

Ruxandra LAMBRU (Romania, Bucharest)

**ANTHROPONYMS IN MEDIAEVAL DONATION
DOCUMENTS (WALLACHIA)**

**Антропоними в средновековните дарствени грамоти
от Влашко
(резюме)**

Статията има за цел да представи значението на влашките грамоти, написани на среднобългарски език, за ономастичното изследване. Тя се основава върху изследването на антропонимичен материал, предоставен в грамотите от XIV и XV век и подчертава разнообразния характер на видовете имена, съществуващи в грамотите (имена на боляри, селяни, писари, и.т.н), като подчертава, че тези имена, в общи линии, са мъжки, заради обществено-историческите условия на периода. Авторката предлага общовалидна схема за структурата на дарствените грамоти (средновековните документи, които включват най-много имена на лица), като уточнява мястото и начина, по който са представени антропонимите в тях.

Ключови думи: средновековна ономастика, средновековна антропонимия, българо-влашки грамоти, старобългарски език, среднобългарски език, палеография, писар, средновековни канцеларии, дарение.

Documents issued by princialy chanceries in Moldavia and Wallachia in the late Medieval period were studied as early as the 19th century, within the context of a Romantic-based interest in history, in the peoples' past. Their documentary importance surpasses though the historical

framework, as the language data registered by those offer on not so few occasions the solution to clarify some controversial aspects or to put the final touch on some diachronic research, making up the bigger picture of the Romanian language. Likewise historical sources put forward a precious inventory of several names of persons, places, crafts or customs, that can be equally turned to account by history, philology or anthropology.

Chancery documents in the Romanian Principalities were edited over time by a great number of Romanian and foreign researchers, mainly interested in information concerning the political, social and economic life during the Romanian Middle Ages. Damian P. Bogdan made a detailed presentation of all documents editions issued at the end of the 19th and the first half of the 20th century with us and abroad, including the mentioning of the transcription method being used by each editor for palaeographic texts (D. P. Bogdan 1978: 78–82).

The series of volumes titled *Documenta Romaniae Historica* (to be further abbreviated as DRH 1966) was devised, at the half of the past century, as an extremely necessary working tool for historical research, taking into account the ever growing difficulties encountered while consulting original documents spread all over in archives, private collections, monasteries or partial editions. DRH 1966 appeared under the auspices of the Romanian Academy (its Historical Sciences Section) and the “Nicolae Iorga” History Institute, and its edition is based on the historical (and not on the philological) method: Slavonic documents are being normalized, superscript letters lowered to line, while abbreviations tacitly completed more often than not. This edition is recognized as useful, as here we can find texts in the original, followed by their translation or just translations (contemporary or later ones) for those cases where the originals were not preserved. Each volume has an onomastics index where we could not find errors or inadvertencies, at least in the one referring to our period of interest¹, i. e. tome I of the series *B. Țara Românească* [B. Wallachia] edited by P. P. Panaitescu and Damaschin Mioc that was published in 1966. Some specialists in onomastics appreciated the way the glossary was edited, where anthroponyms and toponyms were grouped by common indices, therefore recommending it as a model (Pătruț 1984: 10).

Documents issued during the 14th and 15th centuries by Romanian chanceries are generically named *Slavic-Romanian documents*, a term coined by Ioan Bogdan (I. Bogdan 1889a) or texts in *Romanian redaction of Slavonic*, amounting to approximately 7,000, more numerous in Moldavia (about 4,000 of them) and far less numerous in Transylvania (11 of them). The language they are written in is not a unitary one, it differing not only from one province to the other, but even from one scribe to another. The biggest variations are registered when Romanian anthroponyms and toponyms are concerned, the ones scribes introduced in their documents and that were more often than not currently used in the spoken language. A complete philological excursion of documents issued by Wallachian chanceries during the 14th and 15th centuries was made by Lucia Djamo-Diaconiță (Djamo 1971), where in separate chapters and with plenty of examples the Wallachian texts graphics, phonetics, morphology and lexis are being analyzed. The author catches the composite, heterogeneous character of “Wallakian” Slavonian, noticing that documents issued by the princely chancery were less varied than private correspondence, both in their contents, and their style, owing a lot to Old Slavonic and Medio-Bulgarian forms.

Slavic-Romanian documents in Wallachia issued between 1374 and 1500 were in their vast majority princely ones but also noblemen’s and ecclesiastical charters and orders or proceeding from justices and aldermen (mainly donations records or their confirmation and acts to grant trading privileges), to which some letters proceeding from some princes or noblemen are added. The former have a soberer style, being characterized by some fixed formulas that from a linguistic point of view are more conservative, more akin to the Slavic prototype. Texts grouped under the generic name of correspondence are more varied as far as their contents, but also expression is concerned, fixed introductory and closing formulas being frequently shortened or dismissed. Of the latter type we could find fewer translations/”slavization” instances of persons names, a fact we are mainly interested in, but likewise the names frequency is more reduced, as compared to other official documents.

Out of the 311 documents dated up to 1,500 and published in DRH 1966, only 238 are in Slavonic (of which 217 original ones and 21 copied

ones), the rest being in Latin (2 original ones, one a copy, one a translation), Greek (2 copies), Romanian (35 translations) and Hungarian (2 translations). Most of those dating back to the 14th century are issued by the prince's chancery, but in the 15th century there began to appear documents that did no longer belong to the princes' chancery, but to noblemen's, ecclesiastical or city ones.

Some of the documents were not juridically appraised but by reference to other charters expressing some privilege or donation. Most of them refer to persons that are *named* in the document's contents. A document containing a lot of names is the one issued in 1492 by Vlad the Monk (in DRH 1966: 374-375), therewith confirming ownership for his counsel, Stoica Logofăt, a number of villages which he also exempts of taxes. Not less than 40 male and female names are being mentioned in the text, but at first sight one gets the impression that they are far more numerous, as they are resumed by all kinds of phrasal turns and repetition: "And again a third part of Cornăţel and a third of Descupereşti were bought by master *Staicu* Logofăt, from *Udrişte's* mother-in-law, mistress *Boba*, and from *Udrişte's* wife, mistress *Marina*, and from *Udrişte* himself, for 1,000 aspres. (...) And again to master *Staicu* Logofăt and to his sons be granted Bărzeştii belonging to *Mircea Buze*, as it was bought by master *Staicu* Logofăt, from *Mircea Buze's* brother, *Stoica Armaş*, and from *Mircea Buze's* son, *Stoica*, for 24 florins".

In chancery documents we can find numerous times the central authority, in the person of the prince who: 1. rewards by privileges services made by noblemen and chancellors 2. confirms these privileges that were formerly granted by him or his predecessors 3. founds a monastery and grants it lands and privileges or 4. confirms property and privileges formerly granted and/or adds others to them 5. establishes duties and taxes to the state (i.e. to the prince) or grants exemptions from them.

The character of "form" that sources boast also standardizes the way persons names are being spelled, their appearance in a text being linked to fixed formulas². Departing from the most comprehensive type of document (the donation act), we made up a scheme indicating the place where there is usually signalled the name (fields noted with "<>" do not necessarily appear in each document):

Introductory formula: <Holy Trinity Invocation> the *name* and title of the prince <descendence evocation (*name*) > by God's mercy reigning over <the country's borders>

Disposition: I (*name*), in my magnanimity, grant/will/speak/order you...

Recipient (beneficiary): A person (*name*)/ several persons (*name*) <and their families (*name*)>

Description of the donation: assets (villages, boroughs, frontiers, ponds, for whose identification or delimitation persons *names* may also be used)/slaves (*names*) // privileges

<**Reason for the donation:**> Because he/they came ... (*name*)... before me...// Because he/they bought ...(*name*)... from... (*name*)...// Because he/they ... (*name*) ... gave me a good horse³

<**Interdiction of transgressing an order:**> And no one dare [transgress the order], or he will be punished and treated ill by me

<**Curse:**> <Likewise> curse is laid by me...

<**Witnesses:**> *Name*

<**Scribe, date, place:**> These were written by... (*name*)... // It is I (*name*) who wrote these.. // I wrote these (*name*) ... // And (*name*) wrote.. // in the month..., day..., year... // at...

Ending formula: Title and *name* of the respective lord, by God's mercy.

As noted down earlier, not all the texts do necessarily contain the above-stated formulas, while the number of anthroponyms inserted in texts is also variable.

The names regime differs from one paragraph to the other. These shall be analyzed further⁴:

Introductory Formula. That was compulsory and it identified the issuer of the document, i. e. the authority responsible for its contents. As it was already said, for most of the documents, the issuer was the prince himself, self-titling himself as “prince and reigning lord” or as “great prince and reigning lord” (as for *Mircea the Elder*). The prince's Christian name is preceded by the particle *Iō̃* – a palaeographic abbreviation typical to Wallachia⁵ originating in the Greek *Ιωάννης*, a theophoric name meaning ‘God is merciful’, which is not a name in itself, but a title

accompanying the prince's Christian name. In the period we studied, the Wallachian reigning princes' names that are mentioned in the introductory formula of the sources are: *Vladislav, Dan, Mircea, Mihail, Radu, Alexandru, Basarab*, where *Dan, Alexandru, Vladislav* appear as designating two different princes, whereas *Vlad* and *Radu* are those of three different princes⁶. In so far as filiation is concerned, its statement is not compulsory, but it mainly appears when the parent was some respected or awed person, thus transferring upon the son his authority or legitimating him. For example, Vlad the Monk is identifying himself as 'the son of the great prince Vlad': **ѠВ ВЛАД ВОЕВОДА И ГОСПОДИНЬ, СИНЬ ВЕЛИКААГО ВЛАДА ВОЕВОДЕ**. An ample formula whose length and expressivity would thus measure up to the evoked predecessor can be found in a document issued by Mihail, the son of Mircea the Elder: **ѠВАНЪ МИХАИЛ ВЪЕВОДА, СЫНЬ СЛАДЧАИШИ ѠВ МИРЧЮ БЛАГОВЪРНѠМЪ И ХРИСТОЛЮБИВѠМЪ И САМОДЕРЖАВНОМЪ, ВЕЛИКОМЪ ВОЕВОДѠ**.

The Recipients (beneficiaries). These could be noblemen, chancellors (servants waiting on the prince, a fact that explains the frequency of documents issued on their behalf), lords, chieftains or mere villagers. Not always all beneficiaries are being mentioned, in a majority of cases only heads of family or title owners, being included in formulations like '(name) and his family', '(name) and his brethren and children'. In other words, many persons are being identified by their family connection to another person, their name mentioning being optional from the point of view of the issuer. As a rule, the connection is made in the father's name, as the "family head" and household owner. Marica Pietreanu noticed, in a study of social onomastics, that such references to the series father-grandfather-great-grandfather reflect a mechanism by which family patrimony is being transmitted only to the male descendents (Pietreanu 1976: 42). This explains the overwhelming amount of male names as compared to the female ones in documents dating back to that period.

Several donation documents are meant for monasteries that turn out to be extremely rich and the recipients of a great number of privileges. Any document linked to such a place is characterized by its chief cleric or abbot of the community, considered to be the mandatory of the donation.

His name, chosen when receiving the tonsure in exclusive monachism out of Old or New Testament saints' pantheon, is necessarily preceded by the title *kir* (Greek), *egumen* (Greek), *pop* (Slavic) or *otec* (Slavic). Out of the 217 texts on which excerpts were made, more than a half allude to a monastery community headed by its abbot. Only for Cozia Monastery (founded by Mircea the Elder) we counted 20 documents that directly allude to the abbey, 18 of them mentioning its abbots. *Nicodim*, founder and abbot of Tismana, is mentioned in 16 documents.

Description of the donation. Here we may find names of persons who more accurately point to the boundaries (“border”) of plots of land or villages, the so-called *minor toponymy*⁷, of the type *ocina lui Milea* (DRH 1966 doc. no. 180), *miriștea Tâmpeanului* (no. 154), *ocinile lui Stanciu* (no. 11), *poienile lui Lal* (no. 188), *Roșia Știrbeț* (no. 129). We may infer that those named in such cases do own the respective borders or villages, but preservation of it even after the “owner’s” death cannot be ruled out. It is widely known that the great majority of place-names, both in major and minor toponymy are directly correlated to names of persons (Petrovici 1969: 66 and Pătruț 1990: 14), so that old popular names (turned official by their being mentioned in some chancery document) may be at the origin of toponyms created in the following centuries by the authorities.

The Reason for the Donation. Concerning the reason for the donation sources can also bring forth persons names. More often, the written document is only confirming some transaction that has already taken place, identifying the sellers or buyers: in 1489, Prince Vlad ordered that the village of Fărcășești and its watermill stay in property of Tismana Monastery “as its [abbot] bought them from master *Dan Clucer*” (DRH 1966: 355). In 1496, Prince Radu offers to the saintly monastery of Govora a watermill place, ‘as that was bought by my father from *Voico* and *Stoica* of Urși for the sum of 600 aspres’ (DRH 1966: 365). In this paragraph (with an optional appearance) there may also be noted some anthroponyms, as a consequence of a certain happening (that was usually some special service brought to the prince by persons that are neither beneficiaries of a donation or connected to those, nor owners of those or any neighbouring properties to which the documents alludes to, see document no.143 (DRH 1966: 239).

Witnesses. Of all the documents that were at our disposal, more than a half are duly confirmed by witnesses, whose names are more often than not accompanied by titles or offices and are accurately enumerated by the scribe. Generally speaking the witnesses enumerated in documents are noblemen from the court, chancellors, members of the Council. The mentioning of names and offices for the court noblemen helps us understand their rise and fall in importance during one prince's reign or after a change of reign (from *mali dvornic* to *vel[i] dvornic* and then *biv dvornic*⁸). Bojar Cazan, for example, appears as a witness from the Council during the reign of Prince Basarab the Young having the office of treasurer, in three documents (documents 158, 160 and 170), then the title of great dvornik (documents 175, 177) and once as a former dvornik (during the reign of Vlad the Monk, document 181). In that case, the fall from grace was produced once the reigning prince was changed. Historians used to base their microhistorical studies or their dictionaries of noblemen or chancellors on such type of information, see (Stoicescu 1971). In fact the institution named 'princely Council' (СЪВѢТЪ) is not mentioned in documents, but we may infer that the enumeration of 'witnesses' (СВЕДЕТЕЛІЕ) at their end is indeed a list of the council's members. They are very numerous, as the documents show us (for example, those issued during the reign of Vladislav II) and much fewer during that of Mircea the Elder (many documents that have come down to us from his reign do not refer at all to any noblemen witnesses of whom we could infer they belonged to the council). That was interpreted as a sign of the prince's acknowledged power: the council's part is more important when a prince is weaker, younger, lacking in authority, and more diminished in that case of powerful reigning princes, whose authority is recognized and respected (Stoicescu 1968: 88).

The Scribe. Lucia Djamo-Diaconiță refers to a separate type of literate or educated scribes, showing that the scribe's name cannot serve as an accurate criterion of establishing the documents' ethnic origins (Djamo 1971: 278–280). Signatures like *Alb, Albul, Pătru, Radu, Radul, Stanciul, Tatul, Vâlcu, Oprea* and *Oancea* may be clearly interpreted as belonging to Romanians, but *Ban, Coica, Staico* et alii could as well be Romanians, Bulgarians or Serbians and only when the spelling of each document is

analysed can we realize the influences the scribe was taking on⁹. The ones that handwrote documents were certainly employed by the chancery, a fact proved also when beyond their names a quality or office is being mentioned – **ДИАКЪ, ГРАМАТИКЪ, РЪКОПИСАТЕЛЪ, СЪПИСАТЕЛ**] (‘scribe’).

After analyzing the most frequent situations where anthroponyms do appear in Slavic-Romanian documents, one may notice that not all the strata of the population are to be found mentioned in them. The most frequent are the names of noblemen, bojars and other lords (i.e those that owned land and privileges), more seldom being *nominally* mentioned the simple peasants (that were dependents), and only when they had been “offered as a gift” to some monastery. Even more infrequent is the appearance of slaves (gipsies); scribes only render the number of slaves’ families under the generic name of **ЧЕЛЪДИ** [seats] or they indicate the name of the clan’s chieftain and those of his sons.

In the archaic Romanian villages, in each free commonly held peasant family, the man was considered to be the master and representative of the family household; he gave the family grouping its respective name, and the transmission of assets to descendents was usually made only to the male heirs (Pietreanu 1976: 43). Christian Ionescu noticed the fact that we cannot consider as “representative” the names to be found in the old diplomatics sources for the anthroponymic system of the 14th-15th centuries, as these only refer to 1% of the population of the time (Ionescu 1978: 243).

However these anthroponyms, as they are to be found in documents, are the only information concerning denomination and the onomastics inventory of a more remote period of time, so that their study further remains a compulsory stage in the compilation of a historical anthroponymic dictionary.

FOOTNOTES

¹ With exception to two names that we sampled from the documents and that are not to be found in the index, *Gogoșe* and *Man*.

² About diplomatic formulas of documents and their origins see (D. P. Bogdan 1938: 62 and next). The scheme we further put forward is less indebted to

diplomats terminology and it is based on our own observations concerning the occurrence of anthroponyms in the studied texts.

³ “The giving away of the horse” represented the recognition of the prince’s the supreme right to dispose of the land, see (Giurescu 1973: 267).

⁴ Aspazia Reguș and Corneliu Reguș made a reference to the place and names frequency of occurrence in donation documents (Reguș 1974: 497), without elaborating though a scheme comparable to the one presented by us.

⁵ Ioan Bogdan was the first to clarify that particle’s provenance - a palaeographic and/ or diplomatic borrowing (I. Bogdan 1889b).

⁶ According to DRH 1966 index. See also (Reguș 1992: 511).

⁷ By *minor toponymy* (or *microtoponymy*, in French *lieux-dits*) it is understood the names of streets or lanes, of minor water courses, ponds, brooks, see Pascu 1987: 18.

⁸ On state hierarchy of noblemen offices and *cursus honorum* see (Stoicescu 1968: 68-69). The public office was mentioned as a title even after losing it, being accompanied or not by the particle *biv* [former].

⁹ An observation also made by Gheorghe Mihăilă. He stresses though the fact that ethnic origin of the scribe is less important when Romanian words analysis – appellatives, anthroponyms and toponyms – in the documents is concerned (Mihăilă 1974: 5).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

D. P. Bogdan 1938: Bogdan, Damian P., *Diplomatica slavo-română din secolele XIV și XV*, [Slavic-Romanian Diplomatics in the 14th and 15th centuries], București, Imprimeria Națională.

D. P. Bogdan 1978: Bogdan, Damian P., *Paleografia româno-slavă; tratat și album* [Slavic-Romanian Palaeography], București, s.n.

I. Bogdan 1889a: Bogdan, Ioan, „Cîteva manuscrise slavo-romîne din Biblioteca Imperială de la Viena” [A Few Slavonic-Romanian Manuscripts from the Imperial Library in Vienna], *Analele Academiei Române. Memoriile Secțiunii Istorice*, series II, vol. XI, București, p. 29–63.

I Bogdan 1889b: Bogdan, Ioan, „Iω din titlul domnilor romîni” [The Iω from the Title of Romanian Princes], *Convorbiri Literare*, XXIII, București, 721–738.

Djamo 1971: Djamo-Diaconiță, Lucia, *Limba documentelor slavo-române emise în Țara Românească în secolele XIV-XV* [The Language of Slavic-Romanian documents issued in Wallachia in the 14th-15th centuries], București, Editura Academiei.

DRH 1966: *Documenta Romaniae Historica*, seria B. Țara Românească, vol. I [series B. Wallachia, vol. I], București, Editura Academiei RSR.

Giurescu 1973: Giurescu, Dinu C., *Țara Românească în secolele XIV și XV* [Wallachia in the 14th and 15th centuries], București, Editura Științifică.

Grković 1983: Grković, Milica, *Imena u Dečanskim hrisovuljama*, [Names in the old Decani documents], Novi Sad, s. n.

Ionescu 1978: Ionescu, Christian, “Sistemul antroponimic românesc în secolele al XIV-lea și al XV-lea (Țara Românească)” [The Romanian Anthroponymic System during the 14th and 15th centuries (Wallachia)], *Limba Română* XXVII, 3, 243–252.

Ivić and Grković 1977: Ivić, Pavle, Milica Grković, *Dečanske hrisovulje*, [Old Decani documents], Novi Sad, s. n.

Ivić and Jerković 1982: Ivić, Pavle, Vera Jerković, *Paleografski opis i pravopis Dečanskih hrisovulja*, [A Palaeographic Description of the Old Decani documents], Novi Sad, Filozofski fakultet u Novom Sadu, Institut za južnoslovenske jezike.

Mihăilă 1974: Mihăilă, Gheorghe, *Dicționar al limbii române vechi: (sfârșitul sec. X – începutul sec. XVI)* [A Dictionary of the Old Romanian Language (end of the Xth century – beginning of the XIVth century)], București, Editura Enciclopedică Română.

Pascu 1987: Pascu, Ștefan, „Toponimie și istorie” [Toponymy and History], *Studii de Onomastică*, IV, 12–20.

Pătruț 1984: Pătruț, Ioan, *Nume de persoană și nume de locuri românești*, [Romanian persons and place-names], București, Editura Științifică și Enciclopedică.

Pătruț 1990: Pătruț, Ioan, “Tradiție și inovație în onomastică” [Tradition and Innovation in Onomastics], *Studii de Onomastică*, V, 15–42.

Petrovici 1969: Petrovici, Emil, “Oronime formate din antroponime în Carpații românești” [Oronyms Formed out of Anthroponyms in the

Romanian Carpathians], *Studii și Materiale de Onomastică*, Cluj, 61–74.

Pietreanu 1976: Pietreanu, Marica, „O cercetare de socio-onomastică aplicată la material Românesc” [A Study of Applied Social Onomastics on Romanian Documents], *Studii de Onomastică*, Cluj, 38–48.

Reguș 1974: Reguș, Aspazia, Corneliu Reguș, „Antroponimele masculine în documentele slavo-române emise de cancelaria Moldovei între anii 1388-1456. I.” [Male Anthroponyms in Slavic-Romanian Documents Issued by Moldavia’s Chancery between 1388-1456], *Studii și Cercetări de Lingvistică*, XXV, 5, 497–509.

Reguș 1992: Reguș, Aspazia, Corneliu Reguș, “Despre continuitatea numelui de botez în familie” [On the Baptismal Name Continuity within the Family], *Limba Română*, XLI, 9, 509–515.

Stoicescu 1968: Stoicescu, Nicolae, *Sfatul domnesc și marii dregători din Țara Românească și Moldova în secolele XIV–XVI* [The Prince’s Council and the Great Noble Offices in Wallachia and Moldavia in the 14th–15th centuries], București, Editura Academiei.

Stoicescu 1971: Stoicescu, Nicolae, *Dicționar al marilor dregători din Țara Românească și Moldova, sec. XIV–VII* [A Dictionary of the Great Office-Holders in Wallachia and Moldavia, 14th–15th cent.], București, Editura Enciclopedică Română.

Руксандра Ламбру (главен асистент, доктор) е специалист по палеография и старобългарски език, преподава в Букурещки университет, в момента е лектор по румънски език във ВТУ „Св. св. Кирил и Методий”. Съавторка е на граматика на старобългарския език, е изследвала религиозните надписи, написани на среднобългарски език, от манастирите в Олтения, Румъния.