maps are both political and ethnographic, the latter including oddities like Rusak's map of 1939 which has ethnic Byelorussia extending as far north as the Gulf of Finland! All the reproductions are very clear and,

where possible, the British Museum pressmark of each book and map is given, thus making the work a useful reference guide.

J. Dingley

Anuškin, A. *Na zare knigopečatanija v Litve*. 'Mintis', Vilna, 1970. 196 pages.

The book aims to give a survey — from a Marxist point of view — of book production in Lithuania in the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries. *Litva* cannot in this context be interpreted as either the whole of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania or as the ethnic Lithuanian area of Samogitia, but as the territory of the present-day Lithuanian S.S.R., since most of the books discussed were printed in Vilna. Since Anuškin apparently regards Vilna in the sixteenth century as the capital city of ethnic Lithuania, rather than as the capital of a multi-national state, he is forced into using muddled terminology to describe languages and nations. Books were written in Byelorussian, Russian (Byelorussian), Russian (Ukrainian) or simply Russian. Rymša wrote his verses in Russian (Byelorussian) (p. 16) and in Byelorussian (p. 67). The Statute of 1588, itself written in Byelorussian (p. 61), declared Russian (Byelorussian) as the official language of the Grand Duchy (p. 62). The title of the work *Rozmowa Polaka z Litwinem* is misleadingly translated into Russian as *Rozmova poljaka s litovcem* — misleading, because 'Litwin' was used at the time to denote a citizen of the Grand Duchy rather than an ethnic Lithuanian. The adjectives *belorusskij* and *ukrainskij* are fairly used to describe nations (usually in conjunction with the adjective 'bratskij'), but the hoary *zapadnorusskij* is brought out of dishonourable retirement, although admittedly to refer to no more than a writing style. *Rus'* is used to refer to the Muscovite state, and the words 'naša strana' clearly mean the Soviet Union.

There is evidence of similar confusion when dealing with foreign nationalities. Erasmus, although named as 'Erasm Rotterdamskij', is everywhere called a German humanist. The point at issue here is not so much that

the nationality is incorrect, as that any mention of nationality is irrelevant in the context of the Renaissance. Both Erasmus and Skaryna were truly international figures of their time, standing head and shoulders above the puny cliché descriptions given them in this book. Moreover, to describe the co-operation in the Vilna printing shops between Lithuanians, Byelorussians and Russians as evidence of friendship between 'fraternal peoples' is to fail to understand what the Renaissance was really about. Anuškin calls it 'curious' that certain theological writers should have quoted more from classical authors than from the Church Fathers. In the context of the excitement of the rediscovery of classical Greek philosophy there is nothing curious at all in this. Another important aspect of Renaissance intellectual life which the author (or his Marxist point of view) does not come to grips with is the thin dividing line between empirical and speculative science. The final section on astrology of Dyblinski's *Centuria Astronomica* is dismissed as the least interesting part of the book, added, in Anuškin's words, 'to protect the author from the Church censors who might otherwise have taken offence at the more scientific (and therefore anti-official) sections on astronomy proper'. Many scientists of the period would not have made the distinction between astronomy and astrology — Kepler was one of them — just as Newton was quite capable of dabbling in alchemy. In any case this curt dismissal of an intrinsic part of scholarly study could be turned against Anuškin himself. Why has he inserted the apparently irrelevant quotations from Engels on Thomas Münzer? Either he believes that they do serve a purpose, or else he is seeking to appease the censors. Why is the reader told that some works of Andrei Wolan, Stefan Ziza-

nij and Meletij Smotritskij contain 'a great deal of atheist material' which 'could be used in our modern atheist propaganda'? Is this merely a sop, or is it a genuine part of Marxist interpretation?

The book's chief positive achievements are that the author has amassed a vast amount of material on the printed books of the period, and that it contains many interesting illustrations. The absence of an index of any kind constitutes its most serious technical shortcoming, although Anuškin does say that a catalogue is at present being prepared by the 'Kniž-

naja Palata' of the Lithuanian S.S.R. It cannot be said that this book is a satisfactory contribution to the study of an extremely fascinating period. What is needed now is a much more comprehensive study of book production in the whole of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, together with an exhaustive catalogue giving (where possible) the present-day location of each book. This can only be done by accepting the men of the time and their ideas for what they were, and not for what a modern political dogma would have us think they were.

J. Dingley

Bandarčyk, V. K. *Historyja biełaruskaj etnagrafii (Pačatak XX st.)*. 'Navuka i technika', Minsk, 1970. 124 pages. Illustrations.

V. K. Bandarčyk, the Director of the Institute of Ethnography at the Byelorussian Academy of Sciences, is already well-known for his work on Byelorussian ethnography and ethnographers. He has written monographs on such scholars as Ramanaŭ, Niki-faroŭski, and Sieržputoŭski.

The present study of the history of Byelorussian ethnography in the early 20th century is a continuation of his previous book *Historyja biełaruskaj etnagrafii XIX st.* published in Minsk in 1964.

Although short, the book deals in a most scholarly manner with the works of Je. R. Ramanaŭ, A. K. Sieržputoŭski, J. A. Sierbaŭ, and Ja. F. Karski, each in a separate chapter. The more important works of other Byelorussian scholars less well-known than the above mentioned are treated in a quite satisfactory manner in the final section of the book.

Though the subject matter of this work is indeed a specialised one, the very pleasant literary style of the author makes it enjoyable reading. There are several interesting photographic reproductions of the title pages of some of the classic works in Byelorussian ethnography, as well as photographs of the scholars themselves and of ethnographical subjects.

One should, however, point out a methodological weakness of this work, namely, the lack of a general and specific bibliography given separately either at the beginning or the end of the book.

This work makes a valuable contribution to the study of Byelorussian ethnography and will be a welcome addition to the libraries of students of folklore.

R. J. Tamužanski

Kolberg, O. *Dziela Wszystkie. Tom 52. Białoruś, Polesie*. Polskie Towarzystwo Ludoznawcze, Wrocław, Poznań, 1968. 571 pages.

The monumental collection of ethnographical material gathered by Kolberg from the provinces of Poland and the former Grand Duchy of Lithuania was not fully published during the author's lifetime, and much remained in fragmentary form. Originally Kolberg planned to complete his work by publishing three volumes on Red Ruś, Lithuanian Ruś,

Paleśsie (Pinsk and Volhynia) and Byelorussia.

He was by no means a pioneer in this field, for valuable regional studies had already been done by such ethnographers as I. Hryharovič (1790-1852), P. Špileŭski (1827-61), I. Nasovič (1788-1877), J. Kračkoŭski (1840-93), P. Šejn (1826-1900) and Je. Ramanaŭ (1855-1922). Indeed, Kolberg, in