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

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

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

Arnold B. McMillin

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Arnold B. McMillin

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

A. Nadson

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

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

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