

that the postmodernism of the most recent Ukrainian poetry and prose shows a resurgence of modernity.

Pavlychko's postmodernist discourse is refreshing and almost completely free of jargon. It makes stimulating reading—so stimulating that one deputy in today's Ukrainian parliament reacted with a furious condemnation of it, alleging that it slandered Ukrainian national culture. This, surely, indicates that modernity is still a far cry for most Ukrainians, who are unable to welcome an open society. Yet theirs is a hopeless rear-guard fight against not only postmodernism, but also post-colonialism. The changing spectrum of appreciating one's own culture as part of the European heritage has been eloquently depicted by Solomiia Pavlychko. She has done so without resorting to a pure analysis of texts, as so often happens, but within the framework of cultural and intellectual history. For her gesture towards a more traditional critical analysis, this reviewer is especially grateful.

George S. N. Luckyj
University of Toronto

Bohdan Strumiński. *Linguistic Interrelations in Early Rus': Northmen, Finns, and East Slavs (Ninth to Eleventh Centuries)*. Collana di Filologia e Letterature Slave, vol. 2. Rome, Edmonton, and Toronto: La Fenice Edizioni and Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies Press, 1996. 353 pp. \$49.95 paper.

Historical philology has long been a fruitful method for analyzing medieval written sources, and it has provided many good insights into the history of early Rus'. The most recent work in this tradition is the late Bohdan Strumiński's study of the foreign loanwords found in Old East Slavic. After an initial chapter discussing the distinctive features that developed in the East Slavic languages during the ninth through eleventh centuries, the next three chapters examine Old Nordic as reflected in the Old East Slavic languages and vice versa, and the interrelations between Old Nordic and Old East Slavic onomastics. Chapters five and six cover Old Nordic and Old East Slavic mutual lexical borrowings and Finnic borrowings in Old East Slavic. Finally, Strumiński provides a lengthy index, organized by language group, encompassing all the words found in his study. In sum, this is a particularly useful handbook for anyone interested in the possible non-Slavic origins of a given word found in a text relating to early Rus' history.

At a time when scholars have increasingly utilized a multidisciplinary approach in the study of early medieval European Russia, Strumiński steadfastly pursued a highly traditional but very narrow philological method with an underlying assumption that etymology can explain many of the mysteries of early Rus' history. In his very first chapter, the author asks why there was such great linguistic unity among the East Slavic tribes that had settled over a huge territory of some one thousand km. His answer is that the Northmen (Vikings) united the various East Slavic tribes and imposed Nordic political authority and Byzantine religion upon them between the early ninth and mid-eleventh centuries. He then asserts that to demonstrate that this answer is plausible, it is necessary

to show that the basic features of the East Slavic linguistic area developed during this “Nordic” period (p. 11).

Strumiński’s claim that there was an extraordinary linguistic unity among the early East Slavic tribes is a supposition that cannot be proven owing to the lack of written sources from this period. The single most important source, the Rus’ Primary Chronicle, was composed in Kyiv, and perhaps other places, by a number of authors writing after the mid-eleventh century. The language they employed was strongly influenced by Church Slavonic. The best pre-1050 source, *De Administrando Imperio* (ca. 950) by Emperor Constantine Porphyrogenitus, is problematic, because its Rus’/Norse and Slavic names were ostensibly recorded by a Greek author who never came near the Rus’ lands himself. The only way to demonstrate an “amazing linguistic unity” among the East Slavic tribes would be to compare documents written in Old East Slavic by members of the various tribes before 1050. Given the absence of such written sources, archaeology provides the best evidence regarding the degree of homogeneity within East Slavic society during the Viking Age. And, while archaeologists note many common East Slavic features in the material culture, they also emphasize the distinctive characteristics of each East Slavic tribe. In short, there are good reasons to question the basic premise of the book.

The book’s structure also presents problems. It seems to be more a series of collected essays on a variety of linguistic themes than a systematic, well-organized analysis. Chapter four, for example, discusses the origins of the word *Rus’* (from Baltic Finnish **ruotsi* ‘Swede’), the etymology of the word *Ladoga*, the East European river and place names in Old Nordic, the gods of the Rus’, the Old Ukrainian, Old Nordic, and Khazar names for Kyiv, the Old Ukrainian and Old Nordic names for the Dnieper Rapids, the origins of the name *Igor’*, the term *urmane* in the Primary Chronicle, the ethnic composition of the early Rus’ elite as reflected in personal names, and the original form of the personal names found in the Rus’-Byzantine treaties of the tenth century. Each of these subjects is interesting, and Strumiński makes a number of important points. But he fails to show how all these individual sections relate to a larger theme. The absence of a conclusion also emphasizes the lack of a well-developed connection between individual sections. In short, the reader is left to guess how all the parts of this work are supposed to fit together.

In addition to Church Slavonic, Strumiński constantly refers to a variety of languages spoken by the East Slavs during this time—East Slavic, Old Russian, Old Belarusian, Old Ukrainian, Old East Slavic, and Rus’. He never explains what he means by each of these terms, nor does he discuss their interrelationship. The very use of all these terms points to significant linguistic disunity among the East Slavs. It is very difficult to accept the idea that Old Russian, Old Belarusian, and Old Ukrainian already existed in the Viking Age. It seems more plausible to argue that regional dialects of Old Rus’/Old East Slavic had begun to appear already at this time. But such a development would run counter to the author’s basic premise about linguistic unity.

Strumiński’s highly traditional approach also leads him to omit a number of important written sources. Over the past twenty years, linguists such as Andrei A. Zalizniak have published important studies on the Old Novgorodian dialect as reflected in the almost 800 birchbark texts found in Novgorod and other Rus’ towns. The fifty or so texts dating from the eleventh to early twelfth century provide the “purest” linguistic evidence of the language spoken by the people of the northern Rus’ lands. It is thus

regrettable that Strumiński does not consider them. Furthermore, he did not examine the birchbarks and graffiti that contain the earliest references to such words as *berkovets*, *poromon’*, *kapi*, *kolbiag*, *lar’*, *sorochok*, *tiun*, and *iabitnik*. He also omits the Norse name *Azgut*, found in birchbark no. 526 from Novgorod and dating from the second third of the eleventh century. The earliest reference to the word *meta* is found on clasp-lock no. 5 from a Novgorod stratum dating from 973–1051. These early Rus’ “written” sources are especially pertinent for this type of historical-philological study. A number of specific points also need emendation.

While Strumiński provides us with a valuable reference work on the lexical borrowings in Old East Slavic, he does not elaborate any general thesis that explains what these individual borrowings tell us about early Rus’ history.

Thomas S. Noonan and
Roman K. Kovalev
University of Minnesota

Alexander M. Schenker. *The Dawn of Slavic: An Introduction to Slavic Philology*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1995. xx, 346 pp. U.S. \$55.00 cloth.

Alexander Schenker’s *Dawn of Slavic* is a valuable contribution to the field of Slavic studies. A brief review can only touch upon his wide-ranging treatment of various complex, often controversial topics in Slavic philology. The book is intended to be an introductory handbook for the beginning student of the earliest period of Slavic culture and “a guide to further reading, an invitation to a deeper and broader study of subjects” (p. xv) in the history of Slavic. It is arranged and written in such a way that it can also be used by specialists in non-Slavic studies and by non-philologists, for it provides glosses, translations, and explanations of linguistic terminology. The book offers maps, tables, copious notes, a cross-reference index, a full bibliography, and attractive plates reproducing samples of early manuscripts and inscriptions. The work is divided into three long chapters (“Historical Setting,” “Language,” “Early Writing”) and four appendices.

Chapter one comprises “a historical sketch of Slavic settlement in Europe and the integration of the Slavs into medieval European cultural commonwealth” (p. xv). This chapter outlines a number of theories about the Slavic ancestral home (the autochthonous, the Danubian, and the mid-Dnieper theories), and both supporting evidence and inconsistencies are provided for each theory. In addition, the author sketches a broad general picture of the early Slavs, their history, culture, and religious beliefs, and the way in which the Slavs fitted in among the Indo-European peoples. Extensive examples describing the early Slavs as seen by their neighbours in non-Slavic primary sources are provided. Chapter one also presents a detailed account of the Moravian mission and considerable information about the Cyrillo-Methodian tradition, including the role and legacy of Constantine and Methodius and their disciples in the development of Slavic letters. Again, this information is based on Slavic (*Vita Constantini*, *Vita Methodii*, *Bulgarian Legend*, *Primary Chronicle*) and non-Slavic (*Italian Legend*, *Papal Correspondence*, and *Conversio*) primary sources. The portrayal of the Moravian and Bohemian periods is also drawn from primary sources