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1 In the early Old Hungarian period the publication of charters was a special medium of the usage of geographical common words, as these lexemes denoting places tend to occur rather frequently as Hungarian words embedded into the Latin texts of charters. Therefore this special occurrence of geographical common words deserves profound attention and detailed study of the typical roles of this group of lexemes in charters.

2 Although as a rule the Hungarian content of charters is predominantly made up by proper names, they contain also a significant number of common names that refer to places. Incorporating vernacular words into the Latin text was characteristic of charter writing practices across Europe. Nevertheless while proper names as Hungarian linguistic elements have attracted researchers' interest, much less attention has been dedicated to the utilisation of vernacular common word elements for the purposes of language history.

3 Researchers have formulated different explanations for the occurrence of Hungarian linguistic elements in charters written in Latin. Obviously, following European patterns, occurrences of Hungarian proper names in texts were mostly related to the legal assurance provided by charters. However, the embedding of vernacular common words and common word structures is not to be justified with the same legal safeguarding role. An explanation for the appearance of Hungarian lexemes in the texts could be the assumption that the emergence of charters may have created a linguistic-psychological situation in which the notaries' linguistic consciousness was constantly floating between two languages, and this could have triggered the phenomenon that besides proper names also other Hungarian elements came to be inserted into the texts of the charters. Thus in addition to the contemporary norms and rules of charter writing, also some kind of
linguistic confusion of the charter writer could have served as a background for the mentioned phenomenon.

(2) Among common words denoting places two larger groups of words can be distinguished whose elements can often be identified in Hungarian in the text of charters. Either of these preferred groups of words contains names of trees. Their Hungarian language occurrence within the charters can be explained by the fact that in medieval times trees played a significant role in the demarcation of edges and borders due to their relative stability and clear visibility. The other group of common words that keep turning up frequently in charters in Hungarian is the group of geographical common words. In the Latin texts both the Latin and the Hungarian geographical common words serve the same purpose of embedding Hungarian toponyms into the text.

(3) During the study of the elements written in Hungarian it is of crucial importance whose language usage is reflected in these Hungarian linguistic elements. From this aspect, the socio-onomastic value of the toponymical data and that of the geographical common words is not equivalent. Namely, due to the legal safeguard role of charters, toponyms were inserted into these texts in the language of the particular community, and as such, they can be assumed to reflect the language usage of the given community authentically, because this was in the best interest of the community. Preserving the locally used forms of names was namely a guarantee that in the case of a potential legal dispute the identification of the toponym should be beyond doubt. The assumption that the forms of toponyms originated from the local language and name usage is underpinned also by the fact that the pieces of information related to the places were provided by local people. However, in the charters Hungarian geographical common words appear in the role of Latin geographical common words (e.g. 1263: est iuxta quendam potok, qui vulgariter Scorinpotok nominatur), therefore we have good reason to assume that they mediate the charter writer’s language usage.

(4) On the one hand, in charters the frequent insertion of geographical common words in Hungarian may be motivated by the charter writer’s intention to avoid the repetition of words. In addition, geographical common words serve also the clear identification of places whose names are not semantically transparent. At the same time, this role is obviously perfectly fulfilled also by Latin geographical common words; it is not by chance that these are also much more typical in this role. The dominant appearance of Latin type indicator elements can be observed in a charter from 1255: Latin common word references are characteristic even when the names contain Hungarian geographical common words (1255: ad alium fluuium Zumulnukfew vocatum; et per eundem fluuium). In addition, not even the otherwise typically high-frequency geographical common word patak ‘brook’ occurs as a common word in the charter in spite of the fact that the word appears also in the posterior constituent of the name (1255: ad fluuium Borna potoka vocatum, et per eundem fluuium). Such solutions are much more frequent in the texts of charters than formulations with Hungarian geographical common word structures.

As to why Hungarian elements still appear in the same role is explained by most researchers as a result of an oscillation between the two languages, or a kind of a mixed linguistic code of the texts. Nevertheless, the occurrence of Hungarian and Latin common word elements referring to different types of places displays also some regularities. For instance, common word references to roads are mostly in Latin.

In the Latin master text the geographical common words that appear in the form of Hungarian common words may have more roles: (a) they may be elements that denote a
specific type of place, referring back to an earlier toponym (e.g. 1263: Scorinpotok [...] eundem potok\(^{20}\)), (b) they may stand next to a toponym directly as epexegetic elements replacing Latin geographical common words (e.g. [\(1287\)/14th century: \(ad\) bercz Agyagus bercz dictum\(^{13}\)), and (c) Hungarian geographical common words may appear independently of toponyms, merely as common word denotations of a specific place (e.g. 1252: Uenit \(ad\) vnum berch\(^{14}\)).

(a) In the Latin master text geographical common words may appear both in Latin and in Hungarian. One of the earliest charters of Hungarian language history, the mid-11th century deed of foundation of the Tihany abbey uses Hungarian lexemes (e.g. nogut, kartuela, aruk fee) even in places where other charters would use Latin elements (e.g. \(ad\) magnam viam, arbor piri, \(ad\) caput rivuli\(^{15}\)). However, the geographical common words which replace proper names, having the function to refer back to these, are typically in Latin (e.g. 1055: balatin [...] super lacum; 1055: tichon [...] illa insula\(^{16}\), thus cases where Hungarian elements would have a post-referencing function are rather rare (e.g. 1227: Nerges berch [...] eundem berch\(^{17}\)). Why nevertheless some post-referencing elements still appear in Hungarian may be influenced by several factors.

Some place types are less frequently linked with post-referencing elements in Hungarian, for example, also roads typically appear in Latin in this role (1235: \(er\) quam de villa Donsuth venitur Varadinum, \(et\) \(in\) eadem via\(^{18}\)). In this aspect, occasionally we may perceive differences between place types even within the text of the same charter. For example, in the case of a charter from 1263 the geographical common word \(patak\) (‘brook’) occurs as a post-referencing element (1263: \(est\) iuxta quendam potok, \(qui\) \(vulg\)ariter Scorinpotok nominatur [...] eundem potok), whereas the charter writer refers back to the name of the forest with the Latin \(silva\) lexeme (1263: \(ad\) siluam Zaua, \(et\) eandem siluam\(^{19}\)). Similarly, in a charter from 1291 we can observe the same: some place types – such as names of forests or springs – are referred to exclusively by Latin type indicators (e.g. \(fontem\) nominem Monoroskuth [...] \(eodem\) \(fonte\); illetve siluam Bykes nominem, \(et\) eandem siluam), whereas in the case of other names also Hungarian post-referencing elements appear (e.g. Nogyszpataka, \(et\) \(ubi\) eandem patak cadit [...] \(et\) \(in\) eadem patak\(^{20}\)). During the study of these details in charters we can clearly observe that as a rule the appearance of Hungarian post-referencing elements is preceded by a Hungarian geographical common word standing next to the name, while the usage of post-referencing elements in Latin is typically linked to a name which is explained by a Latin geographical common word.

Also the structure of the name seems to influence the choice of the post-referencing lexeme. In the case of the charter from 1263 mentioned above it is noteworthy that the word \(patak\) tends to appear in the text as a post-referencing element when it was preceded by a hydronym containing the same name part (1263: \(est\) iuxta quendam potok, \(qui\) \(vulg\)ariter Scorinpotok nominatur [...] eundem potok\(^{20}\)). \(Patak\) can be found in the same post-referencing role rather frequently also in other charters (e.g. [1240]/[1240]: \(in\) altum iuxta Rithonich potoka \(et\) transit illad potok\(^{21}\); 1334: iuxta rivulum Balahptataka superius viam [...] \(in\) eodem patak transeundo\(^{22}\); 1245/1588: \(ad\) Beredincha pathaka \(et\) per pathoka\(^{23}\)). In one instance the word \(fok\) ‘a brook or channel flowing out of a larger water’ appears referring to a toponym with an identical name part (1211: \(locum\) \(qui\) \(uocatur\) Harrangudfoca [...] iuxta eundem foc\(^{24}\), while the lexeme \(bérc\) ‘mountain, crest’ appears several times (1227: \(que\) \(in\) hungarico Nerges berch nominatur \(et\) \(per\) eundem berch\(^{25}\); 1296: \(Ascendendo\) \(per\) Kyzebpbirch [...] \(Per\) eundem birch perveniet \(ad\) unum collem magnum\(^{26}\)).
However, in the charter of 1263, hydronyms that do not contain a geographical common word are later usually referred to with Latin place type indicator lexemes (in riuum Cohinnich, et transiens eundem riuum). Also the following citations from the charter show the tendency that in general names that do not contain a geographical common word are usually referred to with Latin place type indicator lexemes: 1262: ad fluuium Harnad, et iuxta eundem fluuium; 1217: ad vnum riuum qui vocatur Kutusd et per eundem riuulum; 1256: et riuulum, qui nominatur Stergomenla, et per eundem riuulum. It is evident also from the text of the charter from 1291 that the structure of the names affects the choice between the different post-referencing elements. Hydronyms that contain the geographical common word patak are usually referred to with the Hungarian geographical common word patak (Nogysyzpataka, et ubi eandem patak cadit [...]), whereas the hydronyms that do not contain the element patak are typically post-referenced through geographical common words in Latin (Sayo, et circa quondam ar borem salictis exty de eodem fluuiio).

The frequency of certain geographical common words is substantially higher in post-referencing role than the frequency of others. It is not an incident that in this respect research has focused primarily on the geographical common words patak and bérc, because these two have been identified as the most characteristic Hungarian post-referencing elements found in Latin texts. Nevertheless, in many cases these occurrences may contradict the “regularities” articulated earlier.

For example the element patak may sometimes refer not only to hydronyms that contain this name part, but also to names that do not contain the lexeme patak (1299/14th century: descendit in vallem, que vocatur Zarazorbow [...] ascendit per ipsum potak [...] per idem patak ascendit ad caput eius [...] cadit in potak). Similarly, also the element bérc may stand in a post- (or occasionally even pre-) referencing relation to names that contain a different geographical common word as posterior constituent (1338: ad vnum berch, Darabhege nuncupatum, et exeundo de ipsa semita in vertice ipsius ad partem orientalem eundo, in fronte eiusdem berch descendit in fluuium Topul).

Hungarian place type indicator elements may not only assume a post-referencing role, but they may also adjoin Hungarian toponyms, as epexegetic elements to these. Differences between the types of places can be observed also in the geographical common words used as epexegetic elements. Similarly to the earlier mentioned post-referencing function, Hungarian geographical common words do not occur in epexegetic role next to the names of roads or forests, since this role is at all times performed by Latin geographical common words (e.g. 1334: tangit I publicam viam, que Zaazwt nuncupatur; 1286: et silue Feketeu Erdeu dicte).

Studying these structures it can be observed that the epexegetic elements are usually geographical common words that are identical with the posterior elements of the name (e.g. [-1287]/14th century: ad I berch Agyagus bercz dictum; 1329: in latere I beerch Kysakazo beercy; 1291: ad quidam patak Sygpatak nomine; 1334: intrat in quidam potok Magapataka; 1372/1377: Ad aliud er Tekereser nominatum). Nevertheless, it is not rare that the particular common word element does not appear in the name: this was observed in several instances in the case of bérc ‘mountain, crest’ (e.g. 1282: quoddam berch Kyslacus vocatam) and ér ‘brooklet’ (e.g. 1372/1377: Ad vnum er Rakatyas nominatum), and moreover, in some examples the posterior constituent contains a different geographical common word e.g. 1270/1387: Unum berch Darabheg dictum; 1239/1239: ad patak Kekkektowa). This is not surprising, since the words bérc and patak...
occur quite frequently in charters as common words, yet – as we have seen – in this function we can find also other geographical common words.

17 The geographical common word bérc ‘mountain, crest’ appears even within the same charter in highly versatile roles. For instance in a charter dating back to 1256 it appears first as a toponym. The toponym character of the data is enhanced also by the use of the Latin word nominatur, which is typical of proper names (1256: ad vnum monticulum, qui Berch nominatur43). The lexeme bérc appears several times also later on in the text, already replacing Latin place type indicators. Moreover, in these text sections bérc explains three toponyms with different geographical common words as posterior constituents (1256: ad vnum berch, qui vulgo Eregeteuhig vocatur [...] ad vnum berch, qui vulgo Humurozou dicitur [...] ad vnum berch, qui vulgo dicitur Humucteteu44). These details signal that in the usage of the Latin language in medieval Hungary this lexeme behaves like a charter word (i.e. as a Hungarian neologism of the Latin language as used in Hungary).

18 Until now, from the aspect of this role of the Hungarian epexegetic elements research has mainly focused on the lexemes bérc ‘mountain, crest’ and patak ‘brook’. The elements bérc and patak can often be seen in this function in Latin texts indeed. However, also the geographical common word ér ‘brooklet’ appears in this role rather frequently in the second half of the 14th century (e.g. 1372/1377: Ad aliud er Tekereser nominatum45; 1393/1446: Usque ad quoddam er wlgo Nager dicto46, 1394/1446: Usque quoddam er wlgo Zortuser dicto47). Since with respect to the lexemes bérc and patak researchers concluded that this resulted from a generalisation of the meaning of these words50, it is likely that also the meaning of the geographical common word ér had become more generalised by the second half of the 14th century. This assumption is reinforced even more by examples where the lexeme ér does not constitute a part of the toponym, yet it appears as an epexegetic element (e.g. 1364: Vnum er Sarnyapathaka dictum51). It is noteworthy that – beyond the geographical common words that appear most frequently in this role – we can identify also the geographical common words liget ‘smaller, thin forest’ (e.g. 1243/1335: qd. lyget, quod vocatur Borsodi Dubodel42; 1427: Quddam lygeth Cheres nominatum53), zátony ‘island’ (e.g. 1340/1389: Transit ad medium Danubii ad quendam zaton vulgariter Veytheh Fuuenye nominatum54), sár ‘marshland, swampy area’ (e.g. 1265: Profunda aqua saar que wlgariter Evrem appellatur55; 1327: Ad paludem saar Huzyusaar nominatum56) and fok ‘a brook or channel flowing out of a larger water’ (e.g. 1468: Peruenissent ad quoddam fok Byskefoka vocatum57) assuming the same role.

19 (c) Hungarian common word elements may appear in charters even if they have no toponym counterparts in the texts, that is to say, in cases when the charter writer mentions a particular place by using a common word. Therefore, in this function common words are not used to refer to toponyms, thus avoiding repetition of the latter, like in type (a), nor do they stand next to toponyms as epexegetic elements embedded into the Latin text, like in type (b). In fact it can be assumed that their appearance in the texts results from the mixed linguistic code of the charters54.

20 The status of Hungarian geographical common words that occur independently of toponyms differs from the ones that refer back to toponyms or the ones that stand next to toponyms as epexegetic elements. This exemplifies well that in this function we may discover lexemes which otherwise have not been identified as common words used in other situations, such as the lexeme eresztvény ‘young sprouting forest’, which stands as a
common word independently of a toponym in the following excerpt of a charter: 1234: *iuxta I erethwen*.

Analyzing the frequency of specific Hungarian geographical common words occurring in Latin charters a much higher variety of these denoting places can be witnessed, than in post-referencing or epexegetic functions. In addition to the highly frequent *bérc* (e.g. 1252: *Uenit ad vnum berch*), and *patak* (e.g. 1275: *ad I potok et per ipsum potok*), we can find also the geographical common words *fok* ‘a brook or channel flowing out of a larger water’ (e.g. 1252: *Peruenit ad arborem harast est iuxta quoddam fuk*), *mocsár* ‘swampy area covered with water plants’ (1293: *Descendit in quoddam moscar*), *szurdok* ‘narrow valley, path, riverbed between two steep cliffs’ (1267/1380: *Ascendendo quoddam zurduk vel horhag*), *berek* ‘small, thin forest’ (e.g. 1252: *Ad vnum beruk*), *liget* ‘small, thin forest’ (e.g. 1243/1354: *Deinde uadit ad vnum liget*) and *halom* ‘low hill’ (e.g. 1310: *ad I holum in t. arabili*) in this function. The phenomenon may be related to the tendency that while both post-referencing elements and the ones standing next to toponyms in an epexegetic function are usually geographical common words with a more general meaning, the appearance in Latin texts of lexemes that are independent of toponyms is not restricted by such limitations.

However, it should be pointed out that some of the above listed examples may hold also the status of a toponym. Namely, in the case of geographical common words occurring independently of proper names it can be challenging to establish whether specific occurrences in a particular charter should be categorised as common words or proper names. The decision may be facilitated by the presence of Latin determiners standing next to the geographical common words: pronouns such as *quidam*, *quaedam*, *quoddam* meaning ‘a particular, specific’ (e.g. 1291: *transit Danubium quidam fuk*), and *unus* (*una*, *unum*) in the sense of ‘a(n)/one’, or the numeral *duo* (*duae*, *duo*) meaning ‘two’ (1295: *Transit vnum mochar*) reveal the common word nature of the Hungarian elements. In these cases the Hungarian geographical common words actually behave as neologisms in the Latin text, which is underpinned by the fact that the Hungarian lexemes denoting places may be complemented with a Latin attribute (e.g. 1315/1370/1752: *descendit ad l siccum potok* ‘dry brook’; 1249: *ad siccum potok*; 1271: *In vno sicco potok vadit*; 1279: *Ascendit per aliud minus potok super arborem berekenye ’smaller brook’*). We can find the geographical common words *bérc*, *szurdok* and *liget* in similar roles.

In conclusion, we can make the following statements. Common word occurrences of geographical common words are unlikely to result from the legal safeguard role of charters, in fact their appearance seems to reveal a less conscious behaviour of the charter writers, and is likely to be related to a linguistic-psychological situation that manifested in a constant mediation between the two languages. Therefore, in a sense, the fact that Hungarian common word elements were mixed into the Latin text of charters may be accidental, or even more, a behaviour reflecting the linguistic confusion of the charter writer. Therefore, the presence of Hungarian elements replacing Latin common words is not a typical solution: Latin geographical common words remain dominant in all of the related functions. Thus the Hungarian elements can be linked primarily to the language usage of the charter writer. Consequently, beyond the temporal and spatial variation of charter writing practices, the study of the Hungarian geographical common words embedded into Latin texts is made even more difficult by the differences in the practices of the individual charter writers. Nevertheless, despite some inconsistency, we can still decipher some tendencies.
With regard to Hungarian geographical common words in post-referencing or epexegetic function standing next to a toponym we can identify the factors that determine whether the specific common word element of a Latin text stands in Hungarian or in Latin. On the one hand, the choice is clearly influenced by the type of the place. In addition, we can observe that the occurrence of common words in Hungarian or Latin may be linked also to the structure of the name: in some cases it is of crucial significance if the posterior constituent of the name contains a geographical common word. At the same time, there exist some geographical common words which are so wide-spread in these functions (e.g. bérc and patak) that independently of the structure they may assume both post-referencing and epexegetic functions. However, Hungarian common words appearing in the Latin texts independently of toponyms display different characteristics in comparison with the other two types: in this role we may namely identify also types of places that do not occur as post-referencing or epexegetic elements, furthermore, geographical common words are also more widely represented in this function.
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