

PREFACE

Twenty-four linguists from twelve countries responded to the invitation to take part in the special issue of *Linguistica* on Slavic/Non-Slavic Language Contact in the area of diachronic onomastics. In the end, nineteen contributions were received: five from Slovenia, three from Russia, two from the Ukraine and one from each of the following countries: Austria, Bulgaria, Croatia, the Czech Republic, Germany, Italy, Poland, Serbia and Slovakia.

The contributions deal with contacts between Slavic and non-Slavic languages which can be studied from a historical perspective. They are divided into seven groups on the basis of the non-Slavic languages or language groups treated: Proto-Indo-European, Romance, Germanic, Baltic, Finno-Ugric, Turkic. Two papers do not belong to any of these six groups: the first one, which is concerned with a variety of non-Slavic languages in contact with Slavic languages, and the last one, which is about the synchronic study of proper names.

The special issue opens with a contribution by **Georg Holzer**, who deals with the history of sounds and accents of twenty-four geographical names (ten of them Slovene), which have been loaned by Slavic from its substrates or neighbouring languages around the time of the Slavic expansion.

Zbigniew Babik proposes a reconstruction of the Late Common Slavic forms of fifteen substrate hydronyms from Northern Mazovia, which belong to unknown Indo-European languages spoken on this territory in Late Antiquity. The paper offers a supplement to the author's treatment of the oldest/prehistoric layer of Polish toponymy presented in his 2001 book. **Jaromir Krško's** study is about the influence of pre-Slavic ethnic groups on the hydronyms of present-day Slovakia and gives a survey of the ways in which seven river names, probably of pre-Slavic origin, have been dealt with by other scholars. **Luka Repanšek** seeks to clarify the historical development of the Proto-Indo-European hydronym Soča, from its prehistoric source to its present-day forms, taking into account in particular all the substitutional changes which occurred as the hydronym passed through the various linguistic strata.

The paper by **Metka Furlan** studies the hydronym Dragonja and comes to the conclusion that the hypothesis put forward by Fran Ramovš, according to which the name Dragonja is of substratal origin and reflects the Slavic metathesis of liquids, is incorrect, since the river name in question is actually based on a recent Istro-Venetian adstrate form *Dragogna*. **Maurizio Puntin**, who in his historic anthroponymic research has made use of rich archival sources, suggests that, at least until the end of the 15th century, south-eastern Friuli was inhabited by a Slavic majority and a Friulian minority. He tries to prove that the place name Begliano can more easily be explained on the basis of Slavic than Romance material. His linguistic analysis also shows that the Slovene dialectal noun *čupa*, Friulian *çòp/zòpul*, derives from a pre-Latin Romance source. On the basis of Old Romance geographical names in early South Slavic, **Matej Šekli** confirms that the majority of late Proto-Slavic sound changes were still operative in the period of the earliest Old Romance-Slavic language contacts in the second

half of the 6th century and the beginning of the 7th century. The section on Slavic and Romance interactions closes with the paper by **Svjatoslav O. Verbyč**, who presents an etymological analysis of the hydronyms of the Dniester river basin which have Eastern Romance language elements in their structure. He arrives at the conclusion that the long-lasting Ukrainian-Moldavian and Ukrainian-Romanian contacts can be detected not only in Eastern Romance loan words that are part of Ukrainian common names, but also in Dniester basin toponyms.

In her article on certain place names in the area between the rivers Saale and Elbe, which belonged to the Old Sorbian ethnolinguistic substrate, **Inge Bily** discusses German-Slavic language contact, recognizing nine features relevant for the study of the place names concerned. Czech-German language contacts in the area of anthroponymy are analyzed by **Jana Pleskalová**, who takes into account the specific ethnic, linguistic and cultural conditions in Central Europe. German names were used more frequently by the Czech-speaking population only until the end of the 18th century. The practice of using two-element names, preferred by the German speaking inhabitants of the Czech lands, influenced the introduction of the two-name system in the Czech community. Finally, **Silvo Torkar** analyzes eight Slovene toponyms (or their German variants) and shows that through the German-Slovene phonemic substitution, morphological adaptation and translation the place names sometimes underwent such changes that they could not be satisfactorily explained without historical documents.

Valerij L. Vasiljev deals with hydronyms of Baltic origin in Russia. He offers a critical survey of the history of research on the subject and tries to delimit with greater precision the borders of the original Baltic territory, optimizing the techniques related to searching and confirmation of Baltic hydronyms.

The paper by **Elena L. Berezovič**, **Ana A. Makarova** and **Irma I. Mullonen** puts forward a comparative analysis of toponyms related to the names for evil spirits in Russian and in Finno-Ugric languages of the Russian North and the Republic of Karelia with the roots *čert-* in *hiisi-*. They describe different types of geographical names and attempt to identify the factors which influence the kind of »demonological« names in question in different cultural and linguistic systems. **Nadežda V. Kabinina** presents the history of research on Finno-Ugric heritage in the place names of the Russian North (Arkhangelsk and Vologda regions) and pays special attention to methodological characteristics of the research as practiced by the Ural toponymic school. The new method of semantic modelling and the method of toponymic microsystem relations' analysis is also illustrated.

The paper by **Anđela Frančič** deals with the classification of Croatian surnames containing Hungarian elements. On the basis of linguistic analysis the author shows that some of these surnames were formed in Croatia, whereas others were introduced into the pool of Croatian surnames when their Hungarian bearers arrived in Croatia.

Aleksandar Loma's study concerns the place name *Šepšin* proposing a reconstruction in the form of **Semčijin* on the basis of a historical record dating back to 1528. Ultimately, it appears to derive from the Old Serbian common noun *sěmčija* assumed to be the same as Old Church Slavic *samъčii* 'praefectus' and is probably a loanword

from (Turkic) Proto Bulgarian. **Vasyl V. Lučyk** offers a systematic overview of the toponyms of Turkic origin in the Ukraine. The Turkisms found in Ukrainian place names are classified into three groups, according to the period when they entered the Ukrainian language: the Kievan Rus period (9th-13th century), the Old Ukrainian period (14th-18th century), and the New Ukrainian period (19th-21st century). On the basis of an etymologic analysis of the place names, the author also provides their semantic classification. The final paper in the section, by **Ljudvig Selimski**, suggests an alternative etymological analysis of five area and settlement names in Bulgaria, four of which are of Turkish or Arabic origin, whereas one derives from Romanian.

The special issue concludes with **Eva Sicherl's** contribution on the borrowing of personal names from the point of view of pragmatic borrowing and taking into account the traditional dichotomy between necessary loans on the one hand and luxury loans on the other hand.

Silvo Torkar
ZRC SAZU