

## Reviews

*Bielaruski knižny znak*. Compiled by A. Tyčyna & V. Šmataŭ. ('Bielarus', Minsk, 1975. 128 pages. Illustrations.

Bookplates or 'ex libris' as an art form, date back almost to the origins of printing. Early bibliophiles were anxious to identify books as being their property, and did so by imprinting or marking them with their emblem or badge, almost invariably heraldic in character. From the outset these decorative marks evolved into an independent branch of graphic art.

Early Byelorussian bookplates, like those of most West European countries, depicted the owner's armorial bearing with wreaths, garlands and a variety of baroque or rococo decorative motifs. They did not differ substantially from the traditional designs elaborated during the German Renaissance by engravers such as Dürer, Cranach and Holbein. In their introductory essay, the authors have the merit of dealing with the history of the art in Byelorussia in a balanced way, and do not overstress the importance of the contemporary Soviet period. Even though the illustrations are taken predominantly from the works of modern artists, — probably because of their greater variety and popular appeal, — a few examples of heraldic bookplates are given, and the reader thereby gains a satisfactory impression of continuity and evolution. Whether or not, as the authors maintain, the events of 1917 wrought any far-reaching changes in the character of the book-owning public, it is plain that the 'democratisation' of bookplates, and the evolution of more diversified graphic representations had occurred over the closing years of the 19th century. The authors might have expanded on the origins of this development in Byelorussia, particularly during the *Naša Niva* (1906-1915), and *Inbiełkult* (1922-1929) periods. Out of the 129 illustrations, barely a dozen date from before the 1950s. It should in fairness be pointed out that the most vital upsurge in the field of Byelorussian graphic art has taken place over the last twenty-five years, when new art forms have been able to develop in relative freedom.

The authors distinguish two techniques used by the artists — line-engraving and xylographic reproduction. Adequate examples of each technique are provided.

Many distinguished Byelorussian artists have adopted this uniquely intimate form of expression, which must reflect the individuality of the book-owner as well as of the engraver. Characteristic designs of great charm have been produced by A. Kaškurič (b. 1929), N. Paplaŭskaja (b. 1931), B. Małkin (b. 1908) and the brothers Basałyha (b. 1940, 1942). Perhaps the most dedicated, and certainly the most eminent 'ex libris' designer is A. Tyčyna himself, who has written a number of treatises and become something of an authority on the subject.

On the question of thematics in Byelorussian bookplate art, although the authors warn their public that the most widespread subject relates to Lenin and 'the struggle of the Byelorussian people against fascism' (p. 30), they have endeavoured to single out themes having a more attractive and human interest. And albeit the accent has been placed on graphic forms, it is interesting to note that quasi-heraldic and sigillary motifs still abound. Doubtless scenes of localities connected with the bibliophile, — cities, rooms, caricatures and even cartoons of Mickey Mouse, — have proved popular. Nevertheless a substantial number of bookplates consist of irregular badges or emblems incorporating one or more symbolic, even heraldic elements, with some personal or patriotic connection, reminiscent of the genesis of armorial bearings. These include birds, books, scrolls, quills, mermaids, architectural motifs, and human figures—generally in folk-dress. Occasionally the device chosen will contain a canting reference to the owner's name — a cat for Kotavaja, a dancing bandurist for Hopak, and a poppy-bloom for Ma-koŭskaja. Initials and floral designs, as found in heraldry and sigillo-

graphy, are also widely used.

Naturally enough, the bookplate reflects the passing styles and fashions of graphic art. The work of Tyčyna recalls the vigorous woodcuts of the 20s; that of B. Zaboraŭ (b. 1935) the more experimental forms and techniques of contemporary art. There are however interesting instances of attempts to evoke the style of the Byelorussian renaissance — the art of Francis Skaryna (c1485-c1540) and the monastic schools of Vilna (fl. 1615-1690) and Kucieina (1637-1655) (see Illustrations 21 and 129).

Heraldic shields, as in former times, still find their way into 'ex libris' designs, more as a decorative frame for some architectural ensemble, a human figure, or the owner's initials, than as a conscious attempt to evoke armorial bearings (see Illustrations 28, 33, 44, 87, 92 and 109). Banners,

sigillary motifs — sometimes showing the bibliophile's head — and badges also recur, in the pattern of Soviet heraldic art, with its profusion of wreaths, banners, medals, factory emblems and decorations. All this tends to show that the science of the heraldic artist still has a part of play in a socialist society. Certainly it provides an encouraging example of the will of the individual to identify himself by a personal cipher.

The authors' work is a most attractively produced, scholarly and informative study, refreshingly non-conformist and a pleasure to peruse. It is only a little unfortunate that with a collection of thousands to choose from, the authors could not have selected a higher proportion of illustrations in the Byelorussian language.

Guy Picarda

Bułačaŭ, M. H. *Historyja prymietnikaŭ bielaruskaj movy, č. 3. Leksikalahičny narys (Ahuľnastavianskaja leksika)*. Minsk, 1973. 256 pages, index of dictionaries, bibliography, index of words discussed.

Anyone who is interested in the history of the vocabulary of the Slavonic, and particularly the East Slavonic languages will welcome this valuable contribution to the literature of the subject. Original in concept, it comprises an etymological and historical dictionary of two hundred and sixty adjectives of Common Slavonic origin. Each item is presented with ample documentation from Byelorussian sources, literary and archival, of the late mediaeval period (14th-17th centuries). Common Slavonic status is established by cognates with the other Slavonic languages; further etymological comment indicates the Indo-European ramifications of a root, where the author finds these of interest. Special attention is paid to the semantic development of these adjectives, and to their association with other parts of speech, particularly with nouns. For example, Bułačaŭ points out that in Old Byelorussian *chromyj* could refer not only to a lame leg but also a disabled arm, supporting this with the quotation 'na ruku pravuju chrom' from a document of 1618.

The etymologies are for the most part traditional and non-controversial. One or two points call for com-

ment. Bułačaŭ notes that Aleksander Brückner's article on Pol. *ładny* and Old Pol. *nizadny* 'none' does not explain the semantic development from the original meaning of Common Slavonic \*žedьnъ 'thirsty, desirous'. But Brückner offers no such derivation; according to him *nizadny* is from *nizejeden*, with assimilation to the vocalism of *každy*. There is no question of derivation from \*žed- unless the Polish word is borrowed from Czech. The suffix suggested in Bułačaŭ's reconstruction \*želežьnъ ignores the evidence of Pol. *żelazny*; the development of *ě* to 'a would have been inhibited by a front vowel in the following syllable, cf. *leśny* from \*lěsьnъ. The evidence of the Old Church Slavonic texts also supports a reconstructed form *želěznъ*, since they regularly spell ЖЕЛЪЗНЪ, not ЖЕЛЪЗЪНЪ. Incidentally the -n- suffix is found in the Latin adjective *aenus* (\*ajes-no-), based on *aes* 'bronze', with which the Slavonic metal-name may have some etymological connection. It was apparently that great scholar Sreznevskij, to whom all Slavists owe an inestimable debt for his lexicological work on Old Russian, who was responsible for the popularisation of a reconstruction with suffix -ьn-.

Others who perpetuate this error include W. K. Matthews (*Russian historical grammar*, London, 1960, p. 79), S. P. Bevzenko (*Istorična morfolohija ukrajins'koji movy*, Užhorod, 1960, p. 209) and the editors of the new Bulgarian etymological dictionary, so that Bułachaŭ finds himself in good company.

Comment on adjectives derived from the Common Slavonic word for 'stone' seems to miss the point: \**kaměň* and \**kaměňnъ* differ in form not because they are based on nominative and oblique stem (\**kamy*, \**kamen-*) respectively, but because they employ two different suffixes (-*n-* and -*ъn-*). Bułachaŭ follows the

traditional line in his morphological analysis of the adjectives of dimension: *vysokij* and *nizkij* contain the suffixes -*ok-* and -*ъk-* respectively. Another analysis seems possible. This would interpret the vowels *o* and *ъ* as belonging to the stem, leaving -*k-* as the suffix in each case.

The above remarks are not intended to detract from the general merit of Bułachaŭ's book, whose data will no doubt in due course be subsumed into a historical dictionary of the Byelorussian language. One's only regret is that such a dictionary is not yet available.

H. Leeming

Jolliffe, J., ed. *Auberon Herbert, a composite portrait*, Compton Russell, 1976, 79 pages, illustrations.

It is a measure of the stature and many-sidedness of Auberon Herbert's unforgettable personality that fourteen different pens were required to do his portrait justice. Among the contributors to this composite portrayal of a well-known alborussophile are a handful of well-known English writers and public figures, two friends from Italy, a Byelorussian bishop, a Polish journalist, an Exmoor farmer, an M.F.H. and a president of the British Academy. Three of these were members of the Anglo-Byelorussian Society, of which the Chairman, Hon. John Jolliffe, is the editor of this pleasant literary tribute to a dedicated champion of the oppressed.

Nowwithstanding his predilection for 'convivial hospitality', as Bishop Sipovič moderately observes, Auberon Herbert was a shrewd diplomat and advocate, as well as a reliable and warm-hearted friend, of those whose cause he espoused. His achievements as past Chairman of the Anglo-Byelorussian Society, and his involvement with the Byelorussian Catholic mission are described in a valuable paper by Bishop Sipovič. Other contributors bear witness to his solicitude for Byelorussian affairs, even though initially, as one of them remarks, they may not always have grasped the precise whereabouts of Byelorussia. In letters to the press, at official functions and cocktail parties, even in

Exmoor country kitchens, Auberon was ever prepared to expound to the general public, or to intimate friends the rights of Byelorussia and the integrity of her heritage. That he was not entirely unsuccessful in his efforts is recorded by those who knew him, and felt moved to add their own tribute to this graceful literary garland. Byelorussians in Britain will long remember those 'glorious champagne parties'; his beaming presidency at involved, and not always exciting lectures on abstruse points of linguistics; his kindly shepherding of Byelorussian schoolboys to meets of the Exmoor staghounds; and his witty, well-informed speeches at the opening of some Byelorussian library or club.

The material in the composite portrait is thoughtfully presented, and the successive papers form a coherent and eminently readable whole. Anecdotes and humorous incidents of a type which Auberon would have relished abound, together with affectionate recollections of his numerous picaresque adventures and convivialities. He emerges as a great-hearted, idealistic and courtly figure, bent on knight-errantry in a 'world that was no longer made to his measure'. These features of his portrait contribute to making the collection an eminently entertaining biographical study of a great and good man.

Guy Picarda

Kaľubovič, A. *Mova ŭ historyi bielaruskaha pišmienstva*. I. Munich & London, 1974-5. 84 pages. (Reprinted from *Božym šlacham*, nos 1/139-4/142, London, 1974.)

This little book makes very sad reading indeed; one remark on p. 66 is sufficient to show its subject matter: 'Niekatoryja iz žnikšych pomnikaŭ mohuć być jašče adšukanyja, ale bašynia ich, treba dumač, była žniščanaja ŭ časie systematyčnych čystak biblijatek, archivaŭ i muzejaŭ'. The author encompasses the systematic destruction of Byelorussian written culture that has been carried out from the 18th century to the present day. He details the way in which whole collections of secular and religious archives were dispersed among libraries in Russia and, to a lesser extent, Poland, or deliberately destroyed.

Dispersal is serious enough, although there is still a chance that the material will be located; on pp. 72-82 the author deals with the present location of Byelorussian archival material, ranging from the pitifully small collection in Byelorussia itself, through holdings in Russia, the richness of which is explained elsewhere in the book, to outposts such as the north of the Archangel oblast' and the Komi and Burjat autonomous republics. He shows with references, how Byelorussian scholars, notably Maldzis and Kisialoŭ, are engaged in a painstaking search for valuable documents, to find at least some of the dispersed material.

Wanton destruction, on the other

hand, is totally inexcusable. No amount of religious zeal can justify the wholesale burning of Uniate printed material in the early 19th century, or the abbot who heated his cell for two weeks in 1865 with 'old papers'. What need was there between 1881 and 1883 for 3000 poods of Byelorussian archives of the 16-18th centuries to be sold to Riga as scrap at 1 rouble 18 copecks a pood? Or for old printed books to be used in 1970 to heat the water for the Stoŭbcy municipal baths? The examples cited in detail by the author of lootings, burnings and mysterious disappearances are too numerous to be reproduced here. Kaľubovič has succeeded in chronicling the loss not merely of historical archives, but of whole centuries of Byelorussian history, a loss that was not accidental or even solely the result of war, but deliberately perpetrated by one occupying power after another. In view of the magnitude of the losses sustained it is hardly surprising that Byelorussia is usually thought of as a country that has never known more than a peasant culture. This book is an important contribution to the struggle to remove that particular misconception; it should be read by all those who are interested in a true estimation of Byelorussia's national traditions.

J. Dingley

Kavalenka, V. A. *Vytoki, upłyvy, paskoranašć: raźvičcio bielaruskaj litaratury XIX-XX stahodždziaŭ*. 'Navuka i technika', Minsk, 1975. 336 pages.

Whilst it may be argued that there have been enough general surveys of the origins of modern Byelorussian literature and that the most useful work to be done on this period lies in the rediscovery and publication of missing texts, close textual analysis and the study of authorship, nonetheless it has to be admitted that the three elements in Kavalenka's title are central to any proper understanding of a stage in Byelorussian literary development which has too often been distorted by simplistic analogies with other literatures (especially Russian) and an exaggerated emphasis on such a priori concepts

as the primary role of folk culture. The principal theme of this book was expressed by Bahdanovič in his important article 'Zabyty šlach' of 1915, when he wrote: 'In the eight to ten years of its real existence our poetry has passed through all the paths which European poetry trod for more than a hundred years. From our verses it would be easy to make a 'short revision course' of European literary developments during the past century. Sentimentalism, romanticism, realism, naturalism, and finally modernism — all these, sometimes even in various different ways, have been reflected in our literature, for the most part

fleetingly and partially, but nonetheless they have been reflected. That our poetry possesses great inner momentum is beyond dispute.

*Vytoki, uplyvy, paskoranašć* is divided into two parts, comprising the 19th and early 20th centuries, with a long introduction and a conclusion which continues the themes of the book into the 1920s, and even touches on Mielež's Palesian trilogy. The first part is the longest, covering almost all the main writers from Barščeŭski to Bahuševič; the second concentrates on Kupała and Kołas, although the spirit and ideas of Bahdanovič are never far from the surface. Kavalenka is particularly successful in showing that modern Byelorussian literature did not, as has often been asserted, come directly from folk literature, but that their relationship was as much one of rejection as of borrowing. This part of his study is undoubtedly valuable in its thoughtful questioning of

conventional wisdom. He is also wise to minimise the relevance of Russian 19th-century developments as a model for Byelorussia, since although there were some common elements in the rapid (but of course uneven) growth of both literatures the differences were even more pronounced.

Kavalenka's book is a sensible one, and his judgment generally sound (see, for example, the still relatively rare acknowledgment of Harecki's stature — Bahdanovič's counterpart in prose: pp. 278-80), but it suffers from faults common to much contemporary Byelorussian literary criticism (but not to Bahdanovič or Harecki): wordiness and repetitiveness. Other familiar shortcomings are the lack of a bibliography or index. Surely the reason cannot be lack of space? With even moderate pruning the material of this book could be expressed in less than two hundred pages.

Arnold B. McMillin

*Kindlers Literatur Lexikon (Taschenbuchausgabe)*, 25 vols, DTV, Munich, 1974.

A review attempting to cover the whole range of this encyclopedia is clearly beyond the terms of reference of the *Journal of Byelorussian Studies*. Only the coverage afforded Byelorussian literature needs therefore to be discussed here; references to other areas will be made only where necessary for amplification and elucidation.

The *Lexikon* comprises two volumes of essays on the literatures of the world, the encyclopedia itself (vols 3-23, plus 24, 'Nachträge') and indexes of works and authors in vol. 25. The index of works lists them under the original title in the original language, with ample cross-referencing from German translations and alternative titles. The essay on Byelorussian Literature, entitled 'Die weißrussische Literatur', by Erwin Koschmieder, professor of Slavonic and Baltic philology at the University of Munich, appears on pp. 386-9 of vol. 2. A scanning of the indexes of vol. 25 reveals that the following authors and works are dealt with in the body of the encyclopedia:

Biadula: *Jazep Krušynski (Sałaviej* is the only other work by him to be mentioned)

Čornyj: *Treciaje pakalennje; Bačkaŭšćyna*

Dunin-Marcinkievič: *Hapon*

Kołas: *Chata rybaka; Dryhva; Na prastorach žyćcia; Na rostaniach; Symon-Muzyka*

Kupała: *A chto tam idzie?; Adviečnaja piešnia; Paulinka; Raskidanaje hniazdo*

Professor Koschmieder mentions Bahuševič and Harun in his essay, but no reference is made to them elsewhere in the encyclopedia. Even if we exclude the early history of Byelorussia's literary development, the omissions in this list of post-1850 writers are so glaring as to be positively painful. Where are Bahdanovič and Harecki? What about Byelorussian writers after 1945 — a period amply covered, for example, in the essay on Russian literature and the encyclopedia entries related to it? Even among those authors who are included, the works omitted bear witness, at the very least, to a strange selection procedure. What has happened to Biadula's *Piać lyžak začyrki*, Dunin-Marcinkievič's *Pinskaja šlachta* or Kołas' *Novaja ziamla*, surely his greatest work? Why, of all Kupała's lyrical output, is only one poem

thought worthy of separate analysis—Why, also, is the title of that poem translated as 'Was zieht da heran?', a question, which in view of the reply it elicits in the poem, is hardly polite to the Byelorussian nation?

The defective coverage of Byelorussian literature becomes still more obvious after a comparison with that afforded to Lithuanian, both in the introductory essay by Prof. Antanas Maceina and in entries in the body of the encyclopedia. The essay makes full reference to the history of Grand Duchy of Lithuania without, of course, mentioning its predominantly Slavonic (i.e. Byelorussian) character, and to cultural activities in Vilna, although the author inevitably places them solely in the development of Lithuanian literature. The encyclopedia has articles on Mažvydas' *Catechism* (p. 10546) and Daukša's *Postilla catholica* (p. 7683). Why, then, is no mention made of Simon Budny's *Catechism*, printed in Niašviž in 1562? Where are the references to, let alone discussion of, Skaryna, Ciapiński and other important influential printers and translators in Koschmieder's essay or in encyclopedia articles? The introduction to the whole *Lexikon* deliberately sets out to expand the concept of 'schöne Literatur' to include ritual chants and legal texts; unfortunately the net was not cast widely enough to catch the great law codes of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, written in Byelorussian and therefore forming an integral part of Byelorussia's literary heritage. If a broad definition of literature can include Kurbsky's correspondence with Ivan IV, there can be no reason, other than ignorance, for failing to mention Kmita-Čarnabyłski's *Otpisy* to the Lords-in-Council of the Grand Duchy. (Perhaps one ought to question a definition of literature that can cover *Astérix le Gaulois*, Chomsky's *Syntactic Structures*, Keynes' *A Treatise on Money* and the Kinsey Report (*Sexual Behaviour in the Human Male*), but excludes the lyrics of the Beatles and the Rolling Stones, probably the only literature that many people have ever experienced.) The article on the *Alexanderroman* mentions only the 'Russian version' (pp. 906 f.); there is no reference to the Minsk edition of the text (1962), and, of course, none to Dr. Leeming's

article in the *Journal of Byelorussian Studies*. Professor Koschmieder's essay, unlike Maceina's on Lithuanian, makes scant reference to the vast corpus of Byelorussian folklore material; his main inference is that Byelorussians were peasants who have been subject to alien powers throughout their history. It is precisely this attitude that has resulted in centuries of Byelorussian history being confined to the cultural dustbin, but which often appears to be accompanied by a failure to take these selfsame peasants' own creations into serious consideration. No really serious survey of Byelorussian literature can afford to ignore the magnificent compilation of folklore now in progress, *Bielaruskaja narodnaja tvorčaść*. The volumes of this series are conspicuous by their absence in Koschmieder's bibliography. Incidentally, this bibliography, thin though it is, succeeds in containing two errors. Firstly, Harecki's *Historyja bielaruskaje litaratury*, Vilna, 1920, is listed in Polish translation, an unfortunate mistake to occur in an encyclopedia which prides itself on listing works by title in the original language. Secondly, the name of the Byelorussian bibliographer Nina Vatacy is given as Bataci; this must surely be the most fundamental error that can be committed in a bibliography!

It is worth appending a list of reference works that are all, within their own limitations, more useful on Byelorussian literature than *Kindlers Literatur Lexikon* for all its pretensions at wide coverage. Pride of place must undoubtedly go to the 'Nachwort' and 'Über die Autoren' sections of Randow, N., ed., *Störche über den Sümpfen*, Berlin (East), 1971, pp. 457-503. Mention should also be made of:

Jünger, H., ed., *Literaturen der Völker der Sowjetunion*, Leipzig, 1967. (See the essay by Dr. K. Kasper, pp. 72-6.) trans. as: *Literatures of the Soviet Peoples*, New York, 1970. (Better Georgi Skaryna than no Skaryna at all!)

*Mały słownik pisarzy narodów europejskich ZSRR*, Warsaw, 1966. *Mały słownik pisarzy świata*, 2nd ed., Warsaw, 1972.

*Slovník spisovatelů národu SSSR*, Prague, 1966. (The list of Byelorussian writers on pp. 529-31 gives 141 names.)

The encyclopedia finds room for one Frank Dalby Davison and his, probably worthy, *Dusty, the Story of a Sheep-dog*, but none for Skaryna, Bahdanovič and Mielež. With so many

shortcomings in its dealings with Byelorussian literature, the user is surely justified in being wary of its offerings in other areas too.

J. Dingley

Luk'janenko, V. *Katalog belorusskich izdaniij kirillovskogo šrifta XVI-XVII vv.* The M. Je. Saltykov-Ščedrin Public Library, Leningrad. Pt. 1 (1523-1600), 1973, 196 pages; pt. 2 (1601-1654), 1975, 266 pages. Indexes. Bibliography.

One of the difficulties experienced by a student of Byelorussian printing is the absence of a comprehensive bibliography of early printed books. In most cases the main source of information remains Karatajev's *Opisanije slavjano-russkich knig* (StP., 1883) which, despite its undoubted qualities, is sadly out-of-date. Moreover, since the only thing common to all books in Karatajev's work is the fact that they are printed in Cyrillic script, it is not very helpful for anyone interested in the characteristic features of Byelorussian printing as distinct from, say, printing in Russia or the Ukraine. It is unfortunate that some bibliographers continue to the present day the practice of grouping together all early printed books in Cyrillic script regardless of their origin.

There have been two attempts to compile a bibliography of Byelorussian early printed books, the first being *Historyja bielaruskaj (kryŭskaj) knihi* by V. Ľastoŭski (Kaunas, 1926), and the second a provisional short-title catalogue entitled *Bibliografičeskij spisok belorusskich staropečatnych izdaniij XVI-XVIII vv.* by G. Go-lenčenko (Minsk, 1961; only 60 copies produced on duplicator). In both cases, however, the authors had to rely heavily on second-hand information rather than on direct knowledge of the items described by them.

Owing to peculiar historical circumstances very few Byelorussian early printed books have remained in that country. The largest collections of such works are to be found in places outside Byelorussia, in particular in Leningrad, Moscow, Kiev and, to a lesser extent, in some Western libraries such as the Bodleian, British Museum, Uppsala and Copenhagen. This fact does not make the task of a bibliographer any easier. One way to proceed would be to produce in the first instance catalogues of relevant material in specific libraries. The

appearance of the *Katalog belorusskich izdaniij Kirillovskogo šrifta XVI-XVII vv.* marks an important step in this direction. It is a detailed catalogue of holdings of the Saltykov-Ščedrin Library in Leningrad in the field of Byelorussian books in Cyrillic script printed between 1522 and 1654. Its author, V. Luk'janenko, is a senior member of the staff in the department of rare books in that library, and thus singularly well qualified for her task.

The *Katalog* consists of two parts, the first dealing with 16th century publications, and the second with books printed in the 17th century, up to 1654. It contains altogether descriptions of 114 publications (47 of them in the first part) in Byelorussian and Church Slavonic, represented by a total number of 392 copies. Eight of these publications have hitherto been unrecorded, and were discovered by the author during her work on the catalogue.

The most impressive feature of the *Katalog* is the thoroughness with which all the books are described. Each description includes full bibliographical and typographical features of the book (format, pagination, measurements of the various kinds of typeface used, enumeration of initial letters, ornaments and illustrations, if any) together with an indication of any existing variants; exact title and full table of contents; summaries of prefaces, postscripts, dedications and other auxiliary texts; a history of the study of a given book and information about copies in other libraries; and finally a description of all copies in the Saltykov-Ščedrin Library, including their state of preservation, binding, notes on previous owners, etc. Great care is taken to determine the date of publication in cases when it is not given explicitly, by examining the paper on which the book is printed, and the state of wear of the type, and in particular of the blocks used for printing

initial letters and illustrations. There are also several excellent indexes of book titles, names, places, books according to the place of their publication etc. which greatly facilitate the use of the *Katalog*.

The books described in the *Katalog* represent a fair cross-section of Cyrillic publications by various Byelorussian printing presses in Vilna (Francis Skaryna, the Mamonič brothers and the Orthodox confraternity), Niasviž, Zabłudaŭ, Ciapina, Jev'je, Kucieina (Spiridon Sobol and the Monastery), Bujničy and Mahiloŭ (Spiridon Sobol and the Confraternity). All these presses were situated within the boundaries of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, of which Byelorussia then formed part. These territorial, as well as chronological limitations mean that the *Katalog* contains descriptions of Francis Skaryna's Vilna publications from 1522, but not his Prague editions of 1517-1519. One of the reasons for this given by Luk'janenko is that the latter 'because of their volume and complexity fall outside the scope of the present catalogue and, most probably, will have to be subject of a special monograph' (pt. 1, p. 5). It is not very clear, however, what she means by her second reason, namely that 'the peculiar origin (*svojeobraznoje proischoždenije*) of Francis Skaryna's Prague editions... excludes them from the survey of productions of those printing presses which sprang up directly in the Byelorussian milieu on the basis of their own national culture' (ibid.).

While dwelling on the subject of Skaryna, it may be worth while noting how cautious the author is in determining the data of publication of the *Malaja podorožnaja knižica*. She is familiar with the argument in favour of the year 1522, which was put forward by the present writer<sup>1</sup> and has been accepted by other authors such as A. Koršunaŭ, U. Kalesnik and H. Halenčanka, and L. Carankou.<sup>2</sup> Luk'janenko, on the other hand, prefers to be on the safe side and would go no further than admitting that the publication 'was timed for the year 1523 (*byl priuročen k 1523 g.*)' (pt. 1, p. 27).

Descriptions of books in the *Katalog* are based on copies in the Saltykov-Ščedrin Library. Not all of them are in good condition, and their comparison

with copies in other libraries, whenever possible, would have helped to eliminate certain minor inaccuracies. Thus in describing the Jev'je 1615 edition of *Molitvy povsednevnyje* (pt. 2, no. 55, p. 46) the author gives its title as 'Molitvy povsednevnyje. Ot mnohich svjatyh otec... Iz druka v pervyj raz vydannyje'. Comparison with the copy in the Historical Library in Moscow,<sup>3</sup> which has its title page undamaged, shows that the title should be 'Molitvy povsednevnyje. Ot mnohich svjatyh otec sobranyje s pilnostju prozrenyje. I z druka pjatyj raz vydanyje'. The defective copies of Vilna *Katechism* of 1585 (pt. 1, no. 14, p. 66) and of Sylvester Kosov's *Didakalia* of 1637 (pt. 2, no. 83, p. 138) are not unique. There are perfect copies of these publications respectively in the libraries of Uppsala University<sup>4</sup> and of the Polish Academy of Sciences in Kórnik. In a similar way there is a good copy of the Vilna *Časovnik* of 1597 (pt. 1, no. 43, p. 150) with an undamaged colophon at King's College, Cambridge,<sup>5</sup> but not in the Bodleian Library.

A fragment of a book, consisting of 4 ff., has been identified tentatively by Luk'janenko as part of a Mahiloŭ *Bukvar* of 1649 (pt. 2, no. 105, p. 210), the only known perfect copy of which

1. A. Nadson, 'Kniha Skaryny ŭ Kapienhahienie', *Božym šlacham*, London, 5, 1971, pp. 9-11.
2. A. Koršunaŭ, 'Znojdziena Paschalija', *Pomniki historyi i kultury Bielarusi*, Minsk, 4, 1972, p. 45; U. Kalesnik, H. Halenčanka, 'Skaryna Francysk', *Bielaruskaja Savieckaja Encykłapiedzja*, Vol. 9, Minsk, 1973, p. 552; L. Carankou, *Francysk Skaryna i jaho čas*, Minsk, 1975, pp. 45 & 51.
3. *Katalog russkich knig kirillovskej pečati XVI-XVII vv.*, Moscow, 1972, no. 312, p. 19.
4. L. Kjellberg, *Catalogue des imprimés slavons des XVIIe, XVIIIe et XVIIIe siècles conservés à la Bibliothèque d'Université Royale d'Uppsala*, Uppsala, 1961, nos. 7 & 8. (There are two copies of the *Katechism* in Uppsala.)
5. E. P. Tyrrell, J. S. G. Simmons, 'Slavonic Books before 1700 in Cambridge Libraries', *Transactions of the Cambridge Bibliographical Society*, III, 5, 1963, pp. 390-1.



is in Uppsala. She further assumes that the printer of the book was Spiridon Sobol. Insofar as can be judged from the description (measurements of the type, description of the initial letter A on f. 20 verso, details of the contents), she may be right in her identification. The only difficulty is the word on f. 24 verso, line 1, which Luk'janenko spells *ubivajet* but which in the Uppsala copy is *ubijet*. Incidentally it is the latter form of the word which is found in corresponding passages in all 'bukvari' known to the present writer, from the Jev'je 1618 edition to that of Kucieina 1653. It may be perhaps therefore assumed that *ubivajet* is a simple error on the part of Luk'janenko, especially as she repeats it in the case of the Kucieina *Bukvar'* of 1653, from which she quotes by way of comparison. As to the identity of the printer, only one thing is certain, namely that it could not be Sobol who in 1649 had been dead for at least three years.<sup>6</sup> There is no doubt, however, that the Orthodox Confraternity in Mahiloŭ acquired some of Sobol's printing material.

Luk'janenko refers to certain verses found in some of the 16th century Vilna publications as being written in the Ukrainian language, by a Ukrainian writer Andrej Rymša (pt. 1, pp. 64 & 80). As far as is known, Andrej Rymša (c. 1550-1595) was born in the village of Piančycy near Navahrudak in Western Byelorussia, and spent practically all his life in that country.<sup>7</sup> The fact that he probably (but not certainly) studied at the school in Ostrog, where also his first poem *Chronolohija* was printed in 1581, is not sufficient to make him a Ukrainian. The bulk of his poetic production in Byelorussian (he also wrote in Polish) consisted of verses in praise of the armorial bearings of various Byelorussian magnates. They have for a long time formed part of the curriculum of Byelorussian literature in schools and universities.<sup>8</sup>

The prefaces to both parts of the *Katalog* contain brief accounts of the development of Byelorussian printing and of the political and social conditions existing in Byelorussia during the relevant periods. The accounts are on the whole well balanced, but could have been improved by avoidance of emotionally charged expressions such as 'Polish-Catholic oppression' (pt. 1,

p. 6) or 'enslavement (*zakabalenije*) of the popular masses of Byelorussia and Western Ukraine with the help of the Union of Brest' (pt. 2, p. 6), which contribute nothing towards the better understanding of what was a very complex situation. The statement that the printer Leo Mamonič at the beginning of the 17th century 'became Uniate and, in close league with another active Uniate Leo Sapiieha, zealously served through his publications the interests of the feudal aristocracy' (pt. 2, p. 6) conjures up in the mind of the reader a frightening picture of a covert collusion between a great statesman and a humble printer for some sinister purpose, and makes him wonder what dark threats lurk in the innocent-looking publications such as *Molitvy povsednevnyje* or *Hrammatika*. It is also incorrect, incidentally, because the Chancellor of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania Leo Sapiieha had never been a Uniate.

The foregoing remarks, however, relate to minor points which in no way impair Luk'janenko's considerable achievement. Her *Katalog* is the first serious modern bibliographical work which deals with Byelorussian early printed books for their own sake, and not as part of — to borrow Karatajev's expression, — 'slavjanorusskije knigi'. Based on the Saltykov-Ščedrin Library collection, which is one of the richest in the world, it contains detailed descriptions of more

6. E. Ružycki, 'Novyja viestki ab biełaruskim drukary Spirydnie Sobalu'. *Niva*, Białystok, 12, 1973, pp. 3 & 6; E. Ružycki, 'Nieznane szczegóły z życia białoruskiego drukarza Spirydona Sobola', *Rocznik Biblioteki Narodowej*, IX, Warsaw, 1974, pp. 287-94; *Peršodrukar Ivan Fedorov ta joho poslidovnyky na Ukrajinie*. Zbirnyk dokumentiv, Kiev, 1975, pp. 217-20, 223, 225.
7. I. Sałamievič, 'Rymša Andrej', *Biełaruskaja Savieckaja Encykłapiedyja*, Vol. 9, 1973, p. 219.
8. See e.g. V. Barysienka, V. Ivašyn, *Biełaruskaja litaratura*. Padručnik dla 8 klasa siaredniaj školy, Minsk, 1973, p. 23; *Historyja biełaruskaj dakastryčnickaj litaratury*, Minsk, 1968, pp. 357-8; A. Koršunaŭ, *Chrestamatyja pa staražytnaj biełaruskaj litaratury*, Minsk, 1959, pp. 326-30.

than half of the total number of Cyrillic publications in Byelorussia during the initial period of the development of printing in that country up to the middle of the 17th century. The fact that the books are described from first-hand knowledge, many of them for the first time in this way, enhances considerably the value and

authority of the whole work. Last but not least one should mention the exceedingly high standard of bibliographical description which has been established by Luk'janenko in her *Katalog* and which can be ignored by all future Byelorussian bibliographers only at their own risk.

A. Nadson

Mayo, P. J. *A Grammar of Byelorussian*. Anglo-Byelorussian Society in association with the Department of Russian and Slavonic Studies, University of Sheffield, Sheffield, 1976. 66 pages. Bibliography.

Byelorussian used to be one of the Slavonic languages most neglected by philologists. In recent years there has been a tendency to redress the balance. A great deal of extremely valuable work has appeared, the majority of it produced by Byelorussian scholars themselves. Comparatively little has been written about this language in English. The first, and for long the best general description of it was that given by Professor R. G. A. de Bray in his monumental *Guide to the Slavonic Languages* (London, 1951; rev. ed. 1969). A new and more detailed work has long been needed. Mayo's *Grammar* provides a most welcome remedy to the situation. It is a short book and it limits itself to one, clearly-defined aim: to provide a reference book for those wishing to acquire a passive knowledge of the language. It is a measure of its excellence that it succeeds not only in this, but also in providing an invaluable aid to anyone involved in the teaching or studying of Byelorussian, whether it be at a very elementary level or at a more advanced stage.

It deals exclusively with the modern

language. Comparisons with Russian and Ukrainian are made, where appropriate, in order to establish Byelorussian's relationship to these other members of the East Slavonic group of languages. In this respect it is of particular use to students of comparative Slavonic philology. There is an informative introductory section (pp. I-II) on pronunciation and orthography. One of the great virtues of this work is that, despite its extremely concise nature, it never contents itself with the formulation of general rules. It is meticulous in noting exceptions to the rule. This detailed and orderly approach makes it possible for the author to give an admirably lucid exposition of the use of prothetic (or, as he prefers, prosthetic) consonants. The main body of the book is devoted to morphology. The material is clearly set out. Paradigms are supplemented by notes which discuss individual grammatical endings and provide further phonological information. The bibliography provides a comprehensive guide to works on modern Byelorussian, including dictionaries, in Byelorussian, Russian and English.

S. Akiner

Wexler, P. N. *Purism and Language: a study in modern Ukrainian and Belorussian nationalism (1840-1967)*. Indiana University, Bloomington (USA), 1974. 446 pages. Bibliography.

Any review of this book should certainly begin with a clear statement of the admiration that readers will undoubtedly feel for Dr. Wexler's erudition as reflected in the scope of his subject and the extent of his reading. Whatever individual shortcomings may be found cannot detract from the fact that the book is likely to become a classic in the thorny field of 'language planning' studies.

The analysis of the development of

the Ukrainian literary language follows Shevelov's periodization, starting at 1840 and taking Ševčenko as the first major writer; the analysis of the development of Byelorussian starts in 1890. The opening chapters deal with general matters of approach to the problem, the gathering of primary data on linguistic prescription, and the establishment of terminology. Wexler examines degrees of 'openness' and 'closure' (to external

linguistic factors) of a developing literary language, thereby offering a typology of prescriptive linguistic intervention, although after due presentation of prescriptive evidence from Byelorussian and Ukrainian he does query the feasibility of such a typology (p. 315). He singles out one particular type as 'externally directed purism' and identifies the major controlling principle of purism as 'ideological' (p. 32). Here is the justification for the juxtaposition of two apparently disparate areas of human activity — language and politics — in the title of the book. Wexler proves on the basis of an analysis of how Ukrainian and Byelorussian have been consciously moulded into the literary languages we know today that purism in language has overt political ('ideological') significance. As far as Byelorussian is concerned this is as true of those who sought and are still seeking to make Byelorussian as distinct as possible from Russian (primarily) and Polish, and of those who desire Byelorussian to show a still more 'progressive tendency towards internal unity with Russian'.<sup>1</sup> Clearly linguistic considerations were not uppermost in decisions relating to numeral genitives in literary Byelorussian: the choice for the genitive of e.g. *piac* (*piaci*, close to Russian; *piacióch*, as far removed from Russian as possible) is still motivated by 'purism', which, as Wexler shows, is inextricably linked to ideology. Wexler demonstrates how choosing an obscure word or grammatical form from one dialect may result in the non-acceptance of that word or form in the literary language, e.g. Taraškievič's advocacy of the 'unique' forms *adzinančac* and *dvanančac*, as opposed to *adzinaccac* and *dvanaccac*. Uniqueness does not of itself imply that the forms are 'purer' Byelorussian, or that, even if they are 'pure' Byelorussian (whatever that may be), they will be accepted by all speakers of the language. One of the justifications used in the search for truly Byelorussian forms in the dialects is the difficulty of 'twisting one's tongue on Polonisms and Russianisms'. Once again the assumptions are obviously ideological — if the Polonisms and Russianisms were real 'tongue-twisters', it is doubtful whether they would ever have been acceptable in normal

speech; it is certainly open to doubt that some of the proposed Byelorussianisms were any less 'tongue-twisting'. Wexler provides excellent detail on the development of scientific terminology in both languages, identifying two basic approaches: predominantly ethnographic and modified ethnographic. The former is exemplified by drawing mainly on native resources, e.g. rendering 'chlorophyll' as *listazielen* (exactly equivalent to Finnish *lehtivihreä*), thereby deliberately excluding international words. German provides many examples of such an approach, e.g. *Fernsehen*, *Fernsprecher*. The modified ethnographic approach involves fewer neologisms in the form of loan translations, and draws on established internationalism. Byelorussian *telebačaćnie* provides an example of a fusion of the two approaches with an international (originally Greek) prefix plus native root and suffix. One debate in the 1920s centred around the choice of a Byelorussian word for 'torture', whether it should be *muki*, taken from old Byelorussian legal terminology, or *katavañnie*. One wonders what the word was actually needed for at the time.

Wexler is surely right in seeing linguistic purism as a means of strengthening national consciousness and in going on to say (p. 320): 'The inability of purists to close the language entirely to all nonnative elements (both Slavic and non-Slavic) suggests that speakers of a language, in the final analysis, do not have a choice between establishing connections with foreign sources or maintaining linguistic isolation'. This is undoubtedly true; the problem, however, lies in how the connections are made with the foreign sources. Wexler himself provides part of the answer: 'The process of robbing Belorussian and Ukrainian of their distinctive defining features began in the early 1930s and has continued up to the present time... [Byelorussian and Ukrainian fail] to disappear entirely, and on the other hand, fail to secure themselves as fully independent literary languages' (p. 321). This appears paradoxical;

1. Birillo, N. V. et al., 'Belorusskij jazyk', *Jazyki narodov SSSR*, I, Indoevropijskije jazyki, Moscow, 1966, p. 154.

Burak<sup>2</sup> describes what is undoubtedly an independent linguistic system, yet it is patently obvious that Wexler is correct in his formulation, certainly as far as Byelorussian is concerned. Its failure fully to establish its independence *vis-à-vis* Russian must be seen within the context of the political and social situation of the USSR as a whole. If Byelorussia had full political independence, the problem of the language would not arise in such an exacerbated form (cp. the development of Estonian in the period of independence, 1918-1940, to which Wexler draws attention, and the development of Norwegian).<sup>3</sup> On the other hand, is the weak position of Byelorussian due to its being systematically 'robbed' (and this is the closest Wexler approaches to an emotive appraisal of Soviet linguistic policy) of its distinctive features (by deliberate act of government?), or to other 'centralizing' factors such as films, television, military service in formations that are most decidedly not under the control of technically independent Union republics, the prestige of Russian, and so on? The author's description of the situation (p. 293) is one of the fairest possible: 'One gets the impression that post-1953 regulators are accelerating towards convergences with Russian, but not without occasional application of the brakes'.

The insecurity of Byelorussian is certainly documented in the Soviet Byelorussian press through articles complaining of poor language and literature teaching, poor pronunciation on the stage, poor newspaper style. There exists a very real danger that Byelorussia, perhaps along with Ukrainian, will become a museum piece of enlightened Leninist language policy, a survival of the countryside and *belles lettres* — 'the language of the rural granny' in one of Wexler's most felicitous phrases. It is very much to be hoped that the Byelorussian language will serve its speakers as a living means of communication in all spheres of activity, but the pressures of Soviet society may well determine otherwise. It may simply be

the fate of minority languages to go to the wall in any modern technologically-minded state. Ray's ideals<sup>4</sup> of 'efficiency, rationality, commonality' — are as applicable to Byelorussian as to any other, with the clear implication that once the language ceases to be an 'efficient, rational and common' means of communication (for whatever reason), it ceases to have any *raison d'être*.

Wexler's book opens up new dimensions in western linguistic literature on language planning. Hitherto Soviet language policy has received little attention. It is time for western scholars to pay some attention to the way in which this policy has affected the languages of the USSR that had already become, or were in process of establishing themselves as, literary languages before 1917; in particular the combined effect on Byelorussian and Ukrainian of close genetic relationship with the language of the dominant nation, plus attempts at linguistic prescription of all kinds, plus social engineering, together with the level of Byelorussian national self-awareness in 1917 (and in the 1970s!), needs close study. Wexler's book is a valuable contribution to that study. If it can be faulted anywhere, it is in the presentation of footnotes; surely some of the material relegated to the end of each chapter could have been placed within the body of the text? On p. 281 Wexler is, I believe, being somewhat unfair to the author of *Ab movie* (1920); he does not seem to be suggesting a reflex \**pukny*, merely pointing out that the Byelorussian reflexes of Polish *ę, ą* are *ja, u* respectively. One misprint hurls itself at the reader on p. 227: 'Interbellum Russia' for 'Belorussia', serious enough, but perfectly understandable in a text of this complexity.

J. Dingley

2. Burak, L. I., *Sučasnaja bielaruskaja mova*, Minsk, 1974.
3. See Haugen, E., *Language conflict and language planning*, Cambridge, Mass., 1966.
4. See Ray, P. S., *Language standardization*, The Hague, 1963.

Kostjukovec, L. F. *Kantovaja kul'tura v Belorussii*, 'Vyšejšaja škola', Minsk, 1975. 96 pages. Musical illustrations.

Before the commencement of the Holy Liturgy, during the priest's communion, in and about the church on a pilgrimage or patronal feast-day, it has been a long-standing custom for Byelorussians to join together in the singing of paraliturgical hymns or *kanty*. Frequently composed in a popular metre, and sung to melodies drawn or adapted from folk-music, they have unquestionably become an integral part of Byelorussian folklore. The ethnographical collections of Šejn, Ramanaŭ, Nikifaraŭski and others, have published many examples of *kanty*, whereas historians of Byelorussian literature such as Karskij and Harecki have shown the significant part played by this art-form in the cultural and spiritual life of the nation. Many fine melodies and moving lyrics have become an integral part of the Byelorussian national heritage. It is a matter for regret that so little attention was paid before the Revolution to the history of Byelorussian liturgical and paraliturgical music, — generally considered by Russian and Polish authorities to be corrupt or degraded forms of their own national art; because of this, Byelorussian *kanty* have remained relatively unknown. Nevertheless, historians of East Slavic Church music such as A. Preobraženskij and N. Findcisen, have acknowledged the important part played by Byelorussian musicians in the introduction and adoptions of Western art-forms in Russia, and have described the manner in which much folk material passed into regular liturgical usage (see A. Preobraženskij, *Kul'tovaja muzyka v Rossii*, Leningrad, 1924, pp. 57 ff). The present study by Kostjukovec, though contributing little that is fundamentally new to our knowledge of this relatively unexplored field, at least breaks a fifty year gap in scientific musical research, and marks what may well be a new beginning.

In addition to the main section, which deals with the content and style of Byelorussian *kanty* and *psalmy* (pp. 36-95), the author describes the general background against which the genre grew up — verse forms (pp. 3-9), the cultural milieu (pp. 9-11), the Reformation (pp. 11-15) the lay con-

fraternities (pp. 15-24), the influence of Byelorussia on Russian art (pp. 24-33) and the musical culture of Byelorussia in the 16th and 17th centuries. Most of these aspects have been adequately investigated elsewhere and at greater length by other authors, though it is useful to be reminded of the relevant facts. The sections on the Reformation and on the confraternities in Byelorussia, are sketchy and cast no fresh light on the evolution of the *kant*, being merely reiterations of official historiography.

For a musicologist, presumably having access to the rich collections of the Kiev Academy of Sciences and the Historical Museum in Moscow, the chapter on 16th and 17th century musical culture in Byelorussia is incomprehensibly sparse. Not a word is said of the early *Irmologia*, some of which, like the Supraśl collection of 1601, show clearly the influence of folk-music in some of the local chants (eg. *Mirski napieŭ*). Certainly a study of the origins of *kanty* in the Polish collections of Zarembo and Kawieczynski, would have provided the student with a clearer conspectus, than a wearying rehearsal of 19th century pastiches such as:

Dobra-b nam było  
 Ščasna-b nam było,  
 Kali-b Ruš usja...  
 Zaadno była. (p. 41)

The main part of the work, dealing with the texts and melodies of the *kant stricto sensu*, is of greater value. Popular carols, crib-play chants, and seasonal hymns are studied in their original versions and comparisons are drawn with Ukrainian forms. The author has also provided a number of three-part harmonisations from contemporary manuscripts. As an introduction to the *kant*, Kostjukovec's work is of considerable importance. If it contains nothing particularly original, it collates and summarises much unco-ordinated material, and provides some recent bibliographical references. It will prove a useful handbook for those wishing to embark upon a more serious study of the subject.

Guy Picarda