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1. General introduction

The chief shortcoming of Old Icelandic sagas as source material is the enormous time gaps, which divide their creation and the first and survived records. It is never superfluous to repeat that the sagas have survived in copies of copies of copies and there is not a single autograph preserved. This preservation problem, which, to a certain degree, affects any research in the field, has been much discussed especially in historical contexts.

The present paper is based on one of the strata of “foreign” onomastic material preserved in *Knýtlinga saga*, which makes the work closely related to both contact onomastics and saga research. From this interdisciplinary perspective it seems possible to suggest such an approach of working with the name material attested in sagas, which would turn their key disadvantage into their plus.

As it comes from the title, the paper is preoccupied with one of the aspects of contact onomastics – name adaptation, for details see 1.3. This phenomenon, which is rather complex in nature, can be either initial or non-initial. Since in the present context the whole era lies between the assumed time of the name replication and first manuscript attestations, for details see 1.1, and it is obviously not possible to fix this principal “drawback”, one can only hypothesize about what sort of initial adaptations there could have taken place. However since the name material in question is preserved, and preserved in Old Icelandic sagas, i.e. in copies of copies of copies, it provides a good opportunity to study orthographic adaptation of proper names, for details see 2, i.e. to turn to the variety of actual manuscript forms and try to understand the key mechanisms behind the changes of the name forms in sagas.

1.1 Knýtlinga saga and relevant mss

Due to structural and stylistic parallels, *Knýtlinga saga* (ca 1260–70) can be called an analogue of *Heimskringla* based on Danish material. It is, therefore, exclusively devoted to the lives of Danish monarchs, from Harald I Gormson to Valdemar II Valdemarsson, as *Heimskringla* – to the lives of Norwegian kings.

According to the traditional philological analysis, the mss containing *Knýtlinga saga* form two distinct traditions, A and B. The principal difference between the two is that the former contains the “full version” of the saga as we know it, i.e. starting from Harald I Gormson, while the latter starts from chapter 22, i.e. Sven I Haraldsson (SD 1919–1925:ixff.). The A-redaction includes 7 complete mss and a number of fragments, while the B-redaction comprises 13 complete – from the point of view of the B-redaction – mss and some fragments (op. cit.). Among the survived mss, AM 18 fol⁸ (ca 1700) or M, a late copy of the lost Codex Academicus (ca 1300) or A, is considered to be the best representative of the A-tradition, while AM 180 b fol (ca 1400) or B, has the highest level of textual authority in the B-tradition (SD 1919–1925:xxif.).

For the purposes of the present paper, I surveyed the relevant mss of *Knýtlinga saga* held by the National library of Sweden, i.e. Cod. Holm. 41 4to⁸ (1687) and Cod. Holm. 55 fol⁹ (1682–87), and one more late ms written about the same time, Lbs 222 fol⁹ (1695–98), which is available on the internet.
The paper ms Cod. Holm. 41 4to \(^x\) (124 sheets, fljótaskript) or \(M^x\), was written by Jón Eggertsson, who worked for Antikvitetskollegium in Stockholm (SD 1919–1925:xix). The ms in question is a combination of \(A\) and \(B\)-traditions and can, thus, be divided into two parts: (1) chap. 1–22 copied from a ms belonging to the \(A\)-group, and (2) chap. 22-the end copied from some \(B\)-ms. There is a note on the ms’s third end sheet saying the ms is a copy of a “very old membrane fragment” made in Copenhagen in 1687. The comparative analysis showed however that the note refers exclusively to the second part of the ms, i.e. from chap. 22, which with all certainty is a copy of AM 1005 4to \(^x\) (ca 1600–1650) or \(W\), rather than some membrane (SD 1919–1925:xixf.). The first part of the ms is in all probability copied from \(M\) (op. cit.).

Cod. Holm. 55 fol \(^x\) (258 sheets, halvfraktur) contains the full text of Knýtlinga saga in \(B\)-redaction; it was written by Helgi Ólafsson, who worked as a scribe and a translator of Icelandic mss for Antikvitetskollegium in Stockholm. The ms is a copy of another – now lost – copy of \(W\) (SD 1919–1925:xxiiif.).

Lbs 222 fol \(^x\) (348 sheets, halvfraktur), written by Jón Þórðarson, earlier a priest in Sandar, contains the full \(B\)-tradition text of the saga (Páll Eggert Ólason 1918:77f.). Judging by textual parallels, the ms is apparently an indirect copy of \(W\).

1.2 West Slavic toponyms in Knýtlinga saga

In the present paper I am focusing on West Slavic place-names, which represent a relatively thin onomastic layer in Knýtlinga saga – only 42 (\(A\)-redaction) or 40 (\(B\)-redaction) toponyms in total. The name “West Slavic” does not have anything to do with etymology in the present context. The geographical criterion is chosen to single out the name material in question: although the territories occupied by West Slavic tribes in the early Middle Ages were extremely vast, the contact area between Scandinavians and West Slavs, according to the evidence of Knýtlinga saga, was in most cases limited by the southern shores of the Baltic coast, i.e. Pomerania. Thus, the toponyms mentioned in the source in appropriate contexts are considered to be West Slavic.

It is necessary to mention that the problem of the etymology of the place-names in question is quite complex. In the situation of – although now extinct – language contact, the name’s form as a more or less traditional point of departure does not seem sufficient in the sense that a replicated toponym can appear in sources as linguistically completely integrated, i.e. as a place-name coined by the speakers of the target language. E.g. although the toponyms Burstaborg (Szczecin), where bursta is pl. gen. from burst, f., “bristle”, and Steinsborg (Kamiień Pomorski), where steins “stone” is sg. gen. from steinn, m., “stone”, seem to be of Old Norse origin, their etymology cannot be established with certainty. In the early German sources the towns in question are called Stettin and Cammin (in many orthographic variants), i.e. they represent phonological adaptations of Slavic names; the former according to one of the versions comes from szczeciń “bristly reed-like grass” (Rospond 1984:380), the latter – from kamienień “a stone” (Rzetelska-Feleszko 1991:13f.). One is, thus, left with at least three possibilities: either the Slavic names were translated in Old Norse, or the Old Norse names were translated in Pomeranian, or the ethnic groups in question coined the corresponding names independently from each other embarking on the prominent landscape features.

1.3 Name adaptation

Name adaptation is the change of the replicated name in the target language both at the replication stage and during its lifetime in the target language onomasticon, on all language levels including both the addition and the omission of the name elements, which occurs in accordance with the rules of the target language system (and the target language onomasticon in
particular) and can be attested either in speech or script. It is a highly subjective individual process at the synchronic level, which implies that any individual can adapt the name to its needs or wishes either in accordance with the rules imposed by the abstract onomasticon or not (on the individuality of name adaptation see e.g. Sandnes 2003:71ff.).

It is necessary to take into account a principal change which happens at the replication stage: when a name is replicated, it becomes a part of target language onomasticon and joins other names available to the name user. From this point on, there is technically no difference between replicated and indigenous names – the question of their origin, which naturally belongs to the “jurisdiction” of etymology, is of no importance or interest when considering the process of further name change. The concept of name adaptation can be, thus, extended to embrace all cases of name change: in this “adaptation to new circumstances” linguistic and extra-linguistic factors play their role, but it is the name-using individual who makes the choice.

West Slavic place-names in Knýtlinga saga is a relatively small group of toponyms, which came into existence, e.g. were replicated into Old Norse or coined anew by Scandinavians, under the influence of the same language contact situation1. Since the difference between replicated and indigenous names becomes irrelevant after the name has entered the onomasticon of the target language, it is possible to ignore to a certain degree the question of name’s etymology when speaking of name adaptation. Instead I choose to speak of synchronically transparent (a total of 13) and non-transparent names (23) for a name user or a scribe. E.g. toponyms Ásund (Jasmund), á, f. sg. nom., “river” + sund, n. sg. nom. “a strait, narrow passage, channel”; Burstaborg (Szczecin), bursta, f. pl. gen. from burst “bristle”, + borg, f. sg. nom. “a wall, fortification, castle”; Plazminni (Świnoujście), possibly pláz, n. sg. nom. “a place, spot”, + minni, n. sg. nom. “the mouth”; Kotskógr (Gützkow), kot, n. sg. nom. “a cottage, hut, small farm”, + skógr, m. sg. nom. “a shaw, wood”; Rauðstókkr(r) (Rostock), possibly rauðr, adj. m. sg. nom. “red”, + stokkr, m. sg. nom. “a stock, trunk, block, log of wood”; etc. are transparent, while place-names Dimin (Demmin), Dubbin, Stolp (Stolpe), Usna (Usedom), Voztustu etc. are non-transparent for an Icel andic scribe in the late 17th c. One can also speak of semi-transparent names (4), i.e. the names, some elements of which are transparent (in the present material – only generics), e.g. Jóms-borg, borg, f. sg. nom. “a wall, fortification, castle”; Dimars-brú, brú, f. sg. nom. “a bridge”; Pólónia-land, land, n. sg. nom. “land, a country”; Vízmars-höfn, höfn, f. sg. nom. “a harbour”.

2. Orthographic adaptation

The name change, which a researcher can witness, is usually attested in written sources; however the possible individuality of this written change is not always taken into account. At the same time it can in some cases be only a construct of a single scribe, which does not have anything to do with the real change or the change of the name by its authentic users, i.e. those who know both the name and its referent and use the name relatively often, e.g. a person who lives in the neighborhood, where the name referent is situated. Those individuals, who do not have such close bonds with the names in question, e.g. scribes copying strange names as a part of a document, have the opportunity to adapt as well. One can probably say that in the first case the name is a part of the “active onomasticon” of the name user, while in the second case the name belongs to the user’s “passive onomasticon”. Although obviously affected by the same factors, the adaptation in the first and in the second case has different points of de-

---

1 There are, of course, exceptions, when the name attested in Knýtlinga – although geographically West Slavic – might be much older than the aforementioned language contact between West Slavs and Scandinavians, e.g. Ré (Rügen).
parture: authentic name users, as a rule, embark on the phonological form\(^2\) of the name, while scribes are limited by the name’s orthographic form. Naturally, these groups of name users are destined to use different adaptation types in most cases.

In this respect it can be useful to draw a line between two major situations of interplay between the written sources and the reality. (1) In the first case, which is what most of researchers believe the written sources represent, name material exist in parallel in written and oral tradition. These traditions obviously affect each other, e.g. the change of orthographic form is believed to be motivated by the real change of the name. It should be pointed out here that the concept of oral tradition in this case represents the oral existence of the name in the area the referent of that name is situated. Obviously, even if the name has not preserved the connection with this type of oral tradition, as in (2), see further, it naturally can become a part of oral tradition in the target language/culture. (2) In the second case, the name, which once appears in the written sources, then loses the connection with its oral counterpart in the area the name referent is situated in. Since this name then continues to live its independent written life, its changes do not usually reflect the real changes and are a result of scribe’s orthographic adaptations\(^3\). I would like to emphasize that orthographic adaptation is typical for, but not limited to the second scenario: the unmotivated name changes can naturally occur even in the situation, when the written sources are supposed to reflect the real change of the name.

I want to underline that although I use the expression “real change”, I do not claim that the orthographic adaptation is somewhat less legitimate. Name adaptation is of extremely individual nature; that is why each and every innovation of the name irrespective if it is based on orthography or phonology, is of interest, since it casts new light on the phenomenon in general. From this visual angle, the high variability of Icelandic sagas mentioned above is, therefore, a big plus rather than a minus. It allows one to have a look at individual adaptations in writing.

The main reason behind the choice of West Slavic toponyms in Knýtlinga saga as the material is that they suit quite well the purposes of the present paper, i.e. studying late orthographic adaptation. Whatever the origin of the place-names in question might be, they have lost the connection with their oral counterparts long ago. The Icelanders, whose task was to copy the saga in the end of the 17th c. were hardly bilingual, in this case – hardly spoke or understood Pomeranian, and hardly knew any of the toponyms they were working with, which makes the name “transformations” performed by them engendered and at the same time limited by their mental onomasticon, see 2.1.

### 2.1 Original form

It is quite obvious that an original name from etymological point of view and an original name from the point of view of name adaptation are two different things. The difference lies in the interpretation of the term due to different points of departure. In the first case, there is – in most cases – only one original form, which all other forms descend from, irrespective of the changes the name has undergone during its lifetime, e.g. Pom. *Jôma > O.N. at Jómi* (Petrulevich 2009). In the second case, the original form is the form, which undergoes adaptation, i.e. the original form can be different for each and every new adaptation. In orthographic adaptation this would mean that the forms in the ms the scribe is copying are the originals he can in principle adapt. E.g. Helgi Ólafsson, the author of Cod. Holm. 55 fol⁵ (Knýt.), copied the text from a now lost copy of AM 1005 4to⁴ (W); thus, this lost copy of W is his original.

---

\(^2\) Obviously, this does not mean that adaptation is limited to the phonological level. The two types of adaptation outlined here can affect different language levels depending on the circumstances.

\(^3\) As opposed to oral adaptation.
It should be added that the original – from the point of view of name adaptation – forms are not always preserved, as in the example above. In this case, the only resort a researcher has is to refer to the ms, which is the closest “relative” to the lost one, the copy of which is being studied, i.e. one has to rely on the results of the traditional philological analysis, e.g. in the case with Cod. Holm. 55 fol⁴, I have to accept the forms attested in W as originals for Helgi Ólafsson’s ms. All the adaptations of the name material discovered in the copy are, thus, considered to be the result of the work of the scribe in question, although, obviously, the possibility that the adaptations could have been copied from the lost ms should be taken into account. It should be also added that in principle, names can enter written sources in different forms, which might reflect some oral fluctuations, thus, the relations between different name forms attested in written sources can be far more complex than those outlined above, and the situation needs investigation in each and every case.

2.2 Orthographic adaptation criterion

It is necessary to draw a border between what one can call an example of orthographic adaptation of a name and an example of an orthographic mistake. One can probably suggest the involvement of the name user, in this case – a scribe, into the process as a possible criterion: mistakes are usually made unconsciously, while adaptation implies to a certain degree somewhat conscious efforts. At the same time, name adaptation does not necessarily imply the involvement of the name user’s will, e.g. initial automatic phonological adaptation, which occurs irrespective if the name user wants it or not (Sandnes 2003:329f.). In case of orthographic adaptation the criterion in question does not seem to be sufficient, since the scribe’s “ultimate goal” is not always clear: he could aim either at copying the text as close to the original as possible or at “improving” the original text in his “copy” or, as it is often the case, at combining both of the strategies. It can be, thus, argued that although this type of adaptation does imply the “active” involvement of the scribe, it can sometimes occur as a “byproduct” of copying, when the copyist’s conscious efforts are at their minimum. E.g. as a result of “overgeneralizing”, when a place-name, unknown to the scribe, is replaced with a known one, which resembles the original in its orthographic form: in Lbs 222 fol⁵, 84r, Dimin (W) appears as Dímun (cf. the names of two Faroe Islands – Stóra and Lítla Dímun), Parez (M) appears as Paris (W).

From my point of view, one should consider another criterion when it comes to distinguishing between orthographic adaptation and mistakes, namely the relative synchronic transparency of the adaptation from the point of view of onomasticon and language system in general. In accordance with this criterion, even the name change, which is made by the scribe somewhat unconsciously, is considered to be a case of orthographic adaptation. At the same time, when it comes to name corrections, i.e. undoubtedly conscious acts of name change, which sometimes occur in copies, one should distinguish between those aimed at “improving” the original name within the frames of onomastic and the language system (in this case in accordance with the criterion in question, i.e. adaptation transparency) and those aimed at bringing the copy into the agreement with the form already used in the ms or with the original document. The second category is not covered by my understanding of orthographic adaptation, since it has another point of departure, e.g. in Cod. Holm. 55 fol⁶, 234v, Helgi Ólafsson corrected Arkús, the original form in W, to Arkún, apparently, in accordance with the forms of the name which he has seen earlier in the text. As for the first one, the following example can be seen as a correction of an original place-name in accordance with the aforementioned criterion: the place-name Trippen (M), Tilbipen in W, is interpreted as til Bipen⁴ in all the sur-

---

⁴ It should be added that declension of non-transparent and even transparent names perceived as foreign, can be problematic. The preposition til takes only gen. and, thus, Bipen could be perceived as a genitive form, although

Thus, the deviations from the original form, which are transparent from the point of view of onomasticon and the language system, are considered to be examples of orthographic adaptation, e.g. til Steinborgar (W) – Lbs 222 fol⁹, 86r, til Steins borgar; Cod. Holm. 55 fol⁹, 244v, til Steins [line shift] Borgar, where the compound name changed its model from specific in nom. + generic to specific in gen. + generic; til Svlölands (W) – Lbs 222 fol⁹, 85r, til Svanlandz, where the non-transparent generic Svl- appeared as Svan- from svaetr, m., “a swan”; Vinborg (W) – Cod. Holm. 55 fol⁹, 248v, Winberg, where the toponym changed its generic to berg, n., “a rock, elevated rocky ground”; á Gásnin (W) – Cod. Holm. 41 4to⁸, [119v] 135v, á Gæſúm, Cod. Holm. 55 fol⁹, 248v, á Gæſúm, where the non-transparent toponym Gásnin appears in the form á Gásum, pl. dat., from gás, f., “a goose”; til Jómsborgar (M) – til Jónsborgar (W), where the non-transparent generic Jóms- is perceived as an anthroponym Jóns- in gen. sg.; af Valagust (W) – Cod. Holm. 55 fol⁹, 236v, af Wala wóxt, where the transparent generic for some reason is changed to vöxt, m., “growth, increase”. The deviations from the original form, which are not transparent from the point of view of onomasticon and the language system, are seen as examples of orthographic mistakes, e.g. til Dubrin (W) – Cod. Holm. 41 4to⁸, [94r] 110r, til Dúbim; í Knaus (W) – Cod. Holm. 41 4to⁸, [110v] 126v, í Knúnum, Cod. Holm. 55 fol⁹, 235v, í knúr; Valmig (W) – Cod. Holm. 41 4to⁸, [109r] 125r, Walning, Cod. Holm. 55 fol⁹, 233v, Walnng. It is thinkable that name users can break all the rules to adapt the name in the way they like; however, in the case of orthographic adaptation, it would be quite hard to prove that the case of completely “unmotivated” name change is not an orthographic mistake.

2.3 Name identification.

As regards name identification, orthographic adaptation can provide one with unique opportunity to establish what name users or scribes in the present context consider to be a name in a diachronic perspective. Proper names are more or less regularly marked with an initial capital letter only in later mss⁷, where one can trace the “thinking process” of the scribe when he had to make a decision if this or that “candidate” is a proper name or not. The key factors in the process of name identification seem to be either the influence of onomasticon, if the name in question already belongs to the onomasticon of the name user, or the context or, most plausible, the combination of both. E.g.:

(1) according to the A-group of mss, “[…] þeir hofðu mikinn her ok föru til Valagust ok brendu tveim megin árinnar ok förú svá fram til Steinborgar […]“, while according to a part of the B-group, e.g. W, E, “[…] brendu tveim megin árinnar Rinar ok förú svá fram til Steinborgar […]“ (SD 1919–25 p. 291). In the major editions of Knýtlinga the A-version is preferred, while the attitude towards the other variant differs: it is passed over in silence by Bjarni Guðnason in ÍF (DS 1982), mentioned in a short note in Formmanna sögur edition (Knýt. 1828) and is a legitimate “member” of the variant apparatus in the edition of Carl af Petersens and Emil Olson (SD 1919–25), where it acquired even the reference in the register. Since all the studied mss are copies of W (even if indirect ones), árinnar Rinar is attested in

it does not agree with the declension system of Old Norse, cf. til Valagusta (M), a transparent name, where the generic, gustr, m. sg. “a gust, blast”, is in acc. even in combination with the preposition til; in some cases the form is adapted to til Valaguts e.g. Lbs 222 fol⁹, 83v, Cod. Holm. 41 4to⁸, [119v] 135v.

⁵ Helgi Ólafsson probably misinterpreted the abbreviation bg in the original ms.

⁶ Although gás, f., takes the form gesir in pl. nom. and keeps the ae through all cases in pl., in proper names á seems to be legitimate even in pl. cf. Gásir, pl. nom., the local name of a harbor in Iceland (Cleasby 1874:193).

⁷ Among the surveyed mss, proper names are consistently marked in Cod. Holm. 55 fol⁹ written by Helgi Ólafsson.
all of them: Cod. Holm. 55 fol (1682–87), 255v “arinnar (-) Rinar”; Cod. Holm. 41 4to (1687), [123r] 139r “are=nnar Rynar”; Lbs 222 fol (1695–98), 88r “arinnar Rynar”.

It is obvious that several variants are thinkable in the present context: e.g. the place-name in the B-tradition can be a result of a misinterpretation of an earlier dittoographic mistake, as the editors of Knýtlinga seem to assume; or it could reflect another oral variant of the passage. However in the second case, the appearance of this particular name, Rin, f. (Rhine) in the context, where the troops of Canute VI of Denmark first burn everything on the both banks of the Rhine, which flows into the North Sea, and then proceed to Steinborg (Kamięń Pomorski), which is close to Kamięń Bay (Zalew Kamięński), is rather doubtful, unless the speaker had a rather vague idea of European geography.

Apparently, at some point in the chain of copying a dittoographic – or rather partially ditto- graphic – mistake occurred: ár-innar (a sg. gen. from á, f., “river”, + a sg. gen. from a post-fixed article -en, f.) was possibly perceived by a scribe as á-rinnar (e.g. the letter á and the rest of the word appeared on different sides of the sheet/sheets and, thus, got separated), where the double nn could be contracted, and the last bit – rinar – was then mistakenly copied. This mistake then acquired a much more prominent role and became a proper name in its own right, or, put in other words, a dittoigraphy has become a – in a way – legitimate addition to the text, because the later copyists treated this mistake as a name, Rin, f. sg. gen. It is obvious that the reasons for that first dittoographic mistake (if that was a mistake) will hardly ever be established; however onomastic and the context definitely played their role, if not in the appearance of the mistake, then in its acceptance by other copyists. The river-name Rin, f., (Rhine) must be well known by the scribes as well as the context it appeared in, cf. e.g. Sögubrot ok þættir viðkomandi Danmerkr sögu: “[…] þeir [Danir ok Norðmenn] föru upp eptir ánni Rín, ok brendu þar allar borgir ok kyrkjur […]”, where ánni is a sg. dat. from á, f., “river”, + a sg. dat. from a postfixed article -en, f., and Rín is f. sg. dat. (Sögubrot 1828 p. 407). It is possible to argue that the first copyist of Knýtlinga who made the mistake, as well as all other copyists who accepted it, were influenced by their onomastic competence and the context, since they associated the mistake with the river Rín, although it is situated rather far from the area where the events took place.

(2) Helgi Ólafsson interpreted the appellative by, acc. sg., from byrr, m., “a fair wind”, as a place-name Byr, cf. “[…] lágu þeir [Kristóforús hertogi ok Absalón biskup] XX nært veðr-fastfar í ánni Svøldr í óveðrani miklu ok fengu síðan byr ok føru heim.” (SD 1919–25:273) and Cod. Holm. 55 fol, 240v, “féingú síðann Byr og føru heim.” In this case, as in the previous example, the reason for such interpretation lies both in the onomastic competence of the scribe (the toponym Byr was mentioned earlier in the text: “konungrlagðiz pá við Byr” (SD 1919–25:264)) as well as the context (which allows the interpretation fengu Byr ok føru heim “captured Byr and sailed home”, although fengu byr ok føru heim “got a favorable wind and sailed home” seems more appropriate taking into account Duke Kristoforus and Bishop Absalon had been weather-bound for twenty days before that).

2.4 Orthographic adaptation of West Slavic toponyms in Knýtlinga saga

In the surveyed mss only a relatively small amount of place-names were orthographically adapted, see table 1. Although the material studied is obviously not enough to draw more or less general conclusions, I would still like to outline the main tendencies, which occurred in it. Orthographic adaptation as an individual phenomenon seems to be unpredictable, i.e. it is not possible to determine which place-names will undoubtedly undergo adaptation. It is possible to assume that all names have some adaptation potential; however this potential is not realized
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in each and every case. The name user or the scribe in the present context is responsible for the realization of adaptation potential, even if his will is not actively involved in the process. The mechanisms of orthographic adaptation are somewhat clearer. Although both non-transparent and transparent names can be subjected to orthographic adaptation, it is plausible to assume that ambiguous, non-transparent names are more likely to undergo orthographic adaptation, see table 2. Basing on the studied material, I would like to single out three main types of orthographic adaptation: (1) formal adaptation, when the form of the place-name or its part is adapted, e.g. Steinborg – Steinsborg, Dimarsbrú – Dimarsbrúr etc.; (2) semantic adaptation, when the semantic content of the place-name or its part is adapted, e.g. á Gásnin – á Gásum, Svollands – Svanlandz etc.; (3) place-name replacement, when the original name, unknown to the scribe, is replaced with another toponym resembling the original in its orthographic form, Dimin – Dimun etc.

Table 1. Orthographic alterations of West Slavic toponyms in Cod. Holm. 41 4to⁵, Cod. Holm. 55 fol⁶ and Lbs 222 fol⁶.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ms</th>
<th>Total (percentage of orthographic graphic alterations in the material)</th>
<th>Orthographic mistakes in adaptations (percentage of mistakes in alterations)</th>
<th>Orthographic adaptations in alterations (percentage of adaptations in alterations)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cod. Holm. 41 4to⁵</td>
<td>8 (20%)</td>
<td>4 (10%)</td>
<td>4 (10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cod. Holm. 55 fol⁶</td>
<td>8 (20%)</td>
<td>2 (5%)</td>
<td>6 (15%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lbs 222 fol⁶</td>
<td>10 (25%)</td>
<td>3 (7.5%)</td>
<td>7 (17.5%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Orthographic adaptation of West Slavic toponyms in Cod. Holm. 41 4to⁵, Cod. Holm. 55 fol⁶ and Lbs 222 fol⁶.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ms</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Transparent names</th>
<th>Non-transparent names</th>
<th>Semi-transparent names</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cod. Holm. 41 4to⁵</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cod. Holm. 55 fol⁶</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lbs 222 fol⁶</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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