

**DISTINCTIVE ADDITIONS IN THE EARLY 19TH CENTURY
HUNGARIAN SETTLEMENT NAMES.
A COGNITIVE LINGUISTIC APPROACH**

ANDREA BÖLCSKEI

Abstract

This paper attempts to provide a cognitive linguistic interpretation of place names, focusing primarily on the process of differentiating identical settlement names by way of attaching distinctive additions to them. The author presents the possible sources of identical settlement names in the Hungarian language, describes name differentiation as a means of re-establishing the identifying potential of malfunctioning polysemous habitation names and proposes a possible semantic categorisation of distinctive additions used in Hungarian settlement names in natural (i.e. non-official) naming practices using early 19th century data.

1. Introduction

The main aim of the study is to present and account for the semantic diversity of distinctive additions used in early 19th century Hungarian settlement names. Relevant data were collected from the place name register compiled by the cartographer János Lipszky (1808) at the beginning of the 19th century. In the investigation, basic principles of cognitive linguistics (Langacker 1987, 1991, 2008) as well as compatible elements of the functional-semantic component of István Hoffmann (2007)'s model of place name analysis are adopted as the theoretical background of the study. Elaborating a possible semantic categorisation of distinctive additions used in Hungarian habitation names at the end of the period of natural (i.e. non-official) naming practices provides us with a deeper understanding of the operation of such complex intertwining mental processes as identifying a place in cognition and expressing identification in language. Speakers' conceptualisation of entities like settlements may also be estimated.

2. Settlement names discussed in this study

At the beginning of the 19th century Hungary displayed a variety of rural scenes: in different regions of the country stood rural settlements of different types. In the western and southern counties of Transdanubia, in Northern Hungary, in Transylvania and in Croatia the mountainous and hilly landscape was scattered mostly by small villages of less than 1000 inhabitants. The flat, marshy land of the Great Hungarian Plain was covered with a sparse network of densely populated, but provincial market towns surrounded by vast fields used primarily for breeding beef cattle. The Little Hungarian Plain and the north-eastern part of Transdanubia were packed with thriving medium-sized villages of 1000–5000 inhabitants, whose peasant population was engaged in rearing animals, farming and craftsmanship. Small towns in Northern Hungary, the descendants of medieval royal free boroughs were losing their once existing important roles in mining, commerce and communication and consequently, they

were declining. Temporarily wealthy provincial towns in Transdanubia and at the foot of the Northern Mountain Range gaining their fortunes from wine monoculture were exposed to destruction caused by plant pests.

At that time urbanization did not even start in Hungary: there were only a few dozens of settlements which could have been identified as true towns on the basis of their economic, cultural and administrative functions in the area they were situated as well as on the basis of the number of their inhabitants. The rustic, agrarian character of the country was reinforced by contemporary economic policy: the Habsburg sovereigns considered Hungary as the granary of their empire providing the monarchy with crops and importing industrial products from Austria. It was not until the middle of the century that capitalist industrialization, railway constructions, and thus urbanization as well as the emergence of the middle classes began to appear. The early 19th century names examined in the present paper thus denoted mostly villages and small provincial towns.

3. Differentiation of identical settlement names

Langacker (2008) points out that in contrast with the traditional view, proper names are not meaningless units of language being able to refer to certain entities of the world. In fact, the meaning of a proper name, just as the meaning of any linguistic expression, is the result of the mental construal, abstraction and categorization of the human experience on the designated entity. Proper names thus are also able to activate speakers' „conventional array of encyclopedic knowledge” about the denotatum. According to the functional cognitive view the true peculiarity of proper names is in the nature of their meanings. „As one component of its meaning (one domain in its matrix), a proper name incorporates a cognitive model pertaining to how the form is used in the relevant social group. According to this idealized model, each member of the group has a distinct name, with the consequence that the name itself is sufficient to identify it” (Langacker 2008: 316–318).

This means that by the act of naming, speakers produce a linguistic sign that unambiguously identifies an entity of the real (sometimes imaginary, or a possible) world. The invented name should be unique enough to help to distinguish – at least at a given time, in a given space and in a given context – the designated entity from all the other entities (especially from those of the same type) having a name (Hajdú 2003: 49–58). However, at the same time the new name should also bear strong resemblance to the other names already used in the language: it must be adjusted to the existing name patterns of the given language (Hoffmann 2007: 29–30). In the course of the act of naming, speakers try to reconcile these two contradicting requirements in a single name form. Thus, naming is a creative, active problem-solving activity, a cognitive act depending on how speakers conceptualise the entity to be named (for the concepts see Langacker 1987, 1991, 2008; for onomastic relations of the concepts see also Slíz 2008).

Naming settlements also follows the above principles. Habitation names of a language can give us a vivid insight into speakers' understanding of the concept of SETTLEMENT. Taking Hungarian settlement names as examples: the meaning of the noun *település* (symbolising the concept SETTLEMENT in Hungarian) seems to be the complex matrix of such cognitive domains as TYPE (e.g. *Falucska*, diminutive form of the common noun *falu* ‘village’), SIZE (e.g. *Nagyfalú* ‘great village’), SHAPE (e.g. *Hosszúfalú* ‘long village’), AGE (e.g. *Újváros* ‘new town’), SOIL (e.g. *Vörösmart* ‘red bank’), features of the GROUND (e.g. *Hegveshalom* ‘peaked hillock’), FLORA (e.g. *Nádasd* ‘reedy /place/’), FAUNA (e.g. *Füred* ‘quaily /place/’), RELATIVE OF PRECISE

POSITION (e.g. *Felfalu* ‘high village’; *Tiszatelek* ‘allotment next to the river Tisza’), characteristic BUILDING (e.g. *Kerekegyház* ‘round church’), INHABITANTS (e.g. *Tótfalu* ‘village inhabited by Slovenians’), PROPRIETOR (e.g. *Kaplony* <Hungarian personal name>), PATRON SAINT of the church (e.g. *Szentiván* ‘St. John the Baptist’),¹ etc. (cf. functional-semantic component of place name analysis, Hoffmann 2007: 53–66).

Naming places, at least in natural (i.e. non-official) naming practices, is always a semantically conscious act: speakers tend to invent descriptive names to indicate places aptly (Hoffmann 2007: 174). When naming a habitation, the most prominent feature(s) of the settlement is/are profiled to serve as motivation for the habitation name, whilst less prominent features of the same settlement as well as prominent features of the surrounding settlements are left in the background. In other words, as the examples above suggest, when naming a settlement on the basis of the most salient, thus most identifying feature(s) of it, i.e. on the basis of a feature or features which differentiate(s) the actual place from all the other habitations of the area, one or some relevant cognitive domains are activated overshadowing others connected to less striking features of the settlement. In fact, the course of naming activates as many cognitive domains as there are unique features to be included in the name form to provide the speakers with a clear identification of the settlement. The linguistic reflections of the activated domain(s) comprise the habitation name itself.

Obviously, activating the same domain can produce different name forms in the language. For example, in the Hungarian language the idea that ‘a settlement is inhabited by people of Croatian nationality’ was expressed as *Horvát* ‘Croatian’, *Horváti* ‘Croatian’s’, *Horvátfalv* ‘village inhabited by Croatian people’, or secondarily as *Horváthertelend* ‘the settlement called *Hertelend* which is inhabited by Croatian people, as opposed to the neighbouring *Magyarhertelend*, inhabited by Hungarian(s)’,² depending on linguistic patterns fashionable in place name formation in the era in which these names were created (cf. historical place name typology worked out by István Kniezsa and Géza Bárczi; cf. Bárczi 1958: 142–162). In the same way, the same linguistic form in different settlement names of the language can reflect different cognitive domains. To take an example, the lexeme *almás*, a derivation of *alma* ‘apple’ with the adjectival suffix *-s* in Hungarian habitation names can reflect FLORA (e.g. *Almás* ‘a place overgrown with /crab/ apple trees’) as well as POSITION (e.g. *Almáskeresztúr* ‘the settlement called *Keresztúr* which is situated next to the brook *Almás*’).³ The most typical cognitive domains connected to the concept of SETTLEMENT – as they are primarily based on general human cognition – are in all probability found universally in habitation names of different languages, whilst the linguistic forms in which these domains are represented in the place names are strongly language dependent. Both the typical cogni-

¹ In the article name forms are given according to present-day orthography. The first appearances of the historical settlement names listed here in original spellings are 1546: *Falwchka* (FNESz 1: 62, see entry *Ajfalucska*), 1420: *Nagfalw* (FNESz 2: 184), 1518: *Hozzufalw* (FNESz 2: 718, see entry *Vághosszifalu*), 1808: *Újváros* (FNESz 2: 703), +1246/400: *Verusmorth* (FNESz 2: 779), 1197/1337: *Hegesholm* (FNESz 1: 578), 1233: *Nadast* (FNESz 2: 169), 1211: *Fured* (FNESz 1: 150, see entry *Balatonfüred*), 1454: *Felfalw* (FNESz 2: 537, see entry *Szécsényfelfalu*), 1954: *Tiszatelek* (FNESz 2: 655), 1359: *Kerekeghaz* (FNESz 1: 717, see entry *Kerekegyháza*), 1328/1403: *Thothfalv* (FNESz 1: 759), 1300/1360: *Koplan* (FNESz 1: 682), 1358: *Zenth Iwan* (FNESz 2: 559).

² First appearances of the illustrative examples: 1213/1550: *Huruat* (FNESz 1: 805, see entry *Krasznahorvát*), 1320–9: *Horwathy* (FNESz 1: 424, see entry *Erdőhorváti*), 1548: *Horvat falu[ban]* (FNESz 1: 609), 1882: *Horvát-Hertelend* (FNESz 1: 609).

³ First appearances: 1329: *Almas* (FNESz 2: 391, see entry *Rácalmás*), 1902: *Almáskeresztúr* (FNESz 1: 71).

tive domains and the characteristic linguistic forms are subject to changes in the course of the history of a language, though the rate of change is much slower in the case of cognitive domains (cf. Hoffmann 2007: 40–42).

In principle, not a single cognitive domain or any language structure can be excluded from place name formation. Nevertheless, as the examples above suggest, however various the domains typically represented in settlement names of a period are, they are not unlimited in number: the nature of the entity (i.e. the settlement) bearing the name requires these domains to have reference to certain geographical, historical or social feature(s) of the habitations. In the same way, the morphological and lexical items as well as the syntactic processes used most frequently in name formation at a time are restricted to a number of elements selected from the general lexicon and grammatical rules of the language. The settlement names of a particular period thus reflect only certain cognitive domains in some language forms establishing the set of prototypical habitation names of the language. Categorisation of this set recognised and acquired by speakers to form a central part of their onomastic competence determines nascent settlement names (cf. model effect by way of analogy, Hoffmann 2007: 29–30, 174–175). As a result, in Hungary during the period of natural or popular naming (i.e. before 1898, the year in which naming settlements was placed under government control) in different parts of the country distinct groups of speakers bound by the same naming practices of their shared native language could easily invent identical name forms to indicate different settlements with the same or very similar characteristic features. The two acts of naming – though they were performed independently from each other in both space and usually time by different speech communities – involved common sources of motivation as well as common naming principles. Such a situation could be observed in the case of the two *Szekcsős* (Baranya),⁴ situated about 60 kms from each other: the southern settlement was first mentioned in 1150/13–14th c., the northern village first appeared in a document written in 1475, both in the form of *Szekcső*,⁵ a name created from an old, now disused hydrographic common noun meaning ‘torrent’ as well as ‘ford’ (FNESz 1: 398, 684).

Another possible source of identical settlement names in the Hungarian language was duplication of habitation names. This phenomenon was a concomitant symptom of multiplication of settlements, a characteristic way of establishing new settlements in medieval Hungary. A formerly integral, undivided village could be multiplied either as a result of overpopulation: the fields of a settlement could support only a limited number of inhabitants, and with the increase in population people above that limit had to move further to establish a new settlement with new fields to cultivate; or as a result of disintegration of a nobleman’s estate: properties, including settlements possessed by a nobleman were divided among the inheritors after his death (Szabó 1966: 119–138). In these cases, the newly established habitations very often received the name of the old settlements. In this situation the act of naming the new settlement involved transferring the name of an already existing settlement to identify a new habitation which was somehow related to the one whose name

⁴ The illustrative settlement names in the main text of the paper are presented in the following way: the settlement name is given in italics, after the settlement name in parenthesis the county or the administrative district to which the habitation officially belonged in 1808 is indicated to help the identification of the indicated settlement (as at that time identical names, whether differentiated or not, were not infrequent, especially in different counties of the country). If the context requires, an English paraphrase of the literal meaning of the Hungarian name is also provided in inverted commas.

⁵ First appearances: c. 1150/13–14th c.: *Secuseu*, 1475: *Zekchw* (FNESz 1: 398, 684).

was transferred. Therefore, the identical settlement names, just as the denotata themselves, were genetically interrelated.

Duplication of settlement names could be triggered by the fact that both villages – the one already having a name and the other yet to be named – were in the vicinity of each other. The act of transferring the name of a geographical object to another neighbouring geographic entity in this situation is a clear manifestation of spatial metonymy. This happened in the case of *Petény* (Nógrád), first mentioned in 1274 as *Petény*,⁶ a place name originating from a personal name, when a group of the settlement's inhabitants left the village and established a new, neighbouring habitation with the same name (FNESz 1: 87, 461). Duplication of habitation names, however, could also be induced by another factor: at the time of its foundation the new village – at least in the mind of those who named it – might have borne some resemblance to the settlement whose name was to be transferred to it in the act of naming. In this case repeating an already functioning habitation name to identify yet another settlement is the result of metaphoric extension. As a complex example let us quote the case of *Velence* (Fejér),⁷ bearing a name identical to the Hungarian equivalent of the name of *Venice* in Italy: in fact, there is a slight similarity in the position of the two places (metaphoric relation); besides, the first inhabitants of the Hungarian settlement presumably were Venetians (metonymic relation; FNESz 2: 749). In general, genetically identical habitation names indicated settlements within a shorter distance (thus in a predominantly metonymic relation) more frequently than distant settlements (thus in a predominantly metaphoric relation).

Therefore, in the Hungarian language the development of identical settlement names in the period of natural or popular naming was basically the result of two different processes: either the same, or very similar geographical, historical or social features of distinct settlements were expressed in exactly the same name forms by different speech (or rather naming) communities influenced by the prototypical habitation names of the language; or a linguistic sign used as a habitation name to identify a given settlement in a speech community was given a new toponymic „meaning” (in fact, a new denotation) by being transferred to a new, different, but somehow related settlement. Both processes produced essentially polysemous settlement name forms.

The use of identical names for different settlements, whatever their origins are, could easily lead to misunderstandings in communication, mislocalizations in orientation. People in Hungary tried to avoid this disturbing inefficiency in language use either by changing the name of one of the settlements (especially between 1898 and 1912 in official place naming processes, when the main aim of the established National Settlement Registering Board was to create a place name system in Hungary in which one settlement bears only one name and one name designates only one settlement in the country in accordance with the requirements of Act 4, 1898; for details see Mező 1982: 45–46, 218–240), or by attaching distinctive additions to the identical name forms. To quote the above two examples again: to be able to identify the two settlements called *Szekcső* in Baranya county, speakers differentiated the identical names by distinctive additions referring to names of nearby rivers and in the early 19th century the settlements were generally known as *Dunaszekcső* and *Kaposszekcső*⁸ (the distinctive additions are *Duna-* = ‘Danube’ and *Kapos-* = ‘right-side

⁶ First appearance: 1274: *Pethen* (FNESz 1: 87, 461).

⁷ First written data: after 1486/1568: *Venetia*, 1516: *Welence* (FNESz 2: 749).

⁸ First appearances: 1808: *Szekcső (Duna-)*; 1808: *Kapos-Szekcső* (FNESz 1: 398, 684).

affluent of the canalized river Sió', cf. 4.3.1.1; FNESz 1: 398, 684). For the two neighbouring *Peténys* in Nógrád county speakers invented name forms with distinctive additions indicating the relative position of the villages, so by the 15th century the habitations became known as *Alsópetény* and *Felsőpetény*⁹ (the distinctive additions are *Alsó-* = 'low', 'nether' and *Felső-* = 'high', 'over', cf. 4.3.2; FNESz 1: 87, 461).

The process of differentiating identical settlement names by adding distinguishing elements of diverse types to them was practised since the earliest times, as it is clearly shown in historical documents. Charters from the Arpadian Era (895–1301) display hundreds of its instances. This unique technique was used on a large scale in the following centuries, i.e. during the period of natural naming practices to reach its most extended phase in the 19th century. The large scale adoption of this developed technique is illustrated in one of the most complete place name registers of the century compiled by János Lipszky (1808), which constitutes the primary source of the present study.

The basic linguistic features of the process of differentiating identical settlement names with distinctive elements are discussed in the literature either from a theoretical perspective (e.g. Stewart 1975: 23; J. Soltész 1979: 82–88; Clark 1992: 591) or from a practical point of view (e.g. Cameron 1969: 100–109; Matthews 1975: 112–117; Stewart 1975: 345; Kálmán 1978: 96, 121–122). The unmodified, identical place names are usually known as „generics”, „primary names” or „basic names” (e.g. Stewart 1975: 20–25);¹⁰ whilst the differentiating elements are called „distinctive additions” (e.g. Ekwall 1960: Introduction ix), „distinguishing/distinctive affixes” (e.g. Cameron 1969: 100–109; Clark 1992: 591), „local surnames”, „additional/secondary names” (e.g. Matthews 1975: 112–117), „modifiers” (e.g. Zinkin 1986: 71; Crystal 1997: 140–155), „attributes” (e.g. Reany 1960: 203–206), „secondary specifiers” or „distinguishing specifics” (e.g. Stewart 1975: 23, 345).¹¹ A possible definition as well as a possible typology of place name differentiation in the Hungarian language was proposed by Géza Inczeffi (Inczeffi 1965, 1970: 22–24, 65–69). In most cases describing distinctive additions is a complementary aspect of consideration in works of place name analysis. The semantic categories of Hungarian distinctive additions were examined in relation to a period (e.g. Szabó 1966: 119–126; Mező 1982: 218–240; Rác 1997; Bölcskei 1997, 1999); a name type (e.g. Juhász 1988: 28–29; Mező 1996: 24, 238–249); a geographical or administrative unit (e.g. Juhász 1981: 261–263; Ördög 1981: 18; Barabás 1984: 18–19; Várkonyi 1984: 6, 61–62; Körmendi 1986: 8, 59; Kiss 1992: 92–93). Some of the semantic categories were also discussed in detail (e.g. Pesti 1969; Györffy 1972: 292; Pelle 1989; Szabó 1998: 118–128, 135–146).

Adapting the model for the linguistic analysis of toponyms elaborated by István Hoffmann (2007),¹² the differentiation of settlement names by way of distinctive additions can be described in the following way: when the namers attach a distinctive addition referring to a

⁹First appearances: 1440: *Alsopethyen*, 1405/1477: *ad Pethyen (superi)orem*, 1595: *Felsőpetény* (FNESz 1: 87, 461).

¹⁰ See also the Hungarian terms “alapnév” ‘basic name’, “alaptag” ‘basic component’, “alapelem” ‘basic element’, “alaprész” ‘basic constituent’ (Inczeffi 1970: 67; Mező 1982: 161, 1996: 238; Hoffmann 2007: 63).

¹¹ See also the Hungarian terms “megkülönböztető jelző/előtag/elem” ‘distinguishing attribute/component/element’, “differenciáló jelző/előtag/elem” ‘differentiating attribute/component/element’, “identifikáló jelző” ‘identifying attribute’, “bővítményrész” ‘complement constituent’ (Szabó 1966: 125; Inczeffi 1970: 68; Mező 1982: 104, 218, 1996: 24, 240; Hoffmann 2007: 63).

¹² In this model of place name analysis, the descriptive and the historical examination of toponyms form two different but interrelating levels of enquiry. In the descriptive, structural analysis, names are examined

very unique characteristic of the settlement to the original name form used previously as a habitation name on its own, they create a settlement name of two name constituents, in which the basic constituent (i.e. the original name) denotes the settlement itself and the distinguishing complement constituent (i.e. the distinctive addition) reflects a characteristic feature of the settlement. This means that the functional-semantic structure of a settlement name such as *Garamdamásd*, for example, can be described as follows: ‘the settlement called *Damásd* (1, a basic constituent denoting the settlement itself) which can be found on the bank of the river *Garam* (2, a distinguishing complement constituent expressing a unique feature of the settlement)’.

In some cases the distinctive addition is given to an etymologically transparent habitation name of two constituents – e.g. *Újfalu*: ‘a village (1, a basic constituent denoting the type of settlement) which was established later than the neighbouring settlements (2, a non-distinguishing complement constituent expressing a unique feature of the settlement)’¹³ –, the functional-semantic structure of the differentiated name still reflects that of the first example, e.g. *Garamújfalu*: ‘the settlement called *Újfalu* (1, a basic constituent denoting the settlement itself) which can be found on the bank of the river *Garam* (2, a distinguishing complement constituent expressing a unique feature of the settlement)’, as in the process of differentiation the internal structure of the primary name is irrelevant.

Differentiated settlement names such as *Garamalsóveszele* and *Garamfelsőveszele* might seem to have three name constituents at first sight: ‘the southern (*alsó*)/northern (*felső*) part (1) of the settlement called *Veszele* (2) on the bank of the river *Garam* (3)’; though, as the distinguishing complement constituents are inserted into the basic constituent *Garamveszele* – which incidentally is an already differentiated name form: ‘the settlement called *Veszele* (1, a basic constituent denoting the settlement itself) which can be found on the bank of the river *Garam* (2, a distinguishing complement constituent expressing a unique feature of the settlement)’ – they should preferably be considered as names of two constituents: ‘the southern (*alsó*)/northern (*felső*) part (1, a distinguishing complement constituent expressing a unique feature of the settlement) of the settlement called *Garamveszele* (2, a basic constituent denoting the settlement itself)’.

Regarding the lexical-morphological composition of differentiated settlement names it must be concluded that only real, true habitation names can act as basic constituents, whilst the role of a complement constituent can be fulfilled by several word classes (common nouns, place names, personal names, adjectives and numerals). As far as the syntactic relationship between the name constituents is concerned, it can be observed that most of the differentiated settlement names are adjectival structures and few of them are coordinate constructions. Examining the formation of the differentiated settlement names makes it clear that the names

from a functional-semantic, lexical-morphological or syntactic point of view. Functional-semantic analysis deals with elements of the name, labelled as ‘name constituents’ (i.e. units of the toponym “which – in the situation of name formation – express any semantic feature that is connected with the signalled denotatum”) in their relationship to the denotative meaning of a place name. Lexical-morphological analysis enumerates the lexical and morphological means by which the functional-semantic categories are realised in the name. Place names formed by two constituents are subject to syntactic analysis, which focuses on the grammatical relation between the name constituents. Historical analysis may help to discover the possible ways of place name formation (Hoffmann 2007, quotation from p. 176).

¹³ At the same time this example illustrates the fact that not all habitation names of two constituents are differentiated settlement name forms: if neither of the constituents functioned as the name of a settlement on its own in the past, the habitation name should be considered as a non-differentiated compound (cf. English *Newby*, equivalent to Hungarian *Újfalu*; Ekwall 1960: 79, 339).

with distinctive additions were created in a process called syntactic construction, mostly from attributive phrases, less frequently from coordinate structures. Coordinate settlement names were usually born as a result of administrative, official amalgamation of settlements (e.g. in 1872 *Buda*, *Óbuda* and *Pest* were joined to form *Budapest*; FNESz 1: 261): the exceptional functional-semantic structure of these names (all name constituents denote settlements), however, soon became reinterpreted (the first name constituent acted as if it were expressing a unique feature of the settlement) and as a consequence, most of these names are now conceived as attributive structures (Hoffmann 2007: 84). Valéria Tóth (2005: 138–139) defines name differentiation as a type of settlement name change that partially affects both the forms and the meanings of the names, and separates it from name integration resulting in coordinative name forms.

Differentiated forms of the same basic constituent set up a correlation when the designated settlements are close enough to each other to be known and named by the same speech community. (What is considered „close enough” varies depending on given periods of time. If we consider the period when natural naming practices took place, settlements in the same or in neighbouring counties can be considered „close enough” to one another.) Correlations definitely assist speakers’ spatial orientation by reinforcing the proper identification of settlements (for the typology and historical changes of Hungarian settlement name correlations see Bölcskei 2005, 2006).

4. Semantic categories of distinctive additions

After collecting data from János Lipszky (1808)’s place name register and combining the propositions of the functional-semantic component of the model for place name analysis put forward by István Hoffmann (Hoffmann 2007) and the results of András Mező (1982: 218–240)’s examination of official settlement name differentiations with some of the basic findings of cognitive linguistics, one may attempt to detect the cognitive domains which contributed to the identification of settlements in popular naming by elaborating a possible semantic categorisation of Hungarian distinctive additions used in the early 19th century, at the end of the period of natural naming practices in Hungary.

When categorising distinctive additions, one faces three basic problems. First, formally identical distinguishing elements could in different name forms reflect different cognitive domains. The addition *Aranyos-* (an adjectival derivative of the noun *arany* ‘gold’) in the names *Aranyosgyéres* and *Aranyoslónya* (both in Torda) refers to the domain of RIVER as the settlements are situated next to a river so called, whilst in the cases of *Aranyosmarót* (Bars) and *Aranyosmóric* (Doboka) the same element reflects the domain of MINE, MINING by preserving the memory of panning for gold in the past. In the same way, *Tarna-* (a borrowed hydronym from a Slavic language in Hungarian) in *Tarnaméra* and in *Tarnaörs* (both in Heves) reflects the domain of RIVER as both settlements are found on the bank of the brook *Tarna*, in *Tarnaszentmiklós* (Heves), however, it manifests the domain of ADMINISTRATIVE UNIT by naming the district to which the settlement used to belong (N.B. the name of the former district interrelates with the hydronym).

Secondly, in some cases attaching a distinctive addition to a name form could be induced by more than one, simultaneously activated, cognitive domain. The element *Mező-* (‘field’, ‘meadow’) in the names *Mezőkeresztes* (Borsod), *Mezőkomárom* (Veszprém) and *Mezőkövesd* (Borsod) can reflect the domains of FLORA as well as TRADE by referring both to the surrounding meadowy sceneries and to the fact that the settlements used to be market-

places (cf. Hungarian *mezőváros* ‘market town’). *Gyöngyös-* (an adjectival derivative of the noun *gyöngy* 1. ‘mistletoe’, 2. ‘pearl’) in *Gyöngyöshalász*, *Gyöngyösoroszi*, *Gyöngyöspüspöki* and *Gyöngyöstarján* (all in Heves) can reflect the domains of RIVER and NEIGHBOURING SETTLEMENT by indicating a nearby stream as well as an important town (named after the river) in the vicinity.

Thirdly, sometimes our sources do not give enough information for us to decide which domain is reflected in the distinctive addition, the exact semantic reference conveyed by the distinguishing element is obscure, e.g. *Juszkó-* and *Kosztolna-*, the first constituents of the names *Juszkóvólya* (Zemplén) and *Kosztolnamittic* (Trencsén). Thus, the present categorisation is primarily based on the most plausible motivation of each distinctive addition, so at best it can be considered as a tentative attempt at factual classification.

Langacker (1991: 58–60, 2008: 316–318) emphasises that names, as an aspect of their meanings, evoke the cultural practice of giving supposedly unique names to entities; as a result of its uniqueness, an ideal proper name can function as a means of identification on its own. In some cases, however, the expression used as a proper name happens to indicate more than one entity in the speech community: by losing its special identifying function, the expression also loses its status as a proper name in the language and becomes a common noun. In a situation like this, speakers are forced to attach a descriptive term to the expression to ground it to the entity it identifies. If the expression incorporates this descriptive term as its integral part, its identifying potential becomes re-established and the expression regains its status as a full proper name in the language.

Practically, this is what happens when speakers differentiate place names by way of attaching distinctive additions to them in an attempt to eliminate malfunctioning identical settlement names from the language. Identical settlement names alone cannot meet the criteria for proper names as they are not unique enough to unambiguously identify different settlements. The identification of settlements with the same name as a cognitive act is manifested in the process of settlement name differentiation in the language. In the course of identification a highly characteristic feature of the settlement, – which differentiates it from other villages bearing the same name during a period of time – activates a relevant domain in cognition, which is reflected linguistically in the form of a distinguishing element added to the old name. When differentiating a settlement name by way of attaching a distinctive addition to it, a very unique, salient feature of the settlement is profiled in the distinguishing name constituent with other features of the same settlement as well as striking features of the surrounding settlements, especially of the one(s) bearing the same name in the background. Settlement name differentiation as a linguistic process, whether appearing immediately or long after primary name constructions, thus bears a close affinity with the mechanism of habitation name formation in general (see the above).

As we saw above, the concept of SETTLEMENT consists of several components. A settlement is a place covered with buildings and surrounded by partly natural, partly man-made environment somewhere on the surface of the earth where a group of people live, and sometimes also work together for a while. Thus some components of the concept under discussion must have a reference to the built-up area expressing the properties of the settlement itself: e.g. the size, the age, the shape, the state, the type of the habitation. Other components of the concept display the additional features of the settlement referring to the surroundings, the buildings, the inhabitants, the economy, the history of the habitation. A third group of the components indicates the geographic position of the settlement in some way. Each constituent of settlement names, as illustrated above, reflects one of these components.

Distinctive additions as distinguishing constituents, thus, can also refer to (i) a central feature (i.e. a property of the settlement itself); (ii) a peripheral feature (i.e. an additional attribute of the settlement); or (iii) a positional feature (i.e. the geographic position) of the settlement.¹⁴ Distinctive additions highlighting a characteristic central or peripheral feature of the settlement describe habitations, while distinguishing constituents foregrounding a positional feature of the settlement localise habitations to achieve identification. In some special cases (iv) describing and localising distinctive additions are used parallel with each other to help the identification of a single settlement. As it is presented below, each of the above blanket categories comprises several sub-categories (cf. Hoffmann 2007: 53–66).

4.1. Distinctive additions reflecting CENTRAL FEATURE identify the habitation by indicating a prominent characteristic of the settlement itself. Central characteristics highlighted in the distinguishing elements display the size, the age, the shape or the state of the settlement.

4.1.1. Distinctive additions representing SIZE are fairly popular differentiating elements in the period. In the observed data two distinguishing constituents are used to indicate the size of the habitation: *Kis-* ‘little’ and *Nagy-* ‘great’, usually in correlation with each other, e.g. *Kisbize* : *Nagybize* (Somogy), *Kisdenk* : *Nagydenk* (Hunyad), *Kispeszek* : *Nagypeszek* (Hont).

Size is presumably one of the most easily spotted characteristics of a settlement. The size of the settlement, however, is strongly determined by the number of its population; the latter being even more easily perceptible to the namers. *Kis-* ‘little’ and *Nagy-* ‘great’ as distinctive additions reflect the number of the inhabitants much to the same degree as the actual size of the settlements. This fact is rooted in the way in which these differentiated name forms were predominantly developed. As we saw above, duplication of settlements in the Middle Ages could result in duplication of settlement names: the inhabitants who migrated from a village very often transferred the name of their old habitation to their new settlement adding, for instance, the adjective *Kis-* ‘little’ to the original name form as a distinctive addition. In most of these cases the name of the old village soon became supplemented with *Nagy-* ‘great’ to form a correlation. The same process can be observed in the following example: 1233/1416: *Igmánd*, 1440–6 *Kisigmánd*, 1741: *Nagyigmánd* (Komárom; FNESz 1: 745, 2: 189).¹⁵ The new settlement established by few migrants had a low number of inhabitants at its birth, so it was much smaller in size than the old village. A direct consequence of this name formation is that the opposing name forms of this sort usually indicate settlements in vicinity. *Kis-* ‘little’ as a distinctive addition, however, sometimes has reference rather to the absolute number of the population emphasising the fact that the designated settlement is a small one; as a result, in these cases there are no opposing name forms containing *Nagy-* ‘great’, e.g. *Kisbarnót* (Arad), *Kiskupány* (Ugozca), *Kistikos* (Somogy; Mezö 1982: 223–224).

¹⁴ István Hoffmann (2007: 176) in the functional-semantic component of his place name analysis presents name constituents whose function is to express a feature of the place in essentially the same categories, but labels the categories in a different way: he speaks about name constituents referring to (i) „the attribute of the place”; (ii) „the relationship of the place with something not inherent in it”; (iii) „the relationship of the place with another place”.

¹⁵ Contemporaneous spellings: 1233/1416: *Huigman*, 1440–6: *Kyswygman*, 1741: *Nagy Igmánd[on]* (FNESz 1: 745, 2: 189).

Identical settlement names are sometimes partially differentiated with distinctive additions reflecting SIZE, the opposing name forms contain distinctive additions of a different type, e.g. *Kisnémedi* : *Alsónémedi* (Pest; *Alsó-* ‘low’, ‘nether’, representing RELATIVE POSITION, cf. 4.3.2.), *Nagyvázsony* : *Tótvázsony* (Veszprém; *Tót-* = old Hungarian name of more Slavic nationalities, representing inhabitants’ NATIONALITY, cf. 4.2.4.1.). The adjectives *Kis-* ‘little’ and *Nagy-* ‘great’ are also used as secondary distinctive additions, e.g. *Ipolykiskér* : *Ipolynagykér* (Nógrád), here inserted into a name form primarily differentiated with a distinctive addition reflecting RIVER (cf. 4.4.1.).

4.1.2. Distinguishing constituents reflecting AGE in the settlement names of the period are *Ó-* ‘old’, *Új-* ‘new’ and exceptionally *Öreg-* ‘old’, a commonly used synonym of bound *Ó-* ‘old’. The addition *Öreg-* ‘old’ usually appears in name forms as an alternative distinctive addition, e.g. *Kis-* ‘little’ or *Öreganya* (Komárom), *Nagy-* ‘great’ or *Öreglak* (Somogy; cf. 4.1.1.).

The correlative adjectives *Ó-* ‘old’ and *Új-* ‘new’ are usually attached to otherwise identical names born in the process of duplication of settlements, e.g. *Óbarok* : *Újbarok* (Fejér), *Óléc* : *Újléc* (Torontál), *Ótohány* : *Újtohány* (Brassó). In many cases the process of duplication follows this pattern: the recently populated part of the settlement is identified with the adjective *Új-* ‘new’ added to the primary, original name of the settlement to contrast with the old centre, some time later this newly established, developing part becomes an independent settlement and separates from the old, central part of the village, which takes *Ó-* ‘old’ as a distinguishing constituent in its name. Sometimes the opposition of the name forms had not yet been established fully by the observed period: e.g. *Radna* : *Újradna* (Beszterce). Because of their origins, names differentiated with distinctive additions referring to age usually identify neighbouring settlements, too. In special cases, in contrast with the distinctive addition reflecting AGE, the primary name takes a distinguishing element manifesting POSITIONAL FEATURE to form an opposition, e.g. *Újribnice* : *Felsőribnice* (Ung), *Újsinka* : *Alsósinka* (Fogarás; cf. 4.3.2.).

4.1.3. SHAPE as an identifying central feature of the settlement is typically represented in the distinctive addition *Hosszú-* ‘long’ in the period, e.g. *Hosszúhetény* (Baranya), *Hosszúmacskás* (Doboka), *Hosszúpereszteg* (Vas). Other distinguishing constituents indicating shape (e.g. *Kerek-* ‘round’, *Széles-* ‘broad’) are found only in few names, e.g. *Kerekgede* (Gömör), *Széleslonka* (Máramaros).

4.1.4. In the observed period there is only a single distinctive addition which demonstrates STATE. To indicate the dilapidated state of settlements devastated in the period of the Turkish occupation of Hungary (1541–1686) namers often included the distinctive addition *Pusztá-* ‘desolate’ into relevant habitation names, which usually survived even if the settlement was later repopulated and restored, e.g. *Pusztacsó* (Vas), *Pusztalócsa* (Komárom), *Pusztatereszténye* (Gömör).

Villages bearing names differentiated with distinctive additions reflecting SHAPE OR STATE were usually not born as a result of settlement duplication: they typically developed independently from the settlements of the same primary name, so there was no reason to contrast them with others. Evolving no semantically contrasting distinguishing constituents, these distinctive additions are usually opposed to distinguishing elements of a different type in correlations, e.g. *Hosszú-* and *Németpereszteg* (Vas and Sopron; *Német-* ‘German’, represent-

ing inhabitants' NATIONALITY, cf. 4.2.4.1.), *Pusztá-* and *Vajdakamarás* (Kolozs; *Vajda-* 'voivode', representing INSTITUTIONAL OWNER, cf. 4.2.3.2.).

4.2. Identification of a habitation could also be promoted by foregrounding a characteristic peripheral feature of the settlement in the distinctive addition. Compared to distinguishing elements reflecting CENTRAL FEATURE and POSITIONAL FEATURE, distinctive additions manifesting PERIPHERAL FEATURE are somewhat fewer in number, but they are the most varied in subtypes in the period under discussion.

4.2.1. Distinctive additions reflecting NATURAL SURROUNDINGS as a characteristic peripheral identifying feature of the settlement could have reference to the soil, the terrain, the flora or the fauna.

4.2.1.1. Some distinguishing constituents represent SOIL. The most typical distinctive additions highlighting the quality of the soil in the period are *Homok-* 'sand' and *Sáros-* 'muddy', e.g. *Homokbödöge* (Veszprém), *Homokterenye* (Nógrád), *Sárosciklin* (Vas), *Sárosrevisce* (Ung). Other examples: *Köves-* 'stony', *Fertős-* 'marshy', e.g. *Köveskállya* (Zala), *Fertősalmás* (Ugocsa), etc.

4.2.1.2. In few cases it is TERRAIN that is manifested in the distinctive addition as an identifying feature of the settlement. The most typical distinguishing constituents foregrounding the configuration of the terrain in the period are *Hegy(es)-* 'hill(y)', *Nyerges-* 'saddle-backed', *Szurdok-* 'gorge', e.g. *Hegysúr* (Pozsony), *Nyergesújfalu* (Esztergom), *Szurdokkápolnak* (Kövár).

4.2.1.3. FLORA as an identifying feature of the settlement is demonstrated in few distinguishing constituents in the period. Plants growing wild typically referred to in the distinctive additions (e.g. *fűz* 'willow', *kökény* 'blackthorn', *répa* 'beet', *hagyma* 'onion/garlic', all supplemented in the distinguishing elements with the derivative suffix *-s* expressing the state of being well provided with) are common in all parts of the country, e.g. *Füzesgyarmat* (Békés), *Kökényesmindszent* (Zala), *Répáskeszi* (Bihar), *Hagymáslápos* (Kövár). The distinguishing constituent *Tiszta-* 'clean', also 'bare' may emphasize the lack of vegetation, e.g. *Tisztamarót* (Vas). The most often used distinctive additions in the category are *Erdő-* 'wood' and *Diós-* 'having walnut-trees', e.g. *Erdőkövesd* (Heves), *Dióspatony* (Pozsony). *Szőlős-* 'vine-clad' or 'vine grower' as a distinguishing element could indicate not only the flora (e.g. *Szőlősgyőrök*, Somogy), but also the main occupation of the dwellers (e.g. *Szőlősardó*, Torna; cf. 4.2.4.2.) in the settlement.

4.2.1.4. In some cases the distinctive addition reflects FAUNA as a striking identifying feature of the settlement. Distinguishing elements referring to non-domesticated animals (e.g. *Disznós-* 'having boars', *Békás-* 'having frogs') are few in number, e.g. *Disznóshorvát* (Borsod), *Békásmegyér* (Pest). The problem that arises here is that the names of animals could also be used as proper names in old Hungarian, so a distinctive addition seemingly identifying a place by declaring it the natural habitat of an animal might easily turn out to be developed from a name of a person, e.g. the addition *Kánya-* ('kite', but also an old personal name) in *Kányabölzse* (Abaúj).

4.2.2. Distinctive additions manifesting BUILDING are not rare in the period. An outstanding building in a settlement is easily spotted even from a distance, so as a feature it serves the purpose of identification well enough for people living in the surrounding villages. Our data show that the prominent edifice highlighted most often in the distinguishing constitu-

ents is typically an ecclesiastic building: the most frequent differentiating elements, *Egyházas*¹⁶ (e.g. *Egyházashollós*, Vas; *Egyházásrádóc*, Vas), *Kápolnás*- (e.g. *Kápolnásvisnye*, Somogy) or *Monostor*- (e.g. *Monostorpályi*, Bihar) refer to the fact that the settlement has a church, a chapel or a monastery, respectively. The constituents *Házás*¹⁷ ‘having a church’ (e.g. *Házásnénye*, Hont), *Tornyos*- ‘having a steeple’ (e.g. *Tornyospálca*, Szabolcs) and *Kéttornyú*- ‘having two steeples’ (e.g. *Kéttornyúlak*, Veszprém) also refer to the fact that there is a church in the settlement. The distinctive additions *Vár(as)*- ‘having a castle’ (e.g. *Várgede*, Gömör), *Hidas*- ‘having a bridge’ (e.g. *Hidasnémeti*, Abaúj), *Kőhid*- ‘stone bridge’ (e.g. *Kőhidgyarmat*, Esztergom), *Monos*¹⁸ ‘having a mill’ (e.g. *Monosbél*, Borsod) evoke non-ecclesiastic buildings which were prominent enough to help the identification of a settlement.

4.2.3. Distinctive additions reflecting PROPRIETOR were very popular in the period. These distinguishing constituents usually indicate a former individual or institutional possessor of the settlement, but one may also involve differentiating elements referring to the patron saint of the settlement in this category. Charters from the 11th–12th centuries prove that the ecclesiastic grant was often entitled to a patron saint, who was thus considered as a virtual owner of the settlement established on „his” piece of land (Györffy 1960: 33).

4.2.3.1. Most proprietary distinctive additions represent INDIVIDUAL OWNER. In these cases the distinguishing constituent most often displays the name of a former owner. This fact has a historical explanation. As we saw above, in the Middle Ages the division of a demesne after a nobleman’s death could result in a multiplication of settlements: the heirs either legally or physically divided the inherited settlements, which was usually indicated in the names of the divisions in the form of added distinguishing elements naming the actual owners. A clear, linguistic sign of real ownership is the presence of *-(j)a/-(j)e*, the third person singular possessive suffix in the village name, which often disappears when the possession is terminated, e.g. *Bánffyahunyadja* later becomes *Bánffyahunyad*¹⁹ (Kolozs; FNESz 1: 160). In the observed period first names (e.g. *Amadé*, *Csaba*, *Lénárd*), family names (e.g. *Tegzes*, *Úsz*, *Zay*) as well as nicknames (e.g. *Benke*, *Mike*) of former owners can equally be found in settlement names as distinctive additions, e.g. *Amadékarcsa* (Pozsony), *Csabacsúd* (Békés), *Lénárddaróc* (Borsod), *Tegzesborfő* (Hont), *Úszpeklény* (Sáros), *Zayugróc* (Trencsén), *Benkepatony* (Pozsony), *Mikebuda* (Pest). Family names of local landowners are frequently used as distinguishing elements in the names of possessed villages around the central estate, e.g. *Kecerpálvágása*, *Kecerlipóc*, *Kecerpeklény*, *Kecerkosztolány* were all possessed by the Keczer family in Sáros comitat. Distinctive additions sometimes preserve the name of the person who founded the settlement, e.g. *Paucsinalehota* (Liptó).

4.2.3.2. INSTITUTIONAL OWNER could be demonstrated either by indicating the social rank of the proprietor or by naming the institution in possession of the settlement. The social rank

¹⁶ The term *egyház* is a compound of the extinct lexeme **id ~ így ~ egy* ‘saint’ and the common word *ház* ‘house’. The term had been used in the meaning of ‘church’ before the word *templom*, a stem of Latin origin, was borrowed and spread in Hungarian to indicate the building. The term *egyház* today is only used in the abstract sense to refer to the organisation of the Church (TESz 1: 724–725).

¹⁷ An odd abbreviation of the distinctive addition *Egyházas*- ‘having a church’.

¹⁸ The additions *Molnus*- ~ *Mónos*- ~ *Monos*-, also *Molna*- in settlement names are all derived from the word *malom* ‘mill’ (TESz 2: 831).

¹⁹ Original spellings: 1522: *Banfy Hwnyadya*; 1808: *Hunyad (Bánfi)*. The settlement had been possessed by the Bánffy family since 1435 (FNESz 1:160).

highlighted in the distinguishing constituent, whether lay (e.g. *király* ‘king’, *vajda* ‘voivode’) or ecclesiastic (e.g. *apáca* ‘nun’, *apát* ‘abbot’, *érsek* ‘archbishop’, *pap* ‘priest’, *püspök* ‘bishop’) helps to identify the (former) proprietor, and through them the settlement itself, e.g. *Királylubella* (Liptó, former royal estate; FNESz 1: 734), *Vajdakamarás* (Kolozs, owned also by István and Bogdán, Moldovan voivodes in the 15th century; FNESz 2: 723), *Apácazakállas* (Komárom, possessed by the Nunnery of Margaret Island; FNESz 1: 104), *Apátmarót* (Hont, owned by the Cistercian Abbey of Pilis; FNESz 1: 106), *Érseklél* (Komárom, possessed by the Archbishop of Esztergom; FNESz 1: 429), *Papkeszi* (Veszprém, owned by the Chapter of Veszprém; FNESz 2: 316), *Püspökhatvan* (Pest, possessed by the Bishop of Vác; FNESz 2: 385). However, as terms indicating social ranks often developed into family names in Hungarian, careful judgment is needed, e.g. the addition *Gyula-* in *Gyulafehérvár* (Alsófehér) indicates the seat of the second highest leader of old Hungarians, whilst the same element in *Gyulakeszi* (Veszprém) refers to the name of the family in possession of it (FNESz 1: 551–552). An institution, lay (e.g. *Ghymes*, a castle; *Jolsva* and *Lednic*, manors) or ecclesiastic (e.g. *káptalan* ‘chapter’, *monostor* ‘monastery’) could also possess a settlement, e.g. *Ghymeskosztolány* (Bars, Nyitra), *Jolsvatapolca* (Gömör), *Lednicrovné* (Trencsén), *Káptalantóti* (Zala), *Monostorapáti* (Zala). *Török-* ‘Turkish’ as a distinctive addition suggests that in the period of the Turkish occupation of Hungary (1541–1686) the settlement was possessed by the Turks, e.g. *Törökkoppány* (Bihar), *Törökszákos* (Temes), *Törökszentmiklós* (Heves).

4.2.3.3. Distinctive additions representing PATRON SAINT reflect the importance of the church in medieval villages. The patron saint of the church, who was usually also the patron saint of the whole settlement (e.g. *Szent István* ‘St. Stephen’, *Szent Lőrinc* ‘St. Lawrence’, *Mindszent* ‘All Saints’ in the examples below) was frequently foregrounded in the distinguishing elements of habitation names, e.g. *Szentistvánbaksa* (Abaúj), *Szentlőrinckáta* (Pest), *Mindszentkál* (Zala). Distinctive additions naming a saint might exceptionally indicate a place of worship, e.g. *Máriapócs* (Szabolcs, shrine of Virgin Mary; FNESz 2: 95).

4.2.4. Distinctive additions manifesting INHABITANTS might also contribute to the proper identification of the settlements. In the distinguishing constituents (former) inhabitants of the settlements are described with respect to their nationality, occupation and social status.

4.2.4.1. Distinguishing constituents reflecting NATIONALITY were often born as a result of the fact that in the past people of different ethnic groups tended to settle down in different parts of the villages somewhat separately from each other, which could later easily bring about the settlements’ splitting in two, followed by the appearance of distinctive additions referring to the nationality of the dwellers in the names of the new villages. Examining the geographical distribution of these distinctive additions helps us to clarify which ethnic groups immigrated into which parts of the country, even if we know that not all settlements populated by ethnic minorities were named after the nationalities of their inhabitants. Distinguishing constituents *Német-* ‘German’, *Horvát-* ‘Croatian’, *Tót-* ‘Wendish’, ‘Kajkavski-Croatian’, ‘Slovenian’, *Rác-* ‘Serbian’ are frequently found in names of Transdanubian settlements, e.g. *Németgyirót* (Vas), *Horváthásos* (Vas), *Tótszerdahely* (Zala), *Rácalmás* (Fejér). From the northern, north-eastern counties one could quote *Német-* ‘German’, *Tót-* ‘Slovakian’, *Orosz-* ‘Ruthenian’, *Horvát-* ‘Croatian’, *Olasz-* ‘Romance, esp. Walloon’, *Cseh-* ‘Czech’ as characteristic distinctive additions of this type, e.g. *Németlipcse* (Liptó), *Tótpróna* (Turóc), *Oroszkrucsó* (Zemplén), *Horvátjandorf* (Moson), *Olaszliszka* (Zemplén), *Csehbrezó* (Nógrád). *Oláh-* ‘Rumanian’ and *Szász-* ‘Saxon’ are typically used in names of Transylvanian settle-

ments, e.g. *Oláhresica* (Krassó), *Szászfűlpös* (Kolozs).²⁰ In many cases the above modifiers are opposed to distinguishing elements referring to the Hungarian population: *Magyar-* ‘Hungarian’ and *Székely-* ‘Szekler’, the latter used only in Transylvania, e.g. *Németürög* : *Magyarürög* (Baranya), *Horvátnádálja* : *Magyarnádálja* (Vas), *Rácalmás* : *Magyaralmás* (Fejér), *Oláhkocsárd* : *Székelykocsárd* (Küküllő and Aranyos).

4.2.4.2. Distinctive additions demonstrating OCCUPATION preserve the memory of a special medieval social class. People were obliged to deliver a fixed quota of their surplus agricultural produce or industrial products to the state, to ecclesiastic organs or to landowners, which played an important role in the economic life of the Arpadian Hungary (895–1301). People of the same profession at that time were usually settled down in the same village by their feudal landlord. Distinctive additions could reflect the fact that most inhabitants of the habitation used to be such peasants by presenting various (medieval) jobs: *fazekas* ‘potter’, *lovász* ‘groom’, *ács* ‘carpenter’, *szekeres* ‘carter’, e.g. *Fazekaszaluzsány* (Gömör), *Lovászhetény* (Baranya), *Ácsmecser* (Somogy), *Szekerestörpény* (Belsőszolnok).

4.2.4.3. The personal and economic commitments of the dwellers or the lack of these are expressed in more general terms in distinctive additions reflecting SOCIAL STATUS. In the past people of different ranks often settled down separately within the same village, which could also lead to the split of the settlement, accompanied by the appearance of distinguishing elements *Nemes-* ‘noble’ and *Pór-* ‘peasant’, *Paraszt-* ‘peasant’ in front of the old village name, e.g. *Nemes-* and *Pórládony* (Sopron), *Nemes-* and *Pórszalók* (Veszprém), *Nemes-* and *Parasztbikk* (Borsod). The social status of the inhabitants determined the privileges of the settlement, which are emphasised in distinctive additions such as *Szabad-* ‘free’, or *Város-* ‘town’ in the period, e.g. *Szabadszentkirály* (Baranya), *Városhídvég* (Somogy).

4.2.5. Certain distinctive additions of the period demonstrate ECONOMIC LIFE as a characteristic identifying feature of the settlement. Aspects of economic life appearing in the differentiating elements include agriculture, mining, trade as well as communications.

4.2.5.1. Some distinctive additions reflect PRODUCE. The characteristic agricultural produce of the settlement motivated distinguishing elements such as *Boros-* ‘producing wine’, *Búzás-* ‘producing wheat’ and *Kecske-* ‘raising goats’, e.g. *Borosjenő* (Arad), *Búzásbocsárd* (Alsófehér), *Kecskevarbók* (Hont).

4.2.5.2. MINE, MINING as a distinguishing feature is reflected in few distinctive additions, e.g. *Arany-* ‘gold’, *Kő-* ‘stone’, *Kővágó-* ‘quarrying’ in names *Aranyidka* (Abaúj), *Kőboldogfalva* (Hunyad), *Kővágóörs* (Zala).

4.2.5.3. TRADE as an identifying feature of the settlement is represented in the distinctive additions *Vámos-* ‘toll-taking’ and *Vásáros-* ‘marketing’, e.g. *Vámosgyörk* (Heves), *Vámosmikola* (Hont), *Vásárosdombó* (Bihar), *Vásárosnamény* (Bereg).

4.2.5.4. The distinguishing constituent *Rév-* ‘ferry’ reflects COMMUNICATIONS, e.g. *Révkörtvélyes* (Kövár).

4.2.6. Some distinctive additions demonstrate OTHER FEATURES. The distinguishing characteristics highlighted by these differentiating elements are difficult to categorise, e.g.

²⁰ Some of these terms indicating ethnic groups are used only in place names today: e.g. *tót*, *rác*. In the past *tót* was a collective name of different Slavic nationalities (Slovakian, Slovenian, Wendish, even Moravian), so in different parts of the country it was used to identify different ethnic groups (see the above examples). *Olasz* and *orosz* today mean ‘Italian’ and ‘Russian’, respectively; the other terms are still used in the sense indicated above.

Királyfiakarcsa (Pozsony; *Királyfia*- ‘the King’s son’, the settlement was said to have been inhabited by the descendants of free castle serfs who served Stephen I as soldiers; FNESz 1: 732), *Bősárkány* (Sopron; *Bő*- ‘abundant, capacious’, the settlement was inhabited by allegedly wealthy people; FNESz 1: 251), *Szentkirályszabadja* (Veszprém; *Szentkirály*- ‘St. King’, the dwellers of the settlement were said to have been given exemption from feudal obligations by Stephen I;²¹ FNESz 2: 561).

Distinctive additions foregrounding the same peripheral feature of habitations are used less frequently to differentiate identical settlement names, e.g. *Tegzes*- and *Kálnaborfő* (Hont; INDIVIDUAL OWNER); *Horvát*, *Német*- and *Tótgurab* (Pozsony; NATIONALITY); *Nemes*- and *Pördömök* (Vas; SOCIAL STATUS). Peripheral features of different types, however, are often found in opposing name forms, e.g. *Meszes*- and *Szőlősgyőrök* (Zala and Somogy; SOIL and FLORA); *Király*- and *Nemeslubella* (Liptó; INSTITUTIONAL OWNER and SOCIAL STATUS); even in multiple correlations, e.g. *Kecer*-, *Orosz*- and *Úszpeklény* (Sáros; INDIVIDUAL OWNER, NATIONALITY and INDIVIDUAL OWNER); *Csábrág*-, *Kecske*- and *Korpásvarbók* (Hont; INDIVIDUAL OWNER, PRODUCE, PRODUCE); *Egyházás*-, *Hidas*-, *Nemes*- and *Rempeshollós* (Vas; BUILDING, BUILDING, SOCIAL STATUS and INDIVIDUAL OWNER).

4.3. The most frequently used distinctive additions in the period manifest POSITIONAL FEATURE. Precise or relative localisation achieved by these distinguishing constituents definitely facilitates the identification of the settlements.

4.3.1. Distinctive additions representing PRECISE POSITION determine the more or less exact location of the settlement either by referring to a nearby natural, geographic object (a river, a lake; an area; a mountain; an island; a forest) or by naming a neighbouring or inclusive artificial, man-made construction (another settlement; an administrative unit).

4.3.1.1. Distinctive additions reflecting RIVER (OR BODIES OF WATER in general) name the stream on the bank of which the settlement was established. As rivers, bearing usually unique, stable names known by the surrounding population were important in the everyday life of the village (thoroughfare, source of energy and irrigation, supply of drinking water, etc.), speakers felt the need to include the river name into the habitation name as a distinguishing element for obvious reasons. The first twelve river names used the most frequently as distinctive additions in the period are 1. Tisza; 2. Maros; 3–4. Sajó (i.e. right-side affluent of river Tisza), Rába; 5. Garam; 6–7. Ér, Zala; 8–9. Homoród, Ipoly; 10–12. Duna, Dráva, Tápió. One can easily observe that speakers preferred including names of medium-sized rivers into the settlement names, as they provided the best contribution to identification, e.g. *Maroslekence* (Torda), *Sajógalgóc* (Borsod), *Rábasömjén* (Vas), *Garammikola* (Bars), *Ipolydamásd* (Hont). *Duna* ‘Danube’, the biggest river of Hungary displays poor performance: flowing through the country it must have been considered too long to provide accurate localisation. Nevertheless, it was used as a distinctive addition in some cases, e.g. *Dunapentele* (Fejér), *Dunaszekcső* (Baranya). Small rivers (e.g. *Ciróka*, *Cserta*, *Ilonok*, *Kászon*, *Kiszuca*, *Lesence*, *Miszt*), though they were less well-known, might also help to identify settlements, e.g. *Cirókahosszúmező* (Zemplén), *Csertalakos* (Zala), *Ilonokújfalu* (Ugocsa), *Kászonújfalu* (Csik), *Kiszucaújhely* (Trencsén), *Lesencetomaj* (Zala), *Misztótfalu* (Szatmár). The name of each small river is found only in one or two settlement name forms. Whilst

²¹ Stephen I, the first King of Hungary (1000/1001–1038) was canonized by Pope Gregory VII as Saint Stephen of Hungary in 1083.

distinctive additions foregrounding rivers provide us with „linear” localisation, names of lakes as distinguishing elements (e.g. *Balaton-* in our data) give us „punctual” localisation, e.g. *Balatonederics* (Zala), *Balatonhenye* (Zala; Mező 1982: 221–223).

4.3.1.2. Similar punctual localisation of villages could be achieved by distinctive additions demonstrating NEIGHBOURING SETTLEMENT. Names of widely known, big towns are often used as distinguishing constituents in the names of surrounding small settlements, e.g. *Gyöngyös* in *Gyöngyöshalász*, *Gyöngyösoroszi*, *Gyöngyöstarján* (all in Heves). Many habitations called *Újfalú* ‘new village’ were originally „dependent” settlements established within the boundaries of old villages; later when these new settlements became independent, their names usually included the name of their mother villages as a differentiating element to help their identification, e.g. *Bártfaujfalú* (Sáros), *Csengerújfalú* (Szatmár), *Kassaujfalú* (Abaúj), *Rekenyeújfalú* (Gömör), *Szinyeújfalú* (Sáros)

4.3.1.3. Distinctive additions representing GEOGRAPHIC REGION name the area (e.g. *Csik*, *Jászság*, *Bihari-Hegyköz*, *Nyírség*, *Felső-Őrség*, *Szepesség*, *Szilágyság*, *Zselic*), the mountain (e.g. *Avas*, *Badacsony*, *Karancs*, *Mátra*, *Pilis*), the island (e.g. *Csepel-sziget*), the forest (e.g. *Búr-erdő*) in or in the vicinity of which the settlement is situated, e.g. *Csikszereda* (Csik), *Hegyközpályi* (Bihar), *Jászladány* (Jászság), *Nyírbéltek* (Szabolcs), *Őriszentmárton* (Vas), *Szepesszombathely* (Szepes), *Szilágysomlyó* (Kraszna), *Zselickisfalud* (Somogy), *Avasújfalú* (Szatmár), *Badacsonytomaj* (Zala), *Karancskeszti* (Nógrád), *Mátranovák* (Nógrád), *Piliscsaba* (Pest), *Szigetszentmárton* (Pest), *Búrszentpéter* (Pozsony). Certain factors, however, may reduce the localising potential of such geographic names: *Mezőség*, for instance, indicates more regions in Hungary. Still, references even to this name could successfully fulfil the role of an identifying distinctive addition in a period when people’s view of the world did not extend to the whole country, e.g. *Mezőbánd* (Maros), *Mezőberény* (Békés), *Mezőkaszony* (Bereg), *Mezőkomárom* (Veszprém), *Mezőnyárad* (Borsod), *Mezőpeterd* (Bihar).

4.3.1.4. Distinguishing constituents reflecting ADMINISTRATIVE UNIT are rare in the observed period. In medieval charters scribes often gave the name of the county in which the indicated settlement was found to specify its location. As a result of this practice, behind the name forms having a distinctive addition identical with the name of a county (e.g. *Nyitra* = a river, a town as well as a comitat) speakers first and foremost suspected a reference to the county. Indicating county in the distinctive addition thus in official naming processes became a very popular way of differentiating identical settlement names (Mező 1982: 219–220). People’s natural view of the world in the early 19th century, however, did not necessarily reach beyond the area of a comitat; consequently, at that time foregrounding a county in the distinctive addition was not a real identifying feature, so it was seldom used in name forms, e.g. *Zólyomlipcse* (Zólyom). Names of smaller administrative units, for example districts (e.g. *Belényesi*, *Füleki*, *Alsótarnai járás*) as well as Transylvanian seats (e.g. *Kézdiszék*, *Sepsiszék*) proved to be better localising devices in that era, e.g. *Belényesújlak* (Bihar), *Fülekpüspöki* (Nógrád), *Tarnaszentmiklós* (Heves), *Kézdipolyán* (Háromszék), *Sepsiszentkirály* (Háromszék).

4.3.2. Distinctive additions manifesting RELATIVE POSITION determine the location of a settlement by giving its position in relation to another habitation bearing the same primary name. Distinguishing elements foregrounding the relative position of a settlement in the period are *Al-*, *Alsó-* ‘low(er), nether’, *Fel-*, *Felső-* ‘high(er), over’, *Közép-*, *Középső-* ‘middle’, *Bel-* ~ *Bél-*, *Belső-* ‘inside’, ‘inner’ (cf. *Intrinseca* in English place names), *Kül-*, *Külső-* ‘outside’, ‘outer’, ‘exterior’ (cf. *Extrinseca* in English place names) and *Vég-* ‘end’.

In the case of the opposite adjectives *al(só)* and *fel(ső)* the comparison could equally be based on cardinal points (*alsó* ‘southern’, *felső* ‘northern’), on the rivers’ direction of flow (*alsó* ‘downstream’, *felső* ‘upstream’), or on the position of the terrain (*alsó* ‘low’, *felső* ‘high’; Kázmér 1970. 37). In 19th century Hungary, these possible meanings were basically interrelated: in contrast with the mountainous northern areas the south of the country was relatively flat, and these configurations of the terrain determined the flow of rivers from north to south as well. The combination of the possible adjectival meanings was strengthened by a historical fact influencing namers’ perspective: in Hungary in the course of history people generally migrated from overpopulated lowland villages up to the mountains in fertile river valleys (i.e. upstream, practically from south to north in the country) to cultivate more and more elevated lands to provide enough food for themselves. Duplicated settlements born as a result of this migration were often identified with name forms having distinctive additions describing relative position. First typically the element *Alsó-* appeared in the name of the old village, whilst the name of the new village was extended with the addition *Felső-* some time later, e.g. 1439: *Lapugy*, 1491: *Alsólapugy*, 1526/1601: *Felsőlapugy*,²² (Hunyad; FNESz 1: 83). A seemingly contradicting example is that of *Alsó-* and *Felsőmecenéz* (Abaúj), the latter being the older settlement: with the development of metallurgy dwellers of the old *Mecenéz* exceptionally had to migrate downstream in search of raw material and water. Threefold division of a settlement could result in introducing a third name form containing the modifier *Közép-*, *Középső-* ‘middle’ for the village in the middle, e.g. *Alsó-*, *Felső-* and *Középbencéd* (Udvarhely), *Alsó-*, *Felső-* and *Középcsöpöny* (Pozsony), *Alsó-*, *Felső-* and *Középpetánc* (Vas), *Alsó-*, *Felső-* and *Középszúd* (Hont).

The use of the distinguishing constituents *Belső-* ‘inside’ and *Külső-* ‘outside’ in the period seems to be restricted to certain areas of the country: the examples are from Komárom and Abaúj comitats and from counties around Lake Balaton, e.g. *Belső-* and *Külsőcsobád* (Abaúj), *Belső-* and *Külsőtűrje* (Zala). The reference point with respect to which ‘inside’ and ‘outside’ are interpreted is typically a locally significant geographic entity, e.g. the case of *Belsőlándor* (at the junction of the rivers Vág-Duna and Nyitra, between the two streams) and *Külsőlándor* (outside the junction, over the river Nyitra) in Komárom comitat. The addition *Vég-* ‘end’ in the sense ‘a settlement established at one end of the old village’ is exceptional in the period, e.g. *Végkak* next to *Kak* (Somogy).

Distinguishing elements reflecting POSITIONAL FEATURE might also create correlative name forms. In few cases the additions foreground geographical objects of the same type, e.g. *Duna-* and *Kaposszekcső* (Baranya; RIVER), *Mező-* and *Jászberény* (Békés and Jászság; GEOGRAPHIC REGION, areas), *Kézdi-* and *Sepsimartonos* (Háromszék; ADMINISTRATIVE UNIT, seats). In many instances the highlighted geographical objects are of different nature, e.g. *Duna-* and *Sárpentele* (Fejér; RIVER and GEOGRAPHIC REGION, an area), *Badacsony-* and *Lesencetomaj* (Zala; GEOGRAPHIC REGION, a mountain and RIVER), *Felső-* and *Mezőnyárad* (Borsod; RELATIVE POSITION and GEOGRAPHIC REGION, an area), *Rákos-* and *Piliscsaba* (Pest; RIVER and GEOGRAPHIC REGION, a mountain). Sometimes the opposition is between the unmodified and the differentiated name forms, e.g. *Sömjén* and *Rábasömjén* (Vas; RIVER). The differentiated name form sometimes has not got a correlative name pair, e.g. *Nyírbétek* (Szabolcs; GEOGRAPHIC REGION, an area), *Mezőbánd* (Maros; GEOGRAPHIC REGION, an area). Still, distinctive additions manifesting

²² Contemporaneous spellings: 1439: *Lapugh*, 1491: *Alsolapug*, 1526: *Lapwg superior*, 1601: *Felső Lapugy* (FNESz 1: 83).

POSITIONAL FEATURE are most frequently opposed to distinguishing elements demonstrating CENTRAL OR PERIPHERAL FEATURE, e.g. *Rima-* and *Fazekaszaluzsány* (Gömör; RIVER and OCCUPATION), *Bán-* and *Disznóshorvát* (Borsod; RIVER and FAUNA), *Balaton-* and *Pusztaderics* (Zala; BODY OF WATER and STATE), especially in multiple correlations, e.g. *Balaton-*, *Ördög-* and *Petőhenye* (Zala; BODY OF WATER, INDIVIDUAL OWNER and INDIVIDUAL OWNER), *Hegyköz-*, *Hosszú-*, *Monostor-* and *Olasz/Ópályi* (Bihar and Szabolcs; GEOGRAPHIC REGION, SHAPE, BUILDING and NATIONALITY/AGE).

4.4. Special distinctive additions profile either more than one or not a single identifying feature of the designated settlements.

4.4.1. Consecutive distinctive additions were born in a unique process: when a settlement designated by a differentiated name form was divided into two separate villages, the new habitations usually became identified with new, secondary distinguishing elements added to the already modified old name form. The secondary distinctive additions could be added to the old name forms in front position emphasising present separation, e.g. *Alsótótbaka* and *Felsőtótbaka* (Hont; RELATIVE POSITION and NATIONALITY), *Ófazekasvarsánd* and *Újfazekasvarsánd* (Arad; AGE and OCCUPATION), or in middle position underlining former unity, e.g. *Németalsógencs* and *Németfelsőgencs* (Vas; NATIONALITY and RELATIVE POSITION), *Ipolykiskér* and *Ipolynagykér* (Nógrád; RIVER and SIZE).

4.4.2. Alternating distinctive additions are found if a single settlement is simultaneously designated by more differentiated name forms. The alternating distinctive additions are usually motivated by different features of the settlement. The phenomenon suggests that a habitation may have several identifying features, and this situation can result in the development of several identifying distinctive additions. As time passes, one of the alternating distinguishing constituents becomes a constant element of the name by pushing out the other potential modifiers. In some cases, distinctive additions alternate in the same combination in all the opposing name forms, e.g. *Nagy/Alsókálósa* and *Kis/Felsőkálósa* (Gömör; SIZE/RELATIVE POSITION), *Ó/Magyarvencsellő* and *Új/Németvencsellő* (Szabolcs; AGE/NATIONALITY). In other oppositions only one name form has alternating distinctive additions, but even in these cases one of the alternating distinguishing constituents is semantically related to (one of) the other differentiating element(s) found in the correlative name forms, e.g. *Magyar/Maroscsesztve* and *Oláhcsesztve* (Alsófejér; NATIONALITY/RIVER and NATIONALITY), *Nagy/Pusztakapoly* and *Kiskapoly* (Somogy; SIZE/STATE and SIZE), *Nagy/Tiszatokaj*, *Kistokaj* and *Orosztokaj* (Zemplén; SIZE/RIVER, SIZE and NATIONALITY), *Alsó/Nagy/Németborsa*, *Felső/Kis/Tótborsa* and *Középborsa* (Pozsony; RELATIVE POSITION/SIZE/NATIONALITY, RELATIVE POSITION/SIZE/NATIONALITY and RELATIVE POSITION).

4.4.3. The numeral *Két-* 'two' as a comprehensive distinctive addition forms a common name for two neighbouring settlements with the same primary name, e.g. *Kétdolics* (Vas), *Kétsurány* (Vas).

Statistics – Distinctive additions in early 19th century Hungarian settlement names

Motivation: the distinctive addition profiles a characteristic feature of the settlement	Number	Percentage
	of examples	
1. a central feature	1267	(33,45%)
1.1. size	1066	(28,14%)
1.2. age	112	(2,96%)
1.3. shape	11	(0,29%)
1.4. state	78	(2,06%)
2. a peripheral feature	985	(26%)
2.1. natural surroundings	103	(2,71%)
2.1.1. soil	25	(0,66%)
2.1.2. terrain	7	(0,18%)
2.1.3. flora	55	(1,45%)
2.1.4. fauna	16	(0,42%)
2.2. building	41	(1,08%)
2.3. proprietor or patron saint	316	(8,35%)
2.3.1. individual owner	234	(6,18%)
2.3.2. institutional owner	68	(1,8%)
2.3.3. patron saint	14	(0,37%)
2.4. inhabitants	463	(12,23%)
2.4.1. nationality	381	(10,06%)
2.4.2. occupation	12	(0,32%)
2.4.3. social status	70	(1,85%)
2.5. economic life	23	(0,6%)
2.5.1. produce	5	(0,13%)
2.5.2. mine, mining	4	(0,11%)
2.5.3. trade	12	(0,31%)
2.5.4. communications	2	(0,05%)
2.6. other features	39	(1,03%)
3. a positional feature	1410	(37,22%)
3.1. precise position	614	(16,21%)
3.1.1. river or other bodies of water	283	(7,47%)
3.1.2. neighbouring settlement	204	(5,39%)
3.1.3. geographical region	102	(2,69%)
3.1.4. administrative unit	25	(0,66%)
3.2. relative position	796	(21,01%)
Special distinctive additions	126	(3,33%)
1. consecutive distinctive additions	31	(0,82%)
2. alternating distinctive additions	93	(2,46%)
3. comprehensive distinctive additions	2	(0,05%)
Total:	3788	(100%)

5. Conclusion

As it was illustrated above, if for any reason a speech community used identical names to designate different settlements, names could not function properly as they could not fulfil their identifying role in communication. Differentiation of settlement names as a linguistic process is a means of re-establishing the identifying potential of such names: differentiation re-grounds malfunctioning names. In the course of differentiation, a salient, thus identifying characteristic feature of the settlement – necessarily different from the one(s) already reflected in the primary village name – is profiled and included into the habitation name in the form of a distinctive addition to promote the unambiguous identification of the settlement. Distinctive additions, not surprisingly, tended to recur, and – to some extent – restricted manifestations of the cognitive domains which took part in the formation of non-differentiated settlement name forms. Nevertheless, in early 19th century Hungary, distinctive additions in settlement names displayed considerable semantic diversity, which could serve as a model in differentiating identical settlement names by way of distinguishing modifiers in official naming processes after 1898 (for details see Mező 1982: 218–240).

References

- Barabás, Irén 1984. Fejér megye helységneveinek rendszere [The system of settlement names in Fejér county]. *Névtani Értesítő* 9: 11–19.
- Bárczi, Géza 1958. *A magyar szókincs eredete* [Origins of the Hungarian vocabulary]. 2nd edition. Budapest: Tankönyvkiadó.
- Bölszkei, Andrea 1997. A spontán névkorrelációs rendszer alakulása a XVIII–XIX. századi helységneveink körében [Spontaneous correlations of settlement names in the 18th–19th-century Hungary]. *Névtani Értesítő* 19: 16–26.
- Bölszkei, Andrea 1999. Névkorrelációk az ómagyar kori helynevek körében [Correlations of old Hungarian settlement names]. *Névtani Értesítő* 21: 75–81.
- Bölszkei, Andrea 2005. The correlational system of Hungarian historical place names. In: Maticsák, Sándor (ed.): *Settlement names in the Uralian languages. Onomastica Uralica 3*. Debrecen, Helsinki: Debreceni Egyetem Magyar Nyelvtudományi Intézete, Kotimaisten kielten tutkimuskeskus. 155–182.
- Bölszkei, Andrea 2006. A spontán keletkezésű településnév-korrelációk diakrón szempontú elemzéséhez [On the diachronic analysis of spontaneous settlement name correlations]. In: Hoffmann István – Tóth Valéria (eds.): *Helynévtörténeti tanulmányok 2* [Studies on place name history 2]. Debrecen: Debreceni Egyetem Magyar Nyelvtudományi Tanszék. 47–66.
- Cameron, Kenneth 1969. *English place names*. London: Methuen.
- Clark, Cecily 1992. Onomastics. In: Hogg, Richard M. (ed.): *The Cambridge history of the English language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Vol. 1: 452–489, Vol. 2: 542–606.
- Crystal, David (ed.) 1997. *The Cambridge encyclopedia of language*. University College of North Wales. Bangor: Cambridge University Press.
- Ekwall, Eilert 1960. *The concise Oxford dictionary of English place names*. 4th edition. Oxford: The Clarendon Press.
- FNESz = Kiss Lajos 1988. *Földrajzi nevek etimológiai szótára* [An etymological dictionary of geographical names]. 4th edition. Vol. 1–2. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.
- Györffy, György 1960. A magyar törzsi helynevek [Hungarian place names derived from tribal names]. In: Pais, Dezső and Mikešy, Sándor (eds.): *Névtudományi vizsgálatok* [Studies in onomastics]. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó. 27–34.
- Györffy, György 1972. Az Árpád-kori szolgálónépek kérdéséhez [Servants in the Arpadian era]. *Történelmi Szemle* 15: 261–320.
- Hajdú, Mihály 2003. *Általános és magyar névtan* [General and Hungarian onomastics]. Budapest: Osiris Kiadó.
- Hoffmann, István 2007. *Helynevek nyelvi elemzése* [Linguistic analysis of place names]. 2nd edition. Budapest: Tinta Könyvkiadó.

- Inczefi, Géza 1965. A földrajzi nevek differenciálódásáról [On the differentiation of geographical names]. *Magyar Nyelvjárások* 75–80.
- Inczefi, Géza 1970. *Földrajzi nevek névtudományi vizsgálata Makó környékének földrajzi nevei alapján* [An onomastic analysis of geographical names on the basis of geographical names in Makó's surroundings]. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.
- Juhász, Dezső 1981. Veszprém megye helységneveinek rendszere [The system of settlement names in Veszprém county]. In: Beszteri Béla (ed.): *Név és társadalom* [Name and society]. Veszprém: Magyar Nyelvtudományi Társaság. 253–263.
- Juhász, Dezső 1988. *A magyar tájnévadás* [The naming of regions in Hungarian]. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.
- Kálmán, Béla 1978. *The world of names*. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.
- Kázmér, Miklós 1970. *A „falu” a magyar helynevekben. XIII–XIX. század* [The term *falu* ‘village’ in Hungarian place names. 13–19th c.]. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.
- Kiss, Lajos 1992. Erdély a helynevek tükrében [A short survey of Transylvanian place names]. *Magyar Nyelvőr* 90–94.
- Körmenyi, Géza 1986. *Komárom megye helységneveinek rendszere* [The system of settlement names in Komárom county]. Budapest: Magyar Nyelvtudományi Társaság.
- Langacker, Ronald W. 1987. *Foundations of cognitive grammar: Theoretical prerequisites*. Vol. I. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press.
- Langacker, Ronald W. 1991. *Foundations of cognitive grammar: Descriptive application*. Vol. II. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press.
- Langacker, Ronald W. 2008. *Cognitive grammar. A basic introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lipszky, János 1808. *Repertorium locorum objectorumque in XII. tabulis Mappae regnorum Hungariae, Slavoniae, Croatiae et confinium militarium Magni item Principatus Transylvaniae occurrentium, quas aeri incisas vulgavit Joannes Lipszky de Szedlicsna, regiminis caesario regii equestris Hungarici lib.:[eri] bar:[onis] Frimont supremus vigiliarum praefectus. Secundum varias in his Provinciis usu receptas denominationes ab eodem Auctore elaboratum. Budae, Typis regiae Universitatis Pestanae 1808* [Register of places and objects of Hungary, Slavonia, Croatia and the Military Frontiers as well as of the Grand Duchy of Transylvania occurring on the 12-page map engraved on copper by János Lipszky of Szedlicsna, Major of the Imperial and Royal Frimont Hussar Regiment, according to the different name forms used in those provinces, elaborated by the same author. In Buda, with the letters of the University Press, 1808]. Buda.
- Matthews, Constance Mary 1975. *Place names of the English-speaking world*. Worchester and London: The Trinity Press.
- Mező, András 1982. *A magyar hivatalos helységnevéadás* [Official place naming in Hungary]. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.
- Mező, András 1996. *A templomcím a magyar helységnevekben. 11–15. század* [Patron saints in Hungarian settlement names. 11–15th c.]. Budapest: Magyar Egyháztörténeti Enciklopédia Munkaközösség.
- Ördög, Ferenc 1981. *Zala megye helységneveinek rendszere* [The system of settlement names in Zala county]. Budapest: ELTE Magyar Nyelvészeti Tanszékcsoport.
- Pelle, Béla Mrs. 1989. A helységnevek differenciálódásáról *al-fel*, *alsó-felső* előtagokkal [Differentiating settlement names with distinctive additions *al* ‘nether’ – *fel* ‘over’, *alsó* ‘nether’ – *felső* ‘over’]. In: Balogh Lajos – Ördög Ferenc (eds.): *Névtudomány és művelődéstörténet* [Onomastics and cultural history]. Zalaegerszeg: Magyar Nyelvtudományi Társaság. 153–156.
- Pesti, János 1969. Földrajzi neveink *alsó-*, *felső-* (~ *al-*, *fel-*) helyzetviszonyító elemei [Expressing relative position in geographical names with modifiers *alsó-* ‘nether’, *felső-* ‘over’ ~ *al-* ‘nether’, *fel-* ‘over’]. *Magyar Nyelvőr* 229–231.
- Rácz, Anita 1997. Az ómagyar kori településnevek differenciálódásáról [On the differentiation of old Hungarian settlement names]. *Magyar Nyelvjárások* 125–146.
- Reany, Percy Hide 1960. *The origin of English place names*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Sliz, Mariann 2008. Which out of the four? The origin of family names in the light of cognitive demantics. *This volume*.
- J. Soltész, Katalin 1979. *A tulajdonnév funkciója és jelentése* [The function and meaning of proper names]. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.
- Stewart, George Ripley 1975. *Names on the globe*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Szabó, István 1966. *A falurendszer kialakulása Magyarországon. X–XV. század* [The development of the village system in Hungary. 10–15th c.]. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.
- Szabó G., Ferenc 1998. *A vásározás emlékei középkori helységneveinkben* [Linguistic relics of marketing in medieval settlement names]. Nyíregyháza: Bessenyei György Könyvkiadó.

-
- TESz = Benkő Loránd (ed.), 1967. *A magyar nyelv történeti-etimológiai szótára* [A historical-etymological dictionary of Hungarian]. Vol. 1–3. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.
- Tóth, Valéria 2005. The changes of the Hungarian settlement names. In: Maticsák Sándor (ed.): *Settlement names in the Uralian languages. Onomastica Uralica 3*. Debrecen–Helsinki: Debreceni Egyetem Magyar Nyelvtudományi Intézete, Kotimaisten kielten tutkimuskeskus. 135–153.
- Várkonyi, Imre 1984. *Somogy megye helységneveinek rendszere* [The system of settlement names in Somogy county]. Kaposvár: Somogy Megyei Levéltár.
- Zinkin, Vivian 1986. The specifying component in West Jersey place names. *Names* 34: 62–82.