



Valéria Tóth

University of Debrecen, Debrecen, Hungary

Linguistic Prestige and Toponym Use at the Crossroads of Languages and Cultures

Voprosy onomastiki, 2021, Vol. 18, Issue 3, pp. 66–84

DOI: 10.15826/vopr_onom.2021.18.3.033

Language of the article: English

Valéria Tóth

University of Debrecen, Debrecen, Hungary

Linguistic Prestige and Toponym Use at the Crossroads of Languages and Cultures

Вопросы ономастики. 2021. Т. 18. № 3. С. 66–84

DOI: 10.15826/vopr_onom.2021.18.3.033

Язык статьи: английский



Downloaded from: <http://onomastics.ru>



named after the first President
of Russia B.N.Yeltsin

ИНСТИТУТ
РУССКОГО
ЯЗЫКА
им. В. В. Виноградова
Российской
АКАДЕМИИ НАУК

DOI 10.15826/vopr_onom.2021.18.3.033
UDC 81'27(292.451/.454) + 81'373.231 +
+ 811.112.2:811.511.141

Valéria Tóth
University of Debrecen
Debrecen, Hungary

LINGUISTIC PRESTIGE AND TOPONYM USE AT THE CROSSROADS OF LANGUAGES AND CULTURES

The paper focuses on the general problems of ethnic and linguistic contacts, and their impact on toponymic systems. To illustrate these, the author uses empirical evidence from medieval Hungarian charters originating from the Carpathian Basin, and touches upon some later language contacts in the same area. The guiding principle of the paper is provided by the topics included in the title. First, it discusses the notion of linguistic prestige and its interpretation with regard to toponyms and the linguistic situation of the medieval Carpathian Basin. The author showcases that linguistic prestige played a significant role both in toponym borrowing and toponym use, so as it influenced the practice of medieval charter writing. Secondly, the paper highlights some of the general theoretical considerations of name-giving and toponym use which are closely related to the issue at hand. These refer to the nature of relations between toponyms and culture, as well as toponyms and identity. Finally, it investigates the phenomenon of toponym borrowing and name integration, while outlining a possible model of toponomastic analysis in relation to the latter. This model provides both a descriptive (synchronic) and historical (diachronic) framework for studying toponym pairs of different languages at different stages of name integration. The author proposes a functional approach to this model through the analysis of Hungarian–German toponym pairs, but due to its universal categories, this theoretical framework is applicable to any two languages in contact and any historical periods.

Key words: theoretical onomastics; linguistic prestige; toponyms; name borrowing; name integration; Carpathian Basin; German–Hungarian language contacts

Acknowledgements

This study is part of the project carried out by the Research Group on Hungarian Language History and Toponomastics (University of Debrecen — Hungarian Academy of Sciences) as well as the project *International Scientific Cooperation for Exploring the Toponymic Systems in the Carpathian Basin* supported by the National Research, Development and Innovation Fund, Hungary (ID: NRD1 128270).

1. Linguistic Prestige as a Factor Shaping Linguistic Interactions

Languages in contact with one another have a specific, hierarchical relationship based on the linguistic behavior of the language users in which the languages acquire a certain prestige value. This observation served as the basis for the linguistic prestige model of Abram de Swaan [2001]. This model argues that languages make up a hierarchical system based on their relationship of prestige, in which the lowest level is represented by peripheral languages clustered around languages with a more central role. Supercentral languages are above central languages, linked by a hypercentral language.

Since I would like to apply this theoretical framework to earlier historical periods, I will now review the key ideas and notions of this model in more detail. As it is widely known, there are 5,000 to 6,000 languages spoken in the world.¹ As noted before, the languages of the world and the relationships between them make up a strongly hierarchical pattern. The lowest level is represented by the peripheral languages with 98% of the world's languages belonging to this category and the number of speakers making up less than 10% of the world's population. These languages are referred to as spoken languages with no written communication [de Swaan, 2001, 4].

Peripheral languages are clustered around central languages similarly to moons revolving around planets. There are approximately 100 languages that occupy such a central or “planetary” position in the global language system. They cover around 95% of the human population. Such languages are used in the fields of education, politics, public administration, justice, etc., usually these are national languages also having the official status. Such languages have both spoken and written forms of communication [de Swaan, 2001, 4–5].

Central languages are related to a larger linguistic group enjoying a supercentral position within the system. These languages are also the tools for international communication. Often, these are languages that were once imposed during former colonial rule and after independence continued to be used in politics, administration, law, business, and higher education. There is approximately a dozen of supercentral languages, which include Arabic, Chinese, English, French, German, Hindi, Malay,

¹ This number cannot be specified more precisely as languages are not always countable. This is illustrated by de Swaan using a cloud metaphor, arguing that there is something “cloud-like” in languages: in many cases, it is difficult to tell where one begins and the other ends, even though there are many among them that are unmistakably different [de Swaan, 2001, 3].

Portuguese, Russian, Spanish, and Swahili. All except for Swahili are spoken by more than 100 million people. Their position within the global language system is similar to that of a sun, which is surrounded by its planets, the central languages that are located among their own satellites, the peripheral languages [de Swaan, 2001, 5–6].²

Finally, the language that connects supercentral languages thus creating the axis of the global language system is referred to as the hypercentral language: this language is located in the center of the language system made up by the 12 “suns”. Today only English has the role of a hypercentral language. This, however, is also a new phenomenon: the shift towards English occurred only after 1945. This process was brought about by globalization, but the same can also be seen as a prerequisite to globalization. Whether it be a cause or an effect, a hypercentral language in the sense described above is present only in today’s globalized world [de Swaan, 2001, 6].

This global linguistic prestige model can also be used to highlight the linguistic relationships of earlier times: for example, it can be used to evaluate the linguistic status of the medieval Carpathian Basin. As this linguistic context also represents the socio-cultural background for the interactions between toponymic systems at that time, I believe it is important to provide a brief overview of it as well. Some preliminary remarks are due, regarding the development of medieval linguistic contacts in the Carpathian Basin, as these will also help us understand the relationships of prestige.

Prior to their settlement in the Carpathian Basin, Hungarians had lived as a nomadic people (in the ancient Hungarian era, 1000 BC — 895 AD) and migrated from the Ural Mountains towards the Black Sea as part of the Eastern European migration wave. In the last third of the era, they were surrounded by Turkic languages, which resulted in intensive Hungarian–Turkic contacts especially from the 8th century, when Hungarians lived in proximity and under the supervision of the Khazar Khaganate. Sometime after that, Hungarian tribes reached the Carpathian Basin (in around 895–900), where they found a population speaking primarily Slavic.

This meant the fundamental change of the linguistic environment. At the beginning, Hungarians occupied the flat areas of the Carpathian Basin, especially the river valleys. The fringes of the Kingdom of Hungary, the outer regions of the Carpathian Basin remained largely unpopulated until the 12th century.

The ruler brought in large numbers of Saxons from the west with the objective of populating the north-eastern and south-eastern regions. The German-speaking population living in the north-eastern and south-eastern parts of the Carpathian Basin preserved its original culture and mother tongue for centuries, practically until the 20th century.

²The various chapters of de Swaan’s book discuss such regional constellations which have one or more supercentral languages in the center and which were often created as a result of colonization: for example, the Indian constellation around English and Hindi, the Indonesian constellation around Malay, the French-oriented constellation of Western Africa, the East-African constellation revolving around English, etc. [de Swaan, 2001, 11–17].

From the turn of the 12th and 13th centuries, the Slavic population was present in growing numbers in the northern part of the country, with the Slovak population gradually emerging from it.

This is also the time when the slow migration of Romanians has started from the areas outside the Carpathians to the south-eastern parts of Hungary, with their presence becoming stronger only from the 16th century.

The Turkic-speaking Pechenegs from the east also arrive at this time (12th–13th centuries) due to the pressure of the former wave of migration. They settle on the border territories keeping them safe from other outer invasions. In the first part of the 13th century, Cumans and Jász people arrive in the interior part of the country: these people speaking Turkic and Iranian (Alani) languages became Magyarized within a few centuries but preserved certain ancient elements of their culture almost to this day.

Early contacts with the French, the Walloons, took place due to dynastic relationships as well as by the growing presence of their religious orders (Benedictine, Cistercian, Premonstratensians, Johannites, Knights Templar) in Hungary. The Italian priests conducting proselytizing activities in the country in the 11th century, included, for example, Gerard Sagredo.³

As a result of all these movements, the cultural, intellectual, and economic life of Hungarians changed in many respects. Catholicism became a state religion and with the appearance of administrative institutions and the development of religious literature, the Latin written language became more and more widespread (for more details see [Hoffmann et al., 2017, 39–49]). All this constitutes the linguistic snapshot of the 11th–14th centuries Hungary that we will apply to interpret the prestige relationships of languages used in the Carpathian Basin in that period.

In the European linguistic area, Latin was the language with the highest prestige (in a sense, its supercentral role), which helped integrate Hungary into international communication in Europe (at the time, the name would only refer to the territories under Western Christianity). At certain levels, Latin was also the language of the country's internal communication: in education and science, in the field of state administration and law, and in certain areas of religious life. At first, Latin had an exclusive role in written culture but in certain spheres it was probably also used in oral communication.

³In his *Admonitions* to prince Emeric (*Libellus de institutione morum*, early 11th century), King Saint Stephen articulates such principles of ethnic tolerance that were unparalleled in contemporary Europe: “Sicut enim ex diversis partibus et provinciis veniunt hospites, ita diversas linguas et consuetudines, diversaque documenta et arma secum ducunt, que omnia regna ornant et magnificent aulam et perterritant exterorum arrogantiam. Nam unius lingue uniusque moris regnum inbecille et fragile est” [SRH, 2, 625], i.e.: “Guests arrive from different parts and provinces, so they bring with them a great variety of customs, models, and weapons and all this brings grace to the country, enhances the grandeur of the court, and deters foreigners from overweening contempt. For a country of a single language and one set of customs is weak and vulnerable”.

In the multilingual Carpathian Basin, Hungarian also enjoyed high prestige extending to the entire Kingdom of Hungary (practically, a central status); this is indicated by the fact that besides Latin, it also had a limited usage in written records during the centuries. At the same time, Hungarian was probably used in secular matters, for example, in legal procedures related to ownership such as the inspection of estates, the specification of their borders, the recording of topographical information at the time of the donation of estates or the hearing of court witnesses in other cases of another nature, etc.

German also had a central status in its own area (in the region of medieval German settlements and in the western parts of the Hungarian language area) as the above-mentioned functions of Hungarian were performed by this language. Here gradually German became used along with Latin in written culture and in official oral communication. We should also note that the use of the German language in certain official contexts in the Kingdom of Hungary, especially in urban areas, anticipated the use of Hungarian for the same function [Solymosi, 2011].

Other vulgar languages of the Carpathian Basin (Slavic languages and, at the beginning of the era, different Turkic languages, later Romanian and, besides these at different periods of time, several other languages used by smaller groups of people, e.g. Jász, Walloon) were peripheral languages which were used by speakers only between each other as a kind of familial language. Due to their low prestige, some of the speakers of these languages, especially in the central areas inhabited by Hungarians, gradually gave up the use of their original mother tongue and switched to Hungarian. This also indicates that the balance of languages spoken in Hungary and thus involved in the prestige relationships was continuously changing during the medieval period [also see Hoffmann et al., 2018, 50–52].

The exploration of language prestige relationships in earlier eras is important for the study of language contacts. These relationships are also mirrored in the use of place names in medieval written records serving as the basis for historical studies of toponymy. It is not by chance that in medieval Latin documents the names of especially important places (the country itself, large rivers, major settlements and castles, etc.) were recorded mostly in Latin. Latinized forms were created based on Hungarian toponyms even at places where Slavic–Hungarian or German–Hungarian bilingualism might be suspected behind name use.

Besides Latin, only Hungarian language elements are represented in medieval sources (albeit very rarely): in this respect, the special role of Hungarian is indicated by affixes, postpositions, geographical common nouns and names of trees, which are never mentioned in other peripheral languages in the charters.

The frequent use of German toponyms referring to the relatively isolated German settlements, however, shows the high prestige of this language in the given area as well.

The analysis of records shows that the toponyms of peripheral languages could be recorded in charters only in cases when the use of another language was not typical

at all, but we may see the effect and use of Latin, Hungarian, and German languages (with regional limitations) in recording names even in such areas [see Hoffmann et al., 2018, 50–52]. We must recall this circumstance when studying the impact of the prestige factor on a toponymic system at a given time. At the same time, the relationships of linguistic prestige also influence how toponym borrowing occurs.

I am going to address this issue in the second part of my paper in more detail. First, however, I would like to discuss some general issues of name theory related to toponym formation and use that facilitate the understanding of language contacts and the interactions of name systems.

2. General Theoretical Considerations Related to Name-Giving and Name Use

2.1. Universal Motives for Place Naming

The discussion of the general issues of name theory begins with an overview of the possible reasons behind place naming, i.e. the usual motivations behind the aspirations of people to name a certain place. These reasons also work naturally in multilingual environments even though there might be additional motives at play (partly due to the hierarchical relations and partly due to language policies).

Earlier, the key reason for name-giving was identified by scholars with the idea that people would like to orientate themselves in space and thus primarily important places are named (for Hungarian, see e.g. [Lőrincze, 1947, 3]). More recently, however, it has been emphasized, in both Hungarian and international publications, that the ultimate reason for name-giving is the communication need of people in a particular communicative situation: according to this approach, people do not primarily facilitate orientation with the use of toponyms, but through their creation and use they acquire the ability to refer to different places in communication. Thus, the name awareness of individuals is not related to the orientation but is associated with the communicative situations experienced by them (for such an approach to name genesis see e.g. [Kiviniemi, 1978, 73, 77; Nyirkos, 1989; Hoffmann, 1993, 17–26; 2005, 120]).

Moreover, when talking about the reasons of place-naming, we need to emphasize that anthropological and conventional motivations, i.e. the fact that names represent a fundamental part and universal component of human culture, also play a crucial role. Thus, naming itself is part of universal cultural conventions, so we give names simply because it is customary to label certain types of places with proper names [cf. Hajdú, 2002, 44; 2004, 12].

At the same time, this also means that a group of people arriving to an unknown land (regardless of how geographically, ecologically, economically, and socially different it may be) does not need a long time to fill the environment with toponyms [Benkő, 1998, 113]. “Labeling” places actually occurs due to the changes in communicative

needs, so that people arriving at their new habitat need toponyms immediately as these are required by the communicative situations.⁴

It seems straightforward that in such cases the newly arriving group borrows the names of the most important places from those living there. According to the recent approach of sociolinguistics, if the locals speak another language, borrowing takes place by means of bilingual speakers (for earlier times, see [Sándor, 1998]) and obviously, some time is needed for the emergence of partial bilingualism.

This should also be kept in mind when looking at the centuries following the settlement of Hungarians in the Carpathian Basin (895–900). Seeing, for example, that the names of all larger rivers of the Carpathian Basin are loan toponyms in Hungarian borrowed from or transmitted by Slavic languages we must suppose that there could be Hungarian–Slavic bilingual speakers in the early medieval society, as otherwise Hungarians themselves could have named the rivers; however, there are no indications of this whatsoever. Early Hungarian–Slavic bilingualism is also testified by the large number of Slavic loan words that entered Hungarian after the Conquest. But to what extent is such bilingualism mirrored in medieval sources and what are the consequences of this?

2.2. Polynymy in Written Sources

The recorders of written sources could have been greatly influenced by the relations of linguistic prestige at the time, in terms of which names they recorded in a bi- or multilingual (Hungarian–Slavic, Hungarian–German, Hungarian–Slavic–German, etc.) environment. As a result of these relationships, when mentioning places with both a Hungarian and another language name variant, the notary was likely to enter the Hungarian version into the charter or (much more rarely) mentioned both linguistic variants. The following, for example, is included in a charter from 1447: “*Wjfalw* alio nomine *Zawoda*” (Nógrád County) [Cs., 1, III], i.e. ‘Újfalva or otherwise called Závoda,’ whereby the *Újfalva* name in Hungarian means ‘new village,’ and *Závoda* is a Slavic name form that has no semantic relationship with the Hungarian name. The 1359 record: “de *Leansuk* sive de *Lendorph*” (Moson County) [Gy., 4, 155] indicates both Hungarian and German names of the same place — here, however, the two names are semantic equivalents meaning ‘girl village’.

The dual, mostly Hungarian and German name usage is sometimes also indicated by the charter textually: “*Nova montana seu aurifodina in vulgari Lassyupatak in teutonice*

⁴We are aware of several situations from later times when the establishment of a new settlement is accompanied by a name-giving process. An expedition discovering and taking ownership of a previously unknown land almost always names the camp and the major, most typical places along the way, as did the pioneers in the North American continent. This phenomenon is also mirrored in fiction: it is typical of robinsonade characters, getting settled at their new place of residence (even if they have nobody to communicate with), and so do the child heroes of Jules Verne’s *Two Year’s Vacation*. We have no reason to think that this would have happened differently at the time when Hungarians settled down in the Carpathian Basin a millennium ago.

nomine *Stilbach*” (1344, Szepes County) [Cs., 1, 262], where the Hungarian and the German names both mean ‘slow brook.’ Consequently, we may also suppose that in bi- or multilingual areas the parallel use names from different languages could be much more frequent than what is reflected in charters.

Therefore, we need to be cautious with drawing conclusions from the toponymic data that survived in charters, both regarding the ethno-linguistic situation of the area and the connections between name systems related to the different languages. Thus, the study of name usage in charters and the use-value of certain toponyms may be brought forward primarily by highlighting the relations of linguistic prestige in the multilingual Carpathian Basin.

More specifically, this means that in the outlined linguistic context, the high prestige of Hungarian led to the Hungarian place names being maintained even in areas where Hungarians did not constitute the majority, and even if a foreign language version of a name was used among those not speaking Hungarian it was not reflected in the charters due to the considerations of linguistic prestige. Moreover, this linguistic situation also resulted in the gradual Magyarization of the groups speaking other languages (and, at the same time, that of the name users not speaking Hungarian). Similar theoretical considerations may also support the idea that the toponym and the ethnic group living at the place denoted by it have a complex and complicated relationship.

2.3. Toponyms and Culture — Toponyms and Identity

As already noted, undertaking any linguistic assessment of toponyms in any era requires to specify their use-value in view of their own formal and semantic composition. For this purpose, we need to remember that toponyms, as linguistic signs, may express several functions and meanings boasting the richest semantic structure, which is also true in our case. Of the numerous semantic components, in the following I only highlight those that are also significant from the perspective of the topic at hand.

2.3.1. Cultural meaning can be considered a crucial component of the semantic structure of toponyms [cf. Tolcsvai Nagy, 2008, 39–40; Hoffmann, 2010, 51–53; 2014, 17–18] due to the fact that proper names are strongly determined by society and culture. Thus, to fully grasp the role of names in communication, we need to take into consideration that name usage is just as much a cultural as a linguistic question. As a result, the name system has a fundamental connection not only with the language system but also with culture, and the basic fault lines of name systems are not along linguistic but mostly cultural lines. Let me introduce a specific example as an illustration.

After their settlement in the Carpathian Basin, the Hungarians were fully integrated into European culture and took up the Christian faith. As a result, a new name type appeared in both systems of personal and place names, having the most intimate link with Christian culture and fully driven by this context. In the system of personal names this cultural name type is represented by religious personal names of Greek and Latin origin (e.g. *Péter* ‘Peter,’ *Mihály* ‘Michael,’ *Márton* ‘Martin,’ *Mária* ‘Mary’),

while in the case of toponymy, by settlement names referring to the patron saint, title of the church of the settlement (e.g. *Szentpéter* ‘Saint Peter,’ *Szentmihály* ‘Saint Michael,’ *Szentmárton* ‘Saint Martin,’ *Boldogasszony* ‘Our Lady, i.e. the Virgin Mary,’ etc.). The frequency of these patrociny settlement names was around 7% in medieval Hungary (i.e. every 14th or 15th settlement bore such a name). In the system of personal names, Christian culture brought about an even more significant transformation: to this date, the Greek and Latin religious personal names have predominated Hungarian personal names given at birth [Tóth, 2016, 158–181].

2.3.2. Proper names also play an important role in the development of the sense of identity. The identity-signifying function of names is most obviously manifested in the relationship of individuals and personal names, but it is also reflected in settlement name use. Through giving, using, and modifying their names, the individuals continuously mark and specify their role in the world: for example, giving a name to a place that has been unnamed before, they create its identity while building their own — by expressing their relationship to it [cf. Hoffmann, 2010].

In the Hungarian history, a very strong identity-marking role has been associated with certain types of toponyms. The “changes of regime” occurring in society and culture are clearly mirrored in settlement naming also. Even though the tribal organization of Hungarians disintegrated after settlement in the Carpathian Basin, the memory of the former tribes was still preserved by settlement names formed from their names (by now mostly appearing with affixes): *Nyék*, *Megyer*, *Kürt*, *Gyarmat*, *Tarján*, *Jenő*, *Kér*, *Keszi*, etc. Such denominations could maintain the names of tribes and the awareness of belonging to the tribe culture long after the tribes themselves broke up.

Awareness of the tribal past could therefore be impacting on the sense of people’s identity during many centuries following the settlement in the Carpathian Basin [cf. Hoffmann, Tóth, 2016, 277–278]. The spread of the previously mentioned patrociny settlement names in the Hungarian name system was also influenced by the Church. This supported a fundamental shift to Christian culture meant to popularize the ideology represented by it and to form and reinforce a new type of individual and communal identity. This example of name-giving clearly indicates the impact of Christian identity on society and culture of those times that was reflected in the toponymic system as well.

This crucial community- and identity-building role of place names is also closely related to the fact that toponyms, as vocabulary elements, are directly linked to the extra-linguistic reality, culture, society, which is key to their formation and transformation. The identity-building and identity-signifying role of toponyms is especially significant in bi- and multilingual environments. The following section discusses this issue further.

3. Toponym Borrowing

The branch of onomastics that studies the impact of language contacts on name systems and therein, the different types of name borrowing (name integration or

name adaptation) is now referred to as *contact onomastics* [cf. Sandnes, 2016, 541]. This research area primarily considers the languages in contact, the language-users, and the sociocultural context.

The necessity for naming lies in the background of the phenomenon called toponym integration. In areas of contact, there are two fundamental options for name givers to satisfy such a need: they can either create a new name from their own linguistic elements (internal name formation) or integrate a name that already exists in another language into their own name system (external name formation). The latter may be influenced by several factors: the typological features of the languages in contact, the characteristics of the toponymic system of the two languages (primarily their productive and dominant name patterns), the intensity and means of contact, the already mentioned issues of linguistic prestige, etc.

Language contacts, however, may be observed not only on the level of particular elements but also on the level of name systems, i.e. on the macro-level. A few decades ago, Rudolf Šrámek studied the German–Slavic toponymy and distinguished between three types of language contact affecting the level of toponymic systems. In the first case, the name systems are not in contact with each other, so only certain names enter the name system of the borrowing language as lexical units. The name formation patterns of the languages in contact are not involved in the process, the foreign names remain isolated in the receiving language. Under certain social circumstances, however, another type of contact is also possible: in this case, the name-giving community creates names based on foreign patterns. There is an important difference between the original pattern that is borrowed and the one entering the receiving language, as the latter cannot develop, it remains only a “passing fashion” and therefore does not fit into the system of the receiving language and will not be productive. The third type refers to languages in geographical contact: in this case, within a certain area, a number of place names belonging to different contacting languages may display some identical elements (mostly type-indicating geographical common nouns). Such groups of similar names often constitute distinct geographical clusters in the areas of language contacts and result from the fact that the contacting languages have identical motivational patterns, which, in turn, is most often due to extra-linguistic factors [Šrámek, 1978; see also Póczos, 2010, 48–49, and 2002, 105–106].⁵

⁵ The deviation from the existing norms occurring as a result of language contacts is called interference, which in certain cases may be so strong that it causes more significant changes in the languages in contact. The interaction of Hungarian and Slavic languages, for example, resulted in changes not only in particular names but also in the name system of the languages in terms of name formation. This is confirmed by the type of toponyms ending in *-óc* (< Slavic *-ovec*) that appeared as a rather productive pattern in some parts of the Hungarian language area (Szepes). This process is well illustrated by the settlement names whose primary single-component and two-component versions with the *-falva* second constituent were both declined and were replaced by the name variants ending in *-óc* in the 16th–17th centuries, cf. *Zakár* (1538: *Zakal*) > *Zakárfalva* (1567: *Zakarffalwa*) > *Zakaróc* (1682–1683: *Sakarocz*); *Sváb* (1538: *Swap*) > *Svábfalva* (1544: *Swapfalwa*) > *Svábóc* (1570: *Swabocz*), etc. [see Kenyhercz, 2014].

The process of toponym borrowing is primarily determined by the prestige status of the languages in contact. This means that the community with a higher linguistic (and probably social) status leads the way in name-giving, whereas that of a lower prestige is more inclined to take over the already existing toponyms. The analysis of today's bilingual name systems indicates that official situations also have a key role in the transfer and survival of toponyms [Póczos, 2010, 172, 223]. When describing borrowings, the prestige itself should rather be interpreted as an important characteristic of the relevant linguistic situation.

The phenomenon of toponym borrowing as well as the name-giving activity of the newly arriving group of people often affect settlement names and microtoponyms differently.

The different attitude of the arriving ethnic groups to specific types of places and place names can be explained by the name sociology of differences between settlement names and microtoponyms. The settlement names belong to “civilizational” names, i.e. cultural phenomena knowingly created by people, while most of the microtoponyms (especially in the medieval period which is in the focus of the present paper) fall within the category of “natural” names [Hoffmann, 2005, 120–121; Hoffmann & Tóth, 2016, 264–265; see also parts I and II in Hough, 2016]. The main difference between these two types of names is that “natural” names mainly emerge due to communication needs, while “civilizational” names are strongly motivated by social factors. In the medieval context, a certain degree of officialdom may also apply regarding the use of settlement names, which would be linked to their special status among other toponym types [Hoffmann et al., 2018, 117–127].

Language contacts are also mirrored by the toponym pairs as typical manifestations of polynymy: these are especially frequent in the toponymic systems of bilingual areas. Polynymy is a general term referring to the case when the same referent is attributed with several names used in parallel. Polynymy has two types depending on the ethnic identity of the language users: first is when those name variants are regarded as synonyms within one language community; second, when the toponym pairs belong to different languages. In this second case, we may use the term *name pair* indicating to the identity in meaning or to the sameness of the referent [cf. Póczos, 2010, 173–175]. The latter can be illustrated by the following examples of settlement names: “*possessio Zethyce alio nomine Scenthtrinitas*” (1328, Abaúj County) [Gy., 1, 138]; and: “*villam suam Neusidel vocatam, alio nomine Zumbothel dictam*” (1313/18th century copy, Moson County) [Gy., 4, 182].

4. The Study of Name Integration

Studying toponym borrowing is a complex task that requires not only identifying an etymological antecedent but also accounting for several other factors. The “afterlife” of the toponym after the borrowing occupies a key position in the analysis, focusing on its phonological, morphological, and onomatopoeic adaptation to the linguistic and toponymic rules of the receiving language.

The process of borrowing a toponym and its fitting into the receiving name system is referred to as *name integration*. In terms of the approach used here, integration is the communicative (socially determined) borrowing of a linguistic unit from one language system to another [Eichler & Šrámek, 1984, 9]. As part of this, all processes in which a unit of a name system in one language enters the name system of another by means of borrowing is referred to as *name integration*, irrespective of the extent of change affecting the received form (I will return to the stages of integration later on).⁶ The result of the integration is the proper name (in this case, a toponym) which was integrated from one language into another, implementing the different stages of linguistic adaptation.

The three-level model developed by German onomasticians is still valid today when studying name integration. The first analytical level is represented by studies from the perspective of linguistic sub-systems and includes the phonological and grammatical analysis (actually, it is in these areas that we have the opportunity for more thorough studies in historical linguistics). Sociolinguistic analysis may be considered the second level, which provides the opportunity mostly for synchronous analyses but may also be used as complementary in historical analyses. Finally, studies based on the areal approach represent the third level of analysis [Eichler, 1976; 1981; Eichler & Šrámek, 1984; see also Póczos, 2010, 45–48, 144; 2002, 104; 2005, 139].

In consideration of the fact that data in medieval written sources are in many respects less suitable for mapping name integration,⁷ the phenomenon should first be studied in more modern bilingual name systems and the conclusions drawn there may be used as guidelines regarding old name systems. Such a task was carried out recently by Rita Póczos [2010] on the bilingual (Hungarian and German) toponymic systems of a larger region. Based on this work, she set certain principles, which we shall keep in mind when studying the interactions of early name systems and especially when drawing conclusions on ethnicity based on the results of toponymic studies.

5. Toponym Pairs and Name Integration: an Analytical Model

The model used for the analysis of toponyms needs to cater not only for the description of name systems of particular language communities (such as the study of Hungarian toponyms at any stage of the name system development) but also to

⁶ Berit Sandnes [2016, 540] argues that names are among the first elements that peoples speaking different languages borrow from one another in the case of language contact, although this obviously does not mean that toponyms are always taken over in the process of such a contact.

⁷ First and foremost, because of scarce records, the process may be traced only rarely and the toponyms with only one or two records represent either the state before or after the name integration. Secondly, usually we have no direct information whatsoever on the ethnic groups using the names in the Carpathian Basin during the 10th to 14th centuries. Thirdly, it is not clear or obvious whether we may consider the toponym corpus retrieved the charters for a given region as the name system of a single language-using community, in which case the foreign elements should be interpreted as a part of it, or whether we should consider the surviving data as belonging to two (or possibly more) name systems of different languages.

extend to the study of the interactions of name systems of different languages, including Hungarian and other languages that have come into contact with it.

Assuming this, we need to start out from the fact that in the case of a contact, a referent may have several names used by communities of different languages, and the relationships between the names usually follow some kind of a pattern. Thus, the toponym description model should also include a set of criteria which may be used to introduce the consequences of language contacts and thus may help us in the interpretation of the correlations between name systems of two (or possibly more) different language communities.

Moreover, it is another important criteria regarding the model that it should apply both with contemporary and historical name systems; that is, it should also be universal in the interpretation of name-giving, name-using traditions of different languages and eras.

In the process of toponym borrowing, the integration of loan words from one language into another goes through several stages. At one end of the scale, we find those names that remain unchanged in the process of borrowing and name usage (e.g. SC *Bukvik* > Hung. *Bukvik*). At the other extreme of the integration process are those names that are adapted both to the sound and name system of the receiving language, meaning that their phonological form and morphological structure were both modified, e.g. Hung. *Gerebice* > Germ. dial. *Kerpícvíza* (= *Kerpícvise*) ‘Kerpí meadow.’ Between the two endpoints, there are many other types (and transitions), one of them being that the integrated element is adjusted to the sound system of the receiving language during name use (e.g. SC *Blata* > Hung. *Baláta*) while the other is when the morphological structure of the borrowed element is modified in the process of name use (e.g. Germ. *Pfarrertal* (= *Pfaffer/tal*) ‘Priest valley’ > Hung. *Fartaldomb* (= *Fartall/domb*) ‘Fartal hill’) [Póczos, 2010, 145–147; see also 2005, 140–142; 2006, 89].⁸

Such changes in the integrated elements clearly indicate their use in the receiving language. Incidentally, the name givers and referents of the same name system may belong to different ethnic groups, but this difference would either leave no mark on the name form or cause just slight differences which could only be discovered through precise dialectal phonetic transcription. This circumstance should definitely be considered (especially accounting for the instability of early writing norms) as we attribute the toponymic data of written sources to a language (name givers and name users) and attempt to provide ethnic reconstruction of the medieval sources based on this.

⁸ Berit Sandnes [2016, 544–549] studied different aspects of toponym borrowing and also found that toponyms borrowed from one language to another are rarely taken over without any changes (i.e. they are rarely adopted) into the target language; the majority of them follow the regular adaptation patterns that occur in the receiving language. Their types are defined and introduced in detail by Sandnes as the following: a) phonological adaptation, b) morphological adaptation, c) syntactic adaptation, d) semantic adaptation, e) lexical adaptation, and f) hybridization that she mentions separately from the above.

The coexistence of stocks of toponyms and their joint development over the centuries may result in such system-level interactions that follow unique patterns distinguishable on the level of typology and greatly contribute to the development of new toponymic units. Thus, we may look at the issue of name pairs denoting the same referent but coming from communities speaking different languages as a phenomenon joining the two name systems due to bilingualism.

The relationships of toponym pairs denoting one place may be described within a framework that supports the main principles of the model while endorsing the descriptive (i.e. synchronous) and the historical aspects separately. Rita Póczos [2010] developed such a model for Hungarian–German bilingual name systems, but as the suggested analytical framework consists of general categories, in theory, it may be used for any name system emerging in an area of language contacts.

Types of correspondences in German–Hungarian toponymic pairs

I. Descriptive (synchronous) level

1. Phonological correspondence:

full: Hung. *Puposka* ~ Germ. *Pupiska*;

partial: Germ. *Langetal* (= *Lange/tal* ‘Long valley’) ~ Hung. *Langetálidűlő* (*Langetál-i/dűlő* ‘Langetáli field,’ where the first name constituent consists of the German toponym *Langetal* and the Hungarian suffix *-i*).

2. Semantic correspondence:

full: Hung. *Malomárok* (= *Malom/árok* ‘Mill ditch’) ~ Germ. *Mühlgraben* (= *Mühl/graben* ‘Mill ditch’);

partial: Hung. *Séd* ‘Brook’ ~ Germ. *Mühlbach* (= *Mühl/bach*) ‘Mill brook.’

3. Phonological and semantic correspondence:

Hung. *Hosszúhegy* (*Hosszú/hegy* ‘Long hill’) ~ Germ. *Hossziberg* (*Hosszi/berg* ‘Hosszi hill,’ where the first name constituent is the phonetically modified first part of the Hungarian name).

4. Toponymic equivalents displaying no correspondence:

Hung. *Lovashegy* (= *Lovas/hegy* ‘Horse hill’) ~ Germ. *Freiacker* (= *Frei/acker* ‘Free land’).

II. Historical (diachronic) level

1. Borrowing:

full: Hung. *Puposka* > Germ. *Pupiska*;

partial: Hung. *Szigetidűlő* (= *Szigeti/dűlő* ‘Island land’) > Germ. *Sziget*;

borrowing + complementation: Germ. *Langestal* (= *Langes/tal* ‘Long valley’) > Hung. *Langetálidűlő* (= *Langetál-i/dűlő* ‘Langetáli field’).

2. Translation (calquing):

full: Hung. *Malomárok* (= *Malom/árok* ‘Mill ditch’) > Germ. *Mühlgraben* (= *Mühl/graben* ‘Mill ditch’);

partial: Hung. *Kerekerdő* (= *Kerek/erdő* ‘Round forest’) > Germ. *Gartenwald* (= *Garten/wald* ‘Garden forest’);

translation + complementation: Hung. *Séd* ‘Brook’ > Germ. *Mühlbach* (= *Mühl/bach*) ‘Mill brook.’

On the descriptive level of the analytical model, additional typical relationships may be identified between the members of the bilingual name pairs. The main categories are made up by phonological and semantic correspondence and their combinations, but the main categories themselves are further divided into additional sub-groups depending on the extent to which the correspondence affects (partially or fully) the structure of the name. Besides, it is also possible that members of the name pairs are not connected by any linguistic relationship except for having the same referent, meaning that there is no correspondence between them in terms of language elements.⁹

As the processes behind creating name pairs also work on the system level, we may categorize them in terms of their genesis (name-formation) with the help of the analytical model. The main categories are represented by borrowing and translation, which, in turn, fall into sub-types depending on the extent to which the primary name structure is affected by them: partial and complete borrowing, and partial and complete translation, as well as “borrowing + complementation,” “translation + complementation” may be distinguished in this sense (for a detailed introduction to the model and the specific types of the two levels see [Póczos, 2010, 180–203]).

Based on the study of today’s bilingual name systems, close to half of the name pairs are characterized by complete semantic correspondence [Póczos, 2010, 188]. Yet, it is definitely worth paying attention to the fact that in older times this type of name pairs is rarely found. Such a difference may be explained either by the fact that there was no bilingualism in the Carpathian Basin at the time (and in some time after) the charters were beginning to be written, which is not really likely, or that the contemporary writing norms did not require the recording of name pairs showing lexical matching (and the notaries did not consider it necessary).

In this respect, I believe that polynymy could be a much more frequent phenomenon in early toponymic systems than what might be indicated by sources. Of the names with the same meaning (the same denotative reference), the notary mostly recorded only one and there is a clear reason doing so. In the documents written mostly for legal purposes, toponyms were mentioned only for a more precise identification of referents. In such a function, a listing of variants would not provide any further evidence, but to the contrary, could have resulted in more confusion [cf. Póczos, 2010, 175–179, 204]. We might see exceptions to this case only if the name of the place in question had changed, in such a situation (exactly in order to record the change) the writer of the charter considered it important to include both versions, e.g.: “Super *Selniche* que nunc vocatur *Isipfalva*” (1391) [Gy., 4, 90].

⁹ German onomasticians distinguished name pairs based on the same approach before, specifying a) phonologically bound name pairs, b) semantically bound name pairs, and c) free name pairs [Eichler, 1976, 139–141; Eichler & Šrámek, 1984, 14–15].

6. Conclusions

At the end of my paper, I would like to highlight two issues: first, the significance of considering linguistic prestige when studying language contacts and name borrowing, and second, a methodological principle when exploring the historical ethnolinguistic situation in the Carpathian Basin.

In all ages, linguistic contacts are fundamentally determined by the prestige status of languages that come into contact with each other. Linguistic prestige certainly has an effect on name usage as well, which manifests itself both in the direction of borrowing between languages and the means of name integration. Moreover, linguistic prestige plays a crucial role in the written recording of names, i.e. which of the co-existing names of a referent the notary preferred when recording it in the text.

Stronger differences in prestige may also lead to the adaptation of name systems.

As a result of these considerations, I believe the issue of linguistic prestige should not be disregarded when we study the interactions of linguistic systems and the toponymic systems which are a part of that study.

Based on the above, it also emerges as a question whether we can draw the early medieval linguistic-ethnic map of the Carpathian Basin based on the scientific information available today.

This, above all, entails thorough processing of the linguistic sources of the era, as the Hungarian toponyms that have survived in the foreign language (mostly Latin) text of charters represent practically the only source for mapping the linguistic-ethnic relations of the early Old Hungarian Era. When analyzing toponyms, however, it is not enough to carry out etymological studies focusing on the origin of names, but we also need to use a more complex method of toponym reconstruction, which also takes into consideration the whole history of names (for more details about the process itself, see [Hoffmann, 2019]).

When studying the early (11th–13th centuries) ethnic composition of the Carpathian Basin, of course, other disciplines besides linguistics need to have their say: we cannot disregard the opinion and findings of historians and archaeologists. Cooperation between these disciplines can be truly successful and reliable in terms of the results if researchers of the different areas assess the relevant data within their own field and without looking for arguments from other disciplines that support their own findings. In the next phase of the study, therefore, research results that are independent from one another may become comparable and may then either reinforce or refute each other.

We can get closer to reliable results by taking multiple steps: first, it seems expedient to focus on carefully selected smaller regions, for example, areas for which we have extensive data from the perspective of linguistics, historical and archeological studies and which have been explored adequately. However, even such a research process demands an identical conceptual approach used by scholars and the coordination of their work from the very beginning (István Hoffmann provided a good example for the latter in a series of articles [Hoffmann, 2017a; 2017b]; see also [Tóth, 2019]).

I consider it a key task of historical linguistics and onomastics to assess the historical linguistic source materials of smaller regions carefully also from the perspective of ethnic reconstruction. By fitting the mosaic pieces of studies conducted this way, we may create a more complete and comprehensive image of the historical linguistic and onomastic situation of the entire Carpathian Basin. This, in turn, may provide a sound basis also for constructing the early ethnic image of the region.

- Benkő, L. (1998). *Név és történelem. Tanulmányok az Árpád-korról*. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.
- Cs. – Csánki, D. (1890–1913). *Magyarország történelmi földrajza a Hunyadiak korában* (Vols. 1–5). Budapest: Magyar Tudományos Akadémia.
- de Swaan, A. (2001). *Words of the World: The Global Language System*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Eichler, E. (1976). Sprachkontakte im Lichte der Onomastik. *Onoma*, 20, 128–141.
- Eichler, E. (1981). Sprachkontakte und Sprachebenen in der Onomastik. *Onomastica Slavogermanica*, 13, 7–19.
- Eichler, E., & Šrámek, R. (1984). Thesen zur toponymischen Integration. In E. M. Christoph, E. Eichler, K. Hengst, & R. Šrámek (Eds.), *Sprachkontakt im Wortschatz* (pp. 9–18). Leipzig: Wissenschaftliche Beiträge der Karl-Marx-Universität Leipzig.
- Gy. — Györfly, Gy. (1963–1998). *Az Árpád-kori Magyarország történeti földrajza* (Vols. 1–4). Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.
- Hajdú, M. (2002). Névléktan. In I. Hoffmann, D. Juhász, & J. Péntek (Eds.), *Hungarológia és dimenziális nyelvsemlélet* (pp. 43–72). Debrecen; Jyväskylä: Magyarágtudományi Társaság; Debreceni Egyetem Magyar Nyelvtudományi Tanszéke.
- Hajdú, M. (2004). Hagyomány és újítás a névválasztásban. In F. Farkas (Ed.), *Magyar névtani kutatások itthon és határainkon túl. Névtani tanácskozás Jászberényben* (pp. 11–18). Budapest: Nyelvtudományi Társaság–Szent István Egyetem Jászberényi Főiskolai Kar–TIT Jászági Szervezete–Jászok Egyesülete.
- Hoffmann, I. (1993). *Helynevek nyelvi elemzése*. Debrecen: Debreceni Egyetem Magyar Nyelvtudományi Tanszék.
- Hoffmann, I. (2005). Régi helyneveink névadóinak kérdéséhez. *Névtani Értesítő*, 27, 117–124.
- Hoffmann, I. (2010). Név és identitás. *Magyar Nyelvjárások*, 48, 49–58.
- Hoffmann, I. (2014). Név és jelentés. In J. Bauko, & K. Benyovszky (Eds.), *A nevek szemiotikája* (pp. 5–21). Nyitra: Konstantin Filozófus Egyetem, Közép-Európai Tanulmányok Kara.
- Hoffmann, I. (2017a). Víznevek és településnevek etnikumtörténeti tanulságai. *Történeti Földrajzi Közlemények*, 5, 47–61.
- Hoffmann, I. (2017b). A Bakonyalja etnikai viszonyai a honfoglalást követő évszázadokban. In R. Hajba Renáta, P. Tóth, & F. Vörös (Eds.), *“...ahogy a csillag megy az égen...”*. Köszöntő kötet Molnár Zoltán tiszteletére (pp. 137–150). Szombathely: Savaria University Press.
- Hoffmann, I. (2019). Linguistic Reconstruction — Ethnic Reconstruction. *Onomastica Uralica*, 15, 5–12.
- Hoffmann, I., Rácz, A., & Tóth, V. (2017). *History of Hungarian Toponyms*. Hamburg: Buske.
- Hoffmann, I., Rácz, A., & Tóth, V. (2018). *Régi magyar helynévadás. A korai ómagyar kor helynevei mint a magyar nyelvtörténet forrásai*. Budapest: Gondolat Kiadó.
- Hoffmann, I., & Tóth, V. (2016). A nyelvi és az etnikai rekonstrukció kérdései a 11. századi Kárpát-medencében. *Századok*, 150, 257–318.
- Hough, C. (Ed.). (2016). *The Oxford Handbook of Names and Naming*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kenyhercz, R. (2014). A szláv helynévformánsok kölcsönzéséről (az -óc végű helynevek a magyarban). *Nyelvtudományi Közlemények*, 110, 205–226.

- Kiviniemi, E. (1978). *Nimistöntutkimus ja paikallishistoria*. Helsinki: Paikallishistoriallinen toimisto.
- Lőrincze, L. (1947). *Földrajzineink élete*. Budapest: Néptudományi Intézet.
- Nyírkos, I. (1989). A tulajdonnevek hírértékéről. In L. Balogh, & F. Ördög (Eds.), *Névtudomány és művelődéstörténet. A IV. Magyar Névtudományi Konferencia előadásai Pais Dezső születésének 100. évfordulóján* (pp. 290–294). Zalaegerszeg: Zalaegerszeg Város Tanácsa VB. Művelődési Osztálya.
- Póczos, R. (2002). Nyelvi kölcsönhatások a helynévrendszerekben. In I. Hoffmann, D. Juhász, & J. Péntek (Eds.), *Hungarológia és dimenzionális nyelvszemlélet* (pp. 99–106). Debrecen; Jyväskylä: Magyarisztudományi Társaság; Debreceni Egyetem Magyar Nyelvtudományi Tanszéke.
- Póczos, R. (2005). Nyelvtörténeti szempontok az Árpád-kor etnikai vizsgálatához. *Névtani Értesítő*, 27, 136–143.
- Póczos, R. (2006). Az Árpád-kori Borsod vármegye lakosságának nyelvi-etnikai összetételéhez. *Helynévtörténeti Tanulmányok*, 2, 87–105.
- Póczos, R. (2010). *Nyelvi érintkezés és a helynévrendszerek kölcsönhatása*. Debrecen: Debreceni Egyetemi Kiadó.
- Sandnes, B. (2016). Names and Language Contact. In C. Hough (Ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Names and Naming* (pp. 540–553). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Sándor, K. (1998). A magyar–török kétnyelvűség és ami körülötte van. In I. Lanstyák, & G. Szabó Mihály (Eds.), *Nyelvi érintkezések a Kárpát-medencében, különös tekintettel a magyarpárú kétnyelvűségre* (pp. 7–26). Pozsony: Kalligram, A Magyar Köztársaság Kulturális Intézete.
- Solymosi, L. (2011). Anyanyelv és jogi írásbeliség a középkori Magyarországon. *Történelmi Szemle*, 53(4), 479–501.
- Šrámek, R. (1978). Zu den theoretischen Problemen der Namenforschung im Sprachkontakt. *Onoma*, 22, 388–401.
- SRH — Emericus, S. (Ed.). (1937–1938, repr. 1990). *Scriptores rerum Hungaricarum* (Vols. 1–2). Budapest: Nap Kiadó.
- Tolcsvai Nagy, G. (2008). A tulajdonnév jelentése. In A. Bölcskei, & I. N. Császi (Eds.), *Név és valóság. A VI. Magyar Névtudományi Konferencia előadásai* (pp. 30–41). Budapest: Budapest Károli Gáspár Református Egyetem BTK Magyar Nyelvtudományi Tanszék.
- Tóth, V. (2016). *Személynévadás és személynévhasználat az ómagyar korban*. Debrecen: Debreceni Egyetemi Kiadó.
- Tóth, V. (2019). Methodological Problems in Etymological Research on Old Toponyms of the Carpathian Basin. *Onomastica Uralica*, 15, 13–30.

Received on 16 February 2021

ABBREVIATIONS

dial.	dialectal
Germ.	German
Hung.	Hungarian
SC	Serbo-Croatian

* * *

Tóth, Valéria
 PhD, Professor
 Department of Hungarian Linguistics
 University of Debrecen
 Egyetem tér 1, 4032 Debrecen, Hungary
 Email: toth.valeria@arts.unideb.hu
<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0822-591X>

Тот, Валерия
 PhD, профессор
 кафедра венгерского языкознания,
 Университет Дебрецена
 Egyetem tér 1, 4032 Debrecen, Hungary
 E-mail: toth.valeria@arts.unideb.hu

Валерия ТотУниверситет Дебрецена
Дебрецен, Венгрия**ЯЗЫКОВОЙ ПРЕСТИЖ И ТОПОНИМИЧЕСКАЯ НОМИНАЦИЯ:
НА ПЕРЕСЕЧЕНИИ ЯЗЫКОВ И КУЛЬТУР***

В статье рассматриваются общие проблемы этноязыкового контактирования в аспекте его влияния на топонимические системы. В качестве конкретного иллюстративного материала выступает топонимия Карпатского бассейна, извлеченная из средневековых венгерских хартий, также периодически привлекаются наблюдения над более поздними языковыми контактами. Основные направления рассуждений автора заданы названием статьи. Прежде всего в работе обсуждается понятие языкового престижа и его интерпретация применительно к топонимии и языковой ситуации Карпатского бассейна, где фактор языкового престижа играл существенную роль в процессах заимствований топонимов, их использования, а также сказывался на практике фиксации географических названий в средневековых хартиях. Во-вторых, в статье рассматриваются некоторые базовые теоретические соображения, касающиеся процессов топонимической номинации и использования топонимов, тесно связанные с проблемой языкового престижа. В частности, автор особенно подробно останавливается на связи топонимии и культуры, топонимии и идентичности. Наконец, в статье подробно рассматривается феномен топонимического заимствования и интеграции иноязычного топонима в воспринимающем языке. Предлагается модель описания такого топонимического материала. Модель задает теоретическую рамку для анализа — как синхронного, так и диахронного — топонимических пар, возникающих в двуязычных областях на разных этапах интеграции заимствованного топонима. Материалом для анализа выступают топонимические пары, засвидетельствованные в зонах венгерско-немецкого двуязычия, однако сама модель носит универсальный характер и может быть применена для любых пар языков и исторических эпох.

К л ю ч е в ы е с л о в а: теоретическая ономастика, языковой престиж, топонимия, заимствование имени, усвоение топонима, Карпатский бассейн, немецко-венгерские языковые контакты.

Статья поступила в редакцию 16.02.2021

* Статья подготовлена в рамках исследования, проводимого группой по изучению истории венгерского языка и топонимики (Университет Дебрецена, Венгерская академия наук), а также в рамках проекта «Международная научная кооперация в изучении топонимических систем Карпатского бассейна», поддержанного Венгерским национальным фондом исследований, развития и инноваций (проект NRD1 128270).