

are only locational. Outside Russia, four concordances to Russian poets have appeared so far, all in 1974 and 1975: Demetrius Kourbourlis's concordance to Pasternak (Cornell University Press, 1974), Bilokur's concordance to Tiutchev, and this reviewer's concordances (together with rhyme dictionaries) to Batiushkov and to Baratynskii (both, University of Wisconsin Press, 1975). All four of these concordances were in preparation and in press at the same time and their formats differ. Unlike the Tiutchev concordance, the three others were computer-printed in their final form, and give a line as context for each use. Space does not permit discussion here of the other differences, nor the advantages and disadvantages of each format. The appearance of the Tiutchev concordance, along with the others, makes possible a new stage in the study of Russian poetry.

J. THOMAS SHAW

*University of Wisconsin, Madison*

THE GREAT RUSSIAN-ENGLISH DICTIONARY OF IDIOMS AND SET EXPRESSIONS: OVER 8,600 RUSSIAN ENTRIES. By *Piotr Borkowski*. London: Piotr Borkowski, 1973. xx, 384 pp. £5.00 in UK. £5.50 post free, abroad. (Available from Piotr Borkowski, 146 Gunnersbury Lane, London, England W3 9BA)

This book is the answer to a Russian student's prayer. First of all, it gives good English equivalents for the Russian entries. Second, it is immeasurably larger and more complete (containing 8,600 entries) than any other similar Russian-English work. Third, all the entries are accented, and labeled to indicate stylistic levels and usage. Finally, the work is arranged in such a way that it is almost always easy to find the expression that one is looking for.

The arrangement of the book is one that would recommend itself to authors of similar works in other languages. Rather than taking up large amounts of space by listing each expression under each of the component words, Mr. Borkowski has evolved a simple and sensible system of listing items: if an expression has one or more nouns in it, the entry is under the first noun; if there is no noun but a verb occurs, the entry is under the first verb; if there are neither nouns nor verbs, the entry is under the first adjective, if any; and if the expression contains none of these categories, it is listed under the first word in it, with prepositions, conjunctions, numerals, and personal and possessive pronouns disregarded "as unimportant words." A number of minor rules take care of certain special cases, as well as when there is a very large number of entries under one word (for example, *ruka* with 127 entries). This means that *nachinat' tu zhe muzyku* is under *muzyku*; *kuda vy klonite* under *klonite*; and *kak na kur'erskikh* is under *kur'erskikh*.

In some cases the rules do not seem to have been applied strictly. Under *odin* we find *odin-edinstvennyi*, *odin vsled za drugim*, *kak odin*, *odno i tozhe* (sic! for *to zhe*), and *tut est' odno* "no," which according to his rules should be found under the adjectives *edinstvennyi* and *drugim*, the pronoun *to* (*zhe*), and the adverbs *kak* and *tut*. Even if Mr. Borkowski considers *odin* to be a pronoun, which of course it is morphologically, this would only account for the placement of *odno i tozhe*, and I doubt that most users would consider *odin* anything but a numeral.

In many cases the Russian expressions are first translated by an English expression of the same stylistic level, which is then followed by a more literal and stylistically neutral translation, making it comprehensible to those who might not

be familiar with the idiomatic British expression. An example of this is *zadat' feferu komu* which is first translated by "give s.o. a wiggling." While most Americans, as well as users who are not native speakers of English, might not know this British informal expression, they will have no trouble with Borkowski's next two definitions: "reprimand s.o., give s.o. a good scolding."

The book is well printed and reasonably free of misprints (a list of those noted to date is provided by the author). One could perhaps wish that the author had not typed only on alternate lines—the bulk of the book (and presumably the price) could have been considerably reduced. Blank pages are scattered throughout the book in no easily discernible pattern, "left for reader's own notes." Since one would have trouble finding them to refer back to, and since the reader winds up paying book prices for note paper, I would suggest that it would be more desirable to omit them in future editions, unless they are needed to fill out the last signature, in which case it would be better to put them all at the end of the book, where they could be found more readily.

CHARLES E. GRIBBLE  
*Ohio State University*