

THE OCCURRENCE OF THE SLAVIC APPELLATIVES *OCINĂ* AND *OHABĂ* IN CURRENT ROMANIAN TOPONYMY

Iustina NICA (BURCI)

Romanian Academy

“C. S. Nicolăescu-Plopșor” Institute for Research
in Social Sciences and Humanities, Craiova (Romania)

Abstract

To this day, toponymy has preserved a series of place names based on lexical elements specific to the epochs in which those names emerged. They include such words as: *falcă*/ ‘old unit of measurement’, *funie*/ ‘narrow parcel of land’, *jurebie*/ ‘narrow parcel of land’, *mejdină*/ ‘untilled land’, *moșie*/ ‘estate’, *stângen*/ ‘fathom’, *tablă*/ ‘piece of agricultural land’, etc.

In this article, we aim to make a “radiography” of such terms, namely, *ocină*/ ‘agricultural land/ hereditary property’ and *ohabă*/ ‘property exempt from taxes; transferrable land’. The lexemes will be analyzed both from the perspective of the role and the hypostases in which we encounter them in the legal system of the past (an analysis undertaken on the basis of archival documents), and, of course, from a toponymic perspective (the typology of the structures in which they occur, their frequency).

Keywords: *ocină, ohabă, archival documents, toponymy, structure*

Résumé

La toponymie a conservé jusqu’à présent toute une série de noms de lieux qui ont pour base des éléments lexicaux spécifiques aux époques où les noms respectifs sont nés. Parmi eux on compte des mots tels : *falcă*, *funie*, *jurebie*, *mejdină*, *moșie*, *stângen*, *tablă* etc.

Dans cet article on s’est proposé de faire la « radiographie » ce genre de termes à savoir *ocină* et *ohabă*. Ces lexèmes seront analysés tant de la perspective du rôle et des hypostases dont ils sont rencontrés dans le système juridique du passé (analyse entreprise en base de documents d’archive) et, bien entendu, de la perspective toponymique (la typologie des structures où ils apparaissent, leur fréquence).

Mots-clés: *ocină, ohabă, documents d’archive, toponymie, structure*

The two terms, *ocină* and *ohabă*, are found in the vocabulary of the old *custom of the land*¹, “which included, especially in the first centuries, all our law, both public

¹ Or *customary law*. It comprised a series of unwritten “rules”, “developed in the practice of social life and passed down from one generation to another through tradition” (<https://e-juridic.manager.ro/dictionar-juridic/drept-cutumiar/1581.html> – site accessed 07.03.2019). The bibliography on the role played by the *custom of the land* in the life of Romanian society is vast. Here are a few titles: H.H. Stahl, *Contribuții la studiul satelor devălmașe românești*, vol. I, *Confederații de ocol, structuri teritoriale și tehnici agricole*,

and private. It was the custom of the country. It lived in the soul of the people, largely based on equity and had been preserved over the centuries through tradition”². It represented “local justice, without stamps and incidents, expeditious and very effective”³, through which “order, security, law were guaranteed and defended”⁴.

In the work *Istoria statului și dreptului românesc* ‘History of the Romanian state and law’⁵, Emil Cernea and Emil Molcuț placed them among the words whose meaning indicates *property* and which were used in the relationship between the deceased and the beneficiary or beneficiaries of the goods, between the seller and the buyer, etc. In general, they appear in the documents that indicated, for one reason or another, the change of ownership of real estate. Here are these words:

*baștină*⁶ (“form of private property of incipient type exercised over the inherited immovable goods [estates]. It is used to differentiate this type of immovable goods from those purchased”, p. 347);

*dedină*⁷ (“ancient ownership exercised over real estate”, p. 374);

*delniță*⁸ (“1. A plot for the house and garden assigned from the village land to a family. In this sense, delnița could be alienated, encumbered or passed on to the heirs, which means that it was the object of private property in its incipient form, and, later, of a right of private property. 2. The right of use of a family over some goods from the collective property of the community. Initially, these goods were assigned by drawing lots. 3. Plot of land assigned by the boyar to the enslaved peasant for exploitation. 4. A place intended for meadows or vineyards. It is mentioned in some documents written in Moldavia”, p. 374);

*moșie*⁹ (“private ownership of the land”, p. 410);

*ocină*¹⁰ (“1. Private ownership of agricultural plots. 2. Private property whose owner enjoys immunities of the feudal type. 3. Form of ownership over the land, similar to property, hereditary in nature”, p. 413);

București, Editura Academiei RPR, 1958; *Idem*, vol. II, *Structura internă a satelor devălmașe libere*, București, Editura Academiei Române, 1959; *Idem*, vol. III, *Procesul de aservire feudală a satelor devălmașe*, București, Editura Academiei RPR, 1965; Romulus Vulcănescu, *Etnologie juridică*, București, Editura Academiei RSR, 1970; P. P. Panaitescu, *Obștea țărănească în Țara Românească și Moldova*, București, Editura Academiei RPR, 1964; Ilie Bădescu, Darie Cristea (coord.), *Dicționar de sociologie rurală. Concepte-teme-teorii*, București, Editura Mica Valahie, 2011 etc.

² Andrei Rădulescu, *Viața juridică și administrativă a satelor*, București, Cultura Națională, 1927, p. 10.

³ *Ibidem*, p. 11.

⁴ *Ibidem*.

⁵ Emil Cernea, Emil Molcuț, *Istoria statului și dreptului românesc. Terminologia vechiului drept românesc*, ediție revăzută și adăugită, București, Editura Universul Juridic, 2013.

⁶ Appellative coming from Serb. *baština* – “inherited estate”, Bg. [as an adj.] “parental”, *baština* “native place”, from *bašta* “father” (August Scriban, *Dicționarul limbii românești*, Institutul de Arte Grafice „Presa Bună”, 1939, s.v. *baștină*).

⁷ From O.Sl. *dědina* – “inheritance” (August Scriban, *op. cit.*, s.v. *dedină*).

⁸ From O.Sl. **dělnika*, d. *dělŭ* – “part”, *děliti* – “to divide” (August Scriban, *op. cit.*, s.v. *delniță*).

⁹ The etymology comes from the word *moș* derived with the suffix *-ie*.

¹⁰ From O.Sl. *očina*, from *otičina* “inheritance”, “fatherland”, *otičinŭ* “parental”, *otiči*, *otecŭ* “father” (August Scriban, *op. cit.*, s.v. *ocină*).

*ohabă*¹¹ (“1. Property whose owner has been granted immunities of the feudal type; it is mentioned in documents in Wallachia in the period between the 14th and 15th centuries. 2. Property that could be transferred by succession; it is mentioned in the documents written in Wallachia in the period between the 15th century and the beginning of the 18th century”, p. 414);

*uric*¹² (“1. Form of land ownership, hereditary, given or confirmed by the ruler. 2. The document certifying these legal proceedings”, p. 436);

*vislujenie*¹³ (“1. Lifetime possession of an estate given by the ruler to his vassal for deeds of bravery. It is mentioned in the documents written in Moldavia at the beginning of developed feudalism”, p. 438).

The documents in which we frequently encounter the appellatives *ocina* and *ohabă* are specific, therefore, to the epochs in which they were drafted, their profile varying: inheritance, donation, royal empowerment, sale-purchase, land disputes (in a large number especially after “foreigners entered through gifts, marriages, purchases by disregarding the right of pre-emption; hence the beginning everywhere of the great series of trials relating to succession, which in many parts represent the history of the great property”¹⁴), exchange of property, brotherly union of the estate, pledge, etc.

We rely, in our approach, on the one hand, on archival documents, and on the other hand, on current sources in which these words are still found.

The presentation of the terms will be done, in the beginning, independently of each other, so that, in the end, the (toponymic) analysis will intervene, in order to obtain the complete image of the lexical route of the two.

OCINA¹⁵. Initially, the ownership of land was a collective one (dominated by the form of ownership of the villages in abstract shares, calculated formally, but not distributed to the community members, because “the village cannot be actually subdivided, since it is a single large collective village workshop”¹⁶). In time, it evolved, the final point on its evolutionary path being the fragmentation of the land to total individualization. It is a gradual transition “from district collective property, based on absolute joint property,..., to individual property, the result of the processes of

¹¹ Word coming from O.Sl. *ohaba* “full property”, from *ohabitii* “to stop”, ie “estate that cannot be alienated” (August Scriban, *op. cit.*, s.v. *ohabă*).

¹² Hung. *örök* “perpetual, hereditary, inheritance” (August Scriban, *op. cit.*, s.v. *uric*).

¹³ In *Tolkovii slovar' jivotnogo velikoruskogo jazika* (tome I, Sankt-Petersburg, Moskva, 1880) of the Russian lexicographer Vladimir Dal', there occurs the term *выслужение* (*vislujenie*), a synonym of *заслуга* (*zasluga*) with the meaning “merit”, books.google.ro/books?id=xn3NNBAAoScC&pg=PA307&dq=толквий+словарь+выслужение&source (site accessed 12.04.2020).

¹⁴ Andrei Rădulescu, *op. cit.*, p. 10.

¹⁵ In MDA, it appears with the following meanings: “(Inherited) piece of land; inherited land for building a house - plot of land for a house; (popular) place of birth”. The explanatory dictionaries also record the verb *ocina* – “(obsolete) to inherit, to own” and the noun *ocinaş* – “(obsolete) heir, master, rural owner”.

¹⁶ H. H. Stahl, *Contribuții la studiul satelor devălmașe românești*, vol. II, *Structura internă a satelor devălmașe libere*, București, Editura Academiei Republicii Populare Române, 1959, p. 168 (the emphasis in the quotations is ours).

termination of joint ownership of property. There is thus a tendency to individualize the village property in relation to the district, the property of the hamlet in relation to the mother village, the lineage in relation to the village, and the family in relation to the lineage. On the other hand, these tendencies are also marked by the processes of strict delimitation between the individual property, transferrable to the descendants... and the customary property, with the right to use for the whole community consisting of pastures, forests, roads, and waters”¹⁷.

Therefore, gradually, as the means of working the land diversify, simultaneously with the increase of the population and the maintenance in possession of a family, from one year to another, of the same land area, “some of the local possessions acquire a permanent character, as the possibility of their exploitation also becomes permanent. In this way, the possession of the land tends to turn into *ocină*”¹⁸. *Ocină*, which, although inherited, still functions “economically and legally in the social complex of the joint property village”¹⁹. Under these circumstances, it will continue to be “encumbered with a series of links to the community, with easements that derive, in most cases, from the fact that *ocină* does not serve as a territorial base for a fully autonomous farm, but is only a fragment of the collective village workshop”²⁰.

We will further reproduce some of the types of documents and types of lexical constructions in which we have identified the presence of the appellative *ocină* in archival documents:

1. Documents in which the term designated a property, which became the object of different transactions:

*vânzare*²¹/ ‘sale’: “Adică eu, Nedelco, feciorul Șărbei den satu den Bordușani, dempreună cu fâmeia a me, Tudora, fata lu Nedelco ot satu ot Stenca, scris-am și mărturisescu cu acest zapis al nostru ca să fie de mare credință la mâna dummelui Moisi spătar, cum să se știe că i-am *vândutu* dummelui *ocină* ot satu la Stenca ot sudstvo Ialomița...”/ ‘Therefore, I, Nedelco, the son of Șărbea from the village of Bordușani, together with my wife, Tudora, the daughter of Nedelco from the village of Stenca, we

¹⁷ Ilie Bădescu, Darie Cristea (coord.), *Dicționar de sociologie rurală. Concepte-teme-teorii*, București, Editura Mica Valahie, 2011, p. 81-82.

¹⁸ H. H. Stahl, *Contribuții la studiul satelor devălmașe românești*, vol. II, p. 184.

¹⁹ *Ibidem*.

²⁰ *Ibidem*, p. 184.

²¹ *Ocina* could be sold/bought with Romanians/ serfs (“... partea lui Nan postelnic snă Oprii logofăt, toată partea lui, câtă se va alege, însă delniți 5 și cu un rumân, anume Oprea snă Bodin”/ ‘... the part of seneschal Nan of baillif Oprii, all his part, as much as will be chosen, but 5 *plots of land* and with a Romanian, namely Oprea of Bodin’ - DRH, vol. XXXVIII, doc. no. 43, 14 februarie 1653) or without them (“Adecă eu, Mihai snă lui Staico din Ohaba, scriu și mărturisescu cu acesta al miu zapis ca să fie de mare credință la mâna lui Iaacov căpitan, cum să <șă> știe că i-am vândut partea me de *ocină* di<n> sat Văgiulești, însă *ocina* fără rumâni...”/ ‘Therefore, I, Mihai of Staico from Ohaba, write and testify with this document so that captain Iaacov will have it in good faith and let everyone know I sold him my share of land in the village of Văgiulești, but the land without Romanians...’ - see note 22, doc. no. 34, 30 ianuarie 1652).

wrote and we testify with this document of ours, so that Moisi, the sword bearer, will have it in good faith and let everyone know that I *sold land* to him in the village of Stenca, Ialomița county...’²²;

cumpărare/ ‘purchase’: “Să să știe cum *au cumpărat* Sebe și fii-său, Tornea, *ocină* de la Vladul popii lui Dragomir den sat, din Stănțești, stânjeni de *ocină* pe Tăuleasca 15, den cap până-n capul *ocinii* și până-n apă. Și iar *au cumpărat* Sebe și Tornea de la Vladul, stânjeni za *ocină* în Bojora, iar den cap până-n cap, drept ughi 5...’/ ‘Let everyone know that Sebe and his son, Tornea, *bought land* from Vladul of the priest of Dragomir from the village, from Stănțești, 15 fathoms of land on Tăuleasca 15, from the beginning of the parcel to the water. And again Sebe and Tornea *bought* from Vladul fathoms of *land* in Bojora, a whole parcel, for 5 Hungarian gold coins...’²³;

răscumpărare/ ‘redemption’: “Adică noi, acești șase boiari cari amu fostu luați înaintea dvornicului Manole ca să tocmimu pre cești megiași, cari [*a*]u *scumpărat ocina* cari au fostu vândutu vornicului Hrizi...’/ ‘Therefore, we, these six boyars who were taken before magistrate Manole to entrust these free holders, who *redeemed the land* that was sold to magistrate Hrizi...’²⁴;

zalogire/ ‘pledge’: “Scris-am eu, Crăciun fici<o>rul Hodie și frati-miu Mirce al nostru zapis la mâna finoului Radului dă Suseni ca să fie dă mare credință cum să se știe că am *jolujit* 40 de stă<n>jini însă partea lu Lazaru dreptu ughi 10 până la sveatăi Ilie, dă voi avea banii la zi să-i dau și să-m țin *ocina* și să-i dau 12 dubunda banilor. Iar, dă nu voi avea a-i darea banii la zi, să fie *ocina* stătătoare muși<i>, să aibă a-m darea și zapisele cele vechi la mâna mea’/ ‘I, Crăciun, my son Hodie, and my brother Mirce, have written this document of ours so that our godson Radul from Suseni will have it in good faith and let everyone know that we *agreed* on 40 fathoms, the part of Lazaru for 10 Hungarian gold coins until Saint Elijah, so if I have the money I will give it to him and keep the *land* and give him 12 with interest. And if I don’t have the money, let the *land* remain with the estate and he will give me the old documents back’²⁵, etc.

2. Documents requesting the help of those entitled to confirm the right to a piece of land or to draw its borders by establishing the neighbourhoods:

“... acești 12 boiari să căutăm și să împlăm să socotim și să hotărâm *ocina* Stanciului vataf, *ocină* din câmp, însă în hotarul Moceștilor, care *ocină* o a fost cumpărat Stanciul, vataf di la Stancea, fata lu Șirban Mocescu, moș bătrân ș[i] plin. Dici noi am împlatu împreună cu toți megiașii cari sunt *ocinași* și moșneni într-acel hotar [p]ri alte

²² *Documenta Romaniae Historica* (DRH), B. Țara Românească, vol. XXXVII, (1652), drafted by Violeta Barbu, Constantin Bălan, Florina Manuela Constantin, București, Editura Academiei Române, 2006, doc. no. 30, 20 ianuarie 1652.

²³ DRH, vol. XXXVII, doc. no. 110, 30 martie 1652.

²⁴ DRH, vol. XXXII, 1647, volume drafted by Violeta Barbu, Gheorghe Lazăr, Oana Rizescu, București, Editura Academiei Române, 2001, doc. no. 246, 4 septembrie 1647.

²⁵ DRH, vol. XXX, 1645, drafted by Violeta Barbu, Marieta Chiper, Gheorghe Lazăr, București, Editura Academiei Române, 1998, doc. no. 44, 6 februarie <1645>.

părți și am hotărât și o am împietrit și o am întărit și o am stâlpit și o am a[les] din cap până în cap, adică din cin până în cin, hotar de 250 de stânjeni pre <m>arginea hotarului Mociștilor pri din sus, alături pri lângă hotarul Istiului, adică lungul easte din valea Istiului până în ocina Săhăteanilor, ca să hie di acum *ocină hotărâtă* și *tăiată*, cum easti legea și obiciaiul hotarălor. Și di acum înainti Stanciul vataf să aibă aș faci cărți domnești pri acist hotar prea cu mari cridință ...”/ ‘...these 12 boyars, let us try to establish *the land* of bailiff Stanciu, *land* in the field, but near the border of the Mocești, which was bought by bailiff Stanciul from Stancea, the daughter of Șirban Mocescul, an old and full man. That is to say, we discussed with all the free holders who have land and heirs near that border and we decided to strengthen it and harden it and put a pole and established its borders from one end to another, a border of 250 fathoms along the border of the Mociști, up, along the border of Istiul, that is, the length is from the valley of Istiul to the land of the Săhăteani, so that it will be an *established* and *delimited land* as is the law and custom of borders. And from now on, Stanciul the bailiff will make princely documents on this border in good faith...’.²⁶

3. Acts in which the voivodes strengthened possession over some estates or parts of estates:

“Din mila lui Dumnezeu, Io Matei Basarab voievod și domn a toată Țara Ungrovlahiei. Dă domnia mea această poruncă a domniei mele acestui om, anume Ion din Poienărei din județul Muscel și Pădureț, și cu fiii lui, câți Dumnezeu îi va dăruia, ca să-i fie *ocină* în Poienărei însă partea moșului său Stoica al lui Roșca, toată și din partea Miculețului jumătate din câmp și din pădure și din apă și din siliștea satului și de peste tot hotarul și cu tot venitul cât se va alege, pentru că <este> veche și dreaptă *ocină* întocmită și aleasă de bătrânii satului Poienărei... De aceea am dat și domnia mea lui Ion ca să le fie *ocină* și de ohabă fiilor și nepoților și strănepoților și de nimeni neclintit, după porunca domniei mele. ...”/ ‘By the grace of God, I, Matei Basarab, voivode and ruler of the whole Wallachia. My lordship gives this order of my lordship to this man, namely Ion from Poienărei from Muscel and Pădureț county, and with his sons, as many as God will give him, so that this will be his *land* in Poienărei but his share of his old man Stoica of Roșca, all and from Miculeț half of the field and the forest and the water and the village land and from all over the border and with all the income that will be obtained, because it is old and right *land* established and chosen by the old men of the village of Poienărei... I therefore gave it to Ion so that it would be the land inherited by his sons, and his grandsons and his great-grandsons, and moved by no one, by order of my lordship...’.²⁷

In the documents in which the ownership of an estate was strengthened, in order to emphasize the quality of possession, that of property inherited from previous

²⁶ DRH, vol. XXXVII, doc. no. 138, 1 iulie 1651.

²⁷ DRH, vol. XXX, doc. no. 11, 12 ianuarie 1645, Târgoviște.

generations, to which the descendants (sons, grandsons, great-grandsons) were entitled, “forever and moved by no one by order of my lordship” and in order to grant “immunity” to that land, the rulers “secured” these properties, often using, at the same time, several terms that expressed possession. Four of them are frequently found in archive documents: *dedină*, *moșie*, *ocină* and *ohabă*. Here are some examples in which our “protagonists” occur:

“Pentru aceasta am dat domnia mea [Matei Basarab – n.n.] lui Sava, fiul lui Iorga și lui Costandin, ca să-i fie această grădină mai sus-zisă cu vii *dedină* și de *ohabă* fiilor și nepoților și strănepoților și de nimeni neclintit, după porunca domniei mele”/ ‘Therefore, I, my lordship, [Matei Basarab – our note] gave to Sava, the son of Iorga and to Costandin, the above-mentioned garden with vineyards to be his *immovable property* and *land inherited* by his sons and grandsons and great-grandsons and moved by no one, by order of my lordship’²⁸.

“De aceea, am dat și domnia mea [Matei Basarab – n.n.] credinciosului boier al domniei mele, Iordache postelnic, fiul lui Trufanda vistierul, ca să-i fie aceste mai suspuse ocine și vecini, *ocină* și de *ohabă*, lui și fiilor lui și nepoților lui și strănepoților lui și de nimeni neclintit, după spusa domniei ele”/ ‘Therefore, I, my lordship, [Matei Basarab – our note] gave to the faithful boyar of my lordship, seneschal Iordache, son of Trufanda the treasurer, the above-mentioned lands and neighbours, to be *land* for him and *land inherited* by his sons, and his grandsons, and his great-grandsons, and moved by no one, by order of my lordship’²⁹.

“De aceea am dat domnia mea [Matei Basarab – n.n.] sfintei mănăstiri Sinaia, ca să-i fie acea *ocină* și cu toate viile de la Gorgani din sus până-n jos și cu livadă și cu tot venitul *ocină*, *dedină* stătătoare și neclintită în veci”/ ‘Therefore, I, my lordship, [Matei Basarab – our note] gave to the holy monastery of Sinaia, land and all the vineyards in Gorgani from one end to another and the orchard and all the income *land*, *immovable property* forever and moved by no one’³⁰.

The lexeme **OCINĂ** is often found in the expression “frate de *ocină*”/ ‘brother of *land*’ (characteristic of the late 16th and 17th centuries). The patrimony of a family or community usually evolved within that family or community. For a long time, the preservation of the land fund - that ensured their living - proved to be particularly important for the economic life of both structures and, as a result, the sale of the goods was usually to the members of the same family or community³¹. One means, however, which allowed those outside the community to enter it was the *brotherly union*³² (on the

²⁸ DRH, vol. XXXII, doc. no. 25, 15 ianuarie 1647, Târgoviște.

²⁹ DRH, vol. XXXVII, doc. no. 266, 1 august 1652, Târgoviște.

³⁰ DRH, vol. XXXVII, doc. no. 307, 11 octombrie 1652, București.

³¹ The right of pre-emption contributed to the perpetuation of this factual situation.

³² A term which does not have the character of social category, but indicates only the relationship between the members of the community, is *fratel* ‘brother’, brother of estate, brother of land, of narrow land parcel” (P. P. Panaitescu, *op. cit.*, p. 40). This name “*brother, brother of land*” shows the relationship between the members of the community. It means not only that they form an association, that they own and work the

estate, on the land), “which created mutual succession rights between the brothers and which, by avoiding the right of pre-emption of relatives and neighbours, allowed those who were not villagers to acquire the right of property in the community”³³. The brotherly union was, therefore, the way for some to enter the community, following a “religious ceremony”³⁴ – “Să să ştie cum se-au înfrăţet Zahariia al <lui> Meleian ot Costiiani <şi> Dobre ot Bălteni, de a lor bunăvoie şi denaintea a tuturor fraţilor, întru *sfânta beserecă* şi pre *Sfânta Evanghelie* şi denaintea a preoţilor şi mulţi oameni buni...”/ ‘Let them know how Zahariia of Meleian from Costiiani and Dobre from Bălteni became brothers, of their own free will and before all the brothers, in the *holy church* and on the *Holy Gospel* and before the priests and many good people...’³⁵ - who turned a stranger into a relative. “The members of the community being considered all brothers, that is, of the same blood, descendants of a single ancestor, they alone had the right to use the inherited land. But if someone became a brother by way of this union,..., then he legally entered the community family. Since the purpose of the brotherly union was always to participate in the rights over a part of the community estate, in the documents... it is spoken of ‘brotherly union on the land’ ”³⁶: “Adică eu, popa Vancea şi cu frate-mieu, Mihail şi ficiori<i> miei, anome: Duca şi Stanciul, scris-am zăpis nostru să fie de mare credinţe cum să să ştie că *ne-am înfrăţit* cu Tudur logofăt, de l-am dăruit cu toată *partea a noastră de ocenă* den Sâmbotini... Iar Tudor logofăt, pentru frăţie ne-au dăruit cu bani gata ughi 20, ca să fie lui moşie stătătoare în veac... Şi am pus şi blestem, cene să va scula să spargă ac<ea>stă frăţie a noastră, au den ruda noastră, au di fraţi cari au cu noi moşie, acela să fie anătema şi afurisit de 318 oteţe iji sut vi Nichei, pântru că i-am întrebat pre toţi”/ ‘Therefore I, priest Vancea, and my brother Mihail, and my sons, namely: Duca and Stanciul, we have written this document to be in good faith and let everybody know that we have become brothers with bailiff Tudur and we gave him all our part of *land* in Sâmbotini... And Tudor the bailiff, for our brotherhood – he gave us money 20 Hungarian gold coins so that this would be his estate forever... And I also put a curse, he who will raise to break this brotherhood of ours, be he our relative, brothers who share an estate with us, let him be anathematized and cursed by 318 fathers from Nicheia, because we asked them all’³⁷.

land like brothers, that is, they own it together, as in a single family, but also the consciousness of blood kinship between the members of the community” (*Ibidem*, p. 41).

³³ Elena Tereza Danciu, *Istoria dreptului românesc. Dreptul cutumiar*, Partea I, Craiova, Editura Autograf MJM, 2014, p. 157.

³⁴ P. P. Panaitescu, *Obştea ţărănească în Ţara Românească şi Moldova*, Bucureşti, Editura Academiei Republicii Populare Române, 1964, p. 179.

³⁵ DRH, vol. XXXVII, doc. no. 329, 8 decembrie 1652.

³⁶ P. P. Panaitescu, *op. cit.*, p. 179.

³⁷ DRH, vol. XXX, doc. no. 86, 6 April 1645. The custom of *brotherly union on the estate* was also practiced between close relatives, when they had no direct heirs. Here is an example in which the union takes place between spouses: “Seneschal Dima and his wife, Boloşina, had bargains between them: ‘we became brother and sister’, meaning to inherit each other’s fortune, and in case of death, mistress Boloşina was the owner in Vlasineşti. After their death, half of the property should go to the monastery in Brădet, for

“The expression ‘frate de ocină’ (‘brother of land’), which at one time seems to tend to replace that of simple ‘brotherly union’, expresses very clearly the meaning of the new legal conception which is becoming more and more important. These brothers of land are those who jointly own one ocină or several ocine together within the same village with joint property and who, according to the old situation, should have been ‘blood brothers’ too. Brothers became in time all those who, for one reason or another, possessing jointly, have something to share ‘like brothers’, as if they were indeed brothers; or, as the document of 1601 mentions, ‘let us share like brothers even a handful of land’. The brothers of land appeared in 1591, when, on the occasion of an adoption, the adoptive father declares that he has given his adopted son ‘all my part of the estate from Răzvadul de Sus, but regarding my *brothers of land*, the fourth part’ ”³⁸.

Sometimes, several terms are used to express the status of the same piece of land. We present two examples below. In the first example, we can consider that the expression is pleonastic, because both *delniță* and *ocină* refer to a hereditary property: “Adică eu, Radul snă Dragiul, împreună cu jupâneasa mea, Mariia, scriem și mărturisim cu acest zapis al nostru, ca să fie de bună credință la mâna dumnealui jupânului Costandin postelnic, cum să se știe că i-am vândut o *delniță de ocină* în satul Ștefăneștii, sudstvo Mușcel i Pădureț, care delniță au fost a noastră de zestre de la socru-mieu...”/ ‘Therefore, I, Radul of Dragiul, together with my wife, Mariia, write and testify with this document so that seneschal Costandin will have it in good faith and let everyone know that I sold him one *plot of land* and *agricultural land* in the village of Ștefăneștii, county of Mușcel and Pădureț, which plot of land was our dowry from my father-in-law...’.³⁹ In the second, we record the synonymy *moșie* / *ocină*: “Din mila lui Dumnezeu, Io Matei Basarab voievod și domn a toată Țara Ungrovlahiei. Dă domnia mea această poruncă a domniei mele lui jupan Radul mare comis, ca să hie volnec cu această carte a domni<i>i méle, de să-ș ție toată partea de *moșie* den Albești, care *ocină* o au cumpărat acum în zilele domni<i>i méle de la Radul Răgep, den Buzău, de sântu acum 6 ani...”/ ‘By the grace of God, I, Matei Basarab voivode and ruler of the whole Wallachia. My lordship gives this order of my lordship to Radu, high official in charge with the horses, so that he will have this document of my lordship and keep his *estate* in Albești, which *land* he bought in the days of my reign from Radul Răgep, from Buzău, on this holy day 6 years ago...’⁴⁰.

Although it represented private ownership of the hereditary type, over the land used in agriculture, which was sometimes expressed in some situations by the use of possessive adjectives coming from the owner’s name – “Adică eu, popa Ion ot Mlăjăt,

their remembrance, and half should go to the niece of Boloșina, Mușa” (DRH, vol. XXX, doc. no. 187, 4 iunie 1645).

³⁸ H. H. Stahl, *Contribuții la studiul satelor devălmașe românești*, vol. III, *Structura internă a satelor devălmașe libere*, București, Editura Academiei Republicii Populare Române, 1965, p. 213.

³⁹ DRH, vol. XXXVII, doc. no. 144, 28 aprilie 1652, Târgoviște.

⁴⁰ DRH, vol. XXX, doc. no. 251, 21 august 1645.

cu frații mii, scris-am acesta al nostru zăpis ca să fii de mare cridință la mâna comisului Apostolache, cum să știi că i-am vândut dumnealui 3 pogoane de vii și 2 stânjini de ocină... Și aceste pogoane suntu în dealul Jugurenilor în *ocina dătcoinească...*”/ ‘Therefore, I, priest Ion of Mlăjăt and my brothers have written this document of ours so that the high official Apostolache will have it in good faith and let everyone know that we sold him 3 acres of vineyards and 2 fathoms of agricultural land... And these acres are on the hill of the Jugureni on the *land of Datcu*⁴¹ –, *ocina* could be used jointly, hence the so-called *ocină de ocol*/ ‘district land’⁴²: “The *district* ownership of two or more sharers appears in the Slavic texts from Wallachia and the *district land*, inside the village, meaning that part of the agricultural land that was used in common”⁴³.

If in the archival documents the lexeme *ocină* was somewhat specialized, being frequently used in the legal-administrative field, in different documents and also in various hypostases (see previous analysis), the word is currently found especially in archaic terminology. It was replaced, in specialized language, by the term “proprietate”/ ‘property’ (whose synonym it is), and in colloquial language, by “baștină”/ ‘private property’, from the well-known expression “loc de baștină”/ ‘native place’.

With meanings more or less close to its original meaning, the lexeme still activates at the level of popular geographical terminology⁴⁴ - “the highest, sharp part of a mountain range; the meeting place of the slopes, the point of separation of the waters”(Ocnița-DB), “the oldest place of the village”(Breaza-BV), “the place on the community’s land of the village where there are no houses”(Turnu Roșu-SB) -, and especially of toponymy, which preserved it especially in analytical constructions in which the second term has the role of specifying the named object. In contrast, monomember names are very few - *Ocina* [*part of the village* v.c. Amărăștii de Jos-DJ; *place* v. Mănăilești c. Frâncești-VL; *estate* v. Stroiști c. Mușătești-AG; *village, estate* c. Adunați-PH; *commune*-PH; *village, forest* t. Breaza-PH], *Ocinile* [*arable land* v. Mlecănești and Mischii c. Mischii-DJ]. The cause derives from the fact that, having at one time a frequent use, it was necessary to attach additional elements to individualize the basic word *ocină*.

Therefore, multi-member toponyms are mainly the corpus of our analysis. We have noticed from the beginning that they have a binary structure. While the first part is represented by the invariable element *ocină* (used especially in its singular form), the second can have a variable structure that comprises, depending on the situation that generated its occurrence, from one to several elements. These elements are part of the class of:

Anthroponyms. In these situations, the grammatical form that personal names

⁴¹ DRH, vol. XXX, doc. no. 255, 25 august 1645.

⁴² At the level of the two regions we have in mind, only one name has been preserved in this form - *Ocina de Ocol*, designating a place in the village of Prapor, Amărăștii de Jos commune, Dolj county.

⁴³ P. P. Panătescu, *op. cit.*, p. 33.

⁴⁴ Acceptions excerpted from Gheorghe Bolocan, Elena Silvestru-Șodolescu, Iustina Burci, Ion Toma, *Dicționarul entopic al limbii române*, vol. II, N-Z, Craiova, Editura Universitaria, 2010, s.v. *ocină*.

take is, in overwhelming proportion, that of the *genitive*:

a) **enclitic** (in relatively equal proportions, singular and plural) – *Ocina Barbului* [place v. Brebina t. Baia de Aramă-MH], ~ *Brătulesei* [place v. Corbeni t. Balș-OT], ~ *Cojoceștilor* [estate v. Tătaru c. Dudești-BR], ~ *Comănceanilor* [place v.c. Redea-OT], ~ *Deveselenilor* [land v.c. Redea-OT], ~ *Măteștilor* [estate v. Zorești c. Vernești-BZ], ~ *Mierlarilor* [estate-BZ], ~ *Mihnoaiei* [estate v.c. Jugureni-PH], ~ *Neacșei a Leroaiei* [estate c. Pănătău-BZ], ~ *Oltenilor* [place v. Olteni c. Bujoreni-VL], ~ *Oprei* [estate v. Cornățel c. Buzoiești-BZ], ~ *Petriceștilor* [estate c. Lehliu-CL], ~ *Popeștilor* [estate c. Dumbrava-PH], ~ *Puriceștilor* [estate v. Pleșoiu c. Nicolae Bălcescu-VL], ~ *Sărăștilor* [estate-PH] ~ *Sorei* [place v.c. Redea-OT], ~ *Turcineștilor* [estate-AG], ~ *Urseștilor* [estate v.c. Pârscov-BZ], ~ *Vlaicului* [estate v.c. Bogați-AG] and

b) **proclitic** – *Ocina lui Avram* [estate v. Goruna c. Cocorăștii Mislui-PH], ~ *lui Bârsan* [estate v. Băbeni c. Topliceni-BZ], ~ *lui Berilă* [estate v. Neajlov c. Clejani-GR], ~ *lui Deag* [estate c. Recea-AG], ~ *lui Drăgoi* [place v. Frăsinet c. Vlădila-OT], ~ *lui Fiatu* [land v. Cotoroaia c. Voloiac-MH], ~ *lui Folea* [estate v.c. Hulubești-DB], ~ *lui Neacșu* [estate c. Pănătău-BZ], ~ *lui Pascu* [estate v. Gomoiești c. Costești-BZ], only two cases in the presented material having the impersonal form of the *nominative*: *Ocina Blegu* [estate t. Breaza-PH] and *Ocina Pașadia* [estate v.c. Pârscov-BZ].

Toponyms, which mainly take, again, the form of the *enclitic genitive* in the plural, only a few names being in the singular – *Ocina Băligoșilor* [estate v.c. Vintilă Vodă-BZ], ~ *Blăjanilor* [estate v. Stăncești c. Vadu Pașii-BZ], ~ *Brătieștilor* [estate c. Hârtiești-AG], ~ *Bucului* [estate v.c. Bucu-IL], ~ *Buiceștilor* [place v. Zlătărei t. Drăgășani-VL], ~ *Câlceștilor* [estate c. Davidești-AG], ~ *Cacaleștilor* [place v. Căzănești m. Râmnicu-Vâlcea-VL], ~ *Chirăiștelor* [estate v. Albești c. Smeieni-BZ], ~ *Cislăului* [estate v.c. Cislău-BZ], ~ *Ciumernicului* [estate near București], ~ *Cocorăștilor* [estate c. Mănești-PH], ~ *Copăcelului* [place v. Copăcelu m. Râmnicu Vâlcea-VL], ~ *Cornățelului* [estate m. Oltenița-CL], ~ *Cornenilor* [place v.c. Vlădeni-IL], ~ *Coteștilor* [estate v. Cotești c. Godeni-AG], ~ *Dudeștilor* [estate near m. București], ~ *Gârdeștilor* [place v.c. Turceni-GJ], ~ *Obidiștilor* [estate v. Groșani c. Costești-BZ], ~ *Piersicei* [estate c. Lehliu-CL], ~ *Pietrei* [estate -IL], ~ *Posmagului* [estate c. Lehliu-IL], ~ *Vrăștiței* [place v.c. Burila Mare-MH], ~ *Scăienilor* [estate t. Boldești-Scăieni-PH], ~ *Știrbinei* [estate v. Creța c. Dascălu-IF], ~ *Urlătorilor* [estate v. Dedulești c. Topliceni-BZ], ~ *Vălsăneștilor* [estate v. Vălsănești c. Mușetești-AG], ~ *Zigorenilor* [estate v. Zigoreni c. Băiculești-AG]; *Ocinile Vărbilei* [estate v. Vărbila c. Plopu-PH] and in one example that of the *nominative* – *Ocina Putineiu* [estate v. Sibiciu de Jos c. Pănătău-BZ].

Nouns. This time, too, the place names in the *enclitic genitive* (singular și plural) prevail – *Ocina Aninenilor* [estate v.c. Aninoasa-DB], ~ *Grecilor* [estate c. Grădiștea-IF], ~ *Popii* [estate-IL], ~ *Satului* [place v. Meriș c. Broșteni-MH], ~ *Vacilor* [estate v. Stăncești c. Vadu Pașii-BZ], and there occurs a *prepositional accusative*: *Ocina din Tabără* [estate t. Topoloveni-AG].

Adjectives. They can be:

a) **proper:** *Ocina Mică* [place m. Târgoviște-DB], ~ *Românească* [place v.c. Pârscov-BZ] and

b) **possessive:** *Ocina Bădenească* [estate v.c. Pătârlagele-BZ], ~ *Bătească* [estate v. Tohani c. Gura Vadului-PH], ~ *Berească* [estate v. Oreavu c. Valea Râmnicului-BZ], ~ *Blincească* [estate v. Stănțești c. Vadu Pașii-BZ], ~ *Bohlească* [estate v. Lunca c. Vlădeni-IL], ~ *Boiască* [estate v. Stănțești c. Vadu Pașii-BZ], ~ *Botească* [estate t. Urlați-PH; estate v. Nucet c. Chiojdeanca-PH], ~ *Broștenească* [estate t. Urlați-PH], ~ *Bulească* [estate v. Lunca c. Vlădeni-IL], ~ *Căcănească* [estate v. Mocești c. Iordăcheanu-PH], ~ *Cârlomănească* [estate v. Cârlomănești c. Vernești-BZ], ~ *Cepturenească* [estate c. Ceptura-PH], ~ *Ciocănească* [estate v. Bărăști c. Cislău-BZ], ~ *Coțofenească* [estate near m. Buzău-BZ], ~ *Dobrinească* [estate c. Corabia-DB], ~ *Filitească* [estate c. Belciugatele-CL], ~ *Flocească* [estate v. Lipia c. Merei-BZ; estate v. Lăceni c. Orbeasca-TR], ~ *Fundănească* [estate c. Fundeni-CL], ~ *Gabrovenească* [estate c. Mărzănești-TR], ~ *Gălbinească* [estate v. Matița c. Păcureți-PH], ~ *Gărdească* [land v.c. Turceni-GJ], ~ *Grămească* [estate v.c. Brădeanu-BZ], ~ *Jevrească* [estate m. Buzău-BZ], ~ *Lerească* [estate v.c. Pătârlagele-BZ], ~ *Mărășească* [estate v.c. Pârscov-BZ], ~ *Mătăsească* [estate v.c. Bucu-IL], ~ *Micească* [estate v. Budrea c. Racovițeni-BZ], ~ *Mircească* [estate v.c. Scorțoasa-BZ], ~ *Modenească* [estate -PH], ~ *Muierească* [estate v. Cucuteni c. Moțăieni-DB], ~ *Mușetească* [estate v. Sicrita c. Dumbrava-PH], ~ *Năienească* [estate v.c. Năieni-BZ], ~ *Necșetească* [estate t. Urlați-PH], ~ *Negrească* [estate v.c. Vernești-BZ], ~ *Orlănească* [estate v.c. Buda-BZ], ~ *Pitărească* [estate c. Ciolănești-TR], ~ *Portărească* [estate m. Buzău-BZ], ~ *Prisăcească* [estate v. Priseaca c. Gornet-Cricov-PH], ~ *Prodelească* [estate v.c. Vernești-BZ], ~ *Pupezenească* [estate v. Cătrunești c. Sinești-IL], ~ *Rogozească* [estate m. Ploiești-PH], ~ *Scurtească* [estate v. Fefelei c. Mizil-PH], ~ *Sibiască* [estate v.c. Pătârlagele-BZ], ~ *Șerbănească* [estate v.c. Vasilați-CL], ~ *Șerbească* [estate v. Zorești c. Vernești-BZ; estate v. Smeești c. Vintilă Vodă-BZ], ~ *Tămăduiască* [estate v.c. Tămădău Mare-CL], ~ *Trestienească* [estate v. Trăisteni c. Valea Doftanei-PH], ~ *Turburească* [estate v.c. Năieni-BZ], ~ *Udrească* [estate v. Stănțești c. Vadu Pașii-BZ], ~ *Vernească* [estate v.c. Vernești-BZ], ~ *Zorească* [estate v. Zorești c. Vernești-BZ].

Adverbs. *Ocina de Jos* [village c. Adunați-PH], ~ *de Sus* [village c. Adunați-PH].

OHABĂ⁴⁵. At present, the word *ohabă* is part of the archaic and regional vocabulary. In the past, however, it appeared quite often in documents, in the expression “să fie de ohabă”/ ‘to be inherited’, by which the rulers established full control⁴⁶ over

⁴⁵ Term inventoried in MDA as follows: “Inalienable hereditary estate, exempt from taxes and services” (s.v. *ohabă*).

⁴⁶ To the rulers, the owners of *ohabe* had certain fiscal duties: “The boyars were either the holders of allodial property, acquired by succession, having hereditary character and not being conditioned by the vassalage to the ruler, property that bore the name of ‘baștină’, ‘ocină’ sau ‘dedină’, or the owners of a donation property, conditioned by the fulfillment of the obligations towards the sovereign, which was called

some immovable goods and not only. Most of the time, the expression was completed with other words (*dedină, ocină*), meant to strengthen the meaning of the first one. Here are the examples:

“...Pentru aceea am și dat domnia mea [Matei Basarab – n.n.] lui Badea negustorul ca să aibă a-i plăti Ionașco Șchiopul acei bani, ughi 12, cum s-au tocmit, să-i fie lui acei doi moși de ocină cum scrie mai sus, *ocină, dedină și de ohabă*, fiilor și nepoților și strănepoților și de nimeni neatins după porunca domniei mele”/ ‘... Therefore, I, my lordship, [Matei Basarab – our note] gave to Badea the merchant so that Ionașco Șchiopul would have to pay that money, 12 Hungarian gold coins, as they agreed, so that those two parcels of land, as mentioned before, would be his *land, estate, and property inherited* by his sons and grandsons and great-grandsons and moved by no one, by order of my lordship’⁴⁷.

“... Pentru aceasta, am dat și domnia mea [Matei Basarab – n.n.] jupanului Costandin mare postelnic ca să-i fie aceste două roate de moară și cu jumătate din vad, cât este partea lui și cu tot venitul, *ocină, dedină și de ohabă*, fiilor și nepoților și strănepoților și de nimeni neclintit, după spusa domniei mele”/ ‘... Therefore, I, my lordship [Matei Basarab – our note] gave to Master Costandin, great seneschal, these two wheels of the mill and half of the ford to be his share, with all the income, his *land, estate, and property inherited* by his sons and grandsons and great-grandsons and moved by no one, by order of my lordship’⁴⁸.

“... Pentru aceasta domnia mea [Matei Basarab – n.n.] încă am înnoit și am întărit aceste bătrâne cărți prin această carte a domniei mele. Și am dat domnia mea slugilor domniei mele, Pătrașco și Giura ca să le fie lor satele și moștenirea și viile și ț[anii], mai sus-zise *ocine, dedine și de ohabă* fiilor și nepoților și strănepoților și de nimeni neclintit după porunca domniei mele”/ ‘...Therefore, I, my lordship [Matei Basarab – our note] have renewed and strengthened these old documents through this document of my lordship. And I, my lordship, gave to the servants of my lordship, Pătrașco and Giura, the above-mentioned villages and inheritance and vineyards and gypsies to be *land, estate, and property inherited* by their sons and grandsons and great-grandsons and moved by no one, by order of my lordship’⁴⁹.

As one can see, *de ohabă* could be both a geographical object (a land, most of the time, but also vineyards, fords, mountains, etc.), various constructions, as well as people (Romanians, Gypsies) owned by the wealthy. We illustrate this fact below:

“... Pentru aceasta, am dat domnia mea jupanului Dumitrașco stolnic și fiului său, Pană logofăt, ca să-i fie Râpa țiganul, fiul lui Lupul țiganul, și Stanca țiganca, fiica Radei țigancei, de *dedină și de ohabă* lui și fiilor lui, și nepoților, și strănepoților în veac

‘ohabă’ or ‘vislujenie’ ” (Elena Tereza Danciu, *Istoria dreptului românesc. Drept cutumiar*, Partea I, Craiova, Editura Autograf MJM, 2014, p. 159).

⁴⁷ DRH, vol. XXXII, doc. no. 176, 13 iunie 1647, Târgoviște.

⁴⁸ DRH, vol. XXXII, doc. no. 313, 20 decembrie 1647, București.

⁴⁹ DRH, vol. XXXII, doc. no. 274, 8 octombrie 1647, București.

și de nimeni neclintit după porunca domniei mele”/ ‘... Therefore, I, my lordship, gave to Dumitrașco, high steward, and to his son, bailiff Pană, Râpa the gypsy, the son of Lupul the gypsy, and Stanca the gypsy, the daughter of Rada the gypsy, to be property *inherited* by his sons and grandsons and great-grandsons forever and moved by no one, by order of my lordship’⁵⁰.

“... Drept aceea, am dat domnia mea [Matei Basarab – n.n.] popei lui Ianache și cu feciorii lui, ca să aibă a ținea pre Neaga țiganca, cu fetele ei și cu nepoatele ei, să le fie de moșie *ohabnică*”/ ‘Therefore, I, my lordship, [Matei Basarab – our note] gave to the priest of Ianache and his sons, Neaga the gypsy and her daughters and her granddaughters, to be their *transferable* property’⁵¹.

“... și ne-am vândut noi, de a noastră bunăvoie, fără de niceo silă, și cu știrea tuturor rudeniiilor și a fraților. Și am luat acești bani ce scriu mai sus, toți gata, în mâinile noastre, ca să-i fim dumnealui rumâni de acum înainte, cu feciorii noștri și cu toată moșiia noastră, și feciorilor dumnealui și nepoților, strenepoților de moșie, de stremoșie, *ohabnici*”/ ‘... and we sold, of our own free will, without any coercion, and with the knowledge of all the relatives and brothers. And we took this above-mentioned money, all ready, in our hands, to be serfs to him from now on, with our sons and with all our estate, and to his sons and grandsons, great-grandsons of estate, of ancestry, *transferable property*’⁵².

In the last two quotations there is a derivative from *ohabă*, namely, *ohabnic*, also used with the meaning “full ownership”⁵³. Analyzing the archival documents we had access to, we can say that the adjective enjoyed a wider use than the noun *ohabă*, as it could be used as a determiner of names within the same lexical category: *moșie* and *ocină*.

“Adecă eu Manea, ficiorul Manii Piscotan ot Ibănești ot sudstvo Olt, scris-am și mărturisescu cu acesta al miei zapis ca să hie de mare credință la mâna Ancăi clucereasa, jupâneasa Radului clucer și a feciorilor ei, anume: Dumitrașco i Papa, cum să să știe că i-am vândut eu de a mea bunăvoie 2 funii de ocină din sat ot Ibănești din câmp, din pădure, din apă din uscat și de preste tot hotariul, din hotar până în hotar oarecât se va alege. Și această moșie, ci scrie mai sus, o am vândut eu de a mea bunăvoie, fără de nici o silă, pre bani gata, aspri 6400, ca să-i hie ei și ficiorilor moșie *ohabnică* și nepoților i strănepoților”/ ‘Therefore, I, Manea, the son of Manii Piscotan from Ibănești, Olt county, have written this document and testify with it so that Anca, the wife of steward Radu and her sons, Dumitrașco and Papa, will have it in good faith and let everyone know that I voluntarily sold her 2 narrow parcels of land in the village of Ibănești from the field,

⁵⁰ DRH, vol. XXXVI, doc. no. 113, 10 iunie 1651, Târgoviște.

⁵¹ DRH, vol. XXXII, doc. no. 131, 7 mai 1647.

⁵² DRH, vol. XXXVIII, doc. no. 52, 20 februarie 1653.

⁵³ With the same meaning, the word was recorded too by Dorina Bărbuț in *Dicționar de grai oltenesc*, Craiova, Asociația Independentă Literară, Artistică, Culturală și Editorială „Mileniul III”, 1990, p. 145.

In MDA, it is inventoried as: “Inalienable, hereditary and exempt from taxes and services; (rare) long-lasting; (about owners) who inherits an inalienable estate, exempt from taxes and services; small farmers with an intermediate social situation between free holders and socmen”.

from the forest, from the water, from the land and from all over the border, from one end to another, as will be chosen. And this estate, as written above, I sold it of my own free will, without any coercion, for money, 6400 silver coins, so that this estate would be *transferrable* to sons and grandsons and great-grandsons’⁵⁴.

“Din mila lui Dumnezeu, Io Matei Basarab voievod și domn a toată Țara Ungrovlahiei. Dă domnia mea această poruncă a domniei mele acestor oa[me]ni, pre nume: Ilie și cu fratele lui de ocină, Stoica, și cu frații lui, Iacov și Cârlig, ca să le fie lor niște m[unți] ce să chieamă Lărgile... Dirept acea, le-am făcut această carte a domni<i>i mele, ca să le fie lor moșie... [...] acei munți, și *ohabnică* și ficiorilor lor și nepoților și strănipoților în veci”/ ‘By the grace of God, I, Matei Basarab, voivode and ruler of the whole Wallachia. My lordship gives this order of my lordship to these men, namely, Ilie, and his brother of land, Stoica, and his brothers, Iacov and Cârlig, so that some mountains called Lărgile will be theirs... I therefore made this document of my lordship so that those mountains would be their estate and *transferrable* to their sons and grandsons and great-grandsons forever’⁵⁵.

In other acts, the status of “immovability” that certain assets (villages, estates, vineyards) acquire by the ruler’s decision is intensified by the use, along with the adjective *ohabnic*, of other additional elements: *stătător*, *neclătit*⁵⁶, *neîntors*:

“Adică eu, Lupul din Urziceni, împreună cu frate-mieu, Moș, scris-am zăpisul nostru ca să fie de mare credință la mâna lui Bran și a frăține-său, lui Dragomir iuzbașa și la mâna lui Baico și a frăține-său, lui Dumitru, cum să să știe că le-am vândut partea noastră de moșie din Urziceni din codru, moșului nostru, lui Șărbănuș, partea noastră toată... Și am vândut cu știrea tuturor fraților de moșie de sus și de jos, ca să le fie lor moșie și feciorilor și nepoților și strănepoților lor în veac, moșie *ohabnică*, *stătătoare*, *neclătită*...”/ ‘Therefore, I, Lupul from Urziceni, together with my brother, Moș, have written this document so that Bran and his brother, captain Dragomir, and Baico and his brother, Dumitru, will have it and let everyone know that we sold our part of the estate in Urziceni, in the forest, to our old man, to Șărbănuș, our whole part... And we sold it with the knowledge of all the brothers of the estate from above and below so that it would be their estate forever, and the estate of their sons, and their grandsons, and their great-grandsons, *transferrable*, *steady*, *unmovable*...’⁵⁷.

“Și o am vândut [partea de moșie – n.n.] de a me bunăvoi și cu știrea tuturor megi<a>șilor dimprejurul locului pentru c<ă> această moșie ce scrie mai sus fost-am-o vândut Necolii ot Budinești. Iar Drag<o>mir s-au sculat de-au întors banii ce scriu mai sus și cu mini dimpreună, pentru că easte pre lege să fie la moșnini decât la alție dintralte laturi. Deci, de acum nainte, să fie lu Drag<o>mir moșie *ohabnică* și *stătătoare* până

⁵⁴ DRH, vol. XXX, doc. no. 199, 16 iunie 1645.

⁵⁵ DRH, vol. XXXVIII, doc. no. 26, 26 ianuarie 1653.

⁵⁶ *Neclintit*/ ‘unmovable’.

⁵⁷ DRH, vol. XXXVII, doc. no. 69, 3 martie 1652.

în v<e>ac lui ș[i] feciorilor, nepoților... strinepoților...’/ ‘And I sold it [the part of the estate – our note] of my own free will and with the knowledge of all the free holders around the place because I sold the above-mentioned estate to Necolii from Budinești. And Dragomir got up and gave the money I mentioned above, with me, because by law it must be with the neighbours rather than with others from other sides. So, from now on, let Dragomir have this *transferrable* and *steady* estate forever for him and his sons, grandsons and great-grandsons’⁵⁸.

“Deci se-au aflat dumnealui cămărașul Udreștea le cumpăra [moșii – n.n.], trebuindu-i moșie și am făcut tocmeală cu dumnealui... și le-am vândut noi, amândoi frații, de a noastră bunăvoie... ca să ție și dumnealui cum au ținut tata-nostru, ..., și cum am ținut și noi până acum, să-i fie dumnealui moșie *ohabnică* în veac, *neîntoarsă*’/ ‘So chamberlain Udreștea bought [these estates – our note], as he needed an estate and we bargained... and we sold them, both brothers, of our own free will so that he could keep it as our father kept it,..., and as we have kept it until now, so that it would be his *transferrable* and *uncontested* estate forever’⁵⁹.

At present, the word *ohabă* has a more than modest presence both at the level of the common language⁶⁰ and at the level of toponymy.

Thus, in *toponymy* it appears especially as a unique name: *Ohaba* [village on Argeșel-AG, *village, estate* c. Melinești, *commune, brook* v. Ohaba c. Melinești-DJ; *village* c. Bălănești, *commune, hill* v. Ohaba c. Bălănești, *historical place* v. Ohaba c. Bălănești, *village* near v. Hobîța c. Peștișani-GJ; *village, estate* c. Șovarna, *commune, brook, forest* v. Ohaba c. Șovarna-MH; *village* c. Ionești, *estate*-VL].

As for compound place names, several structures with *toponymic* determiners – most of them in the village of Ohaba-Jiu – have been recorded: *Ohaba de Novaci* [village c. Bălănești, *commune*-GJ], ~ *Jiu* [village c. Bolboși, *commune, estate* c. Bolboși, *hill* v. Ohaba c. Bolboși, v. Menții din Dos, c. Borăscu, *brook*-GJ], ~ *Măldăreștilor* [estate v.c. Ionești-VL], ~ *Menți* [hill v. Ohaba-Jiu c. Bolboși, v. Menții din Dos c. Borăscu-GJ], ~ *-Raci* [brook v. Ohaba-Jiu c. Bolboși, v. Raci c. Negomir-GJ], and only one in which the adverbial phrase „de jos”/ ‘from below’ was used: *Ohaba de Jos* [part of the village v. Ohaba c. Melinești-DJ].

Comparing the appellatives we presented, we will easily notice that, unlike *ocină*, *ohabă* proved to be, in general, much less used. As a consequence, our analysis will be mainly based on the examples subordinated to the former. However, there are convergent points between the two - both have the ability to form (and they do) alone the names of some places, but also divergent - today *ocină* records a diversified structural range as compared with *ohabă*; as for the “common places” where these terms can be found, ie the names formed with toponyms and adverbs, there are also similarities and differences. If

⁵⁸ DRH, vol. XXXII, doc. no. 233, 29 august 1647.

⁵⁹ DRH, vol. XXXVII, doc. no. 73, 10 martie 1653, Târgoviște.

⁶⁰ The term is inventoried in DELR as follows: “deep valley with steep walls” (Aninoasa and Turburea communes, Gorj county).

both use the adverbial phrase “de jos”/ ‘from below’ to determine, geographically, the position of those villages in relation to other villages: *Ocina de Jos* / *Ohaba de Jos*, the selected toponymic determiners are different. In the case of *ocină*, the individualization of the place (of the estate in most of the situations) was done by using toponyms based on group names – *Ocina Blăjanilor*, *Ocina Brătieștilor*, *Ocina Câlceștilor*, *Ocina Dudeștilor* etc., or village names – *Ocina Bucului* (v.c. Bucu), *Ocina Cislăului* (v.c. Cislău), *Ocina Copăcelului* (v. Copăcelu), *Ocina Scăienilor* (t. Boldești-Scăieni), *Ocina Vâlsăneștilor* (v. Vâlsănești), *Ocina Zigorenilor* (v. Zigoreni), *Ocinile Vărbilei* (v. Vărbile), etc., the toponymized names of some small landmarks on the territory of the locality – *Ocina Piersicei*, *Ocina Pietrei*, etc., the social status of people – *Ocina Obidișilor*. Some other times, the secondary toponym can be a metaphor: in *Ocina Urlătorilor*, “urlătoare”/ ‘howler’ refers to the meaning of “a stream that flows with a roar from the height of a mountain along a very steep slope (forming a waterfall); waterfall”⁶¹. From the point of view of expressing the syntactic relations between terms, we have noticed the preponderant use of the enclitic genitive, both in the singular and the plural.

The portfolio of examples held by *ohabă* is considerably poorer, and the determiner in the analytical structures is represented, in particular, by the names of some administrative units, while establishing toponymic relations between the two terms of the compound⁶²: *Ohaba de Novaci*, *Ohaba-Jiu*, *Ohaba-Menți*, *Ohaba-Raci*. The genitive so used in the case of the names formed with *ocină* is, this time, very poorly illustrated, *Ohaba Măldăreștilor* being the only toponym that belongs to this subtype.

In the case of **anthroponyms** and nouns too - and we refer only to the examples below *ocină* - the genitive (enclitic and proclitic) is the one that “monopolized” the relationship between the “partners” of the compound (*Ocina Barbului*, *Ocina Oltenilor*, *Ocina lu Bârsan*, *Ocina lui Pascu*; *Ocina Satului*, *Ocina Vacilor*, etc.), the nominative and the accusative being located at the periphery of the selected means (*Ocina Blegu*, *Ocina Pașadia*; *Ocina din Tabără*).

As for the typology of personal names that have the quality of individualizing element, it includes several levels of analysis. Thus, from the point of view of the persons involved in owning some properties, they could be both men (*Ocina Oprei*, *Ocina Popeștilor*, *Ocina Vlaicului*, etc.) and women⁶³ (*Ocina Brătulesei*, *Ocina Mihnoaiei*, *Ocina Sorei*, etc.). Then, the name they bear facilitate the following classification, depending on the origin and structural aspect of the anthroponyms. They can come from:

- a) simple first names: *Avram*, *Barbu*, *Neacșu*, *Neacșa*, *Oprea*, *Sora*, *Vlaicu*, etc;
- b) collective appellations (derived with the suffixes *-ești*, *-ean*): *Comănceani(lor)*,

⁶¹ <https://dexonline.ro/definitie/url%C4%83toare> (site accessed 01.03.2020).

⁶² See *Dicționarul toponimic al României. Oltenia* (DTRO) (sub redacția prof. univ. dr. Gh. Bolocan), vol. 1 (A-B), Craiova, Editura Universitaria, 1993, p. 59.

⁶³ In the name of an estate in the commune of Pănătău, Buzău county, we have a double feminine determination: *Ocina Neacșei a Leroaei*. The example is typical of the mode of expression of parentage during the period when the official name formula was in the “self-search” stage.

Mătești(lor), Petricești(lor), etc.;

c) name of the husband, through marital suffixes (-*easa, -oia*): *Brătuleasa, Mihnoaia* etc.;

d) the name of the profession practiced directly or by a close member of the family: *Ocina Popii*;

e) names indicating ethnicity: *Ocina Grecilor, Ocina Turcineștilor*;

f) nicknames: *Ocina Blegu*.

In general, anthroponyms participate in large numbers in the formation of compound toponyms. In our case, however, the inventory is poor both numerically and in terms of structural diversity of names. Substantially more numerous are the toponyms that are based on adjectives, especially the possessive ones⁶⁴. Possessive adjectives or “adjectives of belonging”⁶⁵ represent the second largest group of elements with which the “filiation” of a property was established in the past⁶⁶. This may be, in this case, an anthroponymic one: *Ocina Bădenească, Ocina Botească, Ocina Coșofenească, Ocina Dobrinească, Ocina Gabrovenească, Ocina Mărășească, Ocina Mircească, Ocina Negrească, Ocina Șerbănească*, etc., but also toponymic, the qualifications being formed, this time, from the name of the village where the toponym is located: *Ocina Cârломănească* (v. Cârломănești), *Ocina Cepturească* (c. Ceptura), *Ocina Fundănească* (c. Fundeni), *Ocina Năienească* (v.c. Năieni), *Ocina Prisăcească* (v. Priseaca), *Ocina Tămăduiască* (v.c. Tămădău Mare), *Ocina Vernească* (v.c. Vernești).

The toponyms in this paper are, as a rule, unique names, the homonyms being rarely found and not in more than two localities⁶⁷ (in the same county or in different counties): *Ocina Botească* – t. Urlați-PH / v. Nucet c. Chiojdeanca-PH; *Ocina Flocească* – v. Lipia c. Merei-BZ / v. Lăceni c. Orbeasca-TR; *Ocina Șerbească* – v. Zorești c. Vernești-BZ / v. Smeești c. Vintilă Vodă-BZ. Instead, simple toponyms, *Ocina* and *Ohaba*, record a few more occurrences.

As a result of the analysis undertaken in these pages, we have found that reminiscences of the way in which the land was owned in the past can be seen today (too) in the field of toponymy, proving once again, if necessary, the quality of witness of the latter to the development of human history, which it fully reflects and whose

⁶⁴ There are only two adjectives proper: *Ocina Mică, Ocina Românească*.

⁶⁵ *Dicționarul elementelor românești din documentele slavo-române, 1374-1600*, (DERS), red. resp. Gh. Bolocan, București, Editura Academiei Republicii Socialiste România, 1981, p. XXIX.

⁶⁶ Here is just one example from the series of those found in the archives: “Adică eu, popa Ion ot Mlăjăt, cu frații mii, acris-am acesta al nostru zapis ca să fii de mare cridință la mâna comisului Apostolache, cum să să știi că i-am vândut dumnealui 3 pogoane de vii și 2 stânjini de ocină... Și aceste pogoane sintu în dealul Jugurenilor în ocina dătcoinească...”/ ‘Therefore, I, priest Ion of Mlăjăt, with my brothers, have written this document of ours so that the high official Apostolache will have it in good faith and let everyone know that we sold him 3 acres of vineyards and 2 fathoms of land... And these acres are on the hill of the Jugureni on that land...’ (DRH, vol. XXX, doc. nr. 255, 25 august 1645).

⁶⁷ Sometimes we see the preference for this means of expressing possession at the level of a locality. In the commune of Vernești, Buzău county, there occur: *Ocina Cârломănească, Ocina Măteștilor, Ocina Negrească, Ocina Prodelească, Ocina Șerbească, Ocina Vernească, Ocina Zorească*.

lexical “material” it used, in turn, to enrich its own inventory.

Unfortunately, both the meaning of the two words that were the subject matter of our work, *ocină* and *ohabă*, which intersects some of the meanings of the appellative *moșie*⁶⁸ - “wealth, inherited land; any inherited property; hereditary; property in land acquired by someone through purchase, donation; ownership of arable land”⁶⁹, and their remoter origin (Slavic), as opposed to the origin of the same *moșie* - from the word *moș*/ ‘old man’ (land inherited from an old man/ancestor) derived with the suffix *-ie* – put the three of them in opposition, the balance tilting⁷⁰ clearly in favour of the last term, which today enjoys a toponymic presence much amplified numerically and structurally diversified as compared with its “competitors”. However, this does not reduce the importance of knowing all the models recorded at the level of current place names, each of them contributing to the reconstruction of the image of our historical and linguistic past.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Academia Română, *Dicționarul toponimic al României. Oltenia* (DTRO), sub redacția prof. univ. dr. Gh. Bolocan, vol. 1 (A-B), Craiova, Editura Universitaria, 1993.
- Academia Română, *Dicționarul elementelor românești din documentele slavo-române, 1374-1600*, (DERS), redactor responsabil Gh. Bolocan, București, Editura Academiei Republicii Socialiste România, 1981.
- Academia Română, *Documenta Romaniae Historica* (DRH), B. Țara Românească, vol. XXX, 1645, întocmit de Violeta Barbu, Marieta Chiper, Gheorghe Lazăr, București, Editura Academiei Române, 1998.
- Academia Română, *Documenta Romaniae Historica* (DRH), B. Țara Românească, vol. XXXII, 1647, volum întocmit de Violeta Barbu, Gheorghe Lazăr, Oana Rizescu, București, Editura Academiei Române, 2001.
- Academia Română, *Documenta Romaniae Historica* (DRH), B. Țara Românească, vol. XXXVI, 1651, întocmit de Oana Rizescu și Marcel Dumitru Ciucă, București, Editura Academiei Române, 2006.
- Academia Română, *Documenta Romaniae Historica* (DRH), B. Țara Românească, vol. XXXVII, (1652), întocmit de Violeta Barbu, Constantin Bălan, Florina Manuela Constantin, București, Editura Academiei Române, 2006.

⁶⁸ In the documents the synonymy *ocină* / *moșie* is frequent: “Adică eu, Stanciul ot Mursești snă Vladului Temeligă, scris-am acesta al meu zapis ca să fie de mare credință la mâna lu Ștefan logofătu ot Ciorani, cum să se știe că am vândut partea me dă ocină dă la Mursești, cât se va alege, dă păste tot hotarul, moșie sterpă, fără rumâni...”/ ‘Therefore, I, Stanciul of Mursești of Vladului Temeligă, I have written this document so that Ștefan, the bailiff, of Ciorani, will have it in good faith and let everyone know that I sold my share of land in Mursești, as much as will be chosen, all over, barren estate, without Romanians...’ (DRH, vol. XXXVII, doc. no. 41, 1 februarie 1652).

⁶⁹ *Micul dicționar academic* (MDA), vol. III, Literele I-Pr, București, Univers Enciclopedic, 2003, s.v. *moșie*.

⁷⁰ The evolution of society, the change in social, agrarian, administrative conditions, etc., led to the loss of utility of the three of them, to the same extent.

- Academia Română, *Documenta Romaniae Historica* (DRH), B. Țara Românească, vol. XXXVIII, 1653, întocmit de Oana Rizescu, Marcel-Dumitru Ciucă, Florina Manuela Constantin, Andreea Iancu, București, Editura Academiei Române, 2009.
- Academia Română, *Micul dicționar academic* (MDA), vol. I-IV, București, Editura Univers Enciclopedic, 2002-2003.
- Bădescu, Ilie, Cristea, Darie, (coord.), *Dicționar de sociologie rurală. Concepte-teme-teorii*, București, Editura Mica Valahie, 2011.
- Bărbuț, Dorina, *Dicționar de grai oltenesc*, Craiova, Asociația Independentă Literară, Artistică, Culturală și Editorială „Mileniul III”, 1990.
- Bolocan, Gheorghe, Silvestru-Șodolescu, Elena, Burci, Iustina, Toma, Ion, *Dicționarul entopic al limbii române*, vol. I- II, Craiova, Editura Universitaria, 2010.
- Cernea, Emil, Molcuț, Emil, *Istoria statului și dreptului românesc. Terminologia vechiului drept românesc*, ediție revăzută și adăugită, București, Editura Universul Juridic, 2013.
- Danciu, Elena Tereza, *Istoria dreptului românesc. Dreptul cutumiar*, Partea I, Craiova, Editura Autograf MJM, 2014.
- Panaitescu, P.P., *Obștea țărănească în Țara Românească și Moldova*, București, Editura Academiei Republicii Populare Române, 1964.
- Rădulescu, Andrei, *Viața juridică și administrativă a satelor*, București, Cultura Națională, 1927.
- Stahl, H.H., *Contribuții la studiul satelor devălmașe românești*, vol. I, *Confederații de ocol, structuri teritoriale și tehnici agricole*, București, Editura Academiei Republicii Populare Române, 1958.
- Stahl, H.H., *Contribuții la studiul satelor devălmașe românești*, vol. II, *Structura internă a satelor devălmașe libere*, București, Editura Academiei Române, 1959.
- Stahl, H.H., *Contribuții la studiul satelor devălmașe românești*, vol. III, *Procesul de aservire feudală a satelor devălmașe*, București, Editura Academiei Republicii Socialiste România, 1965.
- Vulcănescu, Romulus, *Etnologie juridică*, București, Editura Academiei Republicii Socialiste România, 1970.

ON-LINE SOURCES

- <https://e-juridic.manager.ro/dictionar-juridic/drept-cutumiar/1581.html> (site accessed 07.03.2019).
- Vladimir Dal', *Tolkovii slovar' jivotnogo velikorusskogo jazika*, tom I, Sankt-Petersburg, Moskva, 1880, books.google.ro/books?id=xn3NNBAAoScC&pg=PA307&dq=толкивый+словарь+выслужение&source (site accessed 12.04.2020).
- <https://dexonline.ro/definitie/url%C4%83toare> (site accessed 01.03.2020).