

Reviews

Andrea Bölcskei (Budapest, Hungary)

Two books on the settlement names of the old Bihar comitat

Rácz Anita, A régi Bihar vármegye településneveinek nyelvészeti vizsgálata [Linguistic examination of the settlement names of the old Bihar comitat]. Debrecen, 2005. 235 pages.

Rácz Anita, A régi Bihar vármegye településneveinek történeti-etimológiai szótára [Historical-etymological dictionary of the settlement names of the old Bihar comitat]. Debrecen, 2007. 372 pages.

The Institute of Hungarian Linguistics of the University of Debrecen has been engaged in onomastic workshop activities of a high quality regarding the toponyms of the Old Hungarian age (896 to 1526) for more than ten years now. The objectives of the research team include the building-up of a computer database of the toponyms present in the documents of the Early Old Hungarian age, arranged according to linguistic aspects, but also easy to handle for the representatives of associated disciplines (<http://mnytud.arts.unideb.hu/nevarchivum>), the publication of dictionaries based on this (ISTVÁN HOFFMANN, ANITA RÁ CZ, VALÉRIA TÓTH, eds., *Helynévtörténeti adatok a korai ómagyar korból* [Data from the history of toponyms from the Early Hungarian Age], Vols. 1 and 2, Debrecen, 1997 and 1999, respectively; ISTVÁN HOFFMANN, ed., *Korai magyar helynévszótár* [Dictionary of Early Hungarian Toponyms] Vol. 1, Debrecen, 2005), and the presentation in the form of monographs of the macro- and micro-toponyms of each Old Hungarian comitat. The basis of the uniform theoretical framework used for the analysis of toponyms was elaborated by the leader of the research team, ISTVÁN HOFFMANN in his work entitled “Helynevek nyelvi elemzése” [Linguistic analysis of toponyms] (1993, Debrecen; reprinted in 2007, Tinta Könyvkiadó, Budapest). As a result of the detailed research work, several quality papers for student’s conferences, theses and doctoral dissertations analysing the toponym material of Hungarian comitats from the age of the Árpád dynasty have already been prepared, and several have already been printed in the series entitled “Magyar Névarchívum Kiadványai” [Publications of the Hungarian Names Archives] launched for publishing new results of the study of the history of toponyms in 1997 edited by ISTVÁN HOFFMANN (including ÁGNES BÉNYEI, GERGELY PETHŐ, *Az Árpád-kori Győr vármegye településneveinek nyelvészeti elemzése* [Linguistic analysis of the



settlement names of Győr comitat in the age of the Árpád dynasty]. Debrecen, 1998; VALÉRIA TÓTH, *Névrendszertani vizsgálatok a korai ómagyar korban* [Examinations of the name system of the Early Old Hungarian age]. Debrecen, 2001; VALÉRIA TÓTH, *Az Árpád-kori Abaúj és Bars vármegye helyneveinek történeti-etimológiai szótára* [Historical-etymological dictionary of the settlement names of Abaúj and Bars comitats from the age of the Árpád dynasty]. Debrecen, 2001; RITA PÓCZOS, *Az Árpád-kori Borsod és Bodrog vármegye településneveinek nyelvészeti elemzése* [Linguistic examination of the settlement names of Borsod and Bodrog comitats from the age of the Árpád dynasty]. Debrecen, 2001). The two volumes to be presented here by ANITA RÁCZ are related to the onomastic research work of the Institute and the realisation of the objectives of the research team, based on the doctoral dissertation of the author.

The volume presenting the settlement names of the old Bihar comitat in the form of a historical-etymological dictionary (*A régi Bihar vármegye településneveinek történeti-etimológiai szótára*, 2007) processes old settlement names of the comitat by collecting the material of several historical sources. The two major sources used by Anita RácZ when preparing the dictionary were Zsigmond Jakó's "Bihar megye a török pusztítás előtt" [Bihar comitat before the Turkish destruction] (Budapest, 1940) and György Györffy's "Az Árpád-kori Magyarország történeti földrajza I." [Historical Geography of Hungary in the Age of the Árpád Dynasty] (Budapest, 1963, pp. 567–692) which she supplemented with corresponding data from other works. The aim of the author was to collect the occurrences of settlement names of the old Bihar comitat with the aim of completeness from the first mentioning of settlement names until the end of the 16th century, and to provide us with a linguistic analysis of name forms. Following the practice of the above-mentioned "Korai magyar helynévszótár", the entries of the dictionary in the volume (pp. 17–312) are not different name forms referring to the same denotate but name forms being morphologically the same or having a difference of a single morpheme only, even when these do not refer to the same settlement: this arrangement highlights possible differences between the formal structure of settlement names and facilitates the utilisation in linguistics of the name material. The author separates historical data of the same names referring to different denotates by numbering them; and she indicates the belonging together of name forms referring to one and the same denotate showing a significant difference in their morphology and name structures (that is, being individual entries) by reference. The entry word is followed by the determination and localisation of the denotate and then settlement name data are presented in chronological order and in a letter-by-letter transcription, by accurately indicating the source. The second part of the entries discusses circumstances of the creation of names, the motivation behind



name-giving and the linguistic analysis of name forms, taking into account the opinion of the literature. The utilisation of the dictionary is facilitated by two indices, one being that of letter-by-letter transcribed forms (Betűhív alakok mutatója, pp. 315–350) and the other that of name elements within settlement names (Névelemmutató, pp. 351–353). Following the indices, the bibliography used for the preparation of the entries follows (Irodalom, pp. 355–365). The volume also includes a map presenting the localisation of settlements in Bihar comitat before the 17th century, with an index (Névmutató Bihar vármegye térképéhez, pp. 367–372).

The other volume (*A régi Bihar vármegye településneveinek nyelvészeti vizsgálata*, 2005) is based on the analysis of the data of the historical-etymological dictionary; and it consists of five major chapters. The first chapter (*Bihar vármegye településtörténete* [The settlement history of Bihar comitat], pp. 11–21) provides us with the geography of the old Bihar comitat, including its diverse terrain and hydrogeological situation; and also with the history of its inhabitation by a population of different ethnic origins (Hungarian, Székely, Turkish, Slavic, Romanian) as well as of its secular and religious administrative organisation, based on a rich literature in history and linguistics. When determining the order of settlement of different ethnic groups, following the method for settlement history launched by János Melich and István Kniezsa in the first half of the 20th century, the author highlights the role of toponyms.

The second chapter of the book on the history of the science (*A magyar történeti helynevek kutatásának története és módszerei* [History and methods of the research of Hungarian historical toponyms], pp. 22–37) presents the major events and results of Hungarian toponymic research in a chronological order and thematically within each era, from the beginnings to the end of the 20th century. We can follow how the researchers realised the significance for language history of geographical names originating from old times and the importance of the regular and methodical linguistic examination of toponyms after the initial period when they were concerned with special toponyms only. At the same time, the complexity and interdisciplinary character of onomastics is emphasised, that is, its links with and value in the historical sciences, ethnography and linguistics. The author presents the emergence and development of the principles and methods of historical and synchronous name collection in this chapter and she highlights the special importance of the work of Imre Révész, Károly Szabó, Frigyes Pesty, Attila T. Szabó as regards this process. Major research directions (e.g., the mainstreaming of the name physiology aspect as launched by Lajos Lőrincze; the toponym typology direction as initiated by István Kniezsa, elaborated by Géza Bárczi and then revised by Gyula Kristó; and high quality toponym



etymology research by Lajos Kiss and Loránd Benkő) manifest themselves within onomastics, which outgrew the status of an auxiliary discipline of history and became independent. The author goes into more detail as regards important volumes of studies of Hungarian name historians (e.g., Miklós Kázmér and András Mező) being the most innovative in the systematising and analysis of historical toponyms. Anita Rác pays much attention to highlight and evaluate works (e.g., the historical monographs of comitats by Zsigmond Jakó and Károly Mezősi) and parts of works from each era discussing the settlement names of the old Bihar comitat. In systematising the name collection as compiled by her, the author follows the toponym analysis model as elaborated by István Hoffmann as a theoretical framework, the basic principles of which are presented by her at the end of this chapter.

In the next chapters of the volume, the author makes conclusions in the fields of historical linguistics, dialectology and name history based on the collected settlement names. Chapter 3 (*Az ómagyar kori Bihar vármegye településneveinek hangtörténeti elemzése [Analysis of the phonetic history of the settlement names of Bihar comitat]*, pp. 35–65) first discusses the factors facilitating linguistic separation and linguistic unification with regard to the early history of the Hungarian language, and then it makes conclusions in the fields of language geography, name dialectology and phonetic history. During her analysis, the author is right to examine the settlement names concerned not in isolation and separated from the linguistic state of the era but, where necessary, compares these with the toponyms of other comitats in the Old Hungarian age; also, she pays attention to conclusions arising from the general history of the phonetics and vocabulary of the Old Hungarian age. Anita Rác describes all the major changes in the history of sounds of the Old Hungarian age with the help of settlement names as linguistic data (e.g., labialisation, lowering, two open syllables trend, vowel intrusion, adaptation by front/back vowels in a word, changes in diphthongs; elimination of consonants, shift of the place of sound formation, depalatalisation, affrication, consonant loss, consonant intrusion, changes in consonant relationships, sporadic vowel changes; haplology, contracting) and she highlights features characteristic of the Eastern dialect in settlement names, although she finds it difficult to judge the relationship between transcribed forms and oral sounds due to the deficiencies of the original written records. During her examinations into the history of sounds, the author first examines changes in the history of sounds in the Old Hungarian age as regards vowels and then consonants and, finally, syllables. Her method is the following: following the naming and definition of the change in the history of sounds, she deduces the original form of the settlement names based on the etymology of common words being the basis of settlement names within this phenomenon, and then she states and characterises the change according to available



recorded toponym data. Where possible, the author tries to provide us with chronological and local features of the phenomenon in the history of sounds according to the data and to specify our knowledge in the field. The material collected mainly from charters is suitable for this: according to actual or deducible dating of the many charters remained from the Old Hungarian age, the beginnings and ends of periods when changes in the history of sounds occurred can be determined more accurately and form variants characterising the period of the change may be traced better in charters. As to conclusions in the field of historical dialectology, the author states that features characteristic of Eastern dialects are well reflected in the early toponyms of Bihar comitat; see, for example, the preference for upper and illabial vowels, and forms with / in closed syllables as well as the more frequent usage of forms with hiatus.

The fourth and longest chapter of the volume (Bihar megye településneveinek leíró elemzése [The descriptive analysis of the settlement names of Bihar comitat], pp. 66–171) examines the names of the period between the occupation of Hungary (896) and the end of the 16th century, that is, the whole Old Hungarian age and the very first decades of the Middle Hungarian age. Anita Rácz discusses the two poles of the descriptive and structural analysis of settlement names, i.e. the functional-semantic analysis identifying name parts and their roles in name formation and the lexical-morphological analysis presenting linguistic forms as used in settlement names together, stressing the links between the two levels of analysis. By way of supplementing, where data allow it, she refers to processes of the history of formation and changes participating in the creation and modification of names, too. The analysis is supplemented by the presentation of related parts of the rich material in the literature on settlement names and the contrast of often contradictory research opinions. The examination of toponyms is based on name part functions and is conducted along semantically determined name types. The author discusses settlement names relating to tribes, peoples, occupations (in this context, also to positions and services), persons, patrocines, buildings, markets, the flora and fauna, local relationships and features in a separate chapter and she presents name parts denoting the type of the place, those with a naming and with a differentiating function and the group of names which cannot be analysed. The structure of sub-chapters presenting each name type is uniform and logic: the author presents first the definition of the name type and then summarises conclusions of the literature as regards the type. With reference to all name types, she touches on the origins of names, possible motivation of name-giving, the situation of name creation, the internal semantic division of names belonging to a given type, the origins, and meaning of appellatives and proper names from which names originate as well as the chronological and language geographical features of



the name type. Specific problems of each name type are discussed, too, e.g., the occupations of the residents of Hungarian settlements with tribal names, or the issue whether the fashion in Hungary of giving settlement names originating from patrocines is the result of an external influence from Western Europe or is an internal development in Hungary. Then the structure of settlement names in the old Bihar comitat belonging to the name type is analysed: first basic forms of a single part and, within this, those without formants and those with suffixes functioning in name formation are presented; then two-part names follow which present the name type as a basic part and those which present it as a supplementing part with a basic part being a geographical common word or a settlement name with detailed statistics and rich data. Name parts providing a related location name occurring mostly as distinctive elements of names of two parts and those referring to features have to be discussed in a special way: here the existence or lack of a name form containing an antonym pair or another contradicting attribute and the existence or lack of contemporary form variants supplementing the name forms concerned shall affect the actual analysis. As regards name forms with a function referring to the type of the place, the author examines settlement names containing a geographical common name referring to the character of the settlement and discusses the frequency, chronological features, possible changes and possible semantic and lexical categories of prefixes related to appellative second parts in Bihar comitat. The chapter concludes with presenting the settlement names of the comitat following a name differentiation, paying special attention to the presentation of second parts being settlement names with a naming function as the basic part of individualised names and also to that of attributive first parts with various meanings being complement parts.

Chapter 5 (Bihar megye településneveinek keletkezéstörténeti elemzése [The analysis of the history of the creation of the settlement names of Bihar comitat], 172–222) presents us with possible methods of the creation of settlement names of the former Bihar comitat. As Anita Rácz herself mentions, the history of the creation of settlement names can be ascertained only when settlement names occur frequently in historical records. Despite the available wider or narrower range of data, the author is able to describe the name-forming habits prevailing in Bihar comitat in the age. Names given by the Hungarians are created most frequently by semantic name-creation and, within this, by metonymic name-giving in the comitat. As regards other types of semantic name-creation being possible in theory, name moving contributed, too, although only to the creation of a single settlement name. As to morphematic construction as a possible way of name-giving, we are informed about which formants participated in name-creating processes in what proportion and subject to which lexical constraints. The author pays



special attention to those elements from which it is evident that the given suffix was used as a toponym formant by the one-time name-giving community and she studies the time limits of the productivity in Bihar county of each toponym formant and also the chronology of the birth of name-forms without or with formants referring to one and the same settlement. Settlement names created with syntagmatic construction are described as frequent name forms, although being homogeneous for the history of creation by Anita Rácz. The author finds examples in Bihar comitat for every type of structural change, including reduction and expansion of name elements and ellipses and supplementation of name parts. Settlement names which gained new meanings due to folk etymology, or those being uncategorisable as regards their formation are only a small part of the whole name collection concerned. In this chapter, the changes occurred in the studied period and eventual lexical constraints of change types are also presented apart from the possible cases of the creation of toponyms in Bihar comitat. At the end of the book, we find a bibliography.

The two books which study the settlement names of the old Bihar comitat convince us that the analysis of the oldest Hungarian toponyms in charters from the Old Hungarian age, being early remnants of the Hungarian language, contributes considerably to historical onomastics, and the possible conclusions are equally relevant for the history of language and of dialects.

Ferenc Biró (Eger, Hungary)

Névtörténet — magyarságtörténet

[History of names — history of the Hungarians] In: Nyelvi identitás és a nyelv dimenziói. Eds. István Hoffmann–Dezső Juhász. Debrecen–Budapest, 2007. pp. 9–216.

At the 6th International Congress of Hungarian Studies held on 22–26th August 2006, the representatives of Hungarian Studies presented the results of their most recent research, raised scientific problems and discussed them within the profession. The organisers of the congress applied a symposium system as the consultation mode. The individual presentations at the symposia were more or less closely connected to the main theme of the congress and analysed connections within certain sub-areas of the topic in order to shed light on recent scientific results.



The volume contains the presentations given at the symposia as well as studies written on the basis of the presentations. Eighteen of the “Névtörténet — magyarságtörténet” symposium presentations and twelve of the “Regional and social name changes in the light of historicity” were included in the volume.

The written versions of onomastic presentations are published in the first structural unit of the volume, as a collection of articles investigating the relationship between the Hungarians and personal name history. Within this unit, presentations follow each other as they did in the program of the congress, and the review is also structured to present the articles according to a more or less closer connection between the topics.

The first section of the onomastic articles deals with issues related to historical Hungarian toponyms (pp. 11–112) and the second section deals with personal names (pp. 113–216).

The title of the volume, “Névtörténet — magyarságtörténet”, refers to the editors’ view of the intertwined history of our nation and our language (and within them our personal names) which is significant for researchers in both fields. Justification for this view can be found in the given articles.

ISTVÁN HOFFMANN (Language reconstruction – ethnic reconstruction, pp. 11–20) approaches the issue from a theoretical perspective. He gives a general review of the theoretical and research-methodological questions of contemporary scientific use of early old Hungarian toponyms as an important source for identifying and investigating the history of the ethnic character of the people in the Carpathian basin in the early period (primarily 10–15th century). He attempts to shed light on the ways of discovering new reliable scientific information on the basis of linguistic sources, using linguistic tools and relying on previous research results on the people living in Árpád dynasty Hungary. He lists the research responsibilities and requirements in the field of toponym-reconstruction which the studies focusing on given periods should abide by. He gives an outline of aspects needed for a more complete cognition of historical linguistic changes: the importance of toponym-etymology, newer criteria for toponomastics, denotative meaning and onomato-systematic embeddedness. Analysing the earliest period of the life of Hungarians in the Carpathian basin, he formulates the most current task of the historical toponomastics for the near future: the monographic processing of settlement names of tribal or ethnic origin, names referring to professions, personal name toponyms and certain derived toponyms types; a general overview of alternation processes of toponyms and the language-sociological situation of old settlement names.



The author of the second article, RITA PÓCZOS (Borrowed names and loanwords, pp. 21–8) attempts to give additional information to a more complete presentation of linguistic-ethnic relations of the same period, with a similar aim and standpoint and using a similar general theoretical and methodological approach. She chooses from the aspects listed in the previous article, and aims at finding support for one of the partial issues of toponym-etymology: in order to determine the ethnic group naming the settlement, she seeks to distinguish a toponym type that is difficult to classify. She attempts to distinguish settlement names formed from loanwords which were borrowed as common names and foreign origin names borrowed as personal names (occasionally the latter have the same form). Her final conclusion is that this type, in itself, without further sources, offers little help in unequivocally determining the name-giving community.

The following eight articles on history of toponyms are similar in that they all reach back to the beginning of age of the Árpád dynasty; what is more, the first four have in common the fact that they each analysed a certain toponym type.

ERZSÉBET GYÖRFFY (Studies of our hydronyms, pp. 29–36) gives an overview of one of her research programs: she wishes to discover hydronyms and hydronym systems of certain regions in the Carpathian basin, from the Hungarian Conquest till the 20th century, aiming at formulating generalisations valid for the whole Hungarian language territory. The author considers it necessary to apply a multitude of aspects (synchronic and diachronic) in order to acquire deeper knowledge of this type of toponym. She follows through her complex research to get a more reliable picture of the etymology of hydronyms, of the mode of their genesis, of the unique motivation for name giving, of the linguistic tools used and of the temporal and spatial change of certain names and their name systems; of the characteristics of hydronyms which differ from those of toponyms; of the historical name giving relation between hydronyms and other toponyms; of the place of hydronyms in the Hungarian toponym system, and their connection to other sub-systems, etc. And through all these, she aims at drawing a more reliable picture of the history of the name-giving and name using community.

KATALIN RESZEGI (The relationship between mountain names and other toponym types, pp. 37–43) sheds light on the different types of early old Hungarian toponyms. She focuses on relief names and shows that they have an especially close connection with settlement names. Both sub-groups of toponyms were productive in creating other toponym types.

An equally controversial issue in history and linguistics is the identification of Kabar tribes (and other fragmented tribes) who joined the Hungarian tribes taking part in the Hungarian Conquest. The assumption that we have



toponyms originating from tribal names and ethnic names, as well as behaving like them, has inspired ANITA RÁCZ (About settlement names with a pseudo-tribal origin, pp. 45–55) to deal with this type of toponym. In her study, she includes settlement names hiding hypothetical names of their tribes (*Bercel, Berencs, Berény, Böszörmény, Kalán, Káliz, Ladány, Oszlár ~ Eszlár, Örs, Ság, Székely, Tárkány, Varsány*). She used linguistic means. On the one hand, she compared the typological characteristics of settlement names considered to belong to this name group with those that undoubtedly belong to it, and she also compared them to the typical features of settlements of ethnonym origin; and on the other hand, she gives an overview of the relations between the above and personal names. The author conducts her comparative analysis on the basis of toponyms found in FNESz. Using its data, she concludes that certain members of the pseudo-tribal names are typologically closer to ethnonyms and other members to tribal names. The author, however, implies that reaching a more diversified answer to the question, i.e. drawing a more probable picture of ethnic relations in the past requires a multi-aspectual analysis of a more complete inventory of this group, in other words, basically an analysis of name data individually.

VALÉRIA TÓTH also deals with Hungarian settlement names (About the change sensitivity of settlement names, pp. 57–65). The author surveys how prone this name type is to alternation, re-evaluating the earlier opinion expressed in professional circles that this toponym type is relatively stable. On the one hand, by comparing settlement names from two regions, she concludes that names with a transparent lexical-morphological structure have more probably gone through a morphological change than names without a transparent lexical structure. On the other hand, among partial changes of settlement names, she distinguishes between those structural alternations that are due to and originate from the toponym system and those that regard vocabulary on the whole. She discusses the former in more detail, even providing its chronology. In her opinion, “the majority of linguistic changes happened up to the 16th century, after that, changes mainly refer to adding distinctive attributes” (p. 63).

ÁGNES BÉNYEI (The role of the derivational suffix *-j* in toponyms, pp. 67–77) discusses a toponymic derivational suffix *-j ~ -aj/-ej* which was productive till the end of early old Hungarian period. She reviews opinions from major professional studies and complements them with her own observations and conclusions. Its behaviour and its temporal productivity makes the toponymic suffix *-j*, considered independently by the author, different from other early old Hungarian derivational suffixes, especially from *-i*, but primarily calls attention to the necessity of more detailed analysis of the toponymic suffix *-j* in order to gain more insight into the early old Hungarian



name forming; and it should be done by taking into consideration morphemes of similar function and the multiple aspects together, as is done in the article.

ILONA FÁBIÁN KRISTÓNÉ also examines toponyms of the early old Hungarian period. She justifies a phonological phenomenon, the appearance of *ü* and *ö* in toponyms, their early form and their temporal and spatial spread on the basis of data from an early linguistic record, *Váradi Regestrum* (Short labial palatals in a few toponyms of the *Váradi Regestrum*, pp. 79–87). Her partial analysis does not contradict the earlier history of phonological findings but rather confirms them.

RÓBERT KENYHERCZ discusses toponyms of foreign origin from the last two or three decades of the early old Hungarian period in order to diversify the knowledge of the reasons, starting point and processes of a Hungarian phonological (phonotactic) constraint, the word-initial consonant cluster (The reflection of ethnic relations in the alternations around word-initial consonant cluster, pp. 89–96). He concludes that linguistic changes, and therefore phonotactic processes, in toponymic data from charters originating from a mixed, bilingual community require an approach more complex than the one applied so far.

BÉLA KOCÁN aims at contributing to a more precise reconstruction of the ethnic composition of a comitat from the age of the Árpád dynasty by using linguistic analysis and etymological systematisation of the given region's known toponymic fragments (The linguistic levels of toponyms in Ugocsa comitat from the age of the Árpád dynasty, pp. 97–112). The toponyms' spatial and temporal distribution refers to a weaker Slavic (until 11th century) and a stronger Hungarian presence (after 11th century), primarily in the river valleys of plains. Names of German and Rumanian origin are not present in the name stock of the region.

The following four studies dealing with personal names are connected to the research of Hungarian family names which has boomed in the recent past.

JÁNOS N. FODOR (Lexical-morphological analysis of natural family names, pp. 113–129), among several analysis possibilities, chooses the word class category and the morphological structure of name antecedents and functional name components which serve as a basis for natural family name giving and which carry the motivation for name giving. His research is based on the 14–17th century family name stock from the Miklós Kázmér's "A régi magyar családnevek szótára" [Early Hungarian family name dictionary]. He presents types, sub-types and proportions of the components' morphological structure, components of personal, place, common name and adjectival origin. In the early Hungarian family name inventory, though not in



large proportion, but there is distinct separation of complex, two-componential names of mixed origin: the *Kis/somos*, *Nagy/pósa*; the *Balázs/deák*, *György/biró*; the *Alsó/nagy*, *Vég/kós* type.

ISTVÁN KOZMA deals with another large group of family names, artificial family names, or to be more precise, family name changes from a socio-historical and socio-psychological perspective (The social functions and personal motivations of family name changes in the 19–20th century). Although the title of the article does not imply it, the study offers a concise history of scientific evaluation of family name changes in Hungary, and it refers to further complex (socio-historical, onomastic, socio-psychological, historical psychological and mentality historical) tasks and research possibilities in the topic, as well as giving information about getting access to sources.

Closely connected to the last topic is TAMÁS FARKAS's article, which is basically a cultural historic, lexico-semantic case study (*Kárpáti*, *Kárpáthy* and *Kárpáti*'s, pp. 147–164). Through a multi-aspectual approach to the *Kárpáti* family name and its type, missing from the historical Hungarian family name stock for history of name and typological reasons, the author sheds light on the wide-ranging connections of the Hungarian family name changes, on their relation to other scientific fields, on the validity of a joint survey with the help of most diverse sources and on the possible methodological variety of this analysis. TAMÁS FARKAS's study is an analytic model and example of a history of name and its type, born in the middle of 19th century at the time of the first wave of family name changes, and in the 150 years which have passed since then became an organic part of the Hungarian family name corpus due to literary influences and romanticism in general, as well as mentality historical and linguistic factors.

DEZSŐ JUHÁSZ (In addition to the morphology and semantic connotation of Magyarised family names, pp. 165–173), among the possible motivations for new family name choices in the family name change process, attributes a linguistically distinctive role to the morphological division and semantic connotation of word-building elements. In his case-study serving as a model for further research he also used the name hungarisation data from 19th century (influenced by national romanticism as an important ideological-cultural factor). The author sees the reasons of frequent choice, popularity and spreading of a single morphological tool, *-ányi*, *-ényi* derivational suffix in a multitude of factors. Among these factors, he reviews and justifies the joint impact of grammatical analogies and semantic connotations.



The last four articles of the volume deal with different approaches to personal names.

First, FERENC ÖRDÖG (Settlement, worship-historical and sociological motivations of first name fashion in the 17–18th century, pp. 175–183) follows through the fashion of first names in the west Hungarian region in the period after Turkish reign and after different mixtures of Hungarian peoples, i.e. at the end of 17th and at the beginning of 18th century. From the point of view of motivation for first name choices the final conclusion of the analysis is that there is not much difference regarding fashionable names in certain settlements, not even regarding those with medial frequency, the so-called characteristic names. Names frequent already in the Middle Ages (*János, István, Ferenc, Mihály, György, András, József, Márton, Pál, Péter; Erzsébet, Judit, Anna, Mária, Katalin, Éva, Ilona, Zsuzsanna, Julianna, Rozália*) have ruled the name fashion in the selected period, irrespective of ethnicity, social situation, profession and denomination.

FERENC VÖRÖS (Name translation and name alternation in a bilingual context, pp. 185–199) reports about the consequences of the tragic events in the 20th century, the changes in name giving and name use due to arbitrary, political alternation of state boundaries which made Hungarians citizens of foreign states and the impact of state language. He bases his report on research in Slovakia (Upper Hungary). Among contact impacts concerning first name choice, first name use of Hungarians in a minority context after 1920, he chooses slovakianisation of Hungarian first names by translation and other means. He justifies the continuous strengthening of the (Czecho-) Slovakian state and state language impact, the formation of practice of Hungarian and Slovakian name change for pragmatic and other reasons, the withdrawal of Hungarian first name use, and the further spread of Slovakian first names primarily in formal and official language use contexts and discourse situations and later in informal situations.

JUDIT TAKÁCS details her views on the change of meaning of first name, i.e. their commonisation (Fashionable names and frequent names in the light of meaning change, pp. 201–208). She lists all the factors whose joint alternation causes linguistic changes like this, and which lead to a development of common name meaning, its stabilisation, lexicalisation.

JUDIT KECSKÉS chose a topic in connection to one of the important periods in Hungarian name history and history of Hungarian people, reformation (“National names” and the names of national self-consciousness, pp. 209–216). At the beginning of 19th century, as a consequence of national self-consciousness, national revival and language reform, certain first names (*Árpád, Csaba, Géza, Gyula, Béla, Kálmán, Zoltán, Aranka, Etelka, Piroška, Rózsa, Enikő*, etc.) revived and spread, became frequent. The author concludes, on the basis of her data, that these names spread independently of denomination, and independently of belonging to an ethnic group; to a ma-



jority of them a national reference or national feature was attributed later, as secondary information.

Among the proper name studies found in the “Névtörténet — magyarságtörténet” part of the volume there is an equal proportion of articles dealing with place names and personal names. The topics of the former group are related to the same period (early old Hungarian) and the conclusions aim at contributing as much knowledge as possible to the history of the Hungarians, going beyond the narrow scope of the history of toponyms. The articles concerning personal names are more heterogeneous, both with respect to time and personal name types they deal with, and as a consequence, they are more diverse, but also in connection to other, primarily historical and sociological fields of science. To summarise, the 18 studies present a reliable picture of the diversified nature of modern Hungarian proper name research, and gives an idea of the main topics with which contemporary historical linguists are dealing.

Attila Hegedűs (Piliscsaba, Hungary)

Helynévtörténeti tanulmányok 1–2.

[Toponomastic studies] Eds. István Hoffmann–Valéria Tóth. University of Debrecen, Department of Hungarian Linguistics. A Magyar Névarchívum Kiadványai [Publications of the Hungarian Names Archives] 8. Debrecen, 2004. 207 pages. A Magyar Névarchívum Kiadványai 11. Debrecen, 2006. 224 pages.

With “A Magyar Névarchívum Kiadványai”, the Department of Hungarian Linguistics of the University of Debrecen intends to launch a new series. This is the Department which has rightfully become the major centre of Hungarian onomastics under the planning, governing and organising hand of István Hoffmann. The onomastic subprogramme of the University’s post-graduate program keeps publishing high quality doctoral theses year by year. These theses, together with other publications of the University—especially publications of sources—are a clear proof of a blooming workshop and team work. The product of this joint workshop work is the first volume with its eight articles.

Interdisciplinarity, applied cultural history, onomastics as an auxiliary science of historical geography and history of language, the self principality of onomastics—these key words come to the reviewer’s mind after reading the



first volume. The articles of the first volume are therefore not homogenous; they do not resemble each other: István Hoffmann pays attention not to weigh heavily on his students becoming his later colleagues. His impact, however, is indisputable and is detectible in two phenomena: the onomastic framework developed in 1993 and successfully applied by many people is an organisational force in two articles of this volume; furthermore, an overwhelming majority of the studies presented here uses the historical geography of Árpád-age Hungary written by György Györffy as their source material and their topic is the onomastic use of this material.

The first and, at the same time, the longest article (pp. 9–61) in the volume was written by ISTVÁN HOFFMANN about the linguistic background of toponymic remnants of documents. The article is complex both in its line of thought (what is more, even stylistically!), refers to Loránd Benkő and looks for an answer to two questions. Firstly, why Hungarian toponyms, anthroponyms, appellatives and structures occur in foreign language texts. This question primarily researches the reason for inclusion. The second question, i.e. what kind of linguistic use do they represent, whose linguistic use do they reflect, is more a question of objective: does conscientious language use and the effort to develop an individual (written) norm influence a more frequent use of certain words and structures?

Hoffmann's answer to the first question is that the presence of Hungarian remnants in Latin texts is not due to the inability of scribes to translate them. He puts down the presence of Hungarian words to the joint impact of several factors. Among these, by no means the most important is the role of legal security. However, among the possible explanations we can also mention the European document issuance practice which included occasional vulgar words and structures embedded in the Latin text. Besides all this, we can not exclude a certain arbitrary character, even some linguistic insecurity. To the other question, that is, whose language use do these remnants reflect, the literature has given two answers up to now: they may reflect the dialect of the scribe-draftsman but also the dialect of the region. There are arguments for both approaches. Earlier, the view that the remnants, especially because of their legal security role, are the most faithful forms of a given region's dialect was an almost exclusive explanation. At the same time, it was not simple to decide how to judge the appearance of changes of forms which occurred in the above texts already: are they orthographic variations or impressions of pronunciation reflecting phonetic differences? The author tries to resolve this dilemma through the analysis of the occurrence type of toponymic remnants. Through the examination of the Latinised forms of hydronyms in documents he finds that the notaries found Latinised forms close to the Hungarian ones, and in this way, creatively changed the linguistic facts.



The same thing is present in the characteristic types of settlement names: in names of nationwide significance, in settlement names of church origin, in names complemented by an attribute or in names containing a geographical name. According to Hoffmann, the extent of the consistence in these cases is such that “we can see a manifestation of a certain norm which has developed during derivation” (p. 37). Through a further analysis of other toponyms the author proves that the frequent joining of Latin geographical names to Hungarian toponyms served better understanding; in other words, the scribes changed the data to a certain extent in these cases as well. There are also two other geographical names, *bérc* and *patak*, which occur in document remnants with particular frequency as common words. Since other geographical names belonging to this category are present in the document remnants only sporadically, we can conclude that the two words (beyond their general meaning) reflect the unificatory norm, the effort of the document issuing practice of that period.

The next article is ANITA RÁCZ’s and its title is: “History of population and toponymic research” (pp. 63–89). In her study, the author describes the relations in the old Bihar county with the help of toponyms. From a linguistic point of view, settlement names with ethnonyms and borrowed settlements can be covered by the analysis. It is an important methodological principle that toponyms of anthroponymic origin containing a personal name of foreign origin, if they stand on their own, without any derivative affixes, can only be products of Hungarian name giving. Since, however, the testimony of toponyms on their own is occasional, it is necessary to take into account the results of archaeology and history when we draw conclusions about settlements from settlement names.

Anita RácZ conducts her research taking all this into account. She established that after the Hungarian Conquest the Magyars primarily settled in the region between Berettyó and Sebes-Körös, in the Middle Ages arrived to the south, to the headwaters of Sebes-Körös, in the Fekete-Körös valley to Belényes and in the Fehér-Körös valleys to Józás-patak (Józás stream). The Székelys temporarily resided on the territory of Bihar; their centre could have been Telegd—as implied by toponyms which were moved to Transylvania (e.g. *Küsmöd* stream name). In the beginning, Hungarian met Slavic people in the north, later, possibly as a result of an organised domiciliation, the Slavic people spread. This is shown in the settlement names having *Tót* ‘Slovakian’, *Orosz* ‘Russian’ and *Cseh* ‘Czech’ words. Besides Slavic people, names testify the presence of Pecheneg, Wallon and German people in smaller numbers. Romanian population settled in the region of Belenyés no sooner than the 13th century. In the Middle Ages strong Romanisation took place, as proven by first appearances of toponyms of Romanian origin.



The questions of ÁGNES BÉNYEI's study (Topoformants and their variants in the early old Hungary age, pp. 91–104) are variants and synonyms, i.e. whether we can talk about topoformants as a separate category of derivatives since they are toponymic derivatives only secondarily and have developed from a common name function. When discussing the first question, we have to keep in mind to always formulate our standpoint regarding the issue of variant versus two different derivatives in the given synchronicity. When comparing the two possibilities, the important factors are origin of the derivative, its functional identity and morphological behaviour. Derivatives problematic from an alternational point of view are: a *-d/-t*, *-d/-gy*, *st/-sd*, *-i/-j*. According to the author, the proof that they belong together is in the triaspectual analysis shown above. The members of the derivative pair, however, cannot be considered alternates, since there are strong functional differences between them, although their origin is common.

RITA PÓCZOS presents linguistic layers of the hydronym system of Garam and Ipoly (pp. 105–127). She based her research on Lajos Kiss's study on "Upper Hungarian hydronyms". The author is able to separate three layers in the given territory: layers of Hungarian, Slavic and old European (more commonly referred to as Indo-European) origin. These layers can be separated semantically and morphologically. It is most likely that Indo-European origin can only be detected in *Garam* and *Ipoly*. The difference between Hungarian and Slavic names is that the latter usually form by adding a formant to the base, whereas the former are usually formed from bases without derivatives. There are differences between the two areas, though: the Hungarians borrowed the Slavic names from the Garam region unchanged, in the area of Ipoly, however, these often became two-componential names.

ERZSÉBET GYÖRFFY analysed almost 1000 data of 300 water features (The characteristics of the lexical structure of hydronyms from the Árpád age in the area of Sajó watershed, pp. 129–144). She used István Hoffmann's toponym analysis typology. She differentiates between monocomponential and bicomponential names, whose proportion is 42 : 58 in the examined area, which is almost the same as the 49 : 51 proportion valid for the whole of the country. The group worth noting is the group of names showing a shift from one-componential to two-componential ones (*Holboka* [monocomponential hydronym] > *Holboka pataka*): in these instances the one-componential one is earlier than (or at least contemporary with) the two-componential one. According to the author, the appearance of possessive suffixes in structures is probably due to "the demand to conform to the name type with the majority".

KATALIN RESZEGI's study (*Bérc*, *hegy* and *halom* in the old Hungarian toponyms, pp. 145–165) may be important for the further studies of the au-



thor herself, but it has very little scientific value. Based in the material published by Györffy, the author compiled the data store of the three above mentioned geographical names, examines the question of their origin, their medieval distribution and their name creating relations with a praiseworthy amount of background information.

GYÖRGYI DUDÁS (Labialisation starting from the end of the word in the early old Hungary, pp. 167–182) utilizes the medieval toponyms in their auxiliary role. Her question is rather exciting: do the early old Hungarian toponyms support the canonical statement of earlier literature (especially Bárczi textbook summary, 1967) according to which the $i > ü$ change preceded the $ē > ö$ change (Bárczi 1967, pp. 155–157, 179). In Bárczi (p. 179) only the 13th century fits: in the case of $i > ü$ this is the finishing point, whereas in the case of $ē > ö$, the starting point. As suggested by the author's data compilations, the two processes are temporally closer to each other in the case of toponyms. The merit of this study therefore is not that it proves the earlier starting point of the $i > ü$, but that it shows (maybe even independently of its initial intention) the joint force of the two changes (namely, I would not dare assign the beginning and the end of the 13th century to two separate synchronies). However, since the issue is probably more complex than the one outlined here, I would like to draw the author's attention to a few new studies in the topic (Hegedűs Attila, *Helynevek a helyesírás-történet és a nyelvjárástörténet szolgálatában* [Toponyms and the history of orthography at the service of history of dialects]. In: *Névtudomány és művelődéstörténet*. Eds. Lajos Balogh és Ferenc Ördög. Zalaegerszeg, 1989. pp. 96–99; István Kenesei, *Történeti nyelvtan: elmélet és gyakorlat* [Historical grammar: theory and practice]. Magyar Nyelv 91 [1995], pp. 281–291; Mária Gósy, *Hangtörténeti változások feltételezett okairól* [About the assumed reasons of historical linguistic changes]. Magyar Nyelv 94 [1998], pp. 276–283; Attila Hegedűs, *Zur Wandlung des Systems der kurzer Vokale des Ungarischen in der urungarischen und der altungarischen Zeit*. In: *Acta Linguistica Hungarica*, Vol. 49 [2002], pp. 85–94).

The final study in the volume is VALÉRIA TÓTH's (Archaisms and neologisms in Hungarian toponyms, pp. 183–207). Changes in a given synchronicity show either a cause-effect relation or can be traced back to the same antecedent. Archaism and neologism are therefore correlative notions: in a given synchronicity either lexeme can be both, depending on what it is contrasted with. This author showed the presence of this issue by examining the name entries of FNESz.

Her study extends to toponyms as base word and toponyms as derived words. The following variations are characteristic of the base word: besides the standard one, the toponym preserves an archaic and a neologue variation



(*Monyorókerék* ~ *Mogyoród* ~ *Pusztamagyaród*), besides the standard one, the toponym preserves an archaic form (*Diód* ~ *Algyógy*), and besides the standard one, the toponym preserves a neologue variation (*Besenyő* ~ *Besenyő*). In derived words, the original form may appear in toponyms as a preserved archaism (*lapu* > *Lapuhás* [the name of the mountain slope which preserves the *h* in the original Slavic word]), or the derived word may show a particular neologue characteristic (*kapu* > *Kapos* [instead of *kapus*]). The conclusion of the study: toponyms do preserve a lot of archaisms, but at the same time a lot of archaic phenomena are actually neologisms rooted in the unique characteristic of the toponym. The process of losing the appellative feature favours the processes which affect the part of the word which became a name and is not regulated by the system. This experience chooses the toponymic system as the primary ground for the analysis of toponyms.

The second volume of the “Helynévtörténeti tanulmányok” are articles presented at the onomastic seminar which took place in May 2006 in the Síkfőút research house of the University of Debrecen. The Department of Hungarian Linguistics, University of Debrecen, admittedly wants to set up a tradition with this seminar, which puts forward professional consultation: let discussion replace presentations read aloud; let ideas, even those which may not have received scientific acceptance gain ground, let the representatives of young blood have their say. Thanks to this organisational work the words of the preface (“In the next volume we are expecting articles from all researchers in the field”) inspired more people, so the second volume brought studies by thirteen authors.

The first article in the volume is ANITA RÁCZ’s article on linguistic issues concerning toponyms of tribe name origin (pp. 9–29). The author searches for the answer to “how did tribe names classify into the Hungarian toponymic and personal name system” and what kind of linguistic characteristics they show during the process. These names, together with the names of nations, people and professions, belong to the group of social group names. Their joint analysis (whether they can become personal names and how) is the focus point of Anita Rác’s study. Her findings are the following: from tribe names toponyms can, but personal names rarely develop, however, personal names often develop from ethnonyms. Toponyms may have developed directly from profession names but also with personal name mediation and the same can also be said for ethnonyms. The next question: does an element of a social group name become a toponym on its own or through a morphological stage? Anita Rác found that derivational morphemes are not characteristic of tribe names transforming into toponyms (only 4% is like this), however, 40% of toponyms derived from ethnonyms and profession



names were formed by a derivational morpheme. The author experienced similar proportions when she analysed the case of geographical name addition. Her final conclusion: toponyms of tribe name origin—similarly to borrowed names—form a closed group, they do not have linguistic variants. The former were, probably for historical reasons, fossilized at an early stage (the token of the tribe as an entity ceased to exist, the toponym that derived from it functions only as a label).

The starting thesis of VALÉRIA TÓTH's study (About the change of toponyms formed from a church name, pp. 31–46) is the following: “the patrocinium name types have not developed on the bases on name models, but rather from the above, with the support of the church, as a kind of cultural name type” (p. 32). This fact could have influenced this name type's inclination to change. The author examines the linguistic appearance of this inclination to change from the point of view of semantics, morphological change (syntactic and morphological change) and complex change process (name disappearance, name differentiation, name integration). Valéria Tóth believes the reason for rooting of this name group is exactly its movement: language users adapted the ready name forms to the most different name and change models, consequently, this new name type could integrate into the Hungarian settlement name system exactly due to its changes. However, although the reviewer does not argue with the statements concerning the process, he would place the focal points somewhere else. Namely, while Benkő (MNy. 103 [2007], p. 411) mentions western cultural impact and the “cooperation of the Roman Church”, the author changes the formulations to “church support” (p. 32) and “church initiative” (p. 44). Through these statements she can cast doubt on the “spontaneous linguistic act of the language community” (quotation from Benkő, p. 408) and on the national characteristic of name giving. In my opinion, Benkő's nuanced approach is closer to the reality: the role of the church was not that of the initiator but of the acceptor. It is worthwhile reading Sándor Mikešy's writing on this topic (Névtudományi vizsgálatok, 1960, p. 172): the fact that Christian names were more common in the 13th century and that by the end of the 14th century they almost completely replaced secular names, is a sign of a European development tendency. Namely, the medieval church did not care about names: as an example Mikešy mentions the Landberg monastery where all the 21 nuns in 1195 had German names. The cult of holy names is a cultural trend of the 13–14th century, when people tended to name an illness, grass, ship, village, day after saints. Mikešy emphasises: it is the seculars who had this urge, not the clergy (but the clergy was of course not against it). The church ordered the avoidance of pagan names only in the second half of the 16th century, after the Council of Trent.



ANDREA BÖLCSKEI's presents us the historical relevance of her doctoral thesis in her article. The diachronic analysis of the settlement name correlations which developed spontaneously. In Hungarian administration, unanimous toponym identification became necessary in the 18–19th century. Correlative differentiation of toponyms had existed before this date, too, in cases when name identity became a disturbing localisational factor (this was primarily present within a county but occasionally also across county borders). The author examines the spontaneous differentiations on the basis of three synchronic segments (13–14th century, 15–16th century, and the turn of 18th and 19th century) and 14 counties. She finds that the majority of correlations change though time and only a minority stay unchanged. In any case, this spontaneous practice served as a sample for the functioning of one settlement—one name principle at the end of 19th century, when the official settlement name organisation started.

ISTVÁN HOFFMANN analyses the Deed of Foundation of Tihany Abbey (*Huluoodi, Turku, Ursa*) (pp. 67–82). Through listing and criticising the solutions known so far he presents his theory to the reader: in *Huluoodi* it is not the *hull* infinitive but the orthographically erroneous *holló* (I am reminded of Benkő's warning: supposing orthographically erroneous words leads to mistaken conclusions and should be accepted only as a last resort!). The author reads *turku* as [*türkü*] and identifies it as the Töreki (puszta) near Siófok. Although the Deed of Foundations talks about *ad lacum Turku*, according to Hoffmann, this denomination could have referred to the settlement's lake. The names final etymon is the *türk/török* ethnonym which became a toponym through a personal name mediator. In the analysis of *Ursa* he rejects the possibility of palatal *Örs* reading of the word because of the word-final *-a*. He prefers the **urosa* personal name explanation, whose common word basis is *úr* or *orr*.

ERZSÉBET ZELIEGER (The *u[gr]in bahuana* data from the Deed of Foundation of the Tihany Abbey, pp. 83–86) explains that the digital photo in the newest edition verifies György Györffy's reading: in the problematic part of the Deed it is not „*ad [uiam] baluana*” (as assumed before), nor is near the problematic part a 1409: *possessio Vgron*. The quoted idol could have been the stone column of this.

Numerous interesting issues are dealt with in RITA PÓCZOS's study “The linguistic-ethnic composition of the population of Árpád age Borsod county” (pp. 87–105): the relation between name giver and name user, the integration steps of borrowings, the issue of names which can be etymologically analysed in several ways, the connections between microtoponyms and the ethnic affiliation. All these should be taken into account if we want to characterise a given region's ethnic composition at a given period of time with



the help of toponyms. Rita Póczos based her analysis on the first occurrence of toponyms, and grouped them according to periods, areas and name types. The northern and southern part of the comitat was separated by an unpopulated area, and the analysis of the names shows an almost exclusive chronological dominance of Hungarian names, while the northern part had a significant Slavic population somewhere in the past, but in the examined period it could be neither proven nor denied.

BÉLA KOCÁN edited the toponyms of Slavic origin of the Ugocsa comitat from the early old Hungarian age (pp. 107–127). The entries contain localisation, the precise source of the name format and its etymology.

GÁBOR KISS and BALÁZS ZÁGORHIDI CZIGÁNY's cooperation is a good example that history and onomastics can cooperate and utilise each other's results. Their study is entitled "The historical toponymic data of a microregion" (pp. 129–157). The authors, besides medieval documents, analyse handwritten maps from the 18–19th century, toponymic material of our time, and compare all this to archaeological site observation. This is how they attempted to describe the historical geography of Sár-víz basin on Vasvár's eastern border. They establish of the present day field name that it contains the names of former property owners and that we can find a direct connection between the 13th century names and the names from today. The comparison of historical data helps in the interpretation of names whose etymology became vague or which got a new meaning through ethnic etymology (e.g. *Szarakad* ~ *Szarka-lap*). The integral part of their study is the data store which contains all the historical names of the microregion together with the ownership history explanations. At the end of the article there are maps (Gábor Kiss' drawings) reflecting the relations in Árpád age Hungary.

KATALIN RESZEGI's compares toponyms of two mountain ranges, the Északi-középhegység as the southern and the Selmeci-hegység, Jávoros and the Szlovák-érchegység as the northern mountain range in her study called "The comparison of toponym inventories of two mountain ranged in Árpád age Hungary" (pp. 159–80). Her basic questions are the following: what kind of characteristics do the toponyms of the two mountain ranges have which would refer to the name giving population (Slovakians in the north and Hungarians in the south), are there differences in Slovakian and Hungarian name giving, what kind of language formulation is more characteristic of the south and which of the north? The study, based on the analysis of name components, states that Slavic name giving prefers one-componential names and that Hungarian names giving prefers two-componential ones. What is more, Slavic names show morphological and Hungarian names show syntactic editing. Certain type of mutual influence can be observed as well: the



southern part's Slavic names conform to the Hungarian pattern (they become two-componential in a greater proportion).

FERENC BÍRÓ examined the 157 toponyms of the preserved 65 documents from the Árpád age Heves county (pp. 181–193). The data contain 33 hydronyms, the majority of which are two-componential. The area around waters is represented by 9 names, relief by 13 names and they are all also two-componential. (Among the edifice names there is *molendinum sancti Barnabe* [St. Barnaby mill] from 1275 which confirms what we have stated above regarding patrociniun names: saint names were trendy then.) However, the majority of the settlement names (59 out of 75) is one-componential. The majority of the latter was created via metonymical name forming. A unique group of toponyms are the Episcopal settlement names, but this is the consequence of the material's characteristic: the analysed documents all came from the church archives.

The phonotactics of the Ancient Hungarian and early old Hungarian age does not allow word-initial consonant clusters. However, foreign (especially Slavic) linguistic effect coming through borrowed appellatives and names causes exactly these. To embed these into the structure, the Hungarian language applies the following methods: epenthesis before the cluster (*iskola*), epenthesis within the cluster (*barát*), deletion of the first or second consonant (*csuka*, *szabad*), vocalisation (*unoka*) and the acceptance of consonant cluster (*friss*). RÓBERT KENYHERCZ in his study entitled “The word-initial consonant clusters beginning with *s* and *sz* in the old toponyms” (pp. 195–206) examines the adaptation of borrowings on the basis of early old Hungarian age: how do the early Slavic toponyms show the embedding of words and through this the acceptance of Hungarian language. One third of the almost two hundred examples shown in the study are evidence that Hungarian applied epenthesis at the beginning or in the middle of a cluster within a short period of time. The author found 31 names which preserved the original consonant cluster structure and then gave in to epenthesis. 75 names show the cluster which, according to the author, is the sign of the epenthesis rule losing its exclusivity within a short period of time. The author sees phonotactic/phonological reasons in the solution/preservation dilemma. However, RÓBERT KENYHERCZ does not order his data chronologically (he collects data until 1350), but considers all of them as belonging to one synchronicity (he justifies his method by claiming that the data form the beginning of the 12th century and those from the middle of 14th century are not different, p. 199). This method, however, is not complete according to the reviewer, the same way as the sole example of consonant deletion is not an adequate example for this embedding strategy (what is more, it could be that



this example is due to erroneous spelling, p. 203) (cf. FNESz. *Csikvánd* and *Csorba-tó* name entries: former Slavic *scs*; *Szenyér* name entry, former Slavic *szv* ceases to exist through deletion).

With the breakthrough of information technology, the opportunities are almost unforeseeable: appropriately recorded data stores and good programs the linguist gets help which could not have even be dreamt of only a few years before—JÁNOS M. BÁRTH informs the reader. “The linguistic analysis of toponyms from Háromszék with the help of information technology methods” is the title of his study (pp. 207–217). The digital linguistic geographical data inventory, which for the time being handles only Attila T. Szabó’s Transylvanian toponymic material offers an opportunity to search for personal names and their elements, their grouping, ordering in time and space, creation of maps. Through the printed pages of the program the study presents and discusses the steps of linguistic search and processing done with the program. The limit is the relatively small amount of data in the inventory but its expansion is merely a matter of time (and money).

In the final study of the volume GÁBOR MIKESY presents the more than two-decade long name comparison work of the Institute of Geodesy, Cartography and Remote Sensing in his work called “Geographical name inventory” (pp. 219–244). The aim of this work is to revise map name writing, in order to avoid errors: a local one-time committee is involved, the linguist-cartographer revises the traditional name inventory, determines the valid one from the variants and ensures it by line localisation in the map. In the meantime, numerous problems have to be solved from the ad hoc nature of localisation (certain areas may converge) to dialectal and orthographic issues. So far almost half of the country’s territory (1550 settlements) has been processed, due to which the name material at the disposal of the Institute of Geodesy, Cartography and Remote Sensing increased to 700 000 (approved use and localisation).

The first two volumes of the “Helynévtörténeti tanulmányok” present a steady quality. I would advise the editors not to let the high standards evidenced in the first two volumes drop.



Erzsébet Györffy (Debrecen, Hungary)

**Várnai Judit Szilvia: *Bárhogy nevezzük...*
*A tulajdonnév a nyelvben és a nyelvészetben***

[No matter what we call it... *Proper Names in Language and in Linguistics*]
Tinta Könyvkiadó, Budapest, 2005. 98 pages.

1. On the basis of the subtitle (Proper Names in Language and in Linguistics), Judit Szilvia Várnai's book belongs to those discussing the linguistic aspects of proper names. However, already in the second paragraph of the "Introduction", the author dispels our illusion of getting a clear-cut answer to the question "What is a proper name?", so her study is more a situation report on what is currently going on in linguistics, described by the notion of proper name research.

She justifies the impossibility of answering the question by traditional linguistics using a Kuhnian line of thought, in Hungary hallmarked by VERA BÉKÉS and KLÁRA SÁNDOR: "the study of linguistics as a whole has been in crisis for the last hundred years" (p. 11). Besides the lack of paradigm shift, the author talks about the lack of dialogue and reflexion between linguistic approaches and about the growing self-serving purpose of linguistics research topics.

In the author's opinion, traditional linguistic analyses are essentially incapable of grasping the essence of language. First of all, because "language is not a system that can be fragmented, so that choosing certain aspects of language and founding special disciplines on these aspects leads to missing the point about language itself" (p. 11, the author's parentheses omitted by E. Gy.). Secondly, traditional linguistic analyses are inappropriate because in linguistics, "the discussion of the phenomena transforms into an earlier discussion of the phenomena at a metatheoretical level [...], and, on the other hand, due to lack of empirical material it may be based on hypotheses" (p. 12). As an alternative path, instead of a formal logic approach to linguistics, Judit Szilvia Várnai proposes LÁSZLÓ MÉRŐ's translogic line of thought, which applies viewpoints from arts and metaphysics.

The introduction of this work (pp. 9–13) looks at linguistics from a standpoint wider than the issue of proper names. However, this short detour is entirely justified in a theoretical study of this kind, since it supplies a valid framework to the explicitly critical approach of the study.

2. The first chapter of the book (What is a proper name?, pp. 14–37) is interested in why the class of proper names developed at all, in the first place.



After presenting and evaluating the different viewpoints, we can say that Judit Szilvia Várnai accepts that the proper name is a linguistic phenomenon and a language universal. However, as she claims, “their existence is not absolutely necessary since every proper name can be paraphrased by an appellative” (p. 14, author’s highlight omitted by E. Gy.). She justifies their existence with pragmatic reasons: “they are needed to realise economical, effective communication and to permit society to function” (p. 16). Various disciplines (for example, logic, philosophy, linguistics) do not accept an empirically sufficient definition but try to grasp the category of proper names within their own conceptual frames.

First, Judit Szilvia Várnai presents how some exceedingly important philosophers (GOTTLOB FREGE, BERTRAND RUSSELL, LUDWIG WITTGENSTEIN, SAUL A. KRIPKE) perceive formal logic and the history of philosophy—but she merely draws an outline and, contrary to the original aim of her study, she refrains from criticism, since, “not being competent in the areas of formal logic and philosophy, it would be a rather dangerous experiment” (p. 17).

In contrast, the review of Hungarian onomastics studies begins with new critical observations again. While, however, the introduction raised objections concerning linguistics, onomastics is criticised in this part.

Onomastics, which has with increasing frequency referred to itself as an autonomous discipline is basically undefined: the topic of its research is not precisely determined. Besides this, it cannot even be called a unified paradigm: “it is problematic to refer to it as a linguistic approach (an outsider would probably consider it an auxiliary discipline of history or sociology, or statistics) and it is even more problematic to refer to it as a paradigm—especially because of its auxiliary discipline features” (p. 23). The author does not consider self-serving name collecting and ordering (as she defines onomastics) linguistic work, rather, she sees it as a manifestation of the instinctive human interest in proper names.

After these critical remarks, the study surveys 20th century papers in theoretical onomastics in chronological order, highlighting inconsistencies, obscure points and accentuating the pressure to categorise according to traditional grammar systems.

3. The chapter titled “Grammatical approaches to proper names” (pp. 38–63) is the longest part of the study. In the first subchapter, the author assesses the approaches which discuss the issue of distinguishing between appellatives and proper names, since “the border between these two categories is completely blurred, and instead of logic, a different line of thought guides us to decide what each element of the language is considered to be” (p. 38). In



other contexts, Judit Szilvia Várnai refers to cultural-psychological conventions. Relating to other cases, she emphasises the emotional side of name giving, which already leads the reader towards translogic.

In what follows, the author attempts to present works dealing with morphological and grammatical features of names (derivational affixes forming proper names, agreement and the use of articles). As a side thread and in an independent subchapter, the author also discusses the formal extent of proper names. After this, orthographic problems regarding proper names are analysed—although orthography is not a part of language system. Judit Szilvia Várnai, however, considers this partial issue important to discuss, since orthography reflects at least the codifier's (if nobody else's) judgement in grammatical issues.

Following the review of the literature, we experience great insecurity and contradiction in the mentioned areas, so the four approaches of linguistics do not provide an answer to the final question concerning proper names (What is a proper name?).

4. In Judit Szilvia Várnai's work, in the chapter "Proper names and the issue of formal systematisation" (pp. 64–75) we get acquainted with the problems of classifying linguistic elements into word classes, since proper names are also considered elements of language.

After surveying word class systematisation, the author concludes that word class division faces basic problems and contradictions: "besides the stability of certain basic categories, a more detailed classification is not clear-cut at all, something always stands out, and this does not apply to proper names only. However, since it is a human science, firstly, there is no pressure in linguistics as there is in natural sciences to free itself from contradictions and secondly, the power of tradition is stronger, consequently, the basic aspects of word class classification have been peacefully coexisting with the contradictions for a rather long time" (pp. 64–65).

Judit Szilvia Várnai tends to accept that proper names do not necessarily need to be classified in the hierarchical word class system. As linguistic elements, they may be categorised as nouns, but as proper names they are not part of the linguistic system. Certain linguists admit that the proper name is not a linguistic category; consequently, proper names are differentiated according to some extralinguistic aspect. They can be classified formally, but from a syntagmatic and etymological aspect (the most common aspects of name analysis), proper names behave as any other common linguistic element.

The author refers to the model effect more or less present in the systematisation of proper names. On the basis of the literature, she interprets the lack of



a formal model in name giving as a specific, so-called metamodel, and this phenomenon already takes the reader closer to the analysis of proper names as non-formal systems.

5. As an experienced translator, Judit Szilvia Várnai faces the issue of the translatability of proper names on a daily basis. In the fourth chapter of her study (Proper names as a non-formal system, pp. 76–91), she discusses names primarily in their relationship between cultures and languages, from the viewpoint of translation.

First of all, the practice of proper name translation strengthens our belief that proper names are language universals, although the judgement of “proper namedness” may be language-specific. Secondly, the instability of translation suggests that “a certain type of intuition, supported by a common cultural knowledge” helps us when we need to decide if translation is necessary (p. 79). Thirdly, “it justifies the standpoint that one need not search for a clear border between appellatives and proper names, and especially not on the basis of linguistic criteria” (p. 84).

In the author’s opinion, we need a notion of the system which can be adapted to the systematicity, change and variety of language. This can manifest itself in translogic (occasionally called intuitive, mythological, mystic, transcendent, etc.) way of thinking, which has distanced itself from the conscious line of thought “in the entire so-called Western culture which bases cognition on an analytic approach, and is becoming less organic” (p. 85).

Judit Szilvia Várnai applies a translogic way of thinking in the chapter least elaborate even in her own opinion, discussing proper names through presenting the phenomena of child language, name magic, name enchantment, totemism, taboo and folk tales. This approach is not alien to linguists, either, since—as she writes—“Among Hungarian linguists, there were a few who used to write about these kinds of things [i.e. name magic and other related topics] as early as in the first half of the century, and this fact may lead us to conclude that this is a kind of latent paradigm” (p. 88).

Unfortunately, the author merely flashes the translogic approach at the end of the study, and intends it only as an inspiration, since one of her aims as set out in the introduction is to suggest that “proper names should be considered a separate category only if language itself is interpreted as a non-formal system” (p. 13).

6. Judit Szilvia Várnai’s work offers both more and less than what the title of the work suggests. It is more because the author discusses different linguistic notions, phenomena (for example, wordiness, word class, slang, the issue of translation), scientific methods, and linguistics itself. At the same time, it may also seem less, because we do not get an answer to the essential



question of onomastics (What is a proper name?), and of course, after reading the introduction we do not even count on it. However, it does not elaborate the alternative approach, although the author admits that it is closest to her own standpoint.

To summarise, Judit Szilvia Várnai's book is a well-written, carefully edited work, with a one-page long English abstract. More than 200 pieces of reference lead us to believe the author is an expert in the topic. We hope to see answers to the questions and critical observations raised by her study.