

# PLACE NAMES REFLECTING ECCLESIASTICAL POSSESSION IN LATE MEDIEVAL HUNGARY<sup>1</sup>

ANDREA BÖLCSKEI

Károli Gáspár University of the Reformed Church in Hungary, Hungary

**Abstract:** The paper presents the cultural and linguistic history of place names referring to the (former) possession of a clergyman or that of a religious order in Hungary in the Late Middle Ages (1351–1526). Relevant data have been collected from well-known Hungarian books on historical geography, gazetteers and dictionaries. The author first gives a short overview of the roots of the political influence of the Church in the Kingdom of Hungary in the era. The paper then explores the distribution of the collected place names in time and space; the semantic references, the lexical, morphological and syntactic structures recognizable in the name forms; the structural changes that affected place names in the period, as well as the conventional and unconventional features of the toponyms under discussion in comparison with different types of traditional Hungarian place names.

**Keywords:** toponyms, Medieval Hungary, ecclesiastical possession, linguistic features, place name changes.

## Land tenure and the political influence of the Church in Late Medieval Hungary (1351–1526)

The most significant rulers of the Kingdom of Hungary in the Late Middle Ages included King Louis the Great (1342–1382); King Sigismund of Luxemburg (1387–1437); Regent John Hunyadi (1446–1452) and his son, King Matthias Corvinus (1458–1490); King Vladislaus II (1490–1516) and his son, Louis II (1516–1526). By the time, most of the land and castles that symbolized power in late feudalism had already been donated to members of the aristocracy by former kings. As a result the late medieval king of Hungary was no longer the greatest estate holder, but only one of the largest landowners in his country. Under these circumstances, the king needed the support of other groups of the squirearchy against the nobility, which brought the balancing role of the Clergy to the fore in politics (Engel et al. 2003: 82–87, 225–228).

It is no wonder that most kings in the Late Middle Ages wanted to control the church hierarchy. They also had the right to do so: the King of Hungary, as the main patron of the Church, could appoint prelates and bestow ecclesiastical benefice in his

---

<sup>1</sup> Work on this paper was supported by Bolyai János Research Scholarship of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences.

country. Reliable prelates were turned into big estate owners by the king to enable them to counteract the influence of barons in the royal council, a supreme political decision-making body in the era. In return, the king demanded loyalty. Also, prelates and other respected churchmen were expected to take part in public administration, in jurisdiction, in diplomatic procedures and to offer military services at their own expenses (Kubinyi 1999: 69–105; Engel et al. 2003: 137–138; Mályusz 2007: 163–175).

In fact, in the Late Middle Ages 12% of the land in the country was in the possession of the Church, which was far less than the land owned by the aristocracy. Furthermore, only 10.3% of the castles were in ecclesiastical hands, while 48% of them belonged to the barons and magnates of the era. Revenue coming in from feudal estates was a significant, but not the most significant source of wealth for the Church. Tithes from parishioners and taxes from ecclesiastical market towns, however, generated an income roughly equal with the regular income of the king for the bishoprics each year. Thus, church dignitaries could accumulate enormous wealth for the institutions of the secular church organization under their leadership, and also for themselves, as revealed by their testaments (Engel et al. 2003: 174, 225, 299–304).

Royal and private monasteries of various orders – monastic (the Benedictine, Cistercian and Premonstratensian), mendicant (the Dominican, Franciscan, Augustinian and Carmelite), (semi-)hermit (the Pauline and Carthusian) and chivalric (the Hospitallers, Templars and Stephanites) – in the country were enriched by successive land bestowals. Patrons donated land to the monasteries to guarantee their continued operation. Nevertheless, tax return forms and military obligations laid on abbots and provosts show that the heads of the monasteries could benefit from the estates in their charge, and some of them became as wealthy as the prelates. Despite the fact that parliamentary acts against imposing taxes on churchmen's income were passed several times in the late medieval period, Hungarian kings levied emergency taxes on ecclesiastical property from time to time, especially when battles with the Turks at the borders flared up. In short, late medieval Hungarian kings contributed to and, at the same time, took advantage of the financial strengthening of the Clergy and the political influence resulting from it (Kubinyi 1999: 95–96, 239–248; Engel et al. 2003: 304–306, 346–348; Mályusz 2007: 197–284).

### **The sources of the present survey**

The toponymic data discussed below are taken from a database of Hungarian place names reflecting ecclesiastical possession compiled by the author of the present paper. The database contains toponyms referring to the (former) possession of a clergyman or that of a religious order in Hungary from different time periods (for details see Bölcskei 2015). For the purpose of the present analysis, place names recorded in the Late Middle Ages (also known as Late Old Hungarian toponyms) have been selected. The ultimate sources of these name forms are relevant books on historical geography (Gy., Cs., FN.), a gazetteer (Lip.) and a well-known place-name dictionary (FNESz.; see Primary sources below). A coherent model of linguistic analysis

worked out recently for Hungarian toponyms is used as a theoretical background (see Hoffmann 2007; Tóth 2008).

### **The prevailing linguistic features of the relevant name forms**

The (former) ecclesiastical possessors referred to in the name forms (i), the distribution of the name forms in time and space (ii), the important structural features (iii) as well as the structural changes of the surveyed name forms (iv) are discussed below.

#### ***The (former) ecclesiastical possessors referred to in the surveyed name forms***

In source documents for the Late Middle Ages, 277 denotata bore a name reflecting ecclesiastical possession for at least a short period of the era. The actual ecclesiastical owners of these places are identified in the source documents in the case of 109 geographical entities (39.35%), 88 of which seem to have been possessed by a single ecclesiastical proprietor: 44 denotata were possessed by (the head of) an institution of the secular church organization (e.g. the Diocese of Eger, the Provostship of Jászó, the Archdiocese of Esztergom); 40 by a royal or private abbey, monastery or nunnery (e.g. Zobor Abbey, Abasár Monastery, Somlóvásárhely Nunnery); 4 by a chivalric order (e.g. the Knights Hospitaller). The temporary co-ownership of two or more ecclesiastical bodies was noticed for 21 places. For example, the settlement 1357: *Popfolua* (Kolozs; Cs. 5: 392–3)<sup>2</sup> was jointly owned by Kolozsmonostor Abbey and the Dominicans of Kolozsvár; the settlement 1374/1615: *Kereztes* al. nom. *Fanczal* (Bihar; Gy. 1: 632) was first owned by the Diocese of Vác, then by the Provostship of Lelesz, and later jointly by the Master of the Holy Rood Altar of Nagyvárad Cathedral and the Chapter of Nagyvárad. In the case of 168 geographical entities (60.65%), the ecclesiastical owners are not specified in the source documents.

#### ***The distribution of the surveyed name forms in time and space***

According to the source descriptions, the 277 denotata mentioned above cover 11 distinct types of places. Most of them were settlements (i.e. towns, market towns,

---

<sup>2</sup> Illustrative examples in the paper are given following the described method: first the year in which the name form was recorded is given, followed by the historical toponymic data in authentic spelling (in italics) and finally, in parentheses, the county in which the place indicated by the name form was situated as well as the philological reference to the source document(s). Philological references comprise the abbreviation used for the source document (for full forms see Primary sources below), the serial number of the volume, the page number and, if not obvious, the entry of the data. Types of denotata are identified only in the case of places that were not settlements. A slash (/) separates the years in which the original and the extent copies of rewritten manuscripts were produced; a tilde (~) is found between alternative names; and the greater-than sign (>) stands for highlighting changes. If it is necessary for understanding, the Hungarian name forms are translated into English, reflecting both the semantic content and the grammatical structure of the place names. Toponymic constituents are not translated in the text.

villages, hamlets; 248 instances, 89.53%), but tracts of land can also be identified (8 instances, 2.89%), while farmsteads (7 instances, 2.53%), estates (3 instances, 1.08%), forests (2 instances, 0.72%), border points (2 instances, 0.72%), places (2 instances, 0.72%), parts of settlements (2 instances, 0.72%), a hill, a brook and a plot (0.36% each) are also among the geographical objects indicated. However, it must be noted that names for significant entities such as settlements were more likely recorded in charters in the past than those for less relevant elements of the natural and man-made environments.

The indicated denotata were primarily situated in Transdanubia (95 instances, 34.29%), especially in its southern and western counties, and in the northern part of the medieval Kingdom of Hungary (61 instances, 22.02%). Several denotata were found in the area called Partium (31 instances, 11.19%), in Transylvania (26 instances, 9.39%), the Great Hungarian Plain (26 instances, 9.39%) and the Bačka-Banat region (25 instances, 9.03%). Relatively few denotata were located, however, in Slavonia (9 instances, 3.25%) and Central Hungary (4 instances, 1.44%)<sup>3</sup>. In the past, toponyms of ecclesiastical reference, including the ones referring to the presence, characteristics and dedication of a Church-related building in the place concerned, were widely spread in Transdanubia and they also seem to have been popular in the Great Hungarian Plain as well as in Transylvania. However, place names reflecting ecclesiastical possession gained popularity in Northern Hungary as well, eventually to an even greater extent than in the Great Hungarian Plain or in Transylvania (Mező 1996: 228–230; Bölcskei 2008: 108).

In the source documents, the 277 denotata are identified by 960 relevant name forms. The first appearance of these name forms can be connected to the following periods of the era: 1351–1380: 116 (12.08%); 1381–1410: 144 (15%); 1411–1440: 204 (21.25%); 1441–1470: 210 (21.88%); 1471–1500: 204 (21.25%); and 1501–1526: 82 (8.54%) instances. Thus, most name forms appeared for the first time in written records in the era between the years of 1411 and 1500, in approximately even proportions. Fewer relevant name forms can be quoted from the second half of the fourteenth and from the first decade of the fifteenth century, and historical documents seem to have recorded the fewest surveyed name forms in the first quarter of the sixteenth century.

### ***Important structural features of the surveyed name forms***

The distribution of the 960 relevant name forms for the 277 denotata is uneven. In the corpus, a single name form attests the existence of 120 denotata (43.32%); we have two data for 53 (19.13%), three for 26 (9.39%), four for 25 (9.03%) and five or more for 53 denotata (19.13%). Name forms indicating the same denotatum but obtained

<sup>3</sup> Apart from some generally known territories, two not widely known geographical and historical areas are mentioned above: Partium is the regional situated to the north and west of Transylvania; and the Bačka-Banat region is the area bordered by the River Danube to the west and south, the River Mureş to the north and the Southern Carpathian Mountains to the east.

from documents written in different years may differ from each other in spelling (1481: *Apaczya* > 1484: *Apachya*; Arad, Cs. 1: 766), phonetic character (1405: *Keresztes* > 1469: *Keresthws*; Baranya, Cs. 2: 496), structure (1491: *Pyspeky* > 1497: *Pyspekfalwa*; Trencsén, FN. 178), lexemes (1439: *Monohlehota* > 1493: *Barathlehota*; Trencsén, FN. 96) or type (1361: *Banfolua* > 1410: *Apathlan*; Sopron, Cs. 3: 599).

Several complex differences in name forms can also be observed. For instance, the name forms 1430: *Pispukzekel* > 1434: *Pyspek Zekel* (Tolna; Cs. 3: 450) differ from each other in spelling and phonetic character; the name forms 1364: *Eghazfelde* > 1391: *Eghazfewld* (Zala; Cs. 3: 49) are different from each other in phonetic character and structure; the name forms 1482: *Naghap(p)athy* and *Kysapathy* > 1489: *Apathy* (Zala; Cs. 3: 28) have their differences in structure and reference; the name forms 1355: *Apaty*, terra > 1359: *Apathy*, poss. (Torda; Cs. 5: 691) differ from each other in spelling, but (the identification of) the type of the indicated denotatum is also different in the historical documents (i.e. tract of land and estate respectively). The differences of the recorded name forms may have arisen from the practice of dual naming in bilingual areas, e.g. the German and Hungarian name forms 1410: *Minichhoff* > 1429: *Monohodwar* (Moson; Cs. 3: 683) and the Hungarian and Slavic name forms 1395: *Papkerekee* > 1477–8: *Papoczy* (Valkó; Cs. 2: 341) among others.

The 960 surveyed toponyms include 18 lexemes referring to an ecclesiastical possessor. In the order of their frequency, these lexemes are *apát* ('abbot', 139 instances), *pap* ('priest', 110), *püspök* ('bishop', 66), *remete* ('hermit', 63), *monostor* ('monastery', 54), *barát* ('friar', 47), *keresztes* (here 'Hospitallers', 'Templars' or 'Stephanites', 34), *apáca* ('nun', 32), *monoh* (an obsolete term for 'friar', 25), *egyház* ('church', 19), *érsek* ('archbishop', 4), *Budavár* (referring to the Chapter of Buda as an owner, 3), *dusnok* (a servant given to the Church whose duty was to render services for the salvation of their dead master, 3), *dékán* ('dean', 2), *kápolna* ('chapel', 2), *káptalan* ('chapter', 2), *kustos* ('guardian', 2), *harangozó* ('sexton', an instance). In 4 name forms two of these lexemes are combined to constitute a single toponym: 1493: *Kerezthespyspeky* (Borsod; Cs. 1: 178, see entry *Püspöki*); 1474: *Papmonosthóra* (Heves; Cs. 1: 68, see entry *Pétermonostóra*); 1399: Szent Andras al. nom. *Captalon Püspöke* (tract of land, Heves; Cs. 1: 70, see entry *Szent-András*) and 1416: *Barat Pyspeki* (Bihar; Cs. 1: 599, see entry *Püspöki*).

Of the 960 toponyms, 348 name forms do not include any of the above-listed church-related lexemes, but the denotata they indicated bore alternative names referring to ecclesiastical possession at some time in the past, e.g. 1346 > 1351: *Appati* al. nom. *Zuha* > 1486: *Zádorfalva* (Gömör; Gy. 2: 554, Cs. 1: 149, see entry *Zádorháza*); or the name forms dropped or gained a constituent reflecting ecclesiastical ownership in the era, e.g. 1358: *Apachauasarhel* > 1363: *Wassarhel* (Veszprém; Cs. 3: 215, FNESz. 2: 483, see entry *Somlóvásárhely*); 1460: *Hatwan* > 1462: *Pyspekhatwana* (Pest; Cs. 1: 33). Practically, this means that the following description of place names reflecting ecclesiastical possession in the Late Middle Ages is based on 612 relevant name forms.

Grammatically, most of the observed Late Old Hungarian toponyms are

two-constituent name forms and are realized as adjectival constructions (249 instances, 25.94%). The single-constituent name forms include a topoforment (i.e. a suffix that forms a place name from a common noun: 182 instances, 18.96%) or are bare lexemes (i.e. lexemes without topoformants: 127 instances, 13.23%). Some name forms display foreign structures (54 instances, 5.62%) and contain no church-related lexemes whatsoever (348 instances, 36.25%; see above) (for illustrative examples see the paragraphs below).

Regarding two-constituent toponyms, most of the adjectival constructions are morphologically marked possessive structures (144 instances), including 15 of the 18 lexemes referring to an ecclesiastical possessor listed above (*apáca, apát, barát, dékán, egyház, érsek, káptalan, kápolna, keresztes, kustos, monoh, monostor, pap, püspök, remete*). The lexemes may appear in the basic constituent (e.g. 1351: *Scentmihalremetey* ‘Remete protected by Saint Michael’, Torda; Cs. 5: 728) as well as in the complement constituent (e.g. *Apathchafalwa* ‘the village of the nun’, Baranya; Cs. 2: 468). Rarely, the church-related lexeme can take a plural form in the toponym (e.g. 1407: *Barathokfalwa* ‘the village of the friars’, Baranya; Cs. 2: 468).

In fact, a significant number of toponyms denoting an entity that was not a settlement are morphologically marked possessive structures; thus, these name forms involve various geographical common nouns as basic constituents, e.g. 1452: *Apathfelde*, pred. ‘the land tract of the abbot’ (farmstead, Vas; Cs. 2: 733); 1418: *Dékánhalma* ‘the hill of the dean’ (farmstead, Zaránd; Cs. 1: 748, see entry *Verese egyház*); 15. c.: *Apathhauasa*, alpes ‘the alpine forest of the abbot’ (forest, Kolozs; Cs. 5: 373–4); 1377: *Papfalva pataka* ‘the brook of the settlement called Papfalva’ (brook, Kolozs; Cs. 5: 321–2, see entry *Kolozsakna*). Most toponyms that contained a morphologically marked possessive structure, however, indicated a settlement with the help of basic constituents referring to human settlements, e.g. 1358: *Apatlaka* ‘the cottage of the abbot’ (Zala; Cs. 3: 29); 1406: *Barathílese* ‘the seat of the hermit’ (Zala; Cs. 3: 32); 1366: *Popfolua* ‘the village of the priest’ (Hunyad; Cs. 5: 121–2); an element of the physical or built environment, e.g. 1435: *Papsara* ‘the mud of the priest’ (Somogy; Cs. 2: 635); 1360: *Apathyda* ‘the bridge of the abbot’ (Kolozs; Cs. 5: 327); c.1436: *Apácaegyháza* ‘the church of the nun’ (Békés; Cs. 1: 648); or with the help of basic constituents of toponymic function, e.g. 1476: *Apathmarothya* ~ *Apathwmarothya* ‘Marót of the/sir abbot’ (Hont; FNEsz. 1: 106). In these name forms, the lexemes referring to an ecclesiastical possessor predominantly constitute complement constituents (exceptions include Szent Andras al. nom *Captalon Püspöke*, *Scentmihalremetey*, see above).

Among the two-constituent toponyms, fewer adjectival constructions are morphologically unmarked possessive structures (47 instances), incorporating 12 of the 18 lexemes discussed above (*apáca, apát, barát, egyház, érsek, káptalan, keresztes, monoh, monostor, pap, püspök, remete*). Again, the lexemes appear in the basic constituent (e.g. 1473: *Balpyspeky* ‘Püspöki owned by Bál’, Heves; Cs. 1: 68–9) or in the complement constituent (e.g. 1407: *Remethemezew* ‘hermit meadow’, Szatmár; FNEsz. 2: 407) of the name forms. Morphologically unmarked possessive structures fairly regularly

contain a toponymic basic constituent, e.g. 1361: *Pispukzekel* ‘bishop Székely’ (Tolna; Cs. 3: 450); c.1500: *Káptalangyőr* ‘chapter Győr’ (part of a settlement, Győr; Cs. 3: 541, see entry *Győr*). Geographical common nouns as basic constituents in morphologically unmarked possessive structures are exemplified in name forms such as 1370: *Apácafalú* ‘nun village’ (Szatmár; Cs. 1: 470); 1415: *Remetekapu* ‘hermit gate’ (place, Torda; Cs. 5: 725–6, see entry *Peterd*); 1477: *Remethezeg* ‘hermit corner’ (Szatmár; Cs. 1: 484); 1387: *Paptelek* ‘priest plot’ (Közép-Szolnok; FNEsz. 2: 580); 1494: *Remethewdvar* ‘hermit court’ (Somogy; Cs. 2: 638).

Approximately a fifth of the adjectival constructions in the corpus are attributive structures (57 instances), containing 10 of the 18 lexemes expressing ecclesiastical possessors (*apáca*, *apát*, *barát*, *Budavár*, *egyház*, *harangozó*, *keresztes*, *monostor*, *pap*, *remete*). Most of the attributive structures consist of a complement constituent functioning as a distinctive addition and a toponymic basic constituent including one of the lexemes above, e.g. 1373: *Tothapacha* ‘Slavic Apáca’ (Temes; FNEsz. 2: 65, see entry *Magyarapáca*); 1433: *Kispapfalva* ‘little Papfalva’, *Naghpapfalva* ‘great Papfalva’ (Valkó; Cs. 2: 341). In fewer cases, the church-related lexeme can be found in the complement constituent, which is accompanied by a geographical common noun in the function of the basic constituent, e.g. 1382: *Monostorszeg* ‘monastery corner’ (Bács; Cs. 2: 157); 1481: *Apathitelek* ‘Apáti plot’ (farmstead, Bodrog; Cs. 2: 192); or is accompanied by a toponymic basic constituent, e.g. 1444: *Budauaridench* ‘Dench owned by the Chapter of Buda’ (Somogy; Cs. 2: 600)<sup>4</sup>. A single adjectival construction is realized as a structure with a quantifier: 1390: *Kethremethege* ‘two Remetehegye’ (border point, Hunyad; Cs. 5: 121, see entry *Pala*).

Most single-constituent name forms involve a topoformant. The most common topoformant applied in the name forms of the period is *-i* (a variant of the Hungarian general possessive suffix *-é*; Tóth 2008: 184; Béneyi 2012: 74), which is attached to 5 of the church-related lexemes presented above (*apát*, *barát*, *monostor*, *pap*, *püspök*), e.g. 1404: *Apathi* (Zala; Cs. 3: 493); 1400: *Baraty* (Somogy; Cs. 2: 589); 1493: *Monosthory* (Szatmár; Cs. 1: 481); 1431: *Papy* (Abaúj; Cs. 1: 215); 1380: *Pispeky* (Trencsén; FN. 177–8)<sup>5</sup>. Other suffixes that occasionally take part in forming a place name from a common noun in the surveyed name forms include *-d* (originally a derivative suffix expressing abundance, e.g. 1472: *Papd*, Temes; Cs. 2: 56) and *-tlan* (a privative suffix, e.g. 1410: *Apathlan*, Sopron; Cs. 3: 599)<sup>6</sup>. Other single-constituent name forms consist

<sup>4</sup> In the last two complement constituents, the function of the suffix *-i* is different: in the first case, it is a topoformant forming part of the toponym *Apáti*, to which a geographical common noun was added as a basic constituent. In the second example, it is an adjectival suffix attached to the toponym *Budavár* when it began to function as a complement constituent in the two-constituent name form. NB Buda(vár), the seat of the ecclesiastical institution in possession, could be found relatively far from the settlement indicated by the name *Budauaridench* in Somogy County.

<sup>5</sup> At the end of the latter name forms, *-y* is an early spelling variant for the topoformant *-i*.

<sup>6</sup> The name form *Apátlan* ‘without abbot’ (i.e. not possessed by the abbot) emphasizes that

of bare lexemes (i.e. lexemes without topoformants), including 9 of the 18 relevant lexemes (*apáca, barát, dusnok, keresztes, monoh, monostor, pap, püspök, remete*), e.g. 1456: *Apacza* (farmstead, Szerém; Cs. 2: 240); 1443: *Monoh* (Valkó; Cs. 2: 335); 1427: *Remethe* (Ung; Cs. 1: 397). The old Hungarian habit of addressing ecclesiastics as *úr* 'sir' is reflected in the special name form 1397: *Baratur* 'sir friar' (Baranya; Cs. 2: 471).

Name forms displaying foreign structures were either borrowed from foreign languages into Hungarian, e.g. 1366: *Popouch* (Vas; Cs. 2: 786)<sup>7</sup>, or were proper foreign names that had been developed in parallel with their Hungarian counterparts in bilingual areas and were recorded also in Hungarian-related pieces of writing, e.g. 1410: *Minichhoff* (Moson; Cs. 3: 683)<sup>8</sup>. Hungarian name users living in bilingual areas in the past must have been able to interpret these names due to their structural features, even if their foreign characteristics were perceivable to them.

### ***Structural changes affecting the surveyed name forms in the era***

Several surveyed name forms changed in some way from the beginning to the end of the Late Middle Ages. The addition or loss of a distinctive addition resulted in the appearance or disappearance of a complement constituent referring to an ecclesiastical possessor, e.g. c.1450: *Kezy* > 1488: *Papkezy* 'priest Keszi' (Veszprém; Cs. 3: 246, FNEsz. 2: 316); 1434: *Pyspek Zekel* 'bishop Székely' > 1469: *Zekel* (Tolna; Cs. 3: 450)<sup>9</sup>; or, alternatively, in the appearance or disappearance of a complement constituent of another semantic type, if a basic constituent expressing ecclesiastical ownership was involved, e.g. 1446: *Pyspeky* > c.1500: *Gyengyespyspeky* 'Püspöki by the brook Gyöngyös' (Heves; Cs. 1: 68–9)<sup>10</sup>; 1449: *Olahremethe* 'Wallachian Remete' > 1484: *Remethe* (Ung; Cs. 1: 397, see entry *Remete*); also in pairs, e.g. 1404: *Barathy* > 1425: *Nagbarath(y)* 'great Barát(i)' and 1453: *Kysbarathy* 'little Barát(i)' (Győr; Cs. 3: 545–6); 1373: *Magyarapacha* 'Hungarian Apáca' and *Tothapacha* 'Slavic Apáca' > 1416: *Apachcha* (Temes; Cs. 2: 98). The addition or loss of a geographical common noun also affected name forms in the observed period, e.g. 1458: *Apacza* > 1466: *Apáczakuta* 'the well of the nun' ~ *Apácaegyháza* 'the church of the nun' (Békés; Cs. 1: 648); 1355: *Monusturfalva* 'the village of the monastery' > 1360: *Monustor* (Kolozs; Cs. 5: 307–10).

The addition or loss of a topoformant was realized in the presence or absence the Cistercian Abbey of Heiligenkreuz wrongfully claimed certain areas in the settlement as its own in front of the law court (FNEsz. 2: 161, see entry *Mosonbánfalva*).

<sup>7</sup> The name form is considered to be derived from the Slavic term *popъ* 'priest' (FNEsz. 2: 317, see entry *Pápop*).

<sup>8</sup> Monks from the Cistercian Abbey of Heiligenkreuz moved to the settlement, hence the German *Mönchhof* ~ Hungarian *Monóudvar* 'friar court' (later *Barátfalva* 'the village of the friar', then *Barátudvar* 'friar court') pair of names for the village (FNEsz. 1: 166, *Barátudvar*).

<sup>9</sup> Papkeszi was in the possession of the Chapter of Veszprém (FNEsz. 2: 316). Püspökszékely is said to have been owned by the Diocese of Pécs (Cs. 3: 450).

<sup>10</sup> The village of Gyöngyöspüspöki, by the brook called Gyöngyös, was merged with the town of Gyöngyös in 1923 (FNEsz. 1: 547).



of the final *-i* in some name forms, e.g. 1389: *Barath* > 1396: *Barathy* (Somogy; Cs. 2: 589); 1376: *Nyarasapathy* > 1445: *Nyarasapath* 'Apát(i) having poplar trees' (Pest; Cs. 1: 32, FNEsz. 2: 252). In some cases the third person singular possessive suffix was added to or dropped from the end of the name form, e.g. 1424: *Papthelek* 'priest plot' > 1475: *Paptheleke* 'the plot of the priest' (Közép-Szolnok; Cs. 1: 562); 1427: *Monorethe* 'the meadow of the friar' > 1435: *Monoreth* ~ *Monnoreth* 'friar meadow' (Gömör; Cs. 1: 142, see entry *Monyóréte*).

A complement constituent accompanying the basic constituent referring to an ecclesiastical possessor could be replaced with another, e.g. 1360: *Telukbarath* 'plot Barát' > 1368: *Nagbarath* 'great Barát' (Győr; Cs. 3: 545), or a geographical common noun functioning as a basic constituent could be changed into another next to a complement constituent expressing ecclesiastical ownership, e.g. 1466: *Apáczakuta* 'the well of the nun' ~ *Apácaegyháza* 'the church of the nun' > 1525: *Apáczateleke* 'the plot of the nun' (Békés; Cs. 1: 648). A topoforment was substituted by a constituent in a single name form: 1491: *Pyspeky* > 1497: *Pyspekfalwa* 'the village of the bishop' (Trencsén; FN. 178).

The change of the entire toponym led, in some instances, to the appearance or disappearance of a name form referring to an ecclesiastical possessor, e.g. 1415: *Vkech* > 1435: *Monohaz* 'friar abode' ~ *Fyles* (Sopron; Cs. 3: 619); 1416: *Apaty* > 1417: *Tychon* ~ *Tykoniensis* (Zala; Cs. 3: 26). Integration of name forms was rare in late medieval times, e.g. 1416: *Komlospathaca* ~ *Comlos* and 1427: *Kerestus* > 1458: *Kereztheskomlos* (Sáros; Cs. 1: 300, see entries *Komlós* and *Komlós[-pataka]*), as was the change of semantic content in a name constituent, e.g. 1468: *Apathyda* 'the bridge of the abbot' > 1469: *Apahyda* 'the bridge of a person called Apa' (Kolozs; Cs. 5: 327–8).

The appearance or disappearance of an alternative name form, however, was quite frequent in the Late Middle Ages. The alternative name form expressing ecclesiastical ownership emerged or faded away next to a toponym of a different kind, e.g. 1508: *Kosthesth* > 1515: *Kosthesth* al. nom. *Kerezthes* (Hunyad; Cs. 5: 103, see entry *Kos[z]tesd*); 1367: *Apaty* al. nom. *Vruzfolu* > 1390: *Oruzfalu* (Hunyad; Gy. 3: 289, Cs. 5: 119). In some cases it was a toponym of a different kind that developed or receded as an alternative name next to the one referring to ecclesiastical possession, e.g. 1404: *Barathy* > 1425: *Zwtor* al. nom. *Barath(y)* (Győr; Cs. 3: 545–6); 1374/1615: *Kereztes* al. nom. *Fanczal* > 1396: *Keresthws* (Bihar; Cs. 1: 612–3). Toponyms reflecting ecclesiastical ownership appeared in alternate forms in a given period of the era, e.g. 1426: *Pysky* > 1429: *Pyspuki* ~ *Pysky* (Bihar; Cs. 1: 620); 1415: *Orozapathy* ~ *Orozapath* > 1418: *Orozapathy* 'Russian Apát(i)' (Krassó; Cs. 2: 105).

Data recorded in years closest to each other suggest that the changes listed above sometimes occurred in combination with one another. For instance, the employment of a distinctive addition could go together with that of a topoforment, e.g. 1416: *Leel* > 1449: *Erseklely* 'archbishop Lél' (Komárom; Cs. 3: 506, see entry *Lél*), while the distinctive addition and the geographical common noun could disappear from the name form at the same time, e.g. 1376: *Keresztusenthmikloslaka* 'Szentmiklóslaka belonging

to the chivalric order' > 1425: *Zenthmiklos* (Somogy; Cs. 2: 646). Some name forms changed several times in the late medieval period, e.g. c.1436: *Apáczaegyháza* > 1436, 1458: *Apacza* > 1466: *Apáczakuta* ~ *Apáczaegyháza* > 1525: *Apáczateleke* (Békés; Cs. 1: 648; see also above). However, focusing strictly on modifications that happened in a confined period of time may blur the real nature of the string of changes. The 1331 and the 1406 data of the example 1261/1271: *Zurdukpispuky* 'Püspöki near the valley Szurdok-völgy' > 1331: *Pyspuky* > 1406: *Pyspeky* ~ *Zurdokpyspeky* > 1808: *Szurdok-Püspöki* (Heves; Gy. 3: 127, Cs. 1: 68–9, Lip. 1: 544) reflect the appearance of an alternative name form created by attaching a distinctive addition in the Late Middle Ages. However, the longer form proves to be not only older, but more enduring than the shorter one, at least in writing, the form in which all the data available in the corpus are observed (for a more extensive discussion of the topic see Bölcskei 2014).

### **Conclusion: conventional and unconventional features of the surveyed toponyms**

Place names referring to an ecclesiastical owner in the Late Middle Ages share common features with several distinct types of traditional Hungarian toponyms. First, semantically, these name forms fit well into the group of toponyms reflecting possession history and the group of toponyms having ecclesiastical reference. Grammatically, they display morphological and syntactic characteristics deemed typical of Hungarian toponyms. Their historical changes also follow the patterns observable in the case of sample examples from other types of Hungarian place names. However, in comparison with Hungarian toponyms in general, certain restrictions were discovered with respect to the stock of lexemes and topoformants applied in the surveyed name forms (for details see above). Other unconventional features of place names reflecting ecclesiastical possession include the appearance of the plural forms of lexemes referring to a group of owners (e.g. 1407: *Barathokfalwa* 'the village of the friars', Baranya; Cs. 2: 468); the appearance of toponymic complement constituents in adjectival form that refer to a relatively distant settlement (e.g. 1444: *Budauaridench* 'Dench owned by the Chapter of Buda', Somogy; Cs. 2: 600); the use of the privative suffix in name formation (1410: *Apathlan* 'without abbot', Sopron; Cs. 3: 599); the appearance of old Hungarian address terms (e.g. 1397: *Baratur* 'sir friar', Baranya; Cs. 2: 471; 1476: *Apathwrmarothya* 'Marót of sir abbot', Hont; FNESz. 1: 106); the frequency of the name forms in indicating entities, especially settlements, located in the northern part of the Late Medieval Kingdom of Hungary.

### **Primary sources**

Cs. = Csánki, D. 1890–1913. *Magyarország történelmi földrajza a Hunyadiak korában* [Historical geography of Hungary in the age of the Hunyadis] I–III. V. Budapest: Magyar Tudományos Akadémia.

FN. = Fekete Nagy, A. 1941. *Magyarország történelmi földrajza a Hunyadiak korában* [Historical

geography of Hungary in the age of the Hunyadis] IV. Budapest: Magyar Tudományos Akadémia.

FNESz. = Kiss, L. 1988. *Földrajzi nevek etimológiai szótára* [Etymological dictionary of geographical names]. 4th edition. Vol. 1–2. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.

Gy. = Györffy, Gy. 1963–1998. *Az Árpád-kori Magyarország történeti földrajza* [Historical geography of Hungary in the Arpadian Age]. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.

Lip. = Lipszky, J. 1808. *Repertorium locorum objectorumque in XII. tabulis mappae regnorum Hungariae, Slavoniae, Croatiae et Confiniorum Militarum Magni item Principatus Transylvaniae occurrentium* [Register of places and objects of Hungary, Slavonia, Croatia and the Military Frontiers as well as of the Grand Duchy of Transylvania occurring on the 12-page map]. Buda: Egyetemi Nyomda.

## References

- Bényei, Á. 2012. *Helynévképzés a magyarban* [Place-name derivation in the Hungarian language]. Debrecen: Debreceni Egyetemi Kiadó.
- Bölcskei, A. 2008. Az egyházi településnevek típusai a 19. század elején [Ecclesiastical settlement names in early 19th-century Hungary]. In *Név és valóság. A VI. Magyar Névtudományi Konferencia előadásai. Balatonszárszó, 2007. június 22–24.*, A. Bölcskei and I. N. Császi (eds.), 106–115. Budapest: Károli Gáspár Református Egyetem Magyar Nyelvtudományi Tanszéke.
- Bölcskei, A. 2013. Contemporary Hungarian settlement names reflecting former ecclesiastical possession. In *Proceedings of the Second International Conference on Onomastics “Name and Naming”. Onomastics in Contemporary Public Space*, O. Felecan (ed.), 243–253. Cluj-Napoca: Editura Mega and Editura Argonaut.
- Bölcskei, A. 2014. Changes of Toponyms Reflecting Ecclesiastical Possession in Medieval Hungary. *25th International Congress of Onomastic Sciences. Names and their Environment*. Glasgow. (Paper delivered on the 29th of August, 2014.)
- Bölcskei, A. 2015. Toponyms reflecting ecclesiastical possession in the Medieval Kingdom of Hungary. *Onoma 49: Names and Religion* (forthcoming).
- Engel, P., Gy. Kristó, and A. Kubinyi. 2003. *Magyarország története 1301–1526* [The history of Hungary 1301–1526]. Budapest: Osiris Kiadó.
- Hoffmann, I. 2007. *Helynevek nyelvi elemzése* [Linguistic analysis of place names]. Budapest: Tinta Könyvkiadó.
- Kubinyi, A. 1999. *Főpapok, egyházi intézmények és vallásosság a középkori Magyarországon* [Prelates, ecclesiastical institutions and religiosity in Medieval Hungary]. Budapest: Magyar Egyháztörténeti Enciklopédia Munkaközösség.
- Mályusz, E. 2007. *Egyházi társadalom a középkori Magyarországon* [Ecclesiastical society in Medieval Hungary]. Budapest: Műszaki Kiadó.
- Mező, A. 1996. *A templomcím a magyar helységnevekben. 11–15. század* [Patron saints in Hungarian settlement names. 11–15th c.]. Budapest: Magyar Egyháztörténeti Enciklopédia Munkaközösség.
- Tóth, V. 2008. *Településnevek változástípológiája* [Alternation typology of settlement names]. Debrecen: Debreceni Egyetem Magyar Nyelvtudományi Tanszéke.