Reviewed by Marc Pierce

Jorma Koivulehto, professor emeritus of Germanic philology at the University of Helsinki, who is best-known for his work on loan relations between Indo-European and Uralic, especially between Germanic and Finnish (a number of his papers on the topic are reprinted in Koivulehto 1999), celebrated his seventieth birthday in 2004. The volume under consideration here is the Festschrift presented to him on that occasion. It contains 35 contributions by scholars from ten countries, all in English or German, and arranged in alphabetical order, as well as a brief biographical introduction and a list of Professor Koivulehto’s publications. As an exhaustive discussion of all the contributions is precluded by space limitations, I shall instead briefly outline the contents of the volume and then comment more extensively on some of the papers I found most stimulating.

As one could guess, both from the scholarly interests of the Jubilar and the title of the Festschrift, a number of the papers deal with loan relationships (mainly Indo-European loans in Uralic). Albrecht Greule tackles the question of “Entlehnte ‘Wasserwörter’ in den ostseefinnischen Sprachen und die frühgermanische Hydronymie,” while Axel Holvoet looks at a Uralic construction borrowed into Indo-European in “Eine modale Konstruktion ostseefinnischer Herkunft im Lettischen.” More recent loan relationships are the subject of Wolfgang Mieder’s “Der frühe Vogel und die goldene Morgenstunde. Zu einer deutschen Sprichwortentlehnung aus dem Angloamerikanischen” and Norbert Richard Wolf’s “Anglizismen (bzw. Fremdwörter) im Sprachgebrauch. Eine Wortmeldung in einer immer wiederkehrenden Debatte.” Also, Santeri Palviainen examines “Die germanischen n-Stämme und ihre Reflexe in den ostseefinnischen Lehnwörtern.”

Other contributions address etymological issues. Dagmar Neuendorff looks at “Etymologien in Rusticani und deutschen Predigten Bertholds von Regensburg. Struktur und Funktion.” Arend Quak examines the question of “Der altfriesische huslotha”, a type of tax, and a word attested since the tenth century AD. Peter Schrijver discusses “The etymology of English
weapon, German Waffe, and the Indo-European root *Hwep,” while Patrick V. Stiles addresses “Place adverbs and the development of Proto-Germanic long *êi in early West Germanic.” Finally, Frederik Kortlandt looks at “Indo-Uralic consonant gradation,” and argues against the proposal of Koivulehto and Vennemann (1996) and Posti (1953) that consonant gradation in Finnic is the result of Germanic influence, in favor of the position that it originated in Proto-Uralic.


In my view, several contributions stand out above the rest. Raimo Anttila offers a paper with a title punning on the Jubilar’s name, entitled “Sap from the birch grove -- sulaa mahla koivulehdosta”, in which he suggests that Finnish sula ‘melted, unfrozen’, which is normally taken as an inherited Uralic word, could actually be an Indo-European loan word (there are parallel forms in Baltic and Indo-Iranian, like Sanskrit súrā ‘kind of beer’ and Avestan hurā ‘fermented mare’s milk’). Anttila thoroughly reviews the Uralic and Indo-European evidence, suggests that the phonological and semantic uniformity exhibited by the Uralic forms indicates that the word is a borrowing, and further argues that any rejection of the proposed loan relationship would be due to ‘semantic scruples’ (41).

Joseph Salmons addresses a topic that has received increased attention in recent years, namely the problem of “How (non) Indo-European is the Germanic lexicon? ... And what does that mean?” While one often reads in Germanic handbooks that about one-third of the Germanic vocabulary is of non-Indo-European origin, other influential Germanic linguists have argued that the Germanic lexicon is more conservative in this area than such scholars would have us believe (cf. Mailhammer 2003 and Polomé 1989 for discussion of these differing viewpoints). Salmons offers a characteristically enlightening review of the problem, and ultimately suggests that the possibility of Indo-European-internal developments has not received enough attention, bolstering this claim with the support of a
number of ‘aberrant’ recent developments in colloquial American English, including front rounded vowels and prenasalization (both of which are admittedly confined to a small handful of cases).

Michael Schulte’s contribution, “Zwei Miszellen zum Transfer und zur Adaption von Präfixstrukturen: Germanisch-Finnisch und Niederdeutsch-Norwegisch,” turns to the question of how prefixes are adapted into new languages. This is demonstrated through an examination of Germanic prefixes in Finnish and Low German prefixes in Norwegian. Schulte notes that a number of verbs loaned from Early Germanic into Finnish or Sami lack prefixes, presumably because of phonotactic considerations. In contrast to this, Norwegian seems happy to retain prefixes in borrowed verbs, although accentual patterns may be adjusted to fit Norwegian conditions.

Finally, Theo Vennemann’s “Phol, Balder, and the Birth of Germanic” is another of Vennemann’s adventurous articles on the development of Germanic (many of which are reprinted in Vennemann 2003). Here Vennemann argues that Phol and Balder, the god names recorded in the beginning of the Second Meersburg Charm, are borrowings from Semitic, and are in fact a doublet, two manifestations of the same loan name (Semitic Ba’al and its later form Baldir). Vennemann further suggests that these borrowings took place ‘during a time of extensive Punic activities to the North’ (449). This claim has implications for the chronology of the Germanic Consonant Shift(s), as Phol must have been borrowed before the First Consonant Shift, but Balder after it; Phol also seems to show the effects of the Second Consonant Shift, although Vennemann attributes this to a scribe’s attempt to render a Low German original into High German (445). While I am not completely convinced by Vennemann’s arguments, his article is certainly thought-provoking and will hopefully spur further discussion of his theories.

The volume itself is well and sturdily bound. Typographical errors are vanishingly rare, but there are a number of pages in my review copy where the printing is blurred.

In sum, this book is a mixed bag, like all Festschriften, but the papers are generally of high quality, and some of them are absolutely first-rate. It is a worthy offering to a distinguished scholar.
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