1. Objectives and results of the thesis

1.1. According to what we know today, we cannot generally rely on direct evidence when investigating ethnic relations in periods with no or not enough sources, since there is no written (or other) material that would directly inform us about the population situation in the Carpathian basin. The circumstance does not only refer to the period prior to Hungarian written records, i.e. to the period before the Hungarian Conquest and the age immediately following it, but also to the centuries when thousands of documents were created. Namely, in the early documents, the data referring to the ethnic affiliation of residents were not recorded.

The population history researchers draw conclusions regarding the ethnic composition of the population inhabiting the Carpathian basin in the Árpád age mainly indirectly, from archaeology, historical geography, anthropology, written documents (e.g. chronicles) and even historical linguistic analysis. Historical linguistics' evidence are toponyms, anthroponyms and common names attested later (what is more, far later); and based on this evidence formulates its assumptions about languages in contact with Hungarian. From this, it draws conclusions regarding the population speaking the language and its ethnic affiliation. Among these linguistic sources, the early toponyms are the most conclusive, since they are limited in time and space: if we discover which ethnic group, speaking which language used the stock of toponyms in a given area, we can fairly precisely draw ethnic map of the region.

The method is made more difficult since through an etymological analysis we may only get to know the people who were the given places' name givers; however, even several centuries may pass from name forming to the first record of the name. Consequently – in extreme cases – tracing back the names to the period of record or to an earlier period, we may assume the existence of ethnic groups which actually never lived at the same time. If we are interested in the ethnic composition of a certain period, instead of revealing the name givers, we should reveal the name users of the period.

1.2. In the toponym research with a population history aim, the following line of development can be drawn in the last hundred years' literature: the promising research started by JÁNOS MELICH and continued by ISTVÁN KNIEZSA and ELEMÉR MOÓR stopped for long decades in the middle of last century, to be continued in the 1990's. The analyses which

in the beginning extended over large areas (Melich and Kniezsa studies) did not have a continuation: only after the turn of century does Gyula Kristó attempt to reveal the ethnic relations of a fairly large area, but he also only investigates the population history of former Hungarian border settlements and even from this he leaves out the probably largest ethnic group, the Magyars. Both in the first half and at the end of the 20th century a few studies discussing the population features of certain smaller areas appear, partly by Elemér Móor and partly by Lajos Kiss, Lóránd Benkő and Gyula Kristó. As we go further in time, more and more studies appear which aim at clarifying the methodology and possibilities of research on the relations between population and toponyms: first by Moór and Kniezsa, later by Lóránd Benkő, Gyula Kristó, Lajos Kiss and István Hoffmann. We may experience a visible transformation in the researchers' opinion about the population history value of toponyms: Melich, for example, draws the ethnic map of whole regions of the country based on only a dozen toponyms, Kniezsa elaborates his famous theory on parallel names, Kristó (mostly in his late studies), however, considers toponyms useful in the analysis of population relations only with certain constraints. Benkő and Hoffmann are also careful.

In my thesis, I aim at presenting an onomastic analysis which would offer new aspects of ethnic conclusions derived from the ancient toponymicon, through a study of a multilingual stock of names and the contact between the name users. In the study, I investigate a modern toponymic system, the bilingual stock of toponyms of the Sásdi disctrict, with more than 13000 data and taken from the *Baranya megye földrajzi nevei* (Geographical names of Baranya county) toponymicon. The primary objective of the thesis therefore is the discovery of systematic connections characterising onomatosystems of a Hungarian-German bilingual region. I also hope that the analytic model I have applied can lead to more general observations and tendencies, can be of help in describing bilingual toponymicon relations in general or in the population history analysis of less attested toponymicons from earlier periods.

2. The research conducted, the methods of processing
2.1. My thesis consists of four main units. In the first chapter I review the literature on relationships between toponyms and population studies, and then I present the theoretical and methodological background of the stud-

2

ies. In the next chapter, I analyse the chosen stock of data and finally I reveal the connection the between results of the study and ethnic relations. In the last big chapter, I analyse an early stock of names, the toponymicon of the Árpád age Borsod comitat with the help of experiences gained while investigating the modern onomatosystem. I also make an attempt to reveal the population of this area.

2.2. When drawing conclusions about ancient toponyms we face the following problems: the onomastic corpus from the early old Hungarian period is rather fragmented, it is practically minimal until the 12th century and growing from the 13th century, but still far from complete. Which object's name has remained and which has not is a matter of chance: not only are toponyms with no legal or possession history importance not recorded, but finding them is also incidental. The researcher of the early old Hungarian period can only work on an incomplete database; therefore, he/she is forced to make statements about the whole of the onomatosystem without knowing all of its members. And the linguistic features of certain name using groups are determined based on this heavily assumption-weighed picture. If these conclusions are applied to the toponymic system which served as a starting point, or, what is more, to further toponymic systems, the theory will become more complex, but at the same time less stable due to the instabilities of the starting point (linguistic facts, database). The result is even less reliable if we draw conclusions from linguistic and ethnic relations of earlier periods without records. In order, therefore, to reveal the connections between an onomatosystem and ethnicity, we need a thorough and detailed knowledge of the onomatosystem itself (i.e. its elements and the internal relations between them). Since, however, the remaining fragmented toponymic stocks can barely be expanded by newly familiarised old elements, it is worthwhile reconstructing the relations between them based on fully mapped onomatosystems. Studies like this are excellent sources for a toponymicon recording the present state (i.e. that of the near future), which give information about the form of communication appropriate for onomastic research and inform about the linguistic affiliation of the informant.

2.3. Marking the corpus and choosing the descriptive framework are also of outmost importance for an effective study. For the classification of name data and the investigation of relations between them, i.e. investi-

gating the whole of a given toponymic corpus, we need to choose an analytic model which would comply with the complexity of the studied onomatosystem. First, we need to decide on a model which is flexible enough to process other languages' onomatosystems. Second, the analytic framework should take into account that in the mixed population areas certain denotata have several names used by the different communities, and these are usually in an etymological or semantic relation. In my opinion, the relations between names referring to the same denotatum are not accidental, they follow certain patterns, in the model therefore there needs to be an aspect which would show the consequences of language contact phenomena, i.e. which would be able to interpret the toponymicon of the different name using communities as one system. Besides all these, it is an important requirement of the analytic framework to be able to handle modern and old toponymic systems, in other words, to have a universality which is shown not only to different languages, but also in different name giving, name using traditions.

Based on the above considerations, I chose István Hoffmann's multilayered toponymic analysis model, but it had to be complemented on several points to be suitable for the corpus and the aim of the analysis. First, the model needed subcategories in those partial systems which classify according to the linguistic tools (morphological, etymological features) used in name formation, since these language-specific elements show different features in different languages. We can gain information about the characteristic name giving patterns, as well as about the similarities and differences or maybe even about interference phenomena from a comparative study of German and Hungarian onomatosystems. In other words: name giving models can only describe German and Hungarian names as two independent onomatosystems which due to bilingualism connect the two onomatosystems, i.e. from a certain aspect form them into one system. The result of this connection is multilingualism, whose description requires different analytic methods and patterns: the relations of toponyms referring to the same denotatum and used by different linguistic communities also follow specific patterns, and as such determine the appearance of new names. Besides levels categorising certain names as members of the system, I also complemented Hoffmann's analytic model with a kind of second dimension, a new layers classifying name pairs. For the elaboration of multilingual categories I used Šrámek's

4

model and notions of the research groups from Leipzig and Brno regarding the integration of toponyms.

3. The new scientific results of the thesis
3.1. From the descriptive analytic levels of Hoffmann's model I conducted the **functional-semantic analysis**. Besides a joint analysis of the onomastic corpus it seemed purposeful to divide the corpus into partial systems so that we can compare the subsystems consisting of certain name users' (German and Hungarian) stock of names and denotatum types (settlements, waters, relief, public spaces).

Among the semantic patterns characteristic of the studied database there are three specific models which shed light on the multilingual territories' special name giving and name using customs. They also help discover the differences between the formal and informal name use and even the circumstances of recording in charters. One-componential names of denominating function, the combination of denominating and type denoting components as well as types that can be described as a combination of feature denoting and type denoting components are like this.

Among modern toponym system analyses, the most valuable results are those of settlement name, hydronym and border name analyses, but other name type analyses may also serve complementary information about name giving and name using situations. The public space names are, for example, an excellent illustration of differences between formal and informal, popular name giving and name using. In connection to this, the public space names show differences deriving from a bilingual community's linguistic prestige and the different name use situations.

From the analysis of certain name types it can be clearly seen that the ethnic denoting value of different denotata types' names can vary: among the name types present in the ancient times, settlement names are the least suitable for conclusions about the population. At the same time, name types more susceptible to social changes and less "preserved" by administrative means (hydronyms and names of borders) have a much more reliable ethnic denoting value.

Among the investigated German names there are a large proportion of functional toponyms of foreign origin, which are different from their original form only in pronunciation. (The majority of settlement names is like this.) From the analysis of a modern settlement name stock we can

see that there is an unanimous domination of Hungarian to German oik-onym fragments in charters. Consequently, they do not necessarily mirror the Hungarian population of villages denoted by them, but rather that in the Árpád age the Magyars were in the situation to denominate the settlements or that their names were recorded in the documents. Although the non-oikonym corpus is more reliable from the point of view of ethnicity research, one most keep in mind that the bilingual remnants get into the document after two confirmation (one from the "informant" acquainted with the border and the other from the charter writer). This double filter, largely influenced by prestige relations in the early old period, cannot be ignored when evaluating the early old toponyms.

Toponyms of foreign origin and denoting function do not directly refer to the ethnic group, not even in the case of micronames: if in population studies we derive conclusions regarding ethnic affiliation solely based on the origin of the names, we can easily slip on a sidetrack. In the Sásdi district, for example, the presence of both Hungarian and German population is clearly shown in the toponymicon, but there are also traces of Slavic, although at the record of data Slavic people lived only in one settlement. This phenomenon calls attention to the dangers of merging name giving and name using communities. Since even the gradually assimilated ethnic group's names gradually disappear from the area's stock of names, preserving therefore its memory for a longer period than what they spent at the given area. We can draw conclusions about a given period's population relations from the origin of names only with great foresight. In other words, this phenomenon warns about the merge of name giving and name using community.

I would like to emphasise two momentums from the functional-semantic analysis evaluation, which can be of help when analysing ancient names. Due to a bilingual context, the framework borrowed from Hoffmann seems to call for modifications. First, when defining the denominational function of the name, it is worthwhile having in mind that in active bilingualism names of foreign origin can have further informational content, besides the 'place of X name' (minimally the fact which ethnic group gave the name and beyond this, certain features of the place coded in the name could be interpretable for bilingual name users). Second, the inductive effect of another toponyms referring to an identical

6

denotatum is not present in this typological system, although it is probably an important factor in name formation.

The interaction of different language-speaking community models is present in the integration of toponyms with an originally denominational function and foreign origin: it seems that these names adapt to the onomatosystem of the recipient language by conforming to the dominant models (for example, border names taken from Hungarian in German become two-componential, are complemented by a type denoting basic constituent).

3.2. The role of **etymological analysis** is emphasised because it is on this level that the starting form (i.e. the structure formed at the time of genesis) of a toponym is bound to the language. From this point of view, the establishment of the last name forming momentum is crucial: the toponyms should be assigned to the population whose etymological model served as a basis for name formation.

Analysing the whole onomastic corpus we may conclude that the name forming features remain language-specific, in spite of the long life together. While we can establish the traces of parallel development during a functional-semantic analysis (especially in the internal regions), there are no interactions like this between languages on the etymological level. This factor may also be important when determining the name givers. (Based on the typical Hungarian name giving model, in case of pure personal name toponyms we should assign them to Hungarian communities, irrespective of the linguistic affiliation of the starting anthroponym.)

At this level of analysis, the integration of borrowings and loan names may offer the most information about ethnic conclusions derived from bilingual regions. The analysis of modern onomatosystems indicates that the social prestige relations also influence the proportion of borrowings: a socially prestigious community ranks high in name giving, while name users with lower social prestige are more susceptible to borrowing already existing place names. (Naturally, neither of the statements is exclusive.) If we use the loan toponyms in population conclusions, we need to exclude certain types from the study, for example, those that could have been formed as loan toponyms through borrowing and as loan toponyms through internal genesis.

Besides establishing the origin of the name, it is equally important to study the afterlife of a name (examining the integration of the new names

in the recipient language). On the basis of modern bilingual onomastic corpus analysis we may conclude that the assimilation happened gradually, and that on one of the final points of integration there are the names which do not undergo any change and on the other names whose both semantic and phonological structure changes. (From the etymological analysis point of view name elements whose phonological form changed are especially important, since these changes the spelling of charter was not possible to record.) A more thorough knowledge of the integration process may help in the distinction of name givers from name users.

3.3. I define **multinominality** as the phenomenon frequent in modern and ancient onomatosystems, when a place has several names at the same time. Multinominality is characteristic of monolingual and multilingual toponym stocks as well: we can interpret the members of a name pair belonging to the same language using community as synonyms, and those from different languages I will call a name pair referring to the same denotatum or a name pair (name group) with an identical meaning.

We can analyse the latter from a descriptive and historical aspect. On the former level we may examine correspondences between the members of a name pair: the categories of the model are the phonological, semantic correspondences as well as their subtypes and combinations. On the latter level we may study by which name forming method were they created. On this level the subtypes of translation and borrowing are organised into a system.

The internal analysis results of name pairs and name groups indicate that in a bilingual onomatosystem there is usually a semantic correspondence between names of identical meaning: most often complete concord. Far less frequent are other types, such as those with partial concord, as well as borrowings. And the least frequent are those where no connection can be revealed between the members of the name pair. These features lead us to the conclusion that individual onomatosystems of bilingual regions are not independent, not even when their name users use the elements of these onomatosystems (the toponyms) completely separately, always associating them to only one language during the act of communication. Namely, according to our data, besides numerous features if the denotatum, the genesis of new names in a bilingual community is motivated by its existing pair in the other language.

8

Analysing modern onomatosystems we experience that multinominality is a far more frequent phenomenon that what is assumed of the old onomatosystems based on the charters: we can demonstrate toponym pairs, name groups with the same denotatum less frequently (especially if we only examine synchronic multinominality). This can be explained in two ways: either by ancient chartering practice or by the assumption that there was no bilingualism as the time of charters – due to the lack of bilingual name pairs.

3.4. In the last chapter of the thesis, based on the experience from the investigation of a modern toponymicon, I analyse the toponymic system of **Borsod comitat from the early old Hungarian period**. In this unit I am partially searching the answer to what population can be found in this are on the basis of the name data. Furthermore, I am interested in what changes can be found in the analysed toponymicon from the early old Hungarian period, if we further segment it along the lines of chronological borders.

Based on the Árpád age toponym corpus there is a significant difference between the northern and southern territories of Borsod comitat. In both regions the toponyms indicate a Hungarian dominancy, in the northern region, however, a greater Slavic population could be detected. The toponymicon of Slavic origin can be dated back to periods earlier than the one investigated (at least partially). This assumption can be supported by the extent of integration of Slavic names. First, already in the phonological form and morphological structure of the earliest Slavic etymons we can observe features (for example, historical phonology changes, complementation by Hungarian geographical common name), which are probably traces of Hungarian name using activity. Second, as we head further the proportion of Slavic names among the new names decreases. From these two facts we can conclude the following about the northern region's population: 1. Slavic people lived in great proportions in the period before chartering, 2. the presence of Slavic people in the examined period cannot be unequivocally proved, 3. toponyms doe not indicate the presence of other ethnic groups besides Magyars and Slavic people, 4. in this period, there is no indication of a newly settled Slavic group, either (not even in the period following the Tatar invasions). In the southern region we can count on even less Slavic people: in the examined period

only on the southern borders of the region do a few settlement names appear which can be traced back both to Slavic and Hungarian origin.

The experience and systematic connections of modern multilingual onomastic corpus analysis, when applied to an ancient corpus, not only nuance the picture but also make it more instable, more vague, as if drawing conclusions on the ancient population solely based on etymological explanation of toponyms. The conditionally formulated observations which allow several opportunities are, however, still closer to the ancient reality than conclusions which seem more stable but are derived from less stable bases.