

## Reviews

### BOOK REVIEWS

Aničenka, U. V. *Bielaruska-ukrainskija pišmova-moŭnyja suviazi. 'Navuka i technika'*, Minsk, 1969. 294 pages. Index. Bibliography. Illustrations.

Uładzimir Aničenka has for a decade or so been known to the student of East Slavonic for his works in the field of Old Byelorussian and particularly of its connections with other Slavonic languages. In 1962, his study of Byelorussian versions of the translated *Romance of Alexander* appeared in *Aleksandryja*, a volume including five versions of this work and published by the Academy of Sciences of the Byelorussian SSR. In the following year, the first of his series of articles, each on a facet of the subject now covered by the book under review, appeared in *Slavia*, XXXII, pp. 36-46: 'Da pytańnia ab bielaruska-ukrainskich moŭnych uzajemadziejańniach starażytnaj pary'. This was followed by an article on problems in distinguishing between Byelorussian and Ukrainian documents in *Sovetskoje slavjanovedenije*, 1965, 6, pp. 25-34; one in *Slavia*, XXXV, 1966, pp. 65-72, on Church Slavonic tradition in 16th-17th-century Byelorussian and Ukrainian translations; three articles in *Viešci Akademii Navuk BSSR, seryja hramadskich navuk*: 1966, 1, pp. 102-11, comparing the language of Skaryna's Bible with that of Zuhajov's Ukrainian copy of it; 1968, 4, pp. 115-23, on Byelorussian elements in Ukrainian writings of the 15th-17th centuries; and 1969, 5, pp. 103-10, on Ukrainian vocabulary in 16th-17th-century Byelorussian documents; an article in *Slavia Orientalis*, XVIII, 1969, pp. 325-32, on Polonisms in Byelorussian and Ukrainian documents of the same period; and his contribution on the Skaryna traditions in the Ukraine to *450 hod bielaruskaha knihadrukavańnia* which was mentioned in *JBS*, II, 1, p. 102 (as were some other articles of his; see, for example, *fasc. cit.*, p. 127).

Aničenka's monograph incorporates many of the findings of his articles

as well as offering much new material, and covers the 14th-17th centuries, viz. the period of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania and of the Polish Commonwealth until the beginning of its decline.

Since its appearance, the book has been reviewed in several journals (by L. Šakun in *Poŭmnia*, 1969, 10, pp. 238-42, R. Kraučuk in *Viešci AN BSSR, ser. hram. navuk*, 1969, 6, pp. 133-5, A. Obreńska-Jabłońska in *Slavia Orientalis*, XIX, 1970, pp. 225-6, A. Żurański in *Sovetskoje slavjanovedenije*, 1970, 5, pp. 94-8, A. Burjačok and V. Rusaniv's'kyj in *Movoznavstvo* (Kiev), 1971, 1, pp. 90-93, and a note by I. Bilodid in the same journal, 1969, 6, p. 22). The reader is referred for criticism of a number of points of detail, as well as of some basic premises, to the above authors, and the present reviewer will aim at giving a general idea of the book while avoiding repetition in discussing some details of method and its application.

Aničenka first considers criteria for distinguishing Byelorussian and Ukrainian literary monuments, relying chiefly upon phonetic and morphological features and leaving out detailed consideration of lexical criteria (which is much regretted by some reviewers) in view of the absence of reliable lexicographical aids. Also, especially when dealing with questions of the history of the literary language as he does (as opposed to historical grammar, with which he is not concerned), he regards the place of writing and the ethnic origin of the writer as important criteria; when, however, these point in opposite directions, though he is prepared to regard such monuments as belonging to both the Byelorussians and the Ukrainians, he allows precedence to the territorial principle, admitting that some contro-

versial decisions are unavoidable if this is strictly applied.

The author then proceeds to analyse copious material gathered from a multitude of sources, dividing quotations from them into two juxtaposed groups, those from Byelorussian and Ukrainian documents respectively, each time he discusses a separate linguistic feature. He begins by surveying all features common to the two languages in 14th-16th-century charters, or 'official writings' (*dzielavaja pišmiennašč*); in the Lithuanian Statute of 1566 and 1588 and its 16th-century ms copy made in the Ukraine; in 15th-17th-century chronicles; and in religious literature. He follows this by tracing Byelorussian linguistic influence on Ukrainian writings of various types. A distinguishing feature of Aničenka's method is that he tries whenever possible to compare works of the same content originating in the two linguistic areas; thus after analysing original Ukrainian charters for Byelorussian features he proceeds to examine, under the above heading, Ukrainian copies or editions of Byelorussian originals, which include ecclesiastical works as well as the Lithuanian Statute and some other writings. Although, predictably, the number of Byelorussianisms is above average in works of this particular origin, instances where Ukrainianisms are introduced in place of Byelorussianisms are easily discernible, and the ratio between the Byelorussianisms preserved and those rejected can be estimated, it being always understood that this ratio will be heavily weighted in favour of those preserved merely by virtue of these documents being based on Byelorussian originals. A much more reliable picture can be expected to emerge from an examination of those works of similar content which came into being independently from each other in the two linguistic areas; unfortunately, works of this type are not numerous, and are limited to a few ecclesiastical texts translated independently into 'popular' Ukrainian and Byelorussian, and similarly prepared translations from a Polish chronicle; Aničenka finds more Byelorussianisms in the Ukrainian translation of the latter than of the religious texts. The next category which he examines consists of Ukrainian works which served as sources for later

Byelorussian ones; not surprisingly, Byelorussianisms are least numerous in this category, as well as in those Ukrainian works for which there are no Byelorussian counterparts.

The opposite influence, that of Ukrainian on the Old Byelorussian writings, is examined next, under the subheadings: 'official writings', Byelorussian monuments based on Ukrainian originals or written by Ukrainian authors (or scribes), Byelorussian monuments from South-West Byelorussia, and those from the rest of her territory. Aničenka concludes that Byelorussian influence on Ukrainian was strongest in the 14th-16th centuries, while the opposite influence gathered momentum in the 17th century.

Aničenka separately examines Church-Slavonicisms (*kněžnastavianizmy*) and Polonisms in the 16th-17th-century Byelorussian and Ukrainian literatures and concludes, contrary to the impressions gained by earlier scholars, that it was Ukrainian literature which had the stronger Church Slavonic elements, while Byelorussian literature had a more liberal admixture of Polonisms. The useful chapter on orthographic and palaeographic characteristic features of Byelorussian and Ukrainian mss respectively provides supporting criteria for assigning documents to the one language or the other.

The earliest written language of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania was a variety of Church Slavonic, which absorbed, particularly in its secular applications, more and more local Byelorussian and Ukrainian features, though in documents originating from the Grand-Ducal Chancery preference was given to Byelorussian elements, especially those in common with Ukrainian. Aničenka attributes this last preference to the scribes' consciousness of 'the community of the official (*dziaržaŭnaja*) written literary language in Byelorussia and the Ukraine' (p. 274), for which he suggests the name '*zachodnjeruskaja mova*' (p. 17); this could be rendered into English as 'the West Rus language', but since '*ruskaja mova*' means 'Russian', another ambiguous rendering, 'West Russian', is possible. This name, quite understandably, found no favour with some reviewers who suggested 'Byelorussian-Ukrainian' or 'Ukrainian-Byelorussian' instead.

The break-up of the common 'zachodnieruskaja' language is attributed by Aničenka to the migration of the centres of Orthodox culture from Vilna to Kiev and dated to the beginning or middle of the 17th century in the ecclesiastical and official genres respectively (pp. 274-5), which is much too late, according to the justified objection of I. Bilodid and others, who place the break-up in the 15th century.

The development of the written language proceeded from the alien Church Slavonic in the beginnings, used equally by both peoples, through its 'popularisation', the resultant split, and towards the ultimate close proximity of modern literary Byelorussian and Ukrainian to the respective spoken languages, or at least to the dialects which serve as the foundations of these two literary languages. This development must of course be viewed against the parallel development of the native spoken languages of the two peoples. Their development proceeded, particularly at first, independently from that of the written language(s), remaining in the beginning virtually unrecorded due to the unchallenged supremacy of Church Slavonic as the written form, but later offering more and more evidence of their progress as they gradually intruded into the written medium. The scheme adopted by Aničenka, which does not in its essentials differ from that professed by all Soviet scholars and taken for granted by many Western slavists, is that the East Slavonic linguistic unity lasted until the 12th or 13th century, when it split up, and the three East Slavonic languages began their separate lives as Russian, Ukrainian and Byelorussian. Therefore, in order to establish the linguistic provenance of a document or of some individual features found in it, presumably intruding from the other language, Aničenka matches them up against the features of modern Byelorussian or Ukrainian respectively or against the forms these features assume when retraced into the past. As a rule he avoids examining dialectal data (claiming that not enough work, especially lexicographical work, has been done in this field) and thus abandons the chance of establishing, *inter alia*, a more or less narrow

dialectal localisation of the basis of the official language of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania (for which failure he is reproached by some reviewers). However, he cannot avoid the issue completely; he has to admit that Common Slavonic *ě* (which became 'ѣ' in Old Church Slavonic) has produced *e* not only in Byelorussian but also in the North Ukrainian dialects, while Common Slavonic *ę* has resulted in *e* both in these latter dialects and in the South Byelorussian ones. This proviso has to be repeated with a disconcerting frequency, thereby disturbing the neat dichotomy of Byelorussian/Ukrainian features and mutual influences, and often inducing doubts whether, for example, a basically Ukrainian document having *e* < \**ě* and *e* < \**ę* should be classified as manifesting Byelorussian influence, or as originating in the North Ukrainian dialectal area (and the number of such documents quoted is very considerable). The fact that these dialectal features appear also in the oldest of the documents studied by Aničenka suggests a considerable antiquity of the North Ukrainian and South Byelorussian dialects; and his analysis would have been much more satisfactory and convincing if he had classified his material according to three, not two, language types: (a) North Byelorussian; (b) South Byelorussian and North Ukrainian; and (c) South Ukrainian. In fact, as Yury Šerech (G. Y. Shevelov) has very convincingly shown in his *Problems in the Formation of Byelorussian* (Supplement to *Word*, IX, New York, December 1953), pp. 60-69, 91-3 and *passim*, this division goes back to prehistoric times and cuts across the later Byelorussian/Ukrainian division; to adapt somewhat his terms, the original (say, around the 11th century) language groups were: (a) Połack, (b) Kiev-Polesie, and (c) Galicia-Podolia, and the regrouping process, resulting in the formation of Byelorussian as an entity from the Połack language group and the southern part of the Kiev-Polesie one, was relatively late and complete only by the 16th century. (It must be noted that Šerech's conclusions have, to the present reviewer's knowledge, never been refuted; moreover, Aničenka seems to know Šerech's book, as he approvingly quotes it at least twice, on pp. 44

and 121, without attempting either to make any use of, or to dispute, Serech's central findings.)

Aničenka's above failure to take important and relatively recent research into account is very serious, and yet he personally can hardly be blamed for having failed to reject the accepted opinion on this subject which amounts in fact to an article of faith. But he *can* be blamed for using unreliable sources, such as documents published in *Akty, odnosjaščiesja k istorii Južnoj i Zapadnoj Rossii*, StP, 1862-5, as this is a publication for historians, not philologists, in which a 'b' of the ms is often rendered by an 'e', or 'и' and 'ы' are confused — both features being important in the linguistic classification of a document. He was in fact warned about this unreliability by L. Humets'ka, who discussed in *Voprosy jazykoznanija*, 1965, 2, pp. 39-44, Aničenka's 1963 *Slavia* article.

Subject to the above, it must be stressed that Aničenka's monograph is the result of a conscientious effort, and represents a serious and important contribution to a subject which before him had not been treated with anything approaching his thoroughness. It is very valuable, in particular, that a considerable number of Byelorussian sources (though not so many Ukrainian ones) are quoted from mss for the first time and thus made accessible, at least in parts, to others interested in the subject. Several facsimile reproductions of mss are also very useful, but some of them have been reduced in scale to the detriment of legibility.

However, the vastness of the subject and the lack of historical and dialectological dictionaries make Aničenka the first to admit that his work 'does not aspire to be the last word on the problem under investigation', and he hopes that other scholars will be attracted to it, and that it will become 'one of the foremost tasks of Byelorussian and Ukrainian philology'. The few remarks on individual points which follow are not meant to detract from the above evaluation of the work as a whole.

Aničenka is surely wrong to exaggerate the difference between the vocalisation of the preposition and prefix *v* (в) into *u* (у) in Byelorussian

and in Ukrainian (p. 53.). Although it is true that in Byelorussian the preposition and prefix *v* appear now almost exclusively as *u/ü*, while in Ukrainian they are found in the orthographic guise of *u/v* (у/в), it must be remembered that the Ukrainian letter *v* (Cyrillic в) is always pronounced as *ü* before consonants or finally, and may be thus pronounced even before vowels. It is perhaps only due to a historical accident that the Cyrillic letter *ŷ* for the *ü* sound has not been ultimately adopted for Ukrainian, since it was actually introduced in the anthology *Русалка днѣстровая* (*Ruthenische Volks-Lieder*), Budapest, 1837, where forms such as these were used: *узяў, устаў/ўстаў, свиснуў, ўже, ўся, ўвесь, воўк, шоўк, замоўк, доўго, поўний, тоўпа, гор'ўка, фіяўка*, etc. (As the examples show, *ŷ* was also used at the end of a syllable to represent the sound *ü* deriving from the Common Slavonic *l*.) The letter *ŷ*, which is equally highly appropriate both for Ukrainian and for Byelorussian, would perhaps have gained favour in Ukrainian orthography had not the Austro-Hungarian censorship confiscated nearly all copies of this publication. (Here and below, unless there is an express remark to the contrary, all 20th-century examples from East Slavonic are given in Latin transliteration, while earlier ones are quoted in the original Cyrillic.)

Aničenka sometimes slips up when attributing certain phonological developments to individual words and sounds. To give some examples: he is wrong in positing an original *ě* (ѣ) in *лежала, еднаеть*, the Polishism *обецалъ* (p. 164), *дитя* (pp. 193, 202), and (as noted by Burjačok and Rusaniv's'kyj) in modern Ukrainian *tych, tym, тьму* (p. 63). *Жадати* (p. 174) cannot be adduced as an example of *akañnie*. In *не мору* (p. 202) there is no *o/u* (o/y) confusion. The formulation 'In literary Russian, *r* is (*byvaje*) a hard sound before labials and velars (*zadniejazyčnyja*), and a soft one in remaining cases' (p. 58) is either wrong or very careless; if taken as it stands, it does not cover the vast number of examples illustrating the contrary, of the type *bor'ba, gor'kij, dar, rot*. Aničenka assumes that the late 16th-century Polish spellings *kondicij, protestacij, grecij* (? presum-

ably should be *Grecije*) show the 'soft' *c*, and that it was the Ukrainian translator who changed the 'soft' *c* into the 'hard' one: *кандьцый, протестацый, грецью* (p. 266). However, it is safe to assume that words of this type were pronounced with a 'hard' *c* in the late 16th century (just as they are now: *kondycyj, protestacyj, Grecje*) regardless of the spelling, and the Ukrainian translator rendered here the actual Polish pronunciation more closely in the Cyrillic script than it was reproduced in Latin characters in his Polish original. *Въверечи* (p. 250) is a very bad example of a Church-Slavonicism (*knižnastavianizm*): it shows no less than three East Slavonic (-ere-, č) and non-South Slavonic (vy-) features. *Клас* (p. 125) is hardly a 'word of foreign origin' in modern Ukrainian, in spite of its 'hard' *c*; it is obviously an onomatopoeic particle or interjection (it means 'click' or 'knock'), and it must be remembered that interjections and some words of related types form a system which has its own phonological laws, not all of which are shared with the system of the language at large. Thus, the law that final *c* is 'soft' in Ukrainian (recent loan words excepted) does not have to apply to interjections, however ancient and purely native Ukrainian they may be.

In a book of this length and complexity, misprints are very difficult to eradicate completely; some have already been noted by other reviewers, while others can easily be spotted and put right by the reader. Still others are rather misleading, such as the two references to the Kuciejna edition of Berynda's Lexicon on p. 194; the first of these should in fact have been a reference to the Kiev edition instead. As is only to be expected with printers not used to Latin type, the latter is another source of errors: one finds *q* instead of *g*, *ч* instead of *т* (p. 56), *Q* for nasal *o* (p. 220). It is also rather unfortunate that the printing establishment which bears the name of Skaryna, although it possesses a good stock of special Church Slavonic letters (both 'juses', 'jat', 'omega', the 'oy' digraph in the shape of an open '8' etc.), does not have the specifically Byelorussian (and Ukrainian) letter used for some three centuries until the end of the 1920s, viz. *ѣ*. Instead, the bold letter

*ѣ* is used without apology or explanation, which results in formulations amounting to nonsense, such as: 'In Byelorussian and Ukrainian writings (*pišmiennašč*), ... from the 17th century onwards the plosive *ѣ* was rendered by a special letter *ѣ*' (p. 57; cf. also pp. 55-6, 224).

When Aničenka ventures beyond the period covered by his study he produces some questionable assertions. On the one hand, he quotes the article on Byelorussian by N. Biryła et al. from *Jazyki narodov SSSR*, I, Moscow, 1966, who state that after the annexation of Byelorussia by Russia in 1795 Byelorussian 'did not receive the right of free development', since, in Aničenka's paraphrase, 'the reactionary, chauvinistically-minded government did not secure conditions for its literary development' (p. 278). The situation appears to be totally different with regard to Ukrainian: 'It is a commonly accepted fact', says Aničenka now quoting from the article on Ukrainian by I. Bilodid and M. Žovtobrjuch in the same volume, 'that the uniting of the Ukrainian people "with the Russian people in a unified Russian State ensured conditions for the literary development of Ukrainian in the fraternal family of East Slavonic languages under the influence of the growing progressive culture and learning"' (p. 86, somewhat misquoted: Bilodid and Žovtobrjuch have in fact 'growing Russian progressive...'). The second quotation surely refers to the Tsarist ('Russian', not 'Soviet') state, which is portrayed as progressive and encouraging the Ukrainian language while at the same time being reactionary, chauvinistic and unfairly discriminating against Byelorussian. This is, of course, contrary to the facts. In actual fact, it was precisely during the period that the Russian administration least interfered in the internal affairs of the Ukraine (that is, in the 17th-18th centuries) that the standard of culture and education was remarkably high; but after this, 'in 1804 a decree was issued which banned teaching in Ukrainian ... The 1897 census showed that the least literate people of Russia were the Ukrainians ... at that time, there were thirteen literate persons in every hundred of the population'; '... it seems to be the special task of the Government to persecute the native

languages of all nations. Slavonic nations, Byelorussians, Ukrainians and Poles, are especially persecuted... — all this on no less an authority than Lenin (*Sočinenija*, 3rd edition, XVI, Moscow, 1931, pp. 688-9).

The book is concluded with an 'Index of variant words and certain forms from textually similar Byelorussian and Ukrainian sources'. No doubt such an index can be very useful in establishing lexical differences between Old Byelorussian and Old Ukrainian; unfortunately, many examples exhibit only phonetic or orthographical differences, e. g. Byelorussian *вдатисе, зборъ, зпасти* as against Ukrainian *вдатися, сборъ, спасти*, which does not say anything about lexical differences. Other pairs of words, though lexically different, and may be thought at the first glance to be useful criteria for distinguishing between mss in the two languages, turn out to occur in either language. For instance, *жити* is listed as Byelorussian with *мешкати* as its opposite number in Ukrainian on p. 280, while on the following page the languages of provenance of these two words are reversed, and *мешкати* becomes Byelorussian, with *жити* as its Ukrainian counterpart. Similarly, *велбитисе* and *величати* are indexed in the Byelorussian column, with

*величатися* and *велбити* as their Ukrainian equivalents. Here are some other pairs which occur once as Byelorussian/Ukrainian and once in the reverse: *барзо* — *велми, господь* — *пань, еднакъ* — *однакъ, злото* — *золото, король* — *кроль, присега* — *присяга, присегнути* — *присягнути, пилне* — *пилно*. The presence of such pairs reduces the credibility of the rest of the index, as it makes one wonder how many more presumably characteristically Ukrainian or Byelorussian words would be found in documents belonging to the other language as well if the index were to be made comprehensive, and not merely referring to words and passages quoted in the present book.

The bibliography of sources very usefully lists the locations of a great many Byelorussian mss, but very few Ukrainian ones (Aničenka relies on printed Ukrainian sources). The book titles are given in the original language for the 19th-20th-century editions, and in modern Byelorussian for editions and mss dating back to the 17th century or earlier. This can sometimes lead to difficulties; for instance, how can one hope to find *Vodpis kliryka astrožskaha* (a 1598 printed book) in the catalogue of the Saltykov-Ščedrin library if the actual title is not given?

Victor Swoboda

Lemciuhova, V. P. *Bielaruskaja ajkanimija. Lihvistyčny analiz nazvaŭ nasieľenych punktaŭ Minskaj voblaści* (Byelorussian Oikonymy. A Linguistic Analysis of the Names of Settlements in the Minsk Province). 'Navuka i tehnika', Minsk, 1970. 156 pages.

The study of Byelorussian toponymy is still in its initial stage. It suffered a serious setback in 1968 with the publication of a disastrous book *Топонимика Белоруссии* by V. Žučkievič. Not only is the latter written in Russian, but the author takes the Russian forms of Byelorussian place names as the norm, referring from time to time to the original Byelorussian forms as 'local variants' — one almost expects him to add 'in the West Russian dialect'. The unfortunate thing is that, because of the lack of any literature on the subject, this book is considered to be a work of authority by unsuspecting scholars in the West, as the author of this review has had occasion to witness.

It is, therefore, with double pleasure that one opens Lemciuhova's book on Byelorussian oikonymy. It is a study of the origin and formation of the names of inhabited places (hamlets, villages, towns etc.) in the territory of the present-day Minsk province. There are, however, several examples taken from other regions and from historical documents. Altogether the author examines over 4000 names of inhabited places.

The book is divided into two parts. In the first part the author considers three main groups of place names of, respectively, appellative anthroponymic and hydronymic derivations. The basic words in each group together with their deriv-

atives are arranged in alphabetical order and provided with full explanations. There is also a special study of semantic groups and the geographical distribution of basic words used in the formation of place-names. This part of the book will appeal to a wide circle of readers with an interest in Byelorussian toponymy but with no particular linguistic qualifications.

The second part is of a more specialised nature. It is a study of various types of place names according to the manner of their formation. The author considers the names with no affixes, then the names formed by

means of various suffixes, prefixes or both, and an important class of place names having the plural form. Particular attention is paid to the types of word formation which are characteristic of toponymy in general, and to oikonymy in particular.

It is a very good little book, based on a mass of concrete material and written with a profound knowledge of the subject. Although it is addressed in the first place to the philologist, it can be recommended to anyone interested in Byelorussian toponymy.

A. Nadson

Bachaňkoŭ, A. Ja., Žuraŭski, A. I., Sudnik, M. R. (eds), *Historyčnaja leksika-tohija bielaruskaj movy*. 'Navuka i technika', Minsk, 1970. 340 pages.

Lexicology, once the Cinderella of Byelorussian linguistics, at last comes into its own with this important publication by the Institute of Philology of the Byelorussian Academy of Sciences. The first monograph ever to be devoted to the discipline, it is a collective work and makes use of the vast quantities of material collected (at present in a card index) for the long-awaited Historical Dictionary of Byelorussian.

After an introduction by A. I. Žuraŭski, which presents a frank review and assessment of work in the field of lexicology to date, there follow seven major sections dealing chronologically with the principal aspects of the Byelorussian lexicon (loan-words, basic resources, neologisms, enlargement and contraction of semantic groups etc.) from Common East Slavonic (*staražytnaruskaja leksika*) to the present day, and including a short review of phraseological developments. The seven sections are as follows: 'The Common East Slavonic Vocabulary as the Basis for the Old Byelorussian Lexical System' by A. M. Bułyka (pp. 9-51); 'The Original Byelorussian Lexicon' by U. V. Aničenka (pp. 52-80); 'Borrowed Words in the Old Byelorussian Language' by A. I. Žuraŭski (pp. 81-160); 'Thematic Characteristics of the Old Byelorussian Lexicon' by A. M. Bułyka, A. I. Janovič and Z. K. Turcevič (pp. 161-227); 'The Development of the Lexical System of the Byelorussian Language in the 19th Century and at the Beginning of the 20th Century' by I. I.

Kramko (pp. 228-65); 'Changes in the Byelorussian Lexicon in the Soviet Period' by A. Ja. Bachaňkoŭ (pp. 266-92); and finally 'Byelorussian Phraseology' by A. S. Aksamitaŭ (pp. 293-336).

The contributions are, without exception, solid, although there are some small inaccuracies, inevitable in a work of this size and complexity, particularly in the chronological pinpointing of first usages. To take two fairly random examples, *ukaz* (p. 239) and *chaŭrus* (p. 240) were not introduced to Byelorussian at the beginning of the 20th century: *chaŭrus* occurs once in a poem of Hurynovič, whilst *ukaz* is found in the work of a number of 19th-century writers (Dunin-Marcinkievič, Kalinoŭski and Błus) and anonymous texts (*Schod, Biasieda staraho volnika z novymi pra ichnaje dzieło*). Errors of this type will undoubtedly continue to be made until a great deal more fundamental lexicographical work has been published. It is to the credit of the contributors of this volume that they are not more frequent.

Altogether, this is an excellent piece of work, although an index of words and a general bibliography are, as usual, irritating omissions. The list of Middle Byelorussian texts given at the end of the book, however, will serve as a valuable guide, since the majority of them are either in manuscript or else in editions that have long been bibliographical rarities. *Historyčnaja leksika-tohija*

*biełaruskaj movy* is not only a landmark in its own right, but also represents a happy augury for the eagerly awaited Historical Dictionary

now being prepared (with evident care) by the scholars of the Institute of Philology.

Arnold B. McMillin

- Bialkievič, I. K. *Krajovy slovník uschodniaj Mahiloŭščyny*. Edited by M. V. Biryła and A. A. Kryvicki. 'Navuka i technika', Minsk, 1970. 512 pages.
- Jurčanka, H. F. *Narodnaja sinonimika*. Edited and with an Introduction by A. A. Kryvicki. 'Navuka i technika', Minsk, 1969. 280 pages. Bibliography. Index.
- Jankoŭski, F. *Dyjalektny slovník*, III. 'Navuka i technika', Minsk, 1970. 172 pages.

The years 1969 and 1970 have witnessed the publication of an exceptional number of dialectal dictionaries. The most important of them, however, I. K. Bialkievič's *Krajovy slovník uschodniaj Mahiloŭščyny*, was conceived and realised in a period of even greater activity in the field of lexicography, the years of *Inbiełkult*. In the early 1920s it was projected that in addition to normative, literary dictionaries of the Byelorussian language there should also be compiled dialectal dictionaries of the ten regions comprising what was then Eastern (Soviet) Byelorussia. Of these ten dictionaries only three were completed: Kašpiarovič's *Viciebski krajovy slovník (Mater'jaty)* (Viciebsk, 1927), Šaternik's *Krajovy slovník Červienščyny* (Minsk, 1929) and a *Slovník Mazyrščyny* which remained in manuscript and was lost during the Second World War. Bialkievič's work was not completed until 1959 owing to the unfortunate circumstances of his life, although the majority of the 20,000 words it comprises were collected in the latter part of the 1920s.

Unlike the majority of dialectal lexicographers, Bialkievič did not describe his native dialect. He was born in 1883 in Varoničy near Słonim in the Hrodna region, and after studying and teaching in Sviślač, Varoničy, Słonim and Minsk, only in 1925 moved to Mścisłaŭ in the eastern part of the Mahiloŭ region where he joined the staff of the newly opened teachers training college. The next five years must have been exceptionally active ones, for in 1930 he was compelled to leave Byelorussia for ever, spending the rest of his life in various enterprises such as forestry and steel production in regions far removed from Mahiloŭ, notably the Mari

republic, the Azov — Black Sea region and Doneck. Bialkievič died suddenly in 1960, and it is greatly to the credit of Biryła and Kryvicki, two senior scholars of the Jakub Kołas Institute of Philology, that the work has at last achieved publication.

The dictionary covers an area bounded on the west by Staŭharad, on the south by Białyńkavičy and on the east by Mścisłaŭ and Miłašavičy; to the north it extends a little beyond Drybin. Reading this excellent work, one cannot but regret that the immensely valuable activity of *Inbiełkult* was so short-lived. The publication of such a milestone as Bialkievič's dictionary inevitably induces wistful thoughts of what might have been.

Another important work in an unusual genre (dialectal synonymics) is Jurčanka's *Narodnaja sinonimika*, a study of 440 groups of synonyms from his native Mścisłaŭščyna. Altogether they comprise some 4,000 words (from a wide semantic spectrum), the majority not having appeared in the author's earlier dialectal dictionary (*Dyjalektny slovník (Z havorak Mścisłaŭščyny)*, Minsk, 1966 — see *JBS*, I, 3, 1967, pp. 249-50). Each synonymic group is furnished with a wealth of examples, and special attention is paid to the words' use in various phraseological groupings. The author's care in collecting such a mass of interesting material, much of it hitherto unrecorded, demonstrates to the general reader the great variety of Byelorussian lexical resources, and provides for specialists a useful primary source for the study both of the relationship between the literary and dialectal lexicons and of the history and formation of the vocabulary as a whole.

The first two volumes (*vypuski*) of



Jankoŭski's valuable *Dyjalektny stoŭnik* appeared over ten years ago (in 1959 and 1960) and whilst the appearance of the latest volume is to be as warmly welcomed as were its predecessors it is hard to understand why such a lapse of time should have ensued, in view of the fact that the majority of the material was collected as long ago as 1944-5. In addition to nearly 1,000 words from the Hłusk district of the Mahiloŭ region there is a section consisting of about 200

phrases, tags and proverbs. The author acknowledges the assistance of Mikoła Jankoŭski of Homiel University who contributed some 40 of the dictionary's entries.

Thus, whilst before 1966 and the appearance of Jurčanka's dictionary the eastern region of Byelorussia was linguistically the least well documented, the situation is now, happily, reversed.

Arnold B. McMillin

Varłyha, Adam. *Krajovy stoŭnik Łahojščyny*. 'Zaranka', New York, 1970. 172 pages.

Ściacko, P. U. *Narodnaja leksika*. 'Navuka i technika', Minsk, 1970. 176 pages. Index. Short bibliography.

Ściacko, P. *Dyjalektny stoŭnik (Z havorak Zelviensčyny)*. BDU, Minsk, 1970. 184 pages.

Apart from Šaternik's important *Krajovy stoŭnik Červienščyny* (Minsk 1929) the Minsk region has been rather neglected by dialectal lexicographers, possibly due to the relatively great affinity between the dialects of this region and the modern literary language. Adam Varłyha's defining dictionary of the area around Łahojsk, some twenty-five miles to the north of Minsk, lists in Latin orthography about 7,000 dialectal words, emphasising the local rather than the literary meaning where the latter exists. The dictionary, apart from its intrinsic merits as a reference work, also represents a remarkable feat of memory since Varłyha, a former teacher of the Łahojsk region, left Byelorussia as long ago as 1945.

Mickiewicz described the dialect of the Hrodna region as 'the richest and purest of all Slavonic dialects' and it is to this region of western Byelorussia, and in particular the area around Zelva, that P. U. Ściacko has devoted two valuable pieces of lexicographical work. *Narodnaja leksika* is a semantically arranged study of the dialectal vocabulary of this region. In

it the author confines himself to the material (*bytavy*) vocabulary, analysing in turn the (literary as well as dialectal) words used in the Zelva region under the following semantic headings: food, drink, clothes, footwear, home-woven cloths, bed linen, table linen and table decorations. Based on material collected between 1950 and 1960 from natives of the Zelva region (in 1962 the author defended in Minsk his Candidate's thesis, *Pradmietna-bytavaje leksika zelvienskich havorak*), the work is very welcome now in a relatively accessible form (the edition is of 1,400).

The same author's *Dyjalektny stoŭnik* offers 2,500 dialectal words or words whose meaning in the Zelva region differs from that found in literary Byelorussian. Both books will provide valuable material for scholars, particularly for those concerned with the linguistic relations between Polish and Byelorussian, and with the penetration of Polish, German and other loan words into the Byelorussian literary language.

Arnold B. McMillin

Čamiarycki, V. A. *Bielaruskija letapisy jak pomniki litaratury. Uźniknieńnie i litaraturnaja historyja pieršych zvodaŭ* (Byelorussian Chronicles as Works of Literature. The Origin and Literary History of the First Chronicles). 'Navuka i technika', Minsk, 1969. 192 pages.

The Byelorussian chronicles of the 15-16th centuries have been for over one and a half centuries the subject

of extensive studies by Polish, Russian and Ukrainian scholars, such as Daniłowicz, Szaraniewicz, Jakubowski,

Tichomirov, Hruševskij, Sušickij and Sachmatov, to mention but a few names. Many of them were published in 1907 in the 17th volume of the *Polnoje sobranije russkich letopisej*. Čamiarycki is the first Byelorussian scholar to undertake a serious study of the subject. As the title of his book suggests, he limits his study to the literary aspect of the chronicles or, more exactly, to their origin and literary history.

Unlike his predecessors, Čamiarycki from the start considers the chronicles as works of Byelorussian literature. Their description by earlier scholars as 'Lithuanian', 'Lithuanian-Russian', 'West Russian' or simply 'Russian' arose, according to him, 'firstly because of false ideas about the Byelorussian nation and its history and, secondly, for political reasons. At a time when the very name "Byelorussia" was officially forbidden and when venerable scholars discussed with straight faces whether there existed a separate Byelorussian "tribe", it was quite impossible to speak about a separate history of Byelorussia or about an original literature of the Byelorussian people. It was simply declared to be a provincial Russian variant' (p. 11). At the same time Čamiarycki admits that the chronicles are an important source for the study of the history of not only the Byelorussians, but also the Lithuanians, since at that time these two peoples formed one single state, the Grand Duchy of Lithuania. For this reason they may be referred to as Byelorussian-Lithuanian chronicles.

Another innovation introduced by Čamiarycki is his proposed new classification of the chronicles. Before him it was usual to regard all extant copies as belonging to one of three versions — short, long or full — of what was essentially one chronicle. Čamiarycki on the other hand distinguishes three separate classes of chronicles, differing not only in time and place of origin, but also in content, internal composition and political orientation. He also considers as a distinct work the so-called *Chronicle of the Grand Dukes of Lithuania* which comprises the period from the death of the Grand Duke Hiedymin in 1341 to the death of

Vitaut in 1430. It was written by a contemporary (or, rather, contemporaries) of the Grand Duke Vitaut, and formed the nucleus of all subsequent chronicles.

The first chronicle was composed in the middle of the 15th century, probably in Smolensk by a person belonging to the entourage of the Orthodox bishop of that city. In its political orientation it reflects the attempt of that bishop to make Smolensk, with the support of the Grand Dukes of Lithuania, a religious centre for the whole East Slav world. Apart from the *Chronicle of the Grand Dukes of Lithuania* it contains parts of the local Smolensk chronicle and a compilation made from the early East Slav chronicles. This compilation was made in such a way as to present the Grand Duchy of Lithuania in the most favourable light and to exclude anything that might be to its disadvantage.

The second chronicle was composed some time in the first half of the 16th century. Many things in the first chronicle had lost their interest by that time, among them the compilation from the early East Slav chronicles. It is, therefore, no longer to be found in the second chronicle. There is, on the other hand, a new work, the so-called *Chronicle of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania and Samogitia*. It is a legendary account purporting to trace the origin of the Lithuanian nobility to the ancient Romans. Its composition was a sign of the concern caused by increasing Polish influence in the affairs of the Grand Duchy, and therefore the necessity of proving the superiority of the Lithuanian nobles over their Polish counterparts. According to Čamiarycki the work, although written in Byelorussian, must have been composed by a Lithuanian and was the first sign of nascent Lithuanian nationalism.

The third chronicle is the so-called *Bychaviec Chronicle* from the name of the owner of the manuscript in the 19th century. It was most probably composed in the first decade of the second half of the 16th century by a person who possessed more than average literary talent. He was probably a native of the Słuck district in central Byelorussia, and represented the interests of the great

magnates of the Grand Duchy. It is a highly patriotic work with a marked anti-Polish bias, probably caused by anxiety for the future of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania which was in danger of losing its political independence and identity in the imminent union with Poland.

The great difficulty in the study of the Byelorussian chronicles of the 15-16th century is the fact that their authors, as well as the exact place and time of their original, are unknown. The student is thus often compelled to indulge in suppositions which are more or less probable. The same applies to the conclusions of Čamiarycki, although it must be added that his arguments, based on a thorough analysis of the texts, are very convincing. His proposed new classification of the chronicle is most certainly a step in the right direction and makes more sense than the previous system which created more difficulties than it solved. In several important points Čamiarycki differs from other scholars, such as Florja, Ochmański and even such an authority as Sachmatov.

In a book of such modest size it is impossible to treat all aspects of the

problem with equal thoroughness, and the author is forced to establish his priorities. Thus Čamiarycki devotes the great part of his work (about 120 pages) to the study of the first chronicle which, according to him, is 'the most complex in its composition... and forms the basis for all subsequent Byelorussian-Lithuanian chronicle writing' (p. 188).

On the whole Čamiarycki has succeeded in producing an interesting and valuable work which sheds new light on the origin and composition of Byelorussian chronicles of the 15-16th centuries. It is a good beginning and it is hoped that he will continue to show interest in this subject and be followed in due time by other Byelorussian scholars. But firstly one would like to echo the following wish of the author: 'The time has come to prepare and publish a more complete, improved collection of Byelorussian-Lithuanian and Byelorussian chronicles of the 15-18th centuries, because the 1907 edition... is both incomplete and in many ways antiquated. Moreover it has long become a bibliographical rarity even for specialists' (p. 190).

A. Nadson

Ostrowski, W. *The Ancient Names and Early Cartography of Byelorussia. A revised edition with 50 reproductions.* Published by the author, London, 1971. 19 pages.

The author concludes his text by stating that his object was to supply a brief introduction to the history of the cartography of Byelorussia. In fact his book succeeds in doing much more than this. The maps here reproduced span almost four centuries, and are in themselves of inestimable value to historians. In the introduction Ostrowski goes into great detail on the mass of confusing terminology which has been used over the ages to refer to the area of Lithuania, Byelorussia and the Ukraine. From a linguistic point of view, it is doubtful whether anything useful can now be achieved in English to arrive at a more precise terminology; certainly there is nothing to be gained by the invention of new adjectives such as *Ruśian*, in an attempt to echo the difference in Polish between *ruski* and *rosyjski*, since such new coinages have to be

explained. It would seem just as easy to maintain the traditional words, but using more precise definitions of them — a task which many historians have avoided. Byelorussians and Ukrainians will probably have to reconcile themselves to the fact that many writers will continue to use 'Russian' to mean 'East Slavonic' and 'Great Russian', depending on context. Equally, the word 'Rus', originally applied solely to the Kievan 'State', is now found with reference to the Muscovite state of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, particularly in modern Russian works. Whether politically motivated or not, a semantic shift has taken place, and the word has acquired antiquarian rather than geographical significance. Ostrowski's achievement is to have listed the various names found in the maps, and given them a careful analysis. The

maps are both political and ethnographic, the latter including oddities like Rusak's map of 1939 which has ethnic Byelorussia extending as far north as the Gulf of Finland! All the reproductions are very clear and,

where possible, the British Museum pressmark of each book and map is given, thus making the work a useful reference guide.

J. Dingley

Anuškin, A. *Na zare knigopečatanija v Litve*. 'Mintis', Vilna, 1970. 196 pages.

The book aims to give a survey — from a Marxist point of view — of book production in Lithuania in the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries. *Litva* cannot in this context be interpreted as either the whole of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania or as the ethnic Lithuanian area of Samogitia, but as the territory of the present-day Lithuanian S.S.R., since most of the books discussed were printed in Vilna. Since Anuškin apparently regards Vilna in the sixteenth century as the capital city of ethnic Lithuania, rather than as the capital of a multi-national state, he is forced into using muddled terminology to describe languages and nations. Books were written in Byelorussian, Russian (Byelorussian), Russian (Ukrainian) or simply Russian. Rymša wrote his verses in Russian (Byelorussian) (p. 16) and in Byelorussian (p. 67). The Statute of 1588, itself written in Byelorussian (p. 61), declared Russian (Byelorussian) as the official language of the Grand Duchy (p. 62). The title of the work *Rozmowa Polaka z Litwinem* is misleadingly translated into Russian as *Rozmova poljaka s litovcem* — misleading, because 'Litwin' was used at the time to denote a citizen of the Grand Duchy rather than an ethnic Lithuanian. The adjectives *belorusskij* and *ukrainskij* are fairly used to describe nations (usually in conjunction with the adjective 'bratskij'), but the hoary *zapadnorusskij* is brought out of dishonourable retirement, although admittedly to refer to no more than a writing style. *Rus'* is used to refer to the Muscovite state, and the words 'naša strana' clearly mean the Soviet Union.

There is evidence of similar confusion when dealing with foreign nationalities. Erasmus, although named as 'Erasm Rotterdamskij', is everywhere called a German humanist. The point at issue here is not so much that

the nationality is incorrect, as that any mention of nationality is irrelevant in the context of the Renaissance. Both Erasmus and Skaryna were truly international figures of their time, standing head and shoulders above the puny cliché descriptions given them in this book. Moreover, to describe the co-operation in the Vilna printing shops between Lithuanians, Byelorussians and Russians as evidence of friendship between 'fraternal peoples' is to fail to understand what the Renaissance was really about. Anuškin calls it 'curious' that certain theological writers should have quoted more from classical authors than from the Church Fathers. In the context of the excitement of the rediscovery of classical Greek philosophy there is nothing curious at all in this. Another important aspect of Renaissance intellectual life which the author (or his Marxist point of view) does not come to grips with is the thin dividing line between empirical and speculative science. The final section on astrology of Dyblinski's *Centuria Astronomica* is dismissed as the least interesting part of the book, added, in Anuškin's words, 'to protect the author from the Church censors who might otherwise have taken offence at the more scientific (and therefore anti-official) sections on astronomy proper'. Many scientists of the period would not have made the distinction between astronomy and astrology — Kepler was one of them — just as Newton was quite capable of dabbling in alchemy. In any case this curt dismissal of an intrinsic part of scholarly study could be turned against Anuškin himself. Why has he inserted the apparently irrelevant quotations from Engels on Thomas Münzer? Either he believes that they do serve a purpose, or else he is seeking to appease the censors. Why is the reader told that some works of Andrei Wolan, Stefan Ziza-

nij and Meletij Smotritskij contain 'a great deal of atheist material' which 'could be used in our modern atheist propaganda'? Is this merely a sop, or is it a genuine part of Marxist interpretation?

The book's chief positive achievements are that the author has amassed a vast amount of material on the printed books of the period, and that it contains many interesting illustrations. The absence of an index of any kind constitutes its most serious technical shortcoming, although Anuškin does say that a catalogue is at present being prepared by the 'Kniž-

naja Palata' of the Lithuanian S.S.R. It cannot be said that this book is a satisfactory contribution to the study of an extremely fascinating period. What is needed now is a much more comprehensive study of book production in the whole of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, together with an exhaustive catalogue giving (where possible) the present-day location of each book. This can only be done by accepting the men of the time and their ideas for what they were, and not for what a modern political dogma would have us think they were.

J. Dingley

Bandarčyk, V. K. *Historyja bielaruskaj etnahrafii (Pačatak XX st.)*. 'Navuka i technika', Minsk, 1970. 124 pages. Illustrations.

V. K. Bandarčyk, the Director of the Institute of Ethnography at the Byelorussian Academy of Sciences, is already well-known for his work on Byelorussian ethnography and ethnographers. He has written monographs on such scholars as Ramanaŭ, Niki-faroŭski, and Sieržputoŭski.

The present study of the history of Byelorussian ethnography in the early 20th century is a continuation of his previous book *Historyja bielaruskaj etnahrafii XIX st.* published in Minsk in 1964.

Although short, the book deals in a most scholarly manner with the works of Je. R. Ramanaŭ, A. K. Sieržputoŭski, J. A. Sierbaŭ, and Ja. F. Karski, each in a separate chapter. The more important works of other Byelorussian scholars less well-known than the above mentioned are treated in a quite satisfactory manner in the final section of the book.

Though the subject matter of this work is indeed a specialised one, the very pleasant literary style of the author makes it enjoyable reading. There are several interesting photographic reproductions of the title pages of some of the classic works in Byelorussian ethnography, as well as photographs of the scholars themselves and of ethnographical subjects.

One should, however, point out a methodological weakness of this work, namely, the lack of a general and specific bibliography given separately either at the beginning or the end of the book.

This work makes a valuable contribution to the study of Byelorussian ethnography and will be a welcome addition to the libraries of students of folklore.

R. J. Tamušanski

Kolberg, O. *Dzieła Wszystkie. Tom 52. Białoruś, Polesie*. Polskie Towarzystwo Ludoznawcze, Wrocław, Poznań, 1968. 571 pages.

The monumental collection of ethnographical material gathered by Kolberg from the provinces of Poland and the former Grand Duchy of Lithuania was not fully published during the author's lifetime, and much remained in fragmentary form. Originally Kolberg planned to complete his work by publishing three volumes on Red Ruś, Lithuanian Ruś,

Paleśsie (Pinsk and Volhynia) and Byelorussia.

He was by no means a pioneer in this field, for valuable regional studies had already been done by such ethnographers as I. Hryharovič (1790-1852), P. Špileŭski (1827-61), I. Nasovič (1788-1877), J. Kračkoŭski (1840-93), P. Šejn (1826-1900) and Je. Ramanaŭ (1855-1922). Indeed, Kolberg, in

compiling the material for *Biatoruś*, drew freely on sources which had already been published, not so much in scientific and ethnographical journals, as in the provincial or literary press, such as *Tygodnik Peterburski*, *Tygodnik Literacki* and *Przyjaciel Ludu*, few examples of which survive today. Kolberg's work is therefore a most valuable synthesis of material collected by a number of 19th-century ethnographers such as J. Kraszewski, L. Gołębiowski, P. Borowski and R. Zienkiewicz, and published in collections which are now unobtainable. Most of the 723 songs and dances contained in Kolberg's collection are Byelorussian, although a small number are in East Polish, Volhynian and Latvian dialects.

In the first section Kolberg publishes a number of descriptive passages of the Byelorussian and Palessian provinces from various sources (3-34), and in a second section gives details concerning the people, their customs, work, habitat and style of living (35-79). A third section deals with the customs, folk songs and carols relating to festivals and seasons of the year such as New Year, Holy Week, Easter,

Kupała and Harvest. Many interesting variants of well-known songs appear, including a Palessian version of the north-west Byelorussian carol *Stary Vosip baradaty* (p. 82) and a Mahiloŭ version of the Viciebsk province carol *A u Vietlehiemie Dzieciatka lażyć* (p. 94).

In a further very substantial section headed 'Usages' Kolberg describes a variety of customs for various events in country life from every part of Byelorussia, such as marriages and burials (pp. 139-310).

Folk songs of a general nature, including children's songs, ballads, soldiers' songs, inn ballads and religious songs, together with songs of the *ślachta* class (usually in the East Polish dialect) and melodies without words, are included in the following three sections (311-404, 406-24, 425-30). There is a short chapter on *Wierzenia* (pp. 430-48) followed by a number of folk tales and proverbs (449-72), folk games (474) and examples of various Byelorussian, Ukrainian and Moravian dialects (475-515).

The work concludes with an impressive bibliography brought up to date.

H. Pichura

Hilevič, N. S. *Z kłopatam pra pieśni naroda. Karotki narys historyi žbirańnia i daśledavańnia bielaruskich narodnych piesieñ*. BDU, Minsk, 1970. 160 pages.

This excellently written little book presents in popular form the history of the collection and study of Byelorussian folk-songs from the end of the 18th century up to the present day.

The seven chapters describe the work of various Byelorussian ethnographers — the well-known, such as Karski, Šejn as well as lesser-known scholars in this field.

The author gives a lucid appraisal of the works of the ethnographers he handles, and the book is further illustrated with appropriate examples of various folk-songs.

One would have wished that more

information be given about the less well known scholars and their works than the author has included. A separate bibliography listing the various collections of folk-songs made by these scholars would also have been a welcome addition to this work. As it stands now, the student must look through the pages to locate bibliographical information.

This however does not greatly detract from the value of this little book for anyone interested in the absorbing subject of Byelorussian folklore.

R. J. Tamušanski

Dilec'kyj, M. P. *Hramatyka muzykał'na*. Muzyčna Ukraina, Kiev, 1970. xciv + 109 pages.

This book comprises a reproduction of the 1723 manuscript copy of

Dilec'kyj's work, a transcription of it, a commentary and a glossary of un-

familiar words. It is a sumptuous volume which will be welcomed by musicians and linguists alike; hopefully it will bring recognition to its author in the form of an entry in Grove's Dictionary.

Reservations must, however, be expressed on the value of the transcription system employed. It follows the recommendations of O. A. Bevzo, as laid down in the article *Pro pravila drukuvannja istoryčnych dokumentiv, pysanych ukrains'koju mo-voju XVI-XVIII stolit'* (Visnyk AN URSR, 2, Kiev, 1958). The purpose of these recommendations seems to be to make the language of these old

texts resemble modern Ukrainian as closely as possible. In the manuscript Dilec'kyj's name is written without a soft sign after the *u*; in the transcription one is inserted. Similarly *i* is substituted for *ѣ* *passim*, as is *u* for *ы*. It cannot be said that the publishing house does not possess the letter *ѣ* in its type founts, because it is occasionally used in quotations in the explanatory article. The Polish sections of the manuscript are preserved in the transcription, although the spelling is modernized. These sections are translated into Ukrainian in the commentary.

J. Dingley

---

#### REVIEWS OF PERIODICALS

ACTA BALTICO-SLAVICA. Vol. VII. Białystok, 1970.

This year's *Acta* contain three articles relating to Byelorussian language and history. V. Raudeljunas (Raudeliūnas) of Vilna devotes a controversial article to the origin and meaning of certain juridical terms found in the third edition of the Lithuanian Statute: 'Drevnerusskaja juridičeskaja leksika v jazyke Litovskogo Statuta 1588 goda' (pp. 31-45). Raudeljunas criticises the work of M. Zakar'jan, the established expert on the lexical composition of the Statute (see, for example, his *Slovarnyj sostav Statuta 1588*, Moscow, 1955 (diss.) or 'Drevnerusskaja juridičeskaja leksika v jazyke Litovskogo Statuta 1588', *Kalbotyra*, IV, Vilna, 1962, pp. 171-95), asserting that Zakar'jan's purely linguistic approach is too narrow, and that the juridical terms of the Statute should be viewed as specific semantic units in particular countries at particular times. His questioning of Zakar'jan's interpretation of certain words (*voznyj*, *pravo* and *deržan'je*, for example) is often convincing, and

it may well be true that Zakar'jan has exaggerated the terminological influence of *Russkaja pravda* on the Statute, but nonetheless the tenor of Raudeljunas's article suggests strongly an attempt to minimise the Byelorussian element (acknowledged by most scholars to be the dominant one) in one of the major documents of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania.

If, in the absence of an historical dictionary of Byelorussian, many questions of Middle Byelorussian vocabulary are inevitably speculative, the subject of S. Alexandrowicz's article, 'Geneza i rozwój sieci miasteczek Białorusi i Litwy do połowy XVII w' (pp. 47-108) is one that has long suffered from scholarly neglect. The period covered by the author is from the 14th to the 17th century and within it he presents a well-documented economic analysis of the pattern of foundation and growth of small towns in the Grand Duchy, supporting his conclusions

with several statistical tables and a map.

V. I. Meleško, 'Položenije i klasovaja bor'ba krest'jan v kričevskom starostve v konce XVII — pervoj polovine XVIII vv.' (pp. 109-96) describes some peasant revolts against the Radziwiłłs in eastern Byelorussia. In addition to outlining their putative

causes (arbitrary conscription to private armies, lack of redress for damage to property inflicted by billeted troops, excessive taxation) Meleško attempts to assess the achievements of the revolts in terms of the social and economic life of the peasants.

BOŻYM ŚLACHAM (On God's Highway). London, 1970.

This leading Byelorussian religious bi-monthly magazine has for more than twenty years published documents and material illustrating the character of the Byelorussian spiritual and liturgical tradition. In an interesting study Fr A. Nadson deals with the Prayerbook for laymen printed in Vilna in 1601 by L. Mamonič, where necessary drawing parallels with other texts, and in particular with the Prayerbook of the Vilna confraternity (118/8-12; 119/6-7). The use of such prayerbooks by the faithful was uncommon in the Orthodox world, and virtually unknown in Russia. In Byelorussia books of prayers similar to Mamonič's *Molitvy Povsednevnyje* were widely used during the liturgy, and they cast much light on the doctrinal beliefs and liturgical usages prevalent among the Byelorussians. For example one is led to conclude that the Byelorussian Orthodox believed 'transubstantiation' occurred at the words of consecration, rather

than at the time of the *epiclesis*. This is a field which few writers have ventured to touch upon, and Fr Nadson's initiative in this respect has proved what a fruitful field it may be. Fr J. Hermanovič, who is also known as Vincuk Advažny (b. 1890), gives an adaptation into verse of the old Tartar legend 'Majsiej pytaje', taken from the *Kitab* (119/18-20). V. Prytycki provides notes on the Easter customs of the Braślaŭ region (120/12-13), and there are some extracts from the manuscript records of the Pinsk Vicariate dating from 1832 (120/16-18). The parables from the Gospels were translated into verse by Fr Hermanovič (121/1-22), and Fr Nadson provides a further study of a prayerbook dating from 1695, of considerable philological value (122/5-10; 123/5-9). Other items in the numbers of this magazine include a chronicle of events, both within the Byelorussian church, and in the Byelorussian community as a whole.

MAŁADOŚĆ. A monthly. Minsk, 1970.

This extremely well edited journal for young people in their late teens and early twenties contains the usual rich selection of new works of literature both by beginners and by well-established writers. The novel *My — chłopczy żyvučyja* (We are Tenacious Boys; IV-12, V-9) by Ivan Siarkoŭ is a lively story, often full of humour, about two youngsters in Eastern Byelorussia in the early post-war years. Uładzimir Šycik publishes his new science fiction novel *Ślady viaduč na ziamlu* (The Traces Lead to Earth; II-67, III-54). Other works deserving a mention are the novels

*Paŭnočny farvatar* (Northern Fairway; I-9, II-8) by Aleś Kryha, *Bujata leta* (Summer was in Full Swing; VI-24) by Jaŭhieŭ Radkievič, *Miera ščaścia i bolu* (A Measure of Happiness and Sorrow; III-9) by Klara Piščykava; and the short stories *Horad bez papuhajčykaŭ* (A Town without Parrots; V-58) by Visaryjon Harbuk, *Śviata* (The Feast; XII-9) by Taćciana Harelikava, *Voka tajfuna* (The Eye of the Typhoon; IX-51) by Uładzimir Karatkievič, *Namaluj mnie viecier* (Paint Me the Wind; VII-9) by Nina Majeŭskaja and others. Poetry is represented by new works by Maryja Baravik,



Ryhor Baradulin, Nił Hilevič, Volha Ipatava, Aleh Łojka, Ryhor Siemaškovič, Uładzimir Skarynkin, Jaŭhieŭnia Janiščyc, Piatruś Makal and others.

Vital Volski's *Pa darohach Paleśsia* (On the Roads of Paleśsie; X-66) is a well written and readable diary of the author's travels in the southern parts of the Brest and Homiel provinces. Aleś Bačyla with his article *Pašla darohi* (After the Journey; IX-141) concludes the account of his travels in places intimately connected with Maksim Bahdanovič (1891-1917) to search for new materials relating to the life and work of that poet. It may be noted in passing that Bačyla is the librettist of the new opera *Zorka Venera* (The Star Venus; music by Jury Siemianiaka), based on the life of Bahdanovič.

Alaksandra Smolič in *Jakub Kołas u majoj pamiaci* (Jakub Kołas as I Knew Him; III-120) gives some personal recollections of the great Byelorussian poet.

*Recha Dudki bielaruskaj* (The Echo of the Byelorussian Flute; III-120) by Šciapan Aleksandrovič and *Z bijahrafiŭ Franciška Bahuševiča* (From the Biography of Francišak Bahuševič; III-123) by Uładzimir Kazbjaruk deal with the 19th-century poet Francišak Bahuševič, on the occasion of the 130th anniversary of his birth.

The novelist Kuźma Čorny (1900-1944) was apparently becoming a legend in his own lifetime, and in the

stories that were told about him it was often difficult to distinguish fact from fiction. The poet Vasil Vitka, who knew Čorny well, recalls several anecdotal episodes from his life in *Listki tryvožnych dzion* (Pages from the Anxious Days; VI-93).

Anatol Sabaleŭski contributes an article *Kupałaŭcam — piadčieszat* (The Kupała Theatre is Fifty; XI-138) about the Janka Kupała State Theatre which in 1970 celebrated its golden jubilee. Alaksiej Hardzicki in *Uspaminajuč artysty* (Artists Remember; VI-106) publishes an interview with two well-known actors of that theatre, Uładzimir Uładzimirski and Iryna Ždanovič.

There is a fine article by Arsień Lis, *Piotra Sierhijevič* (I-110) about the leading Byelorussian contemporary painter, who now lives in Vilna. Zianon Paźniak in *Ziamli karėŭni* (Roots of the Earth; II-109) writes about the artist Piotra Šaranhovič who works in the field of book illustration.

Viktar Martynaŭ and Arnold Michnievič conclude their series of articles under the general name *Bielaruskaja etymaŭhija* (Byelorussian Etymology; III-143, VII-148, VIII-141) which began in last year's *Maladość*. Jaŭhieŭ Rapanovič contributes an interesting article *Pasielišča i jaho nazva* (The Settlement and its Name; III-146) about the origin and evolution of the names of various places in Byelorussia.

POŁYMIA. The monthly journal of the Union of Byelorussian Soviet Writers. Minsk, 1970.

It has been said of the novelist Ivan Ptašnikaŭ that the picture of the present-day Byelorussian village in literature would be incomplete without his works, and that he depicts village-life in all its fullness, without hiding any of its positive or negative aspects. All this may be said of his recent novel, *Mściży* (the name of a village), published in this year's *Połymia* (XI-9; XII-15). The hero is a peasant who gives up work on the collective farm to find employment with the forestry management commission as a stable boy. His wife has just died and he himself nearly loses

his life whilst hunting a killer-bear which had been woken up during hibernation and began killing horses. On returning from hospital he learns that the forestry management is about to move further north, and he is promised work there, but must leave his house and young daughter. On the other hand, the collective farm management brings pressure to bear on him to return to work on the farm, and threatens him with the confiscation of the garden plot near his house if he refuses. The whole novel, written with great knowledge of human characters, is not easy to read, as the

author makes free use of dialectal vocabulary and constructions from the north-eastern part of the Minsk province. At the same time one cannot help feeling that Byelorussian literature has been enriched by yet another outstanding work.

Vasil Bykaŭ's new novel, *Sotnikaŭ* (XI-81), may be given the subtitle 'The anatomy of treason'. In it the author attempts to trace the inner process of transformation in a man who begins as a Soviet guerilla in German-occupied Byelorussia and ends as a member of the German-controlled police force.

Alena Vasilevič, in what is most certainly an autobiographical novel, *Pačakaj, zatrzymajsia* (Stop, Wait a Little; VII-3), gives an interesting picture of student life in Byelorussia in the years immediately preceding the Second World War.

There is a great variety of new short stories by Janka Bryl, Michaś Vyšynski, Mikoła Hrodnieŭ, Aleś Żuk, Arkadž Marcynovič, Barys Sačanka, and poems by Mikoła Aročka, Ryhor Baradulin, Piatruś Broŭka, Jurka Hoľub, Siarhiej Dziarhaj, Arkadž Kulašoŭ, Alaksiej Pysin, Juraś Švirka, Ryhor Siemaškievič, Maksim Tank and several others.

Of the three plays, *Usiaho adno žyćcio* (You Only Live Once; VIII-15) by Arkadž Mauzon, *Adkul hrech* (Where Does Sin Come From?; I-11) by Aleś Pietraškievič, and *Trybunał* (The High Court; X-62) by Andrej Makajonak, only the first is of any real interest.

The literary critic Aleś Adamovič publishes the final part of his article about Kuźma Čorny, *Šyrynja piśmien-nickaha śvietu* (I-163), the first two instalments of which appeared in last year's *Potymia*. More about Čorny is to be found in short appreciations of his work *Jon čuŭ serca narodu* (He Felt the Heart of the People; VI-193) by Viečasłaŭ Adamčyk, *Žyvica ziamli* (Sap of the Earth; VI-190) by Mikoła Łoban and *Za što ja jaho lublu* (Why I Like Him; VI-204) by Barys Sačanka.

The article *Ciotka i Šviančicki* (VIII-204) by Taččiana Kabrżyckaja and Viečasłaŭ Rahojša deals with relations between the Ukrainian scholar and friend of Byelorussia Ilarion Svencickij (1876-1956) and the Byelorussian poetess Ciotka (pseudonym of Alaiza

Paškievič, 1879-1916) who for some time lived in L'vov and attended the university there.

Michaś Mušynski contributes an interesting article *Tradycyi, jakija nie starejuć* (Traditions Which Never Grow Old; VIII-190) on the Byelorussian novel in the early 1930s, and in particular on the works of Kuźma Čorny, Platon Haľavač, Symon Baranavych, Vasil Kaval, Jurka Haŭruk and others. The life of many of these talented writers was cut short when they fell victims to the Stalin terror in the mid-1930s. A special appreciation of the work of one of them, Symon Baranavych, is given in the article *Pra Symona Baranavych* (X-179) by Mikoła Chviedarovič. Aleh Łojka in his *Niaspyynnaja estafieta paezii* (A Continuous Relay of Poetry; VIII-181) makes a survey of Byelorussian poetry in the 1960s. There are also several articles on the work of present-day poets and writers such as Maksim Tank, Ryhor Baradulin, Mikoła Aŭramčyk, Uładzimir Duboŭka and others. One should also mention the article *Kiryta Turaŭski* (X-186) by Ściapan Majchrovič on the great writer and poet of the 12th century St. Cyril, Bishop of Turaŭ and author of several sermons and prayers.

Janka Sałamievič in *Piesiennaja kajstra Michała Fiedaroŭskaha* (The Song Bag of Michał Federowski; I-212) writes about the collections of Byelorussian folk songs made by the Polish ethnographer Michał Federowski. An article entitled *Kupaŭcaŭcam* — 50 (The Kupała Theatre is 50; IX-195) by Jaŭhień Ramanoŭski concerns the Janka Kupała State Theatre which in 1970 celebrated its golden jubilee. Tamara Dubkova in *Cymbały* (The Cymbalom; XII-204) writes about the evolution of the cymbalom from a simple folk instrument to a sophisticated instrument for the performance of concert music, and about the author of this transformation, Professor I. Żynovič. Viktor Šmataŭ contributes an article *Mastak Michaś Savicki* (The Painter Michaś Savicki; VI-230) on the life and work of the well-known present-day Byelorussian painter, and Emanuił Jofe in *Partret vučonaha* (Portrait of a Scholar; XII-215) writes about the historian and first Rector of the Byelorussian State University

in Minsk, Uładzimir Pičeta (1878-1947). Finally, Janka Sipakoŭ in his *Pa zialonuju malanku* (In Search of

the Green Cloud; VIII-127, IX-141) describes a journey through the Byelorussian settlements in Siberia.

POMNIKI HISTORIJI I KULTURY BIEŁARUSI (Monuments of the History and Culture of Byelorussia). Minsk, 1970.

In recent years, concern has been expressed in the Byelorussian Soviet press over the fate of many ancient buildings and historical sites in Byelorussia. Fine old churches are being used as warehouses and garages or left derelict, and castle walls serve as training grounds for amateur rock-climbers.

The establishment of a Byelorussian Association for the Preservation of Historical and Cultural Monuments, and the publication of a quarterly journal devoted to promoting an interest in the past, are events which raise high hopes for the future. That much that is worthwhile has survived the holocaust of war and unfeeling, if not deliberately perverse, 're-development' is apparent from the pages of this essentially popular publication. Ideas may differ, of course, as to whether somewhat banal war-memorials of World War II, or the oft-related splendours of the Leningrad Winter Palace, deserve the amount of space — often lavish — which they have been allotted in one of the rare illustrated quarterlies dealing with Byelorussia's past. However *Pomniki* is in its way an admirable attempt to arouse general interest in a sorely neglected field.

The first number includes the text of the fundamental law of the BSSR relating to the preservation of cultural monuments (I/5-8). H. Štichaŭ contributes a study on the 'Polack frescoes of the 12th century' in the Cathedral church of the Holy Saviour. The frescoes of St. Euphrosyne, St. John Chrysostom and St. Basil represent the earliest flowering of Byzantine art in Byelorussia, the stylistic character and similarities of which lead the author to conclude that they are the work of the same master. He also analyses the salient features of a later 14th-century fresco in the same church depicting a Saint with a staff. (I/29-32). A. Pysin reports on the opening of a museum at Białyńczy dedicated to the work of the

painter and landscape-artist Białynicki-Birula (1872-1957) (I/49-50). There are also a number of articles on the writings, monuments and places of residence of Lenin.

The architectural treasures of the Byelorussian cultural centre of Niasviž are the subject of an informative study by S. Adamovič (II/17-21). Many of the most interesting monuments which formerly adorned this ancient seat of the Kiška and Radziwił families, such as the castellated churches of the Dominicans and Bernardines, have unfortunately been destroyed. The city can still pride itself on one of the earliest, and possibly the finest Baroque churches of the Renaissance in the country, the Farny Church, designed in 1584 by the Italian architect Giovanni Bernadoni, and built in 1593. Other notable architectural features include the Town Hall and the 18th-century market place. A brief archaeological survey of the castle of Minsk by E. Zaharulski (II/21-7) is followed by a highly original study by J. Jakimovič of Renaissance and Baroque churches and monuments in the Brest region. Buildings such as the churches of the Transfiguration in Šumaki, the Exaltation of the Holy Cross in Vistyčy and the Purification in Ščebryn provide convincing examples of the individuality and continuity of the Byelorussian architectural tradition in the 17th and 18th centuries (II/30-4). S. Aleksandrovič traces the origin of the clandestine Byelorussian revolutionary pamphlet *Pro bahactvo da b'ednosť*, which was published in Geneva in 1881 (II/38-9), and there is an interesting account of the development of the glazier's art in Byelorussia from the dark ages until the 19th century, with particular reference to the work of such 18th-century masters as the Dubicki brothers, A. Sancieri and Jan Zaleski (II/44-8). This second number also contains notes by A. Hryckievič on the manufacture of Sluck ornamental

girdles (II/48-9), by Z. Mažajka on Palesian folk- and carol-singers (II/49-53) and by M. Łobač and D. Suprun on country life and farm implements (II/53-4). V. Sachno deals with some of the lesser-known aspects of the early history and archaeology of the Brest fortress (III/9-14), and L. Pobal provides a survey of archaeological sites and finds in Byelorussia (III/14-20).

There is an excellent descriptive article by T. Čarniaŭskaja on the antiquities of the city of Mahiloŭ in eastern Byelorussia. This includes a study of the monuments which have survived the devastations of the Muscovite wars of the 17th century — the confraternity church of the Epiphany (1633), and the church of St. Nicholas (1665-72), both of which are stylistically related to the 16th-century Byzantine-Gothic churches of Małamažajsk and Sienkavičy. Other structures of interest described by the author comprise the churches of the Resurrection (1668), the Protection (1697), the Dormition (1670-84), the Holy Saviour (1740), the Catholic church of St. Stanisław (1604, 18th century), and the City Hall (18th century) (III/21-30).

A. Sabalenka writes on the decorated window-frames and patterned gables of Byelorussian rural timber structures (III/43-6), whereas the work of the artist Jazep Drazdovič (1888-1950), a member of Professor Branisław Epimach-Šypila's literary circle in St Petersburg before the First World War, is considered by the well-known art-historian Arsień Lis (III/46-9). Drazdovič's pen-drawings of the Byelorussian countryside were a familiar

and popular feature of Byelorussian literary magazines and journals during the *Naša niva* and inter-war periods. His style, which is reminiscent of certain early-Victorian woodcuts, has a refreshing, oddly antique charm. In a short but revealing study, V. Cybula describes the contents and the history of a few of the Byelorussian monastic and church libraries. The author gives only a hint of some of these riches, now unfortunately dispersed, but formerly contained in the libraries of Supraśl and Žyrovicy, the Dominican convent of Połack, the Piarist monastery of Ščučyn, the churches of St. Jury and the Nativity in Słuck, the church of the Transfiguration in Turaŭ and the Bernardine convent in Słonim (III/50-51).

I. Kazačonak describes the city of Navahrudak, and in particular the castle and the ancient church of SS. Barys and Hleb (1519) (IV/10-16). S. Tylevič and Ju. Čanturyja discuss the architectural lay-out and merits of the old Baroque church in Michaliski (IV/17-21) and there is a note on an expedition to Brest in search of neglected ecclesiastical monuments (IV/22-4). M. Jermałovič considers the literary content of the Byelorussian Chronicles of the 12th-18th centuries (IV/32-5). A. Lavonava deals with the decoration of wooden distaffs in the traditional style (IV/35-9), whereas E. Jofe surveys the life and work of the great Byelorussian historian and philologist Uł. Pičeta (1878-1947).

One may express the hope that this most promising journal will flourish to become a major vehicle for diffusing knowledge, in even greater detail, of Byelorussia's artistic past.

SLAVIA ORIENTALIS. A quarterly. Vol. XIX, 1970 (in Polish).

There is little in this year's issues for students of Byelorussian language and culture. The only article falling within this province is John P. Pauls, 'Monoftongi na miejscu \*ě, \*e i \*o w dialektcie Kobryńskim (Białoruska SSR)' (I-77), translated from the English by Jadwiga Zieniukowa. The author is a native of the Kobryn region (Brest province) who as a student at Warsaw University in the years immediately preceding the Second World War made recordings

of the dialects found in the various districts of the Brest province. It is upon this material that his article is based.

There are a number of book reviews which may be of interest to students of Byelorussian: Antonovič's monumental study of Byelorussian texts in Arabic script (A. Obreńska-Jabłońska; I-98); *Leksika Poles'ja* (Janusz Rieger; I-102); *Nowa siedemnastowieczna rękopiśmienna wersja 'Leksikonu' Pamby Beryndy* (W. Wit.; II-

221); Aničenka's *Biełaruska — ukra-  
niskija pišmova-moŭnyja suviazi* (A.  
O—J.; II-225); the first volume of the  
Academy History of the Byelorussian  
Literary Language (A. Obrebska-  
Jabłońska; II-226); Bidwell's *Outline  
of Byelorussian Morphology* (M. Jr.;  
II-228); 450 *hod biełaruskaha kniha-  
drukavańnia* (Wiesław Witkowski;

III-318); Hilevič's *Z kłopatam pra  
pieśni naroda* (Maria Czurak; III-322);  
Padlužny's *Fanalahičnaja sistema  
biełaruskaj litaraturnaj movy* (Irena  
Sawicka; III-331); and finally Čamia-  
rycki's important *Biełaruskija leta-  
pisy jak pomniki litaratury* (Franci-  
szek Sielicki; IV-425).

VIEŠCI AKADEMII NAVUK BSSR — Seryja hramadskich navuk. A bimonthly.  
Minsk, 1970.

The great majority of articles in  
this year's *Viešci* deal directly or in-  
directly with Lenin on the occasion  
of the 100th anniversary of his birth.

Among the few articles of more  
general interest there are in the first  
place two valuable studies by A. M.  
Bulyka, *Czech Words in Skaryna's  
Editions* (IV-123) and *Phonetical and  
Morphological Adaptations of Borrow-  
ed Words in Old Byelorussian* (VI-  
115). P. Viarchoŭ makes a further  
contribution to the study of Byelo-  
russian noun suffixes with his article  
*The Suffix '-ščyk' in the Byelorussian  
Language* (I-115).

A. Laonava in her article *On Some  
Aspects of the Development of Byelo-  
russian Religious Wooden Sculpture  
of the 17th — early 18th Centuries*  
(IV-114) touches on a subject on which  
practically nothing has been written  
till now. She writes about the wood  
sculptures of the 17-18th centuries in  
the Catholic — Roman and Uniate  
— churches, mainly in western Byelo-

russia, and devotes a whole section of  
her article to the Byelorussian artists  
of that period who went to work in  
Moscow.

Another study of a little-known subject  
is the article by M. Janickaja on *Early  
Glass-Making in the Byelorussian  
Dniepr and Džvina Region* (IV-93).  
The author, on the basis of recent  
archaeological discoveries, shows that  
glass-making was known in the east-  
ern territory of Byelorussia as early  
as the first half of the first millenium  
AD. The important centres of glass-  
making were Połack and Obidnia near  
Bychaŭ on the Dniepr.

In his study *From the History of  
Revolutionary-Democratic Aesthetics  
in Byelorussia in the Second Half of  
the 19th Century* (IV-74) U. Konan  
considers the aesthetical views of the  
poets Francišak Bahuševič, Janka  
Lučyna and Adam Hurynovič, but in  
fact says little that was not already  
known.