GYULA KRISTÓ (Szeged, Hungary)

Settlement Name Giving in the Age of the Árpáds

*T*he age of the Árpáds in the Hungarian history comprises the period between 895 and 1301. Its starting point is the Hungarian Conquest, when the Hungarians occupied their home of today, the Carpathian Basin, and its closing date is the year of the extinction of the male line of the House of Árpád. The quantity of the source material[1] that served as a basis for this study can be depicted as a pyramid, or a funnel in an upside down position. This means that in the starting period (at the top of the pyramid, or in the "inlet" of the funnel) there were not any written sources that would mention any settlement names in the new home of the Hungarians. Basically, it is a period of a hundred years from 895 to the end of the 10th century. The first written information about the settlements of the Carpathian Basin appeared at an uncertain date, maybe as early as the end of the 10th century, but according to other opinions, only in 1002. From this time onwards, data was flowing continuously and in an increasing abundance. Altogether 54 names of 51 settlements are left to us in authentic sources until the end of St Stephen's reign (1038), and this number increases to several hundreds till the end of the 12th century, and swells to several thousands by the turn of the 13th and 14th centuries. Consequenty, while we can study the settlements one by one between 895 and 1301, we only have the possibility of constituting different types towards the end of the era because of the huge quantity of the data.

If we want to describe the settlement name giving of the era, first we need to know since when we can speak about settlements at the Hungarians. As a result of the above-mentioned lack of source material, it would be deceptive to draw the conclusion that since the first settlement names in the Carpathian Basin after 895 are known from the end of the 10th century (or from 1002), the Hungarian settlement system came into existence at that time. This could even be true, but the truth of this cannot be proved in this way. Exactly for this reason, you have to use other devices to get to know the real relations of place names in the mysterious earlier centuries (9th and 10th). We have to state here that the place name and the settlement name are not used as synonyms in

---

[1] The rich but, at the moment, incomplete collection of the corpus of the names of settlements see in GYÖRGY GYÖRFFY (1963–1998). The elaboration of the material of the first two volumes classified along special points of view see in HA 1–2. A big corpus is included and broken down according to subjects in KRISTÓ—MAKK—SZEGFŰ (1973, 1974).

the following. The place name or geographical name is used to identify a geographical object existing in space (it can be a mountain, a river or a settlement), but the settlement name is used only for the last, that is, to name a place inhabited by people. So, the Hungarians may have had (they had) place names, but it is not certain that settlement names existed among them. Exact data from the 9th century (before 895) help to throw light on this work hypothesis.

A source in Greek from the 10th century, Emperor Constantine Porphyrogenitus's work on how to govern the empire, mentions two place names in connection with the Hungarians still staying outside the Carpathian Basin. The author uses both each to refer to a dwelling, and quarters of the Hungarians in the 9thcentury; one of them is Levedia (in its original written form *Λεβεδια*), the other one is Etelköz *(Ατελκουζου)* (MORAVCSIK 1984: 42–44). We do not have to speak about the latter here, because it is evidently not a settlement name, but the name of a territory, and according to the latest explanation, it refers to the territory enclosed by the river Prut, that was called Etel at that time, and another river (the Dnyester or the Danube). The Emperor of Byzantium wrote about Levedia that it had been named after their first voivode, Levedi *(Λεβεδιασ)*. In his work, he mentioned several country names ending in *-ia*, among them those that he himself created from vernacular words. Thus, there is little doubt about that the form Levedia is the emperor's creation (KRISTÓ 1988: 152–154). It is highly credible if we consider the fact that the Hungarians living in the South Ukrainian steppe could hardly know the classical (Greek and Latin) *-ia* formant for country names. However, Constantine's record may correspond with the reality, considering that the Hungarians may have called an area Levedi after their voivode (i.e. their chief), and then the Emperor attached the usual *-ia* formant for country names, and thus, he created the name of Levedia. What provides a stable background for this hypothesis is that the most widespread settlement name type in the earlier times was the plain anthroponymic name, that is, the name of a dwelling (a settlement) was identical with a person's name, because the personal name had become the settlement name, without the addition of any derivatives or case-endings. Thus, Constantine could hear from the Byzantine delegates that they had been at Levedi (as a consequence, in Levedi), and he created the name Levedia as the name of the Hungarians' country. At the same time, he committed the mistake of extending Levedi's (in today's Hungarian form *Lëved*) name to the territory of an entire country, despite that, as LORÁND BENKŐ stated, "the place names formed from plain anthroponyms, such as *Lëved*, *never referred to* countries, provinces, or even to a larger territory, but only to confined quarters, or a settlement" (BENKŐ 1985: 11). Thus, Levedi's name could only refer to a small region, but the question has not been decided with this, because this name could refer to quarters as much as to a settlement.

As a result of the debates in the Hungarian historical science in recent years, the opinion which claims that the Hungarian conquerors were nomadic people, has strengthened (KRISTÓ 1995: 52–54, ELTER 1997: 88). A document in Arabic, which left the following information about the Hungarians of the mid 10th century, throws light on their settlement arrangement: "their quarters are along the river Danube, and they are nomadic people, like the Beduins. They have no towns, nor houses, but they live in yurtas, in scattered encampments" (NYITRAI 1995: 65). It also points at the lack of the Hungarian settlements that the Hungarians' dwelling territory in the Carpathian Basin was defined by Constantine Porphyrogenitus in the middle of the 10th century in terms of rivers, and not, as his practice was otherwise, in terms of towns (MORAVCSIK 1984: 48). So, the Hungarians did not have villages with houses and permanent boundaries before the times around 950, but they changed their lodgings following the rules of the nomadic rotational grazing. The place name that was formed from the anthroponym *Levedi* cannot refer to a settlement, but to a dwelling territory, a small area where the yurtas of Chief Levedi's clan were situated. At the same time this circumstance explains the formation of the plain anthroponymic settlement names. As ELEMÉR MOÓR pointed out some decades before, this way of name giving "certainly originates from the age of nomadization…, namely, when you could go to somebody but not somewhere." (MOÓR 1936a: 110, 1936b: 217). MANÓ KERTÉSZ put across an essentially similar point of view: this is the "Hungarian practice brought from the East", which coincided with the Hungarian age of nomadization, and the "identical name symbolizes the complete identification of the people with the land" (KERTÉSZ 1939: 33–35). The attachment of the plain anthroponymic settlement names to nomadism is shown by the fact that this type of name giving characterizes, besides the Hungarian, only the Turkish in the Eurasian region, who also have a nomadic past (KNIEZSA 1943: 126–128). The Hungarians did not have settlement names in the first period of their stay in the Carpathian Basin, just like in Levedia and Etelköz. (Consequently, what may have seemed to be a deceptive appearance before, is proven in another way now.) This period had lasted until the nomadism started to fall apart, and the Hungarians started to settle down in permanent villages. The beginning of this process may be put at the second half of the 10th century, but the end of it can be assessed much less accurately, because it was protracted for a long time according to written sources until the turn of the 11th and 12th centuries (or maybe, until the middle of the 12th century). The surviving nomadism may also have had a role in the high number of settlement names formed in this way in the later centuries, too.

Thus, the conquering Hungarians after settling down in the Carpathian Basin did not create their own settlement names for decades, because of the simple reason that they did not have settlements with a permanent location, the

names of which could guide them in the territory (KRISTÓ 1997). They referred to the quarters by personal names, as they had done in the South Ukrainian steppe in the case of Levedi's quarters, and when they set up their yurtas farther following the route of the animals, the new place was called by the same person's name. This situation did not allow the possibility of the formation of names given by the Hungarians. The Hungarians did not arrive in a deserted, but in an inhabited region in 895, where the inhabitants had already been living a settled lifestyle, consequently, they had had their settlement names fitting into their name giving system. The Hungarians first met settlement names by borrowing them. (Together with them, they borrowed from the names of the rivers and mountains of the region, but this is not a subject of this treatise.)

The question of what kind of place names the Hungarians found in the Carpathian Basin can be answered in various ways differing significantly in the cases of the different name types. Continuity between the times before 895 and after can be shown mainly in the case of hydronyms, but in the case of settlement names it is much more difficult. The group of the settlement names in question has enormously been reduced by the prerequisite of a straight verification, that is, the settlement name has to be known from an authentic written source from the times before the Hungarians' arrival. Now, there are some sources from the 9th century (before 895) from the west of the Danube in the territory of the Carpathian Basin, although in a meagre quantity, but from the bigger part, i.e. from the east of the Danube, there is none. Thus, we can count with a continuity of settlement names in the western side of the basin only. Our discernment is vexed, because we cannot clearly decide in case of a continuity of the few place names left, originally hydronyms, before and after 895, whether the Hungarians borrowed them as hydronyms, or as settlement names. The Hungarian language has adopted *Ablanza, Durnauua* and *Nitrava* — known from the decades before the arrival of the Hungarians — as *Ablánc, Torba* and *Nyitra,* but it is questionable whether these were originally borrowed hydronyms, or settlement names already, as it is supposedly the case of *Nyitra.*

Pécs and *Keszthely* constitute the short list of those settlements which were undoubtedly not hydronyms originally, and their denominational continuity withstands criticism, however, it is typical, that even in these cases we need some "philological twist" to prove the continuity. The name of Pécs is *Quinque basilicae* around 871, and we can find the form *V. aecclesiae* meaning 'five churches', or 'five Churches' in a Frankish charter fakely dated to 890 (but it can be traced back to an authentic original). This form as *Quinqueecclesiae* was widely used in the Latin of Hungary, as the name of Pécs (the German name of the town, *Fünfkirche,* meaning 'five Churches' originates

from the same), although the Hungarians have never called Pécs as *Ötegyház* ['five Churches' in Hungarian]. Thus, we can suppose that the Hungarian name, *Pécs,* matches an Indo-European (Slavic) word from the times before the Conquest, meaning 'five', which created the Latin forms. The name of *Keszthely* can be easily derived from a Latin word, *castellum,* which may have referred to the fortification of Fenékpuszta near Keszthely, meaning 'castle', or 'fortification', but here we lack the certainty of wether it really referred to that or not. (About the survival of the names see: KRISTÓ 1985, KISS 1997.) In the east of the Danube we cannot justifiably trace back any of the names of the settlements to the times before the Hungarians.

We can get to know from the charter of Veszprémvölgy — written in Greek with an uncertain date — which place names existed in a small part of the Carpathian Basin in the last or the last one and a half decades of the 10th century, but of course, only if we date this document to around 985–990. (Dating it to some decades later, the picture is true of the first quarter of the 11th century, accordingly). Well, there are not any settlement names that have a Hungarian (lastly Finno-Ugric or Uralian) origin among the thirteen settlement names in the charter of Veszprémvölgy. It shows in itself that the Hungarians did not leave traces of any of their denominations which they created from the vocabulary of their Finno-Ugric language, however, their active role in the naming of settlements can be shown in various ways. The name *σάμταγ* has a Hungarian character, and is the progressive present participle of the verb *szánt* 'plough' (so it means *szántó* 'ploughing'), in addition, *Παδρουγου* (today's Padrag[-kút]) and *βεσπρεμ* (today's Veszprém) were created from plain anthroponyms (KRISTÓ 1993: 200–202). We have some knowledge about the denominator of the settlement in the case of Padrag. According to the renewal of the charter of Veszprémvölgy, *Podruc*'s son lived in the village of *Podruc* (DHA 366). In the case of Veszprém, we can claim with high probability that the name *Ortahu,* which can be derived from German, was not borrowed by the Hungarians, but they gave the settlement a new name themselves (BOGYAY 1994: 6–13, SOLYMOSI 2000: 131–132). It is characteristic that in the case of Padrag and Veszprém, too, the denominator's name is of Slavic origin. This can be understood in the way that Slavic people (or Slavic ethnic groups) used to live in these settlements, but the denominators were the Hungarians who settled down nearby. This explanation is strongly supported by the fact that there is a surprisingly high number of names originating from Slavic common nouns (with meanings like 'potters', 'of the Chief', '[settlement] near vine-stocks', '[settlement] beyond the forest', etc.), indicating that a very significant Slavic population used to live in this region, that is, around Lake Balaton, towards the end of the 10th century, and the major part of the settlement names illustrates the Slavs' name-giving activity.

King Saint Stephen's three charters from the first decade of the 11th century (the charters of Pannonhalma, Veszprém, and Pécs), and mainly the deed of foundation of Tihany Abbey from the middle of the century (1055) already show a completely different picture. There is a comparatively high number of common nouns of Uralian (Finno-Ugric, etc.) origin, and they represent a substantial majority in the deed of foundation of Tihany Abbey, which shows the Hungarians' definitive role in the name giving. Although a lot of circumstances refer to the fact that the Slavic-speaking population accounted for a significant number in proportion to the total population of the Carpathian Basin (for almost the half according to the series of conclusions drawn on the basis of the settlement names in St Stephen's age) (KRISTÓ 2000: 12–21), but this was manifested at a low extent in the name giving, in contrast with the earlier charter of Veszprémvölgy. It had various reasons. The Slavic-speaking (and the much smaller Turkish-speaking) population's assimilation had accelerated, and the Hungarian had become the *lingua franca* of the Carpathian Basin after the birth of the Hungarian Kingdom, but what had been decisive is that the nomadic Hungarians had been forced to live a settled lifestyle in higher and higher numbers, which resulted in the commencement and in the wide spread of their settlement name giving. A significant part of the Slavic place names known from the beginning of the 11th century vanished, the rest of them were translated by the Hungarians into their own language (e.g. *Zemogny* = Földvár 'earthwork', *Wisetcha* = [Hegy]Magas 'Mountain-High', etc.). From the very end of the 10th century, and the beginning of the 11th century, we can observe the dynamic advance of the Hungarian name giving. It makes possible that the later centuries of the age of the Árpáds be overviewed by listing the various settlement name types, and not the individual examples.[2]

The plain anthroponymic settlement names are the most caracteristically Hungarian, and the most easily traceable back to the earliest times. An abundant number of examples have remained in various sources showing the vividness of this settlement name type in the later centuries of the age of the Árpáds. Taksony, Chief Árpád the Conqueror's grandson, was buried near the village of Taksony, which stands on the bank of the Danube and still bears his name. When Csanád, the King's military chief, defeated Ajtony, the King's enemy, King St Stephen ordered to call Ajtony's castle *Csanád* from then on, and not *Marosvár,* and it is still the name of the settlement standing on the bank of Mures. St Stephen also donated a property to Bény, whose father, Hont was the King's warrior of German origin, and this property next to the

---

[2] See the detailed elaboration of the following statements and the documentation of the data in KRISTÓ 1976. In the following, we refer to works of special importance only in exceptional cases, and to those that we did not use in our monograph in 1976.

river Garam, still bears his name. The registration of the lands of Pannon-halma in 1093 recorded the origin of their names several times. It is recorded about Tömörd, in Komárom county, and Vének in Győr county, that they received their names each from an inhabitant with the same name. Bailiff Para-buch ordered, in 1266, to abolish the earlier names of several of his land, and to call them *Parabuch.* According to data from 1303, Csany in Pozsony county was named after *Csany,* whose sons are mentioned in the same year. These data provide a clear evidence for the vividness of the settlement name giving in the 13th century.

We also have plenty of data, when the source does not speak about a direct casual relation between a certain person and the settlement bearing their name, but it can be taken for granted after considering various points of view. Besides Bény, several noblemen's names from St Stephen's age (Doboka, Hont, Kajár) served as names of various settlements. It is not accidental that the descendants of Kál, a German person coming with St Stephen's wife, Gizella, also lived 200 years later in a land called *Kál* in Sopron county. Fügöd, a minion of the law who lived in the second half of the 11th century, was also the denominator of a settlement, similarly to Lieutenant Kölcse, or Ugod, Lieutenant of Bakony. Töttös (Becsei Imre's son), who gave his name to Töttös, a settlement in Borsod county, lived in the first half of the 14th century. The village of Gyula in Ugocsa, came to being between 1337 and 1396, because it did not exist according to the perambulation of 1337, but it appeared in the perambulation of 1396. In this case we do not know the denominator, but he must have lived in the middle, or the second half of the 14th century.

Nomadism can provide an explanation at best for a period of plain anthroponymic settlement name giving, but nor for its long survival, neither for its vividness between the 12th and the 14th centuries. There are no written data about the Hungarians' nomadic (or nomad-like) way of life at all after the end of the 11th century (or, maybe, the middle of the 12th century). In certain charters, like the charter of Almádi from 1121, and the charter of Dömös in 1138, the plain anthroponymic settlement names are the majority (among them Christian, or Biblical names, such as *Mihály* 'Michael' or *Ádám* 'Adam', etc.), but there are a lot of similar names in the crusaders' charter of Fehérvár from 1193. In the case of the latter, we almost cannot decide whether the personal names recorded in the perambulation are really still persons' names, or names of the parts of the settlements. As a result of a collection on the basis of a large corpus, what can be certainly stated is that settlement names of this type were created until the middle or the end of the 14th century in higher numbers. Their vividness after the beginning of the 12th century can be explained by the survival of a name giving type inveterated among the Hungari-

ans among different circumstances much earlier, in the end, by a new linguistic trend (or exactly by a linguistic conservativism), in a way, of course, that the motives and the objects of the name giving changed as a consequence of the change of the circumstances. From the 11th century onwards, the proprietor's name was the basis of the name giving, and what was named after this, were not nomadic quarters, or a camp of yurtas any more, but a settlement (or a part of a settlement) with permanent boundaries.

The settlement names originating from tribes' names form a special cluster of the plain anthroponymic settlement names. The Hungarian tribes' names around 950 are the following according to Constantine Porphyrogenitus: *Nyék, Megyer, Kürtgyarmat, Tarján, Jenő, Kér, Keszi* (MORAVCSIK 1984: 46–47). These names have been left to us in about 300 settlement names in the Carpathian Basin. These settlement names differ from those on the list of tribes in that we do not know any settlements bearing the name of *Kürtgyarmat,* but there are *Kürt* and *Gyarmat,* separately. It gives an opportunity to define the date of the genesis of the settlement names from tribes' names. If these had been formed in the Carpathian Basin as early as the middle of the 10th century, or in the fifty years preceding it, there should be settlements bearing the name of *Kürtgyarmat.* But since there are no such names, it is implied that the tribe's names appeared as settlement names after the separation of *Kürt* and *Gyarmat* in the 10th century, and the formation created by the unification of the two tribes, fell apart to its constituting elements. Having the knowledge of the above said about the Hungarian settlement system, the tribes' names in the settlement names could appear around the end of the 10th century, the earliest.

The earliest charter source that contains settlement names originating from tribes' names, is the charter of Veszprém from 1009, when two villages of Kér (according to the original written form *Cari*) appeared. A general rule of the steppe prevailed in that the tribes' names became village names. KÁROLY CZEGLÉDY drew our attention to the fact that "the permanent settlements formed from the earlier nomadic tribal quarters after the decomposition of the clan system, often bore the names of tribes or clans" (CZEGLÉDY 1969: 85). It is highly likely that settlement names of this type were being formed all through the 11th century, when the clan framework embodying the organizing force of the society was falling apart. The disappearance of tribal awareness stopped the formation of the settlement names originating from tribes' names. The time of this is probably the end of the 11th century. However, settlement names having an identical form, but no connection at all with tribes' names may also have been created a few times through transonymization, and transposition of anthroponyms, or in other ways later, even in modern times. The name of *Megyer rét* at the Adriatic sea known from 1308 appeared in a territory that had been under Hungarian rule only at the beginning of the 12th cen-

tury. The denominators of the village of Nyék *(Nichw, Nichuu)* in Pozsony county may have been persons called Nyék from the 12th century. Neither the name of the village of [Alsó]nyék in Tolna county, nor the name of Tarján, a quarter in Szeged, appeared in the Middle Ages at all.

The names referring to natural circumstances and to objects created by people are the earliest in the Hungarian settlement name giving, similarly to the rest of the world. There are several of them among the 54 place names remaining from St Stephen's time, more than one can be derived from Slavic languages, and the rest from Hungarian. Two castles bore the names *Dordomest* and *Duldumast,* the meaning of the first is 'strong castle', and the second is 'long bridge'. A village in Baranya county was called *Zalesé* around the millenial, and the meaning of the Slavic expression is '[settlement] beyond the forest'. In 1009, today's Dunaföldvár was *Zemogny,* meaning 'earth[work]'. The Hungarians later translated it into Hungarian in the form 'Földvár', but they did not do the same with the Slavic name of Visegrád, meaning 'tall castle'. The village of *Fizeg,* today's [Almás]füzitő, appearing around 1005, received its name from the willow-tree *(fűz),* and *Somogy,* appearing as early as around 1002, received its name — known as settlement name and county name, as well — from the cornel *(som).* [Székes]fehérvár, known as St Stephen's sacral center, was named after the colour white of the fortress. This appears in the sources in four languages in the age of the Árpáds (in Hungarian: *Fehérvár,* in Slavic: *Belgrad,* in German: *Weissenburg,* in Latin: *Alba Civitas*). The forms of the base words *(alma, kapu, bálvány)* with the Hungarian *-s* derivative in spite of their Turkish origin, is a clear evidence that the names of *Almás, Kapos* and *Bálványos,* appearing in St Stephen's times, are names naturalized in the Hungarian language, although the first two were still hydronyms at that time, but the settlements next to the river borrowed the name of the water very often; *Bálványos* was the name of a village as early as the beginning of the 11th century. Giving names after natural circumstances, or man-made objects in the nature was extremely vivid during the whole age of the Árpáds, and of course, later, too.

Mainly three suffixes *(-s, -d* and *-i)* played an important role in the Hungarian settlement name giving. We have already mentioned the *-s,* which meant being provided with something, but it also had a diminutive function. Its use cannot be attached to any period, it has been alive since the 11th century until today. The derivative *-d* (earlier *-di*) brings up a lot more problems. Thorough examination proved that it had certainly played a major role in the settlement name giving from St Stephen's age (when villages called *Chimudi, Patadi,* and *Temirdi* were mentioned in Latin and Greek texts) to the 15th century. This is also justified by the fact that settlements which had earlier lacked the derivative *-d,* took it in large numbers in the 13th and 14th centuries. The derivative *-d,* similarly to the *-s,* most often means the abundance of something,

or being provided with something (HAJDÚ 1981). Here we can refer to examples such as *Sárd* [= *Sáros*] 'muddy', *Füred* [= *Fürjes*] 'rich in quail', or *Diód* [= *Diós*] 'rich in walnut-tree'. Sometimes the settlement names with the derivatives *-s,* and *-d,* appear alternately, e.g. *Borsos ~ Borsod, Diós ~ Diód* (what is more, *Diósd*), etc. We can find a remark at Anonymus about the diminutive function of the suffix *-d.* According to this, Bors, known as a participant in the Conquest, "built a castle at the river Bódva, which castle, because of its being small, was given the name Borsod by the local people" (An. 23). The diminutive function of the derivative *-d* manifests itself in providing the settlement called *Kisfalu* with the derivative *-d,* where the *Kis-* adjective of *-falu* in itself refers to smallness.

The settlement names with the derivative *-i* pose several problems. It is not without any difficulties to define and separate the different functions of the *-i* at the end of the settlement names. In earlier settlement names, *-i* was the vowel at the end of the radical, and later it disappeared, however, it resisted the disappearance process for a long time in the relative radical *(-di)* formed together with the *-d.* The *-i* can be a diminutive derivative, as well. We examine in the following only those cases, where the *-i* served as a possessive derivative, and in these cases the *-i* expressed possession, and ownership. Thus, the name of the village of *Apáti* meant 'apáté' [abbot's], *Püspöki* meant 'püspöké' [bishop's], and *Pályi* meant 'Pálé' [Pál's]. It is difficult to decide what can be regarded as the earliest appearance of the *-i* as nomen possessi in the Hungarian settlement name giving, exactly because of the different functions of the *-i.* Research has generally looked for this in the second half of the 11th century, but we cannot exclude the possibility that at the end of the village name *Fyley* (today Füle) in Fejér county, known from 1009, the *-i* can qualify as possessive suffix. If this is so, we can find village names with the *-i* possessive suffix in the earliest stage of the Hungarian settlement name giving, and we can consider the role of the *-i* active until the end of the 15th century. The *-i* possessive suffix took part in the formation of the settlement names most intensively in the 13th and 14th centuries.

The existence or the lack of the suffix *-i,* and the differences experienced here are especially problematic in the ethnonymic settlement names. Thus, we can find a lot of forms like *Oroszi, Olaszi, Horváti, Tóti, Németi* and *Csehi* in the age of the Árpáds. We have to interpret this in the way that the owner of a village with such a name was of Russian *(orosz),* Italian *(olasz),* etc. origin, or the village was inhabited by these people (and as a dwelling it was theirs). At the same time, it is also remarkable that there are no examples of settlement names like **Lengyeli, *Kazári, *Böszörményi, *Besenyői* and **Oláhi.* Usually, a chronological reason is given for this, that is, when the Polish, the Khazars, the Saracens, and the Pechenegs immigrated into the Carpathian Basin, this practice of settlement name giving was not existing yet, and when the

Rumanians called 'oláh' moved in here, it was already non-existent. But two circumstances contradict this explanation. On one hand, the chronology of the formation of the village names with the suffix *-i* described above (which shows that this suffix played an active role in the name giving until the 15th century) is valid for the ethnonymic settlement names, too, on the other hand, it is not true that, for example, the Polish arrived in the Carpathian Basin only before the 11th century, and Rumanians only from the 15th century. Nevertheless, on the basis of our present knowledge, we cannot give a plausible explanation for the duality that the suffix *-i* could be added to certain ethnonyms, but not to others.

Besides, there are a lot of names in the Hungarian settlement name corpus, which take a posterior constituent. These can take various forms, to mention only a few types: the posterior constituent can refer to a compound *(-falva, -laka, -háza, -telke, -szállása, -ülése),* to multitudes of people *(-soka, -népe),* to a settlement having a church *(-egyháza),* etc. The earlier literature claimed that when the plain anthroponymic settlement name giving was losing ground, at the same extent and at the same time, the settlement names with a posterior constituent were gaining significance (that is, the latter replaced the former). But thorough examination pointed out that name giving of the latter type can also be observed from the beginning of the 11th century in Hungary, because *Úrhida* and *Marcalfő* settlements were mentioned as early as 1009, and we can find compound names like *Bogátmezeje, Lovászhalma, Alaphely, Ketellaka, Asszonynépe, Gastatelke, Csemperlaka, Széktelek, Nádateleke, Fehéregyház,* etc. in authentic sources during the 11th and 12th centuries, and *Mikolafalu, Sárófalu, Ivánháza, Papsoka,* etc. appears in charters — which are thought to be fake — from the same time. Sometimes the name left to us only in Latin in the documents of the 11th and 12th centuries suggests the solution that its Hungarian equivalent may have been a name with a posterior constituent. For example, *aceruus Marci* is like that, or *Magna villa,* the former obviously meaning *Márkhalma* 'Márk's hill', and the latter may have already been called *Nagyfalu* 'large village' around 1067 and 1138. However, it is unquestionable that a lot of settlement names without a structural word took a posterior constituent from the 13th century onwards. The fullness of this was beyond the age of the Árpáds, since it reached its peak in the 15th century (KÁZMÉR 1970: 100–104).

We have listed the main types of the settlement name corpus of Hungary in the age of the Árpáds according to a linguistic classification: names without a formant, village names with a derivative, or with a posterior constituent. There might be other classifications, of course, in the first place those that have a historical scientific character. We have mentioned two of them so far, because of their special character: the village names created from tribes' names, and we have shortly considered the ethnonymic settlement names in

connection with the suffix -*i*. These groups, which are important from the historian's point-of-view, can be linguistically classified in several types. There can be derived forms even among the village names originating from tribes' names — the great majority of them originating from plain anthroponyms — which can be regarded as the most homogeneous, (e.g. *Megyercs, Kércs, Kérd*), or forms with a posterior constituent (e.g. *Nyékfalva, Nyékfölde, Jenő-falva, Kéregyház, Kérfalva*). Variability is illustrated by the fact that the randomly selected Christian anthroponym, *Mihály* can appear in the settlement name corpus from the Middle Ages as a plain anthroponymic settlement name (e.g. *[Nagy]mihály* in Zemplén county), with various suffixes (e.g. *Mihál vár* — today's *Mehadia* — in Temes county, or *Mihályi,* originally *Mihály,* in Sopron county), or with a posterior constituent *([Ér]mihályfalva,* originally *Mihály,* in Bihar county, or *Mihályháza* in Veszprém county).

We can discuss here only few of the settlement name types which serve to satisfy the historian's interest. The ethnonymic place names are especially important, because they draw our attention to the fact that a lot of ethnic groups used to live in Hungary in the age of the Árpáds, who also left their traces in village names formed from their ethnonym. The charter form the year of 1075 speaks about Varsány *(Wosciani)* peoples, i.e. peoples speaking an Iranian language, on the confines of Pél in Szolnok county. Some centuries later we can find a village called *Varsány,* which fact could be in itself an authentic proof of the settlement of this ethnic group here, without the data from the year 1075. According to the data from the first half of the 12th century, a *Káliz* clan used to live in Megyer along the river Danube. A village called *Kalász* (today's Budakalász) appeared here later, which preserved the memory of this people having lived here. Of course, not all the ethnonymic settlement names borrowed their denomination directly from the ethnonym, but often via the transposition of an anthroponym. We know, for example, that the denominator of *Orosz* 'Russian' in Borsod county, or the village of *Marót* 'Moravian' in Baranya county lived at the end of the 13th century.

The fact that various ethnic groups lived in Hungary in the age of the Árpáds is revealed in that the different peoples gave names to the same settlement in their own languages. We have already mentioned the example of Székesfehérvár, which had names in four languages (in Hungarian, in Slavic, in German, and in Latin) from the 11th to the 13th century. These names all, without exception, meant the same, 'white castle', thus, they are mirror translations from one language to the other (KRISTÓ 1996). Neither was the situation rare, in which — as a consequence of the effectiveness of different name giving attitudes — the same settlement had completely different names in different languages. Esztergom, St Stephen's principal, and royal seat, was called *Regia civitas* in Latin ('royal town'), *Sobottin* in Slavic ('Saturday' after the Saturday fairs), and later the "Hungarian" *Esztergom* (of Bulgarian-Turkish origin in

reality, meaning 'leather armour') appeared. Also in St Stephen's time, the name of *Győr* was *Raua* (after the river Rába), and *Jauryana civitas* as a Latinized form of the name *Győr,* which may be of Hungarian origin. The different peoples' different attitudes are also revealed, for example, in that the Germans used to call [Nagy]szeben *Hermannstadt* ('Hermann's town'), Brashov was called *Kronstadt* ('town of the crown'), and from it, *Corona* ('crown') in Latin; [Kis]marton, today in Burgenland, was called *Eisenstadt* ('iron castle[town]') by them. But we could mention here the example of Buda, the capital in the late Árpád era, the German name of which was *Ofen* ('oven'). The settlements appearing with names in different languages gave a distinctively colourful character to the settlement name giving in the age of the Árpáds.

The settlement names that were formed from a patrociny are especially important from a cultural historical point-of-view. The number of them is approximately 1440, so they constitute a significant proportion in quantity. We can count with patrociny names in Hungary from the time of the conversion to Christianity, that is, from the end of the 10th century, or the beginning and the middle of the 11th century, varying in the different regions. Where there were churches, the patrociny became the motive of naming the region. An island was called *Szentháromság* 'Holy Trinity' in the charter of Veszprémvölgy, written in Greek. At the same time, the patrociny appeared as a settlement name in various authentic diplomas, like the village of *Szentmárton* in 1061, the village of *Szentgyörgy* in 1091, and *Keresztúr* in the interpolated charter of 1075. The golden age of the formation of settlement names belonging to this type is the second half of the 13th century, and the first half of the 14th century. We do not have to count with a significant quantity of patrocinic village names after the beginning of the 15th century. The settlement names created from patrociny show a diversity from a modal point-of-view; in the half of the cases, the patrociny in itself became a settlement name (so, for example, *Szentkirály, Szentmiklós*), and in the rest of the cases it received various posterior constituents mentioned above. The choice of patrociny gives an opportunity to draw various conclusions in the fields of cultural history and cult history (MEZŐ 1996).

The place names created from trade names are instructive from a social historical point-of-view (HECKENAST 1970, GYÖRFFY 1972: 261–319). The objective basis of their genesis was the serving people's structure, which came to being after the beginning of the 11th century, and existed until the 13th century. Namely, some villages received their names after the obligations of a part of their inhabitants. The earliest examples of this name type can be found in the charter of Veszprémvölgy, where the village names *Γριντζαρι* 'potters' in Slavic, and *σάμταγ* 'ploughing' [*szántó* in Hungarian], pronounced in Hungarian, appeared. Several data verify that the inhabitants' service was the

starting point of the denomination. Thus, royal stablemen [*lovászok* in Hungarian] lived in 1236 in the village of Lovász in Nyitra county; Hetény in Szatmár county received the name *Hodász* later, because beaver hunters [*hodász* or *hódvadász* in Hungarian] used to live there before the Mongol invasion. The denominators of *Nagyszakácsi* in Somogy county were the cooks [*szakácsok* in Hungarian] of Kölked, the neighbouring village. The services which were rendered more often have survived in several village names (at the beginning of the list with 30–50 occurances each there are village names which originated from their inhabitants' trades, who were blacksmiths, vinegrowers, arms manufacturers, and ploughmen), while the names of services rendered rarely have survived in few village names (like 'mead tributary' [*márcadó* in Hungarian], falconer, weaver). A significant part of place names created from trade names have a Slavic origin in the Hungarian language. The settlement names created from trade names can be identical with the plain trade name, or can receive an *-i* suffix, and various posterior constituents.

Those settlement names that render information about holding fairs can be utilized from the point of view of the economic history (SZABÓ 1998). The number of them is 152. The names belonging to this type are diverse, they can refer to the day of the fair (most often with *-hely* 'place' posterior constituent: *Hétfő-, Kedd-, Szerda-, Csütörtök-, Péntek-, Szombathely*), can contain the word *vásár* 'fair' itself, can have a form complemented with the *-hely* 'place' posterior constituent, and with the *-vásáros* 'marketeer' anterior constituent. According to charters with a dubious authenticity, this name type appeared in the 11th century. It flourished in the 13th and the 14th centuries, and such settlement names were not generated after the middle of the 15th century. The spatial arrangement of the village names connected to fairs provides data about the economic development, the frequency of fairs, the road system, the judgement of commercial activity in the regions.

The linguist and the onomastician examining settlement names have to apply the general rules of their profession, and have to put them into practice in the corpus of the names. Not like the historian, who usually does research into processes determined by the society. And this is what he cannot find in place name giving (including settlement name giving). The names of settlements do not imply exclusiveness. People belonging to certain tribes did not only lived in villages denominated after tribes' names, and foreign ethnic groups did not live only in villages denominated after an ethnonym, churches were not only there, where the patrociny was revealed in the settlement name, and there were fairs, where the name does not suggest this. That is, the single settlement name was not chosen from the infinite number of name giving motives in a socially determined way. The accidental moves, and the ethnopsychological motivations had an equally decisive role, and none of them favours the historian's method of investigation. The historian must consider the settlement

name corpus an important source, but she has to consider that using it — similarly to her written sources — requires source criticism and a special treatment because of its special nature.

References

An. = Anonymus, *A magyarok cselekedetei.* Kézai Simon, *A magyarok cselekedetei.* Milleniumi magyar történelem. Források. Budapest, 1999.

BENKŐ, LORÁND (1985) *A magyarság honfoglalás előtti történetéhez* Lëved *és* Etëlköz *kapcsán.* In: *Tanulmányok a magyarság honfoglalás előtti történetéből.* A Magyar Nyelvtudományi Társaság Kiadványai 172. Budapest, pp. 7–37.

BOGYAY, TAMÁS (1994) *A Karoling-kori Veszprém problémája.* In: *Veszprém kora középkori emlékei.* Ed. V. FODOR, ZSUZSA. Felolvasóülések az Árpád-korból 2. Veszprém, pp. 6–13.

CZEGLÉDY, KÁROLY (1969) *Nomád népek vándorlása Napkelettől Napnyugatig.* Körösi Csoma Kiskönyvtár 8. Budapest.

DHA = *Diplomata Hungariae Antiquissima I.* Edendo opero praefuit GREGORIUS GYÖRFFY. Budapestin, 1992.

ELTER, ISTVÁN (1997) *Újabban fellelt arab források a honfoglaláskori magyarság viszonyairól.* In: *Életünk* 1997/1.

GYÖRFFY, GYÖRGY (1963–1998) *Az Árpád-kori Magyarország történeti földrajza I–IV.* Budapest.

GYÖRFFY, GYÖRGY (1972) *Az Árpád-kori szolgálónépek kérdéséhez.* In: *Történelmi Szemle* 15, pp. 261–319.

HA = HOFFMANN, ISTVÁN—RÁCZ, ANITA—TÓTH, VALÉRIA (1997–1998) *Helynévtörténeti adatok a korai ómagyar korból 1–2.* A Magyar Névarchívum Kiadványai 1., 3. Debrecen.

HAJDÚ, MIHÁLY (1981) *Helyneveink* -d-*féle képzőinek funkcióiról.* In: *Tanulmányok a magyar nyelv múltjáról és jelenéről.* Emlékkönyv Benkő Loránd születésének 60. évfordulójára. Budapest, pp.161–172.

HECKENAST, GUSZTÁV (1970) *Fejedelmi (királyi) szolgálónépek a korai Árpád-korban.* Értekezések a történeti tudományok köréből 53. Budapest.

KÁZMÉR, MIKLÓS (1970): *A »falu« a magyar helynevekben (XIII–XIX. század).* Budapest.

KERTÉSZ, MANÓ (1939) *A magyar helynévadás történetéből.* In: *Magyar Nyelvőr* 68, pp. 33–39, 67–77.

KISS, LAJOS (1997) *Pannónia helyneveinek kontinuitása.* In: *Honfoglalás és nyelvészet.* Ed. KOVÁCS, LÁSZLÓ—VESZPRÉMY, LÁSZLÓ. Budapest, pp. 187–197.

KNIEZSA, ISTVÁN (1943) *Keletmagyarország helynevei.* In: *Magyarok és románok I.* Ed. DEÉR, JÓZSEF—GÁLDI, LÁSZLÓ. A Magyar Történettudományi Intézet Évkönyve. Budapest, pp. 111–313.

KRISTÓ, GYULA (1976) *Szempontok korai helyneveink történeti tipológiájához.* Acta Universitatis Szegediensis de Attila József nominatae. Acta Historica 55. Szeged.

KRISTÓ, GYULA (1985) *A Kárpát-medencei helynévanyag kontinuitásának kérdéséhez.* In: *Név és névkutatás.* Az Inczefi Géza halálának 10. évfordulóján rendezett emlékülés előadásai. Ed. BÉKÉSI, IMRE. A Magyar Nyelvtudományi Társaság Kiadványai 170. Budapest, pp. 15–22.

KRISTÓ, GYULA (1988) *Levedia és Etelköz.* In: *Magyar Nyelv* 94, pp. 151–157.

KRISTÓ, GYULA (1993) *Adatok és szempontok a magyar helynévadás kialakulásához a X–XI. század fordulója táján.* In: *Névtani Értesítő* 15, pp. 200–205.

KRISTÓ, GYULA (1995) *A honfoglaló magyarok életmódjáról (írott források alapján).* In: *Századok* 129, pp. 52–54.

KRISTÓ, GYULA (1996) *Székesfehérvár legkorábbi nevéről.* In: *A székesfehérvári Boldogasszony bazilika történeti jelentősége.* Ed. FARKAS, GÁBOR. Közlemények Székesfehérvár város történetéből. Székesfehérvár, pp. 163–179.

KRISTÓ, GYULA (1997) *A Kárpát-medence X. századi helyneveiről.* In: *Magyar Nyelv* 93, pp. 129–135.

KRISTÓ, GYULA (2000) *Magyarország népei Szent István korában.* In: *Századok* 134, pp. 3–44.

KRISTÓ, GYULA—MAKK, FERENC—SZEGFŰ, LÁSZLÓ (1973, 1974) *Adatok "korai" helyneveink ismeretéhez I–II.* Acta Universitatis Szegediensis de Attila József nominatae. Acta Historica 44 (1973), 48 (1974), reprint: 1977. Szeged.

MEZŐ, ANDRÁS (1996) *Templomcím a magyar helységnevekben (11–15. század).* METEM Könyvek 15. Budapest.

MOÓR, ELEMÉR (1936a) *Magyar helynévtípusok.* In: *Népünk és Nyelvünk* 8, pp. 110–117.

MOÓR, ELEMÉR (1936b) *Westungarn in Mittelalter im Spiegel der Ortsnamen.* Acta Litterarum ac Scientarum Reg. Universitatis Hung. Francisco-Iosephinae. Sectio Philologica X. Szeged.

MORAVCSIK, GYULA (1984) *Az Árpád-kori magyar történet bizánci forrásai. Fontes Byzantini historiae Hungaricae aevo ducum et regum ex stirpe Árpád descendentium.* Budapest.

NYITRAI, ISTVÁN (1995) *A magyar őstörténet perzsa nyelvű forrásai.* In: *A honfoglalás korának írott forrásai.* Ed. KRISTÓ, GYULA. Szegedi Középkortörténeti Könyvtár 7. Szeged, pp. 61–76.

SOLYMOSI LÁSZLÓ (2000) *Veszprém korai történetének néhány kérdése.* In: *Válaszúton. Pogányság — kereszténység, Kelet — Nyugat.* Konferencia a X–XI. század kérdéseiről. Ed. KREDICS, LÁSZLÓ. Veszprém.

SZABÓ G. FERENC (1998) *A vásározás emlékei középkori helységneveinkben.* Nyíregyháza.