

A Local Perspective on Lexicography

A Local Perspective on Lexicography:

*Dictionary Research, Practice,
and Use in Romania*

Edited by

Marinela Burada and Raluca Sinu

**Cambridge
Scholars
Publishing**



A Local Perspective on Lexicography:
Dictionary Research, Practice, and Use in Romania

Edited by Marinela Burada and Raluca Sinu

This book first published 2020

Cambridge Scholars Publishing

Lady Stephenson Library, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE6 2PA, UK

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Copyright © 2020 by Marinela Burada, Raluca Sinu and contributors

All rights for this book reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior permission of the copyright owner.

ISBN (10): 1-5275-4939-9

ISBN (13): 978-1-5275-4939-5

TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Contributors	vii
----------------------------	-----

“Other voices, other rooms”: On Dictionaries and Dictionary Making in the Romanian Context—Introduction	1
Marinela Burada and Raluca Sinu	

Chapter One: The Practice of Dictionary Making

The Challenges of Compiling Romanian Monolingual Dictionaries.....	8
Mihaela Marin	

Methods and Practice in Romanian Etymological Research (with Particular Focus on Multiple Etymology)	21
Victor Celac	

Word Formation and Dictionaries Structured into Nests.....	67
Cătălina Mărânduc	

Chapter Two: Dictionary Projects

Riding the Waves of Change: The <i>Dictionary of the Romanian Language</i> Project.....	96
Marinela Burada and Raluca Sinu	

Romanian Collaborative Lexicography: A Brief History of DEXONLINE	123
Cătălin Frâncu and Radu Borza	

Chapter Three: Coverage in Bilingual Dictionaries

Legal Dictionaries and Term Bases in an English–Romanian Context ..	134
Attila Imre	
Microstructure in Online Romanian-English Dictionaries	150
Alexandra Stan	
Index	177

LIST OF CONTRIBUTORS

(IN ALPHABETICAL ORDER)

Radu BORZA

Head of the DEXONLINE Association, programmer
raduborza@gmail.com

Marinela BURADA

Transilvania University of Braşov
m.burada@unitbv.ro

Victor CELAC

Iorgu Iordan – Al. Rosetti Institute of Linguistics of the Romanian Academy, Bucharest
victor_celac@yahoo.com

Cătălin FRÂNCU

Founder of the DEXONLINE Project
cata@francu.com

Attila IMRE

Sapientia Hungarian University of Transylvania
Faculty of Technical and Human Sciences of Târgu Mureş
attilaimre@ms.sapientia.ro

Mihaela MARIN

Iorgu Iordan – Al. Rosetti Institute of Linguistics of the Romanian Academy, Bucharest
marin.rmihaela@gmail.com

Cătălina MĂRÂNDUC

Iorgu Iordan – Al. Rosetti Institute of Linguistics of the Romanian Academy, Bucharest
catalinamaranduc@gmail.com

Raluca SINU

Transilvania University of Braşov
raluca.sinu@unitbv.ro

Alexandra STAN

Transilvania University of Braşov
alexandra.stan@unitbv.ro

“OTHER VOICES, OTHER ROOMS”:
ON DICTIONARIES AND DICTIONARY MAKING
IN THE ROMANIAN CONTEXT—
INTRODUCTION

MARINELA BURADA AND RALUCA SINU

This volume is devoted to Romanian lexicography considered from a synchronic and diachronic perspective. Dictionary making has always been a busy field of activity in our context, with its substantial output running the gamut of reference works. Nevertheless, the discussions on how dictionaries are created and what theoretical grounding they rest upon are few and far between by comparison. This is the gap that the present book aims to fill. To this end, it sets out to provide a structured and coherent account of dictionary research, practice, and use in Romania and share it with the wider, international lexicographic community.

The book addresses a range of culture-specific topics related to both dictionary-as-process and dictionary-as-product. It combines the voices of authors who—despite the differences in their professional backgrounds and in some of their views on matters lexicographical—share a keen interest in dictionaries. Their contributions reflect their respective ongoing preoccupations to further the theory and practice of lexicography, while developing our dictionary culture.

This volume consists of three chapters. The first, **The Practice of Dictionary Making**, includes papers authored by practising lexicographers who provide inside information about general and specific issues in the process of dictionary making. The focus in the second chapter, **Dictionary Projects**, is on two major dictionary projects that have permanently altered the lexicographic landscape in Romania. The final chapter, **Coverage in Bilingual Dictionaries**, is concerned with the use of bilingual dictionaries that are, in their vast majority, products of Romanian lexicography.

The first contribution in Chapter One, **The Challenges of Compiling Romanian Monolingual Dictionaries** (Mihaela Marin), provides

the reader with a guided tour of some of the principles that regulate the lexicographic practice in our context. Taking the case of two major dictionaries, DTLR (*The Dictionary of the Romanian Language*) and DEX (*The Explanatory Dictionary of the Romanian Language*), seen as prototypical products of Romanian lexicography, the author begins the discussion with a succinct background of these reference works, and goes on to consider the principles underlying their compilation. Drawing on their commonalities, the discussion dwells on aspects related to the wordlists, illustrative examples, definitions, etc., as well as to more sensitive issues (e.g., dealing with potentially offensive information) that the lexicographers have to take in their stride.

Methods and Practice in Romanian Etymological Research (with Particular Focus on Multiple Etymology) (Victor Celac) paints a fine-grained picture of the concept of “multiple etymology” in the context of present-day Romanian lexicography. The terminological clarifications concerning the two paradigms of etymology—*étymologie-origine* vs *étymologie-histoire*—are followed by a detailed account of Romanian etymological research throughout the 20th century. The concept of multiple etymology in Romanian lexicography is then analysed via a thorough literature review, and through an ample use of relevant samples of certified and possible multiple etymologies extracted from Romanian dictionaries and accompanied by detailed explanations. The investigation prompts the author to conclude that the practice of multiple etymologies has been “used and abused since the 1950s” (p. 44), and that it is time to reconsider it through an accurate assessment of the etymological data available.

Word Formation and Dictionaries Structured into Nests (Cătălina Măranduc) discusses an alternative way to structure information in the dictionary, seen as more in line with the cognitive processes behind language acquisition. Focusing on two dictionary projects designed by the author herself i.e., the *Dictionary of Derived Words Grouped in Lexical Nests* (DERCU) and the *Dictionary of Romanian Words Formed with Compounding Elements* (DECO), the author argues for structuring dictionaries by nests. This type of organization comes with the main benefit of “[replicating] the way people build their lexical competence as speakers, simultaneously by formal and semantic analogies” (p. 52). She concludes by outlining a plan for the implementation in electronic form of the two dictionaries, and underlines the importance of digitizing Romanian lexicographic resources in order to make them available to users, while also increasing their international visibility.

Chapter Two, **Dictionary Projects**, brings to the fore the peculiarities of two large-scale lexicographic ventures with far-reaching

implications for the dictionary culture in Romania: one resulted in a paper dictionary targeted mainly at specialists; the other, in an online dictionary referred to by 3+ million users each month.

Riding the waves of change: the Dictionary of the Romanian Language Project (Marinela Burada and Raluca Sinu) is a critical analysis of the front matter and content of the two component parts—two dictionaries—in the structure of DTLR. Being compiled over the span of nearly a century by successive teams of lexicographers working in different social, cultural and political circumstances, DTLR bears the marks of the changes that ultimately determined its current form. This accounts for a number of discrepancies between the part compiled earlier, in the former half of the 20th century, and the part compiled starting with the late 1950s, when work on DTLR officially resumed. These discrepancies are conspicuous in both *what the lexicographers say* in the front matters of each part, and in *what they do* when writing the entries. They relate to areas such as the context of dictionary making, the aim of the dictionary, the sources of input, coverage, definitions, etc. Identifying the differences in these areas between the two parts of DTLR is tantamount to retracing some of the steps that Romanian lexicography took in its historical evolution and have a significant documentary value.

The story of the second project is narrated by the creators of the dictionary themselves. **Romanian Collaborative Lexicography: A Brief History of DEXONLINE** (Cătălin Frâncu and Radu Borza) provides the reader with interesting first hand information about the nuts and bolts of DEXONLINE i.e., its making, its mission, the sources of input and future development – in brief, the main elements and ingredients that make it a shining example of successful collaborative lexicography in Romania, as well as the most popular monolingual online dictionary to date. Section 2, devoted to the philosophy behind this volunteer-based project, is particularly revealing: it lays out the work ethos at DEXONLINE, making a compelling case for the service that the dictionary pays to both Romanian language and its users.

Chapter Three, **Coverage in Bilingual Dictionaries**, considers the ways in which the bilingual dictionaries created and/or available in Romania keep up with the demands of intercultural communication.

Legal Dictionaries and Term Bases in an English–Romanian Context (Attila Imre) takes a comparative approach to two sets of reference works, one consisting of seven specialist paper dictionaries published in Romania between 1999 and 2015, the other, of seven dictionaries and terminological databases available online. The investigation is intended to assess, in quantitative terms, the extent to which the

translation of legal terminology is actually supported by the existing resources. The checklist consists of 100 terms selected by their frequency of occurrence in a popular movie series whose storyline is set against the backdrop of corporate law culture. The resulting figures clearly indicate that the online resources provide a wider coverage of terms; also, the translation variants for some headwords are supplied in higher numbers than in the paper dictionaries. The author pertinently argues that dictionaries should also make allowance for items whose metaphorical use eventually catapulted them into the legalese; such is the case, for example, of the verb *grill* (in the sense *submit to intensive police interview*). Keeping up with such forms of specialization may be more problematic in paper dictionaries, whose publication is sporadic. But it is within the realm of possibility with online dictionaries, that are more promptly updatable, once an item has gained entry into the specialist vocabulary.

In a similar, contrastive vein, **Microstructure in Online Romanian-English Dictionaries** (Alexandra Stan) reports on a contrastive investigation of microstructural elements across a corpus of fifteen bilingual/multilingual online dictionaries. Specifically, the analysis is aimed at determining the manner in which 40 culture-specific words were translated from Romanian into English. Cultural terms are notoriously difficult to translate, given their conceptual peculiarity on one hand, and the non-isomorphism between the SL and the TL, on the other. The analysis considers the options that lexicographers have to render the meanings of Romanian terms i.e., equivalence, illustration, gloss, and usage. While all of them were found, at variable degrees, in the microstructural units of the dictionaries under analysis, an interesting find is the variation in the use of equivalence: words related to food/cuisine relied more on translational equivalence, while those referring to traditional dress were more readily translated via explanatory equivalence. Also interesting is the fact that, with one exception, these online dictionaries do not use visuals in either their microstructure or as a cross-reference in order to support the definition. As the author argues, this shows that the dictionaries in question do not avail themselves of the advantages afforded by the online medium.

This volume is the result of contributions by Romanian academics, practitioners from the Institute of Linguistics within the Romanian Academy, and other specialists outside the linguistic fold. We believe their voices should join in the wider discussion taking place on the international lexicographic arena today. This book casts a mere glimpse into a lively and fascinating world; we hope it will provide researchers,

practitioners, teachers and graduate students with a good starting point for further explorations of dictionaries and dictionary making in Romania.

CHAPTER ONE:
THE PRACTICE OF DICTIONARY MAKING

THE CHALLENGES OF COMPILING ROMANIAN MONOLINGUAL DICTIONARIES

MIHAELA MARIN

Abstract: The present paper aims to present some aspects of Romanian language dictionaries seen from the perspective of the Romanian lexicographers' activity. We focus on the particularities of Romanian monolingual lexicography, by comparing DTLR (the *Comprehensive Dictionary of the Romanian Language*) and DEX (the *Explanatory Dictionary of the Romanian Language*), two of the most representative lexicographic projects, in terms of typology and particularities of the definitions, grammatical information, contexts and etymology in both dictionaries. The last part of this article deals with the current topics in monolingual dictionaries, namely providing non-linguistic information and dealing with offensive information.

Keywords: Romanian lexicography, monolingual dictionary, definitions, dictionary entry, neologisms

0 Introduction

Lexicography began with short handwritten lists of words made by traders; nowadays lexicographers are multi-specialized researchers (linguists and IT professionals) able to harness the potential of the new technologies. IT specialists have been deepening their investigation of linguistics and lexicography too, trying to successfully replace the lexicographer's work. Romanian lexicographers have to deal with similar problems as their colleagues from abroad. This means that they have to create modern digitized dictionaries accessible to a great number of users interested in the Romanian language.

Starting from a survey of two authoritative Romanian monolingual dictionaries, the purpose of the present article is to analyse a few challenges facing the Romanian lexicographers today, the extent to

which they impact the quality of the output, and the solutions applied to remedy some of the problems encountered along the way.

1 Romanian dictionaries at present

Romanian modern and contemporary lexicographic output consists of a rich variety of monolingual and multilingual works, lexicons, glossaries, and encyclopedias.

The structure of our dictionaries and design methods have been followed very closely the principles of French lexicography. The older part of DTLR, our academic dictionary, was designed as a bilingualized one, with every headword accompanied by its French equivalent, as illustrated in Example 1 below.

Example 1: Headword followed by its French equivalent

ABURI vb. IV^a, „1^o. *Exposer à l'action des vapeurs, soumettre à des fumigations; couvrir de buée.* 2^o. *Produire des vapeurs, exhaler; fumer. (Refl.) Avoir des bouffées de chaleur.* 3^o. *Souffler légèrement (se dit du vent)“.*
 ~ 1^o. *Trans.* A expune la aburi. [Pe] femea bolnavă...
 moaşa o abureşte cu ovăz, cu coji de ceapă... MA-
 RIAN, N. 134. | A acoperi cu aburi. Îşi luă ochelarii...
 îi aburi; îi şterse şi-i puse; VLAHUŢĂ, D. 12.

The present discussion focuses on two of the most representative Romanian lexicographic works, the *Comprehensive Dictionary of the Romanian Language* (old and new series, DA (1913-1948), DLR (1965-2010)) and the *Explanatory Dictionary of the Romanian Language* (DEX, 1975, new editions in 2009 and 2016). The first one is used by linguists, and language researchers, while the second one is the most widely used dictionary in our country: it is a reference work popular with people of all ages, with students, teachers, different field specialists, journalists, who consult it and buy it.

Currently, the most representative monolingual Romanian dictionaries are DTLR and DEX. The similarities between the two dictionaries relate to their wordlists, the definition of each meaning, the grammatical information provided (feminine and plural forms of the nouns and adjectives, conjugation, verbs voice type, the first person of Present Tense singular of the verbs), headwords stress, pronunciation, spelling, and etymology. The *Dictionary of the Romanian Language* (DTLR) is a historical dictionary, so every sense is followed by specific

chronologically listed contexts, starting with their first attestation, as shown below in the entry for *dalmatic* (Dalmatian).

Example 2: The entry for *dalmatic* (Dalmatian)

DALMĂTIC, -Ă adj. Care aparține Dalmației sau dalmatilor (1), privitor la Dalmația sau la dalmati, originar din Dalmația; dalmat (2), (rar) dalmatin (2), (învechit, rar) dalmaticesc. Cf. LM. *Nu e decât un dublet dalmatic al tribalicului Viminacium de la Dunăre*. PÂRVAN, G. 38, cf. DL, M. D. ENC., DEX. ♦ *Țărm dalmatic* = țărm format prin pătrunderea apelor mării printre culmile paralele cu linia litorală a unor regiuni muntoase; țărm de (sau cu) canale. Cf. LTR², DN², DER II, 8. *Regiune pe litoralul oriental al M[ării] Adriatice ...*, cu țărm dantelat, dublat de numeroase insule] alungite (țărm dalmatic). M. D. ENC. I 234, cf. DEX.
 – Pl.: *dalmatici*, -ce.
 – Din lat. **dalmaticus**, -a, -um.

Contexts are also used in the case of idiomatic expressions, proverbs, etc. Previous dictionaries of our language were important resources and they are also mentioned while writing the entry. The *Explanatory Dictionary of the Romanian Language* (DEX) provides the following items of information for each headword: the stress (for the majority of the words), the explanations of the meanings, the most common idiomatic phrases (where necessary), the pronunciation of words, spelling variants, etyma. In addition, there are a few contexts composed by DEX authors to clarify definitions which seem too abstract.

The DTLR project was based initially on the work by Laurian and Massim (1871, 1876), two linguists from Transylvania whose broad experience was gained during their editing process. B.P. Hașdeu continued the work of his predecessors and succeeded in publishing 1,000 pages. He was followed in his attempts by Al. Philippide, who unfortunately did not manage to publish anything, despite his hard work. Owing to Sextil Pușcariu's efforts and leadership more volumes (words from letter A to the word *Lojniță*) were printed before the beginning of World War II. In 1947 the lexicographers of the recently created Institute of Linguistics of the Romanian Academy started a modern series of the DTLR. Lexicographers in Bucharest, Iași and Cluj-Napoca implemented modern principles, enriched the previous lexical inventory with the help of an extended bibliography of numerous documents, literary and scientific books, newspapers, magazines, language studies and dictionaries.

2 A few particularities of Romanian monolingual lexicography

2.1 The word list and the adaptation of loanwords

The lexical inventory and the adaptation of loans are aspects discussed seriously by linguists, in general, and especially by lexicographers. It is very difficult to decide the best form of a loan. The majority of loans originating from Latin entered the Romanian language in the 19th century through two or more languages simultaneously. This explains the multiple graphic and morphological variants of the same Latin neologism. For example, the neologism ‘acid’ had two forms two centuries ago, *acid* (from French and Italian etyma) and *ațid* (from German, Russian etyma). Each of the Romanian provinces was under different cultural and political influences. Moldavia and Wallachia were influenced by the French, Greek and Italian cultures, while Transylvania—at that time a part of the Austrian Empire—was under German and Latin influence. Moldavian and Wallachian intellectuals studied in Paris, so they were using French intensely, and were familiar with Latin notions via the French language. Transylvanian students, on the other hand, typically went to universities in Buda, Vienna, and Berlin and, as German language speakers, learned Latin concepts through the intermediary of German. Hence, a student in Medicine, Physics, or Chemistry who learned in France, would use the form *acid*, while another, who studied in Buda or Vienna, used the form *ațid*. Both categories of students came back home and tried to create a modern scientific terminology in order to develop their field. Later on linguists decided to adapt the neologisms to the phonological system of our language, and they considered the Latin form of the loans as the most suitable, and recommended it. A neologism firstly used in a text from Transylvania can be a Latin word imported indirectly, through the medium of German, as its phonological aspect and pronunciation prove. Lexicographers have chosen the last form as a standard word, labelling the others as obsolete variants of the former.

There is a relationship between the entry word and its first attestation. It is quite impossible to identify the first attestation of the most recent loans in Romanian. After the 1990s lots of international words were borrowed from English or other languages. Old DTLR references did not offer any attestations of these words. Speakers very often use the meanings of some words or their idiomatic expressions even if they have not been attested anywhere in the bibliographical sources of DTLR.

The lexical inventories of DTLR and DEX include various specialized terms from all fields of human knowledge (science, culture, arts, sport etc.). A word is treated as a dictionary entry if it appears in written texts in at least two language registers. While most of the dictionary entries fulfil this criterion, it is not absolutely compulsory. A very common word will be included in a dictionary even if it is attested in only one work; its frequency of use makes its presence in a dictionary wordlist mandatory. DTLR is more restrictive than DEX from this point of view because it includes quotations. DEX lexicographers did not introduce quotations so they can work on a more flexible inventory. This may explain why DEX contains more neologisms than DTLR.

Both DEX and DTLR recognize the need of dictionaries, in general, to update their lexical inventories because of the rapid developments in all sciences and in technology, which leads to the creation of a lot of new words. However, most of the frequently used items recently acquired from English are missing from DEX, and especially from DTLR. No comprehensive monolingual dictionary can be exhaustive, but it should at least include as many words as possible.

The actual wordlist of DTLR is more comprehensive than that of DEX due to its great number of specialized terms. Unfortunately, there is a lack of resources which help us collect more excerpts of specialized terms. Their earliest attestations were taken from 19th century written texts (dictionaries or Romanian translations of French or German scientific texts). The first attestation of ‘acid’ dates back to 1840 and is recorded in *Vocabular de neologisme* (Loan Words Vocabulary) by I. D. Negulici. After that date many occurrences have been found in books, handbooks, courses, dictionaries, glossaries, lexicons, encyclopedias, journals and magazines, etc. These works are important because they were created by specialists who provided exact, concise and clear definitions, as well as phrases, expressions, and special constructions.

2.2 Sources of quotations in DTLR

DTLR is a comprehensive dictionary; it provides definitions, morphologic, syntactic and etymological information and illustrative excerpts. Lexicographers avoided either dictionaries or Romanian translations of French, German etc. texts as the resources for this dictionary. They raised several objections concerning bilingual dictionaries, recorded by Pușcariu in the preface to DA, volume A-B, and taken into consideration by the lexicographers working on DTLR. Firstly, most translators were foreigners with a very bad command of the Romanian

language. They produced low quality translations full of invented Romanian words and meanings instead of providing their right Romanian equivalents. Those neologisms were only formally adapted to Romanian. For instance, *acid* is a Latin word. It appeared in Romanian texts starting with 1840, in translations into Romanian of French, Italian, German books. This indirect provenience is responsible for more variants of the same word. The variant of *acid* is *ațid*. The first form was a French loan, while the second one came from German.

Secondly, dictionary authors in the first half of the 20th century wrote a lot of wrong definitions based on their low level of knowledge of our culture, traditions and language. Most of these lexicographers did not have any competence and background in linguistics and lexicography. In their opinion, the financial aspects were more important than the accuracy of their work. Sextil Pușcariu gave more examples of Romanian lexicographers' errors and noticed such a problem in international lexicographic works, too. Some of those errors were inherited by many dictionary authors who did not check all the data they used. Pușcariu did not accept translations and dictionaries as resources for DTLR, strongly recommending our national writers' original works instead.

Have our lexicographers always observed this criterion? Yes and no. Yes, in the case of common words used in old texts excerpts. Lexicographers have to compare the numerous attestations collected from manuscripts and printed texts published in the 16th-19th centuries and choose the best ones. No, in the case of very widely used neologisms attested only in dictionaries and translations. That is why the data provided by earlier monolingual and bilingual dictionaries are still very precious.

2.3 Word meanings

Specialized terms are most typically mono-semantic, and only very rarely polysemantic. The polysemous ones are more interesting, because lexicographers need more than one work to explain the meanings of such terms. If an author knows what a term means he/she can produce a clear and concise definition. On the contrary, a lexicographer who is not familiar at all with such lexemes has to study this word very carefully in order to select the best quotations needed, and to check all the available information. The editors of DEX do the same thing, except for collecting contexts which do not appear in this dictionary.

Comprehensive monolingual dictionaries offer both a synchronic and a diachronic perspective of a language. They contain a large quantity of words used during all the centuries, some of which disappeared or were

replaced when the concepts they expressed became old fashioned or without referent. Vocabulary is the most flexible component of a language and open to lexical acquisitions and semantic changes. Words and money are similar: they do not care about frontiers, states, policy, time, they go everywhere and come back to their country. Words appear, disappear, and change their form or/and meanings. They join other words in expression, proverbs, and sayings, turn into place names or anthroponyms.

2.4 The lexicographic definition: contents, traits, problems

The definition is another complex problem in Romanian monolingual dictionaries. DTLR lexicographers design every lexical entry after studying the meanings, grammatical particularities, phonic aspects of the word in each quotation. They decide the standard form of the headword, mark off the stressed syllable, define the denotative and figurative meanings, explain the idiomatic expressions and provide more illustrative contexts after every definition. Speakers use some specialized terms with one or more figurative meanings or even turn them into slang.

Lexicographers must compose short, clear, concise, correct and modern definitions. Some users complained about certain definitions being too lengthy and sophisticated in DEX and DTLR. Their objection is only partially justified, considering that it is often based on a comparison of DEX and DTLR with English language dictionaries for foreigners. Indeed, Romanians often use English or American online dictionaries because of their much friendlier definitions as compared to the Romanian ones. As already pointed out, Romanian lexicography owes very much to the French influence from the point of view of methodology, definitional structure, and metalanguage, which makes it completely different from Anglophone lexicography. Moreover, while DEX and DTLR are monolingual explanatory dictionaries for Romanian natives, the English dictionaries that some users point at are for learners who want to improve their English language and, subsequently, they use a very accessible vocabulary. Besides, Romanian and English have their own particularities. A notion explained in English in a word might require a lengthy explanation in Romanian. Romanian lexicographers try to update and reorganize some definitions in order to modernize their dictionaries. For this purpose, they frequently use the model of foreign dictionaries, particularly English and French.

Lexicographers have to solve some problems during a dictionary processing, like circularity, obscurity and eliminating errors. Circularity appears in all dictionaries while defining basic concepts, like *table*, *house*

etc. It can be avoided by the use of synonyms, for example. Obscurity is more difficult to solve, and it is generally caused by lexicographic meta-language, space saving devices (parentheses), and the restrictive lexicographic vocabulary. Lexicographic meta-language, called 'lexicographese', or 'dictionarese', is a code used by dictionary authors. Foreigners, even those familiar with it, and native speakers who less experienced in using the dictionary cannot easily cope with such a complicated code. The most accessible dictionaries contain friendlier definitions instead of classical ones, and offered more popular explanations. The lexicographic vocabulary leads sometimes to childish or even clumsy definitions more suitable to uncultured or less educated people.

In the dictionaries under analysis, definitions are either analytical (one or more sentences joined by comas, colons) or synthetic (one or more synonyms). Each entry is organized like a tree of main senses and sub-senses. Some linguistic and metalinguistic information added between brackets makes definitions clearer. These data may refer to style (old, rare, slang); geographical area (Moldavia, Dobroudja etc.); political, social, cultural, religious beliefs aspects; terminology domain (Music, Mathematics, Geography etc.), combined information (old; rare); (Mold., old), (Technology, rare) etc.; grammatical information, language level information (children's language; familiar; colloquial; slang). Some brackets give details about rites, people's customs and traditions, sayings and proverbs. This helps us acquire a deeper and a more realistic perception of our society's evolution, mentalities, but also the strengths and weakness of our behaviour. Idiomatic expressions talk about people's mentalities, their worldview, and attitudes in some situations.

Regarding the errors that may occur in definitions, recent loan words are particularly vulnerable in this respect because they are used by different kinds of people. This is compounded by the problem of invented words, and inaccurate lemmatization. In order to check the information and eliminate the errors, lexicographers have to select references carefully, study the original texts, and work with the other languages dictionaries (English, French, German, etc.).

The Internet offers very many dictionaries, some of them simple lists of words, English loans approximately translated into Romanian. Such things cannot be called dictionaries, but they are a good example of what a dictionary must not be.

Definitions in terminological dictionaries, encyclopedias or lexicons made by specialists are necessary and useful for lexicographers. Such works presuppose a strong collaboration between scientists and lexicographers. Scientists who create terminology dictionaries can explain

special terms more accurately than lexicographers without any background in technology or science.

3 Romanian dictionaries: problems and solutions

The most difficult aspect of the lexicographic work is the attestation of old and modern words. Since the 1990s, the technological revolution has brought about an ‘invasion’ of specialized terms in Romanian. Terminology is a specific field of research, and it tries to standardize the meanings of words from different languages using English word pattern. Romanian linguists and translators decided to use English loans instead of adapting them to our language system.

Romanian dictionaries provide a substantial amount of grammatical information, style, Geographic area, use information in parentheses. Some redundant details in dictionary entries should have been cut off, or even avoided because they complicate definitions instead of simplifying them. Parentheses like: ‘the subject is’ ...; ‘the object refers to’; ‘about (people, animals, plants etc.)’ could be omitted if the subject or the object are part of the definition.

Some Modern Persian, Arabic, Chinese, etc. words recently borrowed into Romanian are loosely defined in our dictionaries because, on the one hand, they are very recent neologisms in our language and, on the other hand, some of them are used with their meanings from English or French political articles on terrorism and Islamism. Romanian lexicography has paid close attention to Latin, Old and Modern Greek, French, English, German and Russian, and has focused less on Oriental cultures and languages. Turkish language interested our linguists who studied it very seriously and have written articles, monographic volumes, dictionary and multi-field works (history, linguistics, and archeology). The prominence of Oriental studies in our country does not compare to that of English, French, German, American, Russian because of the restricted numbers of speakers of such languages. This view is limited to political news trend. As a consequence, some modern Arabic, Persian terms which came into our language indirectly via English or French are used only with the figurative meanings they were assigned in Western political journals. Our modern dictionaries are trying to provide real linguistic information; that is why Romanian lexicographers revise and improve the quality of such lexemes.

Etymologists supervised the words origin section of each entry of the Romanian academic dictionaries. They used the label ‘multiple etymology’ to flag a Latin word transferred into Romanian indirectly, via

different languages. ‘Multiple etymology’ is a concept peculiar to Romanian linguistics; it seems more or less inadequate but apparently is the best solution in the case of neologisms that entered our language between the 18th and the 20th century. In fact, ‘multiple etymology’ consists in identifying the potential sources of the same neologism. At the end of 18th and the beginning of 20th centuries many scientific and literary works written in French, German, Greek, or Italian were translated into Romanian by native and non-native speakers of the target language. Translators used either original texts written in French, German, etc., or translations thereof into a language they knew. Romance languages transferred into Romanian modern scientific terminology of Greek and Latin origin, and those translators adapted it as best as they could. That is why neologisms from the mentioned period had more variants, as with the previously quoted instance, *acid* and *ațid*. Morphological adaptation of the neologisms to the Romanian phonological system and grammatical classes was difficult. This fact justifies more plural forms of the same word (ex. *acide*, *aciduri*, *acizi*, *ațide*, *ațiduri*; *vapori*, *vaporuri*, *vapoare*) which were used in parallel.

The right etymological principle starts from the premise that a word has only one etymology. In theory, Romanian linguists agree with this principle but, in practice, they are not always consistent.

In fact, loans come from different languages. That is why they may have more forms, specific to every source language they originate from. Modern Romanian dictionaries reconstructed some word forms taking into consideration French etyma. The influence of the English or French intermediaries explains the graphic and pronunciation variations of the same Oriental lexical unit.

3.1 Providing non-linguistic information

A lexicographer must have a serious background in all the fields of linguistics in order to be able to solve all the language-related problems encountered. A lexicographer should have an excellent command of two or more international languages, know Greek and Cyrillic alphabets, in order to read old documents. Comprehensive dictionaries need quotations, which have to be studied. Next, each sense of the items in the wordlist is explained; the old meanings of words are sometimes difficult to explain. Each entry contains the etymon of the lemma. This can also be a challenge for modern linguists interested in etymology. Words cannot be explained in a convenient way if we do not take into consideration non-linguistic data. Social phenomena, peoples’ beliefs and faith, their system of

knowledge, ritualistic events, mythology, historical personalities, and customs can be understood and described only after a serious study of specific books and papers. The maps, diagrams, tables, pictures in dictionaries help their readers to understand the lemmata.

A lexicographic definition is kept distinct from an encyclopedic definition, and that can be achieved fairly easily, without going to extremes. It seems reasonable to include only as much extra-linguistic information in the definition as is likely to be known to the average native speaker and refrain from citing facts known only to experts, even if the lexicographer happens to be in possession of such facts and therefore feels tempted to impart the knowledge to his/her readers.

3.2 Dealing with offensive information

A dictionary may also provide interesting and useful non-linguistic information. It is usually written in brackets placed at the beginning of a definition or inside it. General explanatory dictionaries of the Romanian language contain less non-linguistic information than encyclopedias or comprehensive dictionaries. Encyclopedias present cultural, social, political, religious, anthropological, historical, etc. details, which help users understand certain linguistic facts. Lexicographers just describe facts, concepts, and phenomena without interpreting them from their point of view. In observing this principle, lexicographers come up against three problems. The first relates to the way in which a lexicographer can define a word coming from a culture different from the Western one. When referring to an Asian or African custom (ritual, cultural event, concepts, mentalities, etc.), a lexicographer should present it as clearly as possible for European/American people who do not know anything about this, but he/she must avoid words or phrases that judge the facts. When describing an Islamic concept, words like ‘terrorist’, ‘extremist’, are avoided. Dictionary explanations do not have to reflect political ideologies or trends, but to describe word senses. Political correctness is more and more invoked while talking about some categories of people belonging to certain groups (LGBT, different race, ethnicity etc.), while overusing the term ‘discrimination’ makes this concept too intrusive, and tends to influence lexicographers’ work in a political direction. Lexicographers should not discriminate against anybody, they should just describe and explain pre-existent facts.

During communism, lexicographers and dictionary supervisors were often interpreting words like ‘God’, ‘faith’, ‘religion’, ‘capitalism’, ‘richness’, property, ‘spirituality’, ‘workers’, ‘farmers’, ‘industry’, ‘trade’,

and different cultural, spiritual, political, and economic notions according to the Marxist ideology. At the moment, the political correctness concerns made lexicographers redefine some concepts in order to eliminate the possible discrimination interpretations while referring to minorities, populations, or social categories. Dictionary-makers strive to find the best ways to avoid all possible discriminatory allusions by using *pro-forma* definitions, e.g. ‘it is considered’, ‘people appreciate’, ‘it is said’, etc. These meta-lexicographic phrases show the lack of personal involvement of the lexicographers in the definition.

Some lexicographers recommend dispensing extra-linguistic information judiciously. In addition, ‘pro-forma entries’ seems a good idea. According to Adamska-Sałaciak (2012, 278), “if all the definitions of ethnic groups are prepared according to the same template, users will have no cause to complain that their nationality, race, or ethnicity has been treated unfairly. Adhering to templates entails using the same ontological markers [...] – e.g. ‘in X religion...’, ‘it is believed /considered to be’ (instead of ‘is’) – for items of similar status.”

4 Conclusion. Looking into the future

The purpose of our paper was to provide a general view of some of the most important lexicographic aspects, stemming from our experience as a professional lexicographer, such as defining (circularity, obscurity, eliminating errors), providing non-linguistic information, dealing with offensive information.

The DTLR project ended in 2007. The current leaders of the Romanian Academy are well aware of the importance of such a comprehensive dictionary for our language and culture, and have decided to start a modern Academic Dictionary of the Romanian Language project. Lexicographers in Bucharest, Iași and Cluj-Napoca have been working very hard to create a dictionary in printed and in digital form, accessible on the internet. Their work has been inspired by the *Trésor de la langue française* authored by ATILF Institute in Nancy. This reference work is available in both classical book format and digitally, freely accessible on the institute’s website. The Institute of Linguistics within the Romanian Academy intends to do a similar job.

It is not very modern and that is why it is very often criticized by some users and language specialists. A digital updated version is absolutely necessary, and our *Comprehensive Dictionary of the Romanian Language* — a lexicographic project in progress, conducted jointly by teams of the Institute of Linguistics in Bucharest, Iași and Cluj-Napoca —

will be meeting this need, which means a digitized dictionary, accessible on the internet. In parallel, linguists in Bucharest are creating an electronic up-to-date edition of the *Explanatory Dictionary of the Romanian Language*.

References

- Adamska-Sałaciak, Arleta. 2012. "Dictionary definitions: problems and solutions". In *Studia Linguistica Universitatis Iagellonicae Cracoviensis*, 129 supplementum (2012). 323-339.
- DEX 1996. *Explanatory Dictionary of the Romanian Language*. Bucharest: Univers Enciclopedic Publishing House.
- DTLR 2009. *Romanian Language Dictionary*. Reprinted editions of DA and DLR. Bucharest: the Romanian Academy Publishing House.
- Laurian, I., and C. Massim, (1871, 1876) *Dicționarul limbei romane*. Tom. I–III. Bucharest: Noua Tipografie a Laboratorilor Români. I: (A–H), 1871; II: (collaborators Iosef Hodoș and G. Barițiu): I–Z), 1876.; III: *Glossariu, care coprinde vorbele din limba română străine prin originea sau forma lor, cum și cele de origine îndoioasă*, 1871.

METHODS AND PRACTICE IN ROMANIAN ETYMOLOGICAL RESEARCH (WITH PARTICULAR FOCUS ON MULTIPLE ETYMOLOGY)

VICTOR CELAC

Abstract: The main aim of this article is to precisely evaluate the concept of “multiple etymology” and its influence on present-day Romanian lexicography. After briefly presenting the two paradigms of etymology – *étymologie-origine* vs *étymologie-histoire* –, the article sets forth the main directions of the Romanian etymological research throughout the 20th century, and the evolution of the relation between the etymological research at (micro)-monographic level and their counterpart at lexicographical level. From here, we will put forward our opinions on the fundamental requirements of the modern etymological science.

Keywords: Etymology, *étymologie-origine*, *étymologie-histoire*, multiple etymology, lexical borrowings.

1 Introduction

Our contribution¹ starts with a brief presentation of the two paradigms in etymology – *étymologie-origine* vs. *étymologie-histoire*. Thereafter, we will try to cover the dominant lines of the Romanian etymological research throughout the 20th century, and the evolution of the relationship between the etymological research at (micro)-monographic level and their counterpart at the lexicographical level. We then discuss what we believe to be the fundamental requirements of the modern etymological science. The main goal is to obtain an accurate evaluation of the Romanian theory of multiple etymology, and the respective practice that characterizes the current Romanian lexicography. In our view, the underlying idea of this theory is quite plausible, but its argumentation must undergo some improvements, as it currently

combines, in a rather uninspired way, the synchronic (and normative) perspective with the diachronic one. Regarding the etymographical practice of the multiple etymologies, it seems to be an attempt to frame an intuition that belongs to the modern *étymologie-histoire* paradigm within the Procrustean limits of the concise formulas of the *étymologie-origine* type.

2 Some Theoretical and methodological aspects of the Romance etymology

2.1 *Étymologie-origine* vs *étymologie-histoire*

Modern etymological research is based on some methodological principles which are unanimously accepted by the scientific community. Firstly, there is the criterion of phonetic concordance and that of semantic concordance between *explicanda* (words whose origins are searched for) and *explicantia* (the suggested etyma). However, taking into account these two criteria exclusively is consistent with etymology in its minimal version, which dates back to the beginnings of modern etymological research, that is, the 19th century. In other words, what we mean by “etymology in its minimal version” represents the outdated paradigm of *étymologie-origine*. It can be illustrated by concise formulas such as:

Rom. *apă* f.n. [‘water’] < Lat. AQUA

Rom. *abanos* m.n. [‘ebony’] < Turk. ABANOZ

Nevertheless, it is clear that the requirements of the etymological science go further nowadays. These requirements derive from the new paradigm of *étymologie-histoire*, which is aimed at writing the history of the presence of the vocables within the lexis, and at describing the changes that have affected them over time. In this conception, each word evolves over the centuries in particular and unique circumstances, in a complicated relational system with other lexemes belonging to the same word family or to other word families. Obviously, this conception was determined by the progress of dialect geography and, more generally, by the enormous accumulation of new linguistic and philological data. In the European linguistics, this paradigm was introduced by the works of H. Schuchardt, J. Gilliéron, W. von Wartburg, and theorized by Baldinger: