

## Reviews

Ababurka, M. V. *Dyjalektyzmy ŭ tvorach bielaruskich saviieckich pišmieńnikaŭ*. Karotki sloŭnik-daviednik. 'Vyšejšaja škola', Minsk, 1979. 142 pages.

Bołsun, A. I., Rapanovič, Ja. N. *Sloŭnik fizičnych i aстранamičnych terminaŭ*. 'Narodnaja ašvieta', Minsk, 1979. 182 pages. Bibliography.

These two small dictionaries represent further welcome evidence of the recent revival in Byelorussian lexicography, though the size of the editions — 1,000 (Ababurka) and 3,000 (Bołsun and Rapanovič) — is disappointingly small. This is rather surprising in the latter case since the book is intended specifically for schoolchildren.

Ababurka's dictionary of dialectisms in the works of Soviet Byelorussian authors is based principally on prose works and contains c. 700 entries. These are prefaced by a short discussion of what constitutes a dialectism with a distinction being drawn between 'dialectism' and 'dialect word': the former term is applied to dialect words which have penetrated the literary language, the latter to those which have not. Ababurka's dictionary thus contains the 'most original and widely used' in the former category. Three criteria are used to assign these words to the category of dialectisms: designation as regional (*abłasnoje*) in *Ruska-bielaruski sloŭnik* (1953), *Bielaruska-ruski sloŭnik* (1962) or *Tlumáčalny sloŭnik bielaruskaj movy* (1977-81); their absence from dictionaries of the literary language but presence in dialect dictionaries; and territorial limitation in their sphere of usage.

The meaning of each entry is elucidated with the aid of one or more examples from specified works of literature and in most cases reference is also made to other lexicographical works which feature the word concerned. A list of these works is given at the end of the book. Encouragingly, it includes the dialect dictionaries compiled in the 1920s by Bajkoŭ and Niekraševič, Harecki, and Šaternik,

for so long taboo in Byelorussian lexicography because of their association with '*nacdemauščyna*'. Another pleasant surprise is a bibliography containing 64 titles (mainly articles) on the subject of dialectology. Altogether a useful little volume, particularly for the non-native student of Byelorussian.

Bołsun and Rapanovič's dictionary has the relatively modest aim of acquainting secondary-school pupils with the meaning of the most commonly encountered terms from physics and astronomy. The 2,000 entries are short, consisting for the most part of just two or three lines of explanation. In addition to physics and astronomy the dictionary also includes some mathematical terminology as well as the chemical elements and their Latin symbols. Much of this specialized vocabulary is, of course, international, but there are entries for the popular names of constellations and phases of the moon. Where native and international terms co-exist the former generally take precedence: the reader who looks up *тэрпенцін* (p. 116) or *сублімацыя* (p. 109) is directed to *жывіца* (p. 44) and *узгонка* (p. 117) respectively for the appropriate explanation. About some of the native terms, however, there is a whiff of purism. Do Byelorussian scientists really employ the artificial-sounding *кале паветраплаванне* (p. 79) when talking about *эранаўтыка* (p. 21)?

The final section of the dictionary (pp. 140-82) consists of a Russian-Byelorussian index of the entries.

Alt, T. F. *The Language of the Lithuanian Statute of 1529: Orthography, Phonology, Inflections*. University Microfilms, Ann Arbor, 1978. 486 pp. Appendices.

This work, Dr Alt's doctoral thesis, is an outstanding contribution to the study of the history of Byelorussian. A painstaking, word-by-word examination of a lengthy document, it is the type of undertaking that often seems boring and unnecessary in the doing, but once done proves to be invaluable, for it provides the precise evidence without which theories, no matter how brilliant, are useless. Dr Alt's methodology is not new: she follows the same model as that adopted by Chr. Stang in *Die westrussische Kanzleisprache des Grossfürstentums Litauen*, i.e. a discussion of phonological features, then of morphological (basically a practical application of the traditional manner of linguistic description, exemplified in Karski's work on old Byelorussian). A similar approach is found in N. T. Vajtovič's study of the *Barkalabaŭski letapis* (Minsk, 1977). What distinguishes Dr Alt's work, however, is the fact that it is far longer, and therefore much more detailed, than any other study of a similar nature. For each topic discussed she cites a substantial range of examples, including exceptions that occur only rarely, which could be nothing more than passing errors or, equally, could be tentative indications of future trends.

The subject of Dr Alt's study is in itself of particular interest. It is the legal codex of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania that was promulgated in 1529, one of the most important monuments of 16th-century Byelorussian. It did not appear in printed form until the mid-19th century, but many manuscript copies were made and four of these are still extant, all dating from the 16th century. Their average size is about 200 pages, hence it is a document of some considerable length. The first published version of the 1529 Statute appeared in 1841 and has since been followed by many others. They have usually been based on one of the MS copies, even though variants from one or two of the others have sometimes been included. There is not yet a single edition that takes account of all four MSS (though such a work is apparently in preparation in Vilnius). Stang

believed that it was essential to compare the four copies and since he was unable to achieve access to them all he decided to exclude the 1529 Statute from his study *Die westrussische Kanzleisprache...* for precisely this reason. Dr Alt, fortunately, has been able to make this comparison and her work is doubly welcome, therefore, since it presents a unique picture of a single text evolving in the hands of scribes over a period of some fifty years and exhibiting changes induced by time and dialect.

The work is divided into ten chapters: an Introduction (pp. 1-31), a chapter on Graphics (pp. 32-53), two on Phonology (Vowels, pp. 54-114; Consonants, pp. 115-66), five on Morphology (Substantives, pp. 167-263; Adjectives, pp. 264-300; Pronouns, including Numerals, pp. 301-40; Verbs, pp. 341-88; Prepositions, Conjunctions and Particles, pp. 389-402) and Conclusions (pp. 403-11). The Introduction describes the source material for the study and gives a survey of previous work in the field; it also discusses the vexed question of the nature and designation of the literary language of 16th-century Byelorussia: this language is often known as 'Old' or 'Middle' Byelorussian, but Dr Alt prefers 'Ruthenian', though her reasons for rejecting the other two terms are not entirely clear. The chapter on Graphics is of major importance for, though the subject might be considered to be of somewhat limited relevance to her thesis, it is nevertheless treated in such detail that it constitutes a most valuable advance in the sadly neglected field of Byelorussian paleographical studies. As Antonovič has indicated, a vast amount of material is available, but it has so far attracted very little research. Dr Alt shows that there are some aspects of orthography and even of phonological development that can only be resolved by a proper understanding of paleographic conventions. It is wrong to assume that these are identical with the Russian tradition; Byelorussian had a distinct style of its own, as has been recognized by authorities on Russian paleography such as I. S.

Beljajev, A. I. Sobolevskij and L. V. Čerepnin. Unfortunately, their brief comments represent almost the sum total of work on this subject, hence the special importance of the present graphical analysis of four 16th-century MSS. The chapters on Phonology and Morphology are very thorough (e.g. in Chapter V, each case, singular and plural form of each paradigm is examined separately and illustrated by a wealth of material). Sub-headings in the Table of Contents are full and explicit, taking the place, in effect, of an Index. The conclusions reached in these chapters are not particularly startling, but they do show that the situation was rarely as straightforward as it is sometimes made to appear, since archaic features are often found alongside recent innovations, an indication of how slow and uneven a phenomenon linguistic development can be. Particular attention is paid to defining Ukrainian and Polish influences, a question of fundamental significance in the history of Byelorussian. It is noteworthy that Dr Alt finds little evidence of Ukrainian features, whilst those of Polish are present, but not nearly so dominant as they were later to become.

The eight Appendices examine the treatment of particular features in each of the four MSS, e.g. *akaŋnie*, consonantal clusters, the gen. sing. and loc. sing. endings of masculine

substantives, the nom. pl. endings of masculine animate substantives, verbal stems and prefixes. The statistical surveys of these forms are of considerable interest, providing as they do precise information on questions about which there has been much speculation. This is especially welcome with regard to the gen. and loc. sing. and nom. pl. endings of masculine substantives; Dr Alt provides a comparison with 16th-century Polish forms in these cases, but it is slightly disappointing that she does not pursue them any further: it would have been useful to have known whether or not she was able to discover any clear motivation for the choice of one or other of the possible endings. However, this is perhaps an unfair quibble; the question of inflectional variation in these cases is extremely complicated and requires a detailed study of its own, taking account of exactly the type of survey that Dr Alt provides here.

Finally, Dr Alt's style of writing must be mentioned. Readability is not a quality that one would normally expect, far less hope for in such a study. It is all the more pleasing, therefore, to find that, despite the highly technical nature of this work, Dr Alt is able to present it in a simple, lucid manner that is eminently easy to follow.

S. Akiner

Bułyka, A. M., Žuraŋski, A. I., Kramko, I. I. *Historyčnaja marfalohija bielaruskaj movy. 'Navuka i technika'*, Minsk, 1979. 328 pp.

The last two decades have seen a substantial number of Soviet publications on the subject of the morphology of Byelorussian. Most of these have concentrated, however, on specific morphological categories e.g. M. G. Bułachaŋ's *Prymietnik u bielaruskaj movie* (1964), M. A. Žydovič's *Nazoŋnik u bielaruskaj movie* (1969), P. P. Šuba's *Dziejastoŋ u bielaruskaj movie* (1968). Often — and quite appropriately — such studies have had a comparative element cf., for example, P. V. Viarchoŋ's *Ličebnik u bielaruskaj movie* (1961) which has comparisons with Russian and Ukrainian, or U. V. Aničienka's *Marfalohija ūschodniestavianskich moŋ. Nazoŋnik,*

*dziejastoŋ, prystoŋje* (1973). Among works which have dealt with the morphology of Byelorussian as a whole, of particular note is M. I. Hurski's excellent *Paraŋnalnaja hramatyka ruskaj i bielaruskaj moŋ* (2nd edn., 1972), three-quarters of which is devoted to this subject. The official position on the morphology of contemporary standard Byelorussian is laid down in the first volume of the Byelorussian Academy of Sciences' *Hramatyka bielaruskaj movy* (1962) which remains the most recent authoritative statement of literary norms.

While these works have paid some attention to the historical develop-

ment of Byelorussian (Hurski's book is a particularly good example), the main emphasis has nevertheless been on the contemporary literary language and its relationship with the dialects. An exception to this was L. M. Šakun's *Narysy historyi bielaruskaj litaraturnaj movy* (published in 1960 and followed three years later by the same author's *Historyja bielaruskaj litaraturnaj movy*), which represented the first post-war attempt at a general historical grammar of Byelorussian. As the first such attempt, Šakun's work was, quite naturally, unable to resolve many of the problems of the history of Byelorussian; furthermore, it was written at a time when much source material was simply not available to the researcher. The collection of photocopies and microfilms of over one hundred texts which had been lost or the existence of which was previously unknown provided the source material for research in the Institute of Linguistics of the Byelorussian Academy of Sciences leading to the publication in 1967-8 of a more complete survey, the two-volume *Historyja bielaruskaj litaraturnaj movy*. The same material forms the basis of the volume under review here; not only that, but two of its co-authors (Žuraŭski and Kramko) were also among the authors of the earlier work.

Where *Historyja bielaruskaj litaraturnaj movy* was an all-embracing survey covering, in varying degrees, phonology, morphology, lexis, orthography, syntax and stylistics, *Historyčnaja marfalohija bielaruskaj movy* confines itself, as the title indicates, to tracing, in much greater detail than the earlier work, the evolution of the inflectional morphology of Byelorussian — the categories of noun, pronoun, adjective, numeral and verb. On the whole it is a thorough, scholarly work which justifies the claim made in the Introduction (p. 6) that it is 'the first attempt at creating a synthesized history of the morphological structure of the Byelorussian language'. Responsibility for the various sections is divided between the three co-authors as follows: Bułyka — Noun (pp. 7-95), Pronoun (pp. 96-137) and Adjective (pp. 138-75); Kramko — Numeral (pp. 176-203); Žuraŭski — Verb (pp. 204-318)

as well as the Introduction (pp. 3-6) and the Conclusion (pp. 319-21). The book also contains a list of sources, but once again, no bibliography and even those works referred to in the Introduction are unattributed.

The section on the Noun begins with a brief outline of the categories of gender, number and case. Fluctuations in gender are documented and comparison drawn between a number of Byelorussian (BR) nouns ending in -ль or -нь which belong to the masculine o-stem declension and their Russian (R) counterparts which are feminine and remain in the i-stem declension (cf. BR боль, цень — R боль, тень). The bulk of this section deals with the declension system, though it is a division according to gender which underlines the treatment of the material, with masculine and neuter nouns being treated under one head. The development of the declension system from *starażytnaruskaja mova* through to the end of the 17th century is documented in considerable detail, case by case, with supporting evidence from texts of a wide variety of genres. Beyond the 17th century Bułyka has little to say, contenting himself with a brief statement about the up-to-date situation and steering clear of any discussion of the 20th-century controversies associated with the creation of a standard literary language.

Bułyka's analysis of the ending of the genitive singular of masculine nouns shows quite clearly that the only inanimate nouns to have had the ending -а/-я consistently throughout the history of Byelorussian are the names of months. Though in the 13th and 14th centuries the use of the ending -y/-ю (from the old u-stem declension) was rare even in deeds and charters, the 15th and 16th centuries show the beginnings of a widespread increase in its use at the expense of -а/-я (e.g. in the *Vislicki statut*, translated from the Latin between 1423-34), and by the 16th century it was common even in some ecclesiastical texts. The further development of this feature can be seen in general terms as having taken place on a semantic basis, with -а/-я being reserved for animate nouns and concrete inanimates, -y/-ю for abstract nouns, substances and collectives. Reinforced by vernacular and dialect usage, this re-

mains the situation in modern Byelorussian, despite attempts at altering the balance in favour of -а/-я in the 1933 'reform' of the orthography.

Less satisfactory is Bułyka's treatment of the prepositional singular of masculine and neuter nouns where, although the different morphological origins of the variety of endings encountered in modern Byelorussian are clearly explained, Bułyka fails to demonstrate the influence of semantic considerations on the distribution of these endings. He also, in assigning the ending -y/-ю to (among others) nouns with a stem in r, x states, somewhat curiously, that this occurs 'if r, x do not alternate with з, с' (p. 44). Rather it is the fact that the ending -y is used by some nouns with a stem in r, x that renders palatalization unnecessary, since the change of r, x > з, с occurs only before the front vowel e (<ъ < оі).

For the instrumental singular of feminine a-stem nouns Karski in his time claimed (without offering any supporting evidence) that the shortened ending -ой/-ей was to be found in Byelorussian sources from as early as the 15th century. Bułyka quite properly rejects this claim, since he was unable to find a single example of the reduced ending in any Old Byelorussian text, but disappointingly fails to go on to show when and how it penetrated the written language.

In dealing with the plural Bułyka focusses most attention on the nominative and genitive cases. With the exception of the spread of the masculine nominative plural ending -ы/-и to neuter nouns, which is referred to but not traced, the changes in these endings are well-documented, particularly the all-conquering spread of the genitive plural ending -оў (<ъвъ, the original u-stem ending) and its variants -аў/-ёў/-яў. Looking at the evidence of both Old Byelorussian and the modern language, it is indeed difficult to resist the conclusion (though it is not one which Bułyka draws) that this ending is fast becoming a generalized genitive plural ending, to be used irrespective of gender. With the changes that have already taken place in the nominative and accusative cases and the generalization in the dative, instrumental and prepositional plural of the original a-stem endings, it is not impossible that a

situation could arise in which formal distinctions of gender in the plural of Byelorussian nouns would cease to exist. Such monolithicity is, of course, some way off as yet, though Bułyka himself seems to wish to hasten the process; for the instrumental plural he accords literary status to only one doublet in -ьмі/-ямі — дзецьмі/дзецямі (p. 85), regarding such forms as грудзьмі, расцьмі and людзьмі as colloquial deviations.

The sections on the Pronoun and the Adjective follow much the same pattern as that on the Noun and are equally well-documented, but leave some questions unanswered. Thus, for example, ample evidence is offered of the widespread use in Old Byelorussian of oblique case forms of the third person personal pronoun with prothetic н-, and its total absence in modern Byelorussian is noted, but no attempt is made to trace the development from one situation to the other. Equally, no information is provided on how the genitive forms of the third person personal pronoun acquired the function of an invariable possessive pronoun or on the challenge to these forms presented by the development of the adjectival pronouns ягоны, ейны and іхні. The unification of the masculine/neuter instrumental and prepositional singular endings of both pronouns and adjectives in the form -ым/-ім is explained solely in terms of the influence of the vernacular. While this may be part of the answer, some credit is surely also due to the influence of Polish. It would be interesting to know, for instance, whether there is any evidence to suggest that the spread of the original instrumental ending to the prepositional case was initially encountered, or particularly prevalent, in texts which show Polish rather than Church Slavonic influence.

The bulk of the section on the Numeral (written by Kramko) is concerned with tracing the historical development of the cardinals, with ordinals, collectives, fractions and indefinite numeral-words such as многа, колькі, шмат etc. meriting only a couple of pages each. It is interesting to discover (p. 183) that the differentiation of genders in the oblique cases of the numeral два/дзве dates only from the 17th century and that the contamination of the oblique case endings of the numerals 5-10 by those of

2, 3, 4 has a literary pedigree in Old Byelorussian, with such forms as *пятиохъ, седмихъ, десетьма* being recorded from the 16th century onwards (p. 188). (It was the widespread use of these latter forms in Byelorussian dialects, of course, which led Taraškievič to propose them as the literary norm in his *Bielaruskaja hrmatyka dla škol*, though this was later reversed.) One is surprised, however, in view of such syntactic combinations as *адні акуляры, адні сані etc.*, to encounter (p. 178) the statement that a feature of the numeral 1 is the absence of a plural form.

Žuraŭski's main contribution to *Historyčnaja marfalohija bielaruskaj movy* — the section on the Verb — is the best written and certainly the most complete in that he devotes rather more attention than do either Bulyka or Kramko to the developments in the 'new' Byelorussian literary language of the 19th and 20th centuries. A good example of this is his treatment of the new type of pluperfect consisting of 'past tense + past tense of *быць*' which, though strictly regarded as a non-literary form, is nevertheless to be encountered in the works of such modern writers as Čorny, Mielež and Piestrak and certainly has a more Byelorussian pedigree than the Russism 'past tense + *было*'.

First of all, however, Žuraŭski deals with the breakdown in Old Byelorussian of the complex system of past tenses and the emergence of a single past tense from the perfect via the loss of the auxiliary. The fate of the aorist, in particular, is dealt with at some length, including reference to such curiosities as the idiosyncratic contaminated forms of the feminine past tense combined with the aorist indicator *-x* in the first person singular to be found in Skaryna's biblical translations e.g. *Азь далахъ рабу мою до лона твоего* (p. 211). In discussing the development of the perfect from an analytical to a synthetic form (the new past tense) Žuraŭski inclines to the view that the change in the masculine ending from *л > љ* occurred under the influence of the past participle in *-въ* (which came to be pronounced *љ*), rather than by analogy with the change of *л > љ* internally in nouns and adjectives such as *воўк, шоўк, жоўты, тоўсты*

(the explanation offered by, among others, Šachmatov and Sobolevskij). Since the past tense masculine form is the only instance of *л > љ* in word final position (cf. nouns such as *вол, стол*), Žuraŭski does seem to have a point, though to buttress his argument by quoting (p. 237) the use of past participles in *-въ* in a similar predicative function to those in *-лъ* in Old Byelorussian is not entirely convincing; a similar phenomenon was widely encountered in Old Russian texts, especially of a bookish-ecclesiastical style heavily influenced by Church Slavonic, but there is no evidence to suggest that the participle in *-въ* was construed as a finite past tense form in the way that the participle in *-лъ* came to be.

A disappointment is that in discussing the changes in the tense system Žuraŭski makes very little reference to the role of aspect; in particular there is nothing at all on the morphology of aspect which had such a vital part to play in the creation, through prefixation and suffixation, of forms which were capable in a morphologically more economical way of conveying the range of meanings of the earlier complex system of tenses.

Economy may also be seen in the stabilization of the analytical form of the future tense. Whereas in Old Byelorussian it was originally constructed with the aid of a number of different auxiliaries in combination with the infinitive, this role was taken over by the future tense of the verb 'to be' and the analytical future became associated exclusively with imperfective verbs. This much is common, of course, to all three East Slavonic languages, but it occurred in Byelorussian rather earlier than in either Russian or Ukrainian, a fact which leads Žuraŭski to describe the Byelorussian linguistic territory of the 14th-15th centuries as the 'epicentre' of this development among the Eastern Slavs (p. 258). In Russian *буду* + infinitive was still rare as late as the 17th century; in Ukrainian its progress was hindered by a preference for the auxiliary *иму* which was later to combine with the infinitive in a synthetic form as a literary norm for the imperfective future alongside the analytical '*буду* + infinitive'. The early spread of *буду* as an auxiliary in Byelorussian may also owe something

to the influence of the West Slavonic languages, particularly Polish. Żuraŭski thinks this unlikely on the grounds that not only did *быць* start to become established in its role before the period of substantial Polish influence on Byelorussian but also manifested itself initially in the north-eastern dialects rather than the western dialects which were most susceptible to that influence. Nevertheless the existence of a comparable construction in Polish would at the very least have been a supporting factor in the rapid spread in the literary language of the auxiliary *быць* at the expense of the earlier alternatives.

The other topic to which Żuraŭski devotes considerable space is the evolution of the morphology of the imperative mood. In doing so he advances the proposition (pp. 274-5) that the distinctive forms of the first person plural are becoming obsolete in the literary language and being replaced by the corresponding forms of the indicative mood. Żuraŭski's argument is based on selective evidence from works of literature, to which elsewhere he is inclined to give little credence as indicators of changes in the norms of the standard language, generally regarding those variations that occur as deviations employed for stylistic purposes. If, however, his assessment is correct, Byelorussian will eventually align itself with Russian.

which has long since ceased to distinguish morphologically between the first person plural of the imperative and indicative moods, rather than (as at present) with Ukrainian.

Summing up, the Conclusion rightly points to the fact that Byelorussian has retained certain morphological features which in Russian have been replaced and suggests that in all its most important aspects the morphological structure of Byelorussian was established no later than the 16th century. In the further evolution of Byelorussian morphology the role of the vernacular and the dialects is stressed at the expense of the literary language; all credit for continuity between the old and the modern periods is given to the former and it is they which are seen as the foundation for the contemporary literary language.

One could have wished to see detailed treatment of the development of *akańnie* and *jakańnie* as morphological features; otherwise *Histaryčnaja marfatahija bielaruskaj movy* can fairly claim to be definitive. Given the complexity of its subject-matter, the book is excellently produced and fills a need long felt by the higher education audience at whom it is aimed. With a print run of only 1200 it is no doubt already unobtainable.

P. J. Mayo

Choroškevič, A. L., comp. *Polockije gramoty XIII - načala XVI vv.* 2 vols. Moscow, 1977-8. 226, 217 pp.

Two volumes, reproduced (sometimes not very well) from typewriting on poor-quality paper, in an edition of 250 copies; this first superficial impression changes, on even a quick perusal, to admiration for what must be the most outstanding publication of documents relating to Byelorussian history for many years. It is all too easy to belittle Soviet standards of book production. Is it really better to hope for collections of documents to be set up in type in the knowledge that the price would be so prohibitive that few publishers would undertake publication anyway? Or should histo-

rians be satisfied with a book in the hand, whatever it actually looks like, in which the documents can be read and used? Moreover the appearance of these two volumes belies the care behind the typing, in several languages, not only of the documents themselves but of complex annotations as well.

The compiler has brought together 325 documents relating to Połack between the 13th and the beginning of the 16th centuries; 110 of these documents are here published for the first time. More than half of the total number of documents are repro-

duced from originals; some 40% are taken from later copies, e.g. the earliest, the treaty of 1263 between the Lithuanian prince Gerden, the Master of the Livonian Order, and the cities of Riga, Połack and Viciebsk, is given in an early 15th-century version. There are three forgeries from the 15th-17th centuries, purportedly relating to the 14th-15th centuries.

The documents included in the collection relate to all aspects of the history of Połack and its surrounding territory. They are written in Byelorussian, German (mostly low German), Latin and Polish; those in the last three languages have been translated into modern Russian for this collection. In those cases where the translation is contemporary with the original, this is made clear in the notes. Valuable information is provided in the introduction about the archival sources from which the documents were taken. The former municipal archive of Riga is particularly important in that it provided 135 of the 172 originals reproduced in the collection. Not surprisingly, therefore, documents dealing with the international relations of Połack and its surrounding territory dominate; this can readily be seen from the summary analysis of the different types of document in the collection on p. 23 of vol. 1. We are indeed fortunate that so much pioneering work was done on the description of Połack documents in the Riga archives in the 19th century, especially by Hildebrand and Schwarz. By 1898 500 of the 800 documents in the 'Moscovitica-Rutenica' section of the archive had been described and annotated. Their work, and the work of later scholars such as von Bulmerincq and L. Arbuzov sen., ensured that the documents would have a good chance of survival. It is interesting that A. A. Šachmatov should have entrusted Branistaŭ Taraškievič, at that time a 22-year-old student of his at St. Petersburg University, with the job of copying documents in the Riga collection. Taraškievič apparently copied 250 documents, of which 130 related to the period before 1461, and Šachmatov put forward a

plan for publication to the Archaeographical Commission. Unfortunately nothing came of the plan and Taraškievič's work seems to have been lost. Here is a noteworthy addition to the scant details on Taraškievič's student career in Aleksandra Bergman's biography *Rzecz o Bronisławie Taraszkiewiczzu*, Warsaw, 1977.

Documents relating to the internal history have not been so lucky. The largest collection of such documents is contained in the *Litoŭskaja metryka*. As Choroškevič points out, the *metryka* was not subjected to special study as a source of historical material until the publication of N. G. Berezkov's *Litovskaja metrika kak istoričeskij istočnik*, I, Moscow-Leningrad, 1946. Other documents on internal history come from the archives of municipal and church offices, and from private collections. Very few of these latter survive, and many monastic archives were destroyed in the change-over from Orthodox to Uniate or Catholic. (It would only be fair to add that Uniate archives were in turn destroyed in the change-back to Orthodoxy. The whole sorry story is amply set out in A. Kałubovič, *Mova ŭ historyi bielaruskaha pišmienstva*, vol. 1, Munich/London, 1974-5; vol. 2, Cleveland (USA), 1978.)

Historians now have at their disposal a unique collection of documents dealing with the economic and political history of Połack from the time of its absorption into the Grand Duchy of Lithuania to the period of economic decline at the beginning of the 16th century. We are indeed lucky that all the technical problems were overcome to allow these volumes to be produced, and that one set of the 250 published has found its way to the Skaryna Library. N. N. Ulaščik's *Očerki po archeografii i istočnikovedeniju istoriji Belorusi feodal'nogo perioda*, Moscow, 1973, as it were, drew the map of the area to be covered. Choroškevič's collection fills in some of the detail. Thanks should go to her and to Ms N. I. Kirsanova who did most of the typing.

J. Dingley



Rahojša, V. P. *Paetyčny sloŭnik*. 'Vyšejšaja škola', Minsk, 1979. 320 pp. Index.

V. P. Rahojša's *Poetic Dictionary* is an ambitious and original project well realized. The author's previous works include *Paetyka Maksima Tanki* (1968), *Pieraklaŭ Jakub Kolas* (1972) and a popularizing book on versification intended for schoolteachers *Hutarki pra vierš. Mietryka. Rytmika. Fonika* (1979), but the Dictionary is undoubtedly a work of more lasting value and significance than any of these, and fills a need long felt by all with a close interest in the history and theory of verse.

Byelorussian lexicography has made great albeit belated strides in recent years with the five-volume defining dictionary near completion, and the dictionary of Skaryna's language, the long-awaited etymological dictionary, and a major dictionary of north-west Byelorussian dialects all well under way. Rahojša's *Poetic Dictionary* differs from these, as, indeed, it does from such 'predecessors' as Makarevič's *Karotki litaraturaznaučy sloŭnik* (1963, 2nd ed. 1969) or A. Kvjatkovskij's *Poetičeskij slovar'* (Moscow, 1966), in both concept and execution, for one of the author's aims has been to show the achievements to date of Byelorussian poetry, and to open some new vistas, as well as providing reference definitions of words relating to poetics and prosody. To this end he has taken the bold step of abandoning alphabetical arrangement in favour of thematic ordering, dividing the book into seven chapters, each introduced by the major topics which give the chapters their titles, followed by shorter articles on more detailed subjects, the latter arranged alphabetically.

The titles of the chapters give an overall picture of the Dictionary's contents: 1. General questions (literary type, lyrics, poetry, poet, content and form, poetic image, poetics, prosody); 2. Poetic vocabulary, Tropes; 3. Metrics, Rhythm; 4. Intonation, Poetic

syntax; 5. Sound (*fonika*), Rhyme; 6. Composition, Strophics; and 7. Poetic genres, Verse types. Problems of classification are inevitable and insoluble, but a subject index at the end facilitates access to particular items. In view of the richness of the illustrative material an index of names and, still more luxurious, of titles would have further enhanced the Dictionary's already great value as a reference tool.

Rahojša's work, is, in fact, far more than a simple work of reference, for the articles are comprehensively illustrated with examples from Byelorussian poetry, occasionally supplemented from Russian and other sources, and it is good to see (compared, for instance, with Kvjatkovskij) so much use made of the work of Byelorussia's talented younger poets. This, combined with the author's lightly worn erudition and customary fluency of style, make the *Poetic Dictionary* a fascinating book in its own right. Not surprisingly, perhaps, some of the statements and choices of example are, to say the least, debatable: for instance, under 'Paezija' we are told that 'Contemporary Byelorussian poets (P. Brouka, P. Pančanka, M. Tank and others) are making an important contribution to the development of all Soviet and European poetry' (p. 11). None the less the lexicographer, anthologizer and compiler can never aspire to accommodate all tastes, and on the whole Rahojša's *Poetic Dictionary* gives a very full and impressive picture of the high achievements and richness of Byelorussian verse, itself contributing to the welcome accompanying growth in the study of Byelorussian poetics and prosody inaugurated by the late I. D. Ralko and M. M. Hrynčyk. No serious student of Byelorussian verse will want to be without a copy.

Arnold McMillin

Zmuidzinas, J. *Commonwealth polono-lithuanien ou l'Union de Lublin (1569)*. Mouton, 1978. 272 pages.

When the terms 'Athens of the North', 'Florence of the North', 'Venice'

and 'Mecca' are used to refer to the same city, Vilnius is not among the

first cities which would leap to the mind of the average layman. This is but one of the surprises in this provocative, Lithuanocentric book. Others include the statements that Mickiewicz, Skaryna and Ivan Fedorov were Lithuanians, that the revolts of 1830-1 and 1863 were Lithuanian revolts, that Hrodna is really called Gardinas, and that the partitions of Poland were partitions of Lithuania. There is, of course, some justification for these claims, but the author, throughout the book, is inclined to blur the distinction between ethnic, Lithuanian-speaking Lithuania and the Grand Duchy of Lithuania as a whole. The antiquity of the texts, grammar and morphology of the Lithuanian language is well known, but the emphasis given to it in this book seems less than wholly relevant given that, almost without exception, the documents quoted are in Latin or Byelorussian (which the author insists on calling Lithuano-Ruthenian). We are told that every effort was made to ensure the use of Lithuanian in churches, and that a condition of Casimir's election to Grand Duke in 1440 was that he learn Lithuanian. The layman may wonder whether he bothered to learn any more Lithuanian than the Prince of Wales has Welsh.

As Professor Joad might have said, it all depends what you mean by Lithuania. For that matter it all depends, in this book, what you mean by 'Union', 'Commonwealth', 'Privilege', 'Charter', 'Act', 'Prince', 'Duke' and 'Grand Duke', to name but a few. The author picks his way gingerly and somewhat unconvincingly through this terminological maze, relying heavily on and quoting copiously from a mass of secondary sources, not to mention secondary sources quoting other secondary sources.

The book is divided into three parts. The first traces, with admirable clarity, the course of Lithuano-Polish relations between 1325 and 1569, but also includes a sixty-page section claiming primacy for Lithuania in such varied fields as opera, printing and jurisprudence. The second part is devoted to a phase by phase survey of the negotiations of 1569 and contains the best writing in the book. Not only are the short chapters easy to digest, but the locations and people come, all too briefly, to life. The third part of the book examines how the Union worked, or failed to work in practice.

The author's intention is clear from the outset. It is to refute the Polish-inspired view which claims that 1569 marked the end of Lithuanian independence. He maintains that the Lithuanians outmanoeuvred the Poles and, unlike the Hungarians between 1867 and 1918, succeeded in remaining a fully independent, internationally recognised nation-state.

The book contains a number of irritating misprints, particularly of dates: 1978 for 1878 (p. 148), 1773 and 1775 for 1793 and 1795 (p. 169). Foreign (in this context non-French) words are also rendered inaccurately. For example 'Old Church Slavonic' is misspelled in both English and German. The book does contain a useful list of Lithuanian rulers, although the reader may have trouble recognizing the patently Polish Sigismund Augustus in spurious Franco-Lithuanian disguise as Zygmantas Auguste.

Perhaps the map which ends the book is an apt comment on the work as a whole: on it both Poland and Lithuania are coloured the same shade of grey.

*Michael Pursglove*