

English equivalents, and (3) incorrect designation of stylistic level, often including Russian examples with exotically mixed styles.

The authors of the *Russian-English Idiom Dictionary* have avoided these pitfalls to produce a reference tool that should prove invaluable to the field. They have limited their corpus to authoritative Russian lexicons (the Ushakov and the 1957 four-volume Academy dictionaries), extracted items identified as to participation in idioms from a store of computer-coded materials, and supplied Russian examples only when they were not provided by the source. Wherever possible, English idioms corresponding in meaning to the Russian ones are given, otherwise an explanation of the Russian idiom is supplied. Educated native speakers of Russian and English have worked together in an admirable combination of man and machine processing.

Although no mention is made of the total number of entries, random sampling indicates that well over five thousand head-word items are included. Often the head word covers a number of idioms, not infrequently as many as twenty, so that the volume provides an extensive reference tool from the standpoint of quantity alone. Lexical and grammatical variations are clearly indicated. Words are marked not only for stress but also for dieresis, a welcome addition. The stylistic code, derived from the source materials, encompasses eighty-five identifying levels of usage; albeit the majority of entries carry no special stylistic evaluation (in cross listing, only the full items carry the full style code). Head words and English references are given in capital letters for easy identification.

There are some transgressions. These are mainly in blind cross listings, English misspellings, and minor typographical matters. (The unfortunate *derzhat' kamen' shire*, where obviously what is intended is *derzhat' karman shire*, in the introduction should not be taken as an indication of the contents of the volume.) Most of the English equivalents succeed well in conveying the stylistic tone of the original. Some could benefit by fuller explanation: for example, under *kombinatsiia iz trekh pal'tsev* "a fig," *derzhat' bank* "to keep the bank," a brief additional comment would make the meaning clearer; *pokryt' aplodishmentamy* connotes not merely "to applaud" but "to applaud to a considerable degree"; *ustavit'sia/smotret' kak baran na novye vorota* is used not only to indicate that someone is "out of one's element" but that the speaker has every expectation that this person should well know or be capable of dealing with the situation; *priiti k shapochnomu razboru* is not "to come to the end of (something)" but "to come at the end of (something)," that is, when everyone is preparing to depart. Such shortcomings, however, can easily be accommodated in future editions of the dictionary, a work which should readily find its way into every Slavist's library.

ADELE K. DONCHENKO
University of Minnesota

MULTILINGUALISM IN THE SOVIET UNION: ASPECTS OF LANGUAGE POLICY AND ITS IMPLEMENTATION. By *E. Glyn Lewis*. Contributions to the Sociology of Language, no. 3. The Hague and Paris: Mouton, 1972. xx, 332 pp. 62 Dglds., paper.

There are only 210,000 speakers of the Icelandic language, but Mordvinian, a Finnic language, has six times as many: 1,263,000. Yet Icelandic is flourishing, and Mordvinian will probably disappear as a spoken language in the next century.

Part of the explanation for this striking difference is that Icelandic functions as the official language of a viable, though tiny, country, while Mordvinian is just one of over a hundred languages of the Soviet Union. Unlike Mordvinian, however, many of these Soviet languages are doing quite well in their competition with Russian, the federal language. Tadjik, which had about a million speakers in the 1926 census, is now spoken by well over two million, according to the 1970 census. The multilingual situation in the Soviet Union is so complicated that one thinks of the Russian proverb, "Here even the devil would break a leg." It is to the credit of the author, E. Glyn Lewis, that he emerges from his study of Soviet multilingualism unfractured; in short, he has given us a useful and lucid account.

One essential element in Soviet language policy has been the concept of *dva potoka*, or two streams, which seeks "to maintain a delicate if unstable equilibrium between promoting the modernizing, technological and centralizing functions of Russian, as well as simultaneously taking account of the intractable fact of the practical necessity of the native languages for the vast majority, and their emotional adherence to them" (p. 60). In obvious conflict with this policy is the Soviet ideological position of *sblizhenie*, or the coming together of Soviet peoples with an ultimate *sliianie* or merging, which presumably would lead to the submerging of all Soviet languages other than Russian.

Lewis points out (p. 45) that the Russians are much like the English (he is too tactful to include the Americans) in their reluctance to learn other languages of the Soviet Union. Only 3 percent of Russians know a second Soviet language, and they are undoubtedly Russians living in other republics. But even in the latter situation there is a tendency for members of the major nationalities to ignore the local languages: "An observer noted in 1965 that Russians or Ukrainians were cynical about the need to learn the language of those among whom they lived, and in fact made no attempt to get acquainted with other major languages, such as Tadjik, Kazakh, Kirgiz or Uzbek" (p. 210).

The language burden for many of the smaller nationalities can be heavy indeed. In school Uyghur children are faced with the study of four languages: Uyghur for the first several grades, then Kazakh, the language of the republic, then Russian, the federal language, then a foreign language. In such a situation the authorities, following "parents' wishes," may simply eliminate Uyghur from the curriculum. Sometimes another choice is made: the language of the republic is jettisoned. This happens in the Ukraine, where Polish, Hungarian, and Moldavian minorities maintain their native languages and Russian, but omit Ukrainian from their curriculum.

Lewis presents a large amount of information on all aspects of Soviet multilingualism: language policy, demographic factors, language maintenance, bilingual education, even theories of second language pedagogy. There are thirty-seven tables and one map, which shows the location of speakers of eighty-five different languages. Lewis will offend Latvians and Lithuanians by his characterization of their languages as "Slavonic" instead of "Baltic" (p. 26); on his language map he uses the more accurate but old-fashioned term "Lettic." He has a useful, twenty-five-page bibliography of works on bilingualism and language problems. Though I shall not list the typographical errors, of which there are a goodly number, I shall claim personal privilege in pointing out that the T. E. Magner cited in the bibliography is really T. F. Magner. The reader should be warned about the numerous mistakes in translation of Russian titles in this bibliography. Either Lewis himself is some-

what uncertain in his handling of the Russian language or some unnamed assistant deserves the blame. Here are a few examples: *v srednei shkole* is translated as "in Early School" instead of the correct "in Secondary School" (p. 316); *v stranakh narodnoi demokratii* comes out "in the Schools of the Nations" instead of "in the Countries of the People's Democracies" (p. 315); *Velikii iazyk nashoi epokhi* should not be "The Great Languages in World History" but "The Great Language of Our Era" (p. 320). Such minor mistakes aside, this work is a solid contribution to Soviet studies and sociolinguistics.

THOMAS F. MAGNER

The Pennsylvania State University

DUMBARTON OAKS BIBLIOGRAPHIES, BASED ON *BYZANTINISCHE ZEITSCHRIFT*. Series 1: LITERATURE ON BYZANTINE ART, 1892-1967. Vol. 1: BY LOCATION. Edited by *Jelisaveta S. Allen*. London: Mansell, published for the Dumbarton Oaks Center for Byzantine Studies, Washington, D.C., 1973. Part 1: AFRICA, ASIA, EUROPE (A-IRELAND). lxxviii, 518 pp. Part 2: EUROPE (ITALY-Z), INDICES. vi, 499 pp. \$60.00.

Here are the first volumes of a new bibliographic tool of extraordinary value. For many years the staff of Dumbarton Oaks has been extracting and organizing systematically the bibliographies which constitute part 3 of each issue of the *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*. Now these extracts (which often include substantial comments) are presented in handy encyclopedic form, slightly reduced in size, but clearly legible. These first volumes will surely remain among the most valuable of the project, for they make instantly accessible the basic bibliography for the art and archeology of every site significant for Byzantine culture, broadly defined. Whether you want a detailed illustrated description of a specific church or a general topographic treatment of a city or region you can expect to be guided to the best available literature in both periodicals and monographs. The next volume to be published will complete the art historical part of the project, grouping entries under more general subject headings for the various media, for iconography, literary sources, and so forth; and future volumes will extend the coverage to other aspects of Byzantium.

Users will be eternally grateful to Mrs. Allen and her assistants for the many precautions they have taken to facilitate consultation. The scheme of organization is essentially self-evident and is clearly explained in the introduction. Each entry has a code number, there are cross references to variant names, and a full index of authors is included. The combined index of place names has a systematic listing of the major monuments or regions of the most important cities, and (in italics) the code numbers of scattered entries which mention the building or site in passing. Entries may be appropriately duplicated, as Halle's *Bauplastik von Vladimir-Suzdal*, which is listed under both "USSR, Sculpture" and "Vladimir." Other entries are divided up and distributed when that is the most satisfactory solution. In short, the editorial work is ideal, and the bibliography will be as helpful as the nature of its source permits.

Sixty volumes of the *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, extending over a period of seventy-five years, edited by human beings, not computers, naturally reveal irregularities in coverage. They also offer the alert browser intriguing insights