Some conclusions on the geography of historical surnames in Vas County

Gábor Ferenczi

Institute of Hungarian Research, H-1014 Budapest, Hungary

ABSTRACT

In my study, I examined the material of the National Tax Census of 1720 (Conscriptio Regnicolaris) of Vas County included in the database of the Atlas of Historical Surnames in Hungary (AHSH) from two approaches. On the one hand, by using the method of name analysis, I sought to reveal the distribution by origin on the basis of the contemporary surname etymons according to which the surnames in Vas County are divided into three categories: German, Hungarian and Slavic. The high representation of the two latter name etymon groups is clearly due to the double border region and the resulting increased inter-ethnic relations compared to the inland areas of the language area. The distribution of surname etymons between Kőszeg and the districts further complicates the picture. A greater number of Hungarian surnames are found in the northern (Kőszeg) and inland (Kemenesalja and Árokköz) districts of the county. In the town of Kőszeg, as well as in the district of Szombathely, which lies directly on the western border, the number of people with German surname etymons is dominant, as do the Slavs in the district of Tótság on the south-south-western edge, for understandable reasons.

On the other hand, with the help of János N. Fodor's (2010) functional-semantic theoretical framework applied at the research on personal names in the Upper Tisza region, I examined the motivations for naming in the Hungarian-origin surname material of Vas County, by districts and in the case of Kőszeg. The results showed that Hungarian names account for about one third of the total family name stock (33.52%), and 92.61% of these names can be classified into one of the five motivation categories (individual attribute; relationship to people, groups of people; social role, status, situation; relationship to place; relationship to things, circumstances). At both county and district (and in the case of Kőszeg, urban) level, it is clear that the vast majority of all motivational options are distributed between the first four categories. This distribution is relatively even at county level, but is more nuanced at district and Kőszeg level. After this overview, I will briefly present the percentage distribution of ethnonymic

surnames at county level and then at district (and Kőszeg) level. Concerning the distribution between the districts (and the city of Kőszeg), the percentage within this category is the highest in the Kőszeg district due to the peripheral location and the consequent greater occurance of interethnic relations. The Kőszeg district is followed by the Szombathely district, which is also peripheral, but lies further south; then by two inland districts, Kemenesalja and Árokköz; and then, interestingly, since it is also a peripheral district, by Tótsági. Finally, this ratio is the lowest in the town of Kőszeg.

1.

For the study of Hungarian peripheral areas, the many types of Hungarian personal names – considered to be significant sources of the history of the Hungarian language – and consequently Hungarian surnames as well carry a considerable amount of relevant information that is important for name geography. These are primarily quantitative (frequency of names), but may be qualitative as well (e.g. grammatical), and from an extralinguistic point of view they are shaped mainly by social factors (e.g. cultural history, migration, etc.). Given their quantity and easy localisation, personal name directories compiled from early population censuses are of particular importance for this study of the geography of historical names (see Juhász 2003, 120–123; for an overview of the history and existence of the geography of names method, see N. Fodor 2014a, 23–41).

Surnames emerged among Hungarian name-bearers in the period between the 14th and 17th centuries, from distinctive names (this paper does not cover the development of surnames; for more on this topic see Hajdú 2003, 733–752; N. Fodor 2010, 17, 20, 32; Slíz 2011, 175–179). My study focuses on a narrower part of the database of the Atlas of Historical Surnames in Hungary (hereinafter: AHSH), the Vas County records of the National Tax Census of 1720 (Conscriptio Regnicolaris),[1] and with the aid of the name analysis method it examines the distribution by origin of the contemporary surname etymons. Drawing on the functional-semantic theoretical framework of János N. Fodor (2010) applied in the study of personal names of the Upper Tisza Region, it also attempts to outline the naming motivations in Hungarian-origin surnames of Vas County and their distribution by district, as well as in the town of Kőszeg. As regards the AHSH, it is im-

portant to note that it is essentially a separate database based on the records of the first two national tax censuses (1715, 1720) that adequately represents the characteristics of surnames (both in terms of space and time); in the case of Vas County, however, we faced a special situation. Since (for reasons unknown to date) only the data collected in 1720 survived for posterity, we can only draw conclusions based on these data (on the preparatory work of the database, the circumstances behind the creation of the data series and the difficulties of their usability see N. Fodor–F. Láncz 2011; N. Fodor 2011; for a summary of the database, see N. Fodor 2014b; N. Fodor 2015). We can confirm, however, that from the 1720 tax records this is the most voluminous by nationwide comparison: it contains the names of the most taxpayers (see also Egyed 2013, 110; for further research on the geography of names in these records, see, among others, Vörös 2012, 13–59; Vörös 2013; Vörös 2015, 15–42; Vörös 2016, 11–38, etc.).

2.

Several factors caused a significant decrease in the number of ethnic Hungarians in the Carpathian Basin by the 18th century (below 50%). The decrease was partly due to the wars and their consequences (e.g. the Turkish conquests, the uprisings after the expulsion of the Turks, Rákóczi's War of Independence, the bubonic plague); it was also partly due to the settling of the surrounding peoples (for a more detailed description of the causes see N. Fodor 2016a, 67). According to data collected by Imre Wellmann (1989, 25), "around 1500, we estimate the population of the Carpathian Basin to have been 4 million; this was almost 5% of the population of Europe at that time. A good 180 years later, on the eve of the war that liberated the country from Turkish rule, these figures were at most 4.2 million, or 3.8%. While Europe's population had increased by 58.7% since the beginning of the 16th century, Hungary's had increased by a mere 5.0%."

In the data collected in 1720 (as in the other national tax censuses[2]), there is relatively little reference to ethnicity; the material is nevertheless valuable regarding the geography of names, as the itemised enumeration of the names of taxpayers allows us to draw conclusions about the spatial distribution and proportion of nationalities living in the Carpathian Basin (N. Fodor–F. Láncz 2011, 179–180; N. Fodor 2016a, 68; for more on the relationship between name and ethnicity see also Szentgyörgyi 2012). According to the data from 1720 there were 506 localities registered in the 5 districts of Vas County: Árokköz, Kemenesalja, Kőszeg, Szombathely and Tótság (see AHSH, 1720); of these, Kőszeg was the only free royal town, 25 were farming towns, 127 were curial towns and 464 were serf villages. The number of inhabitants was 118,606, of which 7,775 belonged to the nobility. 12,956 households

---

2   Hungary: 1715, 1720, 1728; Transylvania: 1713, 1721, 1722

were recorded for the purposes of tax distribution (see Pete 1999, 55). There were 14,410 surnames in the county (see AHSH, 1720).

The surnames in the tax census are of both Hungarian and foreign origin. To examine the ethnic composition of the county, it is necessary to study not only the Hungarian names but also the names of foreign origin, since the ethnic distribution is shown most clearly by the differences and proportions of names of different origins (Kaposi 2015, 150). Furthermore, the 1720 census (together with the 1715 census) "only included part of the population of Hungary at that time, i.e. roughly 4-4.5%, [and since] we do not have a more extensive census (e.g. including the nobility) [...] from the beginning of the 18th century and the centuries before" (N. Fodor 2014b, 451), we cannot forgo the aforementioned exploration of the surnames included in the census.

One appropriate method for studying etymons is name analysis. Use of this method has recently gained importance again, notably in historical science research (see Demeter–Bagdi 2009), despite the dilemmas surrounding its applicability (see Demeter 2009, 5–11 for more details); N. Fodor 2013, 523–526; for a review of its antecedents, see N. Fodor 2016a, 68–69, and N. Fodor 2016b, 233–234). The essence of the method is that the ethnic reconstruction and identification of a name is carried out in two phases. The first phase examines the name's etymon, which allows us to determine the origins of names in the given area; the second phase involves examining the Christian names, which allows us to infer the nationality of the name bearer (see N. Fodor 2013, pp. 523–524, and P. Kocsis 2015, p. 163). In addition to Hungarian and non-Hungarian surname dictionaries (CsnSz. 1993; CsnE. 2010; DFn. 2008), research material on the family names of individual nationalities can also be of great help (see, among others, Kniezsa 1947/2003; Mizser 2000). It is important to note that "inferring ethnicity from personal names using the method of name analysis is limited in the case of individuals, but generally well applicable" (N. Fodor 2016b, 238; Farkas 2015, 187–190; for the use of the method in historical name studies see N. Fodor 2012, 156; Kaposi 2015; P. Kocsis 2015; for the difficulties of ethnic reconstruction, see N. Fodor 2014a, 35).

In the first phase of the study, I performed an origin-based aggregation of the surnames marked in the 1720 data in the AHSH database using the above method. The following table presents the numerical ethnic data of the examined surnames in a systematic way, first at county level, then by district, and for the free royal town of Kőszeg, separately, broken down by town. To determine the ethnic composition of the county, the names of foreign origin were previously categorised (AHSH, 1720), while those of Hungarian origin – due to their more detailed categorisation according to naming motivations (AHSH, 1720) – were categorised into common ethnic groups by myself.

Origin of surname etymon	Number of individuals bearing name	Relative percentage (finds/population)
German	6,382	44.29%
Hungarian	4,490	31.16%
Slavic	3,197	22.19%
Uncertain	341	2.37%

Table 1. Distribution of surname etymons by origin in Vas County (AHSH, 1720)

Based on the aggregation, all names registered in the county are divided into three categories by origin (see Table 1): German, Hungarian and Slavic. The county is located on the western border of the language area, and therefore it is not surprising that, in light of the aggregated data, names with German etymons are more than 10% (for further evidence, see also Egyed 2013: 110) more common (6,382 individuals bearing such names, with a relative percentage of 44.29%) than names with Hungarian etymons (4,490 individuals, 31.16%). The proportion of etymons of Slavic (namely Southern Slavic) origin is also significant: 3,197 individuals, a proportion of 22.19%. The presence of two groups of name etymons with other origins alongside the Hungarian is clearly due to the double border region and the resulting interethnic relations, which are more pronounced in this particular language area than in more central areas. – For the sake of completeness, I included another group of unclassifiable name-etymons of uncertain origin, which is relatively small in number: 341 individuals, with a relative percentage of 2.37%.

Origin of surname etymon	Number of individuals bearing name	Relative percentage (finds/population)
Hungarian	403	87.99%
German	26	5.68%
Slavic	11	2.40%
Uncertain	18	3.93%

Table 2. Distribution of surname etymons by origin in Árokköz district (AHSH, 1720)

Origin of surname etymon	Number of individuals bearing name	Relative percentage (finds/population)
Hungarian	939	91.61%
Slavic	31	3.02%
German	13	1.27%
Uncertain	42	4.10%

Table 3. Distribution of surname etymons by origin in Kemenesalja district (AHSH, 1720)

Origin of surname etymon	Number of individuals bearing name	Relative percentage (finds/population)
Hungarian	986	58.94%
German	531	31.74%
Slavic	122	7.29%
Uncertain	34	2.03%

Table 4. Distribution of surname etymons by origin in Kőszeg district (AHSH, 1720)

Origin of surname etymon	Number of individuals bearing name	Relative percentage (finds/population)
German	4,553	61.94%
Slavic	1,558	21.19%
Hungarian	1,121	15.25%
Uncertain	119	1.62%

Table 5. Distribution of surname etymons by origin in Szombathely district (AHSH, 1720)

Origin of surname etymon	Number of individuals bearing name	Relative percentage (finds/population)
Slavic	1,417	41.02%
German	987	28.58%
Hungarian	945	27.36%
Uncertain	105	3.04%

Table 6. Distribution of surname etymons by origin in Tótság district (AHSH, 1720)

Origin of surname etymon	Number of individuals bearing name	Relative percentage (finds/population)
German	272	60.58%
Hungarian	96	21.38%
Slavic	58	12.92%
Uncertain	23	5.12%

Table 7. Distribution of surname etymons by origin in Kőszeg (AHSH, 1720)

The distribution of the surname etymons of different origins among the free royal town of Kőszeg and the districts contains remarkable results from the point of view of name geography (see Table 2–7). The largest number of people bearing names with a Hungarian etymon is found in the district of Kőszeg (986 persons, 58.94%), followed by the district of Kemenesalja (939, 91.61%) and the district of Árokköz (403 persons, 87.99%). In the district of Árokköz, there is also a small number of people bearing names of a German (26 persons, 5.68%) or Slavic (11 persons, 2.40%) etymon. In the Kemenesalja district, the proportion of names with non-Hungarian, i.e. Slavic (31 persons, 3.02%) and German etymons is even

lower (13 persons, 1.27%). In the Kőszeg district, there is a very large discrepancy compared to the two previous districts: although people bearing names with a Hungarian etymon are the most numerous (986, 58.94%), the number of names with a German etymon is also significant, at almost half of the names with a Hungarian etymon (531, 31.74%), while the names with a Slav etymon make up less than a third (122, 7.29%) of said figure. In the town of Kőszeg, the proportion of people bearing names with a German etymon is quite high (272 people, 60.58%), almost three times the number of names with a German etymon (96 people, 21.38%), but the number of names with a Slavic etymon is not small either, at more than half of the names with a Hungarian etymon (58 persons, 12.92%). In Szombathely, the most populous district, the situation is partly similar: the number and relative proportion of German etymons (4,553, 61.94%) tops the list, and the number of those bearing names with a Hungarian etymon is only in third place (1,121 persons, 15.25%). The second most common group here comprises names with a Slavic etymon (1,558 persons, 21.19%). In one district, namely Tótság, the group of names with a Slavic etymon tops the list with 1,417 persons, which is 41.02% of the total number of people in the district. In this district, names with German and Hungarian etymons are almost equally represented: the names with German etymons (987 persons, 28.58%) are slightly more common than the names with Hungarian etymons (945 persons, 27.36%).

The data above confirm the conclusion drawn in relation to Vas County as a peripheral and double border region, formulated in view of the ratios and pointing towards inter-ethnic relations; in fact, they nuance the picture even further: the greater number of those bearing names with a Hungarian etymon is found in the northern (Kőszeg) and inland (Kemenesalja and Árokköz) districts of the county. In the town of Kőszeg, as well as in the district of Szombathely on the western border, names with a German etymon dominate, as do, for understandable reasons, names with a Slavic etymon in the district of Tótság at the south-southwestern border.

3.

Below I examine in more detail the surnames with Hungarian etymons recorded in Vas County in 1720 (AHSH). Several attempts have been made to systematise the list of historical surnames based on different approaches (for a summary of the most recent, see N. Fodor 2010, 58–65). I have divided the Hungarian names of the census into groups according to the cognitive (functional-semantic) approach of János N. Fodor (see N. Fodor 2010, 69–85). The key to this theoretical systematisation is exploring the motivational possibilities: it is important to isolate the motives (name functions) behind the naming, not the names themselves – of course, this cannot be done comprehensively, i.e. the naming motivation cannot be identified with certainty in the case of all names, even though all naming is intrinsically motivated (for a summary of the principle of multiple classification, which I apply

in my thesis, see N. Fodor 2010, 93–95). The relationship between figure and landmark plays a key role in the process of differentiation (for general issues of cognitive linguistics, see Tolcsvai Nagy 2008): "In naming, the connection of the named person, as the figure, to the main components of reality, i.e. the landmark, is emphasised through the activity of the naming community at the time the distinctive name is created. In the meantime, the individual [...] is positioned in the world around them in such a way that they themselves are obviously part of it" (Tolcsvai Nagy 2008, p. 73). In addition to the central individual, the model takes into account the four segments of reality that surround them and builds on the four types of relations among these segments: (1) the attributes of the named individual, (2) a person or group of people, (3) society, (4) place and (5) things and events (ibid., 73). The grouping categories based on the above principles (ibid. 74) are illustrated by the following surnames with a Hungarian etymon, as taken from the Vas County database being studied (AHSH).[3]

1. Based on the individual attributes of the named person (intrapersonal function)
    1.1   attribute (e.g. *Banga* [*Stupid*], *Gonosz* [*Evil*], *Tunya* [*Lazy*])
    1.2. a word or expression frequently used by the named person (no data available)
    1.3   age (e.g. *Agg/Ág* [*Old*], *Kis Kalmár* [*Young Merchant*], *Közép* [*Middle*])
2. The connection of the named person to another person or group of people (interpersonal function)
    2.1   family relationship (e.g. *Aba*, *Márfi*, *Urban/Orbán*)
    2.2   belonging to someone, social connection (e.g. *Gróf* [*Count*], *Herceg* [*Duke*], *Püspök* [*Bishop*])
    2.3   connection to a people, ethnic group (e.g. *Horvát* [*Croatian*], *Német* [*German*], *Zsidó* [*Jewish*])
3. Social role, status, condition of the named person (social function)
    3.1   occupation, activity (e.g. *Dudás* [*Bagpipe player*], *Mészáros* [*Butcher*], *Vincellér* [*Winemaker*])
    3.2   dignity, position (e.g. *Haramia* [*Thug*], *Porkoláb* [*Ward*], *Vajda* [*Voivode*])
    3.3   social status (e.g. *Földes* [*Landowner*], *Jövevény* [*Newcomer*], *Polgár* [*Bourgeois*])
    3.4   financial status (e.g. *Garas* [*Penny*], *Krajcár* [*Kreutzer*], *Pénz* [*Money*])
    3.5   marital status (e.g. *Koca* [*Sow*], *Legény* [*Bachelor*])
4. connection of the person to a place (local function) (e.g. *Berzsenyi*, *Rába*, *Velemi*)
5. connection to a thing or a circumstance (episodic function)
    5.1   concrete thing (e.g. *Csöbör* [*Pail*])
    5.2   event (e.g. *Farsang* [*Carnival*], *Szarka* [*Magpie*], *Tavasz* [*Spring*])

---

3   Apart from the illustration of one category (1.2.), there are no examples in the database.

Of the 14,410 surnames in the Vas County material, a total of 4,831 are based on a Hungarian etymon, and they occur in 899 different name forms. These make up about one third of all surnames (33.52%). For technical reasons, I had to include an additional group (no. 6) of surnames originating from a Hungarian etymon where the naming motivation is uncertain. A total of 357 surnames (7.39%) belong to this group, and they occur in 297 types of surname form. Thus, 92.61% of the names of Hungarian origin can be classified in one of the five main categories mentioned above. Of course, after several hundred years it is natural that surnames can be classified into several categories in terms of their naming motivation, i.e. the exact reason for naming cannot always be determined. Such surnames include *Babos* [*Dotted*], *Csákó/Cakó* [*Cap*] or *Szemes* [*Eyed*]. The first may refer to an attribute or an occupation, the second may refer to an attribute as well, but also to a family relationship, or even to a connection to a specific thing. The third surname, similarly to the previous ones, may also refer to a family relationship, but it may refer to an attribute or an occupation as well. If all the multiple motivational possibilities are taken into account, it becomes clear that the number of name bearers is more than 100% (broken down: 4,831 surnames with 6,374 motivational possibilities), but for the purposes of the research, we must consider all possible motivations to be 100%. Below I look at the distribution of motivational possibilities in Vas County and then by district, and in the case of Kőszeg, at the town level.

	Data	%
1. Individual attribute	1,662	26.07
2. Connection to another person or group	2,039	31.99
3. Social role, status, condition	1,582	24.82
4. Relation to a place	638	10.01
5. Connection to a thing or circumstance	96	1.51
6. Uncertain	357	5.60
Total motivations	**6,374**	**100.00**

Table 8. Distribution of naming motivations in Vas County (AHSH, 1720)

It is striking that the vast majority of all motivational options are distributed among the first four categories, and in relatively even proportions (see Table 8). Most of these are related to naming referring to connections to other people or groups (with 2,039 data items, 31.99% of all motivational options fall into this category), followed by naming based on individual attributes (1,662 data items, 26.07%). By comparison, the proportion of surnames linked to social role, status or condition as a motivation for naming is only a few percent lower (1,582 data items, 24.82%). The connection of a person to a place is involved in one tenth of the naming motivations (638 data items, 10.01%), while the expression of a connection to a thing or circumstance plays a very minor role in the naming of persons, in only one and a half percent of cases (96 data items, 1.51%).

	Data	%
1. Individual attribute	132	24.63
2. Connection to another person or group	163	30.41
3. Social role, status, condition	164	30.60
4. Relation to a place	44	8.21
5. Connection to a thing or circumstance	12	2.24
6. Uncertain	21	3.92
Total motivations	**536**	**100.00**

Table 9. Distribution of naming motivations in the district of Árokköz (AHSH, 1720)

	Data	%
1. Individual attribute	273	22.67
2. Connection to another person or group	368	30.56
3. Social role, status, condition	350	29.07
4. Relation to a place	152	12.62
5. Connection to a thing or circumstance	11	0.91
6. Uncertain	50	4.15
Total motivations	**1,204**	**100.00**

Table 10. Distribution of naming motivations in the district of Kemenesalja (AHSH, 1720)

	Data	%
1. Individual attribute	337	26.08
2. Connection to another person or group	386	29.88
3. Social role, status, condition	382	29.57
4. Relation to a place	114	8.82
5. Connection to a thing or circumstance	29	2.24
6. Uncertain	44	3.41
Total motivations	**1,292**	**100.00**

Table 11. Distribution of naming motivations in the district of Kőszeg (AHSH, 1720)

	Data	%
1. Individual attribute	393	24.66
2. Connection to another person or group	528	33.12
3. Social role, status, condition	348	21.83
4. Relation to a place	184	11.54
5. Connection to a thing or circumstance	29	1.82
6. Uncertain	112	7.03
Total motivations	**1,594**	**100.00**

Table 12. Distribution of naming motivations in the district of Szombathely (AHSH, 1720)

	Data	%
1. Individual attribute	319	23.97
2. Connection to another person or group	530	39.82
3. Social role, status, condition	265	19.91
4. Relation to a place	95	7.14
5. Connection to a thing or circumstance	15	1.13
6. Uncertain	107	8.04
Total motivations	**1,331**	**100.00**

Table 13. Distribution of naming motivations in the district of Tótság (AHSH, 1720)

	Data	%
1. Individual attribute	18	13.64
2. Connection to another person or group	37	28.03
3. Social role, status, condition	16	12.12
4. Relation to a place	38	28.79
5. Connection to a thing or circumstance	0	0.00
6. Uncertain	23	17.42
Total motivations	**132**	**100.00**

Table 14. Distribution of naming motivations in Kőszeg (AHSH, 1720)

The percentage distribution at the county level is more or less the same for the districts and Kőszeg (see Table 9–14), and there are no significant differences among the proportions. In the district of Árokköz, the highest proportion of surnames belongs to the motivations referring to a social role, status or condition (164 data items, 30.60% of the motivations in the district); and in an almost equal ratio, the motivations referring to a connection to a person or group (163 data items, 3.41%). Naming that refers to individual attributes accounts for almost a quarter of the cases (132 data items, 24.63%); there is a much lower proportion of surnames that suggest a connection to a place (44 data items, 8.21%), and finally, the proportion of surnames that suggest a connection to a thing or circumstance (21 data items, 3.92%) is the lowest.

In the Kemenesalja district, there are also almost equal proportions of surnames referring to a person or group (368 data items, 30.56%) and to a social role, status or condition (350 data items, 29.07%). Individual attributes play a somewhat smaller role in the distribution of motivations for naming (273 data items, 22.67%), and even fewer surnames indicate a connection to a place (152 data items, 12.62%), while surnames indicating a connection to a thing or circumstance (50 data items, 4.15%) are the smallest in number.

The district of Kőszeg is the third (and last) of the districts where the motivation for naming based on a person or group (386 data items, 29.88%) and on a social role, status or condition (382 data items, 29.57%) are almost equally important. With a variation of a few percent, surnames referring to individual attributes are almost just as frequent (337 data

items, 26.08%). Much less frequent are the surnames referring to a relation to a place (114 data items, 8.82%) and to a thing or circumstance (29 data items, 2.24%).

The largest proportion of surnames in the Szombathely district draw on a motivation referring to a person or group of people (528 data items, 33.12%). Almost the same proportion of names refer to an individual attribute (393 data items, 24.66%) and to a social role, status or condition (348 data items, 21.83%). Just over a fifth of surnames refer to a connection to a place (29 data items, 1.82%); and (as in the previous districts) almost none to a thing or circumstance (29 data items, 1.82%).

More than one third of the surnames (530 data items, 39.82%) in the Tótság district refer to a connection to a person or a group of people; almost the same proportion refers to individual attributes (319 data items, 23.97%) and to social role, status or condition (265 data items, 19.91%). Naming was motivated to a much lesser extent by a connection to a place (95 data items, 7.14%) and by expressing a connection to a thing or circumstance (15 data items, 1.13%).

In the surname data from Kőszeg, almost equal proportions of motivation are found in the connection to a place (38 data items, 28.79%) and in the connection to a person or a group of people (37 data items, 28.03%). Once again, there is almost no difference between the expression of individual attributes (18 data items, 13.64%) and the expression of social role, status or condition in the naming (16 data items, 12.12%). One interesting result of the study is that there were no surnames whose motivation referred to the relation to a specific thing or circumstance.

	Data	%
2. Connection to another person or group	2,039	100.00
2.3. Connection to a people	712	34.92

Table 15. The proportion of surnames of ethnonymic origin in Vas County (AHSH, 1720)

	Data	%
2. Connection to another person or group	163	100.00
2.3. Connection to a people	52	31.90

Table 16. The proportion of surnames of ethnonymic origin in the district of Árokköz (AHSH, 1720)

	Data	%
2. Connection to another person or group	368	100.00
2.3. Connection to a people	140	38.04

Table 17. The proportion of surnames of ethnonymic origin in the district of Kemenesalja (AHSH, 1720)

	Data	%
2. Connection to another person or group	386	100.00
2.3. Connection to a people	164	42.49

Table 18. The proportion of surnames of ethnonymic origin in the district of Kőszeg (AHSH, 1720)

	Data	%
2. Connection to another person or group	528	100.00
2.3. Connection to a people	224	42.42

Table 19. The proportion of surnames of ethnonymic origin in the district of Szombathely (AHSH, 1720)

	Data	%
2. Connection to another person or group	530	100.00
2.3. Connection to a people	126	23.77

Table 20. The proportion of surnames of ethnonymic origin in the district of Tótság (AHSH, 1720)

	Data	%
2. Connection to another person or group	37	100.00
2.3. Connection to a people	6	16.22

Table 21. The proportion of surnames of ethnonymic origin in Kőszeg (AHSH, 1720)

Looking at the naming motivation subcategories, the range of surnames of ethnonymic origin deserves special attention (see Tables 15–21), namely because of the high number of main categories (connection to other people, groups of people) as well as the proportion of the subcategories within the main category: at county level this naming motivation group is almost exclusive, and at district level (including Kőszeg) it has the highest percentage. For the county as a whole, the surnames that refer to a connection to other people or groups as a naming motivation category account for slightly more than one third (34.92% of the 712 data items) of the surnames that refer to a connection to people. In terms of the distribution among the districts (and the town of Kőszeg), the highest percentage of this category is found in the district of Kőszeg (164 data items, 42.49%), presumably because of its peripheral location and, consequently, the more pronounced nature of inter-ethnic relations, followed (in decreasing order) by the district of Szombathely (224 data items, 42.42%), which is located further south but also on the periphery, the two inland districts, Kemenesalja (140 data items, 38.04%) and Árokköz (52 data items, 31.90%), then – interestingly, since it is also a peripheral district – by Tótság (126 data items, 23.77%). Lastly, the aforementioned town of Kőszeg has the lowest ratio (6 data items, 16.22%).

4. In my study, I examined the data from Vas County included in the National Tax Census of the year 1720 (Conscriptio Regnicolaris) included in the AHSH database from two points of view. On the one hand, by using the name analysis method I sought to find an answer to the question of the distribution of origin that can be observed in the surnames at that time. The surnames of Vas County are divided into three categories: German, Hungarian and Slavic. The high representation of the two other groups beside the Hungarian etymon group is clearly due to the double border region and the higher degree of inter-ethnic relations as a result, compared to the more inland segments of the language area. The distribution of surname etymons among Kőszeg and the districts nuances the picture even more. A greater number of Hungarian surname etymons are found in the northern (Kőszeg) and inland (Kemenesalja and Árokköz) districts of the county. In the town of Kőszeg, as well as in the district of Szombathely on the western border, names with a German etymon dominate, as do, for understandable reasons, names with a Slavic etymon in the district of Tótság at the south-southwestern border.

On the other hand, using the functional-semantic theoretical framework of János N. Fodor (2010) for the study of personal names in the Upper Tisza region, I examined the naming motivations of the surnames of Hungarian origin in Vas County, broken down by district, and separately for Kőszeg. The results showed that Hungarian names account for about one third (33.52%) of the total number of surnames, and 92.61% of these can be classified into one of the five naming motivation categories (individual attribute; connection to people, groups of people; social role, status, condition; connection to a place; connection to things or circumstances). At both county and district level (or urban in the case of Kőszeg), it was found that the vast majority of all motivational options were distributed among the first four categories. This distribution is relatively even at the county level, but at the level of the districts and Kőszeg the picture is more nuanced. After reviewing this I briefly presented the percentage distribution of ethnonymic surnames at county level, and then at district (and Kőszeg) level. Given its peripheral location and the higher degree of interethnic relations as a result, the distribution percentage among the districts (and the town of Kőszeg) within this category is the highest in the district of Kőszeg, followed by the district of Szombathely, which is further south but also a peripheral district, the two inland districts of Kemenesalja and Árokköz, and then, interestingly, since it is also a peripheral district, Tótság. Finally, the mentioned ratio is the lowest in the town of Kőszeg. ∎

LITERATURE

AHSH. [TMCsA.] *Történeti magyar családnévatlasz (1715–1720).* Elektronikusan tárolt adatbázis. Kutatásvezető: N. Fodor János.

CsnE. 2010. Hajdú Mihály: *Családnevek enciklopédiája.* Tinta Kiadó, Budapest, 2010.

CSnSz. 1993. Kázmér Miklós: *Régi magyar családnevek szótára.* XIV–XVII. század. Magyar Nyelvtudományi Társaság, Budapest, 1993.

Demeter–Bagdi 2009. Demeter Gábor – Bagdi Róbert (szerk.): *Asszimiláció és migráció Északkelet-Magyarországon és a Partiumban 1715–1992.* Kossuth Egyetemi Kiadó, Debrecen, 2009.

Demeter 2009. Demeter Gábor: A névelemzés: divat vagy történeti rekonstrukciós módszer? Kísérlet a XVIII. szaázadi összeírások migrációs és asszimilációs célú felhasználására. In: Demeter Gábor – Bagdi Róbert (szerk.): *Migráció és asszimiláció Északkelet-Magyarországon és a partiumban 1715–1992.* Kossuth Egyetemi Kiadó, Debrecen, 2009. 5–11.

DFn. 2008. Kohlheim, Rosa – Kohlheim, Volker: *Duden Familiennamen. Herkunft und Bedeutung von 20 000 Nachnamen.* Dudenverlag, Mannheim–Leipzig–Wien–Zürrich, 2008.

Egyed 2013. Egyed Noémi: Német eredetű családnevek Vas megyében az 1720. évi országos összeírás alapján. In: Vörös Ferenc (szerk.): *A nyelvföldrajztól a névföldrajzig IV.* A nyelvi kölcsönhatások és a személynevek. Savaria University Press, Szombathely, 2013. 109–113.

Farkas 2015. Farkas Tamás: Családnév és etnikum: utak és lehetőségek a magyar és a nemzetközi alkalmazott névtani kutatásokban. In: Vörös Ferenc (szerk.): *A nyelvföldrajztól a névföldrajzig VI.* Határtalan névföldrajz. Imre Samu Nyelvi Intézet Kiadványai V. UMIZ – Imre Samu Nyelvi Intézet, Unterwart/Alsóőr–Budapest, 2015. 187–211.

N. Fodor 2010. N. Fodor János: *Személynevek rendszere a kései ómagyar korban.* A Felső-Tisza-vidék személyneveinek nyelvi elemzése (1401–1526). Magyar Névtani Értekezések 2. ELTE BTK, Budapest, 2010.

N. Fodor 2011. N. Fodor János: Név és etnikum összefüggésének nyelvföldrajzi vonatkozásai a Történeti Magyar Családnévatlasz példaanyagában. In: Vörös Ferenc (szerk.): *A nyelvföldrajztól a névföldrajzig II.* Családnév – helynév – kisebbségek. Savaria University Press, Szombathely, 2011. 95–108.

N. Fodor 2012. N. Fodor János: Családnevek történeti tanulságai Partium késő középkori és újkori névanyaga alapján. *Helynévtörténeti Tanulmányok,* 7. (2012) 143–158.

N. Fodor 2013. N. Fodor, János: Geolinguistics research of historical personal names found in Carpathian Basin. In: Oliviu Felecan (ed.): *Proceedings of the Second International Conference on Onomastics "Name and Naming": Onomastics in Contemporary Public Space.* Editura Mega, Editura Argonaut, Cluj-Napoca, 2013. 518–527.

N. Fodor 2014a. N. Fodor János: A történeti személynévföldrajz mint a nyelvföldrajz egyik kutatási területe I. A nyelvföldrajzi módszer a névtani kutatásokban. *Névtani Értesítő,* 36. (2014) 23–41.

N. Fodor 2014b. N. Fodor János: Névföldrajz és etimológia. Mutatvány a Történeti magyar családnévatlasz térképlapjaiból. *Magyar Nyelvőr,* 138. (2014) 451–460.

N. Fodor 2015. N. Fodor János: Történeti személynévkutatás. In: Farkas Tamás – Slíz Mariann (szerk.): *Magyar névkutatás a 21. század elején.* Magyar Nyelvtudományi Társaság – ELTE Magyar Nyelvtudományi és Finnugor Intézet, Budapest, 2015. 115–144.

N. Fodor 2016a. N. Fodor János: Moson megye etnikai térszerkezete a 18. század első felében. In: Vörös Ferenc (szerk.): *A nyelvföldrajztól a névföldrajzig VII.* Névregionalizmusok. Savaria University Press, Szombathely, 2016. 67–86.

N. Fodor 2016b. N. Fodor János: Nyelvészeti módszerek a magyar népiségtörténeti kutatásokban. In: Czetter Ibolya – Hajba Renáta – Tóth Péter (szerk.): *VI. Dialektológiai Szimpozion.* Szombathely, 2015. szeptember 2–4. Nyugat-magyarországi Egyetem Savaria Egyetemi Központja – Nyitrai Konstantin Filozófus Egyetem Közép-európai Tanulmányok Kar, Szombathely–Nyitra, 2016. 231–243.

N. Fodor–F. Láncz 2011. N. Fodor János – F. Láncz Éva: A Történeti Magyar Családnévatlasz előmunkálatairól. *Névtani Értesítő,* 33. (2011) 175–190.

Hajdú 2003. Hajdú Mihály: *Általános és magyar névtan.* Személynevek. Osiris Kiadó, Budapest, 2003.

Juhász 2003. Juhász Dezső: A nyelvföldrajz magyar eredményeiből. In: Kiss Jenő (szerk.): *Magyar dialektológia.* Osiris Kiadó, Budapest, 2003. 111–130.

Kaposi 2015. Kaposi Diána: Somogy megye történeti családneveinek névföldrajzi vizsgálata – különös tekintettel a név és az etnikum összefüggéseire. In: P. Kocsis Réka – Szentgyörgyi Rudolf (szerk.): *Anyanyelvünk évszázadai 1.* ELTE Magyar Nyelvtörténeti, Szociolingvisztikai, Dialektológiai Tanszék, Budapest, 2015. 149–159.

Kniezsa 1947/2003. Kniezsa István: A magyar és szlovák családnevek rendszere. In: Kniezsa István: *Helynév- és családnévvizsgálatok.* Lucidus Kiadó, Budapest, 1947/2003. 255–349.

P. Kocsis 2015. P. Kocsis Réka: Tolna megye 18. század eleji családneveinek vizsgálata – különös tekintettel a név és az etnikum összefüggéseire. In. P. Kocsis Réka – Szentgyörgyi Rudolf (szerk.): *Anyanyelvünk évszázadai 1.* ELTE Magyar Nyelvtörténeti, Szociolingvisztikai, Dialektológiai Tanszék, Budapest, 2015. 161–177.

Mizser 2000. Mizser Lajos: *Tirpák vezetéknevek.* Stúdium Kiadó, Nyíregyháza, 2000.

Pete 1999. Pete György (főszerk.): *Vas megye kézikönyve.* Magyarország megyei kézikönyvei 17. Ceba Kiadó – Életünk – Faludi Ferenc Alapítvány, Budapest, 1999.

Slíz 2011. Slíz Mariann: *Személynévadás az Anjou-korban.* Históriaantik Könyvesház Kiadó, Budapest, 2011.

Szentgyörgyi 2012. Szentgyörgyi Rudolf: Név, anyanyelv, identitás összefüggései a középmagyar kor boszorkánypereinek tükrében. *Helynévtörténeti Tanulmányok,* 7. (2012) 133–142.

Tolcsvai Nagy 2008. Tolcsvai Nagy Gábor: A tulajdonnév jelentése. In: Bölcskei Andrea – N. Császi Ildikó (szerk.): *Név és valóság.* A VI. Magyar Névtudományi Konferencia előadá-

sai. Balatonszárszó, 2007. június 22–24. KRE Magyar Nyelvtudományi Tanszékének Ki-adványai 1. KRE Magyar Nyelvtudományi Tanszék, Budapest, 2008. 468–474.

Vörös 2012. Vörös Ferenc: Nyelvjárásról, névföldrajzról, művelődés- és nyelvtörténetről a térinformatika korában. Újabb mutatvány a magyar családnévatlasz térképlapjaiból. In: Vörös Ferenc (szerk.): *A nyelvföldrajztól a névföldrajzig III.* Nyelvjárás – néprajz – művelődéstörténet. Savaria University Press, Szombathely, 2012. 13–59.

Vörös 2013. Vörös Ferenc: *Mutatvány az 1720-as országos összeírás névföldrajzából.* Savaria University Press, Szombathely, 2013.

Vörös 2015. Vörös Ferenc: Szlovák eredetű családnevek Kárpát-medencei névföldrajza. In: Vörös Ferenc – Misad Katalin (szerk.): *A nyelvföldrajztól a névföldrajzig V.* Interetnikus kapcsolatok. Szenczi Molnár Albert Egyesület, Pozsony, 2015. 15–42.

Vörös 2016. Vörös Ferenc: Családnév-regionalizmusok a 18. század eleji Magyar Királyság nyugati térségéből. In: Vörös Ferenc (szerk.): *A nyelvföldrajztól a névföldrajzig VII.* Névregionalizmusok. Savaria University Press, Szombathely, 2016. 11–38.

KIVONAT

A Vas megyei családnévállomány néhány történeti névföldrajzi tanulsága

Tanulmányomban a Történeti Magyar Családnévatlasz (TMCsA.) adatbázisa tartalmazta 1720. évi Országos adóösszeírás (Conscriptio Regnicolaris) Vas megyei anyagát vizsgáltam, mégpedig két megközelítésből. A névelemzés módszerének segítségül hívásával egyfelől arra kerestem választ, hogy milyen eredet szerinti megoszlás figyelhető meg a korabeli családnévetimonok tanúsága alapján. Vas megye névanyaga e szerint három kategória között oszlik meg: német, magyar és szláv. A magyar melletti két másik eredetű névetimoncsoport nagy arányú képviselete egyértelműen a kettős határvidék, és az ebből eredő interetnikus kapcsolatoknak a nyelvterület belsőbb fekvésű területeihez képesti fokozott meglétének tudható be. A családnévetimonoknak Kőszeg, és a járások közti megoszlása tovább árnyalja a képet. A magyar névetimonok nagyobb számban inkább a megye északi (Kőszegi), illetőleg belső fekvésű (Kemenesaljai és Árokközi) járásaiban találhatók. Kőszeg városában, épp úgy, mint a közvetlenül a nyugati határon fekvő Szombathelyi járásban már a német etimonú névviselők száma dominál, ahogyan a szláv pedig a Tótsági járásban, érthető okoknál fogva a déli-délnyugati peremen.

Másfelől pedig – N. Fodor Jánosnak (2010) a Felső-Tisza-vidék személynevei vizsgálata során alkalmazott funkcionális-szemantikai elméleti keretének segítségével – azt vizsgáltam, milyen névadási motivációk fordulnak elő Vas megye magyar eredetű családnévanyagában, járások szerinti bontásban, valamint Kőszeg esetében. Az eredmények rámutattak arra, hogy a magyar nevek a teljes családnévállomány mintegy egyharmadát teszik ki (33,52%), s ezeknek 92,61%-a besorolható az öt névadási motivációs kategória valamelyikébe (egyéni attribútum; emberekkel, embercsoportokkal való kapcsolat; társadalmi szerep, helyzet, állapot; helyhez való viszony; kapcsolat dolgokkal, körülménnyel). Megyei és járási (Kőszeg esetében: városi) szinten egyaránt kiütközik, hogy az összes motivációs lehetőség túlnyomó többsége az első négy kategória között oszlik meg. E megoszlás megyei szinten viszonylag kiegyenlített, de a járások és Kőszeg szintjén már árnyaltabb képet mutat. Ennek áttekintése után röviden bemutatom a népnévi eredetű családnevek megyei, majd járások (és Kőszeg) szintjén való százalékos megoszlását. Peremterület volta, s ebből következőleg az interetnikus kapcsolatok fokozottabb megléte miatt a járások (és Kőszeg város) közti megoszlást tekintve ez a kategórián belüli százalékos arány legnagyobb a Kőszegi járásban; ezt követi a tőle délebbre fekvő, de szintén peremvidék, a Szombathelyi járás; utána a két belső fekvésű járás, a Kemenesaljai és az Árokközi; majd – érdekes módon, hiszen ez is peremterület – a Tótsági. Végül az említett arány Kőszeg városában a legkisebb.