

## **Andrej Belyj's *Glossalolia*:**

### **A Berlin Glossolalia**

**Thomas R. Beyer, Jr.**

Scores of Russian writers descended upon Berlin in 1921 and 1922 hoping to publish their works which had been accumulating since the years of war and revolution. Few were as prolific as Andrej Belyj (Boris Nikolaevic Bugaev 1880-1934) who published over twenty works in Berlin from 1921 to 1923. And nothing was stranger or more complex than his *Glossalolia* (Glossalolija, 1922). At the time it evoked only a few cursory reviews; and it has remained without any serious examination in spite of Belyj's own characterization of it as "the most successful" of his longer poems (1922a: 10). One of Belyj's most opaque works, its publication came at a time when he was particularly fascinated with the role of sound in his art and actively involved with writing and revising prose and poetry. *Glossalolia* was an integral part of Belyj's own aesthetic theory and practice, and a key to the poetry and prose works he wrote or revised in Berlin. It was also the most "German" of Belyj's works, with references to German philosophy and philology and word associations based on the German language.

On April 7, 1922 Belyj gave an impromptu talk on eurythmy, one of the major influences on *Glossalolia*, in the Berlin Russian House of the Arts (Beyer, 1990: 113). His attention to sound is also evident in his introduction and collection of verse, *After the Separation: A Berlin Songbook* (Posle razluki, 1922) composed in May and June of 1922. Belyj was also involved with rewriting his novel *Petersburg* (Peterburg, 1922) and the substantial revision of the collection of his *Poetry* (Stixotvorenje, 1923 [dated September 1922]). The introduction to *Glossalolia* is dated July 1, 1922, Berlin.

*Glossalolia: A Poem about Sound* (Glossalolija: Poema o zvuke) was published by Epoque in the fall of 1922 at the Hermann & Co. Typographie. It is a complex construct of philosophy and poetry, and as Elsworth notes: "Glossolalia. . . fully realizes the tendency of theory towards poetry, but is not definable as either. It exemplifies the breakdown of genre between the different kinds of discourse" (52). *Glossalolia*: is an extended exploration, both hermeneutic and hermetic, of the relationship between sound and sense. As Belyj emphasizes in his title, this is a poem. In his introduction he identifies it as "an improvisation on sound-themes," and "a poem of sound" [zvukovaja poema] and cautions against applying the principles of scientific truth to his text, which he considers "completely senseless" (1922a: 9, 10). But it is simultaneously a

treatise on the origins of language, an essay on the relationship between sound and meaning and the origins of language based on an examination of common Indo-European roots, whose form is simple and straightforward.

In the beginning, writes Belyj, the tongue began its movements that resulted in sounds. The single Russian word **jazyk** for both "language" and "tongue" helps sustain this identification. Incomprehensible to us now, these original combinations of sounds (roots) held meaning which we can no longer recognize. Sounds are gestures of the tongue in the mouth, comparable to the gestures of a eurythmist. Belyj's cosmology is a "physiological" refinement to eurythmy, the movements of the tongue substitute for those of the dancer. These movements embody the root of ancient consciousness and lead back to the land of Aeria, or Arya, starting point for inflected languages and comparative Indo-European philology. An examination of the Russian roots for "ponjatie," "pojatieÆ ("comprehending," "grasping") and German "*Begriff*," "*begreifen*," brings Belyj to the etymological basis of words. As linguist/poet Belyj intertwines etymological associations with poetic associations, frequently false etymologies, progressing from Latin "nomen" and "nemo" to Russian "nem on," concluding that the names of things (terms) are dumb (voiceless).

While such attempts to recreate the original senses-meanings (smysl) of words are for philologists "mindlessness-madness" (bezumie), Belyj makes a "leap of faith" to sound and the spirit of God that hover above the creation of the word, concluding that the conflict between the visible and invisible worlds, between what one sees (videt') and what one knows (vedat'), can be resolved only in sound which is trans-imagal. Truth is embodied in the Ur-, original root. To comprehend, to grasp, we must move beyond the lineal, temporal to the supersensible via sound-wording (zvukoslovie).

Belyj's zvukoslovie echoes esoteric literature, including Jakob Böhme and Rudolf Steiner's discussion of the German "Am Anfang schuf Gott Himmel und Erden" and the Hebrew "B'reshit bara élohim et haschamajim w'et ha'arez."

В приводимом звучании явлено "am-an-an" (am Anfang); интересуется, "m", "n" полугласные, или сонанты; "am-an" или "man" – звуки мысли; действительно: – *man-gti* есть *любить* (по литовски), *man-am* (по армянски) есть тоже; по зендски *мысль* – *mana*; и по санскритски: *мысль* – *manah*, *мыслитель* – и *man-ma*, и *man-tra*, ум – *mana-s*; *подумать* – *man-ate*; "mn" – звуки мысли: *mn-ить* и *mn-ение*; *min-eti* есть *иметь на уме* (по литовски); *um* – и *menos*, и *men-s* и *men-me* (ирландский) – ум. Уразумеем теперь эти звуки. – "Am Anfang" – в них есть сочетание am-an-an, переходящее в (a)mana(n); – "am Anfang" ("в начале") гласит звуком слов, что *"в начале был разум."* Самое начало есть разум: "В начале бе слово."

Евангелист Иоанн вписан звуками.

Так еврейское "берешит" и немецкое "An-fang" дают две картины: пылающий блесками мир; и – Элогимы под ним; это вскрыл Рудольф Штейнер . . . И некий космический человек "Adam Kadmon" (ad-ad-am-on) (в мысли божественной, в "Mana", звучит по немецки; "В начале всего").

Звук "aman" включает мысль разума (mana), любви (ame), жениха (Mann); Начало сошлось с Концом; юдаизм с христианством, картины и звуки иные: жест смысла – один (1922а: 35-36).

Belyj looks at \*mn, \*man, \*men and the interconnection of sounds in Indo-European languages moving back and forth between the philological, the mystical, and the poetical for his comparisons. His sound determined associations cross boundaries of languages, disciplines and traditions. All the while Belyj reiterates his own subjectivity, admitting that this self-awareness of sound inside of us is still in an infantile state, and offering a tale, a fairy tale for some, but for him the *absurd truth* (dikuju istinu) (31).

What follows is the essence of *Glossalolia*, a mixture of free associations, inspired by sound, and grafted onto Steiner's cosmogony of Saturn, Sun, Moon, Earth contained in his *Die Geheimwissenschaft in Umriß*. Belyj briefly describes each day of creation, and then offers an account of how the world of consonants and vowels came to be inside-the-mouth. This

cosmology is assisted in Russian by Belyj's juxtaposition of *nebo* = sky and *n'obo* = palate. Belyj frequently rebounds between the philological and the mythical-mystical.

это время течет из Начала: из "U" - вытекает; и "u-h-r" означает: первичное небо: "Uranos" и "Uhr-alte" - одно (1922a: 42).

"Time," "hour" emerge from "ha" and "er" and Arché begets Chronos, the Herr who conquers Uhr and Ur, Uranus. A graphic depiction of this first day, Saturn, inside the mouth is a cross "h, r, w, sch", within the circle "a-e-i," the vowels for Yahweh, and æggs, æternal, eve, avva, abba, father, Jupiter.

These sound associations for the main part are bound to Indo-European roots, but in two instances Belyj provides non-sense sounds. The first is "wi-we-wa-wo-wu, hi-he-ha-ho-hu, wir-wer-war-wor-wur, chri-chre-chra-chro-chru, wri-wre-wra-wro-wru" (1922a: 48). Here the sounds, not directly related to known roots, resemble most closely the glossolalia of Paul and modern day Pentecostalists.

On the second day, the day of the Sun, we begin to emerge. We who were people of the dawn (*na zare*)-Nazareans. In a key passage Belyj connects his own *zvokoslovie* with *glossolaliija*:

В древней-древней Аэрии, в Аэре, жили когда- то и мы - звуко-люди; и были там звуками вы - дышаемых светов: звуки светов в нас глухо живут; и иногда выражаем мы их звукослови- ем, *глоссополиней* (1922a: 68).

On the third day Belyj provides another non-sense passage along with an explication.

Вот рассказ этот в звуках:

WE-ol: wol-woln; soln-saln-seln; chlin-nz-zk-k: ktz; w-zwt.

Что он повествует?

"We-ol –

– облака –

– и "weoln" (волны моря) бегут; солнце – светит: sol-son! И, тончась на песках, золотая струя пролетает: seln-siln! И вот хлынула в озерце: в нем осаждаются соли: "nze-ze!" в нем растут берега "ze-ka- ka!" И – трава (ti-te-ta) зацветает ("ze") цветом под "v" – вольным воздухом: и "ze-ve- te" – качаются.

Вот какие картины нам вписаны в звуках: их надо уметь прочесть; все звучанья – рассказы, заветы, наследия, мифы (1922a: 82, 83).

While this may all be indecipherable to the listener, it is not senseless to the speaker! It culminates in the assertion that comprehension is the *apprehension* of amendations of the surrounding world: I ottogo to ponjatie est' *pja[ti]e izmenenij obstavshego mira* (1922a: 90). Belyj breaks his narrative to restate his essential belief that understanding is not enough: we must comprehend, take it into ourselves.

On the fourth day of creation, the biblical creation of the world and Man, the sounds of Earth and speech emerge: "Polost' rta est' zarodysh vselennoj, grjaduschej kogda-nibud'... . ." (1922a: 105). The sounds of Earth are Belyj's own *Sefer Jezirah*, which contains the five vowel sounds: a, e, i, o, u and the Russian consonants x, s, r, z, zh, sh, sch, ch, t, k, l, n, d, m, b, f, p, g, k, ts. Many are illustrated by a sort of *zvukoslovie* where meaning is determined or directed by sound:

- "З" - розоватость, заря, лезвие, изостренье, разсыпчатость и простертость лучей от блиста- ний и ясностей "С": разверзание лучом, лезвием, тела мрака: мечи, заревые восходы, напевы, влюбленности, розы и сказки.

- Темный и жаркий, удушливый газ, иль вне-цветности мира - широкое "ш"; купол тверди, когда взор его проникает из "звнн" становится: расширение тел и устремление газов распространится без меры; и - шар возни- кает; шар, жар суть синонимы; "ж" прик- асается к "ш"; воспламенное "ш" и есть "ж"; ощущение эфирного тела дано в сочетании зву- ков "ш", "р": шарина, широта, расширение, шар. (1922a: 108-109).

At these moments of most sustained poetry, or glossolalia, Belyj reiterates the personal and arbitrary nature of his work: "Kogda ja utverzhdaju &ndash; 'zvuk to-to i to-to'; to ne zakrepljaju za utverzhdeniem nichego, a risuju nabroski... i totchas kidaju i zvuki tekut....." (1922a: 114) ).

The ability to read sounds hints at the "tongue of tongues" (jazyk jazykov) and of the Second Coming. It closes the circle. This sound can be depicted graphically, but it is also a gesture, which eurythmy depicts in motion: "evritmija legka, kak pushinka, svetla, kak zarja i chista, kakalmaz" (1922a: 127). Image and thought are a unity and our goal is to overcome the duplicity of the literary word, to transcend the tragedy of thought without the word, to comprehend the whole word. Eurythmy, the new science, this joyful science, enlightens and leads us to restoration of brotherhood of peoples, the Second Coming.

To look at the work simply as a treatise on the origins of human language or even as a cosmogony is to ignore the fact that it is a poem, characterized by devices of poetic speech, or more precisely, those of Belyj's poetic, ornamental prose. The primary organizing factor of the work is sound; the resulting associations and affinities then resonate with assonance, alliteration, internal rhyme, all of which are embodied in the poetry that Belyj is writing in 1922. Note, for example the repetition of t, k, and l sounds:

Что такое земля? Она- лава; лишь корость кристаллов (каменной) сковал пламен; и роко- ты лавы бьют в жёрда вулканов; и верхний пласт - земли - так тонок; покрывает он травой (1922a: 11).

The text also contains frequent extended strings of the ternary feet characteristic of other later "prose" works by Belyj:

amphibrachs    Глубо́кие тайны лежа́т в языке́: . . .

anapests                      Что тако́е земля́? Она- ла́ва; лишь ко́рость  
   криста́ллов (каме́й). . .

dactyls                      Неко́гда не́ было зла́ков, "Земе́ль". . .

Given the complexity of the work it is little wonder that *Glossolalia* perplexed readers and irritated reviewers. When it appeared in Berlin along with a flurry of other publications by Belyj, it attracted little critical attention. Sergej Bobrov wrote a scathing attack on Belyj and symbolism, offended by the religious-mystical-anthroposophical basis of the book, which he dismissed as a "howl" (vopl'ju).

Вся эта книжка наполнена вот этакой невероятной галиматьей. . . . нам от всей души отвратительно и стыдно смотреть эту антропософически-распутинскую балаганщину в которой он [Белый] теперь утонул (156-157).

A somewhat more tempered, albeit critical review signed L. Chatskij appeared in the Berlin journal, *Spolochi*:

Поэмой о звуке назвал автор "Глоссалолию" и в предисловии просит не критиковать научно: бесполезно. Но что же скажешь об этой изящно изданной книге, когда поэзии в ней не вижу, а научно критиковать, даже обойдя просьбу автора, не могу, ибо не достаточно знаю науку о звуке и в языковедении далеко не ушел. . . .

Во всяком случае, при огромной заслуге этой книги в неведомой области, принужден сознаться, что читается она с большим трудом и для рядового читателя (восемь классов гимназии или реального училища, Шерлок Холмс, Тургенев, Толстой, Достоевский и Карл Маркс) совсем непонятна. Конечно, автору она ясна и как "теория", так как он читает свои стихи по ее "системе" (55).

An important exception to this negative reaction was expressed in a review signed simply "V.L.Æ"

О "Глоссалалии" можно и надо бы сказать очень много, гораздо больше, чем позволяет размер газетной заметки.

"Глоссалалия" не просто изумительная поэма о звуке, но и огромное событие. Белый приоткрывает дверь из нашего мира – в новый мир, полный неясностей и хаоса, туда, в бесконечность. И да будет встречена эта не большая поэма не только, как художественное произведение!! (1922: 12).

V. L. was Vera Lourie (Lur'e), who was particularly close to Belyj and had received an autographed copy of *Glossalolia*. The review is significant because it was inspired by Belyj's own words. Vera has admitted:

Я не могла так написать – это конечно Белый мне рассказал. . . . Писала я одна. В этом можете быть уверенным. Это я хорошо помню. Он мне объяснял смысл этой книги, написала я это [рецензию] сама. Я ничего с ним не писала. Все мои рецензии я писала дома.

Честно говоря, я ничего не поняла (1995).

The unrestrained praise for the work both mark her own affection for Belyj and point to his own personal evaluation and enumeration of the key aspects of his work: it is a tale about the creation of the world from sound, the way for our soul(s) to merge again with the world soul, and the path to new art form in which movement, the poetic word, and the graphic arts would complement one another. It is not philosophy, but a poem, where form and content are one, a unity. In this evocation of the symbolic word, Belyj, of course, returns to his own Symbolist roots.

How is the critic/scholar of Belyj to deal then with this "poem" which the author considered so "successful"? The rhythm and poetic form are constituent elements of the text. It is, however, the nature of the content, both hermeneutic-interpretative and hermetic-esoteric, that enriches the text while making it so complex and for most inaccessible. The confusion of genres already mentioned also intimidates and blocks access, and as esoteric literature it defies most attempts at scholarly analysis. Chatskij facetiously offers an option to those interested in comprehending Belyj's text:



Есть выход: это – смотреть на эту работу, как принадлежащую к области тео-, фило- и других софий. Обратиться к древне-санскритским и древне-еврейским источникам, провести месяцы в изучении многочисленного и, боюсь, многотомного материала, на то указывают сноски автора, . . . (55).

Even before examining this voluminous material it is legitimate to ask, to what extent is Belyj's work "glossolalia" at all. The title of the 1922 version is *Glossalolija*. In Belyj's article "Aaron's Staff" (ZHezl Aarona) the word appears as glossalolija (1917: 212), as it does in an excerpt of the work printed in *Drakon* in 1921. Klavdija Nikolaevna Bugaeva and A. Petrovskij also identify the text as Glossalolija, pointing out that the spelling Glossalolija is a misprint (623).

Today glossolaly is relegated to three realms, the religious, the psychological, and the poetic; or as one recent historian of the phenomenon Jean Jacques Courtine puts it: "religieux, pathologique, ou poétique" (1988: 7). The religious tradition has its origins in the New Testament when the Holy Spirit descends upon the Apostles at Pentecost after which they speak in new tongues (Gospel of Luke 16:17). "And they were all filled with the Holy Spirit and began to speak in other tongues as the Spirit gave them utterance" (Acts of the Apostles, 2:4). In Paul "tongues" are seen as gift and a sign of the Spirit (I Corinthians 12), and he refers to "speaking in tongues" (I Corinthians 14). Psychological interest in glossolalia was heightened at the turn of the century in the book by Theodor Flournoy *Des Indes à la planète Mars: Etude sur un cas de somnambulisme avec glossolalie* (Paris 1900) The linguistic aspect of glossolalia has been explored by Roman Jakobson (1979), who does not mention Belyj in this connection, and Efim Etkind in *The Matter of Poetry* (Materija stixa 1978). In his chapter on "Sound and Sense" (Zvuk i smysl), Etkind recalls the Russian fascination with sound in the second decade of the twentieth century. The renewed religious interest in "speaking in tongues" among American Pentecostalists in the 1960's found a poetic or literary echo in the story by John Barth, "Glossolalia" (1963).

Belyj's work fits into all three traditions. The religious-esoteric tradition leads from Genesis: "In the beginning God created heaven and earth" (B'reschit bara élohim et haschamajim w'et ha'arez) to St. John: "V nachale bylo Slovo, i Slovo bylo u Boga. I Slovo bylo Bog...V Nem byla zhizn', . . . Æ (John 1:1) Belyj's hermetic approach includes reference to the *Sefer Yetsirah*, (The Book of Creation), *Zohar* (The Book of Splendor) and Jakob Böhme's *Aurora*. These all point directly to Rudolf Steiner, whose

cosmogony, exegesis of the Genesis, and the emerging art of eurythmy are the key to reading and understanding Belyj's text..

Belyj cites two works by Steiner as key: *Die Geheimwissenschaft im Umriß*, and *Zyklus XIV*. In the first Steiner outlines his own cosmogony consisting of the four days of Saturn, the Sun, the Moon, and the Earth. Steiner is also the likely source of the Jewish Cabala, of substantial interest to him, and the fascination with Max Müller, the philologist-glossologist-mythologist. Belyj mentions several times "eurythmy," the art of movement to express sound. His drawings of the tongue and his repeated references to gestures (;esty) correspond to foundations established by Steiner in his lectures and the actual practice of eurythmy at Dornach, subsequently described in works such as *Eurythmie*, and *Eurythmie als sichtbare Sprache*.

Belyj hints at the psychological, "pathetique" of his own musings calling them in one place "bezumie" (1922a: 28) and in another "bred" (1922a: 34)! While most of his work tries to establish a correspondence between original roots and their meanings, in particular, between the sound and meaning of Indo-European roots and languages, there are as we have noted two instances of what can only be called nonsense sounds.

The linguistic/poetic strain falls into the overlap of glossology and glossolaly. Several philologists, or glossologists, are mentioned including A. Meillet and M. Potebnya. Belyj cites several standard German works, including those by Karl Brugmann and Benseler. The major philological influence in Belyj's work comes from F. Max Müller, German born and educated, who became the Professor of Comparative Philology at Oxford. The categories of language and many of the basic roots appear to be direct borrowings from Müller. Indeed, Belyj's work fits into a context of 19th and early 20th century attempts to find the origin of language, and the positing of Indo-European (Indogermanisch), "Aryan" for Müller, as the basis of language. In a work not cited by either Belyj or Steiner there is an important transition from roots of words to Greek myths in particular, a connection that Belyj too explores poetically in *Glossolalia*.

The poetic preference for sound over sense in Russian was already emerging in 1917 and Belyj, as he had been a decade earlier in his pioneering metrical studies, was one of the leading voices for a new theory and practice of poetic language, even though much of what Belyj composed during these turbulent times of 1916 and 1917 was published only later in 1921 and 1922. *Glossolalia*, in one sense, is as much a product of Belyj's Russia in 1917 as it is of Germany in 1922.

Having returned from Dornach to Russia in the fall of 1916, Belyj spent time at the estate of Ivanov-Razumnik at Carskoe Selo in February of 1917 and then later again in the fall. Here he met Nikolaj Kljuev and Sergej Esenin, both of whom he quotes in *Glossolalia*. He worked on several articles for the journal, *Skify*, including a lengthy unpublished article "Toward the sound of words" (*K zvuku slov*) which would become *Glossolalia*. An important theoretical basis for the work appeared in 1917 in "Aaron's Staff":

Смысл "п о н я т и й н о й" жизни окончен: он мертвый;  
г л о с с о л а л и я же футуристических звуков – срывание  
плода древа слов, древа смыслов для корыстного, плотоядного  
поядения материи звука; всякий плод – оболочка: в плоде живет  
семя... н о в о е с л о в о п о э з и и. В нем по новому соединятся  
три смысла: мифологический, логический, звуковой – в новое  
раскрытие Мудрости" (212).

The article was part of an ever evolving theory of the poetic, symbolic, magical word in Belyj's writings. His working definition of "glossolalia," of the "new poetical word," combining the mythological, logical and the sound senses leading to Wisdom, was for Belyj a matter of faith and ultimately the theory embodied in practice in *Glossolalia*.

*Glossolalia* was thus not an isolated event. At the time of its composition in 1917, Belyj's own prose was moving further and further in the direction of sound dominating over sense or meaning. There would be an acceleration of that process in which sound and sense would be found in inverse proportion, i.e. the sound of words achieved ever increasing significance, while the meaning or reference of words became less important as the organizing force of Belyj's works. Style increasingly became the substance. Sound prevailed over sense. The word predominated over the sentence. The part was often more important than the whole. Belyj disassembled the linear and temporal components of logic. In place of traditional exposition, in which one word following another was logically connected with it, there was a verbal and spatial logic based on the repetition of sounds, roots, words. Connections were made by associating like sound elements. The chaos of external reality was ordered only by the imposition of an internal patterning upon the words. This was the Symbolist poet sensitive to sound and asserting the poet's right to order the world verbally.

The text was far more, however, than simple word play. Belyj, as *Glossolalia* demonstrates, firmly believed in the "magic of words," i.e. that words formed a secret, mysterious repository of esoteric

knowledge, and his life and creative works were attempts to bridge the gap between everyday experience, the perception of reality, and this other noumenal world where the elemental chaos of our existence would give way to order. This was Belyj's search for some way out the chaos which he perceived around him and in his own life. He was forever searching for that special secret, a synthesis, which would provide a simple answer to a complex world. *Glossolalia* was a poetic experiment to find *sense* in the non-*sense* of language. Belyj's aim throughout his artistic career was to revitalize language, to create the "living word." In *Glossolalia* sounds abound, and gradually the reader comes to see and hear that the sound precedes the sense, that the *unit* comes before *unit* - y.

*Glossolalia* is a cosmogony, a theory of the origin of the universe based on sound; but it is less a new direction, than a compilation, culmination, and summation of Belyj's poetic credo. It is the most foreign and most "esoteric" of his completed works, and makes enormous demands upon the reader. In addition to the multilingual word play, ranging from Armenian to Zendic, there is content, the intertextuality of the work, and the difficulty in reading any esoteric literature. The work refers to philology and philosophy, draws on a long Judeo-Christian tradition, the Old and New Testaments, the Cabala, and the teachings of Rudolf Steiner, requiring an act of faith to embrace the supra- or super-sensible.

Belyj's poem was undoubtedly misunderstood, or unappreciated by his readers. Yet, his leaps are bold, and the text shines with a brightness and rings with a clarity so uncharacteristic of the time in Berlin. The text plays the music Belyj was hearing, and if it can be grasped, comprehended &ndash; even if not completely understood &ndash; it opens new possibilities for a re-examination of all Belyj's work after 1917. As Bugaeva and Petrovskij commented: "Sub"ektivno, v plane tvorchesta samogo Belogo, eta 'poema o zvuke' nashla, odnako, podtverzhdenie: (623).

It is also a document to Russian Berlin. It is certainly the most "German" of his works. No other work of the period has such a mixture of Russian and German language and roots, a knowledge of which is crucial for many of the associations; for example, Ich (German for "I") as the monogram for Iustus Christus is crucial to Belyj's cosmogony. Belyj knew German well from his governess, his own reading in philosophy, and his association with Steiner via lectures and life at Dornach He was on occasion the German language spokesman for the Russian literary community in Berlin, for example at an evening with Thomas Mann in March 1922 or Gerhart Hauptmann in November 1922. (Beyer, 1990: 111, 127). There is the unmentioned, but significant influence of the German

Romantics, Novalis and Friedrich von Schlegel. Goethe and Nietzsche are quoted and identified. Potebnya admits his own dependence on the works of dependence on Wilhelm von Humboldt. The study of roots and their relationships are part of a long German philological tradition.

Ultimately Belyj's *Glossalolia* belongs to all and consequently none of the glossolalic traditions, and to no one language. It is a "new word," a multilingual addition to the tradition and bibliography of "spiritual science." The work is unique to Russian literature and is a singular Russian contribution to Indo-European studies. As a "poem" representing Belyj's own evolving emphasis on the primacy of sound over sense, it is an important cultural document of Russian Symbolism and provides ties to the larger European intellectual context.

*Glossalolia* was so ambitious in its reach and intention, that some may conclude it falls short of its goal. Yet if it fails, it does so magnificently.

**G l o s s o l a l i a** "glossolália Also in Anglicized form glossólaly [f. Gr. glosso- [tongue] + -lalia [speaking]. The faculty or practice of speaking with 'tongues.'" The Oxford English Dictionary, 2nd ed. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989), Vol. VI, 593.

On the cover of the 1922 Epoxa edition the title was spelled Glossaloliya , as well as in an the excerpt of the work printed in Drakon in 1921. The cover designed by Sergei Zalshupin is not helpful. It has in all capital letters the Russian script G L O S S A L O L I YA In the introduction and in the text, Bely consistently spelled the word with the "a" vowel after the double "ss" and as "-lolia" instead of "-lalia." In 1917 Bely published his article "Aaron's Rod" (Zhezl Aarona) in which the word glossolaliya appears (p. 669). In their article "Literaturnoe nasledstvo Andrey a Belogo", K. Bugaeva and A. Petrovskij (Literaturnoe nasledstvo, 27-28, 1937, p. 623) identify the text as Glossolaliya, pointing out that the spelling Glossaloliya is a misprint. In the index of Bely's archive at Russian Archives of Literature the work is also identified as Glossolaliya. I recently examined Bely's own "Life Line " [Liniya zhizni] in which under the year 1917-1918 he notes the title as Glossolaliya.

Dmitrij Tschizewskij who was responsible for the reprint edition of the work in 1971 (Munich: Slavisches Propyläen, Band 109) has a footnote to his own introduction to the work in which he says: "In meinen Händen befand sich vor Jahren ein Exemplar, auf dessen Umschlag der Titel "Glossolaliya" heißt. Der Name stammt von gr. 'glossa' oder 'glotta') &mdash; die Sprache." (v). Note that Tschizewskij uses the root glossa, typically found in Russian words.

John Elsworth routinely "corrects" the title and uses Glossolalia. The assumption of all is that since the spelling "-alolia" seems to make no sense, that it is a misprint, a typographical error, and that Bely's intention was to name his work **Zungenreden**, as the Deutsche Bucherei notes in its card catalogue. In my article on "Andrei Bely's Glossalolia: A Berlin Glossolalia," *Europa Orientalis* 14 (1995), 2, pp. 7-25, I discussed the confusion surrounding the title of the work in a footnote [No. 13] : Vera Lourie in the title of her review spells it: Glossalaliya. Bobrov and Chatskij use Glossaloliya. In 1996 I received a note from Taja Gut who has been working on a book about Bely and who carefully examined materials found in the Rudolf Steiner Archives in Dornach, Switzerland. With his permission I quote:

Zürich, 2.VI.96

Dear Tom,

concerning the title of Bely's GLOSSOLALIJA (the question of its misprint, as you discuss it in footnote 13 of your article in *Europa Orientalis*), it might be of interest for you to hear that there is a copy of the book, dedicated and sent by Bely to Marie Steiner, in the Archiv of Rudolf Steiner Nachlassverwaltung in Dornach, as I recently discovered. Bely there corrected the title by hand,... (Letter of Taja Gut to author)

On the enclosed copies it was clear that the corrections to the letters "o" and "a" made by hand to the title page and the Introduction match the handwriting of the inscription to Maria Yakovlevna Steiner signed by Andrei Bely and dated Berlin 5. December [19]22. Thus it would seem that Bely himself was already aware of the misprint shortly after the publication of the work in the fall of 1922, and that his intention was to entitle his work GLOSSOLALIYA. I am grateful to Taja Gut for his careful reading of my article and pointing out this new information. Likewise I am indebted to him for copies of the pages containing those corrections and the dedication. They were reprinted in the Andrei Bely Society Newsletter with the kind permission of the Rudolf Steiner Nachlassverwaltung.

There is however, some reason to wonder if it might actually be interpreted differently, i.e that it is a misprint, or an error in Bely's hearing or memory, that exchanges not **&ndash;lolia** for **-lalia**, but **-lolia** for **-logia**. The distinction between Russian script for "g" and "l" is not that great The German Professor of Classical Philology at Oxford, F. Max Müller, uses the word "glottology" or "Glossology" (*Lectures on the Science of Language*, p. 4) to

designate "the science of language." Müller is cited in Bely's text and he is also mentioned by Rudolf Steiner. The word "glóssology" in English comes from "[glosso+ Gr. logia [discourse] The study of a language or languages. The science of language. (=Glóttology)." (OED, VI, 593-594).

In any case the Russian equivalents of the word, if it is pronounced on the first syllable, results in identical pronunciation of either -**alolia** and -**olalia** because of the reduction of unaccented vowels.

Still one wonders what was in Bely's and in the mind of Sergei Zalshupin, the cover illustrator, when they boldly proclaimed this work in 1922 as GLOSSALOLIYA?

**five years after it was written** The text is followed by the signature of Bely and dated Tsarskoe Selo, October 1917. Bely who had been abroad since 1914 and had worked on building the first Gotheanum at Dornach, the chosen sight for the colony of Anthroposophists guided by Rudolf Steiner, had returned to Russia to answer a draft notice. He was subsequently given a medical waiver. An excerpt of the work was published in *Drakon* in 1921. The work was first published in its entirety in Berlin in 1922 by the Epoxa Verlag in a run of 1500 copies. A reprint of this edition appeared as mentioned in 1971. The work was printed in Russia for the first time in Tomsk (1994).

In April 1922 Bely had given an impromptu lecture on the theory of Glossolalia. Bely who had always been fascinated by the relationship between sound and meaning was particularly engaged with sound themes that year.

**figurative . . . beyond the figurative** The word play revolves around the Russian word for "image" [obraz] in the forms [zvukoobrazy], [obraznyj], and [vne-obraznyj]. The more traditional translation of [obraznyj] is "figurative." I have tried to maintain in English a single root, although I originally considered the root "imago," using the adjective "imaged" (See OED, VII, 665). The problem is, of course, that languages develop along their own paths. In addition, Bely often uses a Russian translation of Rudolf Steiner's terminology. The Russian word [obraz] can be translated into German as "Bild" or "Gestalt." The Russian word for "education" [obrazovanie] is a calque from German "Bildung." Translations of Steiner's work into English use "mental image" for "Bild" and the term "super-" or "supra-" for "that which is beyond."

**roots** A note on etymology and notation. The beginning of interest in classical philology, one of the forerunners of linguistics, can be traced to the second half of the 1700's. As a result of British contact with the writings of India, including the olden texts, there was a new

familiarity with and study of Sanskrit. It was in 1786 that William Jones first pointed explicitly to the relationship between Sanskrit, Greek, Latin, Gothic and Celtic. As Max Müller notes this led to the observation that many not only many Greek and Latin words were related by sound, but that Sanskrit also had many words similar in meaning and sound. Throughout the nineteenth century scholars pursued these similarities in an effort to establish the very beginnings or origin of language. The attempts have not identified any texts of this initial language, called by some Indo-European, by others Indogermanisch, and also Aryan, but a reconstruction with complicated rules governing the subsequent changes throughout languages were made. In the twentieth century some of this work has continued in etymological dictionaries. Etymology for the Greeks was "the true meaning of the word." The standard study is Julius Pokorny. Others include Stuart E. Mann, An Indo-European Comparative Dictionary Hamburg 1984/1987. These books list "roots" that while they do not always exist in any one of the languages studied, appear to have been a point of departure for similar sounding words of like meaning in a cross section of languages. These roots are sometimes preceded by an \*, the convention to indicate that their existence has not been confirmed in actual texts.

**poem** Russian [poéma] is a longer poem, sometimes an epic.

**"Christ has Risen"** [Khristos voskrese] (1918) **"The First Encounter"** [Pervoe svidanie] (1921). Both were long poems (poema). The First Encounter has been translated into English by Gerald Janecek.

**July 1, 1922**, Berlin. Bely had given an impromptu talk on eurythmy in the Berlin Russian House of the Arts on April 7. Cf. Thomas Beyer "Andrei Bely &mdash; the Berlin Years 1921-1923." Zeitschrift fuer Slavische Philologie, L (1990), 90-142. In May and June he composed his collection of verse, "After the Parting" [Posle razluki], under the influence of Marina Tsvetaeva. Cf. Thomas Beyer "Marina Cvetaeva and Andrej Belyj: Razluka and Posle Razluki." Wiener Slawistischer Almanach 35 (1995), 97-132. He called this work "a song book" [pesennik]. Bely was profoundly fascinated with the workings of sound in mid-1922 leading up to his publication of Glossolalia. It would be incorrect to accept Marina Tsvetaeva's observation some dozen years later that the work had been written under her influence. What is more likely is the assertion that the influence of the work could be felt in Bely's later works as noted by Bugaeva and Petrovskij.