Vincent Blanár, Bratislava

Proper Names in the Light of Theoretical Onomastics

1 Introduction

1.1 Binary role of proper names. Discipline of the study of proper names

A proper name is a vocabulary element of a particular language which also belongs to a respective onymic subsystem, thereby acquiring a binary character. Proper names are formed (as a secondary plan of a language) with the background of appellative vocabulary. However, in their formation and use in communication, not only are the rules of the appellative language code applied but also the rules specific to proper names. Two opposing but interrelated tendencies are typical of the position of proper names – a continuous interaction of proper names with other vocabulary and the whole language system and, simultaneously, a continuous polarisation of the category of proper names in relation to appellatives. The interaction of proper names with other vocabulary relates to the ongoing processes of onymisation (appellative → proprium) and apellativisation (proprium → appellative) with the openness of onymy (the social, historical, cultural as well as the political dimensions of proper names present a wide range of possibilities for, e. g. the adoption of exonyms) but, above all, it relates to the social needs of ordinary communication. The polarisation of proper names in relation to appellatives is, hence, conditioned by the special character of onymic nomination. From this binary interrelationship of proper names follows the binary status of the category nomen proprium, i. e. linguistic status and onomastic status. In the analysis of proper names and from the methodological standpoint in onomastics, I consider this to be fundamental. That is why, after the older characterisation of onomastics, I have extended the definition of the linguistic status of proper names as defined by KURYŁOWICZ (*La position linguistique du nom propre*, 1956) to linguistic and onomastic status (BLANÁR 1976, 1977). These terms will be discussed later.

The earliest records of proper names, which often represent the first historical documents of a language, have long attracted attention, especially

from scholars in the social sciences. From the beginning of the 19th century, the older pre-scientific interpretations were replaced by historical and philological interpretations which focused mainly on revealing the etymology (derivational basis) of a name. Etymological analyses represent an important material especially for habitation history. Even now, research into the etymology of proper names is attractive although it does not completely cover the extensive problems of this rich layer of vocabulary. After the First and, in particular, the Second World War, the systematic and organised research into proper names developed its own methodology and what had been an auxiliary branch of the historical and other social sciences was transformed into an independent discipline (onomastics) in which the linguistic component (for a long time a positivistic attitude prevailed) took precedence over the historical and geographical components. The systematic processing of the three basic areas of proper names (bionyms, toponyms and chrematonyms) was required to develop an appropriate onomastic methodology and methods for particular working areas. Since the second half of the 20th century, a general onomastic theory has been developing. Onomastics has become established as a relatively independent discipline of linguistics with extensive connections to other disciplines of social and natural sciences.

The social significance of onymy in communication and in state administration promoted a rapid growth of research into onomastics which could also be sourced from extensive materials and from the elucidation of actual problems in specialist journals of onomastics. Its development was positively affected by regular international congresses on onomastics (the first one was held in Paris in 1938) and conferences organised by the national onomastics committee (the Slovak Committee on Onomastics was established, on the basis of the concept of research into onomastics by V. Blanár, in 1964). Onomastics has its high-level international organisation (*Comité international des sciences onomastiques*). At the end of the 20th century and in the 21st century, several international compendia were published, demonstrating what aims have been achieved by current onomastics; some of them even aimed at contributing to a certain methodological approximation in order to form a better basis for future comparative syntheses (compare *Reader zur Namenkunde* 1994–1996; *Słowiańska onomastyka. Encyklopedia* 2002/03; *Namenarten und ihre Erforschung. Ein Lehrbuch für das Studium der Onomastik* 2004).

1.2 Scientific and investigative procedures and methods of research into onomastics

Proper names have been studied from various aspects. Scientific and investigative procedures and methods of research into onomastics cannot be separated from the linguistic character of proper names and from a broad definition of onomastics with its extensive inter-disciplinary relations. This perception of onomastics is consistent with the extent and complexity of the methods used.

The basic methods of onomastics (similar to those of linguistics – Čermák 2001, 69) are deductive and empirical in character. They comprise the methods of linguistic description, analysis and classification. These basic methods are partially, in a specific manner, applied in the individual methodological procedures utilised in the descriptive, historical-comparative, typological and areal aspects, respectively. The character of the various classes of proper names gives a special stamp to the methods and investigative procedures used. Amongst the most freqently used methodological procedures are: the analysis of the formal construction of names; classification of onymy (by various principles, types of objects named, formal parameters, chronological and genetic aspects etc.); textual analysis; etymological analysis; statistical and stratigraphic analyses; determination of onymic areas; onomastic cartography; study of onomastic generalities (laws in onomastics related to culture; proper name – language – culture) (see Superanskaja et al. 1986, 198).

Onymy and onymic systems can exist only in social communication. That is why one of the basic tasks of onomastics is research into the social function of proper names. This function of proper names elucidates a pragmatic (and, closely linked to this, socio-onomastic) aspect. Of some processes of the social function of proper names, individual views, conventions and tradition rather than exact regularities are typical. In such cases, quantitative methods of the statistical evaluation of trends are used instead of deductive-empirical explanatory procedures (compare Debus 1995, 345). The quantitative and qualitative methods are interrelated. The evaluation of datasets comprising hundreds of thousands or even millions of items by exact quantitative methods (currently, PC techniques play a more and more important role) facilitates a more extensive and detailed analysis of the material and, on the other hand, a deeper scientific analysis provides a better precondition for more purposeful heuristic programmes.

The above methods of research are applied as a part of the whole methodological approach which takes into account the linguistic and onomastic status of proper names. The basic questions of onomastics, such as the character of a proper name, its onymic meaning and content, onymic functions, onymic system and its functions in social communication, are the subjects of research of general linguistics, the theory of communication and the theory of onomastics. The general methodology comprises, e. g. the semiotic aspect of onomastics (the proper name as a linguistic sign sui generis), the method of system analysis and structural organisation of proper names, the reconstruction of the model validity of onymic signs.

Information and research flow (facts, methods, concepts) are not completed in theoretical generalisations (recognition of onymic (micro)systems). Parallel research into the performance and functions of systems in ordinary communication facilitates the tracking of their dynamics and relations in the course of their development and provides a new stimulation to deepen the recognition of both interrelated sides of this complicated phenomenon. Real proper names as elements of the onymic system and dynamic structure of the onymic system – its realisation in social communication – form an area of our scientific research.

1.3 A brief insight into research into proper names as related to the development of philosophy and linguistic thinking

The first ideas about proper names in European thinking were formulated by the Ancient Greek philosophers. Some distinctions between appellatives and propria within the NOMEN category were made by Aristotle. He distinguished individual from general names and noticed that in proper names the significance of their appellative components is weakened. The proper name as a specific category of language was defined by the Stoics, Chrysippos and Diogenes of Babylon (2nd–1st century B. C.), who provided the first definition of proper names. They termed it *όνομα*. The Stoics defined the term *proper name* as designating an individual whose certain meaning is embodied in her/his/its specific characteristics ("individual lekton"). In appellatives, these are general attributes, in proper names, they are individual attributes. The semiotic meaning of a proper name has its initiator in Aurelius Augustinus, who anticipated the problems in communication, considered the first theory of signs and formulated a remarkable definition of a sign. The first philologists and

literary critics were scholars from Alexandria. The Alexandrian grammarians investigated the formal structure of a language independently of the requirements of logic and established a linguistic metalanguage. The high point of Hellenistic research into spelling and morphological problems was reached in Τεχνή γραμματική by Dionysios Thrax (170–90 B. C.). In his book, the proper name is defined for the first time: "A proper name is a sign of individual substance, such as *Homer* or *Socrates.* General names are signs of general substance e. g. *man*, *horse*." One of the most influential Roman grammarians is Aelius Donatus (around 350 A. D.). Donatus adapted *Techné grammatiké* to the Latin lingual system. His definition of a proper name is the high point of the classical definition of propium: "A name is a flexible word-class which denotes a thing individually or commonly; individually, like, for example, *Rome, the Tiber*; commonly, for example, *town*, *river*." In the Medieval period, as in the Classical period, the complex perception of proper names was not formed, but the *Modists*, in particular, formulated several notions which have been further developed by current philosophy, logic and onomastics. *Viliam of Conches* anticipates the concept of the proper name, as formulated by Mill and Kripke as an exclusively meaningless referential sign. According to *Viliam of Conches*, a proper name refers to an individual substance without having any specific meaning. *Thomas of Erfurt*, by contrast, deepened the older perception of proper names and is one of the first thinkers to derive the character of propria from specific characteristics of individuals (i. e. onymic objects). Some concepts of *William of Occam* are close to the contemporary philosophical and logical views on proper names; he perceived proper names as conventional, purely referential signs (more details in Haraj 2006).

As in the Classical and Mediaeval periods, contemporary philosophers and logicians study proper names as isolated concepts, not as the elements of respective onymic systems. Their definitions of the categories of proper names are over-restrictive; they do not even analyse all the basic classes of proper names (e. g. chrematonyms, unofficial names) and also they do not take into consideration the extensive strata of descriptive names (compare, for example, the toponyms *Pod brehom-Under the Slope, Hlboké-the Deep*, nicknames *Trpaslík-Dwarf, Buchta-Dumpling*. The substance of proper names is perceived in a simplified manner as "exclusion of individuals" (Zouhar 2004, 67) and not as an exclusion of individuals within a *given class* (this notable fact was pointed out by Štúr in Nauka reči slovenskej, 1846), not to mention the fact that the consequences of the socially deter-

mined identification // differentiation in particularities of a given class are not studied in their language variability. These disciplines, of course, have established their own methodology and terminology. The still unresolved problem of the meaning of proper names is being elucidated from a philosophical viewpoint. Permanent attention is paid to the theory of reference which is one of the central terms of the philosophy of language and analytical philosophy; the act of bestowing a name ("baptism") is being investigated within a causal network of the procedure of naming etc. In many aspects, this research is inspiring and contributive but, on the whole, it cannot overlay the results achieved by current onomastics which focuses its research on the analysis of the formal aspect as well as the meaning of the onymic sign, onymic microsystems and their social functions. Let us give an example. Formal logic in respect of the manner of existence of a referent (an onymic object) differentiates between real proper names, improper and empty proper names (for more detail on Russell's and Wittgenstein's theory of real (i. e. logical) proper names see Zouhar 2004, 212). Their definition of *proper name* does not conform to the linguistic definition.

One of the theoretical questions by which the philosophy of language has significantly influenced research into proper names is the problem of the meaning of proper names. Perhaps the greatest roles were played by J. S. Mill (mid-19th century) and S. Kripke (2nd half of the 20th century). Mill stressed the notion that a proper name is a sign without meaning, a label which we link in our minds with the image of the object named. Proper names have no attributes which would define the object named. They have only denotation but not connotation. This interpretation is accepted also in logical semantics (compare e. g. Gahér 2006; Zouhar 2004); more recent contributions to onomastics by J. Dolník (1995, 1998) follow in the tradition set by Mill. S. Kripke (1972) achieved relatively widespread popularity with his characterisation of proper names as rigid designators. Direct rigid reference exists in all possible worlds. Proper names in the subject-predicative sentence can only play the role of a subject, they are non-descriptive and they are rigid referents (compare also Zouhar 2004). When Kripke, following Mill (Zouhar 2004, 66 alike), says that the subject does not have to have any specific properties in order to be associated with a name, it is valid only for the narrowly-defined propria usually used by philosophers of language and logicians. With regard to the reference of expressions in various possible worlds, the manner of referencing and the character of referents of expressions, the following types of sin-

gulative reference can be defined: absolute and relative direct rigid reference; absolute and relative mediated non-rigid reference (Zouhar 2004, 75–77). Kripke's idea that all who speak understand proper names – rigid designators – as signs, institutionally fixed, which determine just a certain object, is relatively close to the formulation of a pragmatic feature ⟨stabilisation by an administrative-legal and narrower social convention⟩ which I defined from an internal onomastic viewpoint – along with other onomastic features – in my earlier studies (Blanár 1945, 1950).

By contrast, J. O. Jespersen (as with M. Bréal and others) reasons that proper names as naming classes with one element have to have in the context many more semantic attributes than appellatives; the "meaning" of a proper name in context is always more special than the meaning of appellative words. A similar conclusion was reached by Ernst Hansack (1990, 2004): a set of features that indicate the meaning of a proper name is "theoretically indefinitive as far as terms are concerned". Hansack's position comes from the natural sciences; he rejects the philosophical solution. He perceives natural language as a language programmer to gain effects in consciousness. He recognises the key to the essence of a language and also to names in language data processing (an information set) in the brain (in thinking): the proper name represents an information set about the object named which does not add to the onymic object but constitutes knowledge about the onymic object. "The only basic difference" between appellatives and propria Hansack sees in the fact that propria as elements in one-element classes designate just one object (individual) while appellatives designate elements from multi-element classes. From this definition he derives other differences. Linguistic signs are bearers of an information set, they only point to the "meanings", hence they are unilateral. Knowledge about an onymic object is a stimulating concept which draws us closer to the perception of the "content" of the proper name (see also Blanár 1996 and elsewhere); nevertheless, the full problem of "the content" of proper names is not addressed. I will discuss some of Hansack's explanations elsewhere in this study.

A number of philosophers and linguists, however, are seeking "the third way" between the two opposing standpoints. The idea is gaining favour that, in the content of proper names, one can assume the existence of some elements of expressions, features of meaning, because "without the elements of category and meaning, a name would not be suitable to designate anything real" (Walther 1973). The discussion as to whether

or not reference is mediated was substantially influenced by G. Frege (*Über Sinn und Bedeutung*, 1982). Frege (and others) assumes that, in the case of proper names, in the determination of a referent of an expression, its semantic content should also be considered. He formulated the basic idea of reference (the so-called Frege's thesis) as follows: the referent of an expression (in a possible world and time) is determined by the semantic content of the expression, hence: a) every expression can acquire a referent only if it has a semantic content and is a part of a certain language; and b) referent theory for expressions of a certain category assumes that, for expressions of this category, there already exists a theory of semantic content (Zouhar 2004, 85, who, however, rejects Frege's theory).

On the verge of this discussion as to the meaning of the proper name, I pose the question solely at this moment from the linguistics viewpoint: Can we accept the view that proper names, such as *Pod brehom-Under the Slope, XY Predný-XY Front, Medved'-Bear, Štátna banka slovenská – State Bank of Slovakia*, the field *Kde Golibu zabilo – Where Goliba was murdered*, are non-descriptive and that they refer directly? – According to J. Searl (1969), the designative function of the name is supported by a set of features of mean ing. E. M. Christoph (1985, 1986, 1987) tries to define an inventory of onymic features (onoseme) within the general semantic features without, of course, considering the given onymic system. The explanations offered by F. Debus are of interest here (1985, 54–61). Consistent with his pragmatic aspect, Debus works on an assumption that proper names, in contrast with appellatives, do not have any (system) lexical meaning. He considers the core of the proper name to be its reference and basically contact, situational independence, respectively. However, he incorporates within the core its categorical-grammatical parameters as well as the semantically relevant designation of classes of the proper names. He understands this non-variable core as the universals of the proper name. He writes about an onymically lexical or directly referential meaning (in detail: Blanár 1996).

1.4 On a definition of the paradigm of theoretical onomastics (Questions and problems)

Elucidation of the general problems relating to the proper name in philosophy, logic, linguistics and onomastics is so varied and, in many aspects, conflicting that even today one can speak about seeking new ways, answers and solutions, despite the fact that the multi-approach analyses of

various sectors of onomastics and the professional preparation of materials provide important knowledge and factual assumptions for formulating generalising conclusions and syntheses. In the process of developing the theoretical basis and establishing the paradigm of modern onomastics, it sometimes appears – whether for linguistic or for other reasons – as if the established theories stand, one next to one another, in parallel, rather than in mutual inter-relatedness, in their critical development. The approach which can be observed in linguistics and also in onomastics is almost symptomatic. A significant pragmatic-communicational shift also evident in current onomastics is frequently comprehended in such a way that theoretical knowledge, which has been achieved to date by "the post-structural onomastics" stemming from its methodology, has not been superseded by constructive criticism but, in a programmed manner, has been diverted from this knowledge. This note can be detected in the introductory chapters of the editors of the (otherwise representative and valued) proceedings *Namenarten und ihre Erforschung* (2004; hereafter NE), and especially in S. Brendler's review of the monograph by E. Hansack *Der Name im Sprachsystem. Grundprobleme der Sprachtheorie* (2000). At the end of this exceptionally positive review, Brendler criticises the author for a misleading title to the monograph because "a structuralist will not find there what the title leads him/her to expect to find" and "a post-structuralist will not read it". However, the proceedings of *Namenarten und ihre Erforschung* itself provide evidence that such stances are unacceptable. In the third part of the proceedings, abundant information and valuable analyses of twenty onymic classes are given. Just as sets of individual classes are open, the classes of onymic objects themselves are also not closed. For example, W. Zelinsky (2002) determined more than 130 onymic classes; amongst them some classes of previously unnoticed objects, such as the names of prisons, tunnels, parks, playgrounds, cemeteries, gardens, canals, etc. Besides the basic naming groups (bionyms, toponyms, chrematonyms), the NE proceedings also pay attention to classes of phenomena for which onymic nomination does not have clear proprial attributes and for which their valuation is not equal (citizen and ethnic names). The chapter on the contribution to methods and methodology, the study by P. Videsott on onomatometry as a method in onomastics ("the isonomic structure" of local names in similar geographical conditions is analysed in deep structure) identify new problems. Unfortunately, the proceedings do not contain a contribution on onomastic lexicography which is extremely

important in practical investigation and to which the proceedings were dedicated.

The above facts indicate that, in this very complicated and extensive discipline, the multi-aspect approach is almost an essential prerequisite for wider and deeper understanding. It presents us with a problem when we just focus research on certain methodological procedures which have become the centre of attention, e. g. the current orientation towards the pragmatic-communicational approach (in the EN, D. Krüger demands that attention be directed towards textual-linguistic methods in onomastics also and to change the system-oriented approach to communicational- and function-oriented research; the introductory chapters of the EN express similar ideas). This takes us to the crux of the problem which is the theoretical basis of onomastics. As I have already mentioned, theoretical onomastics is still at the stage of development, formulation and seeking its theoretical basis, a suitable research paradigm. The complex aims of this effort will not be achieved by way of a proclaimed preference for some theories (compare the statement by S. Brendler that Hansack's original explanations of the mental perception of the proper name are inconsistent with the "traditional" standpoint "einfach und zugleich genial" – NE, 45) but the theoretical basis must demonstrate the strength of its foundation and persuasiveness in practice: how it (the theoretical basis) helps to elucidate the basic problems of the theory of proper names and those which are perceived differently, how it leads on from a description of phenomena to their explanation. In addressing the internal problems of onomastics we prefer the basis and aspect of the discipline of proper names – onomastics itself – to those positions postulated by philosophy, logic, natural sciences. The range and complexity of onymy and onymic systems which have been analysed with constant regard to their social functions require the use of various aspects and methods; this is the only way to attain new knowledge which enables us to grasp onymy as a structured whole and to develop this discipline in continuous progress in onomastic research. The aim of a similar effort is to form stronger lines of the paradigm of theoretical onomastics.

Explicit, implicit and interdisciplinary discussion, confrontation and exchange of views is and will be fruitful, especially when we see progress in scientific thinking in the historical perspective of onomastics, an increase in a new flow of information of qualitative and quantitative character, development and strengthening of methodological positions and the use

of computers (mainly in processing data sets numbered in hundreds of thousands, even millions). A different view is evident in questions such as: does onymy possess any integrating organisational principle; why is a proper name a linguistic sign sui generis; what is its content and formal structure; why is it necessary to distinguish between content and (onymic) meaning of a proper name; why is it necessary to differentiate between two groups within a set of informational elements in knowledge of an onymic object; when thinking about the nature of an onymic sign, what is indicative of the fact that its content (more precisely its onymic features) and form are interrelated; how is the transition from the first naming to binary naming anthroponymic system in deep structure indicated; how to describe the microsystem of living proper names; are citizen names and ethnic names categorised as appellatives or propria; is the description of superficial onymic phenomena the final aim of the research; what are the outcomes of modelling of principles of naming and processing data by the computer technique, etc. etc. Or: if the same form *Martin* can be a first name, surname, living family name, the name of a town, boat, recreation facility, animal, book and so on, in these cases is it solely a different referent or behind a different identification are there different (specifically onymic) elements of content which are also reflected in the formal aspect of the name; what is the implication of this fact in the valuation of the onymic sign? The answer to these and similar questions is related to the theoretical basis which, even in the current stage of onomastics, are not uniform. The concepts and explanations which follow further in the text stem mainly from the analysis of personal names which, due to their abundance, internal variety and social determination, provide suitable material for theoretical and methodological generalisation. The answer I formulate in the following chapters of this contribution is a summary and draft of a concept which I have arrived at in my studies and thinking to date.

2.1 The linguistic and onomastic status of proper names

The dual status of the proper name in language (the name as an element of the vocabulary of a language and simultaneously an element of an onymic set) is a crucial starting point in comprehending its special status and the valuation of proper names in a language. Naming individuals of the same species is a special case of nomination. It is the most detailed classification of real phenomena by language means which is induced by so-

cial needs to communicate (social communicational needs). In comparison with basic appellative lexis, proper names are a "secondary stratum" of naming (e. g. Kuryłowicz 1956; Zabrocki 1960) and in respect of these special naming needs they are classified as marked as opposed to the unmarked common nouns. To denote the most universal feature of propria, I use an integrating term ⟨socially determined identification // differentiation of generic individuals⟩. This term combines several common and basic functions of proper names: nominative, individualising and differentiative (on onymic functions in greater detail see Knappová 1992; Šrámek 1999).[1]

The close relationship between the linguistic and onomastic status of a proper name can be observed in onymic nomination, identification and differentiation.

In onymic nomination (in the philosophy of language, the term "baptism" is used) an individual of a given class is named as an individually existing object. In this naming, any language form (grammatical form, prepositional phrase, minimal utterance, abbreviation etc.) is substantiated, e. g. *Tuším-I guess*, *Nazad-Back*, *Driapsa-Climb*; terrain names *Hlboké-the Deep*, *Medzi vršky-Between Hills*, chrematonyms *Vojna a mier-War and Peace*, *Nový čas-New Times*. Where surnames are concerned, so-called parasystem formations are almost typical, which extend the naming inventory that is necessary to identify // differentiate unambiguously by forms which do not have counterparts in the appellative field or which are formed by marginal word-forming procedures, e. g. *Vrbinčík, Nestriga, Podhora, Odnechta, Nechajdoma, Neradovič, Nemtuda*, etc. In constructing a statement, these "secondary" formations are incorporated into a text as substantives but the morphological categories of gender, number and case are used in a manner typical of individual onymic classes (in detail ch. 2. 4).

In onymic identification and differentiation, an individual *"1"* of the class of species A, hence *A1*, is excluded from other individuals *"2"*, *"3"*… *"n"* of the class of species *A* and individuals of other classes hence, $A1 : A2 : A3 \dots An : B\dots, C\dots N$. This identification and differentiation in logic and the philosophy of language is perceived in a simplified way as "exclusion of individuals" (e. g. Zouhar 2004)[2]. However, this is not just

---

1 The use of an *(onymic) function* and *feature* is not uniform. In my functional approach to onymic phenomena and relations I have in mind the most general features of proper names and pragmatic and grammatical features which are characteristic of individual onymic sub-systems. On these terms, more in chapter 2. 2.

2 The speculations of logicians (and philosophers, too) about the character of the proper

a less precise expression of the same phenomenon. The explicit reference to a class of onymic phenomena within which an individual is identified in reference and in contrast to other individuals of the same class (and theoretically to other classes) does not have a negligible cognitive significance. A certain onymic class (sub-system) is implicitly involved whose naming elements have a content different from the homophonic names of other onymic classes (sub-systems). For example, in the naming of persons, a new fact is to be taken into account. In many situations in communication, a person A1 is named also as a member of a certain kinship. At the level of the system, this is a feature of ⟨± family affiliation⟩ which is the area "specifically onomastic": This is to be discussed further in the text.

Using the form *Martin* as an example, let us compare onymic objects with the proprial sphere of singulative naming.

The toponym *Martin* is a singulative (single-denotated) name of a town in the Turiec region. A common, specifically onymic element of the content of toponyms is their relatively close link with the location of an onymic object ⟨location feature⟩. Geographical names have strong local and time dimensions. The distribution of geographical names in a terrain represents a toponymic context (KARPENKO 1967, 4).

The form *Martin* can also be a first name and a surname. For the class of persons, classification by their social and family membership is characteristic. Unlike the surname, the features of ⟨family affiliation⟩ and ⟨heredity⟩ at a negative stage are applied to the first name. (On *Martin* as surname, see text below).

The lexeme *Martin* is also used as a name of a historical description of this town. In this case, it stands for a chrematonym which characterises the links with the economic, productive and cultural activity of a man.

---

name only partially coincide with the views of experts in linguistics and onomastics. The reason lies in the different aim of their research and different aspects of research. Logicians and philosophers analyse the proper name in isolation and not as a component of an onymic system. The second reason is the differing definition of the aims of the research; proper names as involved in onomastics and logic differ (see e. g. ZOUHAR 2004). To our understanding, proper names have their onymic semantics formed by several specifically onymic features (not just the "rigid designator" as used by KRIPKE). The basic elements of onymic systems have model values which also differ within one onymic system by their frequency and area distribution. In language communication, proper names fulfil a role of identification and differentiation. The analysis of isolated proper names, whatever aspect we use, does not make for understanding of their basic character.

The name is a serial product of mass objects which are interchangeable (Šrámek 1999, 14). This extensive group of objects is characterised by a feature of ⟨serial⟩. The above generic features are used to distinguish several categories of onymic classes. Here, the forms *Martin* represent homonymous proprial formations.

However, proprial homonymy reaches into such internally varied subsystems as (official and unofficial // living) anthroponyms. The form *Martin* can be a Christian name, surname, a living family name in unofficial naming and also a nickname used by a small clique for a boy with the less common name *Theophilus*. These are various functional components whose different onymic validity is supported by some specifying onymic features (E.-M. Christoph 1987 onoseme can be considered). *Martin* as a Christian name is an individual name of a person which is given to a person at his birth; in the official binary naming system it is a determining functional component in relation with a surname, it expresses family affiliation and heredity at a negative stage; in a first naming system, it was a basic component of personal naming. The surname *Martin* is a hereditary functional component which expresses affiliation with a family; it is a basic (determined) component of the official naming system. In the official naming, *Martin* as the basic component of a naming unit is linked with features of ⟨heredity⟩ and ⟨family affiliation⟩. In the system of living names, the form *Martin* can also be a nickname used in a small school society. – The individual functional components are characterised by a specific set of onoseme and that is why they are of different onymic validity.

The following are important to the character of an onymic sign and onymic classes: the socially significant characteristics of individual classes of onymic objects as well as the pragmatic attitudes of users of a name towards onymic objects and their naming are integrated in the designation of a proper name as its onymic features. In geographical names, these features are motivated by the linkage of a name to the respective onymic object in the terrain and the socially important or typical character of a residential or non-residential site, respectively. Where personal names are concerned, these are properties characterising living beings in their fundamental social relations, such as relations within family. For the full category of geonyms and bionyms, more general features of ⟨stabilisation by administrative and legal standards⟩ and ⟨stabilisation by a restricted (local) social convention⟩ are typical. On the basis of these generic features, I distinguish between official onymic systems and systems which operate

within semi-official and private relations. Differentiation between official and unofficial naming is of essential significance, especially in anthropomastics.

2.2 Functional and system view of onymy

The above facts lead on to some general observations:

1. Specifically onymic semantic elements are a content component of an onymic sign. A proper name is a linguistic sign (e. g. on personal name, Horecký 2005) but it must be stressed: as a linguistic sign sui generis. The content and form of an onymic sign are closely interrelated and at a proprial level they have a specific form. The interrelations in their content and formal aspects are discussed in detail below.

2. On the basis of the above analyses, it is possible to formulate a certain conclusion about the structural organisation of onymy. Individual classes of proper names are not only open sets of onymic entities; they are also functionally organised subsystems. The definition of terms and categories of *function* and *feature* makes us better able to comprehend the functional principle in onomastics. For example, R. Šrámek develops his arguments on this topic as follows: A function of the form *Brno* is to identify a certain object and differentiate it from other objects of its class. Generally speaking, the term *function* can be defined as "to be something, to exist, act as something". "Function is an expression of the ability to apply certain feaures by either differentiation or integration"…"The proprial function becomes the content of the proprium" (Šrámek 1999, 21). This viewpoint, in its substance, develops on the well-known thesis by G. Frege (1892) who claims that "the meaning of a proper name is the object itself". Also R. Carnap (1956) sees the existence of an individual term in the object which it names. By contrast, the category *feature* "involves a range and type of semantically distinctive characteristics which determine or specify an extent and type of functions…and functional action". The feature, then, is "the ability to grasp the semantic content of a function and its orientation". It can be concluded that, in onymy also, categories such as *function*, *functionality* and *feature* establish the basic organising systematising principle. Due to its functionality, onymy also has a systematic character and "langue" character. Kalverkämper (1998) and Kohlheim (1997) hold similar views. This definition belongs to a broader research context in which systematisation is defined as a unity and coordination of functional, model

and communicative aspects. Kohlheim (1977, 71) draws on a similar systematic and "langue" comprehension of a proprial sphere and he distingushes as virtual units *nomemes* which are realised in communication as different variations (*allonomy*) of proper names (see Šrámek 1999, 49, 113).

2.3 The content aspect of an onymic sign

The following interpretation of the content of an onymic sign is a contribution to the centuries-old discussion on the significance of a proper name.

As mentioned in chapter 1. 3, Hansack's cognitivistic concept of proper names stems from a position of natural sciences; he understands natural language as a language programmer. Linguistic signs are bearers of a set of information which only refer to "meanings" and hence they have a unilateral character. Hansack's theory was further developed by S. Brendler in a lecture given at the 21st International Congress in Uppsala (2002) "Über den gerechten Tod der Auffassung vom Namen als bilaterales Zeichen". This contribution is, in a certain sense, bellum contra omnes; however, the strong words often conceal simplifying explanations which do not serve to endorse Hansack's theory. Hence, Hansack, sourcing from the cognitivistic language theory built on a natural basis, does not provide answers to the theoretical questions raised from positions of the discipline of proper names itself. However, the construct of knowing an onymic object (see also Blanár 1996 and elsewhere) is contributory. According to Hansack, signs (words) just refer to "meanings"; the information set of features which is delivered by a linguistic sign is as far as terms are concerned "theoretically indefinitive". There is an obvious difference between language competence as it is applied in ordinary communication (meanings which are linked to a language form are familiar to the communicating persons and facilitate mutual understanding) while, with regard to proper names, the speaker has to become familiar with names of generic individuals in order to e. g. effect a reference relationship in a dialogue. Knowledge of an onymic object differs by individual (from names of generally known objects through those partially known to the unknown). A usual familiarisation with an onymic object named (a prerequisite of identification) in a dialogue is a common method of exchange of thoughts. The viewpoint (of S. Brendler) is dubious that the relation of an appellative with its denotat is identical with the relation between

a proper name and an onymic object. For a proper name, from the social aspect and the aspect of communication, the characteristic properties and signs of *every* individual of a given (onymic) class are important for identification and differentiation.

The formulation (Hansack 2004, 55–64) can be accepted that a proper name does not take the place of an onymic object; it is more a data set about this object in the human mind. In my understanding and terminology, this encyclopaedic information is just one component of the onymic content of a proper name which is applied at the level of communication. However, this is not the sole aspect of the content of an onymic sign. The following comments on Hansack's understanding of a broad range of "meaning" of a proper name, data set resulting in knowledge of an onymic object, are fundamental:

1. Two groups of phenomena must be distinguished within an open set of information elements. The first group includes individually different elements of information which support the identification and differentiation of individual onymic objects in common communication (e. g. age of the person named, his or her height, his or her appearance, address, etc.). This knowledge is not identical for both the communicating persons, but certain information important to a common communication is to be expected. The second group consists of socially recognised elements of meaning, beyond the individual, which are exclusively characteristic of a particular onymic class. These are specifically onymic features which form the onymic semantics (designation) of a given onymic class (subsystem). These are – as mentioned in the previous discussion – e. g. ⟨localisation⟩ ⟨± residence⟩ with toponyms, ⟨±family affiliation⟩, ⟨± heredity⟩ with bionyms and other largely pragmatic features related to the manner of "baptism".

2. Although E. Hansack opposes the solution of basic problems in theoretical onomastics from positions of philosophy, he perpetuates this traditional line by the fact that he does not understand the proper name as an element of a particular onymic class, of a given subsystem. The analysis of proper names in the appellative context (A : P : A) and especially in the proprial context (P : P : P) makes it possible to extract the above onymically relevant elements of content, mostly of a pragmatic character. They are specifying onymic features which represent the most general principles of naming in the proprial sphere and their hierarchical sets are characteristic of individual classes (subsystems) of proper names. These hierarchical sets of specifically onymic features constitute the onymic semantics (designa-

tion) as the second component of the content of an onymic sign. I define this as presuppositional identification. While *reference identification* is characterised as a phenomenon at the level of communication, *presuppositional identification* is of a systemic, "langue" character. It refers to the content of whole classes of propria in onymic systems regardless of information on or realisation of an onymic object.[3] Hence, the onymic sign has its content and its form. Its content consists of two components: reference identification and presuppositional identification (onymic meaning). It should be stressed that the application of reference identification assumes the knowledge of a respective onymic class (genus proximum), i. e. the hierarchically highest feature; other pre-suppositional features are neutralised in common communication. With regard to ordinary communication, this fact is important from the communication point of view with homonymic proper names (compare the discussions about the form of *Martin* earlier in the text) and especially with internally varied anthroponymic subsystems. The given semiotic understanding of proprium facilitates the distinguishing of the individual functional components of proper names (Christian name, surname, nickname, living family name etc.) as special classes of names of different onymic validity (semantics).

The content aspect of an onymic sign cannot be isolated from its formal aspect.

2. 4 Interrelation between the content and formal aspects of an onymic sign

Onymic features which form a content model are realised in the language in various ways. This is most evident in the language aspect of personal names which vary in their onymic content, and their language structure forms, in many aspects, are a noteworthy part of the lexis of a national language. (That is why we mostly focus on anthroponymic signs). From this point of view, the question has not been studied systematically. In the following text I will proceed according to the hierarchy of onymic features (see BLANÁR 2001). Onymic features are, in their way, reflected in the

---

3 It is of interest to note that, in the semantic aspect of a proper name, the term <u>denotat</u> (<u>designat</u>) of a proper name is different in logic and the philosophy of language; it is understood as an abstract, arbitrary individual (occurrence <u>de dicto</u>; S. KRIPKE: <u>rigidity de jure</u>) and in the empirical aspect, <u>the referent</u> of a proper name as an empirical unit (usage <u>de re</u>; S. KRIPKE: <u>rigidity de facto</u>) – see MATERNA 1998; GAHÉR 2006; ZOUHAR 2006.

formal aspect of an onymic sign in a given subsystem and in the social and communicational conditions established. Here I analyse the situation in the Slovak language.

Features of grammatical character

1. A general feature of propria which has a functional and integrational character ⟨**socially determined identification // differentiation within a given class**⟩ is applied in proprial nomination to the proper name as an independently existing entity. Any language form is substantiated in the validity of the proper name. As far as the language structure is concerned, there are sets of proper names which are richly varied: compare personal names *Krátky-Short, Zlejší-Worse, Mlkvik-Quiet, Nesvadba, Ozembuch*, anoikonyms *Pri pieskoch By Sands, Medzi potoky-Between Streams*, chrematonyms *Kadernícky salón Katka-Hairdressers' Katka*, a novel *Komu zvonia do hrobu-For Whom The Bell Tolls*, logonyms *A + B, TIP-TOP*. The inventory of names extends in respect of various situations of naming by the selection of lexemes (which in appellative form often do not have pendants) and also by less common word-forming procedures (Blanár 1950, 1996, 2005 and elsewhere). Let us cite, for example, the revaluation of the desinential morphemes to the derivational morphemes in the process of the substantiation of grammatical forms: *Oberaj, -a, -ovi; Zapletal, -a, -ovi…, Tomašových, -a, -ovi…, Nebojsa, -u, -ovi…*; the univerbalisation of combinations of words: *Starigazda, Zátroch, Zedvora*; the existence of variations of prepositional anoikonyms allows for the creation of a complete paradigm: *Pri pieskoch – By Sands // Piesky-Sands, Medzi potoky-Between Streams // Potoky-Streams*. A characteristic feature of proper names is the specific usage of the category of gender, number and case when the proper name becomes part of an oral or written text. Several examples of the category of gender follow. Personal names have natural gender. The category of gender of masculine living propria is one of the most active factors in the declination of proper names which in onymisation determines inter-paradigmatic shifts of extensive parts of lexis. In the process of onymisation, paradigmatic reconstruction affects masculine inanimate, feminine and neuter nouns. A characteristic procedure is an internal lingual solution of the discrepancies between the natural gender of a motivating member (masculine person) and a motivated word which does not belong to the class of masculine persons, e. g. *hlava (head)* → surname *Hlava, hruška (pear)* → surname *Hruška,*

kurča (chicken) → surname *Kurča* (surnames are declined following the pattern "hrdina"-hero).

In topographic names, the oppositional relation between singular and plural as non-marked and marked morphological categories is weakened. Quite often, the plural form names the same object as does the singular form, e. g. *Javorina – Javoriny, Rúbanka – Rúbanky, V kúte – Kúty.* In these cases plural forms are used as variations along with singular forms. In my field research in the Slovak-Hungarian environment, I have often discovered the singular form in the parallel Hungarian names: *Lúky – Rát, Doliny – Papphegy* (Blanár 1950, 100). In these instances, plural forms are used in parallel with singular ones. Sometimes, however, a name with the same derivational basis which has both singular as well as plural forms is given to different onymic objects, e. g. *Barina – Bariny, Dolina – Doliny,* which can be located in the same region, e. g. *Konopnica – Konopnice, Kohútka – Kohútky.* In these cases, the plural form is used lexically as a morphological differentiative means (Blanár 1950). Here is an example of the utilisation of the category of number in personal names. The names referring to a group of namesakes with the suffix *-ovci* do not have a singular paradigm: *Ø – Rybárovci, Ø – Valachovci.* The ways in which a set of proper names is extended have their typological differences. For example, for Slavic names (especially Western-Slavic) it is characteristic that the extension of a set of surnames proceeds from the positions of derivational morphemes *(Adam: Adam-čík, -ec, -ička, -ko, -ovič* etc.) The inventory of surnames in many Western European languages is extended by names which have an article of a declined masculine or feminine gender in front of the base morpheme, e. g. Italian *De Amicis, Della Casa,* French *Dupont, Aucassin,* Spanish *Las Casas,* German *Ten Hoff,* often with a prepositional conjunction: *Zumbusch, Andermatt* (Blanár 1996, 118). It is interesting to recall that a group of personal names which are without pendant in the appellative field was extended by the naming inventory as early as in the Ancient anthroponymy. Such forms were frequent, especially amongst composites (Haraj 2006).

2. ⟨**Natural gender of personal names**⟩ For the paradigmatic aspect of personal names, it is extremely important that namings of persons have not the grammatical but the natural gender. Compare: (ten) *Adam, Krivý, Vrana, Stehno – (tá) Eva, Soňa, Krivá, Vranová, Stehnová.* If the ending does not allow for the categorisation of a name into a respective paradigm, the

natural gender is considered in naming a living person: (a son) *Jakubove, Mišeje, Dobiáše Dolních;* (a daughter) *Jakubove, Mišeje, Jožova Krivého.* Names like (a child) *Adamča, Marienča, Štrekárča, Kalíča* represent marginal cases with colloquial coloration. The polarisation of proprial and appellative lexis is remarkable in the declension and formation of feminine surnames from masculine surnames and masculine living family names. Inter-paradigmatic shifts of these layers of anthroponyms are the most dynamic agents in the declension of personal names.

Anthroponyms with a strong characteristic of masculinity with zero ending, e. g. surnames: *Chrobák, Mráz* (genitive *Mráza), Nebehaj, Zátroch;* an individual characteristic: *Bžik, Hajvas, Očenáš, Pánbožťok;* forms with *-o*: *Azo, Šulko, Smejko, Čunčo;* names formed from appellative neutrals or with ambiguous meaning: *Mydlo, Masielko; Laho, Fako* are declined in accordance with the paradigm for "chlap (man)".

Names ending with *-a*: surnames *Mucha, Brada, Veverica, Knieža, Margita, Odnechta;* an individual characteristic: *Šurina, Šadra, Hoďvaďmiška* are declined in accordance with the paradigm for "hrdina (hero)".

In surnames ending with *-o* which were formed from Christian names or where the appellative counterpart is not obvious, two forms are used, e. g. *Ďurčo – Ďurču // Ďurča, Krno – Krnu // Krna.* The inflection of these surnames is influenced by the inflection of Christian names. If exotic names are excluded, foreign surnames are inflected by the paradigms "chlap (man)", "hrdina (hero)" and "Škultéty // kuli".

Giving names to feminine persons proceeds by adding the suffix *-ová* (suffixation) or by declension (in the case of an adjective) of masculine names, e. g. *Králik (Rabbit) – Králiková, Tichý (Quiet) – Tichá.* However, some surnames form an open group. The list of names with endings which do not have a parallel in local forms has been growing. The simple rules of declension/suffixation of masculine names cannot be applied in all instances to some foreign and exotic names of foreigners. The liberation from these rigid codified rules is also affected by the fact that the standard codification must take into consideration tradition and family (local) custom of the bearer of the name; compare the variations in the naming of one person such as *Jana Kirschner – Kirschnerová* or surnames *Feketeová – Feketová* (which do not, however, refer to different families).

Declension according to the animate gender paradigm is usually applied to chrematonyms which were formed from appellative or proprial masculine personal names; the acc. sing. of masculine names of daily news-

papers and magazines is declined according to animate gender paradigm: (to read) *Budovateľa, Bojovníka*, dat. and loc. sing. declension proceeds according to animate or inanimate gender paradigm: *v Čitateľovi // Čitateli (in Reader), o Bojovníkovi // Bojovníku (about Fighter).*

When a proper name from a certain class of propria is used as the name of an onymic object of another class of propria, its designation (more precisely, its content model) will change; the name establishes a homonymic relation with the original name. This transition from one onymic class to another (transonymation) is also frequently accompanied by changes in morphology and changes in word-formation. The paradigm changes mainly in cases when the motivating lexeme is a personal name. Some examples follow:

> personal name → local name:
> masculine names are declined by inanimate paradigms: *vo Svätom Petre (in Saint Peter's)*
> personal name → geographical/terrain name: surname *Ondrejka* (declined by "hrdina" – hero) – a meadow *Ondrejka* (declined by "žena"– woman)
> personal name → names of days and seasons:
> *na Ondreja (on Andrew's), po Ondreji (after Andrew's); na Mateja, po Mateji*
> a name of a region, village, river → surname:
> surnames *Orava, Žilina, Nitra, Dunaj, Kubín* are declined by masculine animate paradigms (more in Blanár 2005).

This vigorous tendency towards declension, which, in general, is characteristic of colloquial communication, copes with serious difficulties in cases of logonyms which quite often are unusual in their structure. Such peripheral naming units are represented mainly by acronyms, compare, e. g. ONAKO, SEKO, SFIG, TOPTEKS (Imrichová 2002).

Features of pragmatic and communicational character

3. ⟨**The stabilisation of a name by administrative and legal standards and by a restricted social (local) convention, resp.**⟩ plays a basic role in the pragmatic features. This feature makes it possible to distinguish between official and unofficial living naming or, more precisely-between official onymic systems whose basic form is written and onymic systems which exist in oral semi-official and private contact. Between official and unofficial naming, there exists a wide spectrum of semi-official functionings of a personal name in various naming situations (see, e. g. Kany 1995). W. Lubaś (1980, 25) applied to onomastics a thesis of three levels of language

contact. The hierarchically uppermost level, i. e. the level of social contact across the full range of society, corresponds to the exclusive use of the official forms of proper names. In local contact, in which a colloquial form is common, standard as well as variant forms are used. Individual contact is characterised by colloquial speech and the speaker and listener are in direct contact; here, synonyms and variant forms are characteristic (e. g. *Marysia – Maryla, Nowy Targ – Miasto, Nowy Sącz – Sącz)*. From the socio-onomastic aspect, however, not only is there a question of the variability of proper names as such but also of the variability of onymic signs as components of the respective onymic subsystems. In the functioning of onymic systems in social communication, the most complex situation arises with the naming of persons. In the naming of persons in official contact, a system of official naming and in unofficial and private contact, a system of living unofficial names have been constituted. Both systems coexist in close relations. Differences between official and unofficial anthroponymic systems result in a number of functional components, the scope of motivation, in structure and distribution of models. In our works *Živé osobné mená na strednom Slovensku – Living Personal Names in Central Slovakia* (BLANÁR/MATEJČÍK 1978/83) and *Teória vlastného mena – The Theory of Personal Names* (1996, in German 2001) we demonstrated the principles of the organisation of anthroponymic systems in deep structure and their functioning in social communication. A surname has an officially stable form which does not translate into a foreign language.

The form written in a register of births is the obligatory, "correct" form of a surname. The problem of the graphical form of foreign and, in particular, exotic names and the formation of feminine names by suffixation with *-ová* is a current problem which the standard codification has to face. Surnames are hereditary, hence acquired from an existing data set. This is sometimes described as "baptism".

The situation in current unofficial naming is different. Living names act in communication as colloquial formations. Research into living names in Central Slovakia has revealed that the proportion of surnames in models of living names is quite high. Living names, on the one hand, continue their old historical development (microsystems with rich functional components are often involved); on the other hand, they follow the process of official naming. In many places, living naming is almost identical with the official one. In unofficial name systems, some less usual principles of naming are recognised. There are areas where the name of a woman – mother

serves as the source for the naming, e. g. *Štefánia Durajová: Jozef Zimen (her son) – Ščefiny Dzurajky Jožko; Juraj Petro: Ďuro Libin; Jano od (of) Piľarky; Ondrej Magdy Evkovej; Jano Hany od (of) Maliniaka*. In these instances, a new naming principle in onymic system resulting from the important social role of a woman-mother has been applied (see Blanár/Matejčík I/2, 1983, 610–611). In the process of the formation of living anthroponymic microsystems, the economic and social status of people in the village played a substantial role.

4. ⟨± **Family affiliation**⟩ This is an essential anthroponymic feature in the development of personal naming. It has two forms. In an old first naming system, it was (and in living names it still frequently is) applied at a negative stage (–). In an official binary naming system, it is an ⟨affiliation with the family as a whole⟩.

In a first naming system, a person is not named as a member of a family but he or she is named as a person as such (*Koza, Pribina, Mojtech*). Personal (and later Christian) names frequently developed in the past from an individual characteristic. The individual characteristic was motivated by the name of the father (*Janovic),* mother (*Tom/ova, Tom/owna);* patronyms and matronyms are typical of Eastern and Southern Slavs. With the Western Slavs, the name of a location, the place of living, and the work (*Anton Podhradký – Undercastle, Juro Masár – Butcher*), origin (*Oravec*), physical or mental characteristics (*Tichý – Quiet*), etc. of a named person is a more usual motif. For genealogy, references to family affiliations are important but the reconstruction of old kinship ties is hampered by the fact that, in mediaeval society, names from the mother's line also were frequently used in naming (Goetz 1993, 257). In the current unofficial naming, in addition to the binary system, the first naming system is also applied, e. g. *Pavol Kvietok: Paľo Družstevník; Alexander Zimen: Dzurajkin Elek; Zuzana Bročková,* neé *Durajová: Žúži, Zuzliana Durajka.*

The set of anthropolexemes of European personal names was substantially affected by Christianity. As a result of the spread of Christianity, the names of biblical and early saints were introduced into the old local anthroponymy. The Christian names gradually become the productive layer which is adopted in a new language environment. In the naming of members of a higher society and of more densely inhabited places, new anthroponymic features are gradually being applied which are linked to the component which, up to that point, had the determining role. The functional component was the bearer of this essentially important semantics

from the viewpoint of personal naming, i. e. it expressed that the feature ⟨kinship with a family as a whole⟩ was linked with the feature ⟨heredity⟩. Due to these features, hierarchically, it became the basic component of a model of naming. In such a way, the surname was constituted as the new functional component. The Christian name took the position of the determining component. The so-called first naming system was transformed into a binary naming system.

Since, in the naming of persons, not only are individuals identified and differentiated as such but also certain means of expression are used to designate their relatives and non-relatives respectively; in anthroponymy, in addition to the means and procedures common in nomination in the appellative area, the means typical of the proprial area are also used. A characteristic feature of the anthroponymic system is making a distinction between related and non-related persons. The rule which differentiates the naming of relatives and non-relatives in combining the Christian name with the surname also merits our attention. Let us consider a model scheme x + A in the binary system:

x + A	y + A	z + A
x + A1	y + A1	z + A1
x + B	y + B	z + B
Ján Murár	*Michal Murár*	*Karol Murár*
Ján Murárik	*Michal Murárik*	*Karol Murárik*
Ján Točík	*Michal Točík*	*Karol Točík*

If a Christian name – (determinant) *x, y, z* – changes along a horizontal line and the surname (determiné) *A, A1, B* stays unchanged, consanguineous siblings are named. If surname *A, A1, B* in a vertical line is changed and the Christian name does not change, members of other families are named (see BLANÁR 1945, 1950). This rule is modified in cases in which, in the stable binary naming system, persons who are not related have the same surname and in cases where their kinship ties are loosened by further branching of consanguineous relatives. The possibilities for identification (and derivation) are not equal in the first naming and binary naming systems. In the first naming system, lexical selection and specifically anthroponymic word-forming procedures carry the most weight. In the binary naming system, the surname is the determining factor in expressing family affiliations. That is why, in the class of surnames, the group of anthropolexemes as well as the group of anthropoformants spreads so re-

markably. Specificity of expression of proper names is demonstrated most clearly in the lingual formation of surnames.

5. ⟨± **Heredity of proper name**⟩ is a matter of personal naming. Heredity is demonstrated in functional components that are established by a more restrictive social convention and in the stabilisation of a name by administrative and legal standards in a different way.

In the old first naming system, hierarchically, the personal name was the basic component in a narrow sense (Germ. Rufname) which was not a hereditary element (e. g. *Matej, Jakuš Gašpara*). Later, the individual characteristic could gain the validity of a byname (e. g. *Stefan Diakovic // Stefan Diak*) by possible adoption of the heredity feature. The current subsystem of living names recognises non-hereditary functional components (*Jozef Zimen – Ščefiny Dzurajky Jožko*) as well as hereditary functional components (*Michal Palovčík – Palovčík od Cestárov; Ondrej Šmihula – Šmihula Belko*). The heredity of living family names is linked to a social convention in certain regions. This may be summarised as follows: living family names are associated with a certain family and are passed on through generations. In some villages, in order to distinguish between persons with surnames which are frequently identical, living family names are used more or less officially. However, the use of surnames is not obligatory; hence children are usually addressed by their living family name. Family names are frequently transferred via a woman-mother who receives the hereditary family name or parental surname in her parents' house; her children are named after her although their official surname after their father is different. Officially, the family is addressed by their surnames but their houses are, by custom, called after their original owners or builders; the current occupants are addressed accordingly. Names of houses are inherited by their residents, regardless of their official surnames (in more detail Blanár/Matejčík, I/2, 601–602).

The inheritance of a new functional component – surname – starts the procedure of the change of the first naming system into the binary naming system. This results from the need to identify the named persons unambiguously in common communication and in official documents. The establishment of the state-political units with a developed administration and legal standards – and the effort of privileged groups to strengthen their legal ownership by means of a well-established family name were the important driving forces towards restructuring in the naming system (see also Pulgram 1950/51). The new functional component had (officially) a

constant form and was inherited by consanguineous relatives down the line of male descendants.

The motivation of a family surname by a particular onymic situation is coded in its language form but, in the process of inheritance, the live motivation relation of the surname becomes less important and it is irrelevant in common communication. Forms like *Holovič, Pisarčík, Jakubíček* can, in morphemic and word-forming analysis, be categorised into their individual morphemes but the derivational morphemes function only as means to differentiation. By contrast, the motivation of non-hereditary living names indicates the current circumstances of naming; compare *Ondro Bitkár (Fighter), Juro Amerikán (American), Drotár (Wire-worker), Jedinák Rybnický, Jula Na uhle*. The live motivation of unofficial names is frequently used in artistic speech.

6. ⟨± **Obligatory character of a name**⟩ This is just a marginal item in the category of personal names which is abstracted away in the developmental and pragmatic approach. The positive stage of obligatory (+) is a characteristic of personal names in the old first naming system and later for groups of Christian names. In the official binary naming system, this feature characterises the basic components of the naming scheme (Christian name, patronymic, matronymic, surname). The basic form of these functional components is standard, written and also colloquial. The effect it has on the language form deals with the stability of the official naming (it is related also to aspects of spelling and grammar). In the negative stage (−), ⟨obligation of a name⟩ characterises the functional components of unofficial naming (individual characteristics, nickname, byname, living family name and name of house). The basic form of these functional components is colloquial and regional. It also includes hypocoristic forms within a very small social radius (e. g. nicknames used within a family: *Mufo, Igiboj, Majko*, etc.). The negative stage of obligatory ⟨obligation for a name⟩ is manifested in communication in the more restricted stability of a colloquial form of an unofficial name.

7. ⟨± **Validity of a name from birth**⟩ This feature in the positive stage (+) relates to personal names in the first naming system in the narrower sense, and in the binary naming system it relates to Christian names and surnames. It is concerned with "baptism", with selection from relatively well-established sets which, however, have certain dynamics (extension, stabilisation, assimilation of foreign names). In the old first naming system, this feature in the negative stage (−) relates to an individual char-

acteristic, nickname and byname, in the unofficial naming of rich sets of living names which are characterised by local economic and social conditions and where the expressiveness of naming means is applied more significantly.

8. ⟨± **Expressiveness**⟩ This feature is more frequent in personal names and less frequent in geographical names; its usage in various classes of chrematonyms would require a special analysis.

Motivation of geographical names indicates some aspects of a naming situation. Expressiveness is attained by a selection of emotionally coloured lexemes or an unusual connection of components in complex naming, compare, e. g. *Čertiak – the Devil, V židáku – In the Jewish Part, Bohov chrbát – the God's Back, Somárska lúka – Easy Slope.* In ordinary communication, the identification function of a name diminishes its original strong, even vulgar, expressiveness (a name of a meadow *Do riti-Up Arsehole*).

In personal naming, the emotional feature applies unequally to individual functional components, even in cases when names have an identical form. The determining factor is their onomastic semantics; compare e. g. personal names *Zubor (Bison), Medveď (Bear), Vlk (Wolf)* which played a protective and magical function in the oldest personal naming; *Zubor, Medveď, Vlk* as surnames have different anthroponymic validity and their meaning is different when they are used as individual characteristics in the system of living names. Historical documents suggest that hypocoristic formations derived from one motivant (e. g. *Martin: Maroš, Martinko…*) could be used as specific names to identify different bearers. With nicknames, the feature of expressiveness is usually used in the positive stage (+). In this functional component, the appellative meaning is quite frequently transposed metaphorically or metonymically or the negative properties of a person motivate the name of the person named; compare *Peter* (called *Fattum*)) *Mastibruch, Zubor, Medveď, Vlk, Baran, Fufňák…*When surnames were formed from (many) nicknames within the binary naming system, their original motivation was lost due to their heredity. The lexical meaning of the derivational basis diminishes and becomes irrelevant. In an ordinary communication, the original meaning of the anthropolexeme becomes noticeable only with significantly expressive words (e. g. *Serenko, Vreštiak, Bachor, Grajzeľ*) although it has no significance as far as identification is concerned. The situation is different, however, in unofficial naming. The motivation of names is live (which is why we use the term *living names*); e. g. *Šubíček* ("he polished shoes"), *Icika* ("he was very

short"), *Dollároš* ("he was in America"). For surnames, the feature of expressiveness refers to the form of the name; for unofficial names the live motivation refers to the person named. A characteristic group of living names is forms with overt expressiveness (*Čunčo, Čirbirák, Frťko, Grňa, Lizák, Harajda, Trlaj, Kičina, Škadra, Huka* etc.).

9. ⟨**Grouping**⟩ has a special status among other onymic features since it is closely related to the anthroponymic feature ⟨family affiliation⟩ or the chrematonymic feature ⟨serial⟩. If it is related to the feature ⟨family affiliation⟩, a name demonstrates relatives within a family, including members of kinship groups. In German, these names are termed Gruppennamen. They have a plural form and in Slovak they are formed by the suffix *-ovci* (*Kubala – Kubalovci, Rybár – Rybárovci*). However, the adherents, followers, or scholars of a person named by his or her proper name are classified as appellatives (and their initial letter is written in lower case: bernolákovci, štúrovci) since the features "follower, adherent, scholar" do not predicate the family affiliations which are relevant to the category of personal names. Names in which ⟨grouping⟩ is combined with the feature ⟨serial⟩ belong to another subsystem. This is a rich class of chrematonyms which includes various kinds of products made in series, such as newspapers, magazines, books (*Pravda, Slovenka, Dom v stráni*), names of means of urban transport (cars, bicycles, trains, boats), cleaning and chemists' products etc. However, the names of some commonly used products (with the initial letter written in lower case) such as *rizling – Riesling, rokfort – Roquefort, kuba – Havana cigar, mercedes* and especially names derived from names of patented products by suffixation (e. g. *fiatka – Fiat car, škodovka – Škoda car, tatramatka – washing machine*) are classified as appellatives.

The reflection of the content elements of a proper name in its language form confirms the perception of the proper name as a binary onymic sign.

2. 5 Modelling in onomastics. On the beginning of modelling of proper names

The concept of modelling the naming act and also modelling the whole set of onymic elements of a given class generalises proprial naming principles and leads to comprehending and depicting proprial relations, elements and their internal organisation in their deep structure (see also Šrámek 1999). Supra-individual hierarchised features (onosemes, functions) embedded in social standards and needs have the most general

character. These features constitute the content component (more precisely, semantic component) of an onymic sign. Content abstractions at a higher level are equal in some aspects in ethnic communities which lived in similar economic and social conditions. While the content component of the naming model is created by general naming principles, the proprial nomination itself is based on the rules of a given language (indeed, in the proprial sphere, their usage is quite specific). **Content models**, usually of a pragmatic character, relate to a concrete naming situation and onymy of a particular language by way of a **motivational model**. The link between the content and the word-forming model is the motivation model. In respect of expanding naming needs and various situations and also the functioning of onymic objects in social contacts, the motivations of proper names in individual classes are considerably varied but it is possible to determine certain typical situations. For example, the naming motifs of official personal names originate from more or less well-established sets (official inventories); this refers to the so-called "baptism" in a broad sense. In unofficial personal naming, living naming motifs are applied: the individual physical or mental characteristics of a person, his or her interests, job, origin, address, etc. (in Central Slovakia we have identified more than 20 different naming motifs – see BLANÁR/MATEJČÍK I/1, 1978). Toponymic motivation models consist of features which are typical of a character or pragmatic aspect of geographical names; these are mainly location, the description of an object, ownership, membership, celebratory, a memorial feature and a residential feature (MAJTÁN 1996, 10–11). These motivating features refer to the origin of a toponymy in a certain situation. As far as the motivator is concerned, logonyms as part of chrematonyms are interesting. Usually, their naming motif is a circumstance related to the area of activity of a firm or the name of its owner (IMRICHOVÁ 2002, 91).

    A word-forming model is defined as "a word-forming pattern for a lingual depiction of the act of naming" (ŠRÁMEK 1972, 1976). In proprial nomination in the word-forming model, the word-forming procedures of a language are used in accordance with the naming rules of a respective onymic sphere which have their local, time and frequency dimensions. The area distribution and social determination of word-forming models are mainly characteristic of toponymy and the group of living personal names. In the word-forming model, anthropobasis and anthropoformant are distinguished. In an act of communication, the anthroponymic word-forming model acquires its respective language form and this is what is

known as a **word-forming type**. The first part of the word-forming type is its word class characteristic; in the second part, anthropoformants are given explicitly (Šrámek 1999; Pleskalová 1976, 1992; Blanár 1978, 1996). The characteristic of formal aspects of living names can be intensified by distinguishing relations of equality (a name is a substantive in nom., sing.) and subordinacy (the function component is a possessive adjective or localisation with preposition) of functional components in the **syntactic model** (Jozefovič 2006, 65).

I described the technique of modelling in anthroponymy in the monograph *Living Personal Names in Central Slovakia* I/1, 1978. In the model classification, two aspects of anthroponymic nomination are combined with graphical symbols. The content models are classified by functional components (Christian name, surname, individual characteristic, byname, living family name, house name); functional components are determined on the basis of a hierarchical set of onymic features (which form designation, onymic semantic). On the symbols of individual functional components, motifs are indicated by generalising exponents (figures, lower case). Hence, the content and motivation model are integrated in a graphical symbol (see chapters 2. 2–2. 4). For example:

> *Jano Ráztočan* $\underline{K}$ + CH^P/RMD
> *Tetka Eva od Zubajov-aunt Eva from the Zubajs*   A − K + MD$_1$ = P
> Legend: / means "functional component used as…"
>   = means "identical with…".

In "*The Theory of Proper Names*" (1996) I outlined rules for describing word-forming models and types for the classification of anthroponyms. A deeper understanding of systems of personal names and, in particular, computer processing of extensive material will be required to enhance the technique of model classification. In one living name several naming models are usually combined; these are defined as *naming types*. A system of living names consists of various naming types and models.

A naming type for living personal names:

> *Milan Strmeň*
> *Horár-forester Strmeň*   CH^z/RMD + P=RMD
> (how to decipher the record: individual characteristic is also used as a living family name and a name of a house + surname which can also be used as a living family name and a name of a house)

word-forming model   [CH/RMD] her. char. + [P=RMD] surname
word-forming type   Sd + Sd
(how to read the abbreviation Sd: substantivum derived + substantivum derived).

Naming types are basic elements of onymic subsystems. Individual ony-mic models should be understood as prototypical (more or less open) sets of components of meaning. Their local, time and frequency dimensions show the internal structure of individual subsystems and facilitate a deeper synchronous, diachronous and confrontational description. The modelling method is considered an important methodological contribution to the development of current theoretical onomastics. The characteristic of extensive sets of living personal names requires the classification of rich and internally varied names on the principle of model abstractions. By the modelling method employed, a basis for comparison within the national language as well as for inter-ethnic confrontation (especially where content models are concerned) is formed and also it exposes (para-systemic) methods for using lingual means of the local language in proprial nomination (motivational models, word-forming models and types are dealt with).

   The data obtained by the modelling method enable us to discover precisely, e. g., as far as living personal names are concerned, the use of individual functional components, the entire model structures in various microsystems and also in larger geographical areas. In comparative research, the as yet unused average anthroponymic microsystem which is formed by the following parameters: the frequency quotient of living names per bearer, the average distribution of content models (the ratio of content models to all living names), the average itemisation of content models, the average usage of functional components (BLANÁR 1996), could be contributory. In comparison with other anthroponymic systems, the significant values are those which are higher or lower than the normal average.

   The description of naming models through metalanguage enables us to process and classify onymic models by statistical and area methods.

On the beginning of modelling of proper names

Currently, the modelling method based on precise PC-performed research is on the increase. In Slovakia, the modelling method in the proprial

sphere has been developing since 1945[4]. Its beginnings are linked to an attempt to apply a semiotic and functional-structural approach to the research into proper names (see V. Blanár, *Osobné mená. K základom semiologickej onomastiky*, 1945, manusc. *Proper names. On the basis of semiotic onomastics*). This deals with an attempt to comprehend the structural organisation in the system of Slovak official and unofficial (living) personal names. This structure is investigated as "types of names". It was understood as an "abstracted naming paradigm" which is formed by onymic signs with a certain structure of semantic functions (cf. 113). From 1966 and 1967, I have been using the term model (of personal names). In my further research, in the description of the content aspect of personal names, I used a method of component analysis and synthesis and I also formulated the theory and method of modelling aspects of the content and motivation of proper names by defining the general naming principles in the proprial nomination of personal names (Blanár 1970/71; summarised in 1996; the classification of word-forming models and types is also outlined here). The substantiation and perspective of this procedure was validated with a set of almost 60 000 living personal names from central Slovakia (Blanár/Matejčík – [Šmelík] 1978/83). As the research continues, the set of onymic features (of prototypical character) in the designation of names has been extended. A similar theory and method of modelling is applied and developed by E.-M. Christoph and G. Wotjak (on the theory of onymic features), J. Matejčík, I. Valentová (living personal names in the upper Nitra region), M. Imrichová (a subsystem of logonyms), M. Jozefovič (computer technique in the modelling of living proper names and its evaluation by graphs and maps), I. Haraj (anthroponymic systems in the naming of persons in the Classical period), W. Wenzel (old personal names in Lusatian Serbia), S. Paikkala (the development of the anthroponymic system in Finland), M. Ološtiak, A. Holá, Ľ. Sičáková, M. Kazík and others. The application of this methodology has facilitated an insight into a system of personal naming (a symbiosis of original local and European official naming) and into differences in the use of several functional components in some African and Asian ethnic groups in communication (Blanár 1988, 1996). A similar theoretical start-

---

4 Pleskalová 1992, 15: "In onymy, the model classification was first applied to anthroponymy by V. Blanár."

ing point is found in work by P. Čučka (2005: Historical-etymological dictionary of Ukrainian surnames from the Transcarpathian region).

The modelling of *toponyms* was closely analysed and, using the Czech language, explained by R. Šrámek (1971/73, 1972/73, 1976, 1999) in the course of the process of the systematic development of his concept of functional onomastics (on the whole, close to the perception which I formulate in this contribution). A model description of the formation of geographical names in Moravia and Silesia by J. Pleskalová (1992) also points out perspectives in comparative onomastics. At this point, reference should be made to the studies by a Slovak researcher, M. Majtán (1976, 1996 and elsewhere).

3. 1 The onymic system and its realisation in a text

By a functional revaluation of the supra-individual pragmatic, socially significant features of a name which are characteristic of whole classes of propria, a content component of naming models was constituted. The motivational and word-forming components stemmed from the naming capacities of the respective language code. The naming models are the basic constituents of onymic systems which, in language communication, are realised as anthroponymic, toponymic, chrematonymic and other signs. In these signs, certain official rules or conventional usages of a given onymic system are stressed. Individual personal names are the expressions of onymic system standards. The onymic system is an abstract unit of the functional system-forming components and rules, standards and models which are specific to individual onymic classes. The organisational and system-forming principle of all onymy and onymic systems is the basic function of proper names ⟨socially determined identification // differentiation⟩. This general feature of the proprial sphere comprises nomination, identification and differentiation; individual onymic subsystems are distinguished by their specifying features (see chapter 2. 1). The onymic system and its functioning in speech and in text are the two interrelated sides of a single coin. What is generally onymic exists only through a concrete realisation in communication. By means of its content and form, every onymic sign is incorporated into a microstructure (synonymous, homonymous and other) of relations, which is one of the characteristic features of any given onymy (for more detail, see Blanár 1977). Onymic systems have their central, marginal and transitional zones. In internally

varied systems, such as classes of living personal names or geographical names, an important characteristic of the structural organisation of the microsystem is the intensive usage of certain content models, motivational models and word-forming models in individual geographical areas and in their historical development. The degree of productivity of these models is reflected in the frequency of their use. The differences in proprial and appellative nomination relate to the fact that onymic and dialect areas do not overlap. Onymic systems, as expressed in a term by V. Mathesius, are flexibly stable. Their dynamic character results from a tension between the naming needs of socially determined identification // differentiation (these reflect administrative-legal and more restricted social standards which, however, are not static variables) and the naming capacities of a respective language. Proper names act in communication as prototypes. The realisation of elemental system components, as presented in an onymic situation, and the mental representation of language-users has a dynamic character and that is why the formal onymic system also has a dynamic status.

Onymic systems, in respect of the character of the objects named, manifest themselves in a certain way in area, time and frequency dimensions. For example, toponymic names in their motivation are permanently related to their location in a geographical area. They are termed proprial (or system) areas. System areas have their time layers and space areas in which macrotypes, microtypes and the so-called small types of local names are studied. In local names, we observe how naming standards in toponymy react to changes in the onymic situation. Quite a large role in the stabilisation and modification of naming standards is played by the ideological positions adopted by the political representatives of a state administration. Proprial lingual geography represents a shift from the etymologising aspect; it is one of the basic working methods of current onomastics (see Šrámek 1999, 86).

The functioning of anthroponyms and the anthroponymic system is performed externally as part of a change of named persons in the classes of men, women and (unmarried) children over generations. Within these three classes, the reproduction of a personal name is realised with each new generation. Personal naming involves not only the dynamic which follows from the need to name new individuals in the continuous exchange of generations but, from the early mediaeval period, a significant role is played by the way in which family relations within kinship groups was expressed. The development progressed from a system of non-

hereditary personal names through names identified more closely with the help of bynames and individual characteristics to an anthroponymic system, the basic component of which is the surname as a symbol of consanguineity. In such a way, a qualitatively new onymic system as an onymic generalium, was established by this internal reconstruction. The Christian name "dropped" to the position of the determining component and the former determining component, strengthened by new anthroponymic features, became the hierarchically basic component in the naming scheme (see chapter 2. 4). The administrative requirements of an organised state and the effort of the privileged class to strengthen their own legal and ownership claims provided the impetus behind the internal reorganisation of the anthroponymic system.

Statistical analysis of personal names and local names has shown that individual names and also content models and word-forming models can be distinguished by the frequency characteristic of certain classes of names. In content models, motivational models and word-forming models, various more or less productive naming procedures have been identified. In microsystems, productive and peripheral models are distinguished in respect of their use. The important discovery was made that content models also have their characteristic area distribution, can be processed by cartography and disclose new interesting facts which can be used in comparative studies.

In the research so far, an analysis of real proper names which can be observed externally has been preferred. Focus on research into superficial phenomena fails to address a large number of questions which theoretical onomastics attempts to answer. Like source materials in heuristic studies, material descriptions are essential prerequisites for penetrating into a deeper structure of onymic relations. Let us give some examples. J. Svoboda (1964, 187) reflects that old Czech bynames are not stabilised, they are variable and non-hereditary (it is also true that there are some examples from the 14th and 15th centuries in which some bynames were passed on to the second generation) and that is why, up to the 18th century, official documents and records were arranged by Christian names which were the persons' own names. However, the author does not address the question of what system changes led to the transition from the first naming to the binary naming anthroponymic system, why official documents and records were later listed alphabetically by surname. In an international handbook on onomastics *Namenarten und ihre Erforschung* (2004, 671), R. and

V. Kohlheim make an original methodological contribution to the development of particular personal names (Rufnamen) in a first naming system. And, similarly, W. Wenzel (2004, 705), who analyses in detail the historical and social conditions leading to the inheritance and establishment of the written form of bynames (protosurnames), does not consider in what the transformation of the system relations between the Christian name and surname in the transition from the first naming to binary naming system lies and how this transformation is manifested or, in other words, what led to the hierarchical transformation of these two functional components (in detail, see chapter 2. 4).

A textological method introduced a deeper view of the position of the proper name in a microtext (compare, e. g. Harweg 1993; Werner 1989). It is interesting to note that, in deepened textological contributions, the so-called proprial context P : P : P was not taken into consideration although pragmatic supra-individual features can be abstracted, especially in proprial contexts. R. Harweg analyses, from the aspect of its linguistic status, the use of the Christian name as a bearer of sentence stress in a macrotext but not as a functional component of an anthroponymic system (of a certain subsystem).

Up to the present, the analysis of isolated proper names obscures the problems associated with the content (meaning) of a proper name. One-sided understanding of an onymic sign can hardly address this question. Perhaps, the above examples can serve to demonstrate the need for the non-conditional collaboration of the two methodological procedures: the analysis of a concrete (and as diverse as possible) material must be linked with an effort to decipher the internal system relations in the organisation and social functioning of onymic systems.

A note on terminology.

Anthroponymy as a systematic structured and standardised whole and as an open set of names which act in social communication is two interrelated variables; the first belongs to "langue" and the second to speech and text. Therefore, it is reasonable to distinguish between them:

An anthroponymic system as a phenomenon of deep structure (langue) can have the character of a first naming structure when, hierarchically, the Christian name is the basic component; when the basic component is the surname then the binary naming system is involved; a special type is a name with an obligatory patronymic and (hereditary) surname. For

example: *a + B; a + b + C*. These anthroponymic structures can be single-component or multi-component. Naming types for unofficial names are more diverse than this official naming basis.

An (anthroponymic) naming scheme is an officially or customarily established manner of naming in language practice; in communication and text. It can involve the single-component or multi-component naming of persons, e. g. *Martin, Maroš spod hory – Under the Wood, Martin Kalík; Anna Krátka – Pôbišová; Juro Minarových Bitkár – Fighter*.

3. 2 Onymy in social communication

Onymy exists in social communication. Phenomena in deep structure are realised in speech, text, or discourse. Proper names contribute in a substantial degree to the construction of various texts. Besides the incorporation of the proper name into a text, their social functions also take on other forms. The difference in the communicative competence of propria and appellatives is most pronounced in texts where the attention given to the referent is not significant, or is not possible, respectively; examples are various administrative lists, data sets, catalogues, calendars, onomasticons, etc. In general, however, proper names are used in all functions of communication. In some types of texts, even several communicative functions may apply. For example, in a dialogue speech, the expressive function is applied (*Little Andy!*), conative (*Hey, Andrew, Andrew!*) and phatic (*Are you there, Andrew?*). In linguistic analysis, the metalingual function is usual (*Hopsasa as personal name is substantive*). In the theory of speech acts, social interaction in various types of communication is differentiated from (narrower) communication using verbal means (Fiske 1982; Strawson 1985); this also includes the use of proper names in communication. With regard to basic contact situations (national, local, individual lingual contact), official discourse and several levels of unofficial discourse are differentiated. The discourse has its communication rules depending on how official and unofficial names are used. For example, a large number of variations of proper names are indirectly proportional to the number of their users. Well-established innovations in local and individual usage affect and disturb the traditional hierarchy of the three areas of lingual contacts (Lubaś 1984; Mrózek 2003). In socially determined identification and differentiation, proper names are formed and used in accordance with the standards of the respective language. But, in addition to this, in the

proprial nomination and structural organisation of onymic systems, specifically onymic elements (e. g. onymic semantics, reflections of onosemes in language form, naming models, functional components in personal naming) are characteristic. In research into the extensive problems of the verbal communication of proper names, not only their linguistic but also their onomastic status must be taken into consideration (Šrámek 2003).

The components of an onymic system function as dynamic values within the given social standards in the contact of lingual and extra-lingual processes and in certain dimensions of time, space and frequency. Let us focus on several examples, mainly of personal naming, to demonstrate how onymy acts in close relation with the naming system.

In the codified standards for personal naming in Slovakia, the binary naming system of the a + B type, is used, i. e. combining two functional components - Christian name and surname. In previous texts, I have shown that the functional components represent certain onymic values (with a given onymic designation). This is the core of the official system (the marginal components can be ignored). The hierarchically basic functional component is the surname due to its anthroponymic features ⟨family affiliations within a family as a whole⟩ and ⟨heredity⟩ which in the Christian name applies in a negative sense. The common features of these two functional components are ⟨natural genre⟩, ⟨stabilisation by administrative and legal standards⟩, ⟨validity from birth⟩. So, the components differ in their onymic validity. Also, the naming of married women and children is included in the official standards. The officially obligatory form is the form of the surname which is recorded in a register of births. The registers of births utilise an official inventory of Christian names which, as far as current social requirements are concerned, is not completely closed. These naming standards are realised in a naming scheme: Christian names *(Adam, … , Eva, …)* + surname *(Hlavaj, Hlavajová…, (Maximilián) Nitra, (Anna) Nitrová…).* In ordinary communication, the Christian names have various hypocoristic forms (dialect usage differs substantially in many aspects); the surname form is standardised. Unofficial personal naming in Slovakia is much more varied. Naming standards of living names originate in local and regional conventions which relate to the construction of functional components, their number, area distribution and also to some naming principles (for detailed description and analysis: Blanár/Matejčík 1978/1983). The homonymic surname *Nitra* fulfils its identifying role when an addressee (the addressed person, speaker, read-

er) is familiar with the genus proximum of this proprial form. When he or she knows that, in this instance, it is not the river, hotel, recreation facility which is being referred to but a particular person. In order to identify by reference, one has to be familiar with the most important information of the "knowledge" of this onymic object. In ordinary communication, the onymic features from a lower range are not important. Knowledge of the whole semantic construction of content models is essential in scientific description when the principles and organisation of an onymic subsystem are studied. For example, a study of the characteristics of living personal names is inconceivable without reconstruction of their naming models.

Now we have arrived at the relationship between reference identification and knowledge of the onymic object. This problem requires a more detailed explanation.

Reference identification and knowledge of an onymic object. As stated earlier, the semantics of proper names exists as an objective value, even though the reference relation has not been realised because the designation of an onymic sign is a phenomenon within an onymic system.

In social communication, in the identification of individuals of a given class, several types of situation can be distinguished which depend on the manner in which the named object is known. This refers to the various degrees of knowing about the onymic object. Language competence does not involve knowledge of the onymic signs. Members of a language community familiarise themselves with native and foreign onymy gradually and individually. In the act of communication, factors are activated which interact in onymic nomination. These are the audio bearer of the information (designator), the unique onymic object (denotat), the knowledge of the denotat (the content of a thought) and onymic semantics (designation). When using a proper name, the provider and the receiver interpret the content of the onymic sign. Their communication assumes, in principle, a similar knowledge of the content of the proper name although there are situations when these conditions need not be fulfilled. Let us note the following examples:

(1) A. I have just returned from a pleasant spring stroll. I went to *Jánošík's cave*, I made a tour around *Farárka* and I got as far as *Baračka*.
  B. I do not know the surroundings of Trenčianske Teplice. I do not know where these objects are located.
  A. I will show you round there tomorrow.

(2) The geographical objects *Jánošík's cave*, *Farárka* and *Baračka* are located in the surroundings of Trenčianske Teplice.

(3) His honour is said to have replied and promised N. money and a knighthood. (D. Krman). – A well-built young man was taken to D., the kids were punished and the old Gypsy woman was put into prison (W. Scott). – A post-woman in N., Emil L., everybody watched the mink, which was dragged from a cage by Stanislav Č. (J. Johanides).

In context (1) communicant B's knowledge of the objects is superficial. However, it is sufficient to identify the names of *Jánošík's cave*, *Farárka* and *Baračka* as local geographical names, or more precisely, as geonyms from the locality of Trenčianske Teplice. In ordinary communication, it is not necessary to "be familiar with" a generic particularity hence it is sufficient to "know" that e. g. the names *Jánošík's cave*, *Farárka* and *Baračka* are the names of uninhabited geographical objects within a set of Slovak local area names.

In context (2), however, the attention is focused on the onymic object. The communicating person is provided with basic information on the respective onymic objects with which he or she may not necessarily be familiar. On the basis of this information, unambiguous reference identification of proper names is possible. In ordinary communication, the reference identification resulting from certain information and encyclopaedic knowledge is usually emphasized. The knowledge, information about the denotat of a proper name, has an individually variable range, even where an identical, relatively known object is concerned.

(3) The examples quoted, which usually occur in written (especially artistic) speeches, are specific; a proper name is not referred to in its full form but only in its initial (seldom random) letter. Intentionally incomplete information is provided by a surname having just the initial letter of the surname. In similar cases, the provider can talk about the onymic object as such, the unambiguous identification of this object is not essential to the receiver, or should stay a secret, or only pragmatic components of the name are important. What is significant, however, is the circumstance that the given context provides the information as to which onymic class the object termed in the abbreviation belongs. Therefore, e. g., in the statement: *Once, it happened in the town N.*, the abbreviation *N.* is not just an empty "label" for the name of an inhabited place. This form is the determining aspect of a toponymic sign. The determined aspect of this sign is its proprial semantics (designation). Despite its abbreviated form, the

communicative value of this type of name is similar to the case of pre-sumed identification in context (1).

3. 3 Naming standards in official and unofficial relations

The use of any given onymy cannot be applied outside the rules and laws which constitute the standard for the common operation of sets of proper names in various communication situations. Communication practice, which must satisfy a variety of naming needs, is an important dynamising factor in standard-making in the proprial area. Official names used in communications important from the aspect of state-political organisation and administration have their standardised forms. The forms of proper names in unofficial and private relations are determined by a non-codified social convention. There are internal and external standard-making factors. The internal standard-making factors are the uniformly acting ten-dencies, laws and rules according to which a given system is structured. The external standard-making factors are the consciously and carefully directed formation and use of standardised forms of proper names in lin-gual communication (language culture and language policy in onomastics are referred to). Communication practice originating from various situa-tions in communication signals the start of the development of the onymic system.

The social determination of identification and differentiation of generic individuals shows profoundly in the close links of their naming with ex-tra-lingual factors, i. e. the social, legal, historical standards of a respective state administration and the whole ideological background of the respec-tive society. These factors leave permanent marks on the standardisation of proper names. In accordance with the requirements of the state admin-istration, committees of experts direct the use, modification and amend-ments of onymic data sets. The existing onymy is massively affected by an altered state-political and ideological situation. Let us remember, e. g. the naming and re-naming of villages, streets, institutions, etc. in the liberated territories after World War II or the official changes of surnames in the process of "unifying" foreign names with the names of the local ethnic group; e. g. *Jedinák → Jóházi, Vízy → Vodnár, Kňažice → Žitavany, Turčiansky Svätý Martin → Martin*. (see BLANÁR 1950). These procedures demonstrate the activisation of the feature ⟨to manifest the association of a bearer of a name with an ethnic group or to manifest the acceptability of a name to

a given ideology by the form of the name). In reevaluation of this onymically relevant characteristic as onoseme (onymic features), similar cases of naming are understood as the realisation of a naming procedure which complies with the needs of the respective period. External factors affect real onymy indirectly by means of the respective onymic system.

A similar phenomenon (the parallel use of multilingual variations of a name) is known from the early mediaeval period, mainly in the contact territories in the recording of proper names in offices in the Austro-Hungarian Empire. However, the difference is that the respective sign was not significant to a convention of these mediaeval offices. The proprial functions were not fulfilled by a language form (more or less stable) but by the appellative meaning of the proper name. For example, analysis of extensive anthroponymic material from the oldest municipal book in Košice *Acta iudicaria* revealed that, in the mind-set of mediaeval man, the "content" of a name was accepted as legally proven and not the lingual and standardised form of this name (Halaga 1970/72, 2002). Examples of such variations are not rare: *Parvus Pinder // Klein Pinder* (*Košice*, end of the 14th century, Halaga 1970/72); *Michal // Mihaj; Georg // Gerg // Jorg // Juro // Jirík // Ďuro // Ďurďa* (Boca 1588–1602; Blanár 1961). The basic component of the naming scheme was stabilised only after the codification of the binary naming system.

The effect of social and societal factors on the formation of new names is observed in particular in the revolutionary historical periods of the societal life of nations. For example, following 1917, the new and altered geographical names in the former Soviet Union differ from the older toponymy in several aspects. However, there is a dynamic dependence of the new names on names which are historically older. Many of the toponymic models have retained their productivity. A typical characteristic of a new toponymy is its total motivation. The new names have an ideological content and emotive background. A special feature of the semantics of the lexical basis of new local names is their strong social semantics *(Svobodnyj, Znamensk)* with an expression of an optimistic characteristic of the object named (*Solnečnogorsk, Jasnomorskij*). In comparison with these tendencies, there is a different situation in countries with an English-speaking population. For example, Australian names are formed mainly according to the rules of geographical names in England (Beleňkaja 1975, 48–49).

In the standards of personal naming, two principles meet: the mechanical and the selectively-connotational. The set of anthropolexemes of Eu-

ropean names was substantially influenced by Christianity. As a result
of the spread of Christianity, the names of Biblical and Greek and Latin
saints began to permeate the old Greek, German, Slavic, Roman etc. an-
throponymy. The productive Christian names were accommodated in a
new environment and their naturalised forms further developed in accor-
dance with the rules of the local language. In the selection of a name for
a baby, the older "mechanical" principle (Kohlheim 1981, 137 illustrates
the situation in German) was replaced by a new selective "connotational"
principle, i. e. an individual selection from an existing inventory based on
the connotation with which the name of the saint was related. This conno-
tational principle can be regarded as an expression of the mentality of the
respective society. The codification of the binary naming system, "bap-
tism" shifted towards the mechanical principle. However, the mechani-
cal principle is loosened, on the one hand, by the selective connotational
choice of Christian name and especially by the mechanical adoption of a
husband's name by a wife not only in unofficial naming but also in the
administrative and legal standards of official names. This resulted in dif-
ferences in some official anthroponymic systems, especially in the naming
of married women. For example, Hungarian has four types of naming for
female-bearers; in Finland, since 1986, five options have been permitted
for naming newly married couples and there are two alternatives for the
naming of babies. If the parents cannot agree on the surname of their child,
the child gets the surname of his or her mother (Blanár 1996, 185–187
and elsewhere). In the more rigorous application of the wife's surname,
the emancipation of women in modern society is demonstrated.

A relatively independent subsystem is represented by unofficial and
semi-official naming (so-called *living* names). While in official onymic
systems (in which the basic form is written) officially codified and stan-
dardised forms of names are used, in unofficial systems, the basic form of
which is spoken, variable, often akin to dialect, forms of names are used.
Living names are distinguished from the official naming by the stabilisa-
tion by a narrower social convention. More than twenty types of motiva-
tional features are used to construct a naming model. One living name
can consist of several naming models in which several motivational fea-
tures are applied which is why the branch of living names has a relatively
rich set of naming models. Compare an example from Slovak (with model
values):

Pavel Bročko (Rakovo)	*Paľo Bročké*	K + RM=P
K + P	*Jirka Hoľík*	CH ᵛ
	Inžiňier	CH ᶻ
	Alkohoľik	CH ᵛ

The established set of metalingual components which constitute the content aspect of anthroponymic signs facilitates an insight into an internal structure of microsystems and macro-systems of living personal names. In almost two thirds of the villages examined in Central Slovakia, the living names with a frequency of "1" constitute more than half of all naming types; these names are marginal. A high percentage of living names is usually concentrated around 7–10 naming types. These names have a central position in a given microsystem. In cartographic processing not only naming types and models are used but also their components. For example, central as well as marginal content models have their specific geographical areas. The construction, development and functioning of unofficial naming cannot be isolated from the official naming system but their formation and further development have their own direction. In living names we have discovered some naming principles which are not known to the official system (they are new laws of living names in deep structure), e. g. a person is named after his or her individual characteristic or indirectly, i. e. in relation to another, usually related person; the naming of a member of a family can be motivated by a name of a courtyard; a name of a mother-breeder can be the starting point for naming in a family. Similar findings with regard to the naming of family members after the mother in the territory of Western Lemki were published by Wolnicz-Pawłowska and by P. Čučka in Hutsul villages in the Transcarpathian region. The classification of extensive material and findings on the frequency and geographical distribution of content models of living personal names has created the conditions for a comparative socio-linguistic analysis of general naming principles of living names in related and unrelated languages (further detail: Blanár/Matejčík 1978/83; Blanár 1996).

In contact situations, personal naming finds itself in various interference relations. These relations are manifested not only in the naming motives in onymically relevant features but also in the naming principles themselves. Let us give an example of Slovak-Hungarian contacts. In the accounting books of the yeoman mine court in Boca from 1588–1602, we

have found four types of female names. The naming types *Janko Strečková,*
Matz Kohlerka are basic naming types in the Hungarian anthroponymic
system. The functional components *Strečková, Kohlerka* are further deter-
mined by the Christian name of their husbands and not by the name of
the wife named; compare Hungarian *Fekete József: Német Katalin → Fekete*
Józsefné. In many systems in African nations which for centuries were
colonies of some Western European countries, we have observed a sort
of symbiosis of traditional (folk) naming with a new, official naming
which was common to the European colonisers. The influence on personal
names of European names and the naming principles which applied in
the anthroponymic system of the colonisers disturbed a stable local folk
convention. The variability in several of the systems analysed is directed
(in the official contacts) towards the binary naming system with a heredi-
tary surname. The onymic feature ⟨heredity⟩ closely related to a naming
situation of a given society in its historical development deeply affects the
respective anthroponymy and individual anthroponymic systems.

3. 4 The use of lingual means in systems of proper names

In proprial nomination, individual objects of a given class are distin-
gushed by a lexical selection or word-forming construction of naming. In
the naming of persons, a new circumstance is involved – individuals of
extended groups are not named as such (as in families or smaller com-
munities of personally acquainted people) but also as members of kin-
ship groups. The distinction between related and non-related persons is
coded in the official and unofficial naming schemes. From this aspect, in-
sufficient attention has been paid to the use of lingual means in personal
naming. Let us note the role played in proprial nomination by a naming
scheme and language type.

   In chapter 2. 4 we saw how a hierarchical relation and the semantics of
functional components in the horizontal and vertical directions in a nam-
ing scheme x + A were used to express relations within one family. An-
other rule for the use of lingual means is observed from a comparison of
the first naming system with the binary naming system (Blanár 1963).
The hierarchically basic component of a naming scheme has the highest
frequency and, as far as the lingual aspect is concerned, it is noted for the
richest set of anthropolexemes and for the most complex affixal deriva-
tion. In the first naming system, a person is named by an individual Chris-

tian name or by his or her individual characteristic or by a combination of both. These situations can be expressed as the model schemes: K (+ $ch…$), CH (+ $k…$). The lexical selection is overburdened in this case. The first naming system is an important source for learning about old anthropolexemes and also specifically anthroponymic word-forming procedures. In the binary naming system, the hierarchically basic component, the surname, ($k + P$) has become the bearer and symbol of kinship. The combination of surname and Christian name extends its identification and differentiation capacities; it names a member of a kinship group. In the class of surnames, the set of anthropolexemes and anthropoformants is extended remarkably. In the lingual construction of surnames, the expressional specificity of proper names is demonstrated most distinctly.

For the question in hand, a comparison with the Bulgarian ternary system can be instructive. The older Bulgarian official system was based on individual Christian names ($a + b + c$). It was a combination of the individual Christian name of the named person with the Christian name of her or his father and grandfather. The components b and c in the form of the possessive adjective identified the kinship of a person with the Christian name a (*Ivan Christov Petrušov*). In this system, a permanent exchange of individual names was characteristic which required an extensive vocabulary of these names. By contrast with, e. g. the situation in Slovak, Czech, Polish, the forms of names which in these languages would be classified as hypocoristic with one basic name (compare *Dimităr – Mitro, Mito, Mitko*), could, as official Christian names, be placed in any position in the Bulgarian ternary naming system (*Vasil Mitov Ivanov, Verin Satirov Mitov*). Names such as *Cano, Boťo, Božko, Duško, Marko* etc. are classified as official forms. Dating from approximately World War I, the type $a + \underline{b} + C$ predominates in official contacts. This type, which is similar to Russian, differs from the Western Slavic naming by the obligatory patronymic ($\underline{b}$). The process of establishing the third component in the Bulgarian official system as a fixed hereditary surname has taken place gradually. It is not just a coincidence that the class of Christian names which was, for a long time, hierarchically basic in the naming model, is substantially richer in Bulgarian than, e. g. in Slovak. N. Kovačev found in the Bulgarian language 33 488 Christian names (13 770 male and 19 718 female names) in 1980 (Kovačev 1995, 20). A complete set of personal names in Slovakia comprises 8433 Christian names and 230 011 surnames (Ďurčo 1996); in surnames, the basic unit is their graphical form.

The frequency data which are indicators of the productivity of onymic phenomena elucidate, from a certain aspect, the character of an onymic system. The frequency aspect can also be applied to how onymic models are used. Interesting contributions to the problem of the lingual construction of proper names come from a comparison of the use of onymic lexemes and onymic formants, e. g. in the name systems of typologically different languages. A comparison of the use of Slovak and Hungarian anthropoformants in the formation of surnames in Hungary (Blanár 1950) showed that in the predominantly inflected Slovak language there is a higher percentage of surnames with a derived word-forming structure while, in the agglutinative Hungarian language, anthropolexemes predominate. In a (relatively limited) set of Slovak names from Hungary, the ratio of all surnames in the area under study to derivational bases is 10 : 7. In approximately 30 % of cases differentiation was made by derivational means. The ratio of Hungarian surnames in the area studied to derivational bases is 10 : 8.2. In the Hungarian data set, there are only 18 % of cases in which differentiation was made by derivational means (i. e. surnames with different derivational formants). In the Hungarian language in comparison with the Slovak language, lexical selection is used more than the derivational capacities of the Hungarian language.

Our earlier findings from the Hungarian territory modify the data obtained by Ľ. Šmelík (1994) resulting from his statistical analysis of surnames from 101 villages in Záhorie (184 076 names). In surnames from Záhorie, about 40 % of names have different anthropolexemes and in 60 % of cases persons are distinguished by a derived surname. If Slovak surnames from northern Hungary are taken into consideration, it can be tentatively proposed that the greater part of surnames are formants which distinguish persons by anthropolexemes and, to a lesser extent, names with different anthropoformants. These findings are relatively close to the linguistic structure of surnames in the Transcarpathian region. 46 % of surnames from the Transcarpathian region in Ukraine are created from forms with anthroponymic formants (Čučka 2005, XXVI: "morphological method of formation").

Let us compare some more data on Finnish surnames which are statistically well-processed (S. and J. Paikkala 1988). According to the data from the citizen registry centre, there were 79 092 Finnish surnames in 1985. E. Kiviniemi (1982) states that Finns used around 34 000 Christian names (approx. 20 000 female and 14 000 male names). In Finland it is cus-

tomary for a person to have more than one Christian name which is why the full set is so numerous. On average, each person has two Christian names. The relatively high frequency of Christian names in Finland can also be attributed to the fact that, up to the 19th century, there were two anthroponymic systems in Finnish. In eastern Finland, the binary naming system was used from about the 16th century ($a + B$) but in western Finland, the village population was identified by the father's names which could be combined with a byname identifying the place where they lived (Paikkala 1988, 27), a naming scheme A + (b). In ordinary communication, in Finnish personal naming, the Christian name plays an important role. From the aspect of typology, a relatively similar use of anthropoformants in Finnish and Hungarian is characteristic. In Finnish, approximately 20 % of names are surnames with different anthropoformants.

Statistical analysis of an extensive set of data will undoubtedly provide more precise information; however, it can be stated that, from the aspect of typology, in the comparison of linguistic formation, e. g. surnames in the binary naming system, a ratio between non-derived surnames (anthroponymic bases) and derived surnames (names with onymic formant) is characteristic. Research into the use of language means in systems of (mainly) personal names has potential for the future.

3. 5 Lexicography of proper names

Here we briefly outline the lexicographic procedures in a given onomasticon by which knowledge of a given onomastic object is objectivised: i. e. what information is added to an entry in order to "familiarise" a communicator (or a reader) with an onymic object, the structure of its lingual naming or motivation and the history of its naming.

With regard to the type and character of an onymic object, onomasticons are classified thematically. Onomasticons can be further distinguished by the aim and scope of the onymy processed. Appropriate lexicographic procedures are applied in respective dictionaries in respect of a given type of dictionary. In older onomasticons, the explanations focused mainly on elucidation of the etymology of a name. When the proprial components are considered as system phenomena and onymy as an internally-structured whole, then the onymy processed in dictionaries is seen in a different light. Also, specific methodological procedures are used in which the principles of general onomastic theory are realised.

Just as generic particularity is named by a proper name, so an onymic object plays an important role in processing an onomasticon (Blanár 1983, 19). In lexicography, the interrelatedness of the following factors is analysed and evaluated: an onymic object, its naming (proper name) and entry (cf. also other explanations Šrámek 1999, 127–144).

A dictionary headword and dictionary entry differ according to whether toponyms or anthroponyms are being processed. The headword and proper name are sometimes homophonic but they are homonyms. A proper name is a naming of a generic individual, the headword is a constructed formation which has, in fact, a standardised form and should facilitate orientation within a document. In naming toponymic objects, the proper name refers to the respective onymic object in nature, so its precise locality is relevant. For example, <u>Nový potok</u> *ľ. Machnáč- New Stream l. Machnáč* (→ *Bebrava* → *Nitra*), 0.6 km; true-left branch of the stream *Machnáč* in the village of Motešice (Krško 2005, 31). In the formulation of an onymic headword, we proceed from the category of "object" or from the category of "name". In respect of the different lingual structure of a toponym and the development of naming an onymic object, several types of headwords can be recognised (for more detail, cf. Šrámek 1999, 132–133). The situation is different for personal names. In surnames and Christian names, there are frequently hundreds even thousands of persons with identical names. An anthroponymic dictionary is not a dictionary of bearers of names but a dictionary of documented personal names. In onomasticons, word-forming nest, reference, auxiliary and etymological entries are usually combined. For example, K. Rymut (*Nazwiska Polaków*, 1991) classifies contemporary and historical surnames on the basis of word-forming nests. He singled out the headword as the construct which is closest to the basis from which the set of names is formed, e. g. *Bat-* od *bat-* (81) followed by a list of alphabetically ordered surnames derived from this basis by various suffixes, e. g. *Bat-aj+ak, Bat-aj+cz+ak…* The construct abstracted as a headword is used especially in comparative studies. Let us take an example from a linguistic and cultural-historical analysis of Slavic names of cows in Austria: *Lôna* a) *Lona, Lone, Lohne, Lonika, Lonja…*; b) frequent in neighbouring languages: *Lána*, in Slovak *Laňa*, in Serbian and in Croatian *Lúna* (Reichmayer 2005, 112–113).

The informative part of a dictionary entry, the classified material basis, is an essential component of an onomasticon. The "lexicographic content" (R. Šrámek uses the term "onymic content") is given first. This part of the

entry as well as other data is closely related to the content aspect of the processed onymy. As for toponyms, there is a direct relation between the name and the location where the object is situated. With reference to motivation, the original naming circumstances are outlined. In respect of the identification role of a generic particularity named in ordinary communication, a kind of de-semantisation of the named lexeme takes place. In names which are already non-existent, the lexical elements are retained (cf. e. g. *debra, chopok, nákel, chríp // hríb, minčol, beskyd // beščaď* etc. – MAJTÁN 1996).

In historical lexicons, an entry can be arranged in two ways. A typological headword stems from the contemporary status of a toponymic fact and the entry is constructed on the principle of retrospection. The entry has four parts: a source headword (in current form or in the form of the period); heuristic basis (records of historical documents listed retrospectively); linguistic basis (reconstruction of its form and content); comment (verification data). A genetic entry is constructed as follows: a source headword (in the period or reconstructed Proto-Slavic form, grammatical data, the meaning of the headword and historical word-forming analysis of the word); progress of toponymisation; heuristic basis (from the oldest document to more recent ones); comment (with additional information) (KRAJČOVIČ 1983, 19–22).

In anthroponymy, official and unofficial names are distinguished. In unofficial names, the motivation driving the naming is clear and live (*Holý – Oblečsa-Naked – Getdressed, Hnilička – Plesnivý-Rotte – Mouldy, Úsečka-Abscissa, Veľká Hlava – Big Head*). The same can be stated for the so-called ambimodal chrematonyms (compare *Vydavateľstvo časopisov a novín – Publishing House of Magazines and Newspapers, Letecký úrad Slovenskej republiky – the Office of Aviation of the Slovak Republic, Automatizácia železničnej dopravy – Automatisation of Railway Transport*). These classes of onymy make it possible to classify their motivational features and to investigate how the naming procedures are used. The current problem is the exceptionally extensive sets of surnames. In their lexicographic processing, one has to cope with the consequences of the loss of motivation. Due to inheriting a surname, the primary motivational features lose their relevance. For example, the surname *Tokár – Turner* recorded in an onomasticon does not name "a craftman who produces round wooden objects"; this etymological meaning could probably relate to the first bearer of this name and not to a person who lives in the town T on the street S. As mentioned earlier,

the surnames processed represent a set of names from a selected region and not a dictionary of individual bearers. The derivational basis which follows a headword is interpreted not from the aspect of semantics but from the aspect of word-formation, hence as a morphematic basis (any possible etymological information acts merely as a historical element). The suffixal morphemes of the derivational formations which follow are there purely as means for differentiation of the original lexeme; compare *Tokár* with *tokár 'turner'*: *Tokarčík, Tokarík, Tokárik*. Sometimes information on the oldest documented forms is added to the individual derivational formations. This is how we understand (or interpret) the method of processing a dictionary entry in Rʏᴍᴜᴛ's onomasticon *Nazwiska Polaków*. A short example follows (274):

> **Tokarz** 1445 – od tokarz, rzemieślnik wyrabiający okrągłe przedmioty z drzewa: Tokarz-ak, 724, Tokarz-ewicz, Tokarz-ewski, Tokarz-owicz 1466; Tokar, Tokar-cz+uk, Tokar-cz+yk 1614 …

Rʏᴍᴜᴛ's lexicographical description relies mainly on the external history of personal naming in Poland and stems from a thorough analysis of rich historical and contemporary materials. A deeper insight into internal proprial relationships is provided by the recently published historical-etymological dictionary of surnames from the Transcarpathian Ukraine by P. Čᴜčᴋᴀ (2005). P. Čᴜčᴋᴀ reasonably reflects that, due to heredity and legal stabilisation, surnames have become "asemantic" (as viewed from the aspect of lexical semantics). That is why their word-forming suffixes retained their original functions only up to the point when bynames (proto-surnames) became hereditary proper names as we understand the term today. The derivational suffixes in official surnames fulfil the role of differentiation (Bʟᴀɴáʀ as early as 1950). The continuation of the old unofficial ways of expressing family affiliations is the current "living surnames" in Ukrainian villages. From the perspective of system organisation, data on frequency are important because they show the way a name is incorporated into the whole anthroponymic set (e. g. Mɪᴋᴋᴏɴᴇɴ/Pᴀɪᴋᴋᴀʟᴀ 1992).

In the preparation of modern onomasticons and atlases (e. g. for the preparation of the *Slavic Onomastic Atlas*), the so-called onomastic *recourse* is an essential methodological contribution. The aim of the onomastic reconstruction is to determine the presumed original form of a current name. In the etymological method, the reconstructed forms are perceived as appellative forms. However, the recourse method aims to determine

the presumed form of a proper name on the basis of knowledge of the proprial naming rules; it stems from the existence of the proprial sphere of a language. De-appellativeness and non-propriality are distinguished (compare Eichler 1983, 24, 1988, 91; Šrámek 1999, 95–100). This systematic method for the explanation of onymic material excludes the explanation of proper names as isolated facts.

An essential prerequisite in lexicography is the richest possible collection of documents which are ordered in accordance with agreed principles (alphabetical and chronological catalogues, catalogues ordered by the types of objects named). Retrogressive indices are welcome useful aids in the morphemic and word-forming analysis of names. Computers can be successfully utilised to create onymic databases with relatively complete documented materials. The computer technique requires formalisation of the proprial phenomena analysed and therefore stimulates further development in onomastic research.

Onomastic lexicography, the scientific description of onymic systems in official as well as unofficial communications and, in particular, a comparative analysis of proper names, presumes knowledge of their presuppositional identification. The model analysis of proper names supported by knowledge of the onymically relevant content components makes possible a precise description of onymic phenomena by computers.

4 Conclusions. From the description to the explanation of onymic phenomena and relations

Research into particular onymic elements at different levels of abstraction resulted in general naming principles in the proprial sphere of a language. A system character for onymy and the structural organisation of individual onymic classes (subsystems) was outlined by semiotic and functional and structural analysis. This is one aspect of the research activities. The other and inseparable aspect is research into partial subsystems and their elements in communication, discourse, text. The functioning of onymic phenomena in social contacts and in text is extraordinarily wide and, to date, has far from exhausted the problems revealed by communicational-pragmatic, socio-linguistic, textological, area, frequency, confrontational etc. aspects. The area of research activities in onomastics is not closed or isolated because individual operations in this system are interrelated. The analysis of real onymy in particular social and historical

conditions provides an essential insight into deep relations in onymy, and a disclosure of the rules which apply in onymic systems. But the functioning of onymy and onymic systems in communication which, is the field in which onymy exists, stimulates progress and prompts development leading to changes in onymy and, subsequently, changes in onymic systems. This is especially true in official naming where complex and changing social situations affect the formation of naming standards which then result in the constituting and functioning of the systems themselves. Official and unofficial naming have their own internal development. For example, in the area of personal names, these two systems are in part interrelated and in part they develop independently.

In the analysis of proper names as elements of various onymic classes, the following general aspects are important: the permanent interaction of proper names with other vocabulary and the entire lingual system of a national language and the concurrent permanent polarisation of proper names as elements of certain onymic systems in relation to appellatives – these two aspects are opposing but reciprocative tendencies. These tendencies result in the binary status of the category nomen proprium – the linguistic status and the onomastic status (cf. parasystem methods of use of language). A broad definition of onomastics with extensive interdisciplinary ties is consistent with its multi-aspect character and the complexity of qualitative and quantitative methods of research. From the individual perspectives, only partial problems related to propia are elucidated. The character of various classes of proper names affects the methods and procedures used in their research in a specific manner. Thanks to the methods and methodological procedures appropriate to the pragmatic-communicational approach, knowledge of several aspects of problems in onomastics has been enhanced. Some theoretical questions need to be further analysed, speculated and confronted. In order to address these questions, complex methodological bases such as the perception of the binary linguistic and onomastic status of a proper name, as well as the semiotic, functional and system approach cannot be excluded. I address and analyse the open problems of proper names from the position of the discipline of proper names itself, using complex methods. These principles make it possible to recognise and elucidate those questions which have not yet been addressed or were resolved inadequately. The perception of problems in onomastics thus outlined leads from the description of phenomena in real onymy to the explanation of onymic relations in deep structure.

1. (Methodological questions)

The most universal relations in proprial nomination are processed using the principle of model abstractions. This method of modelling (which I have been working on since 1945) makes assumptions for a system comparison of onymy within a national language and also the interlingual confrontation of onymic systems. The description of naming models through metalanguage makes possible the processing and classification of onymic models by statistical and area methods. Comparative research also utilises content models (the general principles of proprial nomination of a predominantly pragmatic character) and especially the values obtained in average microsystems. Computer techniques are introducing exactitude into comparative research.

Examples which can help to elucidate the problem from the internal positions of onomastics can be citizen and ethnic names. Up to the present, there is no agreement as to whether these names are propria or appellatives. Unanimity has not yet been reached, even in the recent speculations in NE (2004). E. Hansack (NE 2004, 58–59) evaluates the position of these group names (Gruppennamen) from the aspect of logic. In binary logic ("tertium non datur") citizen and ethnic names are understood as appellativa, in the same way as *Herr Meier – die Meiers* (!). In multi-value logic these are classified as propria because e. g. a nation as an entity is understood as something individual (individuality must not be regarded as being identical with singularity). Hence, the type of logic used determines this classification. L. Rübekeil (NE, 2004, 745) concluded that ethnonyms are close to the point of transition between propria and appellativa. A more precise answer can be extracted from the relation between citizen and ethnic names and a set of specific anthroponymic features. Since the individual functional components of anthroponyms are in the closest possible relation (in both first and binary naming systems the naming can refer to the same person), the application of onosemes in the common matrix of official and unofficial names can be evaluated (Blanár 2005, 26–28). This comparison has shown that citizen and ethnic names do not have characteristic features ⟨socially determined identification // differentiation of persons who are kin⟩, ⟨consanguineity⟩, ⟨knowledge by means of knowing an onymic object⟩, ⟨± validity from birth⟩, ⟨± obligation to name⟩, ⟨stabilisation by administrative and legal standards⟩. The onymic feature which is identical for both of them is ⟨natural genre⟩. The general singular

and plural is, by contrast, characteristic only of citizen names and ethnic names. What is specific is their ⟨motivational relation⟩; a proper name is their essential motivating factor (*Žilinčan → Žilina*). In respect of the proprial motivator, they are written with a capital letter. On the whole, their lexical meaning is characteristic of citizen and ethnic names; in the transition area between propria and appellativa they are closer to appellativa (also Sokolová 2006).

In every methodological approach to research into propria, tasks are formulated and addressed from the point of view appropriate to a given aspect. For example, in the transition from "system-oriented research towards research which is focused on communication- and function-oriented research" (NE, 128), a method is sought from the system description to the description of a language used in real life, i. e. from langue towards speech. Such a method is demonstrated by the textual-linguistic analysis of onymic material. This method focuses onomastic research on addressing the problems related to the functioning of a name in a text. Through elucidation of the conditions in which proper names are used in various texts, new insight is acquired into the treasury of general onomastics. The formulation of tasks from the aspect of textual linguistics (Kalverkämper 1978; Krüger 2004), however, presumes that a linguistic sign does not have natural proprial status and, in fact, any "natural" signalling of propria inherent in lexemes does not exist; their proprial validity depends on the linguistic context of a name and its authentic situation in communication. A linguistic sign or a chain of linguistic signs is understood as a proprium on the basis of coordination in communication between the producer and the recipient of a given discourse. A proper name is not studied as a linguistic means isolated and extracted from a text but it is studied within the immediate language environment. But the onymic class to which the name belongs and in which this name is distinguished by specific common features (e. g. supra-individual features as elements of the content of an onymic sign) is not taken into consideration. We have shown in chapters 2. 3 and 2. 4 that the content and form of an onymic sign have specifically onymic features of a general character and they are also characteristic of a given language. Linguistic signs so understood can be precisely modelled and processed by computer techniques. From its perspective, the textual-linguistic method has led to useful observations; however, it does not make it possible to comprehend the structure of onymic (sub)systems. Only the complex analysis of proper names by various methods

results in a recognition of their rules within deep structure and their social functioning in ordinary communication.

2. (Proper name, linguistic sign sui generis)

The basic feature of onymy is the ⟨socially determined identification // differentiation of individuals within a given class⟩. This, the most general feature of proper names (including nomination, identification and differentiation) establishes a common integral feature of proprial nomination. Onymic sets which belong to various classes of proper names form a structured whole. By analysing particular proper names in their proprial and appellative contexts, we abstract the naming models as elements at the level of ideal objects. The content model with its general onymic naming principles represents a determined component of an onymic sign; the motivation model and word-forming model are its determining components. At the level of speech, in a text, the word-forming models are realised as various word-forming types of names in a given language. Since the ontological character of proper names, in addition to the rules, categories and relations of a given language, is also formed by specifically onomastic features and relations (some have the character of parasystemic means), proper names are understood as linguistic signs sui generis with particularities in their content and form. I speak in this sense of the linguistic status and onomastic status of proper names. In a given language, there is a typical interrelation of the content components of a name (onymic features) with its formal-linguistic aspect. Let us compare the following example: the lexeme *Martin* as a Christian name has hypocoristic forms in unofficial contacts, e. g. *Martinko, Maroš, Maroško, Márty* … As a surname this functional component belongs within a word-forming database of official names *Martin, Martinko, Martinka, Martinec, Martinák, Martinček, Martínek* … The lexeme *Martin,* as a toponym, is declined following the pattern of the inanimate masculine ("dub" oak) and it also differs from the personal name in its pronunciation (compare personal name *Marťin, Marťinák* … : town *Martin*).

The semiotic perception of a proper name as a linguistic sign in a given onymic class leads to the following evaluation: onymic features // functions are the content components of a proprial sign. Their hierarchical sets constitute the onymic meaning (designation) of a proper name and are characteristic of whole classes of synonymous names. It is an important

fact that these content components are projected in the formal aspect of the name. The proper name, then, is a bilateral linguistic sign sui generis. Its content aspects consist of two components. At the system level ("langue") a hierarchical set of supra-individual onymically relevant features of a name forms its onymic meaning (presuppositional identification). In text and in speech, a proper name refers to an individual onymic object (reference identification). A proper name can be understood as a set of information on an onymic object; it relates to knowledge about this onymic object. A precondition of this reference in communication is knowledge of the onymic class to which a name belongs. This knowledge is made possible by the highest generic features; the other features in the communication are less relevant. A complete reconstruction of the onymic meaning of naming models is supported by a scientific description of onymy and an onymic system and the confrontational research. It is essential to distinguish between the terms *content* and *(onymic) meaning* of a proper name. The term *content* of a proper name is superior; it has two components, one of which is an onymic meaning and the second is a reference to a generic particularity.

3. (The onymic system and its function in communication)

An onymic system is a complex of onymic system-forming elements which enter into various onymically relevant relations. The system-forming elements are naming types and onymic models. Relations between these system-forming elements are supported by generic and specifying features; in addition, relations are also established between the formal and content aspects of a naming model. An integral part of the problem of the onymic system is the communicational-pragmatic aspect. Supra-individual features (mostly of a pragmatic character) are integrated into the meaning of an onymic sign as the elements of its content. The onymic sign is incorporated through its content and form into the microstructural relations (onymic synonymy, homonymy, word-forming relations) which are characteristic of a given onymy. The proper name is incorporated into the microstructural relations not as a proper name as such but as a component of the respective class of proper names.

From the socio-linguistic perspective, two forms of onymic systems can be distinguished. In official contacts, the official naming system is functional, in unofficial and semi-official contacts the unofficial naming system is

functional; e. g. in the area of living personal names, the unofficial system has more functional components and differences in motivational features in the distribution and structure of models. In social communication, two contexts are typical of onymic systems. In the proprial context (P : P : P) the onymic features are applied more prominently, often explicitly; this is a basic onymic context. In the appellative context (A : P : A) the features of a lower abstraction level are neutralised and the informative component dominates (the focus on the named object). From the communicational-pragmatic perspective, the so-called appellative context is the basic one.

The characteristic difference between the appellative and proprial areas can be observed in communicative competence. When communicative competence in a language is defined as the unconscious ability of a speaker to use a language according to the requirements of the respective communication situations (Čermák, 2001, 154), this refers to verbal language means from the appellative area. In proper names, the knowledge and information of onymic objects have an individual character. Often, communication is facilitated by supplementary verbal as well as non-verbal means.

Differences in the formation of the content of communicational signs are characteristic of both areas of the vocabulary of a national language. In addition to the distinctive features which form the necessary appropriate conditions for the categorisation of phenomena, the notional lexical meaning of an appellative also includes typical (prototypical) features which are part of an axiological concept as a unit of knowledge related to a lexical meaning (Dolník 2003, 40–41). In proper names, the application of reference identification (along with the knowledge of an onymic object) relates to knowledge of an onymic class (its genus proximum); the specifying features of a lower abstraction level are neutralised in communication.

The onymic system and real onymy are the two sides of a single coin. They are interrelated, as are general and individual. Onymy exists in social communication. Since, in social contacts, real personal names have various functions, they have become the object of obvious scientific interest and onomastic research is only gradually coming to focus also on proprial relations in deep structure. For example, the meaning of a proper name is considered as identical with – and not only in logic – its reference identification. In general, the traditional terminology of this discipline is based on the analysis of superficial phenomena.

The concept under review requires that some terms be modified. It is necessary to distinguish between the terms *anthroponymic system* and *anthroponymic scheme.* The anthroponymic system consists of the functional components of a certain onymic value; it is a phenomenon at the level of langue. The anthroponymic scheme is the realisation of the functional components; here a particular Christian name, surname, individual characteristic, byname, living family name etc. in a text or speech is concerned. The functional components and their realisation may be single-, binary- or multi-componental. The decisive criterion, however, is not the number of components in older or current (official and unofficial) naming but the hierarchy, the ratio of basic functional components. In the first naming system, which can comprise several components, the hierarchically basic component is the individual Christian name. In the binary naming system, which can also comprise several functional components, the hierarchically basic component is the hereditary surname; the Christian name function has "dropped" to the position of determining component.

4. (The dimension of space, time and frequency)

The onymic system in social communication is recognised by its space distribution. In toponyms, geographical areas are characteristic (a fixed link between a name and a named object in a geographical area) which, however, are not identical with the areas of a dialect; anthroponyms are linked with the named objects by social relations, chrematonyms by economic relations. The locational distribution of naming models and their components, typical of a certain microsystem, creates the preconditions for the cartographic processing of onymic phenomena. Research into the designative aspect of living personal names has revealed the possibility of also processing the content models of names in cartography (the processing of word-forming phenomena in cartography is usual). The dimensions of space and time are related. The time factor accompanies a proper name from its origin up to the time when the onymic situation has more or less changed and the original motivational features may have become irrelevant or unclear. In geographical names the original motivation is petrified by a certain onymic situation. Personal names change or continue through generations (surnames, too) but live motivational relations can be tracked in the current unofficial naming. The formation of an onymic standard is substantially affected by extra-lingual circumstances but the essential

rules of an onymic system have their internal evolution. The evolution from the first naming system to the binary naming system, which is an anthroponymic universally, can serve as an example. The evolution progressed from giving a person a name without any indication of family affiliations (an individual as such) through a singular expression of relations within a family (with father, mother, relations between husband and wife) to a plural identification of relations with a family as a whole (by means of the father's surname). The functional component which was the bearer of this primarily important semantics from the perspective of personal naming has gained new anthroponymic features ⟨family affiliation within a family as a whole⟩, ⟨heredity⟩, ⟨stabilisation by an administrative-legal convention⟩ and has become the hierarchically basic component of the naming scheme:

$$A \mathbin{/\!/} + b \,(+\, c\dots) > a + B$$
$$A + b + c \rightarrow a + b + C$$

(lower case designates the determining component, upper case designates the determined, basic component; symbol b̲ designates patronym.)

The transition from the first naming system to the binary naming system represents an internal hierarchical reconstruction of the functional components. The byname, in acquiring the above features, established itself as the new functional component – a surname – and the Christian name which was the former basic naming component dropped to the position of a determining functional component, due to the negative application of these features. The first naming system changed to the binary naming system; however, this does not mean that the reconstruction of the anthroponymic system has finished. The naming system has split into two components: official name-giving and unofficial name-giving. The official subsystem is determined and modified by the naming standards of the state administration (ideological principles are also applied) and the older naming system survives in unofficial communication. Further development and creation will continue in relation to the official naming. For example, in Slovakia the unofficial naming stems, on the one hand, from the official system and, in part, follows a development of its own. A rule can then be formulated: when the first naming anthroponymic system changes into the binary naming system (or binary naming with obligatory patronymic component), the older unofficial system continues in unofficial communication but in interrelation with the official anthroponymic system.

The frequency of onymic phenomena is closely reflected in their productivity. The classification of the content and motivational models by means of proprial semantic metalanguage as well as the modelling of the designation of living personal names and the designation of the content and motivational models with symbols have made possible a complex description of a system of living personal names (in Central Slovakia) from the aspects of frequency and area. In respect of frequency, a distinction is made between central and marginal models. The future of confrontational onomastics in microsystems and macrosystems will lie in the comparison of an average onomastic system with its positive and negative deviations. It is typical of proper names that they use basic morphemes, word-forming formants and their combinations in many ways. In comparative analysis, the word-forming and morphematic methods are contributive. Word-forming analysis enables a comparison (e. g. in various Slavic languages) of the level to which the derivational possibilities in the construction of an onymic system are applied; the use of derivational possibilities is shown by the ratio of derivational bases to the number of all names (e. g. surnames). A comparison of the morphemic construction of appellative and onymic formations demonstrates the degree to which the derivational possibilities in the appellatives and sections of onymic subsystems analysed are applied. Up to the present, the fact that the application of linguistic means in a given onymy depends not only on the type of language but also on the respective onymic system has been almost entirely neglected. Hierarchically dominant functional components have a richer set of naming means in personal naming. In the investigation of onymy in social communication, the distinction between official and unofficial naming is of fundamental significance. For example, in ordinary communication, the functional components are shown to be of unequal validity in the Russian and Bulgarian anthroponymic systems where the second component expresses the patronymic relation (compare Russsian *Nikita Ivanovič* with Bulgarian *gospodin Manolov; čičo Kamen*). The diverse aims of communication satisfy various levels of knowledge of an onymic object. Under various circumstances in communication, a name has an identification role appropriate to the given situation (compare *Banská Bystrica/ Bystrica // our city; Martin Haraj // Martin // Márty*).

5. (Comparative onomastics)

Comparative syntheses (and not only in onomastic atlases) are matter for a long-term team effort. So far, the prospective tasks of comparative research have been fulfilled by partial descriptions of onymy and onymic systems. For comparative aims, it would be useful if the synchronous, historical and frequency lexicons of individual languages processed onymy from the same aspect (compare Blanár, 1998). An effort to combine practical and theoretical onomastics can be seen in the work of the authors of the representative proceedings *Namenarten und ihre Erforschung* (2004). The character itself, the diversity and scope of onymy, as well as a number of unaddressed theoretical issues demonstrate that these tasks are extremely complicated and can be solved only within a long time-frame. More realistic are efforts within the framework of individual groups of related languages (see the useful publication on the structural types of Slavic oikonymy *Strukturtypen der slawischen Ortsnamen* 1988). The methodological approaches and principles which demonstrate the considerable contribution of comparative onomastics are briefly outlined:

1. Component analysis and synthesis (in the reconstruction of the model value of proper names on the basis of onymically relevant, mainly pragmatic features);
2. Word-forming and morphematic analysis (especially in anthroponymy);
3. Modelling of proprial nomination (as an abstraction of general naming principles);
4. An average microsystem and macrosystem (for living personal names);
5. Dependence of linguistic means (also) on naming systems;
6. Comparative analysis of official and unofficial naming (as an exclusively socio-onomastic problem);
7. Interrelation of content and formal aspects (mainly) of anthroponymic signs (with semiological problems of onomastics);
8. Onymy in social communication, naming standards in official and unofficial contacts;
9. Preparation of synchronous and historical onomastic lexicons (using functional and systematic methods for the interpretation of onymic materials).

translated by David J. Shearman and Adriana Shearman

References

Beleňkaja, Viktoria D., Toponimy v sostave leksičeskoj sistemy jazyka. Moskva 1969.

Blanár, Vincent, Osobné mená. K základom semiologickej onomastiky. Bratislava 1945. Dokt. dizert. Rukopis.

Blanár, Vincent, Príspevok ku štúdiu slovenských osobných a pomiestnych mien v Maďarsku. Bratislava 1950.

Blanár, Vincent, Osobné mená v počtových knihách zemianskeho banského súdu na Boci z rokov 1588–1602. In: Jazykovedný časopis 12 (1961) 140–148.

Blanár, Vincent, Využitie jazykových prostriedkov v rozličných sústavách slovanských osobných mien. In: Slavische Namenforschung. Red. Teodolius Witkowski. Berlin 1963, 210–215.

Blanár, Vincent, Onomastický výskum na Slovensku. Ciele, metódy, aktuálne úlohy. In: Jazykovedný časopis 16 (1965) 73–78.

Blanár, Vincent, K vývinu slovanských osobných pomenovacích sústav. Teoretické východiská. In: Třetí zasedání Mezinárodní komise pro slovanskou onomastiku při Mezinárodním komitétu slavistů v Domě vědeckých pracovníků ČSAV v Liblicích u Prahy 16., 17. 9. 1966. Red. Jan Svoboda, L. Nezbedová. Praha 1967, 21–38.

Blanár, Vincent, Das spezifisch Onomastische. In: Disputationes ad montium vocabula aliorumque nominum significationes pertinentes. Red. Herwig H. Hornung. Wien 1969, 81–87.

Blanár, Vincent, Sústava živého pomenúvania osôb. In: Četvrto zasedanie na meǵunarodnata komisija za slovenska onomastika. Govori i referati. Skopje/Ochrid 17.9.–23.9.1970. Red. B. Vidoeski et al. Skopje 1971, 37–51.

Blanár, Vincent, Die soziolinguistische Problematik der Personennamen. In: Ethnographisch-archäologische Zeitschrift 13 (1972) 203–208.

Blanár, Vincent, Lingvistický a onomastický status vlastného mena. In: Onomastica 21 (1976) 5–18. Dt.: Der linguistische und onomastische Status der Eigennamen. In: Zeitschrift für Phonetik, Sprachwissenschaft und Kommunikationsforschung 30 (1977) 138–148 sowie in: Reader zur Namenkunde I, 111–123.

Blanár, Vincent, Poznámky k polysémii, homonymii, antonymii a synonymii vlastných mien. In: Jazykovedné štúdie 13 (1977) 37–43.

Blanár, Vincent, Gegenstand und Methoden der Onomastik. In: Proceedings of the 13th International Congress of Onomastic Sciences. Cracow, August 21–25, 1978. Zv. 1. Red. Kazimierz Rymut. Wrocław u. a. 1981, 211–215.

Blanár, Vincent, Vlastné mená v lexikografickom spracovaní. In: VIII. slovenská onomastická konferencia. Banská Bystrica – Dedinky 2.–6. júna 1980. Zborník materiálov. Red. Milan Majtán. Bratislava/Banská Bystrica/Prešov 1983, 7–16.

Blanár, Vincent, Vlastné meno v jazykovej komunikácii. In: V. Ogólnopolska konferencja onomastyczna. Poznań 3–5 września 1985. Kśięga referatów. Red. Karol Zierhoffer. Poznań 1988, 33–41.

Blanár, Vincent, Obsahový model v onomastike. In: Aktuálne úlohy onomastiky z hľadiska jazykovej politiky a jazykovej kultúry. Zborník príspevkov z 2. československej onomastickej konferencie (6.–8. mája 1987 v Smoleniciach). Red. Milan Majtán. Bratislava 1989, 239–249.

BLANÁR, Vincent, Teória vlastného mena. Status, organizácia a fungovanie v spoločenskej komunikácii. Bratislava 1996. Dt.: Theorie des Eigennamens. Status, Organisation und Funktionieren der Eigennamen in der gesellschaftlichen Kommunikation. Hildesheim/Zürich/New York 2001.

BLANÁR, Vincent, Teória vlastného mena zo slovanského porovnávacieho hľadiska. In: XII. medzinárodný zjazd slavistov v Krakove. Red. JÁN DORUĽA. Bratislava 1998, 169–182.

BLANÁR, Vincent, Problematika vývinu pomenúvania osôb. In: Studia Academica Slovaca 30. Prednášky 37. letnej školy slovenského jazyka a kultúry. Red. JOZEF MLACEK. Bratislava 2001, 59–72.

BLANÁR, Vincent, Wie weiter in der Theorie der Onomastik? Zum internationalen onomastischen Handbuch „Namenarten und ihre Erforschung". In: Namenkundliche Informationen 87/88 (2006) 17–31.

BLANÁR, Vincent, Súvzťažnosť obsahovej a formálnej stránky onymického znaku. In: Jazykovedný časopis 57 (2006) 89–100.

BLANÁR, Vincent, Pragmatickolingvistické metódy a problematika v onomastike. In: Jazykovedný časopis 55 (2004) 3–19.

BLANÁR, Vincent; MATEJČÍK, Ján, Živé mená na strednom Slovensku. I/1: Designácia osobného mena. Bratislava 1978. I/2: Distribúcia obsahových modelov. Martin 1983.

BRENDLER, Silvio, Namenarten und ihre Erforschung. In: Namenarten und ihre Erforschung, 33–48.

BRENDLER, Silvio, Rez. zu: HANSACK, Ernst, Der Name im Sprachsystem. Grundprobleme der Sprachtheorie (2000). In: Namenkundliche Informationen 87/88 (2005) 295–301.

BRENDLER, Silvio, Über den gerechten Tod der Auffassung vom Namen als bilaterales Zeichen. In: Proceedings of the 21st International Congress of Onomastic Sciences. Uppsala 19–24 August 2002. Ed. E. BRYLA et al. Uppsala 2005, 98–117.

CARNAP, Rudolf, Meaning and Necessity. Chicago 1947.

CHRISTOPH, Ernst-Michael, Ist der Eigenname noch ein sprachliches Zeichen? Bemerkungen zu neueren Eigennamentheorien. In: Linguistische Studien, Reihe A, 129/II. Berlin 1985, 72–78.

CHRISTOPH, Ernst-Michael, Überlegungen zu Möglichkeiten und Grenzen der Anwendung der Merkmalanalyse im onymischen Bereich. Ein Diskussionsbeitrag zur Theorie des Eigennamens. In: Namenkundliche Informationen 20 (1986) 13–21.

CHRISTOPH, Ernst-Michael, Studien zur Semantik von Eigennamen. Ein Beitrag zur allgemeinen und deutschen Onomastik. Leipzig 1987 (Namenkundliche Informationen, Beiheft 10).

ČERMÁK, František, Jazyk a jazykověda. Přehled a slovníky. Praha 2001.

ČUČKA, Pavlo, Prizvyšča zakarpatśkych ukrajinciv. Istoryko-etymolohičnyj slovnyk. Ľviv 2005.

DEBUS, Friedhelm, Zur Pragmatik der Namengebung und Namengebrauch in unserer Zeit. In: Der Eigenname in Sprache und Gesellschaft. I. Verhandlungen im Plenum. Red. Ernst EICHLER et al. 15. Internationaler Kongreß für Namenforschung (13.–17. August 1984). Leipzig 1985, 49–75.

DEBUS, Friedhelm, Methoden und Probleme der soziologisch orientierten Namenforschung. In: Namenforschung. Ein Internationales Handbuch zur Onomastik I, 344–351.

DOLNÍK, Juraj, Forma a význam vlastného mena. In: Slavica Slovaca 30 (1995) 105–111.

Dolník, Juraj, K pragmatike vlastných mien. In: XIII. slovenská onomastická konferencia. Zborník materiálov. Zost. Milan Majtán, Pavol Žigo. Bratislava 1998, 21–25.

Dolník, Juraj, Lexikológia. Bratislava 2003.

Ďurčo, Peter, Vlastné mená na Slovensku. In: Studia Academica Slovaca 25. Prednášky 32. letného seminára slovenského jazyka a kultúry. Red. Jozef Mlacek. Bratislava 1996, 54–60.

Eichler, Ernst, Das integrierte (slawisch-deutsche) Toponym in der lexikographischen Bearbeitung. In: VIII. slovenská onomastická konferencia. Banská Bystrica – Dedinky 2.–6. júna 1980. Zborník materiálov. Red. Milan Majtán. Bratislava/Banská Bystrica/Prešov 1983, 24–31.

Eichler, Ernst, Probleme der onomastischen Rekonstruktion als linguistisches Universale. In: Probleme der Namenbildung. Rekonstruktion der Eigennamen und der ihnen zugrundeliegenden Appellative. Uppsala 1988, 91–103.

Eichler, Ernst; Šrámek, Rudolf, Die Strukturtypen der slawischen Ortsnamen. Strukturní typy slovanské oikonymie. Leipzig 1988 (Sonderheft Namenkundliche Informationen).

Fiske, John, Introduction to communication studies. London 1992.

Frege, Gottlob, Über Sinn und Bedeutung. München 1892.

Frege, Gottlob, Výklady o smyslu a významu. In: Fiala, Jiří (ed.), Analytická filosofie. První čítanka. Plzeň 1999, 1–13.

Gahér, František, Stoická sémantika a logika z pohľadu intenzionálnej logiky. Bratislava 2006.

Goetz, Hans Werner, Proseminar Geschichte. Mittelalter. Stuttgart 1993.

Halaga, Ondrej R., Tvorenie osobných mien v najstaršej košickej mestskej knihe (1394–1405). In: Zborník materiálov z III. slovenskej onomastickej konferencie v Banskej Bystrici (4.–6.11.1970). Red. Vincent Blanár. Banská Bystrica 1972, 188–215.

Hansack, Ernst, Bedeutung, Begriff, Name. Regensburg 1990 (Studia et exempla linguistica et philologica. Series II: Studia minora 1).

Hansack, Ernst, Der Name im Sprachsystem. Grundprobleme der Sprachtheorie. Regensburg 2000 (Studia et exempla linguistica et philologica, Series I: Studia maiora 5).

Hansack, Ernst, Das Wesen des Namens. In: Namenarten und ihre Erforschung, 51–65.

Haraj, Igor, Vlastné meno v zrkadle gramatických teórií v antike a stredoveku. Bratislava 2006.

Haraj, Igor, Antroponymická sústava u starých Grékov. In: Slavica Slovaca 41/1 (2006) 50–60.

Harweg, Roland, Zur Textologie des Vornamens. Perspektiven einer Großraumtextologie. In: Reader zur Namenkunde II, 169–184.

Horecký, Ján, Priezvisko ako jazykový znak. In: Kultúra slova 39/1 (2005) 16–17.

Imrichová, Mária, Logonymá v systéme slovenčiny. Prešov 2002.

Jozefovič, Michal, Modelovanie živých osobných mien na strednom Slovensku. Bratislava 2006. Dizertačná práca.

Kaleta, Zofia, The evolutionary stages of Slavonic surnames in the context of European namegiving. In: Onoma 29 (1989) 11–25.

Kalverkämper, Hartwig, Textlinguistik der Eigennamen. Stuttgart 1978.

Kalverkämper, Hartwig, Onomastik als angewandte Semiotik. In: Namenkundliche Informationen 71/72 (1997) 41–46.

Kany, Werner, Namenverwendung zwischen öffentlich und privat. In: Namenforschung. Ein internationales Handbuch zur Onomastik I, 509–514.

Karpenko, Jurij A., Toponimična systema i systemnisť toponimiji. In: Povidomlennja Ukrajinśkoj onomastyčnoj komisji 2 (1967) 3–12.

Kohlheim, Volker, Zur Erforschung der Diffusion onomastischer Innovationen. In: Beiträge zur Namenforschung, N. F. 12 (1977) 1–34.

Kohlheim, Volker, Diffusionstheoretische Aspekte spätmittelalterlicher Anthroponymie. Die Verbreitung der Rufnamengebung nach Heiligennamen in Regensburg bis a. 1375. In: Deutsch-slawische Namenforschung. Hg. von Hans Bernd Harder. Marburg/Lahn 1981, 137–157.

Knappová, Miloslava, K funkčnímu pojetí systému vlastních jmen. In: Slovo a slovesnost 53 (1992) 211–214.

Kovačev, Nikolaj, Čestotno-etimologičen rečnik na ličnite imena v săvremennata bălgarska antroponimija. Veliko Tărnovo 1995.

Kripke, Saul, Naming and Necessity. In: Davidson, Donald; Harman, Gilbert (ed. Cambridge) 1972. Slov.: Pomenovanie a nevyhnutnosť. Bratislava 2002.

Krajčovič, Rudolf, Teoretické východiská stavby hesla v historických topolexikonoch. In: VIII. slovenská onomastická konferencia. Banská Bystrica – Dedinky 2.–6. júna 1980. Zborník materiálov. Red. Milan Majtán. Bratislava/Banská Bystrica/Prešov 1983, 17–23.

Krško, Jaromír, Spracovanie hydronymie. Metodické pokyny na spracúvanie projektov Hydronymia Slovaciae. Banská Bystrica 2005.

Krüger, Dietlind, Textlinguistische Methoden der Namenforschung. In: Namenarten und ihre Erforschung, 123–152.

Kuryłowicz, Jerzy, La position linguistique de nom propre. In: Onomastica 2 (1956) 1–14.

Lubaś, Władysław, Spoleczne varianty nazw własnych we wspólczesnej polszczyżnie. In: Spoločenské fungovanie vlastných mien. VII. slovenská onomastická konferencia (Zemplínska šírava 20.–24. septembra 1976). Zborník materiálov. Red. Milan Majtán. Bratislava 1980, 25–30.

Majtán, Milan, Mimojazyková stránka toponyma. In: VI. slovenská onomastická konferencia. Nitra 4.–6. apríla 1974. Red. Milan Majtán. Bratislava 1976, 31–37.

Majtán, Milan, Z lexiky slovenskej toponymie. Bratislava 1996.

Materna, Pavel, Concepts and Objects. Helsinki 1999 (Acta Philosophica Fennica 63).

Mikkonen Pirjo, Paikkala Sirrka, Sukunimet. Helsinki 1992, 31–45.

Mrózek, Robert, Składniki subsystemów onimicznych we współczesnej praktyce komunikacyjnej. In: Vlastné meno v komunikácii. 15. slovenská onomastická konferencia. Bratislava 6.–7. septembra 2002. Zborník referátov. Ed. Pavol Žigo, Milan Majtán. Bratislava 2003, 27–32.

Namenarten und ihre Erforschung. Ein Lehrbuch für das Studium der Onomastik. Hg. von Andrea und Silvio Brendler. Hamburg 2004.

Namenforschung. Ein internationales Handbuch zur Onomastik. Bd. I: 1995, Bd. II: 1996, Registerband 1996. Hg. von Ernst Eichler et al. Berlin/New York.

Nicolaisen, Wilhelm F. H., Name and Appellative. In: Namenforschung. Ein internationales Handbuch zur Onomastik I, 384–393.

Paikkala, Sirrka, Finnische Familiennamen auf *-(i)nen*. In: Studia Anthroponymica Scandinavica 6 (1988) 27–69.

Paikkala, Sirrka; Paikkala, Jarmo, Statistische Angaben aus den Familiennamen der Finnen. Sukuviesti 1988.

Pleskalová, Jana, Tvoření pomístních jmen na Moravě a ve Slezsku. Jinočany 1992.

Pulgram, Ernst, Historisch-soziologische Betrachtung des modernen Familiennamens. In: Beiträge zur Namenforschung 2 (1950/51) 132–165.

Reader zur Namenkunde. I: 1989, II: 1993, III/1 u. 2: 1996, IV: 1994. Red. Friedhelm Debus und Wilfried Seibicke. Hildesheim/Zürich/New York.

Reichmayr, Michael, Von Ajda bis Žuži. Slawisches in österreichischen Rindernamen. Eine sprachliche und kulturhistorische Analyse. Wien 2005.

Rübekeil, Stefan, Stammes- und Völkernamen. In: Namenarten und ihre Erforschung, 743–771.

Rymut, Kazimierz, Nazwiska Polaków. Wrocław/Warszawa/Kraków 1991.

Searle, John: Speech Acts. An Essay in the Philosophy of Language. Cambridge 1969.

Sokolová, Miloslava, Systémové modely tvorenia obyvateľských mien a etnoným v slovenčine. In: Slovenská reč 71/4 (2006) 205–223.

Strawson, Peter F., Über Referenz. Übersetzt von Joachim Schulte. In: Wolf, Ursula (Hg.), Eigennamen. Dokumentation einer Kontroverse. Frankfurt/Main 1985, 94–126.

Svoboda, Jan, Staročeská osobní jména a naše příjmení. Praha 1964.

Superanskaja, Aleksandra V., Občšaja teorija imeni sobstvennogo. Moskva 1973.

Šmelík, Ľudovít, Využitie štatistickej metódy v onomastike. In: Zborník materiálov zo sympózia o teoretických a metodologických otázkach onomastiky a II. slovenskej onomastickej konferencie v Nitre 22.–24. mája 1969. Red. Š. Krištof. Bratislava 1970, 85–93.

Šmelík, Ľudovít, Poznámky k antroponymii Záhoria. In: Jazyková a mimojazyková stránka vlastných mien. XI. slovenská onomastická konferencia. Nitra 19.–20. mája 1994. Zborník referátov. Red. Ema Krošláková. Bratislava/Nitra 1994, 124–128.

Šrámek, Rudolf, Toponymické modely a toponymický systém. In: Slovo a slovesnost 33 (1972) 304–318. Dt.: Zum Begriff „Modell" und „System" in der tschechischen Toponymie. In: Onoma 27 (1972/73) 55–75.

Šrámek, Rudolf, Onymický příznak. In: VI. slovenská onomastická konferencia. Nitra 4.–6. apríla 1974. Zborník materiálov. Red. Milan Majtán. Bratislava 1976, 7–14.

Šrámek, Rudolf, Slovotvorný model v české toponymii. In: Slovo a slovesnost 37 (1976) 112–120.

Šrámek, Rudolf, Teorie onomastiky a roviny propriálního pojmenování. In: Slovo a slovesnost 47 (1986) 16–28.

Šrámek, Rudolf, Úvod do obecné onomastiky. Brno 1999.

Štúr, Ľudovít, Nauka reči Slovenskej. Vistavená od Ludevíta Štúra. V Prešporku 1846. Nákladom Tatrína.

Valentová, Iveta, K teórii spracovania jazykovej stránky živých osobných mien. In: Vlastné meno v komunikácii. 15. slovenská onomastická konferencia. Bratislava 6.–7. septembra 2002. Zborník referátov. Zost. Pavol Žigo a Milan Majtán. Bratislava 2003, 91–99.

van Langendonck, Willy, Name systems and name strata. In: Namenforschung. Ein internationales Handbuch zur Onomastik I, 485–489.

Walther, Hans, Zu den gesellschaftswissenschaftlichen Grundpositionen der Namen-forschung. In: Der Name in Sprache und Gesellschaft. Beiträge zur Theorie der Ono-mastik. Berlin 1973, 13–30.

Wenzel, Walter, Familiennamen. In: Namenarten und ihre Erforschung, 705–742.

Werner, Otmar, Pragmatik der Eigennamen. Überblick. In: Namenforschung. Ein inter-nationales Handbuch zur Onomastik I, 372–379.

Zabrocki, Ludwig, Gesetze bei Übernahme von fremden Orts- und Flurnamen. Proble-me einer Betrachtungsweise. In: VI. Internationaler Kongreß für Namenforschung, München 24.–28. August. Kongreßberichte. Bd. 3. München 1960, 791–797.

Zelinsky, Wilbur, Slouching toward a Theory of Names. A Tentative Taxonomic Fix. In: Names 50 (2002) 243–262.

Zouhar, Marián, Podoby referencie. Bratislava 2004.

Zouhar, Marián, Rigidná designácia. Metafyzická téma vo filozofii jazyka. Bratislava 2006.