

Mariann S l í z (Budapest)

A TYPOLOGY OF CONTACT PHENOMENA IN MEDIEVAL PERSONAL NAMES (A HISTORICAL ONOMASTIC SURVEY BASED ON MEDIEVAL DOCUMENTS FROM HUNGARY)

Medieval Hungary was a multicultural country: beside the Hungarian majority it also had Turkic, German, Slavic, Walloon, Italian, etc. inhabitants. Although the majority of medieval documents were written in Latin, there are a number of charters written in other languages, such as German. This cultural and linguistic diversity provides an opportunity to investigate contact phenomena among different languages based on personal name phrases. The paper outlines the methodological adaptability and the limits of using given names, bynames or family names and name phrases in the investigation of contact phenomena. It introduces language and discourse contact phenomena on the level of spelling and orthography and the morphology and syntax of name phrases, based upon examples from charters written in Latin and German.

Key words

personal names; bilinguality; contact phenomena; medieval Hungary; charters; German; Latin; Hungarian

1. Aims and scopes

Medieval Hungary was a multicultural country: besides the Hungarian majority, it also had Turkic, German, Slavic, Walloon, Italian etc. inhabitants. The prestige of the languages used by these ethnicities in Hungary was not at all equal. It is beyond question that Latin had the greatest prestige – at least concerning literacy, similarly to other European countries. Thus, it is not surprising that the majority of medieval documents were written in Latin. However, there are a considerable number of 14–16th-century deeds written in other languages, mostly in German and less often in Czech. This cultural and linguistic diversity may provide an opportunity to investigate contact phenomena between different languages based on personal name structures.

This paper intends to connect with works that examine personal name stocks from the viewpoint of contacts between languages and cultures (cf. e.g. Blomqvist, 2015; Haubrichs – Jochum-Godglück, 2019). Studies on contactology have attracted attention in Hungarian anthroponomastics, too, although these primarily concentrate on synchronic name stocks. One reason for this is that the name stocks and name use of Hungarian minorities have been at the centre of onomastic interest. Another reason is methodological: synchronic name stocks are more eligible for research of this kind, as detailed information can be gained from informants

about the lingual and social-political situation, family history, lifestyle and the diversity of attitudes that influence name-giving and name use.

Contrary to this, a historical approach that only uses historical sources for the study of contact phenomena in the personal name system and name use faces several difficulties. The main challenge is that these studies cannot be separated from the question of bi- and multilingualism while the possibility of detecting the ethnicity and mono- or multilingual background of historical name bearers is limited. Additionally, most medieval deeds do not reflect the name use of the bearer, but rather a variant of the name written by a clerk. Latin documents contain mostly Latinised versions, while German documents mostly Germanised forms of names. Moreover, these forms are influenced by the clerk's local dialect and knowledge of the language.

Despite these difficulties, the publication of a select few works in the last two decades indicates that contactology may have a *raison d'être* from a diachronic point of view. For instance, two papers written by János N. Fodor (2008; 2015) examine interference phenomena in a 16th-century census written by a supposedly German clerk and in the databases of the first country-wide censuses (1715, 1720). Rudolf Szentgyörgyi's works (2007; 2012) concentrate on the Hungarian-Slovakian bilingual background of the participants of a witch trial making notable remarks on name use in language contact situations.

As the prequel of this paper can also be considered the examination intended to reveal whether name data from medieval charters is utilizable in the historical study of multilingualism (Slíz, 2013). The answer was partially affirmative. Thus this paper aims to outline a typology of contact phenomena discoverable using medieval given names, bynames or family names and name structures as linguistic data. In the following, the system of contact phenomena among synchronic proper names elaborated by István Lanstyák (2013) will serve as the base of this categorisation.

2. The sources of the investigation

The sources of the study are the author's corpus of about 20,000 personal names collected from Latin charters written between 1301 and 1359 (Slíz, 2011–2017), and data found in 14–16th-century Latin and German documents from the city of Sopron (SoprT.). The use of these two corpora was motivated by the following facts.

In Hungary, the history of document writing dates back to the beginning of the 11th century. The prototypical language of charters was Latin although some other languages were also used in a narrower time frame and in limited functions. German first appeared as the language of charters in Hungarian cities with German-Hungarian populations in the first half of the 14th century, following primarily

Bavarian and Austrian models, and it became more frequent from the end of the century onwards. The first extant German document written at the royal chancellery is from the very end of the 14th century (cf. Mollay, 1982, pp. 120–121). German was mostly used for the documentation of the internal affairs of cities populated by Germans and for the written communication of these cities with each other, while they continued to use Latin in external, country-wide affairs (Solymosi, 2006, p. 165). For this reason, German charters, which did not have long-standing traditions in Hungary and were used in more “familiar” circles, may reflect spoken name use more directly than Latin charters (which of course also preserved some traces).

Nevertheless, it is worth noting that the number of discernible contact phenomena in medieval personal names is so low – even in German documents – that making calculations about their number in proportion to the grand total of any corpus is pointless.

3. A crucial question: the multilingualism of scribes

German and Latin documents are feasible sources for such a study because of the multilingual background of medieval scribes. They were native or educated speakers of one or more languages and additionally learned Latin at school. In the following, when examining discourse contact phenomena in orthography and on morphological and syntactic levels, it will be obvious that at times data make it possible to detect not only multilingualism but also pinpoint the influencing language. When studying the subject, the question arises whether the actual scribe’s knowledge of languages should be regarded as an example of folk (spontaneous, natural) or elite (educational, artificial) bi- or multilingualism. The question can only be answered on a case-by-case basis. However, a general conclusion can be made: Latin was beyond question a learned language, while German may have been a scribe’s mother tongue, for example in the German-Hungarian populated city of Sopron. Moreover, there were foreign scribes in the city too, from Bavaria or Austria. At the turn of the 14th and 15th centuries, King Sigismund of Luxembourg (whose father was King of Bohemia and Holy Roman Emperor, and who himself also became King of Bohemia and Holy Roman Emperor) employed Hungarian, German and Czech scribes at the royal chancellery (Mollay, 1982, pp. 120–121). German scribes born and raised in Hungary can presumably be characterised with German–Hungarian folk bilingualism, as they must have been influenced by the Hungarian language in some level, even in a city populated by a German majority. Contrary to these, scribes from abroad became bi- or multilingual through education. Namely non-Hungarian scribes also had to learn Hungarian, as one of their tasks was explaining the contents of a document to interested parties in their own language (cf. Balázs, 1989, p. 102). Consequently, native

German scribes in medieval Hungary must have been not bi- but at least trilingual: beside German, they learnt Hungarian and Latin. As for native Hungarian scribes, they had to learn Latin and additionally, they may also have known German, if they lived in a mixed German-Hungarian populated area of the Hungarian Kingdom, or they may have learnt German at the universities they attended in the Holy Roman Empire.

Additionally, it should be noted that traces of other influencing languages (Slavic, French, Italian) also appear in Latin documents sporadically, as it will be shown, due to the multiethnic nature of the medieval Hungarian Kingdom and the fact that several Hungarian scribes attended French, Italian, Czech, or Polish universities. There is much less known about the multilingualism of these scribes. However, they were presumably trilingual, too. (For further information on the status of languages and multilingualism in medieval Hungary see Szende, 2009.)

The decision regarding whether data refers to the folk or elite bilingualism of scribes is rather complicated. Mollay considers the spelling of German names in documents to be the trace: phonematic spelling is a typical feature of elite bilingualism (e.g. *Adelheid*, *Klingenbach*) while folk bilingualism is characterised by phonetic spelling (e.g. *Olhayt*, *Chlyngapoh*) (Mollay, 1982, p. 141). Although exact numbers cannot be provided, the latter type seems to be more frequent in the charters examined in the current survey; e.g. *Othonis filij Rugery de Telesprun* (1314; AO. 1: 356; cf. *Tellesbrunn*), *Oleyt* (1325; AO. 2: 208; cf. *Adelheid*), *Hedreh* (1343; AO. 4: 314; cf. *Heidrich*), *Feuldruh* (1350; AO. 5: 416; cf. *Friedrich*), *Nicolaus dictus Hamerspach* (1416, SoprT. I/2: 116; cf. *Hammersbach*). However, it should be noted that such examples may reflect not only the scribes' but the name users' bilingualism. It is equally conceivable that scribes who did not speak German tried to note the names by ear, following the pronunciation of the name users. Due to the doubts this aspect raises, the type of bilingualism cannot be determined based solely on medieval personal name data.

The problem of the scribes' multilingualism is complex and has several inherent uncertainties. Consequently, the main question is: what types of evidence of multilingualism do personal name data found in medieval charters contain.

4. Language contact phenomena in medieval Latin and German documents in Hungary

Language contact phenomena are the results of linguistic borrowing processes generated by contact effects. In the case of direct language contact phenomena, names are borrowed from a donor language. Another type is indirect language contact phenomena when there is no borrowing of names, only the reordering of the elements (phonemes, morphemes, names) of a language caused by another language. (Cf. Lanstyák, 2013, p. 51.)

First, direct contact phenomena will be introduced on the material of the given names and bynames of medieval Hungary. A great part of the name stock of medieval Hungary was of foreign origin. These names were almost certainly borrowed as the result of bilingualism since the borrowing of Turkic, German, Slavic, French names required a direct connection with these languages. Multiethnic cities, regions inhabited by native and settler ethnicities, immigrant monks, priests, ladies and knights who arrived in the royal court from foreign countries, as well as frequent trade contacts with foreign merchants served as opportunities for language contact. (For further information on ethnicities and mobility in connection with personal name-giving, see Slíz, 2014.) Even the ecclesiastical names of Latin or Greek origin were imported through bilingualism: they were transferred by multilingual priests whose German, French, Italian, or Slavic mother tongue was affected by Latin learned at school and maybe by other spoken languages. This explains the fact that some ecclesiastical names reflect Slavic or German influence: for instance, the form of the name *Miklós* ('Nicholas') reflects Slavic influence. Ecclesiastical names spread in the whole population relatively quickly, therefore they cannot be regarded as living contact phenomena.

The borrowed name stock can be divided into direct loannames (when the name itself was borrowed) and formal loannames (when only a foreign variation of a name used in the source language is imported, e.g. German *Niklin* as a variant of *Nicolaus*, Slavic *Csépán* as a variant of *Stephanus* or Walloon *Gyán* < *Jehan* as a variant of *Johannes*). The majority of formal loannames did not spread among monolingual Hungarians, or relatively few data of such has remained extant. For instance, data for *Gyán* are typically from cities and villages populated by Walloons; e.g. from the city of Esztergom: *Gan* (1331, AO. 2: 541). Similarly, the variants *Niklin* (or *Nikkul* and *Nikkel*) were only to be found in the Nagymartoni family in the 14th century: *Nykul* (1351, AO. 5: 536), *Nyklynus* (1352, AO. 5: 576), *Nykkul* (1352, AO. 5: 597), *Nykulino* (1352, AO. 5: 617), *Nykel* (1354, AO. 6: 268), *Nykkel* (1358, AO. 7: 126). This family owned great estates in Sopron county (in the Western part of Hungary) and had an extended relationship with Austrian families by marriage. One of the two Niklins in the family bore the byname *Magyar* 'Hungarian' in some documents, while the other one, his second cousin, was distinguished as *Német Niklin* 'Niklin German'. The name of an uncle of Niklin Hungarian was recorded in its German variant, *Endurl* (i.e. 'Andrew'), too (cf. Engel, 2003). Considering these data may lead to the conclusion that at least some members of the family were German–Hungarian bilingual. The most widespread formal loanname was *Csépán*. Its relatively high and country-wide frequency shows that it cannot be considered a living contact phenomenon in the 14th century.

It is important to note that these variants can only be regarded as formal loannames while the community is aware of their connection to their base form. If this connection is not obvious, the variants must be declared direct loannames as they

are not considered the variants of a name but independent given names. For example, it can be suspected that the connection of the variants *Niklín* and *Gyán* to their respective base forms *Nicolaus* and *Johannes* was not evident to the scribes who wrote *Nyklynus* (1352, AO. 5: 576) and *Gihaninus* (1323, AO. 2: 103). Latinising the spoken variants of names was less typical than using their Latin base form or preserving their German and Walloon form. Namely Latinisation of spoken variants was generally used in cases when spoken variants could not be connected to any Latin base forms; e.g. *Draganus* (1315, AO. 1: 386), *Farkasius* (1339, AO. 3: 567), *Renoldus* (1343, AO. 4: 327).

Bynames of foreign origin used by Hungarians in multilingual communities may also be direct loannames. Although bynames are generally created in the language of the dominant ethnicity, they may also be sourced from other languages (cf. e.g. Bauko, 2013, pp. 74–75), as it is known from synchronic research. It is worth noting that bynames which emerged from a loanword cannot be considered loannames since the language community did not import the name but the common word and the name was created independently of the donor language of the common word. Consequently, the circumstances of the emergence of a foreign byname must be known to discern whether it can be considered a loanname. The problem is that ascertaining these circumstances is almost impossible. For instance, it is undefinable if the byname *Abeydúch* (1327, KárOkl. 65) is a loanname since several factors of its use are shrouded in mystery. There is no data for the common word *abajdóc* ('double, twin') before its occurrence in the 14th century (the first data of this word in the historical-etymological dictionary TESz. refers to the name bearer in question). However, it does exist as a contemporary Hungarian dialectal word (ÚMTsz., entry *abajdóc*). As a consequence, if it was an element of the Old Hungarian lexicon, it cannot be regarded as a loanname. Additionally, it is also unknown whether the name bearer and the naming community were mono- or multilingual.

5. Indirect contact phenomena in medieval Latin and German documents in Hungary

Changes in the medieval Hungarian personal name system due to the influence of other languages can be mentioned as indirect contact phenomena. One of them is the great shift in the functional type of given names: while the majority of names that were Hungarian must have been descriptive (their function was not only identification but also characterisation), referring, the identifying function took over by the end of the 14th century. A structural change also took effect in the personal name system: a two-element system came into being with the emergence of family names replacing the former one-element system. This change can be considered an influence of foreign languages only partially. Nevertheless, there is no denying

the fact that foreign language patterns transferred by the multilingual clergy and western immigrants played a significant part in the emergence of family names. The Drugeth family serves as an adequate example of the latter case. The founder of the family's Hungarian branch came to Hungary with King Charles I from Naples at the beginning of the 14th century (cf. e.g. Csukovits, 2012, p. 60). While the documentation of bynames shows extreme variance in available sources, even in the case of the same name bearer, the mentions of the members of this family always contained the name *Drugeth* (brought from the French language area). Consequently, this name must have been inherited. That is to say it must have been a family name by the time while the vast majority of Hungarians – even the greatest aristocrats – did not bear a family name in the first part of the 14th century. The family – after settling in Hungary and gaining enormous wealth and power – must soon have Hungarianised; and from that point onwards the use of their family name in the context of a majority with no family names may be regarded as a contact phenomenon.

Another phenomenon – well-known from research concentrating on the name use of contemporary Hungarian minorities – is when in a bi- or multilingual community a person's name has its own variants in the languages used by the community. These variants are alternated adjusting to the situation, the language of the communication partners, etc. This phenomenon can be detected in historical sources, too, and can, pragmatically, be regarded as an indirect contact phenomenon. For instance, a byname meaning 'Transylvanus' of a 15th-century city-dweller from Sopron appears in Latin documents in Hungarian (*Jacob Erdeli*; 1484, SoprT. II/4: 319) and in German (*Jacob Sibenpürger*; 1495, SoprT. II/1: 252). The byname of another person (meaning 'linen-draper') can be found in Hungarian, German and also Latin variants in German and Latin charters. Hungarian variants: *Michaelem Wazonaros* (1458, SoprT. I/4: 245, Latin charter), *Michaelis Waznas* (1463, SoprT. I/5: 79, Latin charter); German variants: *Michaelis Lajnbether* (1465, SoprT. I/5: 155, Latin charter), *Michelen des Leinbater* (1457, SoprT. II/1: 87, German charter); Latin variant: *Michael Linificis* (1475, SoprT. I/5: 155, Latin charter). The Latin variant was evidently only an ad hoc translation for the sake of officiality in general, but the Hungarian and German forms must have been spoken variants of the name.

6. Discourse contact phenomena in medieval Latin and German documents in Hungary

Compared to language contact phenomena, discourse contact phenomena can be detected more easily in historical sources due to their ad hoc nature. This term is namely used for linguistic elements or forms that appear in actual discourse under the influence of another language (Lanstyák, 2013, p. 44). While in the

previously mentioned cases of language contact phenomena the majority of the methodological problems were caused by the lack of information about the ethnic and linguistic background of the name bearer and the name using community, the examination of discourse contact phenomena does not face this shortage. Fortunately, such research has to examine only the written form, as the bilingualism of the scribes is given, as shown above.

6.1 Phonological level and orthography

Investigating the orthography of personal name data in charters, the following name is a relevant example for discourse contact phenomenon: *Zaccio* (1350, AO. 5: 402, Latin charter). The letter combination *cci* was not used for the consonant /tʃ/ in Old Hungarian; the name was repeated outside of the document in a more usual form, with *ch*: *Zachyou*. In this case, Italian influence and a native Italian scribe may be presumed.

There are more examples of German contact phenomena in Latin charters. One of these is when the consonant /ʃ/ was signalled with the letter combination *sch* which was otherwise not used in Hungarian: *Schtephanus* (1354: AO. 6: 244).

Hungarian contact phenomena can be discovered in some German deeds from Sopron, such as the *ew* letter combination for the vowel /ø:/; *Gewri* (1493, SoprT. II/1: 241). This scribe must have been Hungarian–German–Latin trilingual.

As for the phonological level, a characteristic phenomenon referring to German influence is the devoicing of voiced consonants, such as *Estphan* (with /f/ instead of Hungarian *István* with /v/) and *Balaschen* (with /ʃ/ instead of Hungarian *Balázs* with /ʒ/). As the bynames next to these given names are of Hungarian origin, the name bearers' Hungarian ethnicity can be assumed. It is probable that German dominated the other two languages (Latin and Hungarian) of the scribes in question. Similar examples were found by János N. Fodor in a census from 1500–1520, presumably written by a native German scribe, e.g. *temeter* 'Demeter' (N. Fodor, 2008, pp. 254–255).

Hungarian contact phenomena can be found in German documents, where names are written with Hungarian characters, such as letter *sz* for the consonant /s/: e.g. *Laszlo von Gemeren* (1434, SoprT. I/3: 72).

The traces of the Middle Bavarian dialect spoken in Sopron city can be detected in the following examples: *Baczlab van der Duba* and *Baldburg* (instead of *Waclaw* and *Waldpurga*; 1422, SoprT. I/2: 218); *Johanni Wubek de Pelsuikch* and *Wudensem* (instead of *Bebek* and *Budensem*; 1418, SoprT. I/2: 137); *Demetrius, dictus Horbat* (instead of *Horvat*; 1437, SoprT. I/3: 137); *magnifici viri Ladislai filius Baybadi* (instead of *voyvodi*; 1421, SoprT. I/2: 206). (The last structure, which refers to László Tamási of the Héder clan is especially interesting as it contains the honorific – the voivode of Transylvania – and not the name of the father.)

These examples reflect the writing custom used in this dialect: the letters *b* and *w* were used for both consonants /b/ and /v/ interchangeably although *w* became more frequent in starting position from the end of the 13th century onwards (Tauber, 1993, pp. 138–139).

6.2 Morphological and syntactical levels

When investigating discourse contact phenomena on morphological and syntactical levels, name order and the syntactic structures should be taken into consideration.

Hungarian and non-Hungarian personal names were equally recorded generally not in the Hungarian but in the Indo-European name order (given name + byname or family name) in Latin and German charters in medieval Hungary. However, occasionally the Hungarian name order can also be found. When it was used for supposedly non-Hungarians, it might have been a contact phenomenon, such as in the following data collected from a Latin census, filled with names not in their Latin base forms but in their German variants: *Glacz Peter*, *Stober Mertt*, *Schon Peter* (1435; SoprT. II/3: 35). However, this phenomenon might also be a trace of a former German spoken name order since German is a language which puts modifiers before heads (cf. Van Langendonck, 2007, p. 258; Farkas, 2009, p. 28–29) – similarly to Hungarian. Moreover, since the source is a census, i.e. a list of names with no more information on their bearers, the atypical name order may be regarded as an intention to aid in distinguishing people who bore frequent given names. At the same time, it should be noted that the vast majority of names in the document were written in the typical Indo-European name order.

Among syntactic structures, suffixes from spoken languages and double marking in personal name structures can be considered to be discourse contact phenomena as they signal the influence of the scribe's mother tongue on his Latin language use. The following examples may have two interpretations. On the one hand, it may be assumed that the scribes knew the language which affected the Latin structure; this is how the actual spoken language could make an impact on their Latin use. On the other hand, the opposite is also conceivable: they may have created hybrid structures because they did not know the actual spoken language. Not recognising the grammatical markedness of the Hungarian, German, and Slavic name forms, they adopted these names in the Latin structures as if they had been unmarked. In the case of the latter, it would be a misinterpretation to regard these examples as discourse contact phenomena. Nevertheless, as it will be shown, some of the following examples suggest that the scribes knew the actual spoken language. Similar cases appear in documents in Hungarian–Latin and German–Latin pairs too although their ratio is infinitesimal in proportion to the regular Latin structures.

One type of using Hungarian suffixes in Latin structures is the double marking of patronymic bynames: e.g. *Johannis filii Balasee* ‘John, son of Balázs + -é Hungarian patronymic suffix’ (1355, AO. 6: 333). A similar type is double marking bynames of toponymic origin: e.g. *Nicolao filio Andree nigri dicti de Turucy* ‘Nicholas, son of Andrew Black called from Turóci’, while *Turóci* means ‘from Turóc’ per se (*Turóc* place name + -i Hungarian suffix) (1344, AO. 4: 391). In the third type, although the beginning of the structure and the order of the elements are in conformity with the rules of Latin (given name + *filius* + the father’s given name), the byname of toponymic origin is connected to this not with the regular Latin structure (*de* + place name) but its Hungarian spoken form: *Dionisius filius Mark Zaadelei* ‘Dennis, son of Mark Szádeleji (*Szádelő* place name + -i suffix)’ (1345, AO. 4: 508). The position of the Hungarian byname in the Latin structure unequivocally reflects that the scribe was aware of its toponymic origin, in other words, he knew Hungarian to some degree.

The German–Latin double marking of toponymic bynames can be detected in the following data: *Oth de Telyesprunnar* ‘Otho from Tellesbrunn + German suffix’ (1354, AO. 6: 201). A byname of toponymic origin inserted in Latin structures in its German spoken form also appears in Latin charters: *Nicolaus filius Seydlini Mogurdorpher* ‘Nicholas, son of Seydlin Mogurdorpher (*Mogurdorph* place name + German suffix)’ (1355, AO. 6: 270). This example also makes it clear that the scribe recognized the origin of the German byname.

Sometimes German bynames of toponymic origin are connected to the given names atypically with *dictus* ‘called’ in Latin charters, which was typically used to connect bynames based on common words: *Petrus dictus Offner* (1388, SoprT. I/1: 217), *Petrus dictus Ophnar* (1388, SoprT. I/1: 220). However, the toponymic origin of this byname is confirmed by another data from a German charter: *Peter von Ofen* (1379, SoprT. I/1: 180). To explain the atypicality of this data, it might be presumed that the scribe did not know the German name of the Hungarian city Buda although this is hardly conceivable. Another possibility may be that he knew the German name of the city (*Ofen*) but did not realise that the byname refers to this toponym. Two other groups of data seem to confirm this explanation. They contain German toponymic bynames contorted beyond recognition: *Thome dicti Tomohar* (1411, SoprT. I/2: 38, Latin charter), *inter Thomam et Nicolaum Sanderfar* (then *Sanderfar*; 1430, SoprT. I/3: 1, Latin charter). These names can be deciphered only on the basis of data which refer to the same people in other Latin and German charters. The first one comes from the Bavarian settlement name *Turnhof*; cf. *Thoma Turenhofer* (1399, SoprT. I/1: 262, Latin charter), *Thoman Thurnhofer* (1410, SoprT. I/2: 29, German charter). The second one emerged from the German name *Schattendorf* ~ *Schadendorf* of a Hungarian settlement (Somfalva in Sopron county); cf. *Nicolaus filius Mathie de Sadendorff* (1430, SoprT. I/3: 6, Latin charter) and *Taman von Schaddendorff* (1431, SoprT. I/3: 31,

German charter). Taking these cases into consideration, it can be presumed that the contorted forms were a result of the fact that the scribes did not recognise the names, which indicates a lack of German or dialectic knowledge. Nevertheless, there is another feasible explanation in the case of *Offner*: the scribe may have intended to record the spoken variant by using Latin *dictus*, which explicitly alludes to spoken language. This interpretation is supported by similar sporadic examples in the case of Hungarian toponymic bynames recorded by *dictus* instead of *de* + place name: *Johannes dictus Geurii* ‘John called Győri (*Győr* place name + *-i* suffix)’ (1353, AO. 6: 71), *Michaelis dicti Dobazy* ‘Michael called Dobozi (*Doboz* place name + *-i* suffix)’ (1356, AO. 6: 452).

The German–Hungarian double marking of toponymic bynames can also be found in German documents, e.g. *Briccius von Ewry* (1449, SoprT. I/3: 278), *Michael von Wathay* (1452, SoprT. I/3: 356). In these examples, the bynames, which are connected to the given names by the German *von* ‘from, of’ preposition, already contain the Hungarian suffix *-i*, expressing the same meaning.

There is only one example for Slavic–Latin double marking in the 14th-century corpus of 20,000 personal name data from Latin charters (Sliz, 2011–2017): *Salamone filio Wlkowy* ‘Solomon, son of Wlk + Slavic *-ov* patronymic suffix + *-i*’ (1356, AO. 6: 498). This *-i* at the end of the father’s name may be a Latin case ending or less possibly a Hungarian patronymic suffix. In the latter case, this data is an example of not double but triple marking.

7. Conclusion

Concluding the above observations, the problems of introducing and interpreting language and discourse contact phenomena in personal name structures reflect the methodological difficulties which make historical name contactology challenging and sometimes indecisive. Only a fraction of the countless data gleaned from medieval charters can be used for this kind of research, as ascertaining the linguistic background of the name bearers as well as the name-giving and name using communities is problematic. More trustworthy data can be obtained from less official sources which are closer to spoken language. However, these sources are extant from later periods only, which means that the terminus post quem of more regular, chronologically, geographically and socially comprehensive historical contactological research on names in Hungary is the 16th century. Investigations concerning the preceding eras may also lead to limited results, as it was presented, but a broad-spectrum study based on medieval charters demands a disproportionately huge investment of energy and time, and would be excessively liable to uncertainty.

REFERENCES

- AO. = *Anjoukori okmánytár* [Collection of documents from the Angevin Age]. Vol. 1–7. [1–6.] I. Nagy (ed.), Budapest: MTA, 1878–1891. [7.] Gy. TASNÁDI NAGY (ed.), Budapest: MTA, 1920.
- BALÁZS, J. (1989): A latin a Duna-tájon [Latin in the Danube Area]. In: J. Balázs (ed.), *Nyelvünk a Duna-tájon*. Budapest: Tankönyvkiadó, pp. 95–140.
- BAUKO, J. (2013): Kontaktusjelenségek a szlovákiai magyarok személynévhasználatában [Contact phenomena in the use of personal names by Slovakia Hungarians]. In: F. Vörös (ed.), *A nyelvi kölcsönhatások és a személynevek. A nyelvöldrajztól a névföldrajzig IV. A 2013. június 8-i dunaszerdahelyi tanácskozás előadásai*. Szombathely: Savaria University Press, pp. 69–78.
- BLOMQUIST, O. (2015): Naming and multilingualism – Swedish-Finnish personal designations in medieval charters. In: O. Felecan (ed.), *Name and Naming. Proceedings of the Third International Conference on Onomastics “Name and Naming”. Conventional / Unconventional in Onomastics*. Baia Mare, September 1–3, 2015. Cluj-Napoca: Editura Mega – Editura Argonaut, pp. 85–97.
- CSUKOVITS, E. (2012): *Az Anjouk Magyarországon I. rész. I. Károly és uralkodása (1301–1342)* [The Anjous in Hungary Part 1. Charles I and his reign (1301–1342)]. Budapest: MTA Bölcsészettudományi Kutatóközpont Történettudományi Intézet.
- ENGEL, P. (2003): Középkori magyar genealógia [Medieval Hungarian genealogy]. In: N.e., *Arcanum DVD könyvtár 4. Családtörténet, heraldika, honismeret*. Budapest: Arcanum. DVD.
- FARKAS, T. (2009): Családnévrendszer, névhasználat, névváltozás nyelvi-kulturális kontaktushelyzetben [The system of family names, their use, and changes to them in a linguistic-cultural contact situation]. *Névtani Értesítő*, 31, pp. 27–46.
- N. FODOR, J. (2008): Egy német ajkú deák által lejegyzett szabolcsi összeírás a XVI. század első évtizedeiből [A conscription from Szabolcs county written by a native German scribe in the first decades of the 16th century]. *Magyar Nyelv*, 104, pp. 254–256.
- N. FODOR, J. (2015): Language contact effects in historical Hungarian and Romanian personal names. In: O. Felecan (ed.), *Name and Naming. Proceedings of the Third International Conference on Onomastics “Name and Naming”. Conventional / Unconventional in Onomastics*. Baia Mare, September 1–3, 2015. Cluj-Napoca: Editura Mega – Editura Argonaut, pp. 163–173.
- HAUBRICHS, W. – JOCHUM-GODGLÜCK, Ch. eds. (2019): *Kulturelle Integration und Personennamen im Mittelalter*. Berlin–Boston: De Gruyter.
- KárOkl. = *A nagy-károlyi gróf Károlyi család oklevéltára* [Collection of documents of the family of Nagykárolyi counts of Nagykároly]. Vol. 1–5. K. Géresi (ed.), Budapest: Kocsi–Franklin, 1882–1897.
- LANSTYÁK, I. (2013): Kontaktushatás a tulajdonnevekben [Contact effect in proper nouns]. In: F. Vörös (ed.), *A nyelvi kölcsönhatások és a személynevek. A nyelvöldrajztól a névföldrajzig IV. A 2013. június 8-i dunaszerdahelyi tanácskozás előadásai*. Szombathely: Savaria University Press, pp. 43–68.

- MOLLAY, K. (1982): *Német–magyar nyelvi érintkezések a XVI. század végéig* [German–Hungarian linguistic contacts until the end of the 16th century]. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.
- SLÍZ, M. (2011–2017): *Anjou-kori személynévtár* [Dictionary of personal names from the Angevin Age]. Vol. 1: 1301–1342, Vol. 2: 1343–1359. Budapest: Históriaantik – Magyar Nyelvtudományi Társaság.
- SLÍZ, M. (2013): A személynevek mint az ómagyar kori magyarországi kétnyelvűség vizsgálatának forrásai [Personal names as sources of the survey of bilingualism in the Old Hungarian Age in Hungary (896–1526)]. In: F. Vörös (ed.), *A nyelvi kölcsönhatások és a személynevek. A nyelvöldrajztól a névföldrajzig IV. A 2013. június 8-i dunaszerdahelyi tanácskozási előadásai*. Szombathely: Savaria University Press, pp. 145–153.
- SLÍZ, M. (2014): Social classes, ethnicity, and mobility in Medieval Hungary – an onomastic survey. *Onoma*, 49, pp. 137–165.
- SOLYMOSI, L. (2006): Oklevéltan [Diplomatics]. In: I. Bertényi (ed.), *A történelem segédtudományai*. Budapest: Osiris Kiadó, pp. 153–168.
- SoprT. = *Sopron szabad királyi város története* [The history of the royal city of Sopron]. Vol. I/1–7, II/1–6. J. Házi (ed.), Sopron: Székely és Tsa, 1921–1943.
- SZENDE, K. (2009): Integration through Language. The Multilingual Character of Late Medieval Hungarian Towns. In: D. Keene; B. Nagy; K. Szende (eds.), *Segregation – Integration – Assimilation. Religious and Ethnic Groups in the Medieval Towns of Central and Eastern Europe*. Farnham: Ashgate, pp. 205–234.
- SZENTGYÖRGYI, R. (2007): Egyéni és közösségi kétnyelvűség. Történeti szociolingvisztikai esettanulmány [Individual and common bilinguality. A case study on historical socio-linguistics]. In: A. Benő – E. Fazakas – N. S. Szilágyi (eds.), *Nyelvek és nyelvváltozatok. Köszöntő kötet Péntek János tiszteletére. Vol. 1–2*. Kolozsvár: Anyanyelvpolók Erdélyi Szövetsége. Vol. 2, pp. 333–343.
- SZENTGYÖRGYI, R. (2012): Név, anyanyelv, identitás összefüggései a középmagyar kor boszorkánypereinek tükrében [Correlations between name, mother tongue, and identity with respect to witch trials in the Middle Hungarian Period (1526–1772)]. *Helynévtörténeti Tanulmányok*, 7, pp. 133–142.
- TAUBER, W. (1993): *Mundart und Schriftsprache in Bayern (1450–1800)*. Berlin – New York: Walter de Gruyter.
- TESz. = *A magyar nyelv történeti-etimológiai szótára* [Historical-etymological dictionary of Hungarian]. Vol. 1–4. L. Benkő (editor-in-chief), Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1967–1984.
- ÚMTsz. = *Új magyar tájszótár* [New dictionary of Hungarian dialects]. Vol. 1–5. É. B. LŐRINCZY (editor-in-chief), Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1979–2010.
- VAN LANGENDONCK, W. (2007): *Theory and Typology of Proper Names*. Berlin – New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

TIPOLOGIE KONTAKTOVÝCH JEVŮ VE STŘEDOVĚKÝCH OSOBNÍCH JMÉNECH (HISTORICKÝ ONOMASTICKÝ PŘEHLED VYCHÁZEJÍCÍ Z MAĎARSKÝCH STŘEDOVĚKÝCH DOKUMENTŮ)

Maďarsko bylo ve středověku multikulturní zemí: vedle maďarské většiny zde žili také obyvatelé turkického, germánského, slovanského, valonského, italského aj. původu. Ačkoli většina středověkých dokumentů byla psána latinsky, dochovalo se i mnoho listin v dalších jazycích, např. v němčině. Tato kulturní a jazyková diverzita poskytuje příležitost prozkoumat projevy jazykového kontaktu mezi různými jazyky na základě osobních jmen dochovaných v tomto materiálu. Článek se zabývá metodologickými možnostmi a omezeným využitím rodných jmen, příjmi nebo příjmení a jmenných spojení ve výzkumu kontaktních jevů. Představuje (pro)jevy jazykového kontaktu v jazyce a diskurzu na úrovni ortografie, morfologie a syntaxe jmenných spojení a vychází při tom z příkladů zapsaných v listinách latinsky nebo německy.

Klíčová slova

osobní jména; dvojjazyčnost; kontaktní jevy; středověké Maďarsko; listiny; němčina; latina; maďarština

Mariann Slíz

sliz.marianna@btk.elte.hu

ELTE Eötvös Loránd University

ELTE BTK Magyar Nyelvtudományi és Finnugor Intézet

Múzeum krt. 4/A

H-1088 Budapest

HUNGARY