Evelin Mozga (Debrecen, Hungary)

*Problems Involved in Defining Anthroponym Etymologies*

1. Characteristic feature of anthroponym systems of all languages are the personal names that have been formed both from lexical elements of the given language and by means of the addition of personal names from foreign languages. These processes are also valid in the case of Hungarian, thus from the earliest documented period of Hungarian language history, besides personal names formed from Hungarian common nouns, we find a great number of anthroponyms borrowed from external sources. Name transfer may occur as a result of intensive ethnic-linguistic contact or a higher-level cultural influence. In the case of Hungarian, the former manifests itself in the appearance of Turkish, Slavic and German loan elements as a result of co-habitation with other peoples, and the latter in that of Latin-Greek elements due to the expansion of Christian culture (for more about this see TÓTH 2016: 158–159).

In my paper, I discuss the difficulties encountered when trying to define the etymological background of anthroponyms from the early Old Hungarian Era through examples of personal names included in the Census of the Abbey of Tihany, a 13th-century remnant; at the same time, I introduce some ideas that could bring us closer to the answer when attempting to explain a certain name-form.

The Census of the Abbey of Tihany was made in 1211 upon the request of Andrew II, who ordered the survey of the estates and peoples of the Abbey of Tihany. This legal document mentions close to 2,000 people who lived and served in the 37 estates belonging to the Abbey of Tihany. The charter also indicates the occupation of and the familial relationships among the majority of people, which frequently provides help when discussing the act of name giving. The Census of the Abbey of Tihany is also closely related to the oldest Hungarian charter that has survived in its original form, the Founding Charter of the Abbey of Tihany from 1055.

2. It can be stated with relative certainty about some of the personal names mentioned in the charter, which etymological layer they derive from. A relatively large part of the names were formed from Hungarian common nouns, c.f., Aianduc < Hung. ajándék ‘present’, Bogar < Hung. bogár ‘bug’, Feketeu <
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2.1. As the great majority of our loan anthroponyms entered the Hungarian personal name system by means of different name-adaptation procedures, the recognition of name-stems and their association with a linguistic layer becomes a primary task when defining the etymology itself. Often a problem arises because name-stems consisting of only 1-2 syllables may occur in the anthroponym corpus of several languages (even in Hungarian) (cf. HOFFMANN 2009: 21, SLÍZ 2011a: 56-67, MOZGA 2013: 156-157). The origin of the *Suda* name-form, for example, is disputed, among others. Slavic origin is possible, with direct name transfer or with the attachment of the Hungarian -*a* personal name formant, cf. Polish *Szud* anthroponym (SISNO. 5: 246), Old Czech shortened first name: *Súd* (SVOBODA 1964: 108), Czech *Suda* anthroponym (cf. FNESz. Szúd, MELICH 1903–1905. 1/2: 128). The Slavic personal names may derive from the Proto Slavic *sadъ* word meaning ‘plantation, garden’. At the same time, we may also consider a *Suda* < Hung. *csoda* ‘miracle’ common noun transformation which may also be supported by the fact that in the Census of the Abbey of Tihany the -*s* suffix appears relatively often as does the [cs] sound as well. Approximately 150 people are mentioned in the Census under the single-syllable name consisting of only 3-4 sounds. These names can usually be considered the shortened forms of a name of foreign origin. (That is, of course, only if we do not recognize any Hungarian common nouns in them.) For example, the *Wis* name-form can be deduced from both the Slavic and German languages, cf. Serb.-Cro. *Viš* anthroponym < *Visoslav*, *Višeslav* (GRKOVIĆ 1977: 54), Czech *Výš* anthroponym (SVOBODA 1964: 129), Polish *Wis*, *Výsch* < *Wisław* (SISNO. 6: 124) and German *Wis* anthroponym (FÖRSTE-MANN 1900: 1622).

The etymology of the *Guz* name is also rather uncertain. It may be associated with the Slavic *Gosmer*, *Gosmir*, *Goslav*, *Gostimer*, etc. personal names, cf. Polish *Gozlav* anthroponym (SISNO. 2: 172), Czech *Hoslav* anthroponym (SVOBODA 1964: 65), from which the Hungarian name-form was created by shortening. The first constituent of these Slavic personal names is the Proto-Slavic *gostiš*, *gostí* word meaning ‘to be a guest’, ‘welcome someone as a guest.’ The Slavic names have the *Guzmarus*, *Guzlaus*, *Guztimarus*
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(SCHLIMPERT 1978: 48–49) forms in German sources, thus borrowing from German is also possible. However, it cannot be excluded either that the personal name is from the Hungarian gūzs ‘loop’ common noun which is of Slavic origin (cf. TESz., OkiSz.).

In the case of single-syllable names, the origin of the initial name pair can be decided with great certainty only rarely (if we find no matching with the anthroponyms of other languages); this is the case, for example, with Pet < Petrus, Petur, Dom < Dominicus, Mich < Michael, Marc < Marcus, Bench < Benedictus, etc.

2.2. When establishing the origin of anthroponym remnants, it is worth examining the personal name-forms that may in theory be attached to Hungarian name-stems etymologically in every language which had in some form come into contact with Hungarian in the era under examination. In many cases it also happens with longer names that several languages may be indicated as the source. Although in the case of the Bodomer personal name appearing in the charter the Slavic origin seems to be rather certain, cf. Bulg. Будимир (ILČEV 1969: 91), Serb.-Cro. Буđимир, Будимира (MARETIĆ 1886–1887: I, 115, MIKLOSICH 1927: 38), Czech Будимир (SVOBODA 1964: 72, MIKLOSICH 1927: 38; see also FNESz. Kissbudmér, Budamér, SLÍZ 2011b. Budmer, FEHÉRTÖI 1981) which were formed from the Proto-Slavic *buditi ‘wake sy. up’ (SCHLIMPERT 1978: 25) > Slavic bud-, budi- ‘watching, alert, excited’ (MIKLOSICH 1927: 37, MARETIĆ 1886–1887: I, 115) and -mir, -mér ‘peace’ words (MIKLOSICH 1927: 75, SVOBODA 1964: 79), still, the possibility of German origin has also come up in connection with the name. According to HALÁSZ, our data derive from the Germanic Bodomar personal name, which was formed with the combination of the bod ~ böd (cf. Gothic biudan ‘offer, give’, OHG. bodo ’messenger, courier’) and māru (cf. Gothic mērs, OHG. māri ‘shiny’, OHG. -mār ‘big, famous’) stems (1956: 91; cf. FORSTEMANN 1900: 319–323, 1099–1107, Duden-Tasch. IV, 48). The form found among old German personal names demonstrates that the entry of the name into Hungarian was possible from several directions. In such cases it is not necessary to take sides in terms of any of the directions of borrowing, but, those linguistic signs should be highlighted and introduced that could help us in identifying the absolutely false suppositions and in deciding which possible etymons could be considered more likely based on the various arguments.

2.3. The formal and structural occurrences of loan names in the charter have to be examined in great detail and based on a clear theoretical starting point. We have found examples when the loan names entered charters from the Old Hungarian Era in an unchanged form, e.g., Paulus < Lat. Paulus, Dauid < Lat. David, Lambert < Ger. Lambert, Salamon < Lat. Salamon, etc.; still, a large part of names of a foreign origin appear in old sources already in a Hungarian form.
2.4. The religious personal names of Latin origin also often appear in the Census of the Abbey of Tihany without an -us ending, which may be considered the Hungarian equivalent of the Latin names, cf. Paul < Lat. Paulus, Peter < Lat. Petrus, Marc < Lat. Marcus, Jacob < Jacobus, etc.

During the Early Old Hungarian Era names were formed not only by dropping the -us ending but typically also by shortening the names to the first or first and second syllables in order to adapt them to the Hungarian language system, cf. Johan < Johannes, Dom < Domuncus, Deme < Demetrius, etc. Shortening was also often associated with derivation, cf. Demeu, Demus < Demetrius; Domsa, Domas < Domuncus; Johanca < Johannes; Marci < Marcus, Marcellus, etc.

The shortening of names was common practice not only in the case of Latin but also with other loan names. Frequently a compound loan name was recorded in the charter in a form shortened to its first constituent, cf. Dersi < Slavic Drž(i)slav, Držimir; Rada < Slavic Radomer, Radomir, Radoslav, Radovan; Aman < Ger. Amantrudis, Amanfrid, Amanold, Amanulf; Heim ~ Heym < Ger. Heimrich; Hede ~ Hedeh < Ger. Hedricus ~ Hedericus, etc. In most of the cases a Hungarian formant was also added to these shortened forms, cf. Borid > Slavic Borišlav; Baga < Slavic Bogomil, Bogomer, Bogoslav; Bertu < Ger. Berthold, Bertolf, Bertram, Bertrand, Bertfried; Haymus ~ Haimus < Ger. Heimrich; Henche < Ger. He(i)rich, etc.

2.5. In many cases the structural and phonological modifications of loan names can be identified in a form recorded in the charter. The Bodomer ~ Bodmer record of the Census of the Abbey of Tihany could have been formed from the Bulg. Бодимер (Шев 1969: 91), Serb.-Cro. Бодир, Будимир, Czech Budimír names (Maretić 1886–1887: I, 115, Miklosich 1927: 38). The Hungarian Bodmér name-form was created by means of the two open syllables trend, that is, by dropping the vowel of the second open syllable (ending in a vowel). The Hungarian Bodomér, Bodamér forms were created as a result of vowel harmony, as in the Hungarian language words consisting of only palatal and velar vowels are typical. The Slavic Budivoj > Hungarian Budvoj change is also the result of the two open syllables rule, during which in the case of three or more syllable words, when two or more open syllables follow each other, the vowel from the second or any later syllable is dropped (E. ABAFFY 2003: 333).

3. As seen from the above that linking a name to an etymological layer is not an easy task. In what follows, I would like to present some procedures that I have used during my work so far for distinguishing different etymological layers, and which in some cases may take us closer to the explanation of a given name.

3.1. When identifying an etymology, the peculiar features of the charters may also help. The special philological situation of the Census of the Abbey of
Tihany could be a good example in this regard, as it is not only the authenticated copy of the charter that is available but also its draft. Of the 1,936 personal names mentioned from different estates, 369 appear in the sealed charter in a form different from that of the draft, which represents close to a fifth of the anthroponyms. The differences between the two copies could help us in the case of some remnants when defining the etymon, e.g., the Pet name-form of the authentic copy appears in Petur form in the draft, or the Symou name of the authentic copy was recorded in Simoun form in the draft.

3.2. Several scholars have already called attention to the fact that the names should not be studied independently when removed from their context. DEZSŐ PAIS (1966) first wrote about the method called “name referencing”, the essence of which is that with the exploration of the particular name connection we may also grow closer to the identification of the name’s origin and meaning. He recognized that in the charters from the Árpád Era the members of the different groups, especially family members, often have related names and this relationship between the names often provides an opportunity to explain one name with the other.

3.2.1. Correlation between names may appear both in terms of semantics and morphology. As for the former, the Farkas ‘wolf’ and Medve ‘bear’ name-pair is often quoted, which also appears among the name-mentions of two families: once the names of a father and son: 1211: Vdornici de Mortus [...] filius Forcos, Medue (Forcas, Medueh) et filius eius Mogus (PRT 10: 512); and later that of two siblings are recorded in this form: In villa Supoc [...] vornicij [...] filius Laurentii, Zemdij cum filiis sui Forcos, Medue (Medueh) (PRT 10: 513). Such a semantic relationship may be revealed, for example, by the fact that the charter mentions a son called Nemel ‘not live’ of the father called Látomás ‘vision’: 1211: In altera vero villa, nomine Belen (Belenh) isti sunt ioubagiones [...] Nemelh, filius Latamas (PRT 10: 507). This method, of course, can only be used in the case of descriptive names of a transparent semantic content.

3.2.2. One of the most typical forms of the morphological relationship between names is when one of the members within a family is named with the base form of the name, while the others with the modified version of the same name, most often the shortened and additionally formed version of the original. This process can be found most often among loan names. This may primarily be due to the unique nature of the name type, i.e., that referential names can only fulfill the identifying function of personal names, and thus it rarely happens within the family that its members are recorded with the same name-form. The intention to express the familial relationship is often revealed by the repetition of identical name-stems. This may help us with the identification of names of the same origin and thus with the definition of the relationship between the shortened
and derived name-forms. Based on the text of the Census of the Abbey of Tihany the family relationships may be easily explored. We find several examples for this phenomenon in the charter, due to the frequency of names primarily among those of Latin origin.

The bond between siblings, however, is also often expressed on the level of names. Thus, for example, the Latin Johannes appears in the charter in diverse name-forms: 1211: *In predio Colon [...] servi [...] filii Stephan (Stefan), Ben-nedec cum filiiis Matia, Elia frater eius Forcos cum filiiis sui Janus, Johannes et alter frater eius Cusid cum filii suo Sorloub (PRT 10: 508); In villa Supoc [...] vornicij [...] filius Zegen, Thomas cum filiiis sui Johannes, Joan, frater eius Egydiud cum filii su Erdeus (PRT 10: 513); In villa Thurkh (Turk) isti sunt joubagiones ecclesie: filii Symien, Joan cum filii suo Vus, et frater eius Ibrachin cum filii suo Joachyn, et tercius Johannes (PRT 10: 515); In villa Zamthou [...] joubagiones ecclesie: filii Bene, Borid [...] Prid [...] frateres sui Johannes, Joanca (Johanca) (PRT 10: 514); In villa Zeuleus [...] sunt servi ecclesie [...] Chetur (Cheter), Heleh, Coza cum filio suo Johanne et Johanca (Joanca), Ceke cum filiiis sui (PRT 10: 514, 516). This pattern can also be seen in the case of other Latin names: *[In Tychon] coci [...] filii Zephal: Mortun, Mortunus (PRT 10: 503); In villa Fured [...] vinitores: Surc cum filiiis sui Alexio, Nicholao et Micu (PRT 10: 506); In predio Colon [...] ioubagiones [...] filius Tucus, Sephal et frater eius Zalas, cum filiiis sui Michael, Michaele, Micha (Mica) et Vros (PRT 10: 508); In villa Thurkh [...] vinitores ecclesie: filii Vros, Quinus (Quinjs) et frater eius Quina cum filio suo Kazmerio (Cazmer) (PRT 10: 515); In villa Pechel [...] vornici [...] filius Cuet, Luca, Luxa, Lucas (PRT 10: 504); in eadem Gomas isti sunt artifices ecclesie [...] filii Monos, Ananian (Anian) cum filio suo Anta et frateres eius Ananias et Ontus (PRT 10: 514), etc.

This pattern can also be seen in the case of other Latin names. The same phenomenon may also be found not only in the father and son relationships but also in the case of more distant relatives. In what follows, I would like to show some examples for these from the charter itself: 1211: *In altera [...] villa [...] Belen [...] ioubagiones [...] Chekeu cum filiiis Toma, Mana (Matica), Yroslou (Yroslau) et Micoudeo, frater eius Micu, cum filiiis Nicolao et Kemus (PRT 10: 507); In villa Zeuleus [...] joubagiones [...] filius Ocii, Micou cum filiiis Michaele (PRT 10: 507); In altera vero villa nomine Belen, isti sunt ioubagiones [...] Symon filius Jac cum filiiis Jacobo et Andrea (PRT 10: 507); In villa Colon [...] ioubgiones [...] Paul cum filio suo Pousa (PRT 10: 508); in eadem Gomas [...] artifices [...] filius Micus, Michoulous (Micolous) (PRT 10: 514), etc.

Based on the pattern introduced earlier, we can suppose the association between several names in which this appears to be much less obvious. The name relations within the family may appear not only in the repetition of identical
etymological stems but also sometimes the close bond between two or three names is revealed by the same formant of the names. This may help us to at least identify the stem of a hard-to-decipher name. In the Census of the Abbey of Tihany, for example, the following personal names borne by relatives could be formed with the same formant.

Father-son name mentions: 1211: [In Tychon] pelliparii [...] filius Lucus, Fulcus (PRT 10: 503); In villa Fuzegy [...] isti sunt exequiales [...] filius Chekeu, Demeu cum filio suo Beneduc (Benehduc) (PRT 10: 513).

Mentions of siblings: 1211: In villa Poposca [...] sunt servi [...] filii Maogy (Mauogi), Ws, Serdeh, Zemeh (PRT 10: 505); In villa Oczufu hi sunt agricole [...] Nemugy et filii sui Mocchi, Bunchi (PRT 10: 505); Vdornici de Mortus hii sunt: filii Karachun (Carachon), Pota cum filii sui, Thomud et filii eius Guz, Beke et frater Thomud, Bene (Tomud, Beneh), cum filio Texe et fratribus eius [...] Bed, Micou, Pota, Motou (PRT 10: 511); In villa Fotud [...] curriferi: filii Zed (Zeud), Micus cum filii sui, Pasca, Thexa (Texe), frater eius Lucus (PRT 10: 511); In villa Thurkh [...] vдорnici [...] filius Tupoz, Codou cum filii sui Quene, Vide, Leguine, Coda (Choda) cum filio suo Tiuan (Tiwan) (PRT 10: 515); In villa Fuzegy [...] sunt exequiales [...] filii Zacharie, Fileh, Selhe, Onda, Paul, Sentus (PRT 10: 513), etc.

4. The circumstances revealed by the text of the charter and also related to family relationships may help us find an explanation for given name-forms or recognize the common stem of specific names, especially in cases when there is no other option in connection with a name. The consistent use of this method can thus also successfully contribute to the more precise study of the internal relationships of the old Hungarian personal name system. However, one needs to consider the possible etymons carefully, and it is not recommended to decide based purely on the supposed association of similar names found among relatives.
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Abstract

The Census of the Abbey of Tihany was made in 1211 mentions close to 2,000 people, so this legal document is suitable for presentation the difficulties encountered when trying to define the etymological background of anthroponyms from the early Old Hungarian Era. It often causes a problem that name-stems consisting of only 1-2 syllables may occur in the anthroponym corpus of several languages. Only a small part of the loan names had entered charters from the Old Hungarian Era in an unchanged form (Paulus < Lat. Paulus, Lambert < Ger. Lambert, etc), a large part of names of a foreign origin appear in old sources in an already Hungarian form (Paul < Lat. Paulus, Domsa, Domas < Lat. Domuncus, Henche < Ger. He(i)nrich, Budvoj < Slavic Budivoj, etc.).

When identifying an etymology, the peculiar features of the charters may help us. The special philological situation of the Census could be a good example in this regard, as it is not only the authenticated copy of the charter that is available but also its draft. The difference the two copies may help in the determination of etymon: e.g., the Symou name of the authentic copy was recorded in Simoun form in the draft. In the charters from the Árpád Era the members of the different groups, especially the family members, often have related names and this relationship between the names often provides the opportunity to explain one name with the other. The correlation between the names may appear both in terms of semantics and morphology.
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