

István Hoffmann (Debrecen, Hungary)

The Last Thirty Years of Hungarian Toponomastics

The aim of the present volume of *Onomastica Uralica* is that the papers should present the history of the toponomastics of each Uralian language focusing on the last quarter of the 20th century with the intention to provide the reader with an overview of the present situation, results and tasks of this field of study. Although the picking out of a period from the processes of the history of the science might be justified by such intentions and practical aims, we must avoid mechanical separation, since the lack of the knowledge of antecedents and connections may seriously deform or make uninterpretable our overview. It is particularly true in the case of such an extended field of study having a great past like Hungarian toponomastics that's why we go into more details about prior research than other papers — to be more exact, our analysis will be the more detailed as we approach towards the period examined.

1. Former antecedents

1.1. Pre-history of Hungarian onomastics. Toponomastics in the 19th century

Scientific interest towards names in Hungary emerged first at the beginning of the 19th century. This period was the era of the Hungarian neologist movement and linguists were above all supposed to create modern dictionaries due to the programme of the development and cultivation of the national language. Into the diverse etymological, historical, explanatory and dialectal dictionaries, proper names were also included in large number, thus becoming the objects of linguistic, that is, in the present sense, lexicographical processing. Lexicographical presentation of names required their collecting which soon became an important programme of Hungarian researchers. The forerunner of the Academy of Science, Magyar Tudós Társaság (Hungarian Society of Science) did a pioneering work even in the European context when it first conducted a competition in 1837 for the collecting of Hungarian toponyms and family names.

From the attempts of diverse standards of the following decades, the undertaking of the historian FRIGYES PESTY stands out by which he wished to collect all the contemporary toponyms of every settlement of Hungary in 1864. On more than 30 000 pages of 68 manuscript volumes, the result of the work done or conducted by the local authorities is an invaluable source of historical toponomastics today.

In the last third of the 19th century, it was mainly historians who examined toponyms, their ultimate goal being to conceive a notion of the changes in the ethnic relationships of the Carpathian Basin. Ethnographical researches, reviving at the turn of the 19–20th centuries, undertook the utilization of the onomastic corpus collected from the spoken language.¹

1.2. Onomastic researches in the first half of the 20th century

It was JÁNOS MELICH who incorporated the research of names into Hungarian linguistics, that is, historical linguistics at the beginning of the 20th century. Being not only one of the most prolific Hungarian philologists, but also an excellent Slavist, MELICH was focusing on the historical linguistic analysis of the Hungarian lexicon. He wrote the etymologies of thousands of Hungarian toponyms within its framework and especially in his unfinished “Magyar Etymologiai Szótár” (Etymological Dictionary of Hungarian; EtSz.) written with ZOLTÁN GOMBOCZ, but also in his individual articles and monographs. His oeuvre founded the international level Hungarian etymological researches. Most of his etymological methods and basic principles are considered authoritative even by contemporary onomastics. An important goal of MELICH’s was to clear up the ethnic composition of the Carpathian Basin in the era of the Hungarian conquest by the methods of linguistics and primarily by etymological toponomastics, that is, to explore nations living here before the Hungarians. His monograph concerning this topic, entitled “A honfoglalás kori Magyarország” (Hungary at the Conquest Era; 1925–1929), was the first large-scale synthesis of the results of Hungarian onomastics.²

JÁNOS MELICH was an outstanding representative of that linguistic tendency which is called the Budapest school. This historical linguistic school represented the views of the neogrammarian school and their linguistic realism predominated the oeuvre of many excellent philologists. From among these researchers, ISTVÁN KNIEZSA, GÉZA BÁRCZI and DEZSŐ PAIS made their marks as onomasticians, too.

As a student of MELICH, ISTVÁN KNIEZSA developed further the work of his master at more than one points. It can be caught in the act in the most direct way in his monograph entitled “Magyarország népei a XI.-ik században” (Hungary’s Peoples in the 11th Century; 1938) which uses an onomastic analysis when presenting the ethnic composition of the Carpathian Basin after the Hungarian conquest. KNIEZSA processed the onomastic corpus of a

¹ History of the research of toponyms in the 19th century was summarized by ATTILA SZABÓ T. in his comprehensive study (1944).

² The oeuvre of JÁNOS MELICH was summarized by KISS LAJOS (1995b) and it was presented by SÁNDOR MIKESY at an international onomastic forum (1956–1957 and 1962–1963) as well.

number of our early literary records in separate papers. His activity was particularly intensive in the research of the features of the toponymic systems of the Eastern regions of the country. For the description of the stock of toponyms he created such a systemic framework or toponymic typology which makes it possible to compare different types of name giving. KNIEZSA's typology of toponyms with its semantic and morphologic classification of names and also with the chronological specification of certain types of names has remained authoritative in the researches of onomastic systems up to this day.³

In the 1930s and 1940s, that is, in the prime of the work of MELICH and KNIEZSA, a new research programme was articulated by ATTILA SZABÓ T., who, diverging from that predominant tendency which focused on settlement names and hydronyms, called attention to microtoponyms. Researchers of the group of onomasticians formed around him, called the Transylvanian school, wished to collect and process the historical and contemporary toponymic corpus of the settlements of Transylvania. After a decade of activity, the promising work was interrupted due to political and social changes in the middle of the 1940s and it could not have been resumed for long decades.⁴

As regards the onomatosystematical procession of microtoponyms, we owe the most to LORÁND BENKŐ whose monograph entitled "A Nyárádmente földrajzi nevei" (Geographical Names alongside the River Nyárád; 1947) has served as a base for many a similar analysis. It was the very same year that a thin book was published by LAJOS LŐRINCZE entitled "Földrajzineveink élete" (The Life of Our Geographical Names; 1947) which book has probably met the most references later on in all contemporary Hungarian toponomastics. LŐRINCZE actually combined the two important tendencies of Hungarian onomastics in his book, one of which was the systematic description introduced by KNIEZSA and the other being the microtoponymical researches urged by ATTILA SZABÓ T. LŐRINCZE created the notion of *onomatophysiology* which actually became a symbol of autonomous and independent onomastics. The emergence of interdisciplinary onomastics as an independent field of study is connected by most Hungarian researchers to the publication of this work.

It is still a specifically controversial phenomenon in the development of Hungarian onomastics that the impetus of the researches was broken at this field just after the declaration of the independence of onomastics. The science policy of the following era pushed onomastics into the background since, in a totally unfair way, it was considered a field of study which served

³ The oeuvre of ISTVÁN KNIEZSA was also overviewed by LAJOS KISS (1994a, in German 1966b) and it was SÁNDOR MIKESY who (1964–1965) commemorated him.

⁴ The oeuvre of ATTILA SZABÓ T. was summarized by IVÁN BALASSA (1996).

extremely nationalist ideas between the two world wars. In the following years, there were hardly any publications in the field of toponymy which had been an extremely vivid and prolific area up to then.

2. About the placing of onomastics

Following the great decline of the 1950s, the next decade saw a great development in onomastic researches. This meant not only the sudden growth in the number of the publications but also that the place of onomastics as such and the question of its being an independent science became more and more important. As to the proper place of onomastics, the approaches and evaluations of the researchers were varied such like it happened and happens in the case of the onomastics of other languages even today.

LORÁND BENKŐ, member of the Academy, represented a traditional but not at all obsolete opinion in his lecture on the situation and tasks of Hungarian onomastics at the second Hungarian conference of onomastics in 1969, saying that, "Onomastics is essentially a linguistic discipline since its subject, that is names, is an element of language; consequently approaching its problems requires above all the application of the theories and methods of linguistics" (1970, p. 7). However, his standpoint did not mean that he wanted to monopolize the research of names for linguistics since onomastics "requires the application of many other fields of science and its results can be useful for many other fields of science, too" (*ibid.*). According to BENKŐ, the most relevant peculiarity of onomastics was this interdisciplinary cooperation.

The views of the historian GYÖRGY GYÖRFFY do not oppose the former at all when he states that linguistics and history are responsible for the research of names "at least equally" (1972, p. 311). What he exposes suggests us about equality that tasks of the historian and the linguist are separate that is, the historian should explore and publish the sources, localize the names, etc., and the linguist should make the etymologies, examine their linguistic form, etc., so that the scopes of knowledge of the two fields complement each other.

Yet the second conference of onomastics made way to different opinions as well. Clarifying the relationship between onomastics and linguistics, LÁSZLÓ PAPP's standpoint was the undeniable fact that we have to use various, not exclusively linguistic knowledge when interpreting names and this "justifies or has justified the claim that onomastics should be considered an independent and autonomous scientific discipline, that is, a discipline which does not serve other sciences as an auxiliary one [...] but a discipline with its own specific problems and own methods to solve these problems" (1970, p. 28).

By the 1970s, the view about the autonomy of onomastics became particularly strong and was presented in such a sharp form like for example the remark by MIHÁLY HAJDÚ, “nowadays we can definitely state that onomastics is an independent field of study” (1974, p. 17). ANDRÁS MEZŐ shared this idea when surveying the results of the 1970s (1981, pp. 87–90). His arguments, illustrated suggestively, derive from the idea that “the criteria for the independence of a discipline are its sharply defined subject and the purpose of the examination, the methods applied, and the specific system of categories; so if these criteria are recognizable in toponymy, we cannot deny its independence” (work cited, p. 88).

At the same time, we must admit that there has not yet been written such a profound and detailed study which would undertake the theoretical discussion of the above viewpoints. Our greatest feeling of want seems to originate from the lack of the presentation of individual methods so much so that we cannot agree with the declaration that in onomastics induction appears to be “the mere method which is useful and explores new knowledge” (L. PAPP 1970, pp. 29–30).

Disputes on the independence of this discipline seem a bit autotelic from a distance of some decades. The attitudes and the works of the researchers were not essentially determined by the standpoint taken up in this case, as it is well indicated by the fact that representatives of autonomous onomastics have examined names since then according to the very same principles and methods like those researchers who confess themselves linguists or perhaps historians when studying names.

Hungarian onomastics had experienced a positive and fast development until the end of the 1970s. With their works, its representatives clearly defined its place primarily among historical disciplines at an interdisciplinary area. Probably this is one of the reasons why only few of the papers focus on the characteristics and tasks of onomastics and on its placement in the system of disciplines in the 1980s and 1990s. But sporadic remarks on the topic also shaded off our knowledge.

LORÁND BENKŐ, in his papers published lately, still considers onomastics one of the most complex disciplines among social sciences and states that its interdisciplinary character primarily manifests itself in the fact that its researcher has to be familiar with many disciplines (1997a, p. 6). He declares onomastics autonomous in that respect that it “alloys its interdisciplinary extensiveness in its own approach and method” (ibid.) but this does not mean autotelism which is well proven when onomastics contributes to many other disciplines with its results. BENKŐ emphasizes that calling it an auxiliary science is not derogatory (formerly onomastics was fighting for leaving this role) but, on the contrary, it is a great evidence of the many-sidedness of

onomastics. He also stresses that, although it is in step with international results in respect of research principles and methods, onomastics is definitely a discipline of national character.

FERENC KIEFER, member of the Academy, the most prominent figure of structuralist linguistics in Hungary, considers onomastics basically a discipline of philological nature (2000, pp. 159–160). But at the same time he holds equally important the logical-philosophical approach in the examination of proper names and he identifies the linguistic interpretation of names with the analysis of their rules of usage. This approach, however, narrows down linguistic interpretation even if it also includes the examination of formal characteristics which hardly belong to rules of usage since it excludes the possibility of historical approach from among linguistics.

The author of the present paper elaborated on a similar view like KIEFER in that respect that “many disciplines has to do with proper names or, speaking more generally, the problem of names. This is a consequence of the fact that names are linguistics phenomena and language as one of the particular features of mankind may become the subject of many types of research” (HOFFMANN 1993, p. 4). But this situation hides the danger of serious distortions in views as a consequence of mixing the basic principles, methods or research purposes of different approaches. Cooperation between the disciplines concerned is inevitably important despite or because of the above. He also stresses that linguistic approach itself might be really varied but approaches do not necessarily complement each other but are not exclusive, either (HOFFMANN 1994, p. 115). According to his conception, methods applied in each case prove better if they are more successful in solving a problem than any other procedures.

Regarding the definition of the area of study of onomastics, such conceptions also appeared which held this area smaller than either the theoretically possible one or the realized ones. E.g., ATTILA HEGEDŰS declares that “Areas of study of onomastics are essentially two aspects of the usage of names, one is the creation of names and the other is the application of names.” (1997, p. 8). ISTVÁN NYÍRKOS wrote the following, “Besides *grammar*, [...] we may not dismiss the notion of *onomastics*” (1989, p. 291) which we can interpret in several ways depending on the definition of *grammar*. If we mean by this the construction or grammar, then onomastics will be extended to a really small area. But if grammar is the whole system of linguistic units and the system of their usage, then onomastics will be interpreted really widely, almost doubling linguistic description. An approach very similar to this latter may be caught in the works of MIHÁLY HAJDÚ, too (1997 and 1998).

3. Institutional frameworks and forums

3.1. Onomastic conferences

Hungarian onomastics actually had not had any institutional framework until the end of the 1950s. The Hungarian Linguistic Society with Hungary's linguists as members organized the first national onomastic conference in Budapest in 1958 thus launching the series of programmes which became perhaps the most important organizing power of Hungarian onomastics in the following decades. It was the congresses of the International Council of Onomastic Sciences that served as a model. The conference was participated by Hungarian onomasticians as well and JÁNOS MELICH was elected an honorary member of the Presidency of the Society at its sixth session just in 1958 (BÁRCZI 1960, p. 16). At the first conference of Hungarian onomasticians, there were 27 lectures, including 11 ones concerning toponymy.

The second onomastic conference was held again in Budapest in 1969 with a lot wider range of topics than the former one since, besides the majority of the lectures given by linguists, there were historians, ethnographers and cartographers, too, in the schedule. About half of the lectures given were dedicated directly to toponyms and, within the framework of the programme, the first national discussion for voluntary field-workers in onomastics was also held.

The third programme of this type followed the second one after 11 years just like it had happened in the previous case. It was in 1980 that the Hungarian onomasticians met in the city of Veszprém where, although this time toponomastics really had the impetus, no more than 13 lecturers were concerned with toponyms. Taken into account the 15 further speeches at the discussion on national collecting of toponyms organized here, we still have to say that the second conference could not have reached the outstanding results of the second one, not even concerning quantity, nor the thematic diversity of the lectures, nor the professional standard taken it as a whole.

It was at the 100th anniversary of the birth of Dezső Pais, the excellent philologist and onomastician in 1986 that the fourth onomastic meeting was held in Zalaegerszeg, his home town. The more than 40 lectures concerned with toponymy signalled an increasing scientific interest although mainly the representatives of linguistics showed up at the programme with only a few exceptions.

The fifth and by this time the last Hungarian onomastic conference was held in Miskolc in 1995 where again not only linguists but also master historians, ethnographers, and archeologists gave lectures. Compared to the previous ones, the greatest change was that many representatives of Hungarian onomastics beyond the frontier also participated, primarily from the Hungarian-populated areas of the neighbouring countries.

Materials of the conferences were published in single volumes, too (Névt-Vizsg. and NytudÉrt., Vol. 70; MNyTK, Vols. 160, 183, 209), and these publications became the indispensable handbooks of Hungarian onomastics. Besides the great conferences on onomastics, several smaller discussions were also held and the materials of some of these were also printed. In addition to the above, certainly some lectures on toponymy were given at many other scientific programmes, conferences and congresses, too.

3.2. Bodies

The first scientific corporation of Hungarian onomasticians was established following the first national conference when the Linguistics and Literary Studies Section of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences set up a committee on onomastics. But it ceased after some years of existence due to restructuring. Later an onomastic department was established at the Hungarian Linguistic Society. First it worked all right but later fewer and fewer lectures were organized by them. For the promotion of onomastic research, an Onomastic Workgroup was set up mainly by younger and middle-aged onomasticians at Eötvös Loránd University in the 1970s. Apart from this loose grouping, presently there is nothing like a corporation for Hungarian onomasticians in Hungary.

3.3. Series

The series of “Magyar Névtani Dolgozatok” (Papers on Hungarian Onomastics) was launched by the Onomastic Workgroup in 1976 the aim of which was to create a publication forum primarily for young researchers. Up to this time, more than hundred and fifty issues were published in the series. Almost half of the publications is concerned with toponymy. Most papers undertake the publication of the toponyms of one or more settlements in dictionary format and, in most cases, they do the classification, too. The first corpora were published from those counties where there were no comprehensive corpora of toponyms. But later on, corpora of Hungarian toponyms from beyond the frontier, mainly from Rumania, outnumbered the other ones.

The first own independent publication forum of Hungarian onomastics, “Névtani Értesítő” (Onomastic Bulletin), has been published by the Onomastic Workgroup since 1979 on. This periodical publication appeared with two issues annually in the first three years and, since 1982, it has been published actually as a yearbook of onomastics, except for a three years break from 1988 to 1990. The first volumes were edited by MIHÁLY HAJDÚ and ANDRÁS MEZŐ. With this publication, the editors and the publisher wished to create a publication forum for the papers of this fortunately developing field of study at the same time helping the researchers to find their way in

the increased substance of knowledge. With the diversity of the studies, the editors wanted to stress on the interdisciplinary character of this area.

As of Issue 8, FERENC ÖRDÖG and JÁNOS PESTI also became members of the editorial board and, since Issue 9, ATTILA HEGEDŰS had also participated in the work. HAJDÚ and MEZŐ led the editorial board as responsible editors. Since Issue 13 on, HEGEDŰS had edited the bulletin on his own. In 1994 he became the responsible editor of the editorial board consisting of KÁROLY GERSTNER, MIHÁLY HAJDÚ, DEZSŐ JUHÁSZ and, since 1997, also KRISZTINA LACZKÓ.

During the twenty years of existence of *Névtani Értesítő*, a spectacular change has taken place in the character of the publication. At its launching, the editors aimed at the creation of a vivid and fresh series suitable even for the exchange of ideas, helping younger researchers and those farther from the professional forums to publication. This could have been served by the two annual issues and by some of the chapters: “*Krónika*” (Chronicle), “*Figyelő*” (Observer), “*Műhely*” (Workshop). This aim, however, could not have been realized really. The toughest criticism was articulated by the editor himself, that is, MIHÁLY HAJDÚ, in the “*Epilógus*” (Epilogue) of Issue 12, “Diversity of the authors resulted in the diverse standards of the papers, the series thus receiving a stroke of amateurism.” (1987). Being excellently acquainted with international literature and an active member of the international organizations of onomastics, BÉLA KÁLMÁN, member of the Academy, stated that, “even the first issue’s standard is at international level”, and he still maintained his views in his review on Issue 5 (1982, p. 502). As to its size, the first 12 issues were rather diverse since the first issue had 75 pages while the last one as many as 270 pages. All issues were published with a shorter summary in English.

Since Issue 13, the bulletin has been more coherent in more than one of its aspects, e.g., it has been published annually, it has contained about 140–150 pages and it has got a new typographical look. Part of the actual chapters mentioned above has ceased and the chapter entitled “*Műhely*” publishes mainly the material of discussions on PhD dissertations. New chapters have also appeared (“*Köszöntő*” [Greetings], “*Esemény*” [Events], “*Emlékezés*” [Commemoration], “*Emlék*” [Memory]) but the bulletin still has no constant structure of chapters. Being congratulatory books, two of these issues stand out from the others, one is for the 60th birthday of MIHÁLY HAJDÚ (Issue 15) and the other is for ANDRÁS MEZŐ (Issue 21). The almost two hundred papers of the two volumes, with a size three times the usual, each signal not only the scientific importance of the celebrated persons but also their popularity among onomasticians.

In the main chapter of *Névtani Értesítő*, that is, “*Tanulmányok, cikkek, adatok*” (Studies, articles, data), more than 450 papers were published in the 23 issues appeared up to this time. Almost 40% of these is concerned with toponymy. Besides papers on toponymy, amounting to three massive volumes, the chapter entitled “*Szemle*” has published reviews on as many as 120 Hungarian and foreign works. If we take into account only the authors of papers concerned with toponyms we will see that top linguists, that is, members of the academy and professors are present among the almost one hundred writers together with young professionals at the beginning of their career. Thus we can say that *Névtani Értesítő* has become an important forum of Hungarian onomastic research for the last quarter of the century.

3.4. Other forums of publication

Hungarian onomasticians has had other publication forums as well. Their lengthier monographs were in most cases published by the most famous Hungarian scientific publishing house, Akadémiai Kiadó, for example in the framework of the series “*Nyelvészeti Tanulmányok*” (Linguistic Studies) or “*Nyelvtudományi Értekezések*” (Linguistic Papers). Many books on toponymy were published in the series “*A Magyar Nyelvtudományi Társaság Kiadványai*” (Publications of the Hungarian Linguistic Society). The most recent onomastic series entitled “*A Magyar Névarchívum Kiadványai*” (Publications of the Hungarian Names Archives) was launched by the Department of Hungarian Linguistics of the University of Debrecen in 1997. So far it has had six volumes. Other university and college departments regularly publish onomastic publications, too.

As to journals, it has been mainly “*Magyar Nyelv*” that publishes papers on toponomastics but the other traditional Hungarian journal, “*Magyar Nyelvőr*”, is also an important forum for onomasticians. From among university annuals, an outstanding number of onomastic publications can be found in “*Magyar Nyelvjárások*” published by the University of Debrecen. High level studies of toponomastics beyond the frontier has been published in “*Nyelv- és Irodalomtudományi Közlemények*” (Publications in Linguistics and Literature), Cluj, Rumania. Many onomastic papers were published previously in “*Hungarológiai Intézet Tudományos Közleményei*” (Scientific Publications of the Institute of Hungarology), Novi Sad, Yugoslavia. Coming to the front of onomastics is spectacular at other field, too, e.g., annuals of museums and archives and other periodicals also tend to publish onomastic papers.

A new kind of initiative also has to be mentioned among the forums of onomastics. Under the guidance of ISTVÁN HOFFMANN, “*Magyar Névarchívum*” (Hungarian Names Archives) was created at the Department of Hungarian Linguistics of the University of Debrecen at the end of the 1990s

which can be accessed via Internet, too (<http://nevarchivum.klte.hu>). Corpora in digital format offer new possibilities to researchers but they also require the solution of new kinds of tasks. In the archives, databases and various publications can be found.

3.5. Onomastics in higher education

The efficacy of a certain discipline is determined by its place in higher education, that is, whether it is taught at universities and colleges. In the 1960s and 1970s, Hungary had no training of this kind and onomastics was taught only at special courses and alike. During the last twenty years, the situation of onomastics became stronger but an independent training in onomastics has not started anywhere yet. Results can be best attested in the theses. Onomastics is a popular topic for theses among the students of our universities and colleges. E.g., as many as 61 theses were written on toponomastics at the Department of Hungarian Linguistics of the University of Debrecen between 1980 and 2000. It would have been of great use in the training of onomasticians if GÉZA BÁRCZI's one-time wish had been realized and a university department had been dedicated to onomastics just like it has already happened abroad (1970, p. 396).

In the former system of scientific qualifications, 15 candidate's and academic doctor's degrees were awarded in onomastics. Besides, many researchers received university doctor's degrees. In Hungary, a new system of awarding scientific degrees was introduced in the middle of the 1990s when universities organized doctoral programmes and then doctoral schools. Due to the difficulties of the change, less degrees were awarded even in the field of onomastics but the doctoral programmes provide good possibilities for the training of researchers. PhD students may pursue special studies either within the framework of the Hungarian historical linguistics programme of Eötvös Loránd University, Budapest or at the independent onomastical subprogramme of the University of Debrecen. The very first PhD students have already defended the first onomastic dissertations in these doctoral schools. Doctoral schools seem to become an important professional basis for the scientific replacement of Hungarian onomastics.

4. Direct antecedents

As we have already mentioned, during the decade following 1947, there had hardly appeared important works in the field of Hungarian toponomastics and there are no books among them. In the next part, we look over the history of Hungarian toponomastics from the end of the 1950s to the middle of the 1970s based on a more and more increased number of publications.

4.1. The collecting and the publication of the toponymic corpus of the spoken language

A proper number of data is indispensable for toponomastics. The publication of historical data had had a century's past at the middle of the 20th century with considerable results but the contemporary corpus from the spoken language had hardly been collected. The process which had had an obvious impetus by the middle of the 1940s stopped almost completely in the next decade. As a conclusion to his lecture at the first onomastic conference, BÁRCZI said that the Academy and the Hungarian Linguistic Society has to do its best "to build up a nationwide network of the research of geographical names" (1960, p. 16).

Following these initiatives, the national collecting of names began with the help of the central and local authorities. Their first results were manifested in the massive volume of the collection of geographical names of Zala county (ZMFN.) after a couple of years. The public collecting movement under the professional guidance of the Research Institute for Linguistics, in person JÓZSEF VÉGH, meant hundreds of voluntary collectors either within county or district framework. From among them some even became reliable experts of this discipline. Collecting work was also done by professionals of universities and colleges, often with the initiation of students, yet by the middle of the 1970s only a couple of lengthier publications of corpora had been published from the 19 counties of the country, namely that of Somogy county, Baktalórántháza district and three districts of Heves county.

Those basic principles and methods of collecting and publication have also emerged which provided a certain degree of uniformity to these registries despite the diversity. The publication of the corpora of the settlements happens in dictionary articles which contains the contemporary forms in phonetic transscription and objective information on the their denotate. Localization is eased by maps. Besides the spoken corpus, the material also contains the toponyms of some outstandingly important sources, mainly from the 19th century. But the processing of toponyms thus published did not really happen in that period.

4.2. Researches in name theory

Not belonging to toponomastics, onomastic theory still can determine this narrower area of onomastics by its posing of questions and giving answers to these. The comprehension of the category of proper names is not a language specific problem so it is easy to understand that name theory is cultivated mainly by theoretical linguists and semanticists even in Hungary.

Since the beginning of the 1960s, Hungarian theoretical literature has uniformly regarded the category of proper name as a meaningful linguistic unit

and that its linguistic peculiarity, its separation from common names can be best caught just in its meaning. Certainly there is a shift of emphasis beyond this conception, which can be perceived even in foreign literature, with its primarily semiotical background, and this is the idea that every sign has a meaning. ANDRÁS MARTINKÓ was the first to represent this idea in Hungarian literature on semantics (1956). From among Hungarian researchers, JÁNOS BALÁZS is an outstanding figure with his work in name theory, who, in his works (mainly 1963 and 1970) stressed the general semantic relevance of names and also the fact that a name can be interpreted as a name only as an element of a certain onomastic system. Further theoretical works could be cited from the given era but we have to state that the outstanding synthesis of Hungarian literature in semantics, “Általános és magyar jelentéstan” (General and Hungarian Semantics) by SÁNDOR KÁROLY (1970) hardly deals with the meaning of proper names, neither did the relevant chapters of our important handbooks (MMNyR., MMNy.) provide new aspects to this question.

Arguments of name theory are present in a rather contradictory way in part-researches this time; almost all the authors acknowledge the denotative character of toponyms but almost all mean something else under denotation. Most of them, consistently with the concept of the influential “Jelentéstan” (Semantics) by ZOLTÁN GOMBOCZ (1926), mean the original etymological meaning or the proper name’s parallel in a common word. This ideological impureness, the diverse interpretation and use of notions make the actual analytic work harder, too. We must say that theory and practice hardly found each other in that era; authors of theoretical works hardly undertook the task of part-researches and those who engaged in the description of names corpora were not eager to accept the constraints of theory.

Here we mention that in this era BÉLA KÁLMÁN, professor of the university of Debrecen, an excellent Finno-Ugrist, was the first to summarize the results of Hungarian onomastics in a book. “A nevek világa” (The World of Names; 1967) gave an overall view of the two most important groups of proper names, anthroponyms’ and toponyms’ histories and systems in various languages in a popular form, at the same time with scientific demands. It is not by any chance that the booklet became a bestseller with four editions in twenty years. Its English edition (KÁLMÁN 1978) made the most important types of Hungarian names familiar abroad as well.

4.3. Descriptive researches in onomastics

Descriptive toponomastics significantly flourished in the 1960s and 1970s, also due to the demand of establishing an independent onomastics. Such investigations were concerned mainly with microtoponyms considered to belong to the younger stratum of toponyms.

The first work that we have to mention here, “Alsó-Szigetköz földrajzi nevei” (Geographical Names of the Lower Szigetköz; 1957) by MIKLÓS KÁZMÉR was prepared at the middle of the 1940s just at the same time with LŐRINCZE’s and BENKŐ’s famous works but it could not have been published until the next decade. The author processed the contemporary and historical toponyms of the Southern part of the greatest Hungarian island of the Danube. He considered mainly the presentation of the genesis of names his aim but he also tried to categorize the corpus with the help of structural analysis. In the structure of names, he separates basic constituents and distinctive constituents which notions were applied by many onomasticians later on. Following KÁZMÉR, the statistic presentation of naming types also spread. This method serves the comparability of the naming systems of diverse regions.

One of the most significant researcher of toponyms of the era was GÉZA INCZEFI, especially in the field of descriptive investigations, but in other respects as well. Being a professor of the college of Szeged, he almost exclusively dealt with toponyms and his onomastic work was concentrated in hardly more than fifteen years. His favourite field was the Southern Alföld and microtoponyms were in the centre of his research. The majority of his papers is of a theoretical kind although they start from the investigation of a certain corpus, collected by him and made available by the registries published by him. That is, his interest was not so much committed to a certain system of names but rather to general rules manifesting in these. In these papers he suggested such aspects, articulated such onomastic theses and introduced such onomastic terms that emerge regularly over and over again in Hungarian onomastic literature.

GÉZA INCZEFI was an adherent to an autonomous onomastics and this is evident by the title of his most important work, “Földrajzi nevek névtudományi vizsgálata. Makó környékének földrajzi nevei alapján” (Onomastic Examination of Geographical Names. Based on the Geographical Names of Makó; 1970). The author wishes to present the knowledge about toponyms condensed into a sole frame of description. This is far from being without contradictions, yet it still has significant scientific results. Complexity is shown even in the titles of the three main chapters, that is, the grammar of geographical names is about the possibilities of descriptive approach, the onomatophisiology of geographical names describes historical approach, and onomastics becomes an auxiliary discipline in the historical moral of geographical names.

INCZEFI’s researches about the structure of names gained particularly great attention and reaction. His suggestions for analysis differing from that of common words was challenged by certain researchers at some points.

LÁSZLÓ BALOGH argued for an other kind of a description against his concepts since he attributed a particular role to structural analysis in the complex examination of names (1970, 1972, 1973). His opinion is not without creative ideas in its descriptive aspects but it is fully unsuccessful in the historical ones. Generally speaking, specific toponymic aspects were predominant in the description of the structure of names in the 1960s and 1970s and categories of the grammar of common words were almost completely pushed into the background.

Apart from structural analysis, other considerable results can hardly be mentioned in the field of the morphologic description of toponyms from this era. Phonetic and morphologic problems of names were considered rather from historical aspects but there were not any papers either on the phonological structure of toponyms or on the system of name formants. As to the grammar of toponyms, some papers were written on the suffixation of settlement names, the use of toponyms as attributives and the connexion of toponyms with articles.

4.4. Historical researches in onomastics

It is clear that, despite the sudden advance of descriptive onomastics, historical toponomastics was definitive in onomastic researches. This area was cultivated by many researchers and, in this era, almost all of our leading philologists had published papers on this field, too. All the individually published works on toponymy are primarily of historical approach but many researchers undertook the less spectacular but the more useful task of dealing with minor details in historical onomastics.

Historical onomastics certainly needs many sources. It uses the very same types of sources as many other disciplines and it also has to rely upon the processing work of other disciplines. So those historical works are among the best sources of toponomastics the authors of which undertake the identification of the toponymical data of charters and other sources following the clarification of the philological aspects of the source. The first written sources of Hungarian onomastics are from the 10th century; it was the Árpáadian era (895–1301) that played a definitive role in the coming into being of the system of toponyms. The most popular and cited source of the historical toponomastics of the Árpáadian era is GYÖRGY GYÖRFFY's book on the historical geography of Hungary in the Árpáadian era (1963), the first volume of which was published in the period treated here and which also satisfies all linguistic demands regarding data publication.

As we have already seen, etymology was always an outstandingly important area in Hungarian toponomastics. This is really an essential condition for the whole of the discipline since the interpretation of the linguistic origin of

names is the base of onomastic researches. Etymological examinations had always had a distinguished role in Hungarian historical linguistics and “A magyar nyelv történeti-etimológiai szótára” (The Historical-Etymological Dictionary of Hungarian Language; TESz.) was published as a summary of these researches. In many cases, we may find toponyms as first data of many of our words, due to the peculiarities of the historical sources of Hungarian language so the results of historical toponomastics had to be taken into account when preparing the dictionary, and in more than one aspects certainly even stepping across them, exactly in the light of the new etymological summary.

Many etymologies of toponyms were published mainly in linguistic journals apart from TESz. in the 1960s and 1970s. Probably we may find curious that the theory and the methodology of etymology was hardly dealt by researchers. In spite of this, our etymological literature had been enriched by many etymologies of toponyms, suitable for drawing general conclusions, thanks to DEZSŐ PAIS, BÉLA KÁLMÁN, ATTILA SZABÓ T., LORÁND BENKŐ, CAMILLO REUTER and SÁNDOR MIKESY as well as the aged but still active JÁNOS MELICH. As the first partial summary, ANDRÁS MEZŐ and the historian PÉTER NÉMETH together prepared the first modern historical dictionary of toponyms of a smaller part of the Hungarian speaking areas entitled “Szabolcs-Szatmár megye történeti-etimológiai helységnévtára” (The Historical-Etymological Registry of Szabolcs-Szatmár County; MEZŐ—NÉMETH 1972).

Researches in the historical classification of toponyms had two, effectively only loosely connected trends in the 1960s and 1970s. One of these continued with the research direction marked with the names of MELICH and mainly KNEZSA, above all regarding settlement names, and the other direction wished to accomplish the aspects of recent onomatophysiological researches, mainly in the system of microtoponyms. As to overall, summarizing works, we may mention only two, and the fact is worth to note that both appeared in a university coursebook. One is by GÉZA BÁRCZI, probably our most influential and versatile linguist, who, in the second edition (1958) of his book entitled “A magyar szókincs eredete” (Origins of Hungarian Vocabulary) provided a great summary of the history of proper names. The other and more condensed summary, being founded by BÁRCZI’s work, was published in “A magyar nyelv története” (History of Hungarian Language) by LORÁND BENKŐ who was not really concerned with onomastics this time (1967). BÁRCZI’s aspiration to mix former researches, which, according to him, became too much historical and not really linguistic, with more recent onomatophysiological aspects in fact was not realized in the following era but a more stable linguistic discussion of names has considerable results.

We may mention the paper by ÉVA B. LŐRINCZY (1962) on Old Hungarian names formed with *-s ~ -cs* derivatives as a work belonging to this latter trend. It must be a result of the character of this given derivative that the author was able to concentrate on names, among them a lesser number of toponyms, as elements of the vocabulary almost exclusively with the application of linguistic aspects. Although the lack of data prevented her from generalization in certain questions, e.g., concerning territorial occurrence, yet we must say that her book is an important piece of Hungarian historical onomastics even from theoretical and methodological aspects.

Being methodologically consistent, well-arranged, uniform and with consequent results, the book entitled “A »falu« a magyar helynevekben” (The Constituent »falu« [village] in Hungarian Toponyms; 1970) by MIKLÓS KÁZMÉR is an outstanding book in Hungarian onomastics. The author undertook the examination of a certain clear-cut type of toponyms, that is those settlement names which contain the geographical common word *falu*. Not leaving the framework of linguistics, the examination concerns the semantic and morphological structure of names as well as specific patterns of change. The presentation of chronological and onomatogeographical features was made possible by the complete data collection. The monograph is perhaps the most significant work of onomatogeographical researches in the narrowest sense.

As we have already seen, the Hungarian typology of toponyms had an other version besides the historical examination of settlement names, too, and it can be rather connected to onomatophysiological researches and thus to microtoponyms. Regarding the names of many kinds of places, this typology is sensitive to the type of the denoted objects but generally it does not want to clarify chronological characteristics of the types. It resembles the other typological description in that it also uses semantic and morphologic means when characterizing names. Onomatophysiological typology concentrates on the genesis of names and the description of change remained outside the scope of the summaries.

There is only one such comprehensive typological classification of toponyms from this era which wanted to continue the tendency started by LŐRINCZE, BENKŐ, and KÁZMÉR and this is the central chapter of GÉZA INCZEFI's above mentioned book entitled “Földrajzi nevek névtudományi vizsgálata” (1970, pp. 71–78). This typology is mostly based on a semantic classification, that is, it focuses on the semantic motives of the name giving situation but other factors also have an important role in it, e.g., types of toponyms, semantic and morphologic types of lexemes that constitute names, onomatostilistical notions, etc. Since these aspects occur at the same level in the typology, despite the many promising results, the system as a

whole does not prove able to present the genesis of toponyms nor the system of toponyms as such.

Contact with various languages had a strong influence on the Hungarian system of toponyms, too, since Hungarian is neighboured by structurally and genetically different languages. In this period, the most results come from etymological research in the analysis of interlingual relations of name systems. Slavicists were the most active in exploring the origins of loan toponyms from various Slavic languages. From among them, the activity of JÁNOS MELICH is outstanding, who, even in his nineties, wrote etymologies rich both in data and in theoretical conclusions. Important papers were published on names of Slavic origin by LÁSZLÓ HADROVICS, LAJOS KISS and ISTVÁN KNIEZSA. KNIEZSA with his papers using Hungarian references, too, enriched Slav toponomastics with significant results. In the examination of names of German origin, KÁROLY MOLLAY was eminent. Some papers examined Old Turkic borrowings of names, e.g., LAJOS LIGETI dealt with this topic in a more indirect way and LÁSZLÓ RÁSONYI made actual etymologies. But loans from Rumanian were hardly discussed at all.

4.5. Researches of applied onomastics

Applied toponomastics was hardly ever cultivated by linguist-onomasticians. It is true that the National Register Committee within the Ministry of the Interior, which as a professional body had dealt with settlement names with the cooperation of linguists since the end of the 19th century, ceased in the fifties. The Committee of Geographical Names established in the 1960s exercised professional control over the toponymic activity of cartographers. The most significant result of its operation was the publication of a series entitled “Magyarország földrajzinév-tára” (The Registry of Geographical Names of Hungary) which determined the normative forms of toponyms not included in official registries of settlement names. Besides names of regions, hydronyms and names of terrain configurations, this registry contains thousands of microtoponyms. More and more attention was dedicated to the examination of the official giving of street names in settlements. The first academic regulation of the orthography of toponyms was published in 1965, entitled “Földrajzi nevek és megjelölések írásának szabályai” (Rules of the Orthography of Geographical Names and Denotations; FÖNMÍSz.) which aimed at solving the orthographical problems of rarer types of toponyms, too.

5. Fields of research in most recent toponomastics

5.1. Gathering and publication of the corpora of toponyms of the spoken language

In the first half of the 1980s, Hungarian toponomastics reached the best results in the publication of toponyms. These years were the most fruitful period of the collection of names which had been on for forty years with a changing level of efforts. A range of county and district registries were published in this period and the collection of names was taking place with a great impetus at the formerly missed areas, too, promising a near finish to researchers. The national collection of names was guided in the framework of the Research Institute for Linguistics of the Hungarian Academy of Science by JÓZSEF VÉGH and FERENC ÖRDÖG who gradually took over VÉGH's tasks. It is due to them both that they had excellently coordinated the numerous teams of collectors and their parallel work at many places for decades. They did an enormous work in the publication of the corpora, too, mainly, as editors of the books published. In this activity, they were helped mostly by LAJOS BALOGH.

At the places where the collection of names bore fruit, the guiding linguists had a determining role. Many of them became excellent onomasticians just thanks to this collecting work. In Heves county, MRS BÉLA PELLE collected the material and in Veszprém county it was MÁRIA VARGA who had a significant role in the work. Elsewhere college departments meant the solid base for the collection of toponyms; in Baranya county it was the Department of Hungarian Linguistics of college of Pécs, and primarily thanks to JÁNOS PESTI, in Vas county it was that of the college of Szombathely, in Jász-Nagykun-Szolnok county it was that of the college of Jászberény, with the guidance of FERENC FARKAS. The collection of the names was the more promising as many young professionals joined the work, e.g., in Komárom and Veszprém counties. The range of the publication of toponyms was also enriched by MIHÁLY HAJDÚ's collection of the corpus of the island of Csepel (1982). The collection of names beyond the frontier resulted in massive books mainly in the Voivodina in Yugoslavia where six volumes were published in a couple of years at the beginning of the 1980s which is due to OLGA PENAVIN and LAJOS MATIJEVICS in the first place.

At this period the sudden increase of the number of registries was not escorted by a fall in their standard but, on the contrary, very rich materials were published. With its completeness regarding the historical details, the collections of Baranya county (BMFN.) and the island of Csepel were not easy to exceed. Almost all the publications included a dictionary of geographical common names and an index to ease the finding of the name constituents. Besides, more and more etymologies and details from local history were appearing in these works.

But from the middle of the 1980s, a seemingly formal change, that is the publishing of collections by districts and not counties, showed that the impetus of the work declined. This change of conception tried to react to the effects resulting from the regress of social and economic support and this adaptation actually resulted in new results. Further collections of names were published although not as fast as previously, e.g., the range of volumes from Szabolcs-Szatmár-Bereg county were published just between the middle of the 1980s and 1990s thanks to researchers from Debrecen, namely ÁRPÁD KÁLNÁSI, LÁSZLÓ JAKAB and ÁRPÁD SEBESTYÉN. But as a result of the stop in the collection of names, the collectors and the editors had to face new professional challenges, too. Using the unfinished collections in the restarted work meant a lot of problems since their incorporation into the registries was sometimes at least as preventive as of help.

By the second half of the 1990s, the organized collection of names almost completely collapsed in Hungary. Yet individual efforts still bore fruits. The books of IVÁN BALASSA and DÁNIEL KOVÁTS (BALASSA—KOVÁTS 1997 and KOVÁTS 2000) publish a rich corpus from the Eastern part of Borsod-Abaúj-Zemplén county, and FERENC BÍRÓ published the toponyms of Körösladány (1999a). Collections from larger areas were in a way replaced by the increasing number of registries appearing as parts of monographs of villages and books on local history. Collections of certain villages were also published in Magyar Névtani Dolgozatok but a more important fact is that this series provided a possibility for the publication of works beyond the frontier. Publications were mainly from Transylvania, the most and richest collections by JENŐ JANITSEK, but collections from the former Upper Northern Hungary (today in Slovakia) and the Subcarpathia (today in the Ukraine) can also be found among them. In the collection of corpora beyond the frontier, Transylvanian researchers were the best and the results of MAGDOLNA CSOMORTÁNI have to be emphasized but their activities were rather individual and it meant that larger collections could not have been prepared even here due to the disintegration.

Summing up the results of the forty years' collecting work, it looks like the following. Registries were published from the greatest part of the Transdanubia, that is the areas west from the Danube. We have collections of names from the whole territories of Zala, Somogy, Tolna, Vas, Baranya, Komárom and Veszprém counties. As regards the large Fejér and Pest as well as Győr-Sopron-Moson counties, only a district collection and the collection of the island of Csepel has been published. From the Eastern part of Hungary, only the corpus of Heves county is completely published and collections from the major part of Szabolcs-Szatmár-Bereg and Jász-Nagykun-Szolnok counties are also published. But from the other five counties, only sporadic publications can be found on the names of certain groups of settlements. The situa-

tion of the large Hungarian-populated regions beyond the frontier is much worse in this respect. The registries published still provided the researchers with hundred thousands of toponymic data, mainly those still used in the spoken language today.

Despite the above, contemporary Hungarian onomastics has to give a new impetus to the stopped collection of names but this requires new forms and methods which can be successful under the present conditions. The collection of names beyond the frontier deserves special attention mainly because now the conditions are far more advantageous as compared to the former ones.

5.2. Researches in descriptive onomastics

Collections of names discussed above made it possible to include a large and relatively uniformly arranged material in the scientific research work. It evidently stimulated certain disciplines, primarily descriptive researches, and it also created new fields of research.

Dealing with names from the spoken language had already during the phase of collection raised a series of such sociolinguistic problems which had to be solved during the process of the work. Such was the gradual coming into prominence of sociolinguistic aspects in the selection of informants. The collectors considered the salvation of former and often ceasing names their main task but their attention could not have been turned to archaisms at every settlement since the complete exploration of the corpora of towns, which have grown significantly in the 20th century, required a totally different attitude from the collectors and consequently the informants had to be chosen according to different aspects. So the practice of the collection of names resulted in the stronger taking into account of name usage. External scientific conditions were particularly advantageous for the realization of this research possibility since it was the period when independent sociolinguistics and researches of the living language became stronger in Hungarian linguistics. That's why it is so remarkable and perhaps less comprehensible why these aspects had no theoretical impact in toponomastics. Though ANDRÁS MEZŐ published an important paper as early as in 1970 presenting the separation of name giving and name usage together with the description of their complex system of relations (1970). In surveying the knowledge of names of the speakers, JÓZSEF ZSOLNAI did the pioneer's work (1967). Still we experience that no independent programme was articulated for the study of the problems in name usage in Hungarian toponomastics, only some ideas were proposed. Developing his former conclusions, ANDRÁS MEZŐ had the best results in working out some basic categories of name sociology (1982, pp. 38–42).

For the examination of the usage of toponyms in multilingual settlements, several registries offer a great corpus. It is mainly the villages of Baranya and Tolna counties that the population speaking German and Southern Slavic languages is numerous but Vas, Veszprém and Komárom counties are also suitable for such research. And this is what could be one of the most important research aspects at Hungarian-populated areas beyond the frontier. The customs in the name usage of the increasing Roma population in Hungary could be examined, too. In spite of the excellent possibilities, it is remarkable how little attention has been paid to phenomena and characteristics of language contacts in the usage of toponyms. Only some researchers dealt with questions of contemporary toponyms. KÁROLY GERSTNER examined parallels between German and Hungarian (1981 and 1993) and the corpus of the Baranya volume was utilized mainly by OTTÓ HOFFMANN (1989) and OLGA PENAVIN (1989). Examination of language contacts seems an important field in toponomastics, too, thanks to the special situation of Hungarian and it is duly emphasized in the discussion of corpora of old names. Results from the analysis of the corpus from the spoken language can add new aspects to researches even in the interpretation of historical relationships.

Due to the publication of collections of toponyms, the names of contiguous areas of more counties or even a large part of the country became known. Yet only one author, ÁRPÁD KÁLNÁSI undertook the presentation of the onomastic system of a larger area in his “Szatmári helynévtípusok és történeti rétegződésük” (Types of Toponyms and their Historical Stratification; 1996) in which he processed the corpus, which he collected and published himself, of four districts from Northeast Hungary. This way KÁLNÁSI continued the tradition launched by LORÁND BENKŐ with the presentation of the system of toponyms alongside the river Nyárad and also MIKLÓS KÁZMÉR and GÉZA INCZEFI with their processed corpora of the names of the Lower Szigetköz and Makó, respectively. KÁLNÁSI’s book does not only fit the range of the so-called onomatophysiographical works but it also surpasses them as it is the mere book that examines the name giving patterns of a larger area in such a detailed way and in its historical process and proceeding towards the whole contemporary corpus of toponyms. Although we may not find a major theoretical innovation in his analysis, his aim was to find a way “to process and analyse the relevant corpus of names at a scientific level and at the same time in a way which can be utilized in popular and school education” (work cited, p. 3). Popular education with scientific demands has a great tradition in Hungarian onomastic literature.

The corpus of toponyms from the spoken language of contiguous areas provides a good possibility for onomatogeographical examinations, too. A new vividness of this field of study is well shown in the fact that a book also was published in this area. OTTÓ VÖRÖS undertook the lexicogeographical ex-

amination of the hydrographic common names in the toponyms of Vas county (1999). The lexicogeographical presentation of toponym-constituent geographical common names has already been the topic of several papers (e.g., HAJDÚ 1986–87; PESTI 1987; KÁLNÁSI 1996). Still we have to be careful with linguistic conclusions drawn from such examinations since the usage of the vocabulary is influenced not only by linguistic factors but by natural circumstances as well. Registries of toponyms can be used as special linguistic atlases with such a dense network on which each settlement can be considered to be a research point. Certain phonological and morphological dialectal features can be presented relatively widely through names but the limitations of such examinations also appear due to the narrow vocabulary segment reflected in toponyms. Such an onomatogeographical result, however, which shows the specific features of proper names emerged only incidentally in some papers. The analysis of the contemporary corpus of names from the aspect of linguistic geography inspired historical examinations of this direction, too.

The most papers concerning the corpus of toponyms from the spoken language were written on the vocabulary reflected in toponyms. Many researchers dealt with the most frequent name constituting lexemes that is geographical common names. Most researchers examined this part or only a smaller detail of this of a settlement or an area of a group of settlements but a range of papers dealt with certain, mostly obsolete words, too. Among these the work examining the name constituting lexemes of the area of the three Körös rivers by FERENC BÍRÓ is an outstanding one and he had already published a lengthier paper on this material (1997). Many papers wished to survey the general significance of geographical common names but the dictionary of this group of words which play an important role in the constitution of names has not yet been prepared. Those words denoting plants received some more attention than other words occurring in toponyms.

In the field of the semantic categorization of toponyms, the lexemic structure also got an important role in the characterization of synonymous variants (KÁLNÁSI 1980; HOFFMANN 1980) and it is evident that other aspects were emphasized in the historical corpus of names in this field (V. TÓTH 1999a). Although the conception of proper name as a meaningful sign spread in Hungarian onomastics this time, the parallelism of names (synonymy and morphological variants) and the sameness of names (polysemy and homonymy) were dealt with only in a couple of works, mostly relating to the researches of KATALIN J. SOLTÉSZ (1972).

Lexemic structure may play a role even in the suffixation of names and in their adverbial inflection but the clarification of this problem requires a multifold approach since grammatical rules hardly catch the suffixation of

toponyms in Hungarian. Sociolinguistical aspects may add important aspects to this but the results of historical examinations are also informative. Morphological and morphophonological relations of suffixation were examined in the most details by JÓZSEF TOMPA (1980).

When speaking about the onomastics of the 1960s and 1970s, we stated that the central question of descriptive examinations was the presentation of the onomastic structure and the creation of its system of viewpoints and stock of notions. Works of this kind were characterized by a detachedness from the description methods of common words that time. In the examined period, far less papers were written on these problems. The majority of the researchers further refined the previous categories (JUHÁSZ 1988 and KÁLNÁSI 1996) and sometimes just in connection with the types of names with strange morphological structure (SOLTÉSZ 1986 and SEBESTYÉN 1998). Providing a recent synthesis of the history of Hungarian between the 10th and the 15th century, “A magyar nyelv történeti nyelvtana” (Historical Grammar of Hungarian) preferred to emphasize the similarity between compound common words and toponymic compounds of toponyms according to its aims with the applied method of description, too (ZELLIGER 1991 and LŐRINCZI 1992).

The structural differences between common words and toponyms were stressed by ISTVÁN NYIRKOS in some of his papers from a theoretical point of view (1989, 1998). His concept is based on that model approach which spread in European onomastics principally due to the work of the Czech RUDOLF ŠRÁMEK and the Finnish EERO KIVINIEMI. This approach looks at the factual linguistic characteristics of names as the realization of models or, to put it in an other way, linguistic features expressed in toponyms are traced back to models representing a higher level of generalization.

This concept is the base for that interpretation framework which was described by ISTVÁN HOFFMANN in his “Helynevek nyelvi elemzése” (A Linguistic Analysis of Toponyms; 1993). HOFFMANN’s work fits the range of our typologies of toponyms but it also differs from them in more than one aspects. It differs in that the systematic description is not based on the analysis of a concrete corpus of names but it was created based on a theoretical standpoint as the author attempted to integrate the general results of Hungarian toponomastics into the framework of the so-called model theory. The description framework created by HOFFMANN is actually such a multilevel typology which affixes functional-semantic and lexical-morphological categories to the structural analysis of names but it also provides a syntagmatic description. The historical part of the model of analysis describes those genetic and change processes of names by means of which the structure of names belonging to the various types came into being (see also HOFFMANN 1999).

HOFFMANN's description framework approaches the methods of structural linguistic description in some respects (as shown in the most evident way in HOFFMANN 2000) as in his opinion the members of the onomastic system and parallelly the process of name formation can be described by the presentation of the employed morphological and lexical elements and by the specification of rules and operations applied. In his work, the author was led by the wish to create a general, overall description framework in order to make possible a comparative description of different parts of the Hungarian-speaking territory and different eras of the Hungarian system of toponyms. This typological system was applied by some researchers for the analysis of a corpus from the spoken language but mainly the coming into being of Old Hungarian toponyms was characterized by it.

5.3. Researches in onomastic theory

One of the most influential works of Hungarian onomastics, entitled "A tulajdonnév funkciója és jelentése" (Function and Meaning of Proper Names), by KATALIN J. SOLTÉSZ was published in 1979. It offers a lot more than what is suggested by the title as it is an up-to-date summary of the results of international and Hungarian onomastics. SOLTÉSZ conceives the meaning of proper names as a rich structure consisting of many factors and she presents these semantic markers in details in the discussion of the types of names. She states that the semantic peculiarity of proper names and their differing from common words derives from the complexity of their rich structure of meaning. According to her, the core of the meaning of a name is its denotation, that is, its reference to the denoted thing. Besides every name has a connotation, a power to recall fantasy and, depending on individual knowledge, information content as well. Names are arbitrary and motivated at the same time, the ratio and the interpretation of which can certainly be various, and etymological transparency has an important role in the meaning of proper names. SOLTÉSZ also mentions the metalinguistic meaning of names.

Almost at the same time with the publication of SOLTÉSZ's book, a work tried to catch the category of proper names by means of structural linguistics (BARABÁS et al. 1977) but this attempt did not produce appreciable results beyond the raising of the problem. This work resulted in animated reaction from the onomasticians' part but it was hardly reflected in publications.

Researches on name theory were almost completely driven back in the 1980s in Hungarian onomastics. Yet it is remarkable that SOLTÉSZ's approach and concepts were gradually incorporated into detailed studies and consequently the given examinations were better founded theoretically than previously. Questions of name theory were dealt with by the lectures of FERENC KIEFER (1989) and ISTVÁN NYÍRKOS (1989) at the fourth onomastic conference. KIEFER later discussed the questions of the linguistic examina-

tion of proper names in his book entitled “Jelentélmélet” (Semantic Theory; 2000) and he separates it from the possibilities of philological and logical-philosophical approaches. In the second half of the 1990s, MIHÁLY HAJDÚ published a series of papers on name theory (e.g., 1997 and 1998) in which he mostly dealt with the place of names in the linguistic system and their being a grammatical category and the problems of their definition. Some of his statements were challenged by ATTILA HEGEDŰS (1997 and 1999) who followed GÁBOR TOLCSVAI NAGY’s work on the sociocultural interpretation of names (1996) in many respects.

Here we should not forget about the Hungarian onomastic terminology. The object of the examination was previously called *helynév* (toponym) but since the end of the 1940s the use of the term *földrajzi név* (geographical name) had spread gradually and it was used almost exclusively. A terminological dispute at the end of the 1970s touched upon many aspects of toponomastics but it had no significant changes in the usage of terms. Heterogeneity of the terminology makes it heavier to compare various onomastic concepts but the use of terms of the researchers is clearer in the latter years. We regret to say that the terminological dictionary of Hungarian onomastics has not been prepared yet.

5.4. Researches in historical onomastics

The need for sources of historical toponomastics is increasingly satisfied by such publications which do not only publish the texts of old charters and other documents but attach to it a serious source-criticism and historical interpretation. The most important initiative among them is beyond doubt the above mentioned historical geography in the Árpadian era by GYÖRGY GYÖRFFY the first volume of which was published in 1963. This monumental work being published evidently slowly, GYULA KRISTÓ, FERENC MAKK and LÁSZLÓ SZEGFŰ undertook the preparation of a registry of types of toponyms, that is, toponyms originating from etnonyms and tribes’ names and anthroponyms, being extremely important from a historical point of view (Adatok, Vols. 1 and 2). The 16–18th centuries or the era of Middle Hungarian lacks the most data in onomastics that’s why it is particularly important that significant publications of sources appeared in the 1960s and 1970s from this era. With decades of work, ATTILA SZABÓ T. prepared the historical data store of toponyms of Transylvania the aim of which, that is the publication of the historical and contemporary toponyms of Transylvania, unfortunately could not have been realized in his life. But his data were in most part incorporated into a dictionary entitled “Erdélyi Magyar Szótörténeti Tár” (Historical Lexicon of Hungarian from Transylvania; SzT.), having been published since 1976, which, with its 11 already published volumes (initials A–P) and the expected further volumes, is one of the most im-

portant regional historical linguistic dictionaries. We should mention the undertaking of GEORG HELLER and KARL NEHRING from Munich who publish a very rich onomastic corpus, creating a new type of historical registry of settlement names, by counties. In twenty volumes, the corpora of twenty-four former Hungarian comitats were published from the very beginning to the 20th century.

In the 1970s, the linguistic examination of the Old Hungarian corpus of toponyms was mostly urged by the historian GYULA KRISTÓ in his “Szempontok korai helyneveink történeti tipológiájához” (Aspects of the Historical Typology of Our Early Toponyms; 1976). Not denying the complexity of the research of names, he presses for a strictly professional examination as his opinion is that “no complex method may replace the researches conducted by the independent disciplines with their own methodology and the sovereign summary of the results reached this way” (work cited, p. 5). KRISTÓ examined types of settlement names studied with special attention in Hungarian onomastics due to their chronological value, his aim being the refutation of traditionally fixed but faulty argumentation procedures as well as that of research methods applied in a wrong way and the consequent untenable conclusions. KRISTÓ holds linguistic analysis important since he sees linguistic processes at such places where others suggest historical background motives. As regarding names with the derivative *-i*, he notes that “the genesis, the heyday and the ceasing [of these toponyms] is not primarily connected to economic and social changes nor to changes in the person of the possessor [...] but sovereign tendencies of linguistic development and changes in the linguistic vogue” (work cited, p. 57). KRISTÓ, relying on the analysis of the corpus published in “Adatok”, suggested essential modifications as to the chronology of types of names included in the examination as compared to the onomastic traditions following the works of KNIEZSA.

LORÁND BENKŐ in the first place urges the extension of the source material in connection with the chronology of Hungarian types of toponyms since “this scope of examination, having the proper source material at hand, can be developed further significantly” (1977, p. 56). More data would promote the better acquaintance of the regional stratification of Old Hungarian, especially bearing in mind that “dialectal stratification of the onomastic corpus [...] was seemingly stronger in older times than that of the corpus of old common words” (BENKŐ 1960, p. 134).

Although the number of the publications concerning historical onomastics at the end of the 1970s and in the 1980s was far less than that of the collections of names and descriptive papers, the most significant result of the era was born in the field of historical onomastics. Playing an important role already

in the realization of “A magyar nyelv történeti-etimológiai szótára” (Historical-Etymological Dictionary of Hungarian; TESz.), and we should note that the etymologies of this work concern many toponymical etymologies, too, through the old data from linguistic history, LAJOS KISS proposed the plan of a great summary in 1970 and his “Földrajzi nevek etimológiai szótára” (Etymological Dictionary of Geographical Names; FNESz.) was published in 1978. Following the first publication of FNESz., LAJOS KISS published papers full of onomastic etymologies. He gave the explanations for many settlement names but he also etymologized a lot of hydronyms and names of hills and other types of geographical names, too. Among these we may find a remarkably great number of names from the Carpathian Basin which are outside the present territory of Hungary now but many of our devastated settlements raised his interest, too. Although he published a lot of etymologies following this work, the fourth edition of “Földrajzi nevek etimológiai szótára” in 1988 surprised the profession with its abundance. The scope of the changes cannot be expressed by saying that it is a revised and expanded edition as it appears on the cover so the reviewers had evidently welcome the two-volume dictionary as a completely new work, the Hungarian corpus of which was twice the original in size. Perhaps it is not an exaggeration to say that this work of his is the greatest and most influential achievement of Hungarian onomastics.

The dictionary contains as many as 13,340 entries and the number of etymologies far exceeds that of the entries. FNESz. deals mainly with toponyms of Hungarian origin and toponyms borrowed from other languages into Hungarian of the Carpathian Basin but thousands of toponyms are included from other parts of the world, too. The main consideration in their selection was proximity to Hungary and Hungarian culture so certainly the European names occur in a greater number than, say, Southern American ones. The richness of the corpus of the dictionary compares it to international results. Another great merit of this work is the creation of a kind of a publicity for onomastics since it made the basic knowledge of his field accessible to a far wider public than linguists in a handbook.

DEZSŐ JUHÁSZ’s work on Hungarian names of regions was published in 1988, in the same year as the fourth edition of FNESz. Its historical-etymological dictionary chapter further enriched our etymological literature. But it is much more important that the author focused his attention to a type of name which had not ever been examined regularly before. The new topic perceptibly increased the research inclination of linguists.

At the beginning of the 1980s, ANDRÁS MEZŐ published a work which was significant even from the viewpoint of general historical onomastics under the title “A magyar hivatalos helységnévadás” (Official Settlement Name

Giving in Hungary; 1982). The importance of the examination of official name giving had been emphasized for decades but this was the first large-scale work to prove the truth of this in practice. MEZŐ traced the development of settlement names, the coming into being of new names and changes of older ones from the 18th century. Classifying the linguistic characteristics of these processes he proves that natural and artificial name giving have much in common and that these types of settlement names which are different in origin are rather connected than separated by linguistic features. MEZŐ's book has much to say to the present official name giving, too, since it traces the name forming and name changing processes up to now.

From among the works on historical onomastics, we have to mention GYULA KRISTÓ's mainly historical works on the continuity of the name material of the Carpathian Basin (1985 and 1986) as well as the material of the discussion on the two subsisting toponyms of the Proto-Hungarian era, that is, *Levédia* and *Etelköz*. The best representatives of disciplines being in contact declared their opinions about these names which denoted two dwellings areas of the wandering of Hungarians east from the Carpathians at an area north or northwest from the Black Sea (GYÖRFFY 1984; BENKŐ 1984; HARMATTA 1984; LIGETI 1985 and 1986; see also KRISTÓ 1998).

The more than ten years following the fourth edition of FNESz., that is, the 1990s is the era of the great flourishing of historical researches of toponyms in Hungary. Partly it happened because of the increasing historical interest resulting from the millicentennial of the Hungarian conquest (895) and the millennium of the founding of the Hungarian state (1000) which beyond doubt interested not only the researchers but the wider public as well. The inner factors, however, give an explanation for this flourishing in a more direct way.

The recent volumes of the historical geography of the Árpadian era by GYÖRGY GYÖRFFY (1987: Vols. 2 and 3, 1998: Vol. 4) give a solid base for the explanation and analysis of our early toponyms in more than half of the area of the historical Hungary. LAJOS KISS went on with his onomastic work being such prolific as earlier and he extended his activity towards new directions as well. LORÁND BENKŐ, who had started with the publication of mainly onomastic works at the end of the 1940s but who later rarely published such papers, wrote a lot of works on historical onomastics in the 1990s, being relieved from the burden of the great syntheses (etymological dictionaries and historical grammar). As to the onomasticians of the following generation, we can only refer to the outstanding performance of ANDRÁS MEZŐ and GYULA KRISTÓ here and we mention that more and more young linguists deal with historical toponomastics.

The leading territory of researches in historical toponomastics is still etymology. This is evident since the clarification of the linguistic origin and their semantic content is required for the linguistic analysis as well as the historical utilization of toponyms. Thus etymology is integrated into other research areas, too, and authors writing about the chronological strata of names and linguistic situation of the Árpadian Hungary or Anonymus's *Gesta* certainly can rely upon etymologies. In the 1990s LAJOS KISS and LORÁND BENKŐ were prominent in etymologies. But at the same time the differences between such activities of the two researchers show that etymology in itself is a complex way of examination in historical linguistics.

LAJOS KISS etymologizes a particularly great number of names of foreign origin, these being mainly Slavic, German and Rumanian, which are explained by the author with a wide Indo-European background. A rich cultural material and a knowledge of a polyhistor is reflected in his works but still these are characterized predominantly by brevity and coherence. His rather analytic etymologies are guided by clear logic but sometimes he offers more than one solutions for the reader. LORÁND BENKŐ is rather a representative of a Hungarian centered etymology with a strong hungarological background. In his works, the wish for the revision of obsolete etymologies and oldish ideas is very strong and these are nourished by his increased feeling of responsibility, resulting from the interdisciplinary character of his research area. Here names and the language appear as part of life and history but these complex systems of relations are held together with BENKŐ with great self-confidence. So his etymologies are characterized by a cognitive approach, a sarmentuous way of thinking and a basically synthetic research method.

BENKŐ's historical view of names is best illustrated in his studies on Anonymus in the most of which names have an important role. The work about the history of the Hungarian conquest is by an unknown author and possibly it was written around 1200. Anonymus's *Gesta* is an important source of both the history of Hungarian language and history. Its rich material of toponyms and anthroponyms still raises a lot of serious problems. The interpretation of the remnants of the *Gesta* requires the careful exploration of the possible sources, knowledge and methods of the author. Onomastic authenticity of names can be judged according to the correspondence of places, persons and their deeds, says BENKŐ (1998, pp. 11–27 and 1999). In following Anonymus, he actually maps certain, mainly Eastern, areas of Hungary at that era (1998, pp. 84–108, 139–148, and 178–185). LORÁND BENKŐ gives an important role to toponyms in his papers on the history and origins of Székelys, a Hungarian group living at the southeastern part of Transylvania (1990; 1991; 1998, pp. 133–138, and 148–150) and he does the same in those of his

papers where he describes the linguistic and linguistic geographical situation of Hungarians in the Árpadian era (1996, and 1997b).

The inspiration for LAJOS KISS to present the linguistic and ethnic situation of Hungary in the Árpadian era came mainly from the historical geography by GYÖRGY GYÖRFFY (1988, 1992, 1999). The non-settlement-name data of the Árpadian era are published in a dictionary format in the volumes of “Helynévtörténeti adatok a korai ómagyar korból” (Historical Data of Toponyms from the Early Old Hungarian Age; HA.), the first containing the comitats from Abaúj to Csongrád and the second from Doboka to Győr. Young researchers in Debrecen published the historical-etymological dictionary of the toponyms of many of our old comitats, that is, Győr (BÉNYEI—PETHŐ 1998), Abaúj and Bars (V. TÓTH 2001a), as well as Borsod and Bodrog (PÓCZOS 2001). ANITA RÁCZ published papers on the system of toponyms of Bihar comitat (1997b, 1999, 2000).

Questions of the chronological stratification of Hungarian toponyms were dealt with LAJOS KISS in many of his papers. Hydronyms, and mainly the names of larger rivers are the best for such examinations. The foreign strata of these can be relatively well connected to peoples speaking different languages who had once lived in the Carpathian Basin (1994b, 1997a, 1997b). Names of the largest rivers of the Carpathian Basin can be traced back to only vaguely definable ancient Indo-European languages (*Duna* [Danube], *Tisza*, *Dráva*, *Körös*, *Maros*), and some of these have no records from the times before the conquest (*Hernád*, *Nyitra*, *Lajta*). Among the names of middle and smaller rivers, we can find many of Slavic origin (*Beszterce*, *Tapolca*, *Kraszna*), but there are some from German and some from Turkic languages.

To a lesser extent, but names of mountains and settlements are also suitable for such stratum examinations (L. KISS 1996b, 1997a, 1997c). Continuity of settlement names and the beginnings of the Hungarian system of settlement names was presented in a much more differentiated way by Hungarian researchers (L. KISS 1996a; KRISTÓ 1985, 1993, 1997) than before. Problems emerge here primarily from the fact that only a couple of them have written records from the times before the conquest (*Nyitra*, *?Keszthely*). It is possible, although it is hard to prove, that the conqueror Hungarians adopted some of the Slavic settlement names (*Csongrád*, *Nógrád*, *Visegrád*), but the overwhelming majority of names came into being following the conquest. Examination of adopted names was undoubtedly largely helped by monographs published this time, discussing contacts between Hungarian and foreign languages (Turkish: LIGETI 1986, German: MOLLAY 1982, Rumanian: BAKOS 1982). Summing up, we can state that the research of borrowings of toponyms from Slavic languages and German was going on at such a high

level as earlier, while the presentation of contacts with Turkish fell back but many papers analysed the adoptions of toponyms between Hungarian and Rumanian.

The so-called typological examinations of toponyms of inner origin had two separable tendencies, as we presented it above, one being the analysis of the genesis of settlement names and the other being the onomatopysiological method applied to the other types of names. In the period examined now, these approaches came closer to each other even in connection with that classification is more and more the presentation of the linguistic characteristics of names. A monumental synthesis of Hungarian historical linguistical researches in the 1990s, “A magyar nyelv történeti nyelvtana” (Historical Grammar of Hungarian; MNyTNyt.) discussed the forms of the derivation of toponyms disregarding the types of names (M. SZEGFÜ 1991 and 1992). The range of these derivatives was supplemented with the toponymic suffix *-aj/-ej ~ -j* by LORÁND BENKŐ (1998, pp. 162–168, and 178–185). MIHÁLY HAJDÚ examined our names with the suffix *-d* (1981); and VALÉRIA TÓTH surveyed our old derived names occurring together with variants (1997). Types of compound toponyms were presented in separate chapters of the above mentioned historical grammar (ZELLIGER 1991; LÖRINCZI 1992).

The categories set up basically for microtoponyms by ISTVÁN HOFFMANN in his “Helynevek nyelvi elemzése” were applied to settlement names and to a historical corpus of names by some researchers. Based on this model, names formed with name differentiation were examined by ANITA RÁCZ (1997a) and ANDREA BÖLCSKEI (1999). Special attention was paid to the occurrence of toponyms in other toponyms (V. TÓTH 1999b; BÍRÓ 1999b) and the group of names with possessive attributives (V. TÓTH 1996).

HOFFMANN’s method for the analysis of names was applied to larger corpora as well by his students. Complex linguistic examinations were prepared on the settlement names of Hungary in the Árpáadian era. ÁGNES BÉNYEI and GERGELY PETHŐ described the corpus of Győr comitat (1998) and RITA PÓCZOS compared the systems of settlement names of a northern and a southern comitat, Borsod and Bodrog, respectively (2001). VALÉRIA TÓTH also made a comparative examination between two old comitats of North Hungary, Abaúj and Bars (2001b). Her book differs from the above mentioned in the deepness of the analysis. She processed the complete remained corpus of toponyms of the given areas before 1332 both analytically, in dictionary format, and synthetically, in a monograph. An important part of the analysis presents the possibilities of the utilization of toponyms in historical phonology and orthography and recent results of these compared to former scientific results thus demonstrating the outstanding general significance of toponyms in general historical linguistics. Systematical examinations are made

by the author at more than one levels; the functional-semantic analysis takes into account the character of lexical-morphological elements and the overview of the genesis of names further refines our image on the processes of the genesis and the change of toponyms, and the linguistic geographical reflections are also presented.

Lately, Hungarian typology of toponyms is gradually supplemented by the description of change processes. LAJOS KISS wrote a monograph entitled “Földrajzi neveink nyelvi fejlődése” (Linguistic Development of Our Geographical Names; 1995a) in which he described phonological and morphological changes in a handbook format based on the experience of FNESz. Research in historical toponymy was very much helped by the publication of LAJOS KISS’s most important papers in one volume of essays entitled “Történeti vizsgálatok a földrajzi nevek körében” (Historical Examinations Within Geographical Names; 1999).

Inside divisions in our historical research of toponyms show that the examination of the Hungarian toponyms of the Árpáadian era plays a favoured role within this discipline. This is partly explained by factors of the system of names since the bulk of names coming into being that time are determinative even from the viewpoint of the present system of toponyms, too. On the other hand, a wider interest of social sciences is connected to the examination of names from the Árpáadian era, since these are important sources of many disciplines, despite the major limitations. In the latter decades, the works of linguists and historians are more and more harmonized in this field.

The creative utilization of the knowledge of different fields of study, together with its enlargement, is proven in those recent monographs that undertake the processing of a certain old type of toponym. An outstanding achievement in the history of Hungarian onomastics is ANDRÁS MEZŐ’s “A templomcím a magyar helységnevekben” (The Patrocinium in Hungarian Settlement Names; 1996). MEZŐ prepared the complex examination of a semantically well separated type of name; with a differentiated analysis of data, he examines the genesis and temporal and spatial spread of these names and he explores the inner and outer cultural and linguistic relations of this type of names and he traces the change patterns of the linguistic structure of settlement names belonging here. His results and conclusions are verified by his complete exploration of data. Certain partial problems were discussed by MEZŐ in papers, too, in connection with the topic. A similar object was targeted by FERENC SZABÓ G. with the examination of settlement names referring to marketing (1998). ILONA K. FÁBIÁN discussed the settlement names of our important linguistic record, the Váradi Registry, in a framework being rather similar to researches in historical geography (1997a) but he also undertook linguistic research (1995, 1996, 1997b). Hungarian

toponomastics would be significantly pushed forward if more and more linguistic records and types of settlement names were processed similarly.

6. International relations of Hungarian toponomastics

An overview of a period from the viewpoint of the history of science may not dismiss to take into account the knowledge and information of the researchers of the given discipline from the wider knowledge of that field of study. Although toponomastics is a nationally oriented discipline it also has general theoretical foundations and background and, on the other hand, language contacts in the material of toponyms require orientation in the researches of the concerned languages. The depth and the way of the appearance of the results of onomastics of other languages in Hungarian toponomastics reveals a lot about the connections and the international embedment of Hungarian onomastics. Such an overview may also show whether and to what extent and where international scientific results and tendencies influenced Hungarian researches.

Generally speaking, we may state that the need for international orientation was gradually increasing in Hungarian onomasticians following the isolation of the 1950s. In that age, it may have had some significance beyond itself that GÉZA BÁRCZI summarized his experiences of the 1958 international onomastic conference in Munich at the opening lecture of the first Hungarian onomastic conference in the same year (1960). He reported the rich range of topics of the conference, with special attention to the question of researches on European hydronyms.

Following it, Hungarian onomasticians continued with their regular participation at international conferences. The schedule of these was briefly summarized by LAJOS KISS at the second Hungarian onomastic conference, focusing on the tendencies concerning anthroponyms of the Florence congress (1961) and the disputes and results about European hydronyms at the Amsterdam (1963) and London conferences (1966) (1970, pp. 24–26). The following international programmes, that is Vienna (1969), Sofia (1972), Bern (1975), and Cracow (1978) were also reviewed by him briefly in his lecture at the fourth onomastic conference (1989).

Since the 1980s, more and more Hungarian researchers have represented Hungarian onomastics at these significant forums, generally with section lectures. Surely, this is not true for overseas programmes (1981: Ann Arbor, and 1987: Quebec) since BÉLA KÁLMÁN was the only Hungarian participant in the USA and GYULA DÉCSY in Canada, the latter not even from Hungary. International conferences were mentioned not only at similar Hungarian programmes but participants also published individual reports on these for the Hungarian professional public. Two papers were published about the

Leipzig congress (1984) which covered the more than half a dozen lectures delivered by members of the Hungarian delegation of fair number and also that the idea of organizing the congress in Hungary had also emerged (BÜKY 1985). According to the plans, it would have been taken place in the 1990s but it could not have been realized due to material and organizational difficulties. The 1990 congress in Helsinki and the 1996 congress in Aberdeen also had Hungarian participants but there were no reports made about these. The programmes in Trier (1993) and Santiago de Compostela (1999) were reviewed in Hungarian journals.

International horizon of Hungarian onomastics was widened with his surveys mainly by LAJOS KISS, his aim being mainly that “Such a wide-horizon glancing out may save us from being conceited and it may suggest ideas and tasks to our further activity” (1989, p. 31). He overviewed the most important results of Hungarian onomastics in the 1960s in a paper (L. KISS 1970). He wrote in details about overall corpus publications and dictionaries, demonstrating the possibilities and tasks before Hungarian onomastics but he also presented some monographs. He detailed German and Slav onomastic researches which have direct importance for Hungarian. The most recent period of the Slav researches on hydronyms, the results of which are indispensable for the analysis of the Hungarian system of toponyms, were presented in a separate paper by him (L. KISS 1969). PÉTER KIRÁLY related onomastic researches going on in Slav speaking countries, mainly Poland, Czechoslovakia and Bulgaria (1970). LÁSZLÓ GÁLDI informed Hungarian researchers about Rumanian onomastics (1970).

In his lecture delivered at the fourth onomastic conference in 1986, LAJOS KISS presented the recent results of European onomastics and he reviewed mainly handbooks and summarizing works. In this review of his, evidently in accordance with his interests, dictionaries discussing the origins of toponyms, published in many languages, were focused on. (See also L. KISS 1985 and 1991.) From among the handbooks he spoke in more details about those which may be of special and direct relevance to the toponyms of the Carpathian Basin. The works of many Slovakian, Czech, Polish and Yugoslavian onomasticians contribute a lot to the clarification of certain strata of Hungarian toponyms. Being also an excellent Slavacist, LAJOS KISS definitely corrected etymologies reflecting obsolete ideas and he rejects those views beyond which the wish for ideological manipulation is stronger than firm scientific conviction.

LAJOS KISS focused on the results of the research of European hydronyms in his inaugural lecture at the Academy (2000). He paid special attention to the so-called Old European hydronyms which had been discussed for ages. He presented the most successful researchers of the topic and those publication forums that were established for the publication of this very field of study.

He reviewed in a massive paper the important onomastic journals (1966a), together with the presentation of the papers of each volume besides general description. His review included the following: “*Namn och Bygd*”, the first onomastic journal of the world; “*Beiträge zur Namenforschung*”, the most important German onomastic journal; “*Revue Internationale d’Onomastique*”, founded by Dauzat and published in Paris; “*Onoma*”, published by the International Onomastic Centre; “*Names*”, from the USA; as well as two Slav journals, “*Onomastica*” from Poland and the Czech “*Zpravodaj Místopisné Komise ČSAV*”. Hungarian researchers occasionally reviewed the volumes of “*Namenkundliche Informationen*”, Leipzig and related the launch of the Italian “*Rivista Italiana di Onomastica*”.

Journal of the International Onomastic Society, “*Onoma*”, regularly published Hungarian writings, too. They continued to publish the bibliography of Hungarian onomastics as of the fourth volume (1953). The compilation of this had been prepared by SÁNDOR MIKESY until 1975 and after it was compiled by FERENC ÖRDÖG (the three latter was done together with KÁROLY GERSTNER; see OU, Vol. 1b, pp. 295–297). The journal published a paper on the situation of Hungarian onomastics by H. DRAYE (1975), LORÁND BENKŐ (1980), FERENC ÖRDÖG and LÁSZLÓ VINCZE (1994–1995 and 2000). In “*Onoma*”, BÉLA KÁLMÁN published a paper on parallel name giving (1977), KATALIN J. SOLTÉSZ on the stylistic functions of proper names (1978), LORÁND BENKŐ on the connection between the etymological dictionary of Hungarian and onomastics (1978), and FERENC ÖRDÖG on the role of onomastics in Hungarian education (1982). “*Onoma*” published birthday greetings for JÁNOS MELICH (80), GÉZA BÁRCZI (75), and DEZSŐ PAIS (70) and it printed necrologies about JÁNOS MELICH, ISTVÁN KNIEZSA, LÁSZLÓ GÁLDI, SÁNDOR MIKESY and ELEMÉR MOÓR.

The openness and sensibility of a field of study is well shown if its cultivators review the most important works published abroad at national scientific forums.⁵ The most reviews were connected to the toponymic researches of Slavic languages. Hungarian researchers reviewed mainly the works of Soviet-Russian authors, among them PODOL’SKAYA’s dictionary of onomastic terminology, the first Russian course-book on onomastics, SUPERANSKAYA’s theoretical monograph on toponyms, a reverse dictionary of Czech toponyms and the etymological dictionary of toponyms around the Ural. Ukrainian toponomastics may interest us especially because of its Hungarian references. In his review on the Ukrainian dictionary of hydronyms and another dictionary of toponyms, ANDRÁS MEZŐ showed their deficiencies in hungarological issues. Bulgarian and Slovakian onomastic works were also

⁵ The bibliographical data of the reviews are missed to save space. Data of the reviews on the onomastic works of the Uralian languages can be looked up in Vols. 1a and 1b of OU.

reviewed. As to German publications, LAJOS KISS presented the selected writings of the prominent Austrian researcher of toponyms, EBERHARD KRANZMAYER, challenging the author's views at many points in connection with the toponymic situation in Burgenland. KRANZMAYER requested ELISABETH SCHUSTER to prepare an etymological dictionary of the toponyms of Lower Austria. The history of the preparation of the three-volume work, its articles and Hungarian relevance were published by MÁRIA HORVÁTH for our Hungarian onomasticians. The most industrious reviewer of English works was MIHÁLY HAJDÚ who prepared an overview on works discussing Oxford street names, English field names and names of houses.

The significantly increased number of reviews is parallel to that growing international activity which is well shown in the participation of our onomasticians at onomastic conferences. Extension of international relations, widening of the international horizon of Hungarian researches are indicated by further factors as well. For the exploration of the borrowed names of the Carpathian Basin, and primarily for the presentation of the old Slav and previous Indo-European stratum of names, it is indispensable to take into account the abundant foreign literature. The range of single papers and relevant etymologies well demonstrate that the researchers actually did it. But certainly we may not go into any further details about this here.

Although onomastics is considered a national discipline by professionals, the results of researches in name theory pervade it more and more. International researches in name theory have their effect not only in works on general onomastics but in factual systematic descriptions, too, like that of ISTVÁN HOFFMANN (1993) who provided a possible model for the analysis of Hungarian toponyms on the basis of the version of European model theories worked out by RUDOLF ŠRÁMEK and EERO KIVINIEMI.

Finnish onomastics has been paid special attention by Hungarian researchers for a long time. This special attention, embodied in the reviews of Debrecen researchers, is not only for the related language but for the internationally recognized Finnish onomastics and the developed name culture in Finland, too. The situation and results were related two times by VILJO NISSILÄ for Hungarian researchers (1967 and 1970). NISSILÄ's onomastic handbook was reviewed by BÉLA KÁLMÁN for Hungarian onomasticians and the first significant work of contemporary Finnish onomastics, EERO KIVINIEMI's book on the names containing a *-va/-vã* ending participle was reviewed by LÁSZLÓ KERESZTES. LAJOS MIZSER presented the Finnish terminological dictionary and NISSILÄ's monograph on the names of Carelia, Finland. The latter and a more recent onomastic monograph by KIVINIEMI were reviewed by MARKKU RAINIO, too.

Two lengthier overviews were published relating to this topic in Hungary in the 1980s and 1990s, the first presenting that period of Finnish toponomastics in the 1960s and 1970s when the new school represented by EERO KIVINIEMI emerged and became gradually stronger (HOFFMANN 1983). After a little more than a decade, at the fifth onomastic conference, ISTVÁN NYÍRKOS returned to Finnish onomastics because he saw that some fields of this, that is, “collecting and processing work done by Finnish onomasticians still serves as an example while on the other hand the whole organization of onomastics could be utilized in Hungary, too, in some of its aspects” (1997, p. 491). The especially interesting details of the overall image described by NYÍRKOS are those which indicate the practical application of the results of onomastics and its applicability in everyday life. Results of Finnish toponomastics were presented by several reviews of books for Hungarian experts. ÁDÁM SZABÓ T. reviewed a work on names from Kainu, and BÉLA KÁLMÁN wrote about a work on Carelian names from Tver. ISTVÁN HOFFMANN analysed EERO KIVINIEMI’s great summary on Finnish toponyms and GERGELY PETHŐ wrote a review on the publication in which international researchers greeted KIVINIEMI at his 60th birthday.

The onomastics of the Finno-Ugric languages is in a special situation since it is also cultivated by Hungarian researchers and mainly in connection with smaller languages. It is evident that this field of onomastics has to receive special attention because of its Hungarian aspects. This area in the period examined and previously was excellently reviewed by MAGDA A. KÖVESI (1970 and 1975). LAJOS MIZSER summarized the numerous onomastic lectures of two Finno-Ugric congresses, one organized in Siktivkar in 1985 and the other in Jyväskylä in 1995 (1985 and 1995).

Onomastics received a separate section in 2000 in Tartu where Hungarian onomasticians delivered lectures, too, and the editors introduced the plan of “Onomastica Uralica” here. We hope that the organizers may register more onomastic lectures at the next Finno-Ugric congress in 2005 and we also hope that “Onomastica Uralica” will contribute a lot to the more efficient future cooperation of the onomasticians of Uralian languages.

References

- Adatok 1., 2. = KRISTÓ, GYULA—MAKK, FERENC—SZEGFÜ, LÁSZLÓ *Adatok „korai” helyneveink ismeretéhez 1–2*. AHistSzeg. 44., 48. Szeged 1973, 1974. 96 + 55 pp.
- BAKOS, FERENC (1982) *A magyar szókészlet román elemeinek története*. Budapest.

- BALASSA, IVÁN (1996) *Szabó T. Attila (1906–1987). Erdély nagy nyelvtudósa.* Püski Kiadó, Budapest. 160 pp.
- BALASSA, IVÁN—KOVÁTS, DÁNIEL (1997) *Sárospatak határának helynevei.* Sárospatak. 288 pp.
- BALÁZS, JÁNOS (1963) *A tulajdonnév a nyelvi jelek rendszerében.* In: *ÁNyT* 1, pp. 41–52.
- BALÁZS, JÁNOS (1970) *A nevek általános nyelvészeti vonatkozásai.* In: *NytudÉrt.* 70, pp. 295–301.
- BALOGH, LÁSZLÓ (1970) *A földrajzi nevek struktúrája.* In: *NyK* 72, pp. 95–124.
- BALOGH, LÁSZLÓ (1972) *A földrajzi nevek szerkezeti rendszere.* In: *NyK* 74, pp. 200–208.
- BALOGH, LÁSZLÓ (1973) *Földrajzi neveink komplex vizsgálatáról.* In: *NyK* 75, pp. 407–418.
- BARABÁS, ANDRÁS—KÁLMÁN C., GYÖRGY—NÁDASDY, ÁDÁM (1977) *Van-e a magyarban tulajdonnév?* In: *NyK* 79, pp. 135–155.
- BÁRCZI, GÉZA (1958) *A földrajzi nevek.* In: BÁRCZI, GÉZA *A magyar szókincs eredete.* 2nd expanded edition. Budapest, pp. 142–162.
- BÁRCZI, GÉZA (1960) *Megnyitó [a Magyar Nyelvtudományi Társaság névtudományi konferenciáján].* In: *NévtVizsg.*, pp. 5–16.
- BÁRCZI, GÉZA (1970) *Elnöki zárszó [a II. névtudományi konferencián].* In: *NytudÉrt.* 70, pp. 393–396.
- BENKŐ, LORÁND (1947) *A Nyárádmente földrajzi nevei.* MNyTK 74. Budapest. 51 pp.
- BENKŐ, LORÁND (1960) *Nyelvjárástörténet a névtudományban.* In: *NévtVizsg.*, pp. 132–135.
- BENKŐ, LORÁND (1967) *A földrajzi nevek.* In: BÁRCZI, GÉZA—BENKŐ, LORÁND—BERRÁR, JOLÁN *A magyar nyelv története.* Tankönyvkiadó, Budapest, pp. 384–388.
- BENKŐ, LORÁND (1970) *Névtudományunk helyzete és feladatai.* In: *NytudÉrt.* 70, pp. 7–16.
- BENKŐ, LORÁND (1977) *Magyar nyelvtörténet — magyar őstörténet.* In: *Magyar őstörténeti tanulmányok.* Edited by BARTHA, ANTAL—CZEGLÉDI, KÁROLY—RÓNA-TAS, ANDRÁS. Budapest, pp. 45–57.
- BENKŐ, LORÁND (1978) *Das neue ungarische etymologische Wörterbuch und die Namenforschung.* In: *Onoma* 22, pp. 682–684.
- BENKŐ, LORÁND (1980) *Über die Sammlung des gesamten Ortsnamenmaterials in Ungarn.* In: *Onoma* 24, pp. 219–226.
- BENKŐ, LORÁND (1984) *A magyarság honfoglalás előtti történetéhez Lëved és Etëlköz kapcsán.* In: *MNy.* 80, pp. 389–419.
- BENKŐ, LORÁND (1990) *Adalékok a székelők korai történetéhez.* In: *ÚEM* 1, pp. 109–122.
- BENKŐ, LORÁND (1991) *Maros- és Udvarhelyszék település- és népiségtörténetéhez.* In: *Száz.* 123, pp. 343–358.
- BENKŐ, LORÁND (1996) *Az Árpád-kori magyarság nyelvföldrajzi helyzete.* In: *MNy.* 92, pp. 399–403.

- BENKŐ, LORÁND (1997a) *Névtudományunk. Megnyitó az V. Magyar Névtudományi Konferencián.* In: *MNyTK* 209, pp. 5–9.
- BENKŐ, LORÁND (1997b) *A honfoglaló magyarság nyelvi viszonyai és ami ezekből következik.* In: *HonfNyelv.*, pp. 163–176.
- BENKŐ, LORÁND (1998) *Név és történelem. Tanulmányok az Árpád-korról.* Akadémiai Kiadó, Budapest. 186 pp.
- BENKŐ, LORÁND (1999) *Barangolások egy ómagyar tulajdonnév körül.* In: *MNy.* 95, pp. 25–40.
- BÉNYEI, ÁGNES—PETHŐ, GERGELY (1998) *Az Árpád-kori Győr vármegye településneveinek nyelvészeti elemzése.* MNAK 2. Debrecen. 128 pp.
- BÍRÓ, FERENC (1997) *Helynévalkotó vízrajzi köznevek a Körösök vidékén.* In: *MNyj.* 34, pp. 93–114.
- BÍRÓ, FERENC (1999a) *Körös-ladány helynevei.* Körösladányi Hely- és Népismereti Dolgozatok 1. Líceum Kiadó, Eger. 177 pp.
- BÍRÓ, FERENC (1999b) *Víznevek hatása Körösladány helynévrendszerére.* In: *NÉ* 21, pp. 36–42.
- BMFN. = *Baranya megye földrajzi nevei I–II.* Edited by PESTI, JÁNOS. Pécs 1982.
- BÖLCSKEI, ANDREA (1999) *Névkorrelációk az ómagyar kori helynevek körében.* In: *NÉ* 21, pp. 75–81.
- BÜKY, BÉLA (1985) *A XV. Nemzetközi Névtudományi Kongresszusról.* In: *MNy.* 81, pp. 369–371.
- DRAYE, H. (1975) *Ungarische Namenforschung.* In: *Onoma* 19, pp. 629–630.
- EtSz. = GOMBOCZ, ZOLTÁN—MELICH, JÁNOS *Magyar Etymologiai Szótár 1–2.* Budapest. 1934–1944.
- K. FÁBIÁN, ILONA (1995) *A Váradi Regestrum néhány helynevéről.* In: *NÉ* 17, pp. 94–98.
- K. FÁBIÁN, ILONA (1996) *Mutatvány a Váradi Regestrum helyneveinek elemzéséből.* In: *MNy.* 92, pp. 501–504.
- K. FÁBIÁN, ILONA (1997a) *A Váradi Regestrum helynevei. Adattár.* Szegedi Középkortörténeti Könyvtár 13. Szeged. 165 pp.
- K. FÁBIÁN, ILONA (1997b) *Néhány népnévi eredetű helynév a Váradi Regestrumban.* In: *MNyTK* 209, pp. 253–258.
- FNESz. = KISS, LAJOS *Földrajzi nevek etimológiai szótára.* Akadémiai Kiadó, Bp. 1978. 726 pp. *Földrajzi nevek etimológiai szótára I–II.* 4th revised and expanded edition. Akadémiai Kiadó, Budapest. 1988. 821 + 822 pp.
- FÖNMÍSz. = *Földrajzi nevek és megjelölések írásának szabályai.* Budapest. 1965.
- GÁLDI, LÁSZLÓ (1970) *Névtudományunk és a romanisztika.* In: *NyudÉrt.* 70, pp. 281–285.
- GERSTNER, KÁROLY (1981) *Magyar–német kettős földrajzi nevek Komárom megyében.* In: *MNyTK* 160, pp. 181–183.
- GERSTNER, KÁROLY (1993) *Folyóvíznevek kétnyelvű környezetben.* In: *NÉ* 15, pp. 125–127.

- GOMBOCZ, ZOLTÁN (1926) *Jelentéstan*. Pécs.
- GYÖRFFY, GYÖRGY (1963, 1987, 1998) *Az Árpád-kori Magyarország történeti földrajza 1–4*. Budapest.
- GYÖRFFY, GYÖRGY (1972) *Az Árpád-kori szolgálonépek kérdéséhez*. In: *TörtSzle.* 15, pp. 261–320.
- GYÖRFFY, GYÖRGY (1984) *Levedia és Etelköz kérdéséhez*. In: *MNy.* 80, pp. 385–389.
- HA. 1. = HOFFMANN, ISTVÁN—RÁCZ, ANITA—TÓTH, VALÉRIA *Helynévtörténeti adatok a korai ómagyar korból 1. Abaúj–Csongrád vármegye*. MNAK 1. Debrecen 1997. 156 pp.
- HA. 2. = HOFFMANN, ISTVÁN—RÁCZ, ANITA—TÓTH, VALÉRIA *Helynévtörténeti adatok a korai ómagyar korból 2. Doboka–Győr vármegye*. MNAK 3. Debrecen 1999. 123 pp.
- HAJDÚ, MIHÁLY (1974) *A magyar becézőnevek. 1770–1970*. Budapest.
- HAJDÚ, MIHÁLY (1981) *Helyneveink -d-féle képzőinek funkcióiról*. In: *Benkő-Eml.*, pp. 161–172.
- HAJDÚ, MIHÁLY (1982) *A Csepel-sziget helynevei*. Akadémiai Kiadó, Budapest. 333 pp.
- HAJDÚ, MIHÁLY (1986–1987) *A szer helyneveinkben 1–2*. In: *NÉ* 11, pp. 41–48, *NÉ* 12, pp. 55–65.
- HAJDÚ, MIHÁLY (1987) *Epilógus*. In: *NÉ* 12, p. 270.
- HAJDÚ, MIHÁLY (1997) *A tulajdonnév mint szófaji kategória*. In: *MNyTK* 209, pp. 471–477.
- HAJDÚ, MIHÁLY (1998) *A tulajdonnév „meghatározása”*. In: *NÉ* 20, pp. 5–12.
- HARMATTA, JÁNOS (1984) *Lebedia és Atelkuzu*. In: *MNy.* 80, pp. 419–431.
- HEGEDŰS, ATTILA (1997, 1999) *Mi a tulajdonnév? 1–2*. In: *NÉ* 19, pp. 5–8, *NÉ* 21, pp. 314–317.
- HOFFMANN, ISTVÁN (1980) *A helynevek jelentéstani vizsgálatához*. In: *MNyj.* 23, pp. 11–22.
- HOFFMANN, ISTVÁN (1983) *Helynévkutatás Finnországban*. In: *MNyj.* 25, pp. 79–90.
- HOFFMANN, ISTVÁN (1993) *Helynevek nyelvi elemzése*. DEMNyIK 61. Debrecen. 163 pp.
- HOFFMANN, ISTVÁN (1994) *Válasz Mező András és Juhász Dezső opponensi véleményére*. In: *NÉ* 16, pp. 115–119.
- HOFFMANN, ISTVÁN (1999) *A helynevek rendszerének nyelvi leírásához*. In: *MNyj.* 37, pp. 207–216.
- HOFFMANN, ISTVÁN (2000) *Megjegyzések a helynevek szemantikai szerkezetéhez*. In: *SNyT.* 4, pp. 110–119.
- HOFFMANN, OTTÓ (1989) *A cigányok földrajzinévadásának néhány jellegzetesége*. In: *MNyTK* 183, pp. 323–328.
- INCZEFI, GÉZA (1970) *Földrajzi nevek névtudományi vizsgálata. Makó környékének földrajzi nevei alapján*. Nyelvészeti tanulmányok 14. Akadémiai Kiadó, Budapest. 275 pp.

- JUHÁSZ, DEZSŐ (1988) *A magyar tájnévadás*. NytudÉrt. 126. Budapest. 112 pp.
- KÁLMÁN, BÉLA (1967, 1971, 1973, 1989) *A nevek világa*. 1st edition. Gondolat Kiadó, Budapest. 1967. 2nd edition. 1971. 3rd edition. 1973. 4th revised edition. Csokonai Kiadó, Debrecen 1989.
- KÁLMÁN, BÉLA (1977) *Parallele Ortsnamen in mehrsprachigen Gebieten*. In: *Onoma* 21, pp. 502–506.
- KÁLMÁN, BÉLA (1978) *The World of Names. A Study in Hungarian Onomatology*. Akadémiai Kiadó, Budapest.
- KÁLMÁN, BÉLA (1982) *Névtani Értesítő*. In: *MNy*. 78, pp. 502–505.
- KÁLNÁSI, ÁRPÁD (1980) *A földrajzi nevek rendszerezésének kérdéséhez*. In: *MNyj*. 23, pp. 23–34.
- KÁLNÁSI, ÁRPÁD (1996) *Szatmári helynévtípusok és történeti rétegződésük*. DEMNyIK 67. Debrecen. 274 pp.
- KÁROLY, SÁNDOR (1970) *Általános és magyar jelentéstan*. Budapest.
- KÁZMÉR, MIKLÓS (1957) *Alsó-Szigetköz földrajzinevei*. MNyTK 95. Budapest. 79 pp.
- KÁZMÉR, MIKLÓS (1970) *A »falu« a magyar helynevekben. XIII–XIX. század*. Nyelvészeti tanulmányok 13. Akadémiai Kiadó, Budapest. 314 pp.
- KIEFER, FERENC (1989) *Mit jelent a tulajdonnév?* In: *MNyTK* 183, pp. 286–290.
- KIEFER, FERENC (2000) *Jelentéelmélet*. Budapest.
- KIRÁLY, PÉTER (1970) *A szláv névtani kutatások és a hazai szlavisztika feladatai*. In: *NytudÉrt*. 70, pp. 270–273.
- KISS, LAJOS (1966a) *Névtudományi folyóiratok*. In: *MNy*. 62, pp. 361–373.
- KISS, LAJOS (1966b) *Stefan Kniezsa*. In: *ALH* 16, pp. 337–362.
- KISS, LAJOS (1969) *Az újabb szláv víznév kutatás*. In: *NyK* 71, pp. 165–176.
- KISS, LAJOS (1970) *Az európai névtudomány fontosabb eredményei*. In: *NytudÉrt*. 70, pp. 16–26.
- KISS, LAJOS (1985) *Barangolás földrajzi neveink világában*. In: *Nyr*. 109, pp. 359–366.
- KISS, LAJOS (1988) *Magyarország földrajzi és társadalmi arculata az Árpád-korban*. In: *MNy*. 84, pp. 129–155.
- KISS, LAJOS (1989) *Az európai névtudomány utóbbi másfél évtizede*. In: *MNyTK* 183, pp. 18–31.
- KISS, LAJOS (1991) *A helynevek eredetét magyarázó szótárak típusairól*. In: *Első Magyar Alkalmazott Nyelvészeti Konferencia*. Edited by SZÉKELY, GÁBOR. Nyíregyháza. Vol. 1., pp. 292–298.
- KISS, LAJOS (1992) *A magyarság legkorábbi nyomai a Délvidék helységneveiben*. In: *MNy*. 88, pp. 410–421.
- KISS, LAJOS (1994a) *Kniezsa István. A múlt magyar tudósai*. Akadémiai Kiadó, Budapest. 144 pp.
- KISS, LAJOS (1994b) *A Felvidék víznevei*. In: *MNy*. 90, pp. 1–19.
- KISS, LAJOS (1995a) *Földrajzi neveink nyelvi fejlődése*. NytudÉrt. 139. Budapest. 67 pp.
- KISS, LAJOS (1995b) *Melich János. A múlt magyar tudósai*. Akadémiai Kiadó, Budapest. 95 pp.

- KISS, LAJOS (1996a) *A honfoglalás és a letelepedés a földrajzi nevek tükrében.* In: *Magyar Tudomány* 41, pp. 964–971.
- KISS, LAJOS (1996b) *A Kárpát-medence régi helynevei.* In: *Nyr.* 120, pp. 440–450.
- KISS, LAJOS (1997a) *Pannónia helyneveinek kontinuitása.* In: *HonfNyelv.*, pp. 187–197.
- KISS, LAJOS (1997b) *Erdély vízneveinek rétegződése.* In: *HonfNyelv.*, pp. 199–210.
- KISS, LAJOS (1997c) *Hegynevek a történelmi Magyarországon.* In: *MNy.* 93, pp. 154–168.
- KISS, LAJOS (1999) *Történeti vizsgálatok a földrajzi nevek körében.* A Pázmány Péter Katolikus Egyetem Magyar Nyelvészeti Tanszékének Kiadványai 1. Piliscsaba. 355 pp.
- KISS, LAJOS (2000) *Az új európai víznév kutatás.* Székfoglalók a Magyar Tudományos Akadémián. Budapest.
- KNIEZSA, ISTVÁN (1938) *Magyarország népei a XI.-ik században.* In: *Emlékkönyv Szent István király halálának kilencszázadik évfordulóján 1–3.* Edited by SERÉDI JUSZTINIÁN. Budapest. Vol. 2, pp. 365–472.
- KOVÁTS, DÁNIEL (2000) *Az abauji Hegyköz helynevei.* Sátoraljaújhely.
- A. KÖVESI, MAGDA (1970) *A névtudomány és a finnugrisztika.* In: *NytudÉrt.* 70, pp. 244–249.
- A. KÖVESI, MAGDA (1975) *Miben segítheti a névtudomány a finnugrisztikát?* In: *MNyj.* 21, pp. 101–109.
- KRISTÓ, GYULA (1976) *Szemponatok korai helyneveink történeti tipológiájához.* AHistSzeg. 55. Szeged. 99 pp.
- KRISTÓ, GYULA (1985) *A Kárpát-medencei helynévanyag kontinuitásának kérdéséhez.* In: *MNyTK* 170, pp. 15–22.
- KRISTÓ, GYULA (1986) *A Kárpát-medence -grad ~ -grád utótagú helyneveiről.* In: *NE* 11, pp. 31–41.
- KRISTÓ, GYULA (1993) *Adatok és szempontok a magyar helynévadás kialakulásához a X–XI. század fordulóján.* In: *NE* 15, pp. 200–205.
- KRISTÓ, GYULA (1997) *A Kárpát-medence X. századi helyneveiről.* In: *MNy.* 93, pp. 129–135.
- KRISTÓ, GYULA (1998) *Levedia és Etelköz.* In: *MNy.* 94, pp. 151–157.
- LIGETI, LAJOS (1985) *Levédia és Etelköz.* In: *MNy.* 81, pp. 1–19.
- LIGETI, LAJOS (1986) *A magyar nyelv török kapcsolatai a honfoglalás előtt és az Árpád-korban.* Budapest.
- LŐRINCZE, LAJOS (1947) *Földrajzineveink élete.* A Magyar Táj és Népismeret Könyvtára 9. Budapest. 32 pp.
- LŐRINCZI, RÉKA (1992) *Földrajzi nevek.* In: *MNyTNyt. II/1*, pp. 891–908.
- B. LŐRINCZY, ÉVA (1962) *Képző- és névrendszertani vizsgálódások. Az -s ~ -cs képzővel alakult névanyag az ómagyarban.* NytudÉrt. 33. Budapest. 138 pp.
- MARTINKÓ, ANDRÁS (1956) *A tulajdonnév jelentéséhez.* In: *Pais-Eml.*, pp. 189–195.

- MELICH, JÁNOS (1925–1929) *A honfoglaláskori Magyarország*. Budapest. 434 pp.
- MEZŐ, ANDRÁS (1970) *Közösségi név — mesterséges név*. In: *NytudÉrt.* 70, pp. 315–320.
- MEZŐ, ANDRÁS (1981) *Földrajzinév-kutatásunk helyzete és feladatai*. In: *MNyTK* 160, pp. 85–99.
- MEZŐ, ANDRÁS (1982) *A magyar hivatalos helységnévadás*. Nyelvészeti tanulmányok 22. Akadémiai Kiadó, Budapest. 407 pp.
- MEZŐ, ANDRÁS (1996) *A templomcím a magyar helységnevekben. 11–15. század*. METEM Könyvek 15. Magyar Egyháztörténeti Enciklopédia Munkaközösség, Budapest. 313 pp.
- MEZŐ, ANDRÁS—NÉMETH, PÉTER (1972) *Szabolcs-Szatmár megye történeti-etimológiai helységnévtára*. Nyíregyháza. 158 pp.
- MIKESY, SÁNDOR (1956–1957) *János Melich*. In: *Onoma* 7, pp. 263–265.
- MIKESY, SÁNDOR (1962–1963) *János Melich. 1872–1963*. In: *Onoma* 10, pp. 303–304.
- MIKESY, SÁNDOR (1964–1965) *Stefan Knieszsa. 1898–1965*. In: *Onoma* 11, pp. 336–340.
- MIZSER, LAJOS (1985) *A VI. Nemzetközi Finnugor kongresszus névtudományi előadásai*. In: *NÉ* 10, pp. 181–182.
- MIZSER, LAJOS (1995) *A VIII. finnugor kongresszus névtudományi előadásai*. In: *NÉ* 17, pp. 135–136.
- MMNy. = BENCZÉDY, JÓZSEF—FÁBIÁN, PÁL—RÁCZ, ENDRE—VELCSOV, MÁRTONNÉ *A mai magyar nyelv*. 8th edition. Budapest. 1991.
- MMNyR. = *A mai magyar nyelv rendszere I–II*. Edited by TOMPA, JÓZSEF. Budapest. 1961.
- MNyTNyt. = *A magyar nyelv történeti nyelvtana I–III/1.*, 2. Edited by BENKŐ, LORÁND. Budapest. 1991–1995.
- MOLLAY, KÁROLY (1982) *Német–magyar nyelvi érintkezések a XVI. század végéig*. Budapest.
- NévtVizsg. = *Névtudományi vizsgálatok. A Magyar Nyelvtudományi Társaság Névtudományi Konferenciája 1958*. Edited by PAIS, DEZSŐ—MIKESY, SÁNDOR. Budapest. 1960.
- NISSILÄ, VILJO (1967) *A Finn Névtani Archívum*. In: *Nyr.* 91, pp. 465–469.
- NISSILÄ, VILJO (1970) *Das finnische Namenarchiv als Sammel-, Sprachpflege- und Forschungszentrum*. In: *NytudÉrt.* 70, pp. 32–35.
- NYIRKOS, ISTVÁN (1989) *A tulajdonnevek hírértékéről*. In: *MNyTK* 183, pp. 290–294.
- NYIRKOS, ISTVÁN (1997) *A finn névkutatásról*. In: *MNyTK* 209, pp. 491–498.
- NYIRKOS, ISTVÁN (1998) *A tulajdonnevek szófaji besorolásának kérdéséhez*. In: *ETFTK* 24, pp. 57–65.
- ÖRDÖG, FERENC (1982) *Der Eigennamen im Unterricht*. In: *Onoma* 26, pp. 215–216.
- ÖRDÖG, FERENC—VINCZE, LÁSZLÓ (1994–1995) *Neue namenkundliche Arbeiten vom ungarischen Sprachgebiet zwischen 1992–1993*. In: *Onoma* 32, pp. 44–51.

- ÖRDÖG, FERENC—VINCZE, LÁSZLÓ (2000) *Der gegenwärtige Stand der Personennamenforschung in Ungarn*. In: *Onoma* 35, pp. 71–84.
- PAPP, LÁSZLÓ (1970) *Névtudomány és nyelvtudomány*. In: *NyudÉrt.* 70, pp. 26–32.
- PENAVIN, OLGA (1989) *A BMFN [Baranya megye földrajzi nevei] szlavisztikai értékeiről*. In: *Baranyai Művelődés* 1989/3, pp. 54–55.
- PESTI, JÁNOS (1987) *A ság, ség, seg (~ segg) és a séd a Dél-Dunántúl földrajzi neveiben*. In: *NÉ* 12, pp. 32–53.
- PÓCZOS, RITA (2001) *Az Árpád-kori Borsod és Bodrog vármegye településneveinek nyelvészeti elemzése*. MNAK 5. Debrecen.
- RÁCZ, ANITA (1997a) *Az ómagyar kori településnevek differenciálódásáról*. In: *MNyj.* 34, pp. 125–146.
- RÁCZ, ANITA (1997b) *Névtani vizsgálódások az Árpád-kori Bihar megye területéről*. In: *MNyTK* 209, pp. 259–262.
- RÁCZ, ANITA (1999) *Földrajzi köznévi alapelemek az ómagyar kori Bihar vármegye településneveiben*. In: *MNyj.* 37, pp. 383–392.
- RÁCZ, ANITA (2000) *A szerkezeti változás szerepe Bihar megye ómagyar kori településneveinek kialakulásában*. In: *MNyj.* 38, pp. 337–345.
- SEBESTYÉN, ÁRPÁD (1998) *A névutós helynevek kérdéséhez*. In: *ETFTK* 24, pp. 66–88.
- J. SOLTÉSZ, KATALIN (1972) *Homonymie, Polysemie und Synonymie der Eigennamen*. In: *ALH* 22, pp. 107–117.
- J. SOLTÉSZ, KATALIN (1978) *Die stilistische Funktion der Eigennamen*. In: *Onoma* 22, pp. 382–387.
- J. SOLTÉSZ, KATALIN (1979) *A tulajdonnév funkciója és jelentése*. Akadémiai Kiadó, Budapest. 207 pp.
- J. SOLTÉSZ, KATALIN (1986) *Szokatlan alaki szerkezetű helynevek*. In: *NÉ* 11, pp. 73–82.
- SZABÓ G., FERENC (1998) *A vásárolás emlékei középkori helységneveinkben*. Bessenyei György Könyvkiadó, Nyíregyháza. 158 pp.
- SZABÓ T., ATTILA (1944) *A magyar helynévkutatás a XIX. században*. ETF. Kolozsvár. 86 pp.
- SZEGFÜ, MÁRIA (1991) *A helynévképzés*. In: *MNyTNyt. I.*, pp. 253–258.
- SZEGFÜ, MÁRIA (1992) *Helynévképzés*. In: *MNyTNyt. II/1.*, pp. 317–320.
- SzT. = *Erdélyi magyar szótörténeti tár I–*. Edited by SZABÓ T., ATTILA et al. Bukarest 1975–.
- TESz. = *A magyar nyelv történeti-etimológiai szótára I–4*. Edited by BENKŐ, LORÁND. Budapest. 1967–1984.
- TOLCSVAI NAGY, GÁBOR (1996) *A tulajdonnév jelentésánál egy névcsoport kapcsán*. In: *Nyr.* 120, pp. 319–325.
- TOMPA, JÓZSEF (1980) *Tulajdonneveink alaktani elkülönítése*. In: *MNy.* 76, pp. 394–412.
- TÓTH, VALÉRIA (1996) *Birtokos jelzős szerkezetű mikrotoponimák a korai ómagyar korban*. In: *MNyj.* 33, pp. 59–70.
- TÓTH, VALÉRIA (1997) *Vizsgálódások a korai ómagyar kor képzett helyneveinek körében*. In: *MNyj.* 34, pp. 147–170.

- TÓTH, VALÉRIA (1999a) *A helynevek jelentéstani vizsgálatához*. In: *NÉ* 21, pp. 55–61.
- TÓTH, VALÉRIA (1999b) *Helynevek a helynevekben*. In: *MNyj.* 37, pp. 435–442.
- TÓTH, VALÉRIA (2001a) *Abauj és Bars vármegye korai ómagyar kori helyneveinek történeti-etimológiai szótára*. MNAK 4. Debrecen.
- TÓTH, VALÉRIA (2001b) *Névrendszertani vizsgálódások a korai ómagyar korban. Abauj és Bars vármegye*. MNAK 6. Debrecen.
- VÖRÖS, OTTÓ (1999) *Vízrajzi köznevek szóföldrajzi és jelentéstani vizsgálata*. MNyTK 211. Budapest. 78 pp.
- ZELLIGER, ERZSÉBET (1991) *Összetett szavak és szoros szókapcsolatok földrajzi névi szerepben*. In: *MNyTNyt. I.*, pp. 540–552.
- ZMFN. = *Zala megye földrajzi nevei*. Edited by PAPP, LÁSZLÓ—VÉGH, JÓZSEF. Zalaegerszeg 1964.
- ZSOLNAI, JÓZSEF (1967) *A lakosság földrajzinév-ismeretének vizsgálata*. In: *Nyr.* 91, pp. 191–208.