
The present dedicatory volume on the occasion of Helmut Wilhelm Schaller’s 70th birthday consists mainly of two parts: a comprehensive list of Dr. Schaller’s publications and lectures (pp. 16–85) and a set of eight papers drawn from the symposium entitled “Non solum philologus”, held in the Bulgarian Cultural Institute in Berlin on November 5, 2010, on the occasion of the jubilee’s 70th birthday on April 16, 2010. These eight papers include one each by the editors Jürgen Kristophson (Hamburg), who also supplied a one-page foreword (“Ein Wort zuvor”; page 9), and Rumjana Zlatanova (Heidelberg). The dedicatory essay “Helmut Schaller zum 70. Geburtstag” (pp. 10–15) comes from the pen of Sigrun Comati (Rüsselsheim; former lecturer of Slavistics at the University of Frankfurt am Main’), who along with Jürgen Kristophson and Rumjana Zlatanova has been influential as an honorary member of the “Deutsch-Bulgarische Gesellschaft” (German-Bulgarian Society) in arranging for the publications of the Society (see also the afterword or “Worte danach” by the jubilee Helmut Schaller on pp. 194–195). The volume also contains a pencil drawing by Friedrich Degenbold (1914–1993) of the jubilee as a thirteen-year old (p. 5) and three figures depicting 1) the Bulgarian ballet-dancer Emilia Andonova (the subject of Zlatanova’s paper; p. 178); 2) Emilia Andonova dancing in A. Khachaturian’s “Masquerade” (p. 193 in Zlatanova’s paper); and 3) members of the German-Bulgarian Society including the jubilee’s wife, Edigne Schaller (p. 195).

The “Schriften- und Vortragsverzeichnis” von Helmut W. Schaller” (published writings and lectures) shows that, at age 70, the jubilee has seen a very productive and multifarious scholarly career. My own path may have crossed with Schaller’s at one of the Slavic conferences or congresses in the USA or Europe but there is one concrete intersection of ours: I reviewed his book on the genitive/accusative selection with negated verbs in Russian for our Canadian Slavistics journal “The Canadian Slavonic Papers” (1982, 1). Let me say that Schaller’s book received my full appreciation as far as his framework’s descriptive adequacy is concerned – he presented several linguistically and pedagogically significant analyses of this challenging aspect in the grammar of Russian.

In the summary of the dedicatory papers below, I have followed the editors’ practice of providing only a place of residence for the authors without any other affiliation. I made an exception above in the case of the author of the dedicatory essay, Sigrun Comati, because, for her, not even a place of residence was provided and her (former) affiliation came up in my web search. Three of the dedicatory papers can be considered to be research papers while the other five papers are probably best called aphorisms (“Gedankensplitter”) rather than research papers. This is not to say that the aphoristic papers are lacking in quality – rather the opposite is the case: they for the most part add significantly to our knowledge of a given subject matter.

In terms of subject matter, two of the eight papers deal with orthodoxy, albeit in very different parameters: Hans-Dieter Döpmann (Berlin) highlights pivotal events in the history of the orthodox church in the light of his own biography and publishing activity (pp. 86–99), while Horst Röhling (Witten) develops his thought patchwork on the humaneness of orthodoxy in connection with the septuagenario’s ability to create a collegial spirit of scientific collaboration free of intrigues and filled with confidence. In a more scientific spirit, Röhling considers the grammatical category of animateness in the Slavic languages to be linguistic evidence of the feature of humanitas slavica orthodoxa (p. 152).

Two papers are devoted to linguistics. Jürgen Kristophson (Hamburg) in effect challenges the explanatory adequacy of this discipline as well as its subject matter, human language. In his metatheoretical musings, Kristophson asks the question, also asked time and time again by practising linguists, how a decision can be made between the often competing, even contradictory explanations given for specific data, such as analytic vs. synthetic constructions in language systems (pp. 144–145). There seems to be little use for Kristophson for the sub-field of etymology (pp. 146–147). It is noteworthy that he does not mention sub-fields such as psycho-, socio-, and neurolinguistics: the questions asked, and often answered there seem to us to be anything but fictive. The second linguistic paper is the hands-on and well-documented etymological study by Bianca Wieland (Marburg) of the terms for “ladybug” (German Marienkäfer) in the various South Slavic languages with comparative evidence brought in from German, Russian, English, Albanian, Finnish, and French. In summary, Wieland maintains that in the South Slavic languages the motivation for naming the ladybug have been its colour (Bulgarian kalinka), the connection with the divine (Bulgarian boža kravička) as well as Bosnian/Croatian/Serbian božja ovčica), to the Holy Mary (Bosnian/Croatian/Serbian bubamara), and to Grandma as in Serbian bakica. Only Slovenian seems to fall out of line with its polonica or pikapolonica, and Wieland here suggests further investigations to explain the origin of this term (my colleague Tom Priestly from the University of Alberta informs me that the Sele dialect of Slovenian has the divinely motivated term bog'ova kravica). I would venture a guess that in literary Slovenian the part pik originates from Italian via French or German picca, pique, pieken (Vasmer); polonica may be a misspelling of the Novorossijski (Dal’!) polunya “wild strawberry”, Ukrainian polunya “strawberry” (the colour motivation).

There are two papers on comparative literature. Dietmar Endler (Leipzig) traces the image of Sofroni von Wraza in the popular novel Bulgaria by Dora Strempel (1837–1919), the author of some ten novels and stories for which her various stays abroad (Sicily, Italy, Turkey, possibly Bulgaria) serve as places of action. In the novel Bulgaria, written in 1887, Strempel manages to create intertextual connections to a famous work of the age of rebirth, the autobiographical first-person narrative Life and Sorrows of the Sinful Sofroni, “the first significant work of the new Bulgarian prose” (Endler, p. 109). The tale was first published in the paper Dunavski lebed in 1861, translated into French in 1885, and published in a Russian translation in 1887. It is possible that Strempel knew the French translation. Endler concludes that the number of German popular novels of the 19th century with a Bulgarian subject matter was insignificant, their artistic value low – but they were being read. In the second
comparative-literature paper Emilia Staitscheva (Sofia) highlights the interest Ivan Vazov (1950–1921), often referred to as “the patriarch of Bulgarian literature”, took in German literature, a topic about which less is known than about his occupation with Russian, French, and Rumanian literature.

The two remaining papers deal with archaeology and the performing arts, respectively. Raiko Krauss (Tübingen) discusses the problem of ethnicity in the light of archaeological studies on the Balkan states including Bulgaria. In his well-documented study he comes to the conclusion that prior to the year 681 there were either “Bulgarians that did not speak a Slavic language or Slavs that did not consider themselves to be Bulgarians” (p. 135). Rumjana Zlatanova (Heidelberg) describes the active role of the Bulgarian school of ballet on the international scene and highlights in particular the role of the dancer Emilia Andonova (born in Sofia in 1941) in Bulgaria and abroad, described elsewhere in Spartak Paskalevksi and Rumjana Zlatanova: Auf Terpsichores Schwingen: die Ballerina Emilia Andonova (Dialog i duchovnost, 5). Sofia: Temto 2011.

In conclusion, the eight dedicatory essays can serve as a convenient introduction to Balkan Studies in Germany in the areas of church history, comparative literature, ethnology and archaeology, linguistics, and the performing arts.