

Ukrainian and Belorussian as intermediaries, since this has not been sufficiently recognized so far, especially in the case of the latter. As to previous treatment of the subject, the author presents a *catalogue raisonné*. If the need for her fresh treatment should not have been apparent before, it certainly will be after perusal of this section.

The purpose of her own book is then set forth very clearly (14 ff.): to ascertain the number of loan words entering Russian with German as the source language, in the period under review; their first occurrence—often considerably antedating the instances given by Vasmer (also in the new Soviet edition supplemented by O. N. Trubačev)—as well as the origin and routing of the words, with particular emphasis on the questions of High vs. Low German origin and of Polish mediation; the phonetic and morphological peculiarities of each word and—at least to some extent—their place in their respective semantic fields. General conclusions are constructed on a painstakingly erected basis. There can be no doubt that the author has splendidly acquitted herself. Linguistic evidence is exploited to its utmost limits, but the concrete cultural background is never lost sight of, especially in view of the frequent insufficiency of the former (*tjur'ma* is a case in point, exhaustively treated).

Among the linguistic problems which the author settles expertly are considerations of specifically Low German features, and Polish mediation. With regard to the latter, she has a shrewd observation to offer on the deviant place of the accent in loanwords mediated apparently by oblique Polish case forms (*muštúk* [now *mundštúk*] patterned on P *munsztuka*, etc., rather than on Nom. sg., p. 279; in the same way, *agént* may also very well come from Polish, despite Vasmer; cf. Hüttl-Worth, 42). That the two stems of a Polish noun may differ only by place of stress is an observation exceeding in importance the scope of Gardiner's special study.

In the part setting forth the linguistic conclusions (roughly two thirds of the book are taken up by a detailed discussion of the loanwords in alphabetical order), the author classifies the phonetic changes observed in loanwords (p. 278) and draws some morphological conclusions, in particular on the marked preference for feminine suffixes (281–283). Full weight is also attached to the semantic aspect: semantic change, classification, relationship between things and their names, and developments within the semantic field released by the mutual impact of the loanwords and native terms. The whole is crowned by conclusions linking the process of linguistic borrowing with the history of Russian civilization (p. 313), including a true maxim that "material civilization is more quickly taken up and more trustingly introduced into ordinary life by those whose cultural and intellectual level is lowest" (p. 48). Appendices on special topics (names of cloths, Oriental words, Belorussian texts) and several indices enhance the usefulness of the book as a reference work.

As the least pleasant part of a reviewer's job, observations on a few individual points, especially invidious in the case of a brilliant performance like Sunray Gardiner's, are necessary: p. 21, two lines misplaced; p. 23, if words like *bunt*, mediated by Polish, are treated as German loans in Russian, by the same token *šerenga* should be identified as Hungarian (*sereg*); p. 98, *Klwyer* follows *Kluyver*; p. 101, read P *tuzin*; p. 104, the Ukr. form is *žovnir*; pp. 115 and 280, German is *Kapitän*; pp. 3, 170, 228–229, and elsewhere, Gardiner vacillates between *Posol'sky* and *Posolskii Prikaz*, in the last instance on facing pages; p. 189, read P *Rzeczpospolita*; p. 238, read P *szwagier*; p. 248, R *bol'nica* three times without a soft sign; p. 262, read P *moždierz*; p. 264, there is no Polish Gen. pl. *fórm* (cf. St. Szober, *Gramatyka języka polskiego* [5th ed.], 198); p. 274, Linde gives *lancaft*, Modern Polish is *landszaft*; p. 287 note, read *leta*; p. 297, why should OR *lodsja* be a borrowing from Scandinavian?; p. 306, modern spelling is only *tancevat'*.

A few other points seem troublesome. An Upper German form may be the source

of R *bems* (p. 264): Austrian dialect has *Bems*. Since *jať* was still a distinct vowel in seventeenth-century Moscow speech (cf. Borkovskij, Kuznecov, *Istoričeskaja grammatika russkogo jazyka* [M., 1963], 138), perhaps the spelling *věna* (p. 268) is connected with the same problem. R *lužėnyj* (p. 144) presupposes a verb *ludit'* and cannot be derived from a hypothetical **luda*; the past participle of an imperfective verb is aspectually preconditioned to denote a continuing state, rather than the result of one specific action, and may well turn into an adjective (e.g., R *zoločėnyj, krašėnyj*).

But these are minor cavils and suggestions and in no way detract from the value of this splendid book, which goes a long way toward remedying the shortage referred to by Hüttl-Worth in her book (p. 9). Gardiner's work is a complement to Mrs. Worth's. It is warmly to be recommended: it is in the best tradition of British philological research, and it is up to date in linguistic methodology.

Herbert Galton, *University of Kansas*

Arturs Ozols. *Veclatviešu rakstu valoda*. Rīga: Liesma, 1965. 625 pp.; portrait.

When a scholar dies, his manuscripts, often the labor of many years, tend to be set aside and frequently fail to reach print. *Veclatviešu rakstu valoda*—a manual on Early Written Latvian by Arturs Ozols, who died at the height of his professional maturity in 1964—has had a better fortune: Ozols' materials, excerpts, and comments had been organized to the point where his colleagues could shape them into a publishable book, complete with appropriate indexes.

The above circumstances explain much of the unevenness encountered in the volume. The bulk of the book is a collage of citations, which, furthermore, have not invariably passed a final scrutiny by the late author. At least one more year of careful scholarly attention seems to be lacking; still, one can hardly demand that the editors (fully competent as they are, to name just the editor-in-chief, Daina Zemzare) should have spent that much time to bring Ozols' posthumous MS to a more nearly perfect state.

In examining the voluminous citations, it appears that some of them could have been dispensed with, had the late author himself put the book in its final shape. Among such are the excerpts on V. Pantenius' school policy (p. 508) and on the writings of Ansis Leitāns (524–526), taken from *Latviešu literātūras vēsture* (Rīga, 1959). The same applies to the bulky excerpts on the *Lettisch-Literarische Gesellschaft* from M. Ārons' book about the Society (527–530). It is quite open to question whether Ozols would have retained the excursus on the beginnings of the Latvian public school system (454–460), all of the many quotations from *Latweēschu Awises* (477–492), etc. Missing, on the other hand, is a separate treatment of Early Written Latgalian, which, after all, constitutes a clearly defined parallel line of development in Latvian literature. Some of the opinions reported or quoted (from A. Birkerts, E. Blesse, A. Augstkalns, and others) lack the appended critical comments that would bring them in line with current research.

The problem of periodization of literary Latvian has often been discussed; Ozols goes along with the view that "Early Written Latvian" subsumes all that was written before ca. the mid-nineteenth century, i.e., some 350 years in all (p. 11). Since the earliest surviving texts must have been preceded by others (rudimentary texts could have arisen in the thirteenth or even the twelfth century), Early Written Latvian could, conceivably, encompass a time span of some 600 years. It is difficult to imagine that this periodization will gain wide acceptance among Baltists.

A major technical flaw is the difficulty one faces in distinguishing directly quoted excerpts from Ozols' own paraphrases, emendations, and critical commentary. One could find one's way through the volume with much greater ease if different sizes of print, and possibly various kinds of quotation marks or some other technical device had been used to indicate the precise relationship of quoted and other material (see, e.g., pp. 323, 506).

In transliterated passages originally in Gothic (black letter, *Fraktur*) type, there is some lack of consistency and uniformity, much of it imported along with citations (cf. the excerpt [p. 184] from J. Zēvers' work on G. Mancelius' numerals, with the corresponding places in *Phraseologia Lettica* [1638]). Inconsistencies and vacillations occur in citing titles of books and articles as well. Most of these inconsistencies, to be sure, take the form of minor errata; still, a user in need of a precise title or exact citation will have to consult originals or facsimiles.

To avoid serious gaps in coverage and misinterpretations, Ozols has freely consulted, as one might expect, the appropriate literature published outside of Latvia. Curiously enough, either Ozols or his editors decided (apparently out of some important considerations) to avoid mentioning the authors by name. On p. 207 we are informed that J. Reiters' *Oratio Dominica* (1675) has been reprinted in facsimile (Copenhagen, 1954), are told what the title of the facsimile edition is, and are provided with some quotes from the Introduction—but the name of Benj. Jēgers, the editor and author of the introductory remarks, is carefully avoided. Similar evasions occur elsewhere as well. This highly unusual practice becomes especially awkward in the bibliography, where a special section of works published abroad is created (618–620); items in that section are entered without the name of the author (among them, Wolfgang P. Schmid, the Editor of *Indogermanische Forschungen*; Haralds Biezais, whose merits include a number of very important text discoveries [the oldest Latvian Lord's Prayer, for instance]; and others).

The positive contribution of Ozols' book is far from negligible, and it is not likely to lose its value in the foreseeable future. Scholars working with Early Written Latvian will not be able to ignore Ozols' comments and observations. Fragmented as they are and varying greatly in extent and incisiveness, they still amount to a considerable body of original scholarship. The "manual" aspect of the book is extremely useful; one can immediately locate references to discussions of any particular text, with the more important passages reprinted at length. The value of the book could have been further enhanced by appropriate illustrations, plates, facsimiles, and the like.

Kārlis Draviņš, Lund

Metropolitan Ilarion (I. Ohienko), ed. *Monk Chrabr on Slavic Writings: The Oldest Cyrillic Version of 1348*. (Readings in Slavic Literature, 4.) Winnipeg: Univ. of Manitoba Press, 1964. 28 pp.

The fourth volume of the *Readings*, a series edited by J. B. Rudnyékyj, is a photo-mechanical reprint of Ohienko's *Opovidannja čencja Xorobroho*, arbitrarily equipped with an English title. The pamphlet handily provides students of the beginnings of Slavic literacy with the oldest known dated version of the famous defense of the Slavic alphabet. A glossary and some notes in Ukrainian are included.

The subtitle claims that the edition is based on the "oldest cyrillic version of 1348." Such specification cannot be very accurate, and is contradicted even by