

DIE RUSSISCHEN LEHNWÖRTER IM SLOVENISCHEN: DIE IN DER ERSTEN HÄLFTE DES 19. JAHRHUNDERTS ÜBERNOMMENEN WÖRTER. By *Annelies Lägried*. Geschichte, Kultur und Geisteswelt der Slovenen, vol. 12. Munich: Dr. Dr. Rudolf Trofenik, 1973. 134 pp.

The title of this book is rather misleading: it is not a comprehensive study of Russian loan words in Slovenian, even of those words which entered the language in the first half of the nineteenth century, as the subtitle implies. In fact, Lägried's book deals with a number of different topics and one wishes that she had restricted herself to less but had produced a more thorough study. Following her brief consideration of the problem of intra-Slavic borrowing (pp. 11–17), Lägried offers a survey of the history of the Slovenian literary language (pp. 18–40) and the role which Valentin Vodnik played in the development of this language (pp. 41–47), and a discussion of the Slovenian dictionaries compiled by Vodnik and Anton Murko in the first quarter of the nineteenth century (pp. 47–57, 59–66)—before we get to the list of words which Lägried designates as Russian loan words in Slovenian (pp. 67–112). As a result, only about ten pages (pp. 113–22) deal specifically with the topic presumably under discussion.

Despite the broad range of topics covered, certain questions come to mind which might have been treated, or treated in greater detail, for example, how does one decide that a particular lexical item is “borrowed” from one Slavic language into another. In view of the fact that many of the words cited by Lägried are of Slavic origin and have a phonological shape which agrees with regular Slovenian developments, it is hard to be sure that they are borrowed, for example, *glagol* (“verb”), or *rokav* (“branch of a river”). It also seems arbitrary to say that these words have been taken from Russian when other Slavic languages might have been the source, for example, *grb* (“coat of arms”) which might have been taken from Czech or Polish. Another problem which should have been discussed is whether these words were actually part of the language of the nineteenth century. Both dictionaries were compiled before the Slovenian literary language was really codified and hardly seem reliable sources for such a study of the language. The fact that only about 40 percent (eighty-three) of the approximately two hundred words listed as Russian loan words are still part of the modern language underscores this point. Even those which are still part of the language (such as *jantar* [“amber”]) would have only had sporadic use in the nineteenth century.

These points aside, however, this reviewer is most disappointed by the lack of a serious consideration of two points: what is a “Russian loan word,” and what are the general areas which were affected by such loan words. (For example, in his Serbo-Croatian etymological dictionary, Skok suggests various origins for some of these same words. Given the very tenuous degree of Russian-Slovenian cultural relations in the late eighteenth century, it is difficult to see a Russian source for some concepts.) There are, however, some interesting sections in Lägried's book which help compensate for the weaknesses, for example, her survey of the development of the Slovenian literary language from the sixteenth to the eighteenth century. In the long run, this small volume may prove useful to South Slavicists interested in topics other than the one indicated in the title.

KENNETH E. NAYLOR  
Ohio State University