Éva Kovács
University of Debrecen, Debrecen, Hungary

Toponymic Findings in Latin-language Medieval Hungarian Charters: Classification, Structural and Motivational Features

Language of the article: English

_____

Éva Kovács
University of Debrecen, Debrecen, Hungary

Toponymic Findings in Latin-language Medieval Hungarian Charters: Classification, Structural and Motivational Features

Язык статьи: английский

Éva Kovács
University of Debrecen
Debrecen, Hungary

TOPONYMIC FINDINGS IN LATIN-LANGUAGE MEDIEVAL HUNGARIAN CHARTERS: CLASSIFICATION, STRUCTURAL AND MOTIVATIONAL FEATURES*

Apart from the relevance they have for language history and onomastic research, toponyms occurring in historical texts may also be a valuable source for other disciplines such as historiography, historical geography, ethnography, etc. This paper focuses on the toponymicon of the four early charters: 1) the Founding Charter of the Abbey of Tihany, dated 1055; 2) the Founding Charter of the Abbey of Százd written in 1067 and amended in the 13th century; 3) the Founding Charter of the Abbey of Garamszentbenedek written in 1075 and amended in the 13th century; 4) the Land Survey of the Abbey of Tihany of 1211. The onomastic data retrieved from these sources is perfectly suitable for providing a general overview of Old Hungarian place name-giving patterns. The whole corpus of place names is considered in structural, semantic, and motivational aspects. The author distinguishes between two essential types of early Old Hungarian toponyms: one-part names (mostly settlement names) derived from anthroponyms and two-part microtoponyms (mostly naming objects of nature) containing a geographical term, although the prevalence and frequency of these two categories of names changed to some extent during the early Old Hungarian era. The motivational analysis shows that the toponymic material used for reconstructing the ethnic composition of Medieval Hungary should be interpreted with extreme precaution. The appellative loanwords as part of these toponyms were supposedly adopted into Hungarian at an earlier stage while the toponyms derived

---

from borrowed personal names seem to mark certain anthroponymic trends during the respective period rather than immediately indicate to the ethnic affiliation of the owner of the named area.

K e y w o r d s: Old Hungarian, historical toponomastics, medieval charters, toponymic corpora, name-giving patterns, ethnic contacts, etymology.

1. Introduction

Being one of the most significant sources for the early history of the Hungarian language, Hungarian elements in Latin-language medieval documents have long been in the focus of scholarly attention. This is primarily due to the fact that toponyms and personal names they include provide valuable information on various aspects of language history: besides the history of words, they can provide guidance for scholars working in the fields of historical phonology and orthography, historical morphology, historical toponymy and anthroponymy. In the case of the study of place names, later mentions and occurrences of certain sites may provide for the identification of linguistic elements appearing in the charter. In this respect, the most important provision is that toponyms should not be surveyed in isolation, but through them we can also grasp their toponymic environment and reconstruct the linguistic-ethnic relations of a particular area. Moreover, their changes are shaped much more by linguistic factors than those of personal names, thereby extra-linguistic (cultural, social) factors need to be taken into consideration with greater weight. This particularly applies to the Hungarian context where the earliest charters that are abundant in toponyms date back to the 11th century. In addition, the toponymic corpus of the charters does not only offer us insights into the language itself, but also gives evidence of the lifestyle and culture of the language users [Hoffmann, 2007, *61–62*].

Besides constituting a crucial source material for linguistic history and onomastic research, toponyms occurring in historical sources (medieval charters) may also be used for the (history-related) purposes of other disciplines such as settlement history, historical demography and geography, ethnography, etc. Historians often rely on toponyms as coordinates in their attempts to map the ethnic composition of an area in the past. Previously, establishing the etymology of place names and their language of origin was considered a reliable source for the ethnic attribution of various name-giving communities. In this vein, the analysis of the toponyms found in early charters was used to restore the ethnic map of 11th-century Hungary. However, it needs to be emphasized that such examinations require special discretion in order to avoid typical pitfalls especially in the field of ethnic reconstruction [see: Kovács, 2014].

Charters have preserved the most of Hungarian-language materials from the early centuries of Hungarian written culture. In my paper, I will introduce and compare toponymic patterns as attested in four early charters: three charters of the 11th century (the oldest authentic source surviving in its original form, the Founding Charter of the Abbey of Tihany (1055); the Founding Charter of the Abbey of Százd which was

written in 1067 and amended in the 13th century; the Founding Charter of the Abbey of Garamszentbenedek which was written in 1075 and amended in the 13th century), and one charter from the 13th century (the Land Survey of the Abbey of Tihany of 1211). Two of them (the Tihany charters) are original (available not only in a copied version) and authentic, the others being interpolated.[1]

In recent years, the interest for in-depth studies of the 11th-century records from the historical linguistic perspective has gained momentum, including the revaluation of previously explored sources with new methods of research. Besides the study of original charters, there has been a growing scholarly interest in non-authentic charters and those that have not survived in their original form. My paper relies on the monographs offering detailed studies of charters and using novel methods of historical linguistics. A theoretical onomastic analysis of the remnants in the Founding Charter of the Abbey of Tihany was carried out by István Hoffmann [2010]. In her detailed study, with reference to the Founding Charter of the Abbey of Garamszentbenedek, Melinda Szőke [2015] developed a methodology for exploring charters of an uncertain chronological origin (those which survived as copies or which were forged). I myself have studied two charters in detail: first, I examined the Land Survey of the Abbey of Tihany, which is closely related to the Founding Charter of 1055, and its toponymic remnants from the Land Survey of 1211 [Kovács, 2015]; then I provided a detailed analysis of the interpolated Founding Charter of the Abbey of Százd [Kovács, 2018].

My paper focuses on studying the research capacity of the corpus of toponyms found in medieval charters as well as the limitations of such research. My goal is to assess which scholarly questions may be answered with certainty relying on the study of toponyms, and which issues within the fields of language history, onomastics, and ethnic history call for more evidence in addition to the above-mentioned linguistic elements.

2. Structural and Motivational Features of Settlement Names

From a linguistic-onomastic perspective, the toponyms of Hungarian origin in these early charters can be classified into two distinctly separated groups: those referring to places that exist independently of human activity and those designating places

---

[1] Copied old Hungarian charters are often interpolated, i.e. contain new pieces of text added during copying [Hoffmann et al., 2017, *75*]. When working with interpolated charters, we should first examine chronological layers of the charters along with those aspects that enable us to distinguish the parts of the charter originating from different periods. Thus, in the case of the charter of Százd and the charter of Garamszentbenedek, we need to consider two chronological layers in principle: the period when the original charter was written, i.e. the 11th century, as the earliest layer, and the period of the amendment and copies, i.e. the 13th century, as the later layer [Kovács, 2018, *11, 108–109*]. The analysis of the orthography and of the sounding of place names can help distinguish between the layers but the separation is not always an easy task.

created by man. It should be noted that the prevalence rate of these two categories of names in the documents cannot be used to draw conclusions on the structure of the toponymicon, as the recording of names belonging to the various categories in a charter depends on the objectives and circumstances of its creation. However, the distinction between these two name types is still important because it serves as the basis of typological-taxonomic analysis: the "natural" and "cultural" names are characterized by distinctive linguistic attributes.

From the structural perspective, the charters feature one-part and two-part toponyms. In the four charters under study, the names of places constantly inhabited, i.e. settlement names, constitute the largest group. I use the term "settlement name" in its widest sense possible that include names referring, *inter alia*, to fish farms [Hoffmann, 2010, *228*]. Settlement names almost always consist of one part, two-part settlement names being extremely rare. There is, actually, only one two-part settlement name in the Founding Charter of the Abbey of Tihany (*Fehérvár*, 1055: *feheruuaru* = *fehér* 'white' + *vár* 'fort'), in the Founding Charter of the Abbey of Százd (*Csabarákosa*, 1067/1267: *Chabarakusa* = *Csaba* personal name + *Rákos* microtoponym), and in the Land Survey of the Abbey of Tihany (*Papsoka*, 1211: *Popsoca* ~ *Popsosca* = *pap* 'religious person' + *sok* 'village'). The toponymic corpus of the Founding Charter of Garamszentbenedek, however, includes a larger number of two-part names in the 13th century-layer: *Mikolafalu* (1075/+1124/+1217: *Mikolafalu* = *Mikola* personal name + *falu* 'village'), *Sárófalu* (1075/+1124/+1217: *Saroufalu* = *Sáró* personal name + *falu* 'village'). This was an important feature of old Hungarian settlement naming because two-part names were rare in the Old Hungarian era [Kovács, 2018, *109*].

The majority of one-part settlement names in the charters were formed from personal names by metonymy. It is a widely accepted view among researchers that toponyms formed by a personal name in itself (i.e. without an affix or a new derivational element) were characteristic only of Hungarian among all the languages used in the Carpathian Basin,[2] which means that these settlement names clearly indicate that the name-givers spoke Hungarian. The use of personal names as toponyms represented the most frequent form of old Hungarian settlement naming, which was used to express the right of ownership by means of the presence of the proprietor's personal name in the toponym. The anthroponym serving as the basis for a toponym, may have a foreign origin: Slavic (e.g., *Tihany*, 1055: *tichon*, cf. 1211: *Tichon* personal name [Fehértói, 2004, *755*] < Czech *Tichoň* [Kiss, 2, *644*]; *Damarád*, 1067/1267: *Damarad*,

---

[2] In Europe and its neighbouring regions apart from Hungary, this naming pattern is characteristic only of Turkish (e.g. toponyms *Dilger*, *Heibulla*, *Tajek*) [Kovács, 2012, *190*]. More recent findings have indicated that some of the Slavic languages also display this kind of settlement naming (e.g., Bulgarian *Преслав* < *Preslav-jь* toponym < *Preslavъ* personal name) [Kovács, 2012, *190*; Hoffmann et al., 2017, *144*]. We can also find some toponyms formed from personal names without any formant in Romance languages (e.g., Spanish *Oreja* < *Aurelia* personal name) [Hoffmann et al., 2017, *144*].

cf. Czech personal name *Domarad ~ Domorad*) [Svoboda, 1964, *83*], Turkish (e.g., *Alap*, 1055: *olup*, cf. 1138/1329: *Alup* personal name [Fehértói, 2004, *60*] < Seljuk *Alp*, Bulghar *Alip* [Rásonyi & Baski, 1, *53*], cf. Old Turkic *alp* 'hero' [Kiss, 1, *65*]; *Csaba*, 1067/1267: *Soba*, cf. 1138/1329: *Saba* personal name [Fehértói, 2004, *174*], cf. Kazak *Čabay*, Turkic *čaba* 'present, gift') [Rásonyi & Baski, 1, *184*], German (e.g., *Pécsely*, 1211: *Pechel*, cf. 1152: *Pecli* personal name [Kiss, 2, *328*] < German *Pezili ~ Pecili*) [Kiss, 2, *328*]. Likewise, it can belong to the Christian Latin name corpus (e.g., *Fülöp*, 1211: *Pilip*, cf. 1141–1161: *Philippo*, 1181: *Philip(us)* personal name) [Fehértói, 2004, *638–639*], or have a Hungarian etymology (*Apos*, 1211: *Opus*, cf. 1131: *Op(us)* personal name [Fehértói, 2004, *604*], cf. Hungarian *apa* 'father') [B. Lőrinczy, 1962, *13*, *28*, *38*]. Most personal names used as settlement names did not have an appellative meaning, which can only be assumed for one or two anthroponyms of Hungarian origin [Kovács, 2015, *200*; 2018, *109*].

It is important to point out that personal names of foreign origin do not necessarily testify to the ethnic origin of the denoted person, nor to his or her language, as they reflect, in the first place, the trends of personal naming that were characteristic of the respective period [Hoffmann, 2010, *228*; Hoffmann & Tóth, 2016]. In fact, these personal names (and the toponyms preserving them) help us get insight into the cultural impacts that affected the Hungarian people and observe the expansion of specific personal names [cf. Tóth, 2001, *33*; 2017, *99–106*].

In relation to this circumstance, it is important to point out that the origin of lexemes should not under any conditions prompt conclusions on the origin of toponyms. In the case of the possessive attributive structure *Ölyves megyéje* (1055: *uluues megaia* 'the boundary of the village of Ölyves' = *ölyv* 'buzzard' + *-s* suffix + *megye* 'boundary' + *-je* Sg3 possessive suffix) found in the Founding Charter of the Abbey of Tihany, it might emerge as a problem that the two lexemes in the name are loanwords: the word *ölyv* 'buzzard' is Old Turkish, while the word *megye* 'county' is Slavic. However, the linguistic origin of the lexemes is "entirely independent of their appearance in the name (or in the descriptive structure), as there can be no doubt that local name givers used these in the moment of the name-giving as elements of the Hungarian language" [Hoffmann, 2010, *105*]. Moreover, the morphological structure clearly indicate to the fact that the name was created by Hungarian-language speakers [for that, see Hoffmann & Tóth, 2016, *268*, *298–299*; Hoffmann et al., 2017, *14*, *27*].

Metonymy as a linguistic tool played major role in the history of settlement names creation. The transfer 'name of a natural object → settlement name' is quite frequent in the Old Hungarian era.

In the Founding Charter of Százd, the names of *Fancsalfenyérje* (1067/1267: *Fonsol fenerie < Fancsal fenyérje = Fancsal* personal name + *fenyér* 'grassy area'), *Hortobágy* (1067/1267: *Chartybak < Hortobágy* hydronym = *Hort* settlement name + '*Bágy* hydronym), *Szeghalom* (1067/1267: *Scegholm < Szeg-halom* oronym = *szeg* 'salient,

corner' + *halom* 'hillock'), *Szihalom* (1067/1267: *Scenholm* < *Szén-halom* oronym = *szén* 'coal' + *halom* 'hillock') settlements primarily denoted natural formations (hillocks, sandy areas, etc.) [Kovács, 2018, *110*]. The village of *Hortobágy*, for example, could be named after the river flowing next to it (1261/1271: iuxta *Hortubaguize*, 1328, 1346: *Hurtubag*, 1452/1460: Fluvy *Hortobágy*, 1521: iuxta aquam *Hortobágy* [see Béres, 2014, *44*]). The change 'hydronym → settlement name' is not uncommon in the Old Hungarian era, there are many examples for it in the Tihany charters also (cf. *Füzegy*, 1211: *Fuzegy* settlement name < 1055: *fizeg ~ fyzeg* hydronym, cf. *fűz* 'willow' + *-gy* suffix; *Morotva*, 1211: *Mortua* settlement name < 1211: *Mortua* hydronym, cf. *morotva* 'dead river') [Kovács, 2015, *201*].

The ethnic motivation in name-giving is represented both in the 11th- and 13th-century sources, for example in relation to the names of villages *Türk* (1055: *turku* ~ 1211: *Turk*, cf. *türk* 'Turkish') and *Besenyő* (1211: *Beseneu*, cf. *besenyő* 'Pecheneg') [Kovács, 2015, *200*]. However, ethnonyms could become oikonyms in Hungarian also through personal names, which means that the metonymic transfer 'ethnonym → personal name → settlement name' is not rare. The etymology of personal names serving as a basis for toponyms can in no circumstances be the foundation of ethnic conclusions [Hoffmann, 2010, *228*; Hoffmann & Tóth, 2018, *14*].

Some settlement names were formed from occupational names, for instance, *Dusnok(i)* (1067/1267: *Dusnuky*, cf. *dusnok* 'servant performing services to the church'), *Timár* (1067/1267: *Tymar*, cf. *tímár* 'tanner') and *Szekeres* (1067/1267: *Zekeres*, cf. *szekeres* 'transporter using wagons') in the Founding Charter of the Abbey of Százd [Kovács, 2018, *109–110*] or *Bocsár* (1211: *Bocar ~ Bogar*, cf. *bocsár* 'cooper') and *Csősz* (1211: *Cheuz ~ Cheuuz*, cf. *csősz* 'royal courier') in Land Survey of the Abbey of Tihany [Kovács, 2015, *200*].

The names of certain settlements refer to fauna (e.g. *Disznó*, 1055: *gisnav* 'pig'; *Füred*, 1211: *Fured* = *für(j)* 'quail' + *-d* suffix; *Szamárdi* 1211: *Somardy* = *szamár* 'donkey' + *-d(i)* suffix), flora (e.g. *Somogy*, 1055: *sumig* = *som* 'dogwood' + *-gy* suffix; *Füzegy*, 1075/+1124/+1217: *Fizeg*, 1211: *Fuzegy* = *fűz* 'willow' + *-gy* suffix) or landscape elements (*Segesti*, 1055: *segesti* = *sēg* 'hill' + *-st(i)* suffix). Except for *gisnav*, these names were formed with a derivational suffix (*-d(i)*, *-gy*, *-st(i)*) [Kovács, 2015, *201*].

Apart from settlement names, in the "cultural" group of names we may also find other categories of names in the charters of the Abbey of Tihany: road names referring to the ancient settlement structure (*Ó-út*, 1055: *ohut* = *ó* 'old' + *út* 'road'; *Hadút*, 1055: *hodu utu*, 1211: *Hoduth ~ Hodut* = *had* 'army' + *út* 'road'), names of fishing places (*Székü vejszéje*, *Putu vejszéje*, 1055: *seku ueieze*, *putu uueieze*, deriving from personal names *Szék(ü)* and *Put(u)* + *vejsze* 'fishing place'), and names of market places (*Martos vására*, 1055: *mortis uuasara* = *Martos* personal names + *vásár* 'market place') [Hoffmann, 2010, *228*]. Such toponyms are not recorded in the founding charters of the Abbey of Százd and Abbey of Garamszentbenedek.

3. Names of Natural Objects

The largest number of one-part and two-part names referring to the objects of nature are hydronyms followed by oronyms. In these four charters, other place names are quite few. The reason is that watercourses serve as natural boundaries of estates, while hills and mountains are suitable for specifying certain points of the border.

Most one-part names of natural objects in the charters of the Abbey of Tihany have the same form as the geographical terms they derive from: *Fertő* (1055: *ferteu*, 1211: *Ferteu*, cf. *fertő* 'wallowing, bathing place (primarily for animals: pig, buffalo, etc.)' and later 'marshy place, swamp, marsh'), *Fok* (1055: *fuk*, 1211: *Foc*, cf. *fok* 'natural or artificial drainage'), *Morotva* (1211: *Mortua*, cf. *morotva* 'dead channel'), *Örény* (1211: *Euren*, cf. *örény* 'swirl, eddy'). Contrary to this, in the Founding Charter of the Abbey of Százd there is only one toponym that has the same form as a geographical appellative term: *Sár:* 1067/1267: *Saar* < *sár* 'marsh, marshy area, muddy watercourse' [Kovács, 2018, *111*]. When analysing the status of the linguistic use of geographical terms attested in charters, we may come across certain obstacles [cf. Hoffmann, 2008, *16*]: in each case, the researcher has to decide whether they are of proprial or appellative value, keeping in mind that they might have had both appellative and proprial usage, cf. in the Founding Charter of the Abbey of Tihany: *Árok* (1055: *aruk*, cf. *árok* 'ditch, river bed; valley') or *Szakadát* (1055: *zakadat*, cf. *szakadat ~ szakadát*, *szakadék* 'watercourse, brook originating from a larger river or from still water'). The proprial use of geographical common names was characteristic of the early old Hungarian toponymicon, several names may prove this, which have been used in their unchanged forms for almost a millennium: *Ér* (cf. *ér* 'natural watercourse), *Fertő* (cf. *fertő* 'marshy place'), etc.

Among one-part names of natural objects there are toponyms formed by derivation. The toponym *Somogy* (1067/1267: *Sumug*) may be considered as having been formed from the plant name *som* 'dogwood' with a derivational suffix *-gy*. The hydronym *Hagymás* (1211: *Hagymas ~ Hagimas*) derives from the noun *hagyma* 'onion' by adding the toponymic formant *-s*. The derivational consonant cluster *-st/-sd* found in *Kövesd* (1211: *Cuest*) refers to the stony (pebbly) ground of the territory [Kovács, 2015, *202*; 2018, *112*].

Certain names of this kind were formed from plant names by metonymy. Such are the hydronyms *Kőrös* (1211: *Queurus ~ Keurus*) formed from *kőris* 'ash tree,' and the *Eger* (1067/1267: *Egur*) derived from *éger ~ eger* 'alder' [Kovács, 2015, *202*; 2018, *112*].

In the early sources, we see that the basic constituent of two-part "natural" names is a geographical term denoting the type of the place. The most frequent geographical common names: *fő* 'source, starting point; entrance of a valley': *Sár-fő* (1055: *sar feu*, cf. *sár* 'swamp' > *Sár* hydronym + *fő* 'source, starting point'), *Árok feje* (1055: *aruk fee*, 'trench' + 'source'); *tő* 'end, estuary of a river, ditch': *Sár töve* (1067/1267: *Sartue*, cf. *sár* 'swamp' > *Sár* hydronym + *tő* 'end of a river'); *ér* 'natural watercourse, brook': *Hamus-ér* (1067/1267: *Homuser* 'ashy' + 'brook'), *Vajas-ér* (1075/+1124/+1217: *Woioser* 'covered with butter' + 'brook'); *tó* 'lake': *Vencsellő tava* (1067/1267:

Wensellev towa 'Vencsellő' + 'lake'), *Fehér-tó* (1075/+1124/+1217: *Feiertou* 'white' + 'lake'); *fok* 'natural or artificial drainage; watercourse': *Tölgyes foka* (1211: *Tulgusfoca ~ Tulusfocca ~ Tulusfoca* 'oak' + 'watercourse'). It can be established from the limited onomastic data mentioned here that in Old Hungarian, a large number of appellative geographical terms were used as part of toponyms [Kovács, 2018, *112*]. Most of them had already been used for several hundred years in the Hungarian language of the Árpad Era (e.g., *tő*, *ér*, *tó*, *hegy*, etc.), but the toponyms from the charters also contain new formations (e.g. *telek* 'land, property'), as well as elements borrowed from Slavic (e.g. *halom* 'hillock; mound').

The complement in the majority of two-part names of natural places refers to a characteristic or an attribute of the place in question. It may be an adjective without a derivational suffix (e.g., *Nagy-örém*, 1067/1267: *Nogewrem* 'big' + 'swirl'; *Szár-hegy*, 1211: *Zaarhegy* 'bald' + 'hill'), an adjective derived from a noun (*Köves-homok*, 1055: *cues humuc*, cf. *kő* 'stone' + -*s* suffix + *homok* 'sand'; *Ludas ere*, 1211: *Ludos Here*, cf. *lúd* 'goose' + -*s* suffix + *ér* 'brook'), a noun attribute (*Szil-kút*, 1055: *zilu kut* 'elm (tree name)' + 'well, source'; *Kökény ere*, 1211: *Cucen Hereh* 'blackthorn (plant name)' + 'brook'), or a number (*Három-fertő*, 1055: *harmu ferteu* 'three' + 'marshes'; *Három-hegy*, 1055: *harmu hig* 'three' + 'hills'). Among two-part place names, several contain an anthroponym as their first element: *Báb homokja* (1055: *babu humca* = *Báb* personal name + 'sand'), *Koku szarmja* (1055: *koku zarma* ~ 1211: *Choczorma* = *Kok* personal name + 'riverbed, river valley'), *Pozsony tava* (1211: *Posuntoua* = *Pozsony* personal name + 'lake'), etc. [Kovács, 2015, *203*]. While in others, the first constituent is a toponym, e.g.: *Vencsellő tava* (1067/1267: *Wensellev towa*), a combination of the settlement name *Vencsellő* also mentioned in the Founding Charter of Százd and of the possessive form of *tó* 'lake' (this form reflects the local attribution of the lake which can be interpreted roughly as 'a body of water in Vencsellő settlement' [Kovács, 2018, *112*]; *Zsitva töve* (1075/+1124/+1217: *Sitouatuin*), a combination of the river name *Zsitva* and the geographical term *tő* 'estuary' [Szőke, 2015, *208*].

4. Loanwords in Place Names

Borrowings are present in the charters in an insignificant number. Among 82 toponymic remnants of the Founding Charter of the Tihany Abbey, only two are of non-Hungarian etymology: settlement name *Kesztölc* (1055: *ca(s)telic ~ kaztelic*, cf. Slavic **kostelъ* 'fort, castle') and lake name *Balaton* (1055: *balatin ~ bolatin*, cf. Slavic **Blatьnъ* 'muddy'). The respective appellative nouns of Slavic origin became part of the Hungarian language through adaptation and are attested in language forms referring to Hungarian language users [see Hoffmann, 2010, *230*; Hoffmann et al., 2017, *14*, *27*, *257*; Hoffmann & Tóth, 2018, *8*, *15*]. Among the 102 names retrieved from the 13th century Land Survey of the Abbey of Tihany there is only one loan — the name of the lake *Balaton* (1211: *Bolotin ~ Balatin ~ Bolotun ~ Bolotyn ~ Bolatin*).

We also find two loanwords among the 51 toponymic remnants of the Founding Charter of Százd: the settlement name *Makra* (1067/1267: *Macra*, cf. Slavic **mokrъ* 'wet') and the river name *Tisza* (1067/1267: *Tyza ~ Tiza*, cf. ancient Indo-European river name **Tīsjo-* 'muddy') [Kovács, 2018, *110*]. The toponymic corpus of the Founding Charter of Garamszentbenedek, however, includes foreign names in a larger number: the hydronym *Gáj* (1075/+1124/+1217: *Gai*, cf. Slavic *gaj* 'grove'), the oronym *Plesivice* (1075/+1124/+1217: *Plesiuicze*, cf. Slavic toponym *Plešivica < pleš ~ pliš* 'bald hill'), the oikonym *Tajna* (1075/+1124/+1217: *Taina*, cf. Slovak *Tajná <* proto-Slavic **tajati* 'melt'; **tajiti* 'hide' or **tajьnь* 'home'), the hydronym *Zsitva* (1075/+1124/+1217: *Sitoua*, cf. Slavic toponym *Žitava < žito* 'grain crop'), etc. [Szőke, 2015, *169*, *189*, *199–200*, *207–208*].

The analysis shows that the vast majority of toponyms for both settlements and natural objects were created after the Conquest, however, the Hungarians borrowed the names of extensive bodies of water, long and significant rivers from the languages of other peoples of the region, especially from Slavic.

5. Conclusion

Studying the 11th–13th-century charters from the onomastic perspective is perfectly suitable for providing a general overview of Old Hungarian place name-giving patterns that can also be used as a starting point for the study of the evolution of place name-giving practices. The analysis reveals that the early Old Hungarian toponyms had two essential types: one-part names (mostly settlement names) formed from anthroponyms and two-part microtoponyms (mostly names of natural objects) containing a geographical term, although the prevalence and frequency of these two categories of names changed to some extent during the early Old Hungarian era. For example, the toponymic corpus of the Founding Charter and the Land Survey of the Abbey of Tihany indicates that during a gap of six to seven generations that passed between the two documents, there were no significant shifts in the system of toponyms. Nor did any major changes apply in naming the objects of nature, however, some alterations occurred among the settlement names. It is also obvious that toponyms alone are not sufficient to reconstruct the ethnic composition and ethnic relations of earlier times, thus we have to be cautious when working with toponymic data used as material for ethnic history.

Béres, J. (2014). Adalékok a *Hortobágy* etimológiájához. *Helynévtörténeti Tanulmányok, 10*, 33–52.

Fehértói, K. (2004). *Árpád-kori személynévtár. 1000–1301* [Personal Names of The Árpád Era]. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.

Hoffmann, I. (2007). A Tihanyi alapítólevél nyelvészeti jelentősége [The Linguistic Importance of the Founding Charter of the Abbey of Tihany]. In G. Érszegi (Ed.), *Tanulmányok a 950 éves*

Tihanyi alapítólevél tiszteletére [Papers in Honour of the 950-Hundred-Year-Old Founding Charter of the Abbey of Tihany] (pp. 61–66). Tihany: Tihanyi Bencés Apátság.

Hoffmann, I. (2008). A Tihanyi alapítólevél helynévi szórványainak névrendszertani tanulságai [Onomatosystematical Consequences of Toponyms in the Founding Charter of the Abbey of Tihany]. *Helynévtörténeti Tanulmányok, 3*, 9–27.

Hoffmann, I. (2010). *A Tihanyi alapítólevél mint helynévtörténeti forrás* [The Founding Charter of the Abbey of Tihany as a Source of Toponym History]. Debrecen: Debreceni Egyetemi Kiadó.

Hoffmann, I., & Tóth, V. (2016). A nyelvi és az etnikai rekonstrukció kérdései a 11. századi Kárpát-medencében [Issues of Linguistic and Ethnic Reconstruction in the Carpathian Basin during the 11th Century]. *Századok, 150*, 257–318.

Hoffmann, I., & Tóth, V. (2018). Theoretical Issues in Toponym Typology. *Onomastica Uralica, 12*, 7–29.

Hoffmann, I., Rácz, A., & Tóth, V. (2017). *History of Hungarian Toponyms.* Hamburg: Buske.

Kiss, L. (1988). *Földrajzi nevek etimológiai szótára* [Etymological Dictionary of Geographical Names] (4th ed., Vols. 1–2). Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.

Kovács, É. (2012). Different Aspects for the Study of Toponyms Deriving from Personal Names. *Acta Onomastica, 53*, 187–197.

Kovács, É. (2014). On the Historical Source Value of Toponyms. Historical Toponyms as a Source for the Reconstruction of Ethnic Relations. *Namenkundliche Informationen, 103/104*, 479–489.

Kovács, É. (2015). *A Tihanyi összeírás mint helynévtörténeti forrás* [The Land Survey of the Abbey of Tihany as a Source for the History of Place Names]. Debrecen: Debreceni Egyetemi Kiadó.

Kovács, É. (2018). *A Százdi alapítólevél mint helynévtörténeti forrás* [The Founding Charter of the Abbey of Százd as a Source for the History of Place Names]. Debrecen: Debreceni Egyetemi Kiadó.

B. Lőrinczy, É. (1962). *Képző- és névrendszertani vizsgálódások. Az -s ~ -cs képzővel alakult névanyag az ómagyarban* [Studies of the Taxonomic Systems of Formative Elements and Names. The Old Hungarian Onomastic Corpus Formed with the *-s ~ -cs* Suffixes]. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.

Rásonyi, L. & Baski, I. (2007). *Onomasticon Turcicum. Turkic Personal Names* (Parts 1–2)*.* Bloomington: Indiana University Denis Sinor Institute for Inner Asian Studies.

Svoboda, J. (1964). *Staročeská osobní jména a naše příjmení* [Old Czech Personal Names and Our Surnames]. Praha: Nakladatelství Československé Akademie věd.

Szőke, M. (2015). *A garamszentbenedeki apátság alapítólevelének nyelvtörténeti vizsgálata* [Historical Linguistic Analysis of the Founding Charter of the Abbey of Garamszentbenedek]. Debrecen: Debreceni Egyetemi Kiadó.

Tóth, V. (2001). *Névrendszertani vizsgálatok a korai ómagyar korban. Abaúj és Bars vármegye* [Onomatosystematical Research into the Old Hungarian Era. Abaúj and Bars Comitat]. Debrecen: Debreceni Egyetem Magyar Nyelvtudományi Tanszék.

Tóth, V. (2017). *Személynévi helynévadás az ómagyar korban* [Toponyms Derived from Anthroponyms in the Old Hungarian Era]. Debrecen: Debreceni Egyetemi Kiadó.

* * *

Kovács, Éva
PhD, Research Fellow
Department of Hungarian Linguistics
University of Debrecen
1, Egyetem Square, 4032 Debrecen, Hungary
Email: kovacseva84@gmail.com

Ковач Ева
PhD, научный сотрудник кафедры
венгерского языка
Университет Дебрецена
1, Egyetem Square, 4032 Debrecen, Hungary
E-mail: kovacseva84@gmail.com

Ева Ковач

Университет Дебрецена
Дебрецен, Венгрия

ТОПОНИМИЯ
ЛАТИНОЯЗЫЧНЫХ СРЕДНЕВЕКОВЫХ ВЕНГЕРСКИХ ГРАМОТ: КЛАССИФИКАЦИЯ, СТРУКТУРНЫЕ И МОТИВАЦИОННЫЕ ОСОБЕННОСТИ

Топонимы, встречающиеся в исторических документах, значимы не только для ономастики и исторической лингвистики, они являются ценными источниками информации для таких научных дисциплин, как история, историческая география и этнография. В данной статье рассматривается топонимикон четырех ранних венгерских документов: 1) Уставной грамоты Тиханьского аббатства, датируемой 1055 г.; 2) Уставной грамоты Саздского аббатства, составленной в 1067 г. и отредактированной в XIII в.; 3) Уставной грамоты Гарамсентбенедекского монастыря, составленной в 1075 г. и отредактированной в XIII в.; 4) Описания земель Тиханьского аббатства, датируемого 1211 г. Ономастические данные, извлеченные из этих документов, позволяют составить представление о моделях номинации географических объектов в древневенгерский период. Автор рассматривает весь корпус географических названий в структурном и семантико-мотивационном аспектах. В структурном отношении весь корпус топонимов распадается на две группы: односоставные отантропонимические названия (в основном ойконимы) и двусоставные микротопонимы, содержащие тот или иной апеллятивный компонент (преимущественно названия природных объектов), хотя частотность и количественное соотношение этих двух типов на протяжении древневенгерского периода менялось. Мотивационный анализ показывает, что топонимический материал, используемый для реконструкции этнического состава средневековой Венгрии, должен интерпретироваться с большой осторожностью. Иноязычные апеллятивные основы, встречающиеся в составе топонимов, были, по всей видимости, заимствованы на более раннем этапе, в то время как топонимы, производные от заимствованных личных имен, отражают прежде всего антропонимическую моду, нежели непосредственно указывают на этническую принадлежность владельца соответствующего земельного участка.

К л ю ч е в ы е   с л о в а: древневенгерский язык, историческая топономастика, средневековые грамоты, топонимический корпус, модели топонимической номинации, этнические контакты, этимология.