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The evolution of the Slavic studies and their particular field Slavic philology into a separate scientific discipline took place in the course of the 19th century. During its 150-year history the Slavic philology encountered many scientific problems that required solution; some of them were not clarified in a satisfactory way even despite the long time passed since their emerging. The disputed issues are mainly related to the ancient history of Slavs, their original homeland, the etymology of language elements, the extinct Slavic dialects, as well as the domain of Ancient Slavic language. Further on, there are some complexes phonetic, morphological, as well as syntactical processes not fully charted yet despite of the fact that they have formed the modern linguistic picture of the Slavic languages.

The researches aiming to solve the disputed issues mainly refer to the periods preceding the appearance of a written Slavic language, therefore for lack of written sources delusions are highly probable. In such cases reliable results can be achieved via logical correlations between linguistic (particularly paleolinguistic, etc, as well as some other history and ethnography-related data) and zoological, botanical scientific research data. Such complex mindset and method of examination were necessary for the researches and scientific results presented in this dissertation, too. Relying upon barely linguistic knowledge would have resulted in inaccurate and uncertain conclusions.

As it was mentioned above, many issues to be solved belong to the domain of the Ancient Slavic language\(^1\). The Ancient Slavic language is defined as a multitude of the dialects descended from the common Indo-European language and evolved in the modern Slavic languages by the means of complex processes.

The secession of Ancient Slavic from the common Indo-European language, as well as the milestones of its history are roughly known, but have not been fully clarified. Particularly indistinct are the time and sequence of language phenomena. Different theories were born, but none of them proved to be an exclusive one. As it is well-known, during its history every language is an object to subsequent change, that's why any sort of division into periods, chronology potentially bears the danger of simplification. Despite that, the historical philology traditionally divides the history of languages into periods, the primary reason of that being a better transparency, another reason being to gain a foot-hold in the history of languages. It is precisely for these reasons that in our research we use the chronological division into periods of the Ancient Slavic by some particular scientists.

\(^{\text{1in other terms: common Slavic language}}\)
The most wide-spread method of chronology that we consider most appropriate from the point of view of our research, too, is the method of chronological definition of the systemic changes occurred in phonetic plane.

Dating the origin of the Ancient Slavic language depends on whether or not we accept the theory of Balto-Slavic language conglomeration formed within the Indo-European family of languages. Numerous researchers\(^2\) presume that the formation of an autonomous Ancient Slavic language was preceded by the existence of a common Balto-Slavic language. This presumption is based on various morphological, phonetic and lexical conformities\(^3\). Contrarily, another group of linguists excludes the possibility of such conglomeration within the Indo-European family of languages. This issue has not been satisfactorily clarified yet.

It is not a deciding, or even a primary factor for our research which of the above-mentioned theories should be followed, as by all means they fall before the examined periods.

It is also problematic to fix the earliest presumable limit of an interval when the Ancient Slavic language could have eventually ceased to exist, that is, when autonomous Slavic languages could have formed. The lack of any strict differentiation between autonomous languages and dialects raises additional difficulties. For the ancient periods it is particularly difficult to define till what time a dialect exists and from what time it should already be considered an autonomous language. The case of the Ancient Slavic dialects is certainly similar. We presume that Ancient Slavic was differentiating and disintegrating into dialects gradually. Such differentiation has been indicated by the comparative linguistic researches. An analysis of the modern Slavic languages and their dialects showed that the various tendencies affected Ancient Slavic born disparate effects in certain dialects. Such disparate effects can naturally be observed in the modern Slavic languages and their dialects developed from the Ancient Slavic dialects.

According to two noted Slavic languages historians, S. B. Bernstein and Vl. Georgiev, a comparative Slavic language unity can be presumed up to the 4\(^{\text{th}}\) century A.D.; it's only late Ancient Slavic dialects that could exist afterwards\(^4\). We assume this late Ancient Slavic period to last until the 8\(^{\text{th}}\) - 9\(^{\text{th}}\) centuries at the utmost\(^5\).

N. S. Trubetskov prolongs the late Ancient Slavic period up to the latest common Slav innovation, namely, to the drop-out of reduced vowels (ъ, ь), as well as links it to

---

\(^2\)Fortunatov, F. F., Brugmann, K., Porzeziński, V., Lehr-Splawiński, T.
\(^3\)Brugmann, Karl. Kurze vergleichende Grammatik der indogermanischen Sprachen. Strassburg, 1902, p. 18.
\(^4\)Бернштейн, С. Б. Очерк сравнительной грамматики славянских языков. Москва, 1961. р. 51.
\(^5\)Бернштейн, С. Б. Очерк сравнительной грамматики славянских языков. Москва, 1961. р. 51.
vocalization. The existence of autonomous Slavic languages can be presumed after this time-limit only.

Based on the historical comparative philology researches done by the above-mentioned linguists and by the author himself, the phonetic variations and tendencies gone on in the Ancient Slavic dialects affected the followings:

- *The destiny of Ancient Slavic reduced vowels*
- *The destiny of early Ancient Slavic ě vowel*
- *The destiny of Ancient Slavic liquidas*
- *The variation of diphthong-like sound relations in Ancient Slavic – the metathesis of sound relations Ĥă, Ăă, ĂălC, ĂălC, ĂălC, ĂălC, CēlC, CēlC, as well as the phenomena of pleophony (polnoglasie)*
- *The variation of early Slavic sound relations *tj, *dj, *kti, *gti*
- *The shift of g-h consonants in Slavic dialects*
- *The destiny of Ancient Slavic nasal vowels*
- *Sound variations induced by the 2nd and 3rd Ancient Slavic palatalization*
- *The e > 'o vowel variation (velarization) in Slavic dialects*

The diverse results of the above-mentioned phonetic tendencies can be found in analysis of certain modern Slavic languages, groups of languages and dialects. Therefore, it can be presumed that these tendencies took effect precisely in the late Ancient Slavic period when the comparative unity of dialects, still existing in the early Ancient Slavic period, ceased. In the late Ancient Slavic period the dialects have separated from each other to such extent that these tendencies could not have resulted in similar variations all over the Ancient Slavic language territory.

Another problem that has not been clarified in a satisfactory way as yet is the time and the procession of the Settlement of the Magyars in Hungary. Plentiful literature has appeared on the subject, therefore the author does not wish to touch upon the details. According to the standpoint accepted by the most of the modern scientists, the Settlement took place in the 9th century. Despite that, there are some other, duly established research results stating that the Settlement went on in an earlier period.

In general, most researchers of the Hungarian language and history intrinsically agree that the event could have taken place from 5th to 9th centuries A.D.⁶

Therefore, if we agree with the results of S.V. Bernstein's and Vl. Georgiev's researches on Ancient Slavic chronology, then we have to accept that the Settlement of the Magyars in Hungary occurred between the 5th and 9th centuries should have just followed the open syllabification tendency in the Ancient Slavic and its disintegration into dialects.

From the point of view of the researches and research results presented in the dissertation it is irrelevant when exactly within the above-mentioned time period and in what particular way the Settlement of the Magyars took place, as if we agree with the opinion of the two noted philologist, the Slavs who lived on the occupied by the Magyars territory were speaking late Ancient Slavic dialects since the 4th century A.D. After dialect researcher philologist Helimsky who introduced the term, we shall call the Slavs lived in Hungary at the time of the Magyar's invasion the Pannonslavs.

The late Ancient Slavic dialects of the Pannonslavs – in other words, of the Slavs who lived in the Carpathian Basin – significantly affected the invaders' language by conveying into Hungarian a huge amount of Slavic words.

Discovering the language signs existed in the Ancient Slavic dialects of the Carpathian Basin is one of the most important tasks of Hungaro-Slavic philology. We hold the view that the Hungarian language is an invaluable and also an extremely accurate source for such researches. Many scientists researched Pannonslavic dialects by the means of Hungarian sources, but the problem was not reliably clarified.

Beside the borrowed words, it is also the toponyms of Slavic origin that testify the presence of Slavic dialects on the territory of Carpathian Basin in the past. The etymology of such toponyms was studied in numerous writings of noted Hungarian Slavists. However, no writing appeared up to the present day that showed the etymology of entire Hungarian toponymic material of Slavic origin.

---


We endeavored to draw up a (nearly) complete picture of the toponymic material of Slavic origin available in the modern Hungary. In provided etymological relations we tried to reliably unfold the late Ancient Slavic dialects spoken on this territory, as well as to describe the variations that can be observed in these dialects compared to the early Ancient Slavic.

Toponym-based dialect examination is an extremely complex task. As a starting point of the examination it is very important to precisely define whether a Slavic or a non-Slavic dialect has been a source of borrowing. Further difficulties are caused by the fact that modern Hungarian language forms not necessarily preserved the borrowed forms that is a borrowed name could have changed after borrowing. The biggest problem is, however, the temporal arrangement of borrowings, as for the lack of written sources it is not possible to define the time of particular borrowings, so inaccuracy and errors are highly probable.

Before the Settlement of the Magyars in Hungary time of which is much disputed many nations lived on this territory for shorter or longer periods. A part of these nations spoke Ancient Slavic dialects. Slavs lived in this area in sparse settlements; it was due to dissected landscape and also to the varied ethnic composition of the region's population at the time. Many non-Slavic settlers came to Hungary after the Settlement of the Magyars as well. In this period the first significant migration wave was the arrival of Kumans and Iasians. The migration to the Carpathian Basin increased especially after the Osman Empire withdrew from the area; sometimes entire territories were repopulated then. At that time and also later on, a considerable migration wave occurred from Slavic territories. Naturally, such recent settlers could also give settlements Slavic-rooted names. Separating this sort of toponyms from the original, pre-Magyar Slavic toponyms presents some difficulty.

Despite the above-mentioned problems and dangers, etymological examination of the toponyms preserved by the Hungarian language provides a good opportunity for investigating the Slavic dialects of the Carpathian Basin of the period preceding the Settlement of the Magyars in Hungary. Such investigations can be performed based on concrete material and, although one has to always keep in mind that voice forms of toponyms could have changed after borrowing, it can be generally stated that the Hungarian language has comparatively well preserved the voice form of the borrowed toponyms. In the process of examination of the Hungarian toponyms of Slavic origin we pay special attention to the phonetic changes happened in the Ancient Slavic dialects.

Disintegration of the comparative unity of early Ancient Slavic period elucidates the diverse results of the changes occurred in late Ancient Slavic period that have appeared in certain late Ancient Slavic dialects and groups of dialects and therefore in the modern
languages and dialects evolved from them. Such diverse results provide an interesting opportunity for phonetic classification of late Ancient Slavic dialects and the modern languages evolved from them. Etymological and phonetic examinations show that the phonetic variations observed in the modern Slavic languages, dialects and group of languages are similar to the changes occurred in late Ancient Slavic dialects and reflected by the Hungarian toponyms.

Hereinafter the dissertation content is presented in outline. At the beginning, as an introduction to the subject, we provide a short review of the history of the Carpathian Basin until the Settlement of the Magyars between the 5th and 9th centuries. In the review special attention is paid to the language diversity of the nations who occupied the territory and, not least of all, to the Slavs.

In the next chapter a short review of Ancient Slavic language history is presented. The chapter is primarily devoted to the phonetic changes and tendencies taken place in Ancient Slavic dialects. Affected by these changes, in the late Ancient Slavic period the dialects increasingly diverged from each other which resulted in the remarkable phonetic variations observable among the modern Slavic languages. The author used late Ancient Slavic phonetic changes to establish the features of the late Ancient Slavic dialects spread on the territory of the Carpathian Basin.

The following chapter demonstrates the phonetic characteristics of late Ancient Slavic dialects and also provides an explanation of phonetic tendencies lead to such characteristics. The detection and backing of phonetic characteristics is performed by the means of etymological examination of toponyms of Slavic origin that can be found on the territory of modern Hungary. The toponyms were selected from the official gazetteer of the Central Statistical Office of Hungary\textsuperscript{13}. Only those toponyms were selected for etymological examinations that were considered by the author to derive from Ancient Slavic.

Late Ancient Slavic phonetic phenomena traceable in toponyms are located by way of etymological examination. Such phenomena provide an exhaustive proof of the late Ancient Slavic dialect served as a source of Hungarian borrowing. Based on them, various late Ancient Slavic dialects can be proved to have existed in the Carpathian Basin.

The last chapter of the dissertation contains the conclusions of the performed researches. They include:

- a description of the phonetic signs of the late Ancient Slavic dialects once existed in the Carpathian Basin;

these dialects' connection with modern Slavic languages and groups of languages.

The dissertation annex is an etymological containing those Hungarian toponyms that, in the author's opinion, can be derived to late Ancient Slavic. Toponyms are presented in entries arranged in dictionary order, each entry being followed by an etymological description based on the author's researches.

The descriptions refer to the parts of the entry names shown in Italic only, since it is exclusively these parts that can be accepted as being of Slavic origin. Entry names are followed by the old forms traceable in certain language memorials and shown in square brackets. The old forms are quoted after Kiss, Lajos. Földrajzi nevek etimológiai szótára. I-II. Budapest, 1988. The author is aware of the uncertain phonetic notation of Hungarian language memorials, so the above-mentioned old forms cannot be based upon at the investigation of the phonetic developments of the past.

By the way of an etymological examination the author endeavored also to detect the semantically meaning of the late Ancient Slavic forms reflected in the toponyms. The author is aware of the possible significant semantically changes occurred in the course of time and carrying fallacy danger.

An extensive bibliography accomplishes the dissertation.