

## The Role of Historical Studies in Hungarian Family Name Research

Mariann Sliz

DOI: 10.2436/15.8040.01.175

### Abstract

The aim of this paper is to demonstrate how the different branches of the historical studies can be used in the research of historical family names. One of the most important but strongly disputed questions of Hungarian historical personal name studies is from which century we can talk about family names in Hungary. This uncertainty has various reasons; for instance, it is very difficult to prove that it was hereditary (which is one of the basic criteria for naming an element a family name). In carrying out this work, genealogy and the history of estates can be helpful.

The paper presents the three types of distinguishing elements which are regarded as the origin from which family names had developed (patronym, placename and byname) with some examples from 14th-century documents. I also intend to demonstrate how we can certify their hereditary character with the means of historical researches.

Furthermore, I am to present some cases where a special Hungarian distinguishing element *de genere* [‘from the kindred of’] appears in the name structure. Finally, my paper touches upon the question how one can explain with the help of historical research of the Hungarian society in the Angevin Age that this element did not have a role in the development of family names.

\*\*\*\*\*

**1.** One of the most important but strongly disputed questions of Hungarian historical personal name studies is from which century we can talk about family names in Hungary. Setting aside the differences caused by the lack of uniqueness in terminology, the main problem is that by definition an element can be regarded as a family name if it is heritable. But it is not easy to prove. In the present article, with the help of some data from the Angevin Age (i.e. the 14<sup>th</sup> century), I will demonstrate how historical studies and its different fields, such as genealogy and the history of estate, can help name studies in solving this problem.

**2.** The use of distinguishing elements, which are regarded as the origins of Hungarian family names, appears from the 13<sup>th</sup> century onwards in the documents. Many reasons played an important role in the development of these, e.g. the demand of formal writing for the most exact marking of the persons – which was motivated by the aim of recording the tax-payers as precisely as possible and by the need to secure heredity by registering descendance. The second reason was the model or fashion coming from the West. Partly due to this the types of Hungarian family names are fairly similar to other European systems of family names. The other reason for this similarity is that the role of the elements mentioned before is to distinguish people from each other; logically, the way of doing so can be the naming by a special attribute of the person. There are only a few possibilities in every language because of the universal structure of the human body and the similarities in the economical and social orders: outer and inner property, family and other relationships, ethnicity, estate, place of birth or residence, occupation, honour etc. Consequently, the emergence of family names can be explained primarily not by linguistic but by social, economical and legal reasons. In their presentation of European systems of family names Hanks and Hodges make a special mention of the Hungarian language, which is not genetically related to the Indo-European languages but the types of Hungarian family names are similar to those of their neighbours due to their cultural influence (Hanks-Hodges, 1988:v). First I will briefly introduce the

different types of the distinguishing elements, then I will demonstrate how to solve each problem connected to these types, using the methods and results of historical studies.

**2.1.** The four types of distinguishing elements are the following: 1. *filius* [‘the son of’] + the given name of the name-bearer’s father, e.g. *contra magistrum Thomam filium Borch* [‘against master Thomas the son of Borch’] (1334, AO. 3: 83) (there are sometimes other relatives’ names in the structure; in other cases there is only the given name of the father without *filius* etc. but these cases are less typical); 2. *de* [‘from’] + the name of the estate or the domicile of the name-bearer, e.g. *Zalok de Bala* [‘Szalók from Bala’] (1338, AO. 3: 506); 3. *dictus* [‘called’] + some kind of attribute (exterior or interior; occupation, ethnicity etc.) of the name-bearer, e.g. *per magistrum Thomam dictum Tyuk* [‘by master Thomas called Hen’] (1325, AO. 2: 177); 4. *de genere* [‘from the kindred of’] + the name of the kindred which the name-bearer belongs to, e.g. *magistri Nicolaus, Jacobus, Johannes et Petrus, filij magistri Laurencij de genere Aba* [‘master Nicholas, Jacob, John and Peter, the sons of master Lawrence from the kindred of Aba’] (1317, AO. 1: 426). However, there did not arise any family name from the last one; therefore, I will set this type aside for the time being but I will return to it at the end of my paper.

In the first part of the 14<sup>th</sup> century there were usually more than one of these elements connected to the given name. Moreover, these types could be combined with each other, e.g. *Johannes filius Marcelli de Sciluas* [‘John the son of Marcel from Szilvás’] (1338, AO. 3: 485). Different variations of a structure were used for the designation of a person nearly in every document, e.g. *Pauli magistri tawarnicorum domine regine* [‘to Paul the Master of the Treasury of the Queen’] (1336, AO. 3: 296), *magnifici viri magistri Pauli de Gara magistri tawarnicorum et iudicis curie domine regine* [‘of the dignified Paul from Gara the Master of the Treasury and the Lord Chief Justice of the Queen’] (1336, AO. 3: 278). (Reaney [1967: 297] directed attention to a similar phenomenon connected to the structures in English documents of the same age. In his example a person was named by four distinct structures in the sources: *Bartholomeus tabernarius de Oxonia*; *Bartholomew Taverner de Oxonia*; *Bartholomeus Bysshope Tabernarius de Oxonia*; *Bysshop de Oxonia*.) Consequently, we cannot talk about stability in these structures designating people whilst that would be the precondition for becoming hereditary. But in some cases heredity can be revealed, or at least it can be shown that the same distinguishing element was used to name more than one member of a family – and that can be regarded as the sign of that element definitely being a family name.

In the following, using some examples from 14<sup>th</sup>-century documents, the problems of the interpretation of structures designating people in the documents will be demonstrated, alongside with the possible solutions for these problems.

a) The type with *filius*. Logically, the use of the same patronym in the structures of brothers’ names cannot give us a hint whether that element was hereditary. A patronym may be regarded as a family name only if there is evidence that it is not identical with the real given name of the name-bearer’s father but refers to an ancestor thereof. When there is no mention of the father in the given source, the fact that it is a family name can be proved only if there is more than one source available for the researchers or if we have a genealogical tree of the family under discussion. However, there are genealogical trees only of a relatively great number of noble families and some notable families from the citizenry. In this question, name studies can considerably recline upon the genealogical research prospering at the turn of the 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> centuries, particularly upon “Turul”, the former journal of the Genealogic Society in Hungary, and some dependable monographies on family history (Karácsonyi, 1900/2004<sup>2</sup>; Engel, 2003). Naturally, the precondition for using these is the identification of the name-bearers; in this, we can get help from archontology (Engel, 1996; Zsoldos, 2011)

– unfortunately only in the case of those who are designated by an honour or some kind of other formal position (again mostly noblemen and some citizens but none from the other classes of society).

b) The type with *de*. The reason for the uncertainty related to the structure involving a place name is that the presence of the same place name in the structure of the father's and his son's name is not enough evidence for being a hereditary element. As the estate has been in that family's property, it would be natural to name all the members of that family by the name of their estate. We can get help only from the history of that family in these cases: if an estate had not already belonged to a person by the time of the origin of the document, but it was mentioned in the structure of that person's name, that element was a family name in all probability (see e.g. N. Fodor, 2004: 36).

There is an interesting datum in a document from 1336, in which Petőc from the kindred of Aba is mentioned by this structure: *possessionem Johannis et Michaelis filiorum Peteuch olim de Zalanch* ['estate of John and Michael sons of Petőc former from Szalánc'] (AO. 3: 267). Petőc, who belonged to the Szalánc branch, exchanged the estate Szalánc for some other estate in 1330. We do not know whether he still lived in 1336 but according to other documents he undoubtedly did in 1335. Five or six years after the exchange of estates it would have been more typical to designate him by the name of one of his new estates but he was still named after the former estate, although *olim* ('former') refers to the change. On the other hand, three years after his sons were designated by one of the new estates: *Georgius Ladislaus et Michael filii Peteuch de Syroka* ['George, Ladislaus and Michael sons of Petőc from Siroka'] (1339, AO. 3: 534). On the basis of the data from 1336 we may think that the name of the estate (Szalánc) was a family name in that structure but the document from 1339 makes it clear that it must have been something different. Considering the whole family, the distinguishing element had not gained its stability yet, but it seems to have been regularly and consistently used for designating Petőc; consequently, this element had already reached the first level of stability. (It had not been able to reach the second – hereditary – level because of the Exchange.)

If someone had more estates but was designated always only by one of them (generally by the most considerable estate or the residence of the named person), that element must have been a family name, especially if the other members of the family were likewise named by that. However, it was more typical in the first part of the 14<sup>th</sup> century to be named by the new estate after someone was donated a bigger or more significant one than the former(s). Moreover, György Székely (1970: 205), András Kubinyi (2003: 100) and Sándor Mikešy (1959: 83) found examples of this occurrence even from the 15<sup>th</sup> century.

c) The type with *dictus*. These elements usually express unhereditary attributions referring only to one person. Due to this, we can more easily find out whether this element was a family name than in cases related to the two other types mentioned before. If we can find this type of distinguishing element in the names of more members of a family, we can make a more certain statement that it must be a family name.

Katalin Fehértői (1969: 30-1) enumerated some data of these cases but those were all from the second part of the 14<sup>th</sup> century. In the first part of this century it had still been rather untypical for a distinguishing element to be hereditary; I have managed to find only five cases among my 14.000 data. I will present only one of them for the time being: *ex permissione [...] nicolai et Stephani dictorum Cantur* ['with the permission of Nicholas and Steven called Cantor'] (1320, AO. 1: 566).

It is a fairly fortunate case because we can clearly define the family relations on the basis of the context. There are some less unambiguous data where we have to use genealogy and history of the family to be certain of the family relationship between the people named by the

same element with *dictus* (e.g. when the names mentioned were not in the same document). Even more unfortunate is the case when we find people named by the same element with *dictus* in a list of names but we do not have any piece of genealogical information about them. We can only suppose but not prove the hereditary being of that element in cases like these.

Contrary to the previous example, it can undoubtedly be claimed that there are no family names in the following structures. By comparing more sources, it can be revealed that a person could have more than one name with *dictus*: *magister Sebus filius Abrae dicti Abychk de Sancto Georgio* [‘master Sebes son of Abraham called Abicsk from Szentgyörgy’] (1338, AO. 3: 456) and *magistri Sebus et Petrus filiis Abrae rufi de Bozyn* [‘masters Sebes and Peter sons of Abraham Red from Bazin’] (1342, AO. 4: 235). In other cases, the different members of the family were named by different names with *dictus*: *inter magistrum Paulum dictum Kozol, et Johannem dictum Butus filios magistri Stephani de Gara* [‘between master Paul called Stack and John called Stick Bearer sons of master Stephan from Gara’] (1317, AO. 1: 450) etc.

The cases in which the members of a family did not have the same name with *dictus*, but had different ones from the same field of meaning are interesting degrees of stabilization. The most famous example of this was the Vas family from Transylvania (see Pór, 1891: 184-5; Fehértói, 1969: 33-4; Kurcz, 1988: 76). The first member who was noted by the name *Vas* [‘iron’] was Nicholas Vas (1304-1346). This name was carried on not by his sons but by his nephews Nicholas (1335-1367), Ladislav (1339-1347) and Dezső (1339-1367).<sup>1</sup> They had a brother called *Acél János* ‘John Steel’, and two other brothers called *Vörös Péter* ‘Peter Red’ and *Vörös Tamás* ‘Thomas Red’. We do not know any distinguishing element combined with the given name of the seventh and the eighth brother (Lawrence and Michael), and there are no other distinguishing elements in the next generation either. It can be a sign that the distinguishing element was not totally stabilised but it is also devisable that there simply did not remain any traces of them in the sources.

There is another example, which is more unique and less known than the previous one: the names of the family *Gyáli*. Among the three brothers, Thomas was called *Tyúk* [‘Hen’], Nicholas was called *Pislen* [‘Chicken’] and Anthony was called *Lúd* [‘Goose’] (Ángel, 2003; see also Kertész, 1938: 1). We know only one name with *dictus* from the next generation. That does not repeat any of these but denominates a new member from the field of meaning of the poultry: Stephan called *Kakas* [‘Cock’]. (There is another person Nicholas called *Lúd*, who was supposed by Engel [2003] to be the son of Anthony but without any other data he must have been motivated to think so precisely due to that name with *dictus*. However, we cannot find any example for the heredity of distinguishing elements in this family, which makes the connection slightly uncertain between this Nicholas called *Lúd* and the family *Gyáli*.)

As we could see from the previous examples, the greatest help in the decision whether an element was a family name or not comes again from genealogy, the history of families and the survey of historical sources.

**2.2.** The type with *de genere*. As I promised before, I will also demonstrate the fourth type of distinguishing elements although there did not develop family names from it. *De genere* was the most circumstance-like and the least name-like among the distinguishing elements. The reflection on the social status was more intense in this type than in the other three because it could appear only in the structures designating the members of original kindreds or of the kindreds of castle-serves. For this reason, in the onomastic research of this element it is indispensable to traverse the works on social history and the history of

<sup>1</sup> The years in the brackets indicate the first and the last data for the named persons (see ENGEL 2003).

Hungarian kindreds because we can find out not only the origin of a distinguishing element but also the reasons for its use with the help of these works.

The first dependable document in which a kindred name was mentioned was issued in 1208 (Kristó, 1975: 957). In the same period, circ. in 1210 the *gest* of Anonymus was written, in which kindred names appeared in large quantities first (Györffy, 1958: 25). For this reason Györffy (*ibid*) and also Loránd Benkő (2009: 70) conceive that the formation of *de genere* could not have been independent of the *gest*.

Karácsonyi (1900/2004: 12) and Erdélyi (1932: 3-6) regarded this distinguishing element as an elementary family name. Moreover, Erdélyi thought that the type with *de* was formed to supersede the extremely long and difficult element with *de genere* by the more forceful expression of someone's right for his estates. In Györffy's opinion the reason for the permeation of *de genere* can be traced back to the efforts of the old baronage to defend their positions from the new barons coming from the gentry (Györffy, 1958: 25). Kristó regarded this reason secondary in comparison to the offensive attitude with which the old baronage wanted to indicate for the king that his future donations for them would be in good hands (Kristó, 1975: 959). These two reasons are indeed connected to each other: the old baronage could defend itself from the new noblemen by gaining more estates before the latter could.

As was seen before, the peak of the fashion of *de genere* can be dated between 1210-1250 according to László Erdélyi (1932: 6). After that period the sum of the kindred names was decreasing gradually during the second half of the 13<sup>th</sup> century. By the first decade of the 14<sup>th</sup> century the kindreds were on the road to being disintegrated. There had emerged a new baronage with the support of the new Angevin king and new families had been entering the noble class by ennoblement. This process was further accelerated by the policy of the Angevin kings: Charles I donated estates to individuals instead of kindreds only in special cases but in the following period, according to the reform of his son Louis the Great, the dominee had the right to determine who from his kindred he would share his new estate with (see Bertényi, 2001; Engel, 2003: 317; Kurcz, 1988: 74-6). The stabilization of the distinguishing elements can be dated approximately back to the middle of the 14<sup>th</sup> century but *de genere* had disappeared from the documents by this time because of these processes. That must have been the main reason why *de genere* did not become a family name, contrary to the other three distinguishing elements.

On the basis of this historical background, onomastics can reveal the motivations of the structures of naming people in the sources; i.e. beside the question of which type of the elements a structure was composed of, it has to be examined why precisely these ones were used.

There could have been more reasons to have *de genere* in a structure despite the end of the fashion in the first part of the 14<sup>th</sup> century. One of them is that the named person aspired to demonstrate the ancient origin of his nobility against the new noblemen. That was a typical behaviour among the noblemen of the counties since the newly ennobled families were mostly their rivals. It can be seen in a document from 1306, in which the sons of Comes Andrew mortgaged a quarter of both of their two properties: *Andreas et Johannes filij Comitis Andree, de generacione Osl* ['Andrew and John, sons of Comes Andrew from the kindred of Osl'] (AO. 1: 110). Through this act, the brothers signalled that even if they were having financial problems, they came from a noble lineage.

In a deed of 1308, a widow, in her own name and in the name of her two under-age sons, assigned the filial quarter to her daughter of age: *nobilis domina, Barbara nomine, filia Nicolai fratris Batyz de genere Negol, relicta Thome filij Pauli de genere Geur* ('noble lady known as Barbara the daughter of Nicholas, brother of Batiz from the kindred of Negol, widow of Thomas son of Paul from the kindred of Györ') (AO. 1: 142). The designation of women, especially in the noble class, was generally carried out by more complicated

circumscriptions than of men. Here we can find a structure which is more complicated than the usual ones. Presumably, the reason for it was that according to the laws the husband and the father had equal importance: the husband's importance came from the *dotalitium* and the *res paraphernales*, and the father's from the filial quarter.

In an estate business in 1320, both contracting parties signed their own origin from a significant kindred to make their equal social status obvious: *comite Mijkaele filio Barch, de genere Chaak, ab una parte, Item comite Briccio filio andree de Batur, de genere Guthkeled* ['to Comes Michael son of Barcs from the kindred of Csák from one part, and the other to Comes Bereck son of Andrew from Bátor from the kindred of Gutkeled'] (AO. 1: 564).

During the time of the Provisorium (1301-1307), *de genere* was to signal that the person with the element in their name belonged to the kindred of a powerful lord. In a document of 1302, Vencel, one of the opponents of King Charles I donated an estate to some person from the kindred of Rátót: *magistri Dominici filij Comitiss Stephani de genere Ratolth* ['to master Dominic son of Comes Stephan from the kindred of Rátót'] (AO. 1: 42). The aim of mentioning the kindred must have been to demonstrate that the kindred was on Vencel's side.

After King Robert had gained power (1307), it was rather the new barons who used the kindred names in order to show that even if their power was new, their nobility was well-established, which was part of an effort to bring older noblemen to accept them as equal in rank. Paul I, one of the most significant members of the Garai family, could be a good example of this aspiration. When King Robert entered the country, he was only the Castellan of Pozsega. He surrendered the castle to Robert and from that time battled for him. Robert appointed him to Ban of Macsó in 1311 or in 1312. Then he became the comes of more counties and the Castellan of Kőszeg; the greatest title he ever gained was the Master of the Queen's Treasury and the Queen's Lord Chief Justice (Karácsonyi, 1900/2004<sup>2</sup>: 438-9). In a deed of 1320, we can find *de genere* in the structure referring to him among other distinguishing elements. The aim of its appearance must have been to emphasize that even his ancient noble origins had played an important role in his social progress: *nobiles uiri uidelicet paulus, Banus de Machow, Comes Wolko de Budrug, et Castellanus noster de Kevzeg, una cum magistro Andrea fratre suo uterino de genere Durusma* ['noblemen Paul the Ban of Macsó, Comes of Valkó and Bodrog, and Our Castellan of Kőszeg with his brother master Andrew from the kindred of Dorozsma'] (AO. 1: 574).

Surveying these motivations, Erik Fügedi's remark that the use of the kindred names in the 14<sup>th</sup> century was a kind of early snobism (Fügedi, 1986: 224) seems to be rather appropriate. The reflection of the social status in the name shows us how the name-bearer was seen by his contemporaries. And there is another point of view connected to this: how the name-bearer wanted to be seen.

As it was shown, to reveal the motivations behind the use of *de genere* we need many pieces of knowledge in the field of social, economic and legal history. Despite this, we have to be cautious in the use of historical and genealogical works since historians mention the characters of the Middle Ages by names created by themselves. That procedure is caused by a methodic necessity: they have to signal which kindred or family the named person belonged to but, in fact, they have never claimed that these names can be found in their sources. Due to this method historical works must not be used as sources of names; otherwise we could easily find "family names" even from the 11<sup>th</sup>-century Hungary.

## References

- AO. 1-4: Nagy, I. (ed.) 1878–1884. *Anjoukori okmánytár* [Collection of Documents from the Angevin Era]. Budapest.
- Benkő, L. 2009. *A Szovárd-kérdés. Fejezetek egy ómagyar nemzetség történetéből* [The Szovárd Problem: Chapters from the History of an Old Hungarian Kindred]. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.
- Bertényi, I. 2001. “A XIV. századi magyar királyi földbirtokpolitika néhány fontosabb kérdése” [Some Notable Questions of the 14<sup>th</sup>-century Hungarian Royal Estate Policy]. In: Tibor Neumann (ed.), *Tanulmányok a középkorról* [Papers on the Middle Ages], vol. 1, 13-35. Budapest: Argumentum Kiadó – Pázmány Péter Katolikus Egyetem.
- Engel, P. 1996. *Magyarország világi archontológiája 1301-1457* [The Secular Archontology of Hungary 1301-1457], vol. 1–2. Budapest: MTA Történettudományi Intézet.
- Engel, P. 2003. “Középkori magyar genealógia” [Medieval Hungarian Genealogy]. In: *Arcanum DVD könyvtár 4. Családtörténet, heraldika, honismeret* [Arcanum DVD Library 4. Family History, Blazonry, Patriotic Knowledge]. Budapest.
- Erdélyi L. 1932. *A magyar lovagkor nemzetségei 1200-1408* [The Kindreds of the Hungarian Chivalric Era 1200-1408]. Budapest: Szent István Társulat.
- Fehértói, K. 1969. *A XIV. századi magyar megkülönböztető nevek* [Distinguishing Elements in 14<sup>th</sup>-century Hungarian Names], *Nyelvtudományi Értekezések* 68. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.
- N. Fodor, J. 2004. “Adalékok a helynévi eredetű családnevek kialakulásához – A Gutkeled nemzetség szőlátmonostori ágának családnevei” [Additions to the Development of Family Names Derived From Place Names – Family Names of the Szőlátmonostor-based Branch of the Kindred Gutkeled]. *Névtani Értesítő* 26, 31-45.
- Fügedi, E. 1986. *Ispánok, bárók, kiskirályok. A középkori magyar arisztokrácia fejlődése* [Comes, Barons, Oligarchs. The Development of the Medieval Hungarian Aristocracy]. Budapest: Magvető Kiadó.
- Györffy, Gy. 1958. “A magyar nemzetségtől a vármegyéig, a törzstől az orszáig” [From the Hungarian Kindreds to the Counties, from the Tribes to the Country], Part 1. *Századok* 92, 12-87.
- Hanks, P.; Hodges, F. 1988. *A Dictionary of Surnames*. Oxford-New York: Oxford University Press.
- Karácsonyi, J. 1900/2004. *A magyar nemzetségek a XIV. század közepéig* [Hungarian Kindreds until the mid-14<sup>th</sup> Century], v. 2. Budapest.
- Kertész, M. 1938. “A Kakas személynévről” [On the Personal Name Kakas ‘Cock’]. *Magyar Nyelvőr* 67, 1-5.
- Kristó, Gy. 1975. “Néhány megjegyzés a magyar nemzetségekről” [Some Remarks on Hungarian Kindreds]. *Századok* 109, 953-67.
- Kubinyi, A. 2003. “Családnévadás a középkori Magyarországon” [Family Name Giving in the Medieval Hungary]. In: János Stirling (ed.), *In virtute spiritus. A Szent István Akadémia emlékkönyve Paskai László bíboros tiszteletére* [The Memorial Volume of the Saint Steven Academy in honour of Cardinal László Paskai], 96-112. Budapest: Szent István Társulat.
- Kurcz, Á. 1988. *Lovagi kultúra Magyarországon a 13-14. században* [Chivalric Culture in 13-14<sup>th</sup>-century Hungary]. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.
- Mikesy, S. 1959. “Miért alakultak ki vezetéknévünk?” [Why did Hungarian Family Names develop?]. *Magyar Nyelvőr* 83, 82-7.
- Pór, A. 1891. “Válasz Nagy Géza ily című értekezésére: Árpádkori személynévünk és az Osl nemzetség eredete” [A Response to Géza Nagy’s paper titled “Our Personal Names from the Arpad Era and the Origin of the Kindred Osl”]. *Turul* 9, 179-88.

- Reaney, P. H. 1967. *The Origin of English Surnames*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Székely, Gy. 1970. "A személynevek és a történettudomány" [Personal Names and Historical Studies]. In: Miklós Kázmér – József Végh (eds.), *Névtudományi előadások II. Névtudományi Konferencia 1969* [Onomastic Lectures II. Conference of Onomastics 1969], *Nyelvtudományi Értekezések* 70, 201-8. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.
- Zsoldos, A. 2011. *Magyarország világi archontológiája 1000-1301* [The Secular Archontology of Hungary 1000-1301]. Budapest: MTA Történettudományi Intézet.

The Project is supported by the European Union and co-financed by the European Social Fund (grant agreement no. TAMOP 4.2.1/B-09/1/KMR-2010-0003)

Mariann Slíz  
Eötvös Loránd University  
Department of Hungarian Historical Linguistics, Sociolinguistics, Dialectology  
Múzeum krt. 4/A  
H-1088 Budapest  
Hungary  
[mariannsliz@gmail.com](mailto:mariannsliz@gmail.com)