

**„OVIDIUS” UNIVERSITY OF CONSTANȚA  
DOCTORAL SCHOOL OF HUMANITIES**

**DOCTORAL THESIS**

**THE ANTHROPOONYMIC SYSTEM OF ROMA  
PEOPLE FROM ROMANIA  
HISTORICAL AND COMPARATIVE PERSPECTIVE**

**SUMMARY**

**SCIENTIFIC COORDINATOR:  
Prof. univ. dr. Domnița TOMESCU**

**DOCTORAL CANDIDATE:  
Alexandru Mihai ZAMFIR**

**CONSTANȚA  
2019**

# CONTENTS

## Introduction

- 0.1. *Objectives of the paper*
- 0.2. *State of research*
- 0.3. *Documentation sources*
- 0.4. *Methodology*
- 0.5. *Terminological aspects*
- 0.6. Paper structure

## 1. The historical and social context of the emergence and development of the Roma anthroponymic system in the Romanian territory

- 1.1. *The historical context of the emergence and development of the Roma anthroponymic system*
- 1.2. *The influence of the Romanian anthroponymic system on the development of names worn by Gypsies in the medieval times*
- 1.3. *Cultural aspects in the development of Roma anthroponymy on the Romanian territory. The Gypsy ethnonym – from historical name to insult*

## 2. The emergence and development of the Roma anthroponymic system in the medieval period

- 2.1. Personal denomination of Gypsies in the XIVth century
  - 2.1.1. *Antroponymy in Țara Românească*
  - 2.1.2. *Antroponymy in Moldova*
- 2.2. Personal denomination of Gypsies in the XVth century
  - 2.2.1. *Antroponymy in Țara Românească*
    - 2.2.1.1. Masculine names conjoint with the Romanian onomastic system
    - 2.2.1.2. Names with uncertain etymology
  - 2.2.2. *Antroponymy in Moldova*
    - 2.2.2.1. Masculine names conjoint with the Romanian onomastic system
    - 2.2.2.2. Specific masculine names coming from the Romani language
    - 2.2.2.3. Names with uncertain etymology
    - 2.2.2.4. Feminine names conjoint with the Romanian onomastic system
- 2.3. Personal denomination of Gypsies in the XVIth century

### *2.3.1. Antroponymy in Țara Românească*

- 2.3.1.1. Masculine names conjoint with the Romanian onomastic system
- 2.3.1.2. Specific masculine names coming from the Romani language
- 2.3.1.3 Names with uncertain etymology
- 2.3.1.4. Feminine names conjoint with the Romanian onomastic system

### *2.3.2. Antroponymy in Moldova*

- 2.3.2.1. Masculine names conjoint with the Romanian onomastic system
- 2.3.2.2. Specific masculine names coming from the Romani language
- 2.3.2.3. Names with uncertain etymology
- 2.3.2.4. Feminine names conjoint with the Romanian onomastic system
- 2.3.2.5. Specific feminine names from the Romani language

## **3. Tendencies of the historical evolution in the anthroponomy of the Roma in the present period**

- 3.1. *Development of the secondary naming system*
- 3.2. *The spread of biblical names in Roma communities of evangelical rite*

## **Final conclusions**

### **Bibliography**

## **Introduction**

### **0.1. Objectives of the paper**

The Roma culture is an ancient culture, in the same way the Roma language is a language with a long history and with roots strongly anchored in the Indian linguistical area. In the present paper we wish to demonstrate that the Roma language has been also lasting through specific anthroponyms of Roma people from the medieval times, showcasing at the same time, through specific anthroponyms of Roma people nowadays, how the names of Roma origin have survived a long period of wandering, assimilation and even slavery.

One reason for the necessity of this paper is the abundance of names through which *Gypsies* are represented in the medieval documents, names worthy of being analyzed from an ethnical point of view, including both the names found in the Romanian anthroponymic system, as well as the specific Roma names.

Furthermore, the theme of Roma or *Gypsy Names*, as they are known historically, has an emotional, personal load, for a Roma ethnic, thus observing, apart from the scientific dimension, with a certain sensitivity, the Roma names from the slavery period, as well as the Roma names from my native community, from where I especially collected the nicknames.

### **0.2. State of research**

A history of personal names attributed to Roma people on the Romanian territory has still not been realized. Mentions of gypsies in the medieval document are part of a rich and diverse material, which must be harnessed through onomastics research as well.

We mention authors who have touched upon aspects of Roma onomastics from Romania: (Petcuț 2015) *Romii din România. Documente* – a tome which includes at the end a name index for names found in documents between 1385 and 1580 in Țara Românească; a similar index is compiled by (Gonța 1995) *Indicele Numelor de Persoane*, in which the author separates the names worn by Romanians from those worn by Gypsies in the documents from Moldova in the period between 1384 and 1625; (Constantinescu 1963) *Dicționar onomastic românesc* – which includes specific mentions of Roma names, although the author declares he has made a selection: „The Roma slaves names appear to be totally distinctive, from which only those who seem to belong to the Romanian language have been chosen; Even since the XVth century, many Gypsies have authentical Romanian names, sometimes their names acquire a distinctive form” – the author „puts aside”, consciously, „the names of Gypsy slaves, with an exotic component” (Constantinescu 1963: XVI).

### **0.3. Documentation sources**

The primary documentation sources are tomes DRH (*Documenta Romaniae Historica*) with the series: A Moldova and B Țara Românească. For the present paper, the documentation basis encompasses the tomes:

DRH A *Moldova*: vol. I (1384-1448), vol. II (1449-1486), vol. III (1487-1504), vol. VIII (1585-1592), vol. IX (1593-1598).

DRH B *Țara Românească*: vol. I (1247-1500), vol. II (1501-1525), vol. III (1526-1535), vol. IV (1536-1550), vol. V (1551-1556), vol. VI (1556-1570), vol. VII (1571-1575), vol. VIII (1576-1580).

#### **0.4. Methodology**

The historical analysis of Roma names has led us to the choice of a methodology based primarily on documentary material. Therefore, we will use the records of names from the archival sources, presenting the medieval onomastical system of Roma people in the Romanian territory through the chronological systematization of person names. Based on the necessity of coherence of our analysis, we will use a chronological distribution through centuries.

Given the parallel between the Roma and the Romanian onomastic systems, the comparative method becomes instrumental, as the historical, temporal or geographical factors which describe the Roma onomastic system require permanent comparisons with the Romanian names system.

##### *Identification of Gypsies in medieval documents*

The naming of Gypsies in archival documents is abundant, whether it is only through the ethnonym *Gypsies*, associated sometimes with other terms such as „Gypsy families” or „slaves”, or through anthroponyms. Gypsies can be easily identified, given that each time archival documents mention appropriation of land to boyars or certain gifts to monasteries, their ethnic background is also, without exception, listed through terms such as „Gypsy families”, „Gypsy slaves” or simply „Gypsies”. Hereby we can observe the obvious intention of clearly identifying the „goods” mentioned in various documents.

Going further than this, the archival documents list, at times, forms of overidentification, when, although the ethnic category of the mentioned people is specified, their name is also accompanied by the ethnonym „Gypsy”, as seen in the example of the first names from the documents in Moldova in the XVth century, in 1441: „the following Gypsies: Manea the Gypsy, Pascu the Gypsy, Cazac the Gypsy, Micul the Gypsy.”

## **0.6. Terminological aspects - *Roma* and *Gypsy* ethnonyms.**

Given the controversial situation of the name of the ethnic category from Romania which we analyze in the paper, name which oscillates between *Roma* and *Gypsy*, and taking into account that in the title of the paper we use the name *Roma*, we will however often refer to the name *Gypsy* throughout the paper. We consider necessary to tackle this issue in the introduction in order to avoid any kind of ambiguity regarding the use of one term or the other or, as we shall go on to showcase in the present paper, the alternative use of both terms.

## **1. The historical and social context of the emergence and development of the Roma anthroponymic system in the Romanian territory**

### *1.1. The historical context of the emergence and development of the Roma anthroponymic system*

The analysis of names, generally, and of Roma names on the Romanian territory, specifically, must take into account the historical and social context in which they are mentioned in the old document from the medieval period, as well as the description of the Roma anthroponymic system, correlating various cultural and linguistic aspects. Therefore, I compiled a short presentation of the history of Roma in Romania and of the major Roma groups and dialects of the Roma language, with the purpose of providing an informational basis for different arguments used in our analysis of Roma names.

The fact that Roma people come from India and that the Roma language, especially through its structure, is connected to the Indian linguistical area, cannot be contested anymore. Looking back to the past, the first plausible hypothesis about the origin of Roma language, and inherently of Roma people, emerges in the second half of the XVIIIth century, in 1754, when the Hungarian Wáli István, a theology student in Holland, researched the strong similarities between the language spoken by his exchange colleagues from India and the language spoken by Roma people in Hungary (Petcuț 2015: 14).

After the departure from India and until reaching the east side of the Byzantine Empire, the Roma groups had a conjoint route and development process. Then, in the east of what we know today as Turkey, the population from the northern parts of India divided into three main groups: the *lom* or *northern* branch, the *dom* or *south-western* branch and the *rom* or *western* branch, each one of them going into a different direction. The *lom* group headed for north-west through Caucasus and on the north-western side of the Black Sea, through the Balkan peninsula, and, further, to the entire Europe. The *dom* group headed for Siria, Palestine, Egypt and the other countries of northern Africa. The third group, the most

numerous, the *rom* group continued their journey into the Byzantine Empire, remaining on its territory for some centuries, moving back, later, to western and central Europe (Sarău 1998: 28).

The first mention of Roma people on the Romanian territory dates back to 1385: „40 families of „ațigani” (DRH B III, 75). Therefore, I analyzed the Roma anthroponymic system from the Romanian territory, taking into account the mentions of this ethnic category in the medieval documents, as being slaves in the property of boyars, monasteries or the ruler of the country.

### *1.2. The influence of the Romanian anthroponymic system on the development of names worn by Gypsies in the medieval times*

We described the names of the primary groups of people who have significantly influenced the anthroponymy in the Romanian territory, pointing out that, as far as the Gypsies from the medieval period are concerned, there is no major influence from their part on the Romanian onomastics. The primary folks who have influenced the evolution of the Romanian anthroponymy are: *the slavs* (VIth – VIIth century), *the pechenegs* (IXth – Xth century), *the cumans* (XIth century).

As it can be observed, Roma people or Gypsies, as historically known, are not included on the list of groups who have shaped the Romanian onomastics system. The major reason for which such an influence could not be exerted, is the late period in which the Gypsies arrive onto Romanian territory, in the XIVth century, taking into account the first mention from 1385. Consequently, at that time the Romanian onomastic system was already developed, marked by unity and stability.

### *1.3. Cultural aspects in the development of Roma anthroponymy on the Romanian territory. The Gypsy ethnonym – from historical name to insult*

We presented, on one side, the frequency with which the ethnonym *Gypsy* appears in the medieval documents, in order to identify this ethnic group, and on the other side, we described the collective perception of the term *Gypsy* in the modern Romanian society, presenting the major causes, in our personal opinion, that have led to the accumulation of prevalent negative meanings for this term, which are still to be found in our days throughout the discourse, especially through proverbs and sayings.

The *Gypsy* term cannot be ignored in the present paper which discusses the Roma anthroponymic system in Romania, starting with the medieval period, where the analyzed ethnic category was identified exactly through the term *Gypsy*. Therefore, on one hand, the

analysis of the term *Gypsy* interests us from the perspective of frequency throughout the entire medieval texts, appearing as a sole ethnonym, and on the other hand, the term *Gypsy* requires a detailed analysis as a result of the meaning changes in the use of this name in the contemporary period.

Firstly, in order to highlight the frequency with which the term *Gypsy* appears in the medieval documents, we gave a series of examples which showcase the unique way in which this ethnic group is identified. Eloquent to this purpose are the documents from the XIVth century from Țara Românească where, from the total of seven documents, the Gypsies are mentioned as following: 1385 „Gypsies, 40 families”; a. 1387 „40 Gypsy families”; a. 1388 „300 Gypsy families”; a. 1390 „17 tent Gypsies”; a. 1391-1392 „40 Gypsies families”; a. 1392 „Gypsies, 40 families”; a. 1392 „Gypsies, 300 families”. In the next centuries, when the Gypsies begin to be identified through anthroponyms, there are many instances of overidentification forms, when the name of the person is also accompanied by the *Gypsy* ethnonym.

In order to demonstrate the changes in meaning of the term *Gypsy* in the Romanian language, we discussed a series of proverbs and sayings, which we classified according to various stereotypes and prejudices associated with the ethnonym. Therefore, we coupled stereotypes and prejudices into different themes such as: *theft: As many Gypsies, as many thieves, Behave, or else the Gypsies are going to steal you; verbal and physical violence: He is used to it as the Gypsy's horse to beating, They are fighting like in front of the tent; begging: He begs like a Gypsy; the nomadic lifestyle: They move around like the Gypsy moves his tent* etc.

## **2. The emergence and development of the Roma anthroponymic system in the medieval period**

We structured the analysis of Roma names from the medieval period into centuries: the XIVth, XVth and XVIth centuries, and into regions: Țara Românească and Moldova, resorting to this structure firstly due to the way in which the documentary material for our analysis is organized, the DRH, as well as DIR being structured into centuries and historical regions.

### **2.1. Personal denomination of Gypsies in the XIVth century**

Altough in the XIVth century the Gypsies are not identified through anthroponyms in Țara Românească, and in Moldova there is no mention of them, the XIVth century remains important for the analysis of the first documentary mentions of Roma people on the Romanian territory.

### **2.1.1. Antroponomy in Țara Românească**

In the XIVth century in Țara Românească appears the first mention of Gypsies on the Romanian territory: „40 Gypsy families” a. 1385 (DRH B I, 19-22). In the documents from this century there is anthroponymical form mentioned for the Gypsies, their identification resuming itself to the term *Gypsy*, especially in collocations such as „Gypsy families” or „tent Gypsies”. There is a total of seven documents in which the Gypsies in the XVIth century are mentioned in Țara Românească. On the contrary, the Romanian anthroponymic system is already characterised through unity and stability in its anthroponymical forms.

### **2.1.2. Antroponomy in Moldova**

In the documents from Moldova dating back to XIVth century there is no mention with regard to Gypsies. The presence of anthroponyms of the Gypsies from the XVth century, however, leads us to believe that the Gypsies were already in Moldova in the XIVth century, especially due to the high number of anthroponyms conjoint with the the Romanian system: *Coste, Negru, Micuță*. At the same time, the hypothesis is strengthened by the presence of a double name, *Slav Hârlovean*, worn by a Gypsy in the XVth century in Moldova, which actually appears in the first document in which the Gypsies are mentioned by anthroponyms, proof of a prolonged stay on this territory.

In the XIVth century, the Gypsies are poorly represented in the medieval documents, with only seven mentions in the documents from Țara Românească and no mention whatsoever in Moldova. The XIVth century remains, however, important, firstly from a historical point of view, as it marks the first mention of Gypsies in the official documents from the Romanian territory; at the same time, the term *Gypsy*, as an ethnonym, will guide the entire onomastic analysis of the medieval period.

## **2.2. Personal denomination of Gypsies in the XVth century**

In the XVth century we observe that the analysis of names worn by Gypsies becomes more diverse, identifying in Țara Românească, besides unique names, names doubled by surname, and in Moldova the names conjoint with the Romanian onomastic system are in opposition with the specific names coming from Roma language. In Moldova in this century appear the first feminine anthroponymical forms from the history of Roma onomastics in Romania.

### **2.2.1. Antroponomy in Țara Românească**

The first Gypsy anthroponyms from Țara Românească appear in the XVth century in a. 1441: *Manea the Gypsy, Pascu the Gypsy, Cazac the Gypsy* and *Micul the Gypsy* (DRH-B I, 160-162). Altough the gypsies start to be identified through anthroponyms, there can still be

found instances in documents where they are mentioned only by the ethnonym: 32 documents in which they are named *Gypsies*; three documents where the intention of naming the Gypsies through anthroponyms appears, but the document is left blank; 11 documents in which Gypsies are mentioned by anthroponyms.

There are totally 53 anthroponymical forms registered in Țara Românească in the XVth century, all of them men' names, of which 17 are religious names and 39

In total, there are 53 anthroponymic forms registered in the Romanian Country in the fifteenth century, all names of men; of these: 17 are religious names and 39 lay names; hypocoristic forms predominate as religious names: Costea, Cârstea, Lal, Manea, Tima; lay names are better represented by delexical names [11], borrowed forms are fewer and often with uncertain etymology, clear forms being of Slavic origin, such as: Boian, Bran, Mircea, Raul, Stan, Stoica; with the exception of a single double name, Radul Răitea a. 1483, all the other anthroponymic forms that refer to the Gypsies during this period, are unique names, entirely male names, traits in tune with the specificity of the Romanian anthroponymy from the 15th century.

As a frequency, the most common name in the Romanian Country in the 15th century is Radul, with four appearances, followed by Costea and Danciu with three appearances. Also, following the distinction between the Romanian names and the specific ones, of Roman origin, we do not find any specific name, which clearly indicates the Roman origin, in this century in the documents from the Romanian Country.

### **2.2.2. Anthroponymy in Moldova**

In the 15th century, the first anthroponyms worn by the Gypsies also appear in Moldova: Slav Hârăvean, Coste, Cernislav and Micuiliță (DRH A I, 184); important forces in this mention are also the first male double name in the history of the anthroponymy of the Gypsies from the medieval period: Slav Haraveanu.

As in the case of Romanian anthroponymy, the religious names in the Moldovan documents in the fifteenth century are more numerous [52], compared to those in the Montenegrin area [17], with even some whole religious names being recorded.

As religious names, also in Moldova, as in the Romanian Country, the hypocoristic religious forms predominate: Alexa < Alexandru, also appeared as a double name, Alexa Herțea; Andrea < Andrei; Coste < Constantin; Lal < Evlalie, Mela < Melania; Mihul < Mihail; Nan < Anania; Nicola < Nicolae; Paintings < Pantelimon; Sima < Simion; Alexander < Alexander; Titus < Titus; only the hypocoristic forms of Moldova [14] close to equal the total number of religious names in the Romanian Country [17] in the 16th century.

And in the case of the anthroponymy of the gypsies of Moldova in the 15th century the religious names are diversified, encountering a number of names that are not found in the onomastic repertoire of the gypsies from the Romanian Country of the same century, new names in Moldova being: Andreico, Dumitru, Gavril, Ioachim, Ion, Luca, Marco, Mihail, Nicolae, Petre / Peter, the chief, Teodor, Toma, Vasiliu. Of these, five are even whole religious names: Luca, Mihail, Nicolae, Petru and Toma, the Andreico variant being a form derived from the Slavic suffix -co, Gavril is a slightly simplified form from Gavriil, Ion is the popular Romanian variant of Ioan. , other popular Romanian variants being Dumitru, Petre, Toader and Toderică; as the frequency of religious names is noted the religious name Coste [9], hypocoristic <Constantin.Diferență numerică dintre numele laice [56] și cele religioase [52] este mică în cazul numelor purtate de țigani în secolul al XV-lea în Moldova.

Most of the names attributed to the Gypsies are common names with those of the Romanians, names like Badea, Christmas, Dumitru, Danciu, Ion, Ivan, Ivanco, Lal, Luca, Mihail, Mircea, Nan, Oprea, Radul, Roman, Nicula, Petru, Stan, Theodore, these defending forms recorded in the medieval documents of this century and for Romanians and Gypsies.

As a frequency, the most common name in Moldova in the fifteenth century is the religious name Coste, with seven occurrences, to which if we add the three mentions of the Costea form, we can accumulate a number of ten anthroponyms with the same radical. The following two are Slavic names: Danciul, with six appearances, and Radul with five appearances;

In the fifteenth century, both in Moldova and in the Romanian Country, the frequency top is held by these three names: Coste / Costea, Danciul and Radul.

Unlike the Romanian Country, where no specific name appears, in this century the first specific names appear, in Roman names of origin: Carfina <subst. rrom carfin „cui”, Dadul <subst rrom. dad "dad" and Praluța <phral "brother", interesting force, derived with diminutival Romanian suffix - uța.

### **2.3. Personal denomination of Gypsies in the XVIth century**

We notice that from the sixteenth century the names of the Gypsies represent increasingly different anthroponymic categories, being registered in this century and in the Romanian Country specific names coming from the Roman language, as well as feminine forms, and in Moldova, the name found also in the century past as single names, double names, common names with those from the Romanian onomastic system, specific names from the Romanian language, feminine names, are increasing, both in number and frequency.

#### **2.3.1. Anthroponymy in the *Tara Românească***

The forms of continuity from one century to the next are few in the Romanian Country, for example, the religious names that contain the past forms are: Cârstea, Costea, Lal, Manea, Tudor, more being the forms of Slavic origin: Bran, Danciul, Mircea, Radul, Stan, Stoica.

In the sixteenth century the Gypsies are still registered mainly by their unique name; However, the double names also start to appear, reaching the Romanian Country to 18 double anthroponymic forms; The first names of women appear in this century, but those carried by men predominate: 606 male names and 64 female names; the disproportion between the common and the specific names is great, being more common anthroponyms with the Romanian system [582] compared to the specific names, those of Roman origin [24];

The nicknames are well represented in the case of the mention of the Gypsies in the 16th century, especially by the nicknames:**a)** physical and moral qualities and defects: *Băloiu, Bunat, Bunea, Caleca, Calica, Calici, Ciomârtă, Ciudatul, Ciupina, Dușman, Fuga, Gălbează, Găinaț, Gârbovul, Golaș, Greu, Grosu, Lepădat, Lunga, Lungoci, Mândrea, Mârșavul, Minune, Mortul, Moș, Mutul, Năvrap, Nebunul, Pârțul, Răcilă, Răul, Repede, Roșca, Țipan, Zăbavă;* **b)** parts of the human and animal body: *Burtea, Buzea, Fundea, Cornea, Gușa, Mațea, Sprânceană, Ureche* **c)** fauna: *Aricea, Berbecea, Cioară, Ciortan, Ciutea, Corbea, Cuca, Curca, Curuia, Epure, Găină, Iepurici, Ipure, Mâța, Porcea, Puia, Puică, Ursul, Vulpea, Zăgan* **d)** flora: *Boba, Boban, Bojora, Brustur, Cartofleș, Dafin, Florea, Gonțea, Gorun, Leuștean, Orzea* **e)** the home universe, tools: *Becea, Budă, Caucea, Cârjan, Ciocan, Corman cf. subst. „cormană”, Cumpăna, Curăla, Mălaia, Muche, Sacul, Tepeluș, Țintea* **f)** natural environment: *Bolovan, Budur cf. „stâncă”, Bulgăr, Ciopârtan, Codreșan, Copaci, Fera, Pădure, Râpa, Scorțea, Steia, Vălean*; **g)** functions, titles or a specific status: *Duca, Fătu, Fecioara, Frățilă, Jupânea, Pașadia, Nana, Uncheașul, Vodă.*

### **2.3.2. Anthroponymy in Moldova**

In the 16th century, the number of anthroponymic forms, as names carried by the Gypsies, is growing amazingly: from 60 male names to 698 male and female names in the Romanian Country and from 206 male and female names to 957 male and female names In Moldova, the dynamics can be explained by direct reference to the increased number of documents in which the Gypsies are registered, probably as a result of the demographic growth of the Roma population.

### **3. Tendencies of the historical evolution in the anthroponomy of Roma people in the current period**

In order to observe the current trends in the anthroponomy of the Roma, we tried to establish a bridge between the names worn by the Gypsies in the medieval period and the anthroponymic forms found today in the Roma communities. In this sense we have collected a number of names from two Roma communities in Prahova County, in the first community, Bereasca (from Ploiești city), noting mainly the Development of the secondary naming system, consisting of nicknames and nicknames, and in the other community, by on the outskirts of Boldești-Scăeni, we have mainly followed the spread of the biblical names in the Roma communities of evangelical rite, trying to establish the extent to which we are currently witnessing the Restoration of Old Testament names in these communities.

#### ***3.2. The spread of biblical names in Roma communities of evangelical rite***

Referring to the current Roma community of evangelical rite, by the biblical names identified: male: Aaron, Elisha, David, Jacob, Isaac, Jonathan, Moses, Samuel, Solomon, and as female names: Abigail, Esther, Leah, Rachel, Ruth, Sara, Sidonia are clearly witnessing a revival of Old Testament names in Roma communities of this type, the greater the importance given to these names by those who select them, as all these forms are official names.

#### ***3.1. Development of the secondary naming system***

Through the parallel developed with the case study nowadays, I noticed that the nickname system still works very well in the Roma communities, by this secondary, unofficial naming system, often depending on the relationships within the community and sometimes even the relationships with different ones. public institutions, such as the school, the medical office, the police station, a special case being the example of local elections, when the ballot papers were also nicknamed: "besides the names, studies and jobs, there were also nicknames of those four candidates [...] We put there as the world knows, to make it easier to vote. "

The nickname forms of the nickname are so well represented today in the analyzed Roma community that even the specific names appear in large numbers:

Men: Bacro (< bakro „berbec”), Balo (< balo „porc”), Bango (< bango „strâmb”), Banghia (< vb. bangărel „a se strâmba”), Calo (< kalo „negru”), Caloro (< kalorro „negruțu”, kalo „negru” + suf. diminutival „orro”), Ciuciaria (< ciuci „sân, tătă”), Dadaie (< voc. dade!a „tată!”), Ciba (< chib „limbă”), Ciuri (< churi „cuțit”), Chiodoreanu (< kilodori „stâlpul cortului”), Gajo (< gažo „etnic nerom”), Hohoi (< şoşoj „iepure”), Limoi (< lim „muc”), Nakalo (< nakh „nas”), Şaragă (prin metateză de la şagar „leu”), Şoralo (< şero „cap”), Şucheală (< şuko „uscat”; fig. „slab”);

women: Angrusnia (< angrusti „inel”), Papina (< papin „gâscă”), Parnia (< parni „albă”), Pusa (< phus „paj”), Somnakaj (< sumnakaj „aur”), Şukarina (< şukar „frumoasă”).

From the series of nicknames encountered there are also missing names that refer to countries, cities, regions: Austrian, Belgică, Brăilean, Franț, Paris, Prusian, Sibianu; Anglia, Argentina, Argintina, Norvegia, Odesa, Persilia, Spania; *brands of some commercial products*: Kenti, Marboro, Martini, Milca *names that seek to assign values*: Dolar, Căpitan, Chilimbar, Comisar, Diamant, Haiduc, Jandar, Județ, Perfect, Printoro, Printu, Prefect, Procuror, Rubin, Secretar, Şerif, Bombona, Cerenia, Contesa, Corabia, Măreața, Știința, Şukarina, Valora, Vaporeanca, Zâna.

### **Final conclusions**

The presentation of the aspects of historical nature as well as of the cultural or linguistic ones came to meet the explanation of certain person names carried by the Gypsies in the medieval period. Thus, following the first documentary attestation of the Roma, in 1385, by the presence of the term gypsy in the chancery documents from the Romanian Country, a term of Greek origin originating in the <reach, it can first be confirmed the route of the Roma left from India and arrived in the Romanian space through the crossing Byzantine Empire. At the same time, by the frequent occurrences of the term (a) gypsy in medieval documents, used with the role of a nickname for identification, or even overidentification of the gypsy slaves, the subsequent emergence of anthroponymic forms such as Țigan, Țiganu (l), Țigăncea, Țigănești, Țigănești, Țigănești and so on

The collected material confirms the hypothesis that the documentary attestations of the Gypsies in the medieval period are abundant.

The cultural component, through the diversity of the Roma and Romani languages, puts its mark on the onomastic forms, encountering occupational type nicknames such as: Alăutar, Căldărar, Zlătar etc., specifically Roman names such as Banghia, Carfin, Calo, Praluța; even the grammar of the Roman language puts its mark on the onomastic forms carried by the Roma, especially by the names derived from vocative forms: "sweet" Gudléa <gudlo, "red" Loléa <lolo, "old / old" Puranéa <purano / phuro, Ouclea "oțeititule" <şuklo etc.

In comparison with the Romanian anthroponymic system, and in the case of the names carried by the Gypsies, the large number of anthroponymic Slavic forms is noted, as well as male names: Bran, Dragomir, Dobromir, Radomir, Drăgan, Dragotă, Stoica, Stan, Vlad etc., as well as female names: Dobra, Neaga, Stana, Stanca, Rada, Voica etc., the heavy

influence of the Slavic element in the anthroponymy of the Gypsies also being felt by high frequency names, such as Radu [70] in the 16th century in the Country Romanian or female name Stanca [11].

Following the analyzes carried out during the paper, we believe that the anthroponymic system of the Roma cannot be taken out of the context of the Romanian onomastic system, first of all through the common anthroponymic forms, Romanian names, carried by the Gypsies, which exceed 90% in both the Romanian Country and in Moldova, during all the three centuries analyzed: the fourteenth, the fifteenth and the sixteenth.

I have even identified in the case of names with uncertain etymology a possible Roman origin of some names, such as the example of the Mandela form, in which, going into the depths of the Roman language, I have come to an entirely and completely different interpretation for the name given. by a gypsy in the sixteenth century, the sending could be an ancient cultural one. Thus, we explained the Mandela form through the verbal structure composed of the subst. Roma. mand "cuget" and vb. del "to give", in the dialectal form from, interpreted as a form of the future, but also recognized as a present form in several Roman dialects. The verbal structures that contain the verb "to give" are numerous in the Roman language, one of the most often used being the del duma (to say), "to speak", construction also used with the verb in the second position: dumadel, in the same sense "to speak". Thus, Mandela means "to think", "to think", the name being given by "the one who thinks", "the wise man", possibly the elder of the community, of the ward, representing most probably the group of those who formed and kris Romani. "The Roman court".

We regret to note, however, that due to the small number of specific anthroponymic forms, the anthroponymic system of the gypsies of the medieval period prefigures the assimilation process and onomastically, justifying the large number of Romanian names carried by Romanians in Romania today.

However, we consider that through the specific forms worn by the gypsies of the medieval period and through those continued by the Roma today, the anthroponymic system of the Roma manages to be highlighted within the Romanian general anthroponymy through a set of distinctive, older names: Calo, Carfin, Dade, Praluța, or newer ones: Bacro, Ciba, Ciuri, Papina or Șaragă.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### I. Documentary sources

*Documenta Romaniae Historica* (DRH), 1972-1976, Editura Academiei, Bucureşti.

DRH A *Moldova*: vol. I (1384-1448), vol. II (1449-1486), vol. III (1487-1504), vol. VIII (1585-1592), vol. IX (1593-1598).

DRH B *Tara Românească*: vol. I (1247-1500), vol. II (1501-1525), vol. III (1526-1535), vol. IV (1536-1550), vol. V (1551-1556), vol. VI (1556-1570), vol. VII (1571-1575), vol. VIII (1576-1580).

*Documente privind istoria României* (DIR), 1951-1955, Editura Academiei, Bucureşti.

DIR A. Moldova: Secolele XIV-XV (1381-1475); Secolul XV vol. II (1476-1500); Secolul XVI vol. I (1501-1550); Secolul XVI vol. II (1551-1570); Secolul XVI vol. III (1571-1590); Secolul XVI vol. IV (1591-1600).

DIR B. *Țara Românească*: Secolele XIII-XV (1247-1500); Secolul XVI vol. I (1501-1525); Secolul XVI vol. II (1526-1550); Secolul XVI vol. III (1551-1570); Secolul XVI vol. IV (1571-1580); Secolul XVI vol. V (1581-1590); Secolul XVI vol. VI (1591-1600).

### II. Lexicographical sources

Academia Română, 2009, *Dicționarul explicativ al limbii române* (ediția a II-a revăzută și adăugită), Institutul de Lingvistică „Iorgu Iordan”, Editura Univers Enciclopedic Gold.

Academia Română, 1998, *Dicționarul explicativ al limbii române*, ediția a II-a, Institutul de Lingvistică "Iorgu Iordan", Editura Univers Enciclopedic.

Academia Română, 1958, *Dicționarul limbii române moderne*, Institutul de Lingvistică din Bucureşti, Editura Academiei.

Academia Română, 2010, *Micul dicționar academic*, ediția a II-a, Institutul de Lingvistică, Editura Univers Enciclopedic, Bucureşti.

Ciorănescu, Alexandru, 1958-1966 *Dicționarul etimologic român*, Editura Universidad de la Laguna, Tenerife.

Constantinescu, N. A., 1963, *Dicționar onomastic românesc*, Editura Academiei RPR, București.

Ionescu, Christian, 1976, *Mică Enciclopedie Onomastică*, Editura Enciclopedică Română, 1975.

Kernbach, Victor, *Dicționar de mitologie generală*, Editura Albatros, București, 1983.

Sarău, Gheorghe, 2006, *Dicționar rrom-român*, Editura Sigma, București.

Sarău, Gheorghe, 2012, *Dicționar român-rrom*, Editura Sigma, București.

Scriban, August, 1939, *Dicționarul limbii românești*, Editura Institutul de Arte Grafice „Presa Bună”.

Seche, Luiza, Seche, Mircea, 2002, *Dicționar de sinonime*, Editura Litera Internațional.

Volceanov, George, 2007, *Dicționar de argou al limbii române*, Editura Niculescu.

### General bibliography

Achim, Viorel, 1998, *Țiganii în istoria României*, București.

Bogza-Irimie, Rodica, *Despre unele caracteristici flexionare ale numelor proprii în limba textelor din secolul al XVI-lea*, în *Omagiu Rosetti*, p. 69-70.

Candrea, I, Aureliu, 1895, *Porecle la români*, București.

Ciobanu, Fulvia, 1965, *Câteva observații despre articularea substantivelor proprii cu articol nehotărât în limba română*, în *Omagiu Rosetti*, București.

Cîmpanu, Eugen, 1975, *Substantivul. Studiu stilistic*, București.

Densusianu, Ovid, 1961, *Istoria limbii române*, vol. I, II, București.

Diaconescu, Paula, 1965, *Articularea cu articol „proclitic” a substantivelor proprii, nume de persoană, în limba română*, în *Omagiu Rosetti*, București.

Drăganu, Nicolae, 1933, *Românii în veacurile IX-XIV pe baza toponimei și a onomasticei*, București.

Drăganu, Nicolae, 1933, *Nume proprii cu sufixul -şa*, Cluj.

Eliade, Mircea, 1980, *De la Zalmoxis la Ghenghis Han*, București.

Fosztó, László, 2009, *Colecție de studii despre romii din România*, Editura ISPMN, Cluj-Napoca.

Graur, Al., 1965, *Articolul hotărât la numele de persoane românești*, în „*Studii și cercetări lingvistice*”, X, p. 551-557.

Graur, Al., 1966, *Articolul hotărât la nume de persoane românești*, în „*Studii și cercetări lingvistice*”, XVII, p. 19-274.

Graur, Al., 1970, *Între numele proprii și cele comune*, în „*Limba română*”, XIX, p. 461-462.

Graur, Al., 1965, *Nume de persoane*, Bucureşti.

Grigore, Delia, 2005, *Curs de antropologie şi folclor rrom*, Editura CREDIS, Bucureşti.

Grigore, Delia, Neacşu, Mihai, Furtună, Adrian-Nicolae, 2007, *Romii...în căutarea stimei de sine*, Editura Vanemonde, Bucureşti.

Ichim-Tomescu, Domniţa, 1973, *Cercetarea gramaticală a numelor proprii*, în „Limba română”, XXII, p. 467-477.

Ichim-Tomescu, Domniţa, *Probleme ale subclasificării antroponimice*, în „Studii şi cercetări lingvistice”, XXVIII, p. 609-619.

Ichim-Tomescu, Domniţa, 1980, *Observaţii cu privire la articularea numelor proprii în limba română*, în „Studii şi cercetări lingvistice”, p. 3-10.

Ichim-Tomescu, Domniţa, *Aspecte ale genului gramatical la numele proprii de persoane în limba română. Prenumele*, în „Studii şi cercetări lingvistice”, XXXIV, p. 210-214.

Ichim-Tomescu, Domniţa, 1989, *Opoziţii de gen la numele proprii de persoane în limba română. Prenumele*, în „Studii şi cercetări lingvistice”, XL, p. 45-52.

Ichim-Tomescu, Domniţa, 1992, *Observaţii asupra cazului vocativ la numele proprii în limba română*, în „Limba română”, XLI, p. 41-46.

Ionaşcu, Al., *Evoluţia sistemului de articulare a numelor proprii şi datele geografiei lingvistice*, în *Sistemele limbii*, p. 173-180.

Ionescu, Christian, 1978, *Sistemul antroponimic românesc în secolele al-XIV-lea şi al XV-lea (Țara românească)*, în „Limba română”, p. 253-152.

Ionescu, Christian, 1980, *-escu în în antroponimia românească*, în „Studii şi cercetări lingvistice” XXXI, nr. 4, p. 417-421.

Ionescu, Vasile, 2000, *DEPORTAREA rromilor în Transnistria : Rromii din România - studii şi documente istorice; De la Auschwitz la Bug*, Editura Centrului rromilor pentru politici publice "Aven amentza", Bucureşti.

Iordan, Iorgu, 1983, *Dicţionar al numelor de familie româneşti*, Bucureşti.

Kiss, Tamás, Fosztó, László, Fleck, Gábor, 2009, *Incluziune şi exluziune. Studii de caz asupra comunităţilor de romi din România*, Editura ISPMN, Cluj-Napoca.

Ralph B., 1969, *The Grammar of English Proper Names*, în ”Names”, p. 107-126.

Mihăescu, H., 1931, *Din morfologia numelor proprii româneşti*, în *Omagiu Bârbolescu*, p. 290-294, Bucureşti.

Lambru, Ruxandra, 2005, *Numele de persoană la români în secolele al XIV-lea şi al XV-lea* (teza de doctorat), Universitatea din Bucureşti, Bucureşti, p. 217.

Năstasă, Lucian, Varga Andreea, 2001, *Minorități etnoculturale. Mărturii documentare. Țiganii din România (1919-1944)*, Editura CRDE, Cluj.

Pașca, St., 1936, *Nume de persoane și nume de animale în Țara Oltului*, București.

Pătruț, Ion, 1980, *Onomastică românească*, București.

Pătruț, Ion, 1984, *Nume de persoane și nume de locuri românești*, București.

Petcuț, Petre, Grigore, Delia, Sandu, Mariana, 2003, *Istoria și tradițiile rromilor*, Editura RO MEDIA, București.

Petcuț, Petre, 2009, *Romii din România. Documente*. Cluj-Napoca.

Petcuț, Petre, 2015, *Rromii. Sclavie și libertate*, Editura Grupul de Presă, Tipografie și Distribuție PPB, București.

Petrovici, Emil, 1927-1928, *Nume proprii de bărbați articulate*, în „Dacoromania”, V, p. 579-583.

Pietraru, Marica, 1987, *Consecințe morfologice ale raportului dintre numele proprii și numele comune*, în *Studii de onomastică*, p. 54-60.

Ponos, Emmanuel, 1999, *Țiganii din România, o minoritate în tranziție*, Editura Compania, București.

Potra, George, 2002, *Contribuții la istoricul țiganilor din România*, București.

Pușcariu, Sexti, 1940, *Limba română. Privire generală*, I, București.

Reguș, Aspasia, 1978, *Antroponime feminină nearticulată în vechi acte istorice*, în „Limba română”, XXVII, p. 311-313.

Reguș, Corneliu, Reguș, Aspasia, 1974, *Antroponimele masculine în documentele slavo-române emise de cancelaria Moldovei între anii 1388-1456*, în „Studii de cercetări lingvistice”, XXV, p. 497-509.

Rizescu, Ioan, 1972, *Asupra sufixelor onomastice -a1 (topoantroponimic) și a2 (antroponimic)*, în *Studii și materiale privitoare la formarea cuvintelor în limba română*, VI, p. 35-54.

Rosetti, Al., 1968, *Istoria limbii române de la origini până în secolul al XVII-lea*, București.

Roșca, Nuțu, 1978, *Particularități ale articolului în onomastica din comuna Bârsana (jud. Maramureș)*, în „Limba română”, XXVIII, p. 321-326.

Roșianu, Ion, *Din gramatica numelui propriu*, în *Studii de onomastică*, p. 317-329.

Sarău, Gheorghe, 1998, *Rromii, India și limba romani*, Editura Kriterion, București.

Sarău, Gheorghe, 2001, *Stilistica limbii rromani în texete*, CREDIS – Universitatea din București.

Sarău, Gheorghe, 2005, *Limba și literatura rromani. Manual pentru clasa I*, Editura Sigma, București.

Sarău, Gheorghe, Stănescu, Camelia, 2005, *Limba și literatura rromani. Manual pentru clasa II*, Editura Signa, București.

Sarău, Gheorghe, 2008, *Curs practic de limba rromani pentru toți*, Editura Sigma, București.

Sarău, Gheorghe, Grigore, Delia, 2006, *Istorie și tradiții rromane*, Editura Organizației Salvați Copiii, București.

Sarău, Gheorghe, Cordovan, Ionel, Stănescu, Camelia, 2015, *Comunicare în limba maternă rromani. Manual pentru clasa I*, Editura Sigma, București.

Ioan, 1914, *Gramatica limbii române*, Partea I, *Etimologia*, București.

p. 383-397.

Teiuș, Sabina, 1969, *Referitor la sfera și locul onomasticii în lingvistică*, în *Studii și materiale de onomastică*, p. 7-11.

Tomescu, Domnița, 1998, *Gramatica numelor proprii în limba română*, București.

Tomescu, Domnița, 2001, *Numele de persoană la români. Perspectivă istorică*, București.

Whitney, Tucker, 1944, *The Romanian Vocative*, în „Language”, XX.

Zdrențea, Mircea, 1956, *În legătură cu vocativul*, în „Limba română”, V, p. 55-59.

### III. Websites

- <https://ansamblulmitropolitaniasi.ro/istoricul-sfintelor-moaste/istoricul-moastelor-sfintei-suvioase-parascheva>
- <https://www.botosaneanul.ro/stiri/faza-zilei-alegeri-pe-porecle-in-primarie/>
- [http://www.adevarul.ro/dilema\\_tiganeasca\\_recensamant etnie 2011](http://www.adevarul.ro/dilema_tiganeasca_recensamant etnie 2011)
- <http://www.locatemynname.com/ro/Pugna>
- [http://nume.casata.md\)](http://nume.casata.md)
- <https://romani.humanities.manchester.ac.uk//rms/browse/meta/sample>