

János N. Fodor (Budapest) – Kitti Hauber (Budapest)

TRACING THE IMPACT OF FOLK ETYMOLOGY ON HUNGARIAN SURNAMES

The paper presents the cases of folk etymology in the Hungarian family name stock. It deals with possibilities and difficulties in the interpretation of the term, as well as the differences in the use of the term between the traditional international and Hungarian linguistics. It also examines the issue of learned folk etymologies or naive etymologies as part of folk etymology with some examples from the 13th century.

The paper argues that communal associations, analogies and approval play an essential role in folk etymological changes and this should be taken into consideration in the study of the phenomena. It presents examples of changes within the Hungarian language and of changes in interlingual connections throughout the latest centuries in the Carpathian Basin. Also, it introduces the case of hidden folk etymology with examples of name Magyarizations.

Key words

folk etymology; false etymology; hidden folk etymology; Hungarian surnames

0. Introduction

This study primarily aims to explain the term *folk etymology* and provide an overview of its various interpretations while pinpointing discrepancies in its usage in Hungarian and international research. The authors then apply the term of *hidden folk etymology*, a more current means of describing the processes related to folk etymology. The secondary goal of our examination is to compile and discuss cases taken from Hungarian surname data that provide examples relevant to the discussion of the impact of folk etymology on this less examined word form. As a member of the Uralic language family, the Hungarian language displays numerous characteristics that vastly differ from those found in Indo-European languages: given the unique nature of the language, analysing how folk etymology influences manifests itself in the Hungarian language offers further insights into its effects. Rather than providing a complete description of the Hungarian language, the current examination focuses on surnames because—compared to common words and place names—it is far more challenging to reveal and observe the influence folk etymology exerts on surnames. An investigation of this type will therefore expand upon the little data available in this area, in spite of the difficulties experienced in gathering sufficient data. Within the available sources, examples displaying a connection to folk etymology are scarce; for the purpose of this paper, the authors were forced to base their research on multiple sources and databases while additionally examining the related research literature.

Folk etymology refers to a type of word creation wherein language users match a word of unknown motivation, meaning or structure to a more or less similar, well-known word (Wiesinger, 1995, p. 463; Dalberg, 2008, p. 80). According to Kálmán, folk etymology mostly affects groups comprising a) foreign words; b) blurred compositions, forgotten words; c) proper names (Kálmán, 1976, p. 165). Although folk etymology is primarily characteristic of common words, since the arrival of the Hungarian people in the 9th century, the multi-ethnic and multilingual composition of the Carpathian Basin has engendered the kind of the linguistic contacts and inner linguistic changes that could also bring about several folk etymological changes.

The study of onymic folk etymology concerns mostly toponyms as these forms possess a longer lifespan and can be spread interlingually, a factor that favours the maintenance of archaic elements (Dámaso – Lorenzo, 1951, p. 204; Baldinger, 1986, pp. 8, 16). As different ethnic groups migrate, words pass from one language to another and are realised in the recipient language as a sequence of sounds possessing unknown meaning. Anthroponyms, however, are connected to individuals and their lifespan: in the case of this category, folk etymological change can be observed primarily in the inheritable family names that connect several generations (Kakuk, 1998; Mizser, 2002; Casanova 2002).

This paper presents the appearance of folk etymological changes in the historical Hungarian family name data with a special focus on cases wherein the reshaping of linguistic elements occurs on a collective rather than an individual basis.

1. The concept of folk etymology

A phenomenon universal to every language, folk etymology “is based on the process of language instinct and analogy, the main source of power for a living language” (Kovalovszky, 1967, p. 245; see also Kálmán, 1976). In fact, folk etymology is not only characteristic of natural (collective) language usage, but can also be the result of an individual innovation, i.e., an associative, synchronic interpretation of the origin, motivation or meaning of a name. In this case, the relevant knowledge was never handed down to the name community. (For the term name community see Tóth, 2016). According to Knobloch, (1968) folk etymology is nothing more than a creative misunderstanding, while Baldinger labels it “the paradise of mistakes” (“paraíso de choques”, Baldinger, 1986, p. 4). Naturally, these individual interpretations or innovations become a part of the collective consciousness when a community accepts them and integrates them into its own element stock (Wiesinger, 1995, p. 464; see also Kovalovszky, 1967, p. 254).

Since its first appearance, researchers have tried to define folk etymology more accurately due to the seeming contradiction that appears to exist between the term

and the linguistic process that it describes (Förstemann, 1852; for a summary see Baldinger, 1986, p. 2; Kálmán, 1976, p. 166; Dalberg, 2008, pp. 80–83). The most commonly used term is still *folk etymology* (*Volksetymologie*, *etimología popular*, *étimologie populaire*, *kansanetymologia*, *népetimológia*). Albeit less commonly, the term *secondary motivation* (*sekundäre Motivation*, *motivación secundaria*, see Wiesinger, 1995; Baldinger, 1986) is also used. These terms refer to the method of word creation or word re-creation that is often accompanied by the phonetic and orthographic modification of the name which is not etymologically transparent for the name user or name community. Yet the terms can also refer to a type of word reinterpretation that does not result in the modification of the name, but rather in an explanation of the origin, motivation or meaning of the name that occurred without the application of a proper methodology of modern linguistics (see Wiesinger, 1995, p. 464; Kálmán, 1976; Dalberg, 2008, p. 84). In works by linguists examining different languages, the focus is sometimes on the former, sometimes on the latter interpretation. Generally speaking, the anthropological approach to the phenomenon is the most dominant one (see Dalberg, 2008, p. 82). Namely, more attention is paid to the method with which names are reinterpreted, a process that can either launch or cause the modification of the form of the name (see among others Neuffer, 1966; Winslow, p. 1984; Murray, 1986).

2. The issue of the range of folk etymology

In contrast, Hungarian researchers use different terms to distinguish between the two phenomena. Coined by Förstemann (1852) as *Volksetymologie*, the Hungarian term of *népetimológia* (*folk etymology*) was translated directly from the German and refers to the method of name creation or name recreation. Throughout this process, the shape of the name—in pronunciation and/or in orthography—changes according to the intention of the language user or the community and in an effort to make sense of the name. Traditionally, Hungarian linguistics therefore uses a tighter interpretation of folk etymology by relying on the ascertainment of what are known as traditional grammars (see Keszler ed., 2017, p. 347, see also Rónai, 1982, p. 9). When a name is being reinterpreted without any modification, the process of the intention to find sense in the name is signaled by the term *népi etimológia* (*'folksy etymology'* in a literal translation, English termini are *false etymology*, *pseudoetymology*, *paraetymology* or *paretymology*) (see Kovalovszky, 1967, p. 245; Fejes, 2013; Stachowski, 2022, p. 62).¹ With this distinction, the separation of the cohesive and often collaborating processes that still result in different outcomes was

¹ Hereinafter we use the term *false etymology*.

possible on the level of terminology. However, the essential problem of the term *folk etymology*—namely the question of how much and in what ways the linguistic process is connected to the community—has not yet been resolved.

This is the reason why there is a disagreement among Hungarian researchers regarding the range of *folk etymology* itself (or *false etymology* according to the tighter interpretation) and whether the so-called learned (dilettante or naïve) folk etymology can be studied as part of it. The term *learned folk etymology* stems from the German term *gelehrte Volksetymologie* (Wiesinger, 1995, p. 464, see also the Polish term *etymologia natchniona* ‘inspired etymology’, Stachowski, 2022, p. 62). Learned folk etymology refers to the process whereby the language user attaches an etymological explanation to a name based on their own associations and without using the (now) accepted methodology of linguistics. The “lack of [modern] linguistic training reveals itself in that the comparative data are not adduced, historical phonetics, philological attestations, and word formation patterns are ignored, etymological literature is not consulted, and so on” (Stachowski, 2022, p. 62). Although this explanation acts as a scientific one, sometimes it is even “published in a scholarly book or journal, equipped with footnotes and references” (Stachowski, 2022, p. 62), it never becomes accepted by the community.

Kálmán (1967) strictly separated this kind of etymologisation from folk etymology (see Kálmán, 1967, p. 189), while others have handled this process as a variation or part of folk etymology (see Rónai, 1982). The international field of onomastics (see e.g. Wiesinger, 1995, p. 464) mostly agrees with the latter opinion based upon the consideration that these learned folk etymologies only differ from the *false etymology* addressed by the Hungarian literature in that they, as individual creations, never become generally accepted. Yet in both cases, similar associative processes underlie the phenomena: given that both are influenced by the instincts of the language user, the creation of the etymological explanation occurs on the basis of similar analogies.

It can be argued that learned folk etymology is in fact presented as scientific, but this is not a sufficient reason for being judged based upon the expectations of modern linguistics. As Dalberg pointed out: “there is hardly more than a difference of degree between the false etymology produced by »the people« and »the learned«, and the untenable suggestions sometimes proposed by professional name-scholars” (Dalberg, 2008, p. 85). Although learned folk etymology indeed resembles “real” folk etymology in that it (together with analogies) works based on the linguistic knowledge of language users, there remains a significant difference: learned folk etymology is marked by consciousness. The reinterpretation of a name or an explanation of unknown origin, motivation or meaning always happens with a certain goal (see Imreh, 2022; Bello, 2007), while folk etymology occurs during daily communication in a spontaneous way (Dalberg, 2008, p. 91).

Learned folk etymologies can already be found in the Spanish speech area as early as in the 6th century (in the works of Isidor de Sevilla) and in the German speech area as of the 12th century (in Vita Altmanni and in the Breve Chronicon Austriae Mellicense) (see Wiesinger, 1995, p. 464; see also Bach, 1952–1953, p. 538; Dalberg, 2008, p. 85). In the times of humanism, the number of this type of etymologies increased and is still present today. Not even historical linguistics or modern methodology of etymology could prevent the creation of folk etymologies.

Regarding the Hungarian language, *Gesta Hungarorum*, a work by Anonymus (P. magister), is the first source in which at least a dozen etymological explanations of proper names can be found. Dating from the first half of the 13th century, this work comprises the first extant historical narrative in the Hungarian language. Although the *Gesta* aims to describe the origins of the Hungarians and the history of the conquest of the Carpathian Basin, the authenticity of the story is questionable as some of the characters were created by the author based on place names (cf. Rady, 2009, pp. 682–683). Anonymus was aware of a certain peculiarity in the Hungarian language stemming from earlier periods. As a result of this characteristic, a given place could receive the name of a person (such as an owner or resident) even without a suffix. Beyond his working method, Anonymus's interest in the etymological origin of names is also reflected in his naive etymologies.

Yet some of Anonymus's explanations could even be authentic or correct. An example of this can be found in his Hungarian explanation of the name of the first ruler (duke), *Álmos* (< *áлом* 'dream'), which can be connected to the traditional legends surrounding the origin of the Árpád dynasty (see Rady, 2009, p. 688). In Latin, his explanation of the name *Álmos*,² however, displays the logic of naive etymologies. He also produces some explanations of names that are based on recognising the function and meaning of certain language elements.

Regarding the leader Bors, a historically fictitious person, Anonymus notes that the castle he built was named *Borsod* because "it was small" (Rady, 2009, p. 700). Although this folk etymological explanation may be based on the diminutive function of the suffix *-d*, the possible inclusion of a presumably very old phraseme³ should also be taken into consideration. In another part of the explanations, even the recognisability of Anonymus's associations is questionable. It remains a mystery why Anonymus connects the word *szerelem* 'love' to the place name *Szerencs*,⁴

² "The author alludes here to the Latin adjective, *almus*, which also conveyed the meaning of *sanctus* or *pius*" (Rady, 2009, p. 688).

³ *Kicsi a bors, de erős* (literally 'The pepper is small, but strong', see the English proverb *Small rain lays great dust*).

⁴ "...seeing from the mountains the quality of the place, they called that place "lovely" which is said in their language *zerelmes*, because they loved that place greatly, and from that day until

even when the word *szerencse* ‘luck’ suggests a far stronger association. It must not be forgotten, that in order to join the collective consciousness, these etymological explanations must meet the expectations of the community. Instead, most of them typically remain on the level of individual ideas. If, however, the community adopts these etymological explanations, they fall into a category that is similar to folk poetry in that they will become a part of the folklore that surrounds names.

This phenomenon is also expressed by terms such as naming tales (Ashley, 1995, p. 472), mythopoetic folk-etymology (Dalberg, 2008, p. 84) or *leyenda etimológica* ‘etymological legend’ (Martinez Ezquerro–Martos García, 2018, p. 122). This is evidenced by research that explores these community symbols in folk etymological explanations (primarily in relation to place names) (see Nyrop, 1882, p. 101; Bach, 1952–1953, p. 539; Winslow, 1984; Murray, 1986).

3. Traces of folk etymology in historical Hungarian data

As regards what chances of survival the spontaneous changes rendered by folk etymology may have, the filter of the community plays an important role. In other words, individual innovations need to become conventional in order to remain extant. To begin with, as an act rooted in analogy, folk etymology is possible because certain patterns and linguistic schemes are assigned to individuals. These form part of the language and name competence.⁵ According to how much they are routinised individually and conventional within the community, they can influence the linguistic changes that also determine proper names (see Verhagen, 2007, p. 48; Langacker, 2008, pp. 55–57; see also Langacker, 1987; Kemmer – Barlow, 2000).

The linguistic goal of onymic folk etymological changes is to fit an unknown, strange-sounding and strange-looking name into the name system known by the individual yet created and operated by the community. Dalberg points out that in the case of toponyms, “many folk-etymological place-names reshapings are probably to be understood primarily as adjustments to the particular structures and norms that are found in the language user’s onomasticon” (Dalberg, 2008, p. 90).

In the next part of the paper, the folk etymological changes of Hungarian family names are presented according to two aspects. First, based on sporadic examples found in the historical name stock, we explain the changes that have occurred within the language. Then we will describe the family name Magyarisations – whether spontaneous or purposeful – that were caused by the influence of interlingual phenomena. It must first be mentioned that the period within which our

now the place is called *Szerencse* from *zerelmu* [now *szezelem*; the authors]” (Rady, 2009, p. 699).

⁵ For *name competence* see Tóth, 2016, p. 51.

data was gathered begins in the 14th and 15th centuries, when Hungarian surnames first emerged, and extends to the 19th century, when many families altered their original, non-Hungarian surnames to reflect Hungarian origins in a process known as Magyarisation. The examples selected for this paper have been collated from published dictionaries (Kázmér, 1993; Hajdú, 2010; N. Fodor, 2010b), the data found in studies, and our own data collections. The examples of 19th-century name alterations analysed in the final section of this examination were gleaned from a collection of official contemporary documents (Szentiványi, 1895).

In folk etymological changes, language users provide new motivation for names by adjusting their lexical elements of unknown origin or blurred meaning to already extant lexemes. By doing this, new meanings are created for these elements: names start to make sense through a spontaneous (not conscious) process. The innovation then spreads throughout the community.

Among Hungarian family names,⁶ some examples can be found in which names whose common word antecedents lost their meaning change in order to find meaningful words in them. In the name stock from the late Old Hungarian era, the family names of *Szalmaházi* (1467: Thomas *Zalmahazÿ*, N. Fodor, 2010a, p. 120) can be found. The name was created by means of folk etymology, even if the name originally comes from the toponym *Samelháza* (in county Ugocsa) in which the anthroponym *Samel* from the era of the House of Árpád was preserved. Language users later tried to make sense of the already forgotten given name by matching it to the common word *szalma* ('straw'), thereby creating a fictitious toponym (pseudotoponym) *Szalmaháza*. This adaptation became acceptable for the language users as it perfectly fitted into their name system.

Examples emerge from later centuries as well, such as in the case of the family name, *Hüvelyes*. Lajos Mizser assumed the influence of folk etymology in the creation of this name as the family with the name in question bore nicknames that "all refer to folk healing, e.g. *Csipke* [*< csipke* 'lace' or 'rosehip'], *Orvos* [*< orvos* 'doctor'], *Pókos* [*< pókos* 'horse with joint disease'], *Vajas* [*< vajas* 'butter maker' or 'butter seller' as butter was often used to smooth burn wounds and itchy rashes] etc." (Mizser, 2002, p. 330), therefore in the family name we should look for the extinct provincial word *imelyes* meaning 'the person who removes larvae from under the skin of cattle'. This unknown provincialism was matched by the language community on the basis of a formal similarity to the word *hüvelyes* 'scabbard maker', an association that meant adjusting the shape of the name as well.

⁶ In a broader categorisation, we include surnames that are not Hungarian in origin, provided these names were used by members of Hungarian ethnic groups living within the historical territory of Hungary during any historical period. (See Farkas, 2010.)

The family name *Szalmasági* is extremely rare and exclusively found in the northeastern part of Hungary. The first mention of the name dates from the year 1826 and the name was borne by Sára *Szalmasági*. Apparently, the name belongs to the type of the toponymic surnames formed with the *-i* suffix referring to origin. Thus, a toponym *Szalmaság* should have served as a base for the family name. However, no settlements with this name existed in the territory of historic Hungary. To find an explanation, earlier mentions of the same family name can be examined: 1620: *Stephanus Sarmasaghi*; 1621–1637: *Sarmasagi*, *Sarmaszaghi*; 1666: *Szármassagi*; 1669: *Sármasági*, *Sarmasági*; 1686: *Szarmasáky*, 1688: *Sarmossági*, 1690: *Szarmoszagj*, 1693: *Szarmosági*. The toponym we seek is probably *Sarmaság* in county Szilágy (today *Șarmășag* – Romania). Another question is how the change from *Sarmasági* to *Szalmasági* happened. The *r > l* phonetic change was regular in the history of the Hungarian language (see e.g. German *erker* > Hungarian *erkel* ~ *erkély*; Hungarian *tarló* > provincial *talló*). However, phonetically the *s > sz* change in the frontal position in the word cannot be detected anywhere else, thus folk etymology remains the only possible explanation. The created pseudotoponym of *Szalmaság* can be interpreted as the composition of the words *szalma* ‘straw’ and *ság* ‘hill’.

Further examples of this type of family names: *Csekely* (< *Csekely* toponym) > *Csekély* (|| *csekély* ‘slight’), *Szentvidi* (< *Szentvid* toponym [*< Szent Vid* ‘Saint Vid’] + *-i* suffix) > *Szenvedi* (|| *szenved* ‘[he] suffers’); *Csanád* (< *Csanád* anthroponym or toponym) > *Csinát* (|| *csinált* ‘[he] did <something>’); *Csippán* (< *Csippán* anthroponym) > *Csippa* (|| *csipa* ‘gum’) (see Ördög, 2012, p. 106); *Márkus* (< *Márkus* anthroponym) > *Markoss* (|| *markos* ‘large handed, strong’ > *Mákos* (|| *mákos* ‘made with poppy seeds’) (Kakuk, 1988, p. 99).

The cases of the Magyarisation of names that were of foreign origin also sheds light on the process of folk etymology. While these examples are spontaneous name Magyarisations, they are also the results of conscious name changes. In both cases, associations based on the standard language variation serve as background, namely for language users matching incomprehensible family names (of non-Hungarian origin, with unknown meaning and etymology) to a common word on the basis of their modal similarity in an effort that helps make sense of them.

Next, we present examples of cases when a name of foreign origin goes through a folk etymological change in the Hungarian language environment as a result of contact between different name systems. One of the earliest examples is the change of the family name *Kendris* > *Kenderes* in the 15th century. The family name was Magyarised to *Kenderes* from the given name *Kendris* of Romanian origin and borne by the first known member of a family (*Malomvizi Kenderes*) from South Transylvania. The change happened under the influence of the Hungarian word *kender* ‘hemp’ (N. Fodor, 2010a, p. 120; N. Fodor 2010b, p. 133).

From cases originating from the recent past, the family name *Terdik* can be featured. The name appears in the form of *Térdig* eleven times in the population register from year 2007. Undoubtedly this is another case of “making sense” of a foreign name: the name was matched to the Hungarian word *térdig* ‘knee-length’ by the language users (Hajdú, 2010). The examples are cases similar to the folk etymological changes of common words that were launched by associations and resulted in spontaneous name Magyarisations.

Further examples for this type include the following: German *Lang* > *Láng* (|| *láng* ‘flame’); Italian *Dellasega* > *Dellaszegi* (|| *-szegi* ‘someone from the edge of something’) (Farkas, 2015, p. 401); Slavic *Hostya* > *Ostya* (|| *ostya* ‘wafer’), German *Scheck* > *Segg* (|| *segg* ‘butt’) (Ördög, 2012, pp. 104, 106); Slavic *Kaszavits* > *Kaszaviszi* (|| *kasza* ‘scythe’ + *viszi* ‘[he] carries’); Slavic *Novotta* > *Nóta* (|| *nóta* ‘melody’) (Kakuk, 1988, p. 97), (of unknown origin) *Fányol* > *Fátyol* (|| *fátyol* ‘veil’) (Kecskés, 1998, p. 79); etc.

The etymological analogy partially occurs in cases when only one part of family name of foreign origin is adjusted to the form of a Hungarian common word or proper name: *Westerham* (1734–1752) > *Westergom/ Wésztergom* (|| *Esztergom* toponym) (Szilágyi-Kósa, 2011, p. 195).

During times characterised by the movement of name changes (such as name Magyarisations in the 19th century), numerous names of foreign (non-Hungarian) origin were changed to ones of Hungarian origin. The main reason for the name change was to change identity (assimilation). However, in some cases people bearing foreign family names and living in a Hungarian language environment changed their names because negative connotations had been attached to their names in the eyes of the Hungarian language users. Probably due to negative comments (mockery), these individuals needed to change their names which, by that time, had taken on a completely different form from before.⁷ The phenomenon can be addressed as **hidden folk etymology** as the sense-making process does not appear in the adopted name, but rather in the previous form of the name that originally generated the change.

From a morphological aspect, two subgroups can be established: a) the whole name, b) only parts of the name match a Hungarian word. For the first type, the following examples can be found in the name Magyarisation stock from the 19th century: German *Kann* || *kan* ‘male’, German *Fink* || *fing* ‘fart’, (probably) German *Pischa* (|| provincial *pisa* ‘piss’, (of unknown origin) *Vitriol* || *vitriol* ‘vitriol’, etc.

From a semantic aspect, the classification is based on whether the connotation of the name is neutral or negative. Examples for the first were presented above,

⁷ Source of the examples is Szentiványi, 1895.

therefore at this juncture we will describe the cases of name changes wherein the change itself was based on negative associations. According to the semantic content two subgroups can be formed: a) obscene, derogatory semantic content, b) semantic content without obscenity.

Examples of group a): *Baszternák* (|| *baszik* ‘[he] fucks’); *Faszl, Fasz binder, Faszler, Kulfasz* (|| *fasz* ‘cock’); *Fink, Finkelnagel* (|| *fin*g ‘fart’); *Hugyec, Hugyik* (|| *húgy* ‘piss’); *Kurgyis, Kuricza* (|| *kúr* ‘[he] screws’); *Maszarik, Szartóy, Piszartsik, Sloszarik* (|| *szarik* ‘[he] shits’); *Pinkasz, Pinkász, Pinkás, Pinkusfeld, Stepina* (|| *pina* ~ *pinka* ~ *pinkus* ‘cunt’); *Pischa* (|| dial. *pisa* ‘piss’); *Pospischil, Pospisil, Postpisil, Poszpischel, Poszpischill, Poszpis* (|| *pisi* ‘piss’). Examples of group b): *Kann* (|| *kan* ‘male’); *Koszovits* (|| *kosz* ‘dirt’); *Ohanyal* (|| *nyal* ‘[he] licks’); *Pecsenyánszky* (|| *pecsenye* ‘roast meat’); *Szukács* (|| *szuka* ‘bitch’); *Vitriol* (|| *vitriol* ‘vitriol’).

4. Conclusion

In this paper, the difficulties surrounding the definition of folk etymology and different possible interpretations of the term were presented. Internationally speaking, researchers can vary on whether they refer to the (re)shaping of names or the reinterpretation of names in their studies on folk etymology. However, in Hungarian linguistics the term folk etymology (*népetimológia in Hungarian*) is understood strictly for the former, relying on the traditional grammars. The term *népi etimológia* (‘folksy etymology’, false etymology) is used for the latter. Another question is whether phenomena known as *learned folk etymologies* can be considered a part of folk etymology. To answer this question, some of the first examples found in the Hungarian-language *Gesta Hungarorum* written by Anonymus in the 13th century is examined for these types. The issue is primarily based on the question of how exactly folk etymology is connected to the folk or to the etymology.

Throughout the paper we argue that the approval of the community is crucial when it comes to cases of folk etymology, a factor that should be taken into consideration in the classification of these phenomena. In the case of the Hungarian family name stock, two main types of etymological change can be observed. On the one hand, the change can occur to names of Hungarian origin that contain unknown motivation or meaning; in this case, the intention of language users is to make (synchronic) sense of these unfamiliar names. On the other hand, the change can occur in the cases of unconscious or intended name Magyarisations when a name of foreign origin appears in the Hungarian speaking environment. Also, the phenomenon of hidden etymology was introduced which refers to the case when folk etymology cannot be found in the changed form of the name, but instead appears in the original form that generated the need for a name change.

REFERENCES

- ASHLEY, L. R. N. (1995): Folk Etymology in the Place Names of the United States. In: E. Eichler (Hrsg.), *Namenforschung. Ein internationales Handbuch zur Onomastik = Name studies: An international Handbook of Onomastics = Les noms propres: Manuel international d'onomastique*. Berlin: De Gruyter, pp. 471–475.
- BACH, A. (1952–1953): *Deutsche Namenkunde Band I/ Teil 1.2.: Die deutschen Personennamen*. Heidelberg: C. Winter.
- BALDINGER, K. (1986): Etimología popular y onomastica. *Lexis*, X/1, pp. 1–24.
- DALBERG, V. (2008): So-called folk-etymological reshaping of place-names. In: V. Dalberg, *Name and Place. Ten essays on the dynamics of place-names*. Edited and translated by Gillian Fellows-Jensen, Peder Gammeltoft, Bent Jørgensen and Berit Sandnes on the occasion of Vibeke Dalberg's 70th birthday, August 22nd 2008. Copenhagen: Department of Scandinavian Research, Name Research Section.
- DÁMASO, A. – LORENZO, E. (1951): *Problemas y métodos de la lingüística*. Madrid: C.S.I.C.
- DEL BELLO, D. (2007): *Forgotten Paths. Etymology and the Allegorical Mindset*. Washington D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press.
- FARKAS, T. (2010): A magyar családnévanyag fogalma és struktúrája. *Magyar Nyelvjárások*, 48, pp. 59–75.
- FARKAS, T. (2015): A magyar családnevek változástipológiájáról. *Magyar Nyelv*, 111, pp. 395–408.
- FEJES, L. (2013): Népetimológia és népi etimológia. *Nyelv és tudomány* [on-line] <<https://m.nyest.hu/hirek/nepetimologia-es-nepi-etimologia>> cit. 2022-08-01.
- FODOR, N. J. (2010a): Személynevek rendszere a kései ómagyar korban. *Magyar Névtani Értekezések* 2. Budapest: ELTE.
- FODOR, N. J. (2010b): A Felső-Tisza-vidék késő középkori személyneveinek szótára (1401–1526). *Magyar Névtani Értekezések* 3. Budapest: ELTE.
- FÖRSTEMANN, E. (1952): Über deutsche Volksetymologien. *Theuthonista*, 13, pp. 1–8.
- HAJDÚ, M. (2010): *Családnevek enciklopédiája. Leggyakoribb mai családneveink*. Budapest: Tinta Könyvkiadó.
- IMREH, R. (2022): Laien-Onomastik in der “neuen ungarischen Mythologie”. Beispiele und Forschungsfragen. In: P. Ernst – S. Gaisbauer – A. Greule – K. Hohensinner (Hrsg.), *Namenforschung im Spannungsfeld zwischen Wissenschaft und Öffentlichkeit*. Regensburg: Edition Vulpes, pp. 221–244.
- KAKUK, M. (1988): Népetimológias névalakulatok Kunszentmárton XVII–XIX. századi anyakönyveiből. *Magyar Nyelvőr*, 112, pp. 97–99.
- KÁLMÁN, B. (1976): A népetimológia. In: L. Benkő – É. K. Sal (eds.), *Az etimológia elmélete és módszere*. Nyelvtudományi Értekezések 89. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó. pp. 165–169.
- KÁZMÉR, M. (1993): *Régi magyar családnevek szótára. XIV–XVII. század*. Magyar Nyelvtudományi Társaság. Budapest.
- KECSKÉS, J. (1998): Alakváltozatok vizsgálata a történelmi családnevek körében. *Névtani Értesítő*, 20, pp. 78–82.

- KEMMER, S. – BARLOW, M. (2000): Introduction: A usage-based conception of language. In: M. Barlow – S. Kemmer (eds.), *Usage-based models of language*. Stanford: CSLI Publications, pp. vii–xxviii.
- KESZLER, B. (ed.) (2017): *Magyar grammatika*. Budapest: Műszaki Könyvkiadó.
- KNOBLOCH, J. (1968): Das schöpferische Missverständnis. *Lingua*, 21, pp. 237–249.
- KOVALOVSKY, M. (1967): Újabb népetimológiáinkról. In: S. Imre – I. Szathmári (eds.), *A magyar nyelv története és rendszere. A debreceni nemzetközi nyelvészkongresszus előadásai*. Nyelvtudományi Értekezések 58. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó. pp. 244–249.
- LANGACKER, R. W. (1987): *Foundations of cognitive grammar. Volume I. Theoretical prerequisites*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- LANGACKER, R. W. (2008): *Cognitive Grammar: A Basic Introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- MARTINEZ EZQUERRO, A. – MARTOS GARCÍA, A. (2018): Etimología popular, toponomástica y paisaje leyendístico. In: E. Ortega Arjonilla (coord.), *El paisaje. Percepciones interdisciplinarias desde las Humanidades*. Granada: Editorial Comares.
- MIZSER, L. (2002): Családnevek Cserépfaluban (1700–1974). *Herman Ottó Múzeum Évkönyve*, 41, pp. 325–333.
- MURRAY, T. E. (1986): Folk Etymology in the Streets of St. Louis. *Names*, 34/4, pp. 373–383.
- NEUFFER, C. H. (1966): Folk Etymology in South Carolina Place Names. *American Speech*, 41/4, pp. 274–277.
- NYROP, K. (1882): *Sprogets vilde Skud*. København.
- ÖRDÖG, F. (2012): A népetimológia kései ómagyar és középmagyar kori személyneveinkben. In: F. Vörös (szerk.), *A nyelvföldrajztól a névföldrajzig III. Nyelvjárásnéprajz – művelődéstörténet*. Szombathely: Savaria University Press. pp. 103–109.
- RADY, M. (2009): The Gesta Hungarorum of Anonymus, the Anonymous Notary of King Béla: A Translation. *The Slavonic and East European Review*, 87, 4, pp. 681–727.
- RÓNAI, B. (1982): A népetimológia földrajzi neveinkben. *Névtani Értesítő*, 7, pp. 9–18.
- STRACHOWSKI, M. (2022): Perceptual Etymology: A Social Aspect of Etymological Research. *Studia Linguistica Universitatis Jagellonicae Cracoviensis*, 139, pp. 61–67.
- [SZENTIVÁNYI, Z.] (1895): *Századunk névváltoztatásai. Helytartósági és miniszteri engedéllyel megváltoztatott nevek gyűjteménye 1800–1893*. Budapest: Hornyánszky Viktor kiadása.
- SZILÁGYI-KÓSA, A. (2011): Ungarndeutsche Personennamen im Plattenseeoberland. Eine antroponomastische Langzeitstudie in Deutschbarnag/ Barnag und Werstuhl/ Vöröstó. *Ungarndeutsches Archiv*, 11. ELTE Germanistisches Institut, Budapest.
- TÓTH, V. (2016): *Személynévadás és személynévhasználat az ómagyar korban*. Debrecen: Debreceni Egyetemi Kiadó.
- WIESINGER, P. (1995): Bedeutung der Eigennamen: Volksetymologie. In: E. Eichler (Hrsg.), *Namenforschung. Ein internationales Handbuch zur Onomastik = Name studies: An international Handbook of Onomastics = Les noms propres: Manuel international d'onomastique*. Berlin: De Gruyter. pp. 463–471.
- WINSLOW, D. (1984): The Onomastic Discourse of Folk Etymologies in Sri Lanka. *Social Analysis: The International Journal of Anthropology*, 16, pp. 79–90.

VLIV LIDOVÉ ETYMOLOGIE NA VZNIK MAĎARSKÝCH PŘÍJMENÍ

Tato studie se věnuje případům lidové etymologie u maďarských příjmení a zkoumá možnosti a problémy interpretace tohoto termínu a kromě toho se také věnuje odlišnosti jeho využití v tradiční mezinárodní a maďarské lingvistice. Zkoumá tzv. bakalářské etymologie a naivní etymologie jako součást lidové etymologie s příklady zaznamenanými ve 13. století. Společenské asociace, analogie a přijetí hrají v lidově-etymologických změnách významnou roli a to by mělo být při zkoumání tohoto jevu bráno v potaz. Studie přináší příklady změn v maďarském jazyce a také změn v mezijazykových vztazích na území Panonské pánve v posledních stoletích. Studie také představuje případ tzv. skryté lidové etymologie na příkladech maďarizace jmen.

Klíčová slova

lidová etymologie; příjmení; Maďarsko

Kitti Hauber

hauber.kitty@gmail.com

*Department of History of the Hungarian Language, Sociolinguistics and Dialectology
Eötvös Loránd University*

Múzeum krt. 4/A.

1088 Budapest

HUNGARY

János N. Fodor

nfodor.janos@btk.elte.hu

*Department of History of the Hungarian Language, Sociolinguistics and Dialectology
Eötvös Loránd University*

Múzeum krt. 4/A.

1088 Budapest

HUNGARY