

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" Canadians 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: Mladinska Knjiga, 1982. Pp. 265.

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 parochialism. 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 *lotiško* (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 appeared, but for anything regarding Old Prussian Toporov's work must now be consulted.

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 *kāsti* 'to bite,' *kandù* 'I bite' with the incorrect circumflex intonation, whereas under the heading *kōs* 'part' (69) we find the same word *kāsti*, *kāndu* with the correct acute intonation. Inconsistently the noun *kāsnis* is given without accentuation for *kāsnis* 'piece, bit.'

A Lith. form *kavōlys* '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. *kavōlis* 'smith.'

Bezljaj correctly notes (68) that Old Prussian *carbīo* 'mlinski lijak, Mühlenkasten, mill-stone box' is an emendation for the actually attested *tarbīo* (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 *kīpa* 'rag, patch' (101) Bezljaj lists Old Prussian *kurpi*, defined as 'črevelj, shoe' as attested in the Third Catechism, but on the same page under the heading *kīpec* 'črevelj, shoe' he lists Old Prussian *kurpe* 'črevelj, 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 Bezljaj correctly notes, with Lith. *kūrpė* 'shoe.' Under the heading *kīplja* 'snow-shoe' (102) Old Prussian *kurpe* is, however, incorrectly defined as 'čevljar, shoemaker.'

Under the heading *kopēti* (64) 'to become stuffy' Bezljaj writes that Proto-Slavic **kopъtь* is derived from Indo-European **kuēp-*, **kuep-*, **kūp-* 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 *kop-* 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 **qeūēp-*. In the entry *kopēti* 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 *līzati* (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. *dēgti* 'goreti, bežati'.' In the first place *dēgti* is Lithuanian, not Latvian (which is *degt*); in the second place *dēgti* 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 *dēgti* 'to do some thing violently (to run, to hit, to throw, to fall).' The impression one gets from Bezljaj's dictionary is that 'to run' is a common meaning, but I suspect that many Lithuanians are unfamiliar with this 28th meaning of *dēgti*. Also under the entry *kuriti* Bezljaj refers to Fraenkel's etymological dictionary of Lithuanian (1955ff:319) for a further discussion. Fraenkel does indeed mention Jēgers' complete discussion of the Baltic cognates found in his dissertation, which Fraenkel quotes in the typescript copy. It should be noted, however, that Jēgers' 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. Būga's *Rinktiniai raštai*, apparently he did not always check this important source. Under the heading *lósos* 'Salmo salar' (151) we encounter the misprint Lith. *lasišá* for correct *lašišà* and the form *lasaša*. According to Būga (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-šāh-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 *matúoti* is defined as 'motati,' but standard Lith. *matúoti* means 'to measure'; Lith. *matóti* means 'to wrap, to wind.'

I have noted the following misprints: Menénedez for Menéndez (19); Old Prussian *culcsi* for *culdzi* (57); English *skate* 'drsalke' for *skates* (73); Lith. *gražùs* for *gražūs* 'beautiful' (82); Latv. *krunķēt* for *krunkēt* 'to wrinkle' (87); Lith. *krāké* for *krākė* 'Picus martius, woodpecker' (105); Strang for Stang (117); Lith. *rairê* for *rairėti* 'to talk nonsense' (120); *l̥jati* for *l̥jati* 'to pour' (121); Lith. *lésti* for *lèsti* 'zobati, to peck' (126); Old Prussian *anlāut* for *aulāut* 'to die' (127); Müllenbach for Mühlenbach (134, 135, 194); Mülenbach for Mühlenbach (136); **l̥jo*, **l̥jo* for *l̥jō l̥jō* 'I pour' (145); *Franekel* for *Fraenkel* (146); Old Prussian *limtweg* for *limtwey* or *limtwei* 'lomiti, to break' (149); Old Prussian *maigun* for *maiggun* 'spanje, sleep' (183); Lith. *meldžiû* for *meldžiù* 'I pray' (193); Mayhofer for Mayrhofer (194); Lith. *vārmās* for *vařmas* 'gnat, mosquito' (199); *m̥ro* for *m̥rō* 'I die' (200); Old Prussian *pirzdau* for *pirsdau* 'before' (210); Gothic *naga þs* for *naqaps* 'naked' (212); Mackeh for Machek (231); Old Prussian *anzdris* for *anxdris* '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.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Būga, K. 1958-1962. *Rinktiniai raštai*. I, 1958, comp. Z. Zinkevičius and edited by V. Mažiulis; II, 1959, comp. Z. Zinkevičius; III, 1961, comp. Z. Zinkevičius; Rodyklės (indices), 1962, comp. Z. Zinkevičius.
- Fraenkel, Ernst. 1955 ff. *Litauisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht.
- Jēgers, Benjamiņš. 1966. *Verkannte Bedeutungsverwandtschaften baltischer Wörter*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht. Also published as pp. 6-162, 291-307 in *KZ*, Vol. 80.
- Schmalstieg, William R. 1969. "Four Old Prussian Etymologies," *Baltistica* 5:163-166.
- . 1978. Review of F. Bezljaj, *Etimološki slovar slovenskega jezika: prva knjiga*. *Language* 54:769.
- Toporov, V.N. 1975-1980. *Prusskij jazyk*. I, 1975; II, 1979; III, 1980. Moscow: Nauka.
- Trautmann, Reinhold. 1910. *Die altpreussischen Sprachdenkmäler*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht.

William R. Schmalstieg, The Pennsylvania State University

Elfriede Mader, *Rückläufiges Wörterbuch des Slowenischen* [= Klagenfurter Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft, Slawistische Reihe, 5]. Klagenfurt: Klagenfurter Sprachwissenschaftliche Gesellschaft, 1981. 244 pp. Austrian Schillings 200.00.

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.