

Aspects regarding the treatment of neologisms in DELR. Completing previous etymological explanations

Ion Giurgea^{1,AR*}, Cristian Moroianu^{1,2,AR}, Monica Vasileanu^{1,2}

¹*“Iorgu Iordan – Al. Rosetti” Institute of Linguistics, 13 Calea 13 Septembrie, 050711 Bucharest, Romania*

²*Faculty of Letters, University of Bucharest, 5–7 Edgar Quinet St., 010017 Bucharest, Romania*

Article info

History:

Received March 2, 2020

Accepted March 15, 2020

Published June 10, 2020

Key words:

etymology

neologism

borrowing

word formation

Abstract

This paper's authors, who are also authors and coordinators of DELR, discuss the etymological treatment of neologisms in Romanian academic dictionaries, with a special emphasis on words starting with the letters *A–D*. The paper comprises some original etymologies, completing and correcting the solutions previously proposed by DEX and DLR. This endeavour calls for a fresh overview of the main criteria used by lexicographers in scientific etymological research, and for a re-evaluation of several concepts such as multiple etymology or mixed etymology. The paper discusses the origins of 132 words and is organized according to the main criterion that underlay the authors' option for a certain etymological solution.

1. Introduction

The present paper presents a series of original solutions that correct and complete the etymological treatment of neologisms in Romanian academic dictionaries. Our solutions are based on the first three volumes of DELR (i.e. *The Etymological Dictionary of Romanian*), published in 2011, 2015 and 2018, and on the work-in-progress for the fourth volume and for the revised version of the first volume¹.

In Romanian linguistics, the term “neologism” embraces both recent words and cultural terms that entered the language in the modern period (starting with the second half of the 18th century).

Etymology is one of the most important aspects of the history of any language, for several reasons: (1) it sheds light on the past and present geographical and cultural contacts that the speakers of a language have had with other languages; (2) it lays the foundation for relevant statistics regarding the number and status of the words that constitute the lexicon of a language; (3) it reveals the tendencies in the evolution of the lexicon, in connection to the integration of a linguistic community in a broader cultural network.

It is well known that Romanian comprises words of quite various origins. On the one hand, Romanian has been substantially influenced throughout its history by languages such as Old Slavic, Bulgarian, Serbian, Turkish, Hungarian, German, and Ukrainian, via direct contact with speakers of these languages. On the other hand, Romanian has suffered many linguistic influences from languages of culture, via written texts (rather than oral communication): Church Slavonic, Latin, (Modern and Ancient) Greek, French, German (again), Italian, Russian, and English. Some of the afore-mentioned languages have partially or totally lost their status of donor languages. For instance, Modern Greek and Russian acted as donor languages only in certain periods and in certain socio-political contexts. Other languages, such as scholarly Latin, Italian and (more recently) Spanish, still contribute to the Romanian lexis in various ways. Latin has remained an important source language for scientific loanwords, whereas Italian and Spanish

*Email addresses: giurgeaion@yahoo.com (IG), cristian_moroianu@hotmail.com (CM), monica.vasileanu@gmail.com (MV).

¹The first volume of is currently being reviewed and augmented in order to comply with the editing norms established in the latest volume (2nd part of the 2nd volume, published in 2018, see the *Bibliography*).

constitute the source for several words that name specific realities of the two cultures. Finally, English has now deepened its influence on the Romanian vocabulary in a specific socio-economic context similar to the one in which the French influence was exerted in the 19th century, but different from the latter due to its global character.

Academic lexicography is especially concerned with finding the most plausible etymologies, i.e. the closest to the word-coining reality, and this can only be achieved by respecting specific scientific criteria (Sala, 1999, p. 23–32). In a nutshell, a certain foreign word (or several) may be considered as the etymon² of a Romanian word if:

- a) there is a clear formal (phonetic and morphological) and semantic correspondence between the two words (*the formal criterion* and *the semantic criterion*); the correspondence has to be evaluated also by taking into account the evolution of the Romanian word;
- b) the alleged foreign etymon is attested in the donor language before its first attestation in Romanian (*the chronological criterion*)³;
- c) the alleged foreign etymon was currently in use in the donor language at the time when it was borrowed into Romanian (*the etymon frequency criterion*)⁴;
- d) in the case of oral loanwords, the direct etymon belongs to a language neighbouring the Romanian area where it was first attested (*the geographic criterion*);
- e) the Romanian word belongs or used to belong to a language layer reflecting a certain cultural orientation. This orientation is confirmed by the cultural biographies of the authors that first used those specific words (*the historical and cultural criterion*).

In the case of words formed by word formation (derivation by affixes, compounding, lexical conversion), at least the following criteria have to be respected:

- a) *the formal criterion*, i.e. the etymologist should be able to clearly identify the morphemes;
- b) *the derivational criterion*, i.e. there should be an established compatibility between the affixes and the grammatical category of the stem⁵;
- c) *the criterion of the origin of the morphemes*, according to which words formed with affixes whose origin is different from that of the stem can only rely on derivation inside the language at issue (here, Romanian);
- d) *the semantic criterion*, i.e. the compositionality of meaning.

Finally, in the case of old or new cultural borrowings, the etymologists must consider the possibility of word formation inside Romanian on the model of one or more external sources, i.e. lexical or lexico-grammatical calque (loan translation). The criteria used for considering a certain word as an instance of calque are the chronological criterion and the historical and cultural one.

An important issue in Romanian etymology is the so-called multiple etymology, which can be external or mixed. The multiple etymology, as an objective fact (rather than a subjective indecision between several possible etymologies), refers to the situation of a word borrowed from two or more languages, either at the same time or at different moments, by different people or even by a single individual who

²We will further use 'etymon' for one or more foreign lexical units.

³Thus, for words that seem old, but are attested late, we must take into account the possibility of an external influence. In this case, the chronological criterion is complemented by the semantic and cultural ones. For instance, the verb *a decădea* 'to decay' is not simply derived in Romanian, but is a loanword from It. *decadere* and Fr. *déchoir*, both adapted on the model of the Ro. verb *cădea* 'to fall'. Ro. *a descrește* 'to decrease' was not formed from *des-* + *crește* independently, but it took on an external model: Fr. *décroître*.

⁴However, if a specific word belongs to a specialized language, its frequency in the donor language is no longer relevant. It might have just a handful of attestations both in the donor and in the target language. In this situation, the chronological criterion and the historical and cultural one are more relevant.

⁵For instance, as a general rule, in Romanian, the negative prefix *ne-* is never attached to a short infinitive or finite verb forms, the suffix *-bil* is attached only to verbs, the suffix *-os* is attached only to noun stems, etc. Some exceptions to these rules may be explained by analogy, see, for instance, the process of derivation by substitution described in Moroianu (2008, p. 194–206; 2009, p. 281–294).

is familiar with the form of the word in more than one language (e.g., with a French word and its Latin etymon). This situation usually occurs with international words and is favoured by the coexistence of multiple cultural influences over a certain period or a certain area, or by the multilingual profile of a certain author⁶. Multiple mixed etymology refers to situations when a certain word may be borrowed, coined in Romanian, or both (for different people/contexts). Thus, if there are no counterarguments pertaining to the chronological, semantic or etymon frequency criteria, the verbs derived with the prefix *re-* may equally be considered Romanian derivatives and analysable loanwords, usually from French, e.g. *a reabona* ‘to renew a pass’, attested at the end of the 19th century, *a reangaja* ‘to rehire’, attested at the beginning of the past century, *a recombina* ‘to recombine’. Likewise, recent adjectives and nouns containing the prefix *anti-* also allow for a double etymological interpretation, either as Romanian derivatives or as analysable loanwords, e.g. *antiacademic* ‘anti-academic’, attested in the 1960’s. A number of neological verbs could have been derived from adjectives or nouns in Romanian, but the derivation may have just as well occurred in a different language (culturally or genetically related to Romanian) and the verbs could have been borrowed as such, e.g. *a anagrama* ‘to anagrammatize’ may be derived from *anagramă* ‘anagram’ or borrowed from Fr. *anagrammer*; *a ancora* ‘to anchor’ may come from *ancoră* ‘anchor’ or from It. *ancorare*; similar cases are *a absenta* ‘to be absent’, *a absolutiza* ‘to absolutize’, *a accidenta* ‘to cause an accident’, *a clica* ‘to click’. Recent adjectives ending in *-bil* usually have a multiple mixed etymology: *acordabil* ‘that may be accorded’, *ameliorabil* ‘that may improve’, *clasabil* ‘that may be classified’, *conectabil* ‘that may be connected’, etc. The same holds from recent adjectives derived from toponyms (e.g. *anatolian* ‘Anatolian’: from *Anatolia* or from Fr. *anatolien*). In such cases, even if there is evidence for an external source, the possibility of creation inside Romanian cannot be ruled out. We must also take into account analogy. For instance, the adverb *abruptamente* ‘abruptly’ may be a loanword from Fr. *abruptement*, modified to fit a series of adverbs of Italian origin ending in *-(a)mente*, or it may be derived from the Ro. adjective *abrupt*, following the pattern of *certamente*, *finalmente*, *totalmente*, etc. Ro. *amicabil*, a variant of the word *amiabil* ‘amiable’, may be considered as either a borrowing from Lat. *amicabilis*, or as an adaptation of Fr. *amiable*, modelled after Ro. *amic* ‘friend’. Likewise, *a complecta*, a form of the verb *a completa* ‘to complete’, is either a Romanian derivation from the adjective *complect* (= *complet* ‘complete’) or a borrowing of Rus. *komplektovat*. Other examples with multiple mixed etymologies include the noun *bioclimatolog* ‘bioclimatologist’, that may be interpreted as a loanword from Fr. *bioclimatologue* or a back formation from Ro. *bioclimatologie*, the verb *a climatiza* ‘to provide the best temperature and humidity level in a room’, a borrowing from Fr. *climatiser* or a back formation from the Ro. noun *climatizare*, attested three decades before the verbs and much more frequently, and the noun *clip* ‘video’, a clipping from Ro. *videoclip* or a loanword from Engl. *clip*⁷.

The new format of DELR was spelled out and applied starting with the second part of the second volume (issued at the Romanian Academy Publishing House in 2018). In this new format, the decisions regarding etymologies rely on a wider linguistic database. In addition to the sources used in the previous volumes of DELR, namely critically interpreted lexicological and lexicographical data from the reference dictionaries (PEW, CDDE, DA/DLR, CADE, SDLR, CDER, DÎLR etc.), fundamental works dedicated to the lexical influences undergone by Romanian, and academic journal articles, we now use a large electronic corpus of Romanian texts, covering all the domains and all the history of the Romanian language⁸.

⁶Multiple external etymology can also be found for etymological variants; thus, the variant *chiarificațiune* of the noun *clarificație* ‘clarification’ may be a borrowing from It. *chiarificazione* and also an adaptation of French *clarification* on the model of the inherited form *chiar*.

⁷See Hristea (1973a, p. 3–15). A word may have also been borrowed from two sources, thus having a multiple external etymology, and at the same time it may have been coined in Romanian, with the same meaning or with a different one. Such is the case of the noun *aristocratism* ‘aristocratic attitude’, attested in the mid-19th century (1859, Bălășescu, D. R.-Fr.), that may be traced back to Fr. *aristocratism*, Rus. *aristokratizm*, and it could as well have been derived from the Ro. adjective *aristocratic* (by substituting the suffix).

⁸This corpus was compiled by the Lexicography Department within the “Iorgu Iordan – Al. Rosetti” Institute of Linguistics.

Moreover, besides the Romanian corpus, we access various online corpora of dictionaries and primary sources in foreign languages. The benefits of this type of research are obvious. First of all, the corpus research allows for a fresh check-up of the previously identified first attestations of a word, establishing the exact form in which it appears and the meaning it had. Secondly, it permits the lexicographer a more accurate estimation of a word's first attestation, sometimes even decades or centuries before the ones indicated in other dictionaries. Moreover, the lexicographers can now verify with higher accuracy the semantic criterion, as well as the chronological criterion (to what extent an alleged etymon is attested before the Romanian word) and the etymon frequency criterion (the alleged etymon's diffusion in the source-language). The lexicographers can also trace back the history of a concept, including its creator (in the case of scientific words) and its use in various terminological fields. All these digital tools allow a deeper investigation into the history of words, and therefore a lexicographic decision that is more coherent and better argued, compared with the previous dictionaries.

In the following sections, we present several etymologies established by the team of **DEL**R, by which we complete or correct the previous solutions provided by the Romanian academic dictionaries. Some of these etymologies have already been published in **DEL**R, others are part of the unpublished work-in-progress. Neologisms are usually given an etymology in academic dictionaries⁹. Therefore, in our argumentation we must refer to these previous etymological indications, and argue in favour of our own solution based on the criteria described above. Thus, our presentation is organized according to the main criterion that underlies our reasons to reject the previous solutions. Sections 2–6 comprise examples based on the formal, semantic, chronological, etymon frequency and concept history criterion. In Section 7 we present a few etymological solutions for words registered with 'unknown etymology' in academic dictionaries. In some cases, we mentioned the first attestation of words and their sources. The full reference of these sources can be found in the bibliography published in **DEL**R, 2nd volume, 2nd part.

2. The formal criterion

The formal criterion (also called the phonetic criterion, **Sala**, 1999, p. 23–25) is the most obvious argument in favour of a certain etymon. It can also be a misleading clue, as will be shown below (see Section 3). The formal changes, be they phonetic or morphological ones, depend on the word's age (inherited word vs loanword) and on the type of contact (popular vs scholarly contact, spoken vs written contact). In the case of neologisms, formal differences between the etymon and the Romanian word are minor; normally, the differences regard the morphological adaptation and the rendering of phonemes foreign to Romanian. Nevertheless, there were some situations in which **DEL**R identified new etymons for neologisms based on the formal criterion.

2.1. Identifying direct etymons formally closer to the Romanian words

For recent cultural borrowings, academic reference dictionaries almost always indicate a direct etymon, as expected since these borrowings come from well attested languages and display minor phonetic changes. In a few cases, when the direct etymon was uncertain, the previous academic dictionaries cited a related form, in a foreign language, with "cf." or "după" 'after'. The wider documentary database used by **DEL**R enabled us to identify the direct etymons, which are formally closer to the Romanian words than the forms previously cited. For instance, for **acipenserid** 'sturgeon', **DEX** indicated a relation with Lat. *acipenser* (using the label "cf."), which is indeed the remote etymon of the Romanian word, via the Latin derivative *Acipenseridae* (< *acipenser* / *acupenser* / *aquipenser* 'sturgeon') and Engl. *acipenserid*. Likewise, **DEX** connects the verb **cașera** 'to apply another layer of material on a paper for aesthetic purposes' to Fr. *cacher* 'to hide'. Indeed, this is the remote etymon of the Romanian word, but the direct etymon is the Germ. verb *kaschieren*, which explains the Romanian form. Romanian also has a verb **cașura** with the same meaning, which is a modification of *cașera*, influenced by *hașura* 'to hatch, hachure' (by means of folk etymology).

⁹Cases where the etymology is indicated as 'unknown' are extremely rare for neologisms.

DEX records only the long infinitive *cașurare* and links it to the noun *cașa* ‘soft woollen fabric, usually dyed in light colours’, an etymology that should be rejected on both formal and semantic grounds.

The relation between the adjective **antum** ‘ante-mortem’ and the Latin preposition *ante* has been registered by **DEX**, but no direct etymon was provided. The etymon had already been identified by **DN**³, as the Fr. adjective *anthume* < [*post*]/*hume* (borrowed from Lat. *postumus*, **TLF**), an instance of antonymic substitution. A similar case is the adjective **caniculat** (botanical term) ‘canaliculate’. **DEX** indicates a relation with the Fr. *cannelé* ‘fluted’, a term of architecture. We were able to identify a direct etymon, closer to the Romanian word both formally and semantically, namely Fr. *canniculé*. This adjective has not been recorded in the main French dictionaries (**TLF**, **Larousse**), but is attested in *Nouveau dictionnaire d'histoire naturelle, appliquée aux arts*, vol. XXXIV, 1819, available online. Fr. *canniculé* was probably borrowed from the scientific Latin term *canniculatus* < *canniculus* ‘little channel’ < *canna* ‘reed; pipe’, cf. Engl. *canniculated*. The related word indicated by **DEX**, namely Fr. *cannelé*, can be traced back to Lat. *canna* ‘reed’, as well.

The noun **caradriiformă** ‘charadriiforme’, that is related, according to **DEX**, with the current French term *charadriidés* designating this order of birds, should be considered a loanword from Fr., Engl. *charadriiformes* (< gr. *χαρადριός* ‘plover’), both of them terms with little circulation, but accepted in the two languages’ taxonomic vocabulary. A similar example is the adjective **monoclorurat** ‘(about substances) that has received a chlorine atom’, considered by **DEX** as formed “after Fr. *monochloré*”, which suggests that the word was derived in Romanian. However, **DEL**R identified a direct etymon, Fr. *monochloruré*, a word that went unrecorded in **TLF** or **Larousse**, but is attested in 19th century books (e.g. *Encyclographie des sciences médicales*, Établissement Encyclographique, 1840, available online).

In the case of the noun **cașa** ‘a soft woollen fabric’, the etymon proposed by **DEX** has no etymological connection to the etymon identified by **DEL**R. **DEX** suggests that there is a link (“cf.”) with Germ. *kaschieren* ‘to hide’, a verb used in the terminology of the textile industry with the meaning ‘to stick together two layers of fabric with a special glue’. But Ro. *cașa* is the direct offspring of Fr. *kasha*, a trademark formed from the words *cachemire*, *Kashmir* ‘cashmere’ (this etymology relies not only on formal, but also on historic and semantic arguments).

Sometimes, the etymon has several variants in the source language. For instance, Ro. **ciclamă** ‘cyclamen’ is deemed by **DEX** as coming from It. *ciclamino*, cf. Fr. *cyclamen*. In Italian, the flower is also called *ciclamo* or *ciclame*. The latter is an older form that was in use at the beginning of the 20th century, when our word was borrowed, so it should be considered the direct etymon of our word. **DEL**R also takes into account Fr. *cyclame*, an obsolete and more rare form of Fr. *cyclamen*, which yielded the Ro. form *siclamă*. Moreover, Germ. *Zyklame* is the direct etymon of the Ro. form *șiclamă*.

The choice for a certain etymon based on the formal criterion should rely also on the pronunciation rules. Thus, Ro. **curry**, pronounced [ˈkʌri, ˈkɛri], cannot be traced back to Fr. *curry*, as indicated in **DEX**, but was borrowed instead from Engl. *curry* (< Tamil *kari* ‘spicy sauce’), as **DCR**³ suggested.

2.2. POS identity

As a general rule, the etymon and the loanword should be the same part of speech (e.g., if a Romanian adjective has a French etymon, this etymon should be an adjective).

However, **DEX** indicates a noun, Fr. *phytocénoze*, as the etymon of the adj. **fitocenotic**. This indication should be rejected on both phonetic and grammatical grounds. **DEL**R states that the Romanian adjective was borrowed from the Fr. *phytocénitique* (alongside with **MDA**, s.v.), but does not reject the possibility of a Romanian derivation by means of suffix substitution from the noun *fitocenoză* (as previously indicated in **DN**³). We noticed a similar situation with the adjective **topoclimatologic**, which may be considered either a loanword from Fr. *topoclimatologique* (adj.), or a Romanian derivative of the noun *topoclimatologie* (both etymologies are accepted in **DEL**R). But under no circumstances could it be a direct borrowing from the Fr. noun *topoclimatologie*. In both situations, we suspect some mere editing errors in **DEX**.

2.3. Correcting the form of the etymon

Sometimes, the etymons indicated in our academic reference dictionaries have incorrect forms. In such situations, **DEL**R corrects these forms or identifies other etymons that better satisfy the formal criterion.

Most of the times, the mistakes are minor and they might be mere editorial spelling errors. For instance, for the noun **chernăr** ‘centre punch; sharp top of some tools’, **DEX** indicates as etymon the Germ. *Kerner*, but the correct form of this word is *Körner*. Likewise, the noun **colon** ‘currency in Costa Rica and El Salvador’ is considered by **DEX** as originated from the Sp. *colono*. The correct form is *colón*, as the currency was named in honor of Christopher Columbus, whose Spanish name is Cristóbal Colón. The etymon of the Romanian word **comanș** ‘Comanche’ is, according to **DEX**, Fr. *commanci*, which is obviously a misspelling of the word *Comanche*. The French word comes, probably via Engl. *Comanche*, from Sp. *comanche*, a loanword from a Numic language (a branch of the Uzo-Aztec family), where it meant ‘foreigner’. The medical term **pericimentită** ‘periodontitis’ was considered by **DLR** a loanword from Fr. *péricimentite*. However, the French term is spelled *péricémentite*. The Romanian form was reshaped by speakers under the influence of the noun *ciment*, a variant of *cement* ‘cement’. The source of the adjective **protocarburat** ‘which forms a protocarbide’ is indicated in **DEX** and **DLR** as Fr. *protocarburat*, but the correct spelling is *protocarburé*. An editorial error is to blame for the situation of Ro. **combo** ‘combo’, which is linked by **DEX** to Engl. *combinaty* (sic!). **DN**³ identified the correct etymon, namely Engl. *combo*, a word clipped from *combination*.

For the noun **chalonă** ‘chalone’, the situation is more complex. **DEX** recorded the word as *chalon* and recommended the pronunciation /ʃalon/. In the etymological paragraph, **DEX** stated that it is a French word. However, in French the correct form is *chalone*, and its pronunciation is /kaloŋ/. The Romanian word is in fact a feminine noun, *chalonă* or *halonă*, recorded as such in **D.med.** and in a few other texts that may be accessed online. In fact, the Romanian word comes from Fr. *chalone* and Engl. *chalone*. The latter was coined by the British physiologist Sir Sharpley Schäfer in 1913, based on Gr. *χαλαῖν* ‘to let loose, to let go, to let fall’, and the final part was modeled after *hormone*, see **TLF** and **Keppel Hesselink (2015)**.

In other cases, **DEL**R identified the correct etymons in other languages than those proposed by the reference dictionaries. For instance, for **aduct** ‘adduct’, the etymology provided by **DEX** is Fr. *adducte*¹⁰, but the French word is in fact *aduit*. That’s why **DEL**R indicated as a direct etymon Germ. *Addukt* (< *Add[ition]pro*dukt < *Addition* ‘addition’ + *Produkt* ‘product’ < Lat. *productum*, the perfect participle of the verb *producere* ‘to produce’) and Engl. *adduct*. Likewise, for the adjective **circumvolut** ‘with circumvolutions’, **DEX** suggests a French etymon, *circonvolut*. But the correct form of the French adjective is *circonvoluté*. Formally, Ro. *circumvolut* is a loanword from Lat. *circumuolutus* (the past participle of the verb *circumuoluere* ‘to turn around, to swirl’), but the semantic evolution can only be explained by taking into account Fr. *circonvoluté* and Ro. *circumvoluție* ‘circumvolution’. Another example is the noun **fotocopier**, a rare synonym of *fotocopiator* ‘photocopier’: **DEX** indicates a German etymon, *Photokopier*. But this word does not exist, as the German word is *Photokopierer*. Therefore **DEL**R, relying on the formal criterion, accepted as etymons Fr. *photocopieur* and Engl. *photocopier*.

2.4. Etymons explaining just one variant

Sometimes, the etymon indicated in other dictionaries may be taken into account only for some of the lexical variants. Such is the case of the word **calmuc** ‘Kalmuck; (Moldova) voracious’. **DEX** and **TDRG**² consider that its origin is Rus. *kalmyk*. This is correct for the Ro. form *calmîc*, whereas the direct etymons of the form *calmuc* are the Turkish *kalmuk* and Fr. *kalmouk* (the latter was suggested by **DA**).

¹⁰This form was introduced in **DN**³ and perpetuated with no further check-ups even in **MDA** s.v., as Fr. *aducte*. Most of the wrong etymologies in **DEX** appear as such in **MDA**.

2.5. Word formation vs borrowing¹¹

The formal criterion may help etymologists decide whether a certain word was coined in Romanian or borrowed. Suffixes, for instance, are attached only to certain types of stems, and an etymology disregarding the restriction is implausible. The suffix *-tor*, for instance, creates agent names from verb stems. Therefore, the noun **decimator** ‘the person who collects the tax called *decimă*’ cannot be derived from the noun *decimă*, as proposed by **DLR**. There is no verb *a decima* ‘to collect the tax called *decimă*’, therefore the noun *decimator* should be considered a loanword from Lat. *decimator* < *decimare* ‘to collect the tax called *decimă*’. The same lexical family contains the noun **decimație** ‘collection of the tax called *decimă*’, which again cannot be derived in Romanian from the noun *decimă* (as indicated in **DLR**), but was borrowed from Lat. *decimatio* (< *decimare*). Likewise, the suffix *-ibil* attaches to verb stems, therefore the word *conceptibil* ‘that may be conceived’ cannot be formed from the noun *concept* ‘concept’, as proposed in **DEX**, but must be considered a loanword from Fr. *conceptible*.

The formal criterion may also argue in favour of derivation inside Romanian. For instance, for the adjective **confundabil** ‘which may be confounded’, the etymology proposed by **DEX**, namely It. *confundibile* (sic!), must be dismissed because the Romanian form does not show *-ibil*, but rather *-abil*. This indicates that the adjective was derived from the verb *a confunda* ‘to confound’, as suggested by **Seche** (1960, p. 57), an idea accepted by **NDU** and **DELR**.

In other cases, the formal criterion will not allow for a categoric decision in this internal vs external etymology dilemma. For instance, the adjective **clientelar** ‘(about relations) based on favours; (about states) that was a client of Rome’, cannot be derived directly from Ro. *client*, as **DEX** indicated, since there is no suffix *-elar* in Romanian. However, it could have been derived from *clientelă* ‘clientele’, as indicated in **SDLR** and accepted in **DELR**, or borrowed from Fr. *clientelaire*.

Last, but not least, an atypical word formation, be it by affixation or compounding, indicates a loan translation. In the case of less transparent compounds, the loan translation allows etymologists to identify the exact morphemes. Thus, the noun **întrajutorare** is considered in **DEX** a compound of *întru* ‘in, within’ + *ajutorare* ‘help’, although it is attested in the mid-20th century (when *întru-* was no longer productive) and its meaning is ‘mutual help’. Therefore, in **DELR** we considered that *întrajutorare* is a loan translation of the Fr. *entraide*, and is made up of *între* ‘between, among’ + *ajutorare* ‘help’, the morphemes corresponding to the constituents of the French word.

3. The semantic criterion

3.1. The semantics of the etymon

Sometimes, the etymon proposed by other academic dictionaries, although acceptable from a formal point of view, does not correspond in meaning with the Romanian word. For instance, for the noun **comper** ‘presenter (of a show), master of ceremonies’, **DEX** indicates Engl. *compeer*, but this word has a different meaning (‘person equal in rank, peer, colleague, comrade’). The Romanian word actually comes from Fr. *compère* ‘godfather’ (< Lat. *compater*), which also developed the meaning ‘presenter of a show, master of ceremonies’.

The noun **corm** ‘the entire body of the plants differentiated into roots, shoots and leaves’ is registered in **DEX** as coming from Fr. *corme*, but this word means ‘corm (a short, vertical, swollen underground stem of a plant that serves as a storage organ to enable the plant to survive winter or other adverse conditions such as drought)’. For the concept corresponding to Rom. *corm*, French uses the form *cormus*, a scholarly Latin borrowing going back to Gr. *κορμός* ‘trunk’. The only suitable direct etymon for the Romanian term

¹¹See **Hristea** (1973b, p. 143–155). The author grouped the examples discussed in three main categories: a) Romanian formations that are considered borrowings; b) borrowings that are considered Romanian word formations; c) words with a double origin (both borrowing and Romanian formation).

we could find is It. *cormo*, which satisfies the meaning criterion (the remote etymon of all these words is the same).

Dacită, the name of a type of explosive, cannot come from Fr. *dacite* (as claimed by **DEX** and **DLR**), which denotes a type of rock and was actually borrowed in Romanian, as a geological term, in the form *dacit*. We have not been able to identify an external etymon for *dacită*. Therefore, we believe that it is a trademark created in Romanian, using the *-ită* suffix, characteristic of names of explosives. Trying to find how this substance (identified by its chemical formula) is called in other languages, we found a different term, Germ. *Fördit*, a trademark with the same *-it* suffix.

For the verb **delabora**, a military term which means ‘to disassemble, dismount installations, machines, or ammunition that has become unusable or dangerous’, **DN²** and **DEX** propose borrowing from Lat. *delaborare*, but this derivative of *laborare* has the meaning ‘to work hard’ (the *de-* prefix does not have a privative meaning here). In any case, borrowing of a modern military term from Latin is totally unlikely. **DLR**, more cautious, writes “cf. *elabora*”. In fact, the word, with the same meaning as in Romanian, can be found in German: *delaborieren*, with the abstract noun *Delaborierung*. This word is derived with the Latin privative *de-* prefix from Germ. *laborieren* ‘to assemble an explosive device’. This meaning of the verb *laborieren* has emerged in German based on the meaning ‘to work hard, labour’ with which this word was borrowed from Latin (*laborare* < *labor*, *-ōris* ‘work’).

The **DEX** entry **culee** brings together two homonyms, providing an etymon that is correct for only one of them. Thus, **culee** ‘abutment; pillar supporting a vault’ comes, indeed, from Fr. *culée* (< *cul* < Lat. *cūlus* ‘butt’), but the meaning ‘geat, ledge or hole through which molten metal runs into a mould’ cannot be explained from Fr. *culée*. We are dealing with a different word, unrelated with the first one: it is a borrowing from Fr. *coulée* (< *couler* ‘to flow’ < Lat. *cōlāre* ‘to filter’ < *cōlum* ‘strainer, vase used for filtering’).

The adjective **costier** was given the correct etymology in **DN²**: Fr. *côtier*, adapted after Ro. *coastă* ‘coast’. **DEX** proposes Fr. *costière*, but this is a noun that denotes various objects or parts of objects (e.g. ‘stone frame of an oven or chimney, hollow on the floor of the stage, used for manipulating the scenery’).

For the adjective **clavicular** ‘clavicular’, **DA** correctly indicates Fr. *claviculaire* as the direct etymon, but **DEX** adds Lat. *clavicularius*, disregarding its totally different meaning – ‘key-keeper, jailer’¹². The Latin anatomic term derived from *clavicula* is *clavicularis*, but given the time when this word appeared in Romanian (the middle of the 19th century) the French etymon is sufficient.

In some cases, we found a semantically closer etymon in a different language, with the same origin as the etymon proposed by previous academic dictionaries. For instance, **damă** ‘rowlock, oarlock; (obsolete) cast iron piece that closes the crucible door in foundries’ comes from Fr. *dame*, which has these very same meanings, rather than from Germ. *Damm* ‘dam’, as proposed in **DLR** (Germ. *Damm* also fails to comply with the formal criterion: we would have expected the form **dam*). The Fr. *dame* does indeed come from the same Germanic etymon as Germ. *Damm* (according to **TLF**, French initially borrowed the Dutch *dam* with the meaning ‘dam’, and the metallurgical meaning is either a specialization inside French, or an independent borrowing from Germ. *Damm*). The ‘oarlock’ meaning is either a development of the meaning ‘dam’ (this device prevents the oar from falling into the water) or is a specialization of the homonym *dame* ‘lady, women’ (< Lat. *domina*), based on an erotic metaphor (cf. **TLF**). Another example is the adjective **defect** ‘(about a device) out of action, broken, defective, faulty’, whose direct etymon given by **DEX**, Lat. *defectus*, is in fact the remote etymon; semantically, the Romanian word perfectly corresponds to Germ. *defekt*, whereas Lat. *defectus*, the past participle of *deficere*, meant ‘lacking, deficient, exhausted’. Given the semantic field of the Romanian adjective, mainly technical, Germ. *defekt* is preferable as a direct etymon.

For borrowings with an ultimate Latin source, Romanian usually displays the same semantic specialization as other modern languages. Dictionaries often give a multiple etymology in which Latin appears

¹²This word comes from the original meaning of *clavicula*, ‘little key’ (< *clavis* ‘key’).

alongside one or more modern languages. This can be justified by the fact that those who introduced the word, knowing its Latin source, adapted its form on the model of Latin (e.g. Ro. *afinitate* ‘affinity’ has the exact meaning of Fr. *affinité*, but formally corresponds to its Latin etymon *affinitas*, which had more meanings – also ‘kinship; vicinity’; therefore, the origin of Ro. *afinitate* can be considered multiple: Fr. *affinité* and Latin *affinitas*, –*atis*). However, as time went on, certain rules of adapting French words developed, so that it is no longer necessary to assume a Latin etymon, alongside the French one, for the Romanian word. Thus, for the words **accelera** ‘to accelerate’, **atenta** ‘to make an attempt on (somebody’s life, honor etc.)’, **atracție** ‘attraction’, **capabil** ‘capable’, DELR only kept the French word as a direct etymon, as had proposed DA and CADE, rejecting the addition of a second Latin etymon, given that the Latin words had a wider or more concrete meaning (*accelerare* ‘to speed up’, *attentare* ‘to try’, *tractio* ‘drawing towards oneself, drawing together, contraction’, *capabilis* ‘that can contain, receive, comprehensible’). For some words the semantic distance between the Romanian and the Latin term is considerable, due to an evolution that took place inside French: thus, for **agapă** ‘feast, banquet’ and **capitula** ‘to capitulate, surrender’ the meanings found in Romanian have appeared in French; Lat. *agape*, a Christian term borrowed from Gr. *ἀγάπη* ‘(brotherly) love, affection’, meant ‘Christian love; charity; charity meal; common meal of the early Christians, at which the sacrament was performed’; Lat. *capitulare* meant ‘to enumerate, make a report point by point, stipulate in a convention, agree’ (< *capitulum* ‘article, paragraph’). Therefore, adding Lat. *agape* and *capitulare* to the French etyma is not justified.

3.2. The semantic criterion as an argument against derivation in Romanian

In some cases, the semantic criterion made us reject a Romanian-internal origin and adopt a foreign etymon instead. The clearest case is the one in which the meaning associated to the purported Romanian derivational affix cannot explain the meaning of the word at hand. Thus, DLR treats the transitive verb **demagogiza** as derived from *demagog* ‘demagogue’ with the *-iza* suffix. But if this were the case, we would expect the meaning ‘to turn somebody into a demagogue’, a meaning not found in the attested example. The verb, rare and obsolete, means something totally different, namely ‘to try to influence people by a demagogic behaviour, to manipulate’ (in the Eminescu example cited by DLR, *demagogizarea locuitorilor săteni* ‘the demagogization of the rural inhabitants’ does not refer to transforming the peasants into demagogues, as would follow from the meaning indicated by DLR for the abstract *demagogizare*, but, obviously, to their manipulation by demagogic means). This meaning is found for the Ancient Greek verb *δημαγωγεῖν*, where it arose naturally from the basic meaning ‘to lead the people’, as a specialization going hand-in-hand with the pejorative specialization of the nominal base *δημαγωγός* ‘leader of the people, of the *demos*; demagogue’¹³. Consequently, we proposed for Ro. *demagogiza* either a cultural borrowing from Ancient Greek, or from German, where a verb *demagogisieren* with this meaning has some sporadic attestations. The occurrence of the word in Eminescu supports borrowing via German, but the rarity of the German word made us consider a direct Greek source equally possible.

Other examples of this type concern the prefix *de-*, which is productive in Romanian only with what we call a “privative” meaning: ‘to bring out of a state, to remove, to make a transformation in the opposite direction with respect to the base verb’. DLR treats as Romanian derivatives a number of words where *de-* does not contribute this meaning. We are actually dealing with borrowing. Thus, the obsolete verb **delucida** ‘to explain, clarify’ comes from It. *delucidare* and scholarly Latin *delucidare*, a late derivative of *lucidus* ‘bright, clear’ on the model of *dilucidare*, *elucidare*; Ro. *delucida* cannot come from *de-* + *elucida* ‘elucidate’, as proposed in DLR. Likewise, the rare and obsolete verb **depreda** ‘to plunder; (about plants) to destroy’ is a borrowing from Lat. *depredari* (< *predari* ‘to plunder’ < *præda* ‘booty’) (DLR indicates here “Cf. *prăda*”). The adjective **degenerator** ‘that provokes degeneration; degenerative’ cannot come from *generator* ‘generator’ as indicated in DLR, but is borrowed from Fr. *dégénérateur*, a rare word attested in

¹³A semantic component with the meaning ‘to lead’ is present in the Greek form: *δημαγωγός* < *δῆμος* ‘people, demos’ + *ἀγωγός* ‘leader, leading’ < *ἄγειν* ‘to lead, to drive’.

the 19th century with the meaning ‘degenerative’ (it is a derivative of the verb *dégénérer* ‘to degenerate’)¹⁴. The verb **derîde** ‘to mock’, for which **DLR** proposes *de-* + *rîde* ‘laugh’, is in fact a back formation from the abstract noun *derîdere* ‘mockery’, which is much more frequent and has an external source: it is a partial calque from Fr. *dérision*, with the adaptation of the root after the inherited verb *rîde* ‘to laugh’ (< Lat. *rîdēre*) and the replacement of the nominal suffix *-sion* with the productive Romanian suffix *-re*¹⁵. Fr. *dérision* itself is a borrowing from Lat. *dērīsiō*, the abstract of *dērîdere* ‘to mock’ (< *rîdēre* ‘to laugh’). As we can see, the affixation of *de-* actually occurred in Latin, the remote source of the Romanian word.

We also encountered situations where the purported base does not have a suitable meaning: for the adjective and noun **digitalic** ‘(medicine) based on digitalis’, **DLR** proposes a derivation from *digital*, but both adjectives *digital* registered in **DLR**, ‘pertaining to fingers’ and ‘digital (in informatics)’ do not correspond semantically; there is in fact a third possible base, *digitală* ‘the plant digitalis’, which is appropriate from a semantic point of view, but due to the technical character of the verb, we opted for Fr. *digitalique*.

In most of the cases in which we rejected a Romanian source, the semantic criterion was combined with the historical criterion: words which belong to specialized technical fields, international scientific or technical terms are most likely to be borrowed, because these fields first developed in other countries and were adopted by Romanians by cultural contact. Thus, for **africanologie** ‘study of African cultures and languages’ a borrowing from Fr. *africanologie* is more likely than the derivation from *Africa* given in **DEX**; **cheiaj** ‘docking of a ship at a wharf; wharfage (tax), quayage’ comes from Fr. *quayage*, as indicated by **SDLR**, rather than from Ro. *chei* ‘wharf’, as claimed by **DEX**; the geometry term **conciclic** ‘concylic’ must come from Fr. *concyclique* (**CADE**), rather than being derived from *con-* and *ciclic* (**DEX**); for **combinor** ‘combiner in a telephone exchange’ we chose Fr. *combineur*, rejecting the derivation from Ro. *combina* ‘to combine’ supported by **DEX**; the adjective **curant** used in the collocation *medic curant* ‘attending physician’ is most likely borrowed from It. *curante*, rather than derived from Ro. *cura* ‘to treat a patient’, as proposed in **DEX**. Other examples of this type are: **crystalinitate** ‘degree of crystallisation of an eruptive rock’ (**DEL**: Fr. *cristallinité*, germ. *Kristallinität*; **DEX**: from Ro. *cristalin*); **cristalizator** ‘crystallizer’ (**DEL**: Fr. *cristallisateur*; **DEX**: from Ro. *cristaliza*); **decarbonizație** (obsolete) ‘the elimination of carbon dioxide from blood’ (**DEL**: Germ. *Dekarbonisation*, Fr. *décarbonisation*; **DLR**: from Ro. *de-* and *carbonizație*), and a number of compounds: **cerebrastenie** ‘brain asthenia’ (**DN**³, **DEL**: Fr. *cérébrasthenie*; **DEX**: from Rom. *cerebr(al)* and *astenie*), **exocortex** (botanic term) ‘exocortex’ (**DEL**: Engl., Fr. *exocortex*; **DLR**: from Ro. *exo-* and *cortex*), **fotocromatic** ‘photochromatic’ (**DEL**: Fr. *photochromatique*, Engl. *photocromatic*; **DEX**: from Ro. *fotocrom* and *-atic*, a derivation that is spurious, since the two adjectives *fotocrom* and *fotocromatic* are synonymous, and also improbable, because the suffix *-atic* does not attach to modern cultural bases; in this word, the segment *-at-* originates in the base, which is the Greek word *χρῶμα*, *χρώματος* ‘color’), **paraclinic** ‘(about medical investigations) paraclinical, using other methods than the direct observation of the patient’ (**DEL**: Fr. *paraclinique*, **DEX**: from Ro. *para-* + *clinic*), **pedoclimatic** ‘pedoclimatic, pertaining to the microclimate of the soil’ (**DEL**: Fr. *pédoclimatique*, Engl. *pedoclimatic*; **DEX**: from Ro. *pedo-* + *climatic*), **pluricarpelar** adj. (botanical term) ‘formed by several carpels’ (**DN**³, **DEL**: Fr. *pluricarpellaire*; **DLR**: from Ro. *pluri-* + *carpelă* + *-ar*), **policromat** ‘multicoloured, made of materials of various colours’ (**DEL**: Fr. *polychromé*; **DEX**: from Ro. *policrom*), **portclișeu** (photography) ‘small box in which negatives are kept’ (**DEL**: Fr. *porte-cliché*, adapted after *clișeu* ‘negative; stereotyped plate’; **DEX**: from Ro. *port-*¹ and *clișeu*), **pseudococaină** ‘pseudococaine’ (**DEL**: Fr. *pseudococaïne*, Engl. *pseudococaine*; **DLR**, **DEX**: from Ro. *pseudo-* + *cocaină* ‘cocaine’), **tetracarbonil** ‘tetracarbonyl’ (**DEL**: Fr. *tétracarbonyle* (*de nickel*), Engl. (*nickel*) *tetracarbonyl*; **DLR**: from Ro. *tetra-* + *carbonil*), **topoclimatologie** ‘topoclimatology’ (**DEL**: Fr. *topoclimatologie*, possibly also Engl. *topoclimatology*; **DEX**: from Ro. *topo-* + *climatologie*).

¹⁴Borrowing from French is supported by the time of the first attestation of the Romanian word: 1862, Pontbriant, D.

¹⁵Romanian also borrowed Fr. *dérision* in the form *deriziune*. The words *derîdere* and *deriziune* represent a synonymic pair made of a calque and a borrowing. See **Stanciu-Istrate** (2006, p. 147, 299), **Moroianu** (2016, p. 265).

3.3. The semantic criterion as an argument for derivation in Romanian

Although much less frequent, situations in which the meaning criterion supports derivation in Romanian against borrowing can be found. Thus, **cuplă** ‘demountable device for connecting two vehicles (usually in railways) or two elements of a technical system’ cannot come from Fr. *couple*, as indicated in **DEX**, because *couple* lacks this technical use, meaning only ‘couple’ (both as a masculine and as a feminine noun, the latter being an obsolete variant). Therefore we treated Ro. *cuplă* as a back formation from the verb *cupla* ‘to interlock, wire, couple’. The adjective **precaut** ‘cautious’ does not correspond semantically to the Latin etymon *precautus* given by **DLR** and **DEX**, which had a passive meaning ‘which has been taken care of’. Therefore we considered it as a back formation from *precauție* ‘caution’. For **calcio-vecchio** ‘type of ornamental plaster’, the form suggests an Italian origin, so that it is not surprising that **DEX** considered it an Italian word. But we have not been able to find an expression with this meaning in Italian. **Treccani** registers three Italian words *calcio*: *calcio*¹ ‘heel’ (< Lat. *calx*); *calcio*² ‘kick with the foot; football; hit at the billiard game’ (< *calciare* ‘to kick (with the foot)’ < *calcio*¹), *calcio*³ ‘calcium’ (a learned borrowing from Lat. *Calcium*, a derivative of *calx* ‘chalk’). We do not dispose of sufficient information about the history of this plaster type and its denomination, therefore the solution adopted by **DELR** is given with a mark of uncertainty (‘probably’). In the absence of an ascertained external source, we considered Ro. *calcio-vecchio* as a false Italianism created in Romanian, using erroneously a masculine *calcio* instead of the feminine *calce* ‘chalk’, triggering masculine agreement on the adjective *vecchio* ‘old’.

4. The chronological criterion

For modern cultural borrowings, a frequent problem is the existence of more than one possible source. Establishing the date when the word entered Romanian is one of the methods that can be used to decide between multiple possible sources. Disposing of a larger corpus, with a lot of digitalized old texts, where automatic word search is possible, we have been able to correct a number of previous etymologies, based on attestations which are either too old or too new for the solutions given by the previous dictionaries. Thus, the noun and adjective **calvin** ‘Calvinist’ cannot come from Fr., as given by **DA**, because it occurs already in 1600, in a document from Transylvania (Doc. Î. XXXII), and continues to be attested during the old Romanian period (in Varlaam, Miron Costin, Dosoftei, Axinte Uricariul, in *Îns. ms.*, etc.). It is in fact a borrowing from Lat. *calvinus*, which had a common noun and adjective use. For **crenel** ‘crenel’, attested already in 1839 (Negruzzi, O. II, 172), the correct etymon is the one given by **DA**, **CADE**, **CDER** 2557, namely Fr. *créneau*, with an etymological reshaping of the *-eau* suffix (Old Fr. *crenel*) supported by the derivatives Fr. *créneler*, *crénelé*. **DEX**, based on the form, proposes Engl. *crenel*, but this is unlikely for the first half of the 19th century. Sometimes our attestations indicate a time posterior to the French influence: thus, the verb **clica** ‘to click (on a computer), to select an icon by pressing the mouse’, which entered Romanian together with personal computers and graphic interfaces such as Windows, is obviously either a borrowing from Engl. *to click* or a Romanian derivative of the noun *clic* ‘click’, used in the expression *a face clic*. The French etymology (*cliquer*) proposed by **DEX** is highly unlikely.

The chronological criterion also involves the diffusion of the purported etymon in the source language at the time of the borrowing. Thus, in the case of the word **xerocopie**, attested in 1966 (**LTR**²), the etymons proposed by **DLR** (Fr. *xérocopie*, It. *xerocopia*) cannot be found before 1966, so the information available to us rules them out. Older attestations are only available for Engl. *xerocopy* (e.g., in the *Photographic Engineering Review*, 6–7, 1955, p. 257, 258). Consequently, we proposed an English etymology. The term was probably coined in English, based on *xerography* (< *xero-* < Gr. *ξηρός* ‘dry’ + *-graphy*) and *copy*.

In many cases, the chronological criterion led to the rejection of derivation inside Romanian, in favour of borrowing. For instance, **DLR** treats the obsolete verb **excontentelui** ‘to pay a compensation’, used in Transylvania, as coming from Ro. *excontenta* (with the same meaning), for whose etymology a relation with *esconta* is indicated (“cf. *esconta*”). But *excontentelui* is attested, in the variant *escontentelui*, already in 1806 (Iorga, S. D. XII), well before *excontenta* for which the first available attestation is 1844 (Barițiu, C.

IV, 196). In fact, we are dealing with two variants of adaptation of the Latin verb *excontentare*. There is no derivational relation between these variants. A similar situation is found with the obsolete adjectives **danic** and **danicesc** ‘Danish’, considered by **DLR** as derivatives of *dan* ‘Dane’. They should rather be considered as borrowings from Lat. *danicus*, Modern Gr. *δανικός*, because of the time when they are attested—1829 (AR, 95) for *danicesc* and 1842 (Asachi, L. 16) for *danic*—, a period when the suffix *-ic-* was in the process of entering Romanian, via borrowings, and was often adapted in the form *-icesc* (hypercharacterized with the native adjectival suffix *-esc*). The latter adaptation precedes the borrowing of the suffix in the form *-ic*.

The words **demofil** ‘demophile, friend of the people’ and **demofilie** ‘demophilia’ are attested at roughly the same time: *demofil* in 1936 (Crainic, P. card. 48), *demofilie* in 1935 (Diamandi, O. P. 188). Therefore **DLR**’s proposal that the latter is a derivative of the former is not supported. More likely, the whole word family was borrowed from French (*démophile, démophilie*).

The chronologic criterion coupled with the concept history criterion indicates an external source for a number of derivatives of place names for which other academic dictionaries propose derivation in Romanian. If the toponym refers to a place unfamiliar to Romanians in the period of the first attestation and the suffix was not productive in Romanian at that time, we must assume that the word is a borrowing. For instance, **african** ‘African’, attested already in the 17th century (1682, Dosoftei, V. S., octombrie, 87^r)¹⁶, cannot be derived from *Africa* with the suffix *-an* (which was not productive in Romanian at that time), but was borrowed from Lat. *Africanus*, possibly also Modern Gr. *Αφρικανός*. The adjective and noun **chinez** ‘Chinese’ cannot be derived in Romanian from *China*, because it is attested in 1830 (Iancu Văcărescu, “Tipografia”), at a time when the *-ez* suffix was just entering the language via borrowings. This ethnonym was borrowed from Western languages (It. *Cinese*, Germ. *Chinese*, Fr. *Chinois*) and its initial part was modified after *China*. The adjective **chinezesc**, attested a little earlier, in 1802 (*Amorven și Zalida, romanț chinezesc*, translated from French, probably by Alecu Beldiman, cited in **Ursu & Ursu, 2011**) contains the element *-ez-* that cannot be explained by derivation in Romanian; it represents an adaptation of the Western ethnonym, with *-esc-* marking the adjectival status (cf. *-icesc* discussed above). Likewise, for **caucazian** ‘Caucasian’, attested in 1848 (Brezoianu, Î. 113), borrowing from Fr. *caucasien* is preferable to the derivation from the toponym *Caucaz* given by **DEX**.

A similar case is the adjective **chirilic** ‘Cyrillic’, for which **DA** and **DEX** indicate the proper name *Chiril* ‘Cyril’ as the direct etymon. The noun appears already at the beginning of the 19th century, in the form *cirilic*, in Petru Maior’s *Dialogu pentru începutul limbei română*, published in 1819. In the same text we encounter the forms *cirilicesc* and *chirilicesc*. As by this time the suffix *-ic* was entering the language via borrowings, it is clear that this adjective was not derived in Romanian, but borrowed from Lat. *cyrillicus*. Petru Maior had used in a previous text, published in 1812, *Dissertație pentru începutul limbei românești*, the adjective *cirilian*, borrowed from Lat. *cyrillianus*. Another form that we encounter in the beginning of the 19th century is *țirilicesc*, in the 1834 translation of a Latin text of Petru Maior (see Maior, S. II 209), which may be come from Lat. *cyrillicus* (with the central European pronunciation of Latin) or from Germ. *cyrillisch*.

A special case where the chronology of attestations is helpful concerns technical terms denoting activities, which occur both as verbs and names of actions. Although, from a formal and synchronic point of view, the noun usually appears as a derivative of the verb, from the historical point of view things may be reversed: sometimes, the term first enters the language as a noun in which the suffix in the source language is replaced with the corresponding Ro. suffix *-re*¹⁷; subsequently, the corresponding verb is created, as a back formation. Let us see a number of examples where the available attestations support a history of this type, refuting the derivation of the noun from the verb indicated in **DEX**: **climatizare** ‘air conditioning’ is attested already in 1949 (**LTR**¹, I) and is more frequent than the verb **climatiza**, attested as late as 1978

¹⁶A little time before, in Let. cantac. (1665–1672), the word appears as part of a proper name, *Știpio African*.

¹⁷See a lot of examples in **Carabulea & Popescu-Marin (1967, p. 277–320)**. **Bogdan-Oprea (2011, p. 96–97)** discusses this issue in the context of the “relatinisation of Romanian”. For the concept of “suffix correspondence/equating” (*echivalare sufixală*), in relation to substitution and linguistic calque, see **Moroianu (2017, p. 335–347)**.

(DN³), which made us explain *climatizare* as an adaptation of Fr. *climatisation*; **cobaltare** ‘covering the surface of a metallic object with cobalt’, attested in 1949 (LTR¹, I), well before **cobalta** (1978, DN³), was considered a borrowing from Fr. *cobaltage* (as also proposed in DN³) and Germ. *Kobaltierung*, with suffix replacement; **colectivizare** ‘merging of individual rural properties into a collective enterprise (imposed by communists)’, attested in 1948 (Contemp. nr. 109, 4/2), before the verb *colectiviza* (attested in 1953, *Cursul scurt de istorie a PCUS*, cited in DLRLC) and used more frequently than the verb, was considered a borrowing from Ru. *kollektivizacija*.

5. The etymon frequency criterion

For words belonging to the specific terminology of various scientific and technical fields, the source language is often hard to identify and the existence of more source languages is plausible. Thus, alongside French, we must take into account German, English, and, for a specific period, Russian. The recent academic dictionaries (DEX and DLR) give priority to French, except for the very recent borrowings, where English begins to be mentioned. This priority is undoubtedly justified by historical facts (French was the international language of culture best known in Romania until the last decades of the 20th century), but in some cases it was pushed too far. Some French etymons proposed by recent dictionaries are either extremely rare or plainly unattested. In our work for DELR, after checking the etymon in the French reference dictionaries (TLF, Robert, Larousse), we proceed by verifying the existence of the term in the sources available online—various technical dictionaries, Wikipedia, web pages written in French—giving priority to the search in books¹⁸ and restricting the search to the period which precedes the first attestation of the word in Romanian. The same procedure is applied to other possible source languages.

First we present a number of cases where the etymon proposed by DEX and DLR could not be attested at all (these are all purported French words, with one exception, see *crib* below). The following sub-types can be distinguished:

- (i) The word actually comes from another language: **calcocloroză** ‘chlorosis due to the shortage of iron in the soil’ was formed from *calco-* and *cloroză* ‘chlorosis’ on the model of Germ. *Kalkchlorose* (DEX: Fr. *chalcoclorose*); **chemitipie** ‘technique of stereotype engraving, based on chemical procedures’ < Germ. *Chemotypie* (DEX: Fr. *chémotypie*); **citocromie** ‘rapid printing procedure using four superimposed colours’ < Germ. *Citochromie*, a word coined by the German engineer Eugen Albert from Lat. *citus* ‘quick’ and Gr. *χρῶμα* ‘colour’ (DEX: Fr. *cytochromie*); **climostat** ‘device for measuring the thermic effect of climatic factors on buildings’ < Germ. *Klimostat*, Rus. *klimostat* (DEX: Fr. *climostat*); **crib** ‘water crib’ < Engl. [*water*] *crib* (DEX: Germ. *Kribbe*; this is in fact a Dutch and Low German word; the standard German form is *Krippe*); **chromoalgrafie** ‘algraphy used for multicoloured printing moulds’ < Germ. *Chromoalgraphie* (DEX: Fr. *chromoalgraphie*); **delint** ‘delint (noun)’ < Engl. *delint* (DLR: Fr. *délint*);
- (ii) The word was in fact created in Romanian: **canisă** ‘dog-breeding farm’ was probably coined on the base *can(i)-* ‘dog’ found in *canin* ‘canine’, *canid* ‘canid’ (DEX: Fr. *canice*); **celaperm** ‘fibre obtained by a chemical procedure from cotton cellulose’ was probably composed of *cel(a)-* (< *celuloză* ‘cellulose’) + *-perm* (< *permeabil* ‘permeable’) (DEX: Fr. *celaperm*); **celofibră** ‘artificial fibre obtained from cellulose’ < *celo-* (< *celuloză* ‘cellulose’) + *fibră* ‘fibre’ (DEX: Fr. *cellofibre*); **carpatin** ‘belonging to the Carpathian mountains’ < *Carpați* ‘Carpathians’ (a solution already given in DA and CADE; DEX: Fr. *karpathin*);
- (iii) The word exists but has a different form: **corona** ‘corona (effect)’ < Fr. (*effet*) *corona*, Engl. *corona* (DEX proposes Fr. *coronne*, a form that does not exist, and Germ. *Krone*, which does not correspond in meaning—it just means ‘crown’; for *corona*, the compound *Koronaentladung* is used); **decozină** ‘delcosine’ < Fr., Engl. *delcosine*, a word created based on the name of the plant from which this alkaloid is extracted, *Delphinium consolida* (DLR: Fr. *décozine*).

¹⁸To this end, we use the “Books” setting of Google.

We now present a number of cases where an etymon was rejected because it has very few attestations in the purported source language:

- (i) The word actually comes from another language: **astroclimat** ‘astroclimate’ < Engl. *astroclimate*, Rus. *astroklimat* (DEX: Fr. *astroclimat*); **characterograf** ‘electronic device that displays the features of the semiconductor devices on the screen of a cathode ray tub’ < Rus. *charakterograf* (DEX indicates Engl. *characterographe* (sic!); a form *characteograph* appears indeed in English, but seems to be very rare); **catometru** ‘cathometer’ < Germ. *Kathometer*, Engl. *cathometer* < *cathode* + *-meter* (DEX: Fr. *catomètre*); **cenotip** ‘coenotype’ < Engl. *coenotype* < *coen-* < Gr. *κοινός* ‘common’ + *type* (DEX: Fr. *cénotype*). For the noun **cvartet** ‘quartet’, It. *quartetto* indicated by DA, CADE, SDLR, CDER and DEX is an acceptable etymon, but DEX adds Fr. *quartette*, which is unlikely given its very low frequency in French (the usual term is *quatuor*); in addition to Italian, it is very likely that the Romanian word also has a German source, Germ. *Quartett*.
- (ii) The word was actually created in Romanian: **dedentiție** ‘loss of teeth’ < *de-* + *dentiție* ‘dentition’ (the Fr. *dédentition* indicated by DEX and DLR is extremely rare; the privative derivatives of the base *dent-* in French show the prefix *é-*: *édenter* etc.); **dendrometrist** ‘specialist in dendrometry’ < *dendrometrie* ‘dendrometrist’, with suffix substitution (DEX, DLR: Fr. *dendrométriste*); **hidrocosmetică** ‘cosmetics that uses water and moisturizing products’, probably formed in Romanian from *hidro-* ‘hydro-, water’ + *cosmetică* (the Fr. *hydrocosmétique* proposed by DEX is extremely rare and only occurs as an adjective, spelled *hydro-cosmetique*).
- (iii) The word is a structural calque: **bioamplificator** ‘bioamplifier’, attested in 1988 (DEX-s), is composed of *bio-* and *amplificator* ‘amplifier’, copying Engl. *bioamplifier*. DEX proposes Fr. *bioamplificateur*, but this is a rare word for which we could not find attestations preceding the first attestation of the Romanian word.

Sometimes the diffusion of the alleged etymon in the source language is restricted to a period or a region for which there is no contact with Romanian. Thus, for **advent**, ‘advent’, alongside Lat. *adventus* indicated by DEX and Germ. *Advent* indicated by MDN, both acceptable, DEX adds Fr. *advent*. But this is an obsolete form that disappeared after the 17th century, the current form being *avent*. For **adaptor** ‘adaptor’, DEX gives Fr. *adapteur* but this is a recent borrowing from English that is used mostly in Canada. The real origin of the word is Engl. *adaptor/adapter*. **Contractor** ‘contractor’, attested already in 1813 (Doc. Orh., 463), initially came from Germ. *Kontraktor* and Rus. *kontraktor*, and nowadays it was revived or reintroduced by the contact with English. The etymon indicated in DEX, Fr. *contracteur*, is unacceptable because it is a recent English borrowing in French. The obsolete verb **defensa** ‘to protect, to defend’, attested in 1848 (Negulici, V.), was introduced in Romanian in order to create a lexical family based on the Latin verb *defendere* (in the same period we find the verbs *defenda*, *defende* ‘to defend’, the nouns *defensă*, *defensie* ‘defence’ and the adjective *defensibil* ‘defensible’); in this case, the frequentative Latin verb *defensare* was used, probably because it was formally closer to the abstract noun *defensă*. DEX proposes Fr. *défenser*, but this verb had gone out of use well before the 19th century (according to TLF, this verb is limited to Middle French).

6. The concept history criterion

For neologisms, this criterion is mainly used for the remote etymology, being involved in establishing the language where the term appeared for the first time. There are nevertheless a few situations where it proved relevant for the direct etymology.

Thus, we encountered two examples of learned compounds created in Romanian for which the academic dictionaries, influenced by the usual situation of cultural neologisms, proposed foreign etyma: the adjective and noun **calofil** ‘(author) who is concerned above all with the beauty of the literary expression (disregarding the content)’ was created by the Romanian writer Camil Petrescu based on Gr. *καλός* ‘beautiful’ and *-φίλος* ‘loving, friend’ (DEX: Fr. *callophile*); **vulcanocarst** ‘karst formed on eruptive rocks’ was

created by the Romanian geologist T. Naum in order to refer to a geological phenomenon specific to the Călimani mountains (DLR: Rus. *vulkanokarst*).

The noun **crotălie** ‘small metal plate applied on the ear of animals as a sign of recognition’, for which DEX proposes Modern Greek *κρόταλον* ‘little bell’, is already explained in M. enc. agr. (vol. III, 698): it was a trademark, *Crotalia*, introduced by the German company Hauptner in 1887, based on Lat. *crotalia* (pl. *tantum*) ‘rattling ear pendant, composed of several pearls’ (< *crotalum* ‘castanet’ < Gr. *κρόταλον* < *κρότος* ‘rattling noise, clapping of the hands, applause’).

For **deculator** ‘decuator, device used in the paper industry for removing air from paper pulp’, DLR proposes Fr. *découleur*, a word unattested with this meaning (it is extremely rare and does not occur in the relevant technical contexts). The word actually comes from Engl. *decuator*, a trademark introduced by the Clark & Vicario Corp., coined on the name of the inventor of the device, the American chemical engineer Judson Albert De Cew.

For trademarks, it is reasonable to assume that the name of the product enters the language alongside the imported product itself, being inscribed on the product or on the pack. Therefore, for a word such as **corhart** ‘refractory aluminium-based material, used in lining the ovens for the manufacture of glass’, a product of the English company Corhart Refractories (formed in the years 1920 by the association of the Corning Glass Works and Hartford Empire companies¹⁹), it is more plausible that Romanian engineers adopted the English trademark directly rather than via another language. Therefore we rejected the solution proposed by DEX, Fr. *corharte* (it must be noticed that a Fr. form in *-e* is unattested, the word was used in French only in the form *corhart*).

7. Words for which no etymon has been proposed before

There are a few neologisms for which no etymon has been proposed in the academic dictionaries or the dictionaries of neologisms (such words are marked with “et. nec.” in DEX and DLR). For the following examples, an etymological solution was first provided by DELR:

- (i) **caprotină** ‘Caprotina (fossil genus of Cretaceous bivalve molluscs)’ < Fr., Engl. *Caprotina*, name given by the French biologist Alcide d’Orbigny in 1842, coined on the related genus *Caprina*;
- (ii) **chenaf** ‘kenaf (the plant *Hibiscus canabicus*)’ < Fr. *kénaf* < Pers. *kenaf* (related to Lat. *cannabis* = Ro. *cînepă*, Engl. *hemp*, etc.);
- (iii) **ciumiză** ‘the plant *Setaria italica-maxima*’ < Rus. *čumiza* (< Chinese *choumizi*, according to ESUM);
- (iv) **colei** ‘to remove the hair from a hide, using depilatory substances’, probably from Fr. *coller* ‘to glue’, as the paste used in the process sticks to the hide.
- (v) **cupiu** (rare) ‘unit of payment (e.g. bill) in which an amount of money is divided’, attested in DOOM¹ and included in DEX, is in fact a singular form created by the false segmentation of the plural *cupiuri* of the noun *cupiură* (with accent shift: *cupiúrá*, pl. *cupiúri* > *cupiuri* > sg. *cupiu*); *cupiură*, which has the same meaning, is a variant of the noun *cupúrá*, a French borrowing (Fr. *coupure* ‘cut, division, way of dividing an amount of money, unit of payment in which an amount of money is divided’ < *couper* ‘to cut’), with the recommended pronunciation /ku’pyrə/ (this noun occurs in DEX, but its relation with the form *cupiu* went unnoticed); as Romanian lacks the front rounded vowel *y*, this vowel is often replaced by *iu* in the language of the people with insufficient proficiency in French or who do not recognize the foreign character of a word (see *pedichiură* < Fr. *pedicure* ‘pedicure’). The etymology of *cupiu* was discovered by our colleague Mihaela Morcov, member of the DELR team.
- (vi) **daourit** (pronounced /da.u.’rit/) ‘rubellite (a variety of red tourmaline)’ < Fr. *daourite*, created by the French mineralogist Leclerc de Buffon, based on the toponym *Daourie*, region in Southern Siberia where this mineral was found.
- (vii) **decelit** ‘plastic material similar to linoleum’ < Germ. *Decelith*, trademark.

¹⁹The name *Corhart* was formed by blending the initial segments of the names of the two companies.

8. Conclusions

The etymological research nowadays enjoys considerable advantages compared to earlier times, first of all due to the electronic corpora (both on- and off-line) that allow a more detailed study of the moment, the way and the context in which a word was borrowed or derived in a language (with or without external models). The availability of brand new dictionaries and scientific works as well as of a large number of literary or non-literary texts from the past allows us to draw a more accurate picture of the history of words, new and modern as well as old and popular, both in Romanian and in the foreign languages they were taken from. At the same time, these resources raise the standards for the etymological research. The Romanian Academy is meant to provide a standard of research in all the fields of science and the dictionaries issued by it should comply with the contemporary standards of lexicography. The attempt of improving upon previous dictionaries already has a tradition in Romanian lexicology²⁰ and should be pursued further, especially in the case of collective works carried out within the same institution. A correlation between the results of the various research groups is necessary in order to avoid perpetuating problematic etymologies. The DELR team is currently working on an updated version of the two already published volumes, which is meant to bring them to the higher standards of the third one. This process inevitably involves corrections, additions and reassessments (concerning meanings, first attestations, sources, variants and etymologies). We aim to develop an online version of the dictionary, which will enable us to permanently update the information, depending on what we may discover during the work for the subsequent volumes of the dictionary. Last but not least, the etymological contributions of our colleagues of other institutes of the Romanian Academy (The “Sextil Pușcariu” Institute of Linguistics and Literary History in Cluj, the “Alexandru Philippide” Institute of Romanian Philology in Iași) are and will be of great help to us.

Bibliography

A. Dictionaries

- CADE = Candrea, I.-A. & Adamescu, Gh. (1931). *Dicționarul enciclopedic ilustrat*, Editura Cartea Românească, București.
- CDDE = Candrea, I.-A. & Densusianu, Ov. (1907–1914). *Dicționarul etimologic al limbii române. Elementele latine (A–Putea)*, Socec, București.
- CDER = Ciorănescu, Al. (2002). *Dicționarul etimologic al limbii române*, ediție îngrijită și traducere din limba spaniolă de T. Șandru-Mehedinți și M. Popescu Marin, Editura Saeculum I. O., București.
- D.med. = P. Simici (red. responsabil), *Dicționar medical*, Editura Medicală, București, 2 vol.
- DA = Academia Română, *Dicționarul limbii române*. Sub conducerea lui Sextil Pușcariu. Tomul I. Partea I: A–B, Librăriile Socec & Co. și C. Sfetea, București, 1913; Tomul I. Partea II: C, Tipografia Ziarului “Universul”, București, 1940; Tomul I. Partea III. Fascicula I: D–de, “Universul”, Intreprindere Industrială a Statului, București, 1949; [Fascicula II: De–deșina; șpalt, 1948]; Tomul II. Partea I: F–I, Monitorul Oficial și Imprimeriile Statului. Imprimeria Națională, București, 1934; Tomul II. Partea II. Fascicula I: J–lacustru, Tipografia Ziarului “Universul” S.A., București, 1937; Tomul II. Partea II. Fascicula II: Ladă–lepăda, Tipografia Ziarului “Universul” S.A., București, 1940; Tomul II. Partea II. Fascicula III: Lepăda–lojniță, Tipografia Ziarului “Universul” S.A., București, 1948.
- DCR³ = Dimitrescu, F., Ciolan, Al. & Lupu, C. (2013). *Dicționar de cuvinte recente*, ediția a III-a, Editura Logos, București.
- DELR = *Dicționarul etimologic al limbii române*, coordonat de A. Avram & M. Sala (vol. I, II₁), I. Giurgea & C. Moroianu (vol. II₂), Editura Academiei Române, București, vol. I, A–B, 2011; vol. II, partea I, Ca–cizmă, 2015; vol. II, partea II, Clac–cyborg, 2018.
- DEX = Coteanu, I. & Mareș, L. (coord.), *Dicționarul explicativ al limbii române*. Ediția a II-a, Editura Univers Enciclopedic, București, 1996; reeditat cu adăugiri în 1998, 2009, 2012, 2016.
- DÎLR = Chivu, Gh., Buză, E. & Roman Moraru, A. (1992). *Dicționarul împrumuturilor latino-romanice în limba română veche (1421–1760)*, Editura Științifică, București, 1992.
- DLR = Academia Română, *Dicționarul limbii române*. Serie nouă. Redactori responsabili: acad. Iorgu Iordan, acad. Alexandru Graur și acad. Ion Coteanu. Din anul 2000, redactori responsabili: acad. Marius Sala și acad. Gheorghe Mihăilă. București,

²⁰See Hristea (Hristea, 1960, p. 235–257; 2007, p. 23–38; 2009, p. 481–498), Avram (1997, 2001, 2006), Loșonți (2001, 2007), Mărgărit (2005, 2010).

- Editura Academiei. Tomul I. Partea a 3-a. Litera *D* (*D–Deinmulțit*), 2006; Tomul I. Partea a 4-a. Litera *D* (*Deja–Deținere*), 2006; Tomul I. Partea a 5-a. Litera *D* (*Deținut–Discopotiriu*), 2007; Tomul I. Partea a 6-a. Litera *D* (*Discord–Dyke*), 2009; Tomul I. Partea a 7-a. Litera *E* (*E–Erzaț*), 2009; Tomul I. Partea a 8-a. Litera *E* (*Es–Ezredeș*), 2010; Tomul III. Literele *J, K, Q*, 2010; Tomul IV. Litera *L* (*L–Lherzolită*), 2008; Tomul V. Litera *L* (*Li–Luzulă*), 2008; Tomul VI. Litera *M*, 1965–1968; Tomul VII. Partea 1. Litera *N*, 1971; Tomul VII. Partea a 2-a. Litera *O*, 1969; Tomul VIII. Partea 1. Litera *P* (*P–Păzui*), 1972; Tomul VIII. Partea a 2-a. Litera *P* (*Pe–Pinar*), 1974; Tomul VIII. Partea a 3-a. Litera *P* (*Pînă–Pogribanie*), 1977; Tomul VIII. Partea a 4-a. Litera *P* (*Pogrijanie–Presimțire*), 1980; Tomul VIII. Partea a 5-a. Litera *P* (*Presin–Puzzolană*), 1984; Tomul IX. Litera *R*, 1975; Tomul X. Partea 1. Litera *S* (*S–Sclabuc*), 1986; Tomul X. Partea a 2-a. Litera *S* (*Scladă–Semînțârie*), 1987; Tomul X. Partea a 3-a. Litera *S* (*Semn–Siveică*), 1990; Tomul X. Partea a 4-a. Litera *S* (*Slab–Spongios*), 1992; Tomul X. Partea a 5-a. Litera *S* (*Songiar–Swing*), 1994; Tomul XI. Partea 1. Litera *Ș*, 1978; Tomul XI. Partea a 2-a. Litera *T* (*T–Tocăliță*), 1982; Tomul XI. Partea a 3-a. Litera *T* (*Tocăna–Twist*), 1983; Tomul XII. Partea 1. Litera *Ț*, 1994; Tomul XII. Partea a 2-a. Litera *U*, 2002; Tomul XIII. Partea 1. Litera *V* (*V–Veni*), 1997; Tomul XIII. Partea a 2-a. Litera *V* (*Venial–Vizurină*), 2002; Tomul XIII. Partea a 3-a. Litera *V* (*Viclă–Vuzum*) și Literele *W, X, Y*, 2005; Tomul XIV. Litera *Z*, 2000.
- DLRLC = *Dicționarul limbii române literare contemporane* (sub direcția prof. univ. Dimitrie Macrea și acad. Emil Petrovici). Volumul I: *A–C*, 1955; volumul al II-lea: *D–L*, 1956; volumul al III-lea: *M–R*, 1957; volumul al IV-lea: *S–Z*, 1958, Editura Academiei, [București].
- DN² = Marcu, F. & Maneca, C. (1966). *Dicționar de neologisme*, ediția a II-a, Editura Științifică, București.
- DN³ = Marcu, F. & Maneca, C. (1978). *Dicționar de neologisme*, ediția a III-a, Editura Academiei, București.
- DOOM¹ = Avram, M. (red. responsabil) (1982). *Dicționarul ortografic, ortoepic și morfologic al limbii române*, Editura Academiei R.S.R., București.
- ESUM = Mel'ničuk, O.S. (coord.) (1982–2012). *Etimologičnyj slovnyk ukrainskoi movy*, Nauk, Dumka, Kiev.
- Larousse = *Dictionnaire de français* [online].
- LTR¹ = *Lexiconul tehnic român. București*, Editura Tehnică; vol. I, 1949; vol. II, 1950; vol. III, 1951; vol. IV, 1952; vol. V, 1954, vol. VI–VII, 1955.
- LTR² = *Lexiconul tehnic român*. Elaborare nouă. Întocmită prin îngrijirea A.S.I.T. de un colectiv sub conducerea prof. Remus Răduț, București, Editura Tehnică; vol. I–II, 1957; vol. III–IV, 1958; vol. V, 1959; vol. VI–VII, 1960; vol. VIII–IX, 1961; vol. X–XI, 1962; vol. XII–XIII, 1963; vol. XIV–XV, 1964; vol. XVI–XVII, 1965; vol. XVIII, 1966; vol. XIX „Indice”, 1968.
- MDA = *Micul dicționar academic*, Editura Univers Enciclopedic, București. Volumul I: *A–C*, 2001; volumul al II-lea: *D–H*, 2002; volumul al III-lea: *I–Pr*, 2003; volumul al IV-lea: *Pr–Z*, 2003.
- MDN = Marcu, F. (2000). *Marele dicționar de neologisme*. Ediție revizuită, augmentată și actualizată, Editura Saeculum, București.
- M.enc.agr. = Filipescu, C. (coord.), *Marea enciclopedie agricolă*, Editura P.A.S., București. Vol. I, 1937; II, 1938; III, 1940; IV, 1942; V, 1943.
- NDU = Oprea, I., Pamfil, C.-G., Radu, R. & Zăstroiu, V. (2006). *Noul dicționar universal al limbii române*, Litera Internațional, București / Chișinău, 2006.
- PEW = Pușcariu, S. (1905). *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der rumänischen Sprache, I: Lateinisches Element, mit Berücksichtigung aller romanischen Sprachen*, K. Winter, Heidelberg.
- Robert = Robert, P. (1996). *Le Grand Robert de la Langue Française. Dictionnaire alphabétique et analogique de la langue française*. 2^e édition entièrement revue et enrichie par Alain Rey, Le Robert, Paris, 9 vol.
- SDLR = Scriban, A. (1939). *Dicționarul limbii românești. (Etimologii, înțelesuri, exemple, citațiuni, arhaizme, neologizme, provincializme)*, Edițiunea întâia, Institutul de Arte Grafice “Presa Bună”, Iași.
- TDRG² = Tiktin, H., *Rumänisch-deutsches Wörterbuch*, 2., überarbeitete und ergänzte Auflage von Paul Miron, Otto Harrassowitz, Wiesbaden. Band I, 1986; Band II, 1988; Band III, 1989.
- TDRG³ = Tiktin, H., *Rumänisch-deutsches Wörterbuch*, 3., überarbeitete und ergänzte Auflage von Paul Miron und Elsa Lüder, Clusium, Cluj-Napoca. Band I, 2000; Band II, 2003; Band III, 2005.
- TLF = *Trésor de la Langue Française. Dictionnaire de la langue du XIX^e et du XX^e siècle (1789–1960)*. Paris, 1972 ș.u. [online].
- Treccani = *Dizionario della lingua italiana, pubblicato dall'Istituto dell'Enciclopedia Italiana fondata da Giovanni Treccani e Giunti T.V.P. editori*, Firenze, 2014 [online].

B. Books and articles

- Avram, A. (1997). *Contribuții etimologice*, Univers Enciclopedic, București.
- Avram, A. (2001). *Noi contribuții etimologice*, Univers Enciclopedic, București.
- Avram, A. (2006). *Comentarii și ipoteze etimologice*, Editura Academiei Române, București.
- Bogdan-Oprea, H. (2011). *Relatinizarea limbii române: privire generală, accepții, delimitări, aspecte*, Editura Universității din București, București.
- Carabulea, E. & Popescu-Marin, M. (1967). *Exprimarea numelui de acțiune prin substantive cu formă de infinitiv lung și de supin*, in “Studii și materiale privitoare la formarea cuvintelor în limba română”, vol. IV, red. resp.: acad. Al. Graur și M. Avram, Editura Academiei, București, p. 277–320.

- Hristea, Th. (1960). *Probleme de etimologie în „Dicționarul limbii române moderne”*, in “Studii și cercetări lingvistice”, 9 (2), p. 235–257.
- Hristea, Th. (1968). *Probleme de etimologie: studii, articole, note*, Editura Științifică, București.
- Hristea, Th. (1973a). *Contribuții la studiul etimologic al neologismelor românești*, in “Limba română”, 22 (1), p. 3–15.
- Hristea, Th. (1973b). *Criterii de diferențiere a formațiilor interne de împrumuturi*, in “Analele Universității din București. Limba și literatura română”, 22 (1), p. 143–155.
- Hristea, Th. (2007). *Etimologia în principalele lucrări lexicografice românești. Considerații critice*, in Pană Dindelegan, G. & Stoica, G. (coord.), “Limba română. Stadiul actual al cercetării. Actele celui de al 6-lea Colocviu al Catedrei de limba română (29–30 noiembrie 2006)”, Editura Universității din București, București, p. 23–38.
- Hristea, Th. (2009). *Considerații pe marginea unui dicționar etimologic: CDER*, in “Limba română”, 58 (4), p. 481–498.
- Keppel Hesselink, J. M. (2015). *The terms ‘autacoid’, ‘hormone’ and ‘chalone’ and how they have shifted with time*, in “Autonomic and Autocoid Pharmacology”, 35 (4), p. 51–58, [Crossref](#).
- Loșonți, D. (2001). *Soluții și sugestii etimologice*, Univers Enciclopedic, București.
- Loșonți, D. (2007). *Certitudini și ipoteze etimologice*, Editura Academiei Române, București.
- Mărgărit, I. (2005). *Ipoteze și sugestii etimologice. Note și articole*, Editura Academiei Române, București.
- Mărgărit, I. (2010). *Noi comentarii etimologice și semantice*, Editura Academiei Române, București.
- Moroianu, C. (2008). *Derivarea prin substituție de afixe. Sufixe neologice*, in Bejan, D. M., Lucatelli, V. & Cenac, O. (coord.), “Lexic comun / Lexic specializat. Actele Conferinței internaționale Lexic comun / Lexic specializat, Galați, 17–18 septembrie, 2008”, “Analele Universității Dunărea de Jos din Galați”, Fascicula XXIV, An 1, Nr. 1, Galați University Press, p. 194–206.
- Moroianu, C. (2009). *Derivarea prin substituție de afixe. Sufixe substantivele vechi*, in Saramandu, N., Nevaci, M. & Radu, C. I. (eds), “Lucrările celui de-al doilea Simpozion Internațional de Lingvistică (București, 28–29 noiembrie, 2008)”, Editura Universității din București, București, p. 281–294.
- Moroianu, C. (2016). *Motivarea formală a relațiilor semantice. Sinonimia analizabilă*, Editura Universității din București, București.
- Moroianu, C. (2017). *Adaptarea împrumuturilor prin echivalare suficală*, in Stanciu Istrate, M. & Răuțu, D. (eds), “Lucrările Celui de-al 6-a Simpozion internațional de lingvistică (București, 29–30 mai 2015)”, Editura Univers Enciclopedic Gold, București, p. 335–347.
- Sala, M. (1999). *Introducere în etimologia limbii române*, Editura Univers Enciclopedic, București.
- Seche, L. (1960). *Cuvinte și sensuri noi în presa actuală*, in “Limba Română”, 9 (1), p. 57–65.
- Stanciu-Istrate, M. (2006). *Calcul lingvistic în limba română (cu specială referire la scrieri beletristice din sec. XIX)*, Editura Academiei Române, București.
- Ursu, N. A. & Ursu, D. (2011). *Împrumutul lexical în procesul modernizării limbii române literare (1760–1860)*, Editura Cronica, Iași, vol. III, *Repertoriu de cuvinte și forme – supliment*, 2 părți.