each paper deals with a separate aspect of Kopitar's activity. Of special interest to this reader were the first, introductory article on "Kopitar's Share in the Evolution of Slavic Philology" by Rado L. Lencek, one of the longest in the volume; "By nature and education a rationalist, by disposition and temper a Romantic, all his life divided between the logic and realism of yesterday and the vision and utopia of tomorrow, a man of colossal erudition and knowledge, J. K. sought to respond to the challenges of the time with new ideas and plans, with which he brought to fruition by his immediate pupils and successors" [19]; the paper of Jole Pogadnik, "J. K. and the Issue of Austro-Slavism" ("With his philosophy of history, which claimed, according to the Greek ideal, that each minute ethnic group could compete for the biggest prize in culture, K. inspired creative enthusiasm especially in small nations" [35]); Henry Cooper's study on "K. and the Beginning of Bulgarian Studies" ("His insistence on the uniqueness of modern Bulgarian among the Slavic languages, its distinctiveness from Serbian, its structure . . . and its similarity as a result to Albanian and Romanian, led directly . . . to the establishment of modern Balkan studies" [59]); the two studies on Kopitar and Vas Karadžić (by Pavle Ivic and Benjamin Stolz); and "New Perspectives on the Collaboration Between Maksimiljan Vrhovac and J. K." by Olga Nedeljkovič ("K. in his program concerning the South Slavic literary languages in many instances had to rely on already existing, Illyrian, that is, Croatian, models and examples" [125]).

The concluding contribution by Sergio Bonazza, "J. K., His Place in Slovene Cultural History," is a justified plea for Kopitar's recognition as a scholar of international stature; however, it tends to go too far, in my opinion, in condemning his Slovene critics, who, after all, did have a point. As appendices, the volume contains the conference program and Kopitar's text "Patriotic Visions of a Slav" in English translation and in three contemporary versions (in microscopic print), two in German, one in Czech: an interesting and influential text, and one that is ideally suited to serve as basic reading material for a course in Slavic history, literature, or culture.

Thomas Eckman, University of California, Los Angeles

Martin E. Huld. Basic Albanian Etymology. Columbus, OH: Slavica, 1983. x, 213 pp., $17.95 (paper).

When I first saw the title of this book I was excited; by the time I finished it I was depressed. The author has an imperfect grasp of Albanian; his citations of references and forms are often inaccurate; he even goes so far as to tamper with verifiable data when he has failed to make sense of it. The book is divided into six chapters, of which the fourth, entitled glossary, is the largest (102 pp.) and contains the basic etymologies. I will therefore discuss it first.

The number of errors in this one chapter exceeds 300, and so I can only cite a few examples of different types. For 245 of 248 main entries, Huld cites all or part of the definition given in the 1954 Fjalor i gjuhës shqipe (Dictionary of the Albanian language, hereafter FGS), the authoritative Albanian dictionary until the publication of the 1980 Fjalor i gjuhës të Shqipërisë (Dictionary of the modern Albanian language), which is not mentioned in Huld's book. Huld also attempts to translate these definitions into English. There are more than 80 typographical errors in the Albanian definitions and over 90 major translation errors. (I did not count minor errors, e.g., translating qëndrueshëm të pëshku i këurri 'gusty' as 'a strong blow' [47].) Thus, for example, the phrase ashtu si duhet të jetë 'as it is supposed to be' is glossed 'as if it enjoyed life' (92). An example of Huld's tampering with verifiable data occurs in the definition of biash 'tail' (45). Apparently misunderstanding the idiom pesku i këurti 'spine' (literally 'the fish of the back'), he inserted a semicolon after pesku and cited this definition: "eshtë të lënëtshëm i peskut; të këurtit, i mbular [sic for mbular] me qime, . . . a scaly extension of
fish, of mammals one covered with hair. . . ." In fact, the definition means 'a mobile extension of the spine covered with hair.' In some cases, Huld's English makes no sense, e.g., 'an armed warrior used to keeping what is his, a man of strength in protection'; Huld's translation of "trim in [omitted by Huld] armastowe të cilin e mbante pas vete nëjri i fikshëm per [sic for per] mbrojtje" (52), which actually means 'an armed warrior whom a powerful man kept behind himself for protection.' Many mistaken glosses must be due to the fact that Huld did not look up the meanings of unfamiliar words. Thus, finikëtër 'nobility' is glossed as 'physique' (46), tretjes 'digestion' is glossed as 'treatment' (136), të njëmlimit 'salty' as 'distinctive' (82), and i majme 'fat' as 'viable' (87).

Even the main entries are sometimes misglossed. Mrgull means 'sog' not 'raincloud' (93). Huld has a main entry ëj (64), which he glosses 'blow (of inanimate things like wind),' and he states: 'not included in the Fjalor i gjuhës shqipe, which instead cites the Gheg form ëj.' In fact, the standard Tosk form, which is ëj, is included in FGS in the entry for the Tosk medio-passive ëjem 'swell up, puff up, become swollen.' The active form means 'to cause to swell' and applies to both animate and inanimate beings, as the FGS definitions make quite clear.

The glossary also contains over 130 other errors. While some of these are undoubtedly accidental typographical errors, others are obviously not. Thus, e.g., Huld claims that G. Meyer (Etymologisches Wörterbuch der albanischen Sprache, 1891) cites Greek phoros 'tribute' in connection with Albanian bërë 'burden, fetus' (41). In fact, Meyer cites phorós, which he glosses 'schwanger' (pregnant) (28). The error, then, is not due to a misplaced accent, but to Huld's failure to cite Meyer correctly. A more substantive error is his claim that Meyer derives Albanian larg 'far' from Turkish alarga [sic for alarg] (85). In fact, Meyer derives the Albanian form from Latin largus (238). Huld uses the abbreviation OCS, which he defines as Old Church Slavic (9), indiscriminately for genuine Old Church Slavic, for later Church Slavic, e.g., kalit' 'temper, cool down' (not 'be cold' (38), and unattested Common Slavic, e.g., *vežul 'elm,' which is cited without the asterisk (87). He also claims that Indo-European *ē can give Slavic ë (45).

The other chapters of the book are the following: (1) Historical and ethnographic background, (2) Plan of the glossary, (3) Phonemic inventories of surveyed dialects, (5) Synopsis of the principal developments of the Indo-European sounds in Albanian, and (6) Relation of Albanian to the other Indo-European languages. The chapters are followed by notes, bibliography, and an Albanian index, all of which contain errors and omissions. For example, in the notes, the definition of mërkosh 'man in couvade' is translated using present tense forms when the Albanian has all imperfects, a fact which alters the significance of the point Huld is trying to make (171); note 8 to chapter 5 was omitted; Ribezzo (19) is cited in the glossary (44) but not in the bibliography; the index is missing at least shkop 'staff' and ag 'private (vulgar);' shkel 'century' is listed as a main entry when it is not; çrëndë should be çrinë.

Chapters 1-3 and 5-6 also contain numerous errors, misglosses, and misstated facts of fact. Thus lemi (1) should be senti (modern shënjë 'holy'). Huld's statement that 'The Albanian-speaking regions of Yugoslavia belong to the Gheg dialect area' omits the fact that the dialects of the Ohrd-Presa region of Yugoslav Macedonia are Tosk (2). In chapter 2, Huld states: "The feminine plural is identical to the definite singular; the definite article is -e' and "Most adjectives do not have distinctive feminine forms" (16). In fact, many Albanian feminine nouns have no marker in the plural; e.g., shëpët 'house/houses' but shëpëtis 'the house,' and almost all adjectives either take the ending -e when modifying feminine nouns or -a when modifying feminine plural nouns. Given the glossary, I did not attempt to check chapter 2 carefully, but I noted other obvious typographical errors (ëch for 28 [24], j for J [29]) and at least one misleading reanalysis (25). Huld's own inventory of the dialect of Pritishina (28) is apparently based on the speech of one person (viii). This might still be a valuable contribution, but how can one trust an analysis done by someone who cannot tell a noun from a substantive (92)?

This same comment applies to chapters 5 and 6. Some, perhaps even most, of what Huld writes is correct, and if he subscribes to the theory that Indo-European had three sets of velars
(plain, palatal, and labialized) and six laryngeals (three voiced and three voiceless), that, at least, can be a subject of debate. But how can one trust the formulations of someone who cannot supply correct glosses, who glosses 'forearm' (l offenders) as 'elbow' (150) and 'anus, large intestine' (zgurde) as 'intestines' (151), who translates 'ardha' as 'may I come to you' as 'to begin' (65)?

Having found so much to criticize in this work, what can I say that is positive? Albanian data are among the most difficult to analyze historically. The earliest texts we have are only four or five centuries old, and the language obviously underwent a large variety of complex sound changes and successive external influences during the previous millennia. Under these circumstances, the task of historical description must be approached with the utmost caution and painstaking exactness wherever possible. It is clear that the author of this book tried very hard and put a lot of effort into it; it is sad that he was not equal to his task.

Victor A. Friedman, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill


Nekrylova’s compact and attractive book contains a wealth of information on the folklore of the marketplace in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Although she emphasizes that she is dealing with city folklore and with folkloric genres in the late stages of their development, her book reveals much about the origins of these genres in rural Rus’ and their viability in previous centuries. After a brief introduction describing the prevalence of the fair (jar-marka) in nineteenth-century Russia, the origins of city festivals, and the history of research on her topic, Nekrylova divides her material into the following chapters: (1) the festive marketplace; (2) bear comedy; (3) the puppet show (with special emphasis on “Petruha”); (4) the equest (a portable pea). show with jocular commentary by the man who ran the show and turned the crank; (5) bearers’ persiflage on the balconies of the balalaika; (6) the interior of the balalaika and the shows staged there. Beautiful illustrations abound in this book and add to its value immensely. We not only read about the swings (the equivalent of modern amusement park rides), the slides (gory), the colorful bucksters and barkers and reenactments of the marketplace — we see exactly how all of this looked. The exuberance, the loudness and color, is well embodied. We are provided with a large sampling of hawkers’ cries and barkers’ repertoire.

There are descriptions of freak shows. The star of one of them, for example, is the “African Man Eater” (“direct from the island of Toombo-Yombo, deep in the heart of the Sahara Desert”), whose main feat is gulping down live pigeons and who never gets around to the grand finale promised by the barkers outside (eating up a human being) because volunteers from the audience are not forthcoming.

There is not room in this review to describe each chapter in detail, but a good representative sample is the chapter on bear entertainment (33-53). Here Nekrylova outlines the history of bear performances in Russia; she mentions the Slavic totem bear, the ancient Russian reverence for the bear, the skomorok as early bear handlers, and bear entertainments for the turs of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. She explains the importance of the goat figure as part of the act (both bears and goats have ancient connections with fertility cults) and hypothesizes that in the “baiting” of the bear by the goat figure and the “wrestling match” between the bear and the handler, nineteenth-century bear comedy preserved vestiges of ancient bear-baiting and single combat between bears and men. She also emphasizes (48) that even in ancient Russia the bear act had overtones of humor; it was a “laughing variant” of a serious spectacle, and the bear handler was an ancestor of the rodeo clown, who parodies the skilled performance of the cowboy by appearing to toy with the bull.