

family in an order that suggests a derivational chain, such as *izvodiť/ proizvodiť/ vosproizvodiť/ pereproizvodiť*. This was accomplished by ordering words "from the inside out," beginning with the prefix nearest the root.

One could hardly disagree with Worth's statement in his introduction that the published version of *RDD* is "as close to derivational order as such linear listings can reasonably be expected to come," provided of course one might add "when the computer is used as the main instrument for segmentation and tabulation." For there are occasional vagaries or lapses (of which Worth warns the reader in advance) which stem from the computer's inability practically to manipulate semantic and other cultural factors vital to the analysis of word formation.

This work will be of immediate interest to all scholars concerned with Russian derivation, but it seems clear that its maximum utility will be for those who subscribe to Worth's views. The real value of *RDD*, therefore, must be judged by future scholars, on the basis of the studies it is expected to spawn—studies Worth alludes to in his introduction.

THOMAS J. BUTLER
University of Wisconsin

STUDIES OF TURKIC LOAN WORDS IN RUSSIAN. By *Nicholas Poppe, Jr.* *Asiatische Forschungen*, vol. 34. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1971. x, 70 pp. DM 28, paper.

This study is the first comprehensive critical survey of one of the least known parts of Russian lexicology. A scholar with a native knowledge of Russian, trained primarily in general and Russian linguistics in America, Nicholas Poppe is one of the few Slavists with a thorough preparation also in Turkic. As such, he was well suited for this kind of investigation, and the result is a clear, concise, and quite exhaustive up-to-date study.

The concept of the book may seem fairly simple, but it required a very good grasp of both the historical and the descriptive method in linguistics. The author reviews the entire history of this area of Slavic lexicology and at the same time scrutinizes all the important etymon items in the light of recent linguistic research. Thus he is able to verify or disprove a number of uncertain cases, and contributes to the still rather scant knowledge in this area. Although research started quite early on other kinds of foreign lexical elements in Russian, the existence of Turkic forms did not attract the attention of scholars until as late as 1854. Though a natural phenomenon, in view of the historical contacts, it long escaped the attention of both historians (Karamzin) and philologists. Of course, the entire area of Turkology is fairly new. It was not until the twentieth century that certain forms (recorded, for example, in such an important monument of Russian literature as *The Tale of Igor*) received some plausible explanation in the light of Turkic linguistics.

Poppe shows his strength in evaluating previous research, especially in the chapters dealing with the more recent investigations by authorities such as Dmitriev and Vasmer. While Dmitriev, for example, was a Turkologist with a somewhat inadequate insight into the more intricate aspects of Russian, Vasmer was mainly an expert on Russian-Greek relations. Vasmer corrected some of the erroneous assumptions made by Dmitriev (e.g., his statement that the word *shal'* [shawl]

was a Turkic borrowing while in reality it came from Persian via French, or that words such as *kiosk*, *kol'chuga*, *otava*, and so forth, were direct borrowings from Turkish, rather than either indirect borrowings via French [*kiosque*] or derivatives from original Slavic forms [*kolo*, *tyti*, etc.], cf. pp. 40–41). Poppe, on the one hand, has been able to reconfirm certain of Dmitriev's assumptions questioned by Vasmer; on the other, he has brought further precision to some of Vasmer's statements ascribing certain forms to Turkish origin rather than Turkic (Tatar, etc.—see pp. 48–49). Skillfully applying the principles of modern linguistics, the author considerably expands the number of criteria in this kind of investigation, and in a number of cases throws new light on the exact background of Old Russian borrowings and their subsequent development.

One would wish perhaps for a more definite stand on a few controversial matters, but then it is true that there are cases of what Karl Menges rightly calls "schwierige . . . Lehnbeziehungen," in which nothing is really definite. (It would seem, though, at least to this reviewer, that one could be at least as definitely against certain claims as Menges is for them; for example, the Turkic origin of the Russian word *kniga*.)

Poppe's work, published in the distinguished *Asiatische Forschungen* series, will be welcomed by both Slavists and Turkologists.

ZBIGNIEW FOLEJEWSKI
University of British Columbia

A CONCISE ENGLISH-MONGOLIAN DICTIONARY. By *John G. Hangin*.
Indiana University Publications, vol. 89, Uralic and Altaic Series. Bloomington:
Indiana University. The Hague: Mouton, 1970. 288 pp. \$10.00, paper.

This dictionary containing some ten thousand words and various expressions will prove to be a useful tool for American students of modern Mongolian. Although for more than two decades interest in this language has been steadily growing, students were hampered by the lack of adequate dictionaries. Existing dictionaries were in other Western languages, and they were mostly designed for use in translating from Mongol into a Western language. They were usually based either on the traditional written language or on a dialect other than Khalkha, the new standard language.

As Samuel Johnson said, dictionaries are like watches, the worst is better than none, and the best cannot be expected to be perfect. Professor Hangin had to make a difficult choice: what words and expressions to include while staying within a rather narrow limit of time and space. Inevitably the dictionary reflects these limitations, and the user will at times feel frustrated. Under "face" no mention is made of "face" in the sense of one's "good name, honor, prestige." The Mongol equivalent listed for "to gamble" is "to play for money," but there is nothing about "to gamble: take a risk in making a decision." The author renders "to have a thick skin" as "not easily disturbed or irritated," which is more an explanation than an idiomatic translation. In Khalkha there is an expression literally meaning "face-thick" for "shameless: thick-skinned." Hangin lists "to fall, fell, fallen," but under "fell" he ignores the causative "to fell (a tree)" and other meanings of "fell." More examples of this sort could be listed.

Leafing through this dictionary one gets a glimpse of how the Mongols strove