

Andrea Bölcskei (Budapest, Hungary)

The Correlational System of Hungarian Historical Settlement Names

The study describes Hungarian historical place-names of a specific type. These names have a twofold structure: they consist of a basic name (functioned earlier as a place-name on its own) and a distinctive addition (attached later to the basic name to identify the settlement). The modified forms of the same basic name stand in opposition with each other, they form a correlation. These correlations can be described and classified first according to the number of their members, second according to the structure of their members, third according to the semantic correspondence of their distinctive additions, fourth according to the limitation on the number of their modifiers, and finally according to the motivation(s) of their distinctive additions.

1. The term *correlation*

In Hungarian historical resources one can generally observe the fact that in the natural process of giving names more than one settlement could get the same place-name form. For instance, in the 18–19th centuries we can find two villages (one in Baranya county, the other one in Bihar county) called *Árpád*, there were four *Bábonys* in the country and we can discover as many as six *Patas* in Hungary. One can realise that settlements with the same name existed not only in the last period of history, but before it as well. In the 15–16th centuries villages of the same name were situated even in the same county: e.g. there were two *Korpáds* in Somogy county, two *Doroszlós* in Vas county, two *Batizfalvas* in Szepes county, two *Lovases* in Veszprém county, two *Mágozsés* in Tolna county, three *Tótfalus* in Baranya county, four *Szentlászlós* in Zala county; in the 13–14th centuries in the same way: there were two *Ruszkas* in Abaúj county, two *Zsombors* in Doboka county, three *Szentmiklóses* in Csanád county, five *Újlaks* in Bihar county, etc.

Basically, this phenomenon can be traced back to two reasons. It is known that more settlements could have similar or the same features suitable for giving a name to the settlements. Thus, more settlements could have similar flora or fauna (see *Korpáds* or *Lovases*); more settlements were inhabited by the same nationality (*Tótfalus*, *Ruszkas*); more settlements could be possessed by the same owner or by owners called in the same way (*Bábonys*, *Patas*, *Zsombors*); more settlements had a church dedicated to the same saint (*Szentlászlós*, *Szentmiklóses*), etc. The namers, based on the similar or the



same name-giving features, could use exactly the same place-name form to name different settlements.

The other possibility for settlements to be named with the same place-name form was when a formerly integral settlement had been divided into two or more offspring settlements as a result of the disintegration of noblemen's domains or overpopulation. In this case the daughter-villages were typically named after the original settlement, they got the name of their mother-settlement. This process, the multiplication of villages, was quite a typical way of creating new settlements in the Middle Ages in Hungary (SZABÓ 1966: 119–138). Place-names thus could migrate a shorter or longer distance with the population, as a result of which several identical name forms spread in the country.

Whilst in the previous case the same name form for the different settlements was a result of a coincidence as the homonymous name forms were not affected by each other in the process of name-giving, in the latter case the names are genetically identical: the migrating inhabitants carried the name of the mother-settlement to the daughter-village. Because of their different origins the identical names of different settlements are homonymous in the former case and polysemous in the latter case (for the concept see J. SOLTÉSZ 1979: 33–43).

The identical place-names originated either from the same motivation of the names or from genetic identity could easily cause misunderstanding in communication. The use of identical place-names designating different settlements could lead to mislocalization, it could make the orientation of people more difficult. Apart from changing the identical place-names to completely different ones a solution for the situation was to attach a distinctive element to the basic place-names to distinguish the different settlements. This is how names as *Garamvezekény*, *Németzsidány*, *Szekerestörpény*, *Egyházasbást*, *Losonctugár*, *Rábatótfalu*, etc. came into existence for the 19th century. The original, unmodified place-name (regardless of the fact whether it is monomorphemic or it consists of several constituents) is known as the *basic name* or *primary name*, whilst the distinctive elements are also called *distinctive additions* (EKWALL 1960, CAMERON 1969, CLARK 1992; see the Hungarian terms *megkülönböztető jelző/előtag/elem*, *differenciáló jelző/előtag/névrész*, *identifikáló jelző*, *bővítményrész* as well: SZABÓ 1966, INCZEFI 1970, MEZŐ 1982, 1996, HOFFMANN 1993), *local surnames*, *additional/secondary names* (MATTHEWS 1975), *modifiers* (ZINKIN 1986, CRYSTAL 1997), *attributes* (REANY 1960) or *secondary specifiers/specifics* (STEWART 1975) in the literature. Distinctive additions thus are attached to already existing identical place-names to differentiate them. The modified place-names



form an opposition, a correlation with each other or with the unmodified basic name (if there is one).

In Hungary the Home Office has been regularizing the process of giving names since 1898, the year in which a law was passed claiming that each settlement in the country should have a unique name, different from all the other names of settlements of the country and each place-name form should designate one settlement only (the idea of “one name : one settlement”). As the names of settlements have been regularized officially in Hungary since 1898, we can assume that most correlations born before 1898 were formed in colloquial communication in the natural process of giving names, so we can refer to them as spontaneous correlations. Spontaneity here doesn't mean that these correlations were totally unaffected by administrative control: the historical resources which preserved these historical place-names for us are official – semi-official documents, in which the recorder could modify the forms of the place-names in many cases, but he did this in accordance with the actual colloquial use of the names. It is true that spontaneous correlations might have been influenced by local administrative bodies, but they weren't controlled by the government. The absence of governmental control dealing with the names of settlements in the whole country at a time made the entire structure of place-name system different from that after 1898. So we should differentiate correlations born before 1898 in the natural process of giving names (spontaneous correlations) from the oppositions that were created after 1898 under governmental direction (official correlations).

Let me quote some examples to show how identical name forms (regardless of their origins) could be distinguished with the help of distinctive additions to form a correlation. In the 13–14th centuries there were two villages called *Vadász* in Abaúj county (1317: *Vadaz*, possessed by the sons of two noblemen, János and Imre since 1329; and 1256: *Wadaz*, possessed by another nobleman, bailiff Lőrinc fia Miklós since 1279, FNEsz. I, 94, 465). The different first recordings and the different owners might suggest the fact that here the identical name forms had developed independently from each other as a result of the same motivation of the names (both villages had originally been inhabited by people obliged to serve the king as hunters). For the middle of the period the two village names were differentiated by adding to the basic names a pair of distinctive additions referring to the position of the settlements in comparison with each other: *Alvadász* – *Felvadász* (1332–5: *Aluodaz* and *Feluodoz*, FNEsz. I, 94, 465). The correlation remained basically the same till 1898. We can find evidence for the case as well where an originally integral settlement was divided into parts. There was only a single *Detrehem* (first recording from 1445: *Detreh*) in Torda county up to 1733, when it was separated into *Alsódetrehen* and *Felsődetrehen* (FNEsz. I, 76).



The new village inherited the name of the mother-settlement: to differentiate the two villages a pair of secondary specifiers was added to the basic names. The distinctive additions here again refer to the position of the villages. Another similar case from the same county: *Léta* (first recorded in 1324) was broken up into two separate villages — this is how *Oláhléta* (mentioned first in 1760–62 as *Oláh Léta*) and *Magyarléta* (mentioned first in 1824 as *Magyar Léta*) came into existence (FNESz. II, 73). Here the distinctive additions have a reference to the nationalities of the people who lived in the villages.

As we have seen so far, the distinctive addition, mostly an attribute, refers to a special distinguishing characteristic of the settlement in which it is (or it was) different from all the other settlements with the same name: e.g. the distinctive addition can have a reference to the position of the village (see above: *Alvadász, Felvadász; Alsódetrehem, Felsődetrehem*); to the name of the river on the bank of which the settlement stands (e.g. *Ipolydamásd, Muracsérnec, Garamvezekény, Rábatótfalu, Laborcvólya*); to the nationality or to the most typical profession of the inhabitants (e.g. *Oláhléta, Magyarléta; Magyarlád, Németlád; Horvátzsídány, Németzsídány; Fazekasgencs, Szeke-restörpény*); to a characteristic building (e.g. *Egyházasbást, Kápolnabölgze, Kőhidgyarmat, Mónosokor*); to a neighbouring settlement (e.g. *Losonctugár, Kassaújfalu, Homonnaolyka*), etc. It is easy to notice that we can group modified place-names according to the different semantic classes to which their specifiers belong: i.e. according to the “meaning” of their distinctive additions; or, with other words, according to the different motivations of their distinctive additions (see above). Apart from the simple semantic analysis of the distinctive additions we can examine the sets of differentiated place-names containing the same basic name, i.e. we can examine the correlations themselves. The aim of my study is to give a detailed synchronic description of the spontaneous correlational systems of three historical periods (the 13–14th centuries; the 15–16th centuries and the 18–19th centuries) on the basis of historical resources.¹

¹ The basis of this study is my PhD-thesis, “A névtani korreláció szerepe a magyar helységnevek alakulásában — kitekintéssel az angol helységnevekre” (The Role of Onomastic Correlation in the Development of Hungarian Place-Names — with a Survey of English Place-Names), in which I give a detailed discussion of the semantic classification of distinctive additions; I analyse the spontaneous correlational systems of these three periods synchronically and by comparing the synchronic descriptions I draw conclusions about the possible diachronic changes of the system; I examine the correlations from a morphological, syntactical, pragmatical and sociolinguistical points of view as well. I also deal with the geographical positions of the settlements having a name with a distinctive addition by producing maps of them for all the three periods. By comparing the average distance of these settlements I draw conclusions about the changes in the scope of human vision.



2. Sources and methodology

My analysis of the correlational system of Hungarian historical place-names is based on data collected from six different sources.

Place-names of the 13th and 14th centuries were collected from the historical geography by GYÖRGY GYÖRFFY (1963–1998; for details see the bibliography). In it GYÖRFFY discusses all the settlements of Hungary in the Arpadian era (895–1301) using data taken from charters and from other written sources (e.g. registers, seals, inscriptions). He also includes the early period of the Anjou era in his work, so he deals with settlements existed from the conquest up to the time of the tithe list of 1332–1337. Unfortunately, his work has not yet been completed, but in the published four volumes we can find information about the settlements of 40 counties of the Arpadian Hungary, from Abaúj county to Pilis county (counties are treated in alphabetical order). As a comparison I also used the series of “Helynévtörténeti adatok a korai ómagyar korból” 1. and 2. (HA), which is concerned with the microtoponyms that can be found in GYÖRFFY’s data base. Apart from the etymology and localization of microtoponyms it also presents a list of settlements county by county, together with a map of settlements for each county from Abaúj to Győr.

Place-names of the 15th and 16th centuries were taken from historical geographies by DEZSŐ CSÁNKI and ANTAL FEKETE NAGY (see CSÁNKI 1890–1913 and FEKETE NAGY 1941). Although this series has remained uncompleted, from the five published volumes we can get a picture about the settlements of 51 counties in the era of the Hunyadies (1437–1490). The authors collected data (not only historical and geographical data, but also data from economic and social history) from archival material to create a medium-sized historical-geographical manual reaching higher standard volume by volume.

Place-names of the 18th and 19th centuries were collected from two registers of place-names. The earlier one, “Lexicon Locorum” (LexLoc.), was compiled for the order of the Hungarian Royal Governing Council between March of 1772 and September of 1773 with the help of the diocesan and local administrative authorities. This register of names of settlements was stored in the archives of the Chancellery for the administrative use of the royal authorities. The register wasn’t published until 1920. The later register was compiled by JÁNOS LIPSZKY, a cartographer, who published at first his map of Hungary in 1806, which served as a basis for his register published two years later, in 1808. LIPSZKY’s Repertorium (LIPSZKY 1808) contains place-names of some districts not included in „Lexicon Locorum”: it contains the place-names of Transylvania, the place-names of the Partium (the collective name of 5 counties: Kraszna, Közép-Szolnok, Bihar, Zaránd,



Máramaros, and 3 districts: Kővár vidéke, Lugos, Karánsebes of East-Hungary after 1541; the territory first belonged to the Principality of Transylvania, later it was reannexed to Hungary) and the place-names of some more territories under military direction.

It is true that my sources are of different types and sometimes they contain different counties. But all in all I could collect the names of settlements of former Hungary from 81 different counties, 50 of which were presented at least in two different historical periods, thus they can be compared diachronically. Out of the 31 counties presented in one period only, 28 counties were registered from the third period, which shows the correlations at their most developed stage. One can examine the oppositions of each period synchronically to give the types of the correlations. This synchronic description and classification of correlations doesn't depend on the fact whether we examine the oppositions of the same counties or not: the properties, the characteristics of the correlations remain the same.

Besides, as a primary source I used the etymological dictionary of place-names by LAJOS KISS (FNESz.) to identify the "meanings", the motivations of the distinctive additions.

I compiled my list of correlations according to the following principles:

While collecting the names I interpreted the term "names of settlements" in the widest sense. I dealt with the names of all inhabited places, so in my list I included the names of farmsteads as well. As the status of a village could easily change during the history, without the names of farmsteads we wouldn't get a clear picture about the oppositions. It is not rare even in the 18–19th centuries that the correlative pair of a name designating a village (a "pagus") is a name of a farmstead (a "praedium"): e.g. *Kispereg* (a village) – *Nagypereg* (a farmstead) in Csongrád county; *Nemesmilitics*, *Rácmilitics* (villages) – *Kismilitics* (a farmstead) in Bács county. Sometimes it is only the name of the farmstead that is differentiated in opposition with the basic name designating a village: e.g. *Izmény* (a village) – *Kisizmény* (a farmstead); *Pély* (a village) – *Pusztapély* (a farmstead) in Tolna county. Rarely both names designate farmsteads: e.g. *Kistabód* – *Nagytabód* in Tolna county. (The examples are taken from LIPSZKY 1808.)

My major concern was to collect Hungarian differentiated names, so I selected modified foreign names (name forms like *Male Novaki* – *Velike Novaki*, *Dolnyi Poloj* – *Gornyi Poloj* – *Szrednyi Poloj*; *Unter-Rauschenbach* – *Ober-Rauschenbach*, *Groß Turbal* – *Klein Turbal*, etc.) designating settlements that were situated in regions inhabited by national minorities of former Hungary as these names obviously didn't have Hungarian equivalents. However, I had to take Latin modified name forms into account. The older



the historical period is, the more likely it is that names of settlements were primarily recorded in Latin. These Latin forms, however, are supposed to have Hungarian equivalents as well: actually, these were the Hungarian name forms that were on occasion translated into Latin by the recorders (SZABÓ 1966: 126). For example, in the 13–14th centuries in Fejér county the correlative pair of the village name *Felacsá* was recorded in Latin only: *Atha Inferiori*, still it is quite probable that the latter name existed in its Hungarian form as well on the analogy of other names of settlements differentiated with the correlative attributes *Al – Fel*. Some more examples: *Oláh-árkos – Arkus Saxonialis* (Fehér in Transylvania), *Németbaka – Sclanica Vata* (Hont), *Kisguta – Maiori Gutha* (Nógrád), *Tófüss – Inferiorem Fyus* (Bars), etc. In other cases both place-name forms were recorded in Latin only in the 13–14th centuries: e.g. *Minor Ceeg – Maior Ceeg* (Kolozs), *Enyd Saxonica – Enyd Superiori* (Fehér in Transylvania), *Geurud ecclesiastica – Geurud superiori* (Bars); or the modified form standing in opposition with the basic name had Latin recording only: e. g. *Kerc – Kerc Olacorum* (Fogaras), *Olaszi – Vulosci Campestris* (Heves), *Tördemic – Inferiore Turdemez* (Moson), *Vereb – Vereb ecclesiastica* (Nógrád). It is easy to realise that without the Latin name forms we wouldn't get a clear picture about the correlations. The problem of Latin name forms affects the first two periods: in the 13–14th centuries out of the 669 modified name forms 102 names of settlements (15,25%) were recorded in Latin only, in the 15–16th centuries one could find only 43 Latin names (1,6%) amongst the 2671 differentiated place-names.

To be able to examine the correlations, of course, I had to collect not only the name forms containing distinctive additions, but possible basic name forms of the oppositions also.

To classify the correlations I followed these principles:

In my classification of correlations I paid attention both to the number of the correlative members and to the motivation(s) of the distinctive additions. Most of the oppositions can easily be classified in this way (see later).

There are some correlations, however, where it is problematic to say how many members the oppositions had, as not all modified forms of the same basic name could have an influence on one another. Can we assume that in the 18–19th centuries the correlation *Alsótelekes – Felsőtelekes* in Borsod county was affected by the opposition *Kistelekes – Nagytelekes* in Vas county? Obviously not, as they could be found too far from each other (approximately 350 kms). Namers who distinguished the two *Telekeses* in Borsod might not have had an idea about the fact that there were two more differentiated *Telekeses* in Vas. They just wanted to differentiate the two settlements they knew regardless of other possible *Telekeses* in the country.



Presumably, these two oppositions were formed independently from each other. It means that we should decide on the number of the members of a correlation with respect to the geographical positions of the settlements identified with the differentiated name forms of the same basic name. Although the scope of vision for the namers has changed from time to time in the history, we must assume that only those differentiated forms of the same basic name belonged to the same correlation which name settlements situated close enough to one another. The same is true for the unmodified basic name as well: we can count it as a member of an opposition if the settlement designated by the basic name was quite close (preferably in the same county) to the settlements identified by the differentiated forms of the same basic name. For example, *Lajtapordány – Vulkapordány – Pordány* belonged to the same correlation as all the names were relatively close to one another in Sopron county, whilst *Kürtös* couldn't be a member of the opposition *Kiskürtös – Nagykürtös* as the basic name was in Zala county and the differentiated forms could be found in Nógrád county around 250 kms from the basic name.

Not only the number of the correlative forms can cause problems, but also the motivation of the oppositions can be dubious. There are some special correlations which can not be classified unambiguously regarding the motivation of their distinctive additions since some or all members of the opposition have two or more different distinctive additions in free variation within a single period: e.g. *Kiskéménd – Nagy/Egyházaskéménd* (13–14th c., Baranya), *László/Tótaranyan – Apos/Nagyaranyan* (15–16th c., Bodrog), *Magyar/Maroscsesztve – Oláhcsesztve* (18–19th c., Fehér in Transylvania), *Németmárok – Rác/Püspökmárok – Márok* (18–19th c., Baranya), etc. In these lucky cases one of the alternating distinctive additions has the same motivation as that (of one) of its correlative pair(s), so they can be classified according to the motivation of these modifiers. In the above examples the motivation of the distinctive additions in the oppositions can be identified as it follows: *Kiskéménd – Nagy/Egyházaskéménd* is a correlation referring to the size of the settlements, *László/Tótaranyan – Apos/Nagyaranyan* has a reference to the former owners of the settlements, *Magyar/Maroscsesztve – Oláhcsesztve* and *Németmárok – Rác/Püspökmárok – Márok* refer to the nationalities of their inhabitants. The other possibility here is to have in the name forms alternating modifiers parallel by twos in their motivations: e.g. *Al/Nagyzolca – Fel/Kiszsolca* (modifiers referring to position/size in both names, 13–14th c., Borsod), *Ó/Nagygezény – Új/Kisgezény* (age/size, 15–16th c., Ung), *Alsó/Tótdiós – Felső/Németdiós* (position/nationality, 18–19th c., Pozsony), *Ó/Magyarvencsellő – Új/Németvencsellő* (age/nationality, 18–19th c., Szabolcs), *Alsó/Nagy/Németborsa – Felső/Kis/Tótborsa – Középborsa* (position/size/nationality, 18–19th c., Pozsony). These cases cannot unam-



biguously be classified into a single class regarding their motivations, so they will be discussed in a separate category called combined correlations (see 3.5.2.).

3. Types of correlations

To analyse correlations I worked out a system in which the characteristic properties of the oppositions can easily be described. Correlations can be classified first according to the number of their members, second according to the structure of their members, third according to the semantic correspondence of their distinctive additions, fourth according to the limitation on the number of their modifiers, and finally according to the motivation(s) of their distinctive additions. This approach gives us the following structure:

According to the number of correlative members we can differentiate potential correlations, correlations of two place-name forms, correlations of three place-name forms and correlations of four or more place-name forms. Potential correlations, as the name suggests, are not real oppositions. There are some cases where we can find a name of a settlement with a distinctive addition, but we don't have its correlative pair: thus we can not find either the unmodified basic name or another differentiated name form of the same basic name to stand in opposition with the single modified form (for examples see later). Correlations of two, three and four or more place-names can be divided according to the structure of their name forms, i.e. according to the fact whether the correlation contains the unmodified basic name as well or it has only differentiated place-names as members. Correlations of two place-names not containing the basic name as a member together with all correlations of three and four or more place-name forms can be further divided into regular (the members of the correlation have distinctive additions belonging to the same semantic class) and irregular (the semantic classes of the modifiers are different) oppositions on the basis of the semantic correspondence of the correlative modifiers. Regular oppositions can be classified further as closed, half-closed and open correlations according to the limitation on the number of their modifiers, i.e. on the basis of the fact whether the correlation accepts more elements to fit into or not. Examples for each of these three types of regular oppositions show different motivations of the modifiers, since not only individual differentiated name forms can be described according to the motivations of their distinctive additions, but we can also classify the correlations themselves on the basis of the semantic reference of their modifiers. Untypical correlations form the class of special correlations. All types of oppositions could be found in all the three periods.



3.1. Potential correlations

As I have mentioned before, these oppositions are pseudo-correlations, as the differentiated name form has no opposing pair. Although in the 13–14th centuries in Borsod county there was a settlement called *Alsóarnót*, we can't find either **Felsőarnót* or **Arnót* next to it in the recordings. Similarly, documents show no evidence for the fact that *Okorpástya* (15–16th c., Baranya) or *Kisgelnic* (18–19th c., Gömör) had a correlative pair in the past. In the first two periods probably it is the defective recording that can be blamed for the lack of certain correlative forms: there might have been an opposing pair for these names but they weren't recorded in the charters. Our sources from the third period, however, are systematic registers of place-names, still we have examples for potential correlations from the last period as well, which underlies the existence of the type. These late potential correlations can be analogical forms: they might have been formed on the analogy of differentiated names having correlative pair(s). Here the function of the distinctive addition was not to differentiate settlements, but to make the name fit into the system of differentiated place-names (for the concept see HOFFMANN 1993: 21). Anyhow, the motivations of the distinctive additions of potentially correlative name forms are exactly the same as the motivations of the modifiers in truly correlative forms: e.g. 13–14th c.: *Kisbarmó* (size, Bihar), *Felsőgödös* (position, Csanád), *Egyházasszomolya* (building, Borsod), *Bodgorzsája* (owner, Csanád), *Szentmártonmány* (patron saint, Esztergom); 15–16th c.: *Újbárfalva* (age, Zaránd), *Oláhlekence* (nationality of dwellers, Torda), *Barakörtvélyes* (neighbouring settlement, Temes), *Bakonyherend* (geographical region, Veszprém); 18–19th c.: *Szilbarmód* (plants, Bihar), *Ácsmecser* (profession, Somogy), *Nemesdéd* (social rank of dwellers, Somogy), *Vámosoroszi* (toll-taking, Szatmár), etc.

3.2. Correlations of two place-name forms

Correlations of two members can consist of either one differentiated name form and the unmodified basic name, or two distinguished name forms.

3.2.1. Correlations of two place-name forms containing the basic name as a member could spring into existence either as a result of the multiplication of settlements or to display a unique characteristic of a settlement.

a) In connection with correlations springing from the multiplication of settlements, we have already mentioned that if inhabitants of a settlement migrated from their original village as a result of overpopulation, they could form the name of their new daughter-village from the name of the mother-settlement by adjusting a distinctive addition to it to differentiate the two settlements. In these cases the name of the mother-village either remained unmodified or it got the correlative distinctive addition some time later. For



example, in the 13–14th centuries in Bereg county we could find the opposition *Dobrony – Kisdobrony*, which, for the 15–16th centuries, was known as *Nagydobrony – Kisdobrony*; in the same way: the correlation *Szólát – Felszólát* (13–14th c., Heves) later became *Alsószólát – Felsőszólát* (15–16th c.). The modified forms of these correlations can have a reference to the size of the settlements (e.g. *Teremes – Kisteremes*, 13–14th c., Nyitra; *Haláp – Kis-haláp*, 15–16th c., Nógrád; *Piricse – Kispiricse* 18–19th c., Szabolcs), to the age of the settlements (e.g. *Abod – Újabod*, 13–14th c., Borsod; *Dány – Újdány*, 15–16th c., Pest; *Radna – Újradna*, 18–19th c., Beszterce) or to the position of the settlements (e.g. *Palatka – Felsőpalatka*, 13–14th c., Kolozs; *Kéked – Felsőkéked*, 15–16th c., Abaúj; *Aranyos – Felaranyos*, 18–19th c., Komárom). Though in opposition with the basic name of the mother-settlement we would expect modified forms having distinctive additions referring to the fact that the settlements they identify were established later (see the name forms above), sometimes, in a smaller proportion, there are examples where it is the name of the mother-settlement that is modified appropriately, whilst the daughter-village is designated by the unmodified basic name: e.g. *Alboglár – Boglár* (13–14th c., Fejér), *Óbást – Bást* (15–16th c., Gömör), *Ótopolyán – Topolyán* (18–19th c., Zemplén).

b) The members of correlations displaying a unique characteristic of one of the settlements are not necessarily connected to each other genetically. Here the settlements could be found at a longer distance from each other suggesting that the originally identical names of the settlements could be formed independently from each other. Only the name of one of the settlements was modified with the help of a distinctive addition. As in these cases the modifier referred to a specific identifying characteristic of the settlement, it would have been difficult for the namers to find a semantically opposing distinctive addition in general. The distinctive additions of the modified forms here can have various references: e.g. 13–14th c.: *Boja – Dezsőboja* (owner, Baranya), *Ábrány – Monostorosábrány* (building, Bihar), *Bozsok – Drávabozsok* (river, Baranya), *Arl – Olaszarl* (nationality of dwellers, Borsod), *Bocsárd – Búzásbocsárd* (produce, Fehér in Transylvania); 15–16th c.: *Gyemerő – Ugygyemerő* (neighbouring settlement, Zala), *Gyán – Mezőgyán* (geographical region, Bihar), *Ohába – Vajdaohába* (rank of the owner, Hunyad), *Kéki – Szentmihálykéki* (patron saint, Somogy), *Galád – Révgalád* (ferry, Temes); 18–19th c.: *Krompács – Nemeskrompács* (social rank, Szepes), *Boda – Fazekasboda* (profession, Baranya), *Horváti – Erdőhorváti* (flora, Abaúj), *Dörögd – Pusztadörögd* (desolate place, Zala), etc.

3.2.2. Correlations of two differentiated name forms can be of two types according to the semantic correspondence of their modifiers.



a) We can speak about a regular correlation, if the modifiers of the name forms belong to the same semantic class (e.g. both distinctive additions refer to the nationality of the dwellers: *Magyarraszlavica – Tótraszlavica*, 15–16th c. and 18–19th c., Sáros). On the basis of the fact whether the regular correlations can be extended by new members or not, we can divide the category further into three classes.

To the closed correlations no more name forms with modifiers of the same type can be added. We can not find a case where apart from the correlative pair *Kis – Nagy* the basic name would be completed with a third distinctive addition referring to the size of the settlements. The closed correlations can refer to the size (*Kisakasztó – Nagyakasztó*, 13–14th c., Kolozs; *Kisapar – Nagyapar*, 15–16th c., Tolna; *Kislónya – Nagylónya*, 18–19th c., Bereg), to the age (*Ónyerges – Újnyerges*, 13–14th c., Nógrád; *Ótopolya – Újtopolya*, 15–16th c., Zemplén; *Óbarok – Újbarok*, 18–19th c., Fejér), to the position of the settlements with modifiers *Külső – Belső* (in the two last periods only: *Belsőkemnye – Külsőkemnye*, 15–16th c., Moson; *Belsőcsöde – Külsőcsöde*, 18–19th c., Zala) and to the social rank of the inhabitants (in the last period only: *Nemesdömölk – Pórdömölk*, Vas).

Half-closed correlations can accept some more differentiated name forms, but there is a limitation on the number of the possible new members. We have quite a few examples where apart from the correlative pair *Alsó – Felső*, a third modifier, *Középső-* is attached to the basic name to refer to the positions of the settlements. However, no more other possible distinctive addition can be used here in this way. Half-closed correlations refer to the position of the settlements with the help of correlative modifiers *Alsó – Felső*: e.g. *Alpalást – Felpalást* (13–14th c., Hont), *Alsóbagd – Felsőbagd* (15–16th c., Temes), *Alcsút – Felcsút* (18–19th c., Fejér).

Open correlations, in theory, can be extended with indefinitely many new members having the same type of modifiers. There is a possibility to attach as many modifiers referring to the nationality of the dwellers to a basic name as namers wish: *Magyarmecske – Rácmecske*, and theoretically the basic name could have been identified with the help of many more modifiers referring to the nationality of the inhabitants. Open correlations can refer to the nationalities of the dwellers (*Németzsúk – Tótzsúk*, 13–14th c., Nyitra; *Magyarfráta – Oláhfráta*, 15–16th c., Kolozs; *Németzsidány – Horvátzsidány*, 18–19th c., Sopron), to nearby rivers (in the last two periods: *Fokszabadi – Sárszabadi*, 15–16th c., Veszprém – Fejér; *Szamoskórod – Tizsakórod*, 18–19th c., Szatmár), to the former owners of the settlements (*Tagadópatya – Timóteuspatya*, 13–14th c., Pest; *Mátyáshorváta – Zsádányhorváta*, 15–16th c., Kraszna; *Lénárdaróc – Tibolddaróc*, 18–19th c., Borsod), to neighbouring settlements (in the last two periods: *Göncruszka – Regeteruszka*, 15–16th c.,



Abaúj; *Peleszardvad – Tasnádszardvad*, 18–19th c., Közép-Szolnok), to the rank of the owners or to the possessor institutes (in the first and the third periods: *Budaiújhely – Pestújhely*, 13–14th c., Pilis; *Apácakörmösd – Papkörmösd*, 18–19th c., Pozsony), to administrative units (in the last two periods: *Baranyaviszló – Somogyviszló*, 15–16th c., Baranya – Somogy; *Kézdimártonos – Sepsimártonos*, 18–19th c., Háromszék), to the flora of the settlements (in the last two periods: *Erdőcsoknya – Mezőcsoknya*, 15–16th c., Somogy; *Erdőszakál – Mezőszakál*, 18–19th c., Torda), to a characteristic building of the settlements (in the last two periods: *Egyházashollós – Hidashollós*, 15–16th c., Vas; *Egyházaskesző – Várkesző*, 18–19th c., Vas), to the social rank of the inhabitants (in the first period only: *Úrnépenéma – Várnépenéma*, Komárom), to the patron saints of the settlements (in the second period only: *Boldogasszony/Kisdergicse – Szentpéterdergicse*, Zala), to geographical regions where the settlements were situated (in the third period only: *Karancsberény – Jászberény*, Nógrád), to any other characteristics of the settlements (*Kerekgede – Sokgede*, 13–14th c., Gömör; *Vásárospacsinta – Ligetpacsinta*, 15–16th c., Valkó; *Borosbocsárd – Búzásbocsárd*, 18–19th c., Alsó-Fejér).

b) Irregular correlations consist of name forms with modifiers belonging to different semantic classes (e.g. one of the distinctive additions refers to the nationality of the dwellers, the other has a reference to a river: *Ráckevei – Túrkevi*, 18–19th c., Pest). Some of the various combinations: 13–14th c.: *Felmislye – Egyházasmislye* (position – building, Abaúj), *Bothudas – Királylugas* (name of the owner – rank of the owner: Fehér in Transylvania – Szászföld), *Tótvadna – Felsővadna* (nationality of dwellers – position, Borsod); 15–16th c.: *Nyárádtóbuja – Bényebuja* (river – neighbouring settlement, Kükküllő), *Mezőcsán – Turcsán* (geographical region – neighbouring settlement, Torda), *Kisnána – Tiszanána* (size – river, Heves); 18–19th c.: *Drávapalkonya – Németpalkonya* (river – nationality of dwellers, Baranya), *Nagyvázsony – Tótvázsony* (size – nationality of dwellers, Veszprém), *Fazekaszaluzsány – Rimaszaluzsány* (profession of dwellers – river, Gömör), etc.

Although the number of the possible variations here is quite large (almost all examples represent a different type), still the most typical combination of the type is the one that has a reference to the position and the size of the settlements: 15–16th c.: *Felsőapadia – Kisapadia* (Temes), *Fellesztemér – Kissesztemér* (Zemplén), etc.

3.3. Correlations of three place-name forms

Correlations of three members can consist of either two differentiated name forms and the basic name, or three modified forms.

3.3.1. Correlations of three place-name forms including the basic name as a member can be classified parallel with oppositions of two modified name



forms, but here, apart from the two differentiated place-names, the correlation always includes the unmodified basic name as well. Furthermore, it is important to remember that the three place-names here designate three different settlements. The cases where the three place-names (two modified names and the basic name) refer to two settlements as the mother-village had primarily been marked by the basic name, which became modified only later (e.g. *Kiskarád – Karád ~ Nagykarád*, 15–16th c., Somogy) are essentially different: basically, we can list them among correlations of two place-names. Correlations of three members including the basic name can also be regular and irregular depending on the presence versus absence of semantic correspondence of their distinctive additions.

a) Regular types of these correlations consist of differentiated place-name forms with modifiers belonging to the same semantic class. These regular oppositions, as we have seen above, can be further divided into closed, half-closed and open correlations on the basis of the fact whether the oppositions can accept one or more new modified place-name forms as members or not.

Closed correlations can refer to the size (*Kisalmás – Nagyalmás – Almás*, 13–14th c., Nógrád; *Kislipóc – Nagylipóc – Lipóc*, 15–16th c., Valkó; *Kisromhány – Nagyromhány – Romhány*, 18–19th c., Nógrád), to the age (*Ópetróc – Újpetróc – Pétróc*, 15–16th c., Zemplén; *Óarad – Újarad – Arad*, 18–19th c., Arad – Temes) or to the position (with distinctive additions *Bel(ső) – Kül(ső)*: *Külszond – Belszond – Szond*, 13–14th c., Bács; *Külsőhegyes – Belsőhegyes – Hegyes*, 15–16th c., Heves; *Külsőbánd – Belsőbánd – Bánd*, 18–19th c., Veszprém) of the settlements.

Half-closed correlations refer to the position of the settlements with the help of distinctive additions *Al(só) – Fel(ső)*: e.g. *Alsóbagota – Felsőbagota – Bagota* (15–16th c., Zala), *Alsódáka – Felsődáka – Dáka* (18–19th c., Veszprém).

Open correlations can refer to the nationalities of the dwellers (*Németbaka – Tótbaka – Baka*, 13–14th c., Hont; *Magyarszakál – Szászsakál – Szakál*, 15–16th c., Torda; *Németmárok – Rác/Püspökmárok – Márok*, 18–19th c., Baranya), to nearby rivers (*Pákaszentgyörgy – Zalaiszentgyörgy – Szentgyörgy*, 15–16th c., Zala; *Lajtapordány – Vulkapordány – Pordány*, 18–19th c., Sopron), to neighbouring settlements (*Rolovaihámor – Tiszolcihámor – Hámor*, 18–19th c., Szepes – Gömör), to the former owners (*Fülesharasztya – Pótharasztya – Haraszt*, 13–14th c., Pest; *Bátatótfalu – Doroszlótótfalu – Tótfalu*, 15–16th c., Bács), to any other characteristics of the settlements (*Borosjenő – Rév/Ungjenő – Jenő*, 13–14th c., Pilis – Pest).



b) The modified place-name forms of the irregular subcategory of these correlations have distinctive additions belonging to different semantic classes.

Some of the possible combinations: e.g.: 13–14th c.: *Tancskereki – Egyházaskereki – Kereki* (owner – building, Bihar), *Küskeszkerki – Szentivánszerke – Szerk* (owner – patron saint, Fejér); 15–16th c.: *Kiscsereg – Tótsereg – Csereg* (size – nationality of dwellers, Bács), *Dánielcenke – Vámoscenk – Cenk* (owner – toll-taking, Sopron); 18–19th c.: *Egyházasködöge – Homoködöge – Ködöge* (building – soil, Veszprém), *Alsószuha – Ratkószuha – Suzuha* (position – neighbouring settlement, Gömör), *Badacsonytomaj – Lesencetomaj – Tomaj* (hill – river, Zala).

3.3.2. Correlations of three modified place-name forms can also be regular and irregular.

a) Regular oppositions of three modified place name forms can be either closed correlations or open correlations. There are not any half-closed correlations of three modified place-name forms as when an opposition referring to the position of the settlements with the help of distinctive additions *Alsó – Felső* is completed by a new member having the only possible modifier of the same reference (*Középső*), the correlation has become closed, it can not be further extended by new members with positional distinctive additions.

Closed correlations of three modified place-name forms refer to the position of the settlements with the help of distinctive additions *Al(só) – Fel(ső) – Közép(ső)*: e.g. *Albárca – Felbárca – Középbárca* (13–14th c., Abauj), *Alsóbapsa – Felsőbapsa – Középsőbapsa* (15–16th c., Temes), *Alsószlécs – Felsőszlécs – Középszlécs* (18–19th c., Liptó).

Open correlations of three modified place-name forms can have a reference to the nationalities of the dwellers (*Magyarpécsvár – Németpécsvár – Rácpécsvár*, 18–19th c., Baranya), to neighbouring settlements (*Surigréb – Toronyigréb – Zoncigréb*, 18–19th c., Pozsony), to the former owners (*Beneete – Hegyete – Töbörete*, 18–19th c., Pozsony), to nearby waters (*Balatonújlak – Kaposújlak – Rinyaujlak*, 18–19th c., Somogy). — This latter type of correlations can only be exemplified from the last period.

b) Irregular correlations of three modified place-name forms can be of two types. To the first subclass one can count the oppositions in which the distinctive additions of two place-name forms belong to the same semantic class and the third modifier has a different motivation. The second subclass consists of oppositions in which all the three distinctive additions of the modified forms belong to different semantic classes.

In oppositions where two of the modifiers belong to the same semantic class, the place-name forms with distinctive additions of the same motivation constitute a “stronger” opposition, to which the third modified form



with a distinctive addition of a different motivation is attached “loosely”. Some of the possible combinations of the type: 13–14th c.: *Alsópeszek – Felsőpeszek – Kispeszek* (position – position – size, Hont), *Alyíres – Felnyíres – Boncnyírese* (position – position – owner, Doboka), *Altárkány – Feltárkány – Egyházastárkány* (position – position – building, Heves); 15–16th c.: *Kisbudak – Nagybudak – Oláhbudak* (size – size – nationality, Kolozs), *Kisपालád – Nagypालád – Botपालád* (size – size – owner, Szatmár); 18–19th c.: *Kisterenye – Nagyterenye – Homokterenye* (size – size – soil, Nógrád), *Kiskotyessó – Nagykotyessó – Nemeskotyessó* (size – size – social rank of dwellers, Trencsén), etc.

Some of the various examples for oppositions where all the three modifiers belong to different semantic classes: 13–14th c.: *Bácsamindszent – Okrimindszent – Kápolnásamindszent* (owner – river – building, Baranya); 15–16th c.: *Balázspéc – Felpéc – Kispéc* (owner – position – size, Győr); 18–19th c.: *Aranyoslónya – Kendilónya – Szászlónya* (river – owner – nationality of dwellers, Doboka – Kolozs), *Kismilitics – Nemesmilitics – Rácmilitics* (size – social rank of dwellers – nationality of dwellers, Bács), etc.

3.4. Correlations of four or more place-name forms

These oppositions can not be divided into such distinct subcategories as those described in connection with correlations of fewer elements, so we can treat oppositions having four or more members together as a single unit. We have to underline here once more that the four or more settlements designated by the modified forms of the same basic name had to be close to one another to form a real opposition. Although there were more settlements called *Olaszi* in the 13–14th centuries in Hungary, still we can not identify them as members of a single correlation, because they were too far from one another: one could find *Kisolaszi* and *Nagyolaszi* in Liptó county, *Mezőolaszi* and *Olaszi* were in Heves county, *Engolaszi* and *Olaszi* were situated in Bihar county. Obviously, the six names here form three separate correlations of two place-names. Therefore, when identifying correlations of four or more place-names we should take care of the geographical positions of the settlements designated by the names as well.

In the 13–14th centuries these correlations consisted of a maximum of 5 place-names, in one half of the cases the unmodified basic name was also a member of the opposition. Here there are correlations in which the distinctive additions of the modified forms belong to the same semantic class (*Ákosnyíre – Ányásnyíre – Királynnyíre – Nyíre*, owners, Pest), but all the modifiers of the opposition can belong to different semantic classes (*Krassópeterd – Nemespeterd – Szekcsópeterd – Peterd*, a nearby river – social rank of the inhabitants – a neighbouring village, Baranya). It is also a common feature of these oppositions that name forms with modifiers of the same mo-



tivation are more connected to each other within the correlations: we might feel the opposition “stronger” between the name forms *Alsómacskás* and *Felsőmacskás* (with distinctive additions referring to the position of the settlements), or between the name forms *Józsefmacskása* and *Genye/Diósmacskás* (with modifiers referring to the former owners of the settlements) than between the two pairs, although the four settlements were close to one another in Doboka county, so the names surely belonged to the same correlation.

In the 15–16th centuries most of these correlations included four name forms, but there were some oppositions of 6–7 place-names as well. As a result of the extension of scope of vision for this period, we might count the oppositions of the same basic name to a single correlation provided the oppositions were situated in neighbouring counties: e.g. the distance of the neighbouring villages *Alkér* and *Felkér* (Tolna county) from *Gunyakér* and *Pusztakér*, two nearby settlements in Somogy county, was around 10 kms, so probably we will not make a mistake when we treat the four names as members of the same correlation. It is also very likely that the modified forms of the same basic name in neighbouring counties formed a single correlation if the majority of the settlements designated by the names could be found in the same county and only one of the settlements was situated in the neighbouring county: e.g. *Batiztilaj*, *Csáktilaj*, *Herbár/Hermántilaj*, *Illéstilaj* and *Lampert/Nagytilaj* were in Vas county, while *Kistilaj* was situated in Zala county (not far from *Lampert/Nagytilaj*). In some cases the distinctive additions of these modified names have the same motivation: e.g. in the names *Boda/Felsőgencse* – *Boncsó/Egyházasgencse* – *Gyulagencse* – *Kozma/Nemesjánosgencse* (Vas) (one of) the modifiers refer to the former owners of the settlements. More frequently, one of the modifiers is an exception: in the opposition of the names *Boldogasszonykátája* – *Szentmártonkátája* – *Szentlőrinc kátája* – *Szenttamáskátája* – *Káta* – *Csekekátája* (Pest) the last distinctive addition refers to the former owner of the place, whilst the rest of the modifiers have a reference to the patron saints of the settlements. An example for correlations with modifiers of different semantic classes: *Kisporubka* – *Németporubka* – *Ördögporubka* – *Porubka* (size – nationality of dwellers – owner, Ung).

In the 18–19th centuries four or more distinctive additions were attached to the most frequent basic names (e.g. *Apáti*, *Berény*, *Keresztúr*, *Mindszent*, *Németi*, *Újfalú*, etc.). We can observe the fact that these frequent basic names were present quite often in different, but one by one neighbouring counties, so in many cases we have to count all the modified forms of the same basic name to a single correlation. Quite a few distinctive additions, often of different semantic types are attached to these common basic names, thus most of these correlations are irregular. The only exceptions are the



modified forms of the basic name *Váralja*, where the distinctive additions always refer to the neighbouring castle, or settlement (as it follows from the meaning of the basic name: 'below the castle [of]'). It is also true that the modified forms of the same basic name can be divided formally into smaller groups of strongly opposing place-names on the basis of the motivational correspondence of their distinctive additions. For example, the distinctive additions of *Göncruszka* and *Regeteruszka* (Abaúj) refer to neighbouring settlements, whilst the modifiers of *Kisruszka* and *Nagyruszka* (Zemplén) have a reference to the size of the settlements. There are, however, more complicated subsystems: e.g. with the basic name *Szentgyörgy*: position: *Alsószentgyörgy* and *Felsőszentgyörgy* (Jászság); nearby rivers, lakes: *Balaton-szentgyörgy* (Somogy), *Dunaszentgyörgy* (Tolna), *Marosszentgyörgy* (Maros), *Sztrigyszentgyörgy* (Hunyad), *Tápiószentgyörgy* (Pest), *Zalaszentgyörgy* (Zala); geographical regions: *Búrszentgyörgy* (Pozsony), *Csikszentgyörgy* (Csík), *Mezőszentgyörgy* (Veszprém), *Mezőszentgyörgy* (Kolozs); former owners: *Bánokszentgyörgy* (Zala), *Csapószentgyörgy* (Torda), *Orbányszentgyörgy* (Pest), *Tatárszentgyörgy* (Pest), *Tüskésszentgyörgy* (Zala); neighbouring settlements *Vértszentgyörgy* (Fejér), *Torockószentgyörgy* (Hunyad); administrative unit: *Sepsiszentgyörgy* (Háromszék); flora: *Erdőszentgyörgy* (Maros); soil: *Homokszentgyörgy* (Somogy). One can observe here that the members of certain groups (e.g. with modifiers referring to the size, to the position, to the owners of the settlements or to the social rank of the inhabitants) were situated close to each other, whilst members of other groups (with modifiers referring to nearby rivers, to geographical regions, to neighbouring settlements or to the nationalities of dwellers) could be found at a longer distance from each other according to the location of the geographical objects their modifiers referred to. Most, but not all of the same basic names have become modified for the last period, thus in many cases the unmodified basic names were also members of the correlations (e.g. one could find 27 settlements called *Szentgyörgy* in 24 different counties of Hungary in the 18–19th centuries).

3.5. Special correlations

One can observe different types of correlations displaying special features:

3.5.1. In some of the differentiated name forms there are two consecutive distinctive additions of different semantic classes. If a settlement having a name with a distinctive addition was doubled, the daughter-villages could be distinguished with the help of correlative modifiers of a different type. For example, in Hont county *Tótbaka* (having a differentiated name whose modifier referred to the nationality of the dwellers in opposition with *Németbaka* in the 13–14th c.) was separated into two villages for the 18–19th centuries: *Alsótótbaka* and *Felsőtótbaka* — the new settlements were identified



with the help of modifiers referring to the position of the villages regardless of the fact that the original place-name contained a distinctive addition of a different type. With respect to the second differentiation the name *Tótbaka* behaved as if it had been an unmodified basic name, as its distinctive addition had no differentiating function in this later correlation. For the same period *Németbaka* has disappeared. These correlations in each period should obviously be classified according to the motivation of the relevant distinctive additions: so in the 13–14th centuries the opposition *Tótbaka* – *Németbaka* referred to the nationalities of the inhabitants, whilst the correlation *Alsótótbaka* – *Felsőtótbaka* in the 18–19th centuries had a reference to the position of the settlements. Formally speaking, these correlations can be of two types: the later distinctive addition can stand either at the beginning (e.g. 15–16th c.: *Alsókaksómindszent* – *Felsőkaksómindszent*, Abaúj; 18–19th c.: *Ófazekasvarsánd* – *Újfazekasvarsánd*, Arad) or in the middle of the place-names (15–16th c.: *Oláhnagybikó* – *Oláhkisbikó*, the third element of the correlation is *Magyar/Szakállasbikó*, Szatmár; 18–19th c.: *Garamalsóveszele* – *Garamfelsőveszele*, Bars). Names of settlements with two consecutive distinctive additions appeared in the last two periods only.

3.5.2. Place-names with alternating distinctive additions (e.g. *Nagy/Egyházaskéménd*) can be found in all the three periods: the two (rarely more) forms here are synonyms as the different name forms (*Nagykéménd/Egyházaskéménd*) designate the same settlement. We have already mentioned the cases where the motivation of one of the alternating modifiers agrees with the motivation of the distinctive addition of its opposing pair (with one alternating modifier: *Kiskéménd* – *Nagy/Egyházaskéménd*, 13–14th c., Baranya; with alternating modifiers in all differentiated name forms: *László/Tótaryan* – *Apos/Nagyaryan*, 15–16th c., Bodrog, see 2). These oppositions can be classified according to the agreeing motivation of the modifiers. More challenging are the cases where the motivations of the alternating distinctive additions in the correlative name forms are parallel. The settlements of these correlations had more characteristics suitable for differentiating them. With these combined correlations it hasn't been established yet which identifying feature of the settlements would occur finally in the names. Examples for combined correlations: 13–14th c.: *Magyar/Kistálya* – *Olasz/Nagytálya* (nationality/size, Heves), *Al/Nagyzsolca* – *Fel/Kiszsolca* (position/size, Borsod); 15–16th c.: *Ó/Nagygezseny* – *Új/Kisgezseny* (age/size, Ung), *Alsó/Kisaklos* – *Felső/Nagyaklos* (position/size, Torda); 18–19th c.: *Ó/Magyarvencsellő* – *Új/Németvencsellő* (age/nationality, Szabolcs), *Alsó/Nagy/Németborsa* – *Felső/Kis/Tótborsa* (position/size/nationality, Pozsony). These combined correlations consist of typically two, rarely three members. The motivation of the alternating modifiers in these correlations most often reflects a combination of size and position in all the three periods.



In the first two periods we can find examples for combined correlations where apart from the two differentiated place-names with alternating distinctive additions there is the unmodified basic name (e.g. 15–16th c.: *Alsó/Kisalmás – Felső/Nagyalmás – Almás*, position/size, Zaránd; *Magyar/Alsósuk – Oláh/Felsőszuk – Suk*, nationality/position, Kolozs) or the third element of the correlation is another differentiated name form with a modifier of a different type (e.g. 13–14th c.: *Kis/Szentivánkeszi – Nagy/Boldogasszonykeszi – Búl/Mátyuka/Sávolkeszi*, size/patron saints – owner, Bács; 15–16th c.: *Magyar/Alsókegye – Oláh/Felsőkegye – Váraljakegye*, nationality/position – nearby settlement, Szatmár; *Alsó/Nagylibercse – Felső/Kislibercse – Egyházalibercse*, position/size – building, Nógrád).

In a special type of combined correlations the alternating motivations of the oppositions are not expressed in all place-name forms: the two possible motivations of the correlation are combined in a single place-name form having alternating distinctive additions: 15–16th c.: *Felsőneporác – Alsó/Nagyneporác – Kis/Pusztaneporác* (position/size, Trencsén); 18–19th c.: *Kisatád – Nagy/Horvátatád – Magyaratád* (size/nationality, Somogy), *Szászbuda – Oláh/Óbuda – Újbuda* (nationality/age, Kolozs). These combined correlations always consist of three name forms. The different possible motivations of the correlation can also be combined in a place-name with two consecutive modifiers: e.g. 15–16th c.: *Magyarcsaholy – Felsőoláh/Felsőcsaholy – Oláh/Középsőcsaholy* (position/nationality, Közép-Szolnok), *Magyar/Szakállasbikó – Oláhkis/Oláhbikó – Oláhnagy/Nagybikó* (nationality/size, Szatmár). In these cases the opposition originally had two place-names, but after the doubling of one of the settlements the new villages were also differentiated with the help of distinctive additions. Combined correlations are classified in a separate class.

3.5.3. In the last two periods there were some oppositions of mostly three place-names where the distinctive additions of two modified forms were exactly the same. The names designated three settlements in the same county: e.g. 15–16th c.: *Al(só)jára – Fel(ső)jára – Felsőjára* (Torda), *Kisszőlős – Kisszőlős – Vindornyaszőlős* (Zala); 18–19th c.: *Kisábránka – Nagyábránka – Nagyábránka* (Bereg), *Alsókerepec – Alsókerepec – Felsőkerepec* (Bereg); or three settlements of different counties: e.g.: 18–19th c.: *Alsópenc – Alsópenc – Felsőpenc* (Nógrád – Pest), *Kis/Pósacsécs – Nagycsécs – Nagycsécs* (Zemplén – Abauj – Borsod). We may refer to these oppositions as twin correlations. Probably one can meet the “multiplication” of the opposition here: one modified place-name takes part in two oppositions where the correlative name forms, though they designate different settlements, are the same. For example: *Felsőkerepec* (18–19th c., Bereg) was the element of two separate correlations: it stood in opposition with both *Alsókerepeces*, though the two identical place-names designated two different settlements. In the 15–16th



centuries, less frequently, we can find twin correlations of two and four or more place-names as well: *Kiskara – Kiskara* (Somogy), *Kislapispatak – Kislapispatak* (Abaúj), *Kispeterd – Kispeterd – Nagypeterd – Kápolnás-peterd – Pazduspeterd – Peterd* (Baranya). Our examples suggest that in most of the cases distinctive additions referring to the size and to the position of the settlements are the ones that take part in this multiplication of op-positions.

3.6. Statistics

We can give the numeral description of the correlations as well:

Type of correlation	13–14 th centuries	15–16 th centuries	18–19 th centuries
1. potential correlations	195	461	434
2. correlations of two place-names	257	892	1096
2.1. with a basic name	149	342	114
a) multiplication of settlements	73	217	54
b) characteristics of settlements	76	125	60
2.2. without a basic name	108	550	982
a) regular	79	458	817
– closed	29	217	393
– half-closed	36	187	299
– open	14	54	125
b) irregular	29	92	165
3. correlations of three place-names	29	150	206
3.1. with a basic name	19	67	41
a) regular	11	36	25
– closed	3	16	11
– half-closed	5	16	10
– open	3	4	4
b) irregular	8	31	16
3.2. without a basic name	10	83	165
a) regular	2	24	29
– closed	2	24	23
– open	0	0	6

b) irregular	8	59	136
– two modifiers of the same mot.	6	42	104
– three different motivations	2	17	32
4. correlations of four or more place-names	10	53	151
5. special correlations	4	39	27
5.1. combined correlations	4	28	11
5.2. twin correlations	0	11	16
Total:	495	1595	1914

4. Conclusion

On the basis of historical resources we could investigate why and how correlations had been born, what types of them had been developed in Hungary. As we have seen above correlations of the three historical periods display many similar characteristics regarding both their types and their frequency. Actually, the different types of oppositions form a strict and coherent system alongside which correlations can be described. However, correlations can not only be described according to their types. Several further aspects might help us to get a whole picture about the characteristics of the oppositions: correlative place-name forms can also be examined according to their morphology, according to their syntax, according to their diachronic changes, according to their pragmatics, according to their register, according to the distance of the settlements they designate. Furthermore, the characteristics of Hungarian correlations could be compared with the features of oppositions in other languages. Correlations can easily be turned out to be onomastic universals. Correlations, whether spontaneous or official, whether Hungarian or foreign, display many interesting characteristics, which can be fully described on the basis of further and larger scale investigations.

*

Hungarian (and Latin) distinctive additions appeared in the article:

Hungarian distinctive additions	English equivalents/meaning/reference
<i>Ács-</i>	'carpenter'
<i>Ákos-</i>	personal name
<i>Al-, Alsó-</i>	'low(er), nether'
<i>Ányás-</i>	personal name
<i>Apáca-</i>	'nun'



<i>Apos-</i>	personal name
<i>Aranyos-</i>	name of a river
<i>Bácsa-</i>	personal name
<i>Badacsony-</i>	name of a mountain
<i>Bakony-</i>	name of a geographical region in Hungary
<i>Balaton-</i>	name of the greatest lake in Hungary
<i>Balázs-</i>	personal name
<i>Bánok-</i>	personal name
<i>Bara-</i>	name of a settlement
<i>Baranya-</i>	name of a county in Hungary
<i>Báta-</i>	personal name
<i>Batiz-</i>	personal name
<i>Bel-, Belső-</i>	'intrinseca, inside, inner'
<i>Bene-</i>	personal name
<i>Bénye-</i>	name of a settlement
<i>Bod-</i>	personal name
<i>Boda-</i>	personal name
<i>Boldogasszony-</i>	'the Blessed Virgin Mary'
<i>Bonc-</i>	personal name
<i>Boncsó-</i>	personal name
<i>Boros-</i>	'producing wine of good quality'
<i>Bot-</i>	personal name
<i>Buda-</i>	(here) former name of the capital of Hungary
<i>Búl-</i>	personal name
<i>Búr-</i>	name of a geographical region
<i>Búzás-</i>	'producing wheat of good quality'
<i>Csák-</i>	personal name
<i>Csapó-</i>	personal name
<i>Cseke-</i>	personal name
<i>Csík-</i>	name of a geographical region
<i>Dániel-</i>	personal name
<i>Dezső-</i>	personal name
<i>Diós-</i>	'place where there are walnut-trees'
<i>Doroszló-</i>	personal name
<i>Duna-</i>	'Danube'
<i>Dráva-</i>	name of a river
<i>Egyház(as)-</i>	'church, kirk'
<i>Eng-</i>	name of a settlement
<i>Erdő-</i>	'forest'
<i>Fazekas-</i>	'potter('s)'
<i>Fel-, Felső-</i>	'high(er), over'
<i>Fok-</i>	name of a river

<i>Füles-</i>	personal name
<i>Garam-</i>	name of a river
<i>Genye-</i>	personal name
<i>Gönc-</i>	name of a settlement
<i>Gyula-</i>	personal name
<i>Herbár-</i>	personal name
<i>Hermán-</i>	personal name
<i>Hidas-</i>	'place where there is a bridge'
<i>Homok-</i>	'sand'
<i>Homonna-</i>	name of a river
<i>Horvát-</i>	'Croat(ian)'
<i>Illés-</i>	personal name
<i>Ipoly-</i>	name of a river
<i>Jász-</i>	name of a geographical region in Hungary
<i>József-</i>	personal name
<i>Kápolna-, Kápolnás-</i>	'chapel'
<i>Kapos-</i>	name of a river
<i>Karancs-</i>	name of a mountain
<i>Kassa-</i>	name of a settlement
<i>Kendi-</i>	personal name
<i>Kerek-</i>	'round'
<i>Kézdi-</i>	name of a former administrative unit in Transylvania
<i>Király-</i>	'king('s), royal, regis'
<i>Kis-</i>	'little'
<i>Kozma-</i>	personal name
<i>Közép-, Középső-</i>	'middle'
<i>Kőhid-</i>	'stone-bridge'
<i>Krassó-</i>	name of a river
<i>Kül-, Külső-</i>	'extrinseca; outside, outer, exterior'
<i>Küske-</i>	personal name
<i>Lajta-</i>	name of a river
<i>Lampert-</i>	personal name
<i>László-</i>	personal name
<i>Lénárd-</i>	personal name
<i>Lesence-</i>	name of a river
<i>Liget-</i>	'park, grove'
<i>Losonc-</i>	name of a settlement
<i>Magyar-</i>	'Hungarian'
<i>Maros-</i>	name of a river
<i>Mátyás-</i>	personal name
<i>Mátyuka-</i>	personal name
<i>Monostoros-</i>	'abbas; abbey'



<i>Mező-</i>	'field, meadow' or name of more geographical regions in Hungary
<i>Mónos-</i>	'mill'
<i>Mura-</i>	name of a river
<i>Nagy-</i>	'great, much, mickle'
<i>Nemes-</i>	'noble'
<i>Nemesjános-</i>	personal name
<i>Német-</i>	'German'
<i>Nyárádtő-</i>	'the estuary of a river called Nyárad'
<i>Ó-</i>	'old'
<i>Okor-, Okri-</i>	name of a river, 'next to the river called Okor'
<i>Oláh-</i>	'Wallachian, Vlach; Romanian'
<i>Olasz-</i>	'Italian'
<i>Orbány-</i>	personal name
<i>Ördög-</i>	(here) personal name
<i>Páka-</i>	name of a river
<i>Pap-</i>	'priest'
<i>Pele-</i>	name of a settlement
<i>Pest-</i>	former name of a settlement
<i>Pór-</i>	'peasant'
<i>Pósa-</i>	personal name
<i>Pót-</i>	personal name
<i>Pusztá-</i>	'lowland plain', 'wasteland'
<i>Püspök-</i>	'bishop(s)'
<i>Rába-</i>	name of a river
<i>Rác-</i>	'Serb(ian)'
<i>Ratkó-</i>	name of a settlement
<i>Regete-</i>	name of a settlement
<i>Rév-</i>	'ferry'
<i>Rima-</i>	name of a river
<i>Rinya-</i>	name of a river
<i>Rolovai-</i>	'next to a settlement called Rolova'
<i>Sár-</i>	name of a river
<i>Sávol-</i>	personal name
<i>Sepsi-</i>	name of a former administrative unit in Transylvania
<i>Sok-</i>	'village [in place-names]'
<i>Somogy-</i>	name of a county in Hungary
<i>Suri-</i>	'next to a settlement called Sur'
<i>Szamos-</i>	name of a river
<i>Szász-</i>	'Saxon of Transylvania'
<i>Szekcső-</i>	name of a settlement
<i>Szekerés-</i>	'carter's'

<i>Szentiván-</i>	'St. John'
<i>Szentlőrinc-</i>	'St. Lawrence'
<i>Szentmárton-</i>	'St. Martin'
<i>Szentmihály-</i>	'St. Michael'
<i>Szentpéter-</i>	'St. Peter'
<i>Szenttamás-</i>	'St. Thomas'
<i>Szil-</i>	'elm'
<i>Sztrigy-</i>	name of a river
<i>Tagadó-</i>	personal name
<i>Tancs-</i>	personal name
<i>Tápió-</i>	name of a river
<i>Tasnád-</i>	name of a settlement
<i>Tatár-</i>	(here) personal name
<i>Tibold-</i>	personal name
<i>Timóteus-</i>	personal name
<i>Tisza-</i>	name of a river
<i>Tiszolci-</i>	'next to a settlement called Tiszolc'
<i>Tó-</i>	'lake'
<i>Torockó-</i>	name of a settlement
<i>Toronyi-</i>	'next to a settlement called Torony'
<i>Tót-</i>	old form of the name of a Slavonian nationality
<i>Töbör-</i>	personal name
<i>Tur-</i>	name of a settlement
<i>Túr-</i>	name of a river
<i>Tüskés-</i>	(here) Hungarian name of a settlement
<i>Ug-</i>	name of a settlement
<i>Új-</i>	'new'
<i>Úrnépe-</i>	'people of a Lord'
<i>Vajda-</i>	'voivode'
<i>Vámos-</i>	'a place to pay duty'
<i>Vár-</i>	'castle'
<i>Váralja-</i>	name of a settlement
<i>Várnépe-</i>	'people belonging to a castle'
<i>Vásáros-</i>	'market'
<i>Vért-</i>	name of a settlement
<i>Vindornya-</i>	name of a river
<i>Vulka-</i>	name of a river
<i>Zala-, Zalai-</i>	name of a river, 'next to the river called Zala'
<i>Zonci-</i>	'next to a settlement called Zonc'
<i>Zsadány-</i>	personal name

Latin	English
distinctive additions	equivalents/meaning/reference
<i>Campestris</i>	'field, meadow'
<i>Ecclesiastica</i>	'church, kirk'
<i>Inferiori, Inferiore(m)</i>	'low(er), nether'
<i>Maior, Maiori</i>	'great, much, mickle'
<i>Minor</i>	'little'
<i>Olacorum</i>	'Wallachian, Vlach; Romanian'
<i>Saxonica, Saxonicalis</i>	'Saxon of Transylvania'
<i>Sclavica</i>	old form of the name of a Slavonian nationality
<i>Superiori</i>	'high(er), over'

Preferences

- BÖLCSKEI, ANDREA (2002) *A névtani korreláció szerepe a magyar helységnevek alakulásában (kitekintéssel az angol helységnevekre)*. PhD-thesis.
- CAMERON, KENNETH (1969) *English Place-Names*. London.
- CLARK, CECILY (1992) *Onomastics*. In: *The Cambridge History of the English Language 1–2*. Ed. HOGG, RICHARD M. Cambridge.
- CRYSTAL, DAVID (ed.) (1997) *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of Language*. University College of North Wales, Bougor.
- CSÁNKI, DEZSŐ (1890–1913) *Magyarország történelmi földrajza a Hunyadiak korában I–III., V.* Budapest.
- EKWALL, EILERT (1960) *The Concise Oxford Dictionary of English Place-Names*. 4th edition. Oxford.
- FEKETE NAGY, ANTAL (1941) *Magyarország történelmi földrajza a Hunyadiak korában IV.* Budapest.
- FNESZ. = KISS, LAJOS (1988) *Földrajzi nevek etimológiai szótára 1–2*. Budapest.
- GYÖRFFY, GYÖRGY (1963–1998) *Az Árpád-kori Magyarország történelmi földrajza I–IV*. Budapest.
- HA = HOFFMANN, ISTVÁN—RÁCZ, ANITA—TÓTH, VALÉRIA (1997–1999) *Helynévtörténeti adatok a korai ómagyar korból 1–2*. A Magyar Névtudományi Társaság Kiadványai 1., 3. Debrecen.
- HOFFMANN, ISTVÁN (1993) *Helynevek nyelvi elemzése*. Debrecen.
- INCZEFI, GÉZA (1970) *Földrajzi nevek névtudományi vizsgálata (Makó környékének földrajzi nevei alapján)*. Budapest.
- LexLoc. = *Lexicon Locorum Regni Hungariae Populosorum anno 1773 Officose Confectum*. Budapest, 1920.



- LIPSZKY, JÁNOS (1808) *Repertorium Locorum Objectorumque in XII Tabulis Mappae Regnorum Hungariae, Slavoniae, Croatiae et Confiniorum Militarum Magni Item Principatus Transylvaniae Occurrentium Quas Aeri Incisas Vulgavit Johannes Lipszky de Szedlicsna*. Buda.
- MATTHEWS, CONSTANCE MARY (1975) *Place-Names of the English-Speaking World*. Worchester and London.
- MEZŐ, ANDRÁS (1982) *A magyar hivatalos helységnévvadás*. Budapest.
- MEZŐ, ANDRÁS (1996) *A templomcím a magyar helységnevekben (11–15. század)*. METEM Könyvek 15. Budapest.
- REANY, PERCY HIDE (1960) *The Origin of English Place-Names*. London.
- J. SOLTÉSZ, KATALIN (1979) *A tulajdonnév funkciója és jelentése*. Budapest.
- STEWART, GEORGE RIPPEY (1975) *Names on the Globe*. New York.
- SZABÓ, ISTVÁN (1966) *A falurendszer kialakulása Magyarországon (X–XV. század)*. Budapest.
- ZINKIN, VIVIAN (1986) *The Specifying Component in West Jersey Place-Names*. In: *Names* 34, pp. 62–82.