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River names in Hungary during the Árpád age

1. About Hungarian hydronomastics

River names is a field constantly present in the history of Hungarian onomastics. A reason for this could be, quoting LAJOS KISS, that the names of international rivers are the most archaic layer of toponyms. Furthermore, this name type seems to be the most resistant to changes, being the least affected by cultural-political-ideological influences. The joint consequence of the two factors is that Hungarian hydronyms document the history of language changes, since by studying them we can follow the phonological and morphological alternations after the 10th century, the period that can be studied thoroughly through the hydronym and toponym corpus of medieval documents. Besides the historical value of the major water-course names, the smaller names of Hungarian origin present a less researched area in dialectology and historical dialectology, although the words forming a part of a hydronym that can be easily localized could present a good basis for territorial studies (cf. KÁLMÁN 1967: 348, BENKÓ 1982: 179).

While the thoughts presented above emphasize the role of hydronomastics in historical linguistics and historical dialectology, FERENC BÍRÓ regards this type of toponym as an important part of “self-principled” linguistics because of its impact on the whole of the onomastic system: “namely, the names of rivers, lakes and other places which are of extreme importance to the life of the population in naming other objects, whether independently or as a distinctive element” (1999: 36).

It can be stated about hydronomastics that, contrary to the wide range of possibilities for its use (presented here), it is not as systematic and organized as settlement names. However, compared to other types of toponyms, hydronomastics is still the among study fields analysed the most frequently and from the most aspects.

1.1. One of the earliest and most dominant directions in Hungarian hydronomastics is etymological analysis – which is understandable, given that it is the basis of any kind of onomatosystematic-typological study. However, in the case of etymological hydronomastics we can see a unique disproportionality: in the centre of attention of Hungarian onomasticians there were primarily borrowings and secondarily semantically opaque hydronyms of inner genesis.

In the field of name explanation methodology, JÁNOS MELICH’s activity was of the utmost importance, and his methods and principles used in toponomas-
tics are regarded as the authority by modern onomastics as well. Namely, “MELICH’s work is known for very detailed historical data-recording: he tended to list all the words originating from the same root, localized them accurately, and by deriving them orthographically, phonologically and morphologically, he showed the history of derivation and development of the given name” (HOFFMANN 2003a: 16). This is how precisely he analysed the origin of the hydronym Turmas (1957), for example, or the origination possibilities of Aqua Turna from the 1113th document from Zobor (1963).

MELICH’s detailed, microphilologically precise research method can be traced in the late work of LORÁND BENKŐ, who analysed and used numerous hydronyms from Anonymous studies important not only for the history of onomastics, but also for the history of language (cf. relevant studies from BENKŐ 1998, 2003).

In the 1940’s, several researchers turned their attention to the territories detached from Hungary by the Paris Peace Treaty of 1920, consequently, to Transylvania and especially to Székely Land. Two factors played a role in choosing these areas for research: on the one hand, the abundancy in water of these former Hungarian territories; and on the other, the national feeling strengthened after the peace treaty, which might have influenced the choice of researched territory. ISTÁN KNIEZSA’s (1942, 1948a, 1948b) and LORÁND BENKŐ’s discussion series (1947a, 1948) from this period have, beyond their description of hydronyms, served as a methodological legacy for future generations of onomasticians. During the polemics between the two authors, BENKŐ filtered the name corpus considered to be of Slavic origin by KNIEZSA (1948). Their comments on the etymology of certain hydronyms and their methodological notes concern the very basics of Hungarian toponomastics: when mapping the genesis of a name, it is important to find out when in which language the given name gained its proper name status, which of course does not influence its value and function in the Hungarian system of toponyms.

LAJOS KISS followed the same direction later on. Firstly, he continued to work on the Hungarian-inhabited territories abroad: he analysed the name corpus of Transylvania (1999: 149–159) and Upper Northern Hungary (1999: 73–93). Secondly, concentrating on borrowed words primarily, he separated layers according to chronology and genesis. He therefore talks about ancient Indo-European hydronyms dated back to the Ancient period (e.g. Garam, Kiszueca, Morva), and in the group of hydronyms documented in the Middle Ages; he discusses Pre-Slavic (e.g. Ārva, Bōdva, Nyitra, Vāg), Slavic (e.g. Bebre, Kompa, Rima, Szalatna, Zsitva), a few Hungarian names (e.g. Balog, Bodrog, Būr-patak, Sajó, Szécső) and he also mentions hydronyms of German origin or with German mediation (e.g. Gölnic, Korpona, Selmec). Fur-
thermore, he wrote studies about hydronyms with no or with uncertain origin (e.g. Ipoly, Laborc, Latorca).

Probably inspired by LAJOS KISS’s work, RITA PÓCZOS conducted similar research. She presents the linguistic layers of the hydronym systems of Sajó (2003) and Garam and Ipoly (2004), especially emphasizing the differences between certain layers of genesis.

In the literature about hydronyms, besides studies based on territorial divisions (comitat or region, i.e. according to drainage areas), there is a large number of works discussing the etymology of certain hydronyms. This aspect was especially strong in the mid 20th century, a non-exhaustive list of certain examples: ATTILA SZABÓ T. discussed the name of Székaszó-patak in more detail (1939), DÉNES SZABÓ devoted an independent study to the controversial Koppány hydronym (1944), ELEMÉR MOÓR to Küükllő (1947), SÁNDOR MIKESY made a few notes on Gyöngyös (1947), etc. Among studies from the later period, LAJOS KISS’S etymological work emerges again: the even today the uncertain genesis of Hortobágy (1999: 160–167) and Hernád (1999: 172–173) are discussed in independent studies, and his monumental FNESz. also contains hydronym etymologies.

1.2. Besides etymological studies, many researchers chose the typological analysis of hydronyms as their topic. We mention here LEVENTE TIBÁD „Hydronyms of the area along Nyikó” (1979) or ÁRPÁD KÁLNÁSI’s study analysing the hydronyms of Tisza-Túr (1988).

In her study of Old Hungarian toponyms, VALÉRIA TÓTH applied a multilevel analysis model. As her dissertation topic, she chose an onomatosystematical investigation of the full toponym corpus of Abaúj and Bars comitat, in which she processed hydronyms as well (2001). In another study she researched the onomastic system of Zala drainage area, showing its functional-semantic and lexical-morphological structure (2003).

I myself used HOFFMANN’S typology in researching the functional-semantic structure of Árpád age river names (GYŐRFY 2002, GYŐRFY–RESZEGI 2003), as well as in presenting the lexical-morphological structure of Árpád age river names of inner genesis, found in the Sajó drainage area (GYŐRFY 2004).

1.3. The question of geographical appellatives is a special research field of general hydronymastics. Hydrographic common names were most frequently investigated as a separate group of words, but much geography of names research has been conducted in this context, too.

Among works unifying semantic aspects and aspects of geography of the word, OTTÓ VÖRÖS’S monograph probably got the farthest (1999). In the
study investigating more than a hundred Western Hungarian hydrographic common names, he shows their role as toponyms.

Researchers have gradually turned their attention to one or more hydrographic common names with vague meanings, consequently, independent studies were born about the following names: aszó (PAIS 1912, NYÍRI 1978, 1979), fok (REUTER 1970, ANDRÁSFALVY 1970, FEKETE 1997), kégy and kengyel (REUTER 1971), patak (HOFFMANN 2003b) and séd (BALÁZS 1981, PESTI 1987).

In his work “Helynévkutatás és szőföldrajz” [Toponomastics and geography of word] (1967), BÉLA KÁLMÁN projected eighteen hydrographic common names on map pages. The map presenting data from Zala county shows that certain words meaning ‘patak’ [stream] “are not placed in capricious fuzziness, but in a certain system” (KÁLMÁN 1967: 349).

VALÉRIA TÓTH conducted a geography of word research on an early Hungarian toponym corpus, involving nine comitats (1997). In her study she separately investigates hydrographic common words meaning ‘stream’ (aszó, ér, jó, patak, sár), so we can read about the territorial distribution of these Early Old Hungarian lexemes.

2. Onomatosystematical analysis of the Early Old Hungarian river names

In what follows I will present the oldest documented layer of Hungarian hydronyms, the onomastic treasure of the Árpád era. The Árpád age is the period in Hungarian history from the Hungarian Conquest until 1301 (the last year in which a king from the house of Árpád reigned). However, for language historians, this period extends until 1350 and is referred to as the Early Old Hungarian period.

In compiling the early Hungarian name corpus I have used the hydronyms found in the first volume of the “Korai magyar helynévszótár” [Early Hungarian toponym dictionary; KMHsz.] and in the II–IV volumes of GYÖRGY GYÖRFFY’s “Az Árpád-kori Magyarország történeti földrajza” [The historical geography of Árpád age Hungary]. The corpus developed in this way contains 1,253 early Hungarian hydronyms.

In my investigation I have used the toponymic analysis model devised by ISTVÁN HOFFMAN, who primarily relied on and further developed research conducted by the Czech RUDOLF ŠRAMEK and the Finn KERO KIVINIEMI (1993). The main characteristics of this typology—as I have referred to already—is that it analyses toponyms in several layers: it approaches names from both a structural and historical point of view. Besides investigating
names from a functional-semantic and lexical-morphological aspect, the genesis and change of names receives attention as well. A simultaneous synchronic and diachronic analysis allows us to discover systematic tendencies and regularities concerning toponyms. At the same time, it is important to look at the two aspects individually, because this is what shows the connection between the two systems.

3. Structural analysis

Structural analysis on the one hand considers the model types that can be used as the basis for name giving and which appear in certain names; on the other hand, structural analysis presents the lexical, morphological and grammatical means applied in designing the functional-semantic classes used in name giving. The key term of structural analysis is the name constituent: this is the segment of the name which expresses certain semantic contents referring to the referent of the name.\(^1\)

The functional-semantic categories present in toponyms can be classified into three big groups: the name constituent can denote the type of the place (henceforth: F function), it can express a characteristic of the place (S function), and it can also denote the place itself (M function).\(^2\) In Old Hungarian hydronyms these three name constituent functions appear in F, S, M; S+F, S+M; M+F structures. These structural types have the following distribution in the Old Hungarian hydronyms I investigated: 4% of the name corpus is of F structure, 20,5% of M function and almost an equal number (19,5%) has S function structure. To sum up, these single-function names make up almost a half of the corpus (44%). Among two-functional names, the proportion of S+F structure type is the highest (23,5%), M+F structure has 12% of the name in the corpus and 7% has S+M structure. Besides these names we can also find those which cannot be categorized: almost every tenth name (9,5%) is like this and certain names could originate from several different sources.

3.1. The naming of the type of water in all cases happens by a hydrographic common word. Almost half of the Old Hungarian corpus contains hydro-

---

1 In my study, I am using terms devised by István Hoffmann in his toponymic analysis model, therefore, for detailed explanations of given terms cf. Hoffmann 1993. Symbols F, S, M used below correspond to the Hungarian equivalents of name part functions.

2 Besides name constituents expressing different characteristics of the denoted place, there are also name constituents which solely express the fact that it is the name of the place. The toponym Duná ‘Danube’ in Hungarian does not have any descriptive meaning, and Fekete-Körös ‘Black Körös’ can also be interpreted only as ‘the river named Körös, whose water is black’. We refer to the role of name constituents like this as the descriptive function.
graphic common names. These names can have a single-function, which is obviously F function, or can be of the S+F or M+F type.

There are hardly any hydronyms in the Old Hungarian corpus which have only one name constituent, i.e. a single geographical common name: e.g. Ér ‘brooklet’, Patak ‘brook’, Sár ‘mud’ and Víz ‘water’. We have to stress, however, that it is sometimes difficult to decide whether the given name in the document is used as a common or as a proper name. Namely, in order to decide this, we would have to reconstruct relations in language use from over more than a hundred years ago, which sometimes proves to be an impossible task due to lack of information.\(^3\)

The most common structural type among hydronyms is when the first component referring to a certain characteristic is connected to a second component expressed by a hydrographic common name: Agyag-patak ‘clay brook’, Hideg-séd ‘cold brook’, Nagy-patak ‘big brook’, Romlott-patak ‘rotten brook’, Sós-patak ‘salty brook’.

Two-part hydronyms of the M+F structure can be described by the following semantic content: ‘the water which is named X’. The hydronym Aranyos pataka can therefore be interpreted as ‘the stream which is named Aranyos’. Hydronyms like this can always be traced back to a one-part name (here Aranyos).

3.2. Name constituents expressing certain characteristics of the water can vary from semantic as well as lexical aspects. We differentiate these big categories within this one: the name constituent can refer to a characteristic of the water, to an external item or to a relation to another place. The reference to a characteristic is shown in S, S+F and S+M structures.

The most common name constituent function is the reference to the exact place of the water. Into this group, we can classify hydronyms that serve as point of reference and those that show the place of the water. Hydronyms Bérc-patak ‘brook near a crag’, Megye-patak ‘brook of the shire’ and Telek pataka ‘brook between plots/near a plot’ relate the position of the water to a nearby region or terrain. Hydronyms named after a settlement: Bokor, Kubin, Pocsaj, Pocsim, Rudnok, Sipek, Sztregova, Tarján,\(^4\) but also Baski-patak, Gönc pataka, Gönyű pataka, Gyán pataka, Lécsény pataka, Ragály pataka, Tolvé-ér, Vezekény pataka, Zselizi-sár, which have an S+F structure; and also

---

3 A detailed study of the wording of documents in Latin can provide us some help in the evaluation of problematic lexemes, cf. Hoffmann 2004.

4 In his early works, discussing polysemous settlement names and hydronyms, Loránd Benkő offers considerable help in determining the name-giving direction of problematic names (1947b, 1948).
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Váradi-Körös, Ragály Szuhája, with S+M structure. In these names the first component, referring to the settlement is without a formant, however, the possession is sometimes expressed by an -i derivational suffix. The second component is present both in its basic form and with the formant referring to the third person singular.

In the name giving process of waters, the flora of the water frequently serves as a motivation: Alma ‘apple’, Füzegy ‘willow’, Nádas ‘reed(y)’, Nyárád ‘birch’ and the first component of the following names is a tree name: Berke-nye pataka ‘service-tree brook’, Fenyő-sevnice ‘pine (acid-)water’, Körtvély-ér ‘pear brooklet’, Somos-patak ‘cornel brook’, Tölgy-patak ‘oak brook’.

Not so much in the case of larger waters, but quite frequently in the case of smaller streams, there is a reference to a person: Apord, Bilna, Boca, Kara, Tápió, Tecső and Károly pataka, Zakariás pataka. We have to note, however, that these names could also have been unrecorded settlement names and that the name of the water was generated from a personal name through a settlement name.

Besides the above three big groups, there are also those where the motivation is the size of the water and its fauna, or the fauna of the surrounding area. There is reference to the size of the water in one-part S function names Keskeny ‘narrow’ and Mélyes ‘deep’, as well as in the two-part S+F function Kis-patak ‘small brook’, Mély-ér ‘deep brooklet’, Nagy-sár ‘big mud’. Hydronyms Disznód ‘pig’, Hódosd ‘beaver’ and Hattyas pataka ‘swan brook’, Pisztrángos-patak ‘trout brook’, according to a functional-semantic aspect refer to the fauna found in the water and nearby.

There are also name constituents which refer to the state of the water or its periodic characteristic and they connect to the geographic common word or an already existing hydronym: Aszú-patak ‘searing brook’, Száraz-patak ‘dry brook’, Romlott-patak ‘rotten brook’, Holt-Duna ‘dead Duna’, Meddő-Selmec ‘dead Selmec’, Száraz-Szesztric ‘dry Szesztric’. Among groups present in smaller numbers, there are those which refer to the material found in the water. For example, the S+F structure hydronyms: Köves-patak ‘stony brook’, Meszes-patak ‘chalky brook’ and Szék-patak ‘soda brook’ and the S+M structure Köves-Vicsoma ‘stony Vicsoma’. In the hydronyms Kúrtös ‘shaped like a horn’ and Homorú-patak ‘hollow brook’ there is reference to its meandering nature, while in Fehér-patak ‘white brook’, Fekete-patak ‘black brook’ and Kék-Kálló ‘blue Kálló’, Fejér-Béla ‘white Béla’ there are constituents referring to the colour of the water. The motivation for the hydronym Sós-patak ‘salty brook’ was its taste. Bűzös ‘stinky’ refers to its smell. In the two-part Hideg-víz ‘cold water’, Hideg-patak ‘cold brook’ and Hideg-Tepi ‘cold Tepi’ the motivation for name giving was the temperature of the water. In the one-part Hangos ‘loud’ and two-part Zúgó-fok ‘shooting brook’ one can dis-
cover a name constituent referring to the sound of the watercourse. Sebes ‘fast’ and Csorgó-ér ‘slowly running brooklet’, Lassú-ág ‘slow arm’ have constituents describing the pace of the water. Edifices found near the water rarely serve as a name giving motivation: e.g. Bánya-patak ‘mine brook’, Malom vize ‘water of the mill’ and Köhid-Körös ‘stonebridge Körös’. The relative position of the water, however, is only present in two-part hydronyms of the S+M structure: Közép-Hanva ‘middle Hanva’, Közép-Sár ‘middle Sár’. The same semantic content is expressed in Közép-ér ‘middle brooklet’, Vég-ág ‘end arm’ and Vég-ér ‘end brooklet’ S+F hydronyms.

3.3. As a name constituent there is always an actual, existing hydronym. Hydronyms containing an M function name constituent can be structurally diverse, among the studied names there are also one-part and two-part names, and the latter can be of M+F or S+M type, where the second component is a geographical common word or in which the first component defines a characteristic, respectively.

One-part names with a name constituent are quite common among hydronyms: this phenomenon can be explained by the fact that water names borrowed from other languages also belong to this category. The hydronyms Béla, Blava, Kraszna, Olt, Szamos, Szuha, Tepla, Tisza, Tugár, Vág, Veperec, Vérőce as parts of the Hungarian toponymic system have only one function, to refer to the denonatum: they do not refer to any feature of the water, and they do not denote the type it belongs to, either. The original semantic content of these names (which can be described in the base language) is irrelevant from the point of view of Hungarian toponymy, although these motives obviously belong to the etymological investigation of given names: Szuha, for example, in Slavic languages means a stream drying out, but getting to Hungarian, this name (constituent) function is gone, and can be interpreted as purely denominating.

Names of inner origin also belong to this group. These river names were two-part toponyms, regarding their original structure. Later, the primary structure became obscure and they became indivisible one-part names and therefore functionally are to be discussed under this name constituent: Berek-jó ‘river of the grove’ > Berettyó, Hév-jó ‘warm river’ > Hájó and Hejó, Mély-ér ‘deep brooklet’ > Millér. The reason for de-etymologisation is probably the obscurring of one of the lexemes (e.g. jó ‘river’) which in return can be explained by its disappearance from the vocabulary.

The two-part M+F structure hydronyms’ first component is an already existing hydronym, which is complemented by a second component expressing the type of the place, consequently, the denotative meaning of these names coincides with the names denotative meaning of the first component: Ida denotes the same water as Ida vize (cf. also Racka > Racka pataka, Sztinva > Sztinva-
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Looking at this group a question arises: why was it necessary to complete the one-part hydronym with a second component of hydrographic common word. If we look at the Hungarian hydronymic system, it seems that all the Early Hungarian names of rivers, except the group of borrowed names, is a two-part name, where the second component is a hydrographic apellative. We can therefore conclude that the names mentioned here became two-part due to analogy, as the river names of Hungarian origin are prototypically two-part and with a hydrographic common word as the second component.

In the case of hydronyms of S+M structure the second component is primarily a hydronym, the first component referring to a characteristic usually denotes a side branch or a backwater. These hydronyms can also be divided into two subgroups according to a borrowed or inner genetic nature of the denominating component. The second component of Fejér-Béla, Kőhid-Körös, Köves-Vicsoma, Közép-Hanva, Túlsó-Borsova and Váradi-Körös hydronyms is borrowed, while it is of internal origin in the following hydronyms: Aszú-Szartos, Holt-Nyárád and Nagy-Sár.

4. Analysis based on the historico-genesis

From a historico-genetic point of view, we examine hydronyms according to the language rules and powers that caused the language elements to infiltrate into the structure of names. Our investigation concerns already existing hydronyms, since the lexical-morphological change of form does not only affect the genesis of new names, but also the change of structure of the existing names.

István Hoffmann, in his historico-genetic study of toponyms, takes into consideration the same word-formation models which can be applied in the investigation of common words as well: among the categories are names derived by syntagmatic editing, morphematic editing, names formed through semantic name-giving, names formed by structural change and name borrowings.

4.1. The largest group among hydronyms are the names derived by syntagmatic editing: these names were originally two-part, i.e. both components of the name convey some information about the denotate. However, the group can be further differentiated according to the relation between the two components into toponyms derived from subordinated or coordinated structures. In the Old Hungarian corpus we did not find any examples for coordinated compounds, but we have found many examples for subordinated compounds. Within this group, I discuss separately the names derived from their qualitative-, quantitative- and possessive-attributive structure.
4.1.1. In the group of qualitative-attributive structure we classify the hydronyms which have a syntactic relation between the name constituents: Bükk-patak, Egres-pataka, Fejér-Béla, Fekete-patak, Hideg-patak, Lassú-ág, Kis-Duna, Nagy-Balog, Nádas-patak, Sebes-patak, Száraz-ér, Vajas-ér, Zselizsár, etc.

Within the group, we can differentiate between emphatic and determining attributives, as well as distinctive attributive compounds, according to the function of the first component. In the former compounds, the first component refers to a characteristic and the second component to a hydrographic common word: Nádas-patak, Pisztrángos-patak, Fehér-patak, Hideg-patak, Mély-ér, Nagy-patak. Contrary to this, the function of the first component of a hydronym with a determining attributive structure is to determine one of the objects having the same name: Közép-Sár, Közép-Hanva, Túlsó-Borsova. There are only a few examples of the latter category: they can be described with ‘the (first component) lies near the (second component)’ semantic structure. For example, hydronyms Köhid-Körös, Ragály Szuhája, Váradi-Körös are like this.

4.1.2. Old Hungarian hydronyms do not really show any examples of quantitative-attributive structure, but we can mention the hydronym Hármas-Körös when discussing the category. Morphologically the name can be classified as one derived from a qualitative-attributive compound, although its meaning is more quantitative-attributive, since Körös names the area where the three branches of the river Körös flow into one.

4.1.3. Among hydronyms derived by syntagmatic editing, there is quite a large number of possessive-attributive structures. Naturally, there is a possibility of classifying the names belonging to this group according to markedness.

In this group, for example, we can find hydronyms, whose first name constituent refers to the settlement close to which the water is located: in hydronyms like Bölzse-patak, Daróc-patak, Hilyó-patak, Hlubokí-patak, Levas-patak, Szerencs-patak, therefore, we see that the given watercourse springs from Bölzse, Daróc, Hilyó, etc. settlements, i.e. they have the meaning ‘the stream is of the settlement names in the first component’.

We have to be extremely careful when analysing hydronyms with possessive-attributive structure, because what is a possessive-attributive structure in form may not refer to an actual possessive relationship.

Among the first components we can find names of nations (Cseh pataka), personal names (Csáka pataka, Károly pataka, Zakariás pataka), names of professions (Prépost pataka). In the cases of these names we can talk about real possession, but it has to be interpreted in a unique way: the possessive re-
lination may refer to the fact that the water is running through the field in possession of the person named in the first component, but it can also mean that the water is named after the owner of the fishing rights—which was especially frequent in the case of lakes.

Among the hydronyms containing a second component in the form of a geographical common word with possessive inflection in biggest number, we find structures with a settlement name in the first component: *Egervár pataka, Balajt pataka, Bátor pataka, Bocsárd pataka, Gyula pataka, Inaktelke pataka, Petlend pataka, Szécsén pataka, Szentkirály pataka, Told pataka, Vája pataka, Várad ere, Vezekény pataka*, etc. These names are semantically referring to the ‘watercourse found on the settlement expressed in the first component’, i.e. morphologically it is a possession, but semantically it is a certain kind of locative relation. *Telek pataka*, which flows between parcels of land, *Láz pataka*, which flows through a meadow, and *Megye pataka*, which refers to the fact that the watercourse served as a borderline, due to the stability of the river basin.

In the morphologically marked hydronyms *Egres pataka, Kökényes pataka, Sós pataka*, the use of the possessive inflection is formal, but it does not refer to possession, nor to local relation. These names show semantic structural similarities concerning their function and content to the unmarked *Egres-patak, Kökényes-patak*, i.e. they are basically categorised as qualitative-attributive structure.

In possessive attributive structures, we see examples for the expression of class-individual relation as well. In this case the first component is a borrowing which is combined with the hydrographic common word *pataka* indicating type: *Beberc pataka, Rednik pataka*.

**4.2.** Hydronyms formed by morphemic editing were generated by using a topo-formant.

During derivation by a topo-formant, “the toponymic, personal name status of a given sign is gained by joining a root morpheme or a sequence of morphemes to the topo-formant” (HOFMANN 1993: 75). In the Old Hungarian names of rivers -d, a-gy and -s topo-formants were used.

Among early Old Hungarian toponyms, there are a large number of names created by the toponym -s. ÉVA B. LÓRINCZY (1962) and KATALIN D. BARTHÁ (1958) studied the formant’s functions and their distribution (cf. D. BARTHÁ 1958: 106–7, B. LÓRINCZY 1962: 85–95). The role of the -s topo-formant could have developed secondarily from its function to express supplies and form collective nouns (cf. TNyt. I, 255). In the investigated corpus this formant was most commonly added to plant name or animal name: *Almás, Egres, Fenyős, Füves, Gyepes, Gyöngyös, Gyümőlcsényes, Hagymás*.
Halyagos, Kenderes, Nádas, Tormás, Zabos, Hódos, Ludas, Ménès, Rákos, Ólyves. The formant -s was also used in the following polysemous names represented by various basic words: Aranyos, Bűzsös, Kürtös, Szartos, Telkes.

The topon-formant function of -d and -gy suffixes has probably also developed from expression of a property (cf. HAJDÚ 1981). These names have explicitly developed from plant and animal names: Égregy, Füzegy, Nyárád, Disznód.

4.3. Semantic word formation uses the already existing element inventory of common names and proper names as toponyms in a way which does not cause any change in morphological structure.

4.3.1. As already seen above, there are hydronyms whose form coincides with a hydrographic common name: Ér ‘brooklet’, Patak ‘brook’, Víz ‘water’. In the case of these names, parallel to their common word value, a proper name value developed in certain name-user communities. We call this process semantic split. This name formation method shows that in forming new words, the influence of the system of the existing names is important, but to follow the name patterns does not exclude the possibility of proper names developing via a gradual re-evaluation of their common name precedents.

4.3.2. In the case of toponyms, transonymization is interpreted as a metonymic or metaphoric name-giving on the basis of conceptual feature contact. This formation type always creates a one-part toponym, whose functional-semantic characteristic can only be a description of a feature of the place.

Among Old Hungarian hydronyms, we only discovered examples of the metonymic subtype. This name formation type is based on the spatial, material or time relation between a place and another place or a person.

Among the names in this groups the most common is the type that can be described by the following metonymic formula: ‘settlement’ → ‘river flowing by the settlement’, e.g. Bokoránd, Boltrágy, Cétény, Dengeleg, Hecse, Iszkorna, Isztebne, Kanizsa, Kara, Lászó, Pográny, Senye, Szalók, Szerencs, Szkacsán, Vitelnek, Záhorh, Zsűny.

The functional-semantic analysis has already pointed to the fact that Hungarian hydronyms have frequently received their name from the flora nearby; this could also have happened metonymically, but the number of names formed this way is small: Bor, Eger, Gyürű, Nyár (the common names having the same form are tree names).

Those hydronyms which were formed from personal names, without adding a formant, can be described by the ‘person/group’ → ‘hydronym’ formula: Boca, Kara, Mile, Mirhó, Pacsa.

4.4. The common feature of hydronyms developed by structural change is that the form of the toponyms changes, but the denotative meaning does not. The
outcome of this change is the creation of names synonymous with the precedents of the change.

4.4.1. The structural change can cause both increase and decrease in the sound body of the hydronym. If this change happens in the functional-semantic structure, i.e. on the level of name constituent, the increase is called complementation and the decrease is called ellipsis.

In the case of Old Hungarian hydronyms, it is difficult to decide whether we are talking about ellipsis or complementation, since the names in this relation can be of parallel genesis as well. The specification can be adjusted by the chronology of occurrence in the documents, but the subsistence of certain documents is completely random, therefore, we have to treat this clue with reservations. Examples of name constituent change: Gyula pataka ~ Gyula, Ózd pataka ~ Ózd.

In any case, the M+F structure hydronyms are also formed by complementation. In these names, in every instance, there is a denominational hydronym and hydrographic common name in the possessive case (pataka, vize). In the primary variants of names that belong to this group we can find borrowings (Kraszna pataka, Recske pataka, Gadna vize, Hernád vize), and one-part (Aranyos pataka, Eger vize, Sár vize) and two-part (Fenyő-sevnice pataka, Hideg-víz pataka, Berettyó vize, Sajó vize) names of inner genesis. The second component in these names indicates the species. I believe their formation can be explained from two aspects. On the one hand, the primary names do not refer to waters, and the document writers used the second components pataka and vize for the sake of clarifying the species. On the other hand, and in connection to this, a certain number of these names are in a homonymous relation to the neighbouring settlements, therefore, the toponym type marker in the form of the basic component could have served to separate the settlement from the water (Ludna pataka, Racka pataka, Gadna vize, Tecșő vize). In my opinion, this method of complementation may have been a part of the linguistic form of the documents, but we can also presuppose an occasional or even continuous name use behind the written form.

4.4.2. When the structural change of the hydronym happens in the lexical-morphological structure, i.e. on the level of name element, then we call it reduction; and when the name is prolonged by a name element, we call it expansion. The element change can refer to a loss of lexeme or a bound morpheme, as long as it does not affect the functional structure of the name, i.e. its one-part or two-part character.

We can experience a change of derivational morpheme in the case of hydronyms denoting the same water: Cseh pataka ~ Cseh-patak and Füzi pataka ~ Füzi-patak, or else such changes as Alma ~ Almás ~ Almádi, Budak ~ Budagd
and Füzes ~ Füzesd; due to the already mentioned insecure ellipsis and complementation I will not try to specify the alternation procedure.

4.4.3. In his toponymic typology model, ISTVÁN HOFFMANN uses the term de-etymologisation to refer to structural changes in toponyms which appear as a consequence of the obscurity of the functional-semantic or lexical-morphological structure of the name, which resulted in an irregular alternation of the toponyms’ sound form.

Among Old Hungarian hydronyms this change took place when one of the words forming the name disappeared from the Hungarian language system. The disappearance of the word jó ‘river’, for example, resulted in formation of (Hév-jó >) Hejő and Hájó, as well as (Berek-jó >) Berettyó. The same process can be observed in (Berek-aszó >) Berekszó, (Keve-aszó >) Kajászó, (Szik-aszó >) Szikszó.

4.5. Comparing the hydronyms to other toponyms, the most striking difference is the larger number of borrowed words than in the case of settlement names. One explanation could be the communication need in the case of natural name-giving and name use, contrary to the expression of possession, or other ideological or socio-cultural factors in the case of settlement name formation.

Borrowings are most common among big and medium sized bodies of water, which can be reasoned by the fact that these waters are familiar not only for a smaller community, but rather, these waters are used along their whole length. In these places, even when there is a change of population, a small population stays and continues to use the name of the river (cf. Knieza 1942: 3, Kiss 1999: 286–7, 2000: 1).


5. Summary

My research into early Old Hungarian hydronyms shows that the prototypical Hungarian hydronyms are of two components. Their first component denotes a characteristic of the water, and the second component is usually a hydrographic common name. Consequently, the most common name formation type among Old Hungarian hydronyms is syntagmatic editing.
A yet unexploited topic in Hungarian hydronym research is the comparison of the Hungarian hydronymicon with the hydronymicon of its most ancient relatives. A comparative study like this could bring us closer to the determination of the panchronic category of river names and to describing linguistic specifics of certain languages; and historico-genetic research could help us to conclude cautiously which were the typical Hungarian name-formation types in the linguistic record period, i.e. before the 10th century.
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