

# Reviews

István Nyirkos (Debrecen, Hungary)

## ***Sirkka Paikkala: Se tavallinen Virtanen. Suomalainen sukunimikäytännön modernisoituminen 1850-luvulta vuoteen 1921***

*[That common Virtanen. Modernisation concerning the use of Finnish family names from the 1850s to 1921] SKS, Tampere–Helsinki, 2004. 809 pages.*

Family names have long been neglected by Finnish family name research. Consequently, Sirkka Paikkala's brave undertaking to write a book remarkable in size, and based on extensive source material and modern research, is most welcome. Although the title of the book suggests that only one family name, *Virtanen*, is discussed in it, it also covers *Laine*, another similarly common name in Finland. I should add that each of the names represents a very common name type (in the case of *Virtanen*, all names with *-nen* ending), and the author can be given credit for examining all the family names belonging to this type. On the basis of the rich corpus of names, Sirkka Paikkala's analysis provides an accurate picture of how Finnish family names developed, their age and linguistic form, etc. It is not a so-called historical onomastic work, but rather—or almost exclusively—it focuses on the contemporary family and family name system. This is the case because the book aims at exploring the system and not just etymologizing or highlighting other aspects.

The author selected the type of name with *-nen* ending and the type *Laine*, because these two types of name were absent from the name corpus of the 16th and 17th century. Consequently, their later appearance was remarkable, and it seemed to be a promising area for research.

Now let us examine in more detail what issues are covered in the book. The book discusses the system and the development of family names from 1840 to 1921, when the first law on family names was passed in Finland. Due to historical circumstances, namely Swedish rule which lasted until 1809, Finns who were the members of the Estates had Swedish names, and this tradition continued even after Finland became part of Tsarist Russia, until about the 1840s. This period is interesting, because the Finnish national awakening began at that time, resulting in a rapid change in social ideology. The author notes that the innovations of the period and their rapid spread starting from the 1850s dissolved the Finnish name system, thus the



theme chosen by her gives us an overview of the interesting and significant historical process of family name change. In the 19th century, a significant change took place within a short period; citizens having had no family names, more and more tended to adopt one. Thus the family name system came to include new, consciously adopted types of name and, as a result, several earlier bynames (*lisänimi* ‘byname, nickname, soubriquet’) became family names. The next step was to fennicize these names.

The main purpose of the research was to discover how and why hereditary family names were incorporated—by way of developing general and standard norms—into the system of Finnish anthroponyms. The author appropriately, methodically and consistently outlines the process of change in the use of Finnish nicknames from the 19th century to 1 January 1921, when the law on family names came into force.

Typical of her way of discussion, she analyses not only distinct changes and strata, but also the whole process, relying on an extensively rich corpus of data. She collected her data from all possible source types (civil registers, population register, archives of the Research Institute for the Languages of Finland, data from geodetic survey offices, land registers, the name catalogue of Suomalaisuuden Liitto [The Association of Finnish Culture and Identity], various maps, handbooks on family names, newspaper advertisements for change of name, minutes and private archives of associations, etc.)

On the basis of the great amount of data, and the thorough theoretical and methodological considerations of the research, the author emphasizes the importance of recognizing and describing different parts of the innovation chain, identifying new types of names, analysing changes in the system of bynames (distinctive names) and family names, and examining the change in the family name concept. She considered the idea of the *fennicization of names* and the realization of the *necessity of using family names* as part of the so-called *innovation chain*. The author also aims at discovering where the impulses—the name models (schemes)—originate from that led to the emergence of new types of names, and how these names spread geographically and socially. She follows the ways in which the *idea of Finnish identity*, and the ideology of the Finnish national awakening were spread in family names, regardless of whether she considers the ideology itself right or not. By the selection of the types *Virtanen* and *Laine*, and their detailed presentation in the form of *name entries* (225–375, 407–421, etc.), the author provides us with a great amount of information. In addition, we can observe that the two types of names were great indicators of the emergence of the new family name concept, and the social and geographical diffusion, as well as the functional changes in the use of family names.



In the second half of the 19th century, there were significant changes in the undeveloped use of Finnish anthroponyms, namely in the unsystematic use of bynames and family names of the time. This period is known as the era of national awakening and national romanticism. The innovations of the name system were connected to other social changes occurring in the 19th century. The modernisation of family names and bynames (distinctive names) had its influence on the society of the era. According to the author, on the one hand, it was a reaction to changes in the operation of the society; it had to meet the demand for an unambiguous and consistent (family) name system and use of (family) names conform to new social institutions and continuously developing conditions of life (e.g. education, dynamic changes in ownership conditions, industrialisation, financial issues, and the development of economic life). Name changes were also encouraged by the ideas of national romanticism and fennicization; instead of the extensive use of Swedish names, the society willingly adopted Finnish language tendencies, fennicization, and the (partial) change of foreign names, because many people thought that, in addition to improving the development of identity, name changes promoted social and linguistic “emancipation” of certain social strata and social groups.

Fennicization of names had already been popular with university students and the intelligentsia in the 1870s, but the tendency reached its climax at the beginning of the 20th century, more specifically around Snellmann’s day (on 12th May, 1906, the 100th anniversary of the great scholar and statesman’s birthday). It was a part of the political turmoil that began in 1905, which convulsed Finland considerably. Different social classes sought a collective force to establish democracy, to abolish the system of the Estates, to loosen the Swedish bonds, and to reduce tsarist oppression. Through the great wave in name changing in 1906, at the same time, the Estates also reached out towards common people, and they could say ‘we have learned the Finnish language, and now we are Finns regarding our thinking and names as well’. In 1906 and 1907—in connection with Snellman’s day—about ninety thousand names were fennicized. Social circles having Swedish affiliations tried to lessen the social importance of people promoting fennicization; nevertheless, name change remained a significant factor. It enhanced the ideas of fennicization, and it had a great influence on the later great name changing campaign in the 1930s. The dynamic wave of name changes on Snellman’s day extended the set of Finnish family names, and it gave rise to the creation of several new model types of family names. The family name types *Virtanen* and *Laine* became the most common types in the country. I also have to mention that patronymic names with *-son* (‘son of somebody’) ending also became family names rapidly both among Finnish and Swedish inhabitants. Interestingly enough however, Finnish patronyms



were not used as family names, as people in Finnish-speaking areas adopted other new family names instead. At the dawn of national development—as a result of the name changes motivated by patriotism and the love of the native land—it was very common to select natural phenomena as family names (e.g. *Lahti-nen*, *Vuori-nen*, *Virta-nen*: created from *lahti* ‘bay’, *vuori* ‘mountain’, *virta* ‘current, stream’). The model for creating the name type *Virtanen* can be traced back to old Eastern Finnish family names. This form with *-nen* ending, characteristic of old Eastern Finnish family names, was selected as a “marker” of the entire Finnish set of family names by Finnish intellectual leaders of the age of national romanticism. Incidentally, the suffix *-nen* is one of the oldest and most productive Finnish suffixes.

The name type *Virtanen* was widespread primarily in towns in the 20th century, but it was very popular also in the countryside. The name itself became a fashion phenomenon, but at the same time, names of type *Laine* were also used (in the 1890s), and later so were compound names. The type *Laine* was a more urban “phenomenon”, and it spread to a wider area than type *Virtanen* (e.g. Helsinki, Turku, Tampere, Viipuri, Kotka, Vaasa, etc.). The old practice of using family names—namely names of Finnish origin—more common and traditional in East Finland, gradually started to spread among Western Finns mainly as a result of the evolving Finnish-language education (Jyväskylä Teacher’s Training College, Hämeenlinna Lyceum). Without the role of the Finnish intelligentsia (Snellman), writers (Linnankoski), literature, the spreading of Finnish-language journalism, and the role of priests, etc., fennicization of names would have advanced much slower. According to the author, it paved the way, at last, to the Finnish law on family names which came into effect in 1921.

Naturally, actual changes in the life of a society generally occur at a slower pace. Although there were huge numbers of people adopting family names, new names were still not considered to be family names in today’s sense. For example, in Western Finland family names were not used the way they are used today, and they were often called *liikanimi* (‘excess name’). The word *sukunimi* ‘family name’ itself was not common either. Earlier expressions used in this sense (*lisänimi* ‘byname, distinctive name’, *perheen nimi* ‘name of a family ⟨consisting of father + mother + children⟩’, and *sukunimi* ‘family name ⟨meaning the extended family with descendants⟩’) fell out of use in this function, and they were replaced by *sukunimi* ‘family name’ in its contemporary sense.

The author makes a clear distinction between the terms *sukunimi-käsite* ‘family name concept’ and *sukunimi* ‘family name’. Sirkka Paikkala approached the family name concept from a system-theoretical perspective, and she examined the use of family names, on the one hand, as the product



of the family system, and on the other hand, as the diffusion of a kind of social tradition. In the author's opinion, "a family name [= sukunimi] is a by-name [= lisänimi] belonging to the system of names, and functioning as the indicator of the name holder's belonging to a certain family" (633). She argues that the family name system [= sukunimijärjestelmä] "consists of by-names [= lisänimistö] expressing the name holder's belonging to a certain family, or of bynames considered to be names inherited in the mature and established system according to the norms of the system. It is thus assumed that the community of name users recognizes and acknowledges the nature of the family name system, and considers heredity or family belonging an onemic characteristic of the name" (633). Naturally, the family name systems originate from family systems. Name models had a significant role in name formation. Modern practice of the use of family names was initiated together with several other innovations in Finland. Innovations fostered each other, and they determined norms and boundaries for the existing new family name system. The author presents the birth of the new family name system step by step showing the links of the innovation chain. Thus, for example, the first and most important "link" was the fact that hereditary family names became commonly used (not only in East Finland, but also in West Finland), old family names remained in use as hereditary markers of family names, bynames were incorporated into the new family name system as well, family names and house names started to be considered two distinct phenomena, family names became Finnish-like/Finnish, name changes had to be officially reported, women began to adopt their husband's name, patronyms were not registered in the civil records any more, etc. (634). I could continue the list, but these few criteria show what thorough and extensive work the author has done.

Sirkka Paikkala points out that at the end of the 19th century and at the beginning of the 20th century, it was emphasized that family names express national characteristics, and their role of expressing family connections was not underlined. The insignificance of this role is clearly seen at the beginning of the 20th century as well, when, for example, siblings or father and son could adopt different names, and this was typical not only of the Finnish practice, but also of the practice of Finland-Swedes. She highlights the fact that the adoption of the use of family names was a part of the modernisation process of the entire society. The renewal of the set of family names requires that ideological objectives and practical necessity meet. Citizens of Finland understood that name change is essential and they considered the modernisation of the name system as a factor uniting the nation.

The author is thoroughly familiar with Finnish and international professional literature, and she can make use of them very well. For example, she applies the diffusion of innovations theory to the research of the rightly supposed



innovation chain, and to explaining the geographical diffusion of the type *Virtanen* during a period, etc. She considered it important to develop a taxonomic approach to names, thus she appreciated Vincent Blanár's anthroponomic model theory, the researches of Rudolf Šrámek, and Eero Kiviniemi with a similar approach on toponyms, and the operation motivation model of Ruben and Fisher (43–50), etc. She can be credited for consulting not only informative Estonian, Austrian, Swedish professional literature, but also Béla Kálmán's works, and Viktor Karády and István Kozma's book titled "Név és nemzet" [Name and nation], which mainly discusses changes in Hungarian family names, and name policy and served as useful background information for the author. Mihály Hajdú's oeuvre would also have been useful for her, but naturally—due to understandable language difficulties—she could not read these works, which I mention as a fact not as a criticism. It also makes we Hungarians realize the necessity of informing foreign colleagues about research activities of such importance, quality and topic by publishing at least some books and summaries in foreign languages.

*Piroska B. Gergely (Miskolc, Hungary)*

***Hajdú Mihály: Általános és magyar névtan***

[*General and Hungarian Onomastics*] Osiris Kiadó, Budapest, 2003. 955 pages.

The first volume of Mihály Hajdú's book entitled "Általános és magyar névtan" meets the first half of the topic as indicated in the title to the widest possible extent. It almost totally achieves its objective with regard to the second part relating to personal names, as indicated in the subtitle (Személynevek), and the author's extraordinary undertaking should be accomplished with the publication of the second volume of this work in progress. When reviewing a volume with such a rich content, we should perhaps abandon the notion of fully evaluating every aspect of the results and the methodical follow-up of the positions of the author together with original research results, limiting ourselves to major aspects only. (In this respect, we have to acknowledge the review by Tamás Farkas which amounts to a study itself, in "Magyar Nyelv" 101 [2005], pp. 464–479.) As for myself, I think it more feasible to highlight certain specific features of the work and to group my comments around these.

"Általános és magyar névtan" runs to almost one thousand pages, and does credit in its presentation to the publishing house, forming part of the series Osiris Tankönyvek [Osiris Textbooks]. The author himself considers his



work to be a textbook: “All of these [our recent descriptive grammars] referred the discussion of proper names to a separate textbook and it was as a result of these that this *textbook* concerning proper names was written” (p. 131, my italics). However, this work exceeds the concept of the highest quality textbook by far and not just because of its length (since now university textbooks of one thousand pages are not rare). However, it has characteristics valid for really good textbooks, which include, first, the methodological character of the presentation of the topic which starts with an introduction to science history, presents name-giving and name-usage of a large part of the world and then arrives at the history of Hungarian personal names. It is to be regretted that its last chapter, that on bynames, is missing from this volume. Evidently, it would have been reasonable to have it in this volume since it would have completed the discussion of this name type and also because it breaks up the uniform contents of the second volume as it now stands. When we consider this work as a textbook introducing onomastics on a high level, then we have to mention two further features consequently present therein, one being the attention paid to the usage of the terminology of onomastics, and the other being methodological argumentation as to the research on each type of personal name (we shall touch upon these later).

However, the book of Mihály Hajdú was not written as a textbook but rather as a synthesis of onomastics, summarising the familiarity of its author with the Hungarian and foreign literature in this field of study and, especially, his own research results respecting several issues of name theory and the middle and new periods in the history of Hungarian personal names. However, everyone should decide as to what “Általános és magyar névtan” is to be considered, by evaluating what the material of knowledge of this book adds to his familiarity with onomastics. Although not a beginner myself, I benefited greatly from this book and my strong belief is that a lot of people will use it as a manual.

But let us return to two efforts applied consequently and already referred to as “textbook qualities”, the first of these being the discussion of terminology usage. As we all know, variants and content references of onomastic terms are not uniform; we encounter fuzzy content and their range of usage and function can be objected to. We (the older onomasticians amongst us) all remember well the discussion or rather, exchange of ideas, on terminology, initiated by Mihály Hajdú in the 1970s which could not be resolved in recent decades, and has rather remained a current question of Hungarian linguistics. Evidently, this was what drove the author to pay special attention to the clarification of onomastic terms in particular in certain chapters of “Általános kérdések” [General issues] and also in the part on the history of personal names.



In the majority of cases, the intention of the author as to clarification (of terms) is successful, however, I encountered less convincing cases, too, due to the entanglement of functional nuances. Such occur in the chapter discussing the semantic structure of proper names (entitled “Denotáció” [Denotation]). As to this issue being perhaps the most complex in onomastic theory, the author adopts the concept of Katalin Soltész elaborated formerly on semantic structure (*A tulajdonnév funkciója és jelentése*. Budapest, 1979). However, he applies a critical analysis to intermingling semantic strata on each of their details. A major difference occurs from the fact that he, contrary to Soltész, does not consider the information contents as part of the meaning of the name, due to, among other factors, the idea that “actual information contents can be realised by identification only to which we have a known referent, apart from the nominator (the name)” (85). But this is a basic prerequisite for the recognition of a proper name, too. I believe that the idea that the information content is realised “by identification” is not contrary to but rather reinforces the idea that the information content is an organic part of the meaning of the name. And in cases mentioned as examples for fuzzy information content (*Vásárhely, Berettyóújfalu, Balmazújváros*) it was not the information content (‘settlement’) that faded but the initial motivation of name-giving. However, the difference between information content and motivation seems to disappear due to their similar definitions: “*information*, that is, the communication of things known about the referent (denotatum)” (84), “the feature of proper names that these refer to some characteristic, belonging to somewhere or being related to something is called *motivation*” (86). The above citations reflect that the information content and the motivation of a name are often the same.

Among the elements of the meaning of a name, he also includes connotation and associations related to the name. However, he fails to stress that the semantic structure of a name involves associations spread on the level of society mainly (and that is what triggers their appellativisation, too), and he focuses on connotation deriving from subjective and emotional associations perhaps also aiming at the separation of the concept and term of name overtones. “We should not mix emotional connotation with overtones which the latter *derives from the etymological meaning of the word* mainly” (p. 87, my italics). In another chapter (*Névlélektan* [Name psychology]) he resumes the explanation of the contents of name overtones (pp. 111–115), but here, slightly contrary to the above, he focuses on other (formal and social) sources of name overtones and as to the overtones resulting from the meaning of the appellative (etymological) source of the name, we are presented with one or two examples only, among those demonstrating humorous name-giving.





In the part on the history of personal names, it is rather the choice of the better synonym for technical terms from among those used that is stressed than a terminology use related to the accuracy of terms in onomastics. Therefore, he chooses *családnév* [family name] instead of *vezetéknév* [surname] since it is more widespread anyway, and he extends its use to the era when this type of personal name did not use to be inherited (pp. 738–740). As to *becézőnév* and *becenév* [both meaning nickname], he returns to the shorter form *becenév*. He revives the terms *egyénnév* ~ *egyéni név* [individual name] but fails to use these with a consistent content (see also p. 347 and pp. 792–793). He introduces the terms *társadalmi megközelítésű* [family names approached socially] and *egyéni megközelítésű családnevek* [family names approached individually] as being new but acceptable terms, which include family names indicating belonging to social groups (occupation, position etc.) and the (external, internal) features of individuals, and thus these can be better compared to other major types of family names. Although the usage of terms is not really significant in this rich work, I found it worth considering this problem in more detail since the author links these by clarifying a series of onomastic terms and, in this regard, it may exert unification effects as a manual, hopefully.

Another feature of Hajdú's book which contributes to its textbook nature is that it contains several longer comments and even, separate chapters, dedicated to issues of methodology. Such are to be found rather in the part on the history of Hungarian personal names. For example, with regard to the two major types of the sources of the history of personal names, that is, summaries and records of births, marriages and deaths, he raises the question whether the results of the examination of these two source materials being typical of different historical eras can be compared, and he solves this question through a practical example (pp. 345–346). The history in the New Hungarian Age of Christian names is introduced by the Chapter on „Az anyaggyűjtés és a feldolgozás módszereiről” [On the methods of material collecting and processing] (pp. 417–422). However, the author provides various methodological guidelines in the subsequent chapter, too (A névanyag általános vizsgálata [The general examination of the name material], pp. 423–453) either for the beginner or for experienced researchers in order to provide grounds for the complex examination of Christian names. From among these, I would like to highlight the introduction of an exact frequency indicator, which allows for the comparison of the name frequency of eras being of different lengths and geographical units being of different sizes. Apart from the structure of the name material, he presents a method for the assessment of the name structure reflecting the name usage better (the internal structure of the name material of a certain settlement, region or era), which is excellent for presenting changes in time and geographical differ-



ences (between towns and villages), too. If this model for the assessment of Christian names will have its followers (I myself tried it on Christian name material from Kalotaszeg), this might facilitate the comparison of the results of future research on Christian names to a great extent. Besides examinations in the structure of names, I believe that the consideration of the group of so-called characteristic names is an important innovation in the field of the examination of the name material by names (these being Christian or family names of medium frequency, however, occurring more frequently than others at a given area) which are more characteristic for name geography than the most frequent names, which are usually widespread. Apart from those mentioned, a lot of practical methods are contained in other chapters, mainly as concrete examples for the examination of certain phenomena.

The review provided by the author on the systems of personal names present or formerly present in certain parts of the world by using several items of the recent international literature contributes greatly to the widening of our universal awareness of onomastic results. Those interested in onomastics, apart from some professionals, could have got acquainted with name systems affecting the development of the Hungarian name system either indirectly or directly or those used with other languages belonging to our language family in more details so far (see Béla Kálmán: “A nevek világa”, revised 4th edition, Debrecen, 1996). Further overview was provided only incidentally in certain aspects (see Katalin J. Soltész: “A tulajdonnév funkciója és jelentése”. Budapest, 1979), or now and then from several short reviews published mainly in “Névtani Értesítő”. This chapter of Hajdú’s book, which was compiled as a result of his enormous work and erudition, widened opportunities for getting informed on the name-giving systems of the world and also highlighted the similarities between different name systems being sometimes separated by continents, and thus these similarities can be rightly included among onomastic universals. Since these are remarkable even after reading it for the first time, we cannot really understand why the author failed to summarise these by way of closing this great and worthwhile chapter.

The second, larger part of the book discussing the history of Hungarian personal names dedicates chapters to the development history of the motivation and semantic groups of the name system preceding Christianity, referred to with the new term *egyéni nevek* [individual names], that is, to the history of three types of personal names: Christian names, nicknames and family names, based mainly on his own former research, and presenting these name types in a more comprehensive and deeper way than could have ever been done before, adding geographical, sociolinguistic, dialectological, stylistic aspects to the examination criteria of each name type.



The elaboration of the history of Christian names in the Middle Hungarian and New Hungarian Ages, respectively, shows quite huge differences which cannot be completely justified by the differences in quantity and character of sources being available from these ages. It is quite understandable that another reason is that the author examined the New Hungarian Age in depth before. However, he published these results quite rarely and only some of these did he include in this work. The data was only completed in 2003 and thus it has at last become known and utilisable for others, for comparison and in order to draw methodological conclusions last.

Detailed research into the language of the Middle Hungarian Age is just underway in these days, and the mapping of the history of names in the Middle Hungarian Age fits into this process. As to this phenomenon, this is the very first work, apart from some excellent studies which are, however, limited to a narrow geographical scope, to provide a comprehensive overview relating to the major part of the territory of Hungarian language following also periods of development and changes, both with regard to Christian names and family names.

He divides the history of Christian names in the Middle Hungarian Age into 10 periods and that in the New Hungarian Age into 9, and thus he can present major trends of changes with an accurate chronology (e.g., the tendency towards monotony of the name corpus at the end of the Middle Hungarian Age and then its gradual, and even, sudden, accumulation in the New Hungarian Age; the reverse trend of the frequency of male and female Christian names in these two eras; the appearance, development and spreading of double Christian name-giving etc.; phenomena of name usage by religious denominations etc.), and thus our knowledge which had been quite general so far can be replaced by something more solid and supported by detailed data. The examination of individual names makes it possible to follow the changes in name fashion from the Middle Hungarian Age until the beginning of the 21st century.

The penetration of Christian names can be known by examining 10 geographical areas. This is illustrated by the most frequent male and female names of the Middle Hungarian Age being shown on a map (it is possible evidently due to the smaller number of available data) and summarised in a subchapter only. However, the Christian names of the 10 geographical names in the New Hungarian Age are illustrated in complete name lists of frequency with regard to all the nine periods of this era. These name lists offer an readily utilisable comparison for the name material of any territory to be examined in the future.

The aspect of religious denominations is present even here in the name geographical examination since, as the author stresses, the spreading of Chris-



tian names is highly influenced by the religion to which the region in question belongs. But the same aspect returns in other chapters, too, e.g., with regard to the sociolinguistic examination of Christian names, the composition of the name corpus (pp. 547–550), and provides a more detailed overview than before on the preferences of the religious denominations as to Christian names. For example, he proves that the same Christian name can belong to different denominations by region (p. 411), may be borrowed by one from the other, or may change from time to time. One name geographical area examined by Hajdú is Ormánság in the southern part of Transdanubia. The author stresses the Christian name corpus of this region as being quite different from that of the others: “The name fashion of Ormánság being quite unique and a bit conservative, it merits the utmost attention where, at the same time, both male and female names from the Old Testament are frequently used” (p. 409). I suppose that this might be explained by a religious influence since, in the 17th century, many students went to study to the Unitarian school of Cluj from Baranya county (Southern-Transdanubia), and Unitarian people (and, more especially, the Sabbatarians being hidden among them) were renowned for giving names from the Old Testament to their children as early as that but, rather, in the 18th century (B. Gergely Piroška, *A felekezetek hatása az erdélyi keresztnévhasználatra a reformáció és az ellenreformáció korában*. Budapest–Miskolc, 2003).

The last major chapter of the Hajdú’s book is on the periods in the Middle and the New Hungarian Ages of the history of family names, based mainly on his individual research and published here for the first time. When discussing the complexity of the reasons for the coming into existence of these names, he highlights the Angevin age which was important in conveying European influences (mainly from Northern Italy). As to the treatment in practice and interpreting of historical data, I think that the chapter on mononymity, the lack of name elements and circumscribing is very important, providing a detailed analysis for the data corpus of the 16th and 17th centuries giving rise to different interpretations and, thus, polemics, and therefore contributing to the description in more details of phenomena mentioned in the title of the chapter. He goes into special detail as to circumscriptions (which he thinks very important in the initial period of the coming into existence of family names, too), and establishes several types in this group. He includes here the so-called married names of women and groups these according to this criterion, showing the similarities with circumscriptions relating to men. Then chapters on the inheriting of family names and the changes of family names follow; and here I would like to emphasise the detailed explanation of the development of the two-part family name type (e.g., *Györgypál*, *Kisgyörgy* etc.), regarding which it is the very first study. However, those engaged in the research of the history of bynames might be



distressed by his statement according to which the telling apart of these names from early family names is almost impossible in the Middle Hungarian Age, as these may be researched only from the 18th century. In the first part of the next chapter entitled “A családnevek rendszerezése” [The classification of family names], the author reviews former classification systems and highlights points where criteria are mixed in them, and, in order to eliminate such problems, he lists criteria in the second part “according to which family names can be classified” (p. 766). Although it is evident that in these cases the researchers group names into classes corresponding to each criterion, applying fourteen criteria for the examination, ranging from time to linguistic means used, and that the classification of family names amounted to a classification based on the motivation of name-giving, or semantics, morphology or word classes (or mixing these). This is why it seems striking that the classification and examination criteria used so far are joined here in this chapter corresponding to the logic of possible classification.

The longest chapter, entitled “A jelentéstani vizsgálatok” [Semantic examinations], presents family name types, including several minor details and historical trends as well. This chapter provides us with a lot of new details as to the history of family names, and we can stress here only some of these. The spreading of family names of foreign origin from the 18th century supports the historical fact of major settlement trends following the Turkish occupation and the expulsion of the Turkish from the onomastic side. He explains the predominance of the type of family names derived from Christian names by the coming into existence of family names which corresponded to the spread of church Christian names. Thus the distinction by the name of the father was realised by the already frequent Christian names of the fathers. The somewhat more frequent occurrence of family names derived from female names in the region of the Alföld is attributed by him to the larger number of war widows. The increase in the number of family names of toponymic origin by the 18th century is again a consequence of the inner migration of the Hungarian population. However, he disregards the influence of so-called school names referring to the place of origin which became more widespread as a result of the increase in the 17th and 18th centuries of school education. He presents us with a practical method for the distinction of family names formed from a single toponym from those formed from similar personal names or for the support of this.

The opportunity for sociolinguistic examination is limited by the fact that we scarcely have a data corpus relating to different social groups from one and the same area. This examination can be based on censuses of the gentry and of peasants from the region of Őrség (West Hungary), and of urban areas and their neighbourhoods from Békés county (east from the river Tisza).



The dialectological examination involves the appearance of three phenomena of dialectic phonetics in family name versions in this chapter. However, those formed from dialectic words appear in semantic groups solely by way of example.

The last, summarising chapter entitled “Névelőfordulási és névgyakorisági vizsgálatok” [Examinations of name occurrence and name frequency] provides us with a comprehensive picture on the corpus of family names comprising 16 name geographical units of a similar area and three centuries, presenting these one by one and with summarising name frequency lists, highlighting the most frequent and characteristic names, and comparing these for name frequency and the proportion of one-off names, too. The temporal comparison of the three centuries leads us to conclude that the family name corpus of the Hungarian population shows no substantial changes. However, the 18th century saw a significant change in the proportion of family names of foreign origin, due to immigration.

“Általános és magyar névtan” will be an essential, standard book in Hungarian onomastics, with its first volume and with the next one, which we hope to see ready soon, completing the work,. We wish that the author may have the strength to accomplish this mammoth undertaking.

*Valéria Tóth (Debrecen, Hungary)*

***Fehértói Katalin: Árpád-kori személynévtár (1000–1301)***

*[Inventory of personal names from the age of the Árpád dynasty (1000–1301)] Akadémiai Kiadó, Budapest, 2004. 895 pages.*

1. In Hungarian name etymology literature there are articles from decades ago in which authors propagate the collection of personal names from the earliest documented period of Hungarian historical linguistics, that is, the age of the Árpád dynasty, as one of the most urgent tasks. An overview of the set of early Hungarian personal names hinders research not only in personal name etymology, but in toponym etymology as well. When discussing the most ancient type of Hungarian toponyms (place names developed from personal names without a name formant) István Kniezsa (1943) pointed out the following: “since nobody has ever systematically collected or processed Hungarian personal names until now, the origins and the personal name sources of toponyms are doubtful” (Keletmagyarország helynevei [The toponyms of Eastern Europe]: Magyarok és románok I–II [Hungarians and Romanians I–II.], eds. József Deér–László Gáldi. Vol. I. Budapest, p. 127). And since there was no significant progress in this area even a quarter of a



century later, the historian Gyula Kristó emphasized in 1976 the need for an etymological dictionary of personal names (Szempontok korai helyneveink történeti tipológiájához [Aspects of an etymological typology of early place names]. Acta historica LV. Szeged, p. 17).

Katalin Fehértói, an expert on the etymology of personal names, has personally experienced the insecurity deriving from an incomplete inventory of old Hungarian personal names. This is undoubtedly one of the reasons that motivated her to collect “an individually compiled, small-sized personal name inventory of the age of the Árpád dynasty” (p. 8). The warm welcome given to the book and the enthusiastic national and international reviews which accompanied its publication all indicate that “The small inventory of personal names from age of the Árpád dynasty” (henceforth ÁKSz.) published in Budapest in 1983 has somewhat remedied the difficulties in personal name research caused by the lack of data. However, the righteous joy over the publication of ÁKSz. has put to sleep the urge of the researchers to compile a “contemporary Hungarian etymological personal name inventory within an institutional framework that would meet scientific requirements”. To quote Katalin Fehértói again, “the idea of a work like this has not even emerged in the two decades that have passed since the publication of the small personal name inventory [...], although in the meantime, monumental works in the field of historical linguistics published would have necessitated information about early Hungarian personal names” (p. 8). Consequently, Katalin Fehértói undertook the project alone (although it would have provided enough work for a whole team), and thus she started work on the long awaited “comprehensive” personal name inventory. She must have received a great deal of help in this enterprise from her husband, Lajos Kiss, the well-known toponym and name etymologist. She expresses her gratitude to him in the acknowledgments to this book and also did so at various forums where she informed the public about progress with the dictionary. After precedents like this, “Árpád-kori személynévtár (1000–1301)” (henceforth: ÁSz.) was finally been published in the spring of 2005 (although the year of publication is given as 2004), offering a unique overview of the early Hungarian personal name set.

2. Although ÁSz. does not contain all personal names from the age of the Árpád dynasty (for example, only a small number of the *Benedictus* and *Jacobus* type names have been included because of their Latinized origin, quite rightly, due to their limited value for historical linguistics), we can agree with the author that “it is a collection drawing a fairly true picture of the personal name form during the age of the Árpád dynasty” (p. 8). Among its data, we can find ethnonyms and place names of certain types. The ethnonyms and the female names are listed separately at the end of the book.



The index of name endings (also to be found here) primarily provides help for the morphological analysis of names.

**2.1.** According to the author, the fact that even after filtering out the majority of the ecclesiastical Latin names there is still a large proportion of them left is due to the latinizing practice of diploma issuing (p. 10). Persons named *Martinus*, *Jacobus* were certainly addressed like this in their environment, but it was rather “the members of monastic or religious orders, priests and notaries who tried to unify the inventory of personal names as well” (Névtani Értesítő 27: p. 8). This idea is primarily important because it reflects a new approach: the role of the national intelligentsia in forming order and norms cannot be debated.

Two further claims of Katalin Fehértói partially relate to this thought, therefore, we will look at them into more detail. One of the statements is the following: “Language contact and borrowing of Latin, German and Slavic words and names can only be imagined with the mediation of people who spoke these languages themselves” (p. 10). We agree with Katalin Fehértói with respect to loanwords, but the situation with borrowed names is slightly different. Since the essential feature of either personal or place names is not their common name segment but their denotational reference, during borrowing it is enough to perceive that the sound pattern functions as a name; it is not necessary to “understand” the common meaning of the word. In other words, to name somebody *Tichon* one does not need to speak Slavic and one does not need to be aware of the primary meaning in the Slavic language (‘silent person, person of low voice’). Thanks to Katalin Fehértói, we know that only one fifth of the personal names from the age of the Árpád dynasty are of Hungarian origin (cf. Magyar Nyelvőr 121: pp. 71–75). It is not plausible—although expected from the above citation—that the rest of the four fifths came into Hungarian from a bilingual (Hungarian–Slavic, Hungarian–German) environment. This, however, does not challenge the fact that the nations themselves were the contact.

Katalin Fehértói’s other significant claim concerning the group of personal names of common name origin was motivated by the frequent occurrence of the name *Farkas*. “A Hungarian notary who was familiar with German or Slavic (or both languages) found it easier to translate the German *Volf*, *Volfgang* or the Slavic *Vlk*, *Vlchk*, *Vulchyk* and their variations by using the Hungarian *Farkas*, *Forcas* instead [...]. If we accept this hypothesis, the early Hungarian *Farkas* can be termed a calque” (p. 10). This hypothesis is thought-provoking, especially if we notice on the basis of the inventory data that the *Vlk* name form is suitable for this due to frequent mentions (the other cited forms appear significantly less frequent, and probably not because they have been translated). The argument against translation is that di-





ploma-issuing practice—because of the function of names as providing for legal security and identification—did not promote the translation of names: the interest of the issuer of legal documents was to ensure that the names were introduced in the manner they were used in the community. There is certainly some kind of relation between the Hungarian *Farkas* ~ German *Volf* ~ Slavic *Vlk* name forms which we can put down to the beginning of name fashion. In other words, the explanation of the Hungarian *Farkas* and its variants can be the influence (pattern, model) of its semantic equivalents in German and Slavic. In this case, the term calque is justified, although interpreted more broadly.

**2.2.** The extremely rich personal name inventory of ÁSz. (a little less than forty thousand names) offers multiple opportunities for researchers of personal name etymology. The book makes it possible to explore the etymology of certain personal names from age of the Árpád dynasty, certain name groups, but even the chronological relations of naming people. For example, how did monosegmental names (e.g. 1198: *servos ... Chuda*) get the phrase with *filius* (e.g. 1234/1294: *Stork filio Chuda*); or the structure referring to profession or place of origin (e.g. 1277/1291: *comes Ipolitus filius Chuda*, 1281>1402: *Ipol[itus] filius Chudo de Vasard*); and finally, a few named with *dictus* appear at the end of the period, becoming a rather frequent form in the 16th century (e.g. 1288: *Andreas dictus Chuna*). These research topics are nevertheless only peripheral to the most significant and finally realizable task: the elaboration of a Hungarian etymological personal name typology. The main aims of etymological analysis will be determined by this research direction.

There is, however, another possibility for research, which Katalin Fehértói, as the most renowned authority in this field cannot suggest whole-heartedly: “For the time being, I do not consider it possible to completely process the data, the names and the name variants collected in the ‘Árpád-kori személynévtár’ according to their origin” (Névtani Értesítő 27: p. 11). What hinders etymological research is the large number of unknown names, the extremely problematic mono- and multi-segmental names (which can be explained from several languages, either as base names or as nicknames), the doubtful status of the names with different endings, and the possibility that the data have been distorted. Even if we do not completely give up the examination of the origin of personal names (in the interest of science), we should always bear in mind Katalin Fehértói’s admonitions.

**3.** “Árpád-kori személynévtár” contains place names as well. There are genitive attributive phrases and toponyms of personal name origin without a formant, as explained in the Introduction (p. 9). The former have a personal name as their first component (e.g. 1245/1257/1447: *vadit ad Babathova*



'the interpretation of an English name', 1282/1282: in capite *Babawelge* 'the English interpretation of the name'). The latter come from early diplomas and represent the given toponym's first known mention. I believe Katalin Fehértói's procedure concerning the inclusion of certain personal name toponyms is fully justified and motivated; however, I think applying a different solution would have been more effective. Namely, an etymological name inventory surely does not aim to trace back a toponym to an earlier date than that already registered. I propose another solution to the task of dating back personal names as early as possible as well. I think the author should have included in the inventory all toponyms consisting of only personal names that can be traced back to an earlier source than that of the name's source. With this procedure, we can date back a personal name to an earlier period, since it is undisputed that the existence of a personal name toponym points out to the existence of the homonymous personal name itself.

4. The hardest challenge in compiling an etymological dictionary is editing the word entries: which forms should be in the same entry, and which should be separated. Katalin Fehértói had her own problems with this dilemma. Finally, relying on her intuition polished during several decades of working in personal name etymology, she decided to include in the same entry all the data which refer to the "phonetic and orthographic variants of an etymologically and derivationally identical name" (p. 13) and to list all the variants in the title entry. This is how *Buza*, *Boza* belong to one, and the names containing a *-d* suffix, *Buzaudi*, *Buzd* and *Buzud* to another name entry. Interrelated name forms are referred to at the end of the entries.

5. "Árpád-kori személynévtár" can be useful for practitioners of other scientific disciplines as well. In the examples that follow, I will show some possibilities for utilizing Katalin Fehértói's book in general historical linguistics and historical toponomastics.

Historical linguistics has several subdisciplines in need of large amounts of data: for example, historical phonetics and etymology. Her dictionary is a treasure trove for both these areas as it offers a multitude of ideas and topics.

The knowledge of early Hungarian personal names is indispensable for certain areas of historical toponomastics, e.g. experts dealing with early toponyms, either from an etymological or a typological point of view, cannot afford the luxury of not being acquainted with personal names from age of the Árpád dynasty.

Toponyms developed from personal names (especially toponyms derived by metonymic name-giving without using the formant) determine the character of the early Hungarian place name system. It is indisputable that the etymol-



ogy of these place names can be authenticated by personal names that have identical morphologies.

Etymological toponym typology considers place names developed from an ethnonym as a type of early Hungarian toponyms. This semantic group triggered the admonition to automatically originate toponyms whose form is identical to those of ethnyonyms originating from it and consequently, the supposing of the presence of the ethnic group denoted by the ethnonym. Namely, personal names frequently originate from ethnyonyms, and toponyms that seem to be ethnyonyms can be traced back to personal names like this. In the light of data from “Árpád-kori személynévtár”, this question will be worth re-examining. The ethnonym > personal name > toponym transfer is far less frequent than what is hypothesized in the literature.

6. “Árpád-kori személynévtár” is also available in a modern format, i.e. on CD, which enhances the search in the inventory. For example, if we look for different professions, we can get a picture of name-giving and name-bearing customs of the different social classes. What is more, we can observe the differences in person denomination in the diplomas of different social groups. This is possible because the author places names in a wide context.

7. Considering its genre, “Árpád-kori személynévtár” is a collection, a source supposed to show the occurrences of a name element group in early sources. Katalin Fehértói provides the generations to come with a reference book not only for onomastic and etymological research, but also for research in history and art history, as well as medieval philology. Her book is rightly considered the peak of her achievements and one of the most significant works in Hungarian onomastics.

*Rudolf Szentgyörgyi (Budapest, Hungary)*

### ***Korai magyar helynévszótár 1000–1350.***

#### ***I. Abaúj–Csongrád vármegye***

*[Dictionary of Early Hungarian Toponyms 1000–1350 I. Abaúj–Csongrád comitatus] Edited by István Hoffmann. Entries edited by Rita Póczos–Anita Rácz–Valéria Tóth. Publications of the Hungarian Onomastic Archivess<sup>1</sup> No. 10. Debrecen, 2005. 449 pages.*

The first volume of “Korai magyar helynévszótár” (KMHsz.) was published as the tenth volume in the series of the Publications of the Hungarian Ono-

<sup>1</sup> A Magyar Névarchívum Kiadványai



mastic Archives. The dictionary incorporates—in the form of a traditional dictionary—the historical toponymic corpus of fifteen Hungarian comitats, from Abaúj to Csongrád comitats between 1000 and 1350. The following volumes, which are to be published in alphabetical order according to the names of the historical comitats, will follow the structure of the four volumes of the primary source (György Györffy, *Az Árpád-kori Magyarország történeti földrajza* [Historical Geography of Hungary in the Age of the Árpád Dynasty], Vols. 1 to 4, Budapest, 1963–1998)—just like the first volume does. The fifth and last volume will present the toponymic corpus from the early Hungarian age of those comitats which could be not processed and completed by György Györffy due to his death. (This work is currently being done by archivists and historians.) The completed work, therefore, will not constitute a dictionary but rather a series of dictionaries in the traditional sense. It is to be appreciated that the lexicographers, namely István Hoffmann, Rita Póczos, Anita Rácz and Valéria Tóth, did not wait for the whole corpus of the dictionary to be gathered but they are continuously publishing those parts of it which have already been edited and prepared for publication. At the same time, it is very likely that the published volumes can be bound together once they are transformed into digital format, and on the completion of the full series “it will be possible to put together the different volumes, thus achieving the ideal form of a dictionary” (KMHsz., p. 8.).

The publication of the first volume of the series was preceded by some important factors and events. I would like to highlight three of its forerunners in both narrow and wider senses: 1. the interdisciplinarity of toponym collection and toponomastics; 2. the Hungarian school of philology (of Budapest); 3. the workshop of Debrecen.

**1. Interdisciplinarity of toponym collection and toponomastics.** The scholars of the 19th century began to study Hungarian place names in more and more detail, having realised, among other things, that these are of significant historical value as resources. At the same time, the systematic collection of place names commenced lexicalising not only the toponymic corpus used in the synchronic language state but also the corpora of historical sources, e.g. Elek Fényes, *Magyarország geográfiai szótára, amelyben minden város, falu és puszta, betűrendben körülményesen leíratik*. [Geographical dictionary of Hungary, which carefully elaborates, in an alphabetical order, on every town, village and field] Pest, 1851; Tivadar Ortway, *Magyarország régi vízrajza a XIII-ik század végeig*. [Old hydrography of Hungary until the end of the 13th century] Budapest, 1882; Frigyes Pesty, *Magyarország helynevei történeti, földrajzi és nyelvészeti tekintetben* [Place names of Hungary from a historical, geographical and philological perspective], Vol. 1, Budapest, 1888 (the material of the remaining volumes is in the form of



manuscript due to the author's death; and the material of some counties has been published recently, cf. Mihály Hajdú, *Pesty Frigyes helynévgyűjtésének megjelentetése* [Publishing the toponym collection of Frigyes Pesty]. In: *Névtani Értesítő* 28, pp. 205–15); Dezső Csánki, *Magyarország történelmi földrajza a Hunyadiak korában*, Vols. I to IV [Historical geography of Hungary in the age of the Hunyadi dynasty] Budapest, 1890–1913, etc. The collection of geographical names continued in the 20th century as well. Let us consider the series encompassing the contemporary place names of Hungarian counties or, from a historical point of view, the work of György Györffy (and in particular his great collection of historical geography from the age of the Árpád dynasty as mentioned above). Owing to the enthusiastic and assiduous work of archivists and historians, the collection of place names still goes on today. This interdisciplinary cooperation has made it possible to lexiconise such a huge source of materials.

The research done on the collected materials can also be characterised by interdisciplinarity. Considering the results of historical toponomastics emerging from the fields of philology, etymology, history, population history, etc., the achievement of the following researchers—among many others—must be emphasised: János Melich, István Kniezsa, Dezső Pais, Attila T. Szabó, Loránd Benkő, Lajos Kiss, András Mező and Gyula Kristó.

**2. The Hungarian school of philology (of Budapest).** With reference to a foreign expression, Bárczi used the phrase “school of Budapest” for the first time in 1953 referring to that trend in Hungarian linguistics which had diverged from the Neogrammarian school and developed in a specific direction. Later he considered that the word “philology” must replace this name (cf. Géza Bárczi–Loránd Benkő–Jolán Berrár, *A magyar nyelv története* [The History of the Hungarian Language], Budapest, 1967, p. 558). From the beginning of the 1960s, several authors have alternately used such terms for this phenomenon as “school of Budapest”, “school of philology of Budapest”, “school of linguistics of Budapest” or “Budapest school of philology”, all being of equal denotative value.

Benkő Loránd believes that instead of “school”, the terms “trend” or “group” should be used (cf. A „budapesti iskola” a magyar nyelvtudomány történetében [The “school of Budapest” in the history of Hungarian linguistics]. In: *Tanulmányok a magyar nyelvtudomány történetének témaköréből*. Jenő Kiss–László Szűts, eds., Budapest, 1991, pp. 13–26); moreover, he considers it more adequate to use the word “Hungarian” instead of “Budapest” since “the workshops in other cities of Hungary are not significantly different from that of the centre, namely Budapest, [...] not to mention the fact that considering the place of operation, there were constant changes and movements back and forth between Budapest and other cities even in terms



of the same people” (Benkő, 1991, p. 15). At the same time, he emphasises the word “philology”, since “all the scholars belonging to this school were adherents of historical linguistics” (ibid.).

There are several workshops which can be considered or rather consider themselves as the “inheritors” and tradition-reviving successors of the school. Notwithstanding certain differences between them, these workshops are all kept together—apart from their engagement in historical linguistics—by the traditional thematic trend: the tradition of lexicological-etymological and onomastic research (in this latter field “it could have accomplished a unique progress, in terms of approach and methodology, mainly due to ‘self-effort’”, Benkő, 1991, p. 23). As regards its methods, its research activities go beyond the positivist “cult of data” in spite of the need for ample data collection, and they attempt to find answers to important questions concerning the history of the Hungarian language, on the one hand, and it can be characterised by philological accuracy, imaginative approach (in the wording of Bárzsi: “it does not turn off the orderly fantasy of the rational linguist”, 1967, p. 558), a wide range of knowledge on history, cultural history and social history, etc., and the need for acquiring knowledge and information.

**3. The workshop of Debrecen.** The onomastic workshop of Budapest (with its main field of research being anthroponyms) and the workshop of Debrecen (being in the forefront with its research into historical toponomastics) are connected to the tradition of the Hungarian school of philology in several respects, being actual followers of that school, particularly in terms of research on onomastics and historical onomastics.

At the Department of Hungarian Linguistics of the University of Debrecen, significant research activities are carried out in the field of historical toponomastics under the leadership of István Hoffmann, which means that a school as well as a workshop of historical toponyms was created. (I prefer the word “workshop” to the word “school” because I used the latter, traditionally, in a broader sense above, and because the term “school” signifies demarcating, as well, while I wish to emphasise the affinity of the inheritors of a fundamental tradition.)

The results of the research activities done in the workshop of Debrecen have been publicly accessible for a decade now, above all in the form of the series entitled “A Magyar Névarchívum Kiadványai” [The Publications of the Hungarian Onomastic Archives], which first appeared in 1997. The volumes of this series (Helynévtörténeti adatok a korai ómagyar korból. [Data from the history of toponyms from the Early Hungarian Age] Published by: István Hoffmann–Anita Rácz–Valéria Tóth. Vol. 1, Abaúj–Csongrád comitatus. Debrecen, 1997; Vol. 2, Doboka–Győr comitatus. Debrecen, 1999) can be regarded as forerunners to KMHsz.



A most spectacular result of the research conducted in this workshop is the publication of the first volume of KMHsz. The fact that in almost every field of academic life, sources and data stores, etc. are published and made accessible from year to year in an ever-growing number entails the risk of sources remaining untouched and unexploited, which have, however, been prepared for research with strenuous effort. KMHsz. does not have to face this risk. It can be said with great pride that well before the publication of the dictionary, several high quality publications had been published relying on its materials, since above all it was the researchers of the workshop, the lexicographers themselves, who began to work, in an academic fashion, on the source materials, which is, beyond doubt, their area of expertise (see, in particular, the volumes of the series of the Hungarian Onomastic Archives: Vol. 4, Valéria Tóth, *Az Árpád-kori Abaúj és Bars vármegye helyneveinek történeti-etimológiai szótára*. [Historical-etymological dictionary of the place names of the Abaúj and Bars comitats in the age of the Árpád dynasty], Debrecen, 2001; Vol. 5, Rita Póczos, *Az Árpád-kori Borsod és Bodrog vármegye településneveinek nyelvészeti elemzése*. [Linguistic analysis of the settlement names of the Borsod and Bodrog comitats in the age of the Árpád dynasty], Debrecen, 2001; Vol. 6, Valéria Tóth, *Névrendszertani vizsgálatok a korai ómagyar korban [Abaúj és Bars vármegye]*. [Onomatosystematical analyses in the Early Hungarian Age (Abaúj and Bars comitats)], Debrecen, 2001; 8. István Hoffmann–Valéria Tóth, eds., *Helynévtörténeti tanulmányok [Studies on the history of toponyms.]*, Vol. 1, Debrecen, 2004; 9. Anita Rácz, *A régi Bihar vármegye településneveinek nyelvészeti vizsgálata*. [Linguistic analysis of the settlement names of the old Bihar comitat], Debrecen, 2005; Vol. 12, Anita Rácz, *A régi Bihar vármegye településneveinek történeti-etimológiai szótára*. [Historical-etymological dictionary of the settlement names of the old Bihar comitat], Debrecen, 2007), and that the researchers continue to use the dictionary as a source material in their further research activities (see e.g. the relevant lectures of the 6th International Congress of Hungarian Studies; published in: István Hoffmann–Dezső Juhász, eds., *Nyelvi identitás és a nyelv dimenziói. Nyelv, nemzet, identitás III. A VI. Nemzetközi Hungarológiai Kongresszus nyelvészeti előadásai*. [Language identity and language dimensions. Language, nation, identity III. The linguistic lectures of the 6th International Congress of Hungarian Studies], Debrecen–Budapest, 2007). These studies show that the researchers of the workshop of Debrecen were not only able to go beyond the positivist “cult of data” but, in their own field of research, they are able to produce results which can be used in a broader context, that is, in other branches of science (namely philology, linguistic record analysis, history, population history, etc.) while they also were committed in their field to systematisation and synthesis via analysis.



KMHsz. published in the workshop of Debrecen is a new and original work which meets a need not satisfied before. It meets a need since—as the authors put it—“the oldest place names of Hungary have never been published in the form of a dictionary before” (KMHsz., p. 5). The recently published work of Katalin Fehértói, entitled *Árpád-kori személynévtár* [Dictionary of anthroponyms in the age of the Árpád dynasty] (Budapest, 2004) emphasised all the more the need for a similarly large-scale work encompassing our old toponyms.

It is an original piece of work in the sense that it is the first to present the old Hungarian toponymicon with the aim of reaching the greatest possible completeness (cf. KMHsz., p. 7), but also in the sense that aspects of linguistic and philological research are primarily considered in the organisation of the materials otherwise traditionally treated by archivists and historians.

The above-mentioned work of historical geography by György Györffy constitutes the primary reference work among the sources of the dictionary, which builds on earlier published and unpublished sources, taking the requirements of historical linguistics into consideration, and thus it has been a reliable and authentic source for researchers into Hungarian philology for decades, and as such it can be regarded as the critical publication of earlier sources (cf. KMHsz., p. 6). The lexicographers, however, expand the framework of this considerable work, partly in time (the work of Györffy ends between 1332 and 1337 when the tithe record ordered by the Pope, the first national register, was made) and in the number of the used sources. Only those source materials were included which, within the expanded time limit of 1350, were published in print and were deemed reliable from a scientific point of view; among these sources, there were such pieces which were published by their authors after the publication of Györffy’s work. (The reference list consisting of 109 entries shows a great variety of sources and can be found in pages 21 to 25 of the book.)

The editorial principles of the KMHsz. were meticulously planned and form a coherent and thoroughly constructed set of rules (KMHsz., pp. 9–18). On the basis of the principle of “reaching the greatest possible completeness”, it can be proudly noted that the dictionary includes toponyms which could be found only in Latin in the sources (secondarily documented toponyms) and data of toponyms with the suffix *-i* (usually referring to personal names) found in old charters; furthermore, referring entries indicate the personal-name elements of place names (*András, Erzsébet, Magdolna, Márk*, etc.), which supports the research into the connections between the two onomastic corpora.



The above-mentioned linguistic and philological approach is manifested by the fact that the entries are not organised according to local identity (denota-



tive meaning) as opposed to the general approach of registers, but according to morphemic equivalence, which is characteristic of philological dictionaries. Accordingly, name forms showing a difference of at least one morpheme will be assigned to separate entries even if they refer to the same denotate. There are, therefore, separate entries for name forms without a suffix and name forms with a suffix: *Alma* ~ *Almás*, *Endre* ~ *Endréd*, *Kóró* ~ *Kórógy*, *Olasz* ~ *Olaszi* (only if *-i* is a topoformant!) etc.; for different versions of name forms with different types of suffix: *Borsód* ~ *Borsós*; *Nyárád* ~ *Nyárágy*, etc.; for name forms showing difference only in one lexeme: *Garadna* ~ *Garadna-patak*, *Kávás* ~ *Kávaskút*, *Magyarzábrány* ~ *Zábrány* etc.; and for the morphosyntactic versions, that is to say, for the marked and unmarked forms of possessive suffixes: *Garadna-patak* ~ *Garadna pataka*, *Patafa* ~ *Patafája* etc., even if they refer to the same geographical place. Within each entry, however, the denotates are separated (by numbers); the names and the different versions of names marking the same place are connected by a clear and transparent system of reference. The entries consist of the accurate, letter-by-letter transcription of place names, the year and a reference to the source. This allows the study of philological changes in the name forms and the study of their linguistic, geographical versions.

The examined charters include not only proper names but also a large number of common words. From among these common words the dictionary presents every lexeme referring to a place, thus adhering to the practice of general philological dictionaries. If the remnants contain common names as separate words, as well, they are organised into separate entries: *domb* ‘hill’, *bükk* ‘beech’, *kökény* ‘blackthorn’, *tölgyfa* ‘oak tree’, etc.; if they are present only in a derived form or as an element of a name, they will be presented as referring entries: *ártány* ‘barrow’, *rák* ‘crab’; *egyház* ‘church’, *magyar* ‘Hungarian’, etc. If there is a common word which takes the same form as a proper name, the form of the proper name will be the entry: *Hegy* ‘Mountain’, *Kő* ‘Stone’, *Méh* ‘Bee’, *Monostor* ‘Monastery’, *Sziget* ‘Island’, etc. The common names and name elements were included in the dictionary (and a precise system of reference was also created) since the lexicographers wished that “the published linguistic data be available for efficient use in the general history of lexicology, as well” (KMHsz., p. 17).

Beyond the linguistic study of the phonological, morphological structures and the etymology of toponyms, research on onomastics includes the localisation of place names, that is the determination of the denotative meaning. KMHsz. proves to be useful in this respect as well. Toponyms are localised in a way which is characteristic of dictionaries rather than encyclopaedias: if a place can be precisely identified, its location is specified at the head of the entries or at the head of the segments separated by denotate; there is no more



information given than what is indispensable for the identification of a place; e.g.: **Hutka** ‘settlement in Abaúj ct., SE of Košice, left bank of Tarca’; **Nekcse I. 1.** ‘stream in the S of Baranya ct., united with Matucsina flows into Velcsica, then into Karasó’. In the case of place names which are difficult to localise, the location mentioned in the source text is followed; e.g.: **Ladoméra** ‘stream mentioned in the Bars comitat, at the border of Apáti and Ladomér’. It can happen that the location can only be defined as a possible location; e.g.: **Evetes** ‘settlement in the NE of Baranya ct., it may have lain around Pécsvárad’. There are several cases when it is impossible to localise a place name, when only the name of the comitat is present; e.g.: **Etény** ‘settlement in Bodrog ct., location unknown’. In the case of common words appearing in charters, only a simplified localisation appears in the dictionary: only the name of the settlement (and the comitat) is mentioned at the border of which the common name is mentioned; e.g.: **kőris** [...] (Belisz, Baranya ct.) *Keyris*.

The dictionary includes an index of the transcribed data appearing in the sources (pp. 309–389), and in each case it is indicated under which entry a given word can be found, and thus the sources themselves can also be retrieved. The book ends with an index of name suffixes of the data (pp. 391–449), which can be useful in the study of the phonological and morphological structure of names, particularly in the study of suffixes. This section contains only a list of name data, but these names can be easily retrieved from the dictionary with the help of the name index.

This carefully edited dictionary, with its wide range of sources, is suitable for different kinds of research activities, while its appealing and neat design as well as its clear typography makes it easy and, at the same time, self-controlled reading. Moreover, data search is made easier by digital accessibility: <<http://mnytud.arts.unideb.hu/nevarchivum/szotar/main.html>>.

The significance of the dictionary is clearly understood by the authors as well: “By providing a wide range of data suitable for research, it makes us face the earlier results achieved in this academic field, and, as a consequence, there emerge some theses and theories which no longer appear to be in the eyes of the experts as correct as before. It may encourage the specific and analytic study of names, but it can be used most productively in taxonomical and synthetic research.” (KMHsz., p. 6). Evidently, this statement cannot and does not only apply to the science of onomastics in a strict sense. The linguistic history of the Early Old Hungarian age, and within this field, in particular, the history of phonology and orthography, cannot be treated on the basis of a few valuable remnants only, therefore there is an ever growing need for the meticulous processing and analysis of the ample historical source materials of anthroponyms and toponyms. Thus, the mainstreaming



of the dimensional perspective of linguistics can be expanded. Research into the linguistic geography of this period will broaden out, enabling us to significantly improve our knowledge regarding historical dialectology. The comparison of the different versions of toponyms, the mapping of the background of their usage and the uncovering of the methods used in place name creation can all contribute to the work of sociolinguistics and historical pragmatics. The dictionary, encompassing the old Hungarian toponymicon, though basically compiled for linguistic and philological purposes, is invaluable not only for linguistic researchers but also for experts of associated sciences, and, what is more, due to its nature, it may become a resource for national as well as international interdisciplinary research.

*Шандор Матичак (Дебрецен, Венгрия)*

***Н. В. Казаева: Апеллятивная лексика в топонимии  
Республики Мордовия***

*Типография Красный Октябрь, Саранск 2005.*

Нина Казаева, выдающийся исследователь более молодого поколения мордовских ономастов, выпустила еще одну новую книгу. Ее новая работа — основательная, со многих точек зрения обработка топонимов, образованных от нарицательных существительных.

Монография подразделяется на две главные части. В первой части автор дает семантический анализ обработанного им значительного топонимического материала. В вводной теоретической части (6–10) я с удовольствием прочитал, что Казаева применяет систему подходов, выходящую за рамки традиционной мордовской топонимии: она различает а) самостоятельные названия (когда нарицательные слова без изменений переходят в класс топонимов, нпр. *lej* ‘река’ > *Lej* гидроним); б) элементы, называемые в русской терминологии детерминантами (*Inel'ej* < *iñe* ‘большой’) и с) элементы, выступающие в роли определения (*Lejlatko* гидроним < *lej* + *latko* ‘овраг’).

Автор определяет нижеследующие семантические группы: 1) гидрографические и 2) орографические апеллятивы, 3) лексемы, указывающие на флору, 4) фауну, 5) типы поселений, 6) хозяйственную жизнь, 7) духовную сферу, социальные и этнические отношения, 8) пространственные отношения, 9) метафорические апеллятивы. В рамках каждой группы географические термины встречаются во всех трех вышеуказанных позициях.



1) Автор собрал 32 гидрографических апеллятива (10–17). Одна часть из них мордовского происхождения (нпр. *e'ke*<sup>2</sup> ‘озеро’, *lej* ‘река’, *lejpra* ‘источник’, *lišma* ‘источник’, *šolt* ‘пруд’, *ved* ‘вода’), другая — такие слова русского происхождения, которые в настоящее время стали частью мордовской именной системы (нпр. *bolota* ‘болото’, *istok* ‘исток’, *kluč* ‘ключ’, *ožora* ‘озеро’, *prud* ‘пруд’, *rodnik* ‘родник’). Н. Казаева права в том, что существительные типа *Kalma kuža aloñ bolotaś* (дословно ‘кладбище + поляна + нижний + болото’), *Pandońprañ klučka* (‘вершина горы + источник’) уже реально считаются частью мордовского словарного запаса, но только путем глубоких социолингвистических исследований на местах можно определить к русскому или мордовскому топонимическому пласту нужно относить названия типа *Istok*, *Ožerki*, *Ušt'-Rahmanovka*.

Автор указывает на происхождение слов с финно-угорскими корнями (вместо/наряду SKES можно было бы в качестве источника использовать и UEW; важным позитивом является то, что автор также использовал несколько источников не на русском языке). Более чем спорна финно-угорская этимология (вообще: существует ли) слов *sar*, *sara*, *sura*, *zara* ‘рукав, приток реки’, невозможно предположить связь между фин. *haara* ‘рукав реки’, карельск. *soara* ‘разветвление’ и морд. *šuro* ‘рог’ лексемами.

2) Орографические апеллятивы, 21 элемент (17–22). Здесь Н. Казаева разделяет две группы: слова, обозначающие положительный (возвышенный) и отрицательный (низинный) рельеф, нпр. *pando* ‘гора, холм’, *pandopra* ‘горная вершина’, *lašmo* ‘углубление’; здесь также в изобилии имеются элементы русского происхождения: *bugor*, *gora*; *dol*, *jamta*, *kanava* и т. д. Я думаю, можно поспорить о причислении сюда *latko* ‘обрыв, ров, яма’ и *lašmo* ‘углубление’. Эти существительные скорее служат для названия гидронимических объектов, так же как и слово русского происхождения *ovrag*. Спорным считаю этимологию слов *mar* ‘холм, возвышение’, *tav* ‘камень, скала’, и особенно *ur* ‘гора’ — марийские параллели (*Urgakš*, *Uržumka*) не дают подходящего решения.

3) Слова, указывающие на растительный мир края — 72 элемента (22–36). Это самая большая и самая разветвленная группа, сюда относятся названия леса и его частей (*vir* ‘лес’, *kužo* ‘лесная поляна’, *pora* ‘роща’, *pulo* ‘роща’), деревьев (*kal* ‘ива’, *ki'ej* ‘береза’, *kuz* ‘сосна’, *lepe* ‘ольха’, *piče* ‘ель’, *poj* ‘осина’), трав, грибов, ягод (*gorhipov* ‘лютик’, *kirmalav* ‘лопух’, *nud'ej* ‘тростник’, *pango* ‘гриб’), культурных растений (*kañst*



<sup>2</sup> Для лучшего понимания представлю только данные эрзя языка. Все названия — и русские и мордовские — даны латинскими буквами.

‘конопля’, *kapsta* ‘капуста’) и т. д. Естественно, что и здесь также большое количество слов русского происхождения.

4) Такая же пестрая и группа апеллятивов, указывающих на животный мир (36–44, 63 элемента): дикие и домашние животные (*alaša* ‘лошадь’, *numolo* ‘заяц’, *ovto* ‘медведь’, *vaz* ‘теленок’, *veřgiz* ‘волк’), птицы (*kargo* ‘журавль’, *pišmar* ‘скворец’, *varaka* ‘ворона’), другие животные (*šćuka* ‘щука’, *šeške* ‘комар’, *vatrakš* ‘лягушка’) и т. д.

5) Типы поселений, 23 элемента (44–49), нпр. *vel'e* ‘деревня’, *oš* ‘город’. Не случайно, что именно в этой группе в огромной степени преобладают русские элементы: начиная с XV–XVI вв. постоянное заселение территории русскоязычным населением оказало влияние и на топонимическую систему (*gorod*, *hutor*, *počinka*, *pošolka*, *sloboda*, *šelišča*, *višelka* и т. д.). Этимология *vel'e* — самого основного элемента мордовской ономастики, не точна (ниже скажу об оценке его как топоформанта).

6) Названия, указывающие на хозяйственную жизнь, 92 элемента (49–67). Здесь Н. Казаева разделяет четыре группы: сельское хозяйство, земледелие (*pakša* ‘поле’, *piře* ‘сад/огород’, *sañd'avks* ‘вырубка’), постройки (*ambar* ‘амбар’, *ved'gev* ‘водяная мельница’), слова, связанные с передвижением (*ki* ‘дорога’, *sed'* ‘мост’); четвертая категория, слова, связанные с хозяйственной деятельностью человека (*čovar* ‘песок’, *d'ogot* ‘смола’, *kev* ‘камень’, *levš* ‘луб’, *muško* ‘пенька’, *šovoñ* ‘материал’, *torf* ‘торф’ и т. д.) достаточно гетерогенна, здесь стоило бы немного упорядочить, т.к. 92 лексемы слишком много для того, чтобы составить однородную группу. Здесь тоже можно встретить очень много русских элементов.

7) Духовная сфера, социальные и этнические отношения, 54 элемента (67–75). Подгруппы: религиозная жизнь (*k'rost* ‘крест’, *ozmona* ‘молитва’); общественно-социальное положение, занятия (это также слишком широкая категория, ведь сюда в одинаковой степени относятся такие лексемы как *ava* ‘мать’, *tejt'er* ‘девушка’, *iñazor* ‘царь’, *saldat* ‘солдат’, *učitel'* ‘учитель’); этническая принадлежность (*vet'ke* ‘чуваш’, *latiž* ‘латыш’, *mokša* ‘мокша’, *ruz* ‘русский’ и т. д.).

8) Пространственные отношения, 19 элементов (76–81): *al* ‘нижняя часть чего-л.’, *čentra* ‘середина/центр’, *jonks* ‘сторона’, *malaso* ‘близко’ и т. д.

9) Метафорические названия, 48 элементов (81–89). Возможно, это самая «захватывающая» категория, сюда относятся такие названия, как нпр. *Pesok kel* ‘песок + язык’, *Peke* ‘живот’, *Pokš šel'me* ‘большой + глаз’, *Keče lišma* ‘половник + источник’, *Pačalgo eřke* ‘сковорода + озеро’, *Tarvaz lejb'ra* ‘серп + источник’ (но *Tarvaz-Molot* ‘серп-молот’



относится скорее к 7-ой группе). На мой взгляд, *potmo* ‘нутро, внутренняя часть чего-л.’ можно было бы отнести не сюда, а в группу, перечисляющую типы поселений (ведь его значение изменилось на ‘далекий, лесной поселок’).

По моим подсчетам Н. Казаева, взяв на вооружение богатый, хорошо обоснованный данными материал, категоризирует 424 топонимических аппеллятива (или элемента, функционирующих как аппеллятивы). Ее категории в основном кажутся обоснованными, хотя в одном-двух местах можно было уточнить подгруппы, принципы категоризации. У меня есть одно более серьезное замечание: несмотря на то, что в начале книги автор разделяет одночленные топонимы, детерминанты (основные члены) и элементы в роли определения, отдельные, отнесенные к заглавным словам топонимы все же подает не соответствуя этому принципу, а «вразнобой, как попало». Но ведь совсем не все равно, что нпр. *lej* ‘река’, *vele* ‘деревня’, *čovar* ‘песок’, *ki’ej* ‘береза’, *ovto* ‘медведь’ и т. д. выступает как самостоятельный элемент или в роли определения (к тому же это подразделение могло бы дать возможность для дальнейших выводов касательно топонимической системы, и на этой основе стало бы возможным описать «поведение» элементов мордовского и русского происхождения).

Вторая часть книги — структурный анализ (89–120). Автор — придерживаясь традиционной мордовской школы учения о топонимах — разделяет топонимы на три группы: он говорит о топонимах, образованных синтаксическим, лексическим и морфологическим путем. Первая группа, т. е. большое количество сложных топонимов — самая распространенная модель мордовского топонимобразования. Н. Казаева по характеру первого члена названия выделяет такие структурные типы, в которых выступают существительные (*Tumo latko* ‘дуб + вымоина’), прилагательные (*Ravža viř* ‘черный + лес’), числительные (*Šišem liš-mapía* ‘семь + источник’) и наречия (*Vasolo viř* ‘далеко + лес’). Кроме двухсложных топонимов в отдельных группах даются топонимы, состоящие из трех и четырех компонентов, более того в одном месте мы находим и из пяти (*Siře veleń gubor aldoń erkońe* ‘старик + деревня-Ген + холм + из-под + озерцо’).

По сути дела лексический тип это множество одноэлементных топонимов, нпр. *Latko* топоним < *latko* ‘вымоина’, *Kal’* топоним < *kal’* ‘ива’, *Kuž* топоним < *kužo* ‘лесная поляна’ и т. д.

К возникшим морфологическим путем названиям относятся топонимы, образованные с помощью суффиксов. Суффиксы, образующие топонимы — по русской терминологии: топоформанты — составляют важную группу мордовской топонимической лексики. Здесь автор подроб-



но говорит о четырех топоформантах — *bije/bijo/buje, e'e/a'e/a'i/ä'e/le, lej/l'äj/laj/nej/la, kužo/kuža/kuž/guž/guža/gužo/kuši/guši*. Я вынужден более подробно коснуться вопроса о формантах, так как думаю, что здесь речь идет о принципиальных методологических (и терминологических) различиях. Самую значительную группу мордовских топонимов — применяя метод подхода венгерской ономастической школы — составляют названия, образованные грамматическим словообразованием. Таким образом, к этой группе можно отнести такие двухсложные топонимы, последний член которых какой-л. географический термин. Среди названий поселений Мордовии в многочисленных названиях встречаются элементы *vel'e* 'деревня' и *bijo* 'род, племя, или их место поселения', а в гидронимах, самым распространенным вторым компонентом является *lej* 'река'. Конечно же, наряду с этим существуют и названия, образованные морфологическим путем, но к ним я причисляю только те элементы, которые и в самом начале функционировали в качестве суффиксов: *-ka, -ov/jev(o), -in(o)*. (В процессе приспособления к русским грамматическим родам мордовские топонимы также часто принимали какой-л. суффикс, но здесь я это не рассматриваю.) Весьма упрощая вопрос: грамматический метод образования в первую очередь — особенность мордовских топонимов, в то время как особенностью топонимов русского происхождения является морфологический метод.

По моему мнению из вышесказанного следует, что перечисленные в книге четыре топоформанта являются не суффиксами, а основными членами синтагматического словосложения. Различные изменения форм (*e'e, laj, nej, guši* и т. д.) также не являются топоформантами, они лишь возникшие в определенных фонетических ситуациях варианты данных основ.

Н. Казаева во второй части главы рассматривает и другие суффиксы. Здесь наряду с настоящими (топонимическими) суффиксами (*-ovka, -ka*) она указывает суффиксы мордовских личных имен эпохи язычества (нпр. *-d'ej, -man, -mas, -nza*; эти личные имена без всякого изменения перешли в класс топонимов, нпр. *Tongaj, Akšov, Väžd'ej*), а также и несколько лексем, перешедших в настоящее время в результате агглютикации в суффиксы (*alks, lavgo, nal, prá*).

В конце монографии даются заключение (121–126), хорошо упорядоченный список сокращений (128–133), список специальной литературы (134–139) и регистр мордовских географических терминов (140–151).

Работа Н. Казаевой огромный ценный труд, монографическая обработка образованных от апеллятивной лексики топонимов Республики Мордовия. Автором обработано исключительно большое количество ономастического материала; семантическая классификация обоснова-



на, логична, пунктуальна. Для структурного анализа, возможно, можно было бы применить и другую систему подходов, но это ни в коей мере не уменьшает ценности работы в целом. Монография станет основой, необходимой для исследования мордовской ономастики.

*Габор Б. Секей (Печ, Венгрия)*

***Татьяна Дмитриева: Топонимия бассейна  
реки Казым***

*Издательство Уральского университета, Екатеринбург 2005. 580 с.*

После выхода работы Татьяны Дмитриевой «Топонимия бассейна реки Казым» по этой теме стоит писать только такие книги. Тем же, кто до сих пор думал, что изучение топонимов является не центральной частью лингвистических исследований, а только скучной языковедческой рутинной работой, после знакомства с содержанием книги пришло время изменить свое мнение.

Эта рецензия начинается необычно, потому что вначале она знакомит с содержанием находящихся в конце книги приложений, однако научная работа начинается именно здесь, только существует другая принятая форма написания. Из приложений видно, что та огромная работа, которая проводится при изучении топонимов территории, где живут северные ханты, подразделяется на филологическую часть и на работу на местности. К филологической части относится полный обзор до сих пор имеющейся литературы; кроме того, автором обработаны касающиеся Казыма карты, изданные в России и за границей, содержащие данные XVI–XX веков, а также и новейшие сельскохозяйственные и географические карты различного масштаба. В исследовании также использованы ценные филологические и исторические данные из фондов Тобольского и Ханты-Мансийского архивов Тюменской области и из отчетов археологической экспедиции Уральского университета.

Однако по-настоящему достоверный материал собран автором в процессе работы на местности. Для получения полной картины с 1987 г. по 2001 г. почти все летние отпуска она провела за работой в районе реки Казым, ею были обследованы все населенные пункты в бассейне Казыма. Те, кто уже работал на местности в Сибири, знает, что эта работа требует всего человека; она сопровождается большими физическими испытаниями, но и постоянная интеллектуальная работа может быть такой же изматывающей, ведь необходимо внимательно следить за





всей кажущейся незначительной информацией в течение 24 часов. Взамен исследователь получает то, что не дано кабинетному ученому, он уверенно чувствует себя на местности, знает, какая охотничья тропа, какая река куда ведет, живущие там люди становятся его личными знакомыми, и в исследованиях местность и говорящий на данном языке человек попадают в неразделимую зависимость. В третьем приложении автор перечисляет имена 57 консультантов (у автора информантов) из села Казым и 90 консультантов из других северохантыйских селений, расположенных в бассейне Казыма и на прилегающей территории по р. Оби. На основании такого количества данных стало возможным составить карту священных мест казымских ханты (1-е приложение, стр. 531, группировка 93 мест по четырем точкам зрения!), которая является настоящей сенсацией для ученых-этнографов.

В первой, вводной главе автор дает общий обзор географии, истории, численности населения, истории исследования топонимии края, принципов транскрипции хантыйских топонимов. Об отличной языковедческой подготовке свидетельствует последующая часть (известно, что не так просто составить фонетико-фонологическое описание хантыйского диалекта): автор, используя, вслед за DEWOS, фонематическую транскрипцию В. Штейница, с учетом уточнений Евы Шмидт, дает характеристику современной системы фонем казымского диалекта. Написание финно-угорских специальных знаков нелегкое дело и в эпоху компьютерного редактирования, эта проблема была решена весьма оригинально: данные приводятся со специальными знаками и выделены курсивом, что подчеркивает их важность и иконографически.

Во второй главе Татьяна Дмитриева характеризует структуру 2357 хантыйских топонимов Казыма с точки зрения их компонентного состава, от одночленных географических названий до шестичленных. Большинство из них трехчленные (1044 – 44,3%), нпр.: «деревня малой реки», «малая болотная река», затем следуют двухчленные (793 – 33,6%), нпр.: «малая река», «островное озеро» и четырехчленные структуры (404 – 17,1%): «малая река ненецкой дороги». Для этимологии названия реки Казым, которое представляет собой одно из 26 одночленных топонимов, принимается предложение А. Матвеева: название может быть связано со словом ненецкого происхождения «сухой, высыхающий». В конце своей книги Т. Дмитриева особо подробно анализирует это важное название реки, подчеркивая, однако, что это возможный вариант его этимологии. Такой же точный и взвешенный анализ можно найти и с точки зрения частей речи.

В дальнейшем она анализирует определяемый компонент сложных топонимов — детерминант, выявляет его семантику и функционирова-



ние. Этот подход — одна из новинок книги, автор последовательным исследованием семантики детерминантов показывает характерные особенности казымской хантыйской топонимии. Детерминантами могут быть как лексемы, обозначающие объекты природы, так и обозначающие объекты культуры. К лексике природы относятся названия гидрообъектов и их частей: «река, ручей, родник («живун»), протока, озеро, высохшее русло; залив, заводь, пережат»; названия болот и берегов, названия прибрежных лесов, а также слова, выражающие пространственные отношения: «устье, низ, верх», «перешеек», «волоок». Представленные в топонимии термины, обозначающие культурные объекты, — «город, деревня, дом», «амбар на сваях», «сеть для птиц», «дорога, просека».

В четвертой главе исследуется атрибутивная часть топонимов и показано, каким образом проявляется гармоническая связь между природой и человеком в зеркале хантыйской топонимии реки Казым. Этот анализ, на который приходится почти половина (260 страниц) книги, является самой интересной и одновременно самой захватывающей ее частью. Здесь лучше всего можно видеть связь между говорящим на родном языке человеком и природой, или, выражаясь термином сегедской лингвистической школы, единство народа и языка. В первой подглаве речь идет о топонимах, связанных с физико-географическими и экологическими характеристиками местности, во второй — о названиях, отражающих деятельность человека. В этой главе немного скользит нумерация, подглавы превращаются в большие буквы, становится несколько затруднительным узнавать темы. Местность характеризуется словами «река, живая вода, приток, болото, высокий берег, низкий берег, протока», пространственные отношения — структурами со значением «северный, нижний — южный, верхний; правый, левый, верх, низ», но важен и размер объекта: «малый, большой, высокий, низкий, короткий, длинный, круглый» (здесь встречаются и метафорические названия), а также «цвет, глубина, закрытость, ценность и т. д.». Топонимы возникают и на основе флоры и фауны края: «лес, дерево, части дерева, куст, мох, трава»; «рыба, птица, дикий зверь: лось, медведь, пушной зверек». Хантыйская материальная и духовная культура раскрывается посредством топонимического материала последующей подглавы: имена, фамилии жителей; приспособления для охоты, рыбной ловли, оленеводства, средства передвижения, постройки, названия предметов быта, типы поселений. Через топонимический материал можно познакомиться с хантыйской мифологией: священные места, высшие боги, духи-охранители, лесные духи, женщина-мис, женщина-пор и таинственная женщина-сюпыр (ср.: *Сибирь*). Есть топонимы, имеющие связь с такими фольклорными героями, и даже со священ-



ными деревьями. Автор, где только был материал, и, к счастью, материал был в изобилии, везде на основе рассказов консультантов показывает местные традиции, рисует картину хантыйской мифологии бассейна Казыма, что может стать предметом дальнейшего анализа.

В последней главе автор делает обзор языковых контактов бассейна Казыма, начиная с других северохантыйских групп, далее характеризует топонимы лесного ненецкого происхождения, включая сюда и параллельные переводы в топонимии. Топонимы коми происхождения значительны и сами по себе, и вместе с тем, что язык коми — будучи языком-посредником — передал топонимы селящемуся здесь русскому населению. Несмотря на то, что на этой территории никогда не жил народ манси, все же из некоторых топонимов («вогульская река, вогульское озеро»), выясняется, что на этой территории можно найти и следы обитания обских семей манси. Только один топоним указывает на татарские связи, гораздо важнее казымские хантыйско-русские контакты и их лингвистический анализ, включение в топонимы русских слов со значением «чай, калач, рыбная мука, табак, погреб, амбар на сваях, артель». Естественно, остаются и этимологически неясные топонимы, относительно их можно также найти достойные внимания, хотя и осторожные предложения.

В заключении Т. Дмитриева кратко, тезисно, в девяти пунктах, подытоживает самые важные результаты работы, их сущность — комплексное историко-этимологическое исследование топонимического материала данной территории, важность сохранить исчезающий топонимический материал для науки. Автор с присущей ему скромностью видит значение своего труда в этом, однако мы смело можем добавить то, что уральская ономастика обогатилась прекрасной книгой и по содержанию, но еще в большей степени по подходу.

Эта книга была и есть для сотрудников кафедры общего языкознания филологического факультета Уральского университета символом первооткрывательства, можно уверенно сказать — они впереди и в сборе, и в обработке материалов. Надеемся, что великий старейшина уральского языкознания Александр Матвеев, который на протяжении десятилетий был руководителем кафедры и организатором многочисленных экспедиций по Уралу (перед казымской экспедицией Татьяна Дмитриева трижды посетила ивдельских манси), обработавший на уровне словаря топонимический материал территории, в настоящее время научный консультант, в самое ближайшее время закончит книгу о мансийской топонимии, наиболее полное собрание которой хранится на кафедре. Находящиеся во внутренней комнате кафедры стеллажи на всю стену заполнены настоящими сокровищами о местах проживания



манси, до которых отсюда мы можем добраться только с большим трудом, или вообще даже не имеем понятия об их существовании, все это есть там. Мы также надеемся, что когда выйдет в свет эта рецензия, для Татьяны Дмитриевой защита докторской диссертации по этой книге в Ижевском университете будет уже в прошлом. Было бы нужно как можно больше подобных работ о каждой долине реки, о каждом поселении, горном массиве, где жили и живут уральские народы.

