The history of the Hungarian personal name system in the context of cognitive-pragmatic description

Abstract The most typical features of anthroponyms as linguistic elements include linguistic and linguistic-taxonomical determination, as well as cultural determination. Therefore, the analysis of the different name systems gives us the opportunity to make a comparative analysis of linguistic and cultural interferences. First of all, this requires a standardised analysis framework that can be extended to most languages. In my presentation, I will propose for this purpose a model for the analysis of anthroponyms, which is based on cognitive-pragmatic aspects and is suitable for the appropriate treatment of both linguistic and cultural characteristics. I would like to illustrate the applicability of this model through the history of Hungarian anthroponomastics, hoping that the extension of the analysis to the name systems of related languages and non-related languages may shed new light not only on the different systems of anthroponyms, but also on the interaction of linguistic and extra-linguistic factors of linguistic changes in general.

1. This work was carried out as part of the Research Group on Hungarian Language History and Toponimastics (University of Debrecen – Hungarian Academy of Sciences)

My study will demonstrate how the theoretical framework outlined by István Hoffman and myself in an article (see Hoffman & Tőth 2015) can be applied to characterize the personal name system of a specific language, Hungarian. During this taxonomic description, I mostly focus on diachronic changes in the name system, showing how each personal name type can be described, and what structural transformations have been caused in the system itself by the changes in their use.

Let us start with a preliminary, brief outline of the model used for an analysis of personal names. I intend to define the types of personal names from pragmatic and cognitive aspects. The pragmatic approach focuses on the circumstances of name giving: namely, it is used to examine the act of name giving through which the individual as a name bearer assumes a particular type of personal name. Based on this, we can distinguish three types of names, described in the following. The type of personal name that becomes the individual’s name through conscious decision via the intervention of certain persons (such as parents, priests, tribe leaders, shamans, etc.) and that is chosen from a relatively closed stock of names (from a list) is called a list name. Another type of personal name is linked to the individual automatically, based on customs, unwritten or written law: the name is independent from the name giver’s intentions, and the individual assumes his or her name based on the rules of name giving in the community. In the field of personal name giving, this is how individuals obtain their family names nowadays, however, the automatic name – as we will shortly see – was also used in ancient times. The third type of personal names are created names, which are not bound by formal rules, as this type of name giving relies on the entire lexicon as well as the name giver’s linguistic creativity, and the name very often emerges only through the act of name giving itself. This is how nicknames emerge in the today’s personal name system, yet the same cognitive-pragmatic process was also probably the underlying motivation for personal names in Old Hungarian name giving (for further details, see Hoffman & Tőth 2015: 145–146).2

From the functional-cognitive aspect of all basic name types, it is created names that are most closely related to their name bearers (as these names reflect the individual’s characteristics, social status, etc.). The individual elements of this type of name are always motivated, they are rich in information and, consequently, they are highly descriptive: thus, from a cognitive point of view, we can call them descriptive names. Automatic names are also characterized by a certain grade of motivation and informativeness, yet as a rule, they only convey one type of information since they traditionally describe the person as belonging to a genetically or functionally clearly defined community (to a mother, father, family, clan or tribe, etc.). In most social formations, genetic identity plays a fundamental role in community building, and any community that is organized on the basis of genetic ties is usually given a name as well. For these types of names, we can use the term nexus names. In the case of list names, we cannot talk about motivatedness, since their main function is to identify the named individual within a relatively small community (primarily within a family). From a cognitive point of view, these are called referential names. (Of course, the other two name types also have a referential function, as this is the most vital role of all personal names, yet in name giving, the other two name types carry special functions characteristic only to them and absent in the case of referential names.) In addition to the aforementioned basic types of names, a fourth category of personal names should be added too, which, when compared to the other types, is a secondary category: that of affective names, the core cognitive-semantic content of which derives from the emotional relationship between a name giver or name user and the name bearer. Since these types of names emerge through the modification of other names, they are called modified names from a pragmatic point of view. With these names, the primary role of identification is linked to a dominant affective function which may often completely outweigh their original functions (for more, see Hoffman & Tőth 2015: 146–147).

In the following, I present a brief sketch of the history of Hungarian personal name giving within the context of this theoretical framework. This article largely relies on the ideas developed in the second half of Hoffmann and Tőth’s study, completing these ideas and providing further examples.

Examining names from a historical perspective largely depends on available written sources that furnish data on personal names. The
earliest documented period of Hungarian language history is from the 10th and 11th centuries. The first written sources from this period preserved Hungarian language elements to some extent. These documents were written in foreign languages, mostly in Latin and sometimes in Greek. As these mostly Latin sources contain a great deal of Hungarian elements, primarily personal and place names, they are also important relics for research into Hungarian language and name history. We have no direct linguistic evidence, and thus no name data, from the time prior to the 10th century; therefore, we can only attempt to describe this early period of Hungarian language and name history on the general basis of onomastic theory, at most building on the continuity of the name system and also by applying the method of retrospective conclusion from later periods.

The earliest linguistic relics prove, through actual data, my general statement that descriptive names, as the name type constituting the backbone of the name system, play a central role in naming and name use in all periods of onomastic history. With regard to Hungarian naming, this general thesis is not only valid for periods directly researchable through linguistic data, but its validity can be extended to earlier periods that cannot be documented through linguistic historical research.

The primary source for the study of the personal name system prior to the 10th century, the so-called Old Hungarian period, is provided by the Greek work of Byzantine Emperor Constantine VII Porphyrogenitus (905–959) entitled De Administrando Imperio, written c. 950–951 CE. Several chapters of this work contain parts relevant to Hungarians, and the personal name data occurring in it represent Hungarian naming in the so-called pagan period and nomadic lifeways, for example, ἀργυροῖς (< ἄργυρος “barley”), φαλακτοῖ (< φαλάκτος “eats”), ἔλθεν (< ἔλθεν “tastes”), ἱπποδριάς (< ἱπποδριάς “he is”). From a taxonomical point of view, these name forms (also including their semantic and morphological structure) perfectly fit in with the personal name data from between the 11th and 13th century charters. 1118: Cucendi (kőkény ‘sloe’; ÁSz. 228), 1211: Koreu (kör ‘ask’; ÁSz. 459), 1138/1329: Lewedi (leisz ‘he is’; ÁSz. 494), 1174: Numvog (‘you are not’), 1213/1550: Fehersa (fehér ‘white’; ÁSz. 303), +1086: Feketeydi (fekete ‘black’; ÁSz. 303), +1086: Zaczal (szakál ‘beard’; ÁSz. 834), +1135: Szedm (szem ‘eye’; ÁSz. 844), 1152: Aianduc (ajándék ‘gift’; ÁSz. 51), 1198: Sukett (széklet ‘deaf’; ÁSz. 734), etc.

Although the relatively small number of personal name data that survived in sources between the 10th and 12th centuries does not provide sufficient information about the personal name giving patterns of the earlier periods, we can nevertheless discern a certain picture of contemporary name giving practices, especially when also taking into account personal name data from later sources. According to researchers of historical personal name giving, the main feature of personal name giving practices among Hungarians in the nomadic times prior to the expansion of Christianity was that individuals were given one single name that they obtained from their environment either at birth or soon afterwards. However, we cannot exclude the possibility that, in some cases, the name was linked to the person only at a later stage in his or her life. Most names were formed from Hungarian appellatives, they were semantically motivated, and they did not substantially differ from the types of Old Hungarian personal name giving, which we call “primitive”, dating back to the period referred to as “pagan” times, “nomadic” or, more recently “secular”, as opposed to the types of Christian names spread by the Church. In the following, I demonstrate that in light of current knowledge, some elements of this idea are disputable.

The taxonomic relationship mentioned above clearly demonstrates the continuity of the name system but, as we will see below, the changes in the sociocultural circumstances of this period also resulted in significant transformations in the system of personal names.

The earliest written sources reliably demonstrate the fact that the Hungarian personal name system also contained personal names with a referential function at this time. Thus, we must certainly regard the name system between the 10th and 11th centuries as a two-fold system (cf. Figure 1). Referential names only have the most elemental function of personal names, that is, they identify the name bearer without being associated to further functions (e.g. characterisation, descriptive, affective role). The basic source for this type of personal name is mostly provided by borrowed personal names.

Of referential names, personal names of Turkish origin represent the earliest chronological stratum from the period documentable with
data. The majority of these names date back to the so-called nomadic naming period, the age before the Hungarians moved into the Carpathian Basin between 895 and 896 CE. After settling in the Carpathian Basin, following the gradual decrease of Turkish-Hungarian linguistic contacts that had been dominant prior, the use of these names was overshadowed by names from other sources, though the Turkish names still need to be taken into account as elements of the name system. As regards the personal names of Turkish origin, the earliest source of information is also the work of Emperor Constantine. The personal name data of this historical work such as ʦaŋ (cf. Turkish personal name Taʃ), ḥeγ (cf. Turkish personal name *Eljy — *Elgy), ḥonm (cf. Turkish jutoj ʼgourmandʼ), etc. must have become parts of the Hungarian name system during the time preceding the 10th century when Hungarian-Turkish cultural relations were most lively. There are plenty or additional personal name data originating from the Turkish languages occurring later, too, recorded in early charter sources:

1138/1329: Tősz (ÁSz. 763), 1146: Acus (ÁSz. 45; cf. Turkish Ag-quš ʼwhite falconʼ), 1138/1329: Besze (ÁSz. 120; cf. Turkish bašq ʼa bird of preyʼ), c. 1200: Ohtum (ÁSz. 45; cf. Turkish Altım), c. 1200: Hulec (ÁSz. 394; cf. Turkish *Illy — *Ely), etc.

In the period following settlement in the Carpathian Basin, new strata of referential names appeared in the Hungarian personal name system due to the fact that other groups of peoples and languages started to influence the Hungarian language in this period and later, in addition to Turkish linguistic contacts. Of these influences, Slavic and German were the most important, as demonstrated by the large number of names of Slavic origin, for example: 1211: Bogat (ÁSz. 133; cf. Slavic Bogaty), 1055: Wüdest comites (ÁSz. 825; cf. Czech Vojtěch), 1111: Jaresclau (ÁSz. 406; cf. Slavic Jaroslav), 1162: Beloslau (ÁSz. 107; cf. Slavic Běloslava), 1217: domine bogostoe (ÁSz. 135; cf. Slavic Bogoslava), 1193: In Zuloc ... terra ... dividitur cum Vincenst (ÁSz. 813), and of German origin in the charters, for example 1055: Lutovic comites (ÁSz. 503; cf. Germ. Luitvic, Lutovic, Lutvíc), 1111: Theobaldus Sumuinquinensis [comes] (ÁSz. 746; cf. Germ. Theobold, Theobaldy), 1134: Adolphreth Sumigensis comes (ÁSz. 47; cf. Germ. Adlbrecht, Albrecht), +1135/XIII.: Lamberto comite Budrugiensi (ÁSz. 480; cf. Germ. Lambrecht), 1211: vdomnici ... Wylmos (ÁSz. 812; cf. Germ.-Lat. Wilhelmus), 1299: Lypohil filius Martini nobilis de Myala (ÁSz. 495), 1211: Wolphilt (ÁSz. 801; cf. Germ. Wolfrid), 1299: comes Walter (ÁSz. 792); 1292: domine Hedwig relite quondam domini Sifridi de Haslowe (ÁSz. 371; cf. Germ. Hedwig), 1216: Gertrudis Regina Vangarie (ÁSz. 333; cf. Germ. Gertrudis, Gerhtrudis), etc.

In the integration into a foreign cultural framework or in making contact with a highly prestigious culture, it is natural for the personal name system of the target language to borrow elements from the culture of higher prestige, mostly through higher social classes or other socio-cultural groups that mediate the culture. Following their migration to the Carpathian Basin, the Hungarians integrated into the Christian feudal culture of Europe and adopted Roman Christianity. The conversion of Hungarians to the Christian faith started between the 10th and 11th centuries, and its influence was soon reflected in the system of personal names. The adoption of Christianity resulted in name use that differed from that of earlier times. A new name type appeared
in the system with a referential function, the category of Christian names, which, due to its prestigious superiority, had a great influence on the choice of names, especially since all people were now compulsorily given a name of Christian origin at their baptism. Alongside the category of Christian names, elements of the previous name system continued to live on. However, with the ever-increasing expansion of Christianity, both the descriptive names of Hungarian origin and the borrowed personal names of foreign origin were relegated to the periphery of the name system. In addition to displacing the above-mentioned two name types, the new church naming model also had wider-reaching consequences for the general nature of Hungarian naming. These effects will be described in further detail below.

The early charter sources provide valuable data about the extent and means of the early spreading of the Greek-Latin Christian name stratum. In the founding charter of the Benedictine Abbey of Tihany from the middle of the 11th century (1055), despite its early age, we can find a surprisingly large number of persons referred to with Christian names, and not only among Church officials, which is natural (e.g. Signum Benedicti archiepiscopi, Signum Mauri episcopi, Signum Clementi episcopi, etc.), but also as names of secular lords: Signum Vitii comitis, Signum Martini comitis, Signum Helle comitis, Signum Andree comitis, etc. There are examples from the next centuries of the ever-extending use of this name stratum in growing numbers, for example 1131: principes ... Janus, Marcus (ÁSz. 404, 514), 1134: testes ... Laurentius (us) filius (us) Salamontis canonici War-ddie[n]sis ecclesie (ÁSz. 483), 1138/1329: mansiones servorum ... In villa Kunda: ... Stephanus, Martinus, Dienis ... Vitalis (ÁSz. 521), 1171: Benedictus ... comites ... Bezpe[re]m[ien]sis (ÁSz. 112), 1193: Dominico curiali comite ... Budrugien[i]si (ÁSz. 255), 1193: Andrea comite de Suprun (ÁSz. 64), 1193: Stephano comite de Worost (ÁSz. 728), 1211: Johannes cum filii sui Petrus, Tenke ... Ibrahim cum filii sui Stephano et Egidio (ÁSz. 630), 1237: Cosma filius Paulus, Elec filius Nicolai (ÁSz. 56), 1276: terram Marcelli filii Jacobi de Kutus (ÁSz. 400), 1209/1209: filia Raguel mulier (ÁSz. 666), 1211: filii Susanne (ÁSz. 753), 1272: Rebeka (ÁSz. 671), 1296/1330: religioso domine ... Judith et Elisabeth vocate de Valle Vesperimynsi (ÁSz. 432), 1171: ancillarum nomina Maria (ÁSz. 518), 1231: Ego Anna

uxor Bors comitis (ÁSz. 68), 1211: Samson, filius Magdalene (ÁSz. 507), 1251: domina Elissabeth filia Sebastiani comitis refiecta Beata filii lund (ÁSz. 277), etc.

These name forms functioned as elements of a very virulent type of cultural name in the Hungarian and, in a broader context, European name system. Names such as Petrus, Johannes, Martinus, Maria and Anna spread around as a result of a cultural initiative, along with Christianity as its inseparable attribute, and the institutions and representatives of the Church played a determining role in this process. This also explains why Christian personal names appeared in Hungarian charter sources for a time almost exclusively in Latin form, in accordance with the language of the Church. This process led to referential names becoming a rather homogenised, more closed and bound category.

Thus, the adoption of Christianity resulted in a significant restructuring of the Hungarian personal name system, which also caused changes in the use of names with a descriptive function. In addition to the high prestige associated with more or less "official" Christian names with a referential function, individuals often continued to bear descriptive names as well. The elements of the two kinds of names in the name of the same person also appeared in Latin charters alternately or in a structure suggesting parallel use, for example 1272–1290: Stephanus dictus Ruphus (cf. Latin ruphis 'red'; ÁSz. 729), 1277/1356: Mychael dictus Tar (cf. tar 'bald'; ÁSz. 740), 1282/1381: Petrus dictus Aggh frater Bartholomei (cf. agg 'old'; ÁSz. 49), 1284: Johannes dictus Balogh ("Johannes called Balogh", cf. balog 'left-handed'; ÁSz. 86), 1291: Mychael dictus Sydo ("Mychael called Sydo", cf. zsid 'Jewish'; ÁSz. 713), [1292–1293]: comes Nycolaus dictus Farkas (cf. farkas 'wolf'; ÁSz. 301), 1300 k.: magister Jacobus dictus Kopoz (cf. kopoz 'bald'; ÁSz. 468), 1399: Blasius dictus Baranyay (Baranyai 'someone from Baranya county'; Fehértói 1969: 63).

These data clearly prove that the two personal name systems, a referential name given by the representative of the Church in accordance with certain rules as well as a descriptive name directly given by the name community, existed side-by-side. The descriptive names used alongside referential names resemble, in several respects, the main types of what were to later become family names. However,
these data do not yet comply with the criteria of family names as a part of nexus names, as they merely serve to name the given person and do not occur in a kinship network, nor are they inherited. Nevertheless, seeing the correspondence of this type of name with typical semantic types of family names, we can rightly regard these descriptive names as some kind of pre-family names or potential family names.

The fact that there already was a demand for the signification of nexus networks at a very early stage is demonstrated by the early data which attempts to identify the given person by their father’s name in official documents and charters, for example +1086: Nemka filius Turuusoi (ÁSz. 579), 1134: Geuril filius Andree comitis (ÁSz. 335), 1157–1158: Stephanus filius Adriani (ÁSz. 47), +1158: Petrus Abbos filius comitis Thuross (ÁSz. 752), c. 1165: Forcos filius Poznan (ÁSz. 621), 1177: Thomas filius Zah (ÁSz. 835), 1181: Ambrosius filius Cusun (ÁSz. 231), 1198: Behe filius Mence (ÁSz. 103), etc. These constructions signifying persons, which, in their form as seen here, cannot be identified with a personal name, demonstrate that there was already a demand in society for the expression of kinship, but that the linguistic device for this expression was still lacking. The tension between the existence of a social and linguistic demand on the one hand and the lack of a linguistic device on the other acted as a catalyst for facilitating the development of nexus names as a personal name type.

During the history of the Hungarian personal name system, two kinds of nexus names developed: genus names characteristic of name use between the 13th and 14th centuries, and later, in fact as their chronological continuation, the category of family names. Whereas the use of genus names was regulated by strict social restrictions, as only landlords were allowed to keep track of their relations in this way, family names extended to the name use of all classes of society over time.

Below I describe the most important features of genera between the 13th and 14th centuries as social formations. The characteristics are briefly summarised here because these circumstances heavily influenced the usage of genus names: a) Members of the genus were linked by actual blood, that is the genus was an economical, legal and social community of kin on the male line, naturally descending from the same ancestor; b) Under medieval Hungarian property law, the ancestor of the genus passed on his wealth to all of his descendants, not only to the members of the following generation, thus the genus—forming a kind of legal community—owned and inherited its wealth based on tribal law; c) The genus also constituted a cult community, based on the veneration of the ancestors (especially of the founder of the genus), the scene of spiritual life in most genera being the common monastery of the genus, which also served as a burial place. Thus the genus system between the 13th and 14th centuries encompassed the higher social classes only, and therefore the use of genus names was, of course, characteristic of only this class. The sense of community and belonging together within the genus expressed through the shared genus name and its symbol, the common coat of arms, was also enhanced by recurring typical personal names within the genus and by its own traditions.

The chronological relations of genus names draw a unique curve in front of us: this type of personal name, marked with the Latin formula de genere, appears in the sources at the beginning of the 13th century; its use peaked in the second half of the 13th century and it virtually disappeared in the first few decades of the 14th century, for example 1204: Tyba de genere Tomoy (ÁSz. 762), 1208: Theodorum de genere Opus (ÁSz. 604), 1214: comitem Henricum de genere Zolouc (ÁSz. 838), 1216: Poth comes de genere Gehr (ÁSz. 335), 1254: Johannes filius Nicolai fratris Vgrini de genere Chak (ÁSz. 175), 1255: Menbardum comitem de genere Aba (ÁSz. 39), 1266: Michael comes filius Alberti de genere Huntpraznon (ÁSz. 395), 1290: Herbardum filium Herbordi de genere Ol (ÁSz. 606), 1339: Thome filii Benediciti nepotis Arpad de genere Zemere (StLiz 2011: 39), etc. Behind this process lie primarily non-linguistic factors. Genus as a social formation and the genus name in close relation to it as a personal name type signifying this formation gradually disappeared when the individual became more important in the society. Parallel with this, the importance of the direct descendants of the individual and of family relatedness grew. The main historical consequence of this change was that genus names were replaced by inherited family names, which spread through all classes of society.

The development and spread of family names in the Hungarian personal name system occurred over a wide period of time (at the
end of 13th century – 17th century), which is explained by the long, drawn-out nature of this process. Weighing several factors, it seems that the following charter occurrences must have functioned as genetically inherited family names: siblings were entered by the same name several times in a charter from 1389: cf. Johannes dictus Churbas and Stephanus filius Pauli Churbas; Thomas dictus Cherteu and Valentinus dictus Cherteu; Georgius Zoltan and Blasius Zoltan (Fehértói 1969: 74, 78, 156).

Several different kinds of language elements can serve as the basis for family names and nexus marking names in general, and in attempting to reveal the history of the naming system, we must take into account different personal name types, loan names and other elements of the vocabulary of the given language (cf. Figure 2).
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**Figure 2**: The model of the three-fold personal name system (R names = referential names, D names = descriptive names, N names = nexus names)

Examining the family names from a morphological point of view, we find that certain types of these personal names have specific name formants. Family names developed from place names often have the suffix -i (e.g., Debrecen > Debrecen-i, Várad > Várad-i, Erdély > Erdélyi). Name forms developed from patronymic lexemes tend to have the patronymic suffix -ől-a (e.g., Lőrinc > Lőrinc-e, Lőrinc-i, András > András-a) or the morpheme \(^{f}I\) ‘son (of a father)’ (e.g., Péter > Péterfi, Pál > Pálfi). However, we can find a large number of examples in both lexical categories which became family names without these name formants (e.g., Buda place name > Buda family name, Péter patronymic name > Péter family name), and, likewise, no morphological device distinguishes descriptive names such as Szabó ‘tailor’, Horvát ‘Croatian’ and Szánta ‘limp, lame’ from the inherited family names developed from them.

The order of the Hungarian personal name structure is defined by the syntactic structure of the Hungarian language. In Hungarian, the family name, as an attributive functional element, precedes the Christian name: Kovács József, Debreuci István, Lőrinczy Éva, etc. This must have been the case with spoken language use at the time of the development of family names. We can consider this very probable even if it is expressed differently in written forms, as the Latin charters recorded the name structures in accordance with the Latin order of names: 1473: Petri Lewrinze ‘Lőrincze Péter’ (RMCSz. 985), 1499: Ladislaus Petheny Péterfi László (RMCSz. 848).

However, in the place names of the period which originate from personal names, we find the Hungarian order of names, for example 1301: Suprunyuklosmalna (Suproni Miklós personal name structure + malom ‘mill’; HA. 3: 29); 1291: Adosoansfeldes (Adós János personal name structure + föld ‘estate’; OklSz.), 1321/1323 > 1370: Kincses András personal name structure + falu ‘village’; Hajdu 2003: 738), etc.

With the appearance of names signifying nexus, the name system became three-fold (cf. Figure 2). The development of family names as a kind of nexus name resulted in important structural changes not only in the personal name system in general, but also in the personal name use of individuals. The appearance of this type of personal name was also associated with the use of each name type in a specified structure: 1302: servientem suum Nymiklous vocatum (Nagy ‘big’ family name + Miklós referential name; A. 1: 28), 1399: Zekewpather ... de Bezeldeg (Szőke ‘fair-haired’ family name + Péter referential name;
Official personal name use is built in this manner even today: it consists of the combination of the family name and the Christian name.

In Hungarian personal name use, the bearing of family names was decreed by royal regulations in the second half of the 18th century, which also tied the changing of names to royal permission (cf. Parkas 2009). However, in reality, these regulations only sanctioned a custom formed long ago. On the other hand, the inheritance of family names did not mean unchanged, solidified name use until this legislation, as these names had not been bound by any kind of codification constraint. Therefore, the changing of one's family name was a natural phenomenon until the introduction of official matriculation.

Independent of the development and solidification of family names as a type of nexus name, a group of descriptive names which operates as an open, varied and variable (mostly oral) subsystem unshackled by any kind of codification has continually existed in Hungarian. These modern bynames appeared in the name system not as some new name type, nor is their development explained by the intention to avoid identical names, but rather their use is the result of the same natural cognitive mechanism which determined the use of the earliest descriptive names. Thus, from a taxonomic point of view, modern examples of descriptive personal names (e.g. Gorilla 'gorilla', Kétméteres 'two-metre tall', Bajusz 'moustache', Sánta 'limp', Faluvégi 'living at the end of the village', Kecske 'goat', Kancsi 'cross-eyed', Hegyesbajusz 'having a pointed moustache', Vén 'old') belong to the same group as the earliest descriptive names and are identical to them in regard to every important feature.

In today's personal name use, names with an affective function (i.e. affective names) are prominently featured on different levels of everyday language use, mostly in a closer community or family environment due to the strong personal and emotional relationship between name users.

Projecting this experience onto a historical plane, we can assume that this name type must have had an essential function in any period of personal name history and use. However, the scholar of personal name history has little opportunity to prove this hypothesis by facts in relation to Old Hungarian. Actual source data hardly make it possible to trace an emotional attitude or affective function behind them. Thus it can be no more than a strong suspicion that the name forms Petőc, Peténye, Póc, Dákó, Páka, etc. of 1293: Petrus dictus Petacuncia (ÁSz. 632), 1306: Petrus filioi Petri dicti petune (Fehértói 1969: 125), 1353: Pauli dicti Powch de Malah (Fehértói 1969: 128), 1391: Dominicum alio nomine dako (Fehértói 1969: 81), 1397: Pauli Faka dicti (Fehértói 1969: 123), etc. could have been personal names with affective functions as the derivatives of the referential names Péter, Pát and Domonkos, since we can only support this view indirectly with general arguments.

To summarise the history of the Hungarian personal name system, I highlight the following circumstances. In the earliest documented period of the history of the Hungarian language, the personal name system undoubtedly possessed descriptive names which are defined as the most ancient name type. In addition, we must also consider
referred names among the elements of the system, for which the source base was partly provided by personal names borrowed from languages in contact with Hungarian. Thus, the personal name system laid out before us in the first centuries of the Kingdom of Hungary may be regarded as a two-fold system and, in all probability, this statement also holds true for the periods preceding. On a later level of social sophistication, the category of nexus names appeared in the Hungarian personal name system, first to express the kinship of the genus, then that of the family. With this development, the name system became a three-fold system.

The present study has offered a model using a cognitive-pragmatic approach for describing personal name systems, and briefly outlined its applicability to the Hungarian name system. In my opinion, it provides better possibilities than other theoretical frameworks due to its universal validity; this approach therefore can effectively handle the very different typological (semantic, syntactic, morphological) characteristics of individual languages. The model is capable of describing the personal name systems of individual languages in synchronic and diachronic terms, and also renders various taxonomic name characterisations mutually compatible. This possibility renders the findings more precise and more reliable, and can reveal cultural relationships through a perspective on those earlier periods that have influenced the giving and use of personal names (see also Hoffmann & Tóth 2015).
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