

## Reviews

Carniaŭskaja, T. I. *Architektura Mahilova*. 'Navuka i technika', Minsk, 1973. 95 pages. Illustrations.

This work traces the 700-year history of the architecture and planning of Mahiloŭ from the city's foundation as a fortified stronghold around the year 1267 to the creation of the new general town plan of the early 1970s. The three sections into which the book is divided correspond to the broad divisions of the town's history — the Polish-Lithuanian, Tsarist and Soviet periods — and the text is generously illustrated in black and white.

From the purely architectural point of view, the most distinctive phase of Mahiloŭ's history was contained in the 150 or so years prior to the town's incorporation into the Russian Empire during the first partition of Poland in 1772. No buildings survive from before the 17th century (although the author does give some attention to the ancient fortress and ramparts) and after partition architectural matters were directed from St. Petersburg and, after 1917, from Moscow, without any particular concession to local tradition and taste. Of especial interest are the 17th-18th century basilical churches with twin west towers (the Churches of the Epiphany, St. Nicholas and the Saviour) in Polish baroque style and the 17th century town hall with its imposing central tower, all bearing witness to Mahiloŭ's position on the cultural crossroads between Poland, Russia and the Baltic States. Carniaŭskaja devotes 23 pages to this early period but researches are evidently hampered by the fact that few monuments have withstood the ravages of time and war.

In 1778 a new town plan was drawn up for Mahiloŭ as part of Catherine II's project for transforming the architectural aspect of the Empire along modern Western European lines. The ancient fortifications were levelled, new streets and squares laid out, administrative and residential buildings constructed in keeping with the town's status as a provincial centre. This section of the book is particularly well-illustrated with photographs,

plans and old engravings. A few pages are also devoted to the 'capitalist period'; it is interesting to note the existence of several buildings in the ornate 19th century Pseudo-Russian style, so out of keeping with local tradition.

Carniaŭskaja's special interest appears to be the transformation of Mahiloŭ from a sprawling, insanitary provincial backwater — 'one of the most neglected towns in Tsarist Russia' (p. 58) — into a rationally planned Soviet town, with all the advantages of well laid-out housing and recreational areas, shopping and transport facilities. Like most towns in the west of the USSR, Mahiloŭ has undergone two distinct planning phases during the Soviet era, before and after the Second World War. About half its buildings were destroyed during the Nazi invasion, including rare examples of 17th-18th century architecture, and this necessitated the fundamental reconstruction of the town, the guidelines for which were contained in the general plan of 1947-50. Since the war, Mahiloŭ has been planned along lines which will be familiar to anyone acquainted with other Soviet provincial cities and counterparts of most of its modern buildings can be found on the streets of Moscow or Leningrad. The author pays considerable attention to the latest buildings in the 'international' style, constructed from simple, functional designs but otherwise undistinguished. The author's modern bias is underlined by the fact that the cover bears an illustration of one such building — the 14-storey 'Mahiloŭ' hotel (1972) — and not, as might have seemed appropriate, one of the more characteristically Byelorussian 17th century monuments. The book does, however, end on a bright note with details of completed and projected work on the preservation and renovation of Mahiloŭ's surviving prerevolutionary buildings, including plans for recreational areas incorporating architectural monuments.

*Architektura Mahilova* is written in a scholarly and factual style and is attractively presented. The author lists her sources in a preface (the work is based on archival written and graphic materials as well as on observation and measurement of existing buildings) and gives a useful survey of literature on the history of Mahiloŭ and on Byelorussian architecture in general. This work is neither a guide book (few of the buildings featured in the first two sections survive) nor a 'coffee table' volume (the illustrations aim at complementing the text rather than delighting the eye) nor does it have much to offer the reader in search of

'great work of architecture'. What it does offer is the history of a town as viewed through its architecture and much informative light is thrown upon the general principles of architectural design and town planning under Mahiloŭ's various rulers. Mahiloŭ, although far from being one of the architectural show-pieces of the USSR and still excluded from the foreign tourist routes, provides an interesting case-study. The history of Byelorussian architecture has not received as much attention as it deserves and Čarniaŭskaja's book is a welcome addition to a comparatively neglected subject.

Lindsey Hughes

Kaźbiaruk, U. M. *Stupieni rostu: biełaruskaja litaratura kanca XIX — pačatku XX st. i tradycyi polskich piśmiejnikaŭ*. 'Navuka i technika', Minsk, 1974. 192 pages. Index.

Study of the relationship between Byelorussian literature and the literatures of other European countries was for a long time confined to vague and inaccurate statements about the beneficial influence of Russian cultural achievements on Byelorussian writers. Analysis of the more complex but in many ways also more significant relations between Polish and Byelorussian literature began in 1958 with Aleh Łojka's *Adam Mickievič i biełaruskaja litaratura*, and has continued to increase in sophistication and understanding until the present, largely thanks to the work of a number of outstanding scholars like Maldziś, Aleksandrovič and Kisialoŭ.

Kaźbiaruk's new book falls some way below the best studies of this kind, being inclined to *parti pris* generalizations, clichés (if the resources of folklore are always inexhaustible, is there any need to say so each time they are mentioned?), and lengthy digressions from the subject towards works that have no connection with Polish literature, such as *Taras na Parnasie* (pp. 34-6) and Jadvihin Š.'s *Što skazaŭ pievień* (pp. 97-8), or else questions like Byelorussian themes in Orzeszkowa (pp. 42-85) or the influence of Russian writers like Nekrasov (pp. 100-1) and Andrejev (pp. 149-52); in places, too, Kaźbiaruk's analyses are inclined to become straightforward descriptions of Byelorussian works (particularly

in the case of Kupala's narrative poems), with minimal reference to foreign influence of any kind. Nonetheless, this study has some merit: a number of previously unknown poems are published, some new information on little-known works and writers is provided, and occasional insights into literary influences are revealing. Inevitably, however, the reader is left with the feeling that had all the irrelevant material been excised this short book could have been considerably shorter still, and that what new matter there is would have been better presented in, perhaps, a pair of articles.

The study comprises six sections. The first ('Vytoki biełaruskaj epiki. Bylica i gavenda', pp. 7-18) analyses the differences between these two genres, laying particular stress on their folk origins: the *bylica* in Dunin-Marcinkievič's work is seen as parallel to, rather than deriving from the Polish *gawęda*. Section 2 ('Kaniec stahoǳdzia. Ahulnyja tendencyi raźvičcia', pp. 18-42) is not very interesting, apart from some new information on the poetess Zofja Trzeszczowska (1847-1911), who wrote under the pseudonym of Adam M-ski: Kaźbiaruk publishes two of her verses, *Kalina* (a translation of Lenartowicz's popular song of the same title), and an untitled version of Mońiuszko's *Kozak*; he also refers to, but, unfortunately, does not publish

a translation of Konopnicka's poem 'Jakże cię mam brać, dziewczyno...' from *Na fujarce* (pp. 28-33), Section 3 ('Biełaruskaja tematyka ŭ polskaj realistyčnaj litaratury Eliza Ażeška i biełaruski narod', pp. 42-85) is irrelevant to the book's given subject, and of limited interest in any context, as is the following section ('Nacyjanal'naja vytoki i plonnaja vučoba', pp. 85-95), which deals with the resurgence of Byelorussian literary activity after 1905: here the only new information concerns a 1913 Polish translation by Józef Wierzyński of Bahdanovič's *Šluckija tkačychi* which Kaźbjaruk republishes (pp. 87-8).

The last two sections are largely devoted to Kupała and are, in general, the most interesting parts of the book. Section 5 ('Tvorčaja škoła. Janka Kupała i realistyčny vopyt Maryi Kanapnickaj', pp. 98-128), deals with his lifelong interest in the work of Marja Konopnicka, a writer for whom Byelorussia exerted a strong but not unambiguous fascination: she described the typical Pinčuk, for example, as 'always skinny, dark, dirty, poor and pretending to be simple'. Kupała's ties with Polish literature were, of course, extremely close, and he in fact began his literary career with Polish verses. His great admiration for Konopnicka was reflected in the numerous translations he made of her work, and Kaźbjaruk devotes much of this section, probably too much, to tracing Kupała's development as a translator through his versions of the Polish poetess (pp. 114-26). In particular, the question of how far he deviated from the original is often less than fascinating, as, for example, in the pedestrian analysis of variations in the theme and metre of *Zorki* as compared with Konopnicka's 'Świeca gwiazdy, świeca...' from *Na fujarce* (pp. 125-6).

The sixth and last section ('Uzbahačennie tradycyji. Ramantyčnaja akrylenaś litaratury', pp. 128-83) opens with a discussion of romantic and realistic elements in early 20th-century Byelorussian poetry, and of the close links and parallels between early 19th-century Polish romanticism and its Byelorussian equivalent nearly a century later. The close ties of the principal Polish romantics with ethnic Byelorussia (epitomized by the opening line of *Pan Tadeusz*) helping to attract the attention of Byelo-

rusian poets to their work, and their influence, like that of the neo-romantics, is felt in many writers, especially Kupała. Apart from a half-hearted attempt to establish a relationship between Bahdanovič's *Apaviadannie ab ikoŋniku i zalataru* and Orzeszkowa's *Czciciel potęgi* (pp. 155-7), the section is in fact entirely concerned with Kupała.

The Byelorussian poet's flirtation with neo-romantic modernism is well known, and Kaźbjaruk devotes a lot of space to analysing his love-hate relationship with Przybyszewski. Although the Polish expressionist is placed by (presumably unintentional) implication amongst the representatives of the 'progressive traditions of Polish... literature' (p. 2) Kaźbjaruk emphasizes what he sees as the essential opposition between Przybyszewski and Kupała. *Pieśniaru — Bielarusu* is regarded as a reply to *Confiteor* (pp. 138-42), the influence of Przybyszewski's *Śnieg* on Kupała's poem is discussed with immense circumspection (pp. 143-5), and *Adwiečnaja pieśnia* described as representing an unequivocally contrary ideological position to *Odwieczna baśń* (pp. 147-53).

Kaźbjaruk, with a vagueness of terminology not uncharacteristic of the book as a whole, regards Kupała's dramatic poems as 'neo-romantic' whilst the narrative poems are 'truly romantic' (p. 154). The latter are discussed individually against the background of Slav romanticism, emphasizing the formal and ideological but not stylistic differences between them and their predecessors. In the case of *Kurhan* the context is the image of the minstrel from Mikiewicz to Wyspiański (pp. 160-8); with *Bandaroiŋna* the other legends and tales about Mikołaj Potocki (pp. 168-77). *Mahila lwa*, meaninglessly criticized for its lack of socio-political content, is deemed to have been stimulated by *Konrad Wallenrod* (pp. 178-81), and *Jana i ja*, less convincingly, to be related to Słowacki's *W w Szwajcarii* (pp. 181-2).

There are places where disbelief can no longer be willingly suspended, but a greater overall fault than the occasional flight of fancy is the author's tendency to simply offer superficial descriptions of works well enough known not to need them — particularly in a book ostensibly

devoted to a special subject. On the positive side, Kaźbjaruk reveals a good knowledge of Byelorussian and Polish literature; he is able to throw light on some obscure corners of Byelorussian literary history and occasionally to offer insights when dealing with the major works which

ushered in a new age during the *Naša niva* period. There is no bibliography and the footnoting spasmodic and inconsistent, but an index of names is a useful aid for the reader hoping to extract the wheat from the chaff.

Arnold B. McMillin

Molčanova, L. A. *Narodnaja metrologija (k istorii narodnych mer dliny)*. 'Navuka i technika', Minsk, 1973. 84 pages.

Skurat, K. U. *Daŭnija bielaruskija miery (leksičny analiz)*. 'Navuka i technika', Minsk, 1974. 192 pages.

Metrology is a fascinating but highly complex subject. It embraces both the science of measuring and the history of this science. In the latter sense it is an ancillary discipline of considerable importance to historical research. An understanding of the forms of measurement and the terms used for them in earlier periods is often of crucial importance in clarifying the meaning of a given text. Unfortunately it is always difficult to establish precise equivalents and sometimes quite impossible. One of the chief problems is the fact that until the introduction of a unified, state-controlled system of weights and measures, every region had its own system. The same term could refer to measurements of widely differing dimensions, depending on the area in which it was used. Dimensions could also differ from one century to the next. In addition to this, the number and variety of terms used is truly bewildering. Many of these terms, drawn for the most part from the physical environment, daily occupations and, of course, the human body itself, have very ancient origins. Not surprisingly, corresponding terms can be found in most parts of the world. In the Slavonic world, as in most other countries, there came a time when certain of these terms were crystallised as it were, given precise definition in an officially-controlled, standardised system which gradually pervaded all spheres of society. From this point onwards the problems of historical metrology become considerably less, for there then comes into existence a body of material which deals with this very question of the establishment and definition of norms. At the same time, many of the terms used in earlier periods continued to be used after the introduction of a

standard system and relics of them often survive to this day in proverbs and folk sayings.

In a field so wide and so fraught with unresolved problems there is always room for new research. In the East Slavonic world in particular metrology is still a somewhat neglected subject and much remains to be done. Both these new books, therefore, are very welcome. Each in its own way has a valuable contribution to make. Both, unfortunately, have drawbacks which could easily have been rectified, thereby making them of much greater use. Molčanova's book is the more general: it purports to be a study of 'folk' measurements of length, presumably Russian, though this is never made very clear. Russian terms are generally taken as the starting point for a discussion but much is made of Byelorussian or Ukrainian terms and cognates from other Slavonic languages. Another point which is not satisfactorily clarified is the use of the term *narodnaja metrologija*. There is an attempt to define it in the introduction, but the result is by no means conclusive. The author posits an opposition between an official (*gosudarstvennij*) system, externally imposed, and a native (*narodnij*) system that developed spontaneously from man's environment. This is surely too simple a view. It is true that a standardised system of weights and measures becomes something of an abstract concept and loses its immediate contact with the physical world; it also entails a degree of simplification, since the number of terms used is relatively small, yet in most countries the official system developed out of commonly used 'folk' measurements, as the author herself later points out, and the

process of standardisation is merely a further stage in their history. Furthermore, how does one define an official system? The author makes no attempt to answer this question and her argument, therefore, lacks point. If one is to assume from her use of the word *gosudarstvennij* that she is in fact referring to the state of Muscovy and to the standardisation of the system of weights and measures set in train by Ivan the Terrible from the middle of 16th cent. onwards, then one must conclude that by *narodnij* she means everything that went before. This is hardly tenable: the systems used by Novgorod and Pskov, to mention only a couple, were as firmly regulated as any used later in Muscovy. If, on the other hand, *gosudarstvennij* is used in a general sense to indicate the governing body of any political entity, one is faced with problems of another nature: terms which were in 'official' use (i.e. used in official documents to refer to the quantities on which taxes and other dues could be exacted) in one area were often not so used in another; it must not be forgotten that most of the terms we know from the earlier periods come under this heading due to the very nature of the documents in which they are found; also, in a book such as this which sets itself no time limits, one is dealing with a constantly changing political scene: as one principality grew more powerful than another, so its terminology gained wider currency. Due partly to this and partly to changing economic patterns words used as standard terms in one century are sometimes scarcely found at all in documents of the next century. A typical example of the complicated history of such words is the fate of *lokot'*: widely used as a standard measurement up to the end of the 15th cent., it gradually gave way to *aršin* in Russia during the 16th cent.; amongst merchants, however, it was still very much in use into the 17th cent., as is shown by *Torgovaja kniga* (1575/1610); in Byelorussia it survived and became one of the basic measurements of length in the 18th cent. In such a fluid situation it is hard to see how a classification is rigid as that suggested by Molčanova could be applied. Again, if she merely intended to draw a distinction between standardised and unstandardised measure-

ments, this too raises certain questions: the systems of measurement used by merchants, by members of certain trades, such as goldsmiths and weavers, for example, even those used by hunters and fishermen do not necessarily coincide with those used by the state (whether the 'state' be a city-state or a centralised empire) and yet they are as standardised as those decreed by the government. They may well be a case for classifying certain terms as 'folk measurements' but the whole question needs to be approached with greater circumspection than has been shown here.

There is a wealth of material in this book, drawn from an impressive number of sources. In a study of the term *šag*, for example, comparison is made not only with Ukrainian and Polish equivalents, but also with Arabic *kadam*. Similarly, *perestrel* is compared with equivalent terms in Estonian and the Turkic languages. The grouping of the terms is interesting: they are classed as a) terms for distances defined by the ability of the eye and ear to distinguish objects and sounds respectively, b) terms for length defined by members of the human body, c) terms for distance defined by the routine of harnessed animals (for example, the distance that a horse carrying a rider can travel without pausing for rest), d) terms for length defined by specific occupations such as ploughing and weaving, e) terms for distance defined by time (a journey taking so many days and nights, for example). As an illustration of the way in which metrology came into being through man's need to bring order into his existence, to express time and distance, length and weight in a system of equivalents based first on his own body, then, gradually, on more sophisticated concepts, this book is extremely interesting. In concentrating on this general approach, however, attention is frequently distracted from the Russian, even the Slavonic world. Terms such as Kazak *tuo kut* 'the distance a camel can travel without pause', Turcoman *bir yatymlyk* 'the distance between one (night's) encampment and the next' and Japanese 'horse's slipper', the distance a horse can travel before the straw slipper tied to its shoe has to be changed, to mention but a few, are cited and discussed at some length. These terms certainly support the

author's thesis that metrology the world over is bound to man's environment (a thesis that has never been disputed, incidentally) but they add nothing to the Russian material, since for most of them there is no possible equivalent, except in the most general sense, in the Russian experience. There is not, however, sufficient material of this sort for the book to stand as a general survey of the subject: indeed, its very size precludes this. Much of the Russian material is extremely good. Words such as *ařšin*, *lokot'*, *pjad'* and *sažen'* are very fully discussed. A few more references to contemporary sources would not have come amiss, though, and a more systematic attempt to define them in terms of modern measurements would have been much appreciated. A serious drawback to this book is the lack of an index. Books on metrology are rarely read by any but a reviewer from cover to cover: consequently, an index is an essential requisite, for without it, the finding of a given word becomes a matter of pure chance. A separate bibliography would also have been helpful. The footnotes contain a large number of useful references, but again, they are impossible to find without a careful perusal of the whole book.

If Molčanova's book can be said to exemplify the anthropologist's approach to metrology, then Skurat's certainly illustrates that of the lexicographer. His interest in the words is primarily linguistic: there is an abundant use of illustrative quotations drawn for the most part from 16th cent. sources (though where a word has survived to modern times this too is shown); grammatical derivatives and set phrases are also noted. The title of the book *Daŭnija bielaruskija miery* defines clearly the field the author has chosen to study. He lists a large number of words (approx. 160) and the result is an admirably comprehensive survey of every possible term of measurement used in Byelorussia up to the 18th cent. The words are well set out in groupings under the following headings: a) terms for measurements of length and area, b) terms for measurements of grain and liquids,

c) terms for weights, d) terms for set quantities, e) terms indicating numbers (eg. *sorok* 'a bundle of forty pelts'). There is an index and a list of sources that contains useful bibliographical material. The one fault of the book is that it gives so little practical information on the measurements. Ideally, a book on metrology should provide tables giving the relative size of measurements and, where possible, modern equivalents. It is somewhat irritating to look up a word such as *tsal'* and find, as an indication of its length, that it is 1/24th of a *lokot'*. It is true that one can then look up *lokot'* and discover that in 1766 in the Grand Duchy its length was set at 0.649 m. and from there work out for oneself the length of *tsal'*, but how much less cumbersome it would have been to give all such information in tabular form! Where indications of length are given, Skurat uses the measurements laid down by the Sejm in 1766. This can be misleading, as many of the measurements had changed their dimensions quite significantly during the preceding two centuries. This point ought surely to have been given more emphasis. Again, in some cases a term had several different dimensions, depending on the area in which it was used and there frequently existed different forms of one measurement. For example, there was both *malaja* or *prostaja pjad'* and *bolšaja pjad'* but no mention is made of this fact; there were also three different types of *sažen'* (*kosaja*, *machovaja* and *kupeckaja*) which were not only of different length but used for different types of measurement (*kosaja*, for example, was used mainly for vertical measurements); Skurat, however, does no more than mention these three types of *sažen'* in a passing reference to a secondary source. Despite this insufficiency of information concerning the actual nature of the measurements, though, this work is an excellent reference book and will no doubt be gratefully received by all students of Byelorussian historical documents.

Pashkievich, V. *Fundamental Byelorussian*. Book 1. Toronto, 1974. 332 pages. Illustrations.

Without doubt this must be the first textbook grammar of Byelorussian written specifically for English-speaking people. *Fundamental Byelorussian* is published by a special committee set up by the Byelorussian Institutes of Arts and Sciences in the United States and Canada. Financial assistance (\$6000) was provided by the Canadian Citizenship Branch of the Department of the Secretary of State, so that the book may be seen as reflecting the lively interest of the Canadian Federal Government in the national minorities living in Canada.

It was perhaps one of the author's primary intentions to write a textbook which would help the children of Byelorussian parents now living in English-speaking areas to learn the language. They, and others who wish to learn Byelorussian for whatever reason, will reasonably expect a textbook grammar of the language to describe it in its standard, most commonly accepted form. They might also expect to learn something about Byelorussia from such a textbook. Any reader of this book will therefore make two basic demands of it: firstly, that it should teach forms of the language accepted by the majority of its speakers both inside Byelorussia and outside, and secondly, that the material should be presented clearly and intelligibly.

As regards presentation of material, the book's most obvious shortcoming is that grammatical rules and explanations are given in both Byelorussian and English. May we not assume that, if the Byelorussian explanations had been omitted, book 1 would have been half the length and so could have included the material scheduled for book 2, publication of which, as things now stand, depends on the generosity of the Canadian government and individual contributors? However this may be, questions of presentation are very much secondary to the actual material being presented.

In the foreword we read: 'The grammar in *Fundamental Byelorussian*, like all grammars up until the first Soviet reform of Byelorussian grammar in 1933, is based on that of the eminent Byelorussian linguist Branislaŭ Taraškievich. Many of the

indigenous characteristics of the Byelorussian language were wiped out by this reform and were replaced by rules and words altogether alien to the Byelorussian language, but which were quite similar if not identical to those of the Russian language. Therefore, this reform has never been accepted by Byelorussians living outside of the Soviet bloc.' The Byelorussian version of the foreword goes even further: 'Hetak, prykładam, u vyniku vykinutaha miakkoha znaku pamiž miakkimi zyčnymi, ludzi, što prajšli biełaruskuju savieckuju školu, słovy 'śnieh', 'śmiech' nia tolki pišuć, ale j vymaŭlajuć parasejsku: 'snieh', 'smiech'.'

There are some general assumptions here that need close examination. Are we really to believe that a governmentally imposed reform can, presumably at a stroke, 'wipe out' the 'indigenous characteristics' of any language? In any case, had any agreement been reached by the end of the 1920s, whether inside the BSSR or outside it, as to what indigenous characteristics of Byelorussian were to be included in the newly emergent literary language, i.e. what its dialect base was to be? What about the acquisition of new words — were they to be in the form of calques or direct borrowings? If 'Byelorussians living outside of the Soviet bloc' do not accept the 1933 reforms, do they accept any of the subsequent reforms, wholly or in part? Whether the answer to the last question is yes or no, we still need to be certain that there is a norm of spelling (in the Cyrillic script) and morphology adhered to by *all* Byelorussians outside the USSR and Poland; I shall assume that the Latin script recommendations made by A. Losik (1943) are generally accepted whenever the 'iacinka' is used. Finally, is the non-acceptance of Soviet literary Byelorussian motivated by considerations of politics or linguistics? The author of *Fundamental Byelorussian* herself invokes the name of Branislaŭ Taraškievič, so we should look to him for answers to some of these questions. In the preface to the fifth edition of his grammar he writes: 'Aŭtar "Bieł. hram. dla škol!" sam ciapier bačyć duža vyrazna ceľuju čaradu jašče

sprečnych pytaňniaŭ (u akañni, u pravapisie čużazemnych sloŭ i inš...), bačyć patrebu i mahčymašć sprasčenia pravapisu, ale nie biarecca pravodzić jakija-kolečy pavażniejšyja žmiery takim indyvidualna-partyzanskim sposabam, nakidajučy svoj prajekt praz školny padručnik. Heta pavialo-b tolki da škodnaha chaosu.' We may conclude from these words that Taraškievič was himself aware of the need for further improvements in several areas of Byelorussian spelling, but was not raising himself to a position of authority from which to dictate his principles.

Just how far does Pashkievich base her work on Taraškievič? The fourth letter of the Byelorussian alphabet given on p. xii of *Fundamental Byelorussian* is *r*, representing the voiced velar plosive /g/. Taraškievič, to the best of my knowledge, never used this letter, neither did Astroŭski (1930) or J. Losik (1928). I have not been able to find it in pre-1933 Byelorussian dictionaries, e.g. Harecki (1919), Lastoŭski (1924), Bajkoŭ & Niekraševič (1926), Drucki-Padziarjeski (1929). Should we therefore conclude that this obvious conscript from Ukrainian has been introduced to represent a new 'indigenous characteristic' of the Byelorussian dialects of Canada? Is it accepted by all 'Byelorussians living outside of the Soviet bloc', let alone by those living 'inside of' it?

On p. 83 the author writes: 'Before a soft *r*, *r*, *k* or *x* only the consonants *z*, *c* become soft and only in the prefix. For example: зьгінуць, ськінуць, сьхіліць but — мазі (sic), вузкі, беларускі. This should be compared with Taraškievič (1929), p. 55: 'Perad miakkimi zučnymi *z*, *s*, *d*, *dž* žmiahčajucca: žniac, ślaza, ćvicieć, dźvie i h. d. Tolki pierad *h*, *k*, *ch* jany nie žmianiajucca: zhinuć, schilić, skinuć.' J. Losik (1928: p. 37) and Astroŭski (1930: p. 20) say substantially the same. Harecki (1919) does give the words ськібка, ськігатаць, сьхіснуць but as he also gives схіснуць, he cannot be regarded as entirely consistent. Also on p. 83 Pashkievich gives the following rule: In prepositions such as *з*, *без*, *праз* the consonant 'з' always becomes soft before the words beginning with a soft consonant, with the jotted vowel (*я*, *е*, *ё*, *ю*) or *і*. For example: зь Вераю, зь ім, зь ямы, безь яю, празь лес.

Taraškievič gives no rule like this, but does give the following sentence on p. 25: што з ім дзеенца? J. Losik (1928: p. 40), in dealing with the preposition без/бяз does not mention the possible addition of the soft sign. Astroŭski (1930: p. 63) gives the sentence: З кім пазнаешся, так сам станешся [sic]. Once again Pashkievich is seen to be at odds with Taraškievič and other Byelorussian linguists of the 1920s.

The insertion or omission of the soft sign between soft consonants is indeed a debatable point, but it is certainly an error on the author's part not even to mention Soviet Byelorussian spelling. How is the learner of the language to cope with texts emanating from the BSSR or Poland? Noone can deny that there were shortcomings in the 1933 spelling reform and in later Russifying tendencies in lexis, particularly as reflected in the *Ruska-bielaruskі sloŭnik* of 1937, but the situation has improved greatly since then, as reference to vol. 2 of the *Historyja bielaruskaj movy* (1968: pp. 281-91) would have shown. In fact reference to this particular book should be an indispensable part of the preliminary work in writing a textbook grammar of modern Byelorussian.

In not accepting the omission of the soft sign, Pashkievich goes on to assert that Soviet Byelorussians pronounce *ч*er and *ч*ex in the Russian way. Where is the evidence for this? Krivickij *et al.* (1973: p. 43) make it quite clear that the pronunciation of 'c' in this position is identical to 'c' in *сёмы* and 'с' in *вось*. When speaking his native language, a Byelorussian surely does not sound the final consonant of *ч*er as /k/ in the Russian fashion. Even if he does, can Pashkievich be quite certain that this is solely the result of heinous Russian influence, and not merely due to some natural interference in the speech flow?

The author's refusal to accept the linguistic *status quo* in the BSSR and Poland leads quite naturally to the use of forms of some words that differ markedly from the forms generally accepted and listed in dictionaries, e.g. сьбота, чьрвень, вайстры, all guaranteed to add to the learner's problems when he starts to read texts. The grammatical norms of *Fundamental Byelorussian* are those



of Taraškievič, but of course no reference is made to the forms now accepted as literary in modern Byelorussian by the vast majority of its speakers. The declension of numerals will presumably be included in the promised second volume, but an instruction on p. 94 is sufficient to tell us what is in store: *Напішце спарадку імёны ўсіх дванаццаціх 'галінаў' і сямёх 'ячак'*. Numeral genitives from five upwards in -ёх are indeed given by Taraškievič (1929: p. 90), but they are now regarded in the BSSR as dialect forms (Blinava & Miacielskaja, 1969: p. 70) and consequently not met with in standard writing. What is the learner to conclude?

The rules for the use of the prothetic consonant *в* and vowel *і* (pp. 97-8) are just one more example of confusion. 'All words beginning with 'o' and 'y' (with a few exceptions) take the prothetic 'в'.' This presupposes not only an understanding of the word 'prothetic', but also some familiarity with historical linguistics. When seeing the word *возепа* for the first time the learner will surely conclude that it begins with 'в', not 'o'. This is a particularly difficult problem of morphonology which needs careful consideration before being presented to any learner of the language.

The 'facinka' is briefly discussed on pp. 5-7. Throughout the book there is some degree of confusion between a transliteration of Byelorussian cyrillic spelling with letters reflecting sounds in a way immediately intelligible to the English reader, i.e. *not* using the letters 'j' and 'c' to represent 'y' and 'ts' without prior warning, and the proper latin script spelling of Byelorussian; hence Bahdanovič (p. 51), Bahdanovich (p. 58), Janka Kupala (p. 56), Rečyca (p. 128). Vilna on p. 51 contrasts with Vilnia on p. 167. Confusion and the author's non-acceptance of linguistic and geographical realities will lead the learner to look in vain on a modern map for Miensk (p. 40),

Navahradak (p. 66), Horadzien (p. 79). He will be puzzled to learn on p. 79 that Vilnia (*alias* Vilna, *alias* Wilno, *alias* Vilnius) is in Byelorussia. He will in fact learn very little about modern Byelorussia from this book, except that there are aurochs in the Bielavieža nature reserve (p. 210) and an oil refinery in Rečyca (p. 228). He will absorb the totally erroneous information that the Kriviči were a Byelorussian tribe (p. 58). The descendants of some sections of the Kriviči indeed *became* Byelorussians, but that is not the same thing. There are three photographs of young people in rustic garb; surely one of them at least could have been replaced by a view of a Byelorussian town?

The English used in *Fundamental Byelorussian* causes an occasional wince, e.g. 'flee' (p. 58, as a translation of *блыха*), 'yea' (p. 55), 'sworm' (p. 200), 'bow legged', 'intellect', 'What a devil!' (= *Што за ліха?*) (all p. 128). What will the young learner make of a phrase like 'impotence against arbitrary rule'?

It is undoubtedly easier to criticise a textbook than actually to write one. Writing a textbook grammar is probably the most difficult task a linguist can undertake, and recent developments in applied linguistics have only served to highlight these difficulties. Certainly the task needs to be approached with a sense of responsibility towards the language, the people who speak it and the country where it is spoken. Authors of textbook grammars ought therefore to avoid confusing linguistics with politics as far as possible. It must regrettably be said that this confusion, one of which Pashkievich would doubtless accuse Soviet Byelorussian linguists, is the most marked feature of *Fundamental Byelorussian*. If the book is taken at all seriously as a grammar of modern Byelorussian, it could introduce the 'škodny chaos' of which Taraškievič spoke.

#### BIBLIOGRAPHY

- ASTROŪSKI, R. *Bietaruski pravapis. Kompilacija pavodle B. Taraškieviča i J. Losika*, 2nd ed., Vilna, 1930.
- BAJKOŪ, M. & NIEKRAŠEVIČ, S. *Bietaruski-rasijski stoŭnik*, Minsk, 1926.
- BLINAVA, E. & MIACIELSKAJA, E. *Bietaruskaja dyjalektaŭhija*, Minsk, 1969.
- DRUCKI-PADBIARESKI, B. *Padručny bietaruska-polski stoŭnik*, Vilna, 1929.
- HARECKI, M. *Nievialički bietaruska-maskoŭski stoŭnik*, Vilna, 1919.

*Historyja biełaruskaj litaraturnaj mo-  
vy*, II [by I. I. Kramko et al.],  
Minsk, 1968.

ŁASTOŪSKI, V. *Padručny rasijska-  
kryŭski (biełaruski) sloŭnik*, Kau-  
nas, 1924.

LOSİK, A. *Biełaruski pravapis*, Minsk,  
1943.

LOSİK, J. *Biełaruski pravapis*. 7th  
ed., Minsk, 1928.

TARAŠKIEVIČ, B. *Biełaruskaja hra-  
matyka dla ŭskoł*. 5th ed., Vilna,  
1929.

J. Dingley

*Sučasnaja biełaruskaja mova (Pytańni kultury movy)*, Navuka i technika,  
Minsk, 1973. 190 pages.

The aim of this collection of articles is defined in the foreword as follows: 'The authors have sought to identify and analyse all the most important deviations from the norms of the literary language, to determine their origin and define their place in the system of the literary language' and 'to give their recommendations on all the most important questions of the culture of the written and oral forms of our (i.e. the Byelorussian) literary language. To this end they have analysed various styles of language — of periodicals, belles-lettres, scientific literature as well as the language of radio, television, the theatre, official speeches and private conversations. The tone of the articles (with the possible exception of Padłužny's) is, however, not as didactic as the foreword and the subtitle would suggest or as is so often the case with publications devoted to the raising of the 'culture' of a language, which ignore the realities of live tendencies in a language in favour of traditionally 'correct' forms.

The seven articles, covering the fields of orthoepy, stress, morphology, syntax, word-formation and onomastics are: A. I. Padłužny, 'Normy biełaruskaha litaraturnaha vymaŭleńnia' (pp. 5-32); M. V. Biryła, 'Nacisk' (pp. 33-55); H. U. Araŭonkava, 'Da pytańnia ab niekatorych skłonavych formach nazoŭnikaŭ' (pp. 56-83); V. P. Lemciuhova, 'Ułasnyja hieahrafičnyja nazvy (skłanieńnie)' (pp. 84-110); A. J. Michnievič, 'Sintaksičnaja norma i kantaminacyja slovazlučeńniaŭ' (pp. 111-40); T. V. Kuźmiankova, 'Niekatoryja vypadki užyvańnia sastaŭnoha imiennaha vykaznika' (pp. 141-53); A. A. Kaŭrus, 'Užyvańnie asobnych sloŭ i vyrazaŭ' (pp. 154-80).

Perhaps the most interesting and clearly set out article of the seven is Biryła's article on stress. This

comprises two main elements: a list of some 600 primary words in which mistaken stress commonly occurs and a detailed analysis of the stress patterns in noun declension and verb conjugation. Four factors are blamed for the fluctuations which occur: the penetration of the literary language by dialect variants, the influence of the Russian stress system, incorrect assimilation of the stress position in borrowed words and the effects of analogy within the Byelorussian literary language itself.

The authors of two other articles, Padłužny and Kaŭrus, also feel that the influence of Russian is partly responsible for deviations from the norm in the area of standard literary pronunciation and word-formation respectively.

Kaŭrus, in an article based on material drawn from Byelorussian newspapers published in the years 1966-72, cites a number of instances of contamination of this kind e.g. the use of *ablahčeńnie* instead of *palohka*, *ahulnažyccio* instead of *supolnaje žyćcio*, *tunny* instead of *miesiacavy*. While Kaŭrus' resistance of such contamination of Byelorussian by Russian is firm and consistent, his article as a whole is characterised by a certain arbitrariness in the acceptance or rejection of forms which violate the literary norm (which he bases on the *Biełaruska-ruski sloŭnik*, Moscow, 1962 and the *Ruska-biełaruski sloŭnik*, Moscow, 1953). A number of forms are accepted by him purely on the grounds that they have gained wide currency, while others are rejected despite this; the spelling *разбяр* (for *разьбяр*) is rejected despite the fact that this is the form in which it appears in the *Biełaruska-ruski sloŭnik*, while on the other hand *крыльа* is preferred to *крыльца* on the ground that it is regularly passed

by correctors which means 'that it is not felt to be unnatural'; *emihryvać* is preferred to *emihryravać* on the ground that where in Russian the suffix *-irova-* is used corresponding Byelorussian words usually have *-ava-*, but this argument is not adduced in favour of *restaŭravać* (as opposed to *restaŭryravać*), which is simply regarded as a permissible alternative. In both instances the *Bielaruska-ruski sloŭnik* gives the form with the suffix *-irava-*.

By contrast Padłužny's article on orthoepy shows a consistency that at times borders on the dogmatic. Furthermore it gives little information that is not readily available in other publications, including his own excellent work in collaboration with Čekman. The majority of the article is devoted to an outline of the phonetic and orthographical characteristics of the Byelorussian literary language, with just a few comments being offered on common deviations from the norm. Padłužny contends that up to the present little attention has been given to a practical course of phonetics and that this is to blame for imperfections in the spoken language of some teachers, television and radio announcers and artists of the national theatre. These imperfections come under three main headings: the preservation of dialectal traits; literal reading i.e. pronouncing words as spelt, when the orthography does not always accurately reflect pronunciation; and the mixing of Byelorussian and Russian pronunciation. This latter fault is aggravated by the fact that many speakers use both languages but are insufficiently bilingual to make the necessary distinctions between their different phonetic characteristics. A contributory factor is that some phonetic characteristics of Byelorussian dialects coincide with those of the Russian (rather than the Byelorussian) literary language. This is particularly true of the pronunciation of unstressed vowels which in north-eastern dialects of Byelorussian are reduced in the same way as in the Russian literary language. Among other features influenced by Russian Padłužny gives the insufficiently hard pronunciation of *č*, labio-dental *v* in place of bilabial *ŭ*, a semi-soft pronunciation of *r*.

Arašonkava's article throws light on the considerable amount of confusion

which exists in the use of the endings *-a(-ja)* and *-u(-ju)* in the genitive singular of masculine nouns, on the spread of the ending *-u(-ju)* at the expense of other endings in the prepositional singular of masculine nouns (particularly to avoid consonant mutation where the stem ends in velar *h* or *k*), and on the various genitive plural endings for nouns of all genders. She takes issue with Andrejenka and Jaŭnievič over their suggested rules for the genitive plural ending of third declension nouns. The latter proposed the following rules: the ending *-jaŭ(-aŭ)* is to be used if the stress is on the last syllable of the stem, the ending *-jej(-ej)* if the ending is stressed and either ending if the stress is not on the ending or the last syllable of the stem. Arašonkava feels that these rules leave some questions unanswered (exactly which questions she does not say) and proposes an alternative set of rules 'on the basis of literary practice and tradition': *-jej(-ej)* is to be regarded as the basic ending, which appears unstressed in bisyllabic and polysyllabic nouns with a stem ending in a consonant group or with a single final stem consonant and also in the majority of nouns with a monosyllabic stem. The use of the ending *-jaŭ(-aŭ)* in such nouns is to be considered a violation of the literary norm. Stressed *-jej(-ej)* is the ending for some monosyllabic nouns with a stem ending in a soft consonant, for nouns with the suffix *-časć* plus the nouns *vobtaść*, *myš*, *noć*, *pieč*, *kroŭ*. The ending *-jaŭ(-aŭ)* is regarded as correct for the nouns *dal*, *reč*, *fleš*, *ščotač*.

V. P. Lemciuhova's informative article on the declension of toponyms contains a full examination of the various types of declension with appropriate comparisons with common nouns of similar structure. The gender and type of declension of a given toponym is in most cases decided on the basis of formal considerations (the ending of the nominative singular) but the obscured etymology of some toponyms leads to some variation. This is especially true of toponyms with a nominative singular ending in a soft or formerly soft consonant (e.g. *Zyvuń*, *Sož*, *Svir*) where there is fluctuation between the second and third declension. Lemciuhova suggests in such cases the gender and type of declen-

sion should be determined by reference to the tradition of the area from which the toponym derives. She also notes a strong and increasing tendency in the press towards the non-declension of many toponyms while in others, especially foreign ones, there is considerable hesitation between declension and non-declension. While recognising the advisability of the non-declension of some toponyms in official genres such as legal and military documents etc. to avoid misunderstanding or ambiguity, Lemciuhova closes the article with a plea for order.

The authors of the two remaining articles both rely heavily on material drawn from newspapers and periodicals. T. V. Kuźmiankova points to an increasing tendency for the nominative case to replace the instrumental in the predicate, a tendency which is particularly marked where the verb is some form of *być*, and regards this as a characteristic of the Byelorussian literary language. Interestingly enough, the reverse process seems to

be at work in Russian, where recent studies have shown that the use of the instrumental case in the predicate is gaining ground at the expense of the nominative (except in conjunction with the present tense of the verb *to be*).

A. J. Michnievič's article is concerned with 'incorrect' syntactical constructions which arise through the mutual influence of two or more models e.g. *ekspanujucca karciny, adkryta vystaŭka > ekspanujecca vystaŭka*. Apart from a brief introduction on the general principles governing contamination of this kind the bulk of the article consists of a list of examples gleaned by the author from various linguistic sources and subdivided into different types of syntactical construction.

A welcome appendix to this excellent collection of articles is a bibliography of some 150 titles concerned with the problems of the norms of contemporary Byelorussian.

P. J. Mayo