The Academic Dictionary of the Romanian Language (Dicţionarul academic al Limbii Române – DLR) Lexicological Relevance and Romanic Context

Cristina FLORESCU

Key-words: *Romanian lexis, etymological dictionary, Romanian Academic lexicography, Romance lexicography.*

1. Quantitative values of the Romanian lexis in DLR

The academician Marius Sala, main editor of the *Dictionary of the Romanian Language* (DLR) [Rom. *Dicţionarul limbii române*], stated, in the *Preface* to *The Small Academic Dictionary* (MDA) [*Micul dicţionar academic*] published in 2001, that this lexicon contained, in its four volumes, 170.000 words and variants. Starting from his assessment, we can estimate the number of words (articles and variants) to be included in the complete version of the DLR (from A to Z) after bringing up-to date and enriching the older series of the Dictionary of the Academy (DA).

Therefore, we can compare lists of words and numeric estimations of the lexemes in our language. For instance, we can parallel the list of all the lexemes beginning with C in the MDA volumes with the provisional list of words beginning with C elaborated by the lexicographers in Iaşi (to be included in the future volume of the DLR). By analyzing such correlations, we can approximate that the number of entries (lexicographic articles and lexical variants) in the future unified and up-to-date DLR will come close to 200.000 lexical elements.

In 1999, the lexicographers in Iaşi were elaborating six DLR volumes containing words / articles in various work stages: sampling, research, lexicographic diagrams, drafting, partial revision, intermediary version, final revision, final rewriting, completion for the Etymologies Commission. All these words comprised almost 14.000 future entries in the six volumes of the DLR projected up to 2010. These volumes are now published[1] and so, the lexical facts can be quantified in real parameters. These figures, 14.000 words and lexical variants represent 7% lexicographic body of the vocabulary of Romanian language according to the DLR standard.

[1] *Cf.* DLR, Tome XIII, Part 2, Letter V, Venial – vizurină (Bucharest, EAR, 2002); Tome XIII, Part 3, Letter V, Vîclă – vuzum (Bucharest, EAR, 2005); Tome IV, Letter L, L – lherzolită (EAR; 2008); Tome V, Letter L, Li – luzulă (EAR; 2008); Tome 1, Part 7, Letter E, E – erzaţ (EAR, 2009); Tome I, Part 8, Letter E, Es – ezdereş (EAR, 2010)

2. The Romance Context

2.1. The above-mentioned sums, 7% and 14.ooo, represent two numeric indices, two figures that do not reflect the lexicological complexity of the analytical facts that characterize a significant stage in the evolution of Romanian lexicography. Nevertheless, *they* are important in explaining why, starting with 1998 – 1999, there has been an increasing need and demand for lexical information regarding the meanings, the attestations and the grammatical values of the lexicographic articles included in the DLR volumes existing, at that time, in the Academic Institute of Iaşi, and comprising words beginning with E, L, V, W, X, Y. The questions and answers of that time have led to an efficient cooperation materialized, among other things, in the implication (in different of its stages) of a number of linguists from Iaşi[2] in one of the most important linguistic projects on Romance languages, *Dictionnaire Étymologique Roman* (DÉRom). In a research paper, we argued that:

> "The present DÉRom comprises ... contemporary analyses and investigations unfolded across the entire territory of Romania. ... Therefore, the project, whose aim is the elaboration of a new REW, as well as of an up-to-date and deeply personalized etymological dictionary of the Romance languages, is founded on a number of work principles that are both functional and thoroughly outlined." (Florescu 2009: 154)

Nowadays, the project is in its second elaboration stage[3] of the first phase: *The Pan-Romance Nucleus*.

Investigating the contrastive research on Romance languages, we can notice in detail (namely lexeme by lexeme) the axiomatic need to rely on the lexicographic tools specific to the Romanian language. Among these lexicographic tools, the DLR is one of the basic materials included in the compulsory bibliography of all the great general works on Romanistics.

In the present study, we will envisage only two of these significant lexicographic works (*cf. infra* 3 and 4).

2.2. The assertion that the DLR (together with its older series – the DA) represents, linguistically and lexicologically, a more than necessary starting point may seem too common, however, it is always useful to exemplify it. I will rely on the affirmation Michael Metzeltin (Romanist, proficient speaker of Romanian, member of the Austrian Academy of Sciences) made a while ago, during a visit to the team lexicographers in Iaşi; the Austrian linguist explained why, in spite of the excellent editions of a number of old Romanian texts, in spite of the Romanian lexicographic wealth, he *always* prefers to look into the DLR: the lexicographic definitions, in all the thesaurus, explanatory, encyclopedic dictionaries have an artificial, reconstructed character rendered to them by the respective specialized language – the lexicographic language. In the DLR, the wealth of examples,

---

[2] The reserchers mentioned are: Cristina Florescu, Eugen Munteanu, Florin Olariu and Laura Manea (named in the temporal order of their involvement in the project).

[3] The first phase of the DÉRom project (project managers – the Romanists Eva Buchi and Wolfang Schweichard) investigates the pan-Romance nucleus, comprising those words inherited from Latin which circulate in the entire Romance-speaking world. The main financing source comes from ANR (Agence Nationale de la Recherche) and DEG (Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft). The first phase was unfolded between 2008 and 2010, the second phase receives the same funds between 2012-2014.

quotations, phrases, fixed expressions, parenthetic explanations, proverbs and sayings, all these lexicographic details help the researcher of Romanian, *non-native speaker* of this language, check the contemporary, real and living usage of the language (the modern language as well as the old language, for instance).

Moreover, this observation is valid (in different parameters, of course) for the native Romanian speaker, as well, if we take into consideration the fact that even the most accomplished linguist cannot encompass, with his memory and knowledge, more than 60% of the vocabulary of a language (in all its diachronic, diatopic, diaphasic and diastratic levels)

The technical aspects of this lexicon – which are more than compulsory, since we aim at the *systematic* storage of a great quantity of specialized information – covers a thesaurus of lexical facts that can be selected and grouped in order to become relevant for different aspects of the Romanian language. This reality has repeatedly become obvious; however, most of the research (on grammar, on word formation) focused directly or indirectly on the Romanian lexis, has not resorted to the DLR material, in its all-embracing amplitude. It is a frequent shortcoming.

2.3. Georges Kleiber's presentation at CILFR (Valencia 2010) envisaged the denomination and designation of odors (Kleiber 2010). The French linguist's analysis and conclusions were possible due to the lexical material offered by the *Thesaurus Dictionary of the French Language* (TLFi). There is no equivalent analysis for Romanian yet, though the DA and DLR offer an extremely relevant material – only to mention the cautious remarks made by the famous French semantician with regard to the South East area of Romania.

The meticulous research on some lexical fields in Romanian undertaken so far – though unfortunately scarce and published before the completion of the DLR – have always relied on the DA + DLR (the volumes that were published at the time of the respective research).

The analysis of the meteorological terminology (scientific and / or popular) of atmospheric phenomena can be equally significant. A contrastive analysis has already begun[4], and it aims at detaching a sum of lexical subgroups (established according to the lexicographic material offered by the DA and the completed DLR, *as well*) relevant for the investigation of various linguistic aspects of the Romanian language.

2.4. Numerous facts researched so far regarding Romanian lexical structure, some word etymologies, a series of particular aspects on the influence of different languages on Romanian will be more thoroughly understood especially with the access, facilitated by our IT colleagues, to what is going to become the up-to-date, unified electronic DLR[5].

---

[4] The research is undertaken within the CNCS project, developed during 2011-2014, entitled *Terminologia românească meteorologică ştiinţifică şi populară a fenomenelor atmosferice. Studiu lingvistic* [En. *The Scientific and Popular Terminology of Atmospheric Phenomena in the Romanian Language. A Linguistic Study*], code PN-II-ID-PCE-2011-3-0656 (project manager: Cristina Florescu).

[5] Cf. *The eDTLR – Dicţionarul tezaur la limbii române în format electronic* [En. *eDTLR –The Electronic Thesaurus Dictionary of the Romanian Language*], project coordinated by the "Alexandru Ioan Cuza" University of Iaşi (project manager: Prof. Dan Cristea, Faculty of Computer Science), a complex CNCSIS project for 2007-2010.

3. DLR and DÉRom

3.1. As mentioned above (*supra* 2), we will exemplify our previous assertions by referring to two lexicographical works significant for Romance linguistics.

The first is the DÉRom, namely the international project *Dictionnaire Étymologique Roman* (DÉRom). (*Première phase: le noyau panroman*) (funded by ANR and DFG). With reference to the DÉRom and its connection to REW, I would like to point out some general aspects of this *on-line* dictionary (http://www.atilf.fr/DÉRom). In their paper (Buchi, Schweickard 2008a), the authors conclude: "The REW serves as a reference point meant to highlight all the innovative aspects in the conception of its successor [DÉRom]"

Consequently, though bearing a different title and based on modern computing techniques, the new etymological dictionary of the Romance languages draws on the essential principle, the material and motivations of the REW's linguistic and lexicographic foundations. Unlike Meyer-Lübke's dictionary, the DÉRom is a lexicographic work based on comparative-reconstruction grammar (Chambon 2007). This extremely efficient and modern method still stirs constructive polemics of high erudition (Buchi, Schweickard 2011).

On the easy–to-navigate, detailed site of the on-going French-German project, we can clearly notice a few aspects – pointed out in other contexts and on other occasions (Buchi, Schweickard 2008; Florescu 2009; Andronache 2010; Buchi 2010; Buchi, Schweickard 2010; Schweickard 2010; Buchi, Schweickard 2011; Celac, Buchi 2011), aspects mentioned as far as they are relevant to the present discussion.

3.1.1. Undoubtedly, taking into consideration the founding principles of the DÉRom, the DA and the DLR are part of its compulsory bibliography. Therefore, the DÉRom always indicates (by including it in the series of quotations from the compulsory bibliography) the etymological and lexical solution given in the old (DA) and the new series (DLR) of the *Academic Dictionary of the Romanian Language* and, implicitly, when the DÉRom's normative system requires it, both the DA and the DLR are quoted with philological rigor.

Thus, the following aspects can be noticed in the lexicographical structure of the DÉRom:

a) possible variations from the etymological, lexicographic, philological, etc. solutions in the DA or the DLR (cf. Celac 2009-2011 in: DÉRom s.v. */a'gʊst-u/, note 1; Delorme 2010-2011 in: DÉRom s.v. */βi'n-aki-a/, note 2);

b) a number of relevant aspects of some of the DA and the DLR articles can, at first, pass unnoticed due to a technical dryness especially pertaining to the DLR (cf. Celac 2010-2011 in: DÉRom s.v. */'βɪndik-a-/ ; Reinhardt 2010-2011 in: DÉRom s.v. */'ɛrb-a/ ~ */'ɛrβ-a/; Buchi 2009-2011 in: DÉRom s.v. */'ɸak-e-/).

3.1.2. In many cases, the DÉRom takes the first attestations from the DA and the DLR, but only when Romanian philological research and the editing of significant old texts have not already altered them. For instance, Alletsgruber 2011 in: DÉRom s.v. */'βad-u/; Schmidt / Schweickard 2010-2011 in: DÉRom s.v. */'barb-a/[1].

In all the DÉRom articles, the DA lexicological structure is always reflected in the argumentative series of the solutions accepted by the DÉRom for the entire Romanian languages, whereas the DLR is mirrored in the central argumentative nucleus for the Daco-Romanian language.

3.1.3. The semantic structure of the DLR and DA articles is an additional argumentative element in solving a number of aspects that were often difficult for Romance linguistic research before the DÉRom.

We exemplify our affirmations through some DÉRom articles:

– Schmidt / Schweickard 2010-2011 in: DÉRom s.v. */as'kʊlt-a-/ underlines the two semantic ideas dissociated in the DA (and overlooked by the MDA), namely "a auzi" [En. "to hear"] and "a fi înţelegător, ascultător, a se supune" [En. "to be obedient, subdued, to obey"] marking their inherited etymological character;

– Schmidt 2010-2011 in: DÉRom s.v. */'anim-a/ - dissociates the Romanian *inimă* [En. *heart*] "central organ of the blood circulation system" from *înrimă* "soul" thus retrieving, for the Daco-Romanian, Megleno-Romanian and Istro-Romanian languages, too, the meaning present nowadays in the majority of the Romance languages and dialects;

- Gross 2010-2011 in: DÉRom s.v. /kat'ena/ correctly includes in the Romance context, what the DÉRom terminology calls the Romanian "cognate" *cătină* [En. *box-thorn*]. This article manages to clarify the semantic problem of the Romanian etymon – cf. Lat. *catena* „chain, string" vs. Rom. *cătină* „plant" by pointing out two aspects. On the one hand, the dictionary refers to the significant meanings in the Aromanian language ("spine") and in the French-Provencal language ("string in a tissue"); on the other hand, other etymological suggestions are eliminated (cf. DA[6], EWRS, Ciorănescu[7] etc.), as the dictionary firmly assumes the primary analogy between a chain and the form of the plant: "[The Daco-Romanian language and the Aromanian language] ont développé indépendamment des sens par analogie de forme".

– Andronache 2008-2011 in: DÉRom s.v. */'pɔnt-e/ connects the feminine Romanian word to the Proto Romance area formed of the Lombardian, the Romanche, the Spanish, the Asturian and the Galician -Portuguese languages.

- Florescu 2010-1011 in: DÉRom s.v. */'laks-a-/ dissociates two Proto-Roman etymological structural types, the Romanian being included in the first type, the originary and majoritary, non-progressive.

- Buchi 2009-2011 in: DÉRom s.v. */'Φak-e-/ distinguishes, by means of this specific method (the comparative – reconstruction grammar), significant temporal dissociations within which the Daco-Romanian, the Aromanian, the Megleno-Romanian and the Istro-Romanian correlates (namely, the whole of the Proto-Romanian) belongs to the I type, the originary and majoritary.

4. The DLR and Corominas' Dictionaries

[6] In the DA, in the etymological paragraph, , *cătină* [En. *box thorn*] is underlined in a comment: "Its meaning could be explained by the fact that the twigs of the box thorn are used for binding or for making baskets".

[7] Proposes the Lat. *catănum* as an etymon.

In 2005, with the celebration of 100 years since the birth of Juan Corominas, a prestigious conference was organized at the University of Catalan Studies in Barcelona. In this conference, Eva Buchi presented a paper (published in the conference volume) entitled *Juan Corominas et l'étymologie lexicale romane: l'exemple roumaine* (Buchi 2006). She asserts that:

> „Pour des raisons de cohérence interne, nous limiterons cependant notre propos aux apports à l'étymologie romane qui se dégagent des deux grands dictionnaires étymologiques de Coromines : le DCEC (1954—1957), devenu par la suite, cosigné par José Antonio Pascual, le DCECH (1980—1991), ainsi que le DECat (1980—2001)" (Buchi 2006: 1).

We would like to stress that these dictionaries include – together with some relatively unsystematic analyses (though well-researched) on a large number of Romance words other than the Iberian – a number of sporadic references to equivalent Romanian terms. In twelve cases, however, the word references are detailed, with relatively extended etymological comments. Eva Buchi analyzes these comments by systematically correlating them with the specialized Romanian bibliography, particularly the DA and the DLR. Therefore, she critically examines in her paper (Buchi 2006) the etymologies (Latin, old Slavonic, Greek, unknown) given by Corominas to the Romanian lexemes: *a umbla* (the most important contribution of the French linguist), *a înfuleca, a învăţa, mantécă* (a sort of butter made of sheep's milk)*, măcar, a pişca, a piţiga, a pleca, a scuipa, smântână* (the analyses are highly erudite and extremely thorough) – which gives her the opportunity to make a series of observations on the etymology of the Rom. *stâng* (criticizing the etymology suggested by the DLR) - , *tont* / *tânt*, Arom. *zîngînar* (analytically connected to the Rom. *zâng*). The author concludes (through pertinent correlations with a series of etymological considerations quoted from modern specialized bibliography) that, out of Corominas' twelve etymologies, seven are correct, three are partially incorrect and two are correct. The DA and the DLR are a permanent starting point for a series of exegetic considerations.

5. Conclusions

A lexicological-semasiological analysis at the Romance level of an inherited element (together with its own lexical family) can no longer overlook the languages in South- East area of Romance languages, out of which the Romanian language is obviously the most extended. We noticed in a previous study (Florescu 1999) that the lexical analyses of many semantic fields were often limited, during the last century, to the Western Romance languages.

After almost twelve years, we can say that, today, the great majority of the lexicological and semantic analyses on the Romance languages cannot omit the significant aspects of the Romanian language. This was also due to the completion of the DLR, a significant philological act that imposes new conclusions to specialists.

By including the Romanian language among the Romance languages with a completed thesaurus dictionary renders the scientist confident and the research *complete* and *significant* for Romania as a whole.

Bibliography

Andronache 2010: Andronache Marta, ***Le Dictionnaire Étymologique Roman (DÉRom)**: une nouvelle approche de l'étymologie romane*, în „Dacoromania", 15, p. 129-144.

Buchi, Schweickard (2011): Éva Buchi, Wolfgang Schweickard, *Sept malentendus dans la perception du **DÉRom** par Alberto Vàrvaro*, et *Ce que oppose vraiment deux conceptions de l'étimologie romane. Réponse à Alberto Vàrvaro et contributions à un débat méthodologique en cours*, in «*Revue de linguistique romane*», 75, p. 305-312 et p. 628-635.

Buchi 2010: Éva Buchi, *Pourquoi la linguistique romane n'est pas soluble en linguistiques idioromanes. Le témoignage du **Dictionnaire Étymologique Roman (DÉRom)***, in Alén Garabato, Carmen et alii (éd.), *Quelle linguistique romane au XXI^e^ siècle?*, Paris, L'Harmattan, p. 43-60.

Buchi, Schweickard 2010: Éva Buchi, Wolfgang Schweickard, *À la recherche du protoroman : objectifs et méthodes du futur **Dictionnaire Étymologique Roman (DÉRom)***, in Maria Iliescu, Heidi Siller-Runggaldier, Paul Danler (éd.), *Actes du XXV^e^ Congrès International de Linguistique et de Philologie Romanes (Innsbruck 2007)*, Berlin/New York, De Gruyter, vol. 6, p. 61-68.

Buchi, Schweickard 2008a: Éva Buchi, Wolfgang Schweickard, *Romanistique et étymologie du fonds lexical héréditaire: du REW au **DÉRom (Dictionnaire Étymologique roman)***, 16 mai 2008, Colloque international *La romanistique dans tous ses états* (Universitatea Montpellier III/Béziers).

Buchi, Schweickard 2008: Éva Buchi, Wolfgang Schweickard, *Le Dictionnaire Étymologique Roman (DÉRom): en guise de faire-part de naissance*. Lexicographica, in *International Annual for Lexicography*, 24, p. 351-357.

Buchi 2006: Éva Buchi, *Juan Corominas et l'étymologie lexicale romane: l'exemple roumaine*, in Badia i Margarit (Antoni M.) (éd.), *Homenatge de l'IEC a Joan Coromines, en el centenari de la seva naixença*, Barcelone, Institut d'Estudis Catalans, 43-80 ; republicat în : Badia i Margarit (Antoni M.)/Solà (Joan) (éd.), *Joan Coromines, vida y obra*, Madrid, Gredos, p. 282-332.

Celac, Buchi 2011: Victor Celac, Éva Buchi, *Étymologie-origine et étymologie-histoire dans le **DÉRom (Dictionnaire Étymologique Roman)**. Coup de projecteur sur quelques trouvailles du domaine roumain*, in Anja Overbeck, Wolfgang Schweickard, Harald Völker (éd.), *Lexikon, Varietät, Philologie. Romanistische Studien Günter Holtus zum 65. Geburtstag*, Berlin/Boston, De Gruyter, p. 363-370.

Chambon 2007: Jean-Pierre Chambon, *Remarques sur la grammaire comparée-reconstruction en linguistique romane (situation, perspectives)*, in *Mémoires de la Société de linguistique de Paris*, 15, p. 57-72.

Chambon 2010: Jean-Pierre Chambon, *Intervention à la table ronde «100 anys d'etimologia romànica : el REW de Meyer-Lübke : 1911-2010»*, in Emili Casanova *et alii* (éd.) : *Actes del 26^é^ Congrés Internacional de Lingüística i Filologia Romàniques (València 2010)*, Berlin/New York, De Gruyter (în curs de apariţie).

Florescu 2009: Cristina Florescu, *Limba română în **Dictionnaire Étymologique Roman DÉRom** (< **Romanisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch REW**)*, in Luminiţa Botoşineanu, Elena Dănilă *et alii* (éd), *Distorsionări în comunicarea lingvistică, literară şi etnofolclorică românească şi contextul european*, Iaşi, Editura Alfa, p. 153-159.

Florescu 1999: Cristina Florescu, *Gîndire specifică şi gîndire europeană în semantismul românescului **a lăsă** (În căutarea sensului pierdut)*, Iaşi, Editura Document.

Kleiber 2010: Georges Kleiber, *Odeurs: dénominations et désignations*, in *Tendècies actuals de la filologia romànica.* 26é Congrés Internacional de Lingüística i Filologia Romàniques. València. Resums de les ponenciès, p. 221-222.
Schweickard 2010: Wolfgang Schweickard, *Die Arbeitsgrundlagen der romanischen etymologischen Forschung : vom REW zum DÉRom*, in *Romanistik in Geschichte und Gegenwart*, 16, p. 3-13.

B. Dictionaries

DA = *Dicţionarul limbii române*. Academia Română. Librăriile Socec, Universul, Bucharest. 1913-1949.
DCEC = Joan Corominas, *Diccionario crítico etimológico de la lengua castellana*, 4 vol., Berne, Francke, 1954—1957.
DCECH = Joan Corominas, José Antonio Pascual, *Diccionario crítico etimológico castellano e hispánico*, 6 vol., Madrid, Gredos, 1980–1991.
DECat = Joan Coromines, *Diccionari etimològic i complementari de la llengua catalana*, 9 vol., Barcelone, Curial Edicions Catalanes, 1980—2001.
DLR = *Dicţionarul limbii române. Serie nouă.* Bucharest. Editura Academiei Române, 1965 – 2010.
MDA = Marius Sala, Ion Dănăilă (coord.), *Micul dicţionar academic*, vol. I-IV, Bucharest, Univers enciclopedic, 2001–2003.
EWRS = Sextil Puşcariu, *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der rumänischen Sprache. Lateinisches Element mit Berücksichtigung aller romanischen Sprachen*, Heidelberg, Winter, 1905.
REW_3 = Wilhelm Meyer-Lübke, *Romanisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch*, Heidelberg, Winter, 1930–1935[3] [1911–1920[1]].
TLFi = *Le Trésor de la Langue Française Informatisé.* Paris, ATILF, CNRS, version 3, 2002.

The Academic Dictionary of Romanian Language (DLR). Lexicological relevance and Romance context

The article presents a series of lexicological data on the Romanian language lexis, which have been visible numerically since *The Romanian Language Dictionary* (written under the scientific patronage of the Romanian Academy) was finished (in the year 2010). Two elements of maximal linguistic relevance for the Romanic area are noticeable in this context. Firstly, the European Romanist level project DÉRom is taken under consideration. A few categories of lexicographical and linguistic facts from the on-line entries of this dictionary are presented, according to the data provided by DA and DLR. The methods of exegetic processing of the lexicographical material from the Romanian language dictionary in the DÉRom are emphasized. The convergent points from DÉRom and DA/DLR are marked, as well as the divergent ones. A series of particular contributions to the Romanic linguistics through DÉRom articles is underlined, from the perspective of the compared-reconstruction grammar method. The last part of the article is focused on the relation between DA/DLR and Corominas' dictionaries, based on an analysis carried out by Eva Buchi.

Institutul de Filologie Română „A. Philippide",
Iaşi, România