

THE USE OF *FRUMOS* IN TOPONYMY*

Iustina NICA BURCI**

Abstract: The vast majority of place names are based, from a lexical-grammatical point of view, on nouns that denote things, beings, phenomena of nature, abstract notions. Less numerous than nouns, the adjectives have the ability to exploit to a much greater extent the imagination and creativity of those who observe and name the objects of the surrounding geographical environment and have a much more expressive character. In the pages of this article, we stopped at the analysis of a single adjective that has aroused, over time, ample discussion: *frumos – beautiful*. The structure of the names in the composition it is found, their frequency, lexical synonyms of the qualifier present in the toponymy are some of the directions of analysis.

Keywords: adjective, frumos, place names, structure, frequency.

Even if they register, compared to the nouns, a much weaker percentage in the economy of place names, the adjectives are found in all branches of toponymy (names of villages, waters, small places on the territory of localities, etc.) in different forms and structures. What made them attractive to the denominators was not just the ability to render valuable, “to a greater extent, their imagination and creativity”¹ (having a more expressive character in the representation, on semantic level, of the surrounding geographic² environment), but as well the fact that their use could not solve, in a simple manner, the homonymy³ occurrences, in case of the place names.

* The present article is part of the research project *Dicționarul toponimic al României. Oltenia. Indice antroponimic* of “C.S. Nicolăescu-Plopșor” Institute for Research in Social Studies and Humanities from Craiova.

** Scientific Researcher II, PhD. “C.S. Nicolăescu-Plopșor” Institute for Research in Social Studies and Humanities from Craiova, of the Romanian Academy; E-mail: iustinaburci@yahoo.com

¹ Adelina Emilia Mihali, *Valențe semantice ale adjectivelor în structura numelor comerciale* http://www.upm.ro/cc12/volCCI_II/Pages%20from%20Volum_texteCCI2-118.pdf, accessed to 16.03.2015.

² The diversity of features that the geographic objects have, allow, at least in theory, any individual, to express their interior experience through the use of linguistic means, among them, the adjective being the one that describes, qualifies and quantifies.

³ The division of a village in two or more parts (due to social or juridical motives, most of the times), usually entered in the possession of a family (on disposal through selling), had as consequence, in the past, the isolation, through name, of one from the others. The simplest manner to do it was to attach an attribute, perceived as a factor that would separate it from the similar names. In *Toponimia Românească* (Bucharest, Romanian Academy Publishing, 1963, p. 191), Iorgu Iordan shows that

The adjective⁴ can designate, different forms of relief or administrative units a) *alone*, through substantivisation, a procedure through which it is changed⁵ the grammatical class which it belongs to (*Adâncă, Adâncu, Afumata, Aleasa, Aninosu, Antoneasca, Bulburosu, Călugăreasca, Frumoasa, Găunoasa, Lutoasa, Nisipoasa, Păltinoasa, Părăginosu, Petecosu, Pietrosu, Spinoasa, Tinoasa, Tulburoasa* etc.)⁶, but especially as in b) *subordinated element* in composed structures *structuri compuse și sintagme toponimice* (*Balta Lungă, Ciutura lu Ion ăl Nalt, Coasta Înaltă, Crucea Nemțească, Pădurea sub Râpa Înaltă, Pârâu Fântânii Bătrâne, Peștera Boierească, Piscu cu Stâna Bătrână, Piscu Prunilor Bătrâni, Plopii Argintii, Podu de la Gârla Bătrână, Podu de la Gârla Bătrână, Poienile din Dosu Văii Rele, Purcărețele lu Manul cel Bătrân, Salcia Cocoșată, Sub Drumu Bătrân, Vadu Bistriței celei Bătrâne, Valea Galbenă, Valea Ra cu Ogașu, etc.*).

In the present article, we endeavour the particularization of our research. As objective, there was established the analysis of a single qualificative – *frumos(-ă)*⁷ –

“commonly, a *N. Big* has as correspondent an *N. Small*, as an *N. New* usually has, an *N. Old* alongside. But the both members of the same toponymic pairs are not always found. Quite often, it appears just one, without any determinative next to it. In this case, most of the times, *N. Big* and *N. Old* miss, a normal occurrence, only the latter-created settlement needs to be distinctive from the previous one through adding to the common name of the both”.

⁴ On the presence of the adjectives in the entopic terminology, see Iustina Burci, *Adjectivul în terminologia geografică populară*, in “Arhivele Olteniei”, New Series, no. 28, Bucharest, Romanian Academy Publishing House, 2014, pp. 228–245 and Iustina Burci, *Names of places with adjectival determiners in the toponymy from Muntenia*, in “Anuarul Institutului de Cercetări Socio-Umane «C.S. Nicolăescu-Ploșșor»”, no. XVI, 2016, Bucharest, Romanian Academy Publishing House, 2016, pp. 235–247.

⁵ A situation in which there is the possibility to receive, in its turn, qualificatives, for example, *Puturoasa Mare* and *Puturoasa Mică* – pools in the locality of Măceșu de Jos (Dolj County) – derived from the adjective *puturo*-foul, through substantivization + the determinative *Mare/Mic*-Big/Small.

⁶ Most of them have the meaning of “place rich in”, or “a place that belongs to X”. In this last case, the adjectives derived with forms of singular of the suffix *-ească* (*Antoneasca, Călugăreasca* etc.) express possession, the belonging or the placement in the field of the denominated objects. The toponyms formed from them denominate, most of the times, estates, lands, properties (DTRO, pp. 27–28; also see Petre Avram, *Toponimia din zona Teleormanului formate de la adjective în -esc*, in “Studii și cercetări de onomastică”, no. 6/2001, Craiova, Universitaria Publishing House, p. 354).

⁷ In *Micul dicționar academic* (2nd edition, Romanian Academy, the Institute of Linguistics, Unvers Enciclopedic Publishing, 2010), the semantic range of the term is a wide one: *frumos* includes definitions that describe the beings/the objects/the facts, not only from the aesthetic, but also moral, behavioural or importance-related point of view. The phrases and the proverbs/sayings that have it in their componence are, nonetheless, numerous: *a face frumos* – to humour sb., *a se purta frumos* – to behave well, *a sta/a șede frumos* – to behave oneself, *frumos/frumușel/frumoasă de pica* – drop-dead gorgeous, “*nu e frumos, nici arătos, dar vânjos și sănătos*” – not handsome, nor good-looking, but stout and healthy (proverb), “*nu-i frumos ce e frumos, ci-i frumos ce-mi place mie*” – the beauty is in the eye of the beholder (proverb), *a lua pe cineva cu binele/cu frumosul* – to sugar-coat, *toate bune și frumoase* – all nice and good, *într-o lumină frumoasă* – in a good light, *din afară măr frumos și-năuntru găunos* – many a rose-cheeked apple is rotten on the inside, *a fi ca paharul de frumos* – approx. as appealing as a neat glass, *a avea pană frumoasă* – to be a witty-pen writer, *porcul e cea mai dulce pasăre, iar varza cea mai frumoasă floare* – the pig is the sweetest of the poultry and the cabbage the most beautiful flower, *sexul frumos* – the beautiful gender

which represents one of the “favourite” words of the human thinking and language, along the time.

The concept of *frumos* has evolved along with the human society, it has changed from one age to the other, starting from Antiquity⁸ and to the modern age, there has been written plentifully on the attempt to establish what is the significance of the notion of *frumos*⁹ and in which way it can be defined, when and how it emerged as a feature of the real world (nature, man, morals, craftsmanship products, artistic creations etc.), the role they have in the ontic, gnoseological, natural, moral fields, which is the relation between *frumos* and other human values, as the truth and the good, is it possible to relate to beautiful through any possible experience: senses, imagination, intellect, or through their merging? etc.

The contemporary period does not lack “combatants” either, because “the history of beauty is both contemporary with the ones that elaborates it and eternal, as much as the object of fascination remains in the memory of the people”¹⁰.

Thus, the concept generated an impressing literature, enriched progressively along the centuries, by the theologians, philosophers, literary men, aestheticians, artists etc., and taking a journey that starts from *frumos* as a derivative of the divine being (the world is beautiful because it is made by God, and the thirst for beautiful is, nonetheless, the search of the prototype, the seeking of the beautiful after it was created, of the Absolute, True Beautiful, that is, God¹¹) to the attributing of this qualificative through the capacity of the subject to perceive it:

(see Gh. Bolocan, Tatiana Voronțova, Elena Șodolescu-Silvestru, Iustina Burci, *Dicționar frazeologic român-rus*, volume I – A-M, Craiova, Universitaria Publishing House, 1999).

⁸ The Greeks regarded *the beautiful* in a wider perspective: it included not only the beautiful things, the forms, the colours, the sounds, but also the beautiful thoughts and morals: the man is both *kalos* and *agathos* (beautiful and kind) (<https://luceafarul.net/conceptul-de-frumos-o-manifestare-estetica-si-filosofica>, accessed to 01.06.2022). on addressing the Greeks, Constantin Noica would say (*Creație și frumos în rostirea românească*, Bucharest, Eminescu Publishing, 1973, p. 93) that “did not conceive the spiritual beauty without the beauty of the body”, and that “the people who manage to understand themselves from the inside, become beautiful on the outside”; the Middle Ages brings forward the concept of *the beautiful* of the moral harmony (*ibidem*), in Renaissance it receives the same dignity as the Good and the Wisdom (*ibidem*), and the Modernism initiates a conflict on beauty – that of the delicacy aesthetics and of the mimetic aesthetics (*ibidem*).

There are numerous variations on this theme, conditioned by time, space, and also the person that observes it, because the beauty is in the eye of the beholder; in Ancient Egypt, the tall women, with slender figures, narrow shoulders and symmetrical face were considered beautiful; in China – there were the short one, with dark complexion and very small feet; Europe, in the Renaissance Age, would appreciate the voluptuous women (<https://historia.ro/sectiune/general/cum-au-evoluat-standardele-de-frumusetate-de-a-565386.html>, accessed to 01.02.2022). From one generation to the other, the standards change constantly and become harder to achieve, leading to the situation, during the contemporary period, when some representatives of the beautiful gender resort to plastic surgery to adapt their look to the beauty “standards”.

⁹ Philosophy gave birth to a branch that studies the art and the beautiful, *the aesthetics*.

¹⁰ For more details, see <https://www.fundatiacaleavictoriei.ro/frumusetea-o-istorie-care-ne-fascineaza>, accessed to 01.06.2022.

¹¹ See <https://bjiasi.ro/editura/frumosul-din-perspective-filosofice-si-teologice-ovidiu-ioan-sarghie/>, accessed to 31.05.2022.

“... the beautiful has no connection to the features of the object, but the dispositions of the subject, who has total rights to define the experience of the beautiful. It occurs the taste opinion, through there are imposed rules for the acknowledgment of the beautiful, and, moreover, the effects that it creates”¹².

*

The Romanian folklore is populated with characters that bear the name of *Frumos*: the most famous of them is *Făt-Frumos* (Prince Charming). The explanatory dictionaries gloss it as – “an extremely handsome young boy or man; (folk) *Făt-logofăt* – a child with special (physical) features; coming from the lat. fetus”¹³; “the main hero from the fairy tales, endowed with moral and physical beauty, kindness and extraordinary bravery; as common name, an exquisitely handsome child, young man or man; ~-logofăt, a child with extraordinary (physical) features; (rarely, ironically) a dandy”¹⁴. A different point of view is that of Romulus Vulcănescu¹⁵, who, after presenting his theories¹⁶ that refer to the etymology of the word – he makes an analysis of *Făt-Frumos*, as an anthropomorphic hypostasis of the holly Sun, concluding that “*Făt-Frumos* is the classical allegory of the *soul beauty*”¹⁷.

It is also the folklore, this time in a negative hypostasis, where *Frumoasele* (Ielele – the Wicked Fairies) are mentioned; here is the opinion on *Călușari* (traditional dancers):

“... In this manner, they spend the ten days between the Ascension of Christ and the Pentecost they wander through the boroughs and the villages, dancing and leaping. In this time, they sleep only under the roof of a church, saying that, if they slept in a different place, the wicked fairies would curse them..., who they call *Frumoasele*”¹⁸.

*

In anthroponomy and toponymy, the adjective *frumos*, has, as well, a prolonged presence. Thus, as a person’s name, in our country¹⁹, it is also attested the

¹² See <https://www.revistanoinu.com/scrive/filosofie/evoluia-ideii-de-frumos>, accessed to 31.05.2022).

¹³ Also, see <https://dexonline.ro/definitie/frumos/definitii>, accessed to 04.06.2022.

¹⁴ *Ibidem*.

¹⁵ *Mitologie română*, Bucharest, the Socialist Republic of Romania Academy Publishing, 1987.

¹⁶ *Ibidem*: 1. “In our folkloric fairy tales, when talking about *exquisitely beautiful children, predestined to be heroes*, it is added the personal name to *făt*... In the case of *Făt-Frumos* the name expresses a tautology (the extraordinarily beautiful child) + more beautiful”; 2. The name derives from *Phaeton*, the son of god *Helios*...; 3. The name of *Făt-Frumos* might have a Slavic origin, lacking any deity signification” (pp. 386–390).

¹⁷ *Ibidem*, p. 389.

¹⁸ Dan Alexe, *Dacopatia și alte rătăcirii românești*, revised and completed edition, Bucharest, Humanitas Publishing House, 2021, pp. 21–22.

¹⁹ The universal history registered a series of leaders, especially in the Middle Ages, that had this flattering attribute: *Philippe le Bel* (France), *Felipe el Bello* (Spain), *Kalopetru* and *Kaloian* (translated as “John the Beautiful” gr. *Kaloiōannēs*) – *Ioan the Beautiful* (Bulgaria), *Radu the Beautiful* – ruler of Wallachia

anthroponym *Frumușelul*, in Moldova, in a document dated on the 31st of March 1546²⁰. The name is not one frequently met (reclaiming obvious qualities of the bearer or, in the case of the baptising names, the projection of the aesthetic values of the denominators on the denominate), as well as it is recorded, from time to time, in documents, as unique name, especially in its feminine variant. Here is an example: “Let there be known that father Simca and his brother, Pătru, with his cousin Malea, the daughter of Radu Sălcenu, agreed upon Malea giving all her father’s share, all way from Salce and Fundeni to Hovizan, with the agreement of father Simca, who got the third part of Salce from his relative, *Fromoasa*, who had received it as dowry from her father”²¹. Petru Craman, in his monograph called *Conceptul frumuseții umane reflectat în antroponimie la români și în sud-estul Europei*²², made a thorough analysis on the first-names that are based on words that express the aspiration towards beauty; among them, there are: *Frumosul*, *Frumoasa*, *Mândrul*, *Mândra*, *Drăguțul*, *Drăguța*, etc. In time, the anthroponym changed its function, from designating a person to a family group, nowadays being registered as patronyms, bot underived and derived forms: *Frumoasa*, *Frumosul*, *Frumușani*, *Frumușeanu*, *Frumușel(u)*, *Frumușina*²³, etc.

Toponymy brings forward older attestations of the qualificative in denominative function, as compared to anthroponomy: *Fromosul* (stream) – in Moldova, April 14, 1411; *Frumoșița*, *Frumoasa* – in Moldova, February 2 1503; *Frumoșii* (village) – in Wallachia, August 7 1523; *Frumoasa* (vilage) – in Moldova, April 14 1570 and in Wallachia, May 20 1580; *Frumoșani* (village) – in Wallachia, October 23 1573; *Frumușan* – in Wallachia, December 12 1579; *Frumușenii* – in Wallachia, September 28 1596; *Frumoșei* (village) – in Wallachia, August 22 1594; *Frumușei* – in Wallachia, September 28 1596²⁴.

Along the entire country, there are met a lot of place names that are based on the respective adjective. The most frequent are the denominations in which *frumos* is used as determinant of a geographic object: *Lunca Frumoasă*, *Dealul Frumos*,

between 1462–1473, 1473–1474, 1474, 1474–1475 (https://ro.wikipedia.org/wiki/Radu_cel_Frumos, accessed on 04.06.2022).

²⁰ *Dicționarul elementelor românești din documentele slavo-române. 1374–1600*, (DERS), editor-in-chief Gh. Bolocan, Bucharest, the Socialist Republic of Romania Academy Publishing House, 1981.

²¹ *Documenta Romaniae Historica*, B. *Țara Românească*, (DRH), vol. XXXVII, 1652, made by Violeta Barbu, Constantin Bălan, Florina Manuela Constantin, Bucharest, Romanian Academy Publishing House, 2006, document no. 204, from June 7 1652.

²² Revised edition, index and bibliography by S. Ciubotaru; introducere de I. H. Ciubotaru, Iași, “Alexandru Ioan Cuza” University Publishing House, 2011.

²³ Iorgu Iordan, *Dicționar al numelor de familie românești*, Bucharest, Scientific and Encyclopedic Publishing House, 1983, p. 209. On site <https://www.namespedia.com/nume-romanesti/ce-inseamna/Frumosu> (accessed to 04.06.2022) it is also mentioned the frequency of the name *Frumosu*, on counties: Bucharest – 43, Mehedinți – 40, Teleorman – 32, Botoșani – 20, Constanța – 16, Timiș – 11, Dolj – 10, Arad – 7, Olt – 5, Caraș-Severin – 5, Brașov – 4, Tulcea – 4, Suceava – 4, Hunedoara – 2, Prahova – 2, Bacău – 2, Giurgiu – 1, Galați – 1, Vrancea – 1.

²⁴ Information taken from DERS.

Iezerul Frumos, Locul Frumos, Ostrovul Frumos, Piscul Frumos, Runcul Frumos, Târgul Frumos etc., followed by derivatives, “among which some can be «personal»:” *Frumușani, Frumușei, Frumușelele, Frumușelele-Popești, Frumușelul, Frumușeni, Frumușica, Frumușița*”²⁵ etc.

Further on, there is to be analysed the presence of the qualificative *frumos* in the toponymy from the south of the country, basing, mainly, on the information supplied by the two dictionaries made for these two regions: *Dicționarul toponimic al României. Oltenia* (The Toponymic Dictionary of Romania. Oltenia)²⁶ and *Dicționarul toponimic al României. Muntenia* (The Toponymic Dictionary of Romania. Muntenia)²⁷. The criterion for classifying the material is represented by the quality of the term in case, that is, denominations in which it has the function of: 1. proper adjective, 2. substantivized adjective, 3. toponym, 4. anthroponym. Each of the four categories, can be divided according to the gender and the number of the adjective, as well as the structural complexity of the denomination.

1. Proper adjective, present in compound structures in which the agreement (gender, number, case) is made with the determinant entopic element:

a) masculine/neuter:

– singular inarticulate element:

Câmpu Frumos (village-VL);

Cracu Frumos (v. Suseni c. Runcu, v.c. Schela, v. Pârvulești v. Vaidei v. Vălari c. Stănești-GJ);

Crângu Frumos (forest v. Zăval c. Gighera, place v. Verbicioara c. Verbița-DJ);

Dealul Frumos (village c. Stâlpeni-AG; village c. Scoarța-BZ; village c. Pietroșița-DB; place v. Podenii Vechi c. Bâlțești, t. Boldești-Scăieni, village, estate, hill c. Bucov-PH);

Fagu Frumos (v. Romanii de Jos t. Horezu-VL);

Gruia Frumos (place v. Cărpiniș v. Radoși c. Crasna-GJ; v. Stoienești c. Berislăvești-VL);

²⁵ Iorgu Iordan, *Toponimia românească*, Bucharest, Romanian Academy Publishing House, 1963, p. 113; also see Ion Iordan, Petre Găștescu, D. I. Oancea, *Indicatorul localităților din România*, Bucharest, the Socialist Republic of Romania Academy Publishing, 1974 and *Tezaurul toponimic al României. Moldova*, vol. II, *Mic dicționar toponimic al Moldovei (structural și etimologic)*, Part II, *Toponime descriptive* (autori: Daniela Butnaru, Dinu Moscal, Ana-Maria Prisacaru, Vlad Cojocaru), Iași, “Al. I. Cuza” University Publishing, 2021, that has a series of toponyms in whose componence there is found the adjective *frumos*: *Frumoasa, Pârâul Frumoasa, Frumoasa Mare, Obârșia Frumoasei, Gura Frumoasei Mari, Schitul Frumoasei, Frumușica, Schitul Frumușelii, Înconjurătoarea Mănăstirii Frumușicăi, Valea Frumoasei, Frumosul, Runcul Frumosul, Arșițele Frumosului* etc.

²⁶ Abbreviated DTRO, editor, prof. Gh. Bolocan, PhD., vol. 1 (A–B), Craiova, Universitaria Publishing House, 1993 and next.

²⁷ Abbreviated DTRM, coordinator, prof. Gh. Saramandu, PhD., vol. 1 (A–B), Bucharest, Romanian Academy Publishing, 2005 and next.

Iezeru Frumos (place v.c. Făcăieni-IL);

Izvoru Frumos (v. Călinești t. Brezoi, v. Cheia t. Olănești-VL);

Pârâu Frumos (v.c. Schela-GJ; v.c. Vaideieni, v. Valea Măceșului c. Voineasa-VL);

Piscu Frumos (v. Albești c. Albeștii de Muscel, v. Albotele c. Priboieni, place v. Golești c. Bălilești-AG; place c. Cobia, v. Broșteni c. Vișina-DB; v.c. Bengești, v. Peșteana-Jiu c. Bâlteni, v.c. Runcu, v. Poiana c. Turburea, v. Florești c. Țânțăreni, v. Valea cu Apă c. Fărcășești-GJ; place v.c. Topana- OT; v. Sâmbotin c. Dăești, v. Vărățici c. Runcu, v. Fumureni c. Lungești, v. Rugetu c. Slătioara, v. Linia Dealului c. Stănești-VL);

Podu Frumos (plateau v.c. Chiojd, v.c. Pătârlagele-BZ; mountain v.c. Runcu-DB);

– proclitic singular articulate element:

Zăvoiu cel Frumos (coppice v. Hobița c. Peștișani-GJ);

b) feminine:

– singular:

Apa Frumoasă (v. Romanii de Sus t. Horezu-VL);

Balta Frumoasă (v. Jugastru v.c. Butoiești-MH);

Coada Frumușică (v. Fumureni c. Lungești-VL);

Coasta Frumoasă (v. Slănic c. Aninoasa-AG; v.c. Călnic, v. Seuca c. Peștișani, v.c. Telești-GJ);

Crucea Frumoasă (place c. Ocița-DB);

Culmea Frumoasă (place v.c. Glogova-GJ);

Fața Frumoasă (v. Slănic, v. Valea Siliștii c. Aninoasa, v.c. Berevoiești, v. Vărzoaia c. Pietroșani-AG; v. Vărățica t. Brezoi-VL);

Fruntea Frumoasă (glade v. Stăncești-Larga c. Mușetești-GJ);

Lunca Frumoasă (estate c. Bisoca, village, estate c. Pârscov, commune-BZ; place v. Matia c. Păcureți-PH);

Măgura Frumoasă (place v.c. Șerbănești-OT);

Muchia Frumoasă (v.c. Rucăr-AG);

Pădurea Frumoasă (v. Miluta c. Borăscu-GJ; v. Greci c. Mateiești, v. Făurești c. Zătreni-VL);

Peștera Frumoasă (v. Curpen c. Stănești-GJ);

Poiana Frumoasă (v. Ciocanu c. Dâmbovicioara-AG; v. Poiana Seciuri c. Bustuchin-GJ; v. Nehoiș c. Nehoiu-BZ; v. Pietriceaua c. Brebu-PH; v. Roșia c. Alunu, arable place v. Streminoasa c. Crețeni, spring v. Romanii de Sus t. Horezu, v.c. Măldărești, v. Rugetu c. Slătioara-VL);

Râpa Frumoasă (v. Pietriceaua c. Brebu-PH);

Valea Frumoasă (stream c. Padeș, affluent of Motru, place v.c. Albeni-GJ; v. Ohaba c. Șovarna-MH);

– plural:

Poienile Frumoase (v. Pițigaia c. Stâlpeni-AG).

2. Substantivized adjective (the structures are simple, derived and underived):

– singular masculine form:

Frumosu (place, forest v. Tunarii Vechi c. Poiana Mare, pond, probably v. Tunarii Vechi c. Poiana Mare-DJ; body of water v. Cernădia c. Baia de Fier, mountain v. Cloșani v. Motru Sec v. Văieni c. Padeș, v.c. Peștișani, v. Izvarna v. Pocruia v. Sohodol v. Tismana v. Topești c. Tismana-GJ; hillock v. Buștenari c. Telega-PH);

– feminine singular and plural form:

Frumoasa (valley v.c. Dobrești, mountain side v.c. Dâmbovicioara-AG; border picquet v.c. Căscioarele, estate v.c. Frumușani-CL; estate c. Crevedia, street t. Găești-DB; field v. Tencănu c. Sălcuța-DJ; stream t. Novaci, coast v. Seuca c. Peștișani, mountain v.c. Tismana-GJ; glade v.c. Coteana, mound v.c. Șerbănești-OT; glade v.c. Iordăcheanu-PH; part of village v. Tecuci c. Balaci, village c. Frumoasa²⁸, commune, estate c. Frumoasa-TR; glade v.c. Lăpușata-VL);

Frumușica (valley v.c. Dobrești-AG; commune-BR; estate v.c. Afumați-IF; village, estate²⁹, stream, forest c. Axintele, commune-IL; coast v. Șerbănești c. Sălătrucel, fountain v. Olteni c. Bujoreni, valley v. Dumbrava v. Fumureni c. Lungești-VL);

Frumușița (village³⁰ c. Sadova-DJ; valley v. Corbii din Vale c. Nicolae Bălcescu-VL; place, probably v. Priporu c. Vlădești, valley v. Dobriceni c. Stoieniști-VL);

Frumoasele (Iezere-BR).

3. Place names. There are met denominations with:

– bi-member structures, formed according to the pattern [defined + simple determinative], in which the first element is represented by an entopic element, and the second is the qualificative *frumos*, *frumoasă* (un/derived), in toponymic function in nominative and genitive cases.

Coadă Frumoasii (v.c. Dobrești-AG);

Coasta Frumoasii (v. Gruiu c. Nucșoara-AG);

Cracu Frumosului (mountain ramification v. Cloșani c. Padeș-GJ);

Drumu Frumușica (v. Dumbrava c. Lungești-VL);

Obârșia Frumușicăi (place v. Fumureni c. Lungești-VL);

Pârâu Frumușelului (v. Bolbocești c. Albeni-GJ);

Pârâu Frumușița (v.c. Bălcești-VL);

Pasu Frumoasa (gorge-VL);

Poiana Frumoasei (glade v. Stăncești-Larga c. Mușetești-GJ);

Râu Frumoasei (v.c. Voineasa-VL);

²⁸ *Frumoasa Nouă* (village c. Frumoasa-TR).

²⁹ *Frumușica-Panduri* (estate c. Axintele-IL).

³⁰ The old name of the village of Piscu Sadovei.

Vâlceaua Frumușica (v. Bistrița Nouă c. Piatra-Olt-OT);

Valea Frumușica (c. Bobicești-OT; c. Fumureni-VL);

Valea Frumușii (valley v. Priporu c. Vlădești-VL);

– toponymic syntagms, formed according to the pattern [defined + compound determinative], in which the first position is, as well, occupied by an entopic element, and the second represents a complex denomination³¹, pre-existent to the forming of the syntagms:

Dealul Coasta Frumoasă (v. Brădiceni c. Peștișani-GJ);

Dealul Lacu Frumoasei (v. Mosoroasa or. Băile Olănești-VL);

Dealul Piscu Frumos (v.c. Mușătești-AG);

Gruia Feții Frumoase (v. Văratca or. Brezoi-VL);

Gura Văii Frumușicai [place-VL];

Pârâul Izvorului Frumos (place v. Izvorul Frumos c. Burila Mare-MH);

Poiana Gurii Frumosului (v. Cloșani c. Padeș-GJ);

Râpa Lacului Frumos (v.c. Vlădești-VL);

In few cases, when the accent falls on the localisation of the denoted object, the secondary lexical unit is accompanied by simple or composed prepositions – *din*, *de la* (from):

Movila din Poiana Frumoasă (place-DB);

Fântâna de la Piscu Frumos (v. Albotele c. Priboieni-AG);

Poiana de la Vârful Frumos (place t. Comarnic-PH).

– simple or composed toponyms, preceded by simple prepositions with locative value (*în* (in), *la* (at)):

În Frumușelu (place v. Beleți c. Beleți-Negrești-AG);

La Copacu Frumos (place v.c. Șirna-PH);

La Gorunii Frumoși (place c. Buda, v.c. Sărulești, v. Valea Salciei-BZ; place v.c. Chiojdeni, v. Dumitreștii de Sus c. Dumitrești-VR);

La Livada Frumoasă (v. Mislea c. Scorțeni-PH);

La Podu Frumos (place v.c. Măgura-BZ).

4. People names. The excerpted material was subclassified according to the structure of the denominations:

– the anthroponym forms the toponym alone:

Frumușel (village c. Licurici-GJ);

Frumușelu (hill v. Paraschivești c. Priboieni-AG; *stream* (it flows in Ungurelu) v. Bârzeiu de Gilort v. Bolbocești v. Doseni c. Albeni, v. Ștefănești t. Târgu Cărbunești-GJ);

Titu Frumușanu (v. Urechești c. Drăgulești-GJ).

³¹ Inside which the morpho-syntactic features of the adjectives are adequate to the term it determines, and its initial function can be different: qualificative, place or person name.

– the anthroponym accompanies a popular geographic term, specifying which is the possessor; from the syntactic point of view, the relation between terms takes the form of the nominative:

*Drumu Frumușica*³² [road-VL], but also that of the genitive, expressed both in enclitic and proclitic way:

Linia Frumoasei (v. Malu Spart c. Bolintin Vale-GR);

Moșia Frumoasei (estate-TR);

Piscu Frumoasei (v.c. Dobrești-AG);

Piscu lu Frumos (place v. Râncăcirov c. Călinești-AG);

Plațu lu Frumosu (v. Aurora c. Cujmir-MH);

Podu Frumușelului (v. Ștefănești t. Târgu Cărbunești-GJ);

Poiana Frumosului (v. Bibești c. Săulești-GJ);

Poteca Frumosului (v. Cloșani c. Padeș-GJ);

Puțu lu Barbu Frumosu (v. Sărățeni c. Balaciu-IL).

– the anthroponym is a component part of a toponymical syntagm in which the prepositions (*pe* (on), *de la* (from)) indicate the positioning of the defined object:

Pădurea pe Valea lu Frumos (v. Popești c. Podenii Noi-PH);

Poteca de la Via lu Frumosu (v.c. Cujmir-MH);

Puțu de la Valea lui Frumos (v. Popești c. Podenii Noi-PH).

– “personal derivatives” from the adjective *frumos*:

*Frumușani*³³ (village c. Frumușani, commune estate c. Frumușani-CL; village c. Piscu Vechi-DJ);

*Frumușei*³⁴ (village, probably c. Sadova-DJ; commune, stream v.c. Novaci-GJ);

*Frumușeni*³⁵ (village c. Licurici, commune-GJ).

As it can be noticed from the previously quote examples, the inventory of the toponyms with compound structures proves to be more generous from the comparative quantitative point of view, with the list of the simple (un/derived) denominations; some of the latter ones, in compensation, having a wider spatial spread (*Frumoasa*, *Frumosu*, *Frumușica*).

³² In this case, the disappearance of the possessive article has as consequence the modification of the denominative relation: if the genitive signals the existence of a possession relation, “the nominative indicates an onimic relation, through which the name of the person becomes the name of the socio-geographic object..., similar to a label. The syntagms lose their initial transparency, become abstract – a process parallel to the progressive loss of the motivation to the simple, personal or descriptive names” (*Introducerea la Tezaurul toponimic al României. Moldova*, vol. II. *Mic dicționar toponimic al Moldovei (structural și etimologic)*, Part I, *Toponime personale* (edited by prof. Dragoș Moldovanu, PhD.), Iași, Alexandru Ioan Cuza University Publishing House, 2014, p. XIV).

³³ From the group name of *frumușani(i)* (from the adj. *frumușan* “frumos”-beautiful, through substantivization or as predicative. *Frumușan* – also see Iordan *T* 113).

³⁴ From group name of *frumușei(i)* (predicative *Frumușel*); also see *Frumușei-Căpreni* – road v.c. Hurezani-GJ; *top. Frumușei + determ. top.*; *Totea de Frumușei* (village c. Licurici-GJ; it belonged to c. Licurici) < *top. Totea + determ. top.*

³⁵ From the group name of *frumușeni(i)*.

On addressing the objects that were “labelled” with *frumos*, they belong to all the categories of the popular geographic terms:

– positive relief forms: *câmpu*-field, *coasta*-coast, *cracu*-hill foot, *culmea*-hill top, *dealu*-hill, *gruiu*-hillock, *muchia*-edge, *piscu*-peak, *vârfulu*-top etc.;

– negative relief forms: *peștera*-cave, *râpa*-precipice, *valea*-valley etc.;

– hydronyms: *apa*-water, *balta*-pool, *iezeru*-mountain lake, *izvoru*-spring, *lacu*-lake, *pârâu*-stream etc.

– unique vegetal elements or vegetative agglomerations: *copacu*-tree, *crângu*-grove, *fagu*-beech, *gorunii*-common oaks, *livada*-orchard, *lunca*-meadow, *pădurea*-forest, *poiana*-glade etc.

– constructions: *crucea*-cross, *podu*-bridge etc.

Besides the appellative *frumos*, in toponymy there are also met other terms that express the specific quality. We are to depict two of them, with visible presences in the place name inventory, more precisely³⁶: *Mușat* and *Dragu*. Here are the denominations registered in the analysed space:

Mușat³⁷:

Cantonu lu Mușat (t. Costești-DB);

Cârciuma lu Gheorghe Mușat (t. Mizil-PH);

Coada Văii Mușatilor (v. Negrești c. Costești-AG);

³⁶ Iorgu Iordan, in *Toponimia românească*, was including in this category other toponyms too, among which *Crasna* (cf. the old Slavic *krasînŭ* “beautiful”, Bulg. *krasen* “beautiful” etc.), *Lepșa* (Slavic. *lěpŭ* “beautiful, pretty”), along with *Cilibia*, *Cilibii*, *Cilibiul*, *Celebi-Chioi* which are based on the word *cilibiu*: “1. (A title given by the Turks especially to the Europeans in the old times, equivalent to effendi, which was specific to the Turks) a nobleman, a leader, a gentleman, a boyar; 2. (obsolete politeness addressing title) ruler, lord, boyar, master; 3. elegant, fine, gracious, beautiful, clean, well-built; 4. delicate, frail, slender...” (pp. 316–317). In Oltenia and Muntenia, there were met the following toponyms: *Cilibiu* (hill v. Izvorani c. Ștefănești-AG) and *Bunaru Cilibii* (v. Șipote c. Poroina Mare-MH), in which *Cilibiu* has the function of anthroponym. In the toponymy from Muntenia, there are other names of places with the meaning of *frumos*: *Lunca Ghizdăveața* (estate-BZ), *Cioaca Ghizdavului* (v. Miluta c. Borăscu-GJ) – the appellative *ghizdav* “(obsolete) beautiful; gracious, pleasant; from Sl. *gyzdavŭ*” (<https://dexonline.ro/definitie/ghizdav/definitii>, accessed to 17.06.2020); *Lunca Hubava* (loc-BZ) and *Lunca Hubavei* (place-BZ), both being based on a Bulgarian anthroponym, originally meaning *frumos*.

³⁷ The adjective *mușat*, “beautiful, pretty”, came from *frumos*, through an infantile expressive alteration, like *mumușat* or *frumușat* (<https://dexonline.ro/definitie/mu%C8%99at>, accessed to 17.06.2022). A dynastic name in medieval Moldova, which derives from *frumoșăt* “a favourite epithet used for caressing the babies, which in time begins to be used as baptising name” (Petru Caraman, *op. cit.*, p. 155); “due to the fact that lady Mușata was the mother of three rulers, who the people denominated with the metronymic appellation «al Mușatei» – in the Slavic form, «Mușatin» – and these appellative perpetuated from generation to generation, creating a traditional use ... Mușatin dynasty is imposed, first and foremost, through the long tradition that made them popular” (*Ibidem*, p. 240). From anthroponymy, the name could not enter easily in the inventory of place names. As person name, *Mușat* was first attested in Wallachia, in 1451, and as a place name, in the same region, at 1475, as *Mușeteștii* (DERS, p. 150). In *Toponimia românească*, Iorgu Iordan recorded the toponyms: *Mușata*, *Mușatul*, *Mușătești*, *Mușetești*, *Mușeteasca*, *Mușetescu* (p. 113).

- Crângu lu Mușat* (v.c. Bucșani-DB, v. Tâmburești c. Bratovoiești-DJ);
La Fântână la Mușat (PH);
Lacu lu Mușat (TR);
Lotu lu Stan Mușat (BZ);
Măgura lu Mușat (TR);
Mușat (lake v.c. Spanțov-CL; sheepfold c. Balaciu, brook v.c. Vlădeni-IL; forest v. Mierleștii de Sus c. Perieți-OT; valley c. Orbeasca, hamlet t. Vedea-TR);
Mușata (glen v. Înfrățirea v. Săliște c. Bulzești-DJ);
Mușatu (forest v.c. Brădești, arable land v. Răcarii de Sus t. Filiași, part of village v.c. Unirea-DJ);
Mușafi (part of village c. Bezdead-DB);
Mușateasca (estate c. Măciuca-BZ; estate c. Dumbrava-PH; estate v. Zimnicele c. Năsturelu-TR);
Mușateica (pasture, lake, mountain v.c. Arefu-AG);
Mușătescu (mountain v. Văleni c. Călinești, stream v.c. Corbi, place v. Suslănești c. Mioarele, estate v.c. Mușătești, mountain v.c. Nucșoara-AG);
Mușătești (part of village v. Săpunari c. Morărești, village c. Mușătești, commune, estate c. Mușătești, monastery c. Mușătești-AG; estate-BZ, village-BZ; part of village v. Pădureni c. Dragodana-DB, village-IL, estate v.c. Sprâncenata-OT; village next to v. Sicrita c. Dumbrava-PH; estate v.c. Peretu-TR; monastery v.c. Sălătrucel-VL; hill v.c. Șuşani-VL);
Mușătoaia (hill v. Lucieni c. Hârțiești-AG);
Mușătoiu (estate-DJ; place v. Cloșani c. Padeș-GJ);
Mușățeanca (estate v.c. Bărăganu, place v.c. Însurăței, place v.c. Zăvoaia, estate c. Murgești-BR);
Mușățeasca (estate v.c. Țintești-BZ; estate c. Dumbrava-PH);
Mușățeasca-Fințești (estate v.c. Țintești-BZ);
*Mușet*³⁸ (stream v. Cernădia c. Baia de Fier-GJ);
Mușetari (mountain v. Cernădia c. Baia de Fier-GJ);
Mușetești (estate, probably v. Bucovăț m. Craiova-DJ; place v. Cârligei c. Bumbești-Pițic, hill v. Vierșani c. Jupânești, village c. Mușetești, commune, stream, historic place, part of village v.c. Mușetești-GJ);
Mușeteștii de Jii (historic place, probably v.c. Mușetești-GJ);
Mușetoaia (mountain, sheepfold v. Cernădia c. Baia de Fier-GJ; mountain peak v. Cloșani c. Padeș-GJ; valley, stream v. Drăganu c. Valea Mare-VL);
Mușetoiu (mountain, mountain cliff, stream v. Cernădia c. Baia de Fier-GJ; part of village v. Cârlogani c. Bălcești-VL);
Partea lui Mușat (place-BZ);
Partea lui Mușat Pârciu (estate-BZ);

³⁸ Np. *Mușet*, variant of *Mușat*.

Pârâu lu Mușat (stream-AG);
Podu lu Mușat (v. Gemenea-Brătulești c. Voinești-DB).

Dragu³⁹:

Coasta Drăguței (v. Uzun c. Călugăreni-GR);
Draga (stream, arable land, hill v. Tabaci c. Vulpeni-OT);
Dragu (cattle pen v. Comoșteni c. Gângiova-DJ; pond v. Plosca c. Bistreș-DJ;
 valley v. Benești c. Bălcești-VL; hill v. Băroiu c. Tetoiu-VL; estate c. Jitia-VR);
Drăguț (pond v. Hunia c. Maglavit-DJ);
Drăguța (valley v. Rădulești c. Crevenicu-TR);
Drăguțești (village c. Morărești-AG; village c. Drăguțești, commune, estate
 v.c. Drăguțești-GJ; lane v. Boroșești c. Sutești-VL);
Drăguțu (place v. Urzica Mare c. Urzicuța-DJ; forest v.c. Orlești-VL);
Pârâu lu Dragu (v. Seaca c. Logrești-GJ);
Pârâu Râpii Dragului (v. Vaidei c. Stănești-GJ);
Pe la Casa Dragului Bălănescu (place v.c. Bălănești-GJ);
Perii Dragăi (v.c. Plenița-DJ);
Piscu Dragului (v. Valea Grădiștii c. Grădiștea, v.c. Pietrari-VL);
Piscu lu Dragu (v. Piscuri c. Ploșoru-GJ);
Plopil lu Dragu (v. Balta Verde c. Gogoșu-MH);
Poiana Dragului (glade v. Genuneni, Moșteni and Surpatele c. Frâncești-VL);
Poiana lu Drăguț (v. Prejna c. Balta-MH);
Știubeiu Dragului (v.c. Grozești-MH);
Știubeiu lu Dragu (v. Pinoasa c. Călnic-GJ);
Toaia Râpii Dragului (v. Vaidei c. Stănești-GJ);
Ulița lu Dragu (v.c. Laloșu-VL);
Valea lu Dragă (v. Ploștina t. Motru, v. Spahii c. Turburea-GJ);
Valea lu Dragu (v. Stănești t. Baia de Aramă, v.c. Obârșia-Cloșani-MH;
 c. Livezi-VL);
Vâlceaia Dragăi (v. Rupturile c. Murgași-DJ);
Vâlceaia Dragului (v. Amărăști c. Fărcaș-DJ);
Via lu Dragu (v. Sterpoaia c. Aninoasa-GJ).

From the structural point of view, similar to *Frumos*, *Mușat* and *Dragu* belong both to simple and compound toponymic constructions; most of the names (either form the denomination of the place alone, or they enter the componence of some analytical structures in which there appear entopic elements or prepositions), initially carried out the function of anthroponym (frequently sustained by the use of the enclitic or proclitic genitive). On addressing the mentioned denominations strictly,

³⁹ The adjective *drag*, -ă “beloved, nice” (<https://dexonline.ro/definitie/drag/definitii>, accessed to 17.06.2022); attested as person name in Moldova at 1414 (as *Dragulovi*) (DERS, p. 70).

they can be underived: *Frumosu, Frumoasa, Mușat, Dragu* and derived⁴⁰: with different suffixes: diminutive, which help supplement the meaning of the words, conferring them loveliness, gentleness, delicacy *Frumușica, Frumușița, Frumușelu; Drăguț*); suffixes that form marital names (*Mușăteasca, Mușătoaia*), patronyms (*Mușătescu, Mușătoiu*), local suffixes (*Mușetești, Frumușani*).

On addressing the oldness of the quoted denominations, in our toponymic system, according to the DTRO and DTRM attestations, *Mușat* (*Mușătescu* – 1526, *Mușătești* – 1526, *Mușăteasca* – 1585, *Partea lui Mușat* – 1655, etc.) is on the first position, followed by *Frumos* (*Valea Frumușiții* – 1626, *Frumușei* – 1594, etc.), the “newest” denominations being those containing *Drag* (toponymic presences registered after 1800).

*

The aspiration towards beauty, present in all the aspects of the human life is also manifested in onomastics. In toponymy, a space approached in the present paper, *frumosul* has two ways of entering: 1. through interonymic transfer: the anthroponyms (*Frumosu, Frumoasa*, etc.) frequently become place names; 2. through direct observation, when certain objects create a lasting impression on the denominators (*Culmea Frumoasă, Pădurea Frumoasă*, etc.). Even though, from the quantitative point of view, the respective toponyms do not register high numeric values, they represent a micromodel that can be framed within the rules of the toponymic denominations, the respective place names having, in addition, an affective feature.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Alexe, D., *Dacopatia și alte rătăcirii românești*, revised and completed edition, Bucharest, Humanitas Publishing House, 2021.
- Avram, P., *Toponimia din zona Teleormanului formate de la adjective în -esc*, in “Studii și cercetări de onomastică”, no. 6, Craiova, Universitaria Publishing House, 2001, pp. 349–362.
- Bolocan, Gh., Voronțova, T., Șodolescu-Silvestru, E., Burci, I., *Dicționar frazeologic român-rus*, volume I – A-M, Craiova, Universitaria Publishing House, 1999.
- Burci, I., *Adjectivul în terminologia geografică populară*, in “Arhivele Olteniei”, New Series, no. 28, Bucharest, Romanian Academy Publishing House, 2014, pp. 228–245.
- Burci, I., *Names of places with adjectival determiners in the toponymy from Muntenia*, in “Anuarul Institutului de Cercetări Socio-Umane «C.S. Nicolăescu-Plopșor»”, no. XVI, 2016, Bucharest, Romanian Academy Publishing House, 2016, pp. 235–247.
- Butnaru, D., Moscal, D., Prisacaru, A.M., Cojocaru, V., *Tezaurul toponimic al României. Moldova*, vol. II, *Mic dicționar toponimic al Moldovei (structural și etimologic)*, Part II, *Toponime descriptive*, Iași, “Al. I. Cuza” University Publishing House, 2021.
- Caraman, P., *Conceptul frumuseții umane reflectat în antroponimie la români și în sud-estul Europei*, Iași, “Alexandru Ioan Cuza” University Publishing House, 2011.

⁴⁰ The derivation usually occurs in anthroponomy, in toponymy the name enters through transfer.

- Dicționarul elementelor românești din documentele slavo-române. 1374–1600*, (DERS), editor-in-chief Gh. Bolocan, Bucharest, the Socialist Republic of Romania Academy Publishing House, 1981.
- Dicționarul toponimic al României. Muntenia*, abbreviated DTRM, coordinator, prof. Gh. Saramandu, PhD, vol. 1 (A-B), Bucharest, Romanian Academy Publishing House, 2005 and next.
- Dicționarul toponimic al României. Oltenia*, abbreviated DTRO, editor, prof. Gh. Bolocan, PhD, vol. 1 (A–B), Craiova, Universitaria Publishing House, 1993 and next.
- Documenta Romaniae Historica, B. Țara Românească*, (DRH), vol. XXXVII, 1652, made by Violeta Barbu, Constantin Bălan, Florina Manuela Constantin, Bucharest, Romanian Academy Publishing House, 2006.
- Jordan, I., Gâstescu, P., Oancea, D.I., *Indicatorul localităților din România*, Bucharest, the Socialist Republic of Romania Academy Press, 1974.
- Jordan, I., *Dicționar al numelor de familie românești*, Bucharest, Scientific and Encyclopedic Publishing House, 1983.
- Jordan, I., *Toponimia românească*, Bucharest, Romanian Academy Publishing, 1963.
- Micul dicționar academic*, 2nd edition, Romanian Academy, the Institute of Linguistics, Bucharest, Univers Enciclopedic Publishing House, 2010.
- Noica, C., *Creație și frumos în rostirea românească*, Bucharest, Eminescu Publishing House, 1973.
- Tezaurul toponimic al României. Moldova, Introducere*, vol. II. *Mic dicționar toponimic al Moldovei (structural și etimologic)*, Part I, *Toponime personale* (edited by prof. Dragoș Moldovanu, PhD), Iași, Alexandru Ioan Cuza University Publishing House, 2014.
- Vulcănescu, R., *Mitologie română*, Bucharest, the Socialist Republic of Romania Academy Publishing House, 1987.

ONLINE BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Mihali, A. E., *Valențe semantice ale adjectivelor în structura numelor comerciale*, available at http://www.upm.ro/cc12/volCCI_II/Pages%20from%20Volum_texteCCI2-118.pdf, accessed to 16.03.2015.
- <https://luceafarul.net/conceptul-de-frumos-o-manifestare-estetica-si-filosofica>, accessed to 01.06.2022.
- <https://historia.ro/sectiune/general/cum-au-evoluat-standardele-de-frumusetate-de-a-565386.html>, accessed to 01.02.2022.
- <https://www.fundatiacaleavictoriei.ro/frumusetate-o-istorie-care-ne-fascineaza>, accessed to 01.06.2022.
- <https://bjiasi.ro/editura/frumosul-din-perspective-filosofice-si-teologice-ovidiu-ioan-sarghie/>, accessed to 31.05.2022.
- <https://www.revistanoinu.com/scrie/filosofie/evoluia-ideii-de-frumos>, accessed to 31.05.2022.
- <https://dexonline.ro/definitie/frumos/definitii>, accessed to 04.06.2022.
- https://ro.wikipedia.org/wiki/Radu_cel_Frumos, accessed to 04.06.2022.
- <https://www.namespedia.com/nume-romanesti/ce-inseamna/Frumosu>, accessed to 04.06.2022.
- <https://dexonline.ro/definitie/mu%C8%99at>, accessed to 17.06.2022.
- <https://dexonline.ro/definitie/drag/definitii>, accessed to 17.06.2022.