it is a recording of some of his very own experiences; for an ethnographer and social
analyst it represents a vivid study of the interaction between “old” and “new” Canadi­
ans in a particular geographic location; a literary historian can see in it a variation on
an old theme. Even a linguist can find the book interesting material for the study of the
influences of the English syntax on the author’s native Slovene. In Slovenia the novel
is very popular. “Prešernova družba”, which caters mainly to its subscribers, has
already run out of copies. In libraries there have been waiting lists of people who want
to read it. To meet the demand, both “Nedeljski dnevnik” in Ljubljana, and “Večer” in
Maribor are serializing Dolenc’s story.

Irma M. Ožbalt, Montréal

France Bezljaj, Etimološki slovar slovenskega jezika: druga knjiga, K-O. Ljubljana:

In my view every etymological dictionary is a fundamental contribution to the
culture of the nation which produces it and therefore also a contribution to world
culture. The second volume of this dictionary (the first volume of which I reviewed in
1978) is no exception and its author is to be thanked for providing us with the results
of his great erudition. Particularly interesting for me is the author’s willingness to cast
his etymological net broadly and to capture the relationships with the Baltic languages.
This is a welcome antidote to what I perceive as the typical East European parochi­
alism. I cannot find any major faults in his dictionary but since it is the duty of the
reviewer to find fault I must content myself with noting minor inconsistencies, errors
and misprints.

One notes, e.g., that for the concepts ‘Lithuanian’ and ‘Latvian’ respectively Bezljaj
uses litavsko (abbr. lit.) and lotisko (abbr. lot.) instead of the forms litovski and
letonski or latovski found in the Slovene Academy Dictionary (Vol. II).

In the first volume of Bezljaj’s dictionary it was probably not possible to take into
consideration V.N. Toporov’s new Prusskij jazyk, three volumes of which have ap­
appeared, but for anything regarding Old Prussian Toporov’s work must now be consul­
ted.

Under the heading kaditi ‘to smoke’ (9) Bezljaj repeats the suggestion that Old
Prussian accodis ‘dimnik v izbi, hole in a hut for smoke to escape’ derives from
*at-kodis and that the second element should be connected with the Slavic root *kad-.
Had he quoted Toporov (1975:70), the reader would be aware that Old Prussian
accodis has also been corrected to *aucodis and been connected with Polish uchod
‘Entweichen, escape’ (Trautmann 1910:298). He would have also found my suggestion
(1969:166) that accodis should be phonemicized as /akutis/ deriving from the Baltic
root ak- ‘eye’ plus a diminutive ending -utis and that the word originally meant
something like ‘little eye.’ A parallel would be found in the derivation of the English
window from Old Norse vindauga — vindr ‘wind’ plus auga ‘eye’ (see Webster’s Third
New International Dictionary, p. 2620).
Under the heading kósiti 'to lunch' (70) we find Lith kąsti 'to bite,' kandu 'I bite' with the incorrect circumflex intonation, whereas under the heading kós 'part' (69) we find the same word kąsti, kandu with the correct acute intonation. Inconsistently the noun kąnis is given without accentuation for kąnis 'piece, bit.'

A Lith. form kavóllys 'faber' is given (75), although the word does not occur in the Lithuanian Academy Dictionary. With such a stress pattern the word cannot be a nominative singular, so presumably it stands for Lith. kavólis 'smith.'

Bezlaj correctly notes (68) that Old Prussian carbio 'mlinski lijak, Mühlenkasten, mill-stone box' is an emendation for the actually attested tarbio (Elbing Vocabulary 325), but he fails to note (68) that Old Prussian kargis 'army' is an emendation for the actually attested kragis (Elbing Vocabulary 410).

Another curious inconsistency is that under the heading kėpa 'rag, patch' (101) Bezlaj lists Old Prussian kurpi, defined as 'cevelj, shoe' as attested in the Third Catechism, but on the same page under the heading kąpec 'cevelj, shoe' he lists Old Prussian kurpe 'cevelj, shoe' (Elbing Vocabulary 500). But kurpi and kurpe are merely alternative spellings (perhaps reflecting dialect difference) of the same word and both are cognate, as Bezlaj correctly notes, with Lith. kūrpe 'shoe.' Under the heading kąplja 'snow-shoe' (102) Old Prussian kurpe is, however, incorrectly defined as 'cevljar, shoemaker.'

Under the heading kopėti (64) 'to become stuffy' Bezlaj writes that Proto-Slavic *kop̂st is derived from Indo-European *kyp̂- just like kipeti 'to boil' and kvapiti 'to drip from a liquid food.' It is not completely clear how one could get from any of the proposed Indo-European root forms to a Slavic kop̂ which would seem to suppose an Indo-European root *kop- or *kap-. In addition if one looks under the heading kvapa where the verb kvapiti is also listed one finds that cognate forms are to be derived from Indo-European *qēyp̂. In the entry kopėti the cognate Old Indic kūpyati is defined as 'kadi, jezi' (65) whereas in the entry kvapa the same Old Indic word is defined as 'vre, jezi se' (116).

Under the heading lizati (145) 'lingere, lambere, to lick' one might add the cognate Lith. liežūvis 'tongue,' Armenian lizem, Old Irish ligim 'I lick.'

In the entry kuriti (113) one finds the collocation: 'lot. dėgti 'goreti, bežati.' In the first place dėgti is Lithuanian, not Latvian (which is degt); in the second place dėgti means 'to burn (both transitive and intransitive),' but only rarely 'bežati, to run.' The Lithuanian Academy Dictionary (Vol. 2, 1969:369) gives for the 28th meaning of dėgti 'to do some thing violently (to run, to hit, to throw, to fall).’ The impression one gets from Bezlaj’s dictionary is that ‘to run’ is a common meaning, but I suspect that many Lithuanians are unfamiliar with this 28th meaning of dėgti. Also under the entry kuriti Bezlaj refers to Fraenkel's etymological dictionary of Lithuanian (1955ff:319) for a further discussion. Fraenkel does indeed mention Jégers' complete discussion of the Baltic cognates found in his dissertation, which Fraenkel quotes in the typescript copy. It should be noted, however, that Jégers' dissertation was published in 1966 in the Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung auf dem Gebiet der Indogermanischen Sprachen and is easily available to interested scholars, so it would not be necessary to
go to the typescript original. I believe that this important Baltic etymological study should have been referenced in Bezlaj's dictionary.

Although in volume I of his dictionary Bezlaj (p. x) gives as one of his references K. Buga's Rinktiniai raštai, apparently he did not always check this important source. Under the heading lōsos 'Salmo salar' (151) we encounter the misprint Lith. lasiša for correct lašiša and the form lasaša. According to Buga (1962:650) the word Lasaša which occurs in Sirvydas' Dictionary is a misprint for Lašiša, but this misprint has been the source for errors in many subsequent linguistic works.

Bezlaj derives mat II 'checkmate' (171) from the final word of the Arabic expression eš-sāh-māt 'the king has died' and he writes that the stem is Indo-European *mrto-s 'dead.' But Arabic is a Semitic language and the masculine 3rd person singular of the past tense of the root m-w-t is māta. It seems to me quite probable that Semitic and Indo-European are eventually related, but one cannot derive the Arabic word māta from an Indo-European stem.

Since Armenian does not distinguish between a long and short /o/ the need for the macron on Arm. mōr 'blato, swamp' escapes me (192).

In the entry motāti 'navijat, sukati, to wind, to twist' (197), the Lithuanian word matuoti is defined as 'motati,' but standard Lith. matuoti means 'to measure'; Lith. matoti means 'to wrap, to wind.'

I have noted the following misprints: Menéndez for Menéndez (19); Old Prussian culcsi for culczi (57); English skate 'drsalke' for skates (73); Lith. gražūs for gražūs 'beautiful' (82); Latv. krunķēt for krunķēt 'to wrinkle' (87); Lith. krākē for krākē 'Picus martius, woodpecker' (105); Strang for Stang (117); Lith. rairė for rairėti 'to talk nonsense' (120); lįjati for lįjati 'to pour' (121); Lith. lėsti for lėsti 'zobati, to peck' (126); Old Prussian anläut for auläut 'to die' (127); Müllenhach for Mühlennach (134, 135, 194); Müllenhach for Mühlennach (136); *lįjo, *lėjo for lįjį lėjo 'I pour' (145); Franekel for Fraenkel (146); Old Prussian limtwey for limtweg or limtwei 'lomiti, to break' (149); Old Prussian maigun for maiggun 'spanje, sleep' (183); Lith. meldziū for meldžiū 'I pray' (193); Mayhofer for Mayrhofer (194); Lith. vārmas for vārmas 'gnat, mosquito' (199); mbrp for mbro 'I die' (200); Old Prussian pirsdau for pirsdau 'before' (210); Gothic naga ps for naqaps 'naked' (212); Mackeh for Machek (231); Old Prussian anzdris for anzdris 'adder, viper' (244).

At the end of the volume we read: "Lektorirali in korigirali: Alenka Šivic-Dular, Darja Globevnik, Bojan Čop, Marko Snoj, avtor in Vilko Novak." One would have hoped that the proofreaders could have done a better job. Proofreading is a serious matter and from my own many mistakes I have learned that when one is as careful as possible errors will still pass unnoticed. In my review of the first volume (1978) I called attention to the many misprints and I should like to do so again. An error in an authoritative etymological dictionary tends to be repeated over and over again and can have a harmful effect on scholarship for generations to come. Professor Bezlaj is a truly great scholar and he deserves more and better help from the Slovene academic establishment.
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In his introduction to this book, Otto Kronsteiner points out that, since Vasmer's of Russian published in 1957, we have seen backwards dictionaries of Serbo-Croatian, Macedonian, Ukrainian, Polish, Bulgarian and Czech; but hitherto, none for Slovene. This book is designed to fill that gap, but (as is indeed suggested by Kronsteiner) only temporarily, for the following reason:

Backwards dictionaries are normally re-compilations of the lemmata in standard ("forwards") dictionaries. The monumental *Obratnyj slovar' russkogo jazyka* (Moscow: Sovetskaja ènciklopedija, 1974), for example, is based on four standard Soviet Russian dictionaries, including the 17-volume one of 1948/64, and contains about 125,000 words. For Slovene, Mader (under Kronsteiner's supervision) rejected Pleteršnik's *Slovensko-nemški slovar'* (1894) because it was unsuitable, being outdated and full of too much dialect material. The Slovene Academy's *Slovar slovenskega knjižnega jezika* would have been ideal but was of course (and will for some time be) incomplete. The interim choice fell, then, on France Tomšič's *Slovensko-nemški slovar*, which contains only "about 40,000 words" (a rough calculation of the number of words in Mader's book results in 36,500).

Admittedly, this is a vast number of words for a single person to tabulate; in theory at least, however, it must be pointed out that the *Slovenski pravopis* of 1962 contains over 100,000 words, and would have served as a much better basis for a backwards dictionary of the language (words marked as non-standard could have been omitted). Nevertheless, this is a very useful first version.