

Katalin R e s z e g i (Debrecen)

## A LINGUISTIC-TYPOLOGICAL STUDY OF THE MOUNTAIN NAMES OF TWO MOUNTAIN RANGES IN MEDIEVAL HUNGARY<sup>1)</sup>

### LINGVISTICKO-TYPOLOGICKÁ STUDIE ORONYM VE DVOU POHOŘÍCH STŘEDOVĚKÉHO MAĎARSKA

Ve svém článku představuji vrstvy jmen, které se vyskytují ve staré oronymii Karpat. V průběhu svého studia jsem, kromě srovnání lingvisticko-chronologických vrstev jmen (slovanská a maďarská), přihlédla rovněž k aspektu jejich umístění: porovnála jsem názvy dvou pohoří z lingvistického hlediska. Ve srovnávací studii slovanských a maďarských vrstev jmen se nejpodstatnější rozdíly objevily v poměru mezi jedno- a dvouslovnými názvy. V maďarské oronymii dominují především dvouslovné názvy, nebo jsou tyto dva druhy struktur víceméně vyrovnané. Kontrast tvoří slovanská oronymie, kde převládají jednoslovná pojmenování. To jasně dokazuje základní rozdíly mezi pojmenovávacími zvyklostmi obou národů. V mém pojednání jsou rovněž zřetelně vidět rozdíly regionální. Podstatné rozdíly můžeme spatřit v pojmenovávacích i přejmenovávacích zvyklostech těchto dvou národů. Zatímco většina (maďarských) jmen domácího původu byla v obou oblastech vytvořena prostřednictvím syntagmatické konstrukce, tj. slučováním, obdobné způsoby tvorby jmen lze mezi slovanskými jmény nalézt jen stěží. Pro slovanskou vrstvu je charakteristická tvorba jmen prostřednictvím formantů, zatímco mezi maďarskými jmény hor se tento způsob vyskytuje pouze okrajově. K rozdílům mezi dvěma zkoumanými horskými pásmy je třeba podotknout, že názvy severního pohoří se v maďarské oronymii objevují mnohem častěji bez formálních změn. Naproti tomu jména slovanského původu vyskytující se v jižním pohoří jsou konstrukčně lépe přizpůsobena maďarské oronymii, obzvláště díky svému propojení s geografickými apelativy.

#### Keywords

mountain names, Slavic names, Hungarian names, semantic and lexical bases of name giving

#### 1. Introduction

The names of elevations comprise the largest name system in the Carpathian basin surviving from the past, besides the names of settlements and waters. In my article I introduce the name layers found in this old mountain name stock. During the course of my study, besides the comparison of the linguistic-chronological layers of the names, I also apply the aspect of location: I compare the names of two mountain ranges from a linguistic point of view. In discussing the linguistic elements, I include the semantic

---

<sup>1)</sup> This work was carried out as part of the Research Group on Hungarian Language History and Toponomastics (University of Debrecen – Hungarian Academy of Science).

contents expressed by them and also introduce the rules for creating the names. With the joint application of these three aspects, we can reveal the connections between the semantic and lexical bases of name giving and the rules governing name formation.<sup>2)</sup>

I have restricted my corpus to two mountain ranges lying near each other, bordered by the valleys of the rivers Hernád and Garam (in the area of what used to be Bars, Hont, Nógrád, Heves, Gömör, Borsod and Abaúj counties). I have collected the names of most of what today is the Northern Mountains, that is the names of the protrusions of the Börzsöny, Cserhát, Mátra, Bükk and Cserehát mountains on one hand, and the Selmecei mountains, the Jávoros and the Slovak Ore Mountains on the other. For the sake of historical fidelity, I find it more precise to designate the two mountain ranges by their geographical situation instead of the artificial landscape names: the former will be referred to below as the Southern, the latter as the Northern range. The reason for my choice is the fact that there are significant differences between the name users in the two areas, even though the two mountain ranges in issue here are adjacent to and parallel with each other. Around the Northern range, there is a much greater Slavic population. From the writings of Lajos Kiss on the ethnic and linguistic aspects of 10–13<sup>th</sup> century Hungary, we can gain a picture of contemporary ethnic and linguistic conditions, which suggests that a significant Slavic population had lived in both areas before the Hungarians entered the Carpathian basin. The Hungarians first occupied the Southern range, and those settling there adopted a large number of the place names of the Slavs already living there.<sup>3)</sup> As the proportion of place names of Slavic origin is greater in the mountains (especially in Nógrád county in north Hungary), the Slavic population are likely to have survived longer there. However, we have no clear picture about the conditions of Slavic-Hungarian bilingualism at that time. Even though at the turn of the 13–14<sup>th</sup> centuries, the common people of the majority of the studied areas were predominantly Hungarian speakers, to the North of the Ipoly valley, the Slavic peoples of the 10<sup>th</sup> century survived in greater numbers, and also, a significant-sized new Slavic population settled in these areas during the 13–14<sup>th</sup> centuries.<sup>4)</sup>

The differences in the proportion of Hungarian and Slavic name users supposedly also reflect differences between the name stocks of the two areas. Since the

---

<sup>2)</sup> On the study of old Hungarian mountain names, cf. also K. Reszegi, Possibilities of Onomatosystematical. Comparative Research in Uralian Languages (On the Examples of Early Hungarian Oronyms), *Folia Uralica Debreceniensia* 17, 2010, pp. 95–111.

<sup>3)</sup> Cf. L. Kiss, Magyarország földrajzi és társadalmi arculata az Árpád-korban, *Magyar Nyelv* 84, 1988, pp. 129–155.

<sup>4)</sup> Cf. L. Kiss, Az Árpád-kori Magyarország Liptó megyétől Pilis megyéig, *Magyar Nyelv* 95, 1999, pp. 9–25.

geographical features of the two mountain ranges are essentially similar,<sup>5)</sup> the differences that are seen to be reflected in the name stocks can only be explained by the linguistic conditions of their populations. Therefore, in the comparative study, according to my presuppositions, we can expect to find significant differences in the linguistic structures of the names as well as in the naming customs and in the changing of names. Studying the Slavic layer, however, can be interesting not only because of its influence on the giving of Hungarian mountain names but, due to the two-way nature of the process, we must also study the potential influence of Hungarian names on Slavic ones, data permitting.

As a source for the compilation of the name stock of the two mountain ranges, I used the volumes of György Györffy's historical geography.<sup>6)</sup> 150 data on the 119 names of 118 denotatums from the Southern range and about 170 data on the 114 names of 111 denotatums of the elevations from the parallel Northern range were entered into the database created on the basis of the above book.

Besides the mountain names proper (that is, those occurring together with the Latin *mons* 'mountain', *monticulus* 'little mountain' etc. common geographical noun), I also included in my studied name stock the names for parts of mountains, e.g. *mál* meaning 'mountain side' and *homlok* 'forehead' meaning the steeply dropping edge of a mountain. Although the word *mons* often appears alongside these names, too, it is improbable that these names indeed served as names for the whole mountain, but they must have rather designated only a part of it. It is true that there are also instances when the name for a part of a mountain later became the name of the whole mountain. However, in the majority of such cases, it is no longer possible to clearly define the objects designated by the names. Because of the uncertainties, I use the term 'mountain name' for every element of the heterogeneous name stock created in this way.

---

<sup>5)</sup> There are differences in the terrain of the two ranges: the Northern one is higher than the Southern, where we can find hills rather than mountains and, furthermore, the Northern range is continuous whereas the Southern is slashed through by large valleys. All this, however, is not likely to have resulted in differences in the names, but rather, the differences might be reflected in the orographic common nouns built into the names.

<sup>6)</sup> Cf. G. Györffy, *Az Árpád-kori Magyarország történeti földrajza* 1–4, Budapest 1963–1998. Györffy's database almost completely covers the two mountain ranges in my study, with only the data for Torma county and the Southern part of Szepes county missing from it. The volumes published by Györffy, however, provide sufficient and completely reliable data for the study, as they contain the complete name stock of the sources relevant to the 10–14<sup>th</sup> centuries.

## 2. The Hungarian layer

The names created by Hungarian name-giving are present in different proportions in the two orographic name stocks. About four-fifths of the protrusions of the Southern range and only two thirds of the Northern range had such a name in the studied period. The majority of the mountain names created by Hungarian name-giving are two-part<sup>7)</sup> names. 57 % of the names in the Southern range are of this structure, and this ratio is somewhat smaller in the Northern range: 52 %. Below, I will discuss one- and two-part names separately, organizing the name stock according to parts of speech and semantic aspects within each group.

### 2.1. One-part names

In this group, most data are sporadic occurrences which are morphologically identical with geographical common nouns. From the area of both mountain ranges, a great number of independent uses of the lexemes *bérc* ‘crag’ and, to a lesser degree, *halom* ‘mound’ are recorded. However, it is worth examining the data available of these two geographical common nouns one by one since, on the basis of the context, it turns out in most cases that they are common noun occurrences, i.e. the lexemes are written in the documents as modelled on the Latin common noun elements referring to locations (actually, as charter words): 1295: in qd. *berch* Seleumal dicto<sup>8)</sup> 1341/1347: in latere 1 *Berch* transit ipsum *Berch* caditque ad solarem vallem alterius *Berch*,<sup>9)</sup> 1276: super 1 altum *holm* seu monticulum.<sup>10)</sup> The geographical common nouns referring to the protrusions may also have become the proper noun names of the mountains; however, the number of names including *Bérc* and *Halom* used as proper nouns is very small in both mountain ranges, and the proper noun nature of these words is also hard to determine. Perhaps the following ones can be classified as such from the Southern range: 1305: per verticem montis quod vulgo *beerch* dicitur,<sup>11)</sup> 1327: per eudem montem qui vulg. *berch* vocatur,<sup>12)</sup> 1303/1352//1450: ad 1 monticulum *Holm* vocatum.<sup>13)</sup> In these charter parts, the context may suggest that these data are used as proper names. From the Northern range, the data 1330: monticulo *Beerch* may perhaps be regarded as a proper name, on the basis of another

---

<sup>7)</sup> The name constituent is the segment of the name which gives some information about its denotatum or expresses any kind of semantic feature in relation to the denotatum referred to in the name forming situation (cf. I. Hoffmann, *Helynevek nyelvi elemzése*, Debrecen 1993, p. 30).

<sup>8)</sup> G. Györffy 3, o. c. in note 6, p. 70.

<sup>9)</sup> G. Györffy 3, o. c. in note 6, p. 125.

<sup>10)</sup> G. Györffy 3, o. c. in note 6, p. 218.

<sup>11)</sup> G. Györffy 4, o. c. in note 6, p. 289.

<sup>12)</sup> G. Györffy 4, o. c. in note 6, p. 252.

one in this charter: *bérc + út* ‘road’ (viam *Beerchuth* < *bérc + út* ‘út’).<sup>14)</sup> The proper name nature of 1318: ad monticulum *Holum* dicitur,<sup>15)</sup> however, is less obvious.

Besides the lexemes *bérc* and *halom*, only *domb* occurs as a name for a protrusion in the Southern range: 1329/1406: monticulo ... vulgo *domb*;<sup>16)</sup> and in the Northern range, *mál* ‘mountain side’ designates mountain (or more precisely, mountain side) on its own, albeit, on the basis of the context, as a common noun: 1276: supra qd. *mal*.<sup>17)</sup> The Northern name of *Gerendes* ([1245]/1245: *Grendus*)<sup>18)</sup> too, contains a geographical common noun: the lexeme *gorond* ~ *gerind* ~ *girind* ~ *görönd* ‘a flat mound, ridge rising out of a low lying area, bog or flood’.<sup>19)</sup> This lexeme is of Slavic origin but it has been naturalized in Hungarian. The mountain name *Erdej* ([1077–1095]/+1158//PR: *Erdey*,<sup>20)</sup> in the Southern range must also contain a geographical common noun, which may be a derivate of the noun *erdő* ‘forest’ with the suffix *-j* (cf. *halom* > *Halmaj*). The forms which actually became proper names from geographical common nouns constitute only little more than one twentieth of the one-part name stock in both areas.

In the one-part names of common noun origin, besides the geographical common nouns, to a lesser degree we encounter in both name stocks designations of plants, designations of animals and designations of substances, which became the names of protrusions usually affixed with some kind of formant, most often with the suffix *-s* and a little less frequently *-d* or *-gy*. This proportion is shown by names referring to flora: the unmarked *Kőrís* ‘ash (forest)’ (1280: *Keurus*)<sup>21)</sup> and the affixed names *Nyíres* < *nyír* ‘birch (forest)’ (1325/1347: *Nyres*)<sup>22)</sup> and *Szőlős* < *szőlő* ‘grapes’ ([1265]/1265: byrth *Zeuleus*)<sup>23)</sup> in the Southern area; and in the name stock of the Northern range, the unmarked *Bükk* ‘beech (forest)’ (1260: *Bik*)<sup>24)</sup> and the marked *Mogyorós* < *mogyoró*

<sup>13)</sup> G. Györffy 1, o. c. in note 6, p. 815.

<sup>14)</sup> G. Györffy 1, o. c. in note 6, p. 85.

<sup>15)</sup> G. Györffy 1, o. c. in note 6, p. 139.

<sup>16)</sup> G. Györffy 1, o. c. in note 6, p. 154.

<sup>17)</sup> G. Györffy 3, o. c. in note 6, p. 218; On the phenomenon of elements with the value of Hungarian common nouns designating places in Latin charters and on the detailed review of the various reasons for their use and ways they are used, see: I. Hoffmann, *Az oklevelek helynévi szórványainak nyelvi hátteréről, Helynévtörténeti Tanulmányok* 1, 2004, pp. 50–59.

<sup>18)</sup> G. Györffy 3, o. c. in note 6, p. 150, 174.

<sup>19)</sup> Cf. L. Benkő (ed.), *A magyar nyelv történeti-etimológiai szótára* 1–3, Budapest 1967–1976.

<sup>20)</sup> G. Györffy 3, o. c. in note 6, p. 42, 115.

<sup>21)</sup> G. Györffy 3, o. c. in note 6, p. 42, 76.

<sup>22)</sup> G. Györffy 1, o. c. in note 6, p. 789.

<sup>23)</sup> G. Györffy 3, o. c. in note 6, p. 139.

<sup>24)</sup> G. Györffy 3, o. c. in note 6, p. 150, 205.

'hazelnut' (1291: *Munoros*)<sup>25)</sup> and *Somogy* < *som* 'cornel' ([1245]/1245: *Symug*).<sup>26)</sup> Among the names referring to the flora of the protrusion, naturally, the appearance of designations of trees is the most typical, and in the case of mountain names created from designations of animals, designations of birds are equally striking. Such are the names of the Southern mountain *Csókás* < *csóka* 'jackdaw' (1303/1352//1450: *Chokas*)<sup>27)</sup> as well as the Northern *Rárós* < *ráró* 'saker falcon' (1327: *Rarous*).<sup>28)</sup> A substance name is the basis for the mountain name *Mész* > *mész* 'lime(stone)' (1303/1352//1450: *Meez*)<sup>29)</sup> in the Southern range, and the mountain name *Karancs* (1327: *Karanch*)<sup>30)</sup> must also be classified here, inasmuch as it can be derived from the common noun *göröngy* ~ *garancs* ~ *göröncs*, meaning 'clod of earth'.<sup>31)</sup> The Northern *Agyagos* < *agyag* 'clay' (1279: *Ogyogos*)<sup>32)</sup> also refers to the soil of the protrusion.

Compound words rarely become toponyms. We can only see this occurring in the south range, in the case of *Ravaszlyuk* (1256: Berch *Rvvozlik*)<sup>33)</sup> which comes from the common noun meaning 'fox hole', by metonymic name-giving.

Underived adjectives only occur in the south range: *Világos* < *világos* 'light' (+1275/[XIV.]: *Vylagus*)<sup>34)</sup> refers to the colour of the mountain, and *Belső* < *belső* 'inner, inside' (1341/1347: ad montem *Belsew*)<sup>35)</sup> probably refers to the location of the protrusion. However, this latter name type hardly ever occurs in the Hungarian mountain name system; therefore we can suppose that it had evolved from a primary, two-part name *Belső-hegy* meaning 'the mountain inside' by elliptic structural change.<sup>36)</sup> The name containing a present participle *Dongó* < *dong* 'giving out a buzzing sound' (+1194: *Dungou*)<sup>37)</sup> might have been motivated by the special sound effect audible on that mountain.

Some mountain names are formally identical with personal names, such as *Bölcs* (1280: *Beylch*,<sup>38)</sup> cf. personal name *Belch*)<sup>39)</sup> in the Southern range and *Konrád*

<sup>25)</sup> G. Györffy 3, o. c. in note 6, p. 182.

<sup>26)</sup> G. Györffy 3, o. c. in note 6, p. 150, 174.

<sup>27)</sup> G. Györffy 1, o. c. in note 6, p. 736, 815.

<sup>28)</sup> G. Györffy 4, o. c. in note 6, p. 303.

<sup>29)</sup> G. Györffy 1, o. c. in note 6, p. 736, 815.

<sup>30)</sup> G. Györffy 4, o. c. in note 6, p. 209, 227.

<sup>31)</sup> Cf. L. Kiss, *Földrajzi nevek etimológiai szótára 1–2*, 4th edition, Budapest 1988.

<sup>32)</sup> G. Györffy 3, o. c. in note 6, p. 150, 227.

<sup>33)</sup> G. Györffy 3, o. c. in note 6, p. 42, 108.

<sup>34)</sup> G. Györffy 3, o. c. in note 6, p. 42, 139.

<sup>35)</sup> G. Györffy 3, o. c. in note 6, p. 42, 125.

<sup>36)</sup> Cf. K. Reszegi, *Hegynevek a középkori Magyarországon*, Debrecen 2011, pp. 51–52.

<sup>37)</sup> G. Györffy 3, o. c. in note 6, p. 1, 801.

<sup>38)</sup> G. Györffy 4, o. c. in note 6, p. 258.

(1331/1394: *Konerad*;<sup>40)</sup> cf. *Conradus*<sup>41)</sup>) and *Türk* ([1245]/1245: *Turk*;<sup>42)</sup> cf. *Turk*<sup>43)</sup>) in the Northern, the last one also being the name of a people. The origin of the mountain name *Szirk* (1334: *Zyrk*)<sup>44)</sup> in the Northern range is probably a Slavic name. It must be noted, however, that it is less typical for personal names (cf. *Syrek* personal name)<sup>45)</sup> to become mountain names, especially without formants, than for them to become settlement names. Therefore, we must also consider the possibility of personal name > settlement name > mountain name transfer.

The mountain names *Dédes* (1247: *Dedus*),<sup>46)</sup> *Gyúl* (1075/+1124/+1217: *Gcohlu*),<sup>47)</sup> *Lapásd* (1227: *Lapasd*)<sup>48)</sup> in the Southern range developed from settlement names by metonymic name-giving. The name of the *Börzsöny* Mountains (1138/1329: *Belsun*)<sup>49)</sup> can also be traced back to a settlement name: it comes from the name of the village (*Nagy*) *Börzsöny* and is probably of Slavic origin. In the Northern range, it is only the mountain name *Lám* (+1135/+1262/1566: *Lom*)<sup>50)</sup> which supposedly contains the Slavic name of a nearby village. Although less typical, it is also possible that the transfer worked the other way around: mountain name > settlement name.

The name of the forest covering the mountain came to designate the protrusion in the cases of *Várerdő* (< *vár* ‘mountain’ + *erdő* ‘forest’; 1265: per montem ... *Warerdev*)<sup>51)</sup> in the Southern and *Apátbükke* (< *apát* ‘abbot’ + a *bükk* ‘beech /forest/’; [1266]/1266/1274: *Apat Byky*),<sup>52)</sup> *Feketeerdő* (< *fekete* ‘black’ + *erdő* ‘forest’; 1413: *Fekethe erdev*)<sup>53)</sup> in the Northern range. However, we can also imagine that these name occurrences were indeed the names of the forests proper, despite the Latin designation *mons* ‘mount(ain)’. It is not rare in the archaic state of the language for name forms primarily designating forests to be used as mountain names. Besides the metonymic development forest name > mountain name, there are also examples of the

<sup>39)</sup> Cf. K. Fehértói, *Árpád-kori személynévtár. 1000–1301*, Budapest 2004.

<sup>40)</sup> G. Györffy 3, o. c. in note 6, p. 150, 229, 230.

<sup>41)</sup> K. Fehértói, o. c. in note 39.

<sup>42)</sup> G. Györffy 3, o. c. in note 6, p. 151, 238.

<sup>43)</sup> K. Fehértói, o. c. in note 39.

<sup>44)</sup> G. Györffy 2, o. c. in note 6, p. 461, 538.

<sup>45)</sup> L. Kiss, o. c. in note 31.

<sup>46)</sup> G. Györffy 1, o. c. in note 6, p. 736, 769.

<sup>47)</sup> G. Györffy 4, o. c. in note 6, p. 242, 247.

<sup>48)</sup> G. Györffy 4, o. c. in note 6, p. 249.

<sup>49)</sup> G. Györffy 3, o. c. in note 6, p. 150.

<sup>50)</sup> G. Györffy 3, o. c. in note 6, p. 150, 183, 215.

<sup>51)</sup> G. Györffy 4, o. c. in note 6, p. 263.

<sup>52)</sup> G. Györffy 3, o. c. in note 6, p. 150, 155, 254.

<sup>53)</sup> G. Györffy 2, o. c. in note 6, p. 457.

opposite development/relationship: the mountains covered with forests that had special economic value such as being suitable for logging and feeding pigs on acorns, frequently occurred in the charters as *silva* ‘forest’ and not as *mons* ‘mount’.<sup>54)</sup> Some examples of this from the examined stock is *Börzsöny* (+1258: *silva Bersen*)<sup>55)</sup> and *Mátra* (1216 [1217]/1230: *silva Matra*)<sup>56)</sup>.

The names of other different places in the vicinity of the mountains also often became names of the protrusion by metonymic name-giving. Most commonly, two-part place names became mountain names in this way. In the Southern range, the basalt plateau called *Medves* (1290/1303/1479: *Medus*)<sup>57)</sup> probably received its name from a stream called *Medves*, flowing in the vicinity, although not proven by data in this area, but occurring in other places.<sup>58)</sup> The names *Izsákláza* (1295: *Ysaacłasa*,<sup>59)</sup> < *Izsák* személynév + *láz* ‘clearing, hay-growing area’, *láz*<sup>60)</sup> and *Miklósluga* (1248/1326: *Myklousluga*<sup>61)</sup> < *Miklós* personal name + *\*lug* ‘forest meadow’, *Miklósluga*<sup>62)</sup> contain the names of meadows. This primary toponymic type can also be found in the Northern range: *Hegyláz* (1290/1303/1479: *Hyglaz*,<sup>63)</sup> < *hegy* + *láz*), *Ökörmező* (1291: *Wkurmezeu*,<sup>64)</sup> < *ökör* ‘ox’ + *mező* ‘meadow’). The name *Munuhpest* (1266/1283: *Munuhpest*)<sup>65)</sup> must have primarily meant the cave in the side of the mountain, as it contains the geographical common noun *pest* ‘cavity, cave’, its first part supposedly being the common noun *monoh* meaning ‘monk, hermit’.

A significant portion of one-part names are of Slavic origin. In the Southern range, a quarter of one-part names exhibit Slavic origins, e.g. *Kemenc* (1331/1394: *Kemench*)<sup>66)</sup> < Slavic *kamen* ‘stone’, *Orl* ([1245]/1245: *Orl*)<sup>67)</sup> < Ancient Slavic *\*orьlь* ‘eagle’.<sup>68)</sup> In the Northern range, this ratio is significantly higher: two-fifths of one-part

<sup>54)</sup> L. Kiss, *Hegynevek a történelmi Magyarországon*, Magyar Nyelv 93, 1997, p. 166.

<sup>55)</sup> G. Györffy 3, o. c. in note 6, p. 150, 184, 241, 209.

<sup>56)</sup> G. Györffy 3, o. c. in note 6, p. 42, 67, 92, 113, 120, 123, 139, 144, 146.

<sup>57)</sup> G. Györffy 2, o. c. in note 6, p. 461, 485; G. Györffy 4, o. c. in note 6, p. 209.

<sup>58)</sup> L. Kiss, o. c. in note 54, p. 160.

<sup>59)</sup> G. Györffy 3, o. c. in note 6, p. 42, 70.

<sup>60)</sup> L. Benkő, o. c. in note 19.

<sup>61)</sup> G. Györffy 1, o. c. in note 6, p. 736, 767.

<sup>62)</sup> L. Kiss, o. c. in note 31.

<sup>63)</sup> G. Györffy 2, o. c. in note 6, p. 461, 485.

<sup>64)</sup> G. Györffy 2, o. c. in note 6, p. 460, 543.

<sup>65)</sup> G. Györffy 2, o. c. in note 6, p. 461, 545.

<sup>66)</sup> G. Györffy 3, o. c. in note 6, p. 150, 229.

<sup>67)</sup> G. Györffy 3, o. c. in note 6, p. 150, 174.

<sup>68)</sup> L. Kiss, o. c. in note 31, p. 2/284.

names belong to this group, e.g. *Hradissza* (1256/[1266?]/1297//1520: *Hradyscha*)<sup>69)</sup>, < *hradište* ‘castle place’,<sup>70)</sup> *Visnyice* (1295/1315: *Wysniche*)<sup>71)</sup> < Slavic *višňa* ‘sour cherry’.<sup>72)</sup> These names as part of the Hungarian name system can be described as having a naming function.

## 2.2. Two-part names

**2.2.1.** Among the **second part** of the two-part names of the mountain names in both ranges, quite understandably the most common ones are orographic common nouns, occurring in great variety in the names of both ranges. In this position, the lexeme *hegy* ‘mount(ain)’ is the most common. The geographical common noun *bérc* ‘crag’ occurs in almost the same number in the two examined areas, whereas the similarly frequent use of the lexeme *kő* ‘stone, rock’ is only typical in the Northern range. Besides these, but in smaller numbers, we can see the geographical common nouns *halom* and *mál* ‘mountain side’ in this role in both ranges. We can only encounter the following orographic common nouns in the name stock of the Southern range: *fő* ‘mountain; top of a mountain or rock’,<sup>73)</sup> *határ* ‘a line or band dividing areas or an object marking it’, *köz* ‘an area dividing things from each other’, *tő* ‘lower part of a mountain or hill’,<sup>74)</sup> and *verő* ‘Southern mountain side’;<sup>75)</sup> e.g. *Fertés-fő* (1341/1347: *Fertysfeu*),<sup>76)</sup> *Vátolyaszó-tő* (1295: *Watulozoutu*),<sup>77)</sup> *Nagydél verője* (1341/1347: *Nogdelwereie*).<sup>78)</sup> On the other hand, *homlok* ‘steeply dropping edge of a mountain’<sup>79)</sup> and *hát* ‘elevation with a wide top, plateau’ only occur in the Northern range, e.g. *Csiszta-homlok* (1294/1321/XVII.: *Chysta humluk*),<sup>80)</sup> *Kecske-hát* (1278: *Kechkehat*).<sup>81)</sup> *Havasok* ‘snowy mountains’ may also belong here, but it only occurs in the name stock in Latin translation: *Golcsa-havasok* (1255: *alpes Golcha*).<sup>82)</sup>

<sup>69)</sup> G. Györffy 3, o. c. in note 6, p. 151, 238.

<sup>70)</sup> L. Kiss, o. c. in note 31, p. 1/567.

<sup>71)</sup> G. Györffy 2, o. c. in note 6, p. 461, 530.

<sup>72)</sup> L. Kiss, o. c. in note 31.

<sup>73)</sup> G. A. Hefty, *A térszíni formák nevei a magyar népnyelvben*, *Magyar Nyelvőr* 40, 1911, pp. 155–169, 206–216, 259–265, 300–308, 361–370, 458–462.

<sup>74)</sup> G. A. Hefty o. c. in note 73, p. 367.

<sup>75)</sup> L. Kiss, o. c. in note 31, p. 2/755.

<sup>76)</sup> G. Györffy 3, o. c. in note 6, p. 42, 124.

<sup>77)</sup> G. Györffy 3, o. c. in note 6, p. 42, 70.

<sup>78)</sup> G. Györffy 3, o. c. in note 6, p. 42, 125.

<sup>79)</sup> G. A. Hefty o. c. in note 73, p. 211.

<sup>80)</sup> G. Györffy 3, o. c. in note 6, p. 150, 233.

<sup>81)</sup> G. Györffy 4, o. c. in note 6, p. 210, 265.

<sup>82)</sup> G. Györffy 1, o. c. in note 6, p. 40, 98; G. Györffy 2, o. c. in note 6, p. 460.

Besides geographical common nouns, we can only find toponyms as the base parts of two-part names in the name stock of the Southern range, and there only in the names *Kis-Galya* (1325/1347: *Kysgala*)<sup>83)</sup> and *Nagy-Galya* (1325/1347: *Noggala*).<sup>84)</sup> This shows that differentiation as a name-forming mode must have been rather rare in the case of old Hungarian mountain names.

**2.2.2** As opposed to function-denoting second parts of two-part mountain names, the range of lexemes constituting the **first parts of the names** is quite varied.

In both ranges, among the most typical common noun prefixes are designations of plants, which can occur without affixes or in a form ending in -s, as shown by *Borsó-hegy* < *borsó* ‘peas’ (1298/1390: *Borsowhyg*),<sup>85)</sup> *Szilfa bérce* < *szilfa* ‘elm tree’ (1256: *Zylfabercy*),<sup>86)</sup> *Szőlő-mál* < *szőlő* ‘grapes’ (1295: *berch Seleumal*),<sup>87)</sup> *Bodzás-hegy* < *bodza* ‘elder’ (1248/1326: *Bozyasheg ~ Bozyashegy*),<sup>88)</sup> *Bükkös-fő* < *bükk* ‘beech’ (1341/1347: *Bykusfew*),<sup>89)</sup> *Hagymás közbérce* < *hagyma* ‘onion’ (1341/1347: *Hagmaskwzberche*)<sup>90)</sup> and *Szederjes-kő* < *szeder ~ szederj* ‘blackberry’ (1326: *Zederiesku*)<sup>91)</sup> in the Southern range. Name parts referring to the flora of the protrusions occur in the Northern range in nearly the same ratio with or without suffixes: *Jávor-hegy* < *jávor* ‘maple tree’ (1291: *Jaurheg*),<sup>92)</sup> *Szőlő-mál* < *szőlő* ‘grapes’ (1219: *Zevlevmal*),<sup>93)</sup> *Körtvélyes-hegy* < *körtvély* ‘pear tree’ (1332: *Korthweleshygh ~ Kurthwelusheygh*),<sup>94)</sup> *Somos-bérc* < *som* ‘cornel tree’ (1333/1334: *berch Sumus*),<sup>95)</sup> *Szőlős-hegy* (1260: *Sceleushyg*).<sup>96)</sup>

<sup>83)</sup> G. Györffy 1, o. c. in note 6, p. 789.

<sup>84)</sup> G. Györffy 1, o. c. in note 6, p. 736, 789.

<sup>85)</sup> G. Györffy 1, o. c. in note 6, p. 785.

<sup>86)</sup> G. Györffy 3, o. c. in note 6, p. 42, 108.

<sup>87)</sup> G. Györffy 3, o. c. in note 6, p. 42, 70.

<sup>88)</sup> G. Györffy 1, o. c. in note 6, p. 767, 768.

<sup>89)</sup> G. Györffy 3, o. c. in note 6, p. 42, 124.

<sup>90)</sup> G. Györffy 3, o. c. in note 6, p. 125. The structure of the name *Hagymás közbérce* and the judgement of the function of the name parts are uncertain. On the basis of the above division, the first part refers to a place where wild onions grow and the second part means a mountain back in the middle (cf. L. Kiss, *Víz-, hegy- és völgynevek a középkori Heves megyéből*. Magyar Nyelv 87, 1991, p. 76.). However, the name can also be divided as *Hagymás-köz bérce*, in which case the first part may be the place name *Hagymás-köz*, which cannot be proven by direct data. In the latter case, however, the semantic structure of the name is also different: it refers to a location.

<sup>91)</sup> G. Györffy 3, o. c. in note 6, p. 42, 105.

<sup>92)</sup> G. Györffy 2, o. c. in note 6, p. 460, 543.

<sup>93)</sup> G. Györffy 3, o. c. in note 6, p. 150, 155, 250.

<sup>94)</sup> G. Györffy 1, o. c. in note 6, p. 40, 91.

<sup>95)</sup> G. Györffy 2, o. c. in note 6, p. 461, 512.

The names containing designations of animals, which occur less frequently, show a similar ratio with respect to the markedness of the first part: *Galambok bérce* < *galamb* ‘pigeon’ + *-k* plural marker (1265: *Golombuk berchy*),<sup>97)</sup> *Sertés-hegy* < *sertés* ‘pig’ (+1258: *Sertes heyg* ~ *Sertesheyg*),<sup>98)</sup> *Csókás-kő* < *csóka* ‘jackdaw’ (1315/1339: *Chokasku*),<sup>99)</sup> *Nyulas-bérc* < *nyúl* ‘rabbit’ (1268: *Nulosberch*)<sup>100)</sup> in the Southern area, and *Bagoly-kő* < *bagoly* ‘owl’ (1240: *Boglku*),<sup>101)</sup> *Kecske-hát* < *kecske* ‘goat’ (1278: *Kechkehat*),<sup>102)</sup> *Sólyom-kő* < *sólyom* ‘falcon’ (1243/1335: *Solyomkeo*),<sup>103)</sup> *Ölyves-bérc* < *ölyv* ‘buzzard’ (1341: *Wluesberch*)<sup>104)</sup> in the Northern.

In the Southern range, there is an extraordinarily large number of substance names: *Homok-hegy* < *homok* ‘sand’ (1280: *Homochege*),<sup>105)</sup> *Kő-hegy* < *kő* ‘stone’ (1250: *Kuhyg*),<sup>106)</sup> *Kő-mál* (1327: *Kumal*),<sup>107)</sup> *Agyagos-bérc* < *agyag* ‘clay’ (1227: *Ogogovs berch*),<sup>108)</sup> *Köves-bérc* < *kő* (1298/1390: *Kuesbere [Kuesberc]*),<sup>109)</sup> *Köves-hegy* (1295: *Kuesheg*),<sup>110)</sup> *Meszes-mál* < *mész* ‘lime(stone)’ (1280: *Mezesmal*).<sup>111)</sup> It is a less typical category in the Northern area: it can only be found in the names *Kövecses-halom* < *kövec* ‘pebbles’ (1337: *Kuechusholm*),<sup>112)</sup> *Köves-bérc* ‘stone’ (1327: *Kuesberch*).<sup>113)</sup>

The names of buildings always occur in mountain names in an unmarked form, as shown by the Southern names *Kápolna bérce* < *kápolna* ‘chapel’ (1341/1347: *Capulna-berche*)<sup>114)</sup> and *Vár hegye* < *vár* ‘fortress’ (1295: *Warhygi*).<sup>115)</sup> In the Northern range,

<sup>96)</sup> G. Györffy 3, o. c. in note 6, p. 205.

<sup>97)</sup> G. Györffy 4, o. c. in note 6, p. 263.

<sup>98)</sup> G. Györffy 3, o. c. in note 6, p. 150, 241.

<sup>99)</sup> G. Györffy 1, o. c. in note 6, p. 736, 767.

<sup>100)</sup> G. Györffy 4, o. c. in note 6, p. 238.

<sup>101)</sup> G. Györffy 2, o. c. in note 6, p. 461, 499.

<sup>102)</sup> G. Györffy 4, o. c. in note 6, p. 210, 265.

<sup>103)</sup> G. Györffy 2, o. c. in note 6, p. 461, 533.

<sup>104)</sup> G. Györffy 2, o. c. in note 6, p. 461, 517.

<sup>105)</sup> G. Györffy 4, o. c. in note 6, p. 321.

<sup>106)</sup> G. Györffy 4, o. c. in note 6, p. 258.

<sup>107)</sup> G. Györffy 4, o. c. in note 6, p. 289.

<sup>108)</sup> G. Györffy 4, o. c. in note 6, p. 249.

<sup>109)</sup> G. Györffy 1, o. c. in note 6, p. 785.

<sup>110)</sup> G. Györffy 4, o. c. in note 6, p. 261.

<sup>111)</sup> G. Györffy 4, o. c. in note 6, p. 321.

<sup>112)</sup> G. Györffy 2, o. c. in note 6, p. 551.

<sup>113)</sup> G. Györffy 4, o. c. in note 6, p. 302.

<sup>114)</sup> G. Györffy 3, o. c. in note 6, p. 42, 125.

<sup>115)</sup> G. Györffy 3, o. c. in note 6, p. 42, 70.

only the name *Vár-hegy* (1333/1334: *Waarheg*)<sup>116)</sup> refers to a building on the protrusion.

The further common noun elements of varied semantic content involved in the construction of the names occur either with or without a formant. *Iker-kő* < *iker* ‘twins’ (1262: *Ykurku*),<sup>117)</sup> belonging to the Southern corpus, designates two protrusions; *Nyerges-bérc* < *nyerges* ‘saddle shaped’ (1227: *Nerges berch*)<sup>118)</sup> refers to the shape of the mountain; and the first part of the names *Őr-hegy* < *őr* ‘guard’ (1304/1335//1376: *Ewrhegh*)<sup>119)</sup> and *Fertés-fő* < *fertés* ‘a place where animals can bathe’<sup>120)</sup> refer to the function of the mountain. The names of the Northern area present a similar picture: *Éles-bérc* < *éles* ‘sharp’ (1331/1332/XVIII.: *Elesberth*),<sup>121)</sup> *Hegyes-hegy* < *hegyes* ‘pointed’ (1255: *Hygyshyg*),<sup>122)</sup> *Lyukas köve* < *lyukas* ‘having a hole in it’ (1296/1488: *Lwkaskwy*)<sup>123)</sup> refer to the shape of the protrusion. *Bálvány-kő* (1267/1272: *balwan-kew*)<sup>124)</sup> may designate a place of pagan worship ‘idol’, but it is also possible that it is in connection with the flora of the protrusion: it may have had a lot of *Ailanthus glandulosa* trees growing on it, whose Hungarian name is ‘idol-tree’.<sup>125)</sup>

The most striking difference is found in the proportion of mountain names containing underived **adjectival** elements: such names constitute a ninth of the two-part name stock in the Southern range. There are underived adjectives in the names *Kék-halom* < *kék* ‘blue’ (1270/1284: *Keykholm*),<sup>126)</sup> *Kerek-kő* < *kerek* ‘round’ (\*1248/1326: *Kerekku*),<sup>127)</sup> *Közép-hegy* < *közép* ‘middle’ (1256: *Kuzephyg*),<sup>128)</sup> *Közép-mál* (1280: *Cuzepmal*)<sup>129)</sup> and also in *Közép-bérc* (1258: *kuzepberch*;<sup>130)</sup> 1298: *Kvzep-berech*),<sup>131)</sup> which designates two different mountains. In the corpus representing the Northern range, underived adjectives constitute a much greater proportion, some one-fifth of the two-part names, and these adjectives have a more diverse range of

<sup>116)</sup> G. Györffy 2, o. c. in note 6, p. 461, 512.

<sup>117)</sup> G. Györffy 3, o. c. in note 6, p. 150, 200.

<sup>118)</sup> G. Györffy 4, o. c. in note 6, p. 249.

<sup>119)</sup> G. Györffy 3, o. c. in note 6, p. 42, 144.

<sup>120)</sup> L. Kiss, o. c. in note 90, p. 76.

<sup>121)</sup> G. Györffy 3, o. c. in note 6, p. 153, 274.

<sup>122)</sup> G. Györffy 1, o. c. in note 6, p. 40, 98.

<sup>123)</sup> G. Györffy 3, o. c. in note 6, p. 224.

<sup>124)</sup> G. Györffy 1, o. c. in note 6, p. 78.

<sup>125)</sup> L. Kiss, o. c. in note 54, p. 164.

<sup>126)</sup> G. Györffy 3, o. c. in note 6, p. 42, 64.

<sup>127)</sup> G. Györffy 3, o. c. in note 6, p. 107.

<sup>128)</sup> G. Györffy 3, o. c. in note 6, p. 42, 108.

<sup>129)</sup> G. Györffy 3, o. c. in note 6, p. 42, 76.

<sup>130)</sup> G. Györffy 1, o. c. in note 6, p. 88.

meaning. The name *Nagy-bérc* < *nagy* ‘big’ (1269/XVIII.: *Nogberk* [*Nogberch*])<sup>132)</sup> refers to the size of the protrusion, *Vörös-kő* < *vörös* ‘crimson’ (1327: *Weresku*)<sup>133)</sup> to its colour, *Lágy-kő* < *lágy* ‘warm’ ([1219]/1219: *Lagku*),<sup>134)</sup> *Meleg-hegy* < *meleg* ‘warm’ (1331/1347: *Meleekhegh*)<sup>135)</sup> to its temperature and *Szár-hegy* < *szár* ‘bald’ (1295/1315: *Zarheg*)<sup>136)</sup> refers to its lack of vegetation. The names *Közép-bérc* (1280: *Kuzepberch*),<sup>137)</sup> *Közép-kő* (1240: *Cuzepku*)<sup>138)</sup> and *Köz-bérc* < *köz* ‘middle’ (1243/1335/XVII.: *Közbercz*;<sup>139)</sup> 1269/XVIII.: *Kuzberch*;<sup>140)</sup> 1280: *Kuzberch*),<sup>141)</sup> which is the name of three different protrusions, designate the relative location of the mountains.

Adjectival participles play a lesser role in the construction of two-part mountain names. In the name stock of the Southern area, present participles can be found. *Verőmál* < *verő* ‘Southern’ (1303/1494: *Werewmal*)<sup>142)</sup> refers to the temperature of the mountain, although the first part may also be regarded as a geographical common noun. The first part of the name *Homloló-kő* (+1258: *Homlolo kw*)<sup>143)</sup> was derived from the verb *homlol* ‘topple, subvert, destroy’, and it may refer to a decaying mountain.<sup>144)</sup> The name *Akasztó-hegy* < *akaszt* ‘hang’ (1291: *Akasztowhegy*)<sup>145)</sup> in the Northern range may retain the memory of a gallows tree that had once stood on it, as hanging used to be quite a common judicial process in the times of landowner jurisdiction. The past participle in the name *Hasadt-kő* < *hasad* ‘split’ (1330, 1331: *Hasathkeu*)<sup>146)</sup> may refer to the condition of the protrusion.

Numerals only occur in the Northern names *Három-hegy* < *három* ‘three’ and *Két-halom* < *két* ‘two’ which, as also shown by their Latin names, may be the joint names

<sup>131)</sup> G. Györffy 1, o. c. in note 6, p. 760.

<sup>132)</sup> G. Györffy 4, o. c. in note 6, p. 298.

<sup>133)</sup> G. Györffy 4, o. c. in note 6, p. 209, 289.

<sup>134)</sup> G. Györffy 3, o. c. in note 6, p. 150, 155, 250; cf. L. Kiss, o. c. in note 31, p. 2/8.

<sup>135)</sup> G. Györffy 2, o. c. in note 6, p. 461, 483, 526.

<sup>136)</sup> G. Györffy 2, o. c. in note 6, p. 461, 530; cf. L. Benkő, o. c. in note 19.

<sup>137)</sup> G. Györffy 1, o. c. in note 6, p. 93.

<sup>138)</sup> G. Györffy 2, o. c. in note 6, p. 461, 499.

<sup>139)</sup> G. Györffy 2, o. c. in note 6, p. 460, 533.

<sup>140)</sup> G. Györffy 4, o. c. in note 6, p. 210, 298.

<sup>141)</sup> G. Györffy 1, o. c. in note 6, p. 139.

<sup>142)</sup> G. Györffy 4, o. c. in note 6, p. 250.

<sup>143)</sup> G. Györffy 3, o. c. in note 6, p. 150, 241.

<sup>144)</sup> L. Kiss, o. c. in note 54, p. 131.

<sup>145)</sup> G. Györffy 2, o. c. in note 6, p. 461.

<sup>146)</sup> G. Györffy 1, o. c. in note 6, p. 40, 100.

of three and two hills, respectively: 1291: ad 3 montes *Harumheg*,<sup>147)</sup> illetve 1232>1347: ad duo monticula ... vulgo *Kethalm*.<sup>148)</sup>

Besides the different proportions of adjectival elements, the other striking difference is that in the stock of the Southern range, there is a much greater proportion of proper noun name elements; and this difference is mostly shown in the place name first parts.

We can suspect a personal name in the Southern names *Apc halma* (1261/1271: *Apucholma*),<sup>149)</sup> *Buku lese* (1265: *Buckulese*),<sup>150)</sup> *Bata köve* ([1240]: *Bathakue*),<sup>151)</sup> *Gyula halma* (1366/XVIII.: *Gyula halma*),<sup>152)</sup> *Jeles bérce* (1341/1347: *Jelusberche*),<sup>153)</sup> in which a geographical common noun affixed with a genitive suffix was attached to the personal name. In the Northern name stock, there is a slightly bigger proportion of name parts derived from personal names: *Dános köve* (1245/1264: *Danusku*),<sup>154)</sup> *Károly lese* (1243/1335: *Karulesy*),<sup>155)</sup> *Mátyás hegye* (1341/1347: *Mathyashege*),<sup>156)</sup> *Szólát hegye* (1324/1326: *Zolachyuge*),<sup>157)</sup> *Tóbiás lese* (1243/1335, 1243/1335/XVII.: *Tobiaslesy*).<sup>158)</sup> These names may suggest the names of landowners of old. In the case of protrusions, however, the landowner relation is less obvious than in the case of settlements, as it is much less likely that mountains would have belonged to one person due to their size and nature. The anthroponymic first part of mountain names may also have had other functions besides this.

In the first part of two-part names, place names occur in large numbers only in the Southern area. In the first part of *Telekes-köz* (1298/1390: *Thelekuskuz*),<sup>159)</sup> the name of the nearby settlement can be traced. The structure of the name *Makjánvára hegye* (1337/1446: *Makyanwarahegy*)<sup>160)</sup> is not obvious. Perhaps the name of the building atop the mountain (< *Makján* personal name + the common noun *vár* 'castle, fortress', affixed with a possessive personal suffix) appears in the first part. The first part of the

<sup>147)</sup> G. Györffy 2, o. c. in note 6, p. 460, 543.

<sup>148)</sup> G. Györffy 2, o. c. in note 6, p. 515.

<sup>149)</sup> G. Györffy 3, o. c. in note 6, p. 67, 118; cf. K. Fehértói, o. c. in note 39, p. 71.

<sup>150)</sup> G. Györffy 4, o. c. in note 6, p. 229; cf. K. Fehértói, o. c. in note 39, p. 152–153.

<sup>151)</sup> G. Györffy 1, o. c. in note 6, p. 810; cf. K. Fehértói, o. c. in note 39, p. 96.

<sup>152)</sup> G. Györffy 4, o. c. in note 6, p. 292; cf. K. Fehértói, o. c. in note 39, p. 339–340.

<sup>153)</sup> G. Györffy 3, o. c. in note 6, p. 42, 125.

<sup>154)</sup> G. Györffy 2, o. c. in note 6, p. 461, 548; cf. K. Fehértói, o. c. in note 39, p. 236.

<sup>155)</sup> G. Györffy 2, o. c. in note 6, p. 461, 533; cf. K. Fehértói, o. c. in note 39.

<sup>156)</sup> G. Györffy 2, o. c. in note 6, p. 485; cf. K. Fehértói, o. c. in note 39.

<sup>157)</sup> G. Györffy 3, o. c. in note 6, p. 150, 155, 236; cf. K. Fehértói, o. c. in note 39, p. 723.

<sup>158)</sup> G. Györffy 2, o. c. in note 6, p. 461, 519; cf. K. Fehértói, o. c. in note 39.

<sup>159)</sup> G. Györffy 1, o. c. in note 6, p. 785, 811.

<sup>160)</sup> G. Györffy 3, o. c. in note 6, p. 42, 114, 134.

names *Ikreshegy-fő* (1341/1347: *Icrushygfew*),<sup>161)</sup> *Magashegy bérce* (1256: *Mogoshegbercy*)<sup>162)</sup> and *Nagydél verője* (1341/1347: *Nogdelwereie*)<sup>163)</sup> are themselves two-part mountain names. In these names, a part/whole relationship is likely to be expressed, that is, the whole of the name may refer to a part of the protrusion designated by the first part (cf. *Ikres-hegy* < *iker* ‘twins’ + *hegy*, *Magas-hegy* < *magas* ‘tall’ + *hegy*, *Nagy-dél* < *nagy* ‘big’ + *dél* ‘Southern mountain side’). In the Northern range, only in the first part of *Jászó-havasok* (1286: *alpis Jazov*)<sup>164)</sup> and *Kassai-Nagy-hegy* (1317: *magnus mons Cassouiensis*)<sup>165)</sup> feature toponyms. However, these mountain names are only on record in Latin, and it is hard to judge whether they are the translations of really existing Hungarian names or rather circumscriptions.

A special group of names of internal genesis is constituted by the two-part names whose first part of **Slavic origin** was combined with a Hungarian geographical common noun. In the latter role, in both corpuses, the lexeme *hegy* occurs most often. This is shown by the names *Bugyihó hegye* (1283: *Budihohege*),<sup>166)</sup> *Konyha-hegy* (1327: *Kuhnyaheg*),<sup>167)</sup> *Zsarna hegye* (1256: *Zarnahyge*),<sup>168)</sup> *Zsarnó hegye* (1321: *Zarnohygy*)<sup>169)</sup> from the Southern range as well as the names *Bagonya-hegy* (1327>XIX.: *Bagonya-hegy*),<sup>170)</sup> *Ladica hegye* (1323: *Ladychahyge*),<sup>171)</sup> *Szol-hegy* (1291: *Zolheg*),<sup>172)</sup> *Viszoka hegye* (1323: *Wyzukahyge*)<sup>173)</sup> from the Northern range. Besides this, in the Northern range, the noun *bérc* also occurs frequently: *Brizó bérce* (1331/1394: *Brizoberche* ~ *Brizoubeerche*),<sup>174)</sup> *Ladica-bérc* (1232>1347: *Lasichaberch*),<sup>175)</sup> *Vidosza bérce* (1341: *Viduztaberche*),<sup>176)</sup> *Zalatna bérce* (1291: *Zalathnaberche*).<sup>177)</sup> Although the word *bérc* is of Slavic origin, it entered the Hungarian language quite

<sup>161)</sup> G. Györffy 3, o. c. in note 6, p. 42, 125.

<sup>162)</sup> G. Györffy 3, o. c. in note 6, p. 42, 108.

<sup>163)</sup> G. Györffy 3, o. c. in note 6, p. 42, 125.

<sup>164)</sup> G. Györffy 1, o. c. in note 6, p. 40.

<sup>165)</sup> G. Györffy 1, o. c. in note 6, p. 40, 103.

<sup>166)</sup> G. Györffy 3, o. c. in note 6, p. 150, 205.

<sup>167)</sup> G. Györffy 4, o. c. in note 6, p. 209, 289.

<sup>168)</sup> G. Györffy 3, o. c. in note 6, p. 42, 108.

<sup>169)</sup> G. Györffy 1, o. c. in note 6, p. 153.

<sup>170)</sup> G. Györffy 3, o. c. in note 6, p. 151.

<sup>171)</sup> G. Györffy 2, o. c. in note 6, p. 461, 516.

<sup>172)</sup> G. Györffy 2, o. c. in note 6, p. 460, 543.

<sup>173)</sup> G. Györffy 2, o. c. in note 6, p. 461, 510.

<sup>174)</sup> G. Györffy 3, o. c. in note 6, p. 229.

<sup>175)</sup> G. Györffy 2, o. c. in note 6, p. 461, 515.

<sup>176)</sup> G. Györffy 2, o. c. in note 6, p. 460, 493.

<sup>177)</sup> G. Györffy 2, o. c. in note 6, p. 501.

early,<sup>178)</sup> and was certainly attached to the Slavic names as a Hungarian common noun. Besides this, on one or two occasions, *halom* and *kő* also appear in the Southern corpus: *Garabos-halom* (1256: *Garaboshalm*),<sup>179)</sup> *Szlovik köve* (1281: *Slovyk Keve*).<sup>180)</sup>

The name group containing toponyms of Slavic origin is among the most common name types in both mountain ranges. However, it is striking that in the Southern range, these names have become two-part names combined with a Hungarian common noun in a much larger proportion, in over two fifths of cases. At the same time, in the Northern area, only slightly over a quarter of names containing a part of Slavic origin have such a structure. On the basis of the last name-giving phase, these names are classified as part of the Hungarian name layer: they were created by Hungarian name-givers in a way that a Hungarian geographical common noun lexeme designating a type of place they attached to an already existing Slavic name. However, it is worth taking into account and studying the name forms already functioning as mountain names as elements of the name layer in which they had originated, as these name parts can naturally shed light on the characteristic features of the Slavic name stock as a system.

**2.3.** Based on all of the above, we can **summarize** what we know about the Hungarian name layer as follows: in both mountain ranges, two-part names constitute the majority of the name stock, but in the Northern range, the proportion of the names with such a structure is somewhat smaller. In the toponyms of the two areas, the range of linguistic devices constituting the names is almost identical, and the only more or less significant differences are in the proportion of specific linguistic elements: in the Southern range, we can find more names containing a proper noun constituent, whereas the proportion of adjectives is smaller. On the other hand, the corpus of the Northern mountain range is dominated by names containing different adjectival elements, and parallel with this, the number of proper names, especially toponymic elements is smaller.

### 3. The Slavic layer

In connection with the Slavic name layer, the possibility can occur that some of these names may not have actually been part of the Hungarian toponymic system, but were only used by the Slavic population. This suspicion, which is impossible to either

---

<sup>178)</sup> Although the first data on the word *bérc* are from the 1210s, in the following years it occurs in large numbers in the charters describing different areas of the country. It shows that this word was already in use in a large part of the Hungarian language area in the first half of the 13<sup>th</sup> century. Its high frequency suggests that it must have been adopted much earlier (cf. K. Reszegi, *Bérc, hegy és halom a régi helyneveinkben. Helynévtörténeti tanulmányok* 1, 2004, p. 153).

<sup>179)</sup> G. Györffy 1, o. c. in note 6, p. 125.

<sup>180)</sup> G. Györffy 3, o. c. in note 6, p. 150.

clearly prove or disprove due to the length of historic time involved, can especially be reasonable with respect to the one-part mountain names. However, names complemented by Hungarian geographical common nouns, as we could see in the previous part, were undoubtedly known and used by Hungarian name users, too. In the case of names where no structural change happened, it is worth examining the names of nearby places on the basis of the charter text containing the name, as Hungarian toponymic data from the vicinity of the protrusion (there may be names of mountains among them) may prove that a particular name of Slavic origin belonged to the Hungarian name system. For example, the *Szitnya* mountain of the Northern range is said to be located between the villages Almás (< *alma* ‘alma’) and Bél (< *Bél* personal name), and besides the mountain names *Somogy* (< *som* ‘cornel’) and *Gerendes* (< *gerend* ‘a flat mound, ridge rising out of a low lying area, bog or flood’), and the Slavic *Orl*; so Hungarian name users must have certainly lived in this place at that time, and they must have known the mountain name of Slavic origin. We can also be sure of Hungarian name use when the phonetic features of a particular name reveal the Hungarian sound change processes. By the dissolution of the word-initial consonant cluster, the Hungarian place name *Pilis* was formed from the Slavic *Ples*, and the Slavic *Kamenec*, originating from the common noun *kamen* ‘stone’ was turned into the Hungarian *Kemenc*. In archaic times, Hungarian words used to only contain either palatal or velar vowels. The forms *Bugyihó hegye* and *Brizó bérce* also suggest Hungarian name use, as the word-final sound *v* (> *β*) of the prefix of Slavic origin, originally functioning as a suffix, became vocalized in them.

Among the old names of the protrusions of the two mountain systems, we can find primarily Slavic names in fairly large numbers. However, their proportion is different in the two areas: in the Southern range, only every fifth one is of Slavic origin, whereas in the Northern range, some one-third of the names are supposedly Slavic loan names.

It is rather difficult to make claims about the proportion of names belonging to the specific name layers. One reason for this is that there are several names which can be traced back to both a Slavic and a Hungarian etymon. The place name *Garáb* and the first part of *Garabos*-halom can be related to the ancient Slavic word *gъrbъ* meaning ‘hill, ridge’.<sup>181)</sup> On the other hand, both names can equally be originated from the

---

<sup>181)</sup> V. Šmilauer, *Příručka slovanské toponomastiky. Handbuch der slawischen Toponomastik*, Praha 1970, p. 75; V. Tóth, *Az Árpád-kori Abaúj és Bars vármegye helyneveinek történeti-etimológiai szótára*, Debrecen 2001, p. 60. In this case, the root of the first part of *Garabos*-halom may have been affixed with the Hungarian suffix *-s*, following the adoption. We can see a similar change in the case of the mountain name *Rudas*, which will be discussed below.

Slavic common noun *grab(r)ъ* ‘hornbeam’.<sup>182)</sup> Besides, in the case of *Garáb*, we have to take into consideration the metonymic formation from the name of the nearby settlement *Garáb*, which could have equally happened in both the Slavic and the Hungarian name systems. However, we can also suspect a Hungarian personal name *Garáb*<sup>183)</sup> in the examined name parts and, what is more, in the case of *Garaboshalom*, even the personal name *Garabos*,<sup>184)</sup> where the formation from the personal name undoubtedly happened in the Hungarian name system.

In the case of some names of ultimately Slavic origin, it is also impossible to clearly ascertain whether it was a case of the adoption of the Slavic toponym originating from a Slavic common noun or whether the Slavic common noun was adopted by the Hungarian language and thus served as the basis for the name of the protrusion as a Hungarian common noun. For example, the mountain name *Galya* can be traced back to the old Slavic common noun *\*gol'a*, meaning a ‘treeless, grassy mountain, grazing land’.<sup>185)</sup> However, it is questionable how it became part of the Hungarian name system. It is very probable that the Hungarian mountain name is the adoption of the Slavic toponym *\*Gol'a*, originating from a Slavic common noun. On the other hand, it cannot be excluded that the old Slavic *\*gol'a* was adopted by Hungarian in contact with western Slavic (cf. Hungarian dialectal *galya* ‘mountain clearing; bald /treeless/ mountain’),<sup>186)</sup> and the name *Galya* may be the result of Hungarian name-giving. What makes the classification of names into name layers even more difficult is that some of them must be regarded as Hungarian formations on the basis of the last name-giving phase: the attachment of the last name element or name part. However, these often contain Slavic mountain names. The name *Bugyihó hegye* might have been derived in this way, the first part being formed from a Slavic personal name such as *Budich*, affixed with the Slavic suffix *-ovъ*,<sup>187)</sup> expressing possession, and in Hungarian, the geographical common noun *hegy* may have been secondarily attached to this, affixed with a possessive personal suffix. On the basis of the last name-giving phase, the mountain name *Rudas* can also be considered as a Hungarian derivation, which presumably contains the Slavic toponym originating from the ancient Slavic noun *\*ruda* ‘ore’,<sup>188)</sup> but it is probably an internal Hungarian genesis which came about by the addition of the presumably Hungarian suffix *-s*.

---

<sup>182)</sup> V. Šmilauer, o. c. in note 181, p. 71.

<sup>183)</sup> K. Fehértói, o. c. in note 39.

<sup>184)</sup> K. Fehértói, o. c. in note 39.

<sup>185)</sup> L. Kiss, o. c. in note 54, p. 163.

<sup>186)</sup> L. Kiss, o. c. in note 31.

<sup>187)</sup> V. Šmilauer, o. c. in note 181, p. 29.

<sup>188)</sup> L. Kiss, o. c. in note 31, p. 2/429.

The names belonging to the Slavic layer are, almost without exception, one-part names. We can only encounter two-part mountain names in the Northern range: *Csernahora*, *Kamenahora*. The majority of the names (57 % in the Northern range and 73 % in the Southern range) entered the Hungarian name system without any structural change, such as the mountain names *Galya*, *Lyukó*, *Naszály* and *Oszra* in the Southern and *Bucsony*, *Drazga*, *Pilis* and *Szitnya* in the Northern range. However, some of the names of Slavic origin were combined with a Hungarian geographical noun: thus were created the *Bugyihó hegye* and *Brizó bérce* type names, mentioned earlier. The combination of names of Slavic origin with a Hungarian first part or a Hungarian formant is peripheral.

### 3.1. One-part names

In the Slavic name layer, we can see a totally different distribution of name forming methods from the Hungarian mountain name stock. The most striking feature is that in the formation of the Slavic mountain names, different suffixes play a much greater role. Therefore, as the Slavic corpuses constitute a significantly smaller group in both ranges, I find it the most appropriate to discuss it on the basis of morphological structure.

Especially in the Northern area we can find names **affixed with formants** in great numbers: approximately half of the names are derived forms. In the Southern range, name-forming formants have been attached to only a quarter of the names, which is, in the case of *Bugyihó hegye* and *Lyukó* (1325/1347: *Lukow*)<sup>189)</sup> the suffix *-ovъ*, originally used to express possession.<sup>190)</sup> The mountain name *Lyukó* may be explained from the *Luk(a)* form of the personal name *Lukács* or, it could also originate from the ancient Slavic word *\*lukъ* ‘onion’, affixed with the adjectival suffix *-ovъ*. Furthermore, we must also take into account the possibility of its origin from the Slavic word *\*lŏkъ* ‘bow’.<sup>191)</sup> Besides *-ovъ*, only the suffix *-ъka* ~ *-ьka* occur in the Southern area in the name *Pelecske* (1295/1389/XVIII.: *Pelleczke*),<sup>192)</sup> which comes from the common noun *plěšъ* meaning ‘baldness, bald mountain; bald peak; bald mountain without vegetation’.<sup>193)</sup> The mountain name *Börzsöny*, which might be the adoption of the Slavic place name *\*Brěžane* meaning ‘those living on a hill or bank’,<sup>194)</sup> reflects a settlement-name-giving form: in Slavic, *-jane* is a frequent settlement name ending,<sup>195)</sup>

<sup>189)</sup> G. Györffy 1, o. c. in note 6, p. 789.

<sup>190)</sup> V. Šmilauer, o. c. in note 181, p. 29.

<sup>191)</sup> V. Šmilauer, o. c. in note 181, p. 115; L. Kiss, o. c. in note 31, p. 2/58.

<sup>192)</sup> G. Györffy 4, o. c. in note 6, p. 307.

<sup>193)</sup> V. Šmilauer, o. c. in note 181, p. 143; L. Kiss, o. c. in note 31, p. 2/347.

<sup>194)</sup> L. Kiss, o. c. in note 31, p. 2/178.

<sup>195)</sup> V. Šmilauer, o. c. in note 181, p. 30.

but it only occurs in mountain names secondarily when, as in this instance, there is metonymic name-transfer behind it.

In the Northern area, formants show a rather more varied picture. The adjectival suffix *-bŋb* is quite frequent: *Aszalna*, *Szitnya*, *Zalatna bérce*. *Aszalna* (1308: *Azalna*)<sup>196)</sup> supposedly comes from the Slavic common noun *\*os(b)la* ‘sharpening stone’.<sup>197)</sup> The mountain name *Szitnya* ([1245]/1245: *Cytun*)<sup>198)</sup> can be traced back to the Slavic word *sit* ‘rush’, and it designates a place overgrown with rushes.<sup>199)</sup> The first part of *Zalatna bérce* must be etymologically related to the ancient Slavic common noun *zolto*, meaning ‘gold’,<sup>200)</sup> and thus indirectly refer to gold mining on the mountain. The idea of it being related to the first part of the name of the nearby *Szalatna pataka* may also arise, which is also of Slavic origin, containing the Slavic water name originating from the common noun *\*soltb* ‘salty bog, salty spring’.<sup>201)</sup> In creating the mountain names of the Northern range, the role of the formant *-bčb* is also significant: *Kemenc*, *Visnyice*. In the mountain name *Kemenc*, the Slavic word *kameň* ‘stone’ was suffixed,<sup>202)</sup> and the mountain name *Visnyice* contains the Slavic common noun *višňa* ‘sour cherry’.<sup>203)</sup> The suffix *-bčb* forms a noun from an adjective,<sup>204)</sup> therefore, it can be supposed on the basis of the function of the formant that first, a *-bjb* adjectival suffix was attached to the common noun root, and the nominal suffix *-bčb*, or *-ica* was secondarily attached to it. The name of the mountain *Gerbencs* (1258/1334: *Guerbench*)<sup>205)</sup> may be the derivative of the old Slavic word *grebenb*, meaning ‘small hill or ridge, crest’ affixed with a diminutive suffix *-bčb*.<sup>206)</sup> In the first part of the names *Ladica hegye*, *Ladica-bérc* the suffix was attached to the ancient Slavic common noun *\*lędo* ‘cleared woodland’.<sup>207)</sup> This mountain name may also have come about from the settlement name *Ladica*, which cannot be proven by direct data, and the settlement name metonymy may have equally happened in either the Slavic or the Hungarian name system. Besides the above, the formant *-ovb*, which is primarily an adjectival suffix, can also be discovered among the names of the Northern area: in the first part

<sup>196)</sup> G. Györffy 3, o. c. in note 6, p. 150, 229.

<sup>197)</sup> V. Šmilauer, o. c. in note 181, p. 136; L. Kiss, o. c. in note 31, p. 2/291.

<sup>198)</sup> G. Györffy 3, o. c. in note 6, p. 150, 174.

<sup>199)</sup> V. Šmilauer, o. c. in note 181, p. 161; L. Kiss, o. c. in note 31, p. 2/586.

<sup>200)</sup> V. Šmilauer, o. c. in note 181, p. 198; L. Kiss, o. c. in note 31, p. 2/798.

<sup>201)</sup> R. Póczos, A Sajó vízrendszerének nyelvi rétegei, Magyar Nyelvjárások 41, 2003, p. 491.

<sup>202)</sup> V. Šmilauer, o. c. in note 181, p. 87.

<sup>203)</sup> V. Šmilauer, o. c. in note 181, p. 191; L. Kiss, o. c. in note 31, p. 2/769.

<sup>204)</sup> V. Šmilauer, o. c. in note 181, p. 29.

<sup>205)</sup> G. Györffy 2, o. c. in note 6, p. 460, 541.

<sup>206)</sup> V. Šmilauer, o. c. in note 181, p. 16, 72; L. Kiss, o. c. in note 31, p. 1/497, 1/531, 2/130.

<sup>207)</sup> V. Šmilauer, o. c. in note 181, p. 110; L. Kiss, o. c. in note 31, p. 1/171.

of the name *Brizó bérce*, in which it was affixed to the Slavic tree name *breza* ‘birch’; its meaning is therefore ‘birch forest’.<sup>208)</sup> In the case of the settlement and mountain name *Drénó* (1291: *Dreno*),<sup>209)</sup> also affixed with the suffix *-ovъ*, the direction of the change is not obvious. If the mountain name can be regarded as primary, it is probably of Slavic origin, whose root is the ancient Slavic noun *дърънъ* ‘grass, lawn’.<sup>210)</sup> The first part of *Bagonya-hegy* is a Slavic personal name such as *\*Bogoj*, affixed with the adjectival suffix *-ina*, expressing possession.<sup>211)</sup> The mountain name *Piliske* (1222: *Plesca*)<sup>212)</sup> was formed with the suffix *-ьka ~ -ьka* (for its history as a Slavic common noun, see the name *Pelecske* above).

In the Northern range, the use of compound suffixes is also typical: the names *Hosztnice* and *Liszec* were formed by adding the suffixes *\*-bn-ica* and *\*bn-ьc*. In the name *Hosztnice* ([1245]/1245: *Hostnice*),<sup>213)</sup> the suffix may have been attached to the ancient Slavic common noun *gostъ*, meaning ‘traveller, visitor’.<sup>214)</sup> The mountain name *Liszec* (1271: *Lyznehc*)<sup>215)</sup> may be explained from the Slavic common noun *lěsъ* meaning ‘forest’.<sup>216)</sup> In some names, you can find the suffix *-ьnikъ*:<sup>217)</sup> *Veternyk* (1243/1335/XVII.: *Veternyk*),<sup>218)</sup> as well as the formant *-jane*, characteristic of settlement names: *Bucsony* (1341: *Buchun*).<sup>219)</sup> However, this suffix only occurs secondarily in mountain names; therefore a Slavic settlement name can be suspected in this mountain name, even though it cannot be directly proven with data. The original Slavic meaning of this was ‘those living in the beech forest’.<sup>220)</sup>

Besides the names having been formed by a suffix, especially in the name stock of the Southern range, the possibility arises that a Slavic common noun became the name of the protrusion **without a formal change**. An example of this is *Galya* (+1275/[XIV.]: *Gala*; 1315/1339: *Gala*),<sup>221)</sup> the name of two mountains in the Southern range, which can be traced back to the old Slavic common noun *\*gol’a*,

<sup>208)</sup> V. Šmilauer, o. c. in note 181, p. 38.

<sup>209)</sup> G. Györffy 3, o. c. in note 6, p. 150, 193, 222.

<sup>210)</sup> V. Šmilauer, o. c. in note 181, p. 60.

<sup>211)</sup> V. Šmilauer, o. c. in note 181, p. 29; L. Kiss, o. c. in note 31, p. 1/136.

<sup>212)</sup> G. Györffy 3, o. c. in note 6, p. 250.

<sup>213)</sup> G. Györffy 3, o. c. in note 6, p. 151, 193.

<sup>214)</sup> Cf. V. Šmilauer, o. c. in note 181, p. 70.

<sup>215)</sup> G. Györffy 4, o. c. in note 6, p. 267.

<sup>216)</sup> V. Šmilauer, o. c. in note 181, p. 112.

<sup>217)</sup> V. Šmilauer, *Vodopis Starého Slovenska*, Praha – Bratislava 1932, p. 500.

<sup>218)</sup> G. Györffy 2, o. c. in note 6, p. 460, 533.

<sup>219)</sup> G. Györffy 2, o. c. in note 6, p. 461, 517.

<sup>220)</sup> V. Šmilauer, o. c. in note 181, p. 30; L. Kiss, o. c. in note 31, p. 1/259.

<sup>221)</sup> G. Györffy 3, o. c. in note 6, p. 42, 43, 139; G. Györffy 1, o. c. in note 6, p. 767.

meaning a ‘treeless, grassy mountain; mountain grazing land’. Besides this, as we saw above, in the case of *Garáb* (1234/1550: *Grab*)<sup>222)</sup> and *Garabos*-halom, we can suspect that they may come from the geographical common noun *gъrbъ* ‘hill, ridge’. In the Northern range, the geographical common noun *pilis* (1245: *Pylis*),<sup>223)</sup> meaning ‘bald mountain top; a bald place without vegetation’ also occurs as a mountain name without a suffix.

In the Northern mountain name stock, the names of other kinds of places also appear. Presumably, *Drazga* (1331/1394: *Drazga*)<sup>224)</sup> was named after the forest covering it, the root of which is the old church Slavic noun *dręzga* ‘forest’.<sup>225)</sup> A landscape name also appears in the mountain name *Szaduszka* (1308: *Zudizca*),<sup>226)</sup> which comes from the ancient Slavic word *\*sq-těska*, meaning ‘gorge’.<sup>227)</sup>

In the case of the name *Lám*, which designates both a mountain and a settlement, we can suppose the primacy of the mountain name: the Slavic word *lomъ* ‘stone, debris’ became the name of the protrusion without a formal change.<sup>228)</sup> The mountain name *Rudas* (1327: *Rudas*)<sup>229)</sup> was created by the adoption of a toponym *Ruda* (< *ruda* ‘ore’); that is, in the Slavic name system, it referred to mining on the surface or inside the mountain. We can also encounter the name *Ruda* in the Northern range (1258/1334: *Ruda*).<sup>230)</sup> The Northern name *Szol-hegy* (1291: *Zolheg*)<sup>231)</sup> contains the Slavic common noun *sol’* ‘salt’.<sup>232)</sup>

The designations of animals could have been built into mountain names without formants, as shown in the Southern range by the name *Szlovik köve*, whose root is the ancient Slavic noun *solvbъbъ* ‘nightingale’.<sup>233)</sup> The mountain name *Kuna* (1303/1352//1450: *Kwna*)<sup>234)</sup> presumably comes from the Slavic designation of animal *kuna* ‘marten’,<sup>235)</sup> and *Nyerce* (1268: *Nerce*)<sup>236)</sup> from *nerce* ‘mink’. Both designations

<sup>222)</sup> G. Györffy 4, o. c. in note 6, p. 243, 322.

<sup>223)</sup> G. Györffy 3, o. c. in note 6, p. 188.

<sup>224)</sup> G. Györffy 3, o. c. in note 6, p. 229, 230.

<sup>225)</sup> L. Kiss, o. c. in note 31, p. 1/391.

<sup>226)</sup> G. Györffy 3, o. c. in note 6, p. 150, 229.

<sup>227)</sup> V. Šmilauer, o. c. in note 181, p. 168; L. Kiss, o. c. in note 54, p. 162.

<sup>228)</sup> V. Šmilauer, o. c. in note 181, p. 113.

<sup>229)</sup> G. Györffy 4, o. c. in note 6, p. 209, 251.

<sup>230)</sup> G. Györffy 2, o. c. in note 6, p. 460, 541.

<sup>231)</sup> G. Györffy 2, o. c. in note 6, p. 460, 543.

<sup>232)</sup> V. Šmilauer, o. c. in note 181, p. 167.

<sup>233)</sup> V. Šmilauer, o. c. in note 181, p. 167.

<sup>234)</sup> G. Györffy 1, o. c. in note 6, p. 736, 815.

<sup>235)</sup> V. Šmilauer, o. c. in note 181, p. 104; L. Kiss, o. c. in note 31, p. 1/813.

<sup>236)</sup> G. Györffy 4, o. c. in note 6, p. 271; cf. L. Kiss, o. c. in note 31, p. 2/253.

of animals also entered Hungarian as common nouns (*kuna*, *nerce*), so the mountain name may also originate from Hungarian name-givers from a Hungarian designations of animal lexeme. Furthermore, the possibility of a personal name transfer cannot be excluded, either.<sup>237)</sup> In the Northern range, an designation of animal only appears without a formal change in the mountain name *Orl*: its root must be the ancient Slavic *\*orьlbъ* ‘eagle’.<sup>238)</sup>

In the Northern range, in the name stock of Slavic origin, the designations of different buildings also appear as names for mountains: in the names coming from the words *Hradissza* ‘place of a castle’<sup>239)</sup> and *Kapla* (1326: *Kapula* ~ *Kapala*)<sup>240)</sup> ‘chapel’.<sup>241)</sup>

In the construction of the mountain names of Slavic origin, adjectives also play a part besides nouns. The size of its denotatum is expressed by the mountain name *Mátra*, which probably existed at the time of the occupation of the Carpathian basin and, according to the most likely explanation, its base word must have been the Southern Slavic word *\*Matora* (*gora* or *planina*), that is, ‘old, or big (mountain)’.<sup>242)</sup> In the case of the mountain name *Oszra* ([1240]: *Oztro*),<sup>243)</sup> the shape of the mountain must have served as a basis for the name-giving. Its base word is the feminine form of the adjective *\*ostrъ* ‘pointed; sharp’.<sup>244)</sup> The common noun history of the mountain name *Naszály* 1075/+1124/+1217: *Nazal*)<sup>245)</sup> is the western Slavic *nosal* ‘big-nosed (person)’, and it may refer to a mountain on whose ridge or side there is a protruding, nose-like feature.<sup>246)</sup> The root *golbokъ* ‘deep’<sup>247)</sup> of the mountain name *Golboka* (1315/1339: *Gulbuka*)<sup>248)</sup> makes the primacy of the mountain name less likely, as such a semantic content is not typical of mountains. Perhaps the name of a stream of water flowing in the valley next to the mountain may have been transferred to name the protrusion.<sup>249)</sup> The root *dolnъ* ‘lower’ occurs in a name of both ranges each, and the

<sup>237)</sup> K. Fehértói, o. c. in note 39.

<sup>238)</sup> L. Kiss, o. c. in note 31, p. 2/284.

<sup>239)</sup> L. Kiss, o. c. in note 31, p. 1/567.

<sup>240)</sup> G. Györffy 2, o. c. in note 6, p. 547.

<sup>241)</sup> L. Kiss, o. c. in note 31, p. 1/681.

<sup>242)</sup> L. Kiss, o. c. in note 54, p. 155–156.

<sup>243)</sup> G. Györffy 1, o. c. in note 6, p. 810.

<sup>244)</sup> V. Šmilauer, o. c. in note 181, p. 135; L. Kiss, o. c. in note 31, p. 2/291.

<sup>245)</sup> G. Györffy 4, o. c. in note 6, p. 209.

<sup>246)</sup> L. Kiss, o. c. in note 31; L. Kiss, o. c. in note 54, p. 103.

<sup>247)</sup> V. Šmilauer, o. c. in note 181, p. 66; L. Kiss, o. c. in note 31, p. 2/52.

<sup>248)</sup> G. Györffy 1, o. c. in note 6, p. 743, 767.

<sup>249)</sup> Cf. I. Hoffmann (ed.), *Korai magyar helynévszótár 1000–1350*. 1. Abaúj–Csongrád vármegye, Debrecen 2005, p. 130–131.

first part of the Southern name *Dolna bérce* (1295: *Dolnaberchy*),<sup>250)</sup> as well as the Northern name *Dolla* (1333/1334: *Dolla*)<sup>251)</sup> both refer to the relative place of the mountain or, alternatively, they can both be explained from the Slavic geographical common noun *dolina* ‘valley’.<sup>252)</sup> Besides these, in the Northern range, the adjectives *vysokъ* ‘high’ and *čistъ* ‘clean, clear’ also appear as constituents of mountain names: *Viszoka bérce*, *Csiszta-homlok*. All of these names, having been derived from adjectives, and also some of the names derived from nouns, feature a feminine ending, which may be explained by their use alongside the Slavic feminine main part *gora* ‘mountain’ or by the analogy of such toponyms.

### 3.2. Two-part names

In comparison with the Hungarian name layer, we can only find a few two-part name forms among the Slavic names. The second part of the names *Csernahora* (1243/1335/XVII.: *Csernahora*)<sup>253)</sup> ‘black mountain’ and *Kamenahora* (1278: *Kamenahora*)<sup>254)</sup> ‘stony mountain’ contains the Slavic geographical common noun *gora* ‘mountain’.<sup>255)</sup>

### 4. Other layer

Beyond Slavic and Hungarian name-giving, the possibility of German origin also occurs, especially in connection with the mountain name *Rigel* (+1326/1330/1446: *Riegel*)<sup>256)</sup> in the Northern range, which may originate from the old high German noun *righe*, meaning ‘precipice, crevice, gorge’. Nevertheless, its uniqueness also raises doubts about the correctness of this derivation.

### 5. Summary

In my paper, during my investigations based on different criteria, I have focused on two main principles. Firstly, it was my aim to introduce the chronological and derivational layers of the mountain names, and secondly, to make a comparative analysis of the mountain names of two well-defined areas. However, the mode of discussion I chose brought to the surface the regional differences present in the

---

<sup>250)</sup> G. Györffy 3, o. c. in note 6, p. 42, 70.

<sup>251)</sup> G. Györffy 2, o. c. in note 6, p. 461, 512.

<sup>252)</sup> V. Šmilauer, o. c. in note 181, p. 56; L. Kiss, o. c. in note 31, p. 1/380.

<sup>253)</sup> G. Györffy 2, o. c. in note 6, p. 457, 460, 533.

<sup>254)</sup> G. Györffy 4, o. c. in note 6, p. 210, 265.

<sup>255)</sup> V. Šmilauer, o. c. in note 181, p. 69. The mountain name was probably adopted by the Hungarian language following the sound change  $g > h$  happening in the Slavic languages, that is, presumably in or after the 12<sup>th</sup> century – cf. I. Kniezsa, *Magyarország népei a XI-ik században*. In: J. Serédi (ed.), *Emlékkönyv Szent István király halálának kilencszázadik évfordulóján 2*, Budapest 1938, p. 373).

<sup>256)</sup> G. Györffy 2, o. c. in note 6, p. 495.

individual name layers. Therefore I find it especially appropriate to summarise the results of my study by paying attention to all of my objectives.

In the comparative study of the Slavic and Hungarian name layers, the most important differences are between the proportion of one- and two-part names. The Hungarian mountain name stock is dominated by two-part names, or at least, the two kinds of structures are more or less balanced. In contrast, in the Slavic name stock, there is the hegemony of one-part names. This clearly shows the basic differences between the name-giving customs of the two peoples. In my study, in accordance with my earlier expectations, regional differences were also shown. Within the Hungarian name stock of internal genesis of the two mountain ranges, we can see differences between the proportions of one- and two-part name forms: among the names of the Northern range, there are somewhat more one-part names than in the Southern range. This can perhaps be explained by the influence of the Slavic name model, that is, in the Northern area, also shown by the large number of names of Slavic origin, there is a bigger Slavic population, who prefer one-part names, and their customs of name-giving and name use may have also influenced the Hungarian name users.

Between the studied name stocks, no relevant differences can be pointed out from a linguistic aspect. However, it may be worth mentioning that the circle of Hungarian geographical common nouns secondarily attached to names of Slavic origin is rather narrow, compared to the variety of geographical common nouns attached to names with Hungarian first parts. One explanation for this may be the smaller number of names with Slavic first parts. On the other hand, we cannot exclude the possibility that the Hungarian geographical common noun appearing beside the name part of Slavic origin did not actually constitute a part of the mountain name in real language use, but only appeared alongside the name as a kind of explanatory element in order for the charter drafter to refer to the type of the terrain feature designated by a non-transparent name.

Significant differences are shown between the name-creating and name-changing customs of the two peoples. While the majority of (Hungarian) names of internal genesis were created in both areas by syntagmatic construction, i.e. by compounding, similar ways of formation can scarcely be found among the Slavic names. However, name creation by formants is characteristic of the Slavic name layer, whereas it is peripheral among Hungarian mountain names.

Of the differences between the two mountain ranges, it is worth pointing out that the names of the Northern range appear in the Hungarian name system without formal changes more often. As opposed to this, the names of Slavic origin of the Southern range have structurally been better adapted to the Hungarian name system and thus became two-part names in greater proportion by being combined with geographical common nouns. This may be explained by the interaction of name use customs. In the name stock of Slavic origin of the two ranges, the differences between the use of

formants – in the South, only a quarter of the names and in the North, half were formed in this way – may also originate from the fact that Hungarian name use customs may have had a bigger influence on the Slavic name users; whereas in the North, the Slavic name creation norm was adhered to more strongly.

*Debreceni Egyetem, Magyar Nyelvtudományi Tanszék*

*H-4010 Debrecen*

*Pf. 54*

*reszegi.katalin@arts.unideb.hu*