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their numerical functions. The material from this manuscript is incorporated by Stone into the basic list found in Laud misc. 47a. Both manuscripts conclude with thematic vocabulary lists containing the names of birds and plants, while Laud misc. 47a in addition contains a list of fishes and a list of the names of diseases, reflecting Ridley’s particular interest.

A third manuscript (Selden supra 61), containing thirty-seven folios with similar content, is also in the possession of the Bodleian Library. The comparatively short lists of Russian words in approximately alphabetical order with English equivalents have not been included in this edition, and might at some point have been a draft or part of a draft for Laud misc. 47a.
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The Dictionary contains a list of seventy-three head words, all body parts, or related to the body (for example život ‘stomach’ and pot ‘sweat’ are included amongst the headwords). Collocational, as well as grammatical, information is provided, and examples are used for illustration, some taken from well-known Russian authors.

Each entry follows a set pattern. To get an idea of how the Dictionary functions, we can consider the entry boroda ‘beard’. The entry contains six-and-a-half pages of grammatical and collocational information, in that order. Beginning with the latter, collocations are organized into sections such as ‘shape and size’, ‘colour’, ‘inflicting injuries’, ‘movements and gestures’. This helps to narrow down the search for an expression. For example, to find the equivalent of ‘wedge-shaped beard’, look in the ‘shape and size’ section (where we find boroda klinom). Alternatively the ‘thickness and tactile properties’ section will yield Russian expressions for ‘fluffy beard’ (pušistaja boroda), or ‘scraggly beard’ (židkaja boroda). Another advantage of this sub-sectioning is where the focus is not directly on body-parts, but on another category such as colour terms (in the case of boroda the colour section is nearly a page long). For example, it might be interesting to see how the colour term inventory has only a restricted use for body-parts; or how a particular term is restricted to cover body-parts, or a particular body-part, only. We discover for example that ‘light brown’ is denoted by rusj for beards (and hair), rather than, say, svelokoričnej. And it might turn out that in the expression sivaja boroda ‘a beard streaked with grey’ this particular meaning of sivj is restricted to hair, or human hair, or beards, only.

The collocations are certainly the most interesting part of the Dictionary, but much can also be gleaned from the grammatical information given for each entry. This is divided into ‘semantic’, ‘morphological’ and ‘syntactic’ information. The semantics section gives precisely what the term demarcates, for
example, ‘hair on lower part of face for humans’, as well as its use with animals (although animal body terminology is of secondary consideration). The morphology accounts for the stress of the noun, its gender and (somewhat redundantly) its animacy. Where there is one, the second locative is given (for example, na bokâ). The ‘syntax’ section is a little disappointing since it is no more than a brief description of how Russian marks possession and (in a few cases, location) of the body-part. Since the mechanisms, and the factors governing the choice of mechanism, is virtually the same for each section, a short paragraph in the Introduction would have probably sufficed.

Derivational information is also included (although for some reason this is treated in the collocational sections). Entries are given with their diminutives, augmentatives and ‘syntactic derivatives’. For example, borodênka is a possible diminutive, with slight disparaging nuance; and we are told that borodišča is used for the augmentative. For ‘syntactic derivatives’ (a term which is never explained) read (in most cases) ‘relational adjectives’. For example, we are told that to express ‘bearded’ a compound of the form -boródyj is constructed, for example, černoboródyj ‘blackbearded’. In the case of the entry nos, the relational adjective is given as nosovoj.

Apart from the Dictionary itself, there is an essay on the importance of body terminology in linguistics. The essay, by L. Iordanskaja, runs on for seventeen pages and functions to motivate the authors’ choice of body-part terminology: body-parts are highly frequent, and are important from a linguistic point of view. The essay is entirely devoted to this latter point, the thesis being that body-parts serve as a good illustration for how reality is divided up differently by different language communities. Of course, it is because they are common to all people that body-parts serve as an obvious starting place for an investigation along these lines, but this is not mentioned. For example, English has a term for back of the neck ‘nape’ which is lacking in Russian; but Russian has the term nosok denoting toes and front of foot, which English lacks. (Surprisingly, the term is not one of the seventy-three included in the Dictionary.) Countless examples of other lexical mismatches are given; of particular interest is the section on body-part expressions used only in direct speech.

This detailed, solid and well-organized set of data on Russian body-part terms and their collocations must be seen as a welcome contribution to Russian linguistics, especially since an electronic version of the Dictionary exists (see http://russian.dmill.cornell.edu/russian.web/material/).
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This new dictionary of Russian proverbs and sayings (poslovicy and pogovorki respectively) has three stated aims. First, and most importantly, it is a comparative study of Russian proverbs and sayings, giving equivalent proverbs