

POLYNUCLEAR TOPONYMIC FIELDS. ILLUSTRATION BASED ON MDTM₁₋₂

Ana-Maria PRISACARU
“A. Philippide” Institute of Romanian Philology of Iași

Abstract

The *toponymic field* defines a denominative structure developed around a *nucleus*, designating in the denominator's view the object of maximum (socio-geographical) importance in a micro-area, to which one or more *derivate toponyms* are subordinated, through a *polarization* relation, names that designate geographical objects of secondary importance in the immediate vicinity of the nucleus. Although such structures are generally *mononuclear*, there are also situations where the elements of a toponymic field have to be subordinated to several nuclei, a solution that conveniently explains relationships that are established between seemingly unrelated toponyms, but which designate contiguous geographical objects. In the latter case, we are talking about *polynuclear toponymic fields*.

Key-words: *toponymy, toponymic field, polarization relation, toponymic nucleus, derivate toponyms*

Résumé

Le *champ toponymique* définit une structure dénomminative développée autour d'un *noyau*, désignant dans la vision du dénominateur l'objet de la plus haute importance (sociogéographique) dans une micro-zone, à laquelle sont subordonnés, par une relation de *polarisation*, plusieurs *dérivés toponymiques*, qui désignent des objets géographiques d'importance secondaire à proximité du noyau. Bien que ces structures soient généralement *mononucléaires*, il existe également des situations dans lesquelles des éléments d'un champ toponymique doivent être subordonnés à deux ou trois noyaux, solution qui explique aisément les relations établies entre des toponymes apparemment non liés, mais qui désignent des objets géographiques situés dans le voisinage. Dans de tels cas, on parle de *champs toponymiques polynucléaires*.

Mots-clés: *toponymie, champ toponymique, polarisation, noyau toponymique, dérivés toponymiques*

Micul dicționar toponimic al Moldovei (structural și etimologic)[*The Brief (structural and etymologic) Toponymic Dictionary of Moldova*] is the result of a project developed by the Department of Toponymy within “A. Philippide” Institute of Romanian Philology of Iași. The initiator and coordinator of this dictionary was the late toponymist, professor doctor Dragoș Moldovanu, who proposed the approach to Moldavian toponymy from the perspective of an analogy between the organization of toponymic fields and the structuring of a toponymic map of a micro-area based on oppositions that imply the existence of a common element and of one or more differentiating elements. Related to toponymy, the outcome of this approach based on opposi-

tions is the *toponymic field*¹, defined as a denominative ensemble organized around a *nucleus* which designates, from the denominator's perspective, the object of outmost (socio)geographical importance in a continuous area. One or more toponyms designating contiguous geographical objects of secondary importance are subordinated to this nucleus.

Whenever the elements of a lexical field are connected by means of opposition relations based on their semantic context, the relationships between the components of a toponymic fields target the importance of the designated geographical objects, as well as their contiguity in the respective micro-area. In the absence of a lexical signification, the function of the toponyms is no longer to signify, but merely to identify the reality designated by means of a *toponymic content*. Despite being rather controversial², this concept is represented by the association between an articulated entopic term, which refers to the class the denominated geographical object belongs to, and an attribute expressing the characteristic considered by the denominator as being the most relevant in the attempt to individualize the referent among the geographical objects of the same type: *Dealul Mare* vs. *Dealul Morii* [*The Big Hill* vs. *The Mill's Hill*], *Pârâul Negru* vs. *Pârâul Sărat* [*The Black Brook* vs. *The Salty Brook*], *Poiana cu Cetate* vs. *Poiana Teiului* [*The Fortress Clearing* vs. *The Linden Tree Clearing*], *Valea Rece* vs. *Valea Seacă* [*The Cold Valley* vs. *The Dry Valley*], etc.

One or more determined elements designating geographical objects that belong to different classes are subordinated, by means of a unilateral dependence relationship, to the nucleus-toponym, the unique determiner within the toponymic field. This type of structuring of the toponymic fields, based thus on oppositions established between a nucleus-basis and one or more *toponymic derivatives* (similar to the oppositions existing between the lexical bases and derivatives) is called *polarization*³.

The toponymic fields of a polarizing type are mostly mononuclear. Besides the polarizing element, they may have one

*Dealul Neicului / Neicu's Hill*⁴ → [*Satul*] *Neicul / Neicul* [*Village*]
[Pârâul] Ruginoasa / Ruginoasa [*Stream*]⁵ → [*Satul*] *Ruginoasa / Ruginoasa*
[Village]
⁺*[Satul] Posadnicii / Posadnici* [*Village*]⁶ → *Valea Posadnicilor / Posadnici*
Valley

or several subordinated toponyms, of which some may become, in turn, nuclei for secondary toponymic derivatives:

*Dealul Năzărioaia / Năzărioaia Hill*⁷ → *Valea Năzărioaiei / Năzărioaia's Valley*
 → [*Satul*] *Năzărioara /*

¹ This concept, called "onomastic field" (*Namenfeld*), was discussed in 1934 by Wilhelm Will, who classified the names of a series of castles and monasteries according to their lexical meaning. Still in relation to the lexical field, Wilhelm Kaspers equals the two concepts, namely onomastic fields and "notional fields" (*Sinngruppen*). For a more detailed perspective on this topic, see Moldovanu, 2010: 9-20.

² For details, see Moldovanu, 2010: 11-14.

³ Moldovanu, 2010: 18.

⁴ MDTM₁: 284.

⁵ MDTM₁: 354.

⁶ MDTM₁: 334.

⁷ MDTM₁: 281.

	<i>Năzărioara [Village]</i>	
<i>[Satul] Galbeni / Galbeni [Village]</i> ⁸	→ <i>+Schitul de la Galbeni / Galbeni Hermitage</i>	
	→ <i>Dealul Galbeni / Galbeni Hill</i>	
	→ <i>Pârâul Galbeni / Galbeni Stream</i>	
	→ <i>Păduricea Galbeni / Galbeni Small Forest</i>	
<i>Valea Pechei / Pechea's Valley</i> ⁹	→ <i>[Satul] Pechea / Pechea [Village]</i>	→ <i>+Odaia Pechea / Pechea Cattle Farm</i>
		→ <i>Dealul Pechei / Pechea's Hill</i>
<i>Dealul Păltinişului / Păltiniş' Hill</i> ¹⁰	→ <i>Pârâul Păltinişului / Păltiniş' Stream</i>	
	→ <i>[Satul] Păltinişul / Păltiniş [Village]</i>	→ <i>Fânaşul Păltiniş / Păltiniş' Hayfield</i>
		→ <i>Drumul Păltinişului / Păltiniş' Road</i>
		→ <i>Pasul Păltiniş / Păltiniş Pass</i>

Therefore, one of the toponymist's tasks is to accurately establish the direction of polarization, the so-called *secondary etymology*¹¹, which reveals and explains the dependence relationship of each toponymic derivate towards its polarizing nucleus. This approach is facilitated by historical and geographical documentation, yet it requires from the toponymist a very good understanding of the "laws" governing the popular and cultivated place denomination system, since these laws can impose a certain nucleus¹² upon a toponymic structure.

However, there are cases when the trajectory of the toponymic polarization process cannot be established beyond any doubt, because findings indicate that the same anthroponomical or appellative base, following derivation with various suffixes, can result in two or more toponyms which designate different geographical objects belonging to the same micro-area and which become, in turn, nuclei for autonomous toponymic structures. In such cases we may speak of a *polynuclear toponymic field*¹³.

⁸ MDTM1: 181.

⁹ MDTM1: 318.

¹⁰ MDTM2, ms.

¹¹ *Secondary etymology* differs from *primary toponymic etymology*, which aims at identifying the designation relationship between the nucleus-toponym and the designated geographical object (see Moldovanu, 2014: X).

¹² In the popular place denomination system, streams often take their names from the mountain or hill in their vicinity, the names of meadows become nuclei for names of hills and according to a third such rule, the foot of a hill or mountain is named after the respective hill or mountain it belongs to. In the cultivated toponymic system, which was applied in geography starting with the second half of the 19th century, meadows are named after the hills they are situated on, whereas mountains or hills, as well as the foot of a mountain or hill are named after the streams in their vicinity.

¹³ Moldovanu, 2014: XI.

For instance, the name of Stanislav *Rotompan*, a boyar mentioned in various documents in the period 1387-1412, constitutes the basis for two nuclei, namely the oronym *Movila lui Rotompan / Rotompan's Hillock* and the place name *Rotopâneștii*, a precise filiation being impossible to establish¹⁴. The name of the feudal landlord *Liuban Stravicu* generated, on the one hand, the place name *Ibănești* and, on the other hand, independently, the hydronym *Ibăneasa*¹⁵, both names subsequently developing their own toponymic fields.

This binuclear toponymic structure, containing exclusively elements of Romanian origin, occurs very often in the toponymy of Moldova:

- *Brăieștii* (oikonym) – *Brăiasa* (hydronym), both nuclei resulting through derivation from the name of the boyar *Brae*¹⁶,
- *Gostileștii* (oikonym) – *Gostileasa* (hydronym, with the version *Pârâul Gostileascăi / Gostileasca's Stream*), originating from the name of the feudal landowner *Gostilă*¹⁷,
- *Burleștii* (oikonym) – *Burla* (name of standing water), based on the name *Burlă*, attested for the first time in the phrase *Heleșteul lui Burlă / Burlă's Pond*¹⁸,
- *Mândreștii* (oikonym) – *Valea Mândra / Mândra's Valley* (hydronym), derived from the name of the judge *Ivan Mândrul*¹⁹,
- *Vornicenii* (oikonym) – *Vorniceasa* (hydronym), originating from the name of the boyar *Ivan Dvornicul*²⁰,
- *Docanii* (oikonym) – *Docăneasa* (oikonym), originating from the name *Docan*²¹ etc.

Toponymic fields with three nuclei can also be identified: the family name *Oance*, for instance, occurs with a toponymic function both in the phrase designating a place name *Slobozia Oancii / Oancea's (tax-free) Village* and the oronym *Dealul Onciul / Onciul Hill* (which, in turn, is the polarizing element for the place name *Onciul*), but it also represents the anthroponomical basis for the place name nucleus *Oncești*²².

Oance → *Slobozia Oancii / Oancea's Village*
 → *Dealul Onciul / Onciul Hill* → *[Satul] Onciul / Onciul [Village]* → *Iazul Onciul / Onciul Pond*
 → *Pădurea Onciul / Onciul Forest*
 → *[Satul] Onceștii / Oncești [Village]*

¹⁴ In turn, the place name attracts through polarization a toponymic reference, *Curtea Rotopânești / Rotopânești Court*, a hydronym, *Gârla de la Rotopânești / The Backwater in Rotopânești*, and a phytonym, namely *Pădurea Rotopânești / Rotopânești Forest* (MDTM₁: 353).

¹⁵ Although the collective suffix *-ești* secures the role of toponymic nuclei for personal place names, the *Ibăneasa* form has not resulted through regressive derivation from *Ibănești* (case in which it would have had the form *Ibăneasca*), being formed with the motional suffix *-easa*, which provides the agreement with the entopic term *vale* [valley] (MDTM₁: 224-226).

¹⁶ MDTM₁: 60.

¹⁷ MDTM₁: 197.

¹⁸ MDTM₁: 70.

¹⁹ MDTM₁: 263.

²⁰ MDTM₁: 449.

²¹ MDTM₁: 135.

²² MDTM₁: 289.

The name of Stanciu *Săcuiul*, attested even since 1491 in the hydronymic phrase *Pârâul Secuiului / Szekler's Stream*, represents the starting point for two other toponymic nuclei, namely the place name *Secuienii* and the hydronym *Secuia*²³.

Secuiul → *Pârâul Secuiului / Secuiul Stream*
 → [*Satul*] *Secuienii / Secuienii [Village]*
 → [*Pârâul*] *Secuia / Secuia [Stream]* → [*Satul*] *Secuia / Secuia [Village]*
 → *Dealul Secuiei / Secuia's Hill*

The Ukrainian influence upon Moldova's toponymy, manifested after the period 1000-1100²⁴, is rendered visible by the existence of binuclear toponymic fields that are either exclusively Ukrainian or have Ukrainian formative elements in one of the nuclei. In order to exemplify the first situation we can mention the name *Cepel*, of Slavic origin, which represents the anthroponomical basis for both nuclei of the corresponding toponymic field, respectively for the place name *Ceplinții*, formed by derivation with the Ukrainian collective suffix *-inci*, and the hydronym *Cepenița*, formed by derivation with the Ukrainian compound suffix *-nica* < *-în-ica*²⁵. The name *Bene*, attested in a Slavonic document of 1490 in the phrase *Casa lui Bene / Bene's House*, formed two toponymic nuclei with Ukrainian suffixes, namely the hydronym *Benia*, formed by derivation with the possessive suffix *-ja*, and the oronym *Benschi*, where the adjectival suffix *-skij* provides the agreement with the masculine entopic term *horá* or *horb*²⁶. Equally complex is the toponymic structure based on the Slavic appellative **rokyta*, which is subject to double derivation: on the one hand with the suffix *-ov*, resulting in the nucleus hydronym *Răcătău* (< v. ukr. *Rokytow(a)* "with wickers"), and on the other hand with the patronymic *-janin* (*-ĕnin*), used with the archaic plural form *-jane* (*-ĕne*), and resulting in the nucleus place name *Răcăciune* (< **Rokičene* "Răchiteni")²⁷.

In MDTM₁₋₂ one can also identify *mixed* binuclear fields, when only one of the nuclei is of Ukrainian origin. For instance, for the hydronym *Pârâul Coșca / Coșca Stream*, the indicated etymon is an old Ukrainian derivate of the proper name *Košo* with the hydronymic suffix *-ka*. The second nucleus of the toponymic field under analysis, specifically the place name *Coșeștii*, is a Romanian derivate from the anthroponym *Coșa* with the collective suffix *-ești*.

Polynuclear toponymic fields are also formed by place names with a double tradition that appeared in Moldova as a result of the Slavic-Romanian symbiosis. This type of toponymic structure unifies two place formations that share the same anthropomical/ appellative base while being derived with suffixes corresponding to each of the languages that come into contact, any relation of subordination being thus annulled. As opposed to mononuclear fields, where names with a double tradition can be identi-

²³ MDTM₁: 370.

²⁴ Ivănescu, 2000: 445.

²⁵ MDTM₁: 82-83.

²⁶ MDTM₁: 40.

²⁷ MDTM₂, ms.

fied, but they are related to the same referent²⁸, in this case the corresponding toponyms refer to distinct geographical objects, each of them subsequently becoming polarizing elements for their own bigger or smaller toponymic structures. The Romanian place name *Rânghilești*, for instance, was used for a while in parallel with its Ukrainian correspondent *Rângăuți*, derived with the suffix *-owci*, both originating from the Slavic anthroponym *Ringo*. It is possible for the two place names to have initially designated the same village; however, starting from 1786 they were attested as designating different administrative units: *Rângăuți* (the county of Dorohoi) and, in its immediate vicinity, *Rânghilești* (the county of Iași). Consequently, in MDTM₁ the two village names are processed as distinct nuclei within the same field, each having independent toponymic derivatives²⁹. The form *Dragova* also dates from the bilingual Slavic-Romanian period, designating a hydronymic nucleus with several autonomous toponymic derivatives within the field developed from the name of Dragoș³⁰. The other nucleus is the Romanian name of a field, namely *Câmpul lui Dragoș / Dragoș' Field* which, by extension, ends up designating a micro-area belonging to the former county of Bacău including approximately 22 villages. Thus, the Ukrainian version resumes the Romanian root *Drag-*, to which it adds the possessive suffix *-ova*, which agrees with the entopic term *dolina* [valley]³¹.

Despite the fact that generally the toponymic fields processed in MDTM₁₋₂ are mononuclear, the analysis indicates situations when the elements of such a toponymic structure must be subordinated to several nuclei, a solution often adopted in order to provide a convenient explanation for the equality relationships established between toponyms related to the same anthroponomical/appellative base, which are apparently not related, yet which designate contiguous geographical objects.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Ivănescu, G., *Istoria limbii române*, Iași, Editura Junimea, 2000.
- MDTM₁₋₂ = Moldovanu Dragoș (coord.), Butnaru Daniela, Cojocaru Vlad, Moscal Dinu, Prisacaru Ana-Maria, *Micul dicționar toponimic al Moldovei (structural și etimologic)*. 1. *Toponime personale*, Iași, Editura Universității „Alexandru Ioan Cuza”, 2014; 2. *Toponime descriptive* (ms.).
- Moldovanu, Dragoș, *Teoria câmpurilor toponimice (cu aplicație la câmpul hidronimului Moldova)*, Iași, Editura Universității „Alexandru Ioan Cuza”, 2010.
- Moldovanu, Dragoș, *Introducere* la MDTM₁.

²⁸ Rom. *Falcău* - Ukr. *Falkiv* (MDTM₁: 160); Rom. *Baineș* - Pol. *Baince* (MDTM₁: 20); Rom. *Bădeuții* - Ukr. *Badewci* (MDTM₁: 27); Rom. *Hudeștii* - Ukr. *Hudinți* (MDTM₁: 214); Rom. *Rădăuții* - Slv. *Radovți* - Pol. *Radowcze* or *Radowice* - Ukr. *Radiwci* (MDTM₁: 341), etc.

²⁹ MDTM₁: 347-348.

³⁰ This may refer to either the first voivode of Moldavia or Dragoș Viteazul [Dragos the Brave], the chief magistrate of the Neamț Fortress in the period 1401-1408.

³¹ MDTM₁: 148.