PAVOL ODALOŠ

Matej Bel University, Slovak Republic
ORCID ID: https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2238-5434
e-mail: pavol.odalos@umb.sk

Paradigmatic Types of Onomastics[1]

Paradygmatyczne typy onomastyki

1. DEFINING THE TERMINOLOGY

Paradigm

Thomas Samuel Kuhn (1962; 1997, p. 10) understands paradigm as a generally accepted set of research results, which represent a model of problems and a model of their solution for a community of experts at a point in time. A paradigm incorporates all generally accepted examples from the current scholarly practice including laws, theories, application, and devices. They also provide models in which specific cohesive research traditions are rooted (see also Viceník, 1999, pp. 312–316). Juraj Dolník (2009) presents Kuhn's paradigm as a scholarly paradigm referring to all generally accepted principles, theories, and models as a basis of all research.

1.1. Type

A type is a set of objects sharing an attribute (*Krátky slovník slovenského jazyka*, 2003, p. 792).

1.2. Type of a scholarly paradigm/paradigmatic type

If the term *scholarly paradigm* is combined with the term *type*, the result is a type of scholarly paradigm or paradigmatic type, a term that refers to a set of specific principles, theories, and models based on which problems are solved, and on whose basis solutions are proposed.

2. PARADIGMATIC TYPES OF ONOMASTICS

Onomastics as the study of proper names, but also proper names as a type of individual objects represent a research subject.

The onomastic paradigm

The onomastic paradigm incorporates onomastic approaches, which draw from specific principles, theories, and models. It provides the basis on which problems are formulated and serves as the foundation/starting point for achieving new onomastic results. In terms of specific approaches, there are several paradigmatic types of onomastics formed in diachronous and synchronous contexts.

Paradigmatic type of onomastics

A paradigmatic type of onomastics is a specific onomastic approach, which draws from principles, theories, and models. Based on them, certain onomastic problems are formulated at a point in time and new onomastic results are presented.

2.1. Historical-etymological paradigmatic types of onomastics

Historical-etymological paradigmatic types of onomastics are the default paradigmatic types of onomastics.

2.1.1. Determination by historical-comparative grammar
The historical-etymological paradigmatic types of onomastics were determined by historical-comparative grammar as the dominant scholarly paradigm of 19th-century linguistics; its research results include, e.g. genetic language classification (with the effort to identify/reconstruct the protolanguage), description of the languages in the Indo-European language family, theory of language relations, etc. The historical-etymological paradigmatic types of onomastics spring from

the interest in the origin of proper names. A predecessor to this type of research can be found in works by polymaths and experts in fields other than linguistics or onomastics. Section 2.1.2 draws from Rudolf Krajčovič's study entitled *Počiatky a vývin slovenskej onomastiky* (1959, pp. 255–280).

2.1.2. Ján Stanislav

In his works, e.g. *Slovenský juh v stredoveku* (1948), Ján Stanislav reconstructs the southernmost border of the Western-Slovak ethnic group based on a linguistic analysis of toponymic material from the former regions of Hungarian Kingdom in today's Southern Slovakia and partly in Northern Hungary. It is typical for Stanislav's method to draw from old records – local or personal names in old written documents, which he reconstructs while relying on the available knowledge and laws of development in individual Slavic languages; eventually, he verifies/proves the results using an inventory of names pertaining to current Slavic languages.

In his study entitled *Zo slovenského sociálneho zemepisu. Odraz rozkladu rodového zriadenia* (1951), Stanislav draws from the idea that local names with roots consisting of personal names without suffixes are remnants of the clanship system. Those names should pertain to families. Local names with possessive suffixes reflect (early) feudalism. The thesis is documented using proper names *Gorazd* and *Goražď*. The names **GorazdЬ* with the personal name in the root located nearby the cities of Nitra and Galanta prove that the family was growing – these are traces of the clanship system. The name **Gorazd-jЬ* or *Goražď* nearby Galanta is a trace of the name from early feudalism.

2.1.3. Characteristics of the historical-etymological paradigmatic type of onomastics

The historical-etymological paradigmatic type of onomastics is defined by principles, theories, and models based on the historical approach to language and interest in the origin of proper names. The historical-etymological paradigmatic type of onomastics has influenced, e.g. Stanislav's clanship names with the proper name without a suffix, i.e. early feudal proper names with suffix; it also influenced the research of all names (not only contemporary ones) in the diachronous approach, name reconstruction, comparison with Slavic material, and drawing conclusions in the context of other relevant scholarly disciplines.

2.2. Structuralist/systemic linguistic paradigmatic type of onomastics

In the 1910s, Ferdinand de Saussure introduced a new scholarly paradigm in linguistics based on the idea that *language is a system of signs*, which consists

of certain elements. The new paradigm was complex in comparison to the partial scholarly paradigm of the 19th-century historical and comparative grammar.

2.2.1. Determination by structuralism

In terms of onomastic research, the Saussure's thesis was applied to study the system of proper names/onyms incorporating different types of proper names. The research of onymy types in smaller and larger territories as well as at different points in time was performed and subsequently summarised in studies, monographs, and dictionaries.

2.2.2. Onomastic terminology

At the end of 1950s, the need to systematise onomastic terminology on the level of Slavic nations emerged. However, the shift towards structuralism in onomastics was pointed out earlier. In Polish onomastics, Ewa Rzetelska-Feleszko (2003) states that in relation to Stanisław Rospond, Polish onomastics shifted towards structuralism, which reflected in using terminology such as onomastic stratigraphy, toponomastic system, one/two-name system, one/two-element system, name models, etc. The basic system and terminology of Slavic onomastics were published in 1973 – it incorporated the system of onomastic terminology (part A, onomastic terminology arranged according to objects and phenomena labelled with proper names) and terminology arranged according to topics (part B, terms of description and processing proper names) (Svoboda et al., 1973).

The basic term on which onomastic terminology was founded was *onym*. The term is used in all Slavic onomastics (*onim*/*onym*). Czech and Slovak onomastics uses the term *onymum*. Libuše Olivová-Nezbedová (1998) ascribes the use of this term to Vladimír Šmilauer. However, its emergence has not been explained. The author has presented possible explanations at the 20th Slovak Onomastic Conference in Banská Bystrica in 2017 (Odaloš, 2019). The probable explanation may be related to the German onomastic dictionary by Teodolius Witkowski (1964), which refers to specific terms using "onymum": p. 27 – *ethnonym(um)*, p. 83 – *toponym(um)*. Both terms include "onymum" with the -*um* suffix. Possibly, the two terms containing "onymum" served as the starting point for Šmilauer when he abstracted *onymum* as a term, which he subsequently started using to refer to any/all proper names. At the turn of the 1960s and 1970s, the terms with the "onymum" part were already established in Czechoslovak (Czech and Slovak) onomastics: *exotoponymum*, *chorionymum*, *potamonymum*, *limnonymum* (Svoboda, 1967, pp. 133–136), *hydronymum*, *toponymum*, *mikrotoponymum* (Knap, 1968, p. 71), *toponymum* (Majtán, 1968, p. 97), *oronymum* (Skála, 1970, p. 219), and *hydronymum* (Šula, 1971, p. 695). The system of terminology was categorised dichotomously to bionyms (*anthroponym*, *pseudo*

anthroponym, *zoonym*, *pseudo zoonym*, *phytonym*) and abionyms (*toponym* / *cosmonym*, *geonym* / *chrematonym*), thus, unifying the terminology in Slavic languages and German (German Democratic Republic).

The development of onomastic research in the second half of the 20th and in the 21st centuries was characterised by onomastic research of types, mainly chrematonomastic research, which also reflected in the most recent categorisations (Šrámek, 1999; Blanár, 2008; Odaloš, 2019). A shift can be observed from dichotomous classification bionym – abionym to trichotomous one: bionym – geonym – chrematonym.

2.2.3. Studying onymic types

Onymic types were studied in terms of anthroponyms, e.g. in Slovak (Blanár and Matejčík, 1978/1983; Valentová, 2009) toponyms (Majtán, 1996; Krško, 2001; Rožai, 2017), chrematonyms (Imrichová, 2002; Odaloš, 2012a). Onymic types have also been fixated in dictionaries (Majtán and Rymut, 1985; Majtán and Žigo, 1999; Krško, 2003; Hladký, 2004), etc.

2.2.4. The Czechoslovak school of onomastic modelling

The term *(onymic) model* was introduced by Rospond, the creator of structural-grammatical toponym classification (1951). The structuralist understanding of a model in onomastics was presented by Vincent Blanár in his research on live personal names in Slovakia (Blanár and Matejčík, 1978). Blanár created models by mapping the system of anthroponomastic semantic signs. In anthroponomastics, multiple experts employed modelling (Valentová, 2009; Jozefovič, 2010; Kazík, 2010; Kopásková, 2010). Rudolf Šrámek created models based on content-semantic categories in terms of oikonymy (1999, pp. 36–37, before 1972, 1976). Šrámek efforts were followed by Jana Pleskalová (1992) in anoikonymy. Pavol Odaloš (2015) created chrematonymic models by recording the semantic attributes of different chrematonym types.

The presented modelling approach of Czechoslovak onomastic experts is referred to as the Czechoslovak school of onomastic modelling in this article, because the theoretical base of the modelling approach and the first/starting point models were both introduced by Slovak and Czech onomastics during the existence of Czechoslovakia as a country of two nations: Czech and Slovak (see Odaloš, 2012b).

2.2.5. The characteristics of the structuralist/systemic linguistic paradigmatic type of onomastics

The structuralist/systemic linguistic paradigmatic type of onomastics is defined by principles, theories, and models based on the understanding of onymy as a system

and interpreting its elements. This paradigmatic type of onomastics influenced, e.g. research on onymic types, system of Slavic onomastic terminology, onomastic schools (see Odaloš, 2018), ways of onomastic modelling, onomastic paradigm, etc.

2.3. The paradigmatic type of onomastics and other disciplines

In the second half of the 20th century, multiple borderline scholarly disciplines emerged by combining linguistics and other fields, e.g. sociolinguistics (linguistics + sociology), ethnolinguistics (linguistics + ethnology), or pragmalinguistics (linguistics + pragmatics), etc.

The purpose of the communication-pragmatic turn in linguistics was the transition from studying language as a system to studying the way it functions in communication; research became more specific, e.g. the influence of society, ethnic group, sex, or other categories on language. In terms of this hybrid paradigmatic type of onomastics, the onomastic concepts whose emergence was initiated by other fields will be discussed.

2.3.1. The concept of language memory

Maurice Halbwachs' collective memory (presented on musicians) (1939; 2009) is created by memories adapted to the requirements and thoughts of the group to which an individual belongs or wants to belong, which contributes to the formation of group identity (Šubrt and Pfeiferová, 2010, p. 15). Besides collective memory, there are different types of memory, e.g. social memory (precondition for group integrity), cultural memory (a type of collective memory institutionalised in the form of memorials/memory sites, important for the intergenerational transfer in terms of group identity), or communication memory (taking place in common communication between the group members) (see Rožai, 2018).

Naturally, application of different memory types in different scholarly fields brings different results. There is a number of ways in which the concept of language memory can be applied in onomastics. For example, Pavel Štěpán (2016) understands memory in the context of onomastics and anoikonyms as the memory of land; extinct objects are hereby presented through motivational attributes and formal features as language memory in relation to no longer existing language categories (words, meaning, functions) as well as a memory of memorials that record the anoikonymy going extinct along with its motivation. This type of memory can be applied in the context of linguistic recording and analysing selected anoikonyms of the past. It includes working with certain onymic types and their language characteristics instead of studying anoikonymy in a social group or its language/onymic identity.

2.3.1.1. ONYMIC IDENTITY

The term *onymic identity* (individual, group) means an application of the concept of language memory to onomastics. In terms of Halbwachs' collective memory, the important memories of a social group should be studied. These memories help create the identity.

Identity (in psychology) represents a person's feeling of unity and completeness in terms of being distinctive and unique, including continuity in time, the meaning of their existence, and their position in the broader context of human society and culture – an authentic feeling of being themselves. The levels of identity are as following: individual/personal identity, social identity (the experience of belonging to a social group/social categories, result of inter-group differentiation into us and them), collective identity (shared group norms, values, and ideology providing more than just similarity among group members), and cultural identity (defining affiliation with a broader community with shared culture) (*Encyclopaedia Beliana*, 2010, p. 626).

Individual onymic identity is a person's onymic identity formed in diachronous and synchronous contexts through memories of onyms of personal identification (name and surname/own or one's friends'), local identification onyms in terms of living (street, place, country), workplace, or other onymic identifications (favourite singer's name, song, musical composition, sports club, place of summer vacation, etc.). Group onymic identity can form based on group characteristics, e.g. in the context of sports – one's sports club, names of fellow sportspeople, names of rivals, names of top domestic and foreign sportspeople, etc.

2.3.2. The country of language concept

The concept (term) is used in cultural geography. The term was defined by Rodrigue Landry and Richard Bourhis (1997, p. 28) and it refers to the language of traffic signs, advertising billboards, names of streets and squares, names of public facilities, and governmental buildings. Jaroslav David and Přemysl Mácha (2014, p. 41) critically assess the "country of language" context, because it does not cover all forms and manifestations of language, merely its written form as manifested in the public space. It works with standardised urbanonymy, country toponyms, and unofficial toponymy. David and Mácha practically focus on a single type of toponymy, which draws them towards systemic linguistic onomastics – they study a limited part of the country of language, some kind of a toponymic country. This approach can also create a country of anthroponymy or chrematonymy. Therefore, a question can be asked, whether there really is a country of language or this modern approach merely covers the research of official and unofficial toponymy, emphasizing identity, meaning, and linguistic aspects of toponymy.

The "country of language" potential lies in its original focus – studying the visually available appellative and proprial language (visible bionyms, geonyms, and chrematonyms in the country), or related language categories (language manifestations, language perception by an individual or a social group), determination of the language by society, state/politics, power, or ethnic groups.

2.3.3. The concept of onymic register

2.3.3.1. SOCIOLINGUISTIC/PRAGMATIC REGISTER

Dana Slančová (1999, pp. 93–110) introduced the most complex understanding of a register in both Slovak and foreign literature. For the first time, the term *register* was used in 1956 (Reid, pp. 28–37) and Slančová cites it according to Elaine Andersen (1992) in the context of bilingualism and realisation that in many language communities, people use language X in certain situations and language Y in others. The sociolinguistic understanding of a register is of a two-fold nature: 1) register as a set of lexical means shared by professional or social groups (Wardhaugh, 1986), e.g. the vocabulary of surgeons, politicians, etc. and 2) register as a language variety, i.e. not only the set of lexical means, but also the way it is used. From the pragmatic viewpoint, a register refers to people's ability to indicate and change their attitude to their communication partner using language means, e.g. formal and informal registers. Slančová (1999, p. 96) defines *register* as a situationally determined way of language expression related to a particular type of social activity. She proposes three types of its characteristics: 1) situational, based on the communication sphere and social environment, 2) based on the code, spoken/written registers, 3) based on the set of lexical means used in certain communicational situations.

2.3.3.2. ONYMIC REGISTER

Jaromír Krško (2016, p. 25) defines an onymic register as a set of onymic (language) and extralingual means used in certain communication spheres and situations, which are determined by social, communication, macrosocial and microsocial norms. In his analysis, Krško studied 573 names on the Facebook social network. He does not study them in terms of communication or observe this context – he works with first names, surnames, pseudonyms, logonyms, and their characteristics based on traditional symbols proposed by Blanár and Ján Matejčík (Krško, 2018, p. 67). This way, models are created. The onymic register therefore consists of models.

This approach might be problematic in the following regard: models, functional elements, and modelling are typical categories of structuralist onomastics, in which the models are formed based on functional elements that create the structure of models/names. However, structuralist onomastics works with sets instead of

communication registers. The communication register approach and the approach of structuralist linguistics both came to the same result: the model.

Both communication and onymic registers record onyms in the context of communication, emphasizing different aspects of approaching onyms in their natural context, e.g. 1) qualitative approach: studying communication onymic variants or other ways of communication determination by the society, 2) quantitative approach, 2a – studying the importance of an element in the onymic register represented as frequency, i.e. its occurrence in the register, 2b – continuity of its occurrence, i.e. whether it occurs in all registers or just in one or two of them, 2c – in the position of the element in the register (front, middle, rear) (Odaloš, 2014).

2.4. New or traditional onymic approaches?

After introducing the concepts of language memory, country of language, and onymic communication register, the following question arises: do the new approaches really represent new, unique developments in onomatics or do they merely cover the traditional or slightly modified systemic linguistic approaches to types of onymy?

The potential of the language memory lies in its relationship to the social group and its onymic identity; the country of language concept can be applied in research of visually available appellative and proprial language; the potential of the communication onymic register can be revealed in research on communication quality in proper names, e.g. social determination of onyms. Could structuralist systemic linguistic onomastics be used instead? All the presented concepts of language memory, country of language, communication onymic register belong to the socionomastic paradigmatic type of onomastics, which studies the influence of society/group on a language.

2.5. Characteristics of the socionomastic paradigmatic type of onomastics

The socionomastic paradigmatic type of onomastics is defined by principles, theories, and models based on the way onymy functions in actual social communication, it aims to uncover the influence of society on the onyms.

3. CONCLUSIONS

By discussing the historical-etymological paradigmatic type of onomastics, structuralist-systemic linguistic paradigmatic type of onomastics, and socionomastic paradigmatic type of onomastics, we aimed to show that different principles,

theories, and models are used in onomastics. They (should) lead towards different and unique, but mainly new and original results in onomastics.

Translated into English by Marianna Bachledová

REFERENCES

Andersen, Elaine Slossberg. (1992). *Speaking with Style. The Sociolinguistic Skills of Children.* London–New York: Routledge.

Blanár, Vincent. (2008). *Vlastné meno vo svetle teoretickej onomastiky.* Bratislava*:* Slovenská jazykovedná spoločnosť pri SAV, Jazykovedný ústav Ľ. Štúra SAV.

Blanár, Vincent, Matejčík, Ján. (1978). *Živé osobné mená na strednom Slovensku.* I. 1. *Designácia osobného mena.* Bratislava: Veda.

Blanár, Vincent, Matejčík, Ján. (1983). *Živé osobné mená na strednom Slovensku.* I. 2. *Distribúcia obsahových modelov.* Martin: Osveta.

David, Jaroslav, Mácha, Přemysl. (2014). *Názvy míst. Paměť, identita, kultúrní dědictví.* Brno: Host, vydavatelství.

Dolník, Juraj. (2009). *Všeobecná jazykoveda. Opis a vysvetľovanie jazyka.* Bratislava: Veda.

Encyclopaedia Beliana. Slovenská všeobecná encyklopédia. (2010). Vol. 6 His–Im. Bratislava: Encyklopedický ústav SAV.

Halbwachs, Maurice. (1939). La mémoire collective chez les musiciens. *Revue philosophique*, *127(3–4)*, pp. 136–165.

Halbwachs, Maurice. (2009). *Kolektivní paměť.* Praha: Sociologické nakladatelství.

Hladký, Juraj. (2004). *Hydronymie povodia Nitry.* Trnava: Trnavská univerzita.

Imrichová, Mária. (2002). *Logonymá v systéme slovenčiny.* Prešov: Prešovská univerzita v Prešove.

Jozefovič, Michal. (2010). Modelovanie slovotvorby živých osobných mien. In: Josef Hladký, Iveta Valentová (eds.), *Lexika slovenskej onymie* (pp. 283–296). Bratislava: Veda.

Kačala, Ján, Pisárčiková, Mária, Považaj, Matej (eds.) (2003). *Krátky slovník slovenského jazyka.* Bratislava: Veda.

Kazík, Miroslav. (2010). Živé osobné mená v triede vydatých žien v Súši. In: Josef Hladký, Iveta Valentová (eds.), *Lexika slovenskej onymie* (pp. 233–241). Bratislava: Veda.

Knap, Eugen. (1968). Problém hydronyma a toponyma Cidlina. In: Vladimír Šmilauer (ed.), *Onomastické práce. Svazek 2. Sborník rozprav k sedemdesátým narozeninám univ. prof. dr. Witolda Taszyckého* (pp. 69–76). Praha: Místopisná komise ČSAV.

Kopásková, Ivana. (2010). Živé osobné mená v Krásne nad Kysucou. In: Josef Hladký, Iveta Valentová (eds.), *Lexika slovenskej onymie* (pp. 297–303). Bratislava: Veda.

Krajčovič, Rudolf. (1959). Počiatky a vývin slovenskej onomastiky. *Onomastica*, *8*, pp. 256–280.

Krško, Jaromír. (2001). *Terénne názvy z Muránskej doliny.* Banská Bystrica: Univerzita Mateja Bela.

Krško, Jaromír. (2003). *Hydronymia povodia Turca.* Banská Bystrica: Univerzita Mateja Bela.

Krško, Jaromír. (2016). *Všeobecnolingvistické aspekty onymie. (Z problematiky onymického komunikačného registra).* Banská Bystrica: Belianum.

Krško, Jaromír. (2018). Antroponymá používateľov sociálnej siete Facebook ako súčasť antroponymického komunikačného registra. *Slovenská reč*, *83(1)*, pp. 58–75.

Kuhn, Thomas S. (1962). *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Kuhn, Thomas S. (1997). *Struktura vědeckých revolucí.* Praha: Oikoymenh.

Landry, Rodrigue, Bourhis, Richard. (1997). Linguistic Landscape and Ethnolinguistic Vitality. An Empirical Study. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, *16(1)*, pp. 23–49.

Majtán, Milan. (1968). Výskum mikrotoponymie a údaje o charaktere nazývaných objektov. In: Vladimír Šmilauer (ed.), *Onomastické práce. Svazek 2. Sborník rozprav k sedemdesátým narozeninám univ. prof. dr. Witolda Taszyckého* (pp. 97–98). Praha: Místopisná komise ČSAV.

Majtán, Milan. (1996). *Z lexiky slovenskej toponymie*. Bratislava: Veda.

Majtán, Milan, Rymut, Kazimierz. (1985). *Hidronimia dorzecza Orawy*. Wrocław–Warszawa–Kraków–Gdańsk–Łodź: Zakład Narodowy imienia Ossolińskich, Wydawnictwo Polskiej Akademii Nauk.

Majtán, Milan, Žigo, Pavol. (1999). *Hydronymia povodia Ipľa*. Bratislava: Jazykovedný ústav Ľudovíta Štúra SAV, Filozofická fakulta Univerzity Komenského.

Odaloš, Pavol. (2012a). *Literáronymá v slovenskej literatúre*. Banská Bystrica: Univerzita Mateja Bela.

Odaloš, Pavol. (2012b). Kontinuita jednotlivého a všeobecného v onomastike. In: Martin Ološtiak (ed.), *Jednotlivé a všeobecné v onomastike* (pp. 14–21). Prešov: Filozofická fakulta Prešovskej univerzity.

Odaloš, Pavol. (2014). Modelovosť a registrovosť v onomastike. In: Jana Keselová, Mária Imrichová, Martin Ološtiak (eds.), *Registre jazyka a jazykovedy (I). Na počesť Daniely Slančovej* (pp. 116–123). Prešov: Filozofická fakulta Prešovskej univerzity.

Odaloš, Pavol. (2015). Modelovanie a modely chrématoným. In: Iveta Valentová (ed.), *19. slovenská onomastická konferencia* (pp. 464–472). Bratislava: Jazykovedný ústav Ľ. Štúra SAV.

Odaloš, Pavol. (2018). Tradícia a dynamika onomastickej terminológie a terminológia onomastických škôl. In: Urszula Bijak, Halszka Górny, Małgorzata Magda-Czekaj (eds.), *Onomastyka, neohumanistyka, nauki społeczne* (pp. 379–384). Kraków: Polska Akademia Nauk.

Odaloš, Pavol. (2019). Sústava slovenskej onomastickej terminológie (vznik, existencia, variantné možnosti vývoja a štandardizácie). In: Alexandra Chomová, Jaromír Krško, Iveta Valentová (eds.), *Konvergencie a divergencie v propriálnej sfére* (pp. 116–123). Banská Bystrica, Bratislava: Veda, vydavateľstvo Slovenskej akadémie vied.

Olivová-Nezbedová, Libuše. (1998). K hierarchii onomastických termínů podle objektů pojmenovaných vlastními jmény. *Acta Onomastica*, *39*, pp. 46–54.

Pleskalová, Jana. (1992). *Tvoření pomístních jmen na Moravě a ve Slezsku*. Jinočany: H&H.

Reid, Thomas Bertram Wallace. (1956). Linguistics, Structuralism and Philology. *Archivum Linguisticum*, *8(1)*, pp. 28–37.

Rospond, Stanisław. (1951). *Słownik nazw geograficznych Polski zachodniej i północnej*. Cz. I: *polsko-niemiecka*, Cz. II: *niemiecko-polska*. Wrocław: Wrocławskie Towarzystwo Naukowe.

Rožai, Gabriel. (2017). *Terénne názvy hornogemerských obcí Rejdová a Vyšná Slaná*. Rožňava: Gabriel Rožai.

Rožai, Gabriel. (2018). Pamäť a regionálna toponymia. 1. časť. *Slovenská reč*, *83(1)*, pp. 47–57.

Rzetelska-Feleszko, Ewa. (2003). Specyfika polskich szkół onomastycznych. Związki (lub ich brak) z onomastyką innych krajów słowiańskich. In: Roma Łobodzińska (ed.), *Przeszłość, teraźniejszość i przyszłość polskiej onomastyki* (pp. 27–32). Wrocław: Wydawnictwo WTN.

Slančová, Daniela. (1999). Potrebuje reflexia súčasnej slovenskej jazykovej situácie pojem register? In: Pavol Odaloš (ed.), *Retrospektívne a perspektívne pohľady na jazykovú komunikáciu* (pp. 93–100). Banská Bystrica: Univerzita Mateja Bela.

Skála, Emil. (1970). K typologii dvoujazyčných oronym v Čechách. *Zpravodaj Místopisné komise ČSAV*, *11*, pp. 209–223.

Stanislav, Ján. (1948). *Slovenský juh v stredoveku I. Turčiansky sv.* Martin: Jazykovedný odbor Matice slovenskej.

Stanislav, Ján. (1951). Zo slovenského sociálneho zemepisu. Odraz rozkladu rodového zriadenia v miestnych názvoch na Slovensku. *Jazykovedný zborník*, *5*, pp. 58–96.

Svoboda, Ján. (1966). Zpráva z terminologické subkomise. In: Ján Svoboda, Libuše Nezbedová (eds.), *Třetí zasedání mezinárodní komise pro slovanskou onomastiku při Mezinárodním komitétu slavistů*

v Domě vědeckých pracovníků ČSAV v Liblicích u Prahy 14–17/9/1966. Sborník referátů. Zvláštní příloha Zpravodaje Místopisné komise ČSAV (pp. 127–138). Praha: Kníhtisk.

Svoboda, Ján et al. (1973). Základní soustava a terminologie slovanské onomastiky. *Zpravodaj Místopisné komise ČSAV*, *14(1)*, pp. 1–280.

Šrámek, Rudolf. (1972). Toponymické modely a toponymický systém. *Slovo a slovesnost*, *33(4)*, pp. 304–318.

Šrámek, Rudolf. (1976). Slovotvorný model v české toponymii. *Slovo a slovesnost*, *37(2)*, pp. 112–120.

Šrámek, Rudolf. (1999). *Úvod do obecné onomastiky*. Brno: Masarykova univerzita.

Štěpán, Pavel. (2016). Pomístní jména a paměť. In: Jaroslav David (ed.), *Toponyma: kulturní dědictví a paměť mís*t (pp. 100–114). Ostrava: Ostravská univerzita v Ostravě.

Šubrt, Jiří, Pfeiferová, Štěpánka. (2010). Kolektivní paměť jako předmět historicko-sociologického bádání. *Historická sociologie*, *1(2)*, pp. 9–29.

Šula, Jaroslav. (1971). K etymologii hydronyma „Hvězdná" u Rokytnice v Orlických horách. *Zpravodaj Místopisné komise ČSAV*, *12*, pp. 695–697.

Valentová, Iveta. (2009). *Živé osobné mená v hornonitrianskej oblasti. Jazykovedné štúdie XXVII*. Bratislava: Veda.

Viceník, Josef. (1999). Thomas S. Kuhn. Struktura vědeckých revolucí. *Organon F*, *6(3)*, pp. 312–316.

Wardhaugh, Ronald. (1986). *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Witkowski, Teodolius. (1964). *Grundbegriffe der Namenkunde*. Berlin: Akademie Verlag.

ABSTRACT

The text aims to present the way Slovak onomastics developed using the concepts and terminology pertaining to onomastic paradigms and paradigmatic types of onomastics. A combination of abstraction and synthetic approach was used to determine the following types of onomastics: historical-etymological type of onomastics focusing on etymology mainly in the historical context; structuralist/system-linguistics paradigmatic type of onomastics presenting onymy as a system of different onymic types; socionomastic paradigmatic type of onomastics interpreting onymy in the context of social groups and society.

Keywords: onomastic, onomastic paradigm, paradigmatic types of onomastics

ABSTRAKT

Tekst ma na celu przedstawienie sposobu, w jaki słowacka onomastyka rozwijała się w zakresie użycia pojęć i terminologii odnoszących się do paradygmatów i rodzajów onomastyki. Połączenie abstrakcji i podejścia syntetycznego posłużyło do określenia następujących rodzajów onomastyki: historyczno-etymologicznego rodzaju onomastyki skupiającego się na etymologii głównie w kontekście historycznym; strukturalistyczno/systemowo-lingwistycznego rodzaju onomastyki przedstawiającego onimię jako system różnych typów onimicznych; socjonomastycznego paradygmatycznego rodzaju onomastyki interpretującego onimy w kontekście grup społecznych i społeczeństwa.

Słowa kluczowe: onomastyka, paradygmat onomastyczny, paradygmatyczne rodzaje onomastyki