

**STEFAN MICHAEL NEWERKLA.**  
**SPRACHKONTAKTE DEUTSCH –**  
**TSCHECHISCH – SLOWAKISCH.***Wörterbuch der deutschen Lehnwörter im Tschechischen und Slowakischen: historische Entwicklung, Beleglage, bisherige und neue Deutungen.**Zweite, durchgehend überarbeitete und aktualisierte Auflage (= Schriften über Sprachen und Texte 7).* Frankfurt am Main et al.: Peter Lang, 2011. 780 str. (ISBN 978-3-631-61026-8).

Under review is the second edition of the Dictionary of German Loanwords in Czech and Slovak, which includes also considerable information not only about the German lexical component of these two languages, but of Slavic as a whole, a book that received some sixteen mostly glowing reviews in its first edition (2004). There is little point rehearsing the many virtues of the first edition, which are subsumed in the second edition. Suffice it to summarize them by saying that this is an extremely important addition to the diachronic lexicography of Czech and Slovak as well as a fundamental contribution to understanding German-Slavic language contact in Central Europe, a surpris-

ingly overlooked topic, given the long-term connections between the linguistic groups. Not only does the book offer a thorough etymological dictionary of German loanwords, but offers the author's detailed theory of German-Slavic language contact.

The new edition is structured in the same as the previous one, including a rather complicated temporal stratification into periods of borrowing according to periodization relevant to the history of German. It is rather surprising therefore, as George Thomas had pointed out in his review of the first edition, that words must be looked up first in the index to find the right section of the book in which a particular lemma is listed, yet there are indexes only to the Czech and Slovak forms and there is no German-language index (*Canadian Slavonic Papers / Revue Canadienne des Slavistes*, vol. 49, No. 3/4 [September–December 2007], pp. 388–391). What has changed is that more material has been added to the entries, making the detailed exposition richer still. So, for example, in a comparison of the entry for *židle* 'chair', we find the addition in the 2011 edition of older Slovak material that was lacking in the 2004 edition.

2004

**židle** 'Sessel, Stuhl'. ◇ — (stolička). © Ač. *židla* (*židla*), *židle* (*židle*) < mhd. *sidele*, *sidel* 'Sitz, Sessel, Bank, Chorstuhl'. © —. ① ahd. *sidella* 'Sitz'; lat. *sedile* 'Sessel, Stuhl, Bank'. © 3 ač. Belege für *židla* (*židla*), *židle* (*židle*); der einzige Beleg für *židla* (*židla*) 'Name eines Steins' findet sich in KlarGlosA 140 (De lapidibus): „židla iudacius“; der erste von zwei Belegen für *židle* (*židle*) 'Sessel, Stuhl' in NaučBrn 148 (1468): „což se toho stola, židli ... dotýče“. In der Kartothek des HSSJ liegt kein Eintrag vor. ① Df 148; H-K 445; H-L 481; May 20, 34, 57; Mch 727; Nek 50; Rz 748; Schnw 12, 27, 38 ▲ EisPo 10; Jg V:847; PSJČ VIII:1041; SSJČ IV:917; SSČ 588.

2011

**židle** 'Sessel, Stuhl'. ♦ **žigla** äsk. © Ač. *židla* (*židla*), *židle* (*židle*), äsk. *žigla*, *židla* < mhd. *sidele*, *sidel* 'Sitz, Sessel, Bank, Chorstuhl'. © —. ① ahd. *sidella* 'Sitz'; lat. *sedile* 'Sessel, Stuhl, Bank'. © 3 ač. Belege für *židla* (*židla*), *židle* (*židle*); der einzige Beleg für *židla* (*židla*) 'Name eines Steins' findet sich in KlarGlosA 140 (De lapidibus): „židla iudacius“; der erste von zwei Belegen für *židle* (*židle*) 'Sessel, Stuhl' in NaučBrn 148 (1468): „což se toho stola, židli ... dotýče“. Der slk. Erstbeleg stammt als *žigla* aus Prievidza (Priwitz, Privigye) 1788. ① Df 148; H-K 445; H-L 481; May 20, 34, 57; Mch 727; Nek 50; Rz 748; Schnw 12, 27, 38 ▲ EisPo 10; HNSJ VII:467; Jg V:847; PSJČ VIII:1041; SSJČ IV:917; SSČ 588.

With regard to the physical volume itself, the new binding is inferior, being glued, rather than sewn, which is evident once the new book is opened a few times and pages begin to fall out. Moreover, the page size is reduced by about two centimeters with a commensurate reduction in type size, making the readability that much more challenging for eyes on the wrong side of forty.

Both of these shortcomings might be addressed by taking the project to its next logical step, an openly-searchable Internet-based dictionary-database. Not only would this avert the inconvenience of retrieving scattered pages, but the user could quickly find the necessary research object while the author could update the database as new material is brought to light.

**Marc L. Greenberg**

*University of Kansas  
mlg@ku.edu*

**FREDERIK KORTLANDT: *SELECTED WRITINGS ON SLAVIC AND GENERAL LINGUISTICS.***

Rodopi, Amsterdam/ New York, NY 2011, 470 pp.

Scholars working in Indo-European and Balto-Slavic linguistics will welcome this new book with selected papers by Frederik Kortlandt (hereafter K), the main proponent of the so called “Leiden Accentological School.” The book is a free-standing sequel to other volumes which thematically present K’s papers: Italo-Celtic origins and prehistoric development of the Irish language

(Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2007), *Baltica & Balto-Slavica* (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2009) and *Studies in Germanic, Indo-European and Indo-Uralic* (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2010). The aim of all these books is to make K’s scientific work since the early 1970s to more accessible to a wider public. This is a very praiseworthy attempt, even if a potential reader can download many of K’s papers from his web page.

K’s contribution to Indo-European and especially to Balto-Slavic linguistics cannot be ignored, especially if one wants to study the development of Balto-Slavic accentuation. K’s background originates from the work of Christian Stang in 1957, V. M. Illič-Svityč, as well as from works by V. A. Dybo. While the Moscow accentological school (centered around Dybo) developed its research mainly on the synchronic state of Balto-Slavic, Baltic and Proto-Slavic, K deals mainly with the relative chronology of changes. His conception can now be considered as the most complete description of accentual changes from PIE to the separate Baltic and Slavic languages. Although it is not generally accepted, the main reason for refusing K’s theories is mainly the lack of information and difficulty in reading K’s papers. A reader is very often discouraged by the apparent unintelligibility of K’s texts, which require a broad context of knowledge: both the narrow topic of accentology as well as the context of some of K’s other papers. The latter is the main problem for scholars who are often discouraged after they read one or two of K’s papers. One must study K as a whole and keep in mind the results of his individual papers to grasp his whole theory. Then scholars can see how detailed and elaborate K’s theory of accentual development from