*Historyja biełaruskaj litaraturnaj mo-
vy*, II [by I. I. Kramko et al.],
Minsk, 1968.

ŁASTOŬSKI, V. *Padručny rasijska-
kryŭski (biełaruski) stoŭnik*, Kau-
nas, 1924.

LOSIK, A. *Biełaruski pravapis*, Minsk,
1943.

LOSIK, J. *Biełaruski pravapis*. 7th
ed., Minsk, 1928.

TARAŠKIEVIČ, B. *Biełaruskaja hra-
matyka dla škot.* 5th ed., Vilna,
1929.

J. Dingley

Sučasnaja biełaruskaja mova (Pytaŭni kultury movy), Navuka i technika,
Minsk, 1973. 190 pages.

The aim of this collection of articles is defined in the foreword as follows: 'The authors have sought to identify and analyse all the most important deviations from the norms of the literary language, to determine their origin and define their place in the system of the literary language' and 'to give their recommendations on all the most important questions of the culture of the written and oral forms of our (i.e. the Byelorussian) literary language. To this end they have analysed various styles of language — of periodicals, belles-lettres, scientific literature as well as the language of radio, television, the theatre, official speeches and private conversations. The tone of the articles (with the possible exception of Padłužny's) is, however, not as didactic as the foreword and the subtitle would suggest or as is so often the case with publications devoted to the raising of the 'culture' of a language, which ignore the realities of live tendencies in a language in favour of traditionally 'correct' forms.

The seven articles, covering the fields of orthoepy, stress, morphology, syntax, word-formation and onomastics are: A. I. Padłužny, 'Normy biełaruskaha litaraturnaha vymaŭleńnia' (pp. 5-32); M. V. Biryła, 'Nacisk' (pp. 33-55); H. U. Arašonkava, 'Da pytańnia ab niekatorych skłonavych formach nazoŭnikaŭ' (pp. 56-83); V. P. Lemciuhova, 'Ułasnyja hieahrafičnyja nazvy (skłanieńnie)' (pp. 84-110); A. J. Michnievič, 'Sintaksičnaja norma i kantaminacyja słovazlučėnniaŭ' (pp. 111-40); T. V. Kuźmiankova, 'Niekatoryja vypadki užyvańnia sastaŭnoha imiennaha vykaznika' (pp. 141-53); A. A. Kaŭrus, 'Užyvańnie asobnych sloŭ i vyrazaŭ' (pp. 154-80).

Perhaps the most interesting and clearly set out article of the seven is Biryła's article on stress. This

comprises two main elements: a list of some 600 primary words in which mistaken stress commonly occurs and a detailed analysis of the stress patterns in noun declension and verb conjugation. Four factors are blamed for the fluctuations which occur: the penetration of the literary language by dialect variants, the influence of the Russian stress system, incorrect assimilation of the stress position in borrowed words and the effects of analogy within the Byelorussian literary language itself.

The authors of two other articles, Padłužny and Kaŭrus, also feel that the influence of Russian is partly responsible for deviations from the norm in the area of standard literary pronunciation and word-formation respectively.

Kaŭrus, in an article based on material drawn from Byelorussian newspapers published in the years 1966-72, cites a number of instances of contamination of this kind e.g. the use of *ablahčėńnie* instead of *palohka*, *ahulnažyccio* instead of *supolnaje žyćcio*, *lunny* instead of *miesiacavy*. While Kaŭrus' resistance of such contamination of Byelorussian by Russian is firm and consistent, his article as a whole is characterised by a certain arbitrariness in the acceptance or rejection of forms which violate the literary norm (which he bases on the *Biełarуска-ruski stoŭnik*, Moscow, 1962 and the *Ruska-biełaruski stoŭnik*, Moscow, 1953). A number of forms are accepted by him purely on the grounds that they have gained wide currency, while others are rejected despite this; the spelling *разбяр* (for *разьбяр*) is rejected despite the fact that this is the form in which it appears in the *Biełarуска-ruski stoŭnik*, while on the other hand *крылца* is preferred to *крыльца* on the ground that it is regularly passed

by correctors which means 'that it is not felt to be unnatural'; *emihryavač* is preferred to *emihryavač* on the ground that where in Russian the suffix *-irova-* is used corresponding Byelorussian words usually have *-ava-*, but this argument is not adduced in favour of *restaŭravač* (as opposed to *restaŭryravač*), which is simply regarded as a permissible alternative. In both instances the *Bielaruska-ruski sloŭnik* gives the form with the suffix *-irava-*.

By contrast Padłužny's article on orthoepy shows a consistency that at times borders on the dogmatic. Furthermore it gives little information that is not readily available in other publications, including his own excellent work in collaboration with Čekman. The majority of the article is devoted to an outline of the phonetic and orthographical characteristics of the Byelorussian literary language, with just a few comments being offered on common deviations from the norm. Padłužny contends that up to the present little attention has been given to a practical course of phonetics and that this is to blame for imperfections in the spoken language of some teachers, television and radio announcers and artists of the national theatre. These imperfections come under three main headings: the preservation of dialectal traits; literal reading i.e. pronouncing words as spelt, when the orthography does not always accurately reflect pronunciation; and the mixing of Byelorussian and Russian pronunciation. This latter fault is aggravated by the fact that many speakers use both languages but are insufficiently bilingual to make the necessary distinctions between their different phonetic characteristics. A contributory factor is that some phonetic characteristics of Byelorussian dialects coincide with those of the Russian (rather than the Byelorussian) literary language. This is particularly true of the pronunciation of unstressed vowels which in north-eastern dialects of Byelorussian are reduced in the same way as in the Russian literary language. Among other features influenced by Russian Padłužny gives the insufficiently hard pronunciation of *č*, labio-dental *v* in place of bilabial *ŭ*, a semi-soft pronunciation of *r*.

Arašonkava's article throws light on the considerable amount of confusion

which exists in the use of the endings *-a(-ja)* and *-u(-ju)* in the genitive singular of masculine nouns, on the spread of the ending *-u(-ju)* at the expense of other endings in the prepositional singular of masculine nouns (particularly to avoid consonant mutation where the stem ends in velar *h* or *k*), and on the various genitive plural endings for nouns of all genders. She takes issue with Andrejka and Jaŭnievič over their suggested rules for the genitive plural ending of third declension nouns. The latter proposed the following rules: the ending *-jaŭ(-aŭ)* is to be used if the stress is on the last syllable of the stem, the ending *-jej(-ej)* if the ending is stressed and either ending if the stress is not on the ending or the last syllable of the stem. Arašonkava feels that these rules leave some questions unanswered (exactly which questions she does not say) and proposes an alternative set of rules 'on the basis of literary practice and tradition': *-jej(-ej)* is to be regarded as the basic ending, which appears unstressed in bisyllabic and polysyllabic nouns with a stem ending in a consonant group or with a single final stem consonant and also in the majority of nouns with a monosyllabic stem. The use of the ending *-jaŭ(-aŭ)* in such nouns is to be considered a violation of the literary norm. Stressed *-jej(-ej)* is the ending for some monosyllabic nouns with a stem ending in a soft consonant, for nouns with the suffix *-čašć* plus the nouns *voblašć*, *myš*, *noč*, *pieč*, *kroŭ*. The ending *-jaŭ(-aŭ)* is regarded as correct for the nouns *dal*, *reč*, *fleš*, *ščotač*.

V. P. Lemciuhova's informative article on the declension of toponyms contains a full examination of the various types of declension with appropriate comparisons with common nouns of similar structure. The gender and type of declension of a given toponym is in most cases decided on the basis of formal considerations (the ending of the nominative singular) but the obscured etymology of some toponyms leads to some variation. This is especially true of toponyms with a nominative singular ending in a soft or formerly soft consonant (e.g. *Žyvuń*, *Sož*, *Svir*) where there is fluctuation between the second and third declension. Lemciuhova suggests in such cases the gender and type of declen-

sion should be determined by reference to the tradition of the area from which the toponym derives. She also notes a strong and increasing tendency in the press towards the non-declension of many toponyms while in others, especially foreign ones, there is considerable hesitation between declension and non-declension. While recognising the advisability of the non-declension of some toponyms in official genres such as legal and military documents etc. to avoid misunderstanding or ambiguity, Lemciuhova closes the article with a plea for order.

The authors of the two remaining articles both rely heavily on material drawn from newspapers and periodicals. T. V. Kužmiankova points to an increasing tendency for the nominative case to replace the instrumental in the predicate, a tendency which is particularly marked where the verb is some form of *być*, and regards this as a characteristic of the Byelorussian literary language. Interestingly enough, the reverse process seems to

be at work in Russian, where recent studies have shown that the use of the instrumental case in the predicate is gaining ground at the expense of the nominative (except in conjunction with the present tense of the verb *to be*).

A. J. Michnievič's article is concerned with 'incorrect' syntactical constructions which arise through the mutual influence of two or more models e.g. *ekspanujucca karciny, adkryta vystaŭka > ekspanujecca vystaŭka*. Apart from a brief introduction on the general principles governing contamination of this kind the bulk of the article consists of a list of examples gleaned by the author from various linguistic sources and subdivided into different types of syntactical construction.

A welcome appendix to this excellent collection of articles is a bibliography of some 150 titles concerned with the problems of the norms of contemporary Byelorussian.

P. J. Mayo