

Hungarian Place Names – Slovak Maps.

Hungarian Place Names on Slovak Maps of the Areas Around Zobor and the Lower Areas of the River Ipoly

Török, Tamás

Introduction

The Hungarian research of toponyms in Slovakia has undergone a considerable development in the past 10–15 years. After the initial sporadic collections and after the appearance of some databases summarizing the toponyms material of several municipalities, the scientific processing of our place names has begun. The results of our toponymists are proved by several publications and conference presentations. However, the booming of Hungarian research of place names in Slovakia has its own history. We must definitely mention the work of Gyula Jankus and the Teleki couple. The scientific interest of Tibor Teleki and Ilna Telekiné Nagy extended to the world of names; they led several theses in this topic at the Hungarian Faculty in Nitra. Due to the collecting of Gyula Jankus, a database of the toponyms material appeared containing the place names of municipalities of Ipoly, Ipoly-area, and Garam-area.

It was the collection of the alive (Hungarian) geographical names from those parts of Slovakia that were inhabited by Hungarians that fascinated the researchers the most, because the earlier re-parcelling of the land threatened those names with extinction. Equally important seems to be, however, the exploration of the toponyms material of historical as well as contemporary maps. In comparison with those, the conscious interference in microtoponymy; the formation, types and the translation features of the Slovak – Hungarian names pairs resulting from the change of the State Language can be measured.

During my research so far I have dealt with the place names of two regions: I have processed and organized both typologically and structurally the living as well as the historical place names material of the areas around Zobor and the

area of the river Alsó-Ipoly (Török 2002a; 2002b; 2002c; 2005, 2006, 2009). However, I was mostly interested in the translation and the translatability of place names. With the comparison of the microtoponymy inspected on Slovak and Hungarian maps I tried to highlight the relationships of name pairs, the process of translation, and the changes detected in Slovak name versions in respect of the historical names material. In my present work I summarize the experiences of these two researches concerning the translations of place names. I have considered the characteristic features of the translation of the Slovak maps of these two regions worth comparing; to see the specific conversions, to highlight the possible differences and similarities.

The hilly area of Nitra is the northern border of the Hungarian language. The villages to the north of the city are linguistic enclaves. To the north of Nitra, on both sides of Zobor, there are 14 Hungarian municipalities. According to local folklore, these villages can be divided into three categories in relation to their position. Those on the western slopes of Zobor-Zsibrica mountain range are called *hegymegi*, those on the south – south-eastern slopes are called *hegyaljai*, while those on the left bank of the river Nitra are called *vízmeji* (*Barangoló...* 1995, 93). In Nitra valley there are Vicsápapáti, Egerszeg, Béd, Szalakusz and Menyhe. On the other side of the mountain, on the south-south-eastern slopes and in the valleys lie Gerencsér, Alsócsitár, Pográny, Alsóbodok, Geszte, Kolon, Zsére, Gímes and Barslédec.

The other inspected area is the lower section of the Ipoly flow. Ranging from Ipolyság to the river's estuary there are 13 municipalities: Ipolyság, Gyerk, Pereszlény, Ipolyvisk, Szete, Ipolyszakállos, Lontó, Ipolybél, Ipolypásztó, Ipolykiskeszi, Szalka, Leléd, Helemba. This area is bounded by the river Ipoly in the east, by the Ipolymenti ridge and the Szekince creek in the north, and by the river Danube in the south.

Research in Name Pairs¹

The translator replaces the lexical units of the source language with those of the target language, rearranges the structure of sentences, alters the word order, omits certain items or adds new ones to the target language sentence. These operations (i.e. replacement, rearranging, omission, addition, etc.) are called converting operations (Klaudy 2002b, 17).

1 In this research I examine the Slovak toponyms material of the following maps together: PM (Pozemkoknizné mapy) and ZM (Základné mapy/Katastrálne mapy). The Slovak entries of these maps are nearly the same. In case of any differences I indicate the morphological variants.

According to the scope of the processes the converting operations fall into 2 main types: 1. lexical converting operations that affect the lexis of the sentence; 2. grammatical converting operations that affect the structure of the sentence, which are justified by the different grammatical structures and text-building features of languages.

By paralleling, the maps of different languages there appeared some typical features of the translation, which helped to create three main categories: calque, transcription and Slovak names based on a new motivation. Since I examined the operation of calque in a wider sense, I had the opportunity for a more modulated introduction of certain converting operations.

With the Hungarian place names I followed the pattern used on PM maps. If there is only a living equivalent of a particular Slovak name, I indicate it [É] and I write it according to the present-day orthography (e.g.: *Kopasz-erdő* [É]). It often happened that on the Hungarian or the Slovak map two versions of the same place name appeared. I have divided the two variants with a colon (e.g.: *Felső fenék* : *Felső Fenék*, *Horný Čarad* : *Horný Čarad*). I put in parentheses that variant where the converting operation does not apply, e.g.: *Belső legelő* (: *Belső legelő*) → *Vnútorný pasienok*, *Gyümölcsös irtások* → (*Vyrúbaný sad*) : *Klčoviny*. In many cases the PM map - otherwise containing Hungarian names material - includes Slovak translations as well. If these differ from those on the ZM maps I indicated both data divided with the / sign (e.g.: *Pustatina Čarad* [PM] / *Čaradská pustatina* [ZM]). These variants can be the results of different translational strategies.

The 19th and 20th century maps of the areas around Zobor contain 546 geographical names altogether. In the era after the Treaty of Trianon the cadastral maps took over 189 (34,61%) from these names. I dealt with 754 historical names of Ipoly area, 337 (44,69%) of these were transferred to Slovak maps.

1. Calque

When examining converting operations, I differentiated between the process of calque and its result, calque words or expressions. Within calque expressions I studied those Hungarian-Slovak name pairs where there is no difference in meaning. On the other hand, due to the differences in the formation of these name pairs I was able to make further categories; in some cases these converting operations slightly influenced the meaning. The creator of the word “becomes inspired” by the foreign word, we can feel the impact of the motivation and/or the grammatical form of the foreign word.

In the area along Ipoly, I examined 261 names in this category, so we can state that the Slovak versions of the local place names are 77, 42% calque words. From the place names of the areas around Zobor I enlisted 179 names in this category, which is 94, 69%.

1.1. Calque Words

For calque words I consider those name pairs where there is no difference in meaning and disparities in grammatical formation are irrelevant. In most cases, these are only grammatical genderizations (e.g.: *Ganádi rét* → *Ganádska lúka*).

In the lower areas of the river Ipoly I found 136 calque expressions among the examined toponyms material (e.g.: *Alsó rétek* → *Dolné lúky*, *Czigány és Póka harasz* → *Cigánska chrast²*, *Egeres* → (*Myšička*): *Jelšava* : *Jelšovka*, *Felső berek³* → *Horný luh*, *Közép dűlő* → *Stredný hon*, *Parlagoldal* → *Úhorová strana*), while from the areas around Zobor there are 118 geographical names belonging to this category (*Alsó telkek* → *Dolné funduše*, *Erdő dűlő* → *Lesný hon*, *Hegyves* → *Špicciak*, *Mogyorós* → *Lieškovište*, *Rétek* → *Lúky*, *Urbéri legelő* → *Urbársky pasienok*).

The geographical common nouns *folyam*, *folyó*, *patak* (Hungarian words for *flow*, *river*, *creek*) are sometimes lost in the Slovak translation (e.g.: *Duna folyam* → *Dunaj*, *Ipoly folyó*: → *Ipeľ*). We can observe that the common nouns mentioned above are explanatory constituents in the Hungarian place names and are not elemental parts of the name. These are topographical entries, denominations functioning as names that are not present among the names alive. When converting to the target language the translator emphasized the actual name from the given structure, probably because he felt the artificiality of the original structure. The Slovak translation is less specific, with a “wider meaning”. The Slovak variants were formed in a way that part of the meaning was lost, as the results of implicit translation. The translator took the names used in real life as a basis, it follows from that this is not about the alteration of the grammatical structure.

1.2. Change in Forms

In the process of translation, there was a grammatical change in forming, which is irrelevant from the point of view of semantics; on the other hand the difference in the grammatical forming is striking. The structures of these two languages are not isomorphic, i.e. the traditional name forms are dissimilar. For example the names containing the constituent *felé* (Hungarian for *toward*) have

-
- 2 The data on PM-maps are “contracted” topographical forms (K1: *Czigány Haraszt*, K2: *Czigány haraszt*, Bv: *Czigány haraszt*, Pesty: *Czigány haraszt*, PM: *Czigány és Póka harasz*, ZM: *Cigánska chrast*, É: Ø), where the translator only translated one of the components as a calque word.
 - 3 Within the considered names as the Slovak translations for *berek* the following expressions appear *háj*, *hústina*, *kružina*, *luh*. These are, however, equivalents of the Hungarian word, as they denote woods or areas covered with bushes, trees. The Slovak expressions broaden the meaning of the word *berek* in some sense, so we can regard this as generalization.

the equivalent Slovak names containing the preposition *do*. In this sense there is no difference in meaning between them, just a divergence in their grammatical forming.

In many cases there is discrepancy between the number of the Hungarian and the Slovak variant. Although I do not always examine them together: there is a separate group for those name pairs where there are only differences in number, while in other cases there are dissimilarities in the grammatical forming.

80 name pairs from the lower areas of the river Ipoly belong here, and 36 name pairs from the areas around Zobor.

1.2.1. Differences in Number

In 22 cases from the areas of the river Ipoly and in 20 cases from the areas around Zobor between the Hungarian and the Slovak version there are only differences in number.

I made up two categories. In the first case the singular Hungarian name has a plural Slovak pair: along the Ipoly 15 (*Aproszlás* → *Dieliky*, *Felemás* → *Miešaniny*, *Hegyköz* → *Medzivršie*, *Homok* → *Pieskoviská*, *Hosszúhomok* → *Dlhé piesčiny*, *Lázak* → *Lazáky*, *Mahér rét* → *Mahérové lúky*, *Mogyorós és Zambák* → *Lieštiny*, *Nagyoszlás szőlők alatt* → (*Velké diely za Vinicami* :) *Velké diely pod vinicami*, *Rajföldek* → *Rajská zem*, *Rétköz* → *Medzi lúky*, *Szedernyes* → *Černice*, *Szúnyogos* → *Komárovce*, *Telek* → *Funduše*, *Uradalmi rét* → *Panské lúky*), around Zobor 17 place names (*Dombi dűlő* → *Brežné hony*; *Galozsa* → *Galože*; *Kenderes* → *Konopnice*; *Kerek szőlő* → *Okrúhle vinice*; *Kert megett* → *Za záhradami*; *Lefánti pallag* → *Lefantovské úhony*; *Puszta rét* → *Suché lúky*; *Sásrét* → *Rákosové lúky*; *Sídi alsó és felső rét* → *Šidovské horné a dolné lúky*; *Söprős* → *Terkelové*; *Szeges* → *Klinové*; *Szőllőhegy* → *Vinice*; *Szőlő alatti* → *Pod vinicami*; *Toplicza sás* → *Teplické rákosy*; *Parti dűlő* → *Kopecké hony*; *Révforgó* → *Zátočiny*; *Kis osztály* → *Malé diely*). In the other case the plural Hungarian name has a singular Slovak realization: along the Ipoly 7 (*Belső legelő* :) *Belső legelők* → *Vnútorný pasienok*, *Csárad kertek* → *Záhradný Čarad*, *Homokok és Homokok mellett* → *Piesok*, *Irtványok* [É] → *Irtván*, *Kopaszok* → *Plešina*, *Öreg lucernások* → *Staré ďatelinisko*, *Pallagok* → *Pallag*), around Zobor 3 place names (*Kertek megett* → *Za záhradou*: (*Za záhradami*); (*Partok és*) *Latka* → (*Brehy a*) *Latky*; (*Salga*: *Partok és*) *Latka* → (*Šalga*: *Brehy a*) *Latky*).

1.2.2. Hungarian Constituent → Slovak Preposition

In the translation of those Hungarian place names where the posterior constituent has referential or directional function a preposition in the Slovak version appears; in 39 cases in the areas of the river Ipoly, and in 12 around Zobor.

The converting operation examined here concerns the grammatical structure and it causes semantic alterations. Although there are differences on grammatical and semantic level between the following name pairs, but there are not any on onomastic level. In the above languages they are used in different forms, however, as names they are perfect equivalents.

In the parity of *felé* and *do* there is only a typological difference, i.e.: the parallel of the Slovak preposition is a Hungarian postposition or suffix. Semantically its accurate Slovak equivalent would be “*smerom k...*” which is cumbersome, and it is not used in geographical names.

a) *felé* → *do*

Ipoly area (9): *Bél felé* → *do Bieloviec*, *Ipolyásgfélé* → *do Šah*, *Kis-Keszifélé* → *do Malých Kosih*, *Kis-Peszek felé* → *do Malého Peseku*, *Ság felé* → *do Šah*, *Szakállos felé* → *do Sakáloše*; *do Ipelského Sokolca*, *Szalka felé* → *do Salky*, *Szetefelé* → *do Setichu*; *do Kubáňova*, *Tompafelé* → *do Tompy*

b) *felől* → *z*

Ipoly area (3): *Esztergom felől* → *z Ostrihomu*, *Szete felől* → *ze Setichu*, *Visk felől* → *z Vyškoviec n/Ipľom*

c) *alatt* → *za*

Ipoly area (2): *Aproszlás szőlők alatt* → *Drobné diely za Vinicami*; *Drobné diely za vinicami*, *Nagyoszlás szőlők alatt* → *Velké diely za Vinicami*; (*Velké diely pod vinicami*)

d) *alja/alatt* → *pod*

Ipoly area (12): *Gödör-alja* → *Pod jamou*, *Hegyalja* → *Pod Horou*, *Kert alja* → *Pod záhradami*, *Kertalja* → *Pod záhradmi*, *Máva alja* → *Pod Mavou*, *Négő alja* → *Pod Négóm*, *Part alja* → *Pod brehom*, *Pinczék alja* → *Pod pivnicami*, *Puszták-alja* → *Pod pustatinou*, *Somos alja* → *Pod Šomoše*, *Szekeress alja* → *Pod Szekeresdom*, *Závoz alja* → *Pod závozom*

Zobor area (8): *Bahorecz alatt* → *Pod Bahorcom/Pod bahorcom*; *Kopotthegy alatt* → *Pod holým vrchom*; *Pod Holým vrchom*; *Nyitrai út alja* → *Pod nitrianskou cestou*; *Poronnák alja* → *Pod poronou*; *Sűrűk alja* → *Pod húštinou*; *Szilas alatt* → *Pod Silašským*; *Szőlők alatt* → *Pod vinohradmi*; *Szőlők alatt* → *Pod vinohrady*

e) alja → pri

Zobor area: *Tormos ut alja* → *Pri chrenovskej ceste*

f) eleje → pred

Ipoly area (2): *Mészög eleje* → *Pred hlbunami*, *Pincek eleje* → *Pred pivnicami*

g) megett/mege → za

Ipoly area (5): *Berekmegett* → *Za kružinami*, *kertmege* → *Za záhradou*, *Kertmegett* → *Za záhradami*, *Sáncz mege* → *Za priekopou*, *Szőlők megett* → *Za vinicami*

h) köze → medzi

Ipoly area: *Két út köze* → *Medzi cesty*

i) fölött/főle → nad

Ipoly area (3): *Szőlők fölött* → *Nad vinicou*, *Templom fölött* → *Nad kostolom*, *Viski út főle* → *Nad vyškovskou cestou*

j) mögött/mögötti → nad

Zobor area: *Szőlő megetti* → *Medzi vinicami/Nad vinicami*;

k) mögött/mögötti → za

Zobor area: *Alsó kert mögötti* → *Za dolnými záhradami*;

l) melléke/mellék → pri

Ipoly area (2): *Holt Ipoly melléke* → *Pri Mírtvom Ipli*, *Sármellék* → *Pri blate*

Zobor area: *Patak melléki* → *Pri potoku*

m) – → pri

Zobor area: *Keresztfa dűlő* → *Hon pri kríži*

1.2.3. Hungarian Suffix → Slovak Preposition

In the examined place names – 19 in the areas of the river Ipoly, 4 in the area around Zobor – the Hungarian suffixes are realized as prepositions in Slovak place names, or more exactly the Hungarian antecedent of the Slovak prepositional structure is a place name containing a suffix. The suffix is an inflexion in the first place that has a similar function as the constituents in the place names of the previous group (namely correlational, directional). In 3 names from the Zobor area the suffix is the *-i*, which also has correlational function.

a) -ra → do

Ipoly area: *Ipoly-Szakállosra* → *do Sakáloše*

b) -ra → k

Ipoly area: *Nagy útra dülő* → *Hon k Velkej ceste*

c) -ra → nad

Ipoly area: *Szetei utra dülő* → *Nad Kubáňovskou cestou*Zobor area: *Rétre dülő* → *Nad lúkamy: Nad lúkami*

d) -ról/-ről → z/zo (ze)

Ipoly area (13): *Alsó-Szemerédről* → *z Dolniech Semerovcov, Bajtáról* → *z Bajtavý, Bélről* → *z Bieloviec, Kis-Sallórol* → *zo Šalova: z Tekovských Šanužek, Páldról* → *z Paldu, Parkanról* → *z Parkanu, Párkányról* → *z Parkany , Pástórol* → *z Pastoviec, Százdról* → *ze Szazdic, Százdról* → *zo Szazdic, Tergenye röl* → *z Trgyně⁴, Tompárol* → *z Tompy : z Tupej, Zalabárol* → *ze Zalaby*

e) -nál/-nél → pri/u

Ipoly area (3): *Litasnál* → *Pri Litašovi : U Litaša : U Litašu, Temetőnél* → *Pri cintoríne, Zalabai útnál: Zalabai utnál* → *Pri zalabskej ceste*

f) -i → pri

Zobor area(3): *Határmegyei dülő* → *Pri chotári; Gesztei út szeri* → *Pri hostóvskej ceste; Pásztor úti* → *Pri pastierskej ceste*

1.3. Change in Grammatical Structure

Although the above mentioned converting operations cause changes in grammatical structure to some extent, but the alteration of the meaning of the name is negligible. However, in the following converting operations the change of the grammatical structure involves alterations in semantics, more specifically it involves alteration in the information content. In some of the following data numerous differences appear, but as this is not the dominant distinction between the target language and the source language data, I deal with them here.

In this category I examined 26 place names from the lower areas of the river Ipoly, and 17 from the areas around Zobor.

4 Czech influence

1.3.1. Implication

After the translation of several two-piece Hungarian names one-piece Slovak names arose. The decrease in the number of the element does not mean the contraction of meaning. That is to say, with the contraction the translator is able to render the meaning of two- or more-piece source language word with one word in the target language; consequently neither its meaning nor its information content is altered of the original expression. In the following place names only one part of the constituents were converted from the source language.

With implication 21 Slovak names appeared in the areas of Ipoly, and 7 around Zobor.

Depending on which functional name constituent got into Slovak language, we can isolate two groups.

a) the basic constituent (or its part) got into the Slovak name

Ipoly area (8): *Cseres oldal* → *Stráň*, *Dunalápa* → *Bariny*, *Falu alatti rét* → *Lúky*, *Gyümölcsös irtások* → (*Vyrúbaný sad*): *Klčoviny*, *Ipoly homoka* → *Pieskoviská*, *Legelő pótlások* → *Dodatky*, *Magyalas és Egerdő* → *Les*, *Uradalmi tag* → *Diely*

Zobor area (4): *Alsó rétek* → *Lúky*: (*Dolné lúky*); *Baba irtvány* → *Kopanica*; *Forgács major* → *Majer*; *Korpa irtvány* → *Klčovisko/Klčovisko*;

b) the distinctive constituent (or its part) go into the Slovak name

Ipoly area (13): *Csádék körtvélyes* → *Šariny*, *Gyepföldek* → *Pažit*, *Hangyásmajor* → *Handaš*, *Kenderföld* → *Konopisko*, *Kendervölgy* → *Konopisko*: *Konopisko*, *Kertallyi tábla* → *Pod záhradmi*: *Pod záhradami*, *Kertmegi vető* → *Záhumence*, *Mészög* → *Hlbiny*, *Patakra dülő* → *Kpotoku*, *Ság felőli vető* → *Od Šiah*, *Sás dülő* → *Šariny*, *Szőlőhegy*: *Újhomokok* → *Vinice*, *Tompa felőli vető* → *Od Tupej*

In the translation of the following two names (*Béli határnál* → *Pri bielovskom*, *Szuh út föle* → *Nad hradskou*) both the distinctive and the basic constituent got into the Slovak version in some form. The target language version uses the distinctive constituent (or one of these constituents) of the Hungarian name to express the function of the basic constituent. The formal means of expression of the given function appear in the source language variant as well.

With two names the converting operation differs from the above mentioned in that there appears a two-piece name instead of a one-piece name: *Nagyoszlás a Mahéron* → *Velké diely*, *Kis somo és nagy somorét szög* → *Šomova lúka*. In addition, in the case of *rét* there appears an „overall” name. The phenomenon is similar to the contraction of meanings.

The following two names could as well be considered as calques (*Homokok aproszlás* → *Piesky : drobné diely*, *Rajcsur Nagyoszlás* → *Výbeh: Velké diely*), after all apart from the difference in number, they are “perfect” equivalents. In both cases the translator transfers the two-piece Hungarian place name into Slovak language in a way that he considers the constituents as separate geographical names. So while the Hungarian name denotes one geographical unit, the Slovak denotes two. This otherwise absurd thing did not bother the translator because – knowing the given cadastre – he knew that there are hillside names like *Homok(ok)* and *Aproszlás* in the area. Nevertheless, he did not know the toponyms as deeply as to be able to realize that the above two names together denote a third geographical form. It is unlikely that the translator reported the Slovak forms as versions of a localization point, because in one case he separated the words with a dash (*Piesky – drobné diely*), while in the other case he did that with a comma (*Výbeh, Velké diely*).

From the toponyms material of the areas around Zobor there are 3 names in this group: *Gyalogút szeri* → *Pešinka*; *Majori dűlő* → *Majerské*; *Badoskúti patak*: *Bartoskúti patak* → *Bartošov potok*.

1.3.2. Explicitation

Through explicitation the translator transforms the one- or two-piece place names into two- or more-piece place names.

Ipoly area (5): *Bánságghi* → *Dom Bánságghiho*, *Felső kukoriczás* → *Horné kukoriczné pole*, *Hosszuak* → *Dlhé vetvy: Dlhá vetiev*, *Indóház* → *Železničná zastávka*, (*Kígyósdomb*): *Kígyós* → *Hadí vršok*

Zobor area (10): *Csetertek* → *Za traťou Četerty: (Za traťou [Za haťou])*; *Hosszúk* → *Dlhé hony*; *Kerejtés* → *Ohradené zeme*; *Közös legelő* → *Výčapské spoločné pasienky*; *Meczke alatt* → *Pod Meskovým vrchom*; *Régi Nyitra* → *Staré rameno Nityry*; *Rétek* → *Gazdovské lúky*; *Szabadosok* → *Slobodné pole*; *Tilalmas* → *Zakázaný háj*; *Tilalmas alatt* → *Pod Zakázaným hájom*;

1.4. Other

The Slovak names belonging to this category were formed differently from the converting operations mentioned above. Even though in some cases the presented operations appear, but together with changes or modifications in meaning.

I examined here 19 names from the Ipoly area and 6 from Zobor area.

In two names from the Ipoly area the Hungarian suffix has a Slovak preposition as its equivalent (*Ipoly-Pásztói hattárra dűlő* → *Hraniční hon od Pastoviec*, *Kis-Keszi határra dűlő* → *Hraničný hon od Malých Kosíh*), but they are connected to different parts of the name. Consequently, the Slovak name has a changed meaning. The reason for this converting operation is not the grammatical dissimilarity of the two languages but alterations in lexical connections. The translation theory termed this phenomenon as displacement of meaning (Klaudy 2002b, 113–116).

In the case of 12 place names from the Ipoly area the translator does not consider the names consisting of more parts as whole units; the separate meanings of the name parts get into the Slovak language. As a result approximate, paraphrasing equivalents appear. However, we cannot say that the new name is based on other motivation (e.g. *Két út köze Visk felé* → *Vyškovské medzicestie*, *Kisberek* → *Kroviny*, *Belső félhold* → *Vnútrotný značený hon*, *Külső félhold* → *Vonkajší značený hon*, *Külső hegy* → *Závršie*, *Partonvaló* → *Na vížku*, *Rózsások* → *Kvetnica*).

Some of the translations, or their results were so specific, that they do not resemble any of the above categories, moreover several converting operation can be discovered. That is the reason I examine and present the cases separately.

Ipoly area (5): *Gödriek* → *Jamy* – In the Slovak version the correlational function disappears. *Hegydüllő* → *Na vrchu* – The particle indicating the type disappears from the translation; the directional correlational function is expressed by the Slovak preposition and its corresponding suffix. *Kiskút pást* → *Pri studničke* – The particle indicating the type disappears, but the denotatum is further expressed by the name with the correlational function. The Slovak *pri* preposition's Hungarian equivalent is the suffix *-nál/-nél*. *Kis utyika* → *Pri chodniku* – The main difference between the two names is not the change of the grammatical structure (two-piece → one-piece), but the appearance of a new – correlational – function. *Kutak* → *Studničky* – The meaning of the new name is expanded. The Slovak diminutive suffix refers to the size of the denotatum.

Zobor area (6): *Közép Cseralja* → *Pod cermi* the distinguishing part is not converted, just the basic part, and there several of the above mentioned converting operations appear. The Hungarian constituent *-alja* is equivalent of the Slovak preposition *pri*, and there is a difference in number as well. *Felvégi kertmegi dűlő*

→ *Na hornom konci za záhradami: (Za záhradami)* – The first part of the Hungarian name was translated through explicitation, where the suffix *-i* – with correlating function – is realized in Slovak name as the preposition *na*. In the Slovak version of *kertmegi* there is not only difference in number, but the earlier examined Hungarian constituent → Slovak preposition correspondence can be observed as well. The Hungarian particle indicating the type is not present in the Slovak name. *Csentekút* → *Tichá cesta* – The Slovak version is the result of misinterpretation, because the Hungarian name denotes a well (= *kút*) and not a road (= *út*, Slovak: *cesta*). The translator also misinterpreted the Hungarian family name *Csente*, and considered it as a form of the Hungarian adjective *csendes* (Slovak: *tichý/á*, Eng.: quiet). *Geszti hegyalja* → *Podhost'ovský kopec* – The translator converted all the parts correctly, but used wrong word order in the Slovak version. More exactly, the Hungarian correlational constituent *-alja* converted into Slovak (*pod*) is linked to the other name part. Therefore the two names are not semantically equivalent. *Tóban innen* → *Pred riekou* and *Tóban túl* → *Za riekou* – In the case of these two names we can say that there is a complete transformation, as there is no logical link between the reversed meanings. More precisely the only common feature is belonging to the same concept: both the *tó* (Eng.: lake) and the *rieka* (Hun.: *folyó*, Eng.: river) denotes natural stretches of water. However, I do not believe that the translation or the translator was so conscious. In my opinion, this is a simple mistranslation, a mistake in translation, where the translator mixed up the target language equivalents for *tó* (Slov.: *jazero*) and the *folyó* (Slov.: *rieka*).

The following “railway” names from the Ipoly area (9) are in fact not “real” geographical names. These are rather paraphrases, denominations functioning as names. In their translations almost all of the previously seen converting operations appear, e.g.: calques (Cs. *Állami vasutak Csata-Ság* → *Československé štátné železnice Čata-Šahy*), explicitation (*Hontmegyei helyi érdekű vasút Krupina-Ság* → *Hontianská župna miestná dráha vo štátnom provozu Šahy-Krupina*), etc. As they form a peculiar group, I present them separately from other place names.

Cs. *Állami vasutak Csata-Ság* → *Československé štátné železnice Čata-Šahy*, Cs. *Állami vasútak Csata-Ság* → Čs. *Štátné železnice Čata-Šahy*, Cs. *Állami vasútak Csata-Ság* → Čs. *štátné železnice Čata-Šahy / Československé štátné dráhy Šahy-Štúrovo*, Cs. *Állami vasútak Csata-Ság* → Čs. *štátné železnice Čata-Šahy-Krupina*, Čs. *állami vasútak Bratislava-Szob* → Čs. *štátné železnice Bratislava-Szob : Československé štátné dráhy Bratislava-Štútovo (Szob)*, Čs. *állami vasútak Csata-Ság* → Čs. *štátné železnice Čata-Šahy*, Čs. *állami vasútak Csata-Ság-Krupina* → Čs. *štátné železnice Čata-Šahy-Krupina*, *Hont megyei helyi érdekű vasutak Krupina-Ság* → *Hontianská župná dráha Krupina-Šahy*, *Hontmegyei helyi érdekű vasút Krupina-Ság* → *Hontianská župna miestná dráha vo štátnom provozu Šahy-Krupina*

2. Transcription

We could consider the place names of this category as loan words, if we presupposed the living name usage of the “Slovak” version. However, I do not have any data concerning this point, though I am planning to do some research in this area. As far as I know, even the topographical office concerned did not do such research that would have examined the place name usage of the Slovak inhabitants of the area. (As for the lower areas of the river Ipoly in the times when the first Slovak map was made the population of Slovak inhabitants was minimal, and it is not significant nowadays either.) In the following cases, it is transcription that is central, because it was not the factors of the usage of names that were important in the creation of the new maps, but the names “slovakization”. If the Slovak “origin” of the name could not be found, and if there were problems with the translation, they just simply transcribed the names with Slovak spelling. Several of the following names could have been translated (there are even examples in the above work, e.g.: *Berek, Irtás*).

In the corpus of the lower areas of the river Ipoly I examined 25 names in this category, which adds up to 7,41% of the converting operations: *Bajcsík* → *Bajčík*, *Bakák* → *Bakák*, *Berek* → *Berek*, *Csárad* → *Čarad*, *Csiklós* → *Čikloš*, *Dóna patak* → *Dóna potok*: *Dóna*, *Dutkás* → *Dutkáš*, *Egeres* → *Egereš*, *Hustyanka* → *Hušťanka*, *Irtás* → *Irtáš*, *Kocsárihegy* → *Kočáryhed*, *Kusztus* → *Kustuš*, *Mahér* → *Mahér*, *Matheisz* → *Matheis*, *Morotva* → *Morotva*, *Parassa* → *Parassa*, *Pleska* → *Plieška*, *Sódar* → *Šódar*, *Somosok* → *Šomoše*, *Szilva* → *Silvás*: *Silvas*⁵, *Szengyi* → *Sendi*, *Tabán* → *Tabán*, *Tábla* → *Tabla*, *Tótmál* → *Tótmal*, *Tsárad* → *Čarad*

From the Zobor area there is only one name belonging to this category, which is 0,52% as opposed to the other operations: *Heréb* → *Hrīb*.

With some names it is possible that they are the results of Slovak/Slavic naming, or their origin can be traced back to Slovak/Slavic common names (e.g.: Ipoly area: *Hustyanka* → *Hušťanka*, *Pleska* → *Plieška*; Zobor area: *Heréb* → *Hrīb*). As I have not done any research into this field, I examine them within the category of transcriptions.

5 It is interesting to note that while the Hungarian version is just a stem, the “Slovak” equivalent contains a suffix. Probably the living geographical name had an impact on translation, which is used as *Szilvás* nowadays.

3. Slovak Names Based on New Motivation

In 51 (15,13%) cases in the lower areas of the river Ipoly, and in 9 (4,76%) cases around Zobor the Slovak name of the area or landmark concerned was formed independently from the Hungarian, through different motivation. Let us see some examples:

Ipoly area: *Agyigás és Szegényvölgy* → *Slovenský dvor*, *Alsó lehen* → *Dolný odpočinok*, *Bagók* → *Viničky*, *Belső földek* → *Pri dedine*, *Belső lehen* → *Vnútorný odpočinok*, *Bencze* → *Kolíška*, *Csádék körtvélyes*: *Telkek és körtvélyes* → *Pri železnici*, *Csonka* → *Pri Ipli*, *Lucska* → *Nad vyškovskou cestou*, *Mogyorós föle* → *Rovné*, *Nagyhegy* → *Vinice*, *Németföldek* → *Nemecké zeme⁶*, *Nyüggő* → *Ilovité*, *Oldalirtvány* → *Pri Plešine*, *Proletár föld* → *Kamenec*, *Ráczok rétje* → *Lúka raczkov⁷*, *Rakottyás* → *Sklad*, *Vadalmás* → *Pivničky*, *Vadalmás* → *Plané*, *Verbokok* → *Vírbiny*, *Zakhegy* → *Žabinec*.

Zobor area: *Czéczés* → *Čerge*; *Domoczi* → *Nad Sto jarkami*; *Huntára véggel* → *Dolný háj*; *Kontrák* → *Cvičište*; *Nyárok* → *Háj horný*; *Horný háj*; *Párizsi patak* → *Hunbák*; *Urasági erdő* → *Štátne lesy*; *Zöldes part* → *Holý vrch*; *Zöldes part mögött* → *Pod Holým vrchom*.

Summary

Summing up the results, we can state that the motivation for the majority of the translations was the Hungarian name. There are only a few place names in Ipoly or Zobor area where the Slovak one was the primary name (e.g.: *Hustyan-ka* → *Hušťanka*, *Pleska* → *Plieška*). The above work also proves that the Slovak toponyms are closely linked to the Hungarian place name corpus; they are the outcomes of – beside the calques and transcriptions – such grammatical converting operations that do not cause – or just to a minimum extent – changes in meaning. The reasons for alterations are primarily the differences of the grammatical structure of the languages, and their word formation processes. New motivation appears only in small proportions: approximately 15% in the toponyms of Ipoly area; in Zobor area it barely reaches 5%.

6 We could consider this as a calque if *Német-földek* belonged to German people and not to the Német family. (Nemec = German)

7 For the translator it was not evident that Rác is a family name. However, he could know the racka breed of sheep, and the translation was formed based on the similarity of the two words.

		Lower areas of Ipoly		Zobor area	
		n	%	n	%
Calque	Calque words	136 (52,10%)*	40,35%	118 (65,92%)*	62,43%
	Change in form	80 (30,76%)*	23,73%	36 (20,11%)*	19,04%
	Change in grammatical structure	26 (9,96%)*	7,71%	17 (9,49%)*	8,99%
	Other	19 (7,27%)*	5,63%	8 (4,46%)*	4,23%
	Together	261	77,42%	179	94,69%
Transcription		25	7,41%	1	0,52%
New motivation		51	15,13%	9	4,76%
Total		337	100%	189	100%

Note: * Within calques

Table 1. Converting operations in the lower areas of Ipoly and areas around Zobor

The change of the toponym material reflects its cause as well. In this case it is the change of the official language. We can state that this change concerned particularly the official language but not the people of the Ipoly area. The proportion of the Slovak population is not numerous (With the exception of the town of Ipolyság, where the third of the population is claimed to be Slovak; and Gyerk, where the proportion of the Slovaks is about 40%), the people here use Hungarian names. In the last 90 years since the Treaty of Trianon there has been a considerable change in the composition of the population in Zobor area. Although the Slavic or Slovak population has been present in bigger or smaller amounts in the area since – or even before – the settlement of Hungarian tribes in Hungary, the hillside names examined are the results of Hungarian naming processes (with the exception of the names of some mountains and stretches of water: Tribecs, Zobor, Zsibrica, Nyitra...).

In my present paper I made observations based on the toponyms of maps from different eras and languages. The ultimate moral could be drawn after the research and comparison of the living names with the above data. As far as I am concerned, I collected living names from both places (10-12 years ago in Zobor area for my thesis work, and in 2005 in Ipoly area for my dissertation), however

I only chose Hungarian informants. It would be worth doing some research on the usage of living names that concerned the place names used by the Slovak population as well. It would turn out to what extent it agrees with the official toponyms on Slovak maps; and also that what the relationship with Hungarian names is like.

References

- Barangoló Csallóköztől Bodrogekzig* (1995): Pozsony: Terra Könyvkiadó.
- Bauko János (2004): Hegymászó útnevek a Szulyói-sziklákon. *Névtudományi Értesítő* 26. pp. 119–135.
- Bv: Birtokvázlat, 1856. [Lontó]
- N. Császi Ildikó (1997): *Nyitra környéke helynévanyagának változásai*. Budapest–Miskolc, pp. 338–341. /Magyar Nyelvtudományi Társaság Közleményei 209./
- N. Császi Ildikó (1999): A zoboralji vízmegi falvak történeti helynevei. *Névtani Értesítő*. 21. n. pp. 113–116.
- N. Császi Ildikó (2002): Nyelvjárási és államnyelvi hatások Zoboralja helyneveiben. In Szabó Géza–Molnár Zoltán–Guttman Miklós (ed.): *IV. dialektológiai szimpozion*. Szombathely, p. 201–206.
- N. Császi Ildikó (2003): Zoboralja településneveinek vizsgálata. *Névtani Értesítő* 25. n. pp. 52–57.
- N. Császi Ildikó (2006): Zoboralja földrajzi neveinek névélettana. In Vörös Ferenc (ed.): *Vallanak a neveink múltjáról és jelenéről. Magyar névtani kutatások Szlovákiában*. Budapest–Nyitra: Magyar Nyelvtudományi Társaság–Konstantin Egyetem Közép-európai Tanulmányok Kara /Magyar Nyelvtudományi Társaság Közleményei 225./
- Hajdú Mihály (2002): A magyar névkutatás helyzete. *Szőrös Kő*, 7. year. 6. issue. pp. 36–41.
- Hoffmann István (2002): A magyar névkutatás az ezredfordulón. In Hoffmann István–Juhász Dezső–Péntek János (ed.): *Előadások az V. Nemzetközi Hungarológiai Kongresszuson (Jyväskylä, 6–10 August 2001)*. Debrecen–Jyväskylä, pp. 9–22.
- Hoffmann István (2003): Magyar helynévkutatás 1958–2002. Debrecen. /Magyar Névtudományi Társaság kiadványai 7./
- Horváth Ildikó–Telekiné Nagy Ilona (2000): *Csilizköz földrajzi nevei*. Pozsony: Kalligram.
- Hönyi Ede (1970): Hogyan kerülnek a népi helymegjelölések és földrajzi nevek az államigazgatási térképekre. *Nyelvtudományi Értesítő* 70. n. Budapest, pp. 70–73.

Jankus Gyula (1988): *Az Érsekújvári járás keleti részének helynevei*. Budapest / Magyar Névtani Dolgozatok 79./

Jankus Gyula (1994): *A lévai járás (Dél-Szlovákia) hét községének helynevei*. Budapest. /Magyar Névtani Dolgozatok 132./

Juhász Dezső (1988): A magyar tájnévadás. *Nyelvtudományi Értesítő* 126., Budapest.

Király Lajos (1970): A hivatalos névadó tevékenység hatása földrajzi neveink életére. *Nyelvtudományi Értesítő* 70. n. pp. 70–73.

Kiss Lajos (1986): Magyar–szlovák helységnév-magyarázatok. *Magyar Nyelvőr* 110. pp. 489–99.

Klaudy Kinga (1999): Az explicitációs hipotézisről. *Fordítástudomány*, 1. year., 2. issue.

Klaudy Kinga (2002a): *Bevezetés a fordítás elméletébe*. Budapest: Scholastica.

Klaudy Kinga (2002b): *Bevezetés a fordítás gyakorlatába*. Budapest: Scholastica.

Kniezsa István (2003): *Helynév- és családnévvizsgálatok*. Budapest: Lucidus.

Kontra Miklós (ed.) (1991): *Tanulmányok a határon túli kétnyelvűségről*. Budapest: Magyarságkutató Intézet. /A magyarságkutató könyvtára, 11./

Kulcsár Aranka (2005): Helységnévi kódváltások az Új Szó című napilapban. In Lanstyák István–Menyhárt József (ed.): *Tanulmányok a kétnyelvűségről III*. Pozsony: Kalligram.

Lanstyák István (2000): *A magyar nyelv Szlovákiában*. Budapest–Pozsony: Osiris–MTA Kisebbségkutató Műhely–Kalligram.

K1: Mappa terrenum possessionis Lonto I: Comitatus Hontensi Ingremitatae inter dominos terrestres proportionaliter subdivisum repraesentans, 1824.

K2: Térképe Lonthó Tagosított Határának. Felmérte: Belcsák Károly mérnök, 1852.

Luttere, Ivan–Kropáček, Luboš–Huňáček, Václav (1976): *Původ zeměpisných jmen*. Praha: Mladá fronta.

Majtán, Milan (1972): *Názvy obcí na Slovensku za ostatných dvesto rokov*. Bratislava: Vydavateľstvo Slovenskej akadémie vied.

Mező András (1982): *A magyar hivatalos helységnévadás*. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.

Pesty (1984): *Pesty Frigyes kéziratok helynévtárából. Hont vármegye és kiegészítések*. Szentendre, 1984.

Sándor Anna (2000): *Anyanyelvhasználat és kétnyelvűség egy kisebbségi magyar beszélőközösségben, Kolonban*. Pozsony: Kalligram Könyvkiadó.

Szabómihály Gizella (1998): A nyelvhasználat törvényi szabályozása és a szlovákia magyar nyelvvaltozatok jellemzői (Cseh)Szlovákiában 1918–1998 között. In Filep Tamás Gusztáv–Tóth László (ed.): *A (Cseh)szlovákiai magyar művelődés története 1918–1998*. 1. vol. Budapest: Ister, pp. 132–197.

Telekiné Nagy Ilona (1993): A Galántai járás víznevei. *Hungarológia* 3., Budapest: Nemzetközi Hungarológiai Központ, pp. 299–303.

Telekiné Nagy Ilona (1994): *Terbeléd földrajzi nevei*. Nyitra. /Anyanyelvi Füzetek/

Török Tamás (2002a): *Zoboralja földrajzi nevei a történeti térképek tükrében*. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.

Török Tamás (2002b): Zoboralja magyar helynevei szlovák térképeken. In Gréczi-Zsoldos Enikő–Kovács Mária (ed.): *Köszöntő kötet B. Gergely Piroska tiszteletére*. Miskolc, pp. 190–194. /A Miskolci Egyetem Magyar Nyelvtudományi Tanszékének Kiadványai, 1./

Török Tamás (2002c): Zoboralja történeti helyneveinek vizsgálata. In *Fórum Társadalomtudományi Szemle* 2002/1, Somorja–Dunaszerdahely: Fórum Kisebbségkutató Intézet–Lilium Aurum, pp. 107–123.

Török Tamás 2005. Tipológiai vizsgálatok Ipoly mente helynevei körében. In Vörös Ferenc (ed.): *Regionális dialektusok, kisebbségi nyelvhasználat*. MNyTK. 224. issue. Budapest–Nyitra–Somorja, Magyar Nyelvtudományi Társaság–Konstantin Egyetem Közép-európai Tanulmányok Kara–Fórum Kisebbségkutató Intézet–Lilium Aurum, pp. 153–160.

Török Tamás (2006): Ipoly mente tulajdonneveinek szlovák változatai. In Vörös Ferenc (ed.): *Vallanak a neveink múltjáról és jelenéről. Magyar névtani kutatások Szlovákiában*. MNyTK. 225. issue. Budapest–Nyitra: Magyar Nyelvtudományi Társaság–Konstantin Egyetem Közép-európai Tanulmányok Kara, pp. 83–95.

Török Tamás (2009): O slovenských variantoch toponým ipelského regiónu. *Fórum Spoločenskovedná revue*, 11. year. 5. issue. pp. 157–174.

Vörös Ferenc (2004): Névpolitika a Felvidéken. In Glatz Ferenc (ed.): *A magyar nyelvi kultúra jelene és jövője*. 1. vol. Budapest: MTA Társadalomkutató Központ, pp. 367–381.

Vörös Ferenc (2006): Helynévkutatás a Felvidéken. In Vörös Ferenc (ed.): *Vallanak a neveink múltjáról és jelenéről. Magyar névtani kutatások Szlovákiában*. MNyTK. 225. issue. Budapest–Nyitra: Magyar Nyelvtudományi Társaság–Konstantin Egyetem Közép-európai Tanulmányok Kara, p. 27–61.

Vörös Ottó (2006): Regionalizmusok és archaizmusok szlovákiai magyar vízrajzi köznevekben. In Vörös Ferenc (ed.): *Vallanak a neveink múltjáról és jelenéről. Magyar névtani kutatások Szlovákiában*. MNyTK. 225. issue. Budapest–Nyitra: Magyar Nyelvtudományi Társaság–Konstantin Egyetem Közép-európai Tanulmányok Kara, pp. 62–70.

VSOS. : *Vlastivedný slovník obcí na Slovensku 1977–1978*. 1–3. zv. Bratislava.