

THE ROLE OF BODIES OF WATER IN SETTLEMENT NAMES REFERRING TO THE NATURAL ENVIRONMENT ¹

Key words: structural types of settlement names related to water, hydronyms and settlement names of an identical form, direction of metonymy, early Old Hungarian Period

1. INTRODUCTION

Unlike the two other types of settlement names that express a characteristic relationship (those 1. referring to the human environment, e.g., based on a personal name, tribal name, ethnonym, occupational name, etc. and 2. to human activities, e.g., referring to residential buildings, mines, markets, etc.), settlement names referring to the natural environment are related to places and entities that exist independently of human activity. In a semantic and lexical-morphological aspect, the group of toponyms that refers to local relations and general geographical conditions (e.g., names of bodies of water, mountains, forests, plants, animals, etc.) is closely related to other types of names, thus their study may provide us with important information in connection with these as well.

In my paper, I examine the relationship of toponyms referring to the natural environment to bodies of water and places associated with water.² I would like to highlight the role of water and hydronyms in the formation of the settlement name type and the form in which they are present in early Old Hungarian settlement names, more precisely settlement names from the 11th-14th centuries.

¹ This work was carried out as part of the Research Group on Hungarian Language History and Toponomastics (HUN-REN-UD, University of Debrecen—Hungarian Academy of Science).

² Earlier I have examined the relationship between hydronyms and settlement names focusing on the etimological aspects (Kovács, 2019a). In that paper I have analyzed the etymological relationship between some toponyms recorded in 11th–13th-century sources (the Founding Charter of the Tihany Abbey from 1055 and the Land Survey of the Tihany Abbey from 1211).

Examining the structural types of settlement names referring to the natural environment, I have previously found that water plays a significant role in settlement names: the vast majority of settlement names with a single component, standing without a formant, and expressing a local function are of a hydronym origin: 83% of them include single-component hydronyms, 50% of them hydronyms or water-related names with two components (e.g., names of wells and springs, cf. Kovács, 2019b, pp. 165–167). These significant proportions also make it worthwhile to look more closely at the role of hydronyms and names of places related to water in the creation of settlement names. To properly scrutinize this issue, a rich historical corpus of names covering the entire Hungarian language area is needed: I have compiled such data myself from various sources (e.g., KMHsz. 1., HA. 1–4.; Gy. 1–4.; Cs. 1–5.; Kocán, 2017; Kenyhercz, n. d.; Mályusz, 1922/2014, Németh, 1997, 2008; Borovszky, 1898, 1900, ca. 1900, 1904, ca. 1910, 1911, 1914) and recorded them in a database, which currently consists of 2,193 entries from the 11th–14th centuries. This name corpus serves as the basis for my study.

2. STRUCTURAL TYPES OF SETTLEMENT NAMES RELATED TO WATER

The typological descriptions differentiate between three larger structural types among toponyms: 1. single-component names without a formant, 2. single-component names created with topoformants, and 3. the two-component toponyms formed by means of compounding. Semantically, in the particular name constituents feature-indicating, type-indicating and designating functions may be expressed (cf. Hoffmann, 1993, p. 55).

We can find a toponym or a common noun related to water in one third of settlement names referring to the natural environment (in 723 names). The vast majority of the names only have a single component: metonymy, name-giving without a formant, occurs in 85% of the names, e.g. settlement name *Szuha* (1251>1368: *Zvha*, terra, Gy. 2, p. 554) < hydronym *Szuha* (1294: in valle *Zuha*, HA. 2, p. 69); settlement name *Tepla* (1264/1696: *Tepla*, terra, Gy. 4, p. 103), < hydronym *Tepla* (1264/1696: *Tepla*, fluvius, HA. 4, p. 28); settlement name *Ér* (*1214/1550: *Her*, predium, KMHsz. 1, p. 92) < geographical common noun *ér* ‘brook’. In the first two cases, the settlement names refer to a local feature in a semantical sense, while a general geographical relationship is referenced in the latter.

In the second large structural type, the topoformant is attached to a geographical common noun. This type of name-giving is rare: it accounts for only 6% of the names of the settlements. Most frequently, the relevant settlement names include the *-s*, *-d* and *-i* suffixes, e.g. *Mocsaras* (1334: *Mocharus*, terra, Gy. 2, p. 517) < *mocsár* ‘swamp’ + *-s* suffix; *Érd* (+ 1263/1324/1580: *Eerd*, possessio,

Gy. 3, p. 374) < *ér* 'brook' + *-d* suffix; *Árki* (+1086 [ad 1250]: *Arqui*, predium, Gy. 2, p. 346) < *árok* 'trench' + *-i* suffix.

The two-component names also account for a small proportion of the names of the settlements at only 9%. The first name constituent of these two-component settlement names may include a hydronym or a geographical common noun, while in their second name constituent there is either a geographical common noun meaning 'settlement' or a settlement name, e.g. *Kőrösmonostora* 'village/next to the River Kőrös' (1332–5/PR.: *Kewrsmonasterio*, 1376: *Keresmonostora*, possessio, KMHsz. 1, p. 165); *Sárvár* 'mud/village' (1345: *Sarwar*, possessio, Gy. 2, p. 86); *Túrpásztó* 'a settlement called Pásztó/located next to the Túr River' (1281: *Tuparstuha*, villa, Cs. 1, p. 671).

The lexical structure of single-component names related to water and standing without a formant may be of three types: these settlement names may contain 1. a single-component toponym, in this case a hydronym, for example *Lipcse*: 1263: *Lypche*, villa (Gy. 4, p. 69) < 1265/1270: *Lypche*, fluvius (HA. 4, p. 26); *Tepla*: 1264/1696: *Tepla*, terra (Gy. 4, p. 103) < 1264/1696: *Tepla*, fluvius (HA. 4, p. 28), etc. 2. a two-component hydronym or water-related name: e.g. *Kölesér*: 1138/1329: *Kuleser*, villa (KMHsz. 1, p. 163) < *Köles-ér* hydronym 'millet/brook'; *Feketepatak*: 1260: *Feketepotok* (Kocán, 2017, p. 91) < *Fekete-patak* hydronym 'black/watercourse', etc., and 3. a geographical (hydrographic) common noun referring to the aquatic environment: e.g. *Patak*: 1230: *Potahc*, terra (Cs. 3, p. 623) < *patak* 'watercourse'; *Sár*: 1322: *Saar* (Gy. 4, p. 454) < *sár* 'mud', etc.). In more than 90% of the settlement names with a single component and without a formant, there is a water name base that can be identified with certainty (in 44% a single-component and 49% a two-component hydronym). Geographical (hydrographic) common nouns are only marginally involved in the formation of the settlement names of this type (7%).

In this essay I do not want to examine the above mentioned structural types in detail as I have provided a detailed overview of the different structural types with many examples of toponyms related to water in one of my papers (for that see Kovács, 2021, pp. 177–185). In the following I would like to focus on the relationship between settlement names and hydronyms recorded in an identical form in 11th–14th centuries.

3. DIRECTION OF METONYMY (HYDRONYM > SETTLEMENT NAME OR SETTLEMENT NAME > HYDRONYM)

The relationship between hydronyms and settlement names has received considerable attention in Hungarian onomastics. This relationship was examined in the most detail by Loránd Benkő (1947a, 1947b, 1948, later cf. 1998, 2003), who

provided several guidelines in his early work for the determination of the direction of name-giving processes. The main question in these cases is whether the settlement is named after the body of water or vice versa, i.e. whether the body of water received its name from the settlement. In the following, I present some points of reference that can be used to determine the direction of metonymy (hydronym > settlement name or settlement name > hydronym). I illustrate the applicability of each criterion with a wealth of examples.

3.1. Semantic content of the settlement name

In the case of settlement names and hydronyms of an identical form, it is primarily the semantic content of the name that may help us to identify the direction of change. In the case of settlement names of a hydronym origin, István Kniezsa pointed out that it is very difficult to separate the categories of plant names and hydronyms, and considered it likely that a large part of the settlement names formed from plant names were originally hydronyms, arguing for a plant name > hydronym > settlement name change (Kniezsa, 1943–1944/2001, p. 15). Loránd Benkő considered it highly probable that place names that were formed from the names of aquatic plants, aquatic animals, or water-related features were originally also hydronyms. He also points out, however, that not all toponyms containing lexemes of plant names may be included here, since they could, of course, have been created independently of water names as well (Benkő, 1947a, p. 260). In order to prove this assumption, it would be necessary to provide data on the hydronyms of the same form, but there are hardly any place name parallels of this kind from the early period. In addition, we must take into account the contingency of the documentation of names, i.e., the fact that the survival of toponyms in written form is sporadic and in a random manner.

In the name corpus studied here, we can apply this idea to 20% of the single-component hydronyms serving as the basis of settlement names. We may assume a single-component hydronym > settlement name change in this respect mainly in those settlement names whose hydronym counterpart contains a lexeme referring to waterside vegetation: e.g. *Alma* ‘apple’ (1211/1252: *Alma* < +1183/1326/1363: ad *Almam*, Gy. 1, p. 270, 385), *Eger* ‘alder’ (1317: *Egur*, possessio < 1067/1267: *Egur*, rivulus, Gy. 3, pp. 39, 80), *Kőrös* ‘ash tree’ (1319: *Keurus* < 1262/1413: *Kewrus*, aqua, Gy. 1, p. 331), where the plant name appears in the base form.³

³ In some cases, however, the plant names found in the hydronyms that form the basis of the settlement names do not refer to the waterside environment, but are only related to the general flora of the area.

A derived hydronym may have been the antecedent of some settlement names: *Füzes*: *füz* 'willow' + *-s* suffix (1315: *Fyzess* < 1232: *Phizes*, aqua, Gy. 1, pp. 248, 304, 306), *Nádasd*: *nád* 'reed' + *-sd* suffix cluster (1269/1270>1391: *Nadasd*, terra < 1296: *Nadasd*, potok, Gy. 4, p. 41); *Nyárágy*: *nyár* 'poplar' + *-gy* suffix (1238/1377: *Narrag*, terra < [ad 1200]: *Naragy*, fluvius, Gy. 1, pp. 736, 751), etc.

The name-giving of the following settlement names was motivated by hydronyms that refer to aquatic animals: *Hattyás*: *hattyú* 'swan' + *-s* suffix (1296: *Hothyás*, possessio < 1282: *Hathias*, piscina, Gy. 1, pp. 314, 325), *Hodos*: *hód* 'beaver' + *-s* suffix (1326: *Hudus*, possessio < 1326: *Hudus*, fluvius, Gy. 1, pp. 570, 625), *Rákos*: *rák* 'crab' + *-s* suffix (1244/1333 [ad 1241]: *Rakus* < [ad 1200]: *Racus*, fluvius, Gy. 4, p. 550), etc.

Hydronyms — mainly in a derivative form — referring to a characteristic property of water (e.g. size, shape, sound, feature, material, quality, etc.) can be found in the settlement names, e.g. *Aranyos*: *arany* 'gold' + *-s* suffix (1275: *Aranyos*, terra < 1275: *Oronas*, fluvius, Gy. 1, pp. 40, 142, 752), *Kengyeles*: *kengyel* 'stirrup' + *-s* suffix (1347: *Kengeles*, terra < [+1018–38]/[1173–96]> 1412: *Kangalw*, alio vocabulo *Kengeles*, Gy. 1, 728), *Vajas*: *vaj* 'butter' + *-s* suffix (*1237: *Woyos* < [+1018–38]/[1173–96]>1409: *Vayas*, lacus, Gy. 1, pp. 695, 729), and the hydronym > settlement name *Keskeny*: *keskeny* 'narrow' (1327: *Kesekun*, possessio < 1075/+1124/+1217: *Kesekun*, aqua, Gy. 1, pp. 896, 899) where the adjective appears in the base form.

The meaning of obscured hydronyms that originally had a complex structure, as well as the settlement names created from them metonymically, is less clear to the name-users. We may mention, for example settelelement names *Berettyó* (1213/1550: *Beruchyó* < 1213/1550: *Beruchyó*, cf. *berek* 'grove along the river' + *jó* 'river', Gy. 1, pp. 569, 613, 668), *Hájó* (1249: *Hewyo*, possessio < 1288/1326: *Heuyo* cf. *hő* ~ *hév* 'heat' + *jó* 'river' Gy. 1, pp. 570, 672), *Sajó* (1332–5/Pp.Reg.: *Soyo* < 1230/1349: *Syov*, fluvius, cf. *só* 'salt' + *jó* 'river', Gy. 2, pp. 43, 66). The complexity of these name structures started to deteriorate in the Old Hungarian Era already, due to the obsolescence of the geographical noun they included with the meaning of 'watercourse'.

The semantic aspects seem to be of little relevance in the case of the large number of loan hydronyms that entered Hungarian, but their primary semantic structure also offers a clue regarding the primacy of the hydronym. For example, water names *Béla* 'white' (cf. 1228: *Bela*, terra < 1228: *Bela*, torrens, Gy. 1, p. 433) or *Csarnavoda* 'black water' (cf. 1299/1435: *Charnawoda* < 1270/1272>1393: *Churnawoda*, Gy. 1, pp. 520, 543–544), which also serve as the basis for certain settlement names, refer to the color of water for users of the Slavic language from which it is borrowed, but speakers of Hungarian can only perceive this semantic feature in the case of a certain degree of bilingualism at most.

3.2. Settlement names formed from common nouns meaning ‘water’

In his early work, Loránd Benkő also pointed out that the settlement names in which the geographical nouns referring to streams, brooks, and water occur, were also formed from water names (Benkő, 1947a, pp. 259–260; 1948, p. 98). In the opinion of Erzsébet Győrffy, settlement names containing a hydrographic common noun can generally be regarded as the result of secondary name formation (Győrffy, 2011, p. 158).

In the name corpus examined, 6% of the single-component settlement names have the same form as the geographical common nouns referring to water or water-related places. The most commonly used hydrographic common nouns are: *patak* ‘watercourse’ (cf. *Patak*: 1230: *Potahc*, terra, Cs. 3, p. 623, Sopron County; 1271/1805: *Potok*, Kocán, 2017, p. 93, Ugocsa County; 1255: *Potok*, villa, Gy. 4, p. 49, Nógrád County, etc.), *sár* ‘mud’ (cf. 1322: *Saar*, Gy. 4, p. 454), *árok* ‘trench’ (cf. 1301: *Aruk*, possessio, Gy. 3, p. 67), *sziget* ‘island’ (cf. 1324: *Zygeth*, possessio, KMHsz. 1, p. 263) and *ér* ‘brook’ (cf. *1214/1550: *Her*, praedium, KMHsz. 1, p. 92).

A suffix may also be attached to geographical common nouns meaning ‘water’ and ‘water-related place’ (4%). The most common suffixes to be observed in this role are *-s*, *-i* and *-d*: e.g. *Árkos* < *árok* ‘trench’ + *-s* (1330: *Arkus*, Gy. 2, p. 131), *Kutas* < *kút* ‘spring, well’ + *-s* (1211: *Cutus*, KMHsz. 1, p. 169), *Árki* < *árok* ‘trench’ + *-i* (+1086 [ad 1250]: *Arqui*, praedium, Gy. 2, p. 346), *Éri* < *ér* ‘brook’ + *-i* (1326: *Eery*, possessio, KMHsz. 1, p. 93), *Érd* < *ér* ‘brook’ + *-d* (+1263/1324/1580: *Eerd*, possessio, Gy. 3, p. 374), *Fertőd* < *fertő* ‘marsh, swamp’ + *-d* (1234: *Ferteud*, villa, Cs. 3, p. 608), etc.

Several suffixes may be attached to the same base word. We could see this, for example, in the case of settlement names presented above: (*árok* ‘trench’ >) *Árkos*, *Árkosd*, *Árki*, (*ér* > ‘brook’) *Érd*, *Éri*, *Ercs*, (*sár* ‘mud’ >) *Sárd*, *Sári*, *Sáros*, *Sárosd*, etc.

These settlement names, however, bear the marks of transition even though they fundamentally refer to general geographical features. It can transpire that a natural name is created from a given common noun (e.g. 1255: *Potok*, flumen, HA. 4, p. 49, Nógrád County), which is metonymically transformed into a settlement name (1255: *Potok*, villa, Gy. 4, p. 49, Nógrád County) and thus a local feature is expressed in the settlement name, while structurally it should be included among those containing a toponym (single-component toponym). Since, however, the microtoponym that could be identified as an antecedent in many cases cannot be found in records, due to a lack of data it is not an easy task to confirm which of the settlement names with a common noun base word refer to local relations and include a toponym (in many cases it is downright impossible).

Hydrographic common nouns may also be found as the second constituent of the two-component hydronyms serving as the basis of settlement names, what is more, this is their main form of use. Most often, the *kút* ‘spring, well’ (19%), *patak* ‘watercourse’ (14%), and *tó* ‘lake’ (9%) geographical common nouns appear as the second constituents of clearly identifiable two-components hydronyms and names related to water in settlement names with a semantic structure meaning ‘settlement near a certain watercourse, stagnant water, spring, well, etc.’, for example *Hidegkút* ‘cold/spring, well’ (1289: *Hydegkuth*, Gy. 3, p. 292), *Feketepatak* ‘black/watercourse’ (1260: *Feketepotok*, Kocán, 2017, p. 91), *Fehértó* ‘white/lake’ (1220/1550: *Fehекton*, villa, 1326/1326: *Feyrtou*, possessio, Németh, 1997, p. 74), etc. A great part of settlements including the *fő* ‘source’ and *tő* ‘estuary, end of the river’ second constituents in their names were established at the source or estuary of a watercourse or nearby it, thus the settlement could receive its name referring to the area around the source or estuary based on a spatial relationship, as for example, in the case of *Körös-fő* ‘the source of the Körös watercourse’ > *Köröső* (1276: *Crysfev*, terra, KMHsz. 1, p. 164) ‘settlement established at the source of the Körös’ metonymy. Besides the metonymic source/estuary name > settlement name change, however, this type of settlement name could also be created analogically, i.e., without the actual use of the source name or estuary name (Györffy, 2011, pp. 158–159). Valéria Tóth, in her analysis of settlement names with the *fő* ‘source’ second constituent, found that this lexeme moved away from its primary ‘source, beginning’ meaning, and with a certain degree of semantic change it became a secondary settlement name formant meaning ‘a settlement with a special attribute,’ or more precisely ‘a settlement located next to a body of water, mostly nearby the source’ (Tóth 2008, pp. 182–183). The *Szuha**fő* settlement with a river name + *fő* ‘source’ structure, for example, is a bit further away, about 4–5 kilometers from the source of the *Szuha* brook (cf. Tóth, 2008, p. 183, Györffy, 2011, 159).

3.3. Several settlements with the same name near a watercourse

Scholarly publications also assume a hydronym > settlement name direction of change when several settlements with the same name as the hydronym are located along a river (cf. Benkő, 1947a, p. 261; Györffy, 2011, pp. 159–160). However, the semantic background of the name may further nuance this statement.

The primacy of the hydronym is likely in such cases if the name contains a Slavic base word referring to the characteristic property of water. The following examples may be mentioned in this regard: 1. a name referring to the state of water, e.g. hydronym *Szuha* (1294: *Zuha*, Gy. 2, p. 459, 554, cf. Slavic **suchъ* ‘dry’, cf. FNESz.) > settlement name *Szuha* (1. 1278/1281/1386: *Zuha*; 2.

1251>1368: *Zvha*; 3. 1323: *Zwha*, Gy. 2, p. 554); 2. a name expressing the temperature of water, eg. *Tapolca* ([1235–43]/1288: *Tapulcha*, fluvius, Gy. 2, pp. 458, 490, cf. **topľь* ~ *teplь* ‘warm’, cf. FNESz.) > *Tapolca* (1. 1243/1335: *Toplucha*; 2. 1258/1334: *Toplicha*, Gy. 2, p. 555); 3. a name referring to the movement of water, e.g. *Beszterce* (1288/1390>1394: *Bezterche*, KMHsz. 1, p. 55, Beszterce region, cf. Slavic. **bystrь* ‘swift-flowing stream’, cf. FNESz.) > *Beszterce* (1. 1241: *Byzturch*; 2. 1332-6/PR.: *Bystrica*, KMHsz. 1, pp. 55–56); 4. a name reflecting the sound effect produced by the swift flow of water, e.g. *Rima* (1246/1383: *Rima*, flumen, Gy. 2, pp. 459, 548, cf. *рымъ* ‘cry’, cf. FNESz.) > *Rima* (1. 1285: *Rymwa*; 2. *1331: *Ryma*; 3. 1268/1278: *Rymua*, Gy. 3, pp. 270–271); 5. a name referring to the fauna on the waterfront, e.g. *Szernye* (+?1248/1393: *Scerneue*, Gy. 1, pp. 519, 537, cf. **сьрна* ‘deer’, cf. Győrffy, 2011, p. 138) > *Szernye* (1. 1270/1272/1476: *Zyrnuu*; 2. 1338: *Zerne*, p., KMHsz. 1, p. 263); 6. a name formed from a common noun meaning water, e.g. *Szalatnya* (1278: *Zlatna*, Gy. 4, pp. 210, 233, 306, cf. Serb.-Croatian *slatina* ‘sour spring’, Czech *slatina* ‘swamp’, cf. FNESz.) > *Szalatnya* (1. 1265: *Zalathna*, villa; 2. 1271: *Zalathna*, possessio; 3. 1294/1358: *Zalathna*, terra, Gy. 4, p. 295), etc. But hydronyms of an internal origin may also be mentioned among the instances of this criterion. Settlement names *Kerektó* (1342: *Kerekthov*, terra, Cs. 3, p. 70 < hydronym *Kerek-tó* ‘round/lake’), and *Szigetfő* (1. +1109 [1295 e.]: *Scigetfev*; 2. 1281: *Zygethfew*, Gy. 2, pp. 407, 441 < hydronym *Sziget-fő* ‘island/ source’) may have been formed from two-component hydronyms originally.

In other cases, however, the semantic character of the name suggests the primacy of the name of the settlement when assessing the name relationship between settlements with the same name near a watercourse. Next to the *Garadna* brook (1234/1243: fluvius *Grathna*) in the former Abaúj County, two settlements called *Garadna* (1. 1234/1243: villa *Gradna*; 2. 1259: terra *Granna*, KMHsz. 1, p. 109) were established with the identical name. In the case of *Garadna*, however, the settlement names could rather be considered to primarily be based on the etymological antecedent. The toponym is of Slavic origin; cf. Serbian-Croatian *Gradna* and Czech *Hradná* toponyms, the basis of which is the word *gradь* ‘castle’ (cf. Tóth, 2001, p. 61). A similar settlement name > hydronym change may be supposed in the case of other toponyms of a Slavic origin as well (eg., in the Polish *Istebna* and Slovakian *Istebné* toponyms (cf. Slovakian *istebna* ‘small chamber’) > Hungarian *Isztebne* settlement name (1316: possessio *Iztebna*) > *Isztebne* hydronym (1316: fluvius *Iztebna*, KMHsz. 1, p. 136). Erzsébet Győrffy calls attention to the fact that this type of transformation can clearly only refer to the process taking place in the transferring language; the settlement name and hydronym of an identical form could enter the Hungarian toponymic system simultaneously as well (Győrffy, 2011, p. 66).

3.4. The size of the body of water

In scholarly studies, the size of the body of water is also an important factor in determining the etymological direction in the case of hydronyms and settlement names of the same form. Loránd Benkő is of the opinion that in the case of larger bodies of water, water may have been the primary name giver, as their names were formed much earlier than the names of the settlements that were created next to them (Benkő, 2003, p. 136). The Roman name of *Arrabona*, which is now *Győr*, can be traced back to the Indo-European water name *Arrabo* ‘Rába’ (cf. **ēreb(h)-*, **ōrob(h)* ‘dark reddish, brownish’, cf. FNESz.).

However, we have to be especially careful with the hydronym > settlement name metonymy, since the reverse direction can also occur (as there is no taxonomic obstacle to this), i.e., some settlement names could have become hydronyms metonymically without adding any formants. In the case of larger bodies of water, we can assume a change from hydronym to settlement name as indeed being more likely, but in the case of a medium and smaller size, we can expect the reverse, the change from settlement name to hydronym, to be at least as likely. The name *Hecse* in Bars County shows this type of change. The *Hecse* hydronym (1234/1364: *Hecha*, fluvius, Gy. 1, pp. 447, 476, cf. Tóth, 2001, p. 201) was metonymically derived from the *Hecse* settlement name (+1209/17th century: *Hecze*, Gy. 1, pp. 447, 480) with roots in the Slavic personal name. Here we can also mention, for example, the settlement name *Nyésta* of a personal name origin (1255: *Neste*, possessio, Gy. 1, p. 125, Abaúj County) > *Nyésta* watercourse name (1256: *Neste*, rivulus, Gy. 1, p. 125) change.⁴ A settlement name antecedent may also be assumed in connection with the names of *Monaj* in Abaúj County (1311: *Monay*; 1256: *Monay*, rivulus, Gy. 1, pp. 102, 120, 125), as according to Loránd Benkő, the *-j* suffix played a role primarily in the creation of settlement names (e.g. *Halmaj*, *Tokaj*). In some cases, the direction of change cannot be established unambiguously, as indicated by the conflicting opinions of researchers. In

⁴ If the settlement names and hydronyms have the same form and are derived from a personal name or a common noun referring to a person, scholars generally consider the name of the settlement to be the primary one (cf. Györffy, 2011, pp. 65–66). Among hydronyms, however, it is not uncommon to find personal name structures without a formant which designate the place in question as a fishing place after its owner. It is highly probable that this motivation (i.e., the possession of a fishing place) was the basis for the naming of the hydronym *Kolon* in Fejér County (1055: *culun*, aqua; 1211: *Colun* ~ *Colon*, stagnum, Kovács, 2015, pp. 25–26, 106–108), which is mentioned in the Tihany charters. In this case, therefore, the hydronym with a personal name basis became the name of the settlement (1211: *Colon*, praedium, Kovács, 2015, pp. 25–26), and this is supported also by the text of the 1055 charter. The homonymy of the settlement name and the lake name may have been ended by the temporary depopulation of the inhabited place and the emergence of a new village with a new name (*Zsák*, 1421: *Isak*, Cs. 3, p. 333).

connection with *Kolbása* ([end of the 13th century]: *Kulkasa* [f: *Kulbasa*], villa, Gy. 1, p. 114) in Abaúj County, Šmilauer considers the name of the settlement derived from the personal name to be the primary one (Šmilauer, 1932, pp. 440, 495), while Lajos Kiss considers the name of the settlement to be derived from the name of the hydronym (1270/1272: *Kulbasa*, rivulus, Gy. 1, pp. 40, 83, 114; Kiss, 1987, p. 338).

It is also worth adding that the size of the bodies of water should only be considered as a criterion with great caution. The perception of size is rather relative, however, and we know that no settlements were named this way from our largest rivers (e.g. the *Tisza*, the *Danube*, cf. Györffy, 2011, p. 160).

Benkő's studies have also highlighted the complexity of the system of section names, namely that smaller streams flowing through several settlements may be named differently at each place: "At the origin of a stream it usually bears the name of the border area where it originates. When it joins several other smaller watercourses, the name changes, a plant name, a personal name, etc. is attached to it. Downstream, at the mouth of the stream, the name changes again. Here it takes its name from the village from the direction of which it flows." (Benkő, 1947b, p. 17, quotation translated from Hungarian by É.K.) This phenomenon can sometimes be observed in historical times also. In the early Old Hungarian Era, the lower course of the *Szikszó* stream (1067/1267: *Scekszov*, Gy. 3, pp. 39, 136) was called *Bába ere* (1327, 1346: *Babaere*, Gy. 3, pp. 39, 68, 101), the middle course *Szalók* (1323/1446: *Zalouk* [f: *Zalowk*], Gy. 3, pp. 39, 133), and the upper course was referred to as *Bátor pataka* (1295: *Bathurpataka*, Gy. 3, pp. 39, 70). The water flowing at the border of the settlement of *Kesző* in Gömör County (1232>1347: *Kezew*, rivulus, Gy. 2, p. 515) is mentioned in the same way as the name of the settlement (1268/1273: *Kezu*, terra, Gy. 2, pp. 515, 518), but in its upper part it is referred to as *Herepány* (1323: *Harypan*, Gy. 2, p. 509) in charters. According to Erzsébet Györffy, the section names of rivers and longer streams "actually belonged to the mental map of a closed community, i.e., these names were not related to each other, since the name-users were probably not even aware that the same referent was named differently elsewhere" (Györffy, 2011, pp. 44–45, quotation translated from Hungarian by É.K.).

These names are thus the denominations of the same referent in different toponymic systems and given by different name-giving and name-using communities. From among the section names, it is presumably the name given by the more prestigious linguistic community which then became the name of the whole watercourse, for example, the name of *Duna* 'Danube', since in Antiquity the *Duna* name of the upper stream of the river (Greek *Δανούβιος* ~ Latin *Danuvius*) was transferred to the lower stream (formerly called **Ιστρος* ~ *Hister*) during a Celtic expansion (cf. Györffy, 2011, p. 45).

3.5. Conclusion

In my paper, I have shown that bodies of water play a significant role in the names of settlements. Looking at the structure of these settlement names, we found that the vast majority of names have a single component: metonymy, name-giving without a formant, occurs in 85% of the names. This means that the character of the name type is clearly defined by the single-component structure. Because of the significant proportions, I have also dealt in detail with the specification of the etymological direction of change in the case of hydronyms and settlement names with the same form. I have tried to collect those points of reference and criteria which, with due care, can be used to identify the direction of metonymy successfully. I have also tried to point out that the hydronym > settlement name direction of change should not be generalized, instead, each case should be judged individually in terms of the process of name formation. When assessing specific cases, the examination of different aspects (e.g. etymological, name typological arguments, Latin context, etc.) may prove to be useful. However, we must also accept that in many cases we still do not have clear answers to our questions even after such scrutiny.

REFERENCES

- Benkő, L. (1947a). *Víz-és helységneveink viszonyához*. [The relationship between Hungarian hydronyms and settlement names]. *Magyar Nyelv*, 43, 259–263.
- Benkő, L. (1947b). *A Nyárádmunte földrajzinevei*. [Geographical names of Nyárádmunte]. (A Magyar Nyelvtudományi Társaság Kiadványai 74.). Budapest: Magyar Nyelvtudományi Társaság.
- Benkő, L. (1948). A székelyföldi szláv eredetű víznevek kérdéséhez. [Supplement to the question of Slavic hydronyms from Székelyföld]. *Magyar Nyelv*, 44, 95–101.
- Benkő, L. (1998). *Név és történelem. Tanulmányok az Árpád-korról*. [Names and history. Studies of the Árpád Era]. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.
- Benkő, L. (2003). *Beszélnék a múlt nevei. Tanulmányok az Árpád-kori tulajdonnevekről*. [Names of the past speak to us. Studies of the proper names of the Árpád Era]. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.
- Borovszky, S. (1898). *Magyarország vármegyéi és városai. Vas vármegye*. [Counties and Towns of Hungary. Vas County]. Budapest: Magyar Tudományos Akadémia.
- Borovszky, S. (ca. 1900). *Magyarország vármegyéi és városai. Zemplén vármegye*. [Counties and Towns of Hungary. Zemplén County], Budapest: Magyar Tudományos Akadémia.
- Borovszky, S. (1904). *Magyarország vármegyéi és városai. Pozsony vármegye*. [Counties and towns of Hungary. Pozsony County], Budapest: Magyar Tudományos Akadémia.
- Borovszky, S. (ca. 1910). *Magyarország vármegyéi és városai. Temes vármegye*. [Counties and towns of Hungary. Temes County], Budapest: Magyar Tudományos Akadémia.
- Borovszky, S. (1911). *Magyarország vármegyéi és városai. Torontál vármegye*. [Counties and towns of Hungary. Torontál County]. Budapest: Magyar Tudományos Akadémia.
- Borovszky, S. (1914). *Magyarország vármegyéi és városai. Somogy vármegye*. [Counties and towns of Hungary. Somogy County]. Budapest: Magyar Tudományos Akadémia.

- Cs. = Csánki, D. (1890–1913). *Magyarország történelmi földrajza a Hunyadiak korában I–III., V.* [Historical geography of Hungary at the time of the Hunyadis] (Vols. 1–3, 5). Budapest: Magyar Tudományos Akadémia.
- Gy. = Györffy, Gy. (1963–1998). *Az Árpád-kori Magyarország történelmi földrajza I–IV.* [Historical geography of Hungary in the age of the Árpád Dynasty] (Vols. 1–4). Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.
- FNESz. = Kiss, L. (1988). *Földrajzi nevek etimológiai szótára 1–2.* [Etymological dictionary of geographical names.] (Vols. 1–2). Fourth, extended and revised edition. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.
- Györffy, E. (2011). *Korai ómagyar kori folyóvíznevek.* [Early old Hungarian names of rivers]. Debrecen: Debreceni Egyetemi Kiadó.
- HA. = Hoffmann, I. & Rácz, A. & Tóth, V. (Eds.) (1997). *Helynévtörténeti adatok a korai ómagyar korból.* 1. Abaúj–Csongrád vármegye. [Data on toponymic history from the Early Old Hungarian Era 1. Abaúj–Csongrád Counties], Debrecen. (1999). 2. Doboka–Győr vármegye. [2. Doboka–Győr Counties], Debrecen. (2012). 3. Heves–Küküllő vármegye. [3. Heves–Küküllő Counties], Debrecen: Debreceni Egyetemi Kiadó. (2017). 4. Liptó–Pilis vármegye. [4. Liptó–Pilis Counties], Debrecen: Debreceni Egyetemi Kiadó.
- Hoffmann, I. (1993). *Helynevek nyelvi elemzése.* [The Linguistic analysis of toponyms]. Debrecen: A Debreceni Kossuth Lajos Tudományegyetem Magyar Nyelvtudományi Intézetének Kiadványai 61.
- Kenyhercz, R. (n. d.). *A középkori Szepes vármegye helyneveinek adatbázisa.* [The database of toponyms in medieval Szepes County] [Manuscript].
- Kiss, L. (1987). Földrajzinév- és szövejtő vizsgálatok. [Toponymic and etimological studies]. *Magyar Nyelv*, 83, 331–345.
- KMHsz. = Hoffmann, I. (Ed.) (2005). *Korai magyar helynévszótár 1000–1350.* 1. Abaúj–Csongrád vármegye. [A Dictionary of early Hungarian toponyms 1000–1350. 1. Abaúj–Csongrád Counties]. Debrecen: Debreceni Egyetem Magyar Nyelvtudományi Tanszéke.
- Knieszsa, I. (2001). *Keletmagyarország helynevei.* [Toponyms of Eastern Hungary]. Budapest: Lucidus Kiadó. (Original work published 1943–1944).
- Kocán, B. (2017). *Helynévtörténeti vizsgálatok a régi Ugocsa megyében.* [Studies in hisorical toponomastics in old Ugocsa County]. Debrecen: Debreceni Egyetemi Kiadó.
- Kovács, É. (2015). *A Tihanyi összeírás mint helynévtörténeti forrás.* [The land survey of the Abbey of Tihany as source for historical toponomastics]. Debrecen: Debreceni Egyetemi Kiadó.
- Kovács, É. (2019a). The Relationship between Early Hydronyms and Settlement Names. *Onomastica Uralica*, 15, 65–74.
- Kovács, É. (2019b). A természeti környezetre utaló településnevek strukturális kérdései. [Structural questions of the settlement names referring to the natural environment]. *Helynévtörténeti Tanulmányok*, 15, 163–178.
- Kovács, É. (2021). Structural Types of Settlement Names Referring to the Natural Environment. *Namenkundliche Informationen*, 113, 177–191.
- Mályusz, E. (2014). *Turóc megye kialakulása.* [The development of Turóc County] (New ed.). Máriabesnyő: Attraktor. (Original work published 1922)
- Németh, P. (1997). *A középkori Szabolcs megye települései.* [The settlements of medieval Szabolcs county]. Nyíregyháza: Ethnica Kiadás.
- Németh, P. (2008). *A középkori Szatmár megye települései a XV. század elejéig.* [The settlements of medieval Szabolcs County until the beginning of the 15th century]. Nyíregyháza: Jósza András Múzeum Kiadványai 60.
- Šmilauer, V. (1932). *Vodopis starého Slovenska.* Praha–Bratislava: Nákl. Učené společnosti Šafaříkovy.
- Tóth, V. (2001). *Az Árpád-kori Abaúj és Bars vármegye helyneveinek történeti-etimológiai szótára.* [The historical-etimological dictionary of the toponyms of Abaúj and Bars counties in the Árpád era]. Debrecen: Debreceni Egyetem Magyar Nyelvtudományi Tanszéke.
- Tóth, V. (2008). *Településnevek változástipológiája.* [Change typology of settlement names]. Debrecen: Debreceni Egyetem Magyar Nyelvtudományi Tanszéke.

SUMMARY

In this essay I examine the relationship of settlement names to bodies of water and places associated with water. I highlight the role of water and hydronyms in the formation of the settlement name type and the form in which they are present in early Old Hungarian settlement names. The vast majority of the settlement names only have a single constituent: metonymy, name-giving without a formant occurs in 85% of the names (e.g. *Ér* < *ér* 'brook', *Tapolca* < hydronym *Tapolca*, etc.), while 6% of the names were created from a common noun related to water or from a hydronym with a topofor- mant (e.g. *Árki* < *árok* 'trench' + *-i* suffix etc.). The two-constituent names also account for a small proportion of the names of the settlements at only 9% (e.g. *Szamosfalva* 'village/next to the River Szamos', *Túrpásztó* 'settlement called Pásztó/located next to the Túr River' etc.).

I also discuss the relationship between settlement names and hydronyms recorded in an identical form. I collect those points of reference and criteria which, with due care, can be used to identify the direction of metonymy successfully (e.g. etymological and name typological arguments, the size of the body of water etc.). I also highlight that the hydronym > settlement name direction mostly accepted in publications on Hungarian historical onomastics cannot be generalized but instead each case has to be examined separately in terms of the name formation process.