

Andrea Bölcskéi (Budapest)

CONTRASTIVE ANALYSIS OF ENGLISH AND HUNGARIAN TOPONYM TYPES

KONTRASTIVNÍ ANALÝZA ANGLICKÝCH A MAĎARSKÝCH TYPŮ TOPO- NYM

Tento příspěvek se snaží porovnat některé modelové sémantické a lexikálněgramatické struktury užívané v anglických a maďarských toponymech k určení některých téměř identických (tedy pravděpodobně univerzálních), jakož i některých zcela jedinečných (zřejmě kulturně a jazykově závislých) tendencí v pojmenovávacím úzu dvou geneticky nepříbuzných jazyků. Výskyt podobných základních zeměpisných entit v Británii a Maďarsku vyústil ve vytvoření (i) toponym se shodnou sémantickou a gramatickou strukturou, (ii) toponym se stejnou sémantickou avšak gramaticky odlišnou strukturou, (iii) toponym se stejnou sémantickou a gramatickou strukturou včetně lexémů omezeného využití, (iv) toponym identické sémantické a/nebo gramatické struktury včetně kulturně silně závislých lexémů a (v) toponym se zřetelnou sémantickou a lexikálněgramatickou strukturou. V dlouhodobém horizontu může kontrastivní analýza v kombinaci s metodami historické jazykovědy a kognitivním lingvistickým přístupem ve studiu místních jmen ozřejmit metody, jakými mohou lidé různých mateřských jazyků konceptualizovat podobné zeměpisné entity a v jakých podobách jsou tyto pojmy zevšeobecňovány v jejich odlišných mateřštinách.

Keywords

contrastive onomastics, English toponym types, Hungarian toponym types, semantics, cognitive linguistics

1. A cognitive linguistic approach to place-name studies

According to the basic principles of cognitive linguistics, proper names are not meaningless units of language able only to refer to certain entities in the world. In fact, cognitive semantics highlights that the true peculiarity of proper names as language items lies exactly in the nature of their meanings. This approach claims that the meaning of a proper name consists of two essential components: the speakers' encyclopaedic knowledge about the denotatum bearing the name (i.e. speakers store a variety of information in their minds in connection with the designated entity), on the one hand, and an idealised cognitive model of how proper names are conventionally used within a speech community (i.e. speakers expect that a name unambiguously identifies a single entity for the members of a speech community), on the other.¹⁾

¹⁾ Cf. R. W. Langacker, *Cognitive Grammar. A Basic Introduction*, Oxford 2008, p. 316–318.

Cognitive linguists also believe that the meaning of a proper name, like the meaning of any other linguistic expression, is based on the mental construal of the designated entity through abstraction, schematisation and categorization of the relevant human experience. In the course of naming a geographical entity, the most prominent perceivable feature(s) of the place is/are profiled to be reflected in the toponym, whilst less prominent features of the same place as well as prominent features of the surrounding areas are relegated to the cognitive background. In other words, the act of naming activates in the mind one or more cognitive domains comprising salient, thus identifying, features of the geographical entity to be named and downplays others connected to less striking characteristics of the place concerned. In fact, the act of naming activates as many cognitive domains as there are unique features needed to be included in the name form to provide the speakers with a clear identification of the place. The linguistic reflections of the activated domain(s) constitute the toponym itself. Thus, a toponym must be considered as the linguistic representation of how speakers conceptualise the geographical entity bearing the name. The questions may arise (i) whether speakers of different mother tongues use common or distinct patterns in construing similar geographical entities mentally and (ii) whether these patterns are represented in similar or different forms in the place-names of their languages. Finding answers to these questions requires a thorough examination of (i) the semantic as well as (ii) the lexical and grammatical features of comparable toponyms.

2. English and Hungarian toponym types

This survey attempts to compare some prototypical semantic and lexical-grammatical structures adopted in English and Hungarian toponyms to discover some closely identical (thus presumably universal) as well as some entirely unique (thus supposedly culture- and language-dependent) trends in the place-naming practices of two genetically unrelated languages. The presence of similar basic geographical entities (settlements, hills, valleys, bodies of water, woods, fields, etc.) in Britain and in Hungary seems to have resulted in establishing (i) toponyms of identical semantic and grammatical structure; (ii) toponyms of similar semantic, but distinct grammatical structure; (iii) toponyms of similar semantic and grammatical structure including lexemes of restricted use; (iv) toponyms of similar semantic and/or grammatical structure including strongly culture-dependent lexemes and (v) toponyms of distinct semantic and lexical-grammatical structure.

2.1. Toponyms of identical semantic and grammatical structure

Early compound settlement names including a second constituent indicating a type of human settlement (e.g. *-ton* ,farmstead, village, town‘, *-ham* ,homestead, village‘, *-worth/-worthy/-wardine* ,enclosure, homestead‘, *-wich/-wick* ,dwelling, village, dairy

farm', *-throp* 'hamlet, outlying farm', *-thorp/e/* 'secondary settlement, outlying farm', *-by* 'farmstead, village', *-chester* 'old fortification, Roman camp, town or city' in English;²⁾ *-falu* ~ *-falva* ~ *-fa* < *-falva* 'village', *-laka* 'dwelling place', *-háza* 'house', *-szállása* 'living quarters', with the final *-a*, the 3rd person singular possessive suffix in Hungarian³⁾ seem to be fairly common both in English and in Hungarian. The first constituents of these names in both languages very often have reference to position, e.g. *Netherton* ('lower tūn', Nb, Wo)⁴⁾ – *Alsófalva* ('lower village', BBR);⁵⁾ *Overton*

²⁾ Cf. K. Cameron, *English Place-Names*, London 1969, p. 75–94, 110–118, 141–152.

³⁾ Cf. B. Kálmán, *The World of Names. A Study in Hungarian Onomatology*, Budapest 1978, p. 140.

⁴⁾ E. Ekwall, *The Concise Oxford Dictionary of English Place-names*, Oxford 1960, p. 338, see entry *Netherhampton*. (Hereafter: DEPN.) Examples of English place-names are taken from DEPN, for details see its relevant entries; cf. also the entries in V. Watts (ed.), *The Cambridge Dictionary of English Place-Names*, Cambridge 2004. Names are spelt according to Ekwall's practice. The name forms are followed in parentheses by an explanation taken from DEPN, the abbreviation of the county in which the settlement bearing the name can be found as well as an indication of source. The abbreviations employed are those of the DEPN: Bd = Bedfordshire, Bk = Buckinghamshire, Brk = Berkshire, Ca = Cambridgeshire, Chs = Cheshire, Co = Cornwall, Cu = Cumberland, D = Devonshire, Db = Derbyshire, Do = Dorset, Du = Durham, Ess = Essex, Gl = Gloucestershire, Ha = Hampshire, He = Herefordshire, Hrt = Hertfordshire, Hu = Huntingdonshire, K = Kent, La = Lancashire, Le = Leicestershire, Li = Lincolnshire, Mx = Middlesex, Nb = Northumberland, Nf = Norfolk, Np = Northamptonshire, Nt = Nottinghamshire, O = Oxfordshire, Ru = Rutland, Sa = Shropshire, Sf = Suffolk, So = Somerset, Sr = Surrey, St = Staffordshire, Sx = Sussex, W = Wiltshire, Wa = Warwickshire, We = Westmorland, Wo = Worcestershire, YE = East Yorkshire, YN = North Yorkshire, YW = West Yorkshire.

⁵⁾ L. Kiss, *Földrajzi nevek etimológiai szótára* [Etymological Dictionary of Geographical Names]. 4th edition, Vol. 1–2, Budapest 1988, p. 1: 78. (Hereafter: FNESz.) Examples of Hungarian place-names are quoted from FNESz. Names are spelt according to present-day Hungarian orthography. The name forms are followed in parentheses by an explanation, the abbreviation of the county/district/region in which the settlement bearing the name can be found as well as an indication of source. Abbreviations of relevant counties/districts/regions are as follows: AbC = Fehér megye, Alba County, Romania; AdC = Arad County, Romania; Bar = Baranya County, Hungary; BAZ = Borsod-Abaúj-Zemplén County, Hungary; BBR = Besztercebányai kerület, Banská Bystrica Region, Slovakia; BhC = Bihar megye, Bihar County, Romania; BK = Bács-Kiskun County, Hungary; Bks = Békés County, Hungary; BIR = Pozsonyi kerület, Bratislava Region, Slovakia; BNC = Beszterce-Naszód megye, Bistrița-Năsăud County, Romania; CjC = Kolozs megye, Cluj County, Romania; Csg = Csongrád County, Hungary; CvC = Kovászna megye, Covasna County, Romania; Fej = Fejér County, Hungary; GyMS = Győr-Moson-Sopron County, Hungary; HB = Hajdú-Bihar County, Hungary; Hev = Heves County, Hungary; HnC = Hunyad megye, Hunedoara County, Romania; HrC = Hargita megye, Harghita County, Romania; JdD = Gyanafalvi járásban, Jennersdorf District, Austria; JNSz = Jász-Nagykun-Szolnok County, Hungary; KcR = Kassai

(< OE *ufera tūn* ‚upper tūn‘, Chs, Db, Ha, Sa;⁶⁾ DEPN: 354) – *Felsőfalú* („upper village“, BBR; FNESz 1: 455); to shape, e.g. *Langton* (< OE *Langa-tūn* ‚long village or homestead‘, Li, We, YE; DEPN: 287), *Lanton* („long tūn“, Nb; DEPN: 288), *Launton* („long tūn“, O; DEPN: 290), *Longton* („long tūn“, La, St; DEPN: 304), *Langham* („long village or homestead“, Do, Nf, Ru, Sf; DEPN: 286) – *Hosszúfalú* („long village“, TvR as *Felsőhosszúfalú*; FNESz 1: 456, see entry *Felsőhosszúfalú*); to size, e.g. *Mickleby* (< OScand *Miklibûr* ‚large village‘, YN; DEPN: 324), *Mickleton* („large tūn“, Gl, YN; DEPN: 324, see entry *Micklefield*), *Mickleham* („large hām“, Sr; DEPN: 324, see entry *Micklefield*) – *Nagyfalú* („large village“, ZnR; FNESz 2: 184);⁷⁾ to age, e.g. *Alton* (< OE *Aldatūn* ‚old tūn‘, Db; DEPN: 8), *Olton* („old tūn“, Wa; DEPN: 349) – *Ófalú* („old village“, Bar; FNESz 2: 268); *Newton* (< OE *nēowa tūn* ‚new homestead or village‘, Nt; DEPN: 341–342), *Newtown* („new hamlet“, Ha, Nb, Wt; DEPN: 342), *Newington* („new tūn“, K, O, Sr; DEPN: 340), *Nīton* (< OE *nīge tūn* ‚new tūn‘, Wt; DEPN: 342, see entry *Ninham*), *Newby* („new by“, Cu, We, YN, YW; DEPN: 339), *Newnham* (< OE *nēowa hām* ‚new hām‘, Bd, Ca, Gl, Ha, Hrt, K, Np, Wa, Wo; DEPN: 340), *Newham* („new hām“, Nb, YN; DEPN: 340), *Ninham* (< OE *nīge hām* ‚new hām‘, Wt; DEPN: 342) – *Újfalú* („new village“, SbC as *Apaújfalu*; FNESz 1: 106,

kerület, Košice Region, Slovakia; KE = Komárom-Eszergom County, Hungary; LMD = Liptószentmiklósi járás, Liptovský Mikuláš District, Slovakia; MmC = Maramaros megye, Maramureş County, Romania; MsC = Maros megye, Mureş County, Romania; NSD = Nezsideri járás, Neusiedl am See District, Austria; Ngr = Nógrád County, Hungary; NtR = Nyitrai kerület, Nitra Region, Slovakia; Pst = Pest County, Hungary; PvR = Eperjesi kerület, Prešov Region, Slovakia; SbC = Szeben megye, Sibiu County, Romania; SBD = Dél-bánsági körzet, South Banat District, Serbia; SjC = Szilágy megye, Sălaj County, Romania; Som = Somogy County, Hungary; SzSzB = Szabolcs-Szatmár-Bereg County, Hungary; Tln = Tolna County, Hungary; TnR = Trencsényi kerület, Trenčín Region, Slovakia; TvR = Nagyszombati kerület, Trnava Region, Slovakia; Vas = Vas County, Hungary; VhR = Nagyszőlősi járás, Vynohradiv Raion, Ukraina; Vpm = Veszprém County, Hungary; Zal = Zala County, Hungary; ZnR = Zsolnai kerület, Žilina Region, Slovakia. N.B. As a consequence of the peace treaty of the First World War (Treaty of Trianon, 1920) Hungary lost more than two-thirds of the territory it had previously controlled: as a result, several settlements with Hungarian names founded in early times belong today to neighbouring countries.

⁶⁾ In relation to both languages, except when stated otherwise, here only those counties are indicated in which settlements designated by names not containing a distinctive addition can be found.

⁷⁾ It is interesting to note that the counterpart settlement names are not identical in grammatical structure, as the relevant Hungarian settlement name contains a diminutive suffix *-d*, see *Littleton* („small tūn“, Do, Ha, Mx, So; DEPN: 300–301), *Litlington* („small tūn“, Sx; DEPN: 300), *Littleham* („small hām“, D; DEPN: 300), *Littleport* („small town“, Ca; DEPN: 300) – *Kisfalud* (*kis* ‚small‘, *falú* ‚village‘ and the diminutive suffix *-d*, GyMS; FNESz 1: 742).

see entry *Apauíjfalu*); to a royal possessor, e.g. *Quainton* (< OE *Cwēne-tūn* ‚the queen’s manor‘, Bk; DEPN: 376), *Quinton* („the queen’s manor“, Gl, Np, Wo; DEPN: 377) – *Asszonyfalva* („the queen’s village“, SbC; FNESz 1: 121), *Asszonyfa* („the queen’s village“, GyMS as *Győrasszonyfa*; FNESz 1: 548, see entry *Győrasszonyfa*); etc.

Settlement names lacking a constituent indicating a type of human settlement might also display the same semantic and grammatical structures in the observed languages, especially if they refer to a characteristic building of the habitation such as a church, e.g. *Whitchurch* („white church“, i.e. „stone church“, Bk, D, Ha, He, O, Sa, So, Wa; DEPN: 513), *Whitkirk* („white church“, YW; DEPN: 514) – *Fehéregyháza* („white church“, MsC; FNESz 1: 445), *Fehéregyház* („white church“, AdC as *Féregyház*; FNESz 1: 468, see entry *Féregyház*), *Fehértemplom* („white church“, SBD; FNESz 1: 446); *Newchurch* („new church“, K, Wt; DEPN: 340) – *Újegyház* („new church“, SbC; FNESz 2: 698); a castle, e.g. *Aldborough* („old fort“, Nf, YW; DEPN: 5), *Aldbrough* („old fort“, YE, YN; DEPN: 5), *Aldbury* („old fort“, Hrt; DEPN: 5), *Albury* („old fort“, Hrt, O, Sr; DEPN: 4–5), *Aldeburgh* („old fort“, Sf; DEPN: 5), *Aldwark* („old fort“, Db, YN, YW; DEPN: 5–6) – *Óvár* („old fort“, BBR; FNESz 2: 293); *Newcastle* („new castle“, Sa; DEPN: 339–340), *Newark* („new work“, i.e. „new castle“, Np, Nt; DEPN: 339), *Newbrough* („new fort or borough“, Nb; DEPN: 339), *Newburgh* („new fort or borough“, La, YN; DEPN: 339, see entry *Newbrough*), *Newbury* („new burg or castle“, Brk; DEPN: 339) – *Újvár* („new castle“, BAZ as *Abaújvár*; FNESz 1: 50, see entry *Abaújvár*); *Arbury* (< OE *eorþburg* ‚earth fortification‘, La, Wa; DEPN: 11) – *Földvár* („earth fortification“, Som as *Balatonföldvár*; FNESz 1: 150, see entry *Balatonföldvár*); *Stanbury* („stone fort“, YW; DEPN: 437) – *Kővár* („stone fort“, MmC; FNESz 1: 800, see entry *Kővárremete*); or if they express the fact that the settlement functioned as a market place in the past, e.g. *Kepwick* (< OE *cēap-* or *cēpe-wīc* ‚market place‘, YN; DEPN: 273) – *Vásárhely* („market place“, KcR; FNESz 2: 739).

Both in English and in Hungarian, common early compound settlement names such as the above-mentioned *Newton* or *Newby* and *Újfalu* today are usually distinguished by distinctive additions. These additions, in both languages, often refer to the river on the bank of which the designated settlement is found, e.g. *Newby Wiske* (situated on the River Wiske, YN; DEPN: 339) – *Berettyóújfalu* (from the nearby river called Berettyó, HB; FNESz 1: 201–202); to a neighbouring settlement, e.g. *Newton by Toft* (Toft is in the neighbourhood, Li; DEPN: 342) – *Bártfaújfalu* (from the neighbouring town of Bártfa, PvR; FNESz 1: 173); to the district to which the identified settlement once belonged, e.g. *Newton in Makerfield* (belonged to the old district of *Makerfield*, La; DEPN: 311, 342) – *Mosonújfalu* (belonged to the old Moson County, NSD; FNESz 2: 162); to the monastery to which the indicated settlement formerly belonged, e.g. *Newton St. Petrock* (possessed by the monastery of St. Petrock, Bodmin, D; DEPN: 342) – *Jászóújfalu* (belonged to the provostry of Jászó, KcR; FNESz 1: 654); to an early possessor of the settlement, e.g. *Newton*

Ferrers (possessed by William de Ferers in 1242, D; DEPN: 342) – *Zichyújfalu* (held by the family of Count Zichy, Fej; FNESz 2: 805); to an ethnic group related to the settlement, e.g. *Welsh Newton* (was presumably in Welsh hands, He; DEPN: 342) – *Tótújfalu* (inhabited by Croatian people, Som; FNESz 2: 673); to a hill in the surroundings, e.g. *Newton Cap* (near to a *cap* or hill, Du; DEPN: 342) – *Nyergesújfalu* (from a mountain saddle nearby, KE; FNESz 2: 253); to the characteristic vegetation of the place, e.g. *Newton le Willows* (from some willows, YN; DEPN: 342) – *Szilvásújfalu* (from its gardens with plum-trees, KcR; FNESz 2: 582–583); etc.

It might attract attention, even at this stage, that in many cases several English toponyms are compared to one (or rarely more) Hungarian equivalent(s) in the above examples. In the course of history, the English language absorbed several synonymous geographical common nouns originating from different languages (e.g. *-wich/-wick* < OE *wīc* ‚dwelling, village, dairy farm‘ < Lat *vicus* ‚village, quarter, street‘, DEPN: 515–516; *-ton* < OE *tūn* ‚farmstead, village‘, DEPN: 482; *-ham* < OE *hām* ‚homestead, village‘, DEPN: 213–214; *-by* < OE *by* < ON *býr, bær* ‚farmstead, village‘, DEPN: 79; *-ville* < ME *ville* ‚town‘ < Fr *ville* ‚town‘; *-worth/-worthy/-wardine* < OE *worþ/ worþig(n)* ‚enclosure, homestead‘, DEPN: 535–536; *cot* < OE *cot* ‚cottage‘, DEPN: 124; *-throp* < OE *þorp, þrop* ‚hamlet, outlying farm‘, DEPN: 468; *-thorp(e)* < OScand *þorp* ‚secondary settlement, outlying farm‘, DEPN: 468–469; *-chester* < OE *ceaster, cæster* ‚old fortification, Roman camp, town or city‘ < Lat *castrum* ‚military camp‘, DEPN: 92; *-borough ~ -burgh ~ -berry ~ -bury* < OE *burg, burh* ‚fortified place, fort‘, DEPN: 74–75)⁸⁾ and actively adopted them in distinct toponyms of the same first constituent, e.g. *Littleborough* (‚small fort or borough‘, La, Nt; DEPN: 300), *Littlebury* (‚small fort‘, Ess; DEPN: 300), *Littlecote* (‚small cots‘, Bk, W; DEPN: 300), *Littleham* (‚small hām‘, D; DEPN: 300), *Littleton* (‚small tūn‘, Do, Ha, Mx, So; DEPN: 300–301); *Newborough* (‚new burg‘, St; DEPN: 339), *Newbrough* (‚new fort or borough‘, Nb; DEPN: 339), *Newburgh* (‚new fort or borough‘, La, YN; DEPN: 339, see entry *Newbrough*), *Newbury* (‚new burg or castle‘, Brk; DEPN: 339), *Newby* (‚new by‘, Cu, We, YN, YW; DEPN: 339), *Newcastle* (‚new castle‘, Sa; DEPN: 339–340), *Newick* (‚new wīc‘, Sx; DEPN: 340), *Newthorpe* (‚new thorp‘, Nt, YW; DEPN: 341), *Newton* (< OE *nēowa tūn* ‚new homestead or village‘, Nt; DEPN: 341–342), *Newtown* (‚new hamlet‘, Ha, Nb, Wt; DEPN: 342), *Newington* (‚new tūn‘, K, O, Sr; DEPN: 340), *Newnham* (< OE *nēowa hām* ‚new hām‘, Bd, Ca, Gl, Ha, Hrt, K, Np, Wa, Wo; DEPN: 340), *Newham* (‚new hām‘, Nb, YN; DEPN: 340). Thus, several different

⁸⁾ Cf. K. Cameron, o. c. in note 2, p. 75–94, 110–118, 141–152. See also C. M. Matthews, *Place-Names of the English-Speaking World*, London 1972, p. 38–41; P. H. Reaney, *The Origin of English Place-Names*, London 1960, p. 127–139, 171–175, 202–204; G. R. Stewart, *Names on the Globe*, New York 1975, p. 114, 255–270.

English place-names sharing the same semantics could have been evolved. This phenomenon, however, is not so widespread in Hungarian. Early toponyms given by the Hungarians, the latest conquerors who settled down permanently in the territory of today's Hungary, were primarily based on Old Hungarian vocabulary and grammar. As a result, though patterns in naming practices changed from time to time in Hungarian as well, in most cases only a few quasi-synonymous geographical common nouns were used in a given sense in place-names, and they rarely formed compounds with the same first constituent to establish toponyms of the same semantic structure (see the examples above). Moreover, Old Hungarian happened to be relatively close to present-day Hungarian, so most of the above mentioned Hungarian toponyms are semantically and grammatically transparent to today's native speakers, which is not necessarily the case with English place-names such as *Mickleton* (,large tūn', Gl, YN; DEPN: 324, see entry *Micklefield*) or *Mickleby* (< OScand *Miklibûr* 'large village', YN; DEPN: 324) including an obsolete expression and, in the second example, a constituent of foreign origin.

It is also important to note that formally identical English compound toponyms indicating different geographical entities are sometimes derived from words of different meanings. An early record of the settlement name *Middleton (on the Hill)* clarifies that this toponym did not, in the past, mean ,middle tūn' (as other *Middletons*), but ,large tūn' (cf. 1086: *Miceltune* < OE *Micla-tūn*, He; DEPN: 325). Similarly, *Overtons* La and YN originally did not identify ,upper tūn'-s (see above examples), but were named from their position next to a river (cf. OE *Ōfer-tūn* ,tūn on a river bank'; DEPN: 354). The place-name *Langton* Du (< c. 1050: *Langadun*; DEPN: 287) primarily denoted a ,long dūn or hill' rather than a ,long village or homestead' (cf. above examples).

River-names of parallel semantic and grammatical structure in the two languages might describe the water; its temperature, e.g. *Caldew* (< OE *cald-ēa* ,cold river', Cu; DEPN: 82) – *Hideg-patak* (,cold stream', SbC; FNESz 1: 595, see entry *Hidegvíz*); its speed, e.g. *Cave* (< OE *Cāfe* < OE *cāf* ,quick, prompt, nimble', YE; DEPN: 91), *Tale* (,the swift one', a derivative of OE *getæl* ,quick, active', D; DEPN: 459) – *Sebes* (,quick, swift', a left-side tributary of River Maros, AbC, SbC; FNESz 2: 461, see entry *Sebeshely*); its taste, e.g. *Saltfleet*, today's Long Eau (< OE *Saltflēot* ,salt creek or stream', Li; DEPN: 403, see entry *Saltfleet Haven*) – *Sajó* (,salt stream', a right-side tributary of River Tisza; FNESz 2: 436); refer to animals frequenting the place, e.g. *Somborne* (,wild boar stream', Ha; DEPN: 430), *Swinburn* (,pig brook', Nb; DEPN: 457, see entry *Swinbrook*), *Swinbrook* (,pig brook', O; DEPN: 457) – *Disznajó* (,wild boar stream', MsC; FNESz 1: 373); etc.

Names of hills displaying identical semantic and grammatical structures in the observed languages most often depict colour, e.g. *Redcliff* (,red cliff', So; DEPN: 383), *Radcliffe* (,red cliff', La; DEPN: 378), *Radclive* (,red cliff', Bk; DEPN: 378, see entry

Radcliffe), *Ratcliff* (,red cliff‘, Mx; DEPN: 381), *Ratcliffe* (,red cliff‘, Le, Nt; DEPN: 381, see entry *Ratcliff*) – *Vörös-kő* (,red cliff‘, Pst; FNESz 2: 779); heights, e.g. *Headon* (maybe from OE *hēa-dūn* ,high ridge‘, Nt; DEPN: 229), *Hendon* (< OE *Hēa-dūn* ,high dūn or hill‘, Mx; DEPN: 234), *Highlow* (,high hill‘, the second element of the name is OE *hlāw*, *hlāw* ,hill, mountain‘, Db; DEPN: 239, 242) – *Magos-hegy* (,high hill‘, KE; FNESz 2: 65); the quality of the soil, e.g. *Chiselborough* (< OE *ceosol-beorg* ,gravel hill‘, So; DEPN: 106) – *Kövecses-hegy* (,gravel hill‘, Fej; FNESz 1: 800–801); vegetation, e.g. *Ashill* (,ash hill‘, So; DEPN: 15) – *Kőris-hegy* (,ash hill‘, Vpm; FNESz 1: 794); etc.

Names of woods of the same semantic and grammatical structure in these languages might have reference, for instance, to the size of the forest, e.g. *Broadwood* (,large wood‘, D, So; DEPN: 67), *Bradshaw* (,extensive grove‘, Db, La, YW; DEPN: 58) – *Nagyerdő* (,large wood‘, HB; FNESz 2: 183). A special type of field-name, referring to the fact that the given field is found far away from the central areas of the village to which it belongs, also seems to exist in both languages, e.g. *America*, *Siberia* – *Amerika* (,America‘), *Szibéria* (,Siberia‘).⁹⁾

2.2. Toponyms of similar semantic, but distinct grammatical structure

If we consider the proportion of simplex (i.e. names of a single constituent) and compound (i.e. names of two or more constituents) toponyms in the place-name stocks of the English and Hungarian languages, a crucially distinctive feature can be observed. As Cameron states,¹⁰⁾ most English place-names are compounds and only a small number of them have to be acknowledged as simplex toponyms. In Hungarian, although there is a tendency in the history of the language to change from simplex to compound name forms,¹¹⁾ one can still find several simplex place-names, a great many of which contain a derivative suffix. Thus, in many cases the identical motivation, the (nearly) same semantic content is expressed in different structural patterns in the observed languages, resulting in compound names in English and simplex names in Hungarian.

This structural distinction can often be realised in case of settlement names referring to the configuration of the terrain, e.g. *Hilton* (< OE *Hyll-tūn* ,tūn on a hill‘, Db, Hu, St, YN; DEPN: 240), *Hulton* (,tūn on a hill‘, La; DEPN: 256), *Downton* (,tūn on or by a dūn or hill‘, He, Sa, W; DEPN: 150), *Dunton* (,tūn on a dūn or hill‘, Ess,

⁹⁾ For the English examples see K. Cameron, o. c. in note 2, p. 210, for the Hungarian examples see I. Hoffmann, *Helynevek nyelvi elemzése* [Linguistic Analysis of Place-Names], 2nd edition, Budapest 2007, p. 130.

¹⁰⁾ K. Cameron, o. c. in note 2, p. 28.

¹¹⁾ Cf. V. Tóth, *Településnevek változáspolitikája* [Typology of Changes of Settlement Names], Debrecen 2008, p. 241.

Nf, Wa; DEPN: 154), *Downham* (< OE *Dūn-hām* ‚hām on a hill‘, Ca, Ess; DEPN: 149–150), *Barham* (< OE *Beorghām* ‚hām on the hill‘, Ca, Hu, Sf; DEPN: 26), *Peckham* (< OE *Pēac-hām* ‚hām by a hill‘, Sr; DEPN: 360), *Clapham* (‚hām on a hill‘, Bd, Sr, Sx; DEPN: 108–109, see entry *Clapcot*), *Clapton* (‚tūn on a hill‘, Brk, Ca, Gl, Mx, Np, So; DEPN: 108–109, see entry *Clapcot*) – *Hegyese* (‚hill, hilly‘ + the derivative suffix *-d*, Vpm; FNESz 1: 578); to the vegetation of the habitation, e.g. *Elmham* (‚hām where elms grew‘, Nf, Sf; DEPN: 164), *Elmton* (‚tūn by the elm/s/‘, Db; DEPN: 165) – *Szil* (‚elm‘, GyMS; FNESz 2: 578), *Szilád* (‚elm‘ + the derivative suffix *-d*, TvR; FNESz 2: 578), *Szilágy* (‚elm‘ + the derivative suffix *-gy*, Bar; FNESz 2: 578), *Szilas* (‚elm‘ + the derivative suffix *-s*, NtR; FNESz 2: 581); *Acton* (< OE *Āctūn* ‚tūn by the oak/s/‘, Chs, Mx; DEPN: 2), *Aighton* (‚tūn by the oak/s/‘, La; DEPN: 4), *Aughton* (< OE *Āctūn* ‚oak tūn‘, La, YE, YW; DEPN: 19) – *Tölgyes* (‚oak‘ + the derivative suffix *-s*, Pst as *Ipolytölgyes*; FNESz 1: 633, see entry *Ipolytölgyes*); *Appleton* (< OE *Āppeltūn* ‚tūn where apples grew‘, Brk, Chs, Cu, K, La, Nf; DEPN: 11), *Appleby* (‚apple by‘, Li, We; DEPN: 11) – *Almágy* (‚crab apple‘ + the derivative suffix *-gy*, BBR; FNESz 1: 70), *Almás* (‚crab apple‘ + the derivative suffix *-s*, NtR as *Alsóalmás*; FNESz 1: 73, see entry *Alsóalmás*), *Almádi* (‚crab apple‘ + the derivative suffix *-di*, Vpm as *Balatonalmádi*; FNESz 1: 148, see entry *Balatonalmádi*), *Almád* (‚crab apple‘ + the derivative suffix *-d*, SbC as *Szászalmád*; FNESz 2: 528, see entry *Szászalmád*); *Plumpton* (‚tūn where plum trees grew‘, La, Np, Sx; DEPN 369) – *Szilvás* (‚plum tree‘ + the derivative suffix *-s*, Bar; FNESz 2: 582); *Barton* (< OE *beretūn* ‚barley tūn‘, Brk, Ca, Chs, Gl, He, K, La, So, Wa, We, YN; DEPN: 28–29) – *Árpás* (‚barley‘ + the derivative suffix *-s*, GyMS; FNESz 1: 117); to the animals kept in the settlement, e.g. *Gotham* (‚homestead where goats were kept‘, Nt; DEPN: 201) – *Kecskéd* (‚goat‘ + the derivative suffix *-d*, KE; FNESz 1: 704), *Goswick* (‚goose farm‘, Nb; DEPN: 201) – *Ludas* (‚goose‘ + the derivative suffix *-s*, Hev; FNESz 2: 53); to the characteristic occupation of the early inhabitants, e.g. *Fiskerton* (< OE *Fiscera tūn* ‚fishermen’s tūn‘, Li, Nt; DEPN: 180), *Fisherton* (‚fishermen’s tūn‘, W; DEPN: 180), *Fisherwick* (‚fishermen’s wīc‘, St; DEPN: 180) – *Halász* (‚fisherman‘, Hev as *Gyöngyöshalász*; FNESz 1: 547, see entry *Gyöngyöshalász*), *Halászi* (‚fisherman‘ + the possessive suffix *-i*, GyMS; FNESz 1: 561); *Smeaton* (‚the smiths’ tūn‘, YN, YW; DEPN: 427), *Smeeton* (‚the smiths’ tūn‘, Le; DEPN: 427) – *Kovácsi* (‚smith‘ + the possessive suffix *-i*, BBR as *Fülekkovácsi*; FNESz 1: 484, see entry *Fülekkovácsi*); *Bickerton* (‚the tūn of the bee-keepers‘, Chs, He, Nb, YW; DEPN: 41), *Bickerston* (‚the tūn of the bee-keeper‘, Nf; DEPN: 41) – *Fedémes* (‚bee-keeper‘, Hev; FNESz 1: 444), *Méhész* (‚bee-keeper‘, KcR; FNESz 2: 116); to a (once) striking building in the settlement, e.g. *Bridge* (‚the bridge‘, K; DEPN: 64, see entry *Bridge Sollers*) – *Hidas* (‚bridge‘ + the derivative suffix *-s*, Bar; FNESz 1: 594).

Settlement names identifying the early proprietors, whether lay or ecclesiastic, of the settlements are typically compounds in English and simplex forms involving the

possessive suffix *-i* in Hungarian, e.g. *Kingston* (< OE *Cyninges-tūn* ‚the king’s tūn‘, Ca, D, Do, Gl, K, Sf, So, St, Wa, Wt; DEPN: 277–278), *Kingstone* („the king’s tūn“, He; DEPN: 278), *Kington* (< OE *cyne-tūn* ‚royal manor‘, He, Wo; DEPN: 278), *Kineton* (< OE *cyne-tūn* or *cyning-tūn* ‚royal manor‘, Gl, Wa; DEPN: 277) – *Királyi* („king“ + the possessive suffix *-i*, NtR; FNESz 1: 734); *Abbotsbury* („the manor of the abbot“, Do; DEPN: 1), *Abbotstone* („the manor of the abbot“, Ha; DEPN: 1) – *Apáti* („abbot“ + the possessive suffix *-i*, SzSzB as *Aranyosapáti*; FNESz 1: 110, see entry *Aranyosapáti*); *Preston* (< OE *Prēosta-tūn* ‚the tūn of the priests‘, Do, Gl, Hrt, La, Mx, Nb, Ru, Sf, Sx, YE; DEPN: 374), *Prescot* („the priests’ cottage“, La, O; DEPN: 373), *Prescott* („the priests’ cottage“, Gl; DEPN: 373, see entry *Prescot*) – *Papi* („priest“ + the possessive suffix *-i*, BAZ as *Hejőpapi*; FNESz 1: 583, see entry *Hejőpapi*); *Bishopstone* („the bishop’s manor“, Bk, He, Sx, W; DEPN: 46), *Bishopton* („the bishop’s manor“, Du, YW; DEPN: 46), *Bishton* („the bishop’s manor“, Gl, Sa, St; DEPN: 46), *Biscott* („the bishop’s cot“, Bd; DEPN: 45) – *Püspöki* („bishop“ + the possessive suffix *-i*, BhC as *Biharpüspöki*; FNESz 1: 213, see entry *Biharpüspöki*). The relevant English settlement names are usually compounds of possessive structure, e.g. *Kingston*, *Kingstone*, *Abbotsbury*, *Abbotstone*, *Preston*, *Bishopstone* (see above); though sometimes the genitive suffix has disappeared during the centuries, e.g. *Kington*, *Kineton*, *Bishopton* (see above). Although both of these compound name structures are found in Hungarian as well, e.g. *Királyfalva* („the king’s village“, JdD; FNESz 1: 732), *Királyfa* („the king’s village“, a variant of *Királyfalva*, BIR; FNESz 1: 732), *Apátfalva* („the abbot’s village“, Csg; FNESz 1: 105), *Papfalva* („the priest’s village“, CjC as *Nádaspapfalva*; FNESz 2: 170, see entry *Nádaspapfalva*) as well as *Apátfalu* („abbot village“, NtR as *Garamapáti*; FNESz 1: 497, see entry *Garamapáti*), *Püspökfalva* („bishop village“, NtR; FNESz 2: 385) we must note that these name forms became popular only after the 13th century in Hungary. Language in the early Old Hungarian period (896–c. 1300) preferred suffixed simplex forms (see above) as well as another, typically Hungarian name type to express the semantic content concerned: up to the 13th century personal names could directly develop into settlement names in Hungarian, e.g. *Békés* („peaceful“, a personal name of Hungarian origin, Bks; FNESz 1: 185), *Maglód* („productive“, a personal name of Hungarian origin, Pst; FNESz 2: 64), *Szőny* („blond“, a personal name of Hungarian origin, KE; FNESz 2: 596), *Szentes* („saint“, a personal name of Hungarian origin, Csg; FNESz 2: 557), *Gyula* („torch“, a personal name of Old Turkish origin, Bks; FNESz 1: 551), *Solt* („sultan“, a personal name of Old Turkish origin, BK; FNESz 2: 481), *Baja* („rich“, a personal name of Old Turkish origin, BK; FNESz 1: 138), *Tabajd* („April“, a personal name of Cumanian origin, Fej; FNESz 2: 606), *Csorna* („black“, a personal name of Slavic origin, GyMS; FNESz 1: 342), *Dorog* („friend“, a personal name of Slavic origin, KE; FNESz 1: 385), *Veszprém* („stubborn, restless“, a personal name of Slavic origin, Vpm; FNESz 2: 758), *Izsák* (< Lat *Isaac* < Hebrew יִצְחָק ‚he will laugh‘, a Christian personal name, BK;

FNESz 1: 643), *Fülöp* (< Lat *Philippus* < *Φίλιππος* ‚lover of horses‘, ‚friend of horses‘, a Christian personal name, HB; FNESz 1: 485), *Mór* (< Lat *Maurus* ‚dark-skinned, Moorish‘, a personal name, Fej; FNESz 2: 158). Many such toponyms are still used today in the Hungarian language.

Some early settlements in both languages were named after the folk or tribe which settled down there. In English, several folk-names derived from personal names by way of adding the OE ending *-ingas* (> today's *-ings*, *-ing*, *-ins*, *-in* ‚the people of‘) became settlement names when the group of people concerned established themselves permanently in a place, e.g. *Hastings* (< OE *Hæstingas* ‚the people of *Hæsta*‘, Sx; DEPN: 224, see entry *Hastingleigh*), *Filkins* (‚the people of *Filica*‘, O; DEPN: 179), *Reading* (< OE *Rēadingas* ‚the people of *Rēad/aʹ*‘, Brk; DEPN: 382), *Kiplin* (‚*Cyppel*’s people‘, YN; DEPN: 279). When developing into a settlement name, many such folk-names were extended by a second constituent indicating a type of settlement, e.g. *Birmingham* (< OE *Beornmundingahām* ‚the hām of *Beornmund*’s people‘, Wa; DEPN: 45), *Knedlington* (‚the tūn of *Cnytel*’s people‘, YE; DEPN: 281), *Bobbingworth* (‚the worþ of *Bubba*’s people‘, Ess; DEPN: 50, see entry *Bobbington*).¹²⁾ In Hungarian, however, the Conquest-time (895/896 AD) tribal names originating mostly from common words regularly became settlement names without an added second constituent, e.g. *Nyék* (< *nyék* ‚fence, hedge‘, a word of Ugric origin, Pst as the name of a devastated medieval settlement, now a wooded area belonging to Budapest; FNESz 2: 252), *Megyer* (< *mogyer* ‚Hungarian‘, ‚the leading tribe of the Hungarians‘, a compound of Ugric origin, Vpm; FNESz 2: 115), *Kürt* (‚horn‘, presumably a tribal badge, NtR; FNESz 1: 820), *Gyarmat* (< Old Turkish **jormatī* ‚one who settled down‘, Vpm; FNESz 1: 540), *Tarján* (< Old Turkish *tarġan* ‚subking‘, KE; FNESz 2: 620), *Jenő* (< Chuvash **jänäġ* ‚advisor, minister‘, Fej; FNESz 1: 657), *Kér* (cf. Turkish *kär* ‚enormous‘, Vpm as *Hajmáskér*; FNESz 1: 560, see entry *Hajmáskér*), *Keszi* (< Old Turkish *kesäk* ‚piece‘, Pst as *Budakeszi*; FNESz 1: 261, see entry *Budakeszi*); though in some cases the diminutive suffix *-cs* was attached, e.g. *Megyercs* (NtR; FNESz 2: 115), *Kércs* (BAZ as *Hernádkércs*; FNESz 1: 588, see entry *Hernádkércs*).¹³⁾

Settlement names indicating the ethnic group to which the first settlers of the habitation belonged are fairly common in both languages. In the relevant English toponyms the ethnic name is usually accompanied by a second constituent identifying a type of settlement, e.g. *Swaffham* (< OE *Swāf-hām* or *Swāf-hām* ‚the hām of the Swabians‘, Nf; DEPN: 455); *Frieston* (‚the tūn of the Frisians‘, Li; DEPN: 188, see

¹²⁾ Cf. K. Cameron, o. c. in note 2, p. 63–74.

¹³⁾ Cf. B. Kálmán, o. c. in note 3, p. 133–135.

entry *Friesthorpe*), *Friston* (,the tūn of the Frisians‘, Sf; DEPN: 188), *Frisby* (,the Frisians‘ by‘, Le; DEPN: 188), *Firsby* (,the Frisians‘ by‘, Li; DEPN: 180); *Saxham* (< OE *Seax-hām*, probably ,the hām of the Saxons‘, Sf; DEPN: 405–406), *Saxton* (< OE *Seax-tūn* ,the tūn of the Saxons‘, Ca, YW; DEPN: 406); *Ingleby* (< OScand *Englabûr* ,the by of the English‘, Db, Li; DEPN: 264); *Irby* (< OScand *Īrabûr* ,the by of the Irish‘, Chs, YN; DEPN: 266), *Ireby* (,the by of the Irish‘, Cu, La; DEPN: 266), *Ireton* (,the tūn of the Irish‘, Db; DEPN: 266); *Danby* (,the Danes‘ by‘, YN; DEPN: 139), *Denby* (,the by of the Danes‘, Db, YW; DEPN: 141); *Normanby* (< OScand *Norðmannabûr* ,the by of the Northmen or Norwegians‘, Li, YN; DEPN: 343), *Normanton* (,the tūn of the Northmen or Norwegians‘, Db, Le, Li, Nt, Ru, YW; DEPN: 343); *Ferrensby* (,the by of a man or men from the Faroe Islands‘, YW; DEPN: 178). This name structure can also be observed in Hungarian, e.g. *Horvátfalú* (,Croatian village‘, JdD; FNEsz 1: 609), *Jászfalu* (,Jazygian village‘, Pst; FNEsz 1: 653), *Magyarfalú* (,Hungarian village‘, LMD; FNEsz 2: 68), *Magyarfalva* (,the village of the Hungarians‘, GyMS; FNEsz 2: 68–69), *Németfalú* (,German village‘, Zal; FNEsz 2: 234), *Olaszfalú* (,Walloon village‘, Vpm; FNEsz 2: 273), *Oroszfalú* (,Eastern Slavic, Russian village‘, BNC as *Alsóoroszfalu*; FNEsz 1: 86, see entry *Alsóoroszfalu*), *Szászfalu* (,Transylvanian Saxon village‘, VhR as *Tiszaszászfalu*; FNEsz 2: 654, see entry *Tiszaszászfalu*), *Tótfalu* (,Slovenian village‘, Bar as *Kistótfalu*; FNEsz 1: 759, see entry *Kistótfalu*). However, in the Old Hungarian language it was far more common that the unmodified ethnic name became a settlement name, e.g. *Besenyő* (,Pecheneg‘, BNC; FNEsz 1: 206–207), *Böszörmény* (,Ishmaelite‘, HB as *Berekböszörmény*; FNEsz 1: 199, see entry *Berekböszörmény*), *Kálóz* (,Ishmaelite‘, Fej; FNEsz 1: 676), *Horvát* (,Croatian‘, SJC as *Krasznahorvát*; FNEsz 1: 805, see entry *Krasznahorvát*), *Lengyel* (,Polish‘, Tln; FNEsz 2: 26), *Nándor* (,Danube Bulgarian‘, HnC; FNEsz 2: 221), *Német* (,German‘, Hev as *Felnémet*; FNEsz 1: 452, see entry *Felnémet*), *Olasz* (,Walloon‘, Bar; FNEsz 2: 272–273), *Székely* (,Szekler‘, SzSzB; FNEsz 2: 540), *Szász* (,Saxon‘, JNSz as *Újszász*; FNEsz 2: 702, see entry *Újszász*), *Tót* (,Slovenian‘, Vpm as *Hosztót*; FNEsz 1: 612, see entry *Hosztót*), *Varsány* (,Alan‘, Ngr; FNEsz 2: 737); or that the possessive suffix *-i* was added to the ethnic name to establish a settlement name, e.g. *Csehi* (,of the Czechs‘, Vas; FNEsz 1: 313), *Horváti* (,of the Croatians‘, BAZ as *Erdőhorváti*; FNEsz 1: 424, see entry *Erdőhorváti*), *Németi* (,of the Germans‘, Bar; FNEsz 2: 234), *Olaszi* (,of the Walloons‘, BAZ as *Bodrogolaszi*; FNEsz 1: 225, see entry *Bodrogolaszi*), *Oroszi* (,of the Eastern Slavs‘, ,of the Russians‘, Vpm; FNEsz 2: 286), *Tóti* (,of the Slovenians‘, BnC; FNEsz 2: 671–672).

Settlement names identifying the patron saint of the settlement display several distinct structures in English: sometimes the saint’s name gets a genitive suffix, e.g. *St. Bees* (from a priory dedicated to Sancta Bega, a virgin saint of Irish descent, Cu; DEPN: 399), *St. Ives* (,the parish of St. Ie‘, Co; DEPN: 400), *St. Neots* (St Neot, a

monk from Cornwall, was buried at Eynesbury, today a part of St Neots, Hu; DEPN: 401, see entry *St. Neot*); in other cases the element *saint* is missing from the toponym, e.g. *Mullion* (‘the church of St. Melan’, Co; DEPN: 334) and the words *church* or *kirk* are added instead, e.g. *Peterchurch* (‘church dedicated to St. Peter’, He; DEPN: 364), *Felixkirk* (‘St. Felix’s church’, YN; DEPN: 177); as a result of Celtic influence the order of the words referring to the saint and to the building dedicated to him is occasionally reversed in place-names, e.g. *Kirkandrews* (‘St. Andrew’s church’, Cu; DEPN: 279), *Kirkoswald* (‘St. Oswald’s church’, Cu; DEPN: 280), *Kirksanton* (‘St. Sanctan’s church’, Cu; DEPN: 280); most typically, however, the settlement is named directly from the saint to whom its church was dedicated, e.g. *St. Breward* (Beward was presumably a Cornish saint, Co; DEPN: 400), *St. Mewan* (Méén of Brittany was a Breton saint, thought to be Cornish or Welsh in origin, Co; DEPN: 401), *St. Osyth* (from a priory dedicated to St. Osyth, Ess; DEPN: 401). In Hungarian, most frequently the unmodified forms of the saints’ names developed into settlement names, e.g. *Szentdomonkos* (‘Saint Dominic’, the founder of the Dominican Order, Hev; FNESz 2: 556), *Szentendre* (‘Saint Andrew’, the Christian Apostle, Pst; FNESz 2: 556), *Szentkatalin* (‘Saint Catherine of Alexandria’, a saint and martyr, Bar; FNESz 2: 560), *Szentistván* (‘Saint Stephen I of Hungary’, the first King of Hungary from 1000 to 1038, BAZ; FNESz 2: 559), *Szentlászló* (‘Saint Ladislaus I of Hungary’, the King of Hungary from 1077 to 1095, Bar; FNESz 2: 562), *Szenterzsébet* (‘Saint Elisabeth of Hungary’, a princess of Hungary lived from 1207 to 1231, SbC; FNESz 2: 557), *Szentgotthárd* (‘Saint Gotthard of Hildesheim’, the town took its name from the Cistercian Abbey of Saint Gotthard, founded in 1183, Vas; FNESz 2: 558), *Szentlőrinc* (‘Saint Lawrence of Rome’: the monastery of the Knights Templar built here was dedicated to St Lawrence, Bar; FNESz 2: 562); though sometimes an additional second constituent indicating a type of settlement was appended to the saint’s name, e.g. *Szentimrefalva* (‘Saint Emeric of Hungary’, a prince of Hungary who lived from 1000–7 to 1031 + *-falva* ‘the village of’, Vpm; FNESz 2: 559), *Szentivánfa* (‘Saint John the Baptist’ + *-fa* < *-falva* ‘the village of’, Vas; FNESz 2: 560), *Szentjánosháza* (‘Saint John of Nepomuk’ + *-háza* ‘the house of’, TnR; FNESz 2: 560), *Szentmihályfa* (‘Saint Michael’ the archangel + *-fa* < *-falva* ‘the village of’, TvR; FNESz 2: 564), *Szentpéterfa* (‘Saint Peter’ the Apostle + *-fa* < *-falva* ‘the village of’, Vas; FNESz 2: 565–566). In some cases the element *saint* as well as the constituent indicating a type of settlement have disappeared over time from the settlement names, e.g. *Fábiánsebestyén* (< *Szentfábiánsebestyénszállása* ‘Saint Fabian and Sebastian’ + *-szállása* ‘the living quarters of’: the two saints have a common feast day on the 20 of January, Csg; FNESz 1: 438); sometimes it is the saint’s name that has vanished and only the explanatory phrase has remained, e.g. *Mártély* (< *Szentadorjánmártír*, from Saint Adrian of Corinth, an early Christian saint and martyr, Csg; FNESz 2: 104); in other cases the saint’s name has become unrecognisable due to strong reduction, e.g.

Somorja (< *Szentmária* ‚Saint Mary‘, i.e. Virgin Mary, TvR; FNESz 2: 488), *Szemerja* (< *Szentmária* ‚Saint Mary‘, i.e. Virgin Mary, CvC; FNESz 2: 551).

Sometimes the grammatical difference is restricted to the use of attributive constructions in English and a (later developed) possessive construction in Hungarian, e.g. *Middleton* (< OE *Middel-tūn* ‚middle tūn‘, Db, Du, Ess, La, Nb, Nf, Np, Sa, Sf, Sx, Wa, We, Wt, YN, YW; DEPN: 324–325), *Middleham* (‚middle hām‘, YN; DEPN: 324) – *Középfalva* (‚middle‘ + *-falva* ‚village‘ > *-falva* ‚the village of‘, BNC; FNESz 1: 802).

Names of natural features with the same semantics (many of which later developed into settlement names) may relate to each other in several different ways in the two observed languages. Names of bodies of water indicating the colour, e.g. *Rede* (< OE *Rēade* ‚the red one‘, a river, Nb; DEPN: 383) – *Veres-tó* (‚red lake‘, a lake, HrC; FNESz 1: 543, see entry *Gyilkos-tó*) and the quality of the water, e.g. *Piddle* (‚fen land, marsh‘, a river, Do; DEPN: 365–366) – *Lápos* (‚fenny‘, a right-side tributary of the River Szamos, MmC; FNESz 2: 15) are often simplex forms in English and compounds or suffixed forms in Hungarian. However, river names referring to the vegetation by the river banks, e.g. *Redbourne* (< OE *Hrēodburna* ‚reedy stream‘, today a village, Li; DEPN: 383, see entry *Redbourn*), *Redbourn* (‚reedy stream‘, today a village, Hrt; DEPN: 383), *Radbourn* (‚stream where reeds grew‘, today a settlement, Wa; DEPN: 378), *Rodbourn* (< OE *hrēod-burna* ‚reedy stream‘, today a settlement, W; DEPN: 390) – *Nádas* (‚reedy‘, a river, CjC; FNESz 2: 169–170, see entry *Nádasdaróc*) are typically compounds in English and suffixed simplex forms in Hungarian. Names of hills identifying the animals frequenting the place, e.g. *Arncliffe* (< OE *earna-clif* ‚eagles‘ cliff‘, a small village surrounded by green hillsides etched with limestone scars, YW; DEPN: 13) – *Sas-kő* (‚eagle cliff‘, a scar, Hev; FNESz 2: 457) are often possessive structures in English and attributive constructions in Hungarian; whilst those which refer to weather conditions, e.g. *Snodhill* (‚snowy hill‘, a settlement on the slope of a high hill, He; DEPN: 429) – *Havas* (‚snowy‘, a hill, its peak often covered with snow even in summer, Hev; FNESz 1: 576) are regularly compounds in English and suffixed simplex forms in Hungarian. Names of woods indicating an early possessor, e.g. *Kingsnorth* (‚the king’s snād or wood‘, today a village, K; DEPN: 277), *Kingswood* (‚the king’s wood‘, today settlements, Gl, Sr, Wa; DEPN: 278) – *Király-erdő* (‚king wood‘, mountains covered with huge forests, BhC; FNESz 1: 732) frequently display possessive structures in English and attributive constructions in Hungarian.¹⁴⁾

¹⁴⁾ Cf. K. Cameron, o. c. in note 2, p. 161–193; C. M. Matthews, o. c. in note 8, p. 55–66; P. H. Reaney, o. c. in note 8, p. 139–143; G. R. Stewart, o. c. in note 8, p. 225–270.

2.3. Toponyms of similar semantic and grammatical structure including lexemes of restricted use

The rules for the use (e.g. intelligibility, frequency, dialect restrictions) of some name-forming lexemes can also be different in the two languages concerned, e.g. the name forms *Kirby* (< ON, OSw *kirkiubûr* ‚church village, village with a church‘, only with distinctive additions; DEPN: 279) and *Kirkby* („church village, village with a church“, La; DEPN: 279–280) consist of dialectally bound lexemes (their use is confined mostly to Scotland as well as to northern and eastern England); the first constituent of *Egyházásfalú* („village with a church“, GyMS; FNESz 1: 410), their Hungarian equivalent, however, preserves the primary, historical meaning of the word *egyház* („saint house“, i.e. the church building), used only in an abstract sense (the Church as an institution) today. The structurally correspondent Hungarian equivalent of the English name forms *Milton* (< OE *Mylen-tūn* ‚mill tūn‘, Cu, Db, K, Nb, Nt, St, We; DEPN: 326–327) and *Millington* (< OE *Mylen-tūn* ‚tūn with a mill‘, Chs, YE; DEPN: 326) is *Malomsok* („village with a mill“, Vpm; FNESz 2: 87), whose second element (i.e. *sok* ‚village‘) as a geographical term has become obsolete today.

2.4. Toponyms of similar semantic and/or grammatical structure including strongly culture-dependent lexemes

Settlement names involving early personal names clearly invite culture-dependent lexemes. Non-Christian personal names are mostly of the following origins in English settlement names: Old English, e.g. *Colaton* („Cola’s tūn“, cf. late OE *Cola*, D; DEPN: 116), *Lufton* („Luca’s tūn“, cf. OE *Luca*, So; DEPN: 307), *Wigton* („Wicga’s tūn“, Cu; DEPN: 518); Goidelic (Irish), e.g. *Corby* („Corc’s by“, Cu; DEPN: 122), *Gatenby* („Gaithan’s by“, YN; DEPN: 193), *Glassonby* („Glassan’s by“, Cu; DEPN: 197); Scandinavian, e.g. *Ingarsby* („Ingwar’s by“, cf. ON *Ingvarr*, Le; DEPN: 264), *Rollsby* („Hrōlf’s by“, cf. ON *Hrólfr* < *Hrōðulfr*, Nf; DEPN: 391), *Ulceby* („Ulf’s by“, cf. ON *Ulf*, Li; DEPN: 485); French, e.g. *Buslingthorpe* („Buselin’s thorp“, cf. OFr *Buselin*, Li; DEPN: 78), *Painsthorpe* („Pain’s thorp“, cf. Fr *Pain*, YE; DEPN: 357); French of continental German, e.g. *Etterby* („Etard’s by“, cf. OHG *Eidhart*, Cu; DEPN: 169), *Mablethorpe* („Malbert’s thorp“, Li; DEPN: 310); or French of Breton, e.g. *Jolby* („Johel’s by“, cf. OW *Iudhail*, YN; DEPN: 268), *Wiggonby* („Wigan’s by“, cf. OBret *Uuicon*; DEPN: 518)¹⁵⁾ and of the following origins in Hungarian settlement names: Proto-Hungarian, e.g. *Arad* (cf. *Arad*, an old personal name < *úr* ‚master‘ + the derivative suffix *-di*, AdC; FNESz 1: 108), *Fót* (cf. *Folt*, an old personal name < *fol* ‚piece, remainder‘, Pst; FNESz 1: 478), *Keve* (cf. *Keve*, a personal name < *kő* : *köv-* ~ *kev-* ‚stone‘, Pst as *Ráckeve*; FNESz 2: 391, see entry *Ráckeve*); Old Turkish, e.g.

¹⁵⁾ Cf. K. Cameron, o. c. in note 2, p. 150–152, 76, 83–86, 93–94.

Csaba (cf. OT *čaba* ‚gift‘ or ‚shepard, wanderer‘, Bks as *Békéscsaba*; FNESz 1: 185, see entry *Békéscsaba*), *Gyula* (cf. OT *jula* ‚torch‘, Bks; FNESz 1: 551), *Tass* (cf. OT *taš* ‚stone‘, BK; FNESz 2: 624); Slavic, e.g. *Galánta* (cf. Polish *Gołęta*, an old personal name, TvR; FNESz 1: 492), *Zsadány* (cf. Czech *Ždán*, a personal name, Bks; FNESz 2: 813), *Szoboszló* (cf. Serbian *Sebeslav*, a personal name, HB as *Hajdúszoboszló*; FNESz 1: 559, see entry *Hajdúszoboszló*); and German, e.g. *Ajka* (cf. Saxon *Aico* ~ *Aeico*, an old personal name < OHG *agī*, *Ygī* ‚fright, fear‘, Vpm; FNESz 1: 62), *Guta* (cf. German *Guta*, an old personal name, Ngr as *Galgaguta*; FNESz 1: 493, see entry *Galgaguta*), *Pécel* (cf. German *Pezili* ~ *Pecili*, an old personal name, Ps; FNESz 2: 328).¹⁶⁾

In the case of settlement names referring to the folk, tribe or ethnic group that settled down in that place, though some possible grammatical discrepancies can also be observed, lexical differences are striking, as a result of the fact that the two countries were populated by different peoples during their history (see above). Besides, the ethnic names appearing in English settlement names (*Saxton* ‚the tūn of the Saxons‘; *Ingleby* ‚the by of the English‘; *Frieston* ‚the tūn of the Frisians‘; *Danby* ‚the Danes‘ by‘; *Normanby* ‚the by of the Northmen or Norwegians‘; etc.) usually indicate former conquest; those applied in Hungarian settlement names (*Horvátfalva* ‚Croatian village‘; *Németfalva* ‚German village‘; *Olaszfalva* ‚Wallon village‘; *Oroszfalva* ‚Eastern Slavic, Russian village‘; *Szászfalva* ‚Transylvanian Saxon village‘; *Tótfalva* ‚Slovenian village‘; etc.), however, mostly suggest (re)population.

Settlement names identifying the patron saints of the settlements display differences both in grammatical structures (see above) and in lexemes in the two languages: compare references to saints of the British Isles, e.g. *St. Bees* (Sancta Bega, a virgin saint of Irish descent), *St. Neots* (a monk from Cornwall), *St. Breward* (Breward was presumably a Cornish saint), *St. Mewan* (Méén of Brittany was a Breton saint, thought to be Cornish or Welsh in origin), *St. Osyth* (Osyth was an English female saint, lived in the 7th century AD) in English settlement names and references to Hungarian saints of the House of Arpad (c. 895–1301), e.g. *Szentistván* (Saint Stephen I of Hungary), *Szentimre* (Saint Emeric of Hungary), *Szentlászló* (Saint Ladislaus I of Hungary), *Szenterzsébet* (Saint Elisabeth of Hungary) in Hungarian toponyms. English place-names ending in *-church* and *-kirk* usually have reference to a (once existing) ecclesiastic building, in perfect state, in the settlements, e.g. *Peterchurch*, *Felixkirk* (the first constituents identify the saint to whom the church was dedicated, see above), whilst their Hungarian equivalent, the element *-egyház(a)*, was very often adopted in Medieval Hungary to suggest the devastation of a settlement in a way that only the re-

¹⁶⁾ Cf. B. Kálmán, o. c. in note 3, p. 136–139.

mains of the church building indicated the place of the previously flourishing settlement (named after a feature different from the patron saint), e.g. *Nyír* > *Nyíregyháza* (1215/1550: *Nyr* > 1326: *Nyir-egyház*, ‚birch‘ + ‚the/ church /of/‘, SzSzB; FNESz 2: 256), *Szer* > *Szeregyháza* (‚row of houses‘ + ‚the/ church /of/‘, Bks; FNESz 2: 383–284, see entry *Pusztaszer*).¹⁷⁾

References to animals kept at early times in given settlements might also reflect distinct cultural practices. English settlement names preserve the memory of former animal husbandry raising sheep, cattle, calves or rams, e.g. *Shepton* (< OE *Scēap-tūn* ‚sheep farm‘, So; DEPN: 416), *Natton* (< OE *Nēat-tūn* ‚cattle farm‘, Gl; DEPN: 336), *Calwich* (< OE *Calf-wīc* ‚farm where calves were kept‘, St; DEPN: 83), *Rampton* (< OE *Ramm-tūn* ‚tūn with a ram or where rams were reared‘, Ca, Nt; DEPN: 380); whilst Hungarian settlement names have reference to raising swine, goats or geese in the past, e.g. *Disznósd* (‚swine, boar‘ + the derivative suffixes *-s* and *-d*, today’s *Borsodszentgyörgy*, BAZ; FNESz 1: 243, see entry *Borsodszentgyörgy*), *Kecskéd* (‚goat‘ + the derivative suffix *-d*, KE; FNESz 1: 704), *Ludas* (‚goose‘ + the derivative suffix *-s*, Hev; FNESz 2: 53).

Similar distinction can be observed when names of occupations appearing in settlement names are considered. Characteristic early occupations preserved in English settlement names include dog-keepers, shoe-makers, e.g. *Hunmanby* (‚the by of the dog-keepers‘, YE; DEPN: 257), *Hunsonby* (‚the by of the dog-keepers‘, Cu; DEPN: 257), *Sutterby* (‚the shoemakers’ by‘, Li; DEPN: 454), *Sutterton* (‚the shoemakers’ tūn‘, Li; DEPN: 454, see entry *Sutterby*). Hungarian settlement names, however, often refer to special servants of the king or of the ecclesiastical order such as stud-grooms, stewards, funeral organisers, e.g. *Lovászi* (‚stud-groom‘ + the derivative suffix *-i*, Zal; FNESz 2: 49), *Udvarnok* (‚steward‘, TvR; FNESz 2: 696), *Dusnok* (‚funeral organiser‘, BK; FNESz 1: 401). Some basic professions, at the same time, seem to have been popular in both countries in the Middle Ages, e.g. potters, smiths, hunters: *Potterton* (< OE *pottera tūn* ‚the potters’ tūn‘, YW; DEPN: 372), *Smeaton* (‚the smiths’ tūn‘, YN, YW; DEPN: 427), *Smethcote* ~ *Smethcott* (‚the smiths’ cottage‘, Sa; DEPN: 427), *Smethwick* (‚the smiths’ dwelling‘, Chs, St; DEPN: 427), *Smisby* (‚the smith’s by‘, Db; DEPN: 427), *Hunston* (< OE *hunteres tūn* ‚the huntsman’s tūn‘, Sf; DEPN: 257), *Huntington* (< OE *huntena tūn* ‚the tūn of the huntsmen‘, He, Sa; DEPN: 258), *Hunton* (‚the tūn of the huntsman or huntsmen‘, K, YN; DEPN: 258) – *Fazekasboda* (‚potters’ Boda‘, ‚potter‘: only as a distinctive addition, Bar; FNESz 1: 444), *Kovácsi* (‚smith‘

¹⁷⁾ See also L. Kiss, *Korai magyar helységnévtípusok* [Early Hungarian Settlement Name Types]. In: L. Kovács – L. Veszprémy (ed.), *Honfoglalás és nyelvészet* [The Hungarian Conquest and Linguistics], Budapest 1997, p. 177–185.

+ the derivative suffix *-i*, BBR as *Fülekkovácsi*; FNESz 1: 484, see entry *Fülekkovácsi*), *Vadász* (,hunter‘, AdC; FNESz 2: 716).

Settlement names consisting of a toponym (e.g. a river name, a name of a hill or a name of a district) and a second constituent identifying a type of settlement, though often structurally parallel forms, clearly manifest lexical differences due to distinct place-name stocks in the two languages, e.g. *Linton* (,tūn on river Lyne‘, Nb; DEPN: 300), *Tamerton* (,tūn on river Tamar‘, Co, D; DEPN: 459), *Measham* (,hām on river Mease‘, Le; DEPN: 319), *Trentham* (,hām on river Trent‘, St; DEPN: 480), *Leintwardine* (,worþ/ign/ on river Lent‘, He; DEPN: 295), *Lugwardine* (,worþign on the Lugg‘, He; DEPN: 307), *Wrockwardine* (,worþign by the hill called Wrekin‘, Sa; DEPN: 539), *Marden* (,worþign in Maund district‘, He; DEPN: 314) – *Szamosfalva* (,village on river /Kis-/Szamos‘, CjC; FNESz 2: 519), *Mátraháza* (,house by the hill called Mátra‘, originally a name of a building, now that of a settlement, Hev; FNESz 2: 108), *Kunszállás* (,living quarters in Kiskunság district‘, BK; FNESz 1: 813).

Venues of famous battles often appear in field names in both of the languages. In each language, these microtoponyms understandably commemorate battles that were important in the history of the nation concerned, e.g. *Waterloo* (referring to the Battle of Waterloo, fought on 18 of June 1815, in which an Imperial French army under the command of Emperor Napoleon was defeated by the combined armies of the Seventh Coalition, one an Anglo-Allied army under the command of the Duke of Wellington and the other a Prussian army under the command of Gebhard von Blücher), *Balaclava* (referring to the Battle of Balaclava, fought on 25 of October 1854, during the Crimean War, as a part of the Anglo-French-Turkish campaign to capture the port and fortress of Sevastopol, Russia’s principal naval base on the Black Sea) in English¹⁸⁾ – *Doberdó* (referring to the Battle of Doberdò, fought in August 1916 between the Italian and Austro-Hungarian Army, which is considered to have been one of the bloodiest battles of World War I) in Hungarian.¹⁹⁾

2.5. Toponyms of distinct semantic and lexical-grammatical structure

Some semantic references can only be identified in one of the observed languages. References to the cardinal points of the compass in settlement names are quite common in English, e.g. *Norton* (,north tūn‘, Chs, Db, Du, Gl, Ha, Hrt, K, Np, Nt, Sf, W, Wo, YE, YW; DEPN: 344–345), *Sutton* (< OE *Sūþ-tūn* ,southern tūn‘, Bd, Ca, Chs, D, Ess, K, La, Li, Nf, Np, Nt, O, Sa, Sf, Sr, Sx, Wo, YW; DEPN: 454–455), *Easton* (< OE *Ēast-tūn* ,eastern tūn‘, Brk, Cu, Ha, Hu, Li, Nf, Sf, W, YE; DEPN: 157–158), *Weston* (< OE *West-tūn* ,western tūn‘, Brk, Chs, Ha, Hrt, Li, Nf, Np, Nt, Sf, So,

¹⁸⁾ Cf. K. Cameron, o. c. in note 2, p. 210.

¹⁹⁾ Cf. I. Hoffmann, o. c. in note 9, p. 130.

Sr, Wa, YW; DEPN: 508–509); but not expressed as such in Hungarian. Some scholars suspect that in Hungarian settlement names the constituents *alsó* ‚lower‘ and *felső* ‚upper‘ might have developed the sense ‚south‘ and ‚north‘, respectively. Indeed, the settlement called *Alsórajk* is found to the south of *Felsőrajk* (‚lower‘ and ‚upper Rajk‘, Zal; FNESz 1: 88, 461) and *Alsónána* is similarly located south from *Felsőnána* (‚lower‘ and ‚upper Nána‘, Tln; FNESz 1: 85, 459), however, *Alsógalla* lies northwards of *Felsőgalla* (‚lower‘ and ‚upper Galla‘, KE; FNESz 1: 79, 455), conforming to the configuration of the terrain and thus reflecting the primary meanings of the words. Hungarian settlement names, moreover, clearly lack the concepts of ‚situated west‘ and ‚situated east‘.

Some Hungarian settlements got their names from the day of the week when the local market was organised, e.g. *Csütörtök* (‚Thursday‘, TvR; FNESz 1: 349), *Szerdahely* (‚Wednesday place‘, AbC; FNESz 2: 572), *Szombathely* (‚Saturday place‘, Vas; FNESz 2: 591–592). Though in the past markets were undoubtedly important in England as well, cf. settlement names such as *Chipping* (< OE *cēping*, *cīeping* ‚market, market town‘, La; DEPN: 105), *Chipstead* (< OE *cēapstede* ‚market place‘, K, Sr; DEPN: 105), *Kepwick* (< OE *cēap-* or *cēpe-wīc* ‚market place‘, YN; DEPN: 273), *Market Rasen* (a small market town, Li; DEPN: 381), indicating the day of the weekly market did not evolve into a motivation for English settlement names. References to the social status as well as the financial situation of the early inhabitants appear in some Hungarian settlement names, cf. the constituents *nemes* ‚noble‘ and *pór* ‚poor, peasant‘ in settlement names such as *Nemeskiszfalud* (the settlement called *Kiszfalud* that was inhabited by members of the lower nobility, Som; FNESz 2: 229), *Nemesoroszi* (the settlement called *Oroszi* that was inhabited by members of the lower nobility, NtR; FNESz 2: 231), *Pórszalók* (the settlement called *Szalók* that was inhabited by peasants, once in Vpm; FNESz 2: 232, see entry *Nemesszalók*); this is not, however, expressed in such a direct way in English settlement names.

In some cases, though a motivational factor is found in both tongues, the semantic implications in settlement names are markedly different in the two languages due to distinct cultural legacies. Settlement names referring to (the remains of) constructions from the Roman era seem to be much more popular in England than in Hungary, though Roman civilisation in the former country left very little influence behind, cf. the English settlement names *Walby* (‚by on the Roman Wall‘, Cu; DEPN: 491), *Walwick* (‚wīc on the Roman Wall‘, Nb; DEPN: 495), *Stratton* (< OE *Stræt-tūn* ‚tūn on a Roman road‘, Bd, Do, Gl, Sr; DEPN: 449), *Stanway* (‚paved road‘, on Roman roads, Ess, He; DEPN: 439), *Gate Fulford* (OScand *gata* ‚road‘ refers to the York–Doncaster road, YE; DEPN: 190), *Frocester* (‚Roman station on river Frome‘, Gl; DEPN: 188), *Manchester* (OBrit *Mamucion* + OE *ceaster* < Lat *castra* ‚a city or walled town, originally one that had been a Roman station‘, La; DEPN: 92, 312), *Porchester* (‚the Roman fort by the port or harbour‘, Ha; DEPN: 371), etc. and the only related, but

obscure Hungarian settlement name *Keszthely* (< Lat *castra* ,a city or walled town, originally one that had been a Roman station', through a Slavic language, Zal; FNESz 1: 724).

Regarding the ownership of places, some social ranks, though having existed in both countries in medieval times, seem to appear only in the settlement names of one of the observed languages, e.g. references to knighthood are found only in English toponyms: *Chilton* (< OE *Cilda-tūn* ,the children's tūn', OE *cild* was also used as a title ,a youth of noble birth', Bk, Brk, K, Sa, Sf; DEPN: 104–105), *Knighton* (< OE *Cnihta-tūn* ,the tūn of the knights', Brk, Do, Le, So, St, W, Wt; DEPN: 282), *Knightcote* (,the cot of the knights', Wa; DEPN: 282), *Knightstone* (,the knight's tūn', D; DEPN: 282), *Knightwick* (,the wīc of the knights', Wo; DEPN: 282). In the territories of the two countries, found in widely separated parts of Europe, different religious orders could come into possession of habitations: in England several settlements were owned by the Knights Templar, e.g. *Templeton* (,tūn once belonging to the Knights of the Temple', Brk, D; DEPN: 463, see entry *Temple*); whilst in Hungary it was the Order of Saint John that gained considerable possessions, e.g. *Keresztes* (possessed by the Order of Saint John, CjC; FNESz 1: 719).

3. Conclusion

As we have seen above, one can identify several toponym types of entirely or partially identical semantics in the English and Hungarian languages (e.g. settlement names referring to size, age, shape, situation, soil, vegetation, animals, buildings, inhabitants, patron saints, possessors, nearby geographical objects or administrative units). The existence of these common semantic patterns definitely supports the view promoted by cognitive linguistics claiming that language elements can be considered as manifestations of how relevant entities of the world are conceptualised in human cognition: similar geographical entities seem to trigger similar mental construal processes. Thus there exist toponyms of similar semantic structures, even if people speaking different mother tongues are involved in the actual name giving practices. As a result of the different structural features of the two languages, based on their belonging to distinct language families, the lexical and grammatical compositions of place-names of similar semantics might sometimes be strikingly different: English seems to have preferred compound toponym forms from the beginning, whilst Hungarian, at least in the early periods, made better use of simplex structures. Furthermore, differences in the history and culture of the English and Hungarian nations led to the development of some toponym types of unique semantic structure (e.g. compass-point, market-day or social rank related settlement names), which structures, correspondingly, were often expressed in diverse language forms.

In short, the comparison of English and Hungarian prototypical toponym types suggested that the semantics of place-names should best be considered partially universal and partially culture and language specific. In the long run, contrastive analysis

combined with historical linguistic methods and a cognitive linguistic approach in place-name studies can definitely cast light on the facts of how humans of different mother tongues conceptualise similar geographic entities and in what forms these concepts are conventionalised in their distinct languages.

*Károli Gáspár University, TERMIK
Reviczky u. 4., H-1088 Budapest
Hungary
bolcskeiandrea@hotmail.com*