
TRANSYLVANIAN REVIEW

Vol. XXI, Supplement No. 4, 2012

History, Philosophy and Politics (10th–21th Centuries)

Edited by
DANIELA MĂRZA • LIANA LĂPĂDATU

ROMANIAN ACADEMY

Chairman:
Academician **Ionel Haiduc**

CENTER FOR TRANSYLVANIAN STUDIES

Director:
Academician
Prof. **Ioan-Aurel Pop**, Ph.D.

Publication indexed and abstracted in the
Thomson Reuters Social Sciences Citation Index®
and in Arts & Humanities Citation Index®,
and included in EBSCO's library products.

On the cover:
Densuş (Hunedoara county),
Orthodox church, 13th century, general view,
photo by ŞTEFAN SOCACIU

Printed in Romania by Color Print Zalău
66, 22 Decembrie 1989 St.,
Zalău 450031, Romania
Tel. (0040)260-660598;
(0040)260-661752



www.colorprint.ro

Transylvanian Review continues the
tradition of **Revue de Transylvanie**,
founded by Silviu Dragomir, which
was published in Cluj and then in Sibiu
between 1934 and 1944.

Transylvanian Review is published
4 times a year by the **Center for
Transylvanian Studies** and the
Romanian Academy.

EDITORIAL BOARD

CESARE ALZATI, Ph.D.

Facoltà di Scienze della Formazione, Istituto
di Storia Moderna e Contemporanea,
Università Cattolica, Milan, Italy
HORST FASSEL, Ph.D.

Institut für donauschwäbische Geschichte
und Landeskunde, Tübingen, Germany
KONRAD GÜNDISCH, Ph.D.

Bundesinstitut für Kultur und Geschichte
der Deutschen im östlichen Europa,
Oldenburg, Germany
HARALD HEPPNER, Ph.D.

Institut für Geschichte, Graz, Austria
PAUL E. MICHELSON, Ph.D.

Huntington University, Indiana, USA
ALEXANDRU ZUB, Ph.D.

Chairman of the History Section of the
Romanian Academy, Director of the A. D.
Xenopol Institute of History, Jassy, Romania

EDITORIAL STAFF

Ioan-Aurel Pop	Rudolf Gräf
Nicolae Bocşan	Virgil Leon
Ioan Bolovan	Daniela Mârza
Raveca Divricean	Alexandru Simon
Maria Ghitta	

Translated by

Bogdan Aldea—English
Liana Lăpădatu—French

Desktop Publishing

Edith Fogarasi
Cosmina Varga

Correspondence, manuscripts and
books should be sent to: **Transylvanian
Review, Centrul de Studii Transilvane**
(Center for Transylvanian Studies)
12–14 Mihail Kogălniceanu St.,
400084 Cluj-Napoca, Romania.

All material copyright © 2012 by the
Center for Transylvanian Studies and the
Romanian Academy. Reproduction or
use without written permission
is prohibited.

cst@acad-cluj.ro
www.centruldestudiiitransilvane.ro

Contents

• Editor's Note	5
------------------------	---

• The Middle Ages: A Different Face	7
--	---

L'horizon des tombes à dépôt de cheval ou parties de cheval dans la région comprise entre le Bas-Danube, les Carpates Méridionales et Orientales et le Dniestr (X ^e -XIII ^e siècles)	9
--	---

Adrian Ioniță

Die Beziehungen zwischen Byzanz und dem Königreich Jerusalem am Beispiel des kaiserlichen Hofzeremoniells von Konstantinopel im 12. Jahrhundert	43
---	----

Vlad Sofronie

Notes on the Documentary Mention of Hațeg in June 19, 1278	53
--	----

Tudor Sălăgean

The Transylvanian Anthroponymy in the 13 th Century: Introductory Views	61
--	----

Victor V. Vizauer

<i>Payne's Universum</i> in The Graphic Collection of National History Museum of Transylvania Cluj-Napoca	73
---	----

Claudia M. Bonța

Représentations sociales, peurs et règlements de conflits : Les Roumains dans les chasses aux sorcières de Transylvanie (XVI ^e -XVIII ^e siècles)	85
--	----

Ioan Pop-Curșeu

• Ideologies: Between Philosophy and Theology	105
--	-----

<i>Quantum potest et eductio formarum</i> : L'analogie de réception dans le <i>Super Dionysium De divinis nominibus</i> , d'Albert le Grand	107
---	-----

Daniel Fărcaș

Berkeley's Argument for the Existence of God in the <i>Alciphron</i> dialogue	125
---	-----

Vlad Mureșan

Culianu and the European Philosophical Inheritance	131
--	-----

Liliana Sonea

Metaphysics According to Ion Petrovici	145
--	-----

Claudia Renata David

Is There a Political Pathology?	165
---------------------------------	-----

Ana-Maria Dragodan

Defining Populism and the Problem of Indeterminacy: Some Conceptual Considerations	175
--	-----

Camil-Alexandru Pârvu

• A World in Motion: Political Realities and International Relations	187
<hr/>	
Protectorates and International Guarantees in South-Eastern Europe (1774–1878)	189
Gheorghe Cliveti	
La genèse de la frontière sur le Prout : les négociations de Giurgiu et Bucarest (1811-1812)	201
Armand Goșu	
La modernité roumaine à l'âge de l'apprentissage politique	221
Raluca Alexandrescu	
The Modernization of Romania—A Success or a Failure?	245
Gheorghe Iacob	
Mining Labor Agreements in the Jiu Valley during the Interbellum Period	257
Mircea Baron and Oana Dobre-Baron	
Processes of Globalization and Sport Development	275
Jean Fircă	
• Cultural and Historical Diversity	289
<hr/>	
Das Wort als Transporteur eines autochthonen Bildes – kann „ <i>Pfanne</i> “ ins Rumänische eindeutig mit „ <i>Tigăie</i> “ übersetzt werden?	291
Annelore Mayer	
Die ungarische Geschichtsschreibung zur Zeit des Dualismus	301
Vilmos Erős	
Chanoines roumains dans les grandes universités européennes pendant la seconde moitié du XIX ^e siècle	317
Ioana Mihaela Bonda	
Matrimonial Behaviours of the Transylvanian Romanian Rural Elite (Second Half of the 19 th Century)	327
Daniela Deteșan	
Sergei Prokofiev: The Relationship between Music and Communist Ideology: Outline of a Typology	339
Florinela Popa	
The Paradigmatic Polyvalence of Romanian Historiography: Past and Present—Themes, Authors, Orientations	357
Stoica Lascu	
Producing and Consuming “Folklore”: Study of the Origins and Usage of Folklore as a Field of Media Culture in Post-Communist Romania	391
Corina Iosif	
Mixed Marriages in a Multiethnic and Multiconfessional Environment: A Case Study on the City of Cluj (1900-1939)	405
Ioan Bolovan	
Bogdan Crăciun	
Daniela Mărza	
• List of Authors	413
<hr/>	

The Transylvanian¹ Anthroponymy in the 13th Century Introductory Views*

VICTOR V. VIZAUER

Brief History of Research

ONOMASTICS, AS a documentary science of history has recorded after the Second World War a powerful crescendo in correlation with the development of Linguistics and the relative abandonment of eventful history. The study of toponymy, especially in the last three decades of the 20th century, has known a greater importance (according to the scientific developments from the rest of Europe, but to a much lesser extent). Older preoccupations regarding this topic can also be taken into consideration. Thus, I can refer to Ion Martian's article published in *Revista Transilvania* (1915), entitled *Contribuiri la toponimia Ardealului*. A historical-linguistic approach to the problem of Toponymy, referring to the Romanian space in general, can be found in the work *Din toponimia românească. Studiu istorico-lingvistic*, published in 1896 by D. Dan. Another study from the early 20th century, with a general character as well, is that of Vasile Bogrea, *Câteva considerații asupra toponimiei românești*, published in *Dacoromania* (I, Cluj-Napoca: 1920-1921).

Since the beginning of the usage in the Romanian historiography of this discipline detached from onomastics, the exegetes showed interest also in some more specific issues relating to the toponymy. Some papers of I. Bilețchi-Albescu approached a somehow similar topic with our present article, but from an opposite perspective, meaning that he analyzed Romania's toponymy and, in addition, the Celtic influence and role in its formation. These articles are: *Din vechea toponomastică a României și celții în toponomastica României* and *Celții în toponomastica României*, both being published in the journal *Orpheus. Revista pentru cultură clasică*, no. III (1927) and no. IV (1928). Another early research addresses the issue of toponymy,

* This article is part of the CNCSIS-UEFISCSU Research Project, PD type, code 485, contract no. 69/28.07.2010 with the following title: *The anthroponymy of Transylvania in the IXth-XIVth centuries*.

however taking into account only one place name (dating from a different historical period than the one covered by our research) which was formed starting from a Christian given name. Thus see: *Câmpul lui Dragoș. Toponimie veche și actuală din județul Neamț*, article published by Constantin Matasa in *Buletinului Societății Regale Române de Geografie* (no LXII, 1943).

During the Second World War, the studies on toponymy were in regress, as all the other historical research, because of the conditions of austerity imposed by the war. After the war, as Romania's destiny was linked to the Soviet Union, the research on toponymy, as well as on history, was oriented towards the study of the Slavs and their influence on the Romanian territory. Already in 1947, a book was published in this regard, *Despre toponimia slavă din Oltenia*, signed by Ion Donat. It may also be mentioned here Petrovich Emil's article, *Toponime de origine slavă pe teritoriul R.P.R.*, published in the second number of the journal *Cercetări de lingvistică* from Cluj-Napoca.

The period of the 60s—80s of the 20th century was much more fertile if we refer to the interest of the Romanian researchers on toponymy, perhaps due to a deeper connection to the western discourse on onomastics, which became possible during the “cultural relaxation” that took place between 1965 and 1971. The Romanian preoccupations regarding toponymy became known to the foreign researchers through the participation of the Romanian researchers in specialized international conferences, like: Ion Donat, *Quelques aspects géographiques de la toponymie de Valachie*, in *Atti e memorie del VII Congresso internazionale di scienze onomastiche* (IV), or *Aspects chronologiques de la toponymie roumaine*, in *Proceedings of the Eighth International Congress of Onomastics Sciences (Paris)*, both in 1966. Some of the studies from these years dealt with topics with a strong national dimension, such as that of Eugen Janitsek, called *Toponime de origine antroponimică din Maramureș (Toponime cu sufixul -esc, la plural -ești)*, published in *Studii de onomastică* (III, 1982) or I. Pătruț's article entitled *Alte toponime formate din antroponime*, published in *Cercetări de lingvistică* (XXIII, 1, 1978).

During this period of time, toponymy began to capture the attention of the historians more than before when it was primarily an apanage of the philologists. Acknowledged historians and archaeologists, like Ștefan Pascu (for example *Toponimie și istorie*, in *Studii de onomastica*, IV, 1987), Radu Popa (among others: *Observații privind vechimea și semnificația ca izvor istoric a unor toponime Maramureșene*, in *Maramatia*, III, 1977) or Coriolan Suci (*Dicționar istoric al localităților din Transilvania*, vol I-II, 1967-1968) focused their research also on this branch of onomastics, seeing in it an important historical source, alongside with anthroponymy, hydronymy etc. It is true that these examples did not represent the first attempts to link toponymy to history (see Nicolae Drăganu, *Toponimie și istorie*, Cluj, 1928 and *Românii în veacurile IX-XIV pe baza toponimiei și onomasticii*, Bucharest, 1933), but the initiative of Nicolae Drăganu was not pursued until much later.

The interest for the study of toponymy in the last decade of last century and in this first decade of the new millennium remained constant (perhaps with a slight decline in the early '90s). It was noticeable a specialization and regionalization of the approached subjects, the authors trying to focus their attention on small topics and on restricted geographical areas. The following works represent eloquent examples: Gh. P. Banica, *Toponimia zonei submontane dintre Olt și Dâmbovița* (2002); Ion Conea, *Toponimia din Valea Dunării Românești* (2006); Maria Crașoveanu, *Toponimia județului Mehedinți* (2008); or C. Mărinouiu, *Toponimia Țării Loviștei* (2001). Works with wide perspective on the phenomenon regarding the place names were also published, such as *Toponimie românească și internațională* (2008) by Ion Bogdan and Nicolae Suditu. It is very important for this type of research to be continued (mentioning that the approach of the themes regarding the Medieval period would be necessary as well, taking into consideration the fact that that was the period when the first written documents appeared in the Romanian territory—in Transylvania starting with the 11th century), because it can provide information and important contributions to our understanding of the Romanian history.

Romanian contribution to the knowledge of toponymy, in particular, and onomastics in general, is placed into a broader and international framework—although for us, the European contributions are the most relevant. We must take advantage of the richer international experience in this field (its beginnings can be placed in the 2nd half of the 19th century) and to use its methodology, at least as an example for our own methodology, shaped according to the particularities of our historical and geographical space.

Thus, an important scientific source may be the journal *Revue internationale d'onomastique*, whose first issue was printed in 1949 or *Onoma* magazine, published by the International Council of Onomastic Sciences—ICOS and also *Rivista Italiana di Onomastica*, which has its beginnings in 1995. Besides these, we can also mention some articles and books written by some prominent experts in the field, such as: E. Ormeling, *Training course on toponymy: Enschede, Frankfurt am Main, Berlin* (2003); or the works of N. S. Sahu, *Toponymy, a genre in onomastic science: a linguistic study* (Delhi: 1989), Margaret Gelling, *Place-names in the Landscape* (London: 1984) and N. Cadmon, *Toponymy, The Lore, Laws and Language of Geographical Names* (New York: 1997)². Some ideas regarding the study of toponymy and comparisons between the ways of formation and evolution of the place names can also be found in the books of some French authors such as Ch Baylon, P. Fabre, *Les Noms de lieux et de perssones* (Nathan Universite: 1982) and E. Vial, *Les Noms de villes et de villages* (Berlin, 1983)³.

From the few aforementioned bibliographical references, one can notice that the Romanian research in this field considered only in a very small degree the realities from the Middle Ages and, in the same time, it did not use the documents from that period as main sources for the research. In conclusion, we might say that the largest

part of the problems concerning the medieval toponymy has remained unknown so far and there are no pertinent opinions expressed concerning the names of places and localities in the 11th—14th centuries Transylvania, much less on those derived from personal names. We will try to fill in some of this scientific gap with some preliminary conclusions regarding the Transylvanian medieval anthropo—toponymy, presented in the present paper.

The Directions and the Methodology of the Research

FIRST OF all, at the beginning of a research of this nature, an index of the names of localities from the textual sources of *diplomatic* (documents that are typologically assimilated to the procedural acts, privileges and registers), *codicologic* and *narrative* (*Gesta Ungarorum*, which mentions many names of settlements from Transylvania; *Legenda maior* and *Legenda minor* of Saint Gerard of Cenad; *Legenda Sancti Ladislai Regis*; *Legenda maior* and *Legenda minor* of the Saint King Stephen of Hungary; *Gesta Hunnorum et Hungarorum* of Simon de Kéza or *Rerum Ungaricarum decades quatuor cum dimidia* of Antonius Bonfinius) type must be realized. The resulted repertoire of the anthropo-toponyms thus represents the basis for any further research.

From the methodological point of view, the analysis will not be based on linguistics, but it will focus on the historical phenomenology and on the hermeneutical interpretations, in order to make us notice, if possible, how these names of localities evolved, were transformed, were composed or truncated, or sometimes how they disappeared (usually together with the village).

From this perspective, the comparative method will be very useful and most often used, mainly after the gathering of all the information resulted after the general review of the anthropo-toponyms, as the constant elements of the European historical evolution can offer good explanations also for the Romanian historical evolution in its Transylvanian part. Obviously, the Transylvanian model is particular through its local characteristics, but the basic elements are generally similar.

During this phase, after the end of the process of recording of the reviewed anthropo-toponyms (which were adopted as names for the localities or from which these names derived), we will start to classify them depending on: *ethnicity* (Latin names, Romanian names, Hungarian names, Slavic names, Greek names, Turanic or Turkic names); *sex*: male names, names of women; *chronology*: names from the 11th century, names from the 12th century, from the 13th century and from the 14th century; *composition*: the elements that compose the locality name (personal name plus flora, fauna, landforms, elements of land ownership etc.).

Then we will analyze the main channels through which the names were transmitted, the causes, by categories, that led to the appearance of composite names

or of two distinct names given to the same locality; to which category these anthroponyms belong (first name, last name, nickname); influences suffered by the anthroponyms that became toponyms according to the fashion of the time (especially from the cultural point of view). After the 12th century, in the context of urbanization and population growth, but also in the context of a more effective control of the state over the population, the surnames started to appear, which gives an interesting perspective to the research: which one of the two names of an individual and under what conditions was given to a specific locality?

In the same time it is important to determine how were the names given to the settlements within specific ethnic and social groups; the main categories of anthroponyms, their frequency depending on the social and professional status of the person who borrows its name (if possible); modifications in the names of some settlements due to changes in status or confession.

The phenomenon of Christianization of the anthroponyms in medieval Transylvania is particularly important because the proportion of changes, in time, between pagan and Christian names (either biblical or saints) demonstrates how the Transylvanian society adopted and adapted itself to the anthropological values of Christian Europe. Also, it would be useful to be observed when and for what reasons the people abandoned the previous names (pagan) in favor of the Christian names.

Determination of the main types of anthroponyms belonging to the populations settled down in Transylvania on their own initiative or because of the Hungarian kingdom (Saxons, Székely's) is another issue targeted in a research of this type. In this context, an interesting element would be to elucidate the motivation that led to the assumption inside an ethnic group of some locality names belonging to the anthroponymical baggage of an other ethnic group - if the situation requires.

Finally we want to say that the presentation of the research directions that can be followed when researching the anthroponyms from medieval Transylvania is not exhaustive.

Recommendation for A Typology

AFTER ORDERING the anthroponyms registered so far⁴, the following typology resulted:

- A. Simple toponyms** (Adrian, Maria, Petrus)
 - A.I. Old Testament names (Abraam, Adam)
 - A.II. New Testament names (Ana, Maria, Petrus)
 - A.III. Not christian names (possibly Bors, Zabolch)

B. Composite toponyms*B.I. Name + flora*

1. Name + *erdeu* (in Hungarian: *erdő* = forest): ex. Pauli Erdeu
2. Name + *faya* (in Hungarian: *fa* = tree): ex. Gregorfaya
3. Name + *nyr* (in Hungarian: *nyír* = birch): ex. Nyrpaul

B.II. Name + landforms

1. Name + *halma* (in Hungarian: *halom* = hill): ex. Bedehalma
2. Name + *hegy* (in Hungarian: *hegy* = mountain): ex. Martonhegy

B.III. Name + elements of landownership

1. Name + *fálva* / *fálua* / *folua* (in Hungarian *falu* = village): ex. Jordanfolua
2. Name + *haza* (in Hungarian: *ház* = house): ex. Markhaza/Marocaza
3. Name + *hyda* (in Hungarian: *hid* = bridge): ex. Bonchyda
4. Name + *laka* (in Hungarian: *lak* = small house, cottage): ex. Wolquinlaka
5. Name + *teluke* / *telke* / *telek* (in Hungarian: *telek* = piece of land, parcel of land): ex. Hermanteluke, Gyulatelke
6. Name + *villa* (village): ex. Villa Petri

B.IV. Name + adjective

1. Name + *kis* (in Hungarian: *kis* = little): ex. Kismaria
2. Name + *nog* (in Hungarian: *nagy* = big, large): ex. Nogmichal/ Nogmihal

B.V. Name + religious terms

1. Name + *sancto* / *sancti* / *zent* (in Hungarian): ex. Sancto Johanne

C. Complex composite toponyms

C.I. Double name + elements of landownership: ex. Mariamagdarena Teleke

C.II. Name + religious terms + landforms: *sancti/sancto* + *lapis* (in latin: *lapis* = stone): ex. Lapis Sancti Mychaelis

C.III. Name + religious terms + elements of landownership

1. *Sancti* + *telek/theleky*: ex. Sancti Michaelis Theleky
2. *Sancti/sancti* + *villa*: ex. Villa Sancte Marie

At first sight, the typology is quite complex, but we wanted to introduce the types of anthroponyms of each main groups (A, B, and C) for a better reflection of their diversity.

Concerning B.I.2. and B.III.1, it might not be the case of two distinct points, because *faya* might also refer to *fálva*, but with a different writing. This is not the only case in which the typology may suffer changes, as further research could bring new elements that will require revisions of parts of it.

The Anthro-Toponyms from Mediaeval Transylvania

NEXT, WE will make a preliminary presentation, according to the stage of the present research, of the groups of anthro-toponyms determined after the consultation of an important part of the edited documents of the 13th century and the first decades of the next century.

The majority of the anthroponyms which became toponyms, especially oiconyms⁵, were Christian, some from the Old Testament (Solomon, Adam and Samson), but most were from the New Testament (Ana, Maria, Paul, Adrian, Peter, George, Michael etc.). The names of saints were also used, usually along with the Latin *sancto / sancti / sancte* or the Hungarian *scenth / scent / zent / send* - different spellings of the word *szent* - *holy* (Sancto Johanne, Sancti Martini, Sancta Katherina, Sancte Marie, respectively Scenthmyclous, Sendgyorg). We have not met doubtless unchristian anthroponyms (maybe Zabolch and Bors), but some of them could not be classified in the category of Christian ones without a certain margin of error (for example Privart). The women's names used as names of settlements, places and possessions were found in much smaller degree than male anthroponyms, and generally they were names of some women-saints (Anna, Mary, Katherine and Agnes).

The first category of anthro-toponyms (A) which we defined in the typology is that of the names of settlements, possessions or castles consisting only of a persons name without other related items (example: Adrian, Abraham or Maria). Obviously alongside the toponym, it also appears the term which defines the legal structure or the land form related to it, such as *villa*, *possessione*, *terra* or *monte*, but this term is not comprised in the name of the settlement or possession in question, as it is the case of the compound anthro-toponyms. A simple toponym consisting of a nickname or appellation is very rare, but, for example, there is a case that could be considered as a family name or a future surname. We refer to *Kenez*⁶ (today Voivozi village, Bihor county), considered by the editors of the collection of documents as being Chiniz, an old Romanian name⁷.

A broader category of anthro-toponyms is represented by the composed ones (B). They consist of two elements: a person's name (especially first names) and a term designating flora (Nyrpaul), landforms (Lapis Sancti Mychaelis), items of property (Villa Umberti, Paulustheluke)⁸, adjectives (Kismaria) or religious terms (Sancti Nicolai, Zenthbeneduk). It is possible that one of the names of settlements reviewed contained a term referring to an occupation. It is the anthro-toponym *Kereky Mihai* (now probably Cherechiu). In Hungarian, *kerék* means *wheel*, so that *Kereky* could come from the Hungarian word for

wheel, so that the meaning could be *wheelwright*, although the correct term in Hungarian would be *kerekes*. A more detailed knowledge of the characteristics of the settlement from the period of its mentioning in the document (1291-1294)⁹ would be necessary as well as of more examples of this kind, in order to determine with a greater certainty the meaning and origin of the anthroponym *Kereky Mihai*.

There are settlements (We have identified just two so far) that were listed with two different names. I refer to a village in Ugocea County (now in Ukraine) called *Akusfalva* and/or *Peturfalva*¹⁰ and a possession from Szabolcs County (now in Hungary) called *Apayteluke* and/or *Zeuleus*¹¹. There were other settlements or places, even within the same document, whose names appear to be different, but in these cases it was just another manner to write the same name.

Concerning the same group of the composed anthroponyms, we would like to draw the attention on the name of a *possessio* in the county of Cluj, namely *Bogartelek/Bogártelke*. I brought into discussion this oiconym, since it could be the only one that included a nickname until this point of our research. In Hungarian, *bogár* means cockroach. We considered this *Bogar* as a possible nickname, because in a document from the 1st of August 1320, it was mentioned a certain Stephanus called Bugar¹². But it is also a great possibility that the name could come from another event or fact related to *bogár* - *cockroach*.

The anthroponyms from the third category (C) have a similar form as the compounded ones, but they are more complex, alongside the name (first name or nickname) there are also at least two other elements as those listed above. A type of anthroponym of this group is composed of a *double name* and an *element of property*, the only example being *Mariamagdalena Theleke*. The situation is not very clear regarding the anthroponym Maria Magdalena—should we consider it as a simple or double forename? - the two anthroponyms (Maria and Magdalena) being found both separately and together. The types of anthroponyms formed from *name + religious terms + landforms or elements of ownership* (Lapis Sancti Mychaelis, Villa Sancte Marie) belong to this category as well. So far, we have identified only a few examples of this type of anthroponyms, most of them being from the category of compounded ones (B).

A difference between the settlement names exists also from the point of view of the appurtenance of the forename/name/nickname, from which the anthroponym is composed, to the anthroponomical *stock* of a certain ethnic group. Thus, we have discovered names with Germanic resonance (villa Humberti, Zenthguthard, Hermanteluke) or names with a Slavic origin (Ivankateleke, Wolquinlaka or Zawa). Besides the above mentioned Romanian surname (Kenez/Chiniz) it is possible that another forename could be attributed to this ethnic group as well, namely the anthroponym *Marcel* (*Marcelfolua*, in Sătmar

County)¹³. We think that this name may have been used by Romanians because we have not yet discovered it in relation to Germans or Hungarians from Transylvania and it has a Latin resonance¹⁴. In the cases of a few anthroponyms, their Hungarian version was used, such as *Scenthmyclous* (correct: Szent Miklós) or *Scentgyurg* (Szent György). We have cataloged two considerably old anthroponyms with a possible Hungarian provenance, used as the names of two settlements in the county of Bihar, namely *Bors* and *Zobolch*¹⁵. We think that these person names have their origins in the Hungarian anthroponyms mentioned by Anonymus in his *Gesta Hungarorum* with the forms of *Borsu* and *Zobolsu*¹⁶. Some of the person names can not be attributed to a particular ethnic group because they are common and they are found at each population, but, in most cases, it was used their Latin version (Paulus, Iohannes, Katherine, Maria etc.).

Relevant for the particularities of this area is also the joining in the same anthroponym of two words written in different languages. Examples might be *Sancti Michaelis Theleky* or *Paulusteluke*. In both cases, the anthroponyms were written in Latin and the word designating the type of property is in Hungarian (*telek*). But in a province like Transylvania, we don't believe that linguistic mixture represents an unusual phenomenon.

In some cases, alongside with that *teluke* / *theleky* / *telke* and referring to the same settlement, it was also used the Latin term *villa*. We identify three reasons for this: the word *telek* was already integrated into the settlement's name in the popular parlance; the writer of the document was not a native from Transylvania and he considered *Galfalua* as the actual name of the village and not having the significance of *village of Gal*, so ultimately resulting *villa Galfalua* - *villa village of Gal*; or it was just a repetition like in the cases of donations: *dedimus, contulimus et donavimus*. It would be helpful to determine the certain motivation for the repetition of the word *village*, and maybe future investigations will bring greater understanding of this problem.

A large and interesting part of the research is to determine how, or more correctly the direction in which the names were transmitted: from a person to a settlement or vice versa? The fact that the settlements were founded by people makes us believe that the taking over of a name was realized from a person to a village / possession. This process took place in this way at least in the case of the foundation of new villages, especially in times of population growth. The name of a settlement mentioned in 1319, *Barthaleuswyfolva* (today Uifalău) could support this hypothesis. Correctly written in Hungarian, the settlement's name would be *Barthaleusújfalva*, which would mean *the new village of Barthaleus*. In these circumstances it is possible that the village's name expressed the very fact of the foundation of a new settlement. But as in the other cases, when the village name meant *the village of X* or *X's village* the loan of the name was

made certainly in the same way, from person to place, even if it was not a new foundation. Changing the old name of a settlement with the name of its owner could take place even if that person came into the possession of the village by inheritance, purchase or donation. An example from the beginning of the 13th century proves, although at a much smaller scale, the existence of the reverse process of adopting the name, namely from the settlement to a person. A man called Dirsig, mentioned in 1213, was a native of the village Dirsig. The fact that the above mentioned Dirsig had the same name at the same time as the locality from which he was originating and he was not the owner of that village rather shows that the person Dirsig was named after the settlement, rather than vice versa.

Instead of conclusions, which at this point of the research would not reflect a reality based on a documentary material consistent enough, we would like to emphasize once again the importance of studying the toponyms, in general, and the anthroponyms in particular, a more deeper knowledge and the solving of some issues generated by them being able to provide a more realistic and complex picture of the habitat in medieval Transylvania.



Notes

1. In this case, through the term Transylvania we understand both itself the voievodship of Transylvania and the territories later known as *Partium*.
2. Other contributions that are worth mentioning: P.E. Raper, *Manual for the giving of place names* (Pretoria: 1979); Ronald L. Baker (edited by), *The study of place names* (1991); Jimenez Mata, Maria del Carmen, *La Granada islámica: contribución a su estudio geográfico-político-administrativo a través de la toponimia* (Granada: 1990); Rickard Graham, *How places got their names* (Ada, OK, 1989); Paul Auguste Piemonte, *La toponymie, conception nouvelle, le sens des noms de localites en pays roman et germanique* (Strasbourg: 1969) and so on.
3. The list can continue with other themes concerning toponymy: Auguste Vincente, *Toponymie de la France* (Paris: 2000); Norbert Guinot, *Mémento de toponymie* (2004); Alain Simmer, *Toponymie mosellane* (2002); Robert Aymard, *Les Pyrénéens au miroir de leur toponymie* (1996); Jean Gervais, *Payré et son terroir: essai de toponymie* (2008); François Lassus, *Noms de lieux de Franche-Comté: introduction à la toponymie* (Paris, 1995).
4. By the time of this article, we gathered the anthroponyms from much of the edited documents of the 13th century and first decades of the 14th century.
5. I. Conea said that the names of most settlements (oiconyms) were originally anthroponyms – Ion Conea, *Vrancea: geografie istorică, toponimie și terminologie geografică* (Bucharest: Ed. Academiei Române, 1993), p. 67. To a similar conclusion had come D. Loșonți too, an important part of the place names collected during his research where

- derived from appellations and anthroponyms – Dumitru Loșonți, *Toponime românești care descriu forme de relief* (Cluj-Napoca: Ed. Clusium, 2000), p. 16.
6. *Documente privind Istoria României. C. Transilvania (veacul XIII)*, vol. II (1251–1300) (Ed. Academiei Republicii Populare Române, 1953), doc. no. 381, p. 336 (hereafter DIR.C.13–II.).
 7. DIR.C.13–II, doc. no. 381, p. 336, n. 10.
 8. Toponyms containing elements of landscape, flora and fauna, as well as property relations were also found in other Romanian provinces, some of them surviving in the next centuries too – Ilie Dan, *Toponimie și continuitate în Moldova de Nord* (Iași, Junimea, 1980).
 9. DIR.C.13–II, doc. no. 381, p. 336.
 10. *Documente privind Istoria României. C. Transilvania (veacul XIV)*, vol. I (1301–1320) (Ed. Academiei Republicii Populare Române, 1953), doc. no. 420 (hereafter DIR.C.14–I.).
 11. DIR.C.14–I, doc. no. 339.
 12. DIR.C.13–II, doc. no. 440.
 13. DIR.C.13–II, doc. no. 154.
 14. We know popes and martyrs who bore this name or its derivatives: Marcellus, Marcellinus (Popes, III-IV centuries), centurion Marcellus, Marcellian (Roman martyrs, the end of the 3rd century) – David Hugh Farmer, *Oxford Dicționar al Sfinților* (Bucharest, Univers Enciclopedic, 1999), p. 349, 351.
 15. DIR.C.13–II, doc. no. 381.
 16. Anonymus Notarius, *Gesta Hungarorum/Faptele Ungurilor* (Translation, preface, introduction and notes by G. Popa-Lisseanu, Bucharest: Ed. Mentor, 2001), cap. XVIII, respectively XXI (but they are also mentioned in other chapters).

Abstract

The Transylvanian Anthro-Toponymy in the 13th Century: Introductory Views*

In the present material we wanted to express some preliminary views on the study of anthro-toponyms from the territory of Transylvania in the 13th century. The research is based mostly on office documents of the specified period (edited documents) but also from the early 14th century.

The article includes a brief overview of previous researches on the theme of toponymy, a statement of methods and directions that can be followed in the research, a proposal for a typological classification of the anthro-toponyms and a preliminary analysis of the anthro-toponymical groups and the issues raised by them.

Keywords

Transylvania; anthro-toponymy; 13th century; typology; methodology; Middle Ages.

