SUMMARY OF DOCTORAL DISSERTATION

Rudolf Szentgyörgyi

The Deed of Foundation of the Abbey of Tihany
as a source for Hungarian historical linguistics

Budapest
2010

# I. The topic of the dissertation and its topicality

The present dissertation approaches *The Deed of Foundation of the Abbey of Tihany* as a source of historical linguistics, and offers a multi-dimensional linguistic analysis of the document that makes such an approach possible.

At first sight, the question obviously presents itself whether it is necessary, or indeed possible, to say anything new about that distinguished document of Old Hungarian, to add anything worthwhile to its historiography, going back to over a century.

In the past five years, after the 950th anniversary of the foundation of the abbey, research on the Deed of Foundation has inflamed: papers by ERZSÉBET ZELLIGER, KATALIN FEHÉRTÓI, ISTVÁN HOFFMANN, DEZSŐ JUHÁSZ, LÁSZLÓ HOLLER, as well as, in neighbouring disciplines, by GÉZA ÉRSZEGI, FERENC PITI, and PÉTER TÓTH, show that it is possible, and even necessary, to add new insights to our existing knowledge.

On the other hand, a number of conferences, talks, and other professional forums testify that this topic is permanently intriguing and incessantly popular; hence, we are right in feeling that The Deed of Foundation of the Abbey of Tihany (DFAT) is our shared treasure, it "has something to do" with every one of us. Therefore, it is not merely a possibility but also our duty to explore everything that might enrich our knowledge of that shared treasure.

Furthermore, this document is a favourite source used in alternative research on the linguistic affinity of Hungarian with other languages (cf. recent works by ELEMÉR NOVOTNY, BÉLA SZÉNA, TIBOR VASVÁRY-TÓTH, etc.), thus we have a fundamental professional responsibility for describing the Hungarian fragments of DFAT as thoroughly and as reliably as we possibly can.

Finally, it is a debt of honour of Hungarian historical linguistics to present a historical synchronic description of the language of the Árpádian Age, an outstanding source of which is DFAT. This has been done with respect to some individual subsystems, but the results are to be revised and completed in the light of more recent research and they also have to be extended, especially with respect to higher linguistic levels. In addition, it would also be desirable to involve other disciplines of historical linguistics (like a historical investigation of linguistic contact effects and bilingualism, historical psycholinguistics, etc.) in the research on our early language documents.

# II. The aims of the dissertation

This dissertation is not meant to enter into competition either with the earlier monograph of GÉZA BÁRCZI (1951), or with more recent monographs by ERZSÉBET ZELLIGER (2005) and ISTVÁN HOFFMANN (2010), either in terms of genre, or in terms of coverage. It does not aim at totality, not even a relative one, or at providing a definitive mine of systematised knowledge. The individual chapters of the present work, arranged along a certain logic and closely interrelated with one another but mainly also interpretable as stand-alone papers, formulate novel assumptions and proposals with respect to certain (primarily methodological or micro-philological) problem areas and try to find solutions to hitherto unanswered questions. Yet

this dissertation is also more than a thematic string of papers: the author tries to draw general conclusions that are based on the concrete case studies but have a significance beyond them.

The most important aim of the dissertation is the preparation of the linguistic material of DFAT (or the beginning of such a preparation) for a future historical synchronic description of the Hungarian of the Árpádian Age inasmuch as it is made possible by extant documents.

To meet that end, the first thing to do was to make the text of DFAT accessible for historical linguistic research by selecting and employing the appropriate manner of transcription and by writing a Hungarian translation of the full text.

In the next step, relying on certain tools of a historical sociolinguistic approach, I studied the language, the linguistic background ("officialese", bilingualism, the relationship between spoken and written language), the style, and eventually the authorship of DFAT. The latter task was made necessary by the fact that linguistic data recorded by a native or a non-native writer are inevitably different in their evaluation. I think that the exploration of the "linguistic environment" is doubtlessly an important component of a better understanding of the Hungarian material of the document.

In the longest chapter of the dissertation, I have undertaken the exploration and evaluation of the linguistic material in the strict sense, with a thorough analysis of selected occurrences of place names and their contexts within the text of DFAT, focusing on their etymology and identification where possible, complemented by some general methodological considerations. The reason why the items I selected for analysis were place names is that they seemed to allow for a variety of diverse and comprehensive linguistic approaches (concerning, e.g., the manner they are made to fit into the syntactic structure of sentences within the text of DFAT), even though a similarly detailed study of the stock of personal names in the document, unduly neglected as they are, would also be an urgent task, but one that is beyond the scope of the present dissertation. In fact, I even had to be selective with respect to the occurring place names, too, given that my aim was not a full description of the complete material. Analyses of particular occurrences and their contexts are only included where I thought I could add something essential to the research results available so far. Such essential additions are variegated: they include novel ideas, confirmations of earlier pieces of knowledge, evidence supporting earlier hypotheses, or indeed new light thrown on issues that had been considered as closed. With respect to the last-mentioned type, I was prompted to discuss cases like this by LORÁND BENKŐ's dictum: he pointed out several times that in any discipline, a critical reconsideration of apparently resolved issues is necessary in regular intervals (especially in view of changed research conditions and new perspectives) since in scholarly research, as a matter of principle, there cannot be definitely closed issues (see e.g. BENKŐ 1977: 131, 1998: 111). With respect to DFAT, an instance of changed research conditions is the significant increase of source materials that can be investigated (like synchronic place name collections, historical collections of place names and personal names, digital databases of diplomas or parochial records, etc.). In terms of new perspectives, the primary issue to mention here is the interdisciplinary approach, much wider in ist scope than heretofore. All that, I think, is quite sufficient reason for an etymological etc. reassessment of some place names of DFAT.

The aim of the last chapter of the dissertation is to discuss some ways in which I intend to employ that reassessed linguistic material in the description of the language system of the early Árpádian Age (in particular, that of DFAT). Instead of an overall description (that would require a large amount of further research), the chapter contains the formulation of some remaining problems (e.g. whether the linguistic material of DFAT does or does not show that the lowering of vowels had already started), as well as an attempt at the description of some well-defined areas, especially ones pertaining to higher linguistic levels (like the adaptation of Hungarian elements to fit the syntactic structure of Latin sentences, or the role of Hungarian items in establishing the cohesion of the Latin text).

Finally, the possibility of further historical linguistic investigations (those of linguistic contacts, disfluency phenomena, etc.) are briefly referred to.

## III. The methods employed

In the linguistic analysis of the material thus selected, the use of traditional methods (like taking both the linguistic system and linguistic changes, the regularities of both synchrony and diachrony into consideration, employing the methodology of comparative linguistics, etc.) obviously takes priority. On the other hand, we cannot ignore the fact that the material of this investigation occurs in the text of the document as a set of proper names (place names); hence the approach of historical onomatology had also a role in the investigation. However, given that the dissertation is one of historical linguistics, I refrained from going into issues of name giving and name use, the taxonomy or sociology of names, or other aspects of historical onomatology, apart from a few cases where this proved to be unavoidable. (All these points are excellently summarised in a recent monograph by ISTVÁN HOFFMANN [2010] that uses DFAT primarily as a source for the historical study of place names.)

My own discussion is introduced, in each case, by a survey of the earlier literature concerning the given issue (or linguistic item). And although the individual chapters required diverse methods, three general methodological points have been followed throughout.

**1. New databases.** The source material of investigations of this type has recently increased by several orders of magnitude due to the availability of historical and synchronic collections of names, and especially that of digitalised collections of documents. Databases of this kind serve the investigations of Hungarian items in the text of DFAT both indirectly and directly. On the indirect side, they mainly offer analogies (cf. HOFFMANN 2010: 14); while their direct influence is felt in the identification of place names (with the help of synchronic collections of geographical names) and in casting light on the life of names, their systematic morphological changes (in the case of historical sources). The individual analyses provide a multitude of examples of the usefulness and efficiency of the involvement of databases.

**2. Context.** Scattered Hungarian data have always been studied by historical linguistic research – as opposed to studies in history and diplomatics – out of their non-Hungarian contexts. This does not mean, of course, that earlier researchers ignored the evidence offered by those contexts; however, they primarily turned to them in matters of identification.

The necessity of studying the context has been increasingly pointed out in the past few decades of the historiography of historical linguistics. After JÁNOS BALÁZS (1980: 290–1), it was LORÁND BENKŐ who warned us that "the orthography – as well as the morphology, semantics, and general onomastics – of Hungarian proper names occurring in early documents should not be studied in themselves as an abstract body of names, torn apart from the basic Latin text – they have to be considered in light of the full context, with special attention paid to the orthography of the whole text, the relationship of names spelt in 'Latinised' vs. 'Hungarianised' ways, the morphological means of inserting the names in the Latin text, etc." (2003: 70).

In writing this dissertation, I also had the occasion to see that a thorough investigation of the narrower or broader context may lead to several novel insights and results with respect to the material of DFAT, too.

**3. Interdisciplinary approach.** The dissertation lays special emphasis on interdisciplinarity, much broader here than in earlier investigations. Earlier on, it was the neighbouring disciplines (especially history, historical geography, and historical hydrology) that utilized the results of historical linguistics. Today, the connection has become bi-directional; it is especially studies in etymology, word history, historical semantics (and obviously in onomatology) that rely heavily on the results of neighbouring disciplines. In my dissertation, I could fruitfully rely – in addition to disciplines within linguistics – on the results of palaeography, diplomatics, archaeology, history, historical geography, economic history, cultural history, ethnography, ecclesiastic history (including especially monastic history and hagiography), and historical hydrology that were gleaned partly from relevant professional publications and partly from consultations with eminent representatives of the branches of knowledge listed.

# IV. Research results

**1. Text presentation.** With respect to the text of DFAT, it was JÁNOS MELICH (1914) who first pointed out that the usual way of text presentation, elaborated for and employed by the historical disciplines, is not quite capable of serving as raw material for historical linguistic study. Nevertheless, no transcription of DFAT has been prepared to date that would make a historical investigation of all linguistic levels possible. Historians' transcriptions uniformly spell proper names with capital initials, fail to differentiate between major palaeographic variants of graphemes, standardise the Latin text, and use modern punctuation. Consequently, they are unreliable sources especially for investigations of the lower linguistic levels (and specifically for the historical study of orthography). Meticulously faithful transcriptions that represent even the minutest distinctions among palaeographic variants of graphemes, on the other hand, are hardly legible for the untrained eye (see, e.g., published versions of codices with diacritical spelling); they unnecessarily burden investigations of the higher linguistic levels or those in neighbouring disciplines (like onomatology) and the publications in those fields. Thus, source presentations in linguistics employ various compromise solutions between those two extremes, and are therefore rather inconsistent.

In the present dissertation, I used a different type of compromise. On the one hand, at the appropriate point of the paper, I present a broadly literal transcription that uses e.g. dotted *i*-s, does not differentiate between the allographs of *s*, and slightly standardises the Latin text, albeit exclusively with respect to what is and what is not spelt solid. (In the typography of the solutions of abbreviations and sigla, and the highlighting of Hungarian items, I also followed the criteria of legibility.) Throughout the text of the dissertation, this transcription system is used for citing forms.

At the end of the dissertation, another transcription is presented, one that is sensitive to the criteria listed, and can be called "narrowly literal". This version can be used for the historical study of orthography (as, for instance, the allographs of *s* have a chronological significance). This transcription is endowed with full philological apparatus, the most detailed so far in the history of the publications of the text of DFAT.

While I was preparing those transcriptions, I also had the occasion to introduce certain minor emendations. For instance, I deleted the traditional reconstructed dividing sign from the beginning of the description of the property by *ugrin*, whereby the division of the text has obviously been changed. Also, I succeeded in reading the original "Vna urna" underneath the overwriting "XInpula-" on the verso of the page that had proved unintelligible in earlier

attempts, and thereby the intention of the overwriter and the sense of the overwriting has now become clear.

**2. Translation.** In translating the text of the document, my intention was that the Hungarian items, left in their original forms (I only resolved the *&* of *p&ra, p&re*), should smoothly blend into the present-day text of the translation. This was problematic at times, given that the status of an item as proper noun vs. common noun, often difficult to decide, determines the use of articles. I had to take a stand in other cases as well, for instance in the case of items of dubious status (considered to be Latin words by some researchers).

Some expressions found their way into the translation upon lengthy consideration, knowing that some of the researchers would study the context in the Hungarian translation(s). For instance, the word *namque*, occurring in the description of the watercourse *fuk*, is primarily (and, in Classical Latin, exclusively) a conjunction of reason ('because'). The earlier literature had built the identification of the port *(portus)* of Lake Balaton with the ford *(transitus)* across the creek on this interpretation of *namque*. The problem is resolved by the second meaning of the conjunction that it assumed in Medieval Latin: 'however'.

**3. Etymologies.** During etymological investigations, in order for the data to remain utilisable and reliable for historical linguistic purposes, I made a point of differentiating among degrees of the strength of etymologies. In an "etymological strength scale", the lowest degree is an etymological idea that is based on the researcher's intuition but cannot be confirmed, typically due to lack of supporting parallel data. The next degree is a possible etymology. Whether it stands alone or is an etymological alternative, a possible etymology can be supported by further data, but it remains an assumption either because of the nature of the parallel data or due to the presence of another "favourite" alternative. As a third degree, consider probable etymology. It is supported by strong arguments, reinforced by both linguistic evidence and arguments of neighbouring disciplines. However, in such cases, either it is impossible to dispel all possible doubt, or else a weaker alternative still remains feasible. Finally, the strongest degree of the scale can be called seemingly certain etymology. In principle, this category could simply be called "certain", given that a number of practically unquestionable etymologies obviously belong here. However, in etymological explorations of names, even the most waterproof cases should carry a modicum of doubt. I consider this scale useful primarily because it may signal the degree of reliability of conclusions (of a historical linguistic nature) built on the linguistic data, lest an uncertain etymology should become a textbook dogma and hence the basis of further apparently safe conclusions, as it has happened for instance in the case of *asauuagi*.

In concrete etymological issues, I offer a palaeography-based idea for resolving the case of *ecli*, suggesting that it might be an abbreviated form of *equi*. Thus the phrase *portus ecli* could be *portus equi* 'port of horses'. A possible etymology of *kangrez* is offered with respect to identification. I consider the Greek common noun origin of *p&ra* as a probable etymology, while the etymology of *Tihany*, also of Greek origin, seems to be certain.

Another result of the etymological investigations is that the stem *kany- ~ kony-* (cf. *kanyar* 'bend (of road)', *konyít* 'cast down', etc.) that arose in connection with the item *kangrez* is probably of Proto-Finno-Ugric origin in my view (rather than unknown, as previously thought), despite the fact that the sound change tendency concerning word initial *k* + back vowel fails to apply here.

**4. Identification of place names.** I can also report a number of results in the identification of place names (i.e., in locating their denotations). In this study, the identification of *petra* with the Cave-dwellings of Tihany Peninsula has been confirmed. I have made the tracing of the military road between Kesztölc and Fehérvár more precise and confirmed it by further

arguments; thereby a slightly more accurate localisation of the property referred to as *mortis* has also become possible. On the basis of recently emerged sources, the identification of *lupa* has also been accomplished, confirming an earlier, well-constructed hypothesis by ISTVÁN HOFFMANN (2010: 93–4). The present-day whereabouts of two adjacent lands next to *bagat mezee* has been proposed as being in Somogy County, in the outskirts of Segesd; I assumed this to be the case on the basis of two limit points and the lake called *lopdi*, as well as on an indirect piece of evidence having to do with the history of certain properties (also discussed by JÓZSEF PÁPAY [1927] and LÁSZLÓ HOLLER [2010: 66–76]).

**5. Toward a historical synchronic description of the Hungarian language of the early Árpádian age.** This dissertation, due to the lack of a large amount of preliminary work still to be done, cannot have undertaken a full historical-synchronic description of eleventh-century Hungarian; however, it attempts to present a few fragments (quasi specimen sections) of such a description.

**5.1. Lowering.** As is well known, the lowering of [u] > [o] is characteristic of the 12–13th centuries, whereas the lowering of [o] > [ɔ] took place by the 13–14th centuries (E. ABAFFY 2003: 329). It is traditionally thought (*ibid.*) that traces of this tendency may already have shown up in the 11th century, and two items of DFAT are normally brought up as evidence.

The orthography of the name *Balaton*, however, vacillates in DFAT in its first syllable rather than in the actually lowered last; but in the first syllable no lowering can have taken place as the name's etymology clearly shows.

In the case of *mogyoró* 'hazelnut', the earliest post-DFAT data uniformly have *o*: 1156: *mogorod,* 1193: *Moinnerov kerek,* 1212/1328: *Monorosheg,* etc., then from the second third of the 13th century we find forms involving *u*, and subsequently this form becomes generally used. In this case, then, we can suspect that the stressed-syllable lowering [u] > [o] (Proto-Uralic *\*muna* > Old Hungarian *mony* 'egg', cf. 1211: *Monios*) may have taken place a lot earlier (cf. Proto-Finno-Ugric *\*kunta* > DFAT *hodu* 'army'), and later spellings in *u* may have nothing to do with the etymology of the word, but rather are a consequence of [a] trying to find its place within the system of orthography. On the other hand, the words involved in Old Hungarian lowering retain their higher vowels consistently for a long time to come, and vacillation may begin as late as in the 13–14th century, cf. e.g. *had* 'army', *halom* 'hill', *fok* 'cape', etc.

**5.2. Vowel harmony and lowering.** A group of Hungarian words, viz. those containing a back vowel followed by front *i* (of whatever provenance) in their last syllable, tend to have their *i* velarised (and labialised), and join the lowering process [u] > [o] mentioned above. Cf. DFAT *mortis* > verso of DFAT *mortus* > *Martos;* DFAT *u[g]rin* > *Vgrun* > *Ugron;* 1002: *Baluuanis* > *Baluanus* > *Bálványos;* Const. *Μορήση(ς)* [morisi(s)] (still with a final vowel) > *Morus* > *Maros;* (French *Louis* >) *Lois* > *Layws* > *Lajos;* (Greek *βασιλεύς* >) *Vazil* > *Wazwl* > *Vászoly;* Funeral Sermon *achscin* > *Asscun* > *asszony* 'woman, lady'; (Turkic *arïq* >) *arik* (cf. *arichdi*) ~ DFAT *aruk* > *árok* 'ditch'; *Martin ~ Mortin > Martun ~ Mortun > Marton ~ Morton.* That velarisation-cum-labialisation may have started relatively early (cf. DFAT *aruk* 'ditch'; DFAT *mortis* ~ verso of DFAT *mortus*), but may have continued later on (cf. Funeral Sermon *achscin* 'woman, lady'), another reason to suspect a later time for [u] > [o] lowering. I think *balatin ~ bolatin (> Bolotun > Balaton)* with an *i* going back to the reduced palatal vowel of Slavic and *sumig (> Sumug > Somogy)* with a final *i* of debated origin constitute further examples of this vowel-shift tendency (and are not results of Latinisation, *pace* HOFFMANN 2010: 218).

**5.3. The adaptation of Hungarian lexical items to the syntactic structure of Latin sentences.** Loanword adaptation in the strict sense is a phenomenon of morphology (cf. BENKŐ 2003: 70), hence it has to involve morphological processes. Therefore, linguistic solutions that serve the establishment of textual cohesion or the embedding of subordinate clauses cannot be classified as tools of adapting a (place) name. Nor can appositive or *dicitur*-constructions (HOFFMANN 2010: 216); the latter, in my view, are appositive constructions enlarged into subordinate clauses.

Authors of diplomas produced written pieces in Latin; and the character of a Latin text requires that its author must adapt Hungarian place names or other lexical items, as well as those partly or wholly translated into Latin or Latinised in some other manner, using the tools and processes of Latin.

Regular means of adaptation are the following: 1. Using the case marker of some oblique case, e.g. DFAT *duabus ... uiis;* in cases where the word is already Latinised by a derivational suffix: verso of DFAT *bezprenensis mercati tributum;* declining a Hungarian name as a Latin word: verso of DFAT *in terrytorio tollenę.* 2. Latin preposition + oblique case, e.g. DFAT *ad lacum* (cf. [1264]: *de castro Pestensi;* 1254: *apud Budam.* 3. Nominative suffix (often covert), e.g. DFAT *est lacus; Concluditur his terminis [:] Magna uia ... aruk tue.* 4. Zero morpheme standing for an oblique case marker (nomina indeclinabilia), e.g. DFAT *super balatin; inter putu ueieze & knez; ad seg.*

As opposed to these natural means of adaptation, there are also "irregular" solutions, ones that are out of place in a Latin text: cases where the writer inserts a name into a Latin text by using Hungarian morphological means of adaptation: 1. Using a Hungarian case marker (this does not occur in DFAT, but cf. Anonymus: *dedit ... terras ... Edunec et Edumernec*). 2. Using a postposition (attested only in DFAT), e.g. *monarau bukurea; ohut cutarea.* 3. Latin preposition + Hungarian case marker (this does not occur in DFAT either, but cf. 1265/1272: *uenit ad Balwankure*). 4. Latin preposition + Hungarian postposition (attested only in DFAT), *ad brokinarea, ad holmodi rea, ad oluphelrea.*

Earlier, it was thought that the fourth solution cited above was a case of double marking, "expressing something both in Latin and in Hungarian" (BÁRCZI 1951: 190). However, if we consider the functional link between 1 and 2 above, we can say that the cases in 4 are similarly linked to cases in 3, i.e., the postposition functionally corresponds to the Hungarian case marker that in fact stands for the Latin case marker, hence the solution in 4 is a contamination similar to that in 3, rather than double marking as previously thought.

**5.4. Text cohesion.** It may sound strange that one should investigate a Latin document in terms of text grammar; since, however, Hungarian elements also contribute to the establishment of textual cohesion in DFAT, the last chapter of the dissertation makes an attempt at exactly that.

**6. Outlook.** The investigation of the bilingualism of the early Old Hungarian period, of the resulting linguistic contact effects and interference phenomena, and of the relationship between the spoken and written language of the period, are also tasks awaiting scholars of historical linguistics.

However, other types of investigations have also started breaking the trail. LEA HAADER's studies with respect to codices from the late Old Hungarian period open up new vistas. Her results are significant (among other things) since she starts from disfluency phenomena attested in those codices, that is, from the direction of historical psycholinguistics, and ends up exploring linguistic consequences and finding conclusions for historical psycholinguistics (2009: 64). And although, in the case of earlier documents, the available linguistic material is a lot more meagre, and the type of sources is also different (Latin documents with scattered

Hungarian material in them), it does not appear to be impossible at all that we might be able to utilise results of historical psycholinguistics, too, in studying those earlier documents.

# References

E. ABAFFY, ERZSÉBET 2003. Hangtörténet (ómagyar kor). In: JENŐ KISS – FERENC PUSZTAI eds., Magyar nyelvtörténet. Osiris Kiadó. Bp. 301–351.

BALÁZS, JÁNOS 1980. Magyar deákság. Anyanyelvünk és az európai modell. Magvető Kiadó, Bp.

BÁRCZI, GÉZA 1951. A tihanyi apátság alapítólevele mint nyelvi emlék. (Nyelvészeti Tanulmányok 1.) Akadémiai Kiadó, Bp.

BENKŐ, LORÁND 1977. A legkorábbi magyar szövegemlék-csoport. Magyar Nyelv 73: 130–46, 288–302.

BENKŐ, LORÁND 1998. Név és történelem. Tanulmányok az Árpád-korról. Akadémiai Kiadó, Bp.

BENKŐ, LORÁND 2003. Beszélnek a múlt nevei. Tanulmányok az Árpád-kori tulajdonnevekről. Akadémiai Kiadó, Bp.

HAADER, LEA 2009. Írásbeli megakadásjelenségek történeti pszicholingvisztikai szemszögből. Magyar Nyelvőr 133: 48–65.

HOFFMANN, ISTVÁN 2010. A Tihanyi alapítólevél mint helynévtörténeti forrás. (A Magyar Névarchívum Kiadványai 16.) Debreceni Egyetemi Kiadó, Debrecen.

HOLLER, LÁSZLÓ 2010. Az 1055. évi tihanyi oklevélben említett két birtok lokalizálása. Javaslat a *lacus segisti* és a *bagat mezee* határú birtok elhelyezkedésére. In: ISTVÁN HOFFMANN – VALÉRIA TÓTH eds., Helynévtörténeti tanulmányok 5. Debrecen. 47–82.

MELICH, JÁNOS 1914. Keresztneveinkről. Magyar Nyelv 10: 97–107, 149–56, 193–9, 248–55.

PÁPAY, JÓZSEF 1927. Segesd és Segesvár. Magyar Nyelv 23: 213–4.

ZELLIGER, ERZSÉBET 2005. A Tihanyi Alapítólevél. Bencés Kiadó, Pannonhalma.

# The candidate's own publications related to the topic of the dissertation

2005. A tihanyi apátság alapítólevele: betűhív átírás és magyar fordítás jegyzetekkel. In: ERZSÉBET ZELLIGER, A Tihanyi Alapítólevél. Bencés Kiadó, Pannonhalma. 47–65.

2006. A tihanyi apátság alapítólevelének hátlapja mint nyelvi emlék. Online publication, downloadable from: http://mnytud.arts.unideb.hu/nevtan/informaciok/mnyt/szr.pdf.

2007. A Kesztölcről Fehérvárra menő hadút. Névtani Értesítő 29: 23–47.

2008a. A Tihanyi alapítólevél *kangrez* szórványáról. In: ISTVÁN HOFFMANN – VALÉRIA TÓTH eds., Helynévtörténeti tanulmányok 3. Debrecen. 31–55.

2008b. *Kanyar* igénk lehetséges finnugor etimológiája. In: PÉTER POMOZI ed., Navigare humanum est… Pusztay János hatvanadik születésnapjára. Finnugor Népek Világkongresszusa Magyar Nemzeti Szervezete, Bp. 203–8.

2008c. A Tihanyi alapítólevél latin szövege és helyneveinek lokalizálása. In: ANDREA BÖLCSKEI – ILDIKÓ N. CSÁSZI eds., Név és valóság. A VI. Magyar Névtudományi Konferencia előadásai. Balatonszárszó, 2007. jún. 22–24. (A Károli Gáspár Református Egyetem Magyar Nyelvtudományi Tanszékének Kiadványai 1.) Károli Gáspár Református Egyetem BTK Magyar Nyelvtudományi Tanszéke, Budapest. 255–67.

2009a. Terminológiai széljegyzet a Tihanyi alapítólevél kétnyelvű helymeghatározásaihoz. Magyar Nyelv 105: 62–8.

2009b. A Tihanyi alapítólevél *ecli* szórványáról. Magyar Nyelv 105: 216–9.

2010a. A tihanyi alapítólevél szövege. In: ISTVÁN HOFFMANN, A Tihanyi alapítólevél mint helynévtörténeti forrás. (A Magyar Névarchívum Kiadványai 16.) Debreceni Egyetemi Kiadó, Debrecen. 21–41.

2010b. Helynevek beillesztése korai latin nyelvű okleveleink szövegébe. In: ISTVÁN HOFFMANN –VALÉRIA TÓTH eds., Helynévtörténeti tanulmányok 5. Debrecen. 31–44.

2010c. A Tihanyi alapítólevél görög helynevei [Part 1]. Magyar Nyelv 106: 295–307 (Part 2 is in press).

2010d. A nyelvi kölcsönhatás nyomai korai ómagyar okleveleinkben. In: KATALIN É. KISS – ATTILA HEGEDŰS eds., Nyelvelmélet és kontaktológia. Piliscsaba. 71–86.

2010e. Tihanyi alapítólevél két vízrajzi nevéről. In: JÁNOS BÁRTH ed., Dénes György-emlékkönyv. (It's in press.)

2010f. A Tihanyi alapítólevél személynevei. Névtani Éresítő. (It's in press.)