

Reviews

Biryła, M.V. and Suprun, A.Ja., eds. *Pytańni bilinhvizmu i ūzajemadziejańnia moŭ. 'Navuka i technika'*, Minsk, 1982. 253 pp.

Of all the union republics the BSSR has the highest proportion of non-Russians (62.1% according to the 1970 census) who claim Russian either as their native language or as a second language; indeed, it is asserted that for many Byelorussians Russian is a second 'native' language. From a Soviet point of view there are obvious advantages in this situation, since it helps to reinforce Russian's understandably dominant position among the languages of the USSR, a position which the foreword to the volume under review attributes to a 'deep respect for the Russian people and a genuine desire for access to the achievements of world culture, including Russian culture'. Be that as it may, bilingualism which involves two languages as closely related as Byelorussian and Russian inevitably brings difficulties along with its advantages. The very similarity of the two languages, while it self-evidently facilitates the acquisition of Russian by a Byelorussian and vice versa, leads to a high level of interference, in either direction, in phonetics and morphology no less than in lexis and semantics. Such interference — the word is used here in its linguistic rather than its political sense — inhibits the attainment of what is referred to in the foreword to this volume as 'symmetrical bilingualism' i.e. the ability to use one or other language as necessary without difficulty and without mistakes. It is to this problem that the collection of articles is primarily addressed.

The nine articles are: E.R. Sabalenka, 'Nacyjanalny skład nasielnictva Bielarusi' (pp.6-17); A.I. Źuraŭski, 'Dvuchmoŭje i šmatmoŭje ū historii Bielarusi' (pp. 18-49); A. Ja. Michnievič, 'Funkcyi movy i maŭleńnia i problemy bielaruska-ruskaha dvuchmoŭja' (pp.50-75); A. Ja. Suprun, H.P. Klimienka, 'Niekatoryja psihalinhvistyčnyja asablivašci bielaruska-ruskaha dvuchmoŭja' (pp.76-105); P.P. Šuba, 'Mižmoŭnaja bielaruska-ruskaja amanimija i paranimija' (pp.106-31); A.I. Pađužny,

'Bijałahičnyja i sacyjalnyja ašpiekty hukavoha řadu movy' (pp.132-142); Ł.C. Vyhonnaja, 'Prablema indyvidualnaha ū sacyjafanietycy' (pp.143-75); P.V. Sadoŭski, 'Z'javy fanietyčnaj interfierencyi va ūmovach bielaruska-ruskaha bilinhvizmu' (pp.176-228); A.F. Manajenkava, 'Ab niekatorych špiecyfičnych z'javach ruska-bielaruskich moŭnych kontaktaŭ u halinie leksiki i siemantyki' (pp.229-62).

Sabalenka's article is a straightforward, factual account of the ethnic composition of the population of the BSSR which is presumably intended to serve as a background for the articles which follow. According to the 1979 census Byelorussians comprised 79.1% of the population, followed by Russians (11.9%), Poles (4.2%), Ukrainians (2.4%). The most mixed population is found in the Hrodna region, where nearly a quarter of the population is Polish; the least mixed in the Minsk region. Russians are found predominantly in the towns, Poles in the countryside. In comparing the ethnic mix over the course of the 20th century the author notes — without comment — the substantial decline in the Jewish population from 13.7% in 1897 to 1.4% in 1979. Źuraŭski's article, likewise, is not concerned with a 'problem' of contemporary bilingualism. It is in the nature of a scholarly, but familiar and uncontentious survey of the history of bilingualism and multilingualism in Byelorussia, in which a considerable amount of attention is devoted to the place of the Byelorussian and Polish languages within the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. Źuraŭski's conclusion is that for Byelorussia the *šmatmoŭje* of previous centuries has given way in modern times to a characteristic Byelorussian-Russian *dvuchmoŭje*.

The articles by both Michnievič and Suprun and Klimienka are mainly concerned with questions of theory, the former being — to this reviewer at least — somewhat impenetrable. Michnievič attempts to draw rather theoretical distinctions

between *mova* and *maŭleńnie*, distinctions which may well be very interesting from a purely theoretical point of view but which do not appear to tell us anything very useful about a given language or — since this is the point of the collection of articles under review — bilingualism. Indeed, it is only towards the end of Michnievič's article that much reference is made to bilingualism, and then what is said makes depressingly familiar reading. Though it is acknowledged that Byelorussian is still used in all spheres of life, Michnievič goes on to add that account must be taken of the role of Russian as 'the language of a great fraternal nation, the language of relations between both nationalities and nations, i.e. a language with specific functions *peculiar to it alone*' (my italics — *PJM*). This sad reflection on the status of Byelorussian in present-day Byelorussia is unfortunately backed up by a table which purports to show that among 28 linguistic situations involving public utterance only in three — funeral orations, formal speeches at table, and oral recounting of everyday events — is Byelorussian used as often as Russian. The bulk of the article by Suprun and Klimienka is taken up with a discussion on what exactly constitutes linguistic interference (attention is paid to the theories of Weinreich, Leont'ev, Osgood and Erwin et al.) and the authors conclude that there is a need for greater terminological exactitude in defining interference from a psychological point of view. With no doubt unintended irony, given the highly theoretical nature of their article, they then add that at the same time the most important thing, particularly in the context of Byelorussia, is to define more precisely the 'actually existing phenomena connected with bilingualism'.

Perhaps the most interesting — and certainly the most factually informative — article in the collection is Šuba's analysis of interlingual homonymy and paronymy, which includes a useful comparative-synchronic classification of the c.500 pairs of Byelorussian and Russian words which can be seen as interlingual homonyms. Šuba uses this term to define 1) words of common East Slavonic/Slavonic/Indo-European origin whose meanings in the two languages have diverged to such an extent that the connection between them is not always readily made (e.g. бич); 2) the coincidence of what is a loan-word in one language with a native word in the other (e.g. вейка); 3) homonyms which have arisen

through a phonetic or grammatical change in one of the two languages (e.g. уезд). His terminology, however, sometimes lacks precision. Thus, he does not always distinguish sufficiently clearly between homonyms and paronyms, including under the latter heading some pairs which, by conventional definition, belong under the former and vice versa. Furthermore, Šuba's definition of what constitutes an interlingual homonym is sufficiently broad to include *faux amis* in which the bilingual speaker of Byelorussian and Russian has, in effect, to make a mental phonetic or grammatical adjustment in order to perceive two similar forms as being homonymous, i.e. his definition includes pairs such as BR рэч — R речь, BR калёсы — R колёса which are neither homophones nor homomorphs. Such criticisms notwithstanding, Šuba's article (unlike some others in this collection) does at least serve a useful function in drawing attention to practical examples of potential confusion for bilingual speakers of Byelorussian and Russian.

Of the remaining articles in the collection those by Pađužny (on biological and social aspects of a language's sound system) and Vyhonnaja (on the question of the individual in sociophonetics) seem to have only marginal relevance to bilingualism — the latter, in particular, is concerned almost entirely with individual variations in stress and pronunciation within one language; while the article by Manajenkava is confined to a rather narrow area — the influence of Byelorussian on the language of native Russian settlers in the Vietka region. The article by Sadoŭski describes, in some detail, the results of a number of experiments conducted with a variety of groups of Byelorussian-Russian bilinguals (differing as to place of abode, age, sex, education etc.) in an attempt to assess the interference of Byelorussian phonetics in their spoken Russian. The problems encountered are the expected ones (e.g. the pronunciation of Russian ч', п', г as Byelorussian ч, п, г, a tendency to pronounce unstressed vowels in keeping with native norms) and Sadoŭski reaches no startling, or even unexpected, conclusions.

All in all, a somehow disappointing book, typical of many of the *zbornik* type, in that it seems unable to make up its mind as to whether to concern itself with abstract, theoretical questions or the more concrete, practical phenomena of bilingualism in the context of Soviet Byelorussia.

Peter Mayo

Grimsted, Patricia Kennedy. *Archives and Manuscript Repositories in the USSR: Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, and Belorussia*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, New Jersey, 1981. 929 pp. Indexes.

Professor Grimsted's earlier monumental volume on Soviet archives was devoted to the metropolitan Russian area, and has brought her gratitude from all Western scholars with a serious interest in research: *Archives and Manuscript Repositories in the USSR: Moscow and Leningrad* (Princeton, 1972), with a first supplement, *Bibliographical Addenda* (Zug, Switzerland, 1976). The present volume, which also fills a real need, must have demanded even greater resourcefulness, for the area it covers is, of course, one whose history has ever been cast in a maelstrom of conquest and reconquest, contraction and expansion. The continuing absence of a satisfactory history of Byelorussia, for example, serves as an illustration of the basic difficulties the author of this magnificent volume has had to overcome, and one can only admire the professional sang-froid with which she outlines the shifting fortunes of this contention-ridden area.

The method employed will be familiar to users of the first volume of this remarkable series, and the numeration of the major sections does indeed follow on from it. After a brief introduction, Part H, entitled 'General Archival Bibliography and Reference Aids for Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, and Belorussia', provides a mine of background information, whilst Parts I-L are concerned with each of the four countries in turn. The parts all follow the same pattern: a carefully researched and cross-referenced historical survey is followed by a descriptive catalogue of bibliographies of archival literature, institutional directories, surveys of sources for specialized topics, serials related to archives, bibliographies of published sources, reports of congresses and symposia, studies of archival history, and reports on archival research; then comes a directory of archives and manuscript repositories ranging from major col-

lections to small institutions happening to hold archival material.

The Appendices to Parts I-L are remarkably comprehensive, offering an invaluable guide to such topics as archival organization, access, and working conditions; tables of geographical names (an immensely complex topic in this region); charts and maps of administrative-territorial divisions from medieval times to 1978; and finally, a glossary of archival terms with their Russian equivalents. The volume is completed by Part M, a preliminary bibliography of archival material now held in collections outside the Soviet Union. Here too the service to Western scholars is immense though, as the sectional title implies, there is bound to be a supplement in time.

In the case of Byelorussia, of course, the Francis Skaryna Library holds the outstanding Western collection, and here one is reminded of the essentially preliminary nature of Professor Grimsted's guide, in which she records little more than the Library's address, the brochure of Guy Picarda (1971) and Alexander Nadson's descriptive article in *Solanus* (1974). The 1981 brochure produced to commemorate the Library's first decade was too late to be included here, but would have given a fuller picture of its now very considerable archive holdings, including the manuscripts and marginalia of Kupała and Kołas described in the previous issue of the *JBS*.

Prof. Grimsted has done much to ease the task of those who would do archival research in the Soviet Union. That her account of Western holdings is more skeletal simply reflects the priorities of her task — and, arguably, the priorities of need, for her readers will naturally find it easier to establish contact and obtain information,

preliminary and detailed alike, from holdings in the West.

The author is to be warmly congratulated on a remarkable achievement; future volumes in the series, and, indeed, supple-

ments to Western collections will be awaited with impatience.

Arnold McMillin

Husoŭski, Mikola. *Pieśnia pra zubra na tacinskaj, bielaruskaj, ruskaj movach*. Trans. by Jazep Siemiażon and Ja. I. Poreckij. Ed. and annot. by Viktar Daraškiewič. 'Mastackaja litaratura', Minsk, 1980. 192 pp. Illustrations. Bibliography.

Novaja ziamla and *Symon-muzyka* represent the magnificent twin apogee of a long epic tradition in Byelorussian literature; a tradition whose history remains to be written and whose outlines are to this day but dimly perceived. Popular 19th-century burlesques like *Enieida navyvarat* and *Taras na Parnasie* have been successful in their own right as distorted reflections of a not necessarily native epic tradition, and a century later exuberant political effusions like Čarot's *Čyrvanakryty viaščun* and *Bosyja na vohniščach* represent a hardly less burlesque version of the genre (epics of the Stalin period such as Kolas' *Rybakova chata* and Kupała's *Tarasova dola* are perhaps best forgotten). But the roots of this tradition, like so much else in our knowledge of Byelorussian literature, remain obscure. The country's troubled socio-political history, ever marked by shifting boundaries and disputed identity, with until recent times Pole and Russian alike asserting political and cultural domination, has meant that much of medieval Byelorussian literature remains unrecognized as such. On the positive side, however, this also means that exciting new discoveries can be and, indeed, are being made from time to time, calling for radical reinterpretation of received views on the country's development. One major discovery, or rather rediscovery, of this kind is of the magnificent Latin epic *Pieśnia pra zubra* (*Carmen de statura, feritate ac venatione Bisontis*, 1523) by Mikola Husoŭski

(Nikolaus Hussoviensis) (b. 1470-80, d. after 1533).

Husoŭski, so far as is known from external sources or can be deduced from internal evidence, was the son of a hunter employed by one of the Princes of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, and extensive detailed knowledge of the flora, fauna, and customs of his native land finds rich reflection in the poem, which like Mickiewicz's *Pan Tadeusz* (a work to which it has been compared) is as broad in scope and national significance as its ostensible theme is narrow. Husoŭski's literary activities appear to have been first inspired by his close friend and patron Erasmus Vitellius, a secretary in the Chancery of the Grand Duchy, and a highly cultured man with a keen interest in his native literature. Vitellius travelled widely as a state emissary, and on the third of his official visits to the Vatican (1518-22) he was accompanied by Husoŭski, to whom it fell to write a poem about boar hunting for Pope Leo X, himself an amateur of poetry and hunting. *Pieśnia pra zubra*, undoubtedly the most outstanding example of 16th-century Byelorussian Latin literature, was written in 1522 and first published in Cracow in the following year. There followed several more 16th-century editions, and then neglect until 1855 when the Cracow 1523 edition was republished in St Petersburg. In the 1960s Husoŭski's poem was brought to the attention of a wider

audience by first a Lithuanian translation and a little later Byelorussian and Russian versions by Jazep Siemiażon and Ja. I. Poreckij. The latter are now brought together with the original in a handsome trilingual jubilee edition, adorned with attractive woodcut illustrations by Jaühien Kulik, and completed by an Afterword, Commentary and Bibliography compiled by the volume's editor, Viktor Daraškiewić.

Whatever reservations one may have about the quality of the translations, this volume is most welcome for the attention it draws to a major monument of medieval culture. Written in somewhat Ovidian elegiac couplets, *Pieśnia pra zubra* is imbued with great lyricism as well as heroic pathos, breadth of vision together with a close eye for detail, and some elements of humour alongside a pervading sense of tragedy at the contemporary weakness and ineffectiveness of the Grand Duchy, embodied in the bison itself. The poem's syntax reflects in part the influence of Husoŭski's vernacular, but there is nothing crude or halting in his magnificent command of vocabulary and imagery. Much of this is caught in Jazep Siemiażon's Byelorussian translation, a gifted piece of work which, however, contains so many anachronisms as to prompt comparisons with *Ben Hur* as a portrait of ancient Rome, or perhaps Stokowski's romantic renditions of Bach as authentic baroque (Poreckij's Russian version is much more faithful). The Byelorussian translator has been severely taken to task for these 'mistakes' in the Soviet press: amongst others Piotr Sadoŭski ('Kulturna-moŭnyja pytańni biełaruskaha pierakładu', *Poływia*, 1981, no. 7, pp. 178-98, especially pp. 183-7) excoriates Siemiażon for the modern, 'democratic', almost

anti-clerical views which he imputes to Husoŭski and his work (*Pieśnia pra zubra* was, after all, a papal commission). These lapses are, indeed, annoyingly inappropriate, but, as with Hollywood and Stokowski, they reflect a different ethos rather than simple inability to maintain a shared cultural standard.

Whatever its shortcomings, this version of Husoŭski's *magnum opus* often reads like original poetry and should open many readers' eyes to the richness of Byelorussian cultural achievement. It is now to be hoped that Siemiażon will turn to Husoŭski's other Latin poetry. Some of his major works have already appeared in Russian versions by Poreckij, and certainly deserve to be put into Byelorussian. Outstanding among them are Husoŭski's poetic *vita* of St Hyacinthus (1525), his outraged poetic reaction to the pagan excesses witnessed during the Italian plague of 1522, 'On the Sacrifice of a Black Bull', an exquisite Sapphic verse to St Sebastian, and a heroic epic entitled *A New and Glorious Victory over the Turks in the Month of July* (1524).

The chances are small of a new masterpiece by Shakespeare coming to light in the 20th century, but the rich mine of Byelorussia's cultural heritage is far from being exhausted, and exciting products will continue to emerge from time to time. Thus, just as the recently discovered *Lament* on the death of Laoncij Karpovič (1620) threw exciting new light on the level of literary culture in 17th-century Byelorussia, so *Pieśnia pra zubra* stands out as a milestone in the history of the previous century. In such a handsome presentation to me it should win many new friends.

Arnold McMillin

The Images Swarm Free. A Bi-lingual Selection of Poetry by Maksim Bahdanovič, Aleś Harun and Žmitrok Biadula. Translated by Vera Rich. Edited with an Introduction by Arnold McMillin. The Anglo-Byelorussian Society, London, 1982. 135 pp.

For these poets their mother tongue, *rod-naja mova*, was an inspiration. Using it they became truly themselves, at home in a living community, sure of their utterance. When Bahdanovič, Harun and Biadula were writing the poems in this book, all of which date from the first quarter of the 20th century, the Byelorussian village still retained most of its immemorial features. Their poetry could draw upon the energies of an oral tradition. The writer in no way condescended to the language and beliefs of the common people: these were the means to his own enlargement. Bahdanovič possessed a wide European culture. He translated poems by Verlaine and Heine; he took his epigraphs from Boileau, St-Beuve, Rimbaud; he even experimented with Japanese and Persian forms. By the age of five, as Arnold McMillin relates in an excellent introduction, Harun could read Polish and Russian. Biadula began with Hebrew verse prayers on models some two or three hundred years earlier; for writing poetry he was expelled from his Talmudic school. All three found in Byelorussian the necessary idiom for an art that should be fully alive and their own.

Biadula in his fine poem *Prysiaha* (Oath of Allegiance), which fittingly closes the collection, pledged his countrymen to honour their mother tongue, the treasure they had: 'Skarb bahaty, što my majem'. Harun in the equally fine *Pieśnia-zvon* (Song-Bell) figures it as a great bell of gold and silver thundering on. Each dedicated poetry to the defence of the Byelorussian people in their want and misery. For Bahdanovič too, as *Letapisiec* (The Chronicler), *Pahonia* (The Pahonia) and *Emihrackaja pieśnia* (Emigrants' Song) variously attest, the situation of Byelorussia demanded a similar national and civic note. In the 1890s Yeats complained of the movement

Young Ireland that it wanted 'a nation unified by political doctrine alone, a subservient art and letters aiding and abetting'. The poetry approved by Young Ireland was trite, alien to the national genius and without character. In Byelorussia during the period of *Naša niva* the poets knew where their priorities should be. Bahdanovič died shortly after the February Revolution of 1917, Harun — by then a supporter of Pilsudski against Soviet Russia — in 1920. Only Biadula, living another two decades, allowed his poetry and prose fiction at times to 'aid and abet' a political doctrine.

Readers who like myself have to work at these poets with frequent recourse to the translations, and with Dal' at their elbow for interest, will soon appreciate the flexibility of Byelorussian verse, as revealed in its distinctive accents. When one discerns in Bahdanovič's *U wioscy* (In the Village) the structural patterning of Russian classical verse, or in his lyric *Pa-nad bietym pucham višniaŭ* . . . (Above the white down of the cherries . . .) the presence of Fet, there may come to mind the old tag describing Crabbe as 'Pope in worsted stockings'. This would appear to range Crabbe beside country craftsmen who imitated Chippendale. The analogy does not hold for these poets. Bahdanovič was set on enriching Byelorussian verse with the movement and sensibility of Russian romantic or symbolist poets, and with the verse forms of French tradition (triolet, rondeaux). But his importations cease to be foreign. The triole for example in late 19th-century English verse is most often an archly affected form, drifting inexorably to light verse and the pages of *Punch*. When Bahdanovič employs it for his elegy on the poet Pajuhan, the result is not in the least artificial. The little poem reads like a

genuine accession to Byelorussian song. So too with Harun and Biadula: their technical skill is rooted in a tradition where the people itself, as Harun claims in *Ludziam* (To People), is naturally poetic: 'Dzie sam narod — pieśniar'.

Poetry addressed to an audience with its own rural culture does not go easily into English today. Since Hardy such forms as the ballad (still sung in his youth) no longer seem natural. A poet at ease in Lowland Scots would probably have less trouble in catching the tone of Byelorussian, though his vocabulary might need more explication than Byelorussian does. Vera Rich is highly regarded for her service to Byelorussian poetry. Without her anthology *Like Water, Like Fire* ignorance of its wealth would be almost insuperable in this country. She breaks new ground with the present volume. Harun had not been represented at all in the former collection; only five of the poems here by Bahdanovič and two of those by Biadula were included. Her method is to preserve as closely as possible metrical form and rhyme-scheme. This procedure has some familiar drawbacks, but a good case can be made for adopting it in a selection where the element of song so much prevails. Only a poet with Pound's infallible ear could find an equivalent for these poems in his style of translation, which works out from the dynamic tension and the weight of each individual phrase.

Vera Rich's conspicuous merit is fidelity to the sense, even though considerations of form have to be overriding. She is uncon-

monly dependable. Sometimes, however, it becomes difficult to avoid wordiness — the metre must be filled out. We have to accept for 'jak laty' the cumbrous 'like old rags, dull and frowsty'; 'šaptannie/I zvon ručaja' spreads out into 'the soft murmured calling/Of the stream running clear'; 'Ty piešnia, nie maŭčy' becomes 'O you song, sink not to voiceless quiet', the last word in uneasy assonance with 'night'. Verisimilitude can be damaged by the exactions of rhyme. 'Bo moj pryhon hŭytaje čas' rings oddly as 'time eats my impetus', and what peasant girl would speak of 'a heifer as my dot'? Now and again uncertainty of tone seems to result from the difficulty of imitating form. Bahdanovič's *Hutarka z panienkami* is a slight piece, but it combines grace with colloquial vigour; 'Conversation with Young Ladies' relegates it to a Victorian keepsake. And finally there are lines in *Letapisiec* which have a straggling movement such as 'Copying the whole from an ancient parchment, from first word to the last, of Mahiloŭ and what passed there'. Bahdanovič uses Alexandrines for this poem.

I should not wish to end in a carping tone. *The Images Swarm Free* is a well-constructed anthology presenting three poets of high and varied accomplishment. Their translator has not failed them: much of the force and colour of the original comes through. The versions lead to a surer recognition of what their language could give these poets, and what they gave in return.

Henry Gifford

Jankova, T.S., comp. *Dyjalektny sloŭnik Łojeŭščyny*. 'Navuka i technika', Minsk, 1982. 432 pp.

Further evidence of the revival in the fortunes of Byelorussian lexicography over the last two decades is provided by the

publication (in an edition of 1200) of this dictionary of the dialect spoken by the rural population living on both sides of the

Dnieper in the Łojeŭ area of the Homiel district. Genetically a member of the Palešsie group of dialects, the Łojeŭ dialect occupies a transitional position: to the north it borders with various Homiel dialects, to the east with those of the Černihiv district of the Ukraine. Its geographical location at the junction of several dialect groups gives it a considerable degree of variety, and the dictionary includes lexis not only of the Łojeŭ dialect proper but also of contiguous dialects. Indeed the Łojeŭ dialect itself is not uniform and may be subdivided into the speech of three different groups: native inhabitants of the area, immigrants from the Minsk and Mahilou districts, and immigrants from the Černihiv district.

Among the most characteristic phonetic features of the Łojeŭ dialect are: the presence (in addition to the standard monophthongs of Byelorussian) of a number of diphthongs e.g. вуол for standard BR вол, куоць for конь; the absence in certain instances of the change of e to ě under stress e.g. авец, уце for standard авћц, уцћ; etymological ы becomes у after labial consonants and the labiodental в e.g. бук, муш, ву- (prefix) for standard бук, мыш, вы-; assimilative *okanĭie* in the immediate pretonic syllable, thus столћм alongside сталћ, ногћй alongside нарћ; the absence of *dziekannĭe* (though *ciekannĭe* is present) e.g. дћтка, дћўка, прыдћце for standard дзћтка, дзеўка, прыдзћце.

In the morphology the Łojeŭ dialect, in

common with other southern Byelorussian dialects, retains relics of the dual number in feminine and neuter nouns after the numeral 2. It also preserves, under stress, the original dative and prepositional plural endings of o-stem nouns (e.g. к пастухћм, на двћрћх) and shows a more widespread use of the vocative case than standard Byelorussian, with such forms as Танћ, Кацћ, чалавћча. Łojeŭ's position on the border with the Ukrainian SSR is responsible for certain features which it shares with standard Ukrainian, among them the accusative plural = nominative plural for nouns denoting animals as well as inanimate nouns, and the attributive use of the short form of the adjective.

The lexical content of the dictionary is based on material gathered by the compiler over the period 1960-80. It is contrasted in each instance with the standard Byelorussian form, such differentiation being of a phonematic (e.g. вћсокі for высокі), accentological (e.g. холћсты for халасты), morphological (e.g. па-наські for па-нашаму), semantic (e.g. цћкавы in the sense of акуратны) or stylistic (e.g. бабка with the meaning of павћтуха) nature. Apart from a short introduction the dictionary consists entirely of around 7,000 entries ordered alphabetically and each containing (in addition to the standard Byelorussian equivalent) examples of usage with an indication of the particular village(s) of the Łojeŭ area in which the given form was recorded.

Peter Mayo

Jaško, D., ed. *Himny chryścĭjan. Christian Hymns in Byelorussian*. Byelorussian Evangelical Baptist Fraternity in the USA and Canada, Cranesville Pa., 1979. xii + 336 pp. Notes.

The Evangelical tradition in the field of Church music has been a part of Byelorussian cultural life since the 16th century. In-

deed, the first collection of music ever to be printed in Byelorussia, albeit in the Polish language, was a Protestant hymnal:

Kancyonal (Niašviž, 1563). Since the beginning of the present century, some five collections of Evangelical hymns in Byelorussian have been published, in particular by the Methodists, the best-known of which has hitherto been *Lira Božaha* (Vilna, 1930), comprising some 152 hymns.

Himny chryścijan appears as a timely reminder of the vigour of the Protestant movement in Byelorussia, which has achieved success largely due to its dedicated use of the vernacular. The collection was published in the United States by a small group of North American Baptists, who in 1973 met together in a farmhouse in Pennsylvania. They established a Byelorussian Evangelical-Baptist Confraternity 'to spread the word of God among the Byelorussian people'. Among their objects was the publication of a hymnal with notes, under the editorship of Daniel Jaško, a well-known preacher who had begun translating hymns into Byelorussian as early as 1943 in Minsk, and who had already produced two Baptist hymnals in the Russian language — *Gimny chryścijan* and *Novyje pesni evangelija*. Making use of these, and other American and German hymnals, Pastor Jaško commenced his work in 1977, and two years later produced his handsome collection of over 600 hymns in the Byelorussian language.

The work is well-produced on good quality paper, with excellent facsimile music culled from existing Evangelical hymnals. The Byelorussian text has been inserted by the editor using a simple scissors and glue technique on the proofs prior to printing. The standard of versification is acknowledged to be variable, but generally good, and the collection as a whole constitutes the most important corpus of Byelorussian Protestant hymnody to have appeared to date. The utilitarian green hard-back binding is tasteful and solid, as is indeed necessary for a work which, in the right hands, will certainly enjoy considerable use.

The hymns are grouped under 18 headings according to their subject matter. The most extensive sections indicate the essentially theocentric nature of evangelical hymnody, and relate to the greatness and goodness of God (s.V, 28 hymns), the life and work of Christ, including his Birth, Passion and Second Coming (s.VI, 119 hymns), the Holy Ghost (s. VII, 14 hymns) and the life of the Church (s.XII, 59

hymns). Other sections cover hymns of thanks and praise (s.I, 33 hymns), hymns for morning and evening (s.II, 19 hymns), hymns for the opening and closing of divine worship (s.III, 33 hymns), prayer and supplication (s.IX, 47 hymns), calling (s.VIII, 32 hymns), following Christ (s.IX, 22 hymns), consecration (s.X, 9 hymns), struggle and victory (s.XI, 16 items), missions (s.XIII, 24 hymns), temptation (s.XIV, 37 hymns), salvation (s.XV, 14 items), faith, hope and charity (s.XVI, 31 hymns), eternal life (s.XVII, 25 hymns), songs of welcome and farewell (s.XVIII, 25 hymns).

Jaško's collection in no way claims to constitute a body of traditional Byelorussian hymns; in any event most of these are of Uniate, Orthodox or Catholic origin composed in honour of the Virgin Mary, the Saints and religious festivals which play a very subsidiary role in Protestant hymnody. Most of such Byelorussian *kanty* exist only in manuscript, or in unrecorded oral tradition. As appears from his preface, the editor's concern was to familiarize Byelorussian Evangelicals with the international musical heritage of their faith by providing translations made direct from the original language (mostly English and German), rather than translations of translations in which the pristine significance of the words may become adulterated.

The sources from which the hymns are taken are manifold and happily ecumenical. Pastor Jaško draws freely on the hymnody of the Anglo-Saxon nations, Germany, Wales (e.g. no.130), France (no.428), Sweden (no.441), Spain (no.476), Portugal (no.496), Brazil (no.313), as well as Negro spirituals (no.152), and even Maori folk-songs (no.93). There is a relatively high proportion of translations from other Slavonic nations — Czech, Ukrainian, Slovak, Russian and Polish. Although many of these reflect the revivalist influence of Boosey and Sankey, there are some which are related to Slavonic popular and folk music (e.g. nos 133, 323, 330, 499).

Well-loved revivalist favourites such as 'The old rugged Cross' (no.234), 'Tell me the old, old Story' (no.188), 'O what a friend we have in Jesus' (no.266) mingle with more restrained Anglican and Lutheran classics: 'Onward Christian soldiers' (no.369), 'The Church's One Foundation' (no.385) 'Ein Fester Burg' (no.366); Polish Catholic carols and hymns: 'Wśród nocnej ciszy' (no.182), 'Pod Twą obronę' (no.124);

and even Russian Orthodox Church chants: 'Christos voskrese' (no.248), 'Otče naš' (no.55) and 'Kol' slaven Bog' (no.2).

Particularly interesting and welcome for the enrichment of the Byelorussian choral repertoire is the inclusion of works by classical composers — Bach, Handel, Haydn, Mozart, Beethoven, Schubert and Mendelssohn. Neither does the genial pastor eschew a snatch of Gregorian plainchant — 'Veni, veni Emmanuel' (no.175). Unfortunately the few hymns selected from *Lira Božaha* (nos. 50, 555, 601) are in standard revivalist style and display few if any Byelorussian characteristics.

Whilst it would perhaps have been unrealistic to expect, with the late Bishop Sipovich, that Byelorussian hymns to Our Lady might have been included in the collection, it is something of a pity that greater use has not been made of traditional *kant* material. Amongst the many verse-forms Pastor Jaško has made available to future Church musicians are not a few which would adapt with ease to

widely-known popular *kanty* such as 'Presvetlyj Angel moj', (e.g. no.375) or 'Mira Zastupnice Mati Vsepetaja' (e.g. no.210). Almost all the verses of one of the most venerable Byelorussian hymns — 'O, moj Boža, viaru ū Ciabie' are perfectly compatible with evangelical canons, and would have enhanced the appeal of the collection to the more traditionally minded. It is perhaps a reproach to be directed in the first instance not at the editor of *Himny chryścijan*, but rather to those whose hoary prejudices have persistently excluded genuine religious hymnody from official collections of Byelorussian folk-music, in favour of spurious doggerel jingles about politicians better forgotten.

By and large, it is hard to fault Pastor Jaško's admirable work. It will certainly prove a valuable help, not only to Evangelicals, but also to his Orthodox and Catholic fellow-Christians. It will also render accessible to all Byelorussian music-lovers an enriching part of the Church music of the Western world. G. Picarda

Laučjute, Ju.A. (Ju. A. Laučiūtė), *Slovar' baltizmov v slavjanskich jazykach*, 'Nauka', Leningrad, 1982. 212 pp.

This is a primarily etymological dictionary of considerable reference value, gathering under one cover a detailed collection of Baltic words found in Slavonic languages. By Baltic languages is meant here, overall, and to avoid excessive hypothesis, Latvian, Lithuanian and Old Prussian. By the Slavonic languages, though all are mentioned, except for Macedonian, are meant particularly Byelorussian, Polish, Russian, Ukrainian and Czech, in that approximate order of significance.

In this way the dictionary is a fine descendant of K. Jablonskis's *Lietuviški žodžiai senosios Lietuvos raštiniu kalboje* (*Lithuanian Words in the Language of the*

Manuscripts of Early Lithuania), Kaunas, 1941, and it sets us a full lexical basis for a better understanding of the earliest Slavonic and Baltic linguistic relationship. It is a work which is modest, thus invaluable, an objective presentation of the state of lexical knowledge in this area as reached, on the whole, by 1979. Many far-flung notes and articles have been brought together.

Within the dictionary we find Baltic words loaned directly into Slavonic, Baltic words loaned indirectly into Slavonic, and non-Baltic words loaned through Baltic into Slavonic. The words themselves have either undergone no further development

in Slavonic, or have gone through further derivational processes. Personal, place and people names are on the whole omitted.

The whole, if we leave out the full list of abbreviations of sources (pp.151-6), of languages and dialects (pp.166-9), of other abbreviations (p.169), and the index of linguistic data (pp.170-210) may be divided into three parts: a main part, a supplement, and an appendix.

The main part is split into several sections: Baltisms in four or more Slavonic languages (pp.9-26), Baltisms in three Slavonic languages (pp.27-41), Baltisms in two Slavonic languages (pp.42-60), Baltisms in one Slavonic language (pp.61-92), and Baltisms in Slavonic texts (i.e. not in the spoken language; pp.93-6). This compromise between an alphabetical ordering and an areal ordering (plus the text-only data) is extremely useful. The separation of the data found exclusively in texts from the rest can help us somewhat to move towards a (relative) chronology of contacts and changes. The areally-based presentation, for a region which once had an extensive Baltic substratum and, for a certain definite period, contacts between various Slavonic peoples and, particularly, the Lithuanians, directs our approach to the whole problem of the precise relationship

between the Balts and the Slavs. And it must be said that the dictionary is not really language-orientated, but rather is it dialectally, or even more narrowly (for Polish and Byelorussian) orientated.

Each entry begins with an enumeration of the Slavonic forms, in the order Byelorussian, Polish, Russian, Ukrainian, as applicable, the first providing the head entry. After the listing, in some detail, we have a more or less detailed etymological section, starting with the probable Baltic source.

The supplement contains the author's own contributions, each entry argued fully as necessary, and presented for the reader's criticism (pp.97-136). The appendix (pp.136-50) contains more or less disputed Baltisms.

This is an invaluable little dictionary, the typographical complexities presented easily and precisely. It will be indispensable for the researcher into contacts between the Baltic and Slavonic languages, particularly when seeking to establish some solid ground in the vexed and perennial question of just what the Baltic/Slavonic 'unity' was.

J. Ian Press

*Pravastaŭnaja carkva ŭ bielastockim kraji i bielaruskaja mova ŭ joj. Rozdumy. Vyda-
victva 'Bielarus', New York, 1984. 33 pp.*

Let no-one be deceived by the small size of this booklet. It contains an important restatement of truths about peoples' rights to use their languages in all spheres of human activity, truths that are all too easily obliterated in the minds of our 'spiritual leaders' by concerns of a baser kind. The brochure was first published anonymously in 1981 and circulated in Poland in one

hundred copies; it was subsequently published in the West in issues 314-318 of the newspaper *Bielarus*.

As is clear from the title, it deals with the position of the Byelorussian language within the Orthodox Church of Poland, specifically in Białystok province. Verses 13-19 of Chapter 14 of S. Paul's first Epistle to the Corinthians are used to set the

subject in a proper context: 'For if I pray in an unknown tongue, my spirit prayeth, but my understanding is unfruitful. . . I had rather speak five words with my understanding. . . than ten thousand words in an unknown tongue'.

The brochure is a timely, and very angry, denunciation of those who deliberately ignore the rights of a nation to speak with understanding. The position described by the author is in no way different from the 19th century, when 'orthodox' automatically meant 'Russian' and 'catholic' meant 'Pole'. Byelorussian cultural life is now assured in Poland, even if not strongly so. Why then should Byelorussian spiritual needs be so lamentably ignored? Is it naive to ask why the Orthodox Church in Poland continues to publish a journal written in an unctuous mix of Russian and Church Slavonic spoken by no normal human being anywhere in the world? The Catholic Church must also do more (correction: it

must start to do something) to recognize that, even in Poland, God understands other languages besides Polish. The author comes closest to the heart of the problem when he exclaims: 'A Boża-ż, ty moj Boża! U naš viek, u našu epochu, treba jašče dabivacca šanavaŋnia čaľavieka i jahonaje movy z boku nie jakohašci paŋciomnaha biurakrata, ale našych, kroŋnych nam, šviataroŋ!' May it not be that the 'šviatary' are as much caught up in a bureaucratic system as the servants of a political regime?

This brochure provides further evidence of the ferment in Byelorussian life in Poland. *Bieltarus* should be congratulated for bringing this valuable document to the attention of a wider public. A translation should be made as soon as possible.

J. Dingley