erudition to attempt Mandelshtam (he contributes here three translations in collaboration with the poet W. S. Merwin), but Alexander Kovitz's translations of "O, I See You Clear" and "We Shall Gather Again in Petersburg" are a pleasant surprise. Kovitz is a rarity: an American poet who knows Russian. Brodsky, whose poetry is also perilous for the translator, has been well treated by Carl R. Proffer and George L. Kline (who have their subject's admiration) and Jamie Fuller (who has mine). I think Fuller has done the impossible: she has conveyed the Brodsky tone (ennui, irony, and that insight into what Novella Matveeva calls the "soul of things") and the intricacies of Brodsky's metaphysics, and she has done so with fidelity to the rhythms, rhymes, and phonics of the original. Her translations of Akhmatova and Gumilev are also good poetry. If it is true, as the late Ivan Kashkin said, that a translator must be his subject's most knowledgeable scholar and critic, then Proffer and Christine Rydel have met this definition. Proffer's essay "A Stop in the Madhouse" is an excellent analysis of Brodsky's *Gorbunov and Gorchakov*, and it is paired with his translation of this, the most difficult of Brodsky's long poems. Rydel's essay "The Metapoetical World of Bella Akhmadulina" is a sensitive study of this fine poet, and it goes with her very feminine translation of Akhmadulina's ultrafeminine "Fairytale About the Rain." Both essays, particularly their notes, tell us much that we need to know about these Russian poets, and both are fine criticism.

Criticism ranges in this issue from "scholarly" (appeal to a specialized audience) to "literary" (appeal to a little magazine audience). Of the items under "Acmeism" I especially like Denis Mickiewicz's *"Apollo* and Modernist Poetics," and I should stress the importance of Boris Bukhshtab's essay (ca. 1929), "The Poetry of Mandelstam," published here for the first time. Under "Style," Nathan Rosen's "Style and Structure in *The Brothers Karamazov*" and Elliott Mossman's "Pasternak's Prose Style" are good. Richard Luplow's "Narrative Style and Structure in *One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich*" proves that it is possible to discuss Solzhenitsyn intelligently without tedious treatises on politics. In the "Moot Points" department Priscilla Meyer takes the writers of such treatises to task in an essay titled "Hoist by the Socialist-Realist Petard: American Interpretations of Soviet Literature." Her statement is long overdue. The bibliographies of Akhmatova, Gumilev, Akhmadulina, and Brodsky make this issue a valuable reference work. And finally, the illustrations—rare photographs—make for a handsome journal.

In an introductory "Notice" the editors state: "We see the journal as a 'post-horse of enlightenment.' Whether it will be a thoroughbred or a nag remains to be seen." In my opinion, *RLT* is what Pushkin would call a *kon' retivyi*.

<div align="right">

Lauren G. Leighton
Northern Illinois University

</div>

RUSSIAN DERIVATIONAL DICTIONARY. By *Dean S. Worth, Andrew S. Kozak,* and *Donald B. Johnson.* New York: American Elsevier Publishing Co., 1970. xxiv, 747 pp. $22.95.

In the introduction to this work, the senior editor, Dean S. Worth, states that the *Russian Derivational Dictionary* does not present a description of Russian derivational morphology, but rather offers "materials" for its study. Worth and his col-

leagues used as their corpus the 110,000 words and expressions in Ozhegov and Shapiro, *Orfograficheskii slovar' russkogo iazyka* (4th ed., 1959). By the end of their seven-year project they had redistributed these words into nearly 11,000 families or "nests," with each nest having from one to sixteen subfamilies.

After the choice of corpus, the first major decision this group faced was whether to segment morphemes by computer or by hand. Although it was recognized that a trained scholar could segment Russian words with greater accuracy than a computer, these researchers opted for computer segmentation because they felt they could develop rules that would ensure a high degree of accuracy. They also believed that the computer operation might help them develop insights into the rules that order Russian word derivation. In practice, the computer had a significantly lower rate of accuracy than was expected, and about 27 percent of the segmented words had to be corrected by hand. Worth states, "In apparently identical environments one and the same entity was segmented differently." It would seem that the major stumbling block to more efficient segmentation procedures was the fact that the segmentation rules operated with routines based on strings of letters, with no reference to meaning or grammar.

In the second stage of this project the segmented words were reordered into families according to their synchronic roots ("occurrence roots"). The corpus was still alphabetized and in a rather amorphous state, since allographs of the same root (*nes/nos/nash/nosh* . . . "to carry") were separated from one another. In the third stage, therefore, all related occurrence roots were regrouped under a basic root—for example, the "carry" words were ordered in subfamilies under *nos*. For his basic roots Worth selected roots with the highest frequency of occurrence, rather than those that afforded the highest degree of morphophonemic predictability. Although Worth writes that he would now prefer to have taken the latter course, one would like to know more about the reasoning behind the original decision to use frequency as the criterion.

Of interest in light of this choice (frequency over morphophonemic predictability) is Worth's apparent theoretical inconsistency in using hypothetical derivational bases such as "ver" instead of the true headword *vera*. This controversial approach must be understood within the framework of his derivational theories as stated in " 'Surface Structure' and 'Deep Structure' in Slavic Morphology" (*American Contributions to the Sixth International Congress of Slavists*, vol. 1, 1968). Actually there is an inner consistency here between the preference for roots of highest frequency and the occasional use of hypothetical roots such as "ver," in that both decisions seem computer-oriented—that is, they seem to simplify the process of manipulation of lexical data.

In the fourth and final stage of *RDD*, words were rearranged within their basic root families and subfamilies in derivational chains. Particular problems were posed by compound words and prefixed words. It was decided that compounds such as *domovladel'itsa* should be treated as suffixal derivatives of compound bases (*domovladelets*) rather than as compounds of suffixed bases (*vladel'itsa*), although Worth maintains the possibility of simultaneous dual derivation for such words. Here, in theory, one notes a fundamental divergence between the ideas of Worth and Shansky, for the Soviet scholar would admit only one possibility, the unilinear one, a choice which Worth himself makes in practice. In this respect one of the more fruitful achievements of *RDD* was its rearrangement of prefixed words of the same

family in an order that suggests a derivational chain, such as *izvodit'/ proizvodit'/ vosproizvodit'/ pereproizvodit'*. 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.

<div align="right">

THOMAS J. BUTLER
University of Wisconsin

</div>

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]