

DOI 10.36074/logos-13.12.2024.061

## ON THE ISSUE OF THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE ANTHROPONYM SYSTEM OF THE UKRAINIAN NOBILITY

Irena Mytnik<sup>1</sup>

---

1. Professor

Warsaw University, POLAND

ORCID ID: 0000-0002-9748-3314

---

*Abstract. The study concerns the methods and means of identification of the Ukrainian privileged class in the sources of the 15th-18th centuries. It was revealed that the anthroponymic system of the princes and nobility was based on the model of toponymic surnames in -s'kyi/-c'kyi but patronymics also played an important role. The nomination of the Ukrainian nobility in the 15th century was slightly different, it was based on the patronymic surname model, but with a large share of toponymic surnames.*

In the analyzed documents, a great variety of naming methods was recorded, which was determined by the nature and rank of the documents. The most frequent among them were two-component formulas consisting of a name and a surname, more elaborate ones could contain actual patronymics and nicknames of appellative, patronymic, and toponymic motivations, as well as prepositional and toponymic constructions. The three-component names with the patronymic in -*ovych/-evych*, which were known even in days of Kyivan Rus, draw attention. Against the background of the anthroponymicon of the privileged stratum of Ukraine, the names of the Galician nobility stand out, which are characterized by multi-component formulas containing individual or family nicknames.

**The object and the purpose of the research.** The proposed considerations concern selected issues of the development of the anthroponymic system of the Ukrainian privileged state during the 15th-18th centuries. They are based on their own research, in particular, they are presented in my publications [1; 2; 3; 4]. Their goal is to introduce the most important results of the conducted research into wider scientific circulation, in particular to present post-name (additional)

meanings (surnames, nicknames, current patronymics) and formulas for identifying princes and nobility:

- classification of names according to their typology and grammatical structure, indicating the productivity of anthroponymic formants,
- methods of naming
- common and distinctive features between the anthroponymicon of both social groups,
- reconstruction of the linguistic and cultural picture of the world and the system of values encoded in the names of the nobility at the nomination stage.

For anthroponyms that were added to the name and performer the function of the historical customary surname, we use the delineation *surname name*, for post-name meanings that indicated a direct father-son relationship, the *actual patronymic*, for others that performed the function of an individual or family designation in multi-locem formulas, - the delineation *individual, family-generic, dynastic nickname*.

**The applied methods.** Linguistic analysis and interpretation of onomastic material was carried out using comparative-historical, descriptive and statistical methods, taking into account the provisions of sociolinguistics and linguocultural studies.

The proposed study was conducted on the basis of more than 4,600 proper names of representatives of the Ukrainian nobility, extracted from sources of the 15th-18th centuries.

**The material base** of the anthroponymicon of the Ukrainian elite of that time consists of handwritten and printed sources. Among them, for example, charters and court books, lustrations of the Ukrainian lands, descriptions of castles, various registers of princes and nobles, censuses of officials of individual voivodships, tax registers and inventories, which contained information about the owners of towns and villages. The research also used anthroponomastic data from documents placed in the Sangushko Archive and in historiographic studies, e.g. M. Hrushevskyi [5], I. Smutok [6] and N. Yakovenko [7], L. Voytovych [8], V. Charnetskyi [9] (tables and genealogical diagrams of families).

#### **Nomination of privileged class.**

The process of development of the anthroponymic system of this class in 15–18th century was heterogeneous and multi-faceted, determined by non-linguistic civilizational, ethnocultural and religious factors. It was accompanied by the transformation of the namesake stock, the appearance of post-nominal terms and, over time, common surnames, and the evolution of nomination methods, characterized by the occurrence of multi-element anthroponym formulas.

The research conducted allowed for the following conclusions to be formulated:

## ABSCHNITT 21.

### PHILOLOGIE UND JOURNALISMUS

1. At the beginning of the 15th century, the common surnames of representatives of the Ukrainian privileged class included the family and were already hereditary. The stock of the major morphological means and the structure of the most common nomination formulas came from a bygone era.

2. The anthroponymy of the Rurikovich and Gediminovich family, descendants of noble Lithuanian princes, princes of Turkish origin and princes of unknown origin, who constituted the elite of the old Ruthenian society, shows the linguistic, cultural and religious assimilation of the descendants of their progenitors, and at the same time a significant similarity to the personal names of the rest of the privileged class, but not identity. The most important differences are associated with the models on which identification was based in the 15th century, as well as the absence in princely anthroponymy of certain morphological types of names recorded among the nobility only and the presence of anthroponymic formulas reserved for princes, related to the history of their dynasty.

3. During the 15th and 18th centuries, the identification of princes and the rest of the nobility in the 16th and 18th centuries was based on a very productive pattern of place-based surnames with *-s'kyi/-c'kyi* (Жаславский, Несвѣцкий), with a significant share of patronymic formations with the formant *-ovych/-evych* (Danilowicz, Promczejkowicz). In the 15th century, patronymics played the most important role in nobility nomination (Каленниковичъ, Прокофьевич), and synthetic and analytical toponymic formations (мнѣтинський; Zarnowieczski de Topolowka, сташко ись давидова) were among the commonly used means of nomination at that time. This is confirmed by regional research on the former nobility onomasticon – the anthroponymy of the Przemyśl nobility stands out from its background, with a very clear predominance of names ending with *-s'kyi/-c'kyi*. Such a rapid increase in their popularity in Ukraine in the 15th–18th centuries can be seemingly explained by extra-linguistic factors related to interlingual influences and close contacts with the Polish nobility, who were most often identified using synthetic place names.

4. As has already been mentioned, in the 15th century, the identification of nobility was based on the patronymic surname model, and that of princes on toponymic formations. In the 16th–18th centuries, patronyms constituted the second largest group of descriptive terms for the entire privileged class. Their main structural and grammatical type were names for *-ych, -ovych/-evych* – the functioning of these formations was not conditioned by time or geography. Other patronyms include *-yn, -ov/-ev, -ak* (only among the Przemyśl nobility in the 17th and 18th centuries), *-k-*,

*-enko* (only among the Kiev nobility in the 17th century), *-\*ęty* in Genitiv plural, names in the form Genitiv singular, and also anthroponyms motivated by full and

diminutive forms of names. Suffixal and semantic patronymics turned out to be a valuable illustration of single-stem and two-part Slavic names and native Ruthenian forms, which have survived to this day in a small number.

The basic morphological differences between the anthroponyms of princes and the rest of the privileged class are linked to the patronyms in *-ak*, *-k-*, *-enko* and *-\*ęty* in the Genitiv plural, which was recorded only in sources referring to the nobility.

5. Appeal and heraldic formations played an insignificant role in the anthroponymy of the entire privileged class.

6. Although the sources examined illustrate a wide variety of nomination methods, they also show some typical identification models. Most of them were two-component, consisting of a historical name and surname: in the 15th century and in the 18th century among princes (*Федор Вишневецкий*, *Бѣнко жабокрицки*), in the 15th–18th centuries among the nobility (*Иван Путаич*, *Ивашко Мелешкович*), and three-component in the 16th–17th centuries in records relating to princes. The latter anthroponymic formulas usually included current patronyms on *-ovych/-evych* and were known throughout the privileged state in various regions of Ukraine (*Костѣнтин Костѣнтинович* *Строзский*, *Васи(л)я Миха(и)ловича Ружи(н)ско(г)[о]*, *Немира Богданович Хренницкий*, *ва(н)ка ста(н)ковича да(д)ко(в)ского*).

7. The remaining formulas, in addition to the name and family name, could include place-based prepositional constructions (*Станислав Вороницкий зо Збаража*), as well as individual (*Iwan Masalski Mińca*, *Василь Львович Глинський Сліпий Мамай*) and family nicknames motivated by anthroponyms of family founders and other famous ancestors (*Томаш Станіславович Война Воронецький*), toponyms (*Юрій Васильович Острозький Заславський/Жеславський*), appellatives (*Jan Hroza Chowanski*) or names of coats of arms (*Andrej Hołownia Ostrożeckij*). These included names specific only to princes and relating to the founders of the Rurikovich (*Gedeon Swiatopołk Czetwertynski*) and Gediminovich dynastic lines (*Aleksander Korjatowicz Kurcewicz*, *Роман Кирикович Наримунтович Ружинський*), as well as individual names related to giving children in princely families the same godfather name (*Семен Молодший (Малий) Васильович Збараський*, *Манівський*, *Семен Середній Васильович Збараський*).

A certain phenomenon of the anthroponymy of the privileged class in Ukraine are the methods of nominating the Galician nobility in the 16th and 18th centuries, based on multi-element formulas containing, in addition to the historical surname ending with *-s'kyi/-c'kyi*, nickname formations.

8. In both states compared, the tendency to pass on name formations from

## ABSCHNITT 21.

### PHILOLOGIE UND JOURNALISMUS

father to child is typical for the 15th century, and subsequent records in an unchanged form of many of them and new family names confirm their heredity and stabilization, and therefore the existence of a customary historical surname. However, the morphological versions of some excerpts from 16th century sources, the variability of family names related to the branching of families and the fragmentation of landed estates, consisting in replacing them with new ones that referred to secondary, separate lines and over time were inherited by subsequent generations, as well as the existence of individual family and ancestral nicknames indicate that the process of development of the anthroponym system was not yet fully completed.

The personal names of the Russian elite are closely related to the spirituality of the nation, reflecting the linguistic and cultural image of the world and the system of values specific to this community, encoded at the nomination stage. They reveal the role of the Slavic and Christian namesake tradition, the importance of land ownership as a noble prerogative, which became the main motivation for family names, as well as the importance of belonging to a family and the role of the father and founder of a family or dynastic line, and to a lesser extent the perception of a person through the prism of his disposition and appearance or circumstances that may have accompanied a certain stage of their life.

#### REFERENCES:

- [1] Mytnik, I. (2010). *Antroponimia Wołynia w XVI–XVIII wieku*. Warszawa: KU UW.
- [2] Mytnik, I. (2017). *Imiennictwo ziemi chełmskiej w XVI–XVII wieku*. Lublin: Wydawnictwo KUL.
- [3] Mytnik, I. (2017). *Słownik historyczno-etymologiczny antroponimów ziemi chełmskiej (XVI–XVII wiek)*. Lublin: Wydawnictwo KUL.
- [4] Митнік, І., Пахомова, С. (2024). *Антропонімікон українського привілейованого прошарку в X–XVIII ст.* Warszawa-Siedlce: WN IKRiBL.
- [5] Грушевський, М. (1907). *Історія України-Руси*. Т. VI. Київ – Львів.
- [6] *Жерела до історії України-Руси. Описи королівщини в руських землях XVI віку*. Під ред. М. Грушевського. Т. III. Львів 1900 : Археографічна комісія Наукового Товариства імені Шевченка.
- [7] Смуток, І. (2019-2020). *Руська шляхта Перемишльської землі (XIV–XVIII ст.). Родоводи*. Том I–III. Львів : Простір-М.
- [8] Яковенко, Н. (1993). *Українська шляхта з кінця XIV до середини XVII ст. (Волинь та Центральна Україна)*. Київ : Наукова Думка.
- [9] Войтович, Л. (2000). *Князівські династії східної Європи (IX–XVI ст.)*. Львів : Інститут українознавства ім. ІП Крип'якевича.
- [10] Czarnecki, W. (2012). *Szlachta ziemi chełmskiej do połowy XVI wieku*. Białystok : Instytut Badań nad Dziedzictwem Kulturowym Europy.