

whose position in the socialist property regime provided them with the social capital of extended state-wide networks that were useful for making value in land after 1989. Getting early access to technology, as already explained, also turned out to be crucial.

Many such interactions are traced out in the final chapter of the book, leaving the reader with a strong impression of the complexity involved in restitution and a wish that its Romanian architects had consulted Verdery *before* embarking on the process. However, I am also saddened by the practical implications of such great ethnography. While I was awed by her ability to map out the diversity of factors shaping decollectivization and their intricate interactions, I was left with a nagging doubt that any state program or system could adequately address or attend to the complexity she documents. A better outcome would seem to require a rethinking of the state itself. This, however, is not a criticism of the book. In fact I found little to fault in this book, but to confirm the objectivity of that assessment I will nitpick. Although engagingly written the length of the book will likely deter some potential readers and will certainly limit its instructional use at the undergraduate level. This is too bad since the lessons are so important and powerful. As a reader who is not an economist I was somewhat confused by the contradictory impacts of two macroeconomic forces. At times the author points to spiralling interest rates as limiting investment, but at other times she notes the debt-consuming aspect of rampant inflation as motivating investment. Greater specification of interest and inflation rates over time (i.e. "real" interest rates) would have helped clarify the overall impact. I was also not sure why she thinks her notion of "demodernization" is so contrary to the re-peasantization thesis of others. Finally, despite covering more than a decade, it's clear that the future profile of Romanian agriculture was still far from settled in 2001, leaving the reader wishing for some conjecture about how the process might be expected to continue based on the author's demonstrated insight. I have some ideas, but only fools rush in ...

Gerald Creed, *City University of New York*

**Antje Wessel.** *Englisches Lehngut in der russischen Fachsprache des Marketings und des Außenhandels.* Scripta Slavica, Band 8. Munich: Biblion Verlag, 2003. 339 pp.

The meat in this sandwich of a book is an examination in dictionary format of 382 English words and expressions relating to marketing and foreign trade that have in one form or another borne influence on their Russian equivalents. This meat is flanked by slices of introduction and scholarly apparatus, though it is the former that is the more substantial, containing as it does a series of detailed analyses of the material and of the formal processes that lead from the English originals to the Russian outcomes, as well as the author's own observations and conclusions.

Though it is nowhere stated explicitly, this book gives every appearance of having originated as a thesis, and in addition to almost all the virtues it contains some of the vices of that particular mode of academic communication. For all that, the analysis is deep, comprehensive and multi-faceted; it is devoted to what is essentially a micro-problem, and some of the circumstantial detail does occasionally give the impression of having been produced for a potentially pernicky External Examiner, rather than for its own intrinsic worth. Nevertheless, these comments should not be construed as negating the overall value of the exercise: the author has assembled here a wealth of useful information, which allows her to draw what are by any standards significant conclusions.

Chief among these is a demonstration of how complicated the question of foreign influence really is. The author identifies the following five manifestations of influence that

may occur when a Russian form is derived from English: lexical borrowing, translation, free rendering (*freie Wiedergabe*), internationalisms which do not (necessarily) originate in English, extensions of meaning in pre-existing words (*Lehnbedeutung*); in addition, the process may involve the addition or subtraction of one or more elements. Since the majority of the 382 units consist of more than one element and the different elements may reflect different manifestations of influence, these are in practice often combined, giving a total of 28 different types of influence altogether (not all theoretically conceivable combinations actually occur). To give an example of how Wessel's analysis works, the Russian phrase *канал прямого маркетинга* (pp. 162-63) is derived from the English *direct marketing channel* using one lexical borrowing, one translation and one internationalism (*канал*). The author also examines the structure of her material and asks whether the influence of English is causing Russian to become a more analytic language. Her answer is a qualified negative, which on the material she adduces is entirely justified; a larger sample, however, might have given her cause to modify that conclusion.

There are two questions that might be asked about Wessel's analysis. At times she seems fired by an excess of analytic zeal, breaking units into more elements than is really required: it is difficult to see what is gained by splitting a word such as *лидер* into lexical borrowing (for the root) and internationalism (for the suffix) or by not distinguishing between the phrase *just in time* and the adjective *just-in-time*; a form such as *бизнес-план* (which was apparently borrowed as a single unit from English) probably does not belong in the same category as *проект-менеджер* (which clearly was not). It also transpires that her categories have surprisingly porous boundaries, and distinguishing between, say, a lexical borrowing and an internationalism or between a translation, a free rendering and an extension of a pre-existing meaning is by no means easy, especially as the author is herself not always consistent in assigning an element to a particular category. Overall, it may be felt that Wessel has over-counted the internationalisms and under-counted extensions of meaning.

Though these questions may cause some readers to take some of the statistical data with a pinch of salt, they are really issues for discussion, rather than objections of principle.

The appearance of this book is much to be welcomed, and it is to be hoped that the exile to New Zealand that the author mentions in her Acknowledgements does not prevent her from building on what she has already achieved.

J.A. Dunn, Glasgow

**Melissa L. Caldwell.** *Not by Bread Alone: Social Support in the New Russia*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2004. xv, 242 pp. Illustrations. Bibliography. Index. \$55.00, cloth. \$ 21.95, paper.

It is rare to find a scholarly book that one can recommend to virtually everybody, but Caldwell's monograph is a product of painstaking and innovative scholarship, and is a work that non-academic readers could consider a gripping read. There are not yet many published works that focus on the role that charitable and non-state organizations play in supplementing the Russian social welfare system, and this book gives a rich account of the dynamics of daily life in a Moscow soup kitchen over a three-year period. Caldwell pursued ethnographic research in 1998 and 1999 in her chosen soup kitchen, which she followed up in the two subsequent summers. She used the participant-observer method to analyze the intricate interactions between the soup kitchen's clients (many of them elderly) and its staff of volunteers.