THE CURRENT TOPONYMY IN OLTENIA AND MUNTENIA FROM THE ETHNIC POINT OF VIEW. A STATISTICAL CONSIDERATION

Iustina BURCI
"C.S. Nicolăescu-Plopşor" Institute for Research in Social Studies and Humanities of the Romanian Academy, Craiova

Abstract

The current ethnotoponymy, in general, and that of Oltenia and Muntenia, in particular – because we will approach it further – is the result of a long evolution, outcome of sedimentations that evidence the linguistic layers (Thracian and Dacian, Romanian, Slavic, Hungarian, Bulgarian, Petcheneg and Cuman, German, Saxon) with a variable lexical concentration, directly proportional to the duration, intensity and surface of the space in which the Romanians lived along with other people.

The toponymical dictionaries, made for the cited regions, offer the possibility for a thorough research (typological, structural, etymological, etc.) of the names of places whose denomination was based on ethnic names. In the present article, a statistical comparative analysis – Oltenia versus Muntenia – is made on addressing the presence of ethnicities in the two areas.

Key-words: *toponymy, ethnic character, Oltenia, Muntenia, statistics*

Résumé

L'ethnotoponymie actuelle en général et sp1cialement celle de l'Olténie et la Valachie –telle que nous allons approcher dans cet article – est le résultat d'une longue évolution, des sédiments qui montrent les couches linguistiques (trace et dace, roumain, slave, hongrois, bulgare, petchenègue et cumane, allemand, saxon) à concentration lexicale variable, directement proportionnelle à la durée, à l'intensité er à l'espace où les Roumains ont habité avec d'autres populations. Les dictionnaires toponymiques, réalisés pour les régions citées, offrent la possibilité d'une recherche approfondie (typologique, structurelle, étymologique, etc.) des noms de lieux dont la dénomination est fondée sur des noms ethniques. Dans cet article on faut une analyse comparative statistique - Olténie versus Valachie - sur l'approche de la présence des ethnies dans ces deux régions.

Mots-clés: *toponymie, caractère ethnique, Olténie, Valachie, statistique*

Starting from the assertion made by the linguist Iorgu Iordan that "since the beginning, the ancestors of the Romanians found themselves in the position of getting in touch with numerous foreign peoples"[1], which either arrived "in this part of the world just to cross it, and to 'plunder', meaning that they wanted to satisfy their economic needs" [2], or "settled …permanently, or at least for a while, mingling with the natives, leaving traces of their existence in the life, language and toponymy of the area, which are still present. Later on, after the creation of the two principalities (Muntenia and

[1] Iordan, 1963: 260-261.
[2] Idem, *ibidem*.

BDD-A28489 © 2018 Editura Sitech
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 20:43:37 UTC)

Moldova), the contact with the foreign peoples, along with the immigrations, some 'natural', other organised, with certain intentions, by the leadership of the Principalities itself"[3] – we will both identify and analyse, in the present work, from the statistic point of view, the presence of the foreign ethnic groups in the current toponymy of Oltenia and Muntenia[4].

Before investigating these denominations, we ought to make the observation that a relation of equivalence between the nationality of the denominated and the ethnonym attributed to them is always needed. There are situations in which "the existence or the deduction of a root of the toponym, similar to any ethnic name, is not enough in order to draw the conclusion that it really has this origin" [5]. Sometimes, there can be people who "travelled in the region they took the name from, as a derived element, for example *Grecu*-the Greek can be a Romanian who spent time in Greece, eventually in the Greek slum, of a Romanian city, or even a Romanian who speaks Greek. *Ungureanu*-the Hungarian is the name of the people who, in the past, used to come from Transylvania, a region that used to belong to Hungary (also called 'the Hungarian Parts'). Besides these, *Bulgaru*-the Bulgarian, *Sârbu*-the Serbian are often names of gardeners, even if they are Romanians. Obviously, there are other explanations too, the ethnic name being also a nickname: doctor Slătineanu, from *Viaţa românească* club, was called *Turcu* (the Turk), although he had never been to Turkey. A police officer from Bucharest was called *Parizianu*-the Parisian..."[6].)"

Generally, it is a name transfer based on similarities (on addressing the look, the language or particular circumstances), in which the individuals found themselves, in relation to a certain ethnicity. The "rare" ethnotoponyms that we have come across in our study, such as *Boşimanu*-the Bushman, *La Americanu*-at the American, *Fântâna lu Chinezu*-the fountain of the Chinese, *Piatra Chinezului*-the stone of the Chinese, etc., but also some "classic" ones, constitute examples in this regard. Concluding, one cannot certainly know, at present, unless a *sui generis* research is carried out, which is the category each name goes in, "the ethnicity not necessarily being a proof of the foreign origin of the bearer"[7].

Moreover, in order to have a complete image on the toponyms that have ethnonyms in their structure, we will analyse part of them further on; the denominations have been classified, according to their internal componence, and the following structural patterns have resulted:

1. ***Simple names*** (to which the nominative, from the statistic point of view, corresponds):

a) derived elements from toponymy: *Grecele* < top. *Greaca* + suff. *-le*; *Sârbia*

[3] *Ibidem*.

[4] The necessary information was taken from the two toponymical dictionaries for the mentioned regions: *Dicţionarul toponimic al României. Oltenia* (DTRO), coordinating prof. Gh. Bolocan PhD, vol. 1 (A-B), Craiova, Universitaria, 1993 and the next, and *Dicţionarul toponimic al României. Muntenia* (DTRM), coordinating prof. Nicolae Saramandu PhD, Bucharest, Romanian Academy Publishing, vol. 1 (A-B), 2005; vol. 2 (C-D), 2007; vol. 3 (E-J), 2009; vol. 4 (L-M), 2011; vol. 5 (N-P), 2013; vol. 6 (R-Ţ); we ought to mention that the most recent DTRM volume has not be published yet. Moreover, we consider that the information in it cannot change significantly the data supplied by all the other volumes.

[5] Bureţea, 1996 : 230.

[6] Graur, 1965: 93.

[7] *Ibidem*.

BDD-A28489 © 2018 Editura Sitech
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 20:43:37 UTC)

< *sârb* + suff. top. *-a*; *Tătara* < np. *Tătaru* + suff. top. *-a*; *Tătăroaica* < np. *Tătăroaică* + suff. top. *-a*; *Nemţeasca* < np. *Neamţu* + suff. *-easca*; *Turcineasa* < top. *Turcinu* + suff. *-easa*; *Ţiganca* < *ţigan* + suff. top. *-a,* etc.

b) underived elements (singular or plural) – *Arnăutu, Bulgaru, Cazaci, Cazacu, Jidovu, Francu, Francii, Frâncu, German, Greci*, *Grecii*, *Grecu*, *Neamţu*, *Ovreiu*, *Sârbu*, *Tătari*, *Turciţi, Turciţii*, *Turcu*, *Ţiganca*, *Ţigani*, *Ţiganii*, *Ţiganu*, *Rudari*, *Rudaru,* etc. – or derived in other spaces adjacent to toponymy: the common language, anthroponomy (therefore without relevance, on addressing the toponymical affixation) – *Grecani, Ovreieşti, Germănoaia, Greceanu, Greceni, Greceşti, Grecşori, Greculeşti, Italieni, Nemţeşti, Nemţoiu, Sârboana, Sârboiu, Sârbescu, Sârboaica, Sârbeana, Sârbeanca, Sâbeasca, Sârbeni, Sârbescu, Sârbeşti, Sârbin, Sârbinu, Sârboaia, Sârbulescu, Sârbuleţu, Turcoaica, Tătărăscu, Turcin, Turceni, Turceşti, Turcinu, Turcoaia, Turculeţu, Ţigănaşu, Unguritu, Ungurici, Ungureana, Ungureanca, Ungureanu, Ungurei, Ungurelu, Ungurenari, Zlătăreni,* etc.

2. ***Analytical names*** – the syntactic connections between the parts of the compounding elements are made through:

– the enclitic genitive (*Ciutura Armeanului, Grădina Bulgarilor, Balta Cazacului, Măgura Evreilor, Aria Frâncului, Drumu Frânceştilor, Casa Grecului, Gorunu Grecilor, Pădurea Greceştilor, Via Grecii, Vâlceaua Talienilor, Braniştea Neamţului, Coada Nemţoaicăi, Crucea Nemţilor, Bordeele Rudarilor, Dealu Rusului, Măgura Rusoaicelor, Ştiubeiu Saşilor, Crâşma Sârbului, Fântâna Sârboaicăi, Fagu Tătarului, Cheia Turcului, Bordeiu Ţiganului, Cotu Ţigăncii, Dealu Ungurului,* etc.) and the proclitic genitive (*Eleşteu lu Cazacu, Hotaru lu Francezu, Lunca lu Frâncu, Fântâna lu Grecu, Fântâna lu Pantelie Grecu, Fântâna ale Nuţă Grecii, Prunii lu Grecu, Livada lui Mateiaş Neamţul, Piscu lu Neamţu, Fântâna lu Nicolae Rudaru, Căsoaia lu Radu Sârbu, Coada lu Sârbulescu, Fântâna lu Nae al Sârbii, Poteca lu Sârb, Cireşii lu Ioniţă Tătaru, Fântâna lu Fănică Turcu, Fântâna ale Turcu, Nucii lu Fane a lu Turcu, Fântâna lu Costică Ţâganu,* etc.);

– the accusative with simple prepositions: *la (at), în (in), sub (under), cu (with), din (from), spre (towards), prin (through)* and compound: *de/di la (from), pe/pi la (around)*. Within these structures, the ethnonyms can be found in different hypotheses:

1) they are preceded by simple and compound prepositions – *La Americana, La Arvatu, La Bordeiu Armencii, La Bulgaru, La Nicolae Bulgaru, La Ovreiu, În Stâlpu Grecului, La Casa Grecului, Sub Grecu, În Piscu Neamţului, La Nemţi, La Nemţoaica, În Sârbi, În Slavu, În Ţiganu, La Nae Ungureanu, Pe la Sârbi, Pi la Dumitru Ungureanu, Pi la Turcitu,* etc.;

2) they are part of complex constructions, consisting of either two prepositional groups – *La Punte la Bulgaru, În Dos la Ovreiu, La Grecu la Carcalichi, La Pod la Neamţu, În Sârbărie la Cazacu, În Pod la Ţigani, La Poiana cu Ţigani,* etc., or of a determined prepositional entopic element – *Puntea de la Cazacu, Ciutura de la Grecu, Curmătura de la Prunii Grecului, Măgura din Drumu Grecilor, Fântâna la Greaca, Fântâna de la Talian, Ogaşu cu Neamţu, Podu de la Ilie Neamţ, Ciutura din Sasu, Uliţa la Saşi, Cişmeaua la Flora Sârba, Drumu di la Sârbi, Drumu la Turcitu, Valea cu Turci, Copaciu din Cucu Ţiganului, Uliţa prin Ţigănie, Drumu spre Rudari, Movila cu Cercul Turcului,* etc.;

– they combine

BDD-A28489 © 2018 Editura Sitech
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 20:43:37 UTC)

1) the accusative with the genitive: *La Bordeiu lu Stârcă Neamţu, La Bunaru lu Grecu, La Nucu lu Neamţu, La Gârla lu Turcilă, Pi la Leana lu Sârbu,* etc.

2) the nominative with the genitive and the accusative (the order of the last two shifts according to the particular situation of each toponym): *Hududoiu lu Turcu din Ţiţiriga, Canalu de la Gârla lu Turcilă,* etc.

The grammatical characteristic of the denominations – the gender (feminine / masculine), the number (singular / plural), the case, etc. – to which is added the perception of the namensgeber related to the geographic object are always used to present / describe, as accurately as possible, the situations in a community.

*

Thus, our statistical analysis considers the toponyms of Oltenia and Muntenia that have ethnical names in their structure, regardless of their form (non/articulated, non/derived, simple or analytical) and their etymological status (appellatives, anthroponyms, toponyms) within the denomination. In order to exemplify, we are further presenting the series of place names which have in their structure the ethnonym *Bulgarian*:

Oltenia: *Bulgaru* (OT), *Fântâna Bulgărească* (GJ), *Fântâna ale Bulgaru* (OT), *Grădina Bulgarilor* (OT), *La Bulgaru* (GJ, VL), *La Nicolae Bulgaru* (VL), *La Punte la Bulgaru* (VL), *Măgura Bulgarului* (DJ), *Pârâu Bulgarilor* (GJ), *Pivniţa Bulgarului* (GJ), *Podu Bulgaru* (VL);

Muntenia: *Bragadiru-Bulgaru* (IF), *Bulgari* (AG), *Bulgaru* (m. Bucureşti, DB, TR), *Bulgăreasca* (TR), *Dealu Bulgariei* (IL), *Fântâna lu Nicu Bulgaru* (PH), *În Bulgari* (CL, TR), *În Bulgărea* (DB), *În Bulgăreasca* (AG), *În Salcâmi la Bulgaru* (PH), *La Anton Bulgaru* (DB), *La Bulgari* (PH, TR), *La Bulgaru* (DB, PH), *La Pietriş la Bulgaru* (AG), *La Salcâmii lui Bulgaru* (IL), *La Tomescu la Vasile Bulgaru* (IL), *Pădurea Bulgăreasca* (TR), *Puţu lu Bulgaru* (AG, IL), *Puţu din Bulgari* (CL), *Satu Bulgarilor* (DB), *Slăveşti-Bulgăreasca* (TR).

From here, we isolated the ethnic name, which was analysed in the general context of the ethnonyms found in the two regions. Here they are, classified alphabetically in a table that indicates their presence or absence, in the mentioned areas. It is also stated that, in order to have a more detailed image, we treated each denomination separately, even if some of them refer to the same ethnic community (for those that are rare, we mentioned, in the footnote, the place name from which it was taken).

No.	Name of ethnicity	Oltenia	Muntenia
1.	*abaz (Abkhazian)*[8]	-	+
2.	*american (American)*	+	+
3.	*arbănaş (Albanian)*	+	+
4.	*ardelean*[9]*(from Ardeal)*	+	+

[8] Toponym *Abazu* (TR); "*Abăzà* is one of the most widely spread personal names in Turkey… in the region of Caucasus, there is an entire province occupied by the people called *Abazĭ* (Schiefner). From there, Abăzeştii came to our country. This family settled in Moldova, not before the half of the 17th century" (B.P. Hasdeu, 1970: 78-79).

[9] Considering the circumstances under which the Romanian principalities were along the time, under different occupations, and that the conscience of the common origin appeared only later, it was normal for the Romanians from a certain province to be regarded as foreigners, due to the metanastic shifts (displacement within the country – see Ion Toma, *op. cit.*, p. 73). "This explains the existence of the

BDD-A28489 © 2018 Editura Sitech
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 20:43:37 UTC)

5.	*armean (Armenian)*	+	+
6.	*arvat (Croatian)*	+	+
7.	*austriac (Austrian)*	-	+
8.	*bosniac (Bosnian)*	-	+
9.	*boşiman*[10] *(Bushman)*	-	+
10.	*boşneag*[11] (*Bosnian*)	+	+
11.	*bulgar (Bulgarian)*	+	+
12.	*calmuc (Kalmuck)*[12]	+	-
13.	*cazac (Cossack)*	+	+
14.	*chinez (Chinese)*	+	+
15.	*englez (English)*	-	+
16.	*evreu (Jew)*	+	+
17.	*franc (Frankish)*	+	-
18.	*francez (French)*	+	+
19.	*franc (Frankish)*	+	+
20.	*gepid (Gepidae)*[13]	-	+
21.	*german (German)*	+	+
22.	*grec (Greek)*	+	+
23.	*hun (Hun)*	+	-
24.	*italian (Italian)*	+	+
25.	*japonez*[14] *(Japanese)*	-	+
26.	*jidan* (*Jew*)	+	+
27.	*jidov* (*Jew*)	+	+
28.	*latin (Latin)*	-	+

toponyms *Moldoveni* etc. in Muntenia, *Munteni* etc. in Moldova and *Ungureni* etc. in both of them" (Iorgu Iordan, *op. cit.*, p. 261)." In this hypostasis – of "foreigners" – are found, in our inventory, *ardelean, muntean* and *ungurean*. Muntean (inhabitant of Muntenia) can also have the origin of: inhabitant of a mountainside region.

[10] The toponym *Boşimanu* (IF); "Indigenous black population in the south of Africa; a person that belongs to the bushman community" (https://dexonline.ro/definitie/bo%C8%99iman – site accessed on 18.03.2018).

[11] "A person that belongs to the population of Bosnia and Herzegovina, or originating from there" (https://dexonline.ro/definitie/bosniac, site accessed on 10.06.2017). The Romanian language records a series of appellatives that define the same notion: "*bosniac*; (pop.) *bosnean*; (reg.) *boşneag*; (reg.) *bosnac*; (old term) *bosnegiu*, *boşnegiu*. The existence of these many terms is explained through their provenience from different sources" (Purdelea Sitaru, Vasiluţă, 2010: 242-246). On addressing our case, in the toponymy of Oltenia, the forms *Boşneagu* and *Boşnegani* are found. If the latter is based on a group name – *boşnegani*, which comes from the anthroponym *Boşneag*(*u*) –, the establishing of the etymology for the first one registered several direction of analysis: thus, Vasile Bogrea (*Pagini istorico-filologice*, with a preface by acad. Constantin Daicoviciu, supervised edition, introductory study and index by Mircea Borcilă and Ion Mării, Cluj, Dacia Publishing, 1971, p. 184) considered that it was a substitution of prefix: of *-eac* with *-eag*; Iorgu Iordan (*op. cit.,* p. 268) derived from Serb. *Bošnjak*, and DTRO (p. 359) explains it through the personal name *Boşneag*(*u*).

[12] The toponym *Uliţa lu Calmucu* (DJ); "A person that belongs to the population from the region of Kalmykia".

[13] The toponym *Gepizi* (OT) – a gorge in the commune of Şerbăneşti (the existence of an old cemetery, called *Cimitirul Gepizilor,* was discovered in that specific place –Iordan, *op. cit.*, p. 271-272).

[14] The toponym *Fântâna lu Ion Japonezu* (DB).

BDD-A28489 © 2018 Editura Sitech
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 20:43:37 UTC)

29.	*leah* (*Polach*)	-	+
30.	*maur*[15]*(Moor)*	-	+
31.	*moldovean (from Moldova)*	+	+
32.	*muntean (from Muntenia)*	+	-
33.	*muscal (Moscal)*	-	+
34.	*neamţ* (*German*)	+	+
35.	*oltean (from Oltenia)*	-	+
36.	*otoman (Ottoman)*	-	+
37.	*ovrei* (*Jew*)	+	+
38.	*peceneg (Petcheneg)*	-	+
39.	*poleac (Polach)*	+	-
40.	*polonez (Polish)*	-	+
41.	*rudar*[16] (*Gypsy*)	+	+
42.	*rus (Russian)*	+	+
43.	*sas (Saxon from Transylvania)*	+	+
44.	*saxon (Saxon)*	-	+
45.	*sârb (Serbian)*	+	+
46.	*schiau* (*Bulgarian*)	+	+
47.	*secui (Szeckler)*	-	+
48.	*slav (Slav)*	+	+
49.	*slovean (Slovenian)*	-	+
50.	*tătar (Tatar)*	+	+

[15] The toponym *Mauru* (DB); "A person who belongs to the population that, in Antiquity, used to live in the north-west of Africa; a person that belongs to the Arabian population that conquered the north-west of Africa and a part of Spain in the Middle Ages" (https://dexonline.ro/definitie/maur – site accessed on 18.03.2018).

[16] There are trades that, in the past, were especially practiced by certain ethnicities, without exclusively attributing these trades to them. "Thus, most of the *Serbians* are merchants and innkeepers, the *Armenians* prefer trading and lease-holding, but they are also tailors, coffee-shop owners, Tabaco-shop owners, joiners. The *Russians* are especially stone masons, adze makers, shoe makers, cart makers, but they are also potters, innkeepers or merchants. The Greeks were generally traders, but few of them were also innkeepers or greengrocers. A significant share of the *Jews* was made of traders, spirits makers and innkeepers. Moreover, they were butchers, cashiers, glass makers, shoe makers, tinsmiths, haberdashers, cloth makers, silver jewellery makers, carpenters, hat makers, wheat flour makers. The *Lippovans* were fishermen. The *Poles* were stone masons, shoe makers, carpenters, locksmiths, painters, but also clockmakers and innkeepers. The *Frenchmen* were well-known French teachers, and the *Hungarians* were excellent architects and German teachers. The *Italians* are known as bakers, confectioners and musicians" (Caproşu, Ungureanu, 1997, II: 3). On the 13th of October 1652, Vasile Lupu thanked to the high official Mihail from Braşov for the gardeners (Greeks –out note) that he sent and who "worked with great devotion"; consequently, the ruler asked that they would be sent again in spring (Ştefan Olteanu, Constantin Şerban, *Meşteşugurile din Ţara Românească şi Moldova în evul mediu*, Bucharest, Editura Academiei Republicii Socialiste România, 1969, p. 72). The Bulgarians were also gardeners, which might explain the great frequency of … *Grădinaru* surnames" (Oancă, 1998: 150). Unlike all these above, *rudar* ("gypsy worker that used to extract gold from river banks"-MDA) and *zlătar* ("gypsy craftsman that worked and sold gold; nomad gypsy"-MDA) represent trades that were confused with the ethnicity that practised them and, due to this fact, they are mentioned in the present study. On addressing the first ones – rudari – it has been even said that they are not gypsies, bringing as an argument the spoken language – the Romanian, and not Romani – and a custom they still observe– called *gurban* (see Iustina Burci, *Minorităţi etnice în toponimia actuală din Oltenia şi Muntenia: ţiganii*, in "Cercetări lingvistice. Omagiu doamnei profesoare Adriana Stoichiţoiu Ichim", coordinator Dragoş Vlad Topală, 2017: 39).

BDD-A28489 © 2018 Editura Sitech
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 20:43:37 UTC)

51.	*turc (Turk)*	+	+
52.	*ţigan (Gypsy)*	+	+
53.	*ungur (Hungarian)*	+	+
54.	*ungurean (Hungarian)*	+	+
55.	*veneţian* (*Italian*)	-	+
56.	*zlătar* (*Gypsy*)	+	+

As one can notice from the previous table, in Oltenia and Muntenia there were registered 56 ethnic appellatives:

a) common ethnonyms for both areas – 32: *american, arbănaş, ardelean, armean, arvat, boşneag, bulgar, cazac, chinez, evreu, francez, frânc, german, grec, italian, jidan, jidov, moldovean, neamţ, ovrei, rudar, rus, sas, sârb, slav, şchiau, tătar, turc, ţigan, ungur, ungurean, zlătar*;

b) ethnonyms found only in Oltenia – 5: *calmuc, franc, hun, muntean, poleac*;

c) ethnonyms found only in Muntenia – 19: *abaz, austriac, bosniac, boşiman, englez, gepid, japonez, latin, leah, maur, muscal, oltean, otoman, peceneg, polonez, saxon, secui, sloven, veneţian.*

Among these, some are not registered at all in Oltenia – *abaz, austriac, englez, gepid, japone,z* etc., while others are mentioned differently, but they refer to the same ethnicity *polonez/leah* (Muntenia) vs *poleac* (Oltenia). And the names, such *oltean*, in Oltenia, and *muntean*, in Muntenia, lack, logically if we think that the ethnicity in the birth place does not represent a differentiating denominative criterion.

After establishing which they are and the way they are spread by regions, we further present the frequency of the ethnic names registered in Oltenia and Muntenia, and the total number of the occurrences.

No.	The denomination of the ethnicity	Frequency		
		Oltenia	Muntenia	Total
1.	*Abaz*	-	1	1
2.	*American*	2	5	7
3.	*Arbănaş*	1	3	4
4.	*Ardelean*	1	2	3
5.	*Armean*	6	21	27
6.	*Arvat*	1	3	4
7.	*Austriac*	-	1	1
8.	*Bosniac*	-	1	1
9.	*Boşneag*	2	2	4
10.	*Boşiman*	-	1	1
11.	*Bulgar*	11	21	32
12.	*Calmuc*	1	-	1
13.	*Cazac*	25	37	62
14.	*Chinez*	3	1	4
15.	*Englez*	-	3	3
16.	*Evreu*	1	2	3
17.	*Franc*	1	-	1

BDD-A28489 © 2018 Editura Sitech
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 20:43:37 UTC)

18.	*Francez*	2	2	4
19.	*Franc*	13	10	23
20.	*Gepid*	-	1	1
21.	*German*	2	1	3
22.	*Grec*	141	169	310
23.	*Hun*	1	-	1
24.	*Italian*	3	7	10
25.	*Japonez*	-	1	1
26.	*Jidan*	4	16	20
27.	*Jidov*	26	16	42
28.	*Latin*	-	4	4
29.	*Leah*	-	1	1
30.	*Maur*	-	1	1
31.	*Moldovean*	3	15	18
32.	*Muntean*	12	-	12
33.	*Muscal*	-	6	6
34.	*Neamţ*	108	58	166
35.	*Oltean*	-	53	53
36.	*Ottoman*	-	2	2
37.	*Ovrei*	13	19	32
38.	*Peceneg*	-	2	2
49.	*Poleac*	1	-	1
40.	*Polonez*	-	1	1
41.	*Rudar*	54	55	109
42.	*Rus*	11	82	93
43.	*Sas*	9	40	49
44.	*Saxon*	-	1	1
45.	*Sârb*	159	113	272
46.	*Schiau*	8	25	33
47.	*Secui*	-	20	20
48.	*Slav*	5	8	13
49.	*Sloven*	-	1	1
50.	*Tătar*	48	101	149
51.	*Turc*	151	132	283
52.	*Ţigan*	207	230	437
53.	*Ungur*	26	21	47
54.	*Ungurean*	108	72	180
55.	*Venetian*	-	1	1
56.	*Zlătar*	6	2	8
	Total	1 177	1 393	

BDD-A28489 © 2018 Editura Sitech
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 20:43:37 UTC)

According to the number of occurrences, we classified the ethnonyms according to the degree of frequency:

I. Oltenia

1 – *arbănaș, ardelean, arvat, calmuc, evreu, franc, hun, poleac*; 2 – *american, boșneag, francez, german*; 3 – *chinez, italian, moldovean*; 4 – *jidan*; 5 – *slav*; 6 – *armean, zlătar*; 8 – *schiau*; 9 – *sas*; 11 – *bulgar*, *rus*; 12 – *muntean*; 13 – *frânc*, *ovrei*; 25 – *cazac*; 26 – *jidov*, *ungur*; 48 – *tătar*; 54 – *rudar*; 108 – *neamț*, *ungurean*; 141 – *grec*; 151 – *turc*; 159 – *sârb*; 207 – *țigan*.

Thus, the first five[17] positions are occupied, in decreasing sequence by: *țigan, sârb, turc, grec, neamț* and *ungurean*.

II. Muntenia

1 – *abaz, austriac, bosniac, boșiman, chinez, gepid, german, japonez, leah, maur, polonez, saxon, sloven, venețian*; 2 – *ardelean, boșneag, evreu, franxez, otoman, peceneg, zlătar*; 3 – *arbănaș, arvat, englez*; 4 – *latin*; 5 – *american*; 6 – *muscal*; 7 – *italian*; 8 – *slav*; 10 – *frânc*; 15 – *moldovean*; 16 – *jidan, jidov*; 19 – *ovrei*; 20 – *secui*; 21 – *armean, bulgar, ungur*; 25 – *scheau*; 37 – *cazac*; 40 – *sas*; 53 – *oltean*; 55 – *rudar*; 58 – *neamț*; 72 – *ungurean*; 82 – *rus*; 101 – *tătar*; 113 – *sârb*; 132 – *turc*; 169 – *grec*; 230 – *țigan*.

The most frequent[18] five ethnonyms are: *țigan, grec, turc, sârb, tătar*.

As one can remark, except for the last position, occupied, in Oltenia, by *nemț* and *ungurean*, and in Muntenia, by *tătar* –the same ethnicities are positioned on the other four – *grec, sârb, turc, țigan*; *țigan* occupies the first place in both of the cases, representing, from all the others, the ethnicity with the oldest presence[19] in our history, and that with the widest and most frequent territorial spreading. Moreover, it is noticed, in general, that most often[20], there are present in our classification those peoples that the Romanians in the southern part of the country lived with for a longer period of time, and who also lived on the wider surface, in the Romanian provinces that we consider. The other peoples, with a reduced presence (sometimes even occasionally) as time and space, in the life of our community, have a lower number of occurrences[21]. Some of them register just one unit, in these situations, the bearer becoming known within the collectivity due to the fact that he either had an ethnicity different from that of the majority, or he was involved in events or occurrences that determined his isolation from the denominative point of view, using for him an element that differentiates immediately him from the others: ethnicity.

[17] The order is not modified even if all the representatives of this ethnicity are reunited: *evreu* + *jidan* + *jidov* + *ovrei* – 44; *bulgar* + *scheau* – 19; *țigan* + *rudar* + *zlătar* – 267; *german* + *neamț* – 110.

[18] The same as in the former case, the hierarchy is not influenced by reuniting all the representatives of this ethnicity: *evreu* + *jidan* + *jidov* + *ovrei* – 53; *german* + *neamț* – 59; *leah* + *polonez* – 2; *otoman* + *turc* – 134; *țigan* + *rudar* + *zlătar* – 287; *bulgar* + *scheau* – 46.

[19] The earliest piece of information that attests the presence of the gypsies in Romania was recorded in a document from 1385, issued by ruler Dan I, representing a donation act – "forty villages of gypsies shall be freed of all their duties and taxes for myself"[19] – to Vodiţa monastery. (Potra, 1939: 125; see also Burci, 2017: 32-33).

[20] Cumulated, the number of the occurrences from Oltenia and Muntenia imposes the following classification: 1. *țigan* (437), 2. *grec* (310), 3. *turc* (283), 4. *sârb* (272), 5. *ungurean* (180), 6. *neamț* (166), 7. *tătar* (149).

[21] As resulting from the data presented in the second table.

BDD-A28489 © 2018 Editura Sitech
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 20:43:37 UTC)

A particular situation is that of the ethnonyms that have in their structure *bulgaru*. There can be easily noticed from the present study that the inventory of place names, formed from it, is an extremely limited one. The causes that determined this situation are multiple. Firstly, it is the confusion created by the naming of the Bulgarians that emigrated to the Principalities, especially during the two Russian-Turkish wars (1806-1812, 1828-1829). The term that designated them was that of *sârb*, which, on the Romanian territory, "was for a long period of time, the denomination of both the Serbians and the Bulgarians"[22]. A clear image of the ethnic "mingle" is offered by the *Monograph of Dolj County. The Cartography from 1831*[23]. Here are numerous examples of people whose origin cannot be established, due to the fact that the nickname *Bulgaru* / *Sârbu* or the ethnonyms *bulgar* / *sârb* are often found in the denominative formula of one and the same individual: *Dumitru Sârbu, Bulgarian; Stan Sârbul, Bulgarian; Penciu sin Petco Bulgaru, Serbian,* etc. The confusion between the Bulgarians ("… many Bulgarians from our country are calling themselves Serbians" [24]) and the Serbians, on addressing the denomination, leads to the favouring of the latter. Yet, only this conclusion does not justify the great number of Serbians in Oltenia and Muntenia. *The Cartography of Dolj County from 1831*, again, offers significant information. Thus, in "the village of Urzicuţa de Jos, from the total number of 186 families, 91 were Serbian and 30 Bulgarian. At Afumaţi, a nearby village, out of 61 families, 10 were Serbian and none was Bulgarian"[25]. Consequently, the migration of the Serbian ethnics to the Principalities must not be mitigated.

Another cause of the low presence of the Bulgarians results from the fact that they were assimilated by the Turks (the term actually designated the inhabitants of different nationalities from the Ottoman Empire) settled in the free territories of the Principalities; a situation that "explains…, to a certain extent, the extremely reduced number of the toponyms *Bulgari* in our country"[26]. "Against" the Bulgarians is also the argument: of using the term *şchiau* instead of *bulgar*. "This fact…also contributed to the creation of the debated situation: where it is less expected to find the names 'bulgari', we find 'şchei', actually a synonym"[27].

The toponymy of a region, regardless of its area, is in a complex relation of reciprocal conditioning with the history of that zone, and with its people (natives or settlers) who have lived there along the centuries. Due to our tumultuous history, it is not unexpected that the minorities have also found an echo "in the toponymy of our countries, which shows a remarkable richness of names that remind of the many and different people that the Romanians have met along the centuries"[28].

Within this article, we intended a description – from the statistical point of view – of the ethnonyms that appear in the toponymy of Oltenia and Muntenia.

[22] Oancă, 1998: 149.
[23] Published in "Oltenia. Documente. Cercetări. Culegeri", Craiova, 1944.
[24] Iordan, 1963: 265.
[25] Oancă, 1998 : 153.
[26] Iordan, 1963: 265.
[27] Iordan, 1963: 266.
[28] *Ibidem*.

BDD-A28489 © 2018 Editura Sitech
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 20:43:37 UTC)

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Academia Română, *Dicţionarul toponimic al României. Oltenia* – DTRO (coord. prof. univ. dr. Gh. Bolocan), vol. 1 (A-B), Craiova, Editura Universitaria, 1993.

Academia Română, *Dicţionarul toponimic al României. Muntenia* (DTRM) (coord. prof. univ. dr. Nicolae Saramandu), 1 (A-B), Bucureşti, Editura Academiei Române, 2005 and the next.

Academia Română, *Micul dicţionar academic.* Vol. IV, literele *Pr-Z* (MDA), Bucureşti, Editura Univers Enciclopedic, 2003.

Bogrea, Vasile, *Pagini istorico-filologice*, prefaţă de acad. Constantin Daicoviciu, ediţie îngrijită, studiu introductiv şi indice de Mircea Borcilă şi Ion Mării, Cluj, Editura Dacia, 1971.

Burci, Iustina, *Minorităţi etnice în toponimia actuală din Oltenia şi Muntenia: ţiganii*, in „Cercetări lingvistice. Omagiu doamnei profesoare Adriana Stoichiţoiu Ichim", coordonator Dragoş Vlad Topală, Craiova, Editura Sitech, 2017, p. 31-49.

Bureţea, Emilian N., *Cu privire la unele nume de locuri româneşti de origine antroponimică*, in „Studii şi cercetări de onomastică" (SCO), nr. 2, 1996, Craiova, p. 229-234.

Caproşu, I., Ungureanu, Mihai Răzvan, *Documente statistice privitoare la oraşul Iaşi,* Iaşi, Editura Universităţii „Al. I. Cuza", 1997, vol. II.

Graur, Alexandru, *Nume de persoane*, Bucureşti, Editura Ştiinţifică, 1965.

Hasdeu, B.P., *Etymologicum magnum romaniae*, vol. 1, Bucureşti, Editura Minerva, 1970.

Iordan, Iorgu, *Toponimia românească*, Bucureşti, Editura Academiei Republicii Populare Române, 1963.

Monografia judeţului Dolj. Catagrafia din 1831, in „Oltenia. Documente. Cercetări. Culegeri", Craiova, 1944.

Oancă, Teodor, *Geografie antroponimică românească. Metodă şi aplicaţii,* Craiova, Editura de Sud, 1998.

Olteanu, Ştefan, Şerban, Constantin, *Meşteşugurile din Ţara Românească şi Moldova în evul mediu*, Bucureşti, Editura Academiei Republicii Socialiste România, 1969.

Potra, G., *Contribuţiuni la istoricul ţiganilor din România,* Bucureşti, Fundaţia Regală, 1939.

Purdelea Sitaru, Maria, Vasiluţă, Livia, *Denumiri pentru unele grupuri minoritare etnic din România. Note Sociolingvistice*, in AUT, XLVIII, 2010, p. 236-250.

Toma, Ion, *101 nume de locuri,* Bucureşti, Editura Humanitas, 2015.

SOURCES

https://dexonline.ro/definitie/bo%C8%99iman –site accessed on 18.03.2018

https://dexonline.ro/definitie/maur –site accessed on 18.03.2018

https://dexonline.ro/definitie/bosniac –site accessed on 10.03.2018.

BDD-A28489 © 2018 Editura Sitech
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 20:43:37 UTC)