

A LOANWORD IN OLD FINNISH: *TEILATA*

Finnish *teilata* <-- Old Swedish *staeghla* (modern Swedish *stegla*)

MARTTI (approx. 1580)

Ios mies tapetan rickomatoim, kaula hakatan eli Steilatan

Murha mies toisen, eli waimo, eli cuka yxi toisen murhaisi ia salanda pois, ia kanda peiton ala, nijn pitä miehen Steilattaman ia waimon poldettaman.

RUOTSIN WALDACUNNAN LAKI (1759)

Jos jocu saa sijtä cuoleman; nijn pitä mies teilattaman, ja waimon pää poislyötämän andacon hengen hengestä, mies teilattacon ja waimo lawosa poldettacon.

DEVELOPMENT

??*steghlata --> steilata --> teilata

HISTORICAL LINGUIST QUESTIONS

- *When* did a given change happen, and *how* does the change relate to other linguistic changes (temporally and perhaps causally)?
- *How* did the change spread in the language (all dialects and variants, or only some)?
- Can it be argued that other languages affected the change?

The word *teilata*: of course, it's a loanword.

But what of the construction *pitää teilattaman* with the passive infinitive?

Cf. Swedish *ska steglas*.

BACK TO THE WHEEL

1. Aside from *teilata* (<-- *staeghla*)

Also: *teili* (<-- *staeghl*)

MARTTI:

”Nytt mistatan mies omans tähden ilman rikoxet, caula leikatan, hijrtehen wedhetän eli Steilin pälle pannan”

Question: has the word *teilata* been borrowed straight from Swedish, or is it an internal Finnish derivation of the noun *teili*?

2. The terms *teilata* and *teili* aren't really found in other 1500- and 1600-century texts:

LJUNGO (1601)

” Nytt turmellan mies lagittomasti ilman rikoxetta , caula leikatan, hirtethän, eli wiruelle pannahan”

ABRAHAM KOLLANIUS (1648)

” Nijn pitä hän, ninuin edhespäin tapoisa eroitetan rangaistaman, ja eij wirwen nenähän pandaman”

Question: why did other legal translators use different terms here?

Perhaps the words *teilata* and *teili* were unknown to them?

Or alternatively they wanted to avoid obvious loanwords?

Arguments:

- Both *teili* and *teilata* appear in Finnish dialects. But mainly in western dialects, so it is possible that the terms did not occur much in spoken language in the 1500s or 1600s.
- We know that at least Ljungo knew Martti's earlier translation (he disses it in his foreword). So he must have known the terms *teilata* and *teili*.
- In the source texts of the land law translations we find the Old Swedish words *staeghla* and *staeghl*.
- Translators in the 1600s weren't linguistic purists. Abraham Kollanius was very creative linguistically, but Ljungo not.

Possible conclusion:

- At least in the beginning of the 1600s the terms *teilata* and *teili* were so new and relatively unknown, that Ljungo and Kollanius preferred to use their own alternative expressions. The terms are specific to legal language, and we know that Martti was the first legal translator (at least, that we know of). It is therefore possible that Martti was the "borrower" of the words.