

on Hungarian influence on Austrian civilization, not merely on Hungary's contributions from a treasure house of *Naturvolk*. Because the Hungarians have a large "diaspora" of a pluralistic character, their influence on contemporary civilizations can be highly pertinent to diffusional studies. Inquiries into Hungarian intellectual influences (Ady's and Attila József's, for example) in Slovak, Croatian, and Rumanian literatures probably exist, but buried in learned journals. Given the large number of Americans of East European background, it is also pertinent to ask about Hungarian influence on American literature, a topic recently raised in *College English* (March 1974), by Rose Mary Prosen. In a contemporary context, a study such as this is meaningful when focused on genuine interaction—in this case, the ability of Hungarian civilization to be creative when receiving outside influences in its own environment or when encountering new environments.

ANTON N. NYERGES
Eastern Kentucky University

A DICTIONARY OF SLAVIC WORD FAMILIES. Compiled and edited by
Louis Jay Herman. New York and London: Columbia University Press, 1975.
xvi, 667 pp. \$20.00.

A unique cross between a root lexicon and a polyglot dictionary with prominent characteristics of an etymological dictionary, Herman's work is a comparative display of the vocabulary structure of the four major Slavic languages. Each of the two hundred articles is headed by a list of the various Russian, Polish, Czech, and Serbo-Croatian allomorphs of a particular Slavic root. The most important or interesting derivatives of the root are then listed in columns according to language so that morphologically identical words line up horizontally. English-language glosses are supplied for every derivative, and the semantic differences and similarities among cognates are immediately apparent. After the tabular listings, notes are provided which point out salient facts concerning the origin, form, and meaning of particular words. For example, the article for *chas* is structured as follows (only one of Herman's thirty derivatives is copied here):

ЧАС	CZAS, CZES	ČAS	ČAS
čas: hour	czas: time; weather; (gram.) tense	čas: time; weather; (gram.) tense	čas: hour; moment, instant
[R]	[P]	[Cz]	[S-C]

Notes for the article on *chas* point out the basic meaning of the root (time), the parallelism with other European languages in usage of the same word for both "time" and "weather," the rationale behind such far-removed derivatives as Polish *czasownik* (verb), Russian *chasovnia* (chapel), and the origins of calques like Polish *czasopismo* (magazine, periodical), on German *Zeitschrift*.

The value of root lexicons has long been recognized for advanced vocabulary study of Russian (compare the lexicons of Wolkonsky and Poltoratzky, George Z. Patrick, and Worth, Kozak, and Johnson). Herman's book recognizes

the need for similar expositions of the vocabulary structure of other Slavic languages, and provides a useful tool for pinpointing translator's "false friends"—for example, Russian *otperet'* (to unlock), Polish *odeprzeć* (to repel), Czech *odepřítí* (to refuse), Serbo-Croatian *odaprijeti* (to open)—for linguistic study of the routes of semantic or phonetic change, or for moments of pleasant and useful browsing.

PHILIP J. REGIER

University of Southern California

RUSSIAN CUBO-FUTURISM, 1910–1930. By *Vahan D. Barooshian*. The Hague and Paris: Mouton, 1974. 176 pp.

Literature on Futurism—as a movement both in literature and in the other arts—has grown considerably during the last decade. While Russian Futurism was virtually unknown to Western readers (except a small group of specialists) some ten or fifteen years ago, they now have available a number of monographs, translations, reproductions of original materials, and so forth. Vladimir Markov's *Russian Futurism: A History* has competently documented and put in perspective the main phenomena of the movement in Russia, and thus has laid the groundwork for further studies of specific groups, or of individual contributions.

Barooshian's study, entitled *Russian Cubo-Futurism, 1910–1930*, is, in effect, a presentation of the five major members of the so-called "Gileia" group. That these members were Khlebnikov, Mayakovsky, Burliuk, Kruchenykh and Kamenskii should not be questioned, although it might be noted that contributions by some other artists, especially Benedikt Livshits and Elena Guro, could have been afforded at least a brief subchapter to make the picture more complete.

The presentations of the five artists are quite lucid and well documented. They are preceded by a brief introductory chapter, "The Background of Early Russian Cubo-Futurism in Brief Historical Perspective." Perhaps because the perspective is so "brief," the triangle Symbolism-Cubism-Futurism appears a little too idyllic and too "equilateral." It is true that Cubism made itself felt in Russia earlier, but the question of the role of Cubism in the program of the Russian Futurists could have been afforded a little more discussion. On the other hand, the chapter entitled "French Surrealism and Russian Futurism" tends to concentrate, at times, on some less "intrinsic" aspects; it assigns too much importance to the French artists' ideological declarations. The interesting chapter on "Futurism in the Post-Revolutionary Period" contributes some valid remarks, although in some places a slight uncertainty in delineating the subject is evident. At one point, for example, the author speaks of "the avant-garde which included the Russian Cubo-Futurists" (p. 116), and on the next page of "the avant-garde and the Cubo-Futurists" (p. 117).

On the whole, this study is a valuable piece of research. It is a welcome addition to the body of "Futurisiana."

Z. FOLEJEWSKI

University of British Columbia