graphy, are also widely used.

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

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

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

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

Guy Picarda

Bulachaŭ, M. H. *Historyja prymetnikaŭ bielaruskaj movy, č. 3. Leksikaŭhičny narys (Ahulnaslavianŭskaja leksika)*. Minsk, 1973. 256 pages, index of dictionaries, bibliography, index of words discussed.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

H. Leeming

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

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

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

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

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

Guy Picarda