

## **Possibilities of Onomatosystematical Comparative Research in Uralian Languages (On the Examples of Early Hungarian Oronyms)<sup>1</sup>**

**Katalin RESZEGI**

### **1. Theoretical questions of an onomastic description**

Name giving and name usage are linguistic-anthropological universals: although proper names are logically not necessary elements of a human language, we are not aware of a language that does not have names. Name giving tradition, however, varies from culture to culture. Consequently, in this paper I aim to introduce the method with which I see the presentation of toponym name giving traditions realisable, which can then serve as a basis for comparison of name giving traditions firstly between related languages and secondly between other languages (for example, regionally connected) in general. In a unified description framework like this we can see if the method of name giving itself also shows universal qualities, and also if the factors causing the similarities and differences between name giving methods can be discovered, for example, if the genetics of languages is also visible in their methods of name giving or if we may count on areal influences instead.

Uralic languages are especially suitable for studies like these since there are some among them that exist in different linguistic and cultural contexts, far from each other, and there are also those that have been in a closer spatial and cultural relationship for centuries or even millenniums. In this paper I present an analysis model which in my opinion is suitable for comparison studies. I chose the Hungarian oronyms for description, since this toponym category can be found in all Uralic languages.

Toponyms, toponym name giving can be characterised by several different aspects: which feature of the place can be traced in the name, which ele-

---

<sup>1</sup> The work is supported by the TÁMOP 4.2.1./B-09/1/KONV-2010-0007 project. The project is implemented through the New Hungary Development Plan, co-financed by the European Social Fund and the European Regional Development Fund.

ments are used by the name givers to express this, how the name is created. In my opinion, the complexity of name giving is most effectively grasped by István Hoffmann's name analysis model (1993). Behind Hoffmann's theory lies Rudolf Šramek's axiomatic claim according to which a given language in all periods has rules and patterns which characterise the inventory of toponyms and determine the creation of new names (1972–1973). In the 1970's, Europe was concerned with the issue of regularities and patterns in names. We should emphasise the results of Scandinavian and Finnish researchers, and among them Eero Kiviniemi's toponym typology studies (1978, 1990). Kiviniemi's papers were of vital impact on Hoffmann's name study model. Kiviniemi analyses the structure of names with relation to name giving motives and lexical features, the historical aspect, however, is missing. Hoffmann's aim was to establish a typology which would make it possible to discover the regularities in the name genesis and functionality of toponyms.

The model considers the analysis of toponyms as linguistic signs conductible on two levels: synchronic (structural) and diachronic. The former level partially refers to describing the motivation of name giving and analysis of semantic content; we aim at studying the types of models which serve as a basis for name giving. This level is referred to as functional-semantic analysis (1993: 30–31, 43–44). The basic quality of name giving varies, and the name giving-name usage mechanism as well as related semantic categories characterise toponyms<sup>2</sup> in general, but due to the different approaches of the speakers, there are proportional and typological differences between the name inventories of different languages.

The basic concept of a functional-semantic analysis is the name constituent. It is the segment of the name which provides information about the denotatum, expresses a semantic quality of the denotatum (Hoffmann 1993: 30). There is no direct connection between a name constituent and each lexeme in the name. For example, *Dió-mál* ('walnut' + 'hillside') oronym refers to a mountain (2), where a lot of walnut trees grow (1), in the *Dió-mál hegye* (*Dió-mál* oronym + *hegy* 'mountain') name structure however there are only two name constituent functions, 'the mountain (2), whose name is *Dió-mál* (1)'. Consequently, based on functional aspects, we can delineate structural types: mono- and two-componential names. Semantic

---

<sup>2</sup> At this point of the study Hoffmann's model shows signs of cognitive approach, which is becoming increasingly popular in onomastics as well. Namely, Hoffmann's starting point is that name giving is a cognitive act, and that categories behind place name giving are related with forms of cognition and human knowledge in general (1993: 44).

functions directly characterise only the name constituents, therefore, all oronyms can be characterised by one or two functions.

The operational condition for toponym use is to have everybody categorise the linguistic formation of the segment of reality denoted by the individual into the same cognitional category: to process it as an element of toponym category on the basis of linguistic procedures used for editing toponyms. Through and in connection to structural analysis the name constituents are also worth analysing from a lexical-morphological aspect. This involves an analysis of the used linguistic means of formulation, in other words, which linguistic (lexical, morphological, grammatical) tools, i.e. name elements are used to express which functional-semantic content in a given period, in a given region. There are many theoretical possibilities to do this, in reality however the group of linguistic means used in toponyms can be well defined (Hoffmann 1993: 31–32, 55–57).

We refer to name segments as name constituents after Hoffmann (1993: 56). He uses this term to refer to lexemes in toponyms and derivational morphemes having a role in name giving. Certain toponyms and name constituents may consist of one or two name elements. When analysing lexical name elements the basic categories may be parts of speech classes. These – similarly to functional categories – can usually be further divided according to meaning: emphasising parts of speech having a role in forming toponyms and sometimes even denoting their different forms. In a lexical-morphological analysis the already mentioned *Dió-mál hegye* name can be divided into four name elements: *dió* (‘walnut’) plan name + *mál* (‘hillside’) geographical common name + *hegy* (‘mountain’) geographical common name + *-e* formant expressing possession.

If we would like to get a full picture of name giving tradition, besides name giving motives and lexical characteristics of toponyms, we should also study which name giving methods form new toponyms. Analyses like these are referred to as etymological toponym studies. In historical analysis, besides acquiring knowledge of name material’s genesis, we also get to acquire information about the history of change. Namely, we should take into account that the already existing toponyms – due to their model impact and via the speakers’ competence – fundamentally determine the qualities of the system’s new elements and also play a role in the change of linguistic structure of already existing toponyms (Hoffmann 1993: 67).

István Hoffman originally developed the model to describe modern microtoponyms but later research had unequivocally proven that it is also perfectly suitable to characterise early name inventories. These studies primarily

undertook the analysis of individual narrow areas (individual early comitats) of toponym name giving. In my work, partially connecting to the above and also broadening the research, I introduce name giving and name usage tradition with regards to oronyms in a period of Hungarian history, the early old Hungarian period (896–1350). In connection to name giving customs we have to take into account that different name types may show variations in their systematic characteristics. Hills of different size provided important orientation to speakers in all periods and everywhere, this is why they were generally named by proper names. Although in different parts of Hungarian language territories people referred to relief types of different size as mountains, this did not really linguistically influence name giving, consequently, results may be compared regardless of relief relations. The chosen period is the period when the Hungarian toponym system was developed in the Carpathian basin. Hungarians, after more than half a millennium of migration, arrived to their current habitat in the 9th century and settling down in the Carpathian basin gradually named all its objects.

The main source of my work were the four volumes of *Historical geography of Árpád age Hungary* by György Györffy, which processes two thirds of Hungarian territory in the period I studied. Spatial borders of the study were the borders of the country developed by the end of the studied period. Other sources from which I collected oronyms: *New document inventory from the Árpád age* (ÁÚO.), *Document inventory from the Anjou period* (A.), *Early Hungarian toponym dictionary 1.* (KMHsz.) and *Etymological dictionary of geographical names* (FNESz.).

## 2. Structural analysis

The functional-semantic description within the structural analysis looks into the semantic content of functional name constituents and the model types serving as foundation for name giving. According to Hoffmann, there are three name constituent functions: type denoting function (F)<sup>3</sup>, semantic content characteristic function (S), denominating function (M). These functions appear in oronyms with the following structures: F (*Bérc* < *bérc* ‘mountain’), S (*Bükkös* < *bükkös* ‘grown with beech tree’), M (*Viszoka* < *Viszoka* Slavic oronym), as well as S+F (*Fehér-halom* < *fehér* ‘white’ + *halom* ‘heap’), S+M (*Kis-Galya* < *kis* ‘small’ + *Galya* oronym) and M+F (*Zsarnó hegye* < *Zsarnó* oronym + *hegy* ‘mountain’). In the study I also aim at presenting the other level of structural analysis, the lexical-morphological

---

<sup>3</sup> Letters stand for the capital letters of Hungarian equivalents for the terms.

characterisation, in order to see what linguistic form the different name giving motivations have in oronyms.

**2.1.** A frequent motive in toponym name giving is denoting the type of the place. This semantic role can only be taken by type denoting words, i.e. geographical common names (cf. Hoffmann 1999: 208, Tóth 2001: 132).

Geographical common names usually appear connected to the basic component of two-componential names, to the first component expressing semantic content characteristic, i.e. they are usually the second component with S+F structure. In structures like this geographical names *hegy* ‘larger prominence in the ground’, a *bérc* ‘hill, smaller prominence in the ground’ and *halom* ‘smaller prominence’ are the most common. The first component is very diverse, for example, the first component of *Fekete-hegy* (*fekete* ‘black’ + *hegy* ‘mountain’) is a colour, the first component of *Éles-bérc* (*éles* ‘sharp’ + *bérc* ‘hill’) refers to the form of the prominence. The name *Mike halma* (*Mike* personal name + *halom* ‘heap’) guards the relationship of the prominence to a person called Mike. Other names with a similar structure are *Kerek-domb* (*kerek* ‘round’ + *domb* ‘hill’), *Bükk-fő* (*bükk* ‘beech’ + *fő* ‘hill-peak’), *Nagy-gyűr* (*nagy* ‘large’ + *gyűr* ‘hill’), *Szép-havas* (*szép* ‘beautiful’ + *havas* ‘tall mountain (covered in snow)’), *Bagoly-kő* (*bagoly* ‘owl’ + *kő* ‘rock’), *Köves-lejtő* (*köves* ‘rocky’ + *lejtő* ‘slope’).

The type denoting name constituent may also connect to the toponym first component, creating names with M+F structure. These names can be characterised with a ‘prominence named X’ semantic content. In these names the Hungarian geographical common name was usually connected to a Slavic oronym: *Viszoka hegye* (*Viszoka* oronym + *hegye* ‘mountain’), *Szlovik köve* (*Szlovik* oronym + *kő* ~ *köve* ‘rock’), *Zsarnó hegye* (*Zsarnó* oronym + *hegye* ‘mountain’).

We can also find a small number of geographical common names by themselves, i.e. F structure names, for example *Domb* (‘hill’), *Halom* (‘heap’), *Tető* (‘hilltop’), *Mál* (‘hillside’).

**2.2.** Name users frequently borrow toponyms from name users in other linguistic communities. Borrowed names, name constituents, always have a denominating function. This semantic role is always that of a real toponym, and its task is solely to refer to the denotatum, it does not express anything else for the speakers of Hungarian language (cf. Hoffmann 1993: 47).

Among Hungarian speakers, borrowed names are frequently used in unalternated form (as names with M structure), for example the Slavic oronyms

*Papaj* (< Ancient Slavic \**popelъ* ‘ash’, FNESz. *Nagy-Papaj*), *Dobóc* (< Ancient Slavic *dobъ* ‘oak’, Šmilauer 1970: 57), *Pizun* (< Slavic *pъšeno* ‘millet’, Šmilauer 1970: 150). Among Hungarian oronyms there is a small number of names with M structure of Romanian and German origin: *Litahaberg* (German *Litaha* river name < Althochdeutsch *lît* ‘hillside’ + *aha* ‘water’, Förstemann II/2: 92; Deutsch *berg* ‘mountain’), *Pod* (< Romainan *pod* ‘plateau, terrace’, FNESz. *Pád*).

We can find denominating function in the first component of two-componential names (names with M+F structure) relatively frequently. Oronyms belonging here can be further grouped according to whether the name constituent with a denominating function is of outer or inner genesis. For example, in the first component of *Brizó bérce* (< Slavic *berza* ‘birch’) or *Pilis-hegy* (< Slavic *plěšb* ‘baldness’). In this name type first component of inner genesis is significantly less frequent. Example for this is *Dió-mál hegye* (*Dió-mál* oronym + *hegye* ‘mountain’) two-componential oronym, in which case the geographical common name *hegye* was linked to *Dió-mál* (*dió* ‘walnut’ + *mál* ‘hillside’).

Among oronyms in the early periods there are very few names with S+M structure, for example *Kis-Galya*, created from adjective *kis* (‘small’) and Slavic oronym *Galya*. The second component with a denominating function is usually a loanword. The emergence of this name type can be explained by the fact linguistic elements expressing a features may be linked as first components to elements of the toponymic system. In these cases the earlier toponym becomes an element with a denominating function in the new toponym, irrespective of what functional features it had earlier (cf. Tóth 2001: 137).

**2.3.** It is especially characteristic of natural name giving that people denote objects which do not yet have names and are found in their environment after a certain feature of theirs. The group of oronyms classified in this group as well as the linguistic elements expressing semantic content largely differ. The name constituent with a semantic content characteristic function may form an oronym by itself (S), but it is most frequently used linked to a geographical common name (S+F), and sometimes to a name constituent with a denominating function (S+M).

The majority of monocomponential oronyms containing a name constituent with a semantic content characteristic function was formed via local contact. This functional quality characterises for example *Geszte*, *Nándor* names, which are identical with the names of nearby settlements. This semantic content is also frequent in two-componential names: *Akna hegye* (*Akna* settlement name + *hegy* ‘mountain’ with a derivational suffix *-e* ex-

pressing possession), *Dorog-hegy* (*Dorog* settlement name + *hegy* ‘mountain’).

Besides settlement names, forest names also appear in large numbers in oronyms (cf. Kiss 1996: 442). For example, *Kereked* (*kerek* ‘forest of round form’), *Bodzáserdeje* (*bodzás* ‘containing elderberry’ + *erdő* ‘forest’), *Hollókerek* (*holló* ‘raven’ + *kerek* ‘forest’) were primarily forest names. When these names are found next to a Latin geographical common name referring to a prominence (*mons* ‘mountain’, *vinea* ‘grape hill’) in documents, they probably denote mountains. Forest names and oronyms are closely connected in general. Names of larger hills, mountains are present in documents as names of forests: for example, *Mátra* oronym (1289: in silva *Matra*, Gy. 3: 120).<sup>4</sup>

Monocomponential *Balya*, *Miskó*, *Pató* and two-componential *Gyula havasa* (*Gyula* personal name + *havas* ‘tall mountain’), *Mátyás hegye* (*Mátyás* personal name + *hegy* ‘mountain’) were formed from a personal name. The personal name constituent usually refers to a possessive relationship, the precise semantic content of the component however is not easy to determine. Namely, due to their size it is difficult to imagine they belonged to a single person. In cases of names like this we should take into account the possibility that the given person owned the forest or meadow on the hill or maybe lived there or that perhaps something happened to the person there. Since in the early periods, settlement names in Hungarian languages were frequently formed from personal names without a formant, it could also be the case that oronyms of the type were developed from settlement names through a personal name mediator.

Relatively stable flora also appears in the names of prominence: *Mogyorós-hegy* (*mogyorós* ‘nut’ + *hegy* ‘mountain’), *Szőlős-halom* (*szőlős* ‘grape’ + *halom* ‘heap’). The most frequent are the names of tree types appearing in groups, such as *Bükk* (< *bükk* ‘beech tree’), *Jávör* (< *jávör* ‘maple tree’), *Nyír* (< *nyír* ‘birch tree’); *Fenyő-mál* (*fenyő* ‘pine tree’ + *mál* ‘hillside’), *Cseresznyés-bérc* (*cseresznyés* ‘cherry tree’ + *bérc* ‘mountain’) oronyms.

The specific animal of the hill may also become the hill’s name, as in *Csókás* (< *csóka* ‘jackdaw’ + *-s* derivational suffix, which expresses the function ‘rich in something’), *Ökrös* (< *ökör* ‘ox’ + *-s* derivational suffix);

<sup>4</sup> On the basis of modern name usage we can explain this phenomenon by the fact that name users do not differentiate between a prominence and woodland covering it, since the two types of places are not differentiated either in the linguistic consciousness of the given linguistic community (cf. Reszegi 2007: 41).

*Bagoly-kő* (*bagoly* ‘owl’ + *kő* ‘rock’), *Keselyű-halom* (*keselyű* ‘vulture’ + *halom* ‘heap’) oronyms. The first component of these names refers to the birds nesting in the forests and sometimes to raised animals.

The size and the form of the place appears less frequently as the motivation for name giving: *Magasd* (< *magas* ‘tall’ + *-d* topoformant), *Nagy-bérc* (*nagy* ‘large’ + *bérc* ‘mountain’), *Kereked* (*kerek* ‘round’ + *-d* topoformant), *Sátor-hegy* (*sátor* ‘tent’ + *hegy* ‘mountain’), colour: *Világos* (< *világos* ‘light’), *Vörös-kő* (*vörös* ‘red’ + *kő* ‘rock’). The material of the environment or the prominence itself is also a rare motivation: *Meszes* (< *mész* ‘limestone’ + *-s* derivational suffix), *Homok-hegy* (*homok* ‘sand’ + *hegy* ‘mountain’), and so is the building, edifice on the hill: *Vár* (< *vár* ‘castle’, *Kápolna bérc* (*kápolna* ‘chapel’ + *bérc* ‘mountain’ + *-e* formant).

There is sometimes reference to other semantic features, usually in two-componential names, such as the temperature: *Árnyék-mál* (*árnyék* ‘shadow’ + *mál* ‘hillside’), *Meleg-hegy* (*meleg* ‘warm’ + *hegy* ‘mountain’), or state: *Homlóló-kő* (*homlóló* ‘dying’ + *kő* ‘rock’). The relative situation of the place and certain parts of the hill is present almost only in two-componential names: *Köz-bérc* (*köz* ‘middle’ + *bérc* ‘mountain’).

**2.4.** Among oronyms from the early period there are also those which show several name giving motivations. For example, the name *Béla* could have been created from a personal name without a formant, cf. 1138/1329: *Bela* personal name (ÁSz. 105), but it may also be a borrowing from Slavic, traced back to the feminine form of *belij* ‘white’, cf. *Bela (gora)* ‘fehér (mountain)’ (Šmilauer 1970: 38). The oronym *Dobó* can also be explained by Hungarian name giving from personal name, cf. 1254/1374/1378: *Dobou* personal name (ÁSz. 253), or from the Slavic toponym *дубъ(въ)* ‘oak’ (Šmilauer 1970: 57).

### 3. Historical analysis

In a historical analysis we study which name forming methods created new names, in other words, how were linguistic elements incorporated into names. In the analysis we also take into account the history of change of names.

**3.1.** The majority of two-componential oronyms was created by syntagmatic editing. Naturally, this way can only form names containing two functional name constituents. Each member of the structure provides some sort of information about the denotatum. In syntagmatic editing any name constituent may be a common word or a proper name (toponym or anthroponym), or it may be simple or complex (cf. Hoffmann 1993: 59).

**3.1.1.** The biggest subgroup of two-componential oronyms are those with attributive qualification phrases, for example *Fekete-hegy* (*fekete* ‘black’ + *hegy* ‘mountain’). In these names the first component expresses a quality characteristic of the object. Consequently, first components are usually adjectives, which can be derivational: *Agyagos-bérc* (*agyag* ‘clay’ + *-s* derivational suffix, which expresses the function ‘rich in something’ + *bérc* ‘mountain’), or underived: *Meleg-hegy* (*meleg* ‘warm’ + *hegy* ‘mountain’), *Vörös-kő* (*vörös* ‘red’ + *kő* ‘rock’), but we may also find nominal adjectives, primarily floral and faunal: *Jávor-hegy* (*jávor* ‘maple tree’ + *hegy* ‘mountain’), *Sertés-hegy* (*sertés* ‘pork’ + *hegy* ‘mountain’), and sometimes even participles: *Akasztó-hegy* (*akasztó* ‘hanging (execution)’ + *hegy* ‘mountain’).

A small special group of oronyms with attributive qualification phrase are defining adjectival phrases. Here the first component of the name defines one of the objects having the same name, i.e. the adjective in them can only be interpreted in relation to something. This referential system can only be set up between names, name pairs in correlative relationship: a *Kis-Galya* (*kis* ‘small’ + *Galya* oronym of Slavic origin), *Nagy-Galya* (*nagy* ‘large’ + *Galya*) names can only be interpreted in relation to each other and to the oronym *Galya* (the objects denoted by these three names lie close to each other).

**3.1.2.** Names *Három-hegy* (*három* ‘three’ + *hegy* ‘mountain’), *Két-halom* (*két* ‘two’ + *halom* ‘heap’) were formed from attributive qualification phrases. Here the adjective is a cardinal number and the attributed word is a geographical common name. Although these constitute only a small proportion of two-componential names, their existence nevertheless shows that this name giving method was present in early old Hungarian period. Names created this way are the closest to denoting a form, namely, names of the *Két-halom*, *Három-hegy* type are basically joint denominations of two and three mountains, respectively, as indicated in the text of Latin documents: e.g. „ad duo monticula ... vulgo *Kethalm*” (Gy. 2: 515), and „ad 3 montes *Harumheg*” (Gy. 2: 460, 543).

**3.1.3.** Among old oronyms we can find those with attributive possessive phrases in large numbers. One part of these is unmarked, e.g. *Gáld-bérc* (*Gáld* personal name + *hegy* ‘mountain’), *Sárkány-hegy* (*Sárkány* personal name + *hegy* ‘mountain’). The other part is marked by a linguistic element on the possessive word: *Mátyás hegye* (*Mátyás* personal name + *hegy* ‘mountain’ + *-e* morpheme expressing possession), *Balog Péter halma* (*Balog Péter* personal name + *halom* ‘heap’ + *-a* morpheme expressing possession), *Apát havasa* (*apát* ‘abbot’ + *havas* ‘tall mountain’ + *-a* morpheme expressing pos-

session). The second component of oronyms with attributive possessive phrase is almost exclusively a geographical common name, while the first component is usually an anthroponym or a toponym. The latter are only formally attributive possessive phrases, since functionally they refer to the position of the object denominated by them, for example, *Akna hegye* name form functionally expresses 'the mountain situated in the settlement named Akna'.

In oronyms with marked attributive possessive phrases the relationship between components can frequently be described as the relationship between class-individual (Tóth 2001: 173): *Csemernye havasa* (*Csemernye* oronym of Slavic origin + *havas* 'tall mountain' -*a* morpheme expressing possession), *Viszoka hegye* (*Viszoka* oronym of Slavic origin + *hegy* 'mountain' -*e* morpheme expressing possession). The basic component in all cases is a geographical common name denoting the type of the object, while the first component is usually a toponym of foreign origin and denominating function. In these names' cases we can take into account that the Slavic name become part of the Hungarian onomatosystem by linking to a geographical common name. In many cases however the Slavic toponym became a part of the Hungarian system unaltered and was then secondarily connected to a geographical common name.

Among names with attributive possessive phrases we can find a small number of names showing part-total relationship (cf. Tóth 2001: 174). In these names the first component denotes the entire object and the second component a smaller part of it, for example *Meggyes-mál eleje*, which denotes the closer part of the hillside named *Meggyes-mál* (*meggyes* 'rich in cherry trees' + *mál* 'hillside').

**3.2.** Through morphematic editing name givers turn different linguistic elements into toponyms by linking them to topoformants (Hoffmann 1993: 73), Consequently, monocomponential place names are created. There are no separate formants for creating toponyms in Hungarian, topoformants were therefore always created from common word derivational morphemes.

In my name corpus the topoformant is rarely connected to proper names (anthroponyms or toponyms), oronyms are usually created from common words. In the early old Hungarian period names formed by suffix -*s* are the most frequent: *Nyíres* (< *nyír* 'birch'), *Borsós* (< *borsó* 'pea'), *Ökrös* (< *ökör* 'ox'). Besides these, the following suffixes were used: -*d*: *Szilad* (< *szil* 'elm'); -*sd*: *Kövesd* (< *kő* 'rock'); -*gy* *Somogy* (< *som* 'cornel'); -*i*: *Gencsi* (<

*Gencs* personal name); *-j ~ -aj ~ -ej*: *Erdej* (< *erdő* ‘forest’); *-ó*: *Akasztó* (< *akaszt* ‘hang somebody’).

**3.3.** Through semantic name giving, name givers use the inner stock of linguistic elements so that the form and the structure of the name do not change while a new toponym meaning is developed. Both proper names and common words were involved in semantic name giving, and the result is always a monocomponential toponym (Hoffmann 1993: 89). In creating monocomponential oronyms different subtypes of this name giving method played a vital role.

**3.3.1.** We can find examples for using common words as toponyms without any differentiating element in the early days, this name creation method is the semantic split (Hoffmann 1993: 93). Common words recorded in large numbers also formed monocomponential oronyms: *bérc* (‘mountain’), *halom* (‘heap’), *domb* (‘hill’), *hát* (‘ridge’), *havas* (‘tall mountain covered in snow’), *mál* (‘hillside’), *orom* (‘hilltop’), *orr* (‘hilltop’), *ség* (‘hill’), *tető* (‘hilltop’). In cases like this, however, one cannot decide if the recorded data are linguistic elements with proper name value or rather common word occurrences. To decide this about historical data we need knowledge about early language use, consequently, what we need to refer to is how these data were pasted into Latin records. According to István Hoffmann these data are always pasted into the Latin context with involvement methods: they either appear after a Latin geographical common name, e.g. 1208/359: *de monte Segh* (Gy. 4: 178; < *ség* ‘hill’), or stand without any separate structure (no example found among oronyms). The lexeme *bérc* in structures of “*ad unum Berch*”, “*super eodem Berch*” (1272/1419: Gy. 1: 64), “*in quod Bercz*” (1341/1342//XVIII: Gy. 1: 541) type is certainly not a proper name. Namely, these structures can be explained by the fact that the word *bérc* became part of the Latin document recording (cf. Hoffmann 2004: 50–59), in other words, it is often present in documents following the Latin pattern and function of denoting objects. We can also consider a part of geographical common names *halom*, *domb*, *mál* common word mentioning (cf. Reszegi 2009).

**3.3.2.** The phenomenon when a given string of phonemes becomes a carrier of new meaning as a result of conceptual contact is referred to as transonymization. Among oronyms, metonymic name giving is most determining. The result of it is always a monocomponential name which expresses a quality aspect of the place (Hoffmann 1993: 101, 103). Names created by metonymic name giving can be further categorised according to whether they are in connection to another place, person, persons, or thing.

The most typical class are names formed based on ‘settlement’ > ‘prominence to which the settlement is’ pattern: *Bodajk* (< *Bodajk* settlement name), *Bucsány* (< *Bucsány* settlement name), *Dédes* (< *Dédes* settlement name). In the early name corpus we can also find names without formal alternation from hydronyms (*Lendva*, *Tapolca*), forest names (*Mogyorókerek* < *mogyoró* ‘nut’ + *kerek* ‘forest’).

Anthroponym or common word denoting a person transfer is less frequent than toponym metonymy. We may however suspect anthroponyms in *Balya*, *Damján*, *Miskó*, *Szirk*, etc. names. With regards to these names – as I already mentioned in the part about structural analysis – we should take into account the possibility that they became place names via settlement name mediation, in other words, it is more plausible that we are dealing with a personal name > settlement name > oronym transonymization.

The singular form of floral names without formants (e.g. *bükk* ‘beech tree’, *cser* ‘Turkey oak tree’, *jávor* ‘maple tree’) are frequently used as collective noun meaning ‘forest, wood’. They became forest names through semantic split and then an oronym through metonymy (*Bükk*, *Cser*, *Jávor*). We can take into account the floral name > oronym pattern when a given individual tree name becomes the name of the hill (cf. Hoffmann 1993: 107). However, oronym data from recordings usually do not provide us with help for establishing the method of name giving.

**3.3.3.** Among oronyms it often occurs that what was primarily a hilltop name is transferred to the whole hill, or a hill name is transferred to the whole mountain range. This phenomenon is referred to as extension of meaning, and its opposite direction as narrowing of meaning (cf. Hoffmann 1993: 99). The condition for both name giving processes is to have the meaning of the already existing toponyms and the newly developed meanings refer to denotata belonging to the same conceptual class (in our case prominence). This is why this particular name giving process is difficult to grasp.

Names containing a geographical common name referring to a part of a hill are frequently present in documents as denoting the whole of the mountain, for example the name *fő* meaning hilltop: *montem Zyn[a]gfev*” (Gy. 3: 42, 105), ‘the end of the hill coming down abruptly’ *homlok* (cf. Hefty 1911: 211): „*montem Chysta humluk*” (Gy. 3: 150, 233), ‘part of the hill which stands out strongly’ *orr* (Hefty 1911: 302): „*montis Heghor*” (Gy. 4: 111, 124). Namely, it occurs frequently that the name of a hill’s part is gradually transferred to denoting the whole hill. In certain cases, however, it can rather be assumed that the writer of the document did not speak the

language well enough and therefore was not able to denote the type of the place more precisely.

Names of mountains, mountain ranges are usually formed from names of the highest point of the prominence. For examples, *Mátra*, *Vértes*, *Pilis* were usually used to denote a given summit, but with time became names of the whole range (Kiss 1997: 154–155, 167).

**3.4.** If the toponym's morphological construction is alternated while the core of the proper name, and the denotative meaning is unchanged, we are talking about *structural change* (Hoffmann 1993: 121). The new name is usually formed due to the analogical impact of influential name models (Bényei–Pethő 1998: 102).

**3.4.1.** Among the different types of structural change complementation is the only one that played a significant role in creating oronyms in the early old Hungarian period. We call complementation the alternation in the body of the name when a mono- or two-componential name is complemented by a geographical common name (cf. Hoffmann 1993: 131). In all cases the former name becomes incorporated into the newly created name as a denominating name constituent. Name forms *Viszoka* > *Viszoka hegye* (*Viszoka* oronym of Slavic origin + *hegy* 'mountain' + *-e* suffix expressing possession), *Brizó bérce* (*Brizó* oronym of Slavic origin + *bérc* 'mountain' + *-e* suffix expressing possession) were created by complementation. As visible in these examples, the first component of names formed by complementation is an oronym of Slavic origin, to which the speakers linked a Hungarian geographical common name after borrowing, so that the names fulfil their defining function more precisely. Another type of complementation is when an oronym of Hungarian origin takes part in the process: it may already contain a geographical common name denoting the place type: cf. e.g. *Dió-mál* < *dió* 'walnut' + *mál* 'hillside'), but may nevertheless be complemented by another one (*Dió-mál hegye* < *Dió-mál* + *hegy* 'mountain').

**3.4.2.** The process working in the opposite direction to complementation is ellipsis, through which an already existing toponym loses a functional-semantic unit, consequently, a two-componential toponym becomes mono-componential (cf. Hoffmann 1993: 123). Ellipsis mainly affects the geographical common name second component, and the middle component strong enough in itself stays in use (Benkő 1947: 48), usually the first component is a toponym denoting a characteristic or an anthroponym (cf. Tóth 2001: 209).

In the corpus I studied, the oronym *Belső* ('inner') is assumed to have been created from a primarily two-componential name by elliptical structural

alternation. Namely, among Hungarian oronyms we will not find names with a structure close to *Belső* name (cf. Reszegi 2008: 142–143).

**3.4.3.** Complementation and reduction do not change the functional structure of the name, they only go hand in hand with change in morphological structure, in other words, they affect a name element (cf. Hoffmann 1993: 128, 135). These methods of change played a small role in creating new oronyms. The name form *Halom hegye* may be explained by complementing *Halom-hegy* (*halom* ‘heap’ + *hegy* ‘mountain’) by a suffix (-e) expressing possession.

**3.5.** In all onomatosystems, besides the above discussed toponym creating methods we should also take into account *t r a n s o n y m i z a t i o n*. We can only include those name forms into the group of transonymized names which were already used as toponyms in their primary language, i.e. which became parts of the Hungarian onomatosystems as toponyms (cf. Rác 2005: 173). Such are for example names *Angyalnica*, *Csemernye*, *Csernahora*, *Dobóc*, *Dobódel*, *Haraduk*, *Makra*, *Rigel*. These are mostly Slavic borrowings, such as oronym *Makra*, which may be a borrowing of Slavic toponym *Mokra* (*gora*) ‘wet (mountain)’. *Rigel* and *Litahaberg* may be examples of German borrowings present in small numbers. There are a few examples of Romanian borrowings: *Pod*. There are also two-componential names: *Dobódel* can be traced back to Slavic *Dubodiel* ‘oaky mountain’, whereas oronym *Csernahora* has a ‘black mountain’ common name meaning. Naturally, all borrowed names function as monocomponential names in Hungarian.

#### **4. Summary**

My study shows that the oronyms used to denote hills belonging to settlements in the borderline area in the early old Hungarian period are most typically two-componential names where the first component has a semantic content characteristic function and the second component is a geographical common name. By analogy, previously monocomponential names were also secondarily complemented by a geographical common name. To denote larger, better known hills, names (name constituents) of foreign origin with denominating function were used. The least name-like structures were names formed from geographical common names without a formant, of the *Bérc*, *Mál* type.

Name giving and name usage tradition, however, as I have already indicated in the introduction, is not only of interest on its own, but this type of analysis may be the first step towards discovering differences and similarities between onomatosystems and name giving customs of different languages.

The presence of differences like these can become apparent in the discrepancies between the early old Hungarian and the Slavic toponym corpus in the Carpathian basin. The most significant difference can be seen in the proportion of monocomponential and two-componential names: in the Hungarian corpus two-componential names dominate, or at least the two structures are in balance, whereas the Slavic corpus shows a domination of monocomponential names. This unequivocally shows the fundamental differences between the name giving customs of the two nations (cf. Reszegi 2006). However, the proportion of monocomponential names within Hungarian corpus in the areas inhabited by Slavic people is much larger than on other territories, which is probably due to the impact of Slavic name models. Besides discovering the differences, I also consider it an important research question how the onomatosystems influence each other.

### Reference

- A. = Anjoukori okmánytár. 1–6. (ed. Imre Nagy), 7. (ed.) Gyula Tasnádi Nagy. Budapest, 1878–1920.
- ÁSz. = Fehértói Katalin 2004: Árpád-kori személynévtár (1000–1301). Akadémiai Kiadó, Budapest.
- ÁÚO. = Wenczel Gusztáv 1860–1874: Árpádkori új okmánytár 1–12. Pest, [later] Budapest.
- Benkő Loránd 1947: A Nyárádmente földrajzinevei. Magyar Nyelvtudományi Társaság Kiadványai 74. Budapest.
- Bényei Ágnes–Pethő Gergely 1998: Az Árpád-kori Győr vármegye településneveinek nyelvészeti elemzése. Debreceni Egyetem Magyar Nyelvtudományi Tanszék, Debrecen.
- FNESz. = Kiss Lajos 1988: Földrajzi nevek etimológiai szótára 1–2. 4rd edition. Akadémiai Kiadó, Budapest.
- Förstemann, Ernst 1913: Altdeutsches Namenbuch II/1, 2. Bonn.
- Gy. = Györffy György 1963–1998: Az Árpád-kori Magyarország történeti földrajza 1–4. Akadémiai Kiadó, Budapest.
- Hefty Gyula Andor 1911: A térszíni formák nevei a magyar népnyelvben. In: Magyar Nyelvőr 40: 155–169, 206–216, 259–265, 300–308, 361–370, 458–462.
- Hoffmann István 1993: Helynevek nyelvi elemzése. A Debreceni Kossuth Lajos Tudományegyetem Magyar Nyelvtudományi Intézetének Kiadványai 61. Debrecen.

- Hoffmann István 1999: A helynevek rendszerének nyelvi leírásához. In: Magyar Nyelvjárások 37: 207–216.
- Hoffmann István 2004: Az oklevelek helynévi szórványainak nyelvi háttéréről. In: Hoffmann István–Tóth Valéria szerk.: Helynévtörténeti tanulmányok 1. Debreceni Egyetem Magyar Nyelvtudományi Tanszék, Debrecen. 9–61.
- Kiss Lajos 1996: A Kárpát-medence régi helynevei. In: Magyar Nyelvőr 120: 440–450.
- Kiss Lajos 1997: Hegynevek a történelmi Magyarországon. In: Magyar Nyelv 93: 154–168.
- Eero Kiviniemi 1978: Paikanimistö systeeminä. In: Nimistöntutkimus ja paikallishistoria. Helsinki. 73–89.
- Eero Kiviniemi 1990: Perustietoa paikanimistä. Suomi 148. Helsinki.
- KMHsz. = Korai magyar helynévszótár 1. Abaúj–Csongrád vármegye (ed. István Hoffmann). Debrecen, 2005.
- Rácz Anita 2005: A régi Bihar vármegye településneveinek nyelvészeti vizsgálata. A Magyar Névarchívum Kiadványai 9. Debreceni Egyetem Magyar Nyelvtudományi Tanszék, Debrecen.
- Reszegi Katalin 2006: Két hegyvonulat Árpád-kori névállományának összevető vizsgálata. In: Hoffmann István–Tóth Valéria (ed.), Helynévtörténeti tanulmányok 2. Debreceni Egyetem Magyar Nyelvtudományi Tanszék, Debrecen. 159–180.
- Reszegi Katalin 2007: A hegynevek és más helynévfajták kapcsolata. In: Hoffmann István–Juhász Dezső (ed.), Nyelvi identitás és a nyelv dimenziói. Nemzetközi Magyarágtudományi Társaság, Debrecen–Budapest. 37–43.
- Reszegi Katalin 2008: A régi hegynevek névterjedelmének kérdéséről. In: Hoffmann István–Tóth Valéria (ed.), Helynévtörténeti tanulmányok 3. Debreceni Egyetem Magyar Nyelvtudományi Tanszék, Debrecen, 135–144.
- Reszegi Katalin 2009: A jelentéshasadás mint helynévalkotási mód. In: Hoffmann István–Tóth Valéria (ed.), Helynévtörténeti tanulmányok 4. Debreceni Egyetem Magyar Nyelvtudományi Tanszék, Debrecen. 35–45.
- Šmilauer, Vladimír 1970: Příručka Slovanské Toponomastiky. Praha.
- Šrámek, Rudolf 1972–1973: Zum Begriff „Modell” und „System” in der Toponomastik. In: Onoma 17: 55–75.
- Tóth Valéria 2001: Névrendszertani vizsgálatok a korai ómagyar korban. A Magyar Névarchívum Kiadványai 6. Debreceni Egyetem Magyar Nyelvtudományi Tanszék, Debrecen.