Melinda Szőke

*The Textual Positioning of Toponyms in Latin Language Medieval Hungarian Charters**

1. Linguistic records and remnants (mostly Latin language charters) are the most important source for the early history of the Hungarian language. In the case of the Hungarian language, the phase of linguistic records spans one millennium. Research on our linguistic records from the earliest times can rely on Latin language charters with Hungarian language elements (chiefly toponyms and anthroponyms) because these charters are the first relics of our records written in the Latin script. They include founding charters, donation charters, surveys of estates and possessions, land surveyor's maps, etc.

Individual charters as linguistic records were processed with monographic methods mainly during the 20th century (MIKOS 1935, SZABÓ 1936, 1937, 1954, PAIS 1939, KNIEZSA 1939, 1947–1949, TERESTYÉNI 1941, GÁCSER 1941, GALAMBOS 1942, BÁRCZI 1951) but, the first work analysing the Hungarian language elements of a charter was published as early as the end of the 19th century (SZAMOTA 1895). In the second half of the 20th century, research on Hungarian language elements occurring in Latin language charters lost ground to the study of old Hungarian texts, with only a handful works dealing with the former (K. FÁBIÁN 1997, MOLLAY 1982: 93–119). During the last 10 to 15 years, however, researchers have again been paying closer attention to relics with Hungarian words. Several linguists have chosen as a research subject the linguistic evaluation, or even re-evaluation of charters and groups of charters, together with the toponyms and anthroponyms they include (SLÍZ 2008, 2014, HOFFMANN 2010a, 2010b, SZENTGYÖRGYI 2011, 2012, 2013, 2014, TÓTH 2013a, 2013b, MOZGA 2014, 2015, 2016, KOVÁCS 2015, 2016a, 2016b, 2016c, PELCZÉDER 2015, PÓCZOS 2015, SZŐKE 2015, 2016).

2. In many respects, researchers stick to traditional methods of analysing linguistic records, but they have also introduced some new methods. One of these new methods instead of taking Hungarian language elements (mostly proper names) out of their Latin contexts, treat the former as parts of the latter, and attribute significance to the ways the elements are fitted into the texts.

The Latin language contexts of toponymic remnants were first systematically scrutinized by ISTVÁN HOFFMANN (2004), who distinguished between the

---

following ways of insertion. 1. Toponyms used by the recorders of the charters in Latin, or in a latinized form: for example, the Hungarian name of the settlement *Újvár* 'new castle' appearing as 1075/+1124/+1217: *Nove Civitas* (DHA 1: 215), the Hungarian name of the comitat *Csongrád* appearing as 1138/1329: *Cerungradiensis* (Gy. 1: 893, KMHsz. 1: 77). 2. Hungarian name forms next to Latin verbs with meanings such as "say" and "call" (e.g. *dico, voco*): 1075/+1124/+1217: *piscine, que Woioser vocatur* (DHA 1: 215). 3. Insertions into the text together with the Latin geographical common word: 1055: *ab eodem lacu Bolatin* (DHA 1: 150). 4. Hungarian names linked into the Latin text using Latin prepositions: 1075/+1124/+1217: *in Sari* (DHA 1: 214). 5. Some Hungarian toponym forms, however, appear by themselves, without any Latin language elements: 1055: *Aruk tue* (DHA 1: 150). 6. And finally, toponyms can appear in the Latin text together with the Hungarian language elements (e.g. a Hungarian adverbial noun-suffix): +1232/1384/1393: ad *Scertora* 'Szer-lake' + *-ra* the Hungarian adverbial noun-suffix answering the question "Where to?" (KMHsz. 1. *Szer-tó?*) (HOFFMANN 2004: 15–50, 2010a: 215–218).

I apply this set of categories in discussing the system of links between toponyms appearing in the charters of Hungary and their Latin language context. For this purpose, I used as my sources the founding charter of the Abbey of Garamszentbenedek (1075/+1124/+1217) and the first volume of the *Korai magyar helynévszótár* (A Dictionary of early Hungarian toponyms, KMHsz.) (cf. SZŐKE 2008, 2015: 120–148). The dictionary includes the toponyms of 15 former comitats found in charters and narrative historical sources up to 1350. I also compare my results against the remarks made by ISTVÁN HOFFMANN in every instance (2004). The result is an overall picture of the toponym insertion practices typical of not just one but Hungarian medieval charters in general.

3. Only a rather insignificant proportion (in the case of toponyms appearing in the vulgar language form, less than 1%) bears the traits of Latin language name usage (GYÖRFFY 1970: 200, cf. PAIS 1955: 6). The native language background is, however, irrefutably present even in the case of these names, and as such, they must not be excluded from the scope of linguistic historical studies (HOFFMANN 2004: 15, cf. BENKŐ 1996: 224). The most striking feature of names used in the charters of Hungary in this manner is that names of certain types (e.g. hydronyms, settlement names and names of hills) are latinized far more frequently than others. This allows for the assumption of deliberate behaviour, adherence to a certain kind of norms on the part of the recorders of the charters, while, of course, intuition must also have had some role in the preference for Latin name forms (HOFFMANN 2004: 37–38).

With respect to text editing, the usage of Latin name forms has an advantage over that of Hungarian forms: to the former, regular declension can be applied, therefore, they easily fit into Latin sentences. It is, however, conspicuous that those who recorded the charters did not latinize all of the Hungarian names although their endings made doing so possible. This is an obvious indication of other factors influencing the recording of the Latin forms. The most important of these factors is how well known and important the named places were at the time. The names of places with national importance (such as, centres of the Church, more significant cities) for example, appear in Latin far more often than the names of smaller settlements (cf. HOFFMANN 2004: 24).

The vast majority of Latin forms found in charters are characteristic of the written Latin language of the era. Therefore, it is at times difficult to determine the Hungarian forms behind them. The forms 1274>1340: *Tembes inferior* and 1274>1340: *Tembes superior* (Gy. 1: 875, KMHsz. 1: 32, 101) for example – due to the fact that the adjectives in question had double forms in early Old Hungarian (i.e. *al ~ alsó* 'lower', *fel ~ felső* 'upper') – can lead to the conclusion that the original Hungarian name forms were *Alsótömpös* 'settlement named Alsó/Tömpös' and *Felsőtömpös* 'settlement named Felső/ Tömpös' but they can also lead to the valid conclusion that the name forms were *Altömpös* and *Feltömpös* (HOFFMANN 2004: 27, SZŐKE 2008: 270, KMHsz. 1: 32, 101). Moreover, Latin forms in the charters may also include denotations of paraphrasing, descriptive nature, which make it difficult to determine the contemporary spoken language form behind them. The Hungarian equivalent of the occurrence 1075/+1124/+1217: *villa Martini* (DHA 1: 216) for example – due to the lack of parallel Hungarian data – can be defined either as the two-part names *Mártonháza* 'Martin's/village' or *Mártonfalva* 'Martin's/village', or as the one-part, formantless name *Márton* 'Martin', or even as the derived name *Márton-i* 'Martin + -i toponymic derivative'. In addition to the above, another possibility that cannot be excluded is that there is actually no element with the status of a proper name behind the Latin form, but it simply includes appellatives as a means of describing the estate belonging to the person mentioned, i.e. *Márton földje*: 'a village in the possession of a person named Martin' (HOFFMANN 2004: 31, SZŐKE 2008: 270–271, 2015: 143).

The Latin and latinized name usage of the charters has various types: a; forms created by the phonological or morphological changes to the original structures; b; the interpretation of Hungarian word endings as Latin word endings; c; partially translated names; d; Latin names created by translating complete Hungarian names; e; the usage of the Latin equivalents of the names (cf. HOFFMANN 2004: 15–38, SZŐKE 2015: 125–148).

a; A dictionary of early Hungarian toponyms has 2000 latinized instances of more than 400 toponyms. 44 % of the 2000 instances are such settlement names which were created by morphological modification. Most of the examples of this method are settlement names. Morphological modification of the names has two types: 1. the adjectival forms with the *-iensis* ending (e.g. the settlement name *Szeged* transformed into 1263: *Sceguediensi,* KMHsz.1. *Szeged*), and 2. the noun forms with the *-inum* ending (e.g. the settlement name *Szeged* transformed into 1282: *Zegedinum,* KMHsz. 1. *Szeged*) (SZŐKE 2008: 271, cf. HOFFMANN 2004: 24–25). This method was typical mainly in the case of semantically non-transparent names (SZENTGYÖRGYI 2010: 39, 2014: 88).

b; Hungarian word endings identified as Latin word endings, on the other hand, represent the smallest segment within this data corpus. The method is most frequently found in hydronyms. Within this latter category, it is primarily hydronyms ending with an *a,* and as such, perfectly conforms to the first Latin declension that has the suffix of one of the dependent cases such as, for example, the instance 1229: *Sythuam* (Gy. 1: 476, KMHsz. 1: 307), a form identifying the *Zsitva* river (SZŐKE 2008: 271, 2015: 129).

c; A Latin geographical common word positioned before the name of a place can be used to identify its type. In some cases, however, such lexemes do not have an explanatory function in the Latin text, but should instead be considered parts of the names themselves. Most of the times, Latin geographical common word + Hungarian proper name structures can be evaluated by applying name taxonomy knowledge. The name 1075/+1124/+1217: *montem nomine Sorul* (DHA 1: 217), for example, is most likely to be the partially translated form of the two-part name *Saruly-hegy* 'a hill named Saruly', as formantless anthroponym name giving (i.e. a name form such as *Saruly*) is not characteristic of oronyms (SZŐKE 2015: 138). In some rare cases, the Latin geographical common word follows the Hungarian proper name. With such instances being sporadic, an apparently handy explanation is the presumption that such structures of the charters have two-part Hungarian name structures behind them, the second part of which was translated into Latin (1075/+1124/+1217: *Scilu piscina,* 'Szil fishpond', where fishpond appears in the Latin form; DHA 1: 217). It is important to emphasise, however, that denotations such as *Tisza folyó* 'Tisza river' instead of *Tisza,* are not uncommon in present day name usage either (in special contexts and only in formal style: for example, on hand-posts, geographical texts), and even the charters themselves have evidence of such hydronyms – that is, hydronyms which are not proper names in their entirety: *Hejő vize* 'the water of the (river) Hejő', *Hernád vize* 'the water of the (river) Hernád' etc. (KMHsz. 1. *víz,* cf. SZŐKE 2015: 139).

Besides these cases, which cannot be evaluated with certainty, mixed language occurrences of secondary names formed of a primary hydronym or oikonym plus an adjective are easier to recognize in the charters (*Nagy-Okor* 'Big/Okor': 1257: *Magnum Okur,* Gy. 1: 375, KMHsz. 1: 197; *Felkassa* 'Upper/Kassa': 1261: *Superior Cassa,* Gy. 1: 102, KMHsz. 1: 100). In the case of these name types, the translation into Latin concerned the adjectives, which, however, are mostly *kis* 'little', *nagy* 'big' or *holt* 'backwater' for hydronyms, and *kis* 'little', *nagy* 'big' or *al(só)* 'lower', *fel(ső)* 'upper' for oikonyms (HOFFMANN 2004: 18–19, 26–27, SZŐKE 2008: 270).

d; Hungarian names translated into Latin in their entirety can be most frequently found among oikonyms. Within this group, translation into Latin is most characteristic of the subgroup of oikonyms with Church-related elements and names with the structure "adjective + geographical common word denoting a settlement" (*Kápolna* 'chapel': 1332–35: *Capella,* Gy. 1: 101, KMHsz. 1: 144; *Nagyfalu* 'big village': 1245: *Magna villa,* KÁZMÉR 1970: 139). Besides this kind of toponyms, however, names of hills, like *Nagy-szikla* 'big cliff': 1327: *magnum lapidem* (FNESz. *Ördög-szikla*), names of forests, like *Fekete-erdő* 'black forest': 1255: iuxta *nigram silvam* (Gy. 1: 98, KMHsz. 1: 98), names of roads, like *Nagy út* 'big road': 1235: *magnam viam* (Gy. 2: 618) and names of islands, like *Tamás-sziget(e)* 'Thomas's/island': 1211: *insulam Thomae* (Gy. 2: 360) can also provide a few examples of occurrences in the charter's language (cf. HOFFMANN 2004: 15–38, SZŐKE 2008: 268–270, SZENTGYÖRGYI 2013: 159–163).

e; A distinction is to be made between names appearing in their entirety in Latin, based on whether the Latin form is translated from Latin to Hungarian, or is a Latin language variant. The Latin forms of names known throughout Europe (mostly names of rivers) belong to the latter group, as the forms in which these appear in Latin language medieval European documents is identical to their forms found in Hungarian charters. Such an example is the main river of the Carpathian Basin, *Duna* 'the river Danube', mentioned as *Danubius* (HOFFMANN 2004: 16–17, SZŐKE 2008: 272, 2015: 148).

4. Moving on from names occurring in Latin to the textual positioning of Hungarian toponyms, the first item to be discussed are the place names occurring next to Latin verbs with meanings such as "say" and "call". There are thousands, more likely even tens of thousands of occurrences of such structures (HOFFMANN 2004: 39). The main element of the structure is always a Latin geographical common word (*villa* 'village', *fluvius* 'river', *mons* 'hill', etc.) indicating the type of place which is denoted by the name within the structure. Occasionally, however, the main element position is filled by the word *locus* 'place', which only gives a general indication of the type of place. The verb

Melinda Szőke

with the meaning "say" and the subordinate clause containing the Hungarian language element are linked to the main element by the relative pronoun *qui, que, quod* 'which, that'. Amongst the verbs, *dico* 'say, denote something by some name' and *voco* 'say, call, denote something by some name' are the ones used most often, but, in addition, *nomino*, *nuncupo*, *appello* and *cognomino* also can be found. The structures mostly include the verbs in their third person singular passive forms: 1086: predium, quod *dicitur Ketel loca* (DHA 1: 251), but there are some rare third person plural active forms as well: +1092/[1325 k.]/1399: villa in *Aureo Loco,* quam vulgo *Aranÿan vocant* (DHA 1: 284). Besides these two forms, the subordinate clause can also be substituted with a passive infinitive verb structure: 1055: Adhuc autem est locus *Mortis dictus* (DHA 1: 150) or with *nomine* the Latin ablative form of the noun *nomen* 'name': 1055: alius locus *Kert hel nomine* (DHA 1: 150). The inclusion of different versions within the same charter was probably caused by attempts to be eloquent. The structure may also include an adverbial complement: in the charters of Hungary, the most frequent one of these is *vulgo* 'usually, often, regularly', while *vulgariter* 'commonly' appears less often: +1092/[1325 k.]/1399: villa in *Aureo Loco,* quam vulgo *Aranÿan* vocant, DHA 1: 284; 1086: *gemine fructice,* quod vulgariter vocatur *ikirbucur,* DHA 1: 255 (cf. HOFFMANN 2004: 38–42).

It is highly unlikely that the usage of these structures was governed by strict rules; then again, there are a few factors which may have influenced their occurrences. ISTVÁN HOFFMANN found four such possible explanations: 1. It is mostly names whose contents are to be emphasized featuring such structures. In the founding charter of the Abbey of Garamszentbenedek, for example, the name of the river *Garam*, which ran near the abbey, appears next to verb with the meaning "say": 1075/+1124/+1217: *flumen, quod vocatur Gran,* i.e. 'the water said to be Gran', DHA 1: 213. 2. Names not well known in wider circles appear in this form in the charters, such as the names of smaller streams: 1075/+1124/+1217: *piscina, que Woioser vocatur*, i.e. 'the lake said to be Vajas-ér', DHA 1: 215. 3. Where a name is mentioned several times within the same charter, and occurs next to a denotational word the first time, it is normally mentioned without one later on: 1075/+1124/+1217: *terram, que vocatur Alpar,* i.e. 'the land said to be Alpár'; *terre Alpar,* DHA 1: 216, 218. 4. Finally, these structures can also be interpreted as a means to resolve the contradiction between the geographical common word part of a name and its actual kind: 1075/+1124/+1217: *terram, que dicitur Melinhalmu,* i.e. 'the land said to be Melinhalom', where the meaning of the word *halom* is 'mound', DHA 1: 217 (HOFFMANN 2004: 40–42, SZŐKE 2006: 267–269, 2015: 147).

Toponyms without a denotational word are preceded by a Latin preposition and/or a Latin geographical common word indicating their type, but it is not uncommon for Hungarian names to occur in the text without these lexemes. The

usage of prepositions is determined by the rules governing sentence structures, therefore, when discussing these four types together, the issue to tackle is what determined the inclusion/omission of the Latin geographical common words. One of the determining factors could be the language of the toponym, since in the case of names translated into Latin or latinized, the recorders of the charters usually do not see it necessary to indicate the kind of place in question. The use of the Latin language geographical common word may also have been influenced by the frequency with which each name occurs; names mentioned several times in the same charter often appear with the Latin geographical common word the first mention only: 1257: vadit ad *Magnum Okur* … in medio *fluminis Okur* … per medium *Okur* (Gy. 1: 375). On the other hand, toponyms with multiple meanings (in most cases, a stream and a settlement by its side with the same name), nearly always occur next to geographical common words in the charters, as it is important to be unequivocal about which (the stream or the settlement) is meant in the text: 1075/+1124/+1217: *terram nomine Sikua* 'the land called Zsikva' and *rivulum Sikua* 'the Zsikva river', DHA 1: 214 (cf. Hoffmann 2004: 44–50, Szőke 2006: 271).

Toponyms are inserted using Hungarian grammatical means (adverbial noun-suffixes, postpositions) in exceptional cases only. In spite of the low number of occurrences, different subtypes within this category can be distinguished. One type occurs when the Hungarian case suffix of the Hungarian language elements is affected by the Latin preposition: +1232/1384/1393: ad *Scertora* (KMHsz. 1. *Szer-tó?*), while the other type includes occurrences where the toponym is preceded by a Hungarian geographical common word instead of the usual Latin geographical common word: 1327/1378: *in aliud patak Fywzerpatak nominatum,* i.e. 'brook, called the Füzér-brook' (Gy. 1: 146, KMHsz. 1: 107). Beyond these two types, the earliest Hungarian authentic charter to have been preserved in its original copy has 11 examples of a third type (the *rea* postposition used to answer the question 'Where to?'): 1055: *ohut cutarea,* i.e. *Ó út kútjára* 'onto the water well of the old road' (DHA 1: 150). However, this solution does not occur in any other charter (Hoffmann 2010: 217).

5. The written culture of Hungary did not exist in isolation, but was a part of the written Latin culture of Europe (Szentpétery 1930: 36, 259, Solymosi 2006: 214). The Hungarian recording of charters, for example, was established based on German imperial charters as models because when King St. Stephan (1001–1038) organized his kingdom, he followed Western examples, consequently, he had the documents on the foundation of churches issued as imitations of German imperial charters (Szentpétery 1930: 34–35, 37–38, Solymosi: 2006: 195). German imperial charters of the time were the end products of a long process of evolution, which, due to the lack of antecedents, could not become wide-spread in Hungary in the long run. From the end of the 11th century onwards,

however, the Hungarian recording of charters was able to develop together with the European practice. Intense interactions with foreign countries were ensured by the international composition of the clerical society in Hungary, the presence of various monastic orders, papal and other Church relationships, and the foreign (mostly in France) school visits of priests dealing with recording charters (Szentpétery 1930: 259, Solymosi 2006: 214).

Considering the status of the written culture of Hungary, it might be worthwhile to investigate this subject matter within a wider context. A monograph focused on the European practices of inserting proper names into written texts would help define the principles guiding the application of the various methods more accurately. Besides, a comparison would also make it possible to define the sets of solutions which are specific to the practices of each charter issuing organization. One proposal is to produce such a monograph in the form of a multi-author English language volume, with one essay from each author willing to make a contribution presenting the medieval charter-recording practices within a given linguistic territory.

References

Bárczi, Géza 1951. *A tihanyi apátság alapítólevele mint nyelvi emlék.* [The Founding Charter of Abbey of Tihany as a linguistic record.] Budapest, Akadémiai Kiadó.

Benkő, Loránd 1996. Anonymus élő nyelvi forrásai. [Sources from live language usage of Anonymus.] In: Kovács, László–Veszprémy, László ed. *A honfoglaláskor írott forrásai.* Budapest, Balassi. 221–247.

DHA = Györffy, György 1992. *Diplomata Hungariae Antiquissima I.* Budapest, Akadémiai Kiadó.

K. Fábián, Ilona 1997. *A Váradi Regestrum helynevei.* [The toponyms of the Váradi Regestrum.] Szeged, Szegedi Középkorász Műhely.

FNESz. = Kiss, Lajos 1988. *Földrajzi nevek etimológiai szótára I–II.* [Etymological dictionary of geographical names.] Fourth, extended and revised edition. Budapest, Akadémiai Kiadó.

Gácser, Imre 1941. *Az 1211. évi tihanyi összeírás helyesírása és hangtani sajátságai.* [Orthography and phonological characteristics of the 1211 Census of the Abbey of Tihany.] A Magyar Nyelvtudományi Társaság Kiadványai 58. Budapest.

Galambos, László 1942. *A szentírási eredetű személynevek a Váradi Regestrumban.* [Anthroponyms originating from holy scripture in the Váradi Regestrum.] A Magyar Nyelvtudományi Társaság Kiadványai 64. Budapest.

Gy. = Győrffy, György 1963–1998. *Az Árpád-kori Magyarország történeti földrajza I–IV.* [Historical geography of Hungary in the age of the Árpád Dynasty.] Budapest, Akadémiai Kiadó.

Győrffy, György 1970. A helynevek és a történettudomány. [Toponyms and historical science.] *Nyelvtudományi Értekezések 70:* 196–200.

Hoffmann, István 2004. Az oklevelek helynévi szórványainak nyelvi hátteréről. [On the Linguistic Background of Toponymic Remnants in Charters.] *Helynévtörténeti Tanulmányok 1:* 9–61.

Hoffmann, István 2010a. *A tihanyi alapítólevél mint helynévtörténeti forrás.* [The Founding Charter of the Abbey of Tihany as a source in historical toponomastics.] Debrecen, Debreceni Egyetemi Kiadó.

Hoffmann, István 2010b. Dél-dunántúli helynevek a pécsi püspökség alapítólevelében. [Toponyms in southern Transdanubia of the Founding Charter of the Bishopric of Pécs.] In: Németh, Miklós–Sinkovics, Balázs ed. *Tanulmányok Szabó József 70. születésnapjára.* Szeged. 77−82.

Kázmér, Miklós 1970. *A »falu« a magyar helynevekben. XIII–XIX. század.* [»falu« 'village' in Hungarian toponyms. 13−19th century.] Budapest, Akadémiai Kiadó.

KMHsz. = Hoffmann, István 2005. *Korai magyar helynévszótár 1000–1350. 1. Abaúj–Csongrád vármegye.* [A Dictionary of early Hungarian toponyms 1000–1350. I. Abaúj–Csongrád Counties.] Debrecen, Debreceni Egyetem Magyar Nyelvtudományi Tanszéke.

Kniezsa, István 1939. Az esztergomi káptalan 1156. évi dézsmajegyzékének helynevei. [The toponyms of the 1156 Decimal Note of the Chapter of Esztergom.] *Századok 73:* 167–187.

Kniezsa, István 1947–1949. A zobori apátság 1111. és 1113. évi oklevelei mint nyelvi (nyelvjárási) emlékek. [The Charters 1111 and 1113 of the Abbey of Zobor as linguistic (dialectical) records.] *Magyar Népnyelv 6:* 3–50.

Kovács, Éva 2015. *A Tihanyi összeírás mint helynévtörténeti forrás.* [The Census of the Abbey of Tihany as source for historical toponamistics.] Debrecen, Debreceni Egyetemi Kiadó.

Kovács, Éva 2016a. A Százdi alapítólevél nyelv- és névtörténeti forrásértékről. [The Foundation Deed of Százd Abbey as a source for historical linguistics and onomastics.] *Névtani Értesítő 38:* 143–156.

Kovács, Éva 2016b. A Százdi alapítólevél helynévi szórványainak névrendszertani sajátosságai. [The onomatosystematical characteristics of the toponymic remnants of the Founding Charter of Százd.] *Nyelvtudományi Közlemények 112:* 283–295.

Kovács, Éva 2016c. A Százdi alapítólevél helynévi szórványainak szövegbeillesztő eljárásairól. [On the Text Integration Procedures of the

Toponymic Elements in the Founding Charter of the Abbey of Százd.] *Helynévtörténeti Tanulmányok 12:* 59–68.

MIKOS, JÓZSEF 1935. A székesfehérvári keresztesek 1193. évi oklevele mint magyar nyelvemlék. [Charter Dated 1193 of the crusaders from Székesfehérvár as Hungarian linguistic record.] *Magyar Nyelv 31:* 152–167, 243–258, 288–308.

MOLLAY, KÁROLY 1982. *Német-magyar nyelvi érintkezések a XVI. század végéig.* [German-Hungarian language contacts until the end of the XVIth century.] Budapest, Akadémiai Kiadó.

MOZGA, EVELIN 2014. Az 1211. évi tihanyi összeírás személyneveiről. [On the Analysis of the Anthroponyms in the Census of the Abbey of Tihany (1211).] *Helynévtörténeti Tanulmányok 10:* 165–178.

MOZGA, EVELIN 2015. A h graféma előfordulásai a Tihanyi összeírás személyneveiben. [The Incidence of the *h* Grapheme among the Anthroponyms of the Census of the Abbey of Tihany.] *Helynévtörténeti Tanulmányok 11:* 161–175.

MOZGA, EVELIN 2016. A Tihanyi összeírás jövevényszemélyneveinek vizsgálata. [An Analysis of Loan Anthroponyms in the Census of the Abbey of Tihany.] *Helynévtörténeti Tanulmányok 12:* 69–80.

PAIS, DEZSŐ 1939. *A veszprémvölgyi apácák görög oklevele mint nyelvi emlék.* [The Greek charter of the Nunnery of Veszprémvölgy as a linguistic record.] A Magyar Nyelvtudományi Társaság Kiadványai 50. Budapest.

PAIS, DEZSŐ 1955. 1055–1955. *Magyar Nyelv 51:* 3–9.

PELCZÉDER, KATALIN 2015. A Bakonybéli összeírás nyelvtörténeti forrásértéke. [The Philological Source Value of the Census of the Abbey of Bakonybél.] *Helynévtörténeti Tanulmányok 11:* 55–68.

PÓCZOS, RITA 2015. A Pécsi püspökség alapítólevelének helynévi szórványai: *Lupa, Kapos.* [Remnants in the Founding Charter of the Bishopric of Pécs: *Lupa, Kapos.*] *Helynévtörténeti Tanulmányok 11:* 69–84.

SLÍZ, MARIANN 2008. Az oklevélírási gyakorlat hatása a családnevek kialakulására a XIV. században. [The Effect of Document-writing Techniques on the Emergence of Surnames in the 14th Century.] *Magyar Nyelv 104:* 186–196.

SLÍZ, MARIANN 2014. A megkülönböztető névelemek és az oklevélírói gyakorlat. [Bynames and the Practice of Charter Writing.] *Helynévtörténeti Tanulmányok 10:* 155–164.

SOLYMOSI, LÁSZLÓ 2006. *Írásbeliség és társadalom az Árpád-korban.* [Written culture and society in the Árpád Era.] Budapest, Argumentum Kiadó.

SZABÓ, DÉNES 1936. A dömösi prépostság adománylevele. [The Donation Charter of the Provostry of Dömös.] *Magyar Nyelv 32:* 54–57, 130–135, 203–206.

SZABÓ, DÉNES 1937. A dömösi prépostság adománylevelének helyesírása. [Orthography of the Donation Charter of the Provostry of Dömös.] *Magyar Nyelv 33:* 99–109.

SZABÓ, DÉNES 1954. *A dömösi prépostság adománylevelének hely- és vízrajza.* [The topography and hydrography of the Donation Charter of the Provostry of Dömös.] A Magyar Nyelvtudományi Társaság Kiadványai 85. Budapest.

SZAMOTA, ISTVÁN 1895. A tihanyi apátság 1055-iki alapítólevele mint a magyar nyelv legrégibb hiteles és egykorú emléke. [The 1055 Founding Charter of the Abbey of Tihany as the oldest authentic and contemporary linguistic record of the Hungarian language.] *Nyelvtudományi Közlemények 25:* 129–167.

SZENTGYÖRGYI, RUDOLF 2010. Helynevek beillesztése korai latin nyelvű okleveleink szövegébe. [The text integration procedures of the toponyms into the text of the early Latin chaters.] *Helynévtörténeti Tanulmányok 5:* 33–45.

SZENTGYÖRGYI, RUDOLF 2011. A Tihanyi alapítólevél személynevei I. Középkori okleveleink teonimái. [Personal Names in the Deed of Foundation of Tihany Abbey I. Theonyms in Hungarian Medieval Charters.] *Névtani Értesítő 33:* 9–28.

SZENTGYÖRGYI, RUDOLF 2012. A veszprémvölgyi monostor görög nyelvű adománylevele – legelső hazai nyelvemlékünk? [The Greek deed of gift of the monastery of Veszprém Valley – the earliest extant document of Hungarian?] *Magyar Nyelv 108:* 303–322, 385–399.

SZENTGYÖRGYI, RUDOLF 2013. A Tihanyi alapítólevél személynevei II. Az alapítólevél hagionimái. [Personal Names in the Deed of Foundation of Tihany Abbey II. Hagionyms.] *Névtani Értesítő 35:* 157–178.

SZENTGYÖRGYI, RUDOLF 2014. *A Tihanyi apátság alapítólevele. Az alapítólevél szövege, diplomatikai és nyelvi leírása.* [The Founding Charter of the Abbey of Tihany, Vol. 1. The text of the charter and its diplomatic and linguistic description.] Budapest, ELTE Eötvös Kiadó.

SZENTPÉTERY, IMRE 1930. *Magyar oklevéltan.* [Hungarian diplomatics.] Budapest, Magyar Történelmi Társulat.

SZŐKE, MELINDA 2006. A garamszentbenedeki apátság alapítólevelében szereplő szórványok nyelvi alkata és szövegbeli helyzete. [The linguistic form and textual position of the toponymic remnants of the Founding Charter of the Abbey of Garamszentbenedek.] In: KOVÁCS, ZOLTÁN–SZIRÁK, PÉTER ed. *Juvenilia I. Debreceni bölcsész diákkörösök antológiája.* Debrecen, Debreceni Egyetem, Kossuth Egyetemi Kiadó. 263–274.

SZŐKE, MELINDA 2008. Régi helyneveink latinizálása. [The Latinisation of Old Hungarian toponyms.] In: BÖLCSKEI, ANDREA–N. CSÁSZI, ILDIKÓ ed. *Név és valóság. A VI. Magyar Névtudományi Konferencia előadásai.* Bu-

dapest, Károli Gáspár Református Egyetem BTK Magyar Nyelvtudományi Tanszék. 267–271.

SZŐKE, MELINDA 2015. *A garamszentbenedeki apátság alapítólevelének nyelvtörténeti vizsgálata.* [Language historical analysis of the Founding Charter of the Abbey of Garamszentbenedek.] Debrecen, Debreceni Egyetemi Kiadó.

SZŐKE, MELINDA 2016. A bakonybéli apátság 1037. évi alapítóleveléről. [On the Founding Charter of the Abbey of Bakonybél Dated 1037.] *Helynévtörténeti Tanulmányok 12:* 45–58.

TERESTYÉNI CZ., FERENC 1941. *Magyar közszói eredetű személynevek az 1211-i tihanyi összeírásban.* [Anthroponyms originating from Hungarian common word of the 1211 Census of the Abbey of Tihany.] A Magyar Nyelvtudományi Társaság Kiadványai 59. Budapest.

TÓTH, VALÉRIA 2013a. Szempontok a középkori források személynévi adatainak értékeléséhez. [Different Aspects for Assessment of the Personal Names Data of the Medieval Charters.] *Nyelvtudományi Közlemények 109:* 227–254.

TÓTH, VALÉRIA 2013b. A középkori források személyjelölő szerkezeteinek névszociológiai értéke. [The Name Sociology Value of the Person Identifying Structures of the Medieval Charters.] *Magyar Nyelvjárások 51:* 17–57.

Abstract

The linguistic analysis of Hungarian linguistic records became popular again in the 21st century. In many respects, researchers stick to he traditional methods of analysing linguistic records, but they have introduced some new methods as well. For example, they do not extract the Hungarian language elements (mostly proper names) from their Latin context, but treat the former as parts of the latter, and attribute significance to the ways the elements are fitted into the texts. There are six insertion ways: 1. The Latin or latinized form of toponyms: for example the Hungarian name of the settlement *Újvár* 'new castle' appearing as *Nove Civitas* in the charters. 2. Hungarian name forms next to Latin verbs with meanings such as 'say', 'call' (e.g. *dico, voco*): piscina, que *Woioser* vocatur. 3. Insertion into the text of a Latin language geographical common word: ab eodem *lacu Bolatin*. 4. Hungarian names linked into the Latin text using Latin prepositions: *in Sari*. 5. Some Hungarian toponym forms, however, appear by themselves, without any Latin language elements: *Aruk tue.* 6. And finally, toponyms included in the Latin text together with their Hungarian language elements (e.g. a Hungarian adverbial noun-suffix): ad *Scertora* 'Szer-tó' + *-ra* the Hungarian adverbial noun-suffix answering the question

'Where to?'. Applying this set of categories the essay outlines the system of links between toponyms appearing in the charters of Hungary and their Latin language context.

Keywords: medieval charters, non-authentic charters, toponyms, source value of toponyms