

*Valéria Tóth (Debrecen, Hungary)*

## ***Anthroponym Systems in Different Languages and Cultures\****

In the fall of 2023, I launched an international research program dedicated to the historical survey of personal name systems across various languages and cultures. The theoretical framework for this project is based on an anthroponymic analysis model that integrates pragmatic and cognitive approaches, as detailed in my book *Personal Names in a Medieval Context* (TÓTH 2022). This model was initially developed to analyze Old Hungarian personal naming practices.

The primary aim of the research program is to provide a comprehensive understanding of the distinctive features of personal name systems in different languages, utilizing this pragmatic-cognitive framework. I have extended invitations to scholars with an interest in both the model and its application to historical perspectives to participate in the program. While numerous methodologies exist for the study of anthroponymic systems—many of which offer coherent and effective models—this program adopts a key theoretical and methodological principle: all participating researchers must work within the same model. This consistency is essential to ensure the comparability of the characteristics of personal name systems across different linguistic and cultural contexts.

The studies on the personal naming systems of each language and country will be published in English in a special thematic issue of the journal *Onomastica Uralica*. To date, I have received contributions on the following languages: Hungarian, Czech, Polish, Romanian, German, French, Portuguese, and Finnish. Additionally, commitments have been secured for studies on other languages and regions. I would like to emphasize that contributions are welcome from any region of the world and for any language, as the ultimate goal of the research program is to ensure cultural and linguistic inclusivity.

In my paper, I will discuss some of the key findings from this international research program.

**1.** I have already discussed **the cognitive-pragmatic model** for describing personal naming systems in several lectures and papers (e.g., HOFFMANN–

---

\* This work was carried out as part of the Research Group on Hungarian Language History and Toponomastics (University of Debrecen – Hungarian Research Network) as well as Hungarian National Toponym Registry Program (Hungarian Academy of Sciences).



TÓTH 2015, TÓTH 2017), as well as in the aforementioned book. Therefore, in this context, I will only briefly outline the model, focusing on the details essential for further understanding.

A personal name becomes associated with an individual through the act of name-giving, thereby acquiring its concrete and individualizing role. When analyzing the **pragmatic factors** of naming systems, it is crucial to examine the implementation of name-giving, along with the circumstances and conditions (such as acts, traditions, and processes) through which specific linguistic elements become anthroponymic categories associated with a given person.

From a pragmatic perspective, which emphasizes the circumstances of name-giving, the following categories of personal names can be identified:

- a) The personal name category *chosen name* or *list name* is assigned to an individual (typically at birth) as a result of a conscious decision or choice. Such names are chosen through the involvement of certain people (e.g., parents, priests, chieftains, shamans) from a relatively closed set of names. This set may be written, unwritten, or based on existing traditions.
- b) The other category of personal names is automatically associated with the individual (based on custom or law) and becomes the person's name based on the rules of community name-giving, i.e., independently of the individual's or their family's naming intentions. Today, family names are typically assigned this way, but *automatic names* were certainly present in the Middle Ages as well.
- c) The *created names* not bound by formal rules and are created using the entire vocabulary and creativity of the name giver. In these cases, the act of name-giving not only establishes the relationship between the name and the name bearer but also creates the designation itself.

From a **functional-cognitive** perspective,

- a) created names have the closest relationship with the name bearer from among the basic name categories (as these name forms reflect a certain feature, the social position, etc. of the individual). The elements of this name category are always motivated, they have a rich information content, and thus they are descriptive. From a cognitive perspective, therefore, we call them *feature-indicating* or *descriptive names*.
- b) Automatic names are also characterized by a certain degree of motivation and information content but these names convey only one type of information as they express a sense of belonging to a community organized on a genetic or



cultural basis (e.g., mother, father, family, clan, etc.). The terms *relationship name* or *nexus name* are used for this name category.

c) In the case of list names, we cannot talk about direct motivation related to the individual, the most important function of these names is to identify the individual within a smaller community, primarily the family. From a cognitive perspective these are called *referential names*.<sup>1</sup>

d) Besides the mentioned three name categories, the so-called basic name categories, there is a fourth personal name type as well, which forms a secondary category compared to those above. In the case of *affective names* the principal cognitive-semantic content is provided by the emotional relationship between the name giver/name user and the person named. As this name category is created with the modification of other names, it may be defined pragmatically as a *modified name*. In these names the affective function is associated with the primary, identifying role in a way that it becomes present in them in a dominant position, often pushing the original functions entirely into the background.

Since naming people is a universal practice, personal names across different cultures exhibit many **universal pragmatic traits**. For instance, in every culture, individuals receive one or more names; often, the name giver is determined by custom (such as parents, grandparents, or other community members). Additionally, certain anthroponymic categories are typically assigned based on fixed practices rather than arbitrarily. In many cultures, the act of name-giving may also involve a special community or private name-giving ceremony (AINIALA–SAARELMA–SJÖBLOM 2012: 126). Despite these universal characteristics, significant **differences** in name-giving practices can be found across languages. This diversity is well illustrated by the matrices of similarities and differences that EDWIN D. LAWSON developed based on the characteristics of name systems of 15 languages (2016: 190–198).<sup>2</sup> RICHARD

---

<sup>1</sup> Naturally, the two other name categories also have a referential function as this is the most essential role of all personal names but in their case at the time of name-giving special functions that characterize only them are also expressed, which are however, absent in the case of referential names. Therefore, these features can be used to distinguish the different categories of names.

It is also important to emphasize that a name can belong to multiple name categories at the same time. A name like *da Vinci* could entail that person is from settlement Vinci (in this case it is a descriptive name) or person belongs to family called with that name (in this case it is a nexus name, a family name).

<sup>2</sup> In his work, EDWIN D. LAWSON (2016) examines the relationship between the anthroponymic systems of various languages, starting from the presumption that there are both similarities and differences between the name-giving systems of languages and these may manifest to varying degrees in the relationship between any two languages. To explore the common features and



D. ALFORD also identified several differences when studying the name-giving customs of 60 different pre-industrial cultures from various parts of the world (1988, see also AINIALA et al. 2012: 126–129).<sup>3</sup>

**2.** The research programme focus on the **medieval history** of personal naming. This period is relatively well-documented by written sources and witnessed significant changes in personal naming systems.<sup>4</sup> In what follows, I provide concrete examples of the similarities and differences between the naming systems of the various languages, specifically **Hungarian** (TÓTH 2022), **Czech** (BOHÁČOVÁ–DVOŘÁKOVÁ 2025) and **Finnish** (RAUNAMAA 2025). These languages were chosen based on the idea that personal naming systems are shaped more by cultural and social factors than by linguistic ones. Thus, their characteristics and processes may be influenced by cultural and territorial relations (as seen with Hungarian and Czech, which belong to the Central European, Danubian language area) rather than by genetic relations (as in the case of Hungarian and Finnish, which belong to the Finno-Ugric/Uralic language family).

As a result of this comparison, I first offer some general observations about the broader (socio-cultural) context of the naming systems in the studied languages, considering their historical background, religious-cultural characteristics, and sources. Then I present some notable differences and similarities within the personal name categories.

**2.1.** When examining personal name-giving, it is essential to consider extra-linguistic factors, as these differences can also influence naming systems.

The medieval Hungarian and Czech personal name systems operated within the frameworks of the Hungarian Kingdom and the Kingdom of Bohemia (Czech Kingdom) as independent medieval states. In contrast, the **historical context**

---

differences in these name systems, he asked 15 researchers from different countries, each representing a different language, to briefly characterize the personal name system of their native language. The publication includes descriptions of the following anthroponymic systems: Hebrew, Chinese, Dutch, French, German, Greek, Hungarian, Jewish, Maltese, Maori, Polish, Portugal, and Zulu as well as the name systems in the UK and the USA. Based on the descriptions, LAWSON (2016: 190–198) summarized the relationships between these name systems in a similarity-difference matrix.

<sup>3</sup> Based on the work of F. NIYI AKINNASO (1981), we can draw the fascinating conclusion that although certain African naming patterns are relatively distant from European traditions, several of their features are reminiscent of the nomadic name-giving practices of the so-called Proto-Hungarian and early Old Hungarian eras (more than a millenium ago).

<sup>4</sup> However, we have to point out that medieval sources are not homogeneous and there can be various problems in analysing them.



for Finnish personal name system was the Finnish language area, which at the time was part of the Swedish Realm (as its eastern region).

**Christianity** spread in all these regions, but with significant time differences. In the Czech lands it began in the 9<sup>th</sup> century; in the Kingdom of Hungary, it emerged in the 10<sup>th</sup>-11<sup>th</sup> centuries. According to the written sources, Christian (mainly Latin) names began appearing in the personal name systems of both countries from the 11<sup>th</sup> century onwards. In Finland, Christianity cemented its position later during the 13<sup>th</sup>-15<sup>th</sup> centuries, though this varied significantly from region to region.

These two non-linguistic factors have also influenced the nature and language of the **written sources** and the structures used to denote individuals. The earliest records of the Hungarian personal naming system date from the mid-9<sup>th</sup> century, with sources (especially charters) becoming more abundant from the late 12<sup>th</sup> century, and even more so in the 13<sup>th</sup>-14<sup>th</sup> centuries. The language of these charters is primarily Latin with a few exceptions in Greek. The earliest written sources in the Czech-speaking area date from the 9<sup>th</sup>-10<sup>th</sup> centuries, though they are few in number, with charter-issuing becoming more significant in the 13<sup>th</sup>-14<sup>th</sup> centuries. These documents are also primarily in Latin, with a small number of German-language charters surviving as well. In both language areas, the Latin documents contain personal names (and place names) in the vernacular language (Hungarian or Slavic), sometimes Latinised. E.g., from Hungary: 1211: In Tichon artifices ... *Paulus filius Johannis*; pistores: filius *Petri*, Stephan cum filio suo *Paulo*; filius *Petri*, *Paulus* (ÁSz. 619); from Bohemia: *Johannes* alias dictus *Hanko* de Stikowicz. In Finnish areas, very few sources from the 13<sup>th</sup>-14<sup>th</sup> centuries have survived, and most of the preserved medieval documents concerning Finland are from the 15<sup>th</sup> century. Among the written sources, many are in Latin, but most are in Swedish, with Swedish forms also typically used for recording personal names. E.g., in the official version of a court document about lands the Finnish name form *kočko heyki j kukola* ('Henrik of Kokko/Kukko in Kukola') was adapted to Swedish: *Henric j Kukola*.

**2.2.** Among the categories of personal names, **descriptive names** form the core of the personal name system. This category is the most ancient (presumably a universal feature of personal name systems).<sup>5</sup> According to sources, medieval

---

<sup>5</sup> The ancient nature of descriptive personal names is supported by the analysis of the internal correlations between current and ancient name systems, along with the observation that other categories of personal names may actually be derived from them. This is further substantiated by concrete research findings. RICHARD D. ALFORD discovered that in two-thirds of the 60 different cultures he studied, it was common for children to be given transparent, descriptive name forms (1988, see also AINIALA et al. 2012: 127). This practice is characteristic, for



descriptive names can be divided into two subcategories based on their usage. The first subcategory includes descriptive names that, from a pragmatic point of view, serve as primary names. In other words, these are individuals' main names which carry a descriptive meaning. The second subcategory consists of secondary descriptive names which are bynames associated with the name bearers in addition to their primary names (e.g., due to the significant homonymy caused by the spread of Christian names). However, distinguishing between these two subcategories is not an easy task.<sup>6</sup> E.g., in Hungarian: 1277/1356: Mychael dictus *Tar* (ÁSz. 740; cf. *tar* 'bald'); in Czech: 1419: Johannes *Holub* de Bitreho; cf. *holub* 'pigeon'; in Finnish: *Henrich Sonni* (< 'bull'), *Jöns Söppä* (*seppä* 'smith').

In different languages, the semantic-motivational features of descriptive names as non-linguistic components, show many similarities.<sup>7</sup> However, at the lexical-morphological level (i.e., the linguistic level), significant differences also can be observed. For example, compound names (i.e., names composed of two lexemes), which are fairly common in medieval Slavic languages, are much rarer in Hungarian and Finnish. But there are a few examples from these languages also: Hungarian: 1389: Andreas *Hothwyw*; < *hat ujjú* 'having six fingers'; *Jóleány* (1282/1327: ancillas ... *Jolyan nominatas*) < *jó leány* 'good girl'; Finnish: *Oluff Mustasilmä* < *musta* 'black' + *silmä* 'eye'. Another important morphological tool for name formation is the use of suffixes. In both Czech and Hungarian during the Middle Ages, suffixes were rich and commonly used in personal name-giving, including the creation of descriptive names. E.g., in Hungarian: *Szolgád* (1198: *Sculgad*; < *szolga* 'servant' + *-d* formant), *Leáncs* (1273/1274: *Leanch*; < *leány* 'girl' + *-cs* formant); *Farkasd* (1138/1329: *Farcasti*; < *farkas* 'wolf' + *-ti* formant). In Czech: 1387: Buzko dictus *Babka* de Tomycz recepit; (< *bába* 'grandmother' + suffix *-ka*); 1483: *Vopička* (< *opice*, *vopice* 'monkey' + suffix *-ka*); 1316: Hincó dictus *Hlawacz*

---

example, of home (or birth) names in Zulu culture (LAWSON 2016: 189, based on Adrian Koopman's notes). Historically, descriptive names also shaped the nature of pre-Christian name-giving (LEIBRING 2016: 201; WILSON 1998: 65–85).

<sup>6</sup> It is also important to note that, although the personal names found in the early written sources are difficult to evaluate from a name-use perspective (pragmatic and social onomastic), based on the general characteristics of personal name usage and the experiences of different cultures living together, we can reasonably assume that a person could have borne more than one name during their lifetime or even simultaneously. This practice likely characterized name usage from the earliest times onwards.

<sup>7</sup> Of course, minor differences can also be observed in this respect: certain semantic features may be more or less prevalent in each personal name system. A comparative analysis might reveal differences, such as the fact that the pre-Christian Finnish descriptive names tend to have peaceful meaning, while warlike names were common among neighbouring tribes and cultures, such as the Scandinavians and Slavs.



(< *hlava* ‘head’ + suffix *-áč*). Based on scarce materials, it seems that Finnish employed fewer suffixes in the formation of descriptive names. Metaphor and metonymy, the two main processes of semantic name-giving, played a role in the creation of descriptive names across all three personal naming systems. E.g., Hungarian: 1198: *Bika* (< *bika* ‘bull’); Czech: 13<sup>th</sup> cent.: *Osel* (< *osel* ‘donkey’); Finnish: *Magnus Hirj* (< *hiiri* ‘mouse’).

**2.3.** The most important source of **referential names** in any language is often names borrowed from the personal naming systems of other languages. These names can be transferred from one language to another through direct ethnic and linguistic contact, as well as through cultural influence mediated by higher social classes. Therefore, the stock of referential personal names in each language is determined by its linguistic contacts on the one hand, and by the cultural sphere in which it is embedded (i.e., its cultural contacts) on the other.

Before their arrival in the Carpathian Basin during their migrations, the Hungarians adopted a large number of personal names from the Turkish languages (e.g., 1146: *Acus* < Turkish *Aq-quš* ‘white falcon’). Later, when they settled in the Carpathian Basin, the surrounding Slavic languages and German had a significant influence on the Hungarian personal name system (e.g., 1211: *Bogat* < Slavic *Bogatъ*; 1111: *Theobaldus Sumugin(ensis) [comes]* < Germ. *Theutbald*), with some Romanian names also being included in the medieval personal name stock. However, the influence of all these languages was far exceeded by the integration of medieval Latin personal names into the Hungarian name system, a process associated with the spread of Christianity (e.g., 1131: principes ... *Janus, Marcus*; 1134: *Laurentius filius Salamonis canonici Waradiensis ecclesie*). In addition, a smaller group of referential names is also noteworthy from a cultural-historical point of view: the names of heroes and heroines from French chivalric romances, which were fashionable throughout Western Europe at the time. These names represent the naming practices influenced by the secular cultural-historical sphere in the old Hungarian personal name system (e.g., 1264: *Rolando preposito de Saag*).

In the medieval Czech personal name system, the influences of German and Latin languages are by far the most significant; the latter due to the spread of Christianity; e.g., *Konrád, Adalbert, Ulrich* (> *Oldřich*), *Heinrich* (> *Jindřich*); *Johannes* (> *Jan, Johann*), *Nicolaus* (> *Mikuláš*), *Petrus* (> *Petr, Peter*), *Venceslaus* (> *Václav*); though the appearance of French personal names mediated by literature can also be observed; e.g., *Tristam, Isolda, Parcifal*.

In Finnish, the earliest referential names are of Scandinavian origin (ultimately related to Germanic); e.g., *Vargh* (< Swedish *varg* ‘wolf’), *Anundi* (< Old Norse *Anund*), *Azico* (< Germanic *Aziko, Asicko*). By the 15<sup>th</sup> century, as a result of the linguistic impact of Christianity’s spread, the dominance of



Christian personal names became evident; e.g., *Mathias*, *Ollj* (< Saint Olof), *Pauo* (< *Pavel*, *Pával*).

The adoption of religious names, which spread due to the adoption of Christianity, not only brought about a fundamental change in the main features of naming in these languages within a few centuries, but it also modified the earlier conditions and characteristics of the borrowing and use of loan elements in these languages. Due to the circumstances surrounding naming, the spread of more or less “official” religious names also led to the perception that the lack of inherent meaning in names was their most common and therefore natural characteristic. Consequently, as these names became more widespread, the naming community increasingly did not expect names to be descriptive or to have any common word meaning or reference, as had previously been a characteristic of many names. This process had two additional consequences for the personal name systems. On the one hand, it led to referential names becoming more homogenized, closed, and bound;<sup>8</sup> on the other hand, it resulted in this type of name constituting the most important group of referential personal names in Hungarian, Czech, Finnish and many other languages within Western Christian culture.

**2.4.** The most common category of **nexus names** is family names. However, in some cultures and languages, other types of nexus names also developed during the Middle Ages. A notable example is the category of genus names (clan names) in Hungarian which emerged in the 13<sup>th</sup> and 14<sup>th</sup> centuries. E.g., 1204: *Tyba de genere Tomoy* (ÁSz. 762); 1214: *comitem Henricum de genere Zolouc* (ÁSz. 838). The use of these names was regulated by strict social restrictions, as only landlords were permitted to track their lineage in this manner.<sup>9</sup> In contrast, family names eventually spread across all classes of society.

<sup>8</sup> The homogenization of personal names is evident in the following examples. Initially, the religious onomastic corpus for female names was more diverse in Hungary. However, by the second half of the 14<sup>th</sup> century, three-fourths of women with religious names shared only one of just six common names: *Erzsébet*, *Margit*, *Katalin*, *Ilona*, *Klára*, and *Anna*. The number of women with other names became negligible. In Czech, the list of the most common medieval female names is very similar: *Anna*, *Margaretha* (*Markéta*), *Katherina*, *Elisabeth* (*Eliška*), *Dorothea*. This pattern is also observed in Finnish: *Margareta*, *Katerina*, *Kristina*, *Brigita*, *Elin*. This trend is even more pronounced for male names. At one point, a third of European men were recorded under the most popular name, *Johannes* (AINIALA et al. 2012: 152, see also WILSON 1998: 89). Various versions of this name emerged in different languages: *Giovanni* (Italian), *Jean* (French), *Juan* (Spanish), *John* (English), *Johan* (Swedish), *Jöns* (Finnish), *János* (Hungarian), *Jan* (Czech), *Ivan* (Russian), etc.

<sup>9</sup> Hungarian clans and their names share similarities with the histories of clans in other cultures in several respects. It is estimated that at least 1,200 different clan names (*Mac*-names) and family names derived from these can be documented in historical sources (classic examples



While genus names (clan names) did not exist in Czech and Finnish, Czech culture developed a unique type of nexus name known as *family names after the roof* or *roof names*. These were family names acquired by the new owner of a house or craft from the previous owner. For example, when *Martin ze Šestajovic* bought a house from *Jan Chudoba* in 1404, he was subsequently recorded as *Martin Chudoba*. Roof names played an important role in rural areas, especially from the 16<sup>th</sup> century onwards. Although these names identified entire families rather than individuals, they were not permanent; when a family moved, they would adopt a new name based on their new residence. Additionally, sources sometimes included roof names alongside the family name of a person; e.g. *Václav Chvátal, jinak Svoboda* (*jinak* means ‘alias, or’). In this way, roof names were more akin to descriptive names (like other proto family names) that reflect local relationships.

Thus, not all nexus-indicating structures can be considered nexus names. An important criterion for a true nexus name is that it is inherited. For instance, personal names with the element *fi(a)* meaning ‘son of’ in Hungarian charters (1474: *Nicolaus Banfi*, RMCsSz. 82; < *bán fia* ‘son of a ban or a person named Bán’) or the *poika* expressions in medieval Finnish documents (e.g., *Michel Petherinpoica* ‘son of Peter’) cannot be classified as family or nexus names as long as they are not passed down from generation to generation and remain variable like descriptive names. Family names derived from fathers’ names (patronymics) are, moreover, an important and dominant subtype in all the family name systems discussed here.

The formation and consolidation of family names in each language can be described as a lengthy process. In Hungarian, this process dates from the 14<sup>th</sup> to the 17<sup>th</sup> centuries. In Czech there is evidence from the 14<sup>th</sup> and 15<sup>th</sup> centuries that family names were passed on to the second generation. However, in the Czech onomastic tradition, it was only after the legal regulation of name-bearing, which took place in 1786, that these names became de jure true family names. In Finnish, written sources from the 16<sup>th</sup> century indicate that in Eastern Finland family names were already established even among the peasantry,

---

include *MacGregor*, *MacDonald*). All of them refer to the ancestor or founder of the clan, making it a monogenetic name type. Today only around 200 to 300 of these names are still in use (DORWARD 1995: 1287–1289). In Africa, clans are often defined as units composed of different families, typically claiming descent from a mythical ancestor, with each clan having its own independent name. In many African cultures, the modern official personal name structure typically follows an individual name + clan name format, such as *Nelson Mandela* (cf. AINIYALA et al. 2012: 125; LAWSON 2016: 189–190 based on Adrian Koopman’s notes; KOOPMAN 2016: 257–258). Despite these similarities, numerous differences can be found, particularly due to the diverse socio-cultural circumstances.



however, it was not the case in Western Finland where bynames were based on patronym, homestead/village, profession or feature/outlook.<sup>10</sup>

**2.5.** As for the **affective names**, I would like to mention one specific aspect. The position of this category of personal names in various languages has highlighted an important theoretical issue. Although there are a large number of descriptive names that express the emotional attitude of the name-giver towards the name-bearer (e.g., Finnish *Ihalempi* < *iha* ‘lovely, delightful, charming’ and *lempi* ‘love, favorite’), these can only be considered affective names according to the model used here if they were created by modifying another personal name of the given person. The primary personal name itself can be a referential name, a descriptive name, or a nexus name.

**3.** In my paper, I aimed to highlight a small part of an international research program on personal name systems in different languages and cultures. I hope it demonstrates the relevance of this kind of research and the benefits of adopting a unified theoretical framework. I believe that the cognitive-pragmatic model can serve these purposes effectively.

The naming systems of the languages examined in this study operate within a largely identical cultural context. However, the study revealed significant differences even among them. These differences are primarily reflected in the linguistic-structural aspects of name-giving and name usage, while they are less apparent in semantic features. In this context, it would be particularly interesting to study the naming systems of languages from different cultural background.

---

<sup>10</sup> The study of personal name systems in different languages can also help reconstruct the spread of particular name types. It seems that family names in medieval Europe first appeared in towns in Northern Italy during the 9<sup>th</sup> and 10<sup>th</sup> centuries, spreading from there to other parts of Europe. They became widespread first in the Neo-Latin regions (e.g., France from the 10<sup>th</sup> century), then in Britain, where they were spread by the Norman conquerors from the 11<sup>th</sup> century, and in the German language areas from the 10<sup>th</sup> and 11<sup>th</sup> centuries. As a result of their spread from the Neo-Latin regions (in Northern Italy and France), this category of names first appeared in the southwestern towns of Germany. It then moved east and north along trade routes known as “the artery of culture”, reaching regions with extensive German contacts, such as Bohemia, the Carpathian Basin (initially its western territories), and eventually Poland. It appeared even later to the south and east of the Carpathian Basin; for example, in Russian territories, it was introduced by Peter the Great by through a decree.



## References

- AINIALA, TERHI–SAARELMA, MINNA–SJÖBLOM, PAULA 2012. *Names in focus: an introduction to Finnish onomastics*. Helsinki, Finnish Literature Society.
- AKINNASO, F. NIYI 1981. Names and Naming Principles in Cross-Cultural Perspective. *Names* 29: 37–63.
- ALFORD, RICHARD D. 1988. *Naming and identity: a cross-cultural study of personal naming practices*. New Haven, HRAF Press.
- ÁSZ. = FEHÉRTÓI, KATALIN 2004. *Árpád-kori személynévtár. 1000–1301*. [Personal names of the Árpád Era.] Budapest, Akadémiai Kiadó.
- BOHÁČOVÁ, MICHAELA–DVOŘÁKOVÁ, ŽANETA 2025. The development of the Czech anthroponymic system from a cognitive-pragmatic perspective. *Onomastica Uralica*. To be published.
- DORWARD, DAVID PHILIP 1995. Scottish Personal Names. In: EICHLER, ERNST – HILTY, GERALD – LÖFFLER, HEINRICH – STEGER, HUGO – ZGUSTA, LADISLAV eds. *Namenforschung – Name Studies – Les noms propres: Ein internationales Handbuch zur Onomastik – An International Handbook of Onomastics – Manuel international d’onomastique*. Berlin, Walter de Gruyter. 1284–1289.
- HOFFMANN, ISTVÁN–TÓTH, VALÉRIA 2015. Viewpoints on the Cognitive-Pragmatic Description of Personal names. *Word* 61(1): 141–164.
- KOOPMAN, ADRIAN 2016. *Ethnonyms*. In: HOUGH, CAROLE ed. *The Oxford Handbook of Names and Naming*. Oxford, Oxford University Press. 251–262.
- LAWSON, EDWIN D. 2016. Personal Naming Systems. In: HOUGH, CAROLE ed. *The Oxford Handbook of Names and Naming*. Oxford, Oxford University Press. 169–198.
- LEIBRING, KATHARINA 2016. Given Names in European Naming Systems. In: HOUGH, CAROLE ed. *The Oxford Handbook of Names and Naming*. Oxford, Oxford University Press. 199–213.
- RAUNAMAA, JAAKKO 2025. Finnish anthroponyms in the Middle Ages. *Onomastica Uralica*. To be published.
- TÓTH, VALÉRIA 2017. The history of the Hungarian personal name system in the context of cognitive-pragmatic description. In: AINIALA, TERHI–SAARIKIVI, JANNE eds. *Personal name systems in Finnic and beyond*. Uralica Helsingiesia 12. Helsinki, Tiedekirja. 363–380.
- TÓTH, VALÉRIA 2022. *Personal Names in a Medieval Context*. Hamburg, Buske.
- WILSON, STEPHEN 1998. *The Means of Naming. A Social and Cultural History of Personal Naming in Western Europe*. London, UCL Press.



**Abstract**

The paper presents the initial findings of an international research project launched in autumn 2023. The project aims to examine personal naming practices across various languages and cultures from a historical perspective. The participating researchers adopt a shared approach, grounded in a cognitive-pragmatic model of personal name analysis.

The paper offers a comparative analysis of Hungarian, Finnish, and Czech personal naming systems, with a focus on the socio-cultural factors that have historically shaped these systems. It highlights both the similarities and differences among the naming conventions of these languages. References to naming systems in other languages are also included to illustrate specific phenomena, emphasizing the value of research that spans a diverse range of languages and cultures.

**Keywords:** international research program, anthroponym systems, anthroponym categories, historical perspective

