

ANNALES  
UNIVERSITATIS MARIAE CURIE-SKŁODOWSKA  
LUBLIN – POLONIA

VOL. XXXVII

SECTIO FF

1-2019

---

JAROMÍR KRŠKO

Matej Bel University, Slovak Republic

ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3015-4521>

e-mail: [jaromir.krsko@umb.sk](mailto:jaromir.krsko@umb.sk)

## Reflection of the Historical Facts in the Formation of the Medieval Anthroponymy (with an Example from Hont)<sup>1</sup>

---

Odbicie faktów historycznych w kształtowaniu średniowiecznej antroponimii (na przykładzie Hontu)

The research of the oldest anthroponymy (Middle Ages) preserved in historical documents, court files, etc. represents an important part of onomastics – through an analysis of these archive materials, day-to-day life of the highest social strata as well as that of their subjects is revealed; the information on the contemporary culture and the way people in the past perceived the environment in which they lived and worked is acquired. Secondary information found in historical documents reveals a lot about the employment conditions, migration of the population within individual domains, relationship of specific people towards superior institutions, and family background in individual micro-communities.

The preserved anthroponyms (especially in the lowest social strata) also reflect unofficial anthroponymy used in day-to-day communication. When the representatives of the given dominion came into official contact with the respective contact person in the village (usually the mayor or a member of the village council), a clerk was present to record the names of the subjects who were obliged to pay taxes to the respective gentry. Another reason why records were kept was that local subjects

---

<sup>1</sup> The study was created within the VEGA 1/0095/17 “Križa a kolaps na pomedzí stredoveku a novoveku (sondy do problematiky v slovenskom kontexte)” / “Crisis and Collapse at the Turn between the Middle Ages and Modern History (Probes into the Issue in the Slovak Context)” research project.

(who were considered as property of the village) included property transactions of the village for sale, purchase, or exchange<sup>2</sup>. The final form in which anthroponyms were recorded may have been determined by the respective clerk's experience and knowledge of the local language (or dialect), therefore, different versions of the same name originated (Fabianus *Posawka* – Žibritov, 1558; Iacobus *Buzawka* / Petrus *Buzalka* – Žibritov, 1602; Andreas *Swecz* / Laurentius *Schwecz* – Krnišov, 1558). If the records at the beginning of the 17<sup>th</sup> century confirm that the two-name system with hereditary surname had already been established, the occurrence of single names may have been influenced by clerks who were unable to write down the first name due to their inability to understand its form; another reason may be that in the context of unofficial names used in the given village, a person may have been known under a single name (however, it would be in conflict with the list of taxpayers as an official document) (*Matheczkj*, *Mjkwš* – Ilija, 1558; *Pjetrovskj* – Svätý Anton, 1602; *Prauotinzkj* – Devičie, 1602; etc.). Lastly, the final form of an anthroponym may have been influenced by a historian who misread the original record in the document. A deviation may be caused, e.g. by graphics in the original document.

Historical documents used for anthroponymy studies from the Hont region of Slovakia include mainly the monograph by István Bakács (1971) and some land inventories, by, e.g. Ferenc Maksay (1959), referring to the Middle Ages settlements in Hont. However, this article does not focus on the Hont region as a whole, only the Čabrad' dominion was selected for research. In the late Middle Ages, the Čabrad' Castle dominion covered the settlement around the castle (later Čabradské Podhradie), Čabrad' praedium (today, probably the Kónské isolated settlement), and villages Čabradský Vrbovok, Medovarce, Devičie, Teplica (today the Tepličky isolated settlement nearby Hontianske Nemce), Krnišov (today Kráľovce-Krnišov), Žibritov, Štefultov (a town borough in Banská Štiavnica), Ilija, Svätý Anton, Prenčov (both villages with extinct *praedia* – Dorfel, Pakhaus a Štálov), Beluj and Lehôtka (today Sitnianska Lehôtka). In the Southwestern part of Hont, the dominion covered Opava and at the end of the Middle Ages, Čelovce were incorporated as well as properties in Horné Nekyje, Neklinec (today a part of the Vinica village), Ďurkovce, and Sečianky. In the central part of the Hont region, the dominion covered properties in Slatina and from the end of the Middle Ages, also in Plášťovce and Rykynčice. Eventually, at the Western border of the Hont region, the dominion owners acquired properties in Devičany, Veľký Pesek,

---

<sup>2</sup> As an example, the division of the Čabrad' dominion in 1475 and 1476 can be used – the property was to be divided among the owners Peter Horvát and his sister-in-law, Eufrozína, the widow of Damián Horvát. The parties had to write down all property including the subjects (heads of the individual families) from whom they collected taxes and demanded work. The inventories specify the names of representatives pertaining to individual settlements (Maliniak and Krško, 2018, p. 2).

Trhyňa (today a part of Sikenica) and Šalov (Maliniak, 2017, including a map of property). Mainly Vladimír Šmilauer (1973) and Milan Majtán (see e.g. Majtán, 1980) studied anthroponymy in this area. In the analysis of multiple anthroponyms, interpretations of several works on historical anthroponymy can be used, mainly Maria Malec's corpus (1994).

In the paper presented at the 20<sup>th</sup> Slovak Onomastic Conference in 2017 (Maliniak and Krško, 2018), the author focused on historical anthroponyms of subjects who lived in the Čabrad' dominion in 1408–1526. There is an inventory of 1475/1476 listing the subjects (heads of the individual families who paid the taxes), because at the time, a major division of property took place (see note no. 2). In this time period, more than 500 personal names were observed. The written form of anthroponyms recorded in the historical inventories was largely influenced by the fact that Latin was used to draft the documents, sometimes complemented by a few German records, but the territory was ethnically mixed. The Slovak population lived in the central part while the Hungarian population lived in the south.

As mentioned in the analysis of the materials from the turn between the 15<sup>th</sup> and 16<sup>th</sup> centuries, the oldest documents from the period indicate that the one-name anthroponymic system was in decline – *Johannes* (Prenčov, 1476), *Martus* (Prenčov, 1512), *Jakab* (Devičie, 1476), *Stephan*, *Moyses*, *Jacobawitz*<sup>3</sup>, *Miksche* (Štefultov, 1509), *Martinus*, *Anthonius* (Krnišov, 1476), *Ladislav* (Medovarce, 1439), *Blasius* (Svätý Anton, 1433), *Gasparus* (Svätý Anton, 1476), *Gilg* (Svätý Anton, 1487), *Gregusch*, *Latzko* (Svätý Anton, 1512), *Venceslav* (Svätý Anton, 1526), *Jacobus* (Žibritov, 1476).

The one-name anthroponymic system no longer allowed for precise identification of the citizens, therefore, more detailed characteristics using the father's name were gradually adopted. This type of anthroponym can also be found in the corpus studied – *Jacobus filius Pauli*, *Thomas filius Johannis*, *Martinus filius Nikoch* (Čabradský Vrbovok, 1408), *Nicolaus filius Jacobi Bensycz*<sup>4</sup>, *Gaspar filius Pagacz*<sup>5</sup> (Čabradský Vrbovok, k1464), *Laurentius et Benedictus filii Luce*, *Naryk filius Berko*, *Symon filius Ruh*, *Petrus filius Jacobi* (Čabradský Vrbovok, 1486).

As previously stated, the records of subjects' names capture the unofficial system of anthroponyms influenced by the need to precisely identify an individual

---

<sup>3</sup> However, the *-ovič* anthropoformant indicates that its owner's name may have also been written in the *filius* form. It was motivated by the father's name (Jakub).

<sup>4</sup> The father's name already consists of two components – Jakub Benšič.

<sup>5</sup> In this case, the father's name was of appellative origin – *Pagáč* (scone). Interestingly, Gašpar Pagáč is recorded as *Gaspar filius Pagacz* in 1464, but in 1476, he is recorded as *Gaspar Pogach*. It indicates that the anthroponym stabilised and the byname was transferred from the father to the son. In this case, it is an early form of a surname.

within a village. Since these records capture live names functioning in day-to-day communication, certain characteristics could be interpreted as nicknames. As correctly pointed out by Iveta Valentová (2012),

[...] an individual nickname and characteristics (Ch) as a functional element of an unofficial name both share the same semantic attribute [specific social practice]. However, in (Ch) and unofficial names of which (Ch) can be a part, the specific social practice is shared by the whole village community. Nicknames are typical in small social groups limited by age, interests, profession, or other social aspects (classroom, teachers collective, other group of colleagues, group of friends, hunters, prisoners, etc. (Valentová, 2012, p. 116).

The relationship between onomastic terms *byname – characteristics* (Ch) – *nickname* as proposed by Valentová in her study seems appropriate, especially regarding the differences between the characteristics (Ch) and nickname. However, the author of this article perceives the position of terms *byname – characteristics* (Ch) as a functional element in an unofficial name differently – in terms of motivational factors and functional validity, they show the largest overlap. Valentová sees a functional connection between the historical byname and nickname,

[...] in Slovak onomastics, this kind of “historical” nickname in the one-name system acquired the term *príměno* (byname). Upon its codification (1781) during Josephinian reforms, it became a hereditary element in the two-name anthroponymic system and the term “surname” was introduced (Valentová, 2012, p. 114).

Individual bynames allowed for precise identification of specific individuals within the social group in the given village – inside the community and outside it (in our case, in relation to the Čabrad' Castle as an administrative unit). They were a stable part of the unofficial form of the respective anthroponym, which means that they only worked along with a specific first name of an individual (apart from the nickname, which works regardless of its owner's first name or surname). By acquiring the attribute (+ heredity), they transformed into a type of anthroponyms referred to as surnames in onomastics. The acquisition of hereditary nature can be observed in younger anthroponyms from the turn between the 16<sup>th</sup> and 17<sup>th</sup> century, which indicates that the 16<sup>th</sup> century was an important period for the formation of the two-name system.

The specific position of bynames can be seen in its close connection with the motivating appellative and proper name to which they are primarily bound in terms of proprial functions – nomination, specification, and differentiation. The existing semantic attributes of the respective appellative are still preserved in the byname, therefore, it could be approached as an appellative itself. On the other

hand, the combination of the byname with the superordinate anthroponym must be seen as a proper name in term of its function (to precisely identify a specific individual) (see also Trawińska, 2017, p. 200). The byname stage (at the border between an appellative and proper name) allowed the clerk to translate some of the names into Hungarian or Latin in certain cases. A proper name as such cannot be translated, only appellatives can (for more details, see Krško, 2002, pp. 150–151). Evidence can be found in subjects' names: *Michael Carnifex*, *Petrus Faber*, *Michael Molnar*, *Benedictus Wamos* (Svätý Anton, 1476, Lat. *carnifex* – “butcher”; Lat. *faber* – “smith”; Hun. *molnár* – “miller”; Hun. *vamos* – “toll collector”), *Laurentius Warga*, *Paulus Molnar* (Prenčov, 1476, Hun. *varga* – “shoemaker”; Hun. *molnár* – “miller”). Some bynames reflect not only the gradual transition from the one-name system to the two-name system, but also refer to the extralingual reality – the tension between pagan and Christian worldviews, e.g. names such as *Symon Pogan* (Medovarce, 1439), *Nicolaus Pohanoczky*, *Georgius Pogaan* (Medovarce, 1476) characterise their owners as pagans. The names *Gallus Pyspek* (Medovarce, 1476, maď. *püspök* – “bishop”<sup>6</sup>), *Nicolaus Sentew dictus* (Čabradský Vrbovok, 1408), *Petrus Zenthe* (Čabradský Vrbovok, 1453, Hun. *szent* – “saint”) are in opposition to the pagan names and refer to baptised persons or strong believers.

As for anthroponyms pertaining to the Middle Ages, the byname (referred to as Lat. *dictus*) was added during the period when the two-name system was emerging to specify an attribute of the name's owner – in a document from Čabradský Vrbovok of 1408, the following names of subjects are listed: *Thomas dictus Pelhes*, *Nicolaus Sentew dictus*, *Vrbanus Nikus dictus Nemeth*, *Johannes dictus Kaezen*, *Anthonius dictus Chulek*; 1464 – *Michael Cherthok dictus*; 1486 – *Ladislaus dictus Warboky*. In later documents (1558 and 1602) this form is no longer found.

The analysis of the older period from 1408 to 1526 brought an important result: the bynames of subjects in the Čabrad' dominion were motivated by katoikonims of villages within the territory pertaining to the castle. According to the records of 1476, Lehôtka included a single farmhouse assigned to *Blasius Lehothkay*. The “Lehotský” (Hun. *Lehotkai*) katoikonim refers to the place where this subject lived. However, the katoikonim was not necessary, since only this one person lived in the village and his first name allowed for precise identification. The same applies to Teplička (extinct village): in the records of 1476, *Georgius Thepliczey* (Teplický) can be found. The Opava records include four subjects including *Lucas Apoway* (Opavský), and the records from Čabradský Vrbovok of the same year

---

<sup>6</sup> In this case, the byname may not have been motivated by the owner being an actual bishop – he may have been bald, which resembled a priest's tonsure or, for example, openly presented his religion.

include *Jacobus Warbok* (Vrbovský, or Vrbovok). Interestingly, the bynames of katoikonymic origin refer to individuals from certain villages, one would therefore expect that all locals would share the same byname. It is not known whether these bynames were actually used in day-to-day communication among the locals or they were merely written down this way (translated into Hungarian or created in Hungarian) by the clerk for the purpose of identification. However, it is assumed that these bynames were motivated by the need to express the relation of the villagers to the respective castle, i.e. these persons facilitated communication between the village and the castle, therefore, the castle representatives addressed these subjects in particular. If so, the bynames would fulfil not only the differentiating, but also informative functions.

In the earlier stage of the two-name anthroponymic system (represented by the 1558–1602 period in our research sample), the traces of the one-name system (first name only) were no longer found. The two-name anthroponymic system referring to the son-father familial relationship was observable minimally when the number of names reached 509, and only 5 names of this kind were found (*Jacobus Philippi filius, Bartolomaeus filius Vhriny* – Sitnianska Lehôtka, 1602; *Ioannes filius Abrahami* – Ilija, 1602; *Bartholomaei Gregorii filii* – Opava, 1602; *Filii Matthiae Nyekj* – Nkyje, 1602). The original model expressing the direct patrilineal relationship has been substituted by a change to the formal aspects of the proper name in terms of onymic derivation. The anthropoformant *-ovič* was used to express the son-father familial relationship *Janko Bogalowjcz, Mjkwš Stepanczowjcz, Janko Galowjcz, Anthal Benjowjcz, Jano Hemplowjch, Sjmko Kapsowjcz* (Prenčov, 1558); *Adamus Paulowich, Iacobus Durinowich, Ioannes Klymentowjch* (Krnišov, 1602); *Gregorii Laczkowjch, Francisci Laczkowjch* (Rykynčice, 1602); *Iacobi Mihalowjch* (Prenčov, 1602); *Michael Ondrasowjch, Stephanus Lukaczowjch* (Svätý Anton, 1602).

Despite stating that in the earlier period (1558–1602) the one-name system was not observed, there are subjects listed under a single name in the analysed file – *Pwrthel* (Svätý Anton, 1558); *Matheczkj, Mjkwš* (Ilija, 1558); *Pjjetrowskj* (Svätý Anton, 1602); *Prautinzkj* (Devičie, 1602); *Ztankowjch, Czernakowjch, Stiemkowjch, Miskowech, Feriencz* (Prenčov, 1602); *Laurentius* (Beluj, 1602); *Florenowich, Kowachowjch* (Krnišov, 1602). However, these names reflect the unofficial system of names, which represented the contemporary communication situation. The person who dictated the names of the individual tax payers house to house to the clerk would do so by providing names used in day-to-day communication – some subjects were listed under their first names and surnames in (official) communication – *Michael Sjbredowskj, Benedictus Klyment* (Krnišov, 1602); some were listed under surnames only – *Miskowech, Feriencz* (Prenčov, 1602); some

first names were written down in their official (Latinised) form, and hypocoristic forms of first names were used in some cases – *Gregorius Zthanjowjcz / Jwrko Gregwssowjcz* (Svätý Anton, 1558); *Jan Zthankow / Janko Bogalowjcz, Janko Galowjcz, Jano Hemplowjch* (Prenčov, 1558). In the list of subjects in Nekye<sup>7</sup> of 1558, the three-name system was found: *Ioannes Thoth Antal, Thoth Janos Thamas*. To allow for precise identification of individuals, the first name and surname were complemented by another element of the unofficial name (byname) – *Antal, Tamáš*.

The extension of the anthroponym elements is related to the need for precise identification of individual tax payers. When the number of people bearing the same name increases, onymic polysemy emerges (see Krško, 2002). If the father and son shared the same name, the clerk resolved the situation by adding *senior, junior* – *Pauli Zabo senioris, Pauli Zabo iunioris* (Slatina, 1602). In other cases, the clerk would use the word *another (alter)* – *Michael Thoth, Alter Michael Thoth* (Slatina, 1558), *Gregorius Hremiar, Alter Gregorius Hremiar* (Žibritov, 1602), *Thomas Burda, Alter Thomas Burda* (Krnišov, 1602).

In records of 1558 and 1602, the list of tax payers began including women too. The clerk listed the widows who were supposed to pay taxes after their husbands died. The way their names were written down also reflect their contemporary usage – some of them were listed using their late husbands' names – *Relicta Lazkow* (Svätý Anton, 1558); *Relicta Gasparic* (Ilija, 1558); *Relicta quondam*<sup>8</sup> *Kropelka* (Svätý Anton, 1602); *Relicta Jelenowjch* (Krnišov, 1602). Some names of late husbands included both their first names and surnames – *Relicta Petri Frolin, Relicta Ioannis Kowach* (Štefultov, 1602); *Relicta Andreae Berka* (Čelovce, 1602); *Relictae Galli Mese* (Medovarce, 1602). A shift in the way female anthroponyms were recorded can be observed in examples such as *Relictae Marthae Zajacowjch, Relictae Dorotheae Zajacowjch* (Čabradský Vrbovok, 1602); here, the women's first names – Marta, Dorota who both married men with the surname Zajac were recorded<sup>9</sup>. As for the *Relicta Dora* (Ilija, 1558) record, an extralingual reality can be assumed – it was probably a woman who lost her husband long ago and people no longer referred to her using his name, instead they used her own first name. *Relicta Polka et Mykws* (Krnišov, 1558) refers to a widow who lived in the same household with a tenant, Mikuš. Their mutual relationship cannot be determined, he

<sup>7</sup> In terms of nationality, the village was inhabited by Slovak and Hungarian population, therefore, the Tóth surname was the most frequent (Hun. *Tóth* = Slovak) to distinguish the members of other than Hungarian ethnic group.

<sup>8</sup> Lat. *quondam* – (about a person) late (Marek, 2012, p. 240) – *Relicta quondam Kropelka* – late Kropelka's widow.

<sup>9</sup> The *-ovič* anthropoformant used in patrilineal male surnames (see note no. 3) is possessive in women's names too.

may have been her partner, brother, brother-in-law... Either way, these records listed the people who were obliged to pay taxes. The last (interesting) record – *Relicta Wýdowa* (Krnišov, 1558) – was created by mistake, the clerk did not understand the anthroponym and listed the person literally as a widow (*vdova*).

A major shift from the two-name anthroponymic system consisting of first name and byname towards the two-name anthroponymic system consisting of first name and surname took place. The surname was no longer hereditary and had no semantic relation to the appellative value of the byname, which reflects in the fact that inhabitants of the same village no longer share surnames – *Daniel Hremiar / Gregorius Hremiar* (Žibritov, 1602). There are also people sharing both first names and surnames who had to be distinguished by the clerk by adding the adjective *another* (*alter*) – *Thomas Burda, Alter Thomas Burda* (Krnišov, 1602). There is clear evidence that the modern two-name system was emerging, i.e. *Ioannes Hrnčiar figulus* (Svätý Anton, 1602) – this man was further characterised by his occupation (Lat. *figulus* – “potter”) although his surname was *Hrnčiar* (= potter). The emphasis on his occupation using the appellative “potter” points out that his surname no longer related to the appellative of occupation or other information.

The anthroponyms pertaining to the Čabrad' dominion subjects during the Middle Ages and Modern History capture unofficial anthroponymy used in day-to-day communication. The research sample reflecting anthroponymy during almost a 200-year period points out that the 15<sup>th</sup> century played the key role in the transition to the two-name system with hereditary surname as we know it today. The gradual transition of the original one-name system through different types of two-name systems in the early stages (mostly a combination of the first name and a characterising byname) moved towards the combination of the first name and hereditary surname, which no longer reflected the original appellative value of the byname.

*Translated into English by Marianna Bachledová*

## REFERENCES

- Bakács, István. (1971). *Hont vármegye Mohács előtt*. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.
- Krško, Jaromír. (2002). Mikroštruktúrne vzťahy v onymii. *Slovenská reč*, 67(3), pp. 142–152.
- Maksay Ferenc. (1959). *Urbáriumok XVI–XVII. század. Magyar Országos Levéltár kiadványai, II. Forráskiadványok 7*. Budapest, 1959. Downloaded from: [https://library.hungaricana.hu/hu/view/MolDigiLib\\_MOLkiadv2\\_07/?pg=4&layout=s](https://library.hungaricana.hu/hu/view/MolDigiLib_MOLkiadv2_07/?pg=4&layout=s) (access: 05.09.2018).
- Majtán, Milan. (1980). Príspevok k metodike výskumu historickej antroponymie. In: Jozef Ružička (ed.), *Jazykovedné štúdie. 15. Horeckého zborník* (pp. 151–155). Bratislava: Veda.



- Malec, Maria. (1994). *Imiona chrześcijańskie w średniowiecznej Polsce*. Kraków: Instytut Języka Polskiego PAN.
- Maliniak, Pavol, Krško, Jaromír. (2018). *Medzi zmenou a kontinuitou. Mená poddaných hradu Čabrad' v neskorom stredoveku*. Paper presented at the "Konvergencie a divergencie v propriálnej sfére" conference (Banská Bystrica 26–28 June 2017), 11 rkp. (in press).
- Maliniak, Pavol. (2017). K majetkovým pomerom na Čabradskom panstve v neskorom stredoveku. *Acta historica Neosoliensia*, 20(1), pp. 4–34.
- Marek, Miloš. (2012). *Glossarium mediae et infimae latinitatis Slovaciae*. Vol. II (L–Z). Trnava: Filozofická fakulta Trnavskej univerzity v Trnave.
- Šmilauer, Vladimír. (1973). Ze staré antroponymie v Hontu. In: Michal Blich, Milan Majtán (eds.), *Zborník Pedagogickej fakulty v Prešove Univerzity P.J. Šafárika v Košiciach, roč. XII, zv. 3 Slavistika, V. zasadanie Medzinárodnej komisie pre slovanskú onomastiku a V. slovenská onomastická konferencia* (Prešov 3–7 May 1972). *Zborník materiálov* (pp. 185–196). Bratislava: SPN.
- Trawińska, Maria. (2017). Między *nomen appellativum* a *nomen proprium* w poznańskich księgach ziemskich z XIV i XV wieku. *Acta Universitatis Lodziensis. Folia Linguistica*, 51(1), pp. 199–206.
- Valentová, Iveta. (2012). Poznámky k rozdielom medzi prezývkou a funkčným členom živého mena – individuálnou charakteristikou. In: Martin Ološtiak (ed.), *Jednotlivé a všeobecné v onomastike. Zborník referátov z 18. slovenská onomastická konferencie (Prešov 12–14 September 2011)* (pp. 113–122). Prešov: Filozofická fakulta Prešovskej univerzity v Prešove (printed version). Downloaded from: <http://www.pulib.sk/elpub2/FF/Olostiak3/index.html>. ISBN 978-80-555-0594-7 (access: 05.09.2018).

## ABSTRACT

The paper discusses the way the two-name anthroponymic system was formed – the original one-name system (first name) evolved into the two-name system (first name + byname) and later, the three-name system was established (first name + hereditary byname + functional element of the unofficial name). In the period when the byname became hereditary and was transferred to the following generation, it turned into a surname in terms of its function, and its semantic value went extinct. The lists of subjects in the Hont region of Slovakia were used as the material for analysis. Functional elements of the unofficial names correspond with today's elements of unofficial anthroponymy; in the past, they were motivated by their owner's occupation, mental and physical attributes, or their place of origin. The analysis of these names brings important knowledge about the history: the anthroponyms provide information on occupation, origin, and appearance of people in the Middle Ages.

**Keywords:** Hont, anthroponymy, anthroponymic system, two-name system, byname

## ABSTRAKT

W artykule omówiono sposób, w jaki utworzony został dwuimienny system antroponimiczny – pierwotny system imienny (pierwsze imię) ewoluował w system dwuimienny (imię + przydomek), a następnie zakorzenił się system trójimienny (imię + nazwisko dziedziczne/rodowe + element funkcjonalny nazwy nieoficjalnej). W okresie gdy przydomek stał się nazwą dziedziczną, która była przekazywana następnemu pokoleniu, zaczął funkcjonować jako zwykłe nazwisko, a jego wartość semantyczna wygasła. Jako materiał do analizy wykorzystano spisy mieszkańców w regionie Hont na Słowacji. Elementy funkcjonalne nazw nieoficjalnych odpowiadają dzisiejszym elementom

nieoficjalnej antroponimii; w przeszłości motywowały je zawód właściciela, atrybuty psychiczne i fizyczne lub miejsce pochodzenia. Analiza tych nazw przynosi ważną wiedzę na temat historii: antroponimy dostarczają informacji dotyczących wykonywanego zawodu, pochodzenia i wyglądu ludzi w średniowieczu.

**Słowa kluczowe:** Hont, antroponimia, system antroponimiczny, system dwumienny, przydomek

---

Article submission date: 20.02.2019

Date qualified for printing after reviews: 07.06.2019