Changes of Toponyms Reflecting Ecclesiastical Possession in Medieval Hungary*

Andrea Bölcskei
Hungary

Abstract

Based on a corpus of medieval Hungarian toponyms referring to the possession of a clergyman, and the possession of a religious order, this paper focuses on the patterns of possible structural and semantic changes of name forms reflecting early ecclesiastical possession. Simple changes involve processes such as the addition, change or loss of a topoformant; the addition, change or loss of a suffix; the addition, change or loss of a geographical common noun; the change of a specific name constituent; the addition, change or loss of a distinctive addition; the change from a suffixed to a compound name form and vice versa; the appearance and disappearance of alternative name forms; the addition, change or loss of semantic content in the name form; foreignization and domestication; and the complete change of a toponym. Furthermore, these processes are sometimes combined together in a single attested change, or appear in the source documents one after the other in a sequence of consecutive simple changes, constituting instances of complex changes. The author uses the principles of Cognitive Linguistics to explore how toponyms in this case were utilized to direct speakers' attention to a culturally significant Church-related aspect of the places bearing the names.

* * *

The Church as a Feudal Landowner in Medieval Hungary

In the medieval Kingdom of Hungary, institutions of the hierarchical secular church organization (archbishoprics, bishoprics, chapters, archdeaconries and parishes), the basics of which were established before the end of the 11th century by the first kings of the Árpád dynasty, and those of monasticism (monasteries of certain monastic, chivalric, mendicant and semi-hermit orders),[1] founded by royalty and important noble families mostly during the 11th-14th centuries, got their financial support from two sources: tithes and the income gained from ecclesiastical estates. Tithes imposed on agricultural products (by King Stephen I, reigning between 997 and 1038),[2] customs and taxes (by King Coloman I, reigning between 1095 and 1116) were given to the Church as an organization and allotted to the bishops of dioceses. A quarter of the tithe was given to parish priests by their superior diocesan bishops. The Church, however, was also entitled to income as a feudal landowner, possessing considerable tracts of land, held by church dignitaries and monasteries or chapels.

---

[1] In Hungary, monastic orders such as the Benedictines, the Cistercians, the Premonstratensians, as well as chivalric orders such as the Knights Templar, the Hospitallers and the Order of Saint Lazarus appeared in the 11th and 12th centuries. Mendicant orders such as the Dominicans and the Franciscans, and (semi-)hermit orders such as the Carthusians and the Paulines, launched in later times, however, they soon became much more popular than the monastic ones (Kristó 1999: 87-91; Kristó 2003: 132-138, 178-179, 194, 213-214, 258-260). For further details on the organization of the Church in Medieval Hungary see also Bölcskei (2013).

[2] Stephen reigned first as a ruling prince, then, after the millennium, as a king of Hungary.

The annual amount of the tithes was strongly dependent on the number of the devout Christian population and on the amount of crops produced in a given year; most clerical land, however, had come into the possession of the Church by the end of the 11th century, providing constant revenues for the church organization and its representatives (Kristó 1999: 103).

To ensure the conditions for operation, donation of land and real assets (lakes, forests, villages, etc.) was a customary practice whenever a bishopric, chapter or monastery was founded in the country. In the 11th century, the most generous bestower was definitely the king, as he founded most of the ecclesiastical institutions. Affluent noblemen also granted tracts of their land to the Church as a gift for the sake of their salvation, or as a bequest; alternatively, they established private monasteries or churches, equipped with landed properties. Monasteries established by the king were usually richer than those founded by landlords. Monasteries, abbeys, parishes and church offices, as a result of chance donations, usually owned widely spread properties. The bishops of dioceses could count on a regular and stable income stream from their estates, although parish priests had to be satisfied with slender means. Landed wealth gained by inheritance and earned by position was intertwined in the case of the members of the ecclesiarchy: sons of rich aristocrats often became prelates, bishops were entitled to keep for themselves a quarter of the goods they obtained while they were in service. An economic responsibility of the Church as a feudal landowner was to teach secular people by example to improve farm profitability. The economic welfare the Church could achieve was undoubtedly higher, thus more attractive, than most previous attempts (Kristó 1999: 104-107; Kristó 2003: 150-151, 258-260; Mályusz 2007: 19-20, 31).

The strong connection between church and state was unquestioned in Medieval Hungary: the basic moral principles of Christianity enhanced respect and service for superiors and protection of the inferiors in society as required by the contemporary feudal political system, while the state legitimized the authority of the Church by making and acknowledging it as a feudal landowner. Data suggest that by the turn of the 14th-15th centuries 12.1% of landed property in the country was possessed by the Church. At the beginning of King Matthias's reign (1458-1490), 10.3% of the castles and 17.4% of the towns, including wealthy market-towns, were in ecclesiastical hands. Although some historians emphasize that the total area of clerical lands at the end of the Middle Ages, when ecclesiastical possession was the most extensive, did not exceed 15% of the territory of the country, which was far below the European average, we cannot doubt that the Church's income from its lands by that time must have been significant, possibly more than the amount of the tithe (Kubinyi 1999: 69-86; Kristó 1999: 106-107; Kristó 2003: 150-151, 258-260; Engel *et al*. 2003: 225).

In these circumstances, it is not surprising that the Church wanted to display its role as a feudal landowner in place names as well. Evans and Green observe that 'language provides ways of directing attention to certain aspects of the scene being linguistically encoded' (2006: 41). By including a reference to a member of the clergy or to a religious order as possessor in the name form, ecclesiastical ownership became the most salient feature of the designated settlement or geographical object. Also, the namers' attention seems to be restricted by culturally significant aspects of their understanding of the world (cf. Palmer 1996, 2007; Kövecses 2006: 28-30, 36). In a feudal society, in which economic and political power was connected to land ownership and the Church acted as a spiritual leader, toponyms

foregrounding ecclesiastical possession at the price of the other perceivable peculiarities of the place could easily be accepted and reproduced by the members of the speech community. As a result, place names referring to (i) the possession of a clergyman, or (ii) that of a religious order constitute typical name types in Medieval Hungary.

The Corpus of Observed Toponyms

In the framework of a research project supported by the Bolyai János Research Scholarship of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, the author of the present paper is currently building a database of Hungarian historical and contemporary place names reflecting (former) ecclesiastical possession. The database includes the same set of information in connection with each place name: a number of identification (identifier); the actual place name (and its possible variants); the type of the indicated denotatum; the county in which the designated habitation or geographical object was/is situated; a more precise localization with the help of significant settlements in the neighbourhood; relevant events in local history (i.e. if known, the ecclesiastical owner, its order, the bestower, the year of donation, changes in ownership, other nearby places bearing a type-specific name; etymological notes); and toponymic data from five time periods: (i) from the earliest times to 1350 (Early Old Hungarian period), (ii) from 1350 to 1526 (Late Old Hungarian period), (iii) from 1526 to 1772 (Middle Hungarian period), (iv) from 1772 to 1920 (Modern Hungarian period), (v) from 1920 up to the present day (Contemporary Hungarian period). The database also includes the year of appearance, the linguistic form(s) and the source document for each toponymic datum. Spelling, lexical, morphologic or syntactic peculiarities, types of name development or name change as well as the semantics of distinctive additions (if there are any) of all toponyms are examined and classified in the database.

Thus, the database serves two main research purposes. Firstly, classic dictionary entries can be retrieved for all included toponyms from the database through query, displaying the headword, name variants (if any), identification and localization of the indicated settlement or geographical object, historical data (comprising year, name form and the source document), relevant remarks on the semantics and structure of the headword toponym, and, if changes were applied, today's equivalent of the name. Secondly, using the database, linguistic analysis of the name forms concerning spelling, sound changes, lexical and structural features, semantics, evolution and modifications could also be carried out.

Relevant toponymic data are being collected from well-known Hungarian historical geographies (Gy., Cs., FN.), published collections of historical documents (AO., ZsO.), gazetteers (Lip., Hnk.), historical-etymological place name dictionaries (KMHSz., FNESz.), standard historical and linguistic sources (PRT., M.) (for the abbreviations see Primary sources). Place names are included in the database if (i) they indicate settlements or geographical objects whose former possession by the Church is verified in the sources; and (ii) (at least) one of their constituents[3] identifies the ecclesiastical possessor linguistically.

---

[3] The term *name constituent* is used here as in Hoffmann (2007): a name constituent is a unit of the toponym 'which—in the situation of name formation—express[es] any semantic feature that is connected with the signalled denotatum', as opposed to a *name element,* which is 'an umbrella term for all the lexemes and suffixive morphemes (derivational and inflectional suffixes) that take part in forming the name' (176, 177).

The Aim and Scope of the Present Survey

The present survey focuses on the possible changes of medieval Hungarian toponyms reflecting ecclesiastical possession. Significant differences in the structural or semantic features of two name forms for the same denotatum appearing in source documents closest in time are qualified here as toponymic changes. Peculiarities of early recordings such as those indicating assimilation with respect to the voiced or voiceless quality of a consonant (progressively, e.g. 1260: *Popth,* FNESz. 2: 316;[4] or regressively, e.g. 1465: *Pabd,* Cs. 2: 514-515; cf. standard *Papd,* consisting of the lexeme *pap* 'priest' and the topoformant *-d*)[5] are not discussed in the paper. Neither is the appearance in writing of certain characteristics of contemporary pronunciation concerning, for instance, the lack of a customary epenthetic vowel breaking the consonant cluster at the beginning of the name (e.g. 1266/1270/1499: *Brath,* Gy. 2: 581; cf. *barát* 'friar'), the insertion of a non-etymological consonant (cf. an epenthetic *p,* e.g. 1470: *Naghzamplen,* but 1890: *Kis-, Barát-* and *Nagy-Zomlin,* Cs. 1: 628, see entry *Zamlén;* cf. *Kis-* 'little', *Nagy-* 'great', *Zamlén* is a settlement name), or the dropping of the first sound from a consonant cluster at the beginning of a name constituent (cf. the loss of *h,* e.g. 1469: *Eghazi Rihcho,* but 1941: *Egyházihricsó,* FN. 127; cf. *Egyházi-* 'church', *Hricsó* is a settlement name). Occasional semantic discrepancies, for instance, inappropriate use of terms for clergymen are also disregarded, e.g. a settlement in Borsod county known in 1332-1335 as *Popi* or *Popy* ('of the priest') was in fact in the possession of the bishop of Eger (Gy. 1: 799, FNESz. 1: 583, see entry *Hejőpapi*); a habitation in Gömör county called *Pyspuky* ('of the bishop') in 1263 seemed to be owned by the archbishop of Esztergom from the very early times on (Gy. 2: 536-537).

Types of Changes

The changes of the observed toponyms fall into two basic categories: simple and complex changes. In more detail, simple changes involve processes such as the addition, change or loss of a topoformant; the addition, change or loss of a suffix; the addition, change or loss of a geographical common noun; the change of a specific name constituent; the addition, change or loss of a distinctive addition; the change from a suffixed to a compound name form and vice versa; the appearance and disappearance of alternative name forms; the addition, change or loss of semantic content in the name form; foreignization and domestication; and the complete change of a toponym. Furthermore, these processes are sometimes combined together in a single attested change, or appear in the source documents one after the other in a sequence of consecutive changes, constituting instances of complex changes.

Simple Changes

Simple changes might affect affixes (topoformants and suffixes) or constituents (geographical common nouns, specifics and distinctive additions) in the name forms; might alter a simplex

---

[4] For the abbreviations see 'Primary sources' below.

[5] Only those components of name forms that are relevant to understanding are explained or translated into English in the paper. Though historical toponymic data are presented authentically, translations and explanations are given by way of using the modern Hungarian spelling of the words found in the name forms discussed. Name constituents not translated or explained in the paper were used as place names in their own right.

into a compound name or the other way round; might elicit the appearance or disappearance of alternative name forms; might modify the semantic content of the place name; and might result in the foregnization, domestication or the complete change of the toponym.

Addition, Change or Loss of a Topoformant

In the observed corpus, the common topoformant added to a previous name form is *-i,* originating from the same root as the Hungarian general possessive suffix *-é* (Tóth 2008: 184; Bényei 2012: 74), e.g. 1256: *Puspuk* > 1338: *Pyspiky* (FNESz. 2: 371, see entry *Pozsonypüspöki;* i.e. 'bishop' > 'of the bishop'). Sometimes the topoformant *-i* was substituted by the topoformant *-d,* developed from an early derivative suffix referring to the abundance of something at a place, in the name form, e.g. 1221: *Popi* > 1260: *Popth,* 1332-7: *Popd* (FNESz. 2: 316, see entry *Papd;* i.e. 'of the priest' > 'priest' + *-d* topoformant). The topoformant *-i* might also disappear from the end of toponyms through the centuries, e.g. 1251/1263/1398: *Barathy* > +1252 /1270: *Barath* (Gy. 2: 580; i.e. 'of the friar' > 'friar').

Addition, Change or Loss of a Suffix

This process usually affected third person singular possessive and locative suffixes (*-a/-e ~ -ja/-je,* and *-n,* respectively). In the case of compound names, the morphologically unmarked possessive constructions sometimes changed into morphologically marked possessive structures, incorporating the relevant suffix into the name forms, e.g. 1424: *Papthelek* > 1475: *Paptheleke* (Cs. 1: 562; cf. *pap* 'priest', *telek* 'plot'). Exceptionally, the possessive suffix was substituted by the suffix *-(o)s,* meaning 'being provided with' in the actual name form, e.g. 1438: *Papsara* > 1894: *Papsáros* (Cs. 2: 635; cf. *sár* 'mud'). The possessive marker might also disappear from the end of a toponym displaying a morphologically marked possessive structure, e.g. 1427: *Monorethe* > 1435: *Monoreth ~ Monnoreth* (Cs. 1: 142, see entry *Monyóréte;* cf. Old Hungarian *monoh* 'friar', *rét* 'field'). Sometimes the locative suffix *-n* at the end of a place name in the course of time became unidentifiable for the speakers and got incorporated into a name form, e.g. 1522: *Appathy* > 1765: *Apathin* (Cs. 2: 185, FNESz. 1: 105; cf. *apát* 'abbot').

Addition, Change or Loss of a Geographical Common Noun

The addition of a geographical common noun to a former name including a topoformant resulted in a compound form, e.g. 1479: *Apathy* > 1481 *Apathyrew* (Cs. 2: 468; cf. *rév* 'ferry'). A geographical common noun might also change into another in the name form, preserving the possessive structure, e.g. 1336: *Dezmasteluke* > 1338: *Dezmasfelde* (Gy. 2: 494; cf. *dézsmás* 'tithe collector', *föld* 'land'). The elimination of the geographical common noun from a compound name led to a simplex form, e.g. 1497: *Remethewdwar* > 1894: *Remete* (Cs. 2: 638, 635; cf. *remete* 'hermit', *udvar* 'court'). Sometimes all these three processes could be observed in the data sequence of a single settlement (i.e. loss, addition, change, respectively), e.g. *c.*1436: *Apáczaegyháza* > 1436: *Apacza* > 1466: *Apáczakuta ~ Apáczaegyháza* > 1525: *Apáczateleke* (FNESz. 1: 305, see entry *Csanádapáca,* Cs. 1: 648; cf. *apáca* 'nun', *egyháza* 'the church of', *kuta* 'the well of', *teleke* 'the plot of').

Change of a Specific Name Constituent

A very typical name structure in Hungarian is the combination of a specific name constituent and a geographical common noun (as a generic) in an attributive compound. The specific name constituent of a compound name sometimes altered morphologically, e.g. the plural marker *-(o)k* disappeared: 1550: *Baráthokfalwa* > 1571: *Baráthfalwa* (FNESz. 1: 166, see entry *Barátudvar;* cf. *barát* 'friar', *falva* 'the village of'); the suffix *-(a)s* was erased, e.g. 1429: *Eghazaspatha* > 1430: *Eghazpatha* (Cs. 5: 393-394; cf. *Egyházas-* 'having a church', *Pata* is a settlement name). In other cases the specific name constituent was changed into another in the name form, e.g. 1292/1358: *Saulfelde,* 1297: *Prepostfelde* > 1341/1358: *Saul* et *Endrefelde* (Gy. 2: 546; cf. *prépost* 'provost', *földe* 'the land of', *Saul* and *Endre* are personal names). Sometimes the complete change of the specific name constituent is illusory, because what really happened was the substitution of an obsolescent word (*monoh,* see above) by a commonly used lexeme of the same meaning (*barát,* see above), e.g. 1439: *Monohlehota* > 1493: *Barathlehota* (FN. 96; *Lehota* is a settlement name).

Addition, Change or Loss of a Distinctive Addition

Distinctive additions are epithets distinguishing otherwise identical name forms. Thus, distinctive additions are always coupled to place names proper. Though differentiating identical name forms, especially names for settlements, with distinctive additions has been a characteristic feature of Hungarian naming practices since the 19th century, its beginnings date back to medieval times. Distinctive additions of different semantic contents could be attached early to name forms to identify – in comparison with other places bearing the same primary name – a unique peculiarity of the indicated location, such as size, e.g. 1392: *Barathy* > 1395: *Kysbarathy* (Cs. 3: 545, FNESz. 1: 550, see entry *Győrújbarát;* cf. *kis* 'little'); animals, e.g. 1319: *Popt* > 1330/1477: *Bekaspab[d]* (Gy. 1: 355; cf. *békás* 'having frogs'); individual owner, e.g. 1245: *Morot* > 1476: *Apathmarothya ~ Apathwrmarothya* (FNESz. 1: 106, see entry *Apátmarót;* cf. *apát* 'abbot', *úr* 'sir', *Marótja* 'Marót of'); institutional owner, e.g. 1332-7: *Dench* > 1444: *Budauaridench* (Cs. 2: 600; i.e. 'Dencs possessed by the Chapter of Buda'); ethnicity of the inhabitants, e.g. 1419: *Jezenew* al. nom. *Remethe* > 1449: *Olahremethe* (Cs 1: 397, see entry *Remete;* cf. obsolescent *oláh* 'Romanian'); social status of the inhabitants, e.g. 1394: *Apaty* > 1510: *Nemes-Apathy,* otherwise *Thwthorzegh* (Cs. 3: 29, FNESz. 2: 227, see entry *Nemesapáti;* cf. *nemes* 'noble'); a river nearby, e.g. 1411: *Püspöki* > 1553: *Zajopispeky* (Cs. 1: 144, FNESz. 2: 438, see entry *Sajópüspöki;* cf. *Sajó* is a river name); a valley nearby, e.g. 1331: *Pyspuky* > 1406: *Zurdokpyspeky* (Gy. 3: 127, Cs. 1: 68-69; cf. the valley is known as *Szurdok-völgy*); a neighbouring settlement, e.g. 1332-5: *Pyspeky* > 1493: *Kerezthespyspeky* (Cs. 1: 178, cf. *Keresztes* is the name of the neighbouring settlement); a region, e.g. 1391: *Apathy* > 1583: *Jász-Apáthi* (Gy. 3: 119, FNESz. 1: 652; cf. *Jászság* is the name for the region).

Distinctive additions might fluctuate over time in name forms, regardless whether they belonged to different or identical semantic types, cf. a building > relative position/owner change, e.g. 1454: *Eghazas Abran* > 1461: *Alsoabran* al. nom. *Barathnyarad* (Cs. 1: 165, see entry *Ábrány;* cf. *egyházas* 'having a church', *alsó* 'low', *barát* 'friar', *Ábrány* and *Nyárád*

are settlement names); an owner > owner change, e.g. *c*.1276: *Zolonta Zakalus* > +1278: *Apachazakalus* (FNESz. 1: 104, Gy. 3: 451; cf. *Szalonta* is a personal name, *apáca* 'nun', *Szakállas* is a settlement name).

Distinctive additions might also, though rarely, disappear from name forms, which, in this way, lost reference to such features of the place as individual owner, e.g. 1261/1271: *Dezmaszykzou* > 1270-72/1390: *Zygzow* (Gy. 3: 136; cf. *dézsmás* 'tithe collector', *Szikszó* is a settlement name); patron saint, e.g. 1351: *Scentmihalremetey* > 1426: *Remethe* (Cs. 5: 728; cf. *Szent Mihály* 'Saint Michael'); a river nearby, e.g. 1261/1271: *Gunguspispuki* > 1301: *Pyspuky* (Gy. 3: 127; cf. *Gyöngyös* is a river name); a region, e.g. 1261/1323: *Mezeupyspuky* > 1332-5: *Pyspeky* (Gy. 1: 801, Cs. 1: 178; cf. *Mezőség* is the name for the region).

Change from a Suffixed to a Compound Name Form and Vice Versa

Topoformants in name forms might be substituted by geographical common nouns, resulting in compound names, e.g. 1491: *Pyspeky* > 1497: *Pyspekfalwa* (FNESz. 2: 680, see entry *Trencsénpüspöki,* FN. 178; see also above). The process could also work the other way round: a geographical common noun sometimes was changed into a suffix in the name form, e.g. 1415: *Borothfalua* > 1567: *Barathos* (FNESz. 1: 166, see entry *Barátos;* see also above).

Appearance and Disappearance of Alternative Name Forms

Toponymic changes, like language changes in general, must have taken place through alternation of forms. Alternative name forms were in fact recorded in documents, e.g. 1429: *Pyspuki ~ Pysky* (Cs. 1: 620; both forms mean 'of the bishop'). The first step of a toponymic change in the past could be the appearance of an alternative form next to a so far extensively used place name, e.g. 1299: *Popy* > 1311: *Papi ~ Papifalu* (Gy. 1. 546, Cs. 1: 418; i.e. 'of the priest' ~ 'priest village'). The final phase, at the same time, could be realised as the disappearance of one of the alternative name forms, e.g. 1415: *Orozapath ~ Orozapathy* > 1418: *Orozapathy* (Cs. 2: 105; i.e. '*Apát ~ Apáti* inhabited by Russians'). The process might lead to the complete change of a toponym, e.g. 1257/*c*.1365: *abb-is* > 1367: *Apaty* al. nom. *Vruzfolu* > 1390: *Oruzfalu* (Gy. 3: 289, Cs. 5: 119; i.e. 'of the abbot' ~ 'village inhabited by Russians').

Addition, Change or Loss of Semantic Content in the Name Form

Regular or irregular sound changes might affect the semantic contents of name forms. A name form unintelligible for the speech community could get a proper meaning by rearranging the sequence of sounds in the name form, e.g. 1093: *Poposka,* 1211: *Poposca* > 1314: *Popsuka* (Cs. 3: 92; i.e. Ø > 'the village of the priest'). A meaningful constituent of a name form might also be given a new sense, e.g. 1468: *Apathyda* > 1469: *Apahyda* (Cs. 5: 327-328; i.e. 'the bridge of the abbot' > 'the bridge of a person called Apa'). Haplology regularly blurred the semantic content in name forms, e.g. 1261: *Pyspyky* > 1415: *Pysky* (Cs. 1: 654; see above).

Foreignization and Domestication

Sometimes foreign name forms became integral parts of the Hungarian name stock by way of foreignization or domestication. In the case of foreignization, the foreign form was borrowed into the Hungarian language to indicate a place that had had a Hungarian name before, which, however, had gradually become disused. Hungarian speakers, failing to recognize the fact that the Hungarian and the foreign names were in fact close semantic equivalents, finally opted for using the foreign form exclusively, at least for a while, e.g. 1488: *Apacza* > 1709: *Opatitza* (Cs. 1: 766, Gy. 1: 170; both names mean 'nun', FNESz. 2: 65, see entry *Magyarapáca*). In case of domestication, the incomprehensible foreign name forms were transformed by the Hungarian borrowers in a way that made them intelligible as Hungarian names, e.g. 1451: *Papina* > 1889: *Papháza* (Cs 1: 359, Wikipedia 2014; i.e. Ø > 'priest's dwelling').

Complete Change of a Toponym

Most often a toponym changed from a name of non-ecclesiastical reference to a name reflecting ecclesiastical possession, e.g. 1246/1383: *Hatuan* > 1294: *Puspuky* (Gy. 4: 287; i.e. a place name originating eventually from a numeral, possibly via a personal name > 'of the bishop'). However, some toponyms displaying ecclesiastical ownership were modified into a non-ecclesiastical name, e.g. 1290/1413: *Apathwlge* > 1347: *Iclod* (Gy. 3: 554, 3: 558, see entry *Pánád;* i.e. 'the valley of the abbot' > a place name developed from a personal name).

Complex Changes

In the past, two or more of the above mentioned processes were sometimes applied to the same name form at the same time, recorded as a single attested change, or appeared in the source documents one after the other in the data sequence of a place as consecutive simple changes, constituting instances of complex changes.

Single Attested Changes

Two toponymic data of the same place consecutive in time in our database might differ from each other in a complex way, i.e. in more than one respect. A single attested complex change usually involves different types of simple changes. Alternations exemplifying this process are, for instance, 1346: *Zentmiclos* > 1376: *Keresztuszenthmikloslaka* (Cs. 2: 646), involving the addition of the distinctive addition *Keresztes-* 'having a connection with the Trinitarians' and that of a geographical common noun *-laka* 'dwelling of' at the same time; 1351: *Scentmihalremetey* > 1426: *Remethe* (Cs. 5: 728) involving the loss of the distinctive addition *Szentmihály-* 'Saint Micheal' and that of the topoformant *-i.*

Consecutive Changes

In consecutive changes, simple changes followed one another within a longer timeframe, e.g. 1410: *Pisspek* > 1491: *Pyspeky* > 1497: *Pyspekfalwa* (FNESz. 2: 680, see entry *Trencsénpüspöki,* FN. 178), involving first the addition of the topoformant *-i,* and then its

change into the geographical common noun *-falva* 'the village of'. Consecutive changes sometimes involve instances of single attested changes, e.g. 1416: *Leel* > 1449: *Erseklely* > 1452: *Erseklel* > 1499: *Erseklely* (FNESz. 1: 106; Cs. 3: 506, see entry *Lél*), involving the addition of the distinctive addition *Érsek-* 'archbishop' as well as the topoformant *-i* first, then the loss and the re-addition of the same topoformant.

Conclusion

Changes of toponyms reflecting ecclesiastical possession, whether affecting affixes, content constituents, the meaning in name forms, or the entire names, always produced name forms that were structurally and semantically consistent with already existing Hungarian place names. By foregrounding the Church's ownership in place names, the mental construal of the designated entities could be strongly influenced: the ecclesiastical possession of the relevant denotatum became an active part of the speakers' conventionalized encyclopaedic knowledge about the indicated place. In the Middle Ages, as toponymic changes suggest, place names were often designed (and sometimes manipulated) to manifest linguistically the contemporary feudal reality from the Church's perspective and were utilized to direct speakers' attention to a culturally significant Church-related aspect of the places bearing the names.

Andrea Bölcskei
Károli Gáspár University of the Reformed Church in Hungary
Hungary
bolcskei.andrea@kre.hu
bolcskeiandrea@hotmail.com

Primary Sources

AO. = Nagy, I. and Tasnádi Nagy, Gy. (eds.) (1878-1920) *Anjoukori okmánytár. Codex Diplomaticus Hungaricus Andegavensis*. Vols. 1-7. Budapest: MTA Könyvkiadó Hivatala.

Cs. = Csánki, D. (1890-1913) *Magyarország történelmi földrajza a Hunyadiak korában*. Vols. 1-3, 5. Budapest: Magyar Tudományos Akadémia.

FN. = Fekete Nagy, A. (1941) *Magyarország történelmi földrajza a Hunyadiak korában*. Vol. 4. Budapest: Magyar Tudományos Akadémia.

FNESz. = Kiss, L. (1988) *Földrajzi nevek etimológiai szótára* 1-2. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.

Gy. = Györffy, Gy. (1963-1998) *Az Árpád-kori Magyarország történeti földrajza.* Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.

Hnk. = *Magyarország közigazgatási helynévkönyve, 2012. január 1*. Date of access: 20.12.2014. Available online at:
http://www.ksh.hu/apps/shop.kiadvany?p_kiadvany_id=11432

KMHSz. = Hoffmann, I. (ed.) (2005) *Korai magyar helynévszótár* 1000-1350. I. *Abaúj– Csongrád vármegye*. Debrecen: Debreceni Egyetem Magyar Nyelvtudományi Tanszéke.

Lip. = Lipszky, J. (1808) *Repertorium locorum objectorumque in XII. tabulis mappae regnorum Hungariae, Slavoniae, Croatiae et Confiniorum Militarium Magni item Principatus Transylvaniae occurentium.* Buda: Egyetemi Nyomda.

M. = Mező, A. (1999) *Adatok a magyar hivatalos helységnévadáshoz.* Nyíregyháza: Bessenyei György Tanárképző Főiskola Magyar Nyelvészeti Tanszéke.

PRT. = Erdélyi, L. and Sörös, P. (eds.) (1902-1916) *A pannonhalmi Szent-Benedek-rend története.* Vols. 1-12. Budapest: Stephaneum.

ZsO. = Mályusz, E. et al. (eds.) (1951-2009) *Zsigmondkori oklevéltár.* Vols. 1-11. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.

References

Bényei, Á. (2012) *Helynévképzés a magyarban.* Debrecen: Debreceni Egyetemi Kiadó.

Bölcskei, A. (2013) 'Contemporary Hungarian Settlement Names Reflecting Former Ecclesiastical Possession'. In: Felecan, O. (ed.) *Proceedings of the Second International Conference on Onomastics 'Name and Naming'. Onomastics in Contemporary Public Space.* Cluj-Napoca: Mega / Argonaut. 243-253.

Engel, P. *et al.* (2003) *Magyarország története 1301-1526.* Budapest: Osiris Kiadó.

Evans, V. and Green, M. (2006) *Cognitive Linguistics: An Introduction.* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Hoffmann, I. (2007) *Helynevek nyelvi elemzése.* Budapest: Tinta Könyvkiadó.

Kövecses, Z. (2006) *Language, Mind, and Culture: A Practical Introduction.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kristó, Gy. (1999) *A tizenegyedik század története.* Budapest: Pannonica.

Kristó, Gy. (2003) *Magyarország története 895-1301.* Budapest: Osiris.

Kubinyi, A. (1999) *Főpapok, egyházi intézmények és vallásosság a középkori Magyarországon.* Budapest: Magyar Egyháztörténeti Enciklopédia Munkaközösség.

Mályusz, E. (2007) *Egyházi társadalom a középkori Magyarországon.* Budapest: Műszaki.

Palmer, G.B. (1996) *Toward a Theory of Cultural Linguisitcs.* Austin: University of Texas Press.

Palmer, G.B. (2007) 'Cognitive Linguistics and Anthropological Linguistics'. In: Geeraerts, D. and Cuyckens, H. (eds.) *The Oxford Handbook of Cognitive Linguistics.* New York: Oxford University Press. 1045-1073.

Tóth, V. (2008) *Településnevek változástipológiája.* Debrecen: Debreceni Egyetem Magyar Nyelvtudományi Tanszéke.

Wikipedia (2014) 'Papháza'. Date of access: 30.12.2014. Available online at: http://hu.wikipedia.org/wiki/Paph%C3%A1za