Toponyms reflecting ecclesiastical possession

in the Medieval Kingdom of Hungary[*]

Andrea BÖLCSKEI

1. Cultural changes at the formation of the Kingdom of Hungary

It is a well-known fact that establishing, spreading and maintaining organized Christianity was a basic unifying feature in Medieval Europe (Davies 2002, p. 285). Peoples who wished to join the civilized world accepted the doctrines of the Christian Church (Le Goff 2003, p. 34). In the Christian countries of Europe, the theocratic attitude, which permeated the mentality of medieval man, necessarily altered public administration, society, economics, lifestyle and other elements of culture (including science, education, legislation, art, history, literature, etc.; cf. Davies 2002, pp. 409–418). Not surprisingly, the same attitude also had a great influence on the languages of the continent, which evidently were used to obtain and mediate human knowledge about this changing world (cf. Evans and Green 2006, pp. 27–52).

Medieval Christianity also significantly modified the landscape in the countries under its influence by erecting churches, monasteries, chapels, crosses and other buildings for ecclesiastical use (cf. Davies 2002, p. 417); and, to provide financial support for the expanding church system and its numerous representatives, it initiated a

---

drastic change in land ownership as well by introducing ecclesiastical private property (Kristó 1999, p. 103; Kubinyi 1999, p. 337; Mályusz 2007, p. 20). Both factors were reflected in contemporaneously evolving toponyms of many European languages: several place names, especially names for newly established settlements, had reference to the ecclesiastical buildings of the designated habitations (to churches, monasteries, chapels and their parts; or to the patron saint to whom the village church was dedicated); other place names stressed the role of the Church as a feudal landowner (by declaring the habitation or the geographical object as the possession of a clergyman or of a religious order).[1]

At the millennium, the newly appointed ruler and first king of Hungary, Stephen I (997–1038)[2] wisely realized that, having arrived in the Carpathian Basin not more than a century previously, Hungarians could survive and prosper among the highly civilized Western European peoples who had established themselves long before on the continent, only if they built a sovereign state modelled on the western feudal countries, adopting their political, social and economic system, in which authority was connected to private ownership of landed properties and in which the ambitions of the social elite were supported by the doctrines of the (Roman) Christian faith.

To achieve his goal, King Stephen I had to carry out, sometimes by force, some fundamental changes in the socio-economic sphere of the country, which affected practically all-important aspects of his people's lives. After living in a nomadic tribal state for centuries, where land and pastures had been owned by the community, Hungarians were made to grasp and respect the idea of the inviolability of private

---

[1] In Hungary, both name types were flourishing in the era. For certain cultural and linguistic features of the relevant Hungarian place names see Benkő 1987, 1993; Bölcskei 2008, 2012, 2013; Hajdú 1991; Hoffmann 1999; Kónyi 1979; Kristó 1983; Lévai 1994; Mező 1966, 1979, 1981, 1991, 1992, 1996a, 1996b, 1997, 2003; Mikesy 1967; Murádin 2000; Rácz 1999; Tóth 2006, 2007, 2011, 2012. For some relevant place names from European countries see Agertz 2009; Cameron 1996, pp. 124–132; Gelling 2010; Matthews 1972, pp. 67–76; Quinton (ed.) 2009; Reaney 1960, pp. 81, 123–127, 168, 195, 205–206; Tóth (ed.) 2011.

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

property. Vagrancy and nomadic animal husbandry were replaced by a settled way of living, strongly dependent on farming activities. In the past, blood relatives belonging to the same clan had dealt with legal matters; in Stephen's state, however, newly introduced institutions of public administration were responsible for performing executive actions. Written royal laws recorded in legislation replaced traditional justice and customary laws. Heathen practices were stigmatized and outlawed (e.g. breach of oath, taking justice into one's own hands, abduction of young girls, licentiousness) to make space for the new moral principles of Christianity (e.g. obedience, loyalty, honesty, mercy, humbleness, restraint, fair judgement, patience, devotion, affection, chastity). In brief, Hungarian people were required to undergo a complete shift in culture to fit in, and to transform, within a relatively short period of time, from natively migrant pagans into educated inhabitants of Western European Christendom (Kristó 1999, pp. 54–58, 62–66, 137–161; 2003b, p. 55).

2. The organization of the Church in Medieval Hungary

The impact of Christianity was first felt in the middle of the 10th century in the eastern parts of the territory occupied by the Hungarians. Gyula, the governor of the area under discussion, invited a missionary bishop from Byzantium to spread eastern Christianity, and although he and his court converted to the new faith, his subjects were reluctant to give up their old beliefs. Western Christianity started to affect the western parts of the country, which almost entirely belonged to the ruling Árpád dynasty, in the 970s; only a second wave, however, beginning around 995, led to the large-scale conversion of the Hungarians to Christianity. A more difficult task was to instil the elements of Christian morality into people's everyday lives. By starting to establish the institutions of the secular Church, King Stephen I could also initiate this process (Kristó 1999, pp. 75–79).

King Stephen, descendant of the Árpáds, organized three dioceses in his own territory before 1001. The dioceses were led by bishops, appointed by the king himself, who, as a sovereign ruler, was also the head of the Church. The seats of the first three bishops were in Veszprém, Győr and Esztergom. Stephen's successful military actions to annex more territories in the Carpathian Basin from the rival Hungarian chieftains to his own kingdom were always followed by the establishment of institutions for public and ecclesiastical administration. As a result, the territory of the new dioceses organized by Stephen roughly coincided with the earlier tribal areas of former Hungarian chieftains. Some new dioceses incorporated previously unoccupied frontier zones as well. As the dioceses were founded and granted by him, Stephen tended to treat these bishoprics as if they had been his own private bodies. He created altogether eight, or possibly ten dioceses in the Kingdom of Hungary, with their centres, apart from the above-mentioned ones, in Gyulafehérvár, Pécs, Kalocsa, Eger, Csanád, Bihar and Vác. Two of the dioceses (Esztergom and Kalocsa) earned the rank of an archbishopric between 1001 and 1050. Two additional dioceses, with their seats in Zágráb and Nyitra, were organized somewhat later by King Ladislaus I (1077–1095) and King Coloman (1095–1116), respectively. In the first half of the 1200s two more dioceses were formed in the southern part of the country, resulting altogether in fourteen dioceses in Medieval Hungary (Kristó 1999, pp. 79–83; 2003a, pp. 101–110, 152, 193; 2003b, pp. 56–68).[1]

Furthermore, in the 11th century, monasteries housing secular priests as well as Benedictine monks were built regularly at the diocesan centres. With the removal of the monks, these monasteries were gradually transformed into cathedral chapters. In the same century, following contemporary German practices, members of the Árpád

---

[1] Ladislaus also initiated the canonization of Hungarian saints for his people, including King Stephen I and his son, Emeric, while he himself became a saint by the proposal of Béla III (1172–1196); the Árpád dynasty thus could eventually evolve into a clan of holy kings (Kristó 1999, pp. 99–103; 2003a, pp. 101–110, 152, 193).

dynasty also founded private collegiate chapters. The most important one was established by King Stephen himself in Székesfehérvár, which became the sacral seat of the Árpáds. The provost of this chapter had considerable prestige and a strong political influence even in later periods (Kubinyi 1999, pp. 101–105; Kristó 1999, p. 82; 2003a, pp. 101–110, 152, 193–194).

In Stephen's Kingdom of Hungary, the vast majority of privately owned land belonged to the king. The king's landed properties lay widely spread across the constantly growing area under his control, and while parts of these were used to serve the very mobile royal household, which ambulated around the country for strategic purposes, other tracts of land constituted estates scattered around royal castles. The king's estates were governed by a bailiff, who, at the same time, also had to perform public duties (e.g. local jurisdiction, collecting fees and payments in kind from subjects for the king, preventing work from being done on sundays to encourage churchgoing, protecting the inhabitants of the area at war). His authority in this latter respect spread over the whole territory in the vicinity of the central castle, comprising tracts of land owned both by the king and affluent noblemen. His staff also managed the public affairs of the area as clerks; thus, a bailiff's seat slowly became the centre of public administration as well. In early Hungary, royal counties as administrative units were ultimately developed from castle districts, equipped with the institutions of the king's private management, before the end of the 13th century (Kristó 1999, pp. 62–66; 2003b, pp. 68–69, 80–81).

The seats of the bailiffs were also important ecclesiastical centres with baptistery churches, whose priests, collaborating with the bishops of the dioceses, became equal in rank with the bailiffs. These priests, later also known as the archdeaconry, formed the intermediate layer in church administration, just as the bailiffs did in public

administration. Stephen also started to set up the lowest level of church organization by ordering every ten villages to build a common church. Stephen's decree required the king to supply the (altar-)clothes, the regionally responsible bishop to provide a priest and books, and the villages concerned to donate a plot, servants and farm animals for the new church. Raising a new church thus involved extensive social cooperation, even if the network of parish churches was rather sparse at first. By the end of the 11th century, a basic secular church organization (i.e. archbishoprics, bishoprics, chapters, archdeaconries and parishes) had already been developed in Hungary (Kristó 1999, pp. 82–83; 2003a, pp. 101–110, 152, 193; 2003b, pp. 92–102; Mályusz 2007, pp. 20–21).

The 11th century also witnessed the development of monasticism in the country. The first Benedictine abbeys (in Pannonhalma, Zalavár, Bakonybél and Zobor) and a nunnery (in Somlóvásárhely) were established by King Stephen in the territory of the first three dioceses. Later rulers of the Árpád dynasty founded additional monasteries mostly in the western region of Hungary as well (for instance, in Tihany, Szekszárd, Garamszentbenedek, Somogyvár and Báta); and the first private abbey was also set up in Transdanubia (in Zselicszentjakab, by Ottó, bailiff of Somogy County). In the second half of the 11th century, royal and private monasteries appeared also in the eastern part of the country (in Kolozsmonostor, Szentjobb and Százd, etc.). Benedictine abbeys were mostly built in places difficult to access (on hilltops, in forests, at sites surrounded by swamps), which suggests that they were not expected to be involved in missionary work or the daily routine of church administration, but were devoted almost entirely to intellectual activities (e.g. education, prayer). The effects of the three most influential Benedictine reform movements (the ones initiating from Cluny Abbey in Burgundy, Gorze Abbey in Lorraine and Italy, respectively) manifested themselves as different intellectual trends in contemporary Hungarian monastic life, and affected not only the

monks, but also the secular priests, who often mixed with Benedictine monks at that time. An interesting feature of the 11th-century monasticism in the country was the presence of Basilian monasteries of the Byzantine Rite (in Oroszlámos, Visegrád and Oroszkő) (Kristó 1999, pp. 87–91; 2003a, p. 194; Mályusz 2007, pp. 22–32, 197–237).

In the following centuries, monastic life changed significantly in Hungary. In the 12th century, apart from the monasteries of the Benedictines, abbeys of other monastic orders such as the Cistercians and Premonstratensians were established one after the other by the ruling kings or by important noble families. The new private monasteries built by affluent landlords were usually also meant to be burial places for the members of their founding families, and fell under the control of their patrons. Sometimes such private monasteries were enriched by their founders with tracts of land encompassing the joint churches of ten villages, whose priests were then appointed by the abbot of the monastery, so ultimately they were in the employ of the patron landlord. By the end of the 12th century, a network of episcopal and private churches had been woven throughout the country (Kristó 2003a, p. 194; Mályusz 2007, pp. 22–32, 197–237).

In addition, chivalric orders such as the Knights Templar and the Hospitallers were supported with considerable donations in the country by King Béla III (1172–1196). In Esztergom, the Order of Saint Lazarus ran a hospital. Moreover, King Géza II (1141–1162) established a new order of knighthood, the Order of Hospitaller Canons Regular of St Stephen. By the end of the 13th century, monastic orders had lost their popularity in the country to the benefit of the newly launched mendicant orders such as the Dominicans, the Franciscans, and (semi-)hermit orders such as the Carthusians and the Paulines (Kristó 2003a, pp. 132–138, 178–179, 194, 213–214, 258–260; Mályusz 2007, pp. 238–284).

Financial support for the increasing secular ecclesiastical and monastic system came from two basic sources in the period: i.e. tithes given to the bishops by the communion and the income from the feudal estates belonging to the Church. The kings granted tithes to the Church as an organization. The obligation to pay tithes upon the profits of the annual agricultural products was first imposed by King Stephen by the strength of law (in the 1030s). The amount of the tithe, paid regularly by the head of the family, was determined by self-assessment. King Ladislaus ordered that a quarter of the collected tithe had to be given to parish priests by their superior bishops (*c.*1092). A statute implemented by King Coloman gave also a tenth of taxes and customs to the bishops. King Andrew II (1205–1235) ensured tax exemption to the Church, and forbade the monetary redemption of the tithe in the 1222 Golden Bull issued by him. The Bull is considered to have equipped the senior clergy with the privileges of a feudal order (Kristó 1999, pp. 103–107; 2003a, p. 194; Mályusz 2007, pp. 17–19).

The Church, however, was also entitled to have an income as a feudal landowner. To provide the conditions for their operation, land was donated by the founders and patrons to abbeys and monasteries, and to the institutions of the secular church organization. In the 11th century, the king established most bishoprics, provostships and monasteries, and royal bestowal was considerable. The nobility's donations of landed properties to the Church were usually more modest, but nonetheless valuable. Landlords gave pieces of their estates to the Church, sometimes just temporarily, theoretically for the sake of the salvation of their and their relatives' souls, or as a bequest; in practice, at the same time, their patronage often made it possible for them to exert pressure on the outcome of local political, economic or social affairs by way of ecclesiastical influence (Mályusz 2007, pp. 22–32).

Lands belonging to the ecclesiastical institutions, as a consequence of casual donations, were usually diffuse in character. On these clerical lands, however, the well-educated ecclesiastics could carry out model farming activities and instruct the laity on how to achieve more success in agriculture. High profitability made the Church's practices attractive and worth following; wealth produced by the Church superseded the results of all previous attempts. Apart from landed properties and allotted real assets (lakes, forests, villages, etc.), ecclesiastical institutions also possessed servants, whose task was to provide the representatives of the Church with products and services (Kristó 1999, pp. 103–107; 2003a, pp. 150–151, 194, 258–260; Mályusz 2007, pp. 19–22).

In the 11th century, income flowing from its feudal estates to the Church must have been higher than the amount of tithes collected from the relatively small number of devout Christian believers. Though land acquired by the Church increased only to a small degree after the 11th century, and never exceeded 15% of the territory of the country in the Middle Ages, which falls behind the contemporary European average, we still can not doubt that the constant income from land guaranteed a comfortable life for bishops and monks living in royally founded abbeys of significant wealth, even if parish priests had to be satisfied with lesser means (Kristó 1999, pp. 103–107; 2003a, pp. 150–151, 194, 258–260; Mályusz 2007, pp. 17–22).

3. Toponyms manifesting ecclesiastical possession

The symbiotic coexistence of feudalism and Christianity in Medieval Hungary corresponded to the contemporary European trends. The basic moral principles of Christianity (obedience and loyalty to superiors, protection of inferiors, respect for private property etc.) served as ideological basis for the seigneurs' attempts to seize and retain the political and economic power in society; while the state legitimized the

authority of the Church in ecclesiastical as well as in public affairs by making and acknowledging it as a feudal landowner. In a feudal society, which connected power to land ownership, emphasizing this role in the names of the possessed geographical objects seems to have been a reasonable approach of the Church. As Evans and Green (2006, p. 48) observe, "language does not directly reflect the world. Rather, it reflects our unique human construal of the world". Toponyms, being conventionalized linguistic representations of the speakers' mental construals of relevant geographic entities, are perfectly capable of displaying and influencing people's convictions and beliefs about the most salient (former) features of the indicated places. In Medieval Hungary, foregrounding ecclesiastical possession in place names resulted in two name types: toponyms referring to (i) the possession of a clergyman, and (ii) that of a religious order.

4. The corpus of the observed toponyms

Toponymic data for the present paper have been collected from three primary sources focusing on the Early Old Hungarian period (*c.*895–1350): a highly acclaimed four-volume, albeit unfinished historical geography describing the settlements of 40 out of the 69 counties in the Arpadian Era (Gy.),[1] a historical-etymological place name dictionary presenting early Hungarian toponyms according to their linguistic features (KMHsz.), and a three-volume gazetteer listing the microtoponyms occurring in Gy. (HA.); but relevant early data have also been gathered from a five-volume historical geography depicting the habitations of 51 counties of Hungary in the Age of the Hunyadis (Cs. and FN.)[2] and from a two-volume concise etymological place-name

---

[1] The Arpadian Era lasted from the establishment of the Kingdom of Hungary in 1000 until the extinction of the male line of the Árpád dynasty in 1301.
[2] The name *Hunyadies* refers to János Hunyadi, governor of Hungary between 1446 and 1453, and his son, Matthias Corvinus (Hunyadi), king of Hungary between 1458 and 1490.

dictionary discussing the linguistic history of several Hungarian place names, mostly settlement names, up to 1988 (FNESz.) (for the abbreviations see Primary sources). Place names have been included in the corpus if (i) they were demonstrably in use in the Early Old Hungarian period; (ii) they indicate geographical entities whose (temporary) possession by the Church in the period is verified in the sources; and (iii) (at least) one of their constituents[1] identifies the ecclesiastical possessor linguistically. The corpus of the collected toponyms forms part of a larger database of Hungarian historical and contemporary place names reflecting (former) ecclesiastical possession, currently being built by the author of the present paper in the framework of a research project supported by the Bolyai János Research Scholarship of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences (for further details see Bölcskei 2014).

5. Linguistic features of the relevant name forms

The present survey focuses on the linguistic analysis of the collected Early Old Hungarian toponyms. Linguistic features discussed in the paper involve semantic references to ecclesiastical possessors in the name forms (5.1); the appearance and spread of the name type in time and space (5.2); structural features, including the stock and frequency of the relevant lexemes and toponym-forming suffixes (i.e. topoformants) in the names, the syntactic and semantic structures of the single- and two-constituent names (5.3) as well as possible patterns of evolution, sound, structural and semantic changes affecting the name forms in the period (5.4).

5.1. Semantic references to ecclesiastical possessors in the name forms

---

[1] 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 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" (pp. 176–177).

The corpus of the observed toponyms includes 452 data for 186 denotata of 15 types. The distribution of the types of denotata is as follows: 1 fishing-place, 1 orchard, 1 grove, 1 mound, 2 hills, 2 mountains, 2 rivers, 2 valleys, 2 vineyards, 2 water-courses, 3 lakes, 6 forests, 8 tracts of land, 145 settlements and 8 places of unspecified type.

Possessors are identified in the source documents in the cases of 114 (61,3%) denotata. Almost a third of these denotata were owned by (the head of) an institution of the secular church organization in the era: the Diocese of Transylvania, the Provostship of Ittebe, the Provostship of Nagyszeben, the Chapter of Bács, the Chapter of Eger, the Chapter of Pécs and the Chapter of Székesfehérvár each possessed a place; the Diocese of Pécs, the Diocese of Vác, the Provostship of Jászó and the Provostship of Óbuda each owned two; the Archdiocese of Esztergom, the Diocese of Nagyvárad and the Diocese of Nyitra each had four; and the Diocese of Eger owned nine of the relevant places. Clerks of an ecclesiastical institution are exceptionally mentioned as possessors in the sources: the tithe collectors of the Archdiocese of Esztergom owned a settlement (1286/1412: *Desmasteluk*, Gömör; Gy. 2: 494)[1] and a place of unspecified type (1338: *Dezmasweulgzada*, Gömör; Gy. 2: 494) in the observed period.

In half of the cases the owner is said to have been a royal or private abbey, monastery or nunnery: Abasár Abbey, Ábr(ah)ám Monastery, Adorjánpuszta Abbey, Báta Abbey, Borsmonostor Abbey, Bozók Monastery, Bulcs Abbey, Csanád Abbey, the

---

[1] Historical toponymic data are presented in the paper authentically. Illustrative examples comprise year of (first) appearance, toponymic data (in italics), contemporary county for the indicated place, and philological reference to the source document(s). Types of denotata are mentioned only in the case of geographical objects that were not settlements. Signs and abbreviations are used as in the source documents: if the manuscript itself was copied, the years in which the original and the extant copy was prepared are separated by a slash (/); manuscripts copied several times repeatedly in the period between the years indicated are identified by double slashes (//); the years in which the original and the interpolated manuscripts were prepared are separated by the greater-than sign (>); forged manuscripts are identified before the year by the addition sign (+); the year or period in which an undated manuscript was presumably prepared is given in brackets ([]). References to primary sources are given in the customary format for quoting from dictionaries: the abbreviation for the source document comes first, and then the serial number of the volume followed by a colon, the page number and, if not obvious, the entry for the data concerned. Translations and explanations of the Hungarian name forms are given if needed for understanding.

Dominican Nunnery on the Isle of Hares (today's Margit-sziget), Garamszentbenedek Abbey, Jást Abbey, Kerc Monastery, Körű Monastery, Lébény Abbey, the Monastery of St. Theodosius in Jerusalem, Monostor Monastery, Monostorszeg Abbey, Pélmonostor Monastery, Pornó Abbey, Sárvármonostor Monastery, Szakalmonostor Abbey, Szekszárd Abbey, Szentjobb Abbey, Szentlélek Monastery, Szer Monastery, Torda Abbey, Zalavár Abbey and Zebegény Monastery each possessed a place; Bélháromkút Abbey, Heiligenkreuz Abbey, Pécsvárad Abbey, Somlóvásárhely Nunnery and Zselicszentjakab Abbey each owned two; Pannonhalma Abbey had three; Kolozsmonostor Abbey possessed four; Tihany Abbey and Zobor Abbey each owned five of the places under discussion.

In some cases chivalric orders are identified as contemporary possessors in our sources: the Johannite Convent of Győr owned a settlement (1261/1411: *Cruciferorum,* Győr; Gy. 2: 605), two further places were in the possession of the Knights Hospitaller in the era (e.g. 1289/1291: *Kerestus,* Baranya; Gy. 1: 325, Cs. 2: 496); and the Stephanites of Esztergom-Szentkirály owned two of the relevant places (e.g. 1307/17th c.: *Dieles ~ Keresztessy ~ Keresztessi*, Hont; Gy. 3: 207, 195, see *Gálosi*).

Our corpus suggests that ecclesiastical co-ownership was not rare in the past: the Diocese and the Chapter of Eger, Kolozsmonostor Abbey and the Dominicans of Kolozsvár, Pannonhalma and Bakonybél Abbeys, Pannonhalma Abbey and the Provostship of Székesfehérvár, Pannonhalma and Zselicszentjakab Abbeys, and the Premonstratensian Provostship and the Pauline Monastery of Pápoc all jointly possessed settlements; and the Diocese and the Chapter of Nagyvárad collectively owned two of the relevant places. Changes in ecclesiastical ownership in the Early Old Hungarian period are also justified in the source documents in some cases: one of the denotata under discussion was first possessed by the Diocese, then by the Chapter of

Transsylvania (1276: *Pyspuki,* Hunyad; Gy. 3: 298, Cs. 5: 125); another first by Kolozsmonostor Abbey, then by the Diocese of Transylvania (+1263/1324/1580: *Leske ~ Apathaasa ~ Apathoasa,* a forest, Kolozs; Gy. 3: 362, Cs. 5: 373–374); a third first by Százd Abbey, then by the Diocese of Eger (1261/1271: *Apati,* Borsod; Gy. 1: 752); a fourth settlement first by Tihany Abbey, then by Báta Abbey (1337: *Appati,* Bodrog; DHA. 291, Gy. 1: 706); and a fifth one first by the Knights Templar, then by the Knights Hospitaller ([+1235]/1350/1404: *S. Laurency de Wkur*, Baranya; Gy. 1: 389, FNESz. 1: 719, see *Keresztespuszta*). According to our data, changes in ownership might also combine with co-ownership in this era: a settlement bearing a relevant name was first possessed by the Provostship of Lelesz, then jointly by the Master of the Holy Rood Altar of Nagyvárad Cathedral and the Chapter of Nagyvárad (1332–1337: *Kereztes,* Bihar; Gy. 1: 632); similarly, another settlement was first the common property of the Provostship of Mórichida, the Provostship of Turóc, the Chapter of Győr and Pannonhalma Abbey, then of the Chapter of Győr and Csorna Abbey (1211: *Barath,* Győr; Cs. 3: 545). An uncertain possessor is mentioned in one occasion: as the relevant source document claims, a settlement was owned either by Ják Abbey or by Pornó Abbey in the period (1328: *Apaty,* Vas; FNESz. 1: 508, see *Gencsapáti,* Cs. 2: 733).

In general, the material makes it clear that references to ecclesiastical possession in the medieval Kingdom of Hungary were customarily included in toponyms indicating places of fairly different types possessed either by (the head of) an institution of the secular church organization, or by the Benedictine, Cistercian, Premonstratensian, Dominican or Pauline orders or by certain orders of chivalry.

5.2. The appearance and spread of the name type in time and space

The first appearance in written records of name forms for the 186 denotata under discussion occurred in Hungarian in 168 (90,32%) cases and in Latin in 18 (9,68%) occasions. We are surely not mistaken, however, if we assume Hungarian name forms in the actual use behind the Latin forms, reflecting the approach to official name use in the country, e.g. the 1322 form *villa Abbatis* must have had the Hungarian equivalent *Apátfalva* ('the village of the abbot') in colloquial speech (FNESz. 2: 528, see entry *Szászapátfalva*); similarly, the 1347 form *Rivulus abbatis* must have been pronounced as *Apát pataka* ('the brook of the abbot') in Hungarian (KMHsz. 1: 34). This assumption is especially justified, if one constituent of the name form was actually recorded in Hungarian, e.g. the toponymic data *Scena abbatis* from a charter forged for the 11th century must have been the half-calque of the Hungarian name *Apát-széna* ('abbot hay') (KMHsz. 1: 34).[1] Thus, Latin forms will henceforth be treated together with Hungarian name forms in the paper.

Details of the first appearance of the relevant name forms as attested in our corpus are as follows (categorizing data from charters of indefinite date and from rewritten or interpolated documents at the earliest possible year): 1000^2–1050: 1 (0,54%); 1051–1100: 6 (3,23%); 1101–1150: 1 (0,54%); 1151–1200: 2 (1,07%); 1201–1250: 20 (10,75%); 1251–1299: 72 (38,71%); 1301–1350: 80 (43,01%); time unspecified: 4 (2,15%) relevant name forms. Thus, it seems that the name type gradually became more and more popular in the observed period, with more than 80% of its instances documented between 1251 and 1350.

---

[1] Translations of the Hungarian name forms into English intend to reflect the semantic content as well as the grammatical structure of the Hungarian name, if possible. Each illustrative name form is translated or explained fully once, at its first occurrence. Name constituents used as place names in their own right are not translated or explained in the paper.

[2] In Hungary, the practice of producing charters and other written records began with the adoption of Christianity.

The spatial distribution of the name type according to regions is surprisingly uniform: places with such names are 51 (27,42%) in the northern part of the Kingdom of Hungary, also 51 (27,42%) in the Great Hungarian Plain, 59 (31,72%) in Transdanubia and 25 (13,44%) in Transylvania. Both in the Great Hungarian Plain and in Transdanubia, the southern counties held significantly more places indicated by the observed name forms than the northern ones. In comparison with most other counties, the surveyed name type appeared especially frequently in the toponymy of Heves (12 instances), Bihar (15 instances) and Baranya (17 instances) Comitats.

5.3. Structural features of the name forms

In the observed name forms, the stock and frequency of the church-related lexemes display the following pattern: *apát* ('abbot') 109, *püspök* ('bishop') 62, *pap* ('priest') 54, *barát* ('friar') 28, *monostor* ('monastery') 28, *keresztes* (here 'Hospitallers', 'Templars' or 'Stephanites') 16, *remete* ('hermit') 13, *apáca* ('nun') 8, *dézsmás* ('tithe collectors') 6, *prépost* ('provost') 5, *monoh* (an obsolete word for 'friar') 5, *dusnok* (a servant whose job was to provide food for ceremonies to commemorate their dead master) 2, *harangozó* ('sexton') 2, *Jást* (referring to Jást Abbey as an owner) 2, *presbiter* ('churchwarden') 1, *dékán* ('dean') 1 examples. As we can see, most lexemes have a reference to an ecclesiastical official; some others, however, refer to (lay) people in the service of the Church, and the list also includes a word designating the institution in possession as well as a toponym identifying the location of the institution in possession. In 110 further cases, the actual name form does not contain a church-related lexeme, but previous or later name forms for the same denotatum have such a component (see 5.4 below).

The listed lexemes form (parts of) single-constituent name forms in 198 (43.81%) cases; stand as (one element of) the basic constituent of two-constituent name forms in 35 (7.74%) examples, and function as (one element of) the complement constituent in 109 (24.11%) two-constituent name forms (in 94 of the latter cases the basic constituent is a generic element, whilst in 15 the basic constituent is a toponym on its own right). 110 (24,34%) toponyms in the corpus lack a church-related lexeme, thus fall out of the scope of this aspect of analysis (see above).

Morphologically, 148 (32,74%) of the single-constituent toponyms are suffixed forms, and 50 (11,06%) of them are bare (i.e. suffixless) appellatives. 98 (21,68%) of the two-constituent name forms are realized as morphologically marked possessive structures, 34 (7,52%) of them constitute morphologically unmarked possessive structures, and there are also 12 (2,65%) two-constituent name forms displaying attributive structures. Again, 110 (24,34%) toponyms lack church-related lexemes.

In single-constituent suffixed name forms, most commonly it is the topoformant *-i,* originating from the same root as the Hungarian general possessive suffix *-é* (Tóth 2008, p. 184; Bényei 2012, p. 74), that can be identified.[1] In the observed corpus, this suffix is added to lexemes *apát, barát, jást, keresztes, monoh, pap* and *püspök* to form toponyms, e.g. 1258: *Apaty* (Győr; Gy. 2: 638); 1263: *Barathy ~ Zenth Iwan* (Somogy; Cs. 2: 589); 1268: *Jasty* (a tract of land, Esztergom; Gy. 2: 293); 1307/17th c.: *Keresztessy ~ Keresztessi ~ Dieles* (Hont; Gy. 3: 207, 195, see entry *Gálosi*); 1332–1337: *Monachy ~ Monoy ~ Monohy* (Baranya; Cs. 2: 508); 1211: *Popi* (Bodrog; Gy. 1: 726); 1276: *Pyspuki* (Hunyad; Gy. 3: 298, Cs. 5: 125). The lexeme *pap* at the same time could also be suffixed with the by then semantically empty topoformant *-d* (or its former variant *-di*), developed from an early derivative affix referring originally to the

---

[1] At this time, *-y,* which appears frequently at the end of the relevant name forms (see the examples below), is a spelling variant for the topoformant *-i.*

abundance of something at a place, e.g. 1280: *Popd* (Tolna; Cs. 3: 445); 1349: *Popdi* (Temes; Cs. 2: 56).

Our corpus suggests that bare appellatives themselves could be turned into single-constituent name forms. The lexemes *apáca, barát, dusnok, harangozó, keresztes, monostor, pap, püspök* and *remete* definitely behaved in this way in the past, e.g. 1333–1335: *Apacha ~ Apatha* (Arad; Gy. 1: 170, Cs. 1: 766); 1274>1340: *Barath* (Csanád; Gy. 1: 847); [1193–1196]>1216 and 1218: *Dussunc* [i.e. *Dussnuc*] (Fejér; Gy. 2: 423); 1332–1337: *Haronkozow ~ Harengozen ~ Haranguzen* (Heves; Gy. 3: 89); 1289/1291: *Kerestus* (Baranya; Gy. 1: 325, Cs. 2: 496); 1332–1335: *Monustur* (Baranya; Gy. 1: 343); 1272–1290: *Pop* (Szabolcs; Cs. 1: 523, FNESz. 2: 315); 1256: *Puspuk* (Pozsony; Cs. 2: 786, FNESz. 2: 371, see entry *Pozsonypüspöki*); 1255: *Remethe* (Abaúj; Cs. 1: 265, FNESz. 2: 569, see entry *Szepesremete*). Interestingly enough, the lexemes *apát* and *barát* must often have been complemented with the term of address *úr* ('sir'), which seems to have formed a coherent part of the identification of the person, and thus found its way into single-constituent toponyms as well, e.g. 1093: *Apathur* (Zala; Cs. 3: 29); 1332–1335: *Baratur* (Baranya; Gy. 1: 281, Cs. 2: 471).

Two-constituent toponyms of morphologically marked possessive structures in our corpus involve the lexemes *apáca, apát, dékán, dézsmás, keresztes, monostor, pap, prépost* and *remete.* Most of the name forms consist of a complement constituent referring to the (former) ecclesiastical possessor and a geographical common noun (usually identifying the type of the indicated geographical object) in the function of the basic constituent, e.g. 1326: *Apathharazta* ('the forest of the abbot', a forest, Kolozs; Gy. 3: 380); 1272/1419: *Dekan Gemulshe* ('the orchade of the dean', an orchade, Abaúj; Gy. 1: 81); 1336: *Dezmasteluke* ('the plot of the tithe collector', Gömör; Gy. 2: 494); 1261/1271: *Kerezthusfeulde* ('the land tract of the chivalric order', Heves; Gy. 3:

108); 1282: *Kenazmunustura* ('Kenéz's monastery', Bodrog; FNESz. 2: 156, see entry *Monostorszeg*); 1230/1349: *Popteleke* ('the plot of the priest', Doboka; Gy. 2: 84); +1294/1471: *Praepostpataka ~ Praepostpataka* ('the brook of the hermit', a stream, Gömör; Gy. 2: 507); 1348: *Remetheweulge* ('the valley of the hermit', a forest, Kolozs; Cs. 5: 399, see entry *Sármás*). In some name forms, however, the complement constituent referring to the (former) ecclesiastical possessor is followed by a toponymic basic constituent, e.g. 1270: *Appachasomlya* ('Somló of the nun', Veszprém; Cs. 3: 215, see entry *Vásárhely*). Exceptionally, a lexeme concerned forms a part of the compound complement constituent, e.g. 1338: *Dezmasweulgzada* ('the entrance of Dézsmásvölgy', a place of unspecified type, Gömör; Gy. 2: 494).

Two-constituent toponyms of morphologically unmarked possessive structures incorporate one of the following lexemes: *apáca, apát, barát, dézsmás, dusnok, keresztes, pap, püspök* and *remete.* Similarly to morphologically marked possessive structures, in most cases the complement constituent referring to the (former) ecclesiastical possessor is accompanied by a geographical common noun (typically identifying the type of the indicated geographical object) as the basic constituent, e.g. [+1235]/1350/1404: *Apatÿwelgh* ('abbot valley', a valley, Baranya; Gy. 1: 285); 1305>1411: *Barathkut* ('friar well', Nyitra; Gy. 4: 350); 1286/1412: *Desmasteluk* ('tithe collector plot', Gömör; Gy. 2: 494); 1329: *Kereztuserdeu* ('forest belonging to the chivalric order', a forest, Doboka; Gy. 2: 71); [1269]: *Popmal* ('priest southern hill-slope', a vineyard, Pilis; Gy. 4: 634); [1269]: *Pyspukmal* ('bishop southern hill-slope', a vineyard, Pilis; Gy. 4: 634); 1295/1296: *Remetehyg* ('hermit hill', a hill, Liptó; Gy. 4: 67). In some examples the complement constituent referring to the (former) ecclesiastical possessor goes together with a toponymic basic constituent, e.g. 1267/1297: *Apachasumlo* ('nun Somló', Veszprém; FNESz. 2: 483–484, see entry

Somlóvásárhely); 1235/1416: *Dusnik Lybyn* ('Lébény inhabited by servants whose job was to provide food for ceremonies to commemorate their dead master', Komárom; Gy. 3: 413).

The few two-constituent name forms of attributive structures in the corpus include the lexemes *dézsmás, monoh, monostor, pap* and *püspök.* In these toponyms, a geographical common noun functioning as the basic constituent is rare, e.g. 1349: *Monusturalyafalu* ('the village at the foot of the monastery', Nyitra; Gy. 4: 491). Instead, most name forms involve a toponymic basic constituent. The lexemes referring to the (former) ecclesiastical possessors are mostly elements of the suffixed or compound toponymic basic constituents, e.g. 1330/1477: *Bekaspab[d]* ('Papd having frogs', Baranya; Gy. 1: 355); 1261/1271: *Gunguspispuki* ('Püspöki by the river Gyöngyös', Heves; Gy. 3: 127, FNESz. 1: 547); 1345: *Olsomunuhuduor ~ Olsoumunuhuduor* ('low Monohudvar', Moson; Gy. 4: 158, Cs. 3: 683, FNESz. 1: 166, see entry *Barátudvar*); though they might also act as complement constituents in the observed name forms, e.g. 1261/1271: *Dezmaszykzou* ('tithe collector Szikszó', Heves; Gy. 3: 136).

Whenever two-constituent name forms with a toponymic basic constituent are concerned, regardless of whether the complement and the basic constituents form morphologically marked, unmarked possessive or attributive structures, the complement constituent always functions as a distinctive addition in the name. Relevant toponyms in which the (former) ecclesiastical possession is referred to in the basic constituent and those in which the same semantic content is expressed in the complement constituent are described below separately.

In the observed era, 21 out of the total 186 denotata bore a name (at least for a while) that displayed a distinctive addition.[1] The surveyed two-constituent name forms in which the (former) ecclesiastical possession is referred to in the basic constituent include the lexemes *apát, monoh, pap* and *püspök.* The complement constituent, always a qualifier in these name forms, might refer to the size of the denoted settlement (e.g. 1335: *maioris et minoris Apati* 'great and little Apáti', Bars; Gy. 1: 425); to the relative situation of the habitation (e.g. 1345: *Olsomunuhuduor ~ Olsoumunuhuduor* 'low Monohudvar', Moson; Gy. 4: 158, Cs. 3: 683, FNESz. 1: 166, see entry *Barátudvar*); to the topographical setting of the place (e.g. 1261/1271: *Mezeupispuky* 'Püspöki in the field', Borsod; Gy. 1: 801); to the (former) fauna of the habitation (e.g. 1330/1477: *Bekaspab[d]* 'Papd having frogs', Baranya; Gy. 1: 355); to the (former) owner of the settlement (e.g. 1319: *Keralpopa* 'the king's Pap', Bereg; Gy. 1: 546); to a river next to the habitation (e.g. 1261/1271: *Tizapispuky* 'Püspöki by the river Tisza', Heves; Gy. 3: 127); to a well-known geographical feature nearby (e.g. 1261/1271: *Zurdukpispuky* 'Püspöki near the valley Szurdok-völgy', Heves; Gy. 3: 127); or to some other features of the place (e.g. 1341: *Thelukbarath* 'plot Barát', Győr; Gy. 2: 581).

Two-constituent toponyms in which the complement constituent (i.e. the distinctive addition) indicates the (former) ecclesiastical possession in our corpus involve the lexemes *apáca, apát, barát, dézsmás, dusnok* and *püspök.* Obviously, these lexemes as distinctive additions have a reference to the (former) owner of the place in the name forms. Examples are +1278: *Apachazakalus* 'nun Szakállas', possessed by the Dominican Nunnery on the Isle of Hares, Komárom, Gy. 3: 451; 1342: *Apathvnukatheteus* 'Töttös owned by the grandchild of a person called Apát [probably

---

[1] We must add here that distinguishing identical place names (especially settlement names) by way of attaching distinctive additions to them, though its beginnings date back to medieval times, became a characteristic feature of Hungarian naming practices in the 19th century (for details see Bölcskei 2010).

after his office]'[1], Vas, Cs. 2: 805; 1323: *Barathynarag* 'the friar's Nyárágy', possessed by the Diocese of Eger, Borsod, Gy. 1: 793; 1261/1271: *Dezmaszykzou* 'tithe collector Szikszó', possessed also by the Diocese of Eger, Heves, Gy. 3: 136; 1339: *Buda Episcopi* 'bishop's Buda', Heves, Cs 1: 59. An exception is the 1235/1416 toponym *Dusnik Lybyn* (Komárom; Gy. 3: 413), in which the distinctive addition refers to the inhabitants of the settlement by profession (who, as ecclesiastical servants, however, were in the possession of the Church; cf. Solymosi 1997). The basic constituents of these names, functioning primarily as independent settlement names, have reference to the former lay owner (e.g. +1278: *Apachazakalus* 'nun Szakállas', cf. H. *Szakállas,* an old personal name, Komárom; Gy. 3: 451); to the flora (e.g. 1323: *Barathynarag* 'the friar's Nyárágy', cf. H. *nyár* 'poplar', Borsod; Gy. 1: 793); to the river close to the habitation (1261/1271: *Dezmaszykzou* 'tithe collector Szikszó', cf. H. *Szikszó-patak,* a river nearby, Heves; Gy. 3: 136); and to a geographical feature nearby (e.g. 1251/1263/1398: *Barathy Sokorow* 'Sokoró of the friar', cf. H. *Sokoró,* a name of a range of hills in the area, Győr; Gy. 2: 623).

5.4. Patterns of evolution, sound, structural and semantic changes affecting the name forms

At their first occurrences in documents, the name forms for the 186 denotata, based on their structural and semantic features, display four distinct patterns of evolution. Most of the name forms came into existence from standard syntactic units, especially from possessive and attributive phrases (83 instances, 44,62%), e.g. 1338: *Apathfalva* ('the village of the abbot', Borsod; Cs. 1: 168); 1330/1477: *Bekaspab[d]* ('Papd having frogs', Baranya; Gy. 1: 355). Many name forms were born as a result of adding a

---

[1] In Hungary, celibacy became mandatory for priests only in the first half of the 13th century (Mályusz 2007, p. 31).

toponymic suffix to a standard lexeme (71 instances, 38,17%), e.g. 1308: *Popi* (*pap* 'priest' + the topoformant *-i,* Szerém; Cs. 2: 250); 1280: *Popd* (*pap* 'priest' + the topoformant *-d,* Tolna; Cs. 3: 445). In some cases speakers started to use a standard lexeme in the language also as a toponym without any changes in the structure of the actual word (30 instances, 16,13%), e.g. 1274>1340: *Barath* (cf. H. *barát* 'friar', Csanád; Gy. 1: 847); 1323: *Remethe* (cf. H. *remete* 'hermit', Krassó; Cs. 2: 106, FNESz. 2: 357, see entry *Pogányosremete*); semantically, these latter names had their roots in the metonymic relationship between the person(s) and the place owned by them. Names devoid of their original semantic content appeared rarely (2 instances, 1,08%), e.g. 1339: *Pysky* (from a presumable **Pispiky* 'of the bishop', see below, Bodrog; Gy. 1: 726).[1]

After their first appearance in writing, several relevant toponyms underwent some changes. These changes might affect the sounds of the name forms. Our data suggest that vowels might turn from rounded to unrounded, e.g. 1256: *Puspuk* > 1338: *Pyspiky* (i.e. *ü > i,* Pozsony; FNESz. 2: 371, see entry *Pozsonypüspöki*); from high to mid, e.g. +1263/1324/1580: *Colusmonustura* > 1283/1414/1568: *Clusmonosthora* (i.e. *u > o,* Kolozs; Gy. 3: 353); or from mid to low, e.g. 1243: *Popi* > 1332–1335: *Papy* (i.e. *o > a,* Abaúj; Gy. 1: 128–129). We also have examples in the corpus for the insertion of an intrusive consonant between vowels, e.g. [+1077–1095]>+1158//1403: *Apattoa* > [+1077–1095]/+1158//15th c.: *Apathaua ~ Apat-thaua* (i.e. Ø > β ~ *v,* a place of unspecified type, Baranya; Gy. 1: 371); and for the insertion of an epenthetic vowel breaking the consonant cluster at the beginning of the name, e.g. 1266/1270/1499: *Brath* > 1269: *Baraty* (i.e. Ø > *a,* Győr; Gy. 2: 581, Cs. 3: 545).

---

[1] This approach to place name formation in the Hungarian language has been adapted from Hoffmann 2007.

The structural and semantic changes of the surveyed toponyms fall into several minor categories. One might observe the addition, change or loss of a topoformant in the name forms, e.g. 1261/1350: *Pop* > 1284: *Popy* (i.e. Ø > -*i,* Bereg; Gy. 1: 546); 1221: *Popi* > 1260: *Popth* (i.e. -*i* > -*d,* Pest; FNESz. 2: 316, see entry *Papd*); 1322/1514: *Barathy* > 1339: *Barath* (i.e. -*i* > Ø, Győr; Gy. 2: 581, Cs. 3: 545). Sometimes the suffix affected by the change is not a topoformant, but an inflectional suffix. The appearance of the third person singular possessive suffix at the end of the name form changes a morphologically unmarked possessive structure into a morphologically marked one, e.g. 1267/1297: *Apachasumlo* > 1270: *Appachasomlya* (i.e. Ø > -*(j)a,* Veszprém; FNESz. 2: 483–484, see entry *Somlóvásárhely,* Cs. 3: 215, see entry *Vásárhely*).

The addition or loss of a geographical common noun turns a single-constituent name form into a two-constituent one or vice versa, respectively, e.g. 1299: *Klus* > 1301/1390: *Clusmonustra* (i.e. Ø > -*monostora* 'the monastery of', Kolozs; Gy. 3: 353); 1330>1409: *Penthelemonostra* > 1350>1409: *Penthele* (i.e. -*monostora* 'the monastery of' > Ø, Fejér; Gy. 2: 400). In certain cases, the specific constituent is changed in the name form, resulting in modification in the semantic content, e.g. 1292/1358: *Saulfelde,* 1297: *Prepostfelde* > 1341/1358: *Saul* et *Endrefelde* (i.e. *Prépost-* 'provost' > *Saul* and *Endre* are personal names, -*földe* 'the tract of land of', a tract of land, Gömör; Gy. 2: 546). The addition, change or loss of a distinctive addition might lead either to structural or to semantic alterations in the name forms, e.g. 1319: *Popt* > 1330/1477: *Bekaspab[d]* (i.e. Ø > *Békás-* 'having frogs', Baranya; Gy. 1: 355, Cs. 2: 514–515); [*c.*1276]: *Zolonta Zakalus* > +1278: *Apachazakalus* (*Szalonta-* > *Apáca-* 'nun', *Szalonta* is a personal name, Komárom; Gy. 3: 451); 1261/1271: *Gunguspispuki* > 1301: *Pyspuky* (i.e. *Gyöngyös-* > Ø, *Gyöngyös* is a river name, Heves; Gy. 3: 127, FNESz. 1: 547). One

might find an example for the change of an element in the toponym into a constituent, e.g. 1093: *Apathur* > 1327: *Apathlaka* (i.e. *-úr* 'sir' > *-laka* 'the dwelling of', Zala; Cs. 3: 29).

The addition, change or loss of semantic content in the name form can also be easily exemplified, e.g. 1211: *Poposca* > 1314: *Popsuka* (i.e. Ø > *-soka* 'the village of', Zala; Cs. 3: 92);[1] [+1077–1095]>+1158//1403: *Apatkuzhyda* > [+1077–1095]/+1158//17th c.: *Apakoshida* (i.e. *Apát-* 'abbot' > *Apa-*, *Apa* is a personal name, a place of unspecified type, Baranya; Gy. 1: 340); 1341: *Pispiky* > 1342–1382: *Pysky* (haplology, Hunyad; Gy. 3: 298, Cs. 5: 125, FNESz. 2: 352). The appearance and disappearance of alternative name forms seem to be fairly common in our corpus, e.g. 1284: *Popy* > 1311: *Papi ~ Papifalu* (Bereg; Gy. 1: 546, Cs. 1: 418); 1234–1270: *Hegmogus ~ Apati* > 1349: *Apati* (Veszprém; Cs. 3: 59); 1336: *Geus ~ Pyspuky* > 1338: *Geus* (Bihar; Gy. 1: 620). The complete change of a toponym from or to a name reflecting ecclesiastical possession can also be observed, e.g. 1290/1413: *Apathwlge* > 1347: *Iclod* (i.e. 'the valley of the abbot' > a place name developed from a personal name, Küküllő; Gy. 3: 554, 3: 558, see entry *Pánád*); 1246/1383: *Hatuan* > 1294: *Puspuky* (i.e. a place name originating eventually from a numeral, possibly via a personal name > 'of the bishop', Nógrád; Gy. 4: 287).

Our data suggest that these simple modifications were sometimes combined into complex changes, e.g. 1336: *Dezmasteluke* 'the plot of the tithe collector' > 1338: *Dezmasteluk* 'tithe collector plot' ~ *Dezmasfelde* 'the tract of land of the tithe collector', involving the disappearance of the third person singular possessive suffix and the appearance of an alternative name form displaying the change of the geographical common noun (Gömör; Gy. 2: 494). They could also follow one another in time,

---

[1] In this example, the addition of semantic content might be illusory, because *Poposca* might have been a slip of the pen instead of *Popsoca*.

resulting in consecutive changes, e.g. 1276: *Zolunthazakalas* 'Szakállas owned by a person called Szalonta' > +1278: *Apachazakalus* 'nun Szakállas' > 1283: *Zakalus,* involving first the change, then the loss of the distinctive addition (Komárom; Gy. 3: 451).[1]

6. Conclusion

The fundamental cultural changes that took place in the Medieval Kingdom of Hungary resulting from the adoption of the crucial elements of contemporary Western civilization (e.g. feudalism in society, private property in economy, Christianity in ideology) brought a new type of toponyms into life in the language. These new place names foregrounding ecclesiastical possession at the price of other perceivable peculiarities of the indicated place served well to portray the Church as a feudal landowner. By doing so, the Church, as the acknowledged spiritual leader in the state, could make people understand and accept its claim to be treated as equal with lay landowners in the political and economic life of the country as well. At the same time, toponyms reflecting ecclesiastical possession could also be used to display, even if indirectly, the importance of religion in medieval life, and thus to influence people's convictions and beliefs about contemporary reality.

Primary sources

---

[1] A similar approach to settlement name changes in the Hungarian language has first been adopted in Tóth 2008. A more detailed categorization of the changes of toponyms reflecting ecclesiastical possession in Medieval Hungary has been elaborated in Bölcskei 2014.

Cs. = Csánki, Dezső, 1890–1913: *Magyarország történelmi földrajza a Hunyadiak korában* [Historical Geography of Hungary in the Age of the Hunyadis], vol. I–III and V. Budapest.

DHA. = Györffy, György, 1992: *Diplomata Hungariae Antiquissima* I. 1000–1131. Budapest.

FN. = Fekete Nagy, Antal, 1941: *Magyarország történelmi földrajza a Hunyadiak korában* [Historical Geography of Hungary in the Age of the Hunyadis], vol. IV. Budapest.

FNESz. = Kiss, Lajos, 1988: *Földrajzi nevek etimológiai szótára* [Etymological Dictionary of Geographical Names], vol. 1–2. Budapest.

Gy. = Györffy, György, 1963–1998: *Az Árpád-kori Magyarország történeti földrajza* [Historical Geography of Hungary in the Arpadian Age], vol. 1–4. Budapest.

HA. = Hoffmann, István, Rácz, Anita and Tóth, Valéria (eds.), 1997–2012: *Helynévtörténeti adatok a korai ómagyar korból* [Data on Place-Name History from the Early Old Hungarian Period], vol. 1–3. Debrecen.

KMHsz. = Hoffmann, István (ed.), 2005: *Korai magyar helynévszótár 1000–1350.* I. *Abaúj–Csongrád vármegye* [A Dictionary of Early Hungarian Place Names 1000–1350, vol. 1, Abaúj–Csongrád Counties]. Debrecen.

References

Agertz, Jan, 2009: Name change as a consequence of Monastic ownership, In: Wolfgang Ahrens, Sheila Embleton and André Lapierre (eds.), *Names in Multi-Lingual, Multi-Cultural and Multi-Ethnic Contact. Proceedings of the 23rd*

International Congress of Onomastic Sciences. August 17–22, 2008, p. 57–62. Toronto.

Benkő, Loránd, 1987: Rolle der Schutzheiligen in der mittelalterlichen ungarischen Namengebung, In: Kálmán Benda, Thomas von Bogyay, Horst Glassl and Zsolt K. Lengyel (Hrsg.), *Forschungen über Siebenbürgen und seine Nachbarn. Festschrift für Attila T. Szabó und Zsigmond Jakó,* vol. 1, p. 303–315. München.

Benkő, Loránd, 1993: Az Árpád-ház szentjeinek szerepe a középkori magyar helynévadásban [The role of saints of the Árpád dynasty in medieval Hungarian place-name giving practices], In: *Magyar Nyelv,* vol. 89/1, p. 10–19.

Bényei, Ágnes, 2012: *Helynévképzés a magyarban* [Place-Name Derivation in the Hungarian Language]. Debrecen.

Bölcskei, Andrea, 2008: Az egyházi településnevek típusai a 19. század elején [Ecclesiastical settlement names in early 19th century Hungary], In: Andrea Bölcskei and Ildikó N. Császi (eds.), *Név és valóság. A VI. Magyar Névtudományi Konferencia előadásai. Balatonszárszó, 2007. június 22–24*, p. 106–115. Budapest.

Bölcskei, Andrea, 2010: *A magyar településnevek korrelációs rendszerének alakulása a természetes névadás korszakában* [The Correlational System of Hungarian Settlement Names in the Period of Non-Official Place-Naming Practices]. Budapest.

Bölcskei, Andrea, 2012: Az egyház mint egykori birtokos a magyar helységnevekben [The Church as a former possessor in Hungarian settlement names], In: *Névtani Értesítő,* vol. 34, p. 71–80.

Bölcskei, Andrea, 2013: Contemporary Hungarian settlement names reflecting former ecclesiastical possession, In: Oliviu Felecan (ed.), *Proceedings of the Second*

International Conference on Onomastics "Name and Naming". Onomastics in Contemporary Public Space, p. 243–253. Cluj-Napoca.

Bölcskei, Andrea, 2014: Changes of toponyms reflecting ecclesiastical possession in Medieval Hungary. *25th International Congress of Onomastic Sciences. Names and their Environment.* Glasgow. (Paper delivered on the 29th of August, 2014.)

Cameron, Kenneth, 1996: *English Place-Names.* London.

Davies, Norman, 2002: *Európa története* [Europe: A History]. Budapest.

Evans, Vyvyan and Green, Melanie, 2006: *Cognitive Linguistics: An Introduction.* Edinburgh.

Gelling, Margaret, 2010: *Signposts to the Past: Place-Names and the History of England.* Chichester.

Hajdú, Mihály, 1991: Középkori -*monostora* utótagú helyneveink tipológiájához [On the typology of medieval Hungarian place names ending in -*monostora* 'monastery'], In: Mihály Hajdú and Jenő Kiss (eds.), *Emlékkönyv Benkő Loránd hetvenedik születésnapjára,* p. 250–254. Budapest.

Hoffmann, István, 1999: Névrendszertani megjegyzések a patrocíniumi helységnevek történetéhez [Comments on the onomastic taxonomy of patrociny settlement names: a historical approach], In: *Névtani Értesítő,* vol. 21, p. 66–70.

Hoffmann, István, 2007: *Helynevek nyelvi elemzése* [Linguistic Analysis of Place Names]. 2nd edition. Budapest.

Kónyi, Sándor, 1979: *Félegyháza – Derekegyház,* In: *Magyar Nyelvőr,* vol. 103, p. 473–477.

Kristó, Gyula, 1983: Az -*egyház(a)* utótagú helynevekről [On place names ending in -*egyház(a)* 'the church of'], In: Gyula Kristó (ed.), *Tanulmányok az Árpád-korról,* p. 450–455. Budapest.

Kristó, Gyula, 1999: *A tizenegyedik század története* [History of the Eleventh Century]. Budapest.

Kristó, Gyula, 2003a: *Magyarország története 895–1301* [The History of Hungary 895–1301]. Budapest.

Kristó, Gyula, 2003b: *Tájszemlélet és térszervezés a középkori Magyarországon* [Landscape Approach and Spatial Organization in Medieval Hungary]. Szeged.

Kubinyi, András, 1999: *Főpapok, egyházi intézmények és vallásosság a középkori Magyarországon* [Prelates, Ecclesiastical Institutions and Religiosity in Medieval Hungary]. Budapest.

Le Goff, Jacques, 2003: *Európa történelméről mesél* [L'Europe racontée aux jeunes]. Budapest.

Lévai, Béla, 1994: *Szóládmonostora,* In: *Magyar Nyelvőr,* vol. 118, p. 445–448.

Mályusz, Elemér, 2007: *Egyházi társadalom a középkori Magyarországon* [Ecclesiastical Society in Medieval Hungary]. Budapest.

Matthews, Constance Mary, 1972: *Place-Names of the English-Speaking World.* Worcester and London.

Mező, András, 1966: *Nyíregyháza,* In: *Magyar Nyelvjárások,* vol. 12, p. 137–142.

Mező, András, 1979: *Félegyháza,* In: *Névtani Értesítő,* vol. 1, p. 14–20.

Mező, András, 1981: *Móregyháza = Nyíregyháza?,* In: *Névtani Értesítő,* vol. 5, p. 3–6.

Mező, András, 1991: *Szegegyház,* In: Mihály Hajdú and Jenő Kiss (eds.), *Emlékkönyv Benkő Loránd hetvenedik születésnapjára,* p. 432–434. Budapest.

Mező, András, 1992: *Szentkirályszabadja* és társai [*Szentkirályszabadja* and its partners], In: *Magyar Nyelvjárások,* vol. 30, p. 25–35.

Mező, András, 1996a: *A templomcím a magyar helységnevekben. 11–15. század* [Patron Saints in Hungarian Settlement Names. 11–15th centuries]. Budapest.

Mező, András, 1996b: *Boldogasszony* és más asszonyok [The Blessed Virgin Mary and other women], In: *Magyar Nyelvjárások,* vol. 33, p. 25–41.

Mező, András, 1997: Az „egyházi" helységneveink típusai [Types of Hungarian "ecclesiastical" settlement names], In: Piroska B. Gergely and Mihály Hajdú (eds.), *Az V. Magyar Névtudományi Konferencia előadásai,* vol. 1, p. 244–249. Budapest and Miskolc.

Mező, András, 2003: *Patrocíniumok a középkori Magyarországon* [Patron Saints in Medieval Hungary]. Budapest.

Mikesy, Sándor, 1967: A „vallási" helynevekről [On the "religious" place names], In: *Magyar Nyelv,* vol. 63, p. 474–476.

Murádin, László, 2000: *Egyházi településnevek Erdélyben* [Ecclesiastical Settlement Names in Transylvania]. Székelyudvarhely.

Rácz, Anita, 1999: Az ómagyar kori Bihar megye patrocíniumi nevei [Patrociny names in Bihar County in the Old Hungarian period], In: *Névtani Értesítő,* vol. 21, p. 71–74.

Quinton, Eleanor (ed.), 2009: *The Church in English Place-Names.* Nottingham.

Reaney, Percy Hide, 1960: *The Origin of English Place-Names.* London.

Solymosi, László, 1997: *Dusnok* neveink előfordulásai a középkori Magyarországon [Occurrences of the name *Dusnok* in Medieval Hungary], In: Gábor Kiss and Gábor Zaicz (eds.), *Szavak – nevek – szótárak. Írások Kiss Lajos 75. születésnapjára,* p. 372–386. Budapest.

Tóth, Valéria, 2006: A templomcímből alakult településnevek változásáról [On the changes of patrociny settlement names], In: István Hoffmann and Valéria Tóth (eds.), *Helynévtörténeti tanulmányok* 2, p. 31–46. Debrecen.

Tóth, Valéria, 2007: A templomcímből alakult településnevek keletkezési körülményeiről [On names of settlements based on patrocinia], In: *Magyar Nyelv,* vol. 103/4, p. 408–419.

Tóth, Valéria, 2008: *Településnevek változástipológiája* [Alternation Typology of Settlement Names]. Debrecen.

Tóth, Valéria, 2011: Patrociny Settlement Names in the Carpathian Basin, In: *Onomastica Uralica,* vol. 8, p. 175–206.

Tóth, Valéria, 2012: Patrocíniumi településnevek Európában [Patrociny settlement names in Europe], In: *Magyar Nyelv,* vol. 108, p. 292–303.

Tóth, Valéria (ed.), 2011: *Patrociny Settlement Names in Europe.* Onomastica Uralica 8. Debrecen–Helsinki.

Summary: Toponyms reflecting ecclesiastical possession in the Medieval Kingdom of Hungary

This paper intends to examine the cultural and linguistic history of place names stressing the role of the medieval Church as a feudal landowner, i.e. toponyms referring to (i) the possession of a clergyman, and (ii) that of a religious order will be surveyed. The author first gives an overview of the political, economic and cultural changes that took place between 896 and 1301 in the territory of Hungary, paying special attention to the Hungarian peculiarities of church organization and their consequences to land ownership. Linguistic features discussed in the paper involve: (i) semantic references to ecclesiastical possessors in the name forms; (ii) the appearance and spread of the name type in time and space; (iii) structural features (including the stock and frequency of the relevant lexemes and toponym-forming suffixes in the names, the syntactic and

semantic structures of the single- and two-constituent names) as well as (iv) possible patterns of evolution, sound, structural and semantic changes affecting the name forms in the period. The author uses the principles of Cognitive Linguistics to explore how names in this case were designed to manifest linguistically the contemporary reality from the Church's perspective and were utilized to direct speakers' attention to a given Church-related aspect of the place being named. The mechanism of using place names to display, even if indirectly, the importance of religion in medieval life and how it influenced people's convictions and beliefs is also explored in the paper.

Postal address:

Károli Gáspár University of the Reformed Church in Hungary, Faculty of Humanities,

Institute of Hungarian Linguistic, Literary and Cultural Studies,

Department of Hungarian Linguistics

H-1146 Budapest, Dózsa György út 25–27.

Hungary

E-mail address:

bolcskei.andrea@kre.hu; bolcskeiandrea@hotmail.com