

# **HOW ROMANIANS SAY IT, IN THE PEOPLE'S WORDS: LOCAL ONOMASTICS AND TOPONYMY IN LATIN TRANSYLVANIAN DOCUMENTS**

**Ioan-Aurel Pop**\*

**Abstract:** *The Transylvanian area, unlike other regions, knew a rather late development of the national languages, thus leading to a late and fragmentary use of vernacular languages in written form. Only in the 16th century the use of vernacular became common. The present paper intends to analyze some aspects of the mixture between the official and administrative language, Latin, and the vernacular elements. Written communication mingled Latin with spoken words and expressions, documenting an interesting dialogue within the confines of a cultural environment which featured many languages and confessions.*

**Keywords:** vernacular languages, local onomastics, toponymy

## **Introduction**

Proper and common nouns, originating from vernacular languages, often present in some Medieval Latin documents, have a great importance for reconstructing the past and may, very often, indicate the ethnicity of their carriers, notaries or people living in certain places. Naturally, determining ethnicity based on onomastics and toponymy is relative, even risky, if not corroborated with other clues. However, the form of names of places and people provides the opportunity to clarify certain historical and philological aspects of utmost importance. For example, the fact that the same river bears on its upper course a Romanian name of Latin origin (Repedeia), and the same name on the lower course, but translated into Slavic or putting on a Romanian-Slavic variant (Bistrița) is relevant in this sense. It can show that late latinophones or early Romanians were pushed at a certain time to the hilly and mountainous area of Slavs (slavophones), who have done nothing but translate the existing name into their language. Likewise, the toponyms or oronyms of Slavic origin known in Romanian, coupled with other resonant names given by Hungarians, Saxons or Szeklers show the priority of the first, stemming from the period when latinophones cohabitated with the Slavs. This is the case, for instance, of Târnave versus Kokel (Küküllő), Bălgrad versus Alba Iulia (Fehérvár), Braşov versus Kronstadt, etc.

---

\* PhD, Professor, „Babeş-Bolyai” University, Cluj-Napoca; [rector@ubbcluj.ro](mailto:rector@ubbcluj.ro)

„Anuarul Institutului de Istorie «G.Barițiu». Series Historica”, Supplement 1, 2015, “Literacy Experiences concerning Medieval and Early Modern Transylvania”, p. 143-155.

### 1. The name Braşov

The demonstration concerning the name of Braşov is thus significant as a model, less known and put forward relatively recently in Romanian by the late medievalist historian Thomas Nagler: “As regards the German name of the city Braşov, Kronstadt, the historical continuity in Transylvania comes further out. The name Braşov has been taken from the Slavic language during the stay and assimilation of the Slavs by the Romanians in Barsei County, meaning juniper, a plant which is common in the Carpathian Mountains. On their arrival in Barsei County, after 1211, as they met here the Romanian population, the Saxons took over the name, translating it into Medieval German, where Krane was the word for juniper. This name, like all the others, had to be adapted to the official language, Medieval Latin. As in Latin Krane meant nothing, the scribes of the time, bothering themselves not with a translation into Latin and, due to the linguistic proximity between Krane and Krone (= crown), have naturalized the name Corona and the German Kronen = Kronstadt, meaning now «the city of the crown», although it originally had nothing to do with any crown, but with the above-mentioned plant. In today’s Saxon dialects (Kronen and its variants) one does not necessarily understand the meaning *crown*. The name history of the city of Braşov-Kronstadt hence illustrates a perfect continuity since the period of Romanian-Slavic cohabitation (7-8<sup>th</sup> centuries) to that of Romanian-German cohabitation (13<sup>th</sup> century), the name being documented in the form «Brasu» in 1271, and since 1336 in the form of «Corona», the two names being used in parallel until now”<sup>1</sup>.

### 2. Romanian names of places

From 1944 already, the historian Ion Moga inventoried a number of Romanian toponyms in Transylvania and its neighboring regions, all mentioned in Medieval Latin documents, of course, in corrupt, but easily identifiable forms: *Kapreuar* or Caprioara, in 1337 *Nuksora*, namely Nuşoara, in 1359, *Charamida* (*Charamada*) or Caramida, in 1364, *Margina* (Marginea) in 1365, *Radesd* (Radeşti) in 1369, *Zekulay* (Sacalaia) in 1379, the *Neutidul* Mountains (Netedul) and *Nedele* (Nedeia) in 1307, respectively 1373, the rivers *Riusor* or Rauşor (1377), *Chernyswara* or Cernişoara (1380), *Stramba* or Stramba (1390) and many others<sup>2</sup>. Some of these toponyms have fascinating stories, brought to light under special circumstances. Many have undergone so great transformations while they were rendered by scribes (notaries, chancellors) who did not know Romanian that it is now almost impossible to seize their real Romanian sonority.

---

<sup>1</sup> T. Nagler, *Transilvania ntre 900 şi 1300*, in I.-A. Pop, T. Nagler (coord.), *Istoria Transilvaniei*, vol. I, Cluj-Napoca, 2003, p. 215-216.

<sup>2</sup> I. Moga, *Les Roumains de Transylvanie au Moyen Age*, Sibiu, 1944, p. 50-71.

For instance, on July 24<sup>th</sup>, 1364, reporting to King Louis I about the demarcation of the Icuș estate (probably a district) for the Romanians Stanislau and Carapciu and their brothers, the capitol in Cenad notes, along with the situation of the boundaries, many toponyms, including “a place commonly called Teglauar, that is, as the Romanians say, Cărămida [brick], where two boundary signs have been raised “(*unum locum Teglauar vocatum, vulgariter, secundum vero Olachos, Charamada vocatum, ubi sunt due mete terre erecte*)”<sup>3</sup>. One can see how the Romanian name of the place – Cărămida [brick] – given by the locals in their language, has been reproduced in Hungarian, in agreement with the notary's language. Other times, different methods have been chosen, as is the case of the toponym Valea: a document issued on May 20<sup>th</sup>, 1378, after a long trial with the old Romanian owners of princely origin, certified that the judge of the royal court had awarded the *Woya* estate in Banat to Benedict Himfy, the former ban of Bulgaria; in that context it was said that, in 1342, King Charles Robert had confirmed, for eternity, for faithful endeavours, the Romanians Mihail [Michael], Ioan [John] and Nicolae [Nicholas], sons of Petru [Peter], son of *Tyuan*<sup>4</sup>, the place where they lived, called *Patak*, in the Ilidia district, and that this place “is called *Woya*<sup>5</sup> by another name”. But the Hungarian word *patak* means “valley”, which testifies that the name *Woya* is the corrupt version of the Romanian “Valea”. Similarly, the name *Nogfalu*, in Hungarian, *Gorozdorf* in Saxon or *Magna Villa walachicalis* in Latin, are nothing but the translations into these three languages of the Romanian-Slavic toponym Săliște (attested about two decades before the names in German and Hungarian), in 1383, which both mean “big village”)”<sup>6</sup>. Other Romanian (or Romanian-Slavic) place names attested in forms close to the original, are Cuiesti (*Kuesd*), Secaș (*Scokus*) and Gârliște (*Gralista*), in Banat, on August 3<sup>rd</sup>, 1351<sup>7</sup>, Ampoița (*Ompeyicha*) and Abrud (*Abrudbana*), in Alba, on June 2<sup>nd</sup>, 1320<sup>8</sup>, Ampoița (*Ompaycza*) again and Filești (*Fylesd*), in Alba, in 1369<sup>9</sup>, Cacova (*Kakoua*), near Sibiu, on November 24<sup>th</sup> 1366<sup>10</sup>, Ciuta (*Chuta*) in Banat, in 1411<sup>11</sup>, Bârsana (*Barzanfalua*), Maramureș, 1390,<sup>12</sup> etc. Besides, in Maramureș, the villages Cămârzana, Călinești, Copăcești, Crăcești, Crăciunești, Crăiniceni, Crișănești, Criva, Dănești, Darva, Desești, Dragomirești, Gănești, Hărniciești, Ieud, Iza, Lipceni, Moisei, Nănești, Neagova, Oncești, Rozavlea, Săcel, Săliște, Săpânța,

<sup>3</sup> *Documenta Romaniae Historica, Series C. Transilvania* (infra: DRH. C), vol. XII, p. 295-303.

<sup>4</sup> It is an example of Romanian name corrupted by the notary, difficult to trace back.

<sup>5</sup> DRH, C, vol. XV, p. 413-438.

<sup>6</sup> I. Moga, *Les Roumains de Transylvanie*, p. 61.

<sup>7</sup> DRH, C, vol. X, p. 48.

<sup>8</sup> *Documente privind Istoria României, Seria C* (infra: DIR. C), 14th century, vol. I, p. 355-356.

<sup>9</sup> DRH, C, vol. XIII, p. 568-569.

<sup>10</sup> DRH, C, vol. XIII, p. 276-277.

<sup>11</sup> F. Pesty, *Krassó vármegye*, vol. III, p. 269-270.

<sup>12</sup> R. Popa, *Țara Maramureșului*, p. 66.

Uglea, Bilca<sup>13</sup>, etc. are in the same situation, all recorded in forms of names containing the Romanian or Romanian-Slavic terms from which these names derive. The same process is registered in Hațeg County and its vicinity, with the settlements Balomir, Bărești, Bar, Băiești, Bărișor, Breazova, Britonia, Bucova, Bunila, Călan, Câmpul lui Neag, Cernișoara, Cârnești, Chitid, Ciula, Clopotiva, Costești, Crăguș, Criva, Crivadia, Densuș, Dumbrăvița, Fărcădin, Galați, Grid, Hobița, Hățăgel, Leșnic, Lingina, Livadia, Ludești, Mălăiești, Mățești, Merișor, Muncel, Nălați, Nușoara, Ohaba, Ohăbița, Ostrov, Ostrovel, Paroș, Pâclișa, Peșteana, Petros, Peștiș, Plăișor, Poienița, Ponor, Pui, Răchita, Răchitova, Râușor, Săcel, Sânpetru, Sibiușel, Strei, Streisângeorgiu, Stroești, Șerel, Ștei, Totești, Tuștea, Unciuc, Uric, Vad, Valea, Zăicani, Zlaști<sup>14</sup>, etc. One may thus enumerate such names in Banat as well: Agriș, Almăj, Baciuc, Bădra, Belibuc, Berliște, Besna, Biniș, Bizerea, Bogdan, Bogăltin, Borziuc, Bolvașnița, Bratoaca, Bruznic, Caran, Caransebeș, Carașova, Caraș, Cerna, Cerneț, Ciuta, Comiat, Cornet, Criva, Cuiști, Dobrogoste, Dobroian, Dobrotă, Dragotă, Dubrul, Gamza, Gârliște, Goruia, Grădiște, Grebenaț, Gurea, Hălmeag, Ianova, Iancu, Ilidia, Jupa, Leordiș, Lugoj, Luncavița, Maciova, Mal, Margina, Măcicaș, Măgoiești, Mâtnic, Mehadia, Miculești, Mihăești, Mihălinț, Neacșu, Novac, Ohaba, Ohabița, Pleșa, Pogănici, Prisaca, Ramna, Rădești, Rădulenți, Rudăria, Ruginosu, Săcel, Săliște, Sebeș, Secaș, Severin, Stancu, Stăvarcea, Strâmtura, Surduc, Surian, Șoșdea, Timișel, Tincova, Toplicean, Toplița, Turcu, Valea, Vozeștia, Sanislau, Zăzești, Zăvoi, Zorlenț<sup>15</sup>, etc.

Quite often, however, Romanian names, after being used in parallel with the Hungarian ones, have been changed entirely, depending on the patronage of the Catholic chapels newly-funded for Hungarian masters or on other criteria. Thus, a document from 1230, mentions the village Sântejude, near Gherla, in connection with an older donation (made to some noblemen coming from Hungary), by the name *Wesscel*, later mentioned as *Vizoulteluk* (1291) or *Vascultelke* (1315). The name *Zent Egjed* (Sant Egidio) is mentioned only in the 14<sup>th</sup> century, by the patron of the Catholic church, mentioned in 1331. Therefore, the village was first named *Vescel*, *Vâscel* or *Vascul/ Vâscul*, a toponym with Romanian resonance if we consider the diminutization and the enclitic definite article masculine *-l*. Originally, the name was taken as such (with the adapted spelling), so that, in a new stage, to be added the termination *-telek (-telke)*, namely “place”, “land”, “piece of land”. After the village entered in the territory of the Wass family and a Catholic church dedicated to St. Egidio (Szent Egjed) was founded in the 14<sup>th</sup> century, the name *Sancto Egidio* or *Scenth Egud*, with its variants is imposed<sup>16</sup>. That name, strange for

<sup>13</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 63-112.

<sup>14</sup> *Idem*, *La începuturile Evului Mediu românesc*, p. 84-131.

<sup>15</sup> D. Țicu, *Banatul montan*, p. 290-400.

<sup>16</sup> Vezi I.-A. Pop, *De la lumea medievală la cea modernă*, in Ioan Mârza (coord.), *Monografia comunei Țaga*, Cluj-Napoca, 2009, p. 283-305.

Transylvania, shows precisely the extra-Transylvanian, Western origin of the Wos family; there is no other church in Transylvania with this patron, but there is one instead in the Vas County in Hungary, where the Wass family probably stems from<sup>17</sup>. The same happened with Oncești in Maramureș, also called *Varalia* (Sub Cetate) in 1360, with Tohan (near Brașov), called *Olahteleky* (The Romanian Land), with Beznic (in Banat), later named *Abosfalva*, with Mihalț (Alba), “*Kozepvinc*, by another name” (Vințul de Mijloc), with Nedele (Nedeie), later named *Wegsaghavasa*, etc. For many other villages the Romanian names have been translated into Hungarian: Văleni (Maramureș) becomes *Patak*, Râu Bărbat, Râu Alb, Râu de Mori, Grădiște, Reea from Hațeg become *Borbatviz*, *Feheviz*, *Malomviz*, *Varhel*, respectively *Gunazfolu*, and Măru, Neacșu, Spini or Prisaca from Banat, become, in Hungarian, *Almafa*, *Nexefalua*, *Novakfalua*, *Tyvis*, respectively *Gyepew*, etc. The village Grădiște (a name with Slavo-Romanian resonance, acquired during the cohabitation of latinophones with the Slavic population), from Hațeg County – where the ancient *Ulpia Traiana Sarmizegetusa*, the capital of Roman Dacia, was located – has preserved in the Middle Ages, for a while, the Romanian name Brătunia<sup>18</sup> or Bătrâna<sup>19</sup>, translated into Latin documents as *Brethonia*.

In some cases, the Romanian names of places are added Hungarian terminations, as in the examples: *Kopachfalwa*, *Dezefalwa*, *Hernyachfalwa* (document concerning Maramureș, from October 12<sup>th</sup>, 1365<sup>20</sup>). These names of villages (*falva/falu* means village) come from common nouns and adjectives in Romanian, such as “tree”, “often” and “diligent”. “Satul lui Stancu [Stancu's Village]” appears *Ztankfolua* (document from Banat, issued on March 29<sup>th</sup>, 1378<sup>21</sup>). In the same documents from the 14<sup>th</sup> century, under the corrupt or adapted spelling of the scribe (*Terra Moldavana*, *Zlatyna*, *Zelete*, *Vyssou*, *Moyze*)<sup>22</sup>, one may recognize traditional local names such as Țara Moldoveană, Slatina, Săliște respectively Moisei. The Romanian resonance of some toponyms from Hațeg can be seen in a document dated on June 8<sup>th</sup>, 1377<sup>23</sup>, issued in Alba Iulia: *fluvium Ryusor* (with the variant *Ryusoor*)..., *villam Olacalem Thuelyfalw vocatam*..., *quatuor villas Olachales Brazua, Bradath, Walee et Ohaba vocatas*. It refers to the Romanian toponyms Râușșor (river and village), Breazova, Brădet (later called Zeicani), Vale (later named Păucinești) and

<sup>17</sup>The same can be said about the village Sucutard, taking its name from Sf. Gothard (Sanctus Gothardus). See A. W. Kovács, *The History of the Wass de Czege Family*, Hamburg, 2005, p. 49.

<sup>18</sup>Maria Holban, *Din cronica relațiilor româno-ungare*, p. 234-235. R. Popa, *La începuturile Evului Mediu românesc*, p. 87-89. Maria Holban derives the name *Brithonia* from Brătunia or Brătuia, stemming from the antroponym Bratu. Radu Popa agrees with this opinion.

<sup>19</sup>S. Brezeanu, *Identități și solidarități*, p. 283-286. Stelian Brezeanu proposes, bringing forward many analogies, the derivation of the corrupt form of *Brithonia* from the Romanian *Bătrâna*.

<sup>20</sup>DRH, XII, p. 362-363.

<sup>21</sup>DRH, XV, p. 387-390.

<sup>22</sup>DRH, XII, p. 398-399.

<sup>23</sup>DRH, XV, p. 248-251.

Ohaba (later named Hobîța). The name of the Romanian village *Thuelyfalw* (located about 2 km from Sarmizegetusa, meanwhile disappeared) probably comes from the noun “tei [linden]”. On September 12<sup>th</sup>, 1380<sup>24</sup>, the name appears, still in a Romanian context, *terra Polonycza vocatam penes rivulum Cernyswara*, namely “the land called Poienița, located on the river Cernișsoara”. “Poienița” is the Romanian diminutive of the common noun “poiana [meadow]”.

### 3. Romanian common nouns

Surprising Romanian common nouns such as *cergă [rug]* (1331), *cărămidă [brick]* (1364), *pod [bridge]* (14<sup>th</sup> century), *baltă [pond]* (1418), some of them now toponyms, appear early. All of them are mentioned in a Romanian context and in connection with the Romanians. For example, on March 7<sup>th</sup>, 1418, Pippo of Ozora (Filippo Scolari), earl of Timiș, relating about a demarcation of estates made for two groups of Romanians who were in conflict, in the presence of “certain honest and noble knezes” (*certos probos et nobiles kenezys*), mentions “a certain swamp called *Fertes*, named Balta [pond] in Romanian” (*quendam paludem Fertes vocatum, in volacho Baltha dictum*)<sup>25</sup>. As in other cases, the Romanian noun pond (now a toponym) is rendered in Latin as *palus, -dis* (= swamp) and *fertes* (= slime) in Hungarian, taken as synonyms. In 1202, the Romanian name Ficior (anthroponym originating from a common noun, too) is mentioned as *Fichur*, North of Oradea, near the “Bihor fortress”<sup>26</sup>. The same name would later become the nickname of some members of the Romanian More family from Ciula Hațegului. When certain Romanian words could not be rendered in their original form, but it was intended (very rarely, otherwise) to indicate them, phrases are used. Thus, in a document dated July 26<sup>th</sup>, 1368, containing a contention between serfs, one of them had to give to the other, inter alia, two pairs of sandals called “Romanian shoes” (*caligas Olachales*)<sup>27</sup>.

Of particular importance are the names of social categories, functions, authorities, status that exist in Romanian and are reproduced in Latin texts. Hence, the noun *cnez* [kneze] or *chinez* is mentioned, stemming in Romanian from Slavic, but absorbed by the Slavs from old German (*kunig, kenig*, namely prince, king). The Romanian knezes are old Romanian leaders of communities, now ruling over villages or parts of villages, with their own subjects. The ruling area of a kneze was called a *cnezat* [principality]. The forms of rendering in Latin texts these names of kneze and *cnezat* vary. Thus, on November 8<sup>th</sup>, 1352, *quenesi in provincia Seebus* (“the knezes from Caransebeș County”)<sup>28</sup> are mentioned, and a year later (on

<sup>24</sup> DHR, XV, p. 776-777.

<sup>25</sup> F. Pesty, *Krassó vármegye*, vol. III, p. 284-287.

<sup>26</sup> I. Moga, *Les Roumains de Transylvanie*, p. 49.

<sup>27</sup> DRH, C, vol. XIII, p. 533-534.

<sup>28</sup> DRH, C, X, 1977, p. 160-161.

November 29<sup>th</sup>, 1353), the same leaders, this time in the Ciceu region in Northern Transylvania, appear as *kenezj* (*Olachos suos et kenezjos* = his Romanians and knezes<sup>29</sup>). Other forms of the name of knezes are *ipsi kenesii* (1363)<sup>30</sup>, *Iuan kenezzyo* (1369)<sup>31</sup>, *Nicolaus quenessius* (1376)<sup>32</sup>. The term *cnezt*, derived from *cnez* [kneze] has fewer variations: *keneziatus*, *kenezatus*, *kenezyatus*. The name voivode (Romanian-Slavic term), used in connection with the Romanians, has various forms as well: *vaivoda*, *voivoda*, *woyvoda*, *waywoda*, *woyvada*, *woyvoda*, etc. There were many Romanian voivodates in the Medieval kingdom of Hungary, more precisely in Transylvania, Maramureșș, Banat, Crișșana, Ung, Bereg, Ugocea, etc., but only one of them was officialised, namely Transylvania, ruled by a leader ranked as voivode, named by the Hungarian king. Initially, the old local voivodes were recognized in this position. The same process, which took place earlier in Transylvania, happened in Maramureșș in the 14<sup>th</sup> century. Here, in the voivodate of Maramureșș, one can see how the Romanians' voivodes, chosen by the gathering of the country's knezes, are accepted as rulers by the Hungarian king as well. However, the difference in relation to Transylvania is that the ancient Romanian voivodes are appointed by the king as earls, the old voivodate gradually becoming, towards the end of the 14<sup>th</sup> century, county in the kingdom of Hungary. The term voivode, official perpetuated in Transylvania until the 16<sup>th</sup> century, entered in Hungarian as *vajda*.

Equally interesting are the names given to Romanians in the Latin and Hungarian Transylvanian documents. The old forms, found also in narrative sources, are *blacus*, *vlachus*, *valachus*, *volachus*, etc., stemming apparently from the name of the first Romanized Celtic tribe, *volcae* or *vlocae*. Due to the specificity of Hungarian, *vlachus* turned into *olachus* or *olahus*. In the Latin texts of the 13<sup>th</sup> and 14<sup>th</sup> centuries, both forms (*vlachus* and *olachus*) are to be found, with the predominance of the second. Examples: *Olachi* (1353), *Olaci* (1355), *Olaki* (1357), *Volaci/ Volachi* (1357), *Holahi* (1363), *Valachi* (1366), *Wlachones* (1474), *Walchi* (1373). The latter forms, quite weird, come from Western, papal editorials, where the realities of Transylvania and Hungary were little known. All these variants originate from the languages spoken to the West and North of the regions inhabited by Romanians. They are vernacular words adapted to Latin, words through which the Romance peoples were called. As in South-East Europe the Romanians were the only latinophones, *Valachus* and its derivatives refer to Romanians. For example, the form *Olahus* is modeled in Medieval Latin after Hungarian, where the Romanian is called *olah* and the Italian *olasz*.

---

<sup>29</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 239-241.

<sup>30</sup> DRH, C, XII, p. 137-144.

<sup>31</sup> DRH, C, XIII, p. 608-609.

<sup>32</sup> DRH, C, XV, p. 1-3.

#### 4. Names of people

The most fascinating is, however, the Romanian anthroponymy present in Latin documents related to Medieval Transylvania and the surrounding regions. It is generally of Latin and Romanian-Slavic origin, but it includes many calendar names, even from the Catholic calendar. The double names for the same person start to emerge now, a Romanian traditional name and one chosen from the usual Hungarian names, usually from the Catholic calendar. The tendency is only beginning in the 14<sup>th</sup> century, but it will increase in the 15<sup>th</sup> century, the best known case being that of the Hunedoara brothers, sons of Voicu, named Iancu and Ivaşcu at home, in the Romanian orthodox environment, and in society, in the their official elitist world, among Hungarians and Westerners, Ioan [John] (Ivaşcu's early death no longer claimed another distinctive name in relation to Ioan [John])<sup>33</sup>. Double names could result from a new baptism, Catholic, as it happened with the Romanian Şerban, which became Ştefan [Stephen]: on May 16<sup>th</sup>, 1366 in Cluj, King Louis I gave the news that, since his faithful servant, the Romanian Şerban of Aciua, had become Ştefan [Stephen] through baptism in Catholic rite, receiving as a gift the Aciuţa estate neighbouring Aciua (villages in Arad county), having the obligation to donate each year the sheep fiftieth tax, the pigs tax and to fulfil faithful services in the future as well<sup>34</sup>. Baptism did not mean however abandoning the old name, which continued to be used at home, where they could practice biritualism (attendance of both Orthodox and Catholic churches). The new name usually had the resonance of the old one: Şerban – Ştefan, Şerban or Şurban – Urban, Radul or Ladul – Ladislau, Vladislav – Ladislau etc. But most Romanian ennobled knezes, who have remained small feudal leaders in their villages, have continued to keep the old traditional names along with the Byzantine faith and the whole complex of beliefs, customs and traditions called “Romanian law”.

The names of rulers, mentioned South of the Carpathian Mountains, are very often recorded in Transylvania, in surprising forms and circumstances. Litovoi, Seneslau, Tihomir, Basarab, Vlaicu, Dan, Vlad, Radu, Mircea, Aldea, etc. appear like this, the names of the country's founders, of the founders of the dynasty and of the rulers of Țara Românească [Wallachia]; likewise, one may meet Dragoş, Bogdan, Muşat, Laţcu, Iuga, etc., founders and members of the Moldavian dynasty. Moreover, all the names of noblemen, ladies and princesses, courtiers and servants which are to be found South and East of the Carpathians are found again in Transylvania, Banat and the neighbouring regions.

To illustrate this, let's take a look at an almost forgotten document, issued on August 12<sup>th</sup>, 1389, concerning Banat, where dozens of Romanian names are enumerated, belonging essentially to small knezes, still owners of their subjects, and

---

<sup>33</sup> I.-A. Pop, *Numele din familia regelui Matia Corvinul: de la izvoarele de epocă la istoriografia contemporană*, in “Studii și materiale de istorie medie”, vol. XXVI, 2008, p. 123-137.

<sup>34</sup> DRH, C, vol. XIII, p. 100-101.

their homes<sup>35</sup>. Thus, the following are mentioned: 20 serfs and an empty courtyard, plus three mills “on the river commonly known as Pogănici” (*Poganch*); Marcu Ștefan, son of Drăgușa (*Dragucha*); Marcu cel Mic [The Small], Vasile (*Basilius*), kneze Răduș (*Rados*), Brateș (*Brethes*) and Dracșa (*Draxa*), George, Dionisie, Mușat (*Musa*), Miliță (*Milita*), Bogdan, Radul, widow of Stoian (*relicta Stoyani*); then there are four or 24 cnezate [principalities] (the document has gaps and has been deciphered with difficulty), five serfs and an empty position in the cnezate [principality] of kneze Neacșu (*Nexa*), located on the part of village Pricul or Precul (*Prekolfalua*); moreover, kneze Prodan (*Proda*) with four of his serfs, kneze Stancu (*Stank*) with six of his serfs, kneze Dobrușa (*Dobrucha*) with nine of his serfs; the village Borziuc (*Borzlyuk*) appears next, with 21 serfs, out of whom seven, namely Văsiel (*Woszeel*), Solozlău (*Salazla*), Dușa or Ducșa (*Duxa*), Mogoș (*Magas*), Ilie (*Iliam*), Călin (*Calyn*) and an empty position (without serf), were located right in Borziuc, while other 13 serfs lived in the possession called Săceu or Săcel (*Zacho*), belonging to Borziuc as well; furthermore, the possession Jupa (*Supafalua*) included six serfs and was equalled with the previous two, namely Borziuc and Săcel; Drușan (*Drusanfalua*) estate follows, with nine serfs, the possession Sanislăul cnezesc [of the kneze] (*Zanislo Kenezfalua*) with eight serfs, the village Hălmeagul cnezesc [of the kneze] (*Halmagi Kenezhaza*) with two serfs and Ionușu cnezesc [of the kneze] (*Ianuskenezfalua*) with 18 serfs; in a portion of the mentioned Jupa lived kneze Ioan [John] and a serf; in the villages called Nicolae [Nicholas] (*Mikloşfalua*) and Lupu (*Farkasfalua*), belonging to Remetea, there were 15 serfs; in Râșca village (*Rachkfalua*) there were 14 serfs; in Drășani (*Drasanfalua*) three; in the village Fileșu cnezesc [of the kneze] (*Phileskenezfalua*) 15; in Giur (*Gyurfalua*) 11; the serfs of the village Cheșa cnezească [of the kneze] (*Kechakenez*) are mentioned by name, namely Cheșa cnezul [the kneze], Lădean (*Laden*) Bogdan, Duie (*Duya*), Anca (*Anka*), Nicolae, Mihă (*Myhe*) Bogdan, Gheorghe Dragomir (*Dragmer*), Gheorghe Balea (*Balya*), Boriac (*Baryak*), Ioan, Oprișa (*Opprisa*) and Bușea or Bucea (*Bucha*); likewise, the serfs Ruja (*Ruza*), another Ruja, Lădulea (*Ladula*), Gheorghe, Fileș (*Fyles*), Ștefan, Drășan (*Drasan*), Bogdan, Noșa (*Nosa*), Dâncu (*Dank*), Iuan (*Iwan*), Pușă (*Pousa*), Stanul (*Stanol*), Ionuș (*Janus*), Dobrușa, Dragomir, Filipaș (*Fylepes*) and Ioan, located there as well; then, the serfs Nicolae, Iuan, Buda, Dumitru, Gheorghe, Radeș (*Rades*), Oprișa, Roman, Stoian, Mircea? (*Mrisauch*) and Lacea (*Lacha*), in the same place; there is also the village Moian (*Mayanfalua*) with its mill located on the river Bârzava (*Borzua*), the village of kneze Nicolae [Nicholas] (*possessio Nicolai kenezii*) with 24 serfs, “the village of Nicolae [Nicholas], son of Pribil” (*Pribilfyamycloşfalua*) with 24 serfs and a mill, also located on the river Bârzava; the Cuiesti district appears, too (*districtum de Kwesd*), emptied of inhabitants, etc.

<sup>35</sup> F. Pesty, *Krassó vármegye*, vol. III, p. 185-192.

Another example, from 1353, taken from the boundaries of Transylvania, speaks about *castellanus de Chycho, Olachos suos et kenezjos, videlicet Petrum, filium Michaelis, Iula, Iwan, filium Brerer, Wayk, Frath et Iwan Longum ... destinasset* (“the castellan of Ciceu sent his Romanians and knezes, namely Petru [Peter], fiul lui Mihai [Michael], Iula, Iuan [John], fiul lui Brerer, Voicu, Fratu and Iuan cel Lung [John the Long].”<sup>36</sup> In a document of October 12<sup>th</sup>, 1355, the following names given to Romanians are mentioned: *Iohannes, Iga, Dragus (filius Gyula, filii Dragus), Stephanus, Tatar, Dragamer, Kuzta, Myruzlo*<sup>37</sup>. It is clear that Ioan [John] and Ștefan [Stephen] – calendar names – are rendered by the form established in Medieval Latin and not as they were pronounced by Romanians. In the case of the others, an attempt has been made to render them phonetically, close to the pronunciation of their carriers and they must have sounded in the Romanian language of the time as follows: Iuga, Drăguș or Dragoș, Tătar, Dragomir, Costea and Mirăslău. *Gyula* must have been pronounced in Romanian Giula or Giulea, where the village name Giulești resulted from. Almost the same characters appear after exactly ten years, on October 12<sup>th</sup>, 1365, as loyal Romanian servants of the king (*fidelibus suis Volachys*) in the form: *Gywle, filio Dragus ... item Stephano, Myroslawo presbitero, et Dragomer, filiis eiusdem Gywle*. Despite some phonetic rendering differences, they are Giula, son of Drăguș, Ștefan [Stephen], the priest from Mirăslău, and Dragomir.

According to a testimony from August 6<sup>th</sup>, 1351<sup>38</sup>, some Romanians West of Maramureș, from Ugocea County, were called *Zerechen, Nicolaus, Balathin et Rugas, filii Karachun, woyvade de Bilke*. *Nicolaus* is again a calendar name, easy to render in Romanian, *Zerechen* can be Sărăcin and *Karachun* is undoubtedly Crăciun [Christmas]. The other two are however impossible to guess. By chance, a document from December 8<sup>th</sup>, 1363<sup>39</sup>, where almost the same sons of the Romanian voivode Crăciun of Bilca are mentioned, helps us understand: *Valentinum, Serechin et Luchasium, filios Karochon, Valacos*. Therefore, *Balathin et Rugas*, from 1351, become Valentin and Luca in 1363. This difference in spelling is strange, especially since it is about calendar names. It is highly unlikely that the scribe from 1351 has not understood the ordinary Catholic names Valentin [Valentine] and Luca [Luke]. Taking into account certain analogies of the time, it can be assumed that the old forms of traditional Romanian names (maybe Balotă or Paltin, for the first, Rugoș or Lugoș for the second) have been adjusted/ changed, perhaps following the conversion of their carriers to Catholicism. The change was usually made with

---

<sup>36</sup> DRH, C, X, p. 239-241.

<sup>37</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 362-364.

<sup>38</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 55-56.

<sup>39</sup> DRH, XII, p. 192.

Catholic names that had the same resonance. On December 30<sup>th</sup>, 1359<sup>40</sup>, a “voivode of Romanians” called *Bybarch*, appears in Hălmagiu (*Holmad*) along with a “*Reman Olachus*”. It’s almost impossible to tell how the two names must have sounded in Romanian. On May 14<sup>th</sup>, 1361<sup>41</sup>, a document that refers to “our faithful Romanians from the Land of Maramureș” mentions *Bud, Sandor, Oprissa, Johannis, Dragomer et Bayla, filiorum Locovoy, fidelium Olachorum nostrorum de terra Maramarusiensi*, speaks about a Romanian *cnezat* [principality] (*keneziatum*), as well as about another Romanian (*similiter Olahus*) called *Stan dictus Fejyr*. The Romanian names must have been Bud or But (preserved in Maramureș until today), Șandru, Opriș, Ioan, Dragomir, Balea and Stan. Licovoi can be very good be Litovoi (considering the graphical confusion between consonants c and t). The names *Sandor* and *Fejyr* are Hungarian variants for Alexandru [Alexander], respectively Albul [The White]. From the Hungarianized nickname of Stan the kneze the Romanian name of the Ferești, the village from Maramureș, would result in time. On March 3<sup>rd</sup>, 1363<sup>42</sup>, “all knezes and old Romanians from Hațeg district” (*universis kenezis et senioribus Olachalibus districtus Haczak*) judged by the laws of the knezes (*ius keneziale*), in the context of the cause mentioning Romanian names such as *Musath, Stroja/ Sztroja, Zayk*. These might sound in Romanian Mușat, Stroia or Stroie and Zeicu or Țeicu.

In a document with legal force from February 2<sup>nd</sup>, 1365<sup>43</sup> one can find the names *Bakdan* for Bogdan and *Dragmer* for Dragomir and on February 26<sup>th</sup>, 1365<sup>44</sup> Petru [Peter] Negoiu, Maxim and Roman are mentioned, the voivodes of the Romanians (*Petro de Kege, Neguoy, Maxin et Roman, voyvodis Olachorum*) next to a kneze Ilie (*Elya kenezio*). The same year (September 22<sup>nd</sup><sup>45</sup>), other names are mentioned (*Karapch Olachus, filius Ladislai, filii Zarna Olachy ... Stanizlao, Negwe, Wayuk, Nicolao et Ladislao, filiis Ladislai, filii Zarna*), belonging to certain Romanians from Țara Românească [Wallachia] who have been given estates in the Romanian districts Marginea (*Margina*) and Icuș (*Ikus*), in Banat. Here as well appear Hungarian forms of calendar names (Ladislau), common forms of calendar names (Nicolae), but also strange Romanian forms (Carapciu? Românul [The Romanian], Zârână Românul [The Romanian], Stanislau, Neagu, Văiuc?). If we corroborate the information given here with those from the Act of June 20<sup>th</sup>, 1371<sup>46</sup>, then Carapciu remains unchanged (*Karapch*), while Neagu is articulated (*Negul*) and

---

<sup>40</sup> DRH, XI, p. 452-453.

<sup>41</sup> DHR, XII, p. 27-29.

<sup>42</sup> DRH, XII, p. 130-133.

<sup>43</sup> DRH, XII, 398-399.

<sup>44</sup> DRH, XII, p. 402-404.

<sup>45</sup> DRH, XII, p. 444-448.

<sup>46</sup> DRH, XIV, p. 56-60.

*Ladislaus* becomes *Layk*, namely *Vlaicu*. On July 3<sup>rd</sup>, 1372<sup>47</sup>, among the men sent by the Romanian knezes and nobles to dig the ditch of the Orșova fortress, *Nexe, filius Kopach, Gouasdya, Stan kenezius, Radul kenezius, Iuan Ruphus, Karachon* are to be found, namely *Neacșu/ Necșea*, son of *Copaciu, Găvoșdea, Stan* the kneze, *Radul* the kneze, *Iuan cel Roșu* [John the Red], respectively, *Crăciun*. The name *Neacșu* appears, on the same July 3<sup>rd</sup>, 1372, as *Nekche. Iohannes dictus Stoyan kenezius... Drag, filius Gyula, Gruhestan, Dragomer, Crichywan et Stanizlaus* from *Maramureș* are found in a document from July 1<sup>st</sup>, 1375<sup>48</sup>. They could be, in Romanian, *Ioan* also called *Stoian*, the kneze, *Drag*, son of *Giula, Gruie Stan, Dragomir, Crișan* or *Criș Ioan/ Criș Iuan* and *Stanislau*. Other Romanians are mentioned in the July 6<sup>th</sup>, 1374<sup>49</sup>: *Stoykan, filius Dragmerii, filii Voyna de Laysta, Danchul, Neeg, Woyk, filius Raduzlu et Selibor*, namely *Stoican*, son of *Dragomir*, son of *Voinea* of *Loviște, Danciul, Neag, Voicu*, son of *Radoslau* and *Selibor/ Sălibor*. An anthroponym, *Stancu*, was the one that gave the name of the village *Ztankfolua*, mentioned on March 29<sup>th</sup>, 1378<sup>50</sup>. On September 12<sup>th</sup>, 1380<sup>51</sup>, one may find *Stoyan, filius Mosyna de Nyres, kenezius Olachorum de districtu castris Hathzak*, namely “*Stoian*, son of *Mușină* of *Mesteacă*n [Birch], the kneze of the Romanians from the district of *Hațeg Fortress*”. It is easy to see how the Romanian toponym *Mesteacă*n [Birch] has been translated to Hungarian. In the ambience of the Hungarian court at *Visegrad*, the records mention, on June 19<sup>th</sup>, 1376<sup>52</sup> *Bagdanum, filium Stephani et Radul, filium Wozunk* (later written *Woy nuk*), which may suggest in Romanian *Bogdan*, son of *Ștefan* and *Radul*, son of *Voinic* or *Voinuc*. On October 6<sup>th</sup>, 1378<sup>53</sup>, a Romanian noble born *ex nobili domina Margareta, filia Iwan, filii Myk de Urmezeu*, namely “*from the noble lady Margareta* [Margaret], son of *Iuan*, son of *Micu* of *Urmezeu*” is mentioned. The name *Margareta* [Margaret] may suggest here the lady’s conversion to Catholicism, although it may well be only the translation of the name *Mușata*. An interesting onomastic is revealed on July 7<sup>th</sup>, 1376<sup>54</sup>, in *Sandrino, alio nomine Alexa vocato, filio Bochus dicto Ffichormiklous, filii Dorman de Dormanhaza de comitatu Maromosiensi*, which means “*to Sandrin*, also called *Alexa*, son of *Buhuș* called *Ficior Miclăuș*, son of *Dărman* of *Dărmănești* from *Maramureș* county”. *Sandrin* is a diminutive from *Alexa/ Alexandru*, while the nickname *Ficior/ Fecior* (from the Latin *fetiolus*) shows how a common noun is about to become a proper noun. On

<sup>47</sup> DRH, XIV, p. 237-240.

<sup>48</sup> DRH, XIV, p. 564-566.

<sup>49</sup> DRH, XIV, p. 472-473.

<sup>50</sup> DRH, XV, p. 387-390.

<sup>51</sup> DRH, XV, p. 776-777.

<sup>52</sup> DRH, XV, p. 51-53.

<sup>53</sup> DRH, XV, p. 487-495.

<sup>54</sup> DRH, XV, p. 60-62.

June 19<sup>th</sup>, 1376<sup>55</sup>, a *Radul, filius Woznuk*, with the version *Woynuk*, suggesting a connection with the common noun “voinic [sturdy]” (of Slavonic-Romanian origin).

### Conclusions

All these names are particularly important not only from a historical point of view, but also from a philological one. Some of them are clear even in their Latin-Hungarian clothes, but others can only be guessed under the corrupt form in which they have been rendered, due to the specificity of Medieval Latin, but also to the unskillfulness of the notaries who did not know Romanian. From a historical point of view, the document reveals a world of small princely masters of yesterday with their subjects called “serfs”, but also an ending world in terms of the old Romanian organization, now subordinated to other masters. However, knezes still had authority over their villages, the lands and people, on whose work they perceived aliquots, as ever, but saving for themselves only a part; the rest went to the new masters. The names of knezes and serfs, but also the names of the old villages are of old Romanian and Romanian-Slavic resonance, many enclitically articulated or diminutized after the specificity of the Romanian language, or ended in Romanian suffixes. Some names of places and people are kept as such, as the locals pronounced them, although the spelling invariably transforms them. Others are maintained, but Hungarian endings such as *-falva*, *-falu*, *-telke*, *-telek*, *al-*, *fel-*, etc are added to them. In the case of names of places and people (especially nicknames), it is clear that they stem from common nouns or adjectives in Romanian. There are also examples of replacing old names with new ones, suited to the new rulers, or of abandoning archaic names for others.

Through these local words and phrases, present in documents written in Medieval Latin, one can trace the specificity of a world that sometimes leaves itself to be discovered with difficulty under the coating of chancellery language.

---

<sup>55</sup> DRH, XV, p. 51-53.

