1. Objectives of the thesis, the description / delineation of the topic

In the history of Hungarian toponomastics, hydronyms were the second most popular topic after settlement names. However, while the oikonym system turned out to bear numerous features derived from the system itself which are not or only barely characteristic of other name types; we have very little information about hydronyms and the fact whether they have these features.

Almost all toponym researchers draw attention to the importance of hydronyms, however, this area of study, although having rich literature, is characterised by a certain disproportion: the majority of works have aimed at etymological analysis of larger waters and drawn conclusions from them. Since these names have entered the Hungarian toponymicon from other languages' toponymic systems, the unilaterality above also indicates that borrowed hydronyms received greater attention than hydronyms of internal genesis, although, understandably, the latter provide us with more insights.

Hydronym analysis offers more than l'art pour l'art onomastics, it is of importance to other disciplines as well: history of language and dialect, population and settlement history, historical geography, plant and animal geography.

In my dissertation I deal exclusively with the analysis of hydronyms. I attempt to draw a picture of the whole stock of river names based on its sample. The basis of my study is the hydronymicon from Arpad age, I have, however, expanded the borderlines of the periods to 1350, to the beginning of early old Hungarian period – partly to conform to the chronological borderlines of my references.

2. Methods applied

My thesis consists of three larger chapters. In the first chapter I summarise the studies and monographies dealing with Hungarian hydronyms. In the other two chapters first I try to delineate the term *river name* and then I analyse the relationship between a hydronym and its denotatum from the traditional semantic, cognitive linguistic and sociolinguistic aspect: here I primarily focus on the issue of multilingualism. The next chapter is the main part of my dissertation: it contains an onomatosystematic analysis of early old Hungarian river names. First I conducted studies regarding the onomatosystems of river names: I analyse the onomastic corpus from a structural and etymological aspect. In the next stage of the work I discuss the role of river names in denominating other place names (settlement, mountain, region and castle names). At this point I consider it appropriate to expand the chronological borders in order to be able to point to those significant connections which could not have been brought to the surface by working only on the early old Hungarian toponymicon. The last, comparative chapter reviews the similarities and differences of river names and (onomastically the closest class of) lake names.

Many have already attempted to present names from a typological aspect, these analytical systems are, however, mostly one or mixed-aspectual and their main disadvantage is that their application is strongly limited. Namely, the less typical names cannot be easily placed in the above frame. Although the authors devised these classification systems as expandable, it is only a virtual possibility since in the latter case it is exactly their systematic characteristic that would be lost.

In the central part of my dissertation, in the chapter presenting river names in detail, I have applied ISTVÁN HOFFMANN's multiple level toponym typology model. This system, contrary to the previous ones, distinguishes four analytic levels: it conducts the descriptive aspectual analysis of names from functional-semantic, lexical-morphological, syntagmatic and etymological aspects. He emphasises that this model is characterised by great variation within the different levels. These four analytic levels basically merge synchronic and diachronic description.

In my study I analyse rover names on all four levels, however, not applying the individual aspects separately but in a combined manner. I conduct the structural analysis on the functional-semantic level, and apply the lexical-morphological level as a complementary aspect. I divert from applying the latter level in a separate, independent chapter because the two levels are closely connected and their relations are more visible when their analyses are not separated. I discuss the etymological level in a separate chapter but not the syntagmatic analysis, for two reasons. On the one hand, because I apply the syntagmatic aspect at the level of structural analysis: when discussing one- and two-componental names; and on the other hand because this level is also present in the etymological framework, when analysing toponyms derived via syntagmatic editing.

3. Results of the thesis

The history of Hungarian hydronym research

While reviewing the work on Hungarian hydronyms, one experiences that the researchers dealt with hydronyms from three perspectives. They consider it their task to research the etymology of hydronyms: primarily, however, it is the borrowings and the semantically opaque names created by internal genesis that have attracted their attention. A unique area of investigation is the geographical names which formed hydronyms. Besides etymological analysis, a typological study of certain areas' hydronymicons is also a favourite topic, sometimes compared with other toponyms. The third large topic is the role of hydronyms in creating other toponyms.

The theoretical bases for research of hydronyms

The second chapter of the dissertation deals with the theoretical questions concerning hydronyms. First, I attempt to give a definition of a river name. I review all explicit and implicit definition attempts and weigh them. As a conclusion, I regard natural brooks, brooklets, rivers, as well as artificial ditches and ducks as members of this name type. Besides, I discuss the fact that the reviewed classification systems use terminologically pure notions needed for categorisation, in reality, however, certain hydronyms cannot be classified so unanimously into subcategories. It is especially difficult to categorise the historical hydronyms. What may help is that in the text of diplomas the great majority of toponyms are qualified in Latin. These qualifications – via transcripts – correspond to modern toponyms categories.

What should precede an onomatosystematic analysis, besides classification of river names, is a detailed clarification of the relationship between compared names. In the onomastic corpus of charters we can find numerous names which denominate water objects, not in any kind of connection. Among the analysis data we can find three or even more (in certain cases ten) river names bearing the following names: *Almás, Aranyos, Aszú-patak, Béla, Bükk-patak, Egres pataka, Ér, Fekete-patak, Fok, Füzegy, Hársány, Láz pataka, Megye-patak, Mély-patak, Patak, Rákos, Sár, Száraz-patak, Szuha* and *Tapolca*. The relationship between the names can be best shown in an analysis of the relationship between the phonetic form and semantics. This method could be useful in the better understanding of the issue of multilingualism and section names. Since modern name use is characterised by multilingualism, the same river could have had several names in the ancient period as well. Certain waters had different names as settlements (these are the section names), however, during the language use one name becomes more dominant than others. I discover a connection between section names and the different mental pictures in different name communities and I explain the dominance of one of the name variants by cultural, economic and linguistic prestige factors.

The results of the structural analysis

In the "Structural analysis" part of the dissertation I first reviewed the model types which served as the theoretical basis for river name giving. Second, this level of analysis involves the presentation of lexical-morphological tools denoting the functional-semantic classes used in name giving.

Studying the early old Hungarian river names we come across a rather varied stock of data. The distribution of one- and two-componential hydronyms is almost the same: 51:49%. This proportion needs, however, to be dealt with reservation, namely, one fifth of one-componential names has a two-componential variant, complemented by a common water name. And another large group of names is a loanword hydronym. On the basis of the above, we can say that the prototypical river name of internal genesis is two-componential. At the same time, following the chronological distribution of one- and two-componential we may experience that the oldest hydronyms are monocomponential and later, on the analogy of double segmentation in other toponyms as well as the result of instinctive logical-notional two-componentiality present in toponyms, two-componential names become more general among hydronyms, too.

A part of early old Hungarian stock of river names are names which denote a feature of the water denominated by the name. From the standpoint of linguistic elements forming hydronyms we can see that these may refer to the type of place into which the denotatum may be classified. This function is called the name segment type denoting function and it is always denoted by a hydrographic common name. Although rarely (4%), but type denoting one-componential names appear among ancient names, too: e.g. *Ér, Patak*.

On the other hand, the linguistic elements present in hydronyms may refer to the characteristics of the water (23%). We call this semantic content characteristic function (S). This is what is present for example in the name *Almás* (apple), which refers to the feature of the water to have apple trees on its shores.

We may further differentiate the latter name component functions based on their semantic content.

The most S functional name components are one-componential, in the case of old Hungarian hydronyms what served as the basis for name giving was a local contact with a settlement. This functional feature is characteristic of *Bokor*, *Pocsim* hydronyms. In the case of river names the relationship between them and the settlement is rather complex, namely, besides denominating that the river runs through the settlement, it may also refer to the direction it flows in.

The relatively constant flora and fauna is one of the most stable guidelines of localisation, therefore it often serves as the basis for name giving. While the flora element appears as a motivation in *Alma, Nádas* hydronyms, *Disznód, Rákos* refer to the fauna found in the water or in its surrounding from a functional-semantic aspect.

Tecső and *Zsúny* hydronyms denote a relation to a person. To anthroponyms as a functional category it is mostly the expression of possession that is associated, but in the case of hydronyms, the motivation for name giving could be that the river runs through or near the given person. This name giving method is less characteristic of river names, it is more common for fishing places to receive their names after the former owner of fishing rights.

In a one-componential name the following semantic features served name giving motivation far less frequently. For example, *Keskeny* (Narrow) and *Mélyes* (Deep) hydronyms are in connection with size. *Kürtös* and *Tekerő* (Meandering) hydronyms refer to the meandering form of the river basin, while *Csergő* (Rattler) refers to the river's sound effect. The material found in and around the river is denoted by the hydronym *Aranyos* (Golden). The unpleasant smell is referred to by the *Büdös* (Smelly) hydronym. The name component referring to the movement of water forms a name in *Sebes* (Fast).

The denominational and feature function type combine with each other, creating an S+F structure names and appearing like this in an onomatosystems of a language. In two-componential names like this a first component denoting a feature of the water meets a second component referring to the type of the place (27%).

In two-componential hydronyms the most frequent semantic content is the expression of localisation. *Gönc pataka,* for example, refers to the fact that the brook flows from or to the *Gönc* settlement. Content like this is also visible in *Bérc-patak* and *Telek pataka*. The water's relative situation can only be expressed by two-componential names: this function can be seen in *Közép-patak* and *Vég-ér* having S+F structure. A similar functional content is hidden behind *Megye-patak*: this name can be interpreted as a 'border-brook'.

Name components referring to flora may be found in large numbers among two-componential hydronyms as well: *Körtvély-ér, Meggyes-patak, Tölgy-patak*. Far less frequent are hydronyms referring to the fauna in or surrounding the water: *Hattyas pataka, Pisztrángos-patak*.

In a smaller number of hydronyms the name giving motivation comes from size (*Kis-patak*), form (*Kürtös pataka*), colour (*Fekete-patak*), taste (*Sós-patak*), temperature (*Hideg-víz*), sound effect (*Zúgó-fok*), state (*Romlott-patak*), speed (*Lassú-ág*), material (*Köves-patak*). We may found names whose first component refers to a building or construction near the water (*Bánya-patak*). In the first component of *Zakariás pataka* we may suspect a personal name, while *Orosz-víz* refers to an ethnic group living near the water or to a person of affiliation to this ethnic group. Among hydronyms only in two-componential names can the name component function 'the water is part of something' function appear: in the case of *Csombó ága* hydronym what is denominated is the water present in the first name component.

The three "ancient" or "primary" functional-semantic structures (F, S and S+F structure) are not suitable for representing hydronym systems which use borrowed or already existing hydronyms to form new ones. This phenomenon characterises the ancient Hungarian hydronym system, since firstly, the Hungarians did not conquer unpopulated areas, and secondly, their name were re-used in further name forming processes.

The already existing names may express a quality in a new name: this is visible in the already mentioned *Pocsim* 'settlement' > *Pocsim* 'brook' and *Gönc* 'settlement' > *Gönc pataka* 'the brook running through' type of processes. Furthermore, using already existing names one may form names of the *Váradi-Körös* type: this structure can be described by 'the branch of Körös river which runs through Várad settlement'. This latter structure can be described by introducing the denominational function. It is always the real, already existing name that has this function and its role – embedded in a new name – is identical to its original toponymic meaning: reference to the denotatum.

Hydronyms containing a name component of denominating function (henceforth M) may be of several types: there are one-componential M structure names, hydronyms with a hydrographic second component M+F (*Béla-patak*) and a first component denoting a feature S+M (*Holt-Ida*). There are quite a few members of the first, M group (24%): *Duna, Klukucs, Tepla*, etc. We can divide the second, M+F group

(14%) into two according to the type of the first component. The first group has a borrowing, i.e. a first component of foreign origin (*Szitnyice > Szitnyice pataka*). The second group's first components are names of internal genesis (*Aranyos > Aranyos pataka*). All these hydronyms may be described with the following semantic content: 'the water denominated by the name in the first component'.

An already existing, borrowed or a hydronym of internal genesis may receive a first component with a distinctive function of referring to a characteristic of the water. This name type has S+M structure (8%) and they are mostly names of branches or backwaters of the water denoted in the denominating component. In ancient Hungarian hydronyms the second component may refer to the water's size: *Nagy-Ilosva*, colour *Fejér-Béla*, locality *Váradi-Körös*, relative position *Közép-Sár*, state *Száraz-Proszek*, temperature *Hideg-Tepla*.

The results of etymological analysis

During the historical toponym analysis I investigate which linguistic rules influence the genesis of new names, what kind of powers guide the incorporation of linguistic elements into a language. Besides this, the study also extends to the already existing names, since the changes in their lexical-morphological image affect the transformations in their structure as well. For this reason, we put names into the category of historical typology according to the last name forming momentum.

From the etymological perspective, river names formed by syntagmatic editing are the largest group represented in the onomastic corpus of the early old Hungarian period (32%). Two-componential names belonging to the group were formed either by adding a geographical common name as a second component (*Sebes-patak*) or a first component with a differentiating function (*Somogyi-Bódva*) attached to the proper name basic constituent, the majority of these from an attributive qualification (*Romlott-patak*) or attributive possessive phrase (*Bökény pataka*). Based on these names we can conclude that the syntactic structure and function do not always synchronise. Among attributive possessive phrase names we can find quite a few hydronyms with common geographical names as second components which contain a possessive person marker (*Mogyorós pataka*), although these names belong more to the names with attributive qualification phrases. Among the group of names formed from attributive qualification phrases we have to emphasise those with a personal name first component, denoting an unmarked possessive relation: *Kalenda-víz*. Other names to be mentioned are oikonym first componential names and those with a geographical second component having a possessive person marker: in the latter group, instead of possession, the reference is to a local relation (*Szentkirály pataka*). In names formed from a denominating first component and a geographical second component the part-to-whole relation is denoted (*Karasó ága*).

It is well known that the most ancient layer of Hungarian toponymicon are our largest rivers (*Duna, Tisza, Maros, Dráva*), left to us by previous peoples. In the light of this it is not surprising that besides internal genesis external name forming also formed a significant part in the creation of Hungarian river name system. It can be derived from my studies, however, that it is not only the largest rivers that can have names of foreign origin, but also small and middle-size waters often receive a loan toponym: every fifth element (21%) of the early old Hungarian onomastic corpus is a loanword, usually from a Slavic language.

Semantic name forming also belongs to the more frequent name genesis types (14%). Within this category, names formed through semantic split represent a smaller proportion (*Ér, Fok, Sár*). Here we need to mention that it is often fairly difficult to distinguish between a geographical common name which turned into a river name from its common name appearances. Among names created by semantic transonymisation we can find metonymic names (*Boltárgy, Gyűrű, Úz*) and one or two names (*Hortobágy, Tömös*) which give rise to the possibility of name movement.

Etymological analysis can often give convincing results only if the studies hydronym is attested frequently enough in the analysed period. Due to the lack of data we are often forced to rely on obvious analogies and systematic analyses from the old Hungarian period. This is especially true for names formed via structural change affecting the name length (12.5%). Based on analogy, in the case of *Nyerges-patak* (1268: *Nerges potok,* Gy. 4: 281) ~ *Nyerges pataka* (1268: *Nergues potoka,* Gy. 4: 210, 271), we may consider the unmarked form as the primary. Among the names belonging to this group, however, in many cases it is only the chronological arguments that enforce the etymological approach: according to these arguments in *Cseh-pataka* (1266/1283: *Cech potoka,* Gy. 2: 459, 545) > *Cseh patak* (+1294/1471: *Csehpatak,* Gy. 2: 507) name pair we are to take reduction into account.

The least frequent name forming method is the morphological editing (9.5%): the names in this category gained their proper names status by adding a *-d (Köved), -gy (Gyiógy)* vagy *-s (Egres)*derivational affix denoting 'being provided with something'.

Toponyms derived from river names

The settlement names derived from river names in the ancient times are attested in the largest number, and after them come the mountain, castle and region names. In order to present the role of hydronyms in the denomination of other places as broadly as possible, we had to chronologically expand the source material. Namely, this opened the possibility to analyse the denominations of objects which are in a more direct relationship with river names but which were not (or at least not in great numbers) recorded in the ancient times (pond, valley, cave, strait, pass names). Naturally, we should not forget that hydronyms took part in the creation of various other name types, for example, road, bridge, mill, field, meadow.

The extension of chronological borders of the corpus did not only broaden the group of toponyms derived from hydronyms but also sheds light to the fact that the newly formed names constitute a rather colourful group from an etymological aspect as well. In the early old Hungarian period, especially among castle, settlement and region names the metonymical name giving mode (i.e. when a hydronym becomes the name of a place which it is on a local relationship, without adding any kind of formant) is strongly present. After this period, however, toponyms (especially microtoponyms) were more often created from hydronyms by syntagmatic editing: the river name was added the geographical common name second component denoting the type of place and forming thus a two-componential toponym.

Among oikonyms complementation with a hydronym first component is also a productive name forming method. According to the data this phenomenon was also present in the ancient times, however, with the development and stabilisation of toponymic system it received a greater role in the differentiation of denotata with the same name.

The onomatosystematic comparison of river and lake names

As it already became obvious from the comparison of oronyms and river names, certain toponym models show significant systematic differences (and similarities). In the last chapter of my thesis we can experience the same situation when comparing lake and river name stock. There are significant proportional discrepancies in certain functional-semantic structure types and accordingly, different etymological processes characterise the two types of water denominations.

The results have confirmed my choice to present only one category of the numerous classes of hydronyms, river names: a joint study of all hydronyms would have covered up the unique features of individual name types. At the same time, with the sketchy comparison of the two hydronyms I aimed at showing that comparing certain partial systems of the Hungarian toponymicon can only be conducted after a detailed study of the given types on their own. A thorough mapping of toponym characteristics on their own can be a perfect basis for their comparison with other toponyms from other languages.

4. Publications in the topic of the thesis

Independent publications

1. GYŐRFFY ERZSÉBET(–PÓCZOS RITA–RÁCZ ANITA–RESZEGI KATALIN–TÓTH VALÉRIA), *Korai magyar helynévszótár 1. Abaúj–Csongrád vármegye*. Főszerk. HOFFMANN ISTVÁN. Debrecen, 2005. 449 lap.
2. *Similarities and dissimilarities between Swedish and Hungarian hydronyms*. Namn och samhälle 22. Uppsala, 2008. 50 lap.

Study

1. Régi vízneveink funkcionális szerkezetéről. *Magyar Nyelvjárások* 40 (2002): 35–46.
2. GYŐRFFY ERZSÉBET(–RESZEGI KATALIN), Árpád-kori hegy- és víznevek funkcionális-szemantikai szempontú összehasonlító vizsgálata. *Magyar Nyelvjárások* 41 (2003): 195–204.
3. Az Árpád-kori folyóvíznevek lexikális szerkezetének jellemzői a Sajó vízgyűjtő területén. In: *Helynévtörténeti tanulmányok* 1. Szerk. HOFFMANN ISTVÁN–TÓTH VALÉRIA. Debrecen. 129–44.
4. A helynevek jelentéstani kategóriáiról. *Magyar Nyelvjárások* 43 (2005): 95–102.
5. Vizsgálódások vízneveink körében. In: *Nyelvi identitás és a nyelv dimenziói*. Szerk. HOFFMANN ISTVÁN–JUHÁSZ DEZSŐ. Debrecen–Bp, 2007. 29–36.
6. A svéd névtudományról és helynévkutatásról. *Névtani Értesítő* 29 (2007): 247–57.
7. Az *ér, sár* és *víz* földrajzi köznevek Árpád-kori folyóvízneveinkben. In: *Helynévtörténeti tanulmányok* 3. Szerk. HOFFMANN ISTVÁN. Debrecen, 2008. 121–33.
8. Folyóvíznevekből alakult településnevek. In: *Név és valóság. A VI. Magyar Névtudományi Konferencia előadásai*. Szerk. BÖLCSKEI ANDREA–N. CSÁSZI ILDIKÓ. Budapest. 142–7.

9. On the functional structure of old Hungarian hydronyms. (Megjelenik a 22. Nemzetközi Névtudományi Konferencia kötetében.)
10. Old Hungarian river names. (Megjelenik az *Onomastica Uralica*-ban.)
11. Old Hungarian river names in the multilingual Carpathian basin. (Megjelenik a 23. Nemzetközi Névtudományi Konferencia kötetében.)
12. A többnevűség a szakasznevek folyóvízneveink körében. (Megjelenik *Helynévtörténeti tanulmányok* 4. kötetében.)