Secondly, this model was presented as the opposite of De Saussure's in his time. That antagonism was not entirely accurate. Or at least, it is not entirely accurate that it was only Vossler who was the protagonist. But I do imply that Vossler's idealism dealt with various manifestations of the human spirit. Among them, of course, was literature. Vossler himself had a long list of important literary contributions to literature in Romania.

Thus, it seemed to have returned to the starting point, to a state of things similar to the philological one, although from another epistemological approach. The reception of both models, in any case, determined an almost immediate specialization, which ended up separating their paths. Linguistic idealism became, rather, a starting point from which to cement a model of literary analysis. His main disciple, L. Spitzer, was a true reference, but within the literary style. In fact, with Vossler himself and with Hatfeld they published in 1932 a work of this nature applied to Romance languages.

Academic linguistics, therefore, remained within the Saussurian canon, with the relevant literature separated. It is true, and some of this has been pointed out above, that this canon was more radical in its following than in its design. As had already happened with external linguistics, the subsequent configuration of the proposal founded in De Saussure did not exactly correspond to the literalness of the Cours. In fact, there he had raised the convenience of projecting linguistic studies within a broader framework, of a general theory on signs. Of course, it is impossible to venture the extent of that projection or the implications it would have had. De Saussure limited himself to raising this possibility, without further ado. In any case, the study of signs over time also included literature, with one of its most vigorous branches during the 20th century, literary semiotics.

II.3 The development of structuralism[1]

After De Saussure, the full development of structuralism in Europe and America, there was no room for literature. European linguists concentrated on delimiting their units of analysis (Bally, Schehaye), applying large quotas of formalization (Hejmslev). They deepened in the grammatical and morphological mechanisms (Mathesius) and in the functions of language (Bühler, Jakobson). They founded phonology (Troubetzkoi) and developed the psychomechanics of languages (Guillaume). They were able to locate universals (Benveniste) and to establish predictive models of the evolution of human language (Martinet). They meticulously applied the structural perspective to describe even the smallest detail of linguistic reality (Firth) or the organization of vocabulary (Trier).

There was no room for any literature beyond Jakobson's singularity and his approaches to poetics, Maikowski and literary theory (Jakobson, 1973, 1977, 1980, 1986). These works are an exception, within Jakobson's immense and heterogeneous contribution. Some of these literary interests, moreover, were developed practically at the end of his life. In fact, the penultimate of these works appears two years before his death and the last one is posthumous. This literary look did not find much continuity in his followers either.

In America the situation was even more drastic. It is not true that Bloomfield (1933) [3] denied the existence of semantics. This is a cliché, unfounded, that does not correspond to the great scientific capacity of the American linguist. Semantics is unquestionable evidence. What Bloomfield denied was the effective

---

[1] For an overview of 20th century linguistics, see Cerný (1996) [2].

capacity to address it. To this end, he applied systematic empirical criteria. This was an indispensable requirement of linguistic analysis in Bloomfield's conception. Unlike a phoneme or a morpheme, with an objective empirical basis, the meaning lacked it. Even being aware of its importance for languages, however, it was forced to renounce its study because of the impossibility of undertaking it with empirical guarantees.

From this theoretical foundation, American structuralism designs a very exhaustive and systematic methodology for the empirical examination of language. This methodology successively analyzes the constituents of a language. It starts with the maximum unit of reference (the sentence) and ends with the minimum (the distinctive features).

In all this long activity, capable of covering the theoretical, methodological and descriptive orders, literature had no place either. The programme of delimitation with respect to philology, therefore, was being fulfilled in a very strict way and, in view of the above, with more than effective results.

II.4 Literary Criticism

The separation between linguistics and literature turned out to be somewhat asymmetrical. Literary studies also broke away from philology, founding its corresponding literary science.Over time, it established three major domains-history of literature, theory of literature and literary criticism-which were completely delimited and settled during the 20th century.In time, these studies established three major domains -history, theory and criticism- which were completely defined and established during the 20th century. On this occasion, their precursors went back to Aristotelian Poetics and Rhetoric, although it is in the 20th century when they acquire the format of a scientific model. It does so by concentrating on the literary fact itself, devoid of external influences and conditioning. This is the nucleus of the proposal of OPOYAZ, the Society for the Study of Poetics, from which the Russian formalist school officially departed in 1914.

Stalinism censors these authors for their neglect of the social context. As a result, it outlawed them in 1923. But before this, Shlovski's followers had had time to join, authors such as Tomashevski, Eichenbaum or Propp. Afterwards, their postulates had a more or less direct continuity through the American New Criticism, the stylistics inherited from linguistic idealism or the semiology of narration.

Russian formalism developed a point of balance that led it to break with philology, but not to oppose - explicitly or implicitly - linguistics, as had happened in the latter. So much so that they maintained close contacts with the Moscow Linguistic Circle, which was based on the figure of Fortunatov, one of the precursors of structuralism, as mentioned above.

This autonomy, which was not opposed to other nearby disciplines, has been a constant in Literary Criticism over the years.Sometimes it has moved from it to the outside (as in the case of Russian formalism and linguistics). But on other occasions it did so in the opposite direction. The grammar of the text found one of its great applications in the literary domain. It will come back to this later.Before, however, so had semiotics, which had a version of semiotic-literary studies.

In this way there was the possibility of approaching the linguistic fact from the presuppositions of literary science; and the opposite, without the need to lose disciplinary autonomy or to incur philological regressions. What happened is that this possibility was only exercised in one direction, that which was moving from literature to linguistics.

II DYNAMIC LINGUISTIC MODELS

Linguistics has undergone a very substantial variation since the 1960s. This is the moment when what A. Pisani (1987) [4] characterised as dynamic models appear. The monographic concentration on the description of linguistic systems was abandoned because of a central interest in the use of languages.The new objective was to describe how languages were used in everyday reality. This implied a very significant change in the epistemological order of linguistics. Specifically, it developed new models that dealt with many other areas of language use, such as sociolinguistics, conversation analysis, pragmatics and text grammar.

Potentially, this implied a certain possibility of incorporating literature, as a form of language use. At this point in the 20th century, any kind of philological suspicion could be banished. It could rather be a matter of recovering linguistic manifestations from the prism of an autonomous science that had been in existence for decades.

Certainly, there was not much effort in that either. It did turn out to be first-rate when it happened. M.A.K. Halliday, one of the great protagonists of the beginning of the dynamic models and of the linguistics of the 20th century as a whole, elaborates one of the most integrating models of current linguistics. He starts from considering that the organization of language is functional, not arbitrary. In this way it responds to its reason for existence; that is, to satisfy the needs of human communication. In accordance with this, it establishes seven major functions in charge of solving these communication needs (Halliday, 1978) [5].

Table 1
The functions of language according to Halliday

Macro-functions	Interpersonal	Conative (or expressive) meaning of language
	Ideational	Logical (literal) meaning
	Textual	Relationship with the context through prosodic procedures
Micro-functions	Instrumental	It solves material needs
	Regulatory	Controls foreign behaviour
	Interactional	Contacting others
	Personal	Identify/express yourself

In principle, all this makes language a semiotic resource available to its users. However, it is not distributed uniformly. It is a potential of meaning but stratified and with differentiated access according to each social group. To deal with all these issues, Halliday develops his systemic-functional model. In it he integrates components of structural grammar, together with dynamic parameters that describe pragmatic and sociolinguistic components. In analyzing the levels and types of uses that concern linguistics, Halliday also includes literature. He thinks that this is the most elaborate level of use of a language. Therefore, linguistics could also deal with its study from this perspective.

Halliday's literary proposal was part of one of the fundamental models of contemporary linguistics. However, it did not have repercussions among linguists either. Even the author himself did not apply it. It is true that the literary question does not form part of the nucleus of his model of human language either.

On the contrary, the grammar of the text did have a more intense link with literature, practically from the beginning. This was so because he applied the notion of textuality to every literary work. This implied initiating a field of analysis totally linked to the linguistic model designed by Van Dijk (1977) [6]. His textual macrostructures ended up creating specific models for the analysis of literature in authors such as Greimas, Algirdas or Petöfi (Albadalejo, 1986)[7].

However, it is necessary to specify this link. Albadalejo (1984)himself[8] had recalled that the presence of elements coming from textual linguistics provided suitable instruments for linguistic poetics. This implied that the links were not bidirectional: the theoreticians of literature incorporated linguistic procedures, which was not the same as carrying out a linguistic analysis of the literary fact.

III SOCIOLINGUISTICS AND LITERATURE

Sociolinguistics, for its part, has also made some timid incursions into the literary domain, in various stages and from various perspectives. Its scholarly diversity, of course, fostered the potential heterogeneity of these approaches, however much they all shared the denominator of examining the interrelationship of languages with societies. This diversity - which is not exempt from dispersion - also had its counterparts. In principle, not all the ways of sociolinguistic approach to the literary fact were exhausted. That of Halliday was pending development, of course. But it is that, in addition, other readings of the sociolinguistic fact could reach interesting results, at least in the beginning.

III.1 A precursor. Bakhtin

But before coming to contemporary sociolinguistics, one of its founding figures in the USSR, M. Bakhtin, worked in both disciplines. This nuance should be stressed from the outset. Bakhtin is not an evolved philologist. On the contrary, Bakhtin develops a comprehensive research programme. This program begins with language and ends with culture and its products, including literature. Bakhtin reacts immediately to the *Cours*. Against what he classifies as abstract objectivism, he insists on the ideological character of the linguistic sign. Languages, in his opinion, are first and foremost phenomena of communication. Therefore, the main objective of his study must necessarily be aimed at speech, in absolute contrast to the pre-eminence of the system on which structuralism will bet. As we enter into speech, the first thing that becomes evident are the links between language and ideology. This is what saves languages, while at the same time they sustain and reproduce ideology. Consequently, going into the analysis of language necessarily means going into the analysis of the ideological mechanisms of societies.

First, he determined that social ideology conditions. Then he proceeded to examine it. From that moment Bakhtin began to introduce concepts - ethical act and aesthetic act, etc. - that ended up shaping a complete literary theory.

To his enormous scientific contribution, we must add the symbolic repercussion of his intellectual figure. He is a confessed Marxist, but he was disowned during Stalinism, which confined him in a strict way. He simply disappeared as an author and as a scientist. The starting point of that trajectory, his linguistic contribution on the ideological sign, appeared with the title of Marxism and the philosophy of language, signed by Valentin Voloshinov. It has not yet been clarified - nor does it seem possible that it can be done - whether he is a heteronomous or a real disciple of Bakhtin who lent him his name to circumvent the censorship.

In any case, for what we are discussing here, the case of Bakhtin provides a truly extraordinary example from the point of view of scientific historiography. In principle, both linguistics and literary science were two systems of emerging ideas that replaced philology. Precisely, they shared the defining note of dissociating their then young disciplines from all the others with which they had coexisted mixed within philology. But there was a fourth possibility, that of proposing another scientific programme which, starting from the ideological consideration of language, would end up taking charge of culture, art and literature.

The latter was Bakhtin's proposal, as just mentioned, which was received asymmetrically by those possibly interested in it. Literary theory made him one of its great founders, often ignoring the fact that it all began in language. For linguistic structuralism, on the other hand, it was a deviation from its disciplinary objectives. In this sense, it suffered the same fate as Meillet, another precursor of sociolinguistics. It is true that there was a line of continuity both in the Soviet sociolinguistic school and in the French one during the 1930s, 1940s and 1950s. But that line was eventually blurred when sociolinguistics in the United States were reformulated in the 1960s.

The paths of linguistics and literature continued to be dissociated.

III.2 Some subsequent sociolinguistic research

However, sociolinguists continued to take an interest in literature. They did not do so from a clear scholarly position, nor with continuity or a defined methodological framework for various authors. But at least this interest did exist, and sociolinguistics continued to provide approaches to the literary fact.

Some of its resources found in sociolinguistics a useful tool to analyze it, even if sometimes that sociolinguistics could be understood in a somewhat broad sense. Preti (1994) [9] dealt with the levels of speech in Brazilian literature, a problem that had to do with the sociolinguistic distribution of records. Undoubtedly, this is an aspect directly linked to sociolinguistics, practically in all its versions. One of its most continuous objectives has been precisely to delimit the records and, as far as possible, to establish their distribution patterns among the different social groups. Of course, some literary schools have frequently resorted to this resource to characterize their characters. A certain way of speaking referred the reader to all the stereotypes he could have attached to it and, therefore, constituted a powerful resource to characterize characters and situations. Galván (1983) [10] applies similar criteria to the analysis of heroes and anti-heroes in English literature.

In relation to the above, these socially marked elements also allowed a complementary reading. From them, valuable information could be inferred about the social and cultural dynamics within the communities of origin. Fuentes González (2013) [11]carries out a study on the genres in the work of Najat EL Hachmi: genres denote a particular configuration of relationships and values within a society.

Likewise, it is possible to contrast through literature the confrontation of norms within a language, always depending on the social and historical dynamics among which the authors have developed. For Oliveira and Oliveira (2014) [12], modernist literature in Brazil uses a partially different language, because it ultimately transcribes a society different from the metropolitan one.

Finally, sociolinguistic links have been found with literature in a broader sense. Rojas (1985) [13] examined the functions of language that were fulfilled in I. Allende's *La Casa de los espíritus*, following Halliday's proposal very closely. For their part, Prieto and San Martín (2002) [14] address the media as a literary subject, from the perspective of the influence they exert on the societies that receive them as an innovation.

III.3 The ethnography of speech The Speaking Model
Among the American models that emerged from the UCLA Congress (1964) on language and society, speech ethnography soon incorporated a notional corpus that, on a sociolinguistic basis, had an immediate projection beyond it. Its unit of analysis was fixed on the communicative event. This was defined as a complete verbal interaction, based on the intervention of a series of components. Hymes (1974) [15] synthesized them in his cited acronym SPEAKING: Setting and Scene, Participants, Ends (Fines), acts sequence, Key Instrumentalities, Norms and Genre. These components did not act in an atomized way. On the contrary, the communicative event was only accessed through the whole system resulting from the combination of all of them.

To act in a communicative event, it was necessary to handle a series of skills, to have a series of grammatical abilities, but also sociolinguistic, psychological and pragmatic ones. This is what Hymes called communicative competence, as opposed to Chomsky's competence, which was exclusively limited to grammar.

The proposal of speech ethnography contained enormous potential. There were no limits of extension or thematic scope to develop communicative events. It could be so from the intervention of a judge during an oral hearing to the interaction that a client had with a shoe store clerk.

Speech ethnography, of course, was immediately applied to the examination of the everyday communicative life of speech communities. Since the 1970s, there were already several well-established thematic lines around the legal and health worlds, as well as the interactions of everyday life.

However, the potential radius of the communicative event was considerably wider. In 1996 Burke published a series of research papers that he labelled the social history of language. In fact, they are the culmination of a line begun with Porter a decade earlier. His proposal consisted in approaching the social life of past times through the idiomatic uses employed at each moment. The theoretical reference from which he started explicitly were the approaches of Hymes and the ethnography of speech. The social history of language was an unquestionable success and opened up a new way of making and telling history.

Undoubtedly, the communicative event could extend its application beyond what might have been initially thought in the early 1970s. Literature seems to be one of those more immediate and evident possibilities. It probably is, moreover, in a double sense. On the one hand, a literary work itself is a communicative event. It meets all the requirements of the SPEAKING model.

1. It has a stage (the book, the theatrical representation, an electronic support) and a scene (the psychological link with the reading, initially, the emotions it transmits, then).

2.It has participants: the reader and the public, in a first level; both and the characters, in a second.

3. It has some purposes (to delight, to transmit values, etc.) that sometimes are explicit and others remain implicit.

4.It is organized sequentially.

5. It uses keys that delimit the tone between the one that unfolds.

6.Uses a varied range of expressive instruments, with a varying degree of sophistication (from the simplest to the most elaborate, in poetry, for example).

7.Has some rules to follow, although transgressing them can also become a literary option (surrealism, counter-cultural literature)

8.It runs between genres, one of its canons of performance since classical times.

But, in turn, at least some literary works may contain minor communicative events within them. In particular, the dialogues in narrative works are events in themselves, different from the act of narration that the novel entails. Thus, the literary communicative event becomes a macro-event that combines and integrates other internal events.

IV. A PROPOSAL FOR THE SOCIOLINGUISTIC ANALYSIS OF LITERATURE. DREAM OF THE RED CHAMBER PROJECT

Dream of the Red Chamber, (紅樓夢, *Hónglóumèng*), is one of the great classics of Chinese literature and one of the masterpieces of world literature. It was written by Cao Xuegin in the 17th century, although it did not circulate in printed form until 1791. This last edition contained the 80 original chapters of Cao, to which were then added another forty complementary ones by Gao E, co-editor of the text together with Cheng Weiyuan. That is the version which has finally prevailed and has circulated until our days.

Dream of the Red Chamber, it seems, recreates an autobiographical environment of the author himself. Whether or not this very personal aspect fits reality, the truth is that it reflects life under the Qing dynasty in an extraordinary way. Besides being an extraordinary testimony of his time, it has a wide range of characters and psychological profiles. Among them, a detailed analysis of the female figure stands out, forming a very valuable picture of her social status and daily life in China for almost two centuries.

This way of getting into the daily life, into the depths of the characters' lives, makes the dialogues have an extraordinary value in the work. This circumstance made them optimal for applying an analysis based on the ethnography of speech. Taking up the criteria that have just been explained, each dialogue has been considered as a closed communicative event but inscribed within the major event that would constitute the whole of the work. Thus, it is possible to examine the intervention of the components of the SPEAKING model, to determine two values: the dynamics they follow as a communication system, on the one hand, and, on the other, the functions of language that are activated according to Halliday's proposal.

A first approach has highlighted the extraordinary relevance of the axes of power and solidarity to examine the conversations gathered in the dialogues. This, of course, has been one of the most active axes in the characterization of the speakers who participate in an event. The relations between them -vertical (power) and horizontal (solidarity)- determine not only the verbal selection used, but also the sequence of the dialogues.

At the moment, this is an ongoing project within the Andalusian Circle of Applied Linguistics of the University of Almería. It is being developed by Patricia AmateNúñez, under my own supervision. It is a theoretical-methodological hypothesis for the analysis of the literary fact from sociolinguistic approaches, following, therefore, the proposal of Halliday. In any case, there is much to be done to assume it completely, especially in its most intense and demanding component: to incorporate literature as a sociolinguistic variety of a speaking community. This is the objective towards which work is being done through the investigation of Dream in the Red Pavilion, a work of enormous scope in every sense. Time will clarify whether what is

proposed now opens up a path along which it is interesting to continue or whether, on the contrary, a wrong direction is being followed. But, for the moment, it is worth trying.

V. CONCLUSION

More than a century of the *Cours*has passed. The work that De Saussure started has been accomplished. Today linguistics is a completely autonomous scientific discipline. There is no danger that its approach to literature will divert it from its goal. Therefore, it seems that it is possible to analyze it without philological suspicions.

There are three possibilities for this linguistic treatment of literature. On the one hand, literature can be treated as a linguistic level. That was fundamentally Halliday's idea. That task is still pending. On the other hand, literature can be used to document linguistic behaviour. Finally, linguistics can offer instruments for the analysis of literature.

This last possibility is what we have tried to propose here. The SPEAKING model allows to understand the literary work as a communicative event. This makes it possible to apply its components to analyse elements such as dialogues. The project currently being developed at the University of Almeria follows this perspective. The results finally obtained will allow to confirm (or refute) this hypothesis.

REFERENCES

[1]   Lévi-Strauss, C. *Anthropologie structurale*. (París: Plon, 1958)

[2]   Cerný, J. *Historia de la Lingüística*. (Cáceres: Universidad de Extremadura. 1996/1998).

[3]   Bloomfield, L. *Language* (New York: Henry Holt, 1933)

[4]   Pisani, A. *La variazionelinguistica. Causalismo e probabilismo in sociolinguistica*.(Turín: Angeli, 1987).

[5]   Halliday, M. A. K. *El lenguajecomosemiótica social. La interpretación social del lenguaje y el significado*. (México: FCE, 1978/1982).

[6]   Van Dijk, Th. *Text and context. Explorations in the semantics and pragmatics of discourse*. (London: Longman, 1977).

[7]   Albaladejo, T. Sobrelingüística y textoliterario. *Actas del III Congreso Nacional de LingüísticaAplicada,* Valencia, 1986, 33-46.

[8]   Albaladejo, T. La críticalingüística . Aullón de Haro , Pedro (coord.) Aullón de Haro , Pedro (coord.) Introducción a la críticaliteraria actual (Madrid, Playor**,** 1984,141-207).

[9]   Preti, D. *Sociolingüística: osníveis de fala: um estudosociolingüístico do diálogonaliteraturabrasileira*. (Edusp, 1994).

[10]   Galván, J. Caracterizaciónsociolingüística de Charlie Thornton y Paul Morel. *Actas del V Congreso de AEDEAN*, 1983, 169-178.

[11]   Fuentes González , A. D. El últimopatriarca, de Najat EL Hachmi: Una lecturasociolingüística. *Álabe*(8. [www.revistaalabe.com], 2013).

[12]   Oliveira, I. y Oliveira da Costa, E. O. Língua, literatura e sociedade: umaanálisesociolinguística do Modernismobrasileiro. *Signótica*, *26* (2), 2014, 541-556.

[13]   Rojas, M. A. La casa de los espiritus de Isabel Allende: Una aproximacionsociolinguistica. *Revista de CríticaLiterariaLatinoamericana*, 1985, 205-213.

[14]   Prieto, L. y San Martín, A. Diferencias de géneroen el empleo del discursoreferido: aproximaciónsociolingüística y pragmático-discursiva. *Boletín de Filología*, 39 (1), 2002.

[15]   Hymes, D. *Foundations in Sociolinguistics: An Ethnographic Approach*. (Filadelfia: Univ. Pennsylvania Press, 1974).