

Eötvös Loránd University Faculty of Humanities

**THESES OF THE DOCTORAL DISSERTATION**

**MAGDALENA KISS**

**NAME TAXONOMIC ANALYSIS**

**OF THE KÖRÖS RIVERS BASIN**

Doctoral School of Linguistics, leader: Dr. Vilmos  
Bárdosi CSc

Hungarian Linguistics Program, leader: Dr. Gábor  
Tolcsvai Nagy DSc

Members of the Committee:

Chairman: Dr. Jenő Kiss DSc., prof. emer.

Rewievers: Dr. Andrea Bölcskei and Dr. Rudolf  
Szentgyörgyi

Other Members: Dr. Erzsébet Zelliger CSc, Dr. Klára  
Korompay CSc and Dr. Erzsébet Gyórfy PhD (alternate  
members)

Supervisor: Dr. Juhász Dezső CSc

Budapest, 2014

## **1. Defining the topic and the objectives of the dissertation**

The **main aim** of this essay is to analyse the hydronym naming of the Körös Rivers basin according to the HOFFMANN name taxonomic research. In the typologic analysis I differentiate between the Hungarian and Romanian names, and after translating the latter ones I analyse them etymologically the same way as the Hungarian names, and at the end of the descriptive parts I compare the test results of the names from two different language layers.

This functional-semantic analysis incorporates more than two thousand river names and offers results which are essential for the historical and contemporary linguistics, since they paint a reliable picture of the changes in language in the light of hydronyms. Because of the vast expanse – 27.000 m<sup>2</sup> – of this territory I only deal with the group of river names, thereby we can obtain an overall picture of the naming activity of this area's people, which activity is basically centred on the Hungarian and Romanian languages. A number of studies have been published about hydronyms in the Hungarian and international bibliography, presenting the onomastic systems of greater or smaller streams, but – as I know – this kind of summary about a river basin that connects two countries and have analyzed all of its hydronyms which can be found in data storages or on maps has never came out. It is well known that place names have got a significant role in knowing the history of the Hungarian language, as both early and contemporary hydronyms in a foreign language environment give a picture of the status of the written Hungarian language and their constant changing reveals

the changes of the whole language on its own way. Therefore a systematic examination of these names gives chance for general deductions by the monographic analysis of the names of the territory. Choosing the Körös Rivers basin is justified by the fact that due to its large extension it has a large variety of geographical conditions; however, it is very rich in its hydronym collection and its population has many ethnicities.

## **2. The method and the aspects of analysis**

I have examined the Körös Rivers basin hydronyms based on the given resources, and the time limit of this analysis was from the old Hungarian times till the 21<sup>st</sup> century. First I have accommodated the data base and the map resources, and then I have localized and interpreted them – in many cases just after translating the Romanian hydronyms into Hungarian. Basically I have used three types of resources: geographic descriptions (the works of HUNFALVY, HAÁN and KORBÉLY), historical geography of GYÖRFFY, data bases (HA. 1–3., PESTY and the ETH. 3., 10. and 11.), and I have looked through various dictionaries and maps (EKFT., MKFT., HKFT., Huszár-map, EOTR. etc.).

After the historical research I outline the possible interpretations of the basic hydronym elements which have a reliable base, the areal linguistic analysis. This method points out the similarities and differences between historical and linguistic layers of hydrographic common names.

This essay consists of two parts: the analytic and the other one is the collection of the analyzed names. The first part consists of five bigger sections of which the first chapter is about the history of the hydronyms' research from the early works till nowadays. In the second chapter I present the possible interpretations of these hydrographic common names, lining up the analyzed river basin's common names, as well as their characteristics, and the historical and language layers of these names. The third chapter deals with the typological overview of hydronyms, presenting the relevant analytical possibilities. The next chapter includes the functional-

semantic analysis of the Körös River basin's Hungarian and Romanian hydronyms according to structural and etymological aspects. Finally, the fifth and last chapter summarises the results of this examination and shows it on various diagrams.

The Appendix - the second part of the dissertation - includes the list of the base hydronyms which had been analyzed and their identifications on the map. Among these lists there are some which orders all the hydronyms according to their flowing with a map number, separate the Hungarian and Romanian (with a minimal number of German) names in alphabetic order. Interpretations of hydrographic common names can be found in the dictionary appendix then the Data base. Additionally the dissertation has a Data base and a map appendix on CD.

### **3. New scientific results of the dissertation**

By the functional-semantic analysis of the Körös River basin's hydronyms we can trace the connections, territorial and temporal differences, changes of the Hungarian place name system.

On account of the basin's boundary role we can have an overall picture about the name giving activities of this territory's people, which is basically grouped around the Hungarian and Romanian languages. During my work I have used several data bases and map resources along with the Hungarian and international hydronym researches in order to fulfill my assumed object. Surveying the research works about hydronyms we can observe a characterizing process: in the beginning we could choose hydronyms only from data base and macrotoponymic summaries, however from the mid 20th century, when microtoponymic researches came into light, claims raised to study hydronyms. Since the cartographic identification of hydronyms is primarily attached to maps, during my research I have left the county/administrative partitions out of account in order to reach the influx from the wells of minor or greater rivers, from East to West and from North to South. It is noticeable in this collection of names that in case of minor rivers' names, they are more variable (BENKŐ 1947a: 22) and connected to personal names on a high rate which can be explained with possession claims. Further researches

show that in case of Hungarian and Romanian anthroponyms the latter ones are more common and among these we can find many adaptations (ex. *Zsiga* anthroponym > *Jighi* ‘belongs to Zsiga’). Furthermore in the case of hydronyms with Slavonic personal names in them - which can be found in a less amount - the next order is likely: anthroponym > settlement name > hydronym (ex. *Kémer anthr.* > *Kémer* settl. > *Kémer-patak hydr.*).

In the second part of the dissertation I present the possible ways to interpret **hydrographic common names**, listing the analyzed basin's common names, as well as their characteristics, historical and etymological layers. After these language usage related questions, we get an insight view on the special role of the name giving affects of semantical and morphological characteristics. We can follow up the connection between historical and linguistic layers in the physiology of common name forms. Hydronyms have been exposed to various ethnic effects which have left distinctive marks on the name collection, however, changes in the language has also characterized the hydrographic common names (eg, certain names’ meanings are not clear any more). The list in the appendix contains the living and the extinct Hungarian and Romanian name forms of the Körös river basin’s name collection.

The third part provides a **typological overview** of hydronyms and shows the relevant sorting options. Over the decades, various tasks emerged by categorizations which have been illuminated by different perspectives by linguists. Currently, from all the place name typological models HOFFMANN ISTVAN’S analyzing system counts as the most accepted.

The next chapter includes the name taxonomic analysis of the Hungarian and Romanian hydronyms of the Körös River basin from a structural and etymological point of view. 20% of the Hungarian hydronyms are monomial, and 80% is made up of binominal names. Hungarian monomials are usually marked by an –s suffix (means: supplied with something) or by a continuous adjectival participle or an infinitive affix. 60% of the Romanian hydronyms are monomial and there are also suffixes, mostly diminutive ones, but metonymic takeover of settlement names is also a method in creating names,

however the backlog of hydrographic common noun is very specific; furthermore, there is a significant number of Hungarians adaptations as well (Hun. *Kis-tag* > Rom. *Chiștag*, Hun. *Keszend* > Rom. *Chisindia*), which reveal the former Hungarian name or partial name compositions.

By the three-level structural analysis it can be seen that basically what kind of semantic and formal tools are involved in the hydronym name giving process of the Körös River basin, and the interaction among them. During the semantic-functional analysis I separated the monomial and binominal names, presenting a separate role for each name part. Based on the determination of these name parts they can be divided into three groups: parts with type marker, specifying and with name giving function. In the case of word combinations, a specifying name part usually associates to the type marker element (S+T: *Nagy-ér*, *Kertes-patak* or a part with naming role (N+T: *Tusza pataka*, *Körös-ér*), but rarely it is likely to happen that the naming part later gets involved in a specifying name part (S+N: *Sebes-Körös*, *Fehér-Körös*).

On the level of name taxonomic analysis we separated the functional-semantic, the lexical morphological and the syntagmatic structures (see KISS M. 2012a: 82). The first, **functional-semantic categorization** offers several options, depending on what does an analyzed name part denotes: type (T), specificity (S), or gives name to a place (N). The majority of the collection is of course made by word combinations, so the above categorizations are grouped as follows: S+T, N+T, S+N. Such classification is not always easy to perform (eg, hydrographic common noun is dying), but if the data set is analyzed on linguistic level, we can see how the meaning of the creek's name changes in the second language, and at the same time how it shifts from one functional category to another (eg, Hun. *Hollód* > Rom. *Holod*; Hun. S > Rom. N). The summary shows that from the three main semantic characteristics the naming parts appear most often (12.6%) and right after that comes the ones with specifying characteristics (10.8%), while the type marking name parts shows 1.8% of the whole toponymy, so in the case of more than two thousand lexemes, this latter amount is at least 40 data. Word combinations were found with the largest difference between the

Hungarian and Romanian hydronym set. The functional relationship between specifying and type marker parts (67.3%) are the most common in Hungarian hydronyms (46.1%), while the Romanian data do not reach the half of that rate (21.2%). The reason for this is in the Romanian naming function rate where the Hungarian data are only 2.3% while the Romanian hydronyms are 10.3%. This is explained by the fact that the Romanian language during the takeover of the binominal Hungarian names it counts them as monominal hydronyms, this way their taxonomic structure change as follows: Hun. S+T > Rom. N (eg, Kis-ér > Chișer, Budi-ér > Budieru, Jakab-ér > Iacober, Vár vize > Varvizel). This is the most common procedure but in the case of monominal Hungarian names similar semantic change is also possible where the specifying or type marker Hungarian name getting into the Romanian language earns naming function (eg, Közép > Cuzap, Patak > Potoc). To fit into a host language a foreign name often gets a common noun suffix which facilitates the identification of the object (eg, Hun. Száraz-ág > Rom. Zărzag > Rom. Valea Zărzagului).

While in the previous section we examined the semantic categories, during the **lexical-morphological analysis** we examine the name forming role of the stem and the affix morphemes. The lexical-morphological analysis examines the type and ratio combination of the linguistic means of expression. Word and word structures Distribution of participants (common name, personal name, place name, a group of words with adjectival nature, number name) in naming have got the highest proportion in the section of place names (32%), which proves that mountain, forest, settlement names, and further microtoponyms greatly influenced the formation of hydronyms.

The examined denominatum group is divided into mono- and binominal names, followed by further categories. Among the monominal names there are some which contain marked and unmarked lexemes, based on their substantial (common and proper

nouns) or adjective characteristics, and according to word structures. Monominal names with suffixes are usually originated by plant names, furthermore they can be found among Hungarian and Romanian zoonyms, material or construction names as well. The lexical-morphological structure of binominal hydronyms can be divided into two further groups: prefix and suffix, adjunctive and base part. Based on principle part we primarily interpret and group hydrographic common names, presenting the results of the hydrographic analysis, which highlights the spread of the most commonly occurring common names (eg, brook, stream, flow) in the region. The examined main part can be an proper name which instead of adding a new name to an affluent, it only integrates one of the more significant river's name by an adjunct (eg, Hun. *Anya-*, *Ásott-*, *Fehér-*, *Fekete-*, *Hármas-*, *Kettős-*, *Kis-*, *Középső-*, *Nagy-*, *Petrósz-*, *Rossz-*, *Váradi-Körös*; Rom. *Crișul Pietros*, *Crișul Poienii*). The prefix structure of binominal hydronyms show greater diversity compared to suffix structures, in which the adjective prefixes (size, shape, colour, temperature, age, status, smell, taste of the water) as well as words created by deverbial and denominal suffixes name the movement and the speed of flow of the water. Beside these water characterizing lexemes there are some other motivational aspects such as names of peoples (Czech, Russian, Serbian; Hungarian, Székely, Kun, Pechenegs; Saxon; Jewish; Gypsy; Romanian), as well as profession, proper and material names, however we can follow up the separation of backwaters in hydronyms containing cardinal numbers (*Két-ér*, *Kettős-patak*; *Hármas-Körös*). In the word structures, or collocations usually the ones with quality markers appear in the Hungarian Körös hydronyms, and adverbial syntagmas are more likely in the Romanian name collection. At the end of the subsection we can follow the patterns of parts of speech and word structures of the Hungarian and Romanian names finding that the ratio of place names shows the greatest difference between the two linguistic layers.

The **syntagmatic analysis** reveals the syntactic relationship between name parts in the structure of phrases. According to the HOFFMANN classification we have distinguished subordinate (adjectival and adverbial), and co-ordinating structures. Comparing the adjectival and adverbial word structures it was found that 87% of

the names which are made by syntagmatic structuring are adjectival, where the difference between Hungarian and Romanian words are not considerable, in contrast with the low ratio of adverbial structures (13%), of which a great amount is in the Romanian name collection. Names created by syntagmatic editing can be characterized on the basis of ideas in the previous section, highlight that attributive structures dominate more. In the creation of morphem(at)ic compositions place name suffixes play an important role, so the great amount and flexibility of derivational options can be observed primarily with the *-s, -d, -ó/-ő*, secondly, the *-gy, -cs, -ás/-és* and *-i* name creating suffixes. In contrast to the elements of the formative system, in the case of the examined names hydronyms with nominal sign, adverbial inflection or with postpositions occur less frequently.

By the **etymological analysis** we can monitor the operation of the linguistic rules that activate when a name is formed. The inner and outer naming levels of word formation include on the one hand, syntagmatic, morphematic, semantic and structural changes, and on the other hand names formed by borrowing.

In contrast to the structural change the semantic naming does not follow the development of nameform, but that progress during which the language uses the existing elements to create a new word so the forming of the new meaning takes place without changing the structure. The linguistic tools for this are the semantic splitting (eg, *ér* hydrographic common name > *Ér* hydronym), semantic expansion (*Érmellék* does not only mean the river basin of *Ér*, but also certain territories of the *Kraszna*), semantic contraction, name transfer (in this case metonymy) and name removal (eg, *Küsmöd*). From these categories in the group of name transfer, metonymy has a special role in the process of naming, since hydronyms can be created by plant, animal, proper, building or by relief names, however, a hydronym can be a basis for naming a settlement (KISS M. 2010b: 83) or a territory (eg, *Kalota*). We can follow up the separation of names created by structural changes in HOFFMANN's system, where adding a name part means complementation, and adding a name element means expansion/broadening, taking away a name part means ellipse, and taking away a name element means reduction. These changes are specially characterize the hydronyms of the Körös Rivers basin,

where in the Romanian names the ellipse appears more frequently, while in the Hungarian name collection hydronyms created from settlement names by metonymy are more current. In the course of de-etymologization the functional-semantic and lexical-morphological structures of names become blur (*Hejő*, *Berettyó* etc.). The interpretation of these structures requires a linguistic historical analysis but a similar process is needed to unravel the people etymological names (eg, *Vérsorog*).

In the course of name transfer usually the names of greater rivers were recorded in the hydronyms of the Körös rivers basin. These exonyms can be embedded in different ways to the new place name system: with or without sound shape change, furthermore we can list here the cases of parallel place name transmissions. 61% of the hydronyms of the Körös rivers basin are Hungarian, the rest are divided into Romanian and other origins (eg, Slavic) with insignificant rate of data. Although, the Romanian name substance have a great amount of Hungarian borrowings, but the territorial distribution of Hungarian and Romanian names show the expansion of the Romanian data going from North to South, which culminates in the right hand side hydronym ratio of the River *Fekete-Körös*, while this data reaches the lowest level on the right hand side of *Ér*.

The **historical stratification of name borrowing** can be surveyed through a detailed chronological presentation of the hydronym substance of the *Ér* region, thus, we can witness the genesis and changes of hydronyms throughout the historical times. Though hydronyms with Slavic origin also appears in the territory of the Körös Rivers basin, we primarily deal with the distribution of Hungarian and Romanian names.

As a final conclusion, we can say that hydronyms of the Körös Rivers basin show a very colourful picture. As for the etymology of the participating lexemes, the origin of the names of the main branch – due to its ancient origin – cannot be derived as definitely as the other smaller section names. The names of the significant tributary streams of the three arms of River Körös are mainly originates from the Hungarian language, and only in four cases we can count with Slavic hydronyms, while minor stream names contain Hungarian,

Romanian and Slavic name elements as well. With the development of later name variations escalated the name substance, since in many cases the Romanian users have adopted the Hungarian names, i.e. they have borrowed or translated it without any changes. Collecting, collating and locating these names were not always smooth, furthermore the classification of these mono- or binominal hydronyms in one language according to descriptive or etymological aspects also made the procedure difficult. This has also made me to separate the Hungarian and Romanian names, to present and compare the result of my analysis in parallel to each other. The final results show that Hungarian names constantly lose ground and this tendency is directly proportional to the rarefaction and assimilation of the Hungarian people. It would greatly help the scientific research, if there were a modern, up to date and thorough sociolinguistics place name collection available to us.

The simultaneously analyzed name collection raises issues that concern both the Hungarian and the Romanian specifics of (water) name giving, but the thesis is far from fully exploit the offered scientific possibilities since the detailing would go beyond our content limitations. However, from a name physiological point of view it is important to see this region's people of the spatial and temporal location, movement, and their changing role in the naming process. During the analysis it has been shown that the ethnic composition of this region fundamentally influenced the development of every name type thus the hydronyms as well. The enumeration of these external factors affects several areas of science, as involving historical, geographical, social historical and ethnographical results of research many uncertainties can be filtered out.

The name taxonomic analysis only covers the genesis history in the case of the Romanian names. I have also made etymological analyses among the hydronyms of Rivers *Ér* and *Berettyó*, where next to the very few Slavic data the contrastive analysis of the Hungarian and Romanian forms has well exemplified the interaction of the two languages. In the historical introduction part of the second chapter of my work I have presented the scientific studies of the topic, but about linguistic interaction we can find just a few works, and in the Romanian literature - as I know it - no one has ever tried

to present parallel a bilingual region, thus this analysis hopefully can be a starting point for a similar analysis.

In my work - beyond the name taxonomic analysis - I tried to get a brief look at new perspectives that will take on the research according to different new aspects.

## Bibliography

- BENKŐ LORÁND 1947a. A Nyárádmente földrajzinevei. Magyar Nyelvtudományi Társaság Kiadványai 74., Budapest. [Második kiadás: MNyTK. 217. Budapest. 2001.]
- EKFT. = Az első katonai felmérés. A Magyar Királyság teljes területe 965 nagyfelbontású színes térképszelvényen. 1782–85. 1:28.800. Arcanum Adatbázis Kft. DVD. 2004.
- EOTR = Egységes országos térképrendszer az ország területéről 1:10.000. HM Térképészeti Közhasznú Társaság. 1978. (48-111, 48-122, 48-212; 49-111; 69-111).
- GYÖRFFY GYÖRGY 1963–1998. Az Árpád-kori Magyarország történeti földrajza 1–4. Akadémiai Kiadó, Budapest.
- GyMSMFN. = Győr-Moson-Sopron megye földrajzi nevei. 1. A Kapuvári járás. Közzétette HEGEDŰS ATTILA. Szerk. BALOGH LAJOS – ÖRDÖG FERENC. Apáczai Csere János Tanítóképző Főiskola, Győr, 1998. 2. A Győri járás. Közzétette ÁBRAHÁM IMRE – UNTI MÁRIA. Szerk. UNTI MÁRIA – VARGA JÓZSEFNÉ. Nyugat-magyarországi Egyetem Apáczai Csere János Kar, Győr, 2009.
- HA. 1. = Helynévtörténeti adatok a korai ómagyar korból. 1. Abaúj–Csongrád vármegye. Közzéteszi: HOFFMANN ISTVÁN – RÁCZ ANITA – TÓTH VALÉRIA. (A Magyar Névértéktár Kiadványai 1.) KLTE Magyar Nyelvtudományi Tanszék, Debrecen, 1997. [Elektronikus elérhetőség: <http://mek.oszk.hu/01600/01694/>.]
- HA. 2. = Helynévtörténeti adatok a korai ómagyar korból. 2. Doboka–Győr vármegye. Közzéteszi: HOFFMANN ISTVÁN – RÁCZ ANITA – TÓTH VALÉRIA. (A Magyar Névértéktár Kiadványai 3.) KLTE Magyar Nyelvtudományi Tanszék, Debrecen, 1999. [Elektronikus elérhetőség: <http://mek.oszk.hu/01600/01696/>.]
- HA. 3. = Helynévtörténeti adatok a korai ómagyar korból. 3. Heves–Küküllő vármegye. Közzéteszi: HOFFMANN ISTVÁN – RÁCZ ANITA – TÓTH VALÉRIA. A Magyar Névértéktár Kiadványai 25., Debreceni Egyetem Magyar Nyelvtudományi Tanszék, Debrecen, 2012.
- HAÁN LAJOS 1870. Békés vármegye hajdana 1–2., Pest.

- HKFT. = Harmadik katonai felmérés 1869–1887. A Magyar Szent Korona Országai 1: 75.000. Arcanum Adatbázis Kft. Budapest, 2007. DVD.
- HOFFMANN ISTVÁN 2007. Helynevek nyelvi elemzése. Segédkönyvek a nyelvészet tanulmányozásához 67. Tinta Kiadó. Debrecen. Második kiadás.
- HOFFMANN ISTVÁN 1999. A helynevek rendszerének nyelvi leírásához. MNyj. 37: 207–16.
- HUNFALVY JÁNOS 1863. A Magyar Birodalom természeti viszonyainak leírása. 1–3. Emich Gusztáv Magyar Akad. Nyomdásznál. Pest. 2. kötet. 385–415.
- HUSZÁR = HUSZÁR MÁTYÁS A Tisza Tokaj–Szeged szakaszának, valamint a Berettyó, a Körösök, a Hortobágy folyóknak felmérése és szabályozási terve 1823. (68 db 1 : 36.000-es méretarányú térképlap, lelőhely: MOL S80 0039.01.10–0039.01.41-50.).
- KISS MAGDALÉNA 2010b. Bihar megye víz- és településneveink lexikái kapcsolata. In: Félúton 5., Az ELTE BTK Nyelvtudományi Doktori Iskolájának konferencia-kötete. Budapest 83–95.
- KISS MAGDALÉNA 2012a. A Körösök magyar vízneveinek funkcionális-szemantikai elemzése. In: Helynévtörténeti tanulmányok. 8. Szerk. HOFFMANN ISTVÁN – TÓTH VALÉRIA. Debrecen, Debreceni Egyetem Magyar Nyelvtudományi Tanszék. 81–99.
- KORBÉLY JÓZSEF 1901. Bihar vármegye hegy- és vízrajza. In: Bihar vármegye és Nagyvárad. Szerk. BOROVSZKY SAMU. Budapest.
- MKFT. = A második katonai felmérés. A Magyar királyság és a Temesi bánóság nagyfelbontású, színes térképei. 1819–69. Arcanum Adatbázis Kft. Budapest, 2005. DVD.
- PESTY, Arad = Pesty Frigyes kéziratot helynévtára, 1864. Arad vármegye. 2. mikrofilm. (OSZK, Kézirattár).
- PESTY, Békés = Pesty Frigyes kéziratot helynévtára, 1864. Békés vármegye. Közzéteszi: JANKOVICH B. DÉNES és HÉVVÍZI SÁNDOR. Békéscsaba. 1983.
- PESTY, Bihar = Pesty Frigyes, Bihar vármegye I–II. Közzéteszi: HOFFMANN ISTVÁN – KIS TAMÁS 1996, 1998. A Debreceni Egyetem Magyar Nyelvtudományi Intézetének Kiadványai 65. Debrecen.

## **Publications with reference to the topic of the dissertation**

### **Publications**

1. BUBOLY<sup>1</sup> MAGDOLNA 2004. Kémer (Szilágy megye) helynevei. Magyar Névtani Dolgozatok 187. Budapest. Kiadta az ELTE Magyar Nyelvtudományi [és Finnugor] Intézet Névkuató Munkaközössége.

### **Revised studies**

1. KISS MAGDALÉNA 2010a. Bihar megye víz- és településneveink lexikai kapcsolata. In: Félúton 5., Az ELTE BTK Nyelvtudományi Doktori Iskolájának konferencia-kötete. Bp. 83–95.
2. KISS MAGDALÉNA 2010b. A Küsmöd víznév etimológiai vizsgálata. In: Helynévtörténeti tanulmányok 5. Szerk. HOFFMANN ISTVÁN – TÓTH VALÉRIA Debrecen. 151–5.
3. KISS MAGDALÉNA 2012a. A Körösök magyar vízneveinek funkcionális-szemantikai elemzése. In: Helynévtörténeti tanulmányok 8. Szerk. HOFFMANN ISTVÁN – TÓTH VALÉRIA Debrecen. 81–99.
4. KISS MAGDALÉNA 2012b. Nyelvi érintkezések az Érmellék területén a víznevek tükrében. Névtani Értesítő 34. 93–100.
5. KISS MAGDALÉNA 2014. A Körösök magyar vízneveinek lexikális-morfológiai elemzése In: Helynévtörténeti tanulmányok. Szerk. HOFFMANN ISTVÁN – TÓTH VALÉRIA Debrecen. (megjelenés alatt).

---

<sup>1</sup> Kiss Magdaléna született Buboly Magdolna

## Foreign language revised studies

1. KISS, MAGDALENA 2009. Toponimele românești în culegerile lui Frigyes Pesty și Attila Szabó T. In: *Lucrările celui de al doilea Simpozion Internațional de Lingvistică*. Szerk. NICOLAE SARAMANDRU – MANUELA NEVACI. Bukarest. Editura Universității din București. 107–13.
2. KISS, MAGDALENA 2013. Analiza funcțional-semantică a hidronimelor române din bazinul Crișurilor. In: „Name and Naming” *Onomastics is Contemporary Public Space (ICONN 2013)*. Szerk.: OLIVIU FELECAN. Editura Mega, Editura Argonaut. Baia Mare. 329–38.

## Other articles, editions

1. KISS MAGDALÉNA 2011. Víz- és helységnevek viszonya néhány Bihar megyei településben. In: BÁRTH M. JÁNOS – TÓTH ÁLMOS szerk.: *Karszt, történelem, helynevek. Köszöntők és tanulmányok a 88 éves Dénes György tiszteletére*. Budapest. Meteor Természetbarátok Turista Egyesülete. 227–30.
2. ETH. 5. = Szabó T. Attila Erdélyi történeti helynévgyűjtése 5. Torda-Aranyos megye. SZABÓ T. ATTILA kéziratok gyűjtéséből közlésezi HAJDÚ MIHÁLY, BUBOLY MAGDOLNA és SEBESTYÉN ZSOLT. Bp., 2004.
3. ETH. 11. = Szabó T. Attila Erdélyi történeti helynévgyűjtése 11. Erdély peremvidéke. SZABÓ T. ATTILA kéziratok gyűjtéséből közlésezi HAJDÚ MIHÁLY, BUBOLY MAGDOLNA és BÁRTH M. JÁNOS. Bp., 2010.