

## LOCAL ANTHROPOGENIES - LINGUISTICS

### LOGICS OF TEN INDO-EUROPEAN LANGUAGES

## 6. RUSSIAN AND THE ISBA

*Forest and glade (Liès, da palianeu), without anyone around (bizliouidiyé krougom), snowstorm and cries and groans (Viyoga i plâtchètt i stôniètt). Mussorgsky, Songs and Dances of Death for voice and piano.*

### 6A. The language

In the previous cases, the environment certainly had a large role to play. But it was still manageable, it could be made sufficiently dialectic that we could think that languages were largely independent from it, hence conceivable for themselves, even if they then had to mark their consonances with the landscape and the other aspects of the culture.

There are different situations. It seems impossible to situate Dutch correctly without evoking the extraordinary social and bodily integration, the 'gezelligheid' that supposed the secular battle against a sea that was higher than the lands. We could not understand Arab if we did not consider the deathly threat exerted on the bodies by the torrid heat and the naked immensity of the desert of sand. Similarly, how can we describe the structures and fundamental fantasy of the Russian language, which settled around Moscow somewhere between the 14<sup>th</sup> and the 17<sup>th</sup> century, and is hence northern before being southern, without starting from the environment where it developed?

First there is the cold; the river where one fishes with the eyes fixed on the hole made in the ice; the permafrost that twists the rails. Then, it is the immensity of the steppe, which is not marked by oasis like a sand desert, but that is continuously formless, except for the hillocks (kurgan), in an expanse that, except for the Ural, is crossed from the South to the Great North, but also from Lvov to Vladivostok without major punctuation. These physical provocations led to other social and political provocations. The invasions of the Mongol by the East, the conquering fantasies of Swedish, Danish, French, and German monarchs by the West. While the power tended to remain both blurred and discretionary because of the distances.

So, the Russian language built itself up like a heating machine against the cold, the anchorage against the expanse, permanently under invasion, both of privacy and conviviality seeing the aberrations of public like. While in French, English, German, Italian, Spanish, in a largely meditating milieu, the body is at the service of the language, this time it is language that

is at the service of bodies. Not by individually gloving them, as befits the combat of the Arab speaker against the drying heat, nor by enjoying a close but exterior community elbow-to-elbow, as requires the fight of the Dutch speaker against the sea coming in from all sides. But by getting *participation (laterally) the organisms one to the other like from the inside, thermally and physiologically*, more than gesturally. We shall speak of the endosomy of Russian, like we speak of endopathy.

However, we shall note that the Russian speaker does not protect himself against the cold and emptiness like an Eskimo or Ural-Altaiic. He is an Indo-European. He fits in an area of language that has, from the very start, privileged a great lateral cohesion of the syntagm, which it has done syntactically, morphologically, phonetically. We probably know quite a lot on the structure and fundamental fantasy of Russian if we say that it is an *endosomic* specialisation of an Indo-European fund that is already very *lateralising* from the start; in other words, that it lateralises strongly. Amongst the other languages with a great somatic influence, this sets it apart from Arab, which is not Indo-European, and that does not lateralise at all. And from Dutch, which, while being Indo-European, hence lateralising, has preserved the frontalness in regards to things within the elbow-to-elbow, and is hence not endosomic in the sense we understand here.

### 6A1. Phonosemics

Since we are so close to the body, it is essential that we should start off from phonetics. A usual manner of protecting oneself against a hostile environment consists in multiplying consonants, and Russian accumulates them, just like Arab and Dutch: 'zdrav-stv-oui(tié)!', 'hello!', from the root 'zdrav', healthy and reasonable, in good order (moreover, the first 'v' is not pronounced, and the complete form is very often reduced to 'zdrastie'). But, since it is endosomic, it palatizes them and makes them sonorous, for in this way they overlap, forming a continuous fabric that is both impenetrable and thick. The palatal-alveolar fricatives are privileged and insistent: 'jè', 'tchè', 'cha', 'chtcha'. Where German creates a succession of implosion and explosion, in the affricative, here is a succession of the explosion and the implosion in the 'vp' (opposite of the German 'Pferd'), 'dn' ('Dniepr'), 'zn', 'sd', 'stv', 'chk', 'kv', sorts of countdown affricatives. Especially, in addition to their hard version, almost all consonants have a palatized version, which is ignored in French. The other choices confirm the sonorous fleece: the 'r' is rolled in a roar, and the doubles ('ss', 'nn', 'll', 'tt') are lengthened without the Italian extraversion. No real aspiration, and the guttural sound only produces a Greek khi, which is transliterated 'kh', relatively soft, at the opposite to the Spanish jota, and also of the very scraping aspirations and gutturals of Arab and Dutch.

In languages of defence against the environment, vowels, which are too uncovered, are generally reduced. This is the case of Arab, which only counts three (a, ou, i), and Dutch, which, although it has more, at times diphthongizes them (moeite), or grinds them in the milestone of consonants ('graug', 'slurpen'). Russian has six main vowels, although the only opened is the 'a'; already the 'è' and the 'o' are semi-opened, and the 'i' (anterior), the 'eu' (central and written 'bi') and the 'ou' (posterior) are firmly closed. The system is dominated by the 'a' sounds (the most compact and primordial of vowels) and the 'i' (which here, at the opposite of French, makes soluble more than it points). Therefore, 'o' becomes an 'a' supported before the accent, and a mute 'a' after: 'avtabiagrafia'; 'è' becomes 'i' before the accent: 'nigatif'. The 'i'

is still omnipresent under the form of the yod ('y'), 'ya', 'yè', 'yo', 'you', 'yi': 'Briejniev', particularly that there are countless endings in 'iet', 'iyou', and the abstract ending is 'tsiyé': 'dimocratsiye', 'likvidatsiye' ('liquidation'). However, Russian ignores diphthongs, which are too confounding: the 'y' and 'i' that we have just written do not make one with the vowel that follows them, but belongs to the palatization, to the softening of the consonant preceding them (it is as difficult for a Russian speaker to hear our diphthongs than it is for us to hear his soft consonants). Nasal vowels and the ü, so characteristic of French, are excluded, the former because they resound towards the inside in a narcissist manner (therefore not endosomic in the defined sense); the second because it creates too much distance.

Here were some details amongst many others of a diction that is both masticating and savouring, where interactions that are both lateralising and sonorising are attentive not only to the dissimilation necessary to every language, but also to the tone (relative intensities of the harmonics) that can come between the dissimilated elements. There is no better way of maintaining oneself in the physiology of a sonorous body than the tone, with its rhomb effects. English phonetics also exploits this, but by leaving its realisation to individual fantasy. The endosomic Russian phonosemics produces a fabric that is more continuous and thick than the position of every thread is delicately defined, point by point. It is reminiscent of the *sadhi* of Sanskrit.

Still, we would understand nothing of this thermic and physiological diction if we were to neglect the vital breath that supports it. Russian is spoken rather loudly and not too quickly, say the manuals, which befits its environment. The accentuation does not pursue the decision of French, or the effusion of English, or the digging of German, or the quantification and the thrust of Italian, or the frontal pressure of Spanish; but nor does it pursue the slackening of Walloon, whose hindered vowels ('eu' for 'i', 'mon p'teu') would resemble that of Russian, minus the breathing. It is a fundamental support, a constant reprise by the back, an almost abdominal swelling, called upon by the effect of the rhomb, which manifests itself right to the general posture of the speaker and in the sphericity of his mouth (more than a simple roundness) that concords with the babyish face that has already been selected by the climatic and dietary needs. Hence, the meter, sensitive in the verse but also in the prose, does not have the aggressive 'vis' that it claims in Latin and ancient Greek. In the thermic turbine of Russian diction, it too strongly lateralises and thickens the syntagm.

## **6A2. The writing**

Cyrillic characters, adapted from Greek in the 9<sup>th</sup> century by Saints Cyril and Methodius to write down the languages of the Slavs that they were aiming at evangelising, remarkably visualise this phonosemics party, and we understand that independently from the link that they ensure between the various peoples of Russia, they are not about to disappear in an international graphic like their Chinese counterpart Pinyin. They too lateralise and thicken the text by the mimetic length of 'jê', 'cha', 'you', by the spread out down strokes of 'd' and 'l'; by the appendixes of 'tsê', 'chtcha' and by the harshening sign 'tviordeuï znak'; many are squarer than they are high; there are more full signs than there are fine signs; lowercases have capitalised forms, which has the double effect of magnifying the whole and of equalising it by drowning the real capitals. But especially, these thick characters make visible every little savouring interaction of the Russian 'sandhi'. To the extent that many are not essential phonetically. Of

the thirty-three signs of the alphabet, ten or so could easily be removed without the reading being affected. But everything occurs as if, at the opposite of the Arab reader, who valorises the reduction of signs to ambiguity, and of the English reader, who digs the graphic gap between reading and etymology, the Russian script and reader would want that the text writes everything that can link them together in the phonemes, creating a continuous and thick fabric. The punctuation is strong, and the subordinate clause is always separated from the clause from which it depends with a comma.

In turn, the morphology lateralises by powerfully underlining the articulation root/theme/flexional ending, characteristic to Indo-European. This gave way to the so-called morphologic spelling: the 'house' is 'dom' at the singular nominative form and 'dama' in the plural nominative form, but is written 'doma' even in the plural so that the external and internal flexions remain patent. The word can therefore take on a huge weight. One currently tells off a child: '(êta) bièzabrazna'. We translate: 'it is bad'. In fact, it was uttered, written and read: 'this <is> without image'; èta (this) bièz (without) obrass (icon)-na'. Served by the morphological unveiling, the semantic is as dense as the phonic fabric.

### **6A3. Semantics**

The internal sexualisation of vocables still comforts the vividness, hence the endosomy. The three genders of the Indo-European cosmic trinity, masculine, feminine, neutral, are this time not only simple characters of the declension, but belong to the theme of the noun using several rules. Moreover, these rules have an analogical scope. In the canonical form of the noun, meaning its singular nominative, the masculine theme leaves its hard or palatized consonant uncovered (first declension). The feminine theme covers it vocally with the '-a' or '-ia' if it is hard (second declension), and leaves it uncovered if it is palatized or palato-alveolar, as it is then vocalised in advance (third declension). Neutral themes are recognised with the '-o' and are categorised in the first declension. Dictionaries do not characterise a word using 'masculine' or 'feminine' like they do in French, but using: 'masculine root (rod)', 'feminine root (rod)'. The morphological sexualisation can be found even in verbal forms: in the past tenses, the genders, not the persons, form the conjugation. As for the plurals of nouns, it is asexual, but maintains the other intense Indo-European distinction, which is sometimes active at the singular: animated/inanimate. A corpse is inanimate, but a dead is animated; a crowd and an army, being collectives, are inanimate. What implicit sociology!

But it is the declension that syntactically contributes the most to the organic lateralisation. Nothing makes a more coalescent fabric than marking the functions using declined cases, and not by solely using prepositions or the position of the word like in French, the distance-inducing language. Russian therefore declines, just like German. And it does this using a wide variety of consonantal: 'm', 'n', 'v', 'kha', and vocalic endings: 'a', 'ou', 'o', 'è', 'i', 'ia'. While the German cases, which are most discreet, never weaken the monematic character of words and only tighten their deflagration, the very visible cases of Russian proclaim the functions as such, intimately tying the verbal fabric from afar and from up close.

Simultaneously, there are many cases. They evidently include the four cases of German: subject (nominative), determiner (genitive), frontal object (accusative), and tangential or beneficiary object (dative). But we find two others cases of the proto-Indo-European: the

locative and the instrumental, the latter being frequently and markedly used. In this way, almost all the functions can do without the distance-inducing preposition, and belong interiorly to the word. There is however, one remarkable absence, but one that concords with the endosomic will: The ablative, the case of ablation, so very operating in Latin, the legal language, and whose function is here insured by other cases, like in Greek.

Otherwise, when the preposition is required, it makes one with the name it precises, seeing that it governs a case: 'ia v komnatié maièï pichou' is thereby tighter than 'I write in my room' and can fill a verse by Pushkin. And sometimes, the preposition can also contribute to the heat; where the French dryly says: 'un champion d'échecs', 'un compagnon d'armes', Russian says and things 'tchèmpiyon po chakhmatam' and 'tavarichtch po aroujiyou', thereby creating the multiple links of the 'po + dative'. Evidently, in contrast with English prepositions that are themselves very directional, the preposition here is often content with marking a simple type of adherence, which is then specified by the case. Therefore, depending on the case, 'Na' covers such varied directions as 'on', 'in', 'against', 'while', 'for' (for two rubles), 'by' (being late by fifteen minutes), 'in' (in the manner of), (in the next year), (in the New Year).

#### **6A4. The verb**

However, how can the endosomy be extended to the verb? Are verbal tenses not the irreducible experience of exteriority? We may be able to cross the distances of space, however great they may be, but we cannot return to the past, nor can we go forth in the future!

Well, all Russian verbs present, and primordially so, before any other determination of mode and time, what we call an *aspect*, which marks whether the action is undetermined in relation to its completion, and is hence eventually repeated (read), it is the imperfective; or to the contrary if it includes its completion (reading one page from front to back), it is the perfective. The perfective usually comes first, even when it can be reformed from a perfective. This system belongs to the proto-Indo-European, and we find traces of it in the Greek conjugation, for instance in its perfect tense (perfective). In this way, actions are immediately situated in the pure passage, Heraclitean, or in the definitive completion, as with Parmenides, these two registers being the two faces of the state. In post-Socratic Greek, these aspects of the verb progressively gave way to the tenses of the verb, or more exactly they have become a simple characteristic of some tenses (like the perfect and pluperfect tenses); they have even disappeared in the other languages in this study. This is a sign that the state did not blur as first transcendental to the profit of another transcendental: the progressive action, progress (pro-gredi), with its present, imperfect, aorist, the future, the future perfect, pluperfect, opening a dialectic.

In Russian, the aspect, hence the status, remains foremost. Keeping the proto-Indo-European practice, verbal themes comprise their aspect by prefixation, suffixation, infixation, before even being conjugated, just like, as we have seen, the noun themes have a gender before being declined. And so-called tenses preserve this prevalence of status over the dialectic of progress. Perfective or imperfective, the verb only has a past, without distinction of imperfect, aorist, perfect, pluperfect, and the past is not conjugated after the persons, but whether the subject is plural or singular, and in the singular whether it is masculine, feminine or neutral; the past is therefore used as an adjective, and is more qualifying than it is active. And there is only

one future, where the status is generally privileged, since, when there is an original form, it is perfective, and otherwise is conjugated depending on the being + infinitive (the French future tense consists of the infinitive + having: aimer-ai). As for the present tense, it is only applied to imperfectives, hence designating actions whose completion is not known, and that are hence constant or iterative, one of the two sides of the status.

In summary, this endosomic system confirms in stasis what the modern philosophers, used to the progressive times of their verbs, sometimes called the ex-stasis of the moments of time. The verbal modes are then limited. The indicative and the conditional suffice, without the subjective or the optative. On the other hand, the infinitives, participles, gerundives, and all other forms that have the status of nouns, adjectives and adverbs, therefore marking states, are largely represented.

There are two essential verbs to envisage: to be and to have. The being and the having, this is where the fundamental topology of the living, and particularly the mammal, lies: being encompassed, or *being*; being encompassing, or *having*; the former does not create exteriority, the second creates one. We guessed this. In the Russian endosemy, the being is so naïve, so native, it so rarely makes a splash in the *states* that links the subject and the complement, that it does not have to be expressed in the present tense: 'I am at home' = 'ia' ('I') 'dom-a' ('house' in the locative tense); 'my house is convenient' = 'moï dom oudobneuï' ; 'to be' in the present tense is indicated by a pause in the diction or a dash in the text. 'To be' only ever really intervenes to mark another tense than the present, or else the negation: 'niètt' (ne ièstt) with the genitive.

On the other hand, having, since it is exteriorising, is an issue. Russian turns its active encompassing into a passive encompassing through the resource of 'at': 'someone having something' = 'something at someone'. 'I have a pencil' = 'Ou mini<ba< b=""> (at me) karandach (pencil)'. 'You have a pencil' = 'Ou tibi<ba< b=""> karand<ba< b="">ch'. 'He has a pencil' = 'Ou nivo karandach'. 'She has a pencil' = 'Ou niy<bo< b=""> karand<ba< b="">ch'. In the event of an insistence or an interrogation, the 'ièstt' is added. Then, the plural possessed does not change 'ièstt': 'Yes, he truly has a wife and a son' = 'Ou nivo ièstt jeuna i seun'. The topology of a language is an unwavering coherence.</ba></bo></ba></ba></ba>

There is no reason, in such a system of existence, to specify, as we do with French articles 'un', 'des', 'les', 'le-la', that a noun represents a singular individual, or individuals, or a universal in extension, or a universal in comprehension. Therefore, there are no articles. On the other hand, why should we deprive from the convivial warmth of the pronoun in front of the personal forms of the verb, as with Latin and Italian? And how can the names, first names and patronymics of persons not be declined (what German does not do), substantively in the last two cases, and adjectively in the former, which is probably more peripheral, more simply legal? In the endosomy, instead of the individual being an unmovable phonic and graphic, it is itself made syntax.

## 6A5. Syntax

In summary, here is a tight linguistic fabric, overlapping, strongly lateralised, thick around its speaker, which preserves warmth and life, and at the same time shines warmth and

life. Thought subtle and defined tones. Through the ostentation of functions thanks to the declension and prepositions governing the cases. Through the evidence of the themes and even of the archaic roots, which are very few and protected by a so-called morphological spelling. Through the absence of articles, another exposing of the roots and themes. Through the impact and the swarming of Cyrillic graphic. And particularly, we must now add, through the freedom that the declension gives, not only of playing with the places of the determiner and the determinatum, but also of placing the semantic blocks and functions in the most efficient shaking order for the fantastical and logical warmth of the sentence. There, the verses of Mayakovsky will often consist of an isolated word: 'the word is therefore heavier, juicier, more bloody, as tight as a firmly pulled nail, just tried and immediately expelled, making us more responsible of it, inverting the meter endlessly.'

Many of these characteristics mean that Russian is, with Sanskrit, one of the most insistent presence of the old proto-Indo-European fund, and particularly of its syntactic lateralising resources brought forward by compared grammar: the distinction animated/inanimate, the couple perfective/imperfective, the declension and the agreeing conjugation, the masculine-feminine-neutral trinity, the trinity of the three degrees of one same radical: strong vowel/inflected vowel/absent vowel, or the vocalic ablaut. All this on a background of sociological trinity: fecundity/war/law, mirroring the peasant/warrior/king.

The archaeological analyses of Marija Gimbutas (1963) attribute the proto-Indo-European revolution to the 'civilisation of hillocks (kurgan)' born in the 4<sup>th</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> millenniums in the plain that goes from the Dnieper River to the high Yenisei River, meaning from Ukraine to Kazakhstan, along the 50<sup>th</sup> parallel, in places that were already favoured of Neolithic civilisations that we learn to know better each day. Then, not only is the Russian language an endosemic specialisation of the Indo-European syntactic revolution, lateralising, but the Russian milieu, with its particular geography, has probably had a decisive part to play in the birth of this syntactic revolution itself.

Plain + hillock + continental climate, meaning easy circulation + military defence and top-bottom social stratification + immediate physical defences, but also stretched transitions of night and light (\*deiv, god)! This environment and this topology, creating a situation that is not yet dialectic (we shall have to wait for the post-Socratic to go from the aspect of the state to time), but proto-Socratic, deserves to be meditated when we think of the anthropogeny. Just like the absence of major punctuation in this landscape is, to believe some current Russian speakers, the image (the induction?) of the phonic, morphologic, syntactic lateral compenetrations (of the non-punctuation) of their language.

## **6B. Cultural consonances**

The main institution consonant with such an endosomic language is obviously the meal. A meal of substantial food, where burning liquids, borscht, vodka and tea alongside the constant reserve of boiling water in the samovar, are as vital as the meats, are more important that vegetables are rare, apart from the cabbage (quintessence of phonetics, cabbage soup is said 'chtichi'). But this meal is also a recharging of the 'psyche' in the Greek sense (corporal

animator principle), then of the 'pneuma', still in the Greek sense (evasive spiritual principle, pneumatic), in a savouring of dishes that counts less than that of words. There are two moments in the liturgy of meals: the expression of the common affection, then soon the loss of each and everyone into space, in time, among the divagation of men and the rigors of the laws, as the evening passes and the drunkenness increases. Indeed, the deepening of the nocturnal immensity is a part of the deepening of the community. We do not say: of society, which is always suspect.

Around the meal, there is the room, 'komnata', the agricultural-nomad shelter against the smooth fleeing of the outside environment, the room that privileges the viscosity of forms and colours, which are stabilising and warming, like the words and the dishes. The architectural cell is not the house, unless the latter, like the isba and today the datcha, does not exceed the dimensions of the room too much. A fortiori there is no urbanism, like the Napoleonic troops already noted as they moved from Paris to Moscow. The perspectives of Leningrad are the 'windows through which Russia looks at Europe'. Elsewhere, in the torsion of their globes and the insistence of their colours (of transparent nightfall, 'prazratch(i)neuï soumrak'), the palaces and churches create on a large scale the agricultural-nomad viscosity that the bedroom ensures in small scale.

For the rest, everything leads to the icon, which shines like the Russian word. Through the monotony of its themes, through its centring on the face, through the interlacing of its backgrounds and its figures, through the colour-light that is both thick and diffuse, the icon and the iconostas transform space and time into states, trapping the transcendence itself in the endosemy. In the West, images are distinct from what they represent: 'imago alicuius rei est ad quandam significationem, non est ipsa res' Thomas of Aquinas insisted, cutting all idolatry short. Continuing Byzantium, the Russian image participates ontologically, and not only in a semiotic manner, to what it figures. Stasis in the iconostases, state amongst the stasis, declared perfective/imperfective, it truly *is* the Blessed Virgin Mary and the Saviour, or in any event it is their light. Whence the seriousness of iconoclast quarrels, perpetuated before the portraits of Lenin and Stalin. The genius of Rublev was to broaden the interlacing of the icon, to filtrate the viscosity of its colour, without losing its epiphany. It is remarkable that he should have worked in Moscow at the time of the constitution of the current Russian in around 1400. Malevich in the Heraclites and Parmenides speed of forms, and Rothko in the light suffusion of colour all demonstrate that this epiphany continues through the 20<sup>th</sup> century.

As was to be expected, there is no shattering philosopher. Nothing in the physiological and thermic turbine of endosemy calls for the faraway meditation that makes a great philosophy. Lenin's materialism un-dialecticises Marx: 'Every mysterious, ingenious and subtle difference between the phenomenon and the thing in itself is only a fabric of philosophic absurdities'. The 'sophiology' of Soloviev (perhaps a poet before all else) and Bulgakov is an erudite gnosis obsessed by communion and immediate contact, where real and reality, and particularly memory and present want to coincide. The orthodox religion pushed as far as possible the conjugal symbolic of the body of Church united to the Saviour. It also firmly rejected the legal definitions that defined the evil that one confesses and the good that one does not confess, in the Roman manner, to cultivate a free confession that leaves the repentant with an almost physical intimacy of the sin and repentance.



The philosophical laziness had to go hand in hand with a powerful prose literature, only means of the gnosis in act. The Russian novel is comparable to the wind of the outside immensity, sometimes attempting to domesticate it through the orchestrated path with Tolstoy, sometimes abandoning oneself to its madness with Gogol, sometimes tolling its charitable or diabolical illuminations, 'idiot' in any event, right to the drafts of Dostoyevsky's interiors. All these novelists share the same process: tackling head on tiny, very precise details with general designs that are devoid of reference axis. This has sometimes been called realism and metaphysics, but is neither, only the experience of a time and a space that cannot be dialectised and where every full is empty, every living is dead or never born, in endless *Dead souls*, incompatible, not coordinable and the impossible to finish *Karamazov Brothers*. From 1849, in *Oblomov's Dream*, Gontcharov described the attempt of conversion of the quietist Russian Oblomov ('Abl<bo< b="">mov', abl<ba< b="">meuvatye', being broken) by the semi-westernised Russian Shtoltz, and the failure of this perestroika. Lenin knew the writing and measured its scope.</ba<></bo<>

On such a plain, poetry may only be horizontal in a first while, meaning that it is epic: Na biériégou pousteunneukh voln (on the bank <of> desert waves) / Stayal On (<he> stood) , doum vilikikh poln (<of> great thoughts filled) , i vdal gliédièl (and in distance looked)'. This is how Pushkin's canonical *Bronze horseman* begins. And, for the same reasons as those of the novelists, the poets conjoin vastness and detail. A 1922 poem by Maïakowsky starts with a simple and large light effect: a boy ('M<ba< b="">ltchik') goes toward an incomparable yellow sunset ('niéprivza<bï< b="">dima jolt'), where even the snow became yellow ('snièg jeulti<bè< b="">1'). And suddenly: </bè<></bï<></ba<>

Chol (moved forward) / vdrouk (suddenly) / vstal (stopped) / F cholk (in silk) / rouk (of hands)

/ stal(i) (steel).

Suicide is consumed in six monosyllables, six verses, with all the circular causalities of 'Chol/cholk, vdrouk/rouk, vstal/stal, without mentioning "jolt/jeultièl/Chol/cholk'. Since 'cholk' is accusative, we even feel the knife slide in the silk of the hands. Thanks to the extraordinary iconic strength of Russian words, the landscape ('jolt') and the walk ('chol') are enough to determine death. Camus' entire *The Stranger* in fifteen lines or so.

As was to be expected, the musical art fed from the 'sandhi' of the language, meaning the tones rather than the melody or the rhythm. It was first the tone of liturgical songs, archaic like the roots and themes of the words. Then, when it became instrumental, it placed itself not in true operas or symphonies, but in suites of instrumental paintings (*Pictures at an exhibition*), veritable sonorous icons, from Mussorgsky to Shostakovich. Current Russian rock music is a poem that is as long as the meals and the orthodox services, where the band participates from the inside (in an endosemic manner) to the voice and the body of the poet and of everyone. In the native dances, the individual bodies are the organs or the replicas of the convivial body. In this area, classical dance is in Russia as much as museum as Leningrad, where Marseilles-born Petipa originally introduced it.

As for the *intelligentsia*, whilst its name has gone around the world, it only finds its native force there, communicating, sometimes believer sometimes atheist, but always millenarian, exalting to paroxysm the repast of food and words. The words of Jesus and of

Pilates in Mikhail Bulgakov's *The Master and Margarita* sufficiently illustrate the gnostic essence of his logicism, particularly if we are to compare them to Borges on the same theme.

The Russian community is probably the only one where the notion of 'class' in the Marxist sense could be something completely different to a militant abstraction. Participating to the weeping crowds at Lenin's death, Mayakovsky closely marries endosomy and class: 'joy that even the tears out of the eyes should be common (...). More strongly / and more purely / impossible to share / with the noble sentiment / that has the name - / class! Sil(i)niéié / i tchiichchié / nil(i)zia pritchiastitsa / po imeni - / klass! For the use of 'pritchiastitsa', the official comment does not fear to remind its first sense: receiving the Eucharist. Political programmes, like religions, need some linguistic soils to blossom.

The powerful Russian contribution to linguistics does not refute the endosomy and the iconicity. Jakobson systematised the phonemes of all known languages by bringing them back to the various fillings of a matrix in twelve traits, twelve couples of sonorous, physical and existential opposites: compact/diffuse, strong energy/weak energy, voiced/not voiced, strident/not strident, sharpened/not sharpened, toned down/not toned down, etc. He frankly marked the restrictions that needed to be brought to the arbitrary of the sign that Saussure too massively borrowed from American Whitney, in the relation of significant/signified, but also in the phonic sense of words, which coincide or not with their lexical sense. And he quotes Mallarmé when the latter remarks that 'nuit' is phonetically clear, while 'jour' is phonetically dark, whereas in the Czech couple den/noc (as with the Latin diem/noctem), this discordance does not occur. He endlessly signalled that we could not adequately understand a language if we could not situate the paths according to which it is learned in a child and it is lost with the senile or the aphasic, and in particular, he offered a genetic psychology of phonemes from the opposition a/p, a/ou, ou/i, p/t, d/t, and so on. He was constantly preoccupied with situating the phonetic function, considering that language refers as much to it than at exterior designated.

We have spoken a lot of the Russian soul. This type of cliché is never false. If 'soul' is understood in its etymological sense of powerful, hot, interior and still subtly laterally modulated breadth, this is indeed a rigorous description.

**Henri Van Lier**

*Translated by Paula Cook*