

different local flavor, but its ritual significance is not lost for centuries. At the present stage, the recipes are not only forgotten in the current generation, but continue to live in traditional coloring, sent by our ancestors, so these three dishes are not «guests», and the most real «owners» of the Belarusian memorial table.

REFERENCES

1. Казакова І. На парозе жыцця: агульнасць сімволікі сямейна-абрадавага комплексу беларусаў // Роднае слова. – 009. - №1. – с. 96-99
2. Ліс А. С. Асяніны // Этнаграфія Беларусі: Энцыкл. / Гл. рэд. І. П. Шамякін. – Мн.: БелСЭ, 1989. – с. 39 – 40.
3. Запісана аўтарам ад Клячок Аліны Васільеўны 1931 г. н., у 2008 г., у в. Глінішча, Ушацкага раёна, Вялікадолецкі с/с.
4. Кухня народов СССР. / Сост. Т.В. Реутович. – 3-е изд. испр. – Мн.: Полымя, 1987. – 271 с.
5. Байбурын А.К. Ритуал в традиционной культуре. Структурно-семантический анализ восточнославянских обрядов. – С-П.: “Наука”, 1993. – 223 с
6. Запісана аўтарам ад Падгол Алены Пятроўны, 1931 г.н., у 2008 г. у в. Рагазіна, Ушацкага раёна, Вялікадолецкі с/с.
7. Беларусь: У 8 т. Т. 5: Сям’я / В.К. Бандарчык, Г.М. Курыловіч, Т. І. Кухаронак [і інш.]; Ін-т мастацтвазнаўства, этнаграфіі і фальклору; рэдкал.: В.К. Бандарчык. – Мінск: Бел. навука, 2001. – 275 с.
8. Никифоровский Н.Я. Простанародные приметы и поверья, суеверные обряды и обычаи. – Витебск, 1897. – 315 с.
9. Сысоў У. М. З крыніц прадвечных. – Мн.: Выш. шк., 1997. – 415с

UDC 908(476)(043.3)

**EUSTACHY TYSZKIEWICZ, 19TH CENTURY ARCHAEOLOGIST AND ANTIQUARY.
ON HIS APPROACH TO THE HISTORY OF THE GRAND DUCHY OF LITHUANIA****KATSIARYNA ANDREICHYK, ULADZIMIR SOSNA
Polotsk state university, Belarus**

The article considers the basic directions of activity of Eustachy Tyszkiewicz – the outstanding figure of Belarusian history, archeology, Ethnography of the 19th century, provides its basic views on the issue of ethnicity historical and cultural heritage of the Belarusian territory and other.

To present the complex personality of Eustachy Tyszkiewicz is a challenging task, considering his family background and the historical context of his native land. Born in 1814 in Lahojsk, a small town owned by his family since 1517 in the district of Barysau, governorship of Minsk (the present capital of Belarus), Tyszkiewicz was a son of Pius and Augusta maiden name countess Plater. References to his family’s ancient roots were found in many records concerning the history of Grand Duchy of Lithuania.

The family was one of the oldest gentry of lithuano-belarusian origin in the Grand Duchy [1]. The Duchy covered the territory of present-day Lithuania and Belarus. After 1795, following the third partition of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, it became a part of the Russian Empire. As befitted upper-class children of that time, Tyszkiewicz was educated at home. He acquired extensive knowledge, especially in history and archaeology, and did so by self-instruction. On completing his secondary education at a Minsk grammar-school in 1831, Tyszkiewicz worked till 1835 in the Imperial Public Library of St. Petersburg. Then he settled in Vilna and started archaeological excavations in various parts of the country [2].

His career grew successfully, in the professional and the social plane. Results of his archaeological explorations were first published in 1842.3 A year later he was elected chief deputy by gentry of the Barysau district (the so-called „nobility marshal”) and – in 1847 – honorary supervisor of the Minsk grammar-school (since 1840 he was already honorary supervisor of the Barysau district schools). In addition to his research and social activities, Tyszkiewicz took to writing literature but, in spite of many works published in 1840s and later, fiction had never become his priority interest [4]. In the late 1840s and in the 1850s Tyszkiewicz published a

number of works dealing with the history of ancient Lithuania in its historical borders (contemporary territory of Lithuania and Belarus). Many of these papers dealt with the history of the Barysau district and with the archaeological expeditions on territories of the former Grand Duchy, others were monographs of source character. Some of those works were distinguished for their remarkable reflection on the situation of European archaeology [5]. Collecting ancient relicts of the past - a fairly typical activity for upper-class Europeans at the time led him to organizing an archaeological „Commission” and a museum in Vilna. That happened finally in 1855, but it all started much earlier.

The idea was born in 1847, when Tyszkiewicz moved his collection of antiquities to Vilna, with the intention to open it to the public. Despite many visits to St. Petersburg and even with the unofficial consent of Emperor Nicholas I, he could not get official blessing for his project [6]. Tyszkiewicz's endeavours to launch the commission and museum won a lot of sympathy in St. Petersburg. Russian aristocrats, Cabinet ministers such as Dmitriy Bludov, Sergey Stroganov, Modest Korff, Sergey Uvarov, Evgraf Kovalevski and many others supported his efforts. Yet, because of the restrictive political climate ruling in the Russian Empire during the last decade of the reign of Nicholas I, even first-rate connections with leading Czarist officials in Petersburg and Vilna were not enough [7].

The political climate in Russia changed with the accession to the throne of Alexander II and the so-called „Post-Sevastopol Spring”, caused by the defeat in Crimean war. At the beginning of 1855 the museum and commission were set up, under the wardship of the Vilna Education District Board and, personally, of Vladimir Nazimov, the new general-governor of Vilna province.

Permission for opening the museum was necessarily tightly linked with the official line of politics of imperial Russia. Therefore Tyszkiewicz was, in a sense, obliged to present the history of Grand Duchy of Lithuania with a strong pro-Slavonic sentiment, and to stress the Russian origin of the country. He fulfilled an order in the museum regulations, which were written with a strong pan-Slavic attitude and with a curtsy to Petersburg. The main purpose of the museum was „collecting and saving the antiquities of the whole province”. As „the best part of them is of Slavonic character”, thus nearly all objects, collected and transferred to the museum, are of „Slavic origin” [7].

Tyszkiewicz had to prove his loyalty to the throne. On the other hand, it seems that he accepted, in a narrow sense, some of those pan-Slavic ideas.

In this respect he was not an exception among the landlords and the upper class of the „Western Gubernias” who were keen on finding a *modus vivendi* with the Russian authorities [8]. Tyszkiewicz knew that the language of all documents of the Grand Duchy till the 15th-16th century was „old-Slavonic”: very similar to contemporary Belarussian, and that the Orthodox church had a very strong impact on the early history of ancient Lithuania.

Being conscious of those peculiarities, it was easier to accept the Russian point of view, at least partially.

The latter half of the 1850s was the best period in the history of the Vilna institution. The museum was visited twice by the Emperor Alexander II, once by the Grand Duchess Helen, Grand Dukes Michael and Alexander. The exposition was also accepted by members of the Cabinet: Count Dmitriy Bludov, the Prime Minister, the ministers of public education Avraam Norov and Evgraf Kovalevski. By the end of 1858, the Museum had 11,000 visitors every year [8]. The collection started to be the largest in the whole „Western Region” of the Empire. The quality and unique value of all objects gathered in the museum started to be famous not only in Russia but also all-over Europe [9].

The January uprising of 1863, which was in fact a war between Russia and the former citizens of Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, ended that exceptional situation. There was no question of Polish-Russian flirtations or reconciliation. The Western Gubernias of the Empire had to be treated as ancient Russian territories. Any record that could supply evidence of the Polish or Lithuanian influence on the history of that region had to be eliminated [10]. Tyszkiewicz found himself in a very uncomfortable situation. The main objection, which he vigorously rejected, was that the Museum of Antiquities in Vilna had been created as a Polish one. The Russian elements in the history of the „Western Region”, the Czarist authorities claimed, were not enough exposed [10]. Tyszkiewicz decided to resign the post of the President of the Archaeographical Commission – and the honorary museum supervisor. But before all that happened he prepared himself to give a detailed description of the reasons of his resignation. Tyszkiewicz wanted to explain why it would be impossible to agree with the politics of the commission, dominated by Russian top officials, and driven by a tight anti-Polish and anti-Lithuanian sentiment.

In his protest against the line of the commission, driven by its pro-Russian majority, Tyszkiewicz gave a detailed description of his approach to the history of Grand Duchy of Lithuania. The main point of his explanation was that the so-called historical Lithuania was created as a multi-national state, in which influences of all nations living on its territory mingled. Therefore it is impossible to present just one nation, the Belarussians for example (treated by the Czarist authorities as Russians) or the Poles – as the one and only developing power

in the country's history. In a paper addressed to the Governor-General of Vilna province he wrote that at the beginning of the museum's activity the main rule of his approach to the history of the Grand Duchy was „no religious or class or national differentiation of the past” [10].

That attitude of mind helped to establish open and efficient relationships with all researchers in Central Europe: in Russia, East Prussia, and Austria-Hungary.

To the charge that the museum had a pro-Polish character Tyszkiewicz replied there was no sufficient knowledge to separate the national elements in the political history of Lithuania and Lithuanian Rus'. There was not enough source evidence to interpret all „that was purely local as Polish heritage” [10]. He underlined that the political élite of the country did not come to Lithuania from the Kingdom of Poland. The lords of Grand Duchy took precautions against the influx of persons from abroad, especially to take official posts. That practice, Tyszkiewicz argued, came mostly from a fear of losing privileges.

The adoption of the Polish language by the upper classes of Grand Duchy was an after-effect of the Polish-Lithuanian union of 1413 (Horodlo), confirmed by the union of 1569 in Lublin. That Polish domination, in Tyszkiewicz's opinion, was temporary, even though it lingered on for five centuries [10].

There is much evidence to show that Tyszkiewicz formulated his opinions under the overwhelming pressure of the political circumstances of the defeat of the 1863 Polish-Belarusian-Lithuanian uprising against Russia. Defending his multi-national approach to history Tyszkiewicz sought to explain his position and, at the same time, not to offend the Czarist officials. On the other hand, he tried to paint a rosy picture of the country's multi-national and multi-cultural history which he thought could change or soften the attitude of the Czarist bureaucracy.

On an example of the history of Vilna, the Lithuanian capital, Tyszkiewicz attempted to show the mixture of influences – at the time of the wars of Peter the Great with Carl of Sweden and Alexander I with Napoleon.

The monuments of those events were very valuable not only to historians but also because of their great artistic value.¹⁷ Coming to a more specific subject, i.e. the Museum of Antiquities, Tyszkiewicz expressed his strong objection to the removal of many first-rank exhibits. He stressed that the only reason for that unprofessional elimination, in fact „censorship”, was that the names of historic personages or artists ended with „...ski.” But the exhibition was reduced not only in its „Polish department.” Much the same was true of its Lithuanian and Belorussian sections. There was no trace of the writings by Adam Mickiewicz and Ludwik Kondratowicz (Wladyslaw Syrokomla), no paintings by Jan Dama, Jan Rustem or Franciszek Smuglewicz, no Codex Diplomaticus Regni Poloniae et Magni Ducatus Lithuaniae by Maciej Dogiel, and even no portrait of the great chancellor of the Grand Duchy Lew Sapieha, the strongest supporter of the Orthodox religion in Lithuania. No professor of Vilna Academy and University were mentioned in the museum exhibition, nor were the historic personages of Maryna Mniszech (wife of False Dmitriy), Barbara Radziwill (wife of Sigismund II Augustus) and Charles Radziwill „Panie Kochanku” [10].

The message from the government was exactly opposite to the museum founder's expectations. The authorities decided that the Museum of Antiquities in Vilna must no longer exist. Tyszkiewicz found it impossible to abdicate the historic tradition in favour of the official political line of Great Russia. His protest, among other things, could only hasten the decision to suppress the museum.

After leaving the post of President of the Archaeographic Commission in 1865, Tyszkiewicz moved to Biržai, a small town of his family estate. He continued his research till 1873, published some significant works on the history of archaeology in Lithuania, on the history of Biržai manor, and he released an edition of sources and a numismatic catalogue [11]. His scientific position, especially in Central European circles, was unimpaired. Since 1858 Tyszkiewicz was an honorary member of the Imperial Academy of Sciences in Petersburg, member of the Imperial Russian Archaeological Society (since 1851), of the Imperial Archaeological Society of Moscow (since 1865) and of the Imperial Society of History and Antiquities in Odessa (since 1871) [12]. He was also elected to the Royal Society of Northern Antiquarians in Copenhagen, the Royal Academy in Stockholm, the Scientific Societies in Cracow and Mainz, the Society of Friends of Sciences of Poznan, to the Society of Baltic Provinces History in Riga etc.

From the standpoint of national consciousness, Tyszkiewicz was a representative of the local élite (so called „Locals” – Tuteyshyya) who strove to bind together all currents of the country – ethnic, religious and national.

Though educated in a Polish environment and considering himself a Pole, he could feel as a local Lithuanian or Belarussian. These two nations were, sometimes, much closer to his heart than the Poles from Warsaw or Poznan.

In the political notions, Tyszkiewicz was a typical conservative with a strong pro-Russian sentiment. But there were limits to his Rusophilism. He could not accept a destruction of tradition – the tradition of the Polish-

Lithuanian Commonwealth and the Grand Duchy itself. Therefore Tyszkiewicz's views could be also considered as those of an ancient, even feudal, landlord or nobleman. In this respect he was very similar to many of his relatives and compatriots of the former Grand Duchy.

REFERENCES

1. Sobieszcański, F.M. Tyszkiewiczowie / Encyklopedia Powszechna S. Orgelbranda / F.M. Sobieszcański. – Warszawa, 1867. – Vol. 25. – S. 860 – 864.
2. Krzyżanowski, S. Eustachy hrabia Tyszkiewicz i jego praca / S. Krzyżanowski. – Lwów, 1873. – 134 s.
3. Grigalavičienė, E. Zalvario ir ankstyvusis geležies amžius Liteuvoje / E. Grigalavičienė. – Vilnius: UAB Lietuvos rytas, 1995. – P. 8.
4. Tyszkiewicz, E. Obrazy domowego pożycia na Litwie / E. Tyszkiewicz. – Warszawa, 1865. – 228 s.
5. Kostrzewski, J. Dzieje polskich badań prehistorycznych / J. Kostrzewski. – Kraków: UJ, 1948. – 362 s.
6. Biblioteka Narodowa w Warszawie, Zbiory Specjalne, Materiały do Muzeum Starożytności Eustachego Tyszkiewicza w Wilnie, IV. – 7826, 1. – 1.
7. Mienicki, R. Wileńska Komisja Archeologiczna (1864 – 1915) / R. Mienicki. – Wilno: PTK, 1925. – 468 s.
8. Różiewicz, J. Polsko-rosyjskie powiązania naukowe (1725-1918) / J. Różiewicz. – Wrocław: UW, 1984. – S. 105 – 148.
9. Pawłowicz, E. Biblioteka hr. Tyszkiewiczów w Wilnie / E. Pawłowicz // Kwartalnik Historyczny. – 1894. – Vol. 8. – № 1. – S. 67 – 71.
10. Flynn, J.T. Uvarov and the «Western Provinces»: a study of Russia's Polish problem / J.T. Flynn // The Slavonic and East European Review. – 1986. – № 64 (April). – S. 212 – 236.
11. Tyszkiewicz, E. Archeologia na Litwie / E. Tyszkiewicz. – Kraków, 1872. – 482 s.
12. Blombergowa, M.M. Polscy członkowie rosyjskich towarzystw archeologicznych 1839 – 1914 / M.M. Blombergowa. – Wrocław: UW, 1988. – S. 128 – 129.
13. Bardach, R. Wieloszczeblowa świadomość narodowa na ziemiach litewsko-ruskich Rzeczypospolitej w XVII – XX w. / R. Bardach // Pamiętnik XV Powszechnego Zjazdu Historyków Polskich. – Vol. 1. – Part. 1; ed. J. Staszewski. – Gdańsk-Toruń: UG, 1995. – S. 25 – 38.
14. Borzym, S. Zarys dziejów filozofii polskiej 1815 – 1918 / S. Borzym, H. Floryńska, B. Skarga, A. Walicki. – Warszawa: STUW, 1983. – S. 99 – 101.

UDC 947.6:688.72

**BELARUSSIAN NATIONAL FOLK TOY:
HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT, PRESENT SITUATION**

SVETLANA ANDRYEVSKAJA
Polotsk State University, Belarus

The article is devoted to the role of a toy in the national culture of the Belarusians. The toys embodied symbolism of the national culture, aesthetic views of the nation. Here are considered functions and the role of colour symbolism of the traditional toy in the national culture and its place in modern life.

The history of a nation begins from the history of a childhood. Traditional culture permits the only way of transition – new generations absorb from the elder their world outlook, life ideals, aesthetic views and so on [1, p. 125]. "Personal" inclusion into national culture begins from the earliest childhood. One of the main means of such inclusion is a game and a toy.

A toy is a thing used for the purpose of children's play. By introducing real and imaginary objects and images it helps a child to apprehend its environment, it also serves as a means of psychological, aesthetic and physical education. At the same time a toy is a kind of folk arts, and its direct function has not always been playing the leading role. Exactly in the toy the ideas of folk craftsmen about the world, nature and people were revealed. Using the minimum resources, they produced bright images that still live and impress us [2, p. 10].

The art of toy-making is one of the most ancient that is why it demands a thorough study. But Belarusian toy is studied insufficiently due to a number of objective reasons: investigators' insufficient attention of towards