Adelina Emilia Mihali, *Toponimie maramureșeană. Valea superioară a Vișeului*, Editura Mega, Cluj-Napoca, 2015, 255 p.

Dinu Moscal*

"A. Philippide" Institute of Romanian Philology, Str. Th. Codrescu 2, 700481 Iași, Romania

The work of Adelina Emilia Mihali, researcher in the Department of Dialectology and Onomastics of "Sextil Pușcariu" Institute of Linguistics and Literary History of Cluj-Napoca, is part of a broader approach that includes a few other contributions dedicated to the toponymy of Maramureș county, presented in the introduction (p. 17–20). There follows a short history of Romanian toponymy studies, including studies of onomastics and lexicography considered relevant for the field of toponymy (p. 21–30), the research methodology (p. 31–33) and a larger chapter, as compared to the previous ones, containing historical and geographical considerations (p. 34–54). The fourth chapter—a glossary of toponyms from the area indicated in the title, namely Borșa, Moisei and Vișeul de Sus (that includes Vișeul de Mijloc)—represents the main section of this work (p. 55–175). In the fifth chapter (p. 176–221), the author proposes a classification of toponyms, while in the last chapter (p. 222–227) she presents the linguistic peculiarities specific to the dialect spoken in Maramureș as reflected by the toponyms included in the glossary.

The restraint geographical area indicates that major toponyms represent a very small percentage of the toponyms included in the glossary. However, microtoponymy provides the researcher with an excellent opportunity to depict the image of a community from an internal (direct) perspective, through the names given to socio-geographic realities in the area inhabited by the community itself. The author of this volume points out to this open perspective provided by the study of microtoponymy, even if this aspect is emphasized at a rather descriptive level: "a person [...] selects out of the many terms of the language she uses those words that best correspond to the noticed characteristic of a point in the field. The geographical and historical <sic!> aspects of the place are subject to change in time, yet the toponym is resistant to time and remains a proof of the characteristics of the environment, social and political changes, linguistic contact, migrations and historical events" (p. 17, cf. also p. 22, 31).

Microtoponymy does not have a well-defined scientific status within the broader field of toponymy as microhistory has within history; it is different from toponymy just as far as the analyzed material is concerned (minor toponyms). However, at a methodological level, the survey questionnaire, preferably a direct survey, is absolutely necessary, as in the case of this specific paper. A part of the considerations included in the third chapter consist of information regarding social, geographical, historical and economical realities reflected in toponymy; see, for example, the toponyms *Țipțerai* (which is an adaptation of the German *Zipserei*, and not a derived term with a supposedly Romanian prefix *–ai*; see s.v., cf. și p. 216, 219), *Pasul Prislop*, *Borcut*, *Vinișorul*; *Preluca Tătarilor*, *Jgheabul Tătarilor*; *Borșa Handal*, *Gura Băii*. Obviously, etymological explanations for microtoponyms often raise difficult issues, since not all motivations were of a major importance, as opposed to the motivations related to the above-mentioned toponyms.

Sketching a socio-historical and economic image of a community from the perspective of microtoponymy involves many elements of local history that represent the main source in indentifying the etymology of most microtoponyms. The difficulties become increasingly challenging in case of a toponymic etymology that supposes a justification of the relationship between the linguistic sign (the appellative or proper-name the toponym is based upon) and the designated (socio-)geographical reality. The distinction between the toponymic and linguistic etymology of toponyms is indicated by

*Email address: dinu.moscal@gmail.com.

Moldovanu (1972, p. 75), a study actually quoted in this work. As opposed to toponymic etymology, linguistic etymology indicates the appellative or proper name the toponym is based upon, without indicating the motivation of the relationship between the respective appellative or proper name and the designated (socio-)geographical reality. Observations in this respect can be found in Conea (1969, p. 246), a geographer who distinguishes between "the linguistic origin" of a toponym (namely the word a toponym is based upon) and the motivation of denomination through the respective word. From the perspective of this specific distinction, the etymological explanations included in the glossary focus on the linguistic aspect, continuing then with the lexical etymology, this approach becoming implicitly the method. Thus, in the case of descriptive toponyms the appellative of origin is indicated, and then there is a transition towards the lexical area, through etymological indications regarding the appellative, as in the example below:

> LA CRUCE [la crúčă] [At the Cross], arătură [ploughland] (Borşa). Et.: prep. *la* + subst. *cruce* (< lat. *crux, –cis*).

In such a case, a toponymic etymology would have required the indication of the meaning of the etymon *cruce* [cross], namely 'roadside crucifix' or 'crossroads', which could only have been possible after establishing the toponymic etymology, that is identifying the motivation of the denomination: either identifying a crossroad for the second meaning, or the existence of a roadside crucifix that was placed there following a specific event (the death of a person) or in relation to a geographical reality (placed near a fountain or a crossroads). Such information forms the basis of toponymic etymology and provides in addition an image of the way in which a community relates to its environment. From this last perspective, microtoponymy could aspire to its own scientific status, as a branch of the broader field of toponymy.

Lexical etymological indications do not belong to the field of toponymy. Etymological explanations such as the ones suggested above occur quite often in the glossary of toponyms, yet they are not absolutely necessary in the etymological explanation, functioning rather as additional information:

> LA BĂI [At the Baths], teren pe Valea Vinului, unde s-au făcut amenajări cu scop balnear [territory on the Valley of Wine where balnearies were arranged] (Vişeu de Mijloc). Et.: prep. *la* + subst. pl. *băi* [baths] „staţiune balneară" [balneary resort].

Undoubtedly, on many occasions, the information can only be a presumption, since local history does not always pass the test of time and can be subject to re-etymologization, occasionally through an allusion to local legends. As far as local legends are concerned, they can provide real etymological explanations as in the case of the toponym *La Comoară* [At the Treasure].

Many times, when it is known, toponymic etymological information occurs in the section before the etymology, as in the following example:

> ARŞIŢA BĂLŢII [árşîţa bălţî] [The Sunny Hill of the Marsh], deal [hill] (Vişeu de Sus). În vîrful dealului se află o baltă cu apă călduţă, datorită poziţiei către soare a dealului [On top of the hill there is a marsh with warm water, due to the fact that the hill is oriented towards the sun]. Et.: subst. *arşiţă* (art.) + subst. *baltă* (gen.), cu origine incertă în DER, după alţi lingvişti cuvînt autohton [noun *heat* + noun *marsh*, of uncertain origin in DER, native word according to some linguists] (Brâncuş, 1983, p. 35–37).

Most probably, 'the top of the hill' indicates the upper part of the hill and not the top proper, yet the existence of the marsh is the necessary information for the toponymic etymology in the case of the determinative contained in the phrase. Such information, even if unexploited at the etymological explanations level, represents the real etymological contribution for the toponymy in the researched area. The author's on-the-spot inspection and direct investigation bring information that might be more difficult to obtain with the passage of time, either because the geographical aspect might change (as in the case of the above-mentioned example) or because the facts are simply forgotten by the community, as is the case of information regarding the motivation of the presence of a certain anthroponym in toponymic phrases (this is why in such cases etymological explanations most often do not go beyond the linguistic level).

Another side deriving from the linguistic approach on the etymology of toponyms, to the detriment of a toponymic etymology, is to ignore the discordance between the lexical meaning of the etymon and the characteristic of the denominating geographical reality. Without this congruity, the denominative act, that is the genesis of a name, its etymology, cannot be justified. In the following example:

ARINIŞ [arińíş] [Alder Forest], pîrîu, afluent al rîului Ţîşla (Borşa) [stream, tributary of the river Ţîşla in Borşa]. Et.: subst. *ariniş* „pădure de arin" [alder forest] < *arin* (< lat. *alinus*) + suf. col. *–iş*,

the meaning '(small) alder forest' does not indicate the existence of a stream of water. The hydronym *Ariniş* cannot have an etymon whose meaning would be 'forest'; in other words, a stream cannot be an alder forest. However, the stream might be in the vicinity of an alder forest that has a homonym name, *Ariniş(ul)*, a name that makes the transition from a geographical reality (small alder forest) to another geographical reality (a stream of water) in its close vicinity. This process, called *polarization*, is described in detail by Moldovanu (1972, p. 78–82). Thus, in the above example we must identify a primary toponym (a fitonym) that has the indicated etymology and is the etymon proper for the hydronym (secondary toponym, polarized from the primary toponym). Moreover, this process is considered by the author in the fifth chapter, within the first type of classification, based on semantics, where she identifies a category of "toponyms based on another name for a place" (p. 188) and discusses the issue of "name transfer". The examples she uses are the most striking ones, namely the toponymic phrases made of a geographical term and a "transferred" name (*Băile Borşa, Toroioaga Borşa, Culmea Moiseilor*, etc.). Such cases are always treated in relation to the primary toponym, yet this so-called "transfer" is often ignored whenever the geographical term is implied (*Aluniş, Ariniş, Arşiţa*[1], etc.). Our intention is not to emphasize the way in which "the name transfer" is understood, yet we must note that a transfer requires both formal and functional identity (as it does not designate a geographical reality belonging to a different category), which is not the case in the above-mentioned examples. An example of name transfer is *Lizeanu* street in the village of

Costişa (Frătăuţii Noi, the county of Suceava), which represents a transfer proper of the name of *Lizeanu* street in Bucharest; other examples are the names of Romanian localities *Plevna, Smîrdan, Rahova, Griviţa*, which are transferred from the names of Bulgarian localities where fights were carried out during the Independence Wars. However, the name of the street *Regimentul 11 Siret* [The 11th Regiment Siret] in Galaţi cannot be considered a transfer of the name of the regiment; the name is here motivated by the fact that the military barracks were placed on this street for a certain period of time.

The same aspect must be followed when both the primary and the secondary toponym(s) are identified, because it is necessary to individualize them, since they do not have a common etymology. One such example is:

ARŞÎŢA[2] [árşîţa] [The Sunny Hill], 1. pădure [forest] (Moisei); 2. deal [hill]; 3. cartier [neighbourhood] (Vişeu de Sus)...

Besides the individualization issue (necessary for the second and third sections), it might not be possible for the first section to be treated in the same place if another "sunny hill" (a part of the mountain oriented towards sunlight) is involved, namely one situated in Moisei.

Another important semantic aspect related to the "transfer of name" (i.e. polarization) is the morphological meaning. Thus, the "transfer of name" issue is exemplified by two toponymic fields, one starting from the oronym *Pietrosul* [Stone-hard], and the other from the oronym *Bătrîna* [The Old, fem.] (p. 189). In the second case there should be a gender congruity between the geographical term that can be related to the mountain and the name *Bătrîna*, most probably *coastă* [coast, flank], in relation to that part of the mountain, although it can also refer to another geographical reality from which the "transfer of name" (i.e. a polarization) was applied. These different readings are valid for other cases as well. However, the information about the toponyms included in the glossary does not lose validity because of some different interpretations, sometimes even beyond the toponymic perspective.

In the fifth chapter, the author proposes two classifications of toponyms—based on the semantic criterion and on the formal criterion—as well as a presentation of the etymological stratification

(p. 210–221), resulted from her own pertinent observations and interpretations; see, for example, the explanation for *Betigi*, based on the analogy with the explanations provided by V. Frățilă for *Bichigi* (see *Betigi, s.v.*).

In the last chapter, dedicated to linguistic particularities, the phonetic traits specific to the dialect from Maramureș are confirmed, along with a series of observations at both the morphological (among which those singular forms that are rebuilt from the plural) and the lexical level.

The contributions of this work go beyond the field of toponymy since, as we already have noticed, the author approaches the whole range of linguistic and extralinguistic issues required by toponymic research.

Bibliography

Conea, I. (1969). *Toponimia și cercecarea toponimică în cadrul geografiei*, in *Îndrumător de cercetări geografice. Cercetări economico-geografice*, Societatea de Științe Geografice, București, p. 243–247.
Moldovanu, D. (1972). *Principii ale lexicografiei toponimice*, in "Anuar de lingvistică și istorie literară", vol. XXIII, p. 73–100.