

## Reviews

Čanturija, V.A. *Atlas pamjatnikov arxitektury i memorial'nyx kompleksov Belorussii*. 'Vyšejšaja škola', Minsk, 1983. 110 pages.

*Zbor pomnikaŭ historyi i kultury Bietarusi. Bresckaja vobtašč*. Ed. S.V. Marcieľu. 'Bielaruskaja Savieckaja Encykłapiedyja', Minsk, 1984. 368 pages.

Both these books are evidence of a laudable concern for the Byelorussian cultural heritage reflected not only in a recently increased output of well-produced scholarly works on art and architecture (see my reviews in *JBS*, IV (1978), pp.72-74 and V (1981), pp.40-46) but also in a series of enactments on conservation at both Union and Republic level and in specific projects for the preservation and restoration of monuments. Yet welcome developments that may have saved centuries-old buildings from disintegration have their ideological price. As we read in the Foreword to *Zbor pomnikaŭ*: 'Pomniki historyi i kultury — svojeasablivy letapis žyćcia naroda, jaskravyja šviedki jaho pracoŭnaj, revaluacyjnaj i bajavoj slavy' (p.5). In other words, special pride of place is to be given to the depressingly numerous 'memorial complexes' and monuments to heroes of politics, war and labour that adorn almost all inhabited points in the BSSR. Čanturija's book illustrates this particular focus. It begins with the partially preserved Cathedral of the Holy Wisdom in Połack (1044-66) and ends with the Rylenki war memorial near Viciebsk (1973). There are 86 tables illustrating 44 buildings or ensembles, eight of which are memorials of the post-war era. The students of architecture for whom this book is intended are invited to study the chronologically presented monuments as though they were items in the unbroken chain of Byelorussian cultural history. Despite these reservations about the ideological approach, the book provides a clear presentation of the major surviving buildings erected on Byelorussian soil between the 11th and 19th centuries, all of which have been measured during the last twenty years by teams from the Red Flag of Labour Polytechnic Institute. The photographs are somewhat pallid (for better ones, consult Čanturija's *Istorija arxitektury Belorussii* (1977), but the plans, elevations and line drawings are clear and plentiful. It should be added that this 'atlas' provides no precise information about the location of monuments.

*Zbor pomnikaŭ* is an altogether more ambitious work, part of a project for recording the monuments of all Byelorussia. The approach is systematic. A map of the Brest region (the recipient, we are informed, in 1967 of the Order of Lenin) precedes a historical essay on the area, which is followed by sections on individual districts, towns and villages, with individual monuments alphabetically listed. There are 1602 entries, amply illustrated with plans, photographs and line drawings. In some cases it is possible that the very act of recording it will have a positive effect on a building's fate. In others, entries provide some indication of the state of preservation of well-known *pomniki* — e.g. the palace at Ružany (no.1446 — apparently just a shell) and the Church at Iškaldź (no.135 — evidently still in use and well-preserved). Unfortunately, one is also obliged to wade through innumerable war memorials and partisans' huts (the section of the index devoted to the period 1941-45 is by far the largest), statues to V. I. Lenin and shopping centres, hotels and cinemas in the undistinguished 'modern' style of the 1960s and 1970s. But these stand side by side, both in the book and in life, with some architectural gems. A surprising number of wooden churches have survived and one is struck by their amazing variety and colourfulness — the blues and greens of the Church of the Trinity at Bieździeż (no.468), the pastel shades of the pseudo-Russian church at Pavićcie (no.961) or the Baroque blue and purple interior of St Michael at Ściapanki (no.592). Later buildings also catch the eye, for example the Cathedral of the Intercession at Baranavičy (no.93 — 1924-31), with mosaics originally prepared for the Cathedral of Alexander Nevsky in Warsaw. Each building is supplied with a somewhat solemn caption to the effect that it is 'a monument of the Gothic/Renaissance/Baroque/Classical/etc. style'. Whatever its shortcomings in terms of emphasis — and it may be that this reviewer underestimates the Soviet reader's interest in war memorials — the chief virtue of this volume is its use as a

practical guide. It gives a fuller indication than previously available of the rich variety of architectural styles on Byelorussian

soil and makes one dream of setting forth with a visa, a car and a good map.

Lindsey Hughes

Donelajtis, Krystyn. *Pory roku*. Translated from the Lithuanian by Zygmunt Ławrynowicz [with the Lithuanian text *en vis-à-vis*]. Introduction by Andrzej Wakar and Zygmunt Ławrynowicz. 'Pojezierze', Olsztyn-Białystok, 1982. xlv + 205 pp.

Born in Lithuania and educated within the Polish system in Vilna in the 1930s, the poet Czesław Miłosz laments that his generation of schoolboys were told nothing 'about the fine, rich folklore of Lithuania, even though pagan activity was still extant there, nor about the first printed texts in peasant dialects, or the Protestant pastor Donelajtis who in the 18th century wrote *The Four Seasons*, a poem in Lithuanian hexameters which can be interestingly compared with the *Seasons* of the more or less contemporary James Thompson' (*Rodzinnia Europa*, 2nd edn, 1980, p. 83).

From childhood the average Pole cannot escape awareness of the Lithuanian and Byelorussian landscape, if only from its fairy-tale apotheosis in Adam Mickiewicz's *Pan Tadeusz*. It is again from Mickiewicz that the average Pole will have heard of Kristijonas Donelaitis. A footnote appended to *Grażyna* (1823) mentions his poem *The Four Seasons*, published a few years previously in Königsberg by Jan Ludwik Reza, as being 'deserving of praise both for its subject-matter and its fine poetic expression. It should be of particular interest to us in that it presents a faithful picture of the customs of the Lithuanian peasantry'. It is probable that from the very outset Mickiewicz consciously or subconsciously plotted a poetic mythologization of the Lithuanian past: the first in-kling of his plans for a national epic can be traced back to his essay on *Dyzma Bończa Tomaszewski's Jagiellonida, czyli połączenie Litwy z Polską* (1818). One may therefore safely speculate that the very existence of Donelaitis's poem, even in Reza's bowdlerized and embellished German rendering, was seminal in Mickiewicz's development. Nevertheless the native culture of Lithuania has remained a largely unknown quantity in the general cultural awareness of Poles, in spite of several centuries of intimate political union with the Grand Duchy.

Within the Grand Duchy itself, the as-

pendancy of Polish culture accounts more than any other single factor for the slow development of Lithuanian literature in the vernacular. Ironically, it was over the border in Lithuania minor alias Lithuanian East Prussia (inhabited largely by Lithuanian colonists but coming increasingly under the sway of the East Prussian authorities) that old Lithuanian literature was to achieve its finest florescence: Donelaitis's *The Four Seasons* is by common assent the greatest literary work of the feudal period. It is odd to reflect that this development went hand in hand with Prussian plans for cultural unification: bent on gaining influence over the local Lithuanian population through educational means, the Prussian authorities organized a network of parish schools. This created a need for bibles, hymnals and collections of sermons, whose authors in the main were German pastors with some knowledge of Lithuanian acquired in the Lithuanian seminary at Königsberg University. Meanwhile it should be noted that German literati and thinkers in the second half of the 17th century were the first to evince an interest in the folk culture of Lithuanian East Prussia, and that subsequently the stimulus and incentive of such men as Lessing, Kant, Herder and Goethe gave Lithuanian lore a permanent status within the cultural context of Europe.

The father of Lithuanian literature, Kristijonas Donelaitis, owes much to the tradition of Protestant pastors. He was born in 1714 in the village of Laždynėliai (district of Gumbinsk), East Prussia, one of seven children of a poverty-stricken peasant who died six years later. At school he acquired a good grounding in Latin, Greek, Hebrew, French and religion. Theological studies at Königsberg University, where he lived in Collegium Albertinum, enabled him to deepen his knowledge of Lithuanian language and literature, and rhetoric; he also studied musical theory and practice. After qualifying he spent

three years as choirmaster in Stalupienie (present-day Nesterov), several miles away from Laždynėliai, where he probably composed his *Fables* in the Aesopic vein. Then, after a further spell at Königsberg, he was appointed to the parish of Tolminkiemis (present-day Čistye Prudy), where he remained until his death in 1780.

According to sources of the period, the parish comprised four crown farms, two free farms, and thirty-two serf villages, as well as a 40-hectare estate for the maintenance of the pastor and his family. Apart from performing his clerical duties, Donelaitis is known to have built a new stone church in place of the old wooden one, and a hospice for the widows of pastors. He was more than once in conflict with the manager of the crown estates, and in a court case c. 1770 between manor and local peasantry he came out strongly on the side of the latter. Extant manuscript material testifies to Donelaitis's mildness of character, his proneness to spiritual depression, and his deep-rooted love for his native tongue.

*Metai* was started in 1765, and it is not known how many drafts were produced before what is assumed to be the final version of 1773-74. At his death, his widow handed his papers over to J. Jordan, the pastor at Walterkiejmy, who lent the manuscript to J. Hohfeldt in the neighbouring parish of Gierwiszkin; and some material was irretrievably lost in the turmoil of Napoleon's Muscovy campaign. At the behest of Herder and later Humboldt, Jan Ludwik Reza of Königsberg University, a collector of Lithuanian folk songs, published in 1818 an abridged — and morally improved — text, together with his own translation into German. His endeavour was highly praised by the philologist S.B. Linde, by the philologist and publisher J. Grimm, and came up for discussion at meetings of the Society for the Friends of Sciences in Warsaw. It was however only in 1865 that the first complete edition was published for the Russian Academy of Sciences by Professor A. Schleicher, at a time when the Lithuanian language was banned by the tsarist authorities. There were further editions in 1869 (G.H.F. Nesselmann, with a literal German translation), 1894 (in Halle), and in 1897 the works of Donelaitis were brought out in the United States.

In his foreword Reza writes that 'this

work should be considered by the Lithuanians as worthy of imitation both in poetry and in eloquence, the more so as it bears the hallmark of true originality: there is nothing borrowed from foreign literatures'. Donelaitis certainly had his followers in the 19th century; and his *Metai* gained regular mention in the ethnographic and folkloric materials compiled throughout the century.

Mickiewicz called *Metai* a descriptive poem. In the 1818 edition it was termed 'ein landliches Epos'. For those who stress its value as a source of ethnographic material, *Metai* remains primarily an encyclopaedia of customs of the Lithuanian countryside. It presents an appeal to the reader's love of the vernacular, a eulogy of the Lithuanian peasantry, and a condemnation of the feudal German overlords. Its theme is also the beauty of nature and of work; and the equality of peasants and landowners. Donelaitis is in danger of being all things to all critics: formulator of literary linguistic norms, spokesman for Lithuanian nationalism, mouthpiece for the peasant point of view in the class struggle. The illustrations of the artist Vytautas Kalinauskas are a good case in point, as they exploit its potential usefulness to the cause of socialist realist aesthetics.

There has been little disagreement on the subject of the poem's originality. *Metai* was approximately contemporaneous with James Macpherson's *Fragments of Ancient Poetry* (1760), with *Fingal* (1762) and *Temora*, the Ossianic epic (1763) and Percy's *Reliques of Ancient English Poetry* (1765). It was completed at about the same time as Goethe's *Sorrows of Young Werther* (1774), and the beginnings of his *Wilhelm Meister* (1777). In this context Miłosz's reference to Thompson is helpful in that it serves to define *Metai* by negatives and opposites.

A quick flashback to Thompson's *Damons and Celadons*, to his Teviotdale, and its explicit associations with the landscapes of Lorraine, Rosa and Poussin; to the aura of pleasurable imaginative reflectiveness that emanates from his rosy and even indolent way of life, can serve as a starting-point for stating what Donelaitis's *Metai* is not. As nature poetry it is neither an exercise in idyllic escapism, nor a eulogy of rural retirement in the Horatian vein. Though its spirit is closer to the *Georgics*

than the *Eclogues*, it is not a poetic compendium of husbandry and tilling.

Nor is *Metai* landscape poetry in the strictest sense of the word. There is no precise topography, and with the exception of the neighbouring locality of Taukiai the village remains anonymous; nor are the natural geodesic contours of river, lake and hillside made manifest. We accept that it is Donelaitis's village, but also any Lithuanian village. At the same time the pictorial and emotional potential of landscape are fully revealed; and nature is here in full spate of season, climate and weather.

The natural calendar provides a formula which organizes the structure of the poem, imposes patterns and contrasts, and motivates the sequence of events. Nature sets the time for works and duties on the land, while weather orchestrates the mood. Agricultural and liturgical time are fused in sacral time, thereby connoting the existence of sacral place. As calendar literature of the highest order Donelaitis's poem stands somewhere between Hesiod and Virgil on the one hand, and the great quasi-novelistic canvasses of Mickiewicz's *Pan Tadeusz* on the other: calendar and breviary are the main organizers of time and space in some of Polish literature's most representative works, and play a particularly significant role in the Polish-language literature of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania. There is no evidence of any major connection between Donelaitis and the Polish literary tradition; but the need for a comparative study would seem to stem from the very nature of the material being discussed.

This is however but one aspect of *Metai*. Its main protagonists — nature, climate, the weather, the sun and the rain — also provide the backcloth for a sideshow of dramatic genre scenes. Set up to prove a moral point, these pictures illustrate a medieval typology of human character centred round the cardinal vices of gluttony, avarice, and so forth. (One might here note that Donelaitis's animals possess an innate ethical code that serves as a yardstick for passing judgement on the comportment of men.) These episodes often bring to mind the paintings of a Brueghel or a Brouwer, commented and explicated by a preaching chivving pastor. It is tempting to see *Metai* as a sublimation of disparate strands such as fable and

sermon apparent in previous centuries of Lithuanian literature: yet the arguments in favour of *summa genorum* must be resisted, as in the poem's present form description and action episodes are loosely structured; the upshot being juxtaposition rather than synthesis.

Donelaitis's Protestant work ethic distinguishes his rural epos from the mainstream of landed-estate poetry in baroque and post-baroque Poland. The realism of his picture diverges in a number of ways from the idealization of Mickiewicz, and provides a healthy corrective to some of the historical embellishments of subsequent writers and scholars. He evinces an awareness of the pre-Christian practices still prevalent among a people who in the words of the chronicler 'worshipped the entire creature world'. For Polish literary enthusiasts of the Lithuanian past fascination with paganism, enhanced by memories of resistance to the conquests of the Teutonic Knights, often provided a convenient code for national resistance *tout court*. For Donelaitis, the village pastor, there is nothing here to condone, let alone praise.

From the parallel text in this edition even the non-Lithuanian reader will get a sense of the remarkable assonantal and alliterative qualities of Donelaitis's verse, inherent perhaps in the phonetics and stress patterns of the Lithuanian language and the native folk genre of the *dainos*. These sonorities are less apparent in Polish. Yet Zygmunt Ławrynowicz, himself a poet of distinction, has approached the translation of *Metai* with a strong feeling for the intrinsic poetic virtues of the original, and has sought to give as faithful a rendering as possible. Discrepancies are thus the result of editorial teamwork and not of a translator's licence. His version is eminently fluent and readable, full of verve and colour, and he strikes on the whole a felicitous balance between the word-horde of Polish rural poetry, and the rumbustious colloquialness called for in the genre scenes.

Besides a bibliography, this edition carries two highly informative forewords: Andrzej Wakar writes on the cultural and historical background of Lithuanian East Prussia, and Ławrynowicz surveys the life and works of the poet. Both these introductions, and a recent article by Rimvydas Silbajoris ('Kristijonas Donelaitis, a Lithuanian classic', *Slavic Review*, 41 (2),

1982, pp. 251-65) testify to the permanent value of Donelaitis's *oeuvre*. The appearance of this Polish translation is a particularly welcome event in terms both of Baltic and Slavonic literature, and the publishing-house of Pojezierze in Olsztyn deserves warm words of credit for making readily available texts from a region of Europe too often neglected by the general publisher in the West: one might here note that *Metai* is available in Armenian, Byelorussian, Czech, Estonian, German, Latin, Latvian, Russian, Ukrainian and Yiddish.

Clearly, there is a mass of fascinating background material tucked away in Lithuanian scholarly journals; and the three articles mentioned would seem to argue the case for making *Metai* readily

available to the Anglo-Saxon reader. With such rare exceptions as Theodor Fontane's delicate mood watercolour etchings of sand dunes and pine forests in the Prussian Junker country of *Effi Briest*, and the archetypal contours of Johannes Bobrowski's Sarmatian Shadow Land, the Baltic landscape impinges all too seldom on the imaginative awareness of literate Europe. Miłosz's testimony to Baltic culture and civilization (*inter alia* in *The Captive Mind*), the aura of Hanseatic orderliness and wellbeing that emanates from that world, would suggest that the sermonizing poetics of pastor Donelaitis were deeply and durably rooted in the ethos of his people.

Nina Taylor

Janovič, Sakrat. *Miniatures*. Edited and translated by Shirin Akiner. The Anglo-Byelorussian Society, London, 1984. 91 pp.

Sakrat Janovič (b. 1936) is one of the most original and talented Byelorussian writers today, and certainly the leader amongst the not inconsiderable group who live in ethnically Byelorussian east Poland. In a splendidly lucid introduction to her bilingual anthology Shirin Akiner not only describes Janovič's life and special qualities as a writer but also explains how it comes about that there should be a significant Byelorussian minority to the west of the Soviet Byelorussian border. Well known for her work on not only Byelorussian language and literature but also Tatar and Central Asian studies, Dr Akiner has already published a substantial article on Byelorussian writers of the Białystok region ('Contemporary Byelorussian Literature in Poland (1956-81)', *Modern Language Review*, 78, 1 (1983), pp. 113-29) which has been translated and republished for readers in the geographically isolated but culturally alive region whose culture she has championed. *Miniatures* is a timely and valuable addition to her work in this field.

Prose miniatures are a genre that Sakrat Janovič has made peculiarly his own. To them he brings a sensitive, immensely precise, lapidary style and a considered economy that makes comparison with poetry inevitable; in his finely honed imagery and powerfully restrained lyricism he makes even Turgenev's celebrated poems in prose seem clumsy and

overblown; perhaps closer in technique are Lev Konson's compressed sketches of labour camp life, *Kratkie povesti* (Paris, 1983). Dr Akiner is well aware of the problems of translating poetry, and understands the tag '*traduttore, traditore*'. Her versions are almost entirely accurate and read smoothly, but, for all that, the parallel text format will be welcome, since, like all poets, in prose or verse, Janovič really needs to be read in the original.

In his love of his native land, affection for country traditions, and dismay when youth seems to reject its heritage, Janovič recalls the Russian village writers, particularly Vasily Belov. Janovič's sense of national identity is, of course, of quite a different nature. He has a considerable following in Poland, and many of his works are translated into Polish; some, indeed, have, sadly, appeared only in translation. However, he has avoided the temptation of becoming a Polish writer with a large and appreciative audience (the position of Vasil Bykaŭ *vis-à-vis* Russian literature is not dissimilar, though he faces none of the practical difficulties with which Janovič has to contend). In his own words, quoted in the Introduction: 'I can only feel in Byelorussian; my imagination derives its inspiration from that language, the language of my childhood. In any other language I would not be able to create, only to enumerate the names of things'.

Dr Akiner has caught the essence of this

writer as an individual and as a phenomenon when she concludes: 'In truth Janovič is a Byelorussian writer not merely because he writes in Byelorussian, but because his whole being is informed with an awareness of his Byelorussian identity. He does not consciously strive to express it; it is a natural part of his outlook. Similarly, he does not write about his community out of a sense of duty, but simply because it is his world. His ultimate involvement with it gives him the power to reveal it in sharp relief and at the same time to transcend its local boundaries and find in it the universal' (pp. 14-15).

Janovič, highly appreciated in Poland and Soviet Byelorussia as well as his native Białystok region, has been lucky to find in Shirin Akiner such a talented advocate. It must now be hoped that a means will be discovered to publish those of Janovič's works as have not yet appeared in their original Byelorussian, and that before long the admirable *Miniatures* will be followed by more translations which will reveal further this recondite but immensely worthwhile corner of contemporary European literature.

Arnold McMillin

Jurkiewicz, Jan. *Rozwój polskiej myśli politycznej na Litwie i Białorusi w latach 1905-1922*. Uniwersytet im. Adama Mickiewicza w Poznaniu. Seria Historia, no. 100. Poznań, 1983. 259 pages.

In the early part of the 20th century the lands of the former Grand Duchy of Lithuania were inhabited by four major national groups: Byelorussians, Lithuanians, Poles and Jews. Though less numerous than either of the first two groups, the Poles had traditionally represented the most influential segment of the local population economically and culturally, and, after 1905, with varying success, politically. Jan Jurkiewicz's monograph examines the various currents of political thought represented in the Polish community of Lithuania and Byelorussia in the years 1905-22. The chronological limits are appropriate. The Revolution of 1905 and its aftermath brought about the curtailment of the tsarist policy of ruthless suppression of the Polish and Lithuanian national movements continuing since the Insurrection of 1863-64. The year 1922, on the other hand, marked the incorporation of so-called Central Lithuania into the Polish state and the victory of Polish nationalism over the traditions of the Commonwealth of the Two Nations. The title of the work is a little misleading since it signals a much broader and more comprehensive treatment of the subject than the author provides in the book. First of all, he concentrates his discussion on the intellectual and political milieu of the capital city of the region, Vilna, with somewhat uneven treatment of the smaller Polish communities in the Kovno area and in Byelorussia. Secondly, the author chooses not to deal with the key problem of Polish-Jewish

relations, suggesting that it requires a separate study.

The book is divided chronologically into three chapters corresponding to the following three subperiods: the constitutional years following the Revolution of 1905, World War I, and the years 1918-22 which brought about a drastic territorial and political reshaping of the Lithuanian-Byelorussian lands. Within this historical sequence the author traces the changes within what he recognizes as the four broad currents of Polish political thought in the area. The first of these currents was represented by conservative landowners, who on the whole were more concerned with preserving the social order than with the national aspirations of the Polish, Lithuanian, or Byelorussian populations. The second course was comprised of the National Democrats promoting the goals of Polish 'national egoism' but quite flexible in the choice of political means to achieve these goals. The third direction was that of the 'natives' (*krajowcy*) who longed for an independent historic Lithuania in which Poles would occupy an equal political and cultural position to that of Lithuanians and Byelorussians. Finally, the fourth current, the least popular one, was represented by left-socialists who saw revolution as the only solution to all the nationality problems of the Russian Empire. Gradually, changing political circumstances, brought about by the collapse of the Russian Empire in 1917 and the defeat of the Central Powers in the

following year, channelled the first three currents into two mainstreams, federalist and incorporationist. Relative lack of interest among the Byelorussian and Lithuanian populations in a federal solution, and only limited success in the war against the Bolsheviks, strengthened the incorporationist camp, which finally triumphed at the Conference of Riga in 1921 and in the annexation of Central Lithuania by Poland in 1922. In view of the very real differences among the various directions of Polish political thought in the Lithuanian-Byelorussian lands, it is not altogether clear why the author asserts in the course of his study, and again in the conclusion (p. 252), that all Polish political currents, with the exception of the socialist-internationalist, were characterized by a 'community of fundamental goals' (*wspólnota zasadniczych celów*). A quite opposite view emerges from his presentation.

The work is based primarily on Polish periodical press from the Vilna area supplemented by materials from Polish archives and published memoir literature. The author had utilized the historical literature available to him in 1980, being thus unable to draw upon such more recent works as Waclaw Jedrzejewicz's study of Central Lithuania and Wiktor Sukienicki's monumental *East Central Europe during World War I*. Jan Jurkiewicz's book comprises the first part of his doctoral dissertation which covers the period up to 1945. It can only be hoped that the second part will also be published soon. Even in its present form, the book represents a major item in the historiography of Polish political thought and a significant contribution to the intellectual and political history of Lithuania and Byelorussia.

Maciej Siekierski

Šalkievič, Viačaslaŭ. *Kastuś Kalinoŭski: Staronki bijahrafii*. Hołas radzimy, Minsk, 1985. 128 pp.

Despite the extensive literature on Kastuś Kalinoŭski (1838-64) produced in the Soviet Union, the Byelorussian patriot's writings have never been published in full there. The reason is plain: Kalinoŭski's expressions of religious and nationalist, anti-Russian feelings are simply too strong to be explained away by even the most subtle exegesis. For example, in the fourth issue of *Mužyckaja praŭda* he declares roundly: 'In our country, boys, they teach you in school only to read the Muscovite language (*pa maskoŭsku*) in order to turn you completely into Muscovites'; and in his third *Piśmo z-pad šybienicy*, a little more than a year later, we read: 'For I say to you from beneath the gallows, my People, that only then will you live happily when no Muscovite remains over you'. Kalinoŭski's original writings have, however, been fully published in the West, together with an English translation: *The 1863 Uprising in Byelorussia: 'Peasants' Truth' and 'Letters from beneath the Gallows'* (Texts and commentaries by Jan Zaprudnik and Thomas E. Bird. The Krečėuski Foundation, Inc., New York, 1980). Indeed, it seems to be principally with the aim of counteracting or discrediting the latter publication that the quasi-popular biogra-

phy now under review was produced. Its stated aim is to trace Kalinoŭski's spiritual and intellectual development, answering the 'Byelorussian bourgeois nationalists [who] have always tried to put the image of Kastuś Kalinoŭski, so attractive to the workers, to the service of their narrowly class-based, anti-populist interests. Parasitizing his statements against Russian autocracy and the Tsar, they have tried to use them to show that the revolutionary was some sort of middle-class Russophobe' (pp.6-7). Any remaining doubt as to the author's intentions are dispelled by his quotation from the Introduction to the New York edition, albeit without naming it. Indeed, all the quotations of non-kosher material in this book are unannotated (parasitized?), as, incidentally, are the few direct quotations from Kalinoŭski's own writing (for example, on pp.8-9). There is also (deliberate?) obscurity in some of the references that are furnished with annotation (for instance, fn.70 on p. 116). The 73 endnotes underline the book's quasi-scholarly character and include some references to archive material, but nearly one quarter are from the writing of Lenin.

Given, then, the work's polemical, publi-

cist nature, what value has it for our understanding of Kastuś Kalinoŭski's life and thought? There is quite a deal of information about his early years, particularly at school and university, though Dr Šalkievič at times seems to be presenting all the known detail regardless of its significance, for instance in the passage dealing with the seating capacity and opening hours of St Petersburg Public Library. Nor is the author loth to engage in speculation, such as on Kalinoŭski's putative influence on the thought of Feliks Deržinskij (p. 4) or on the possibility of his having met Čer-nyševskij (p. 67). However, some things are deemed axiomatic, such as the origin of Kalinoŭski's social concepts in the folk songs 'which he took in with his mother's milk' (pp. 19-20), or the importance of other revolutionary movements, from the Decembrists to the Philomaths, in the period after what Dr Šalkievič calls 'the final uniting of Byelorussia with Russia (1795)' (p. 23). Stress is laid on the beneficial influence of the 'great Russian social democrats' such as Dobroljubov and Čer-nyševskij: much more important to Kalinoŭski, however, was Herzen (as Karskij

observed in *Belorusy*, II, 3, p. 86), for Herzen was both an inspiration and an influence, with his concern and support for the aspirations of the oppressed minorities of the Russian Empire.

The central part of Viačasłaŭ Šalkievič's short monograph ends with the following uncontroversial declaration: 'Together with *Mužyckaja praŭda*, the *Listy* ('Letters to the Byelorussian People') represent the basic source for characterizing the world view of the Byelorussian revolutionary democrat' (p. 120). All the more regrettable, then, that access to this primary material is still denied to readers in Soviet Byelorussia, whose picture of their national heroes remains, as a result, obscured and distorted. Without such direct, pungent and colourful publicist writings as *Mužyckaja praŭda* and the *Piśma* Byelorussian 19th-century literature seems even more impoverished than in reality. Publication of uncensored and unabridged primary texts remains the main *desideratum* for Soviet scholarly publishing.

Arnold McMillin

Sobczak, Jacek. *Położenie prawne ludności tatarskiej w Wielkim Księstwie Litewskim*. Poznańskie Towarzystwo Przyjaciół Nauk. Wydział Historii i Nauk Społecznych. Prace Komisji Historycznej. Tom XXXVIII. Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, Warsaw-Poznan, 1984. 133 pages.

This book deals with a relatively little-studied segment of the population of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, the Tatars. The work comprises three chapters. The first traces the settlement of the Tatars, beginning with the 13th century, in the lands of the Grand Duchy, primarily in the Byelorussian parts of the provinces of Troki and Vilna, as well as in the province of Navahrudak. The next chapter covers the military, social and religious organization of the Grand Duchy's Tatars, whom the author divides into four basic categories (*Tatarzy hospodarscy*, *kozacy*, town dwellers, and those in the service of magnates). Finally, the third chapter analyzes the legal status, and the rights and obligations of these Moslem settlers.

It is this third section which includes perhaps the author's most valuable contribution. Here he presents, quite convincingly, the argument that, contrary to established views, none of the four basic

categories of Tatars possessed the status of *szlachta*, since none of them ever had full political rights, including participation in the legislative process and holding of public office. The position of the highest category of Tatars, the *Tatarzy hospodarscy*, was defined by the peculiar conditions of their land ownership. Unlike the *szlachta* of the Grand Duchy, who ever since the promulgation of the Second Lithuanian Statute in 1566 had full freedom to dispose of their land, the Tatars did not. Unlike the *szlachta*, whose personal obligation to serve the Grand Prince derived from their noble status, the *Tatarzy hospodarscy* were obliged to serve in exchange for their limited ownership of land. One cannot, however, speak of the legal situation of the Tatars as a whole, since the four categories had quite different rights and obligations. These the author covers in considerable detail. Summing up his findings, Dr Sobczak concludes that the Tatars of the



Grand Duchy of Lithuania, though relatively few in number (earlier in the book he estimates the total Tatar population of the Grand Duchy to be about 11,000 at the time of the partitions of the Commonwealth), represented a substantial military force, but played a far less significant political and economic role in the country.

The work is based largely on archival materials available in Poland, with the Main Archive of Early Acts (AGAD) in Warsaw, or more specifically, its Radziwiłł

Archives, providing most of the author's original sources. The bibliography which supplements the text is extensive, though it does not include certain items published in the West. But that is a minor deficiency. This is a very important book which represents the best monographic coverage to date of the position of the Tatars in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania.

*Maciej Siekierski*