EUGEN PAVEL

REFLECTIONS ON THE CENTENNIAL ANNIVERSARY OF THE ROMANIAN LANGUAGE MUSEUM (1919–2019)

In the turbulent autumn of 1919, more precisely on October 1, the foundations of a unique research institute, which was to bring about a genuine resurrection of linguistic and philological studies, were laid down in Cluj: the Romanian Language Museum. The actual birth certificate had been endorsed by the Governing Council's Resolution of 27 August 1919, when the new Romanian cultural and scientific institutions, which had emerged as a result of the Great Union, began to be implanted in the Transylvanian space, marked by an effervescent assertion of identity and by the spirit of renewal. The merits of establishing such an institution for the study of the national language belonged exclusively to Sextil Puşcariu, who presented an organization and functioning plan to the Governing Council of Transylvania, in the session of August 7, 1919. Created as a "school of higher education" (DR, I, p. 560) that was adjacent to the Faculty of Letters and Philosophy of the University of Upper Dacia (known, as of 1927, as the "King Ferdinand I" University), the Romanian Language Museum (continued by the present-day "Sextil Puşcariu" Institute of Linguistics and Literary History) developed a distinctive profile over the course of one century.

There have been discussions about whether the museum's date of entry into service coincided or not with the date of its establishment. Indeed, work started in the following year, on February 16, 1920, with the start of the communication sessions, and the actual installation took place in the autumn of 1921, after the complete vacation of the building, as mentioned in the administrative report published in the "Dacoromania" Bulletin (*ibidem*). However, such details cannot overturn the anniversary moment, which entered, from very early on, the tradition of the university and academic world of Cluj. In an article published in the cultural press of the time, a close friend of the Museum stated the following:

> "On March 12, 1929, in the house placed in the middle of the gardens, on Elisabeta Street in Cluj, a pleiade of Romanian philologists who liked to be called themselves «the museists» had gathered to celebrate the 10th anniversary of the establishment of the Romanian Language Museum. Indeed, it has been a decade since this institute came into being, and all those who worked so that it could become what it

DACOROMANIA, serie nouă, XXIII, 2018, nr. 2, Cluj-Napoca, p. 111–121

BDD-A30817 © 2019 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.31 (2026-11-27 13:00:16 UTC)

is today can look back, with satisfaction, at the fruits of their tireless work" (Manoilescu 1930, p. 85).

The intervention of Puşcariu's daughter, lexicographer Lia Manoilescu, launched, in fact, a series of anniversary celebrations dedicated to a decade since the founding of the museum. Taking the year 1919 as an indisputable landmark, round-figure anniversaries have been successively celebrated to this very day. In fact, the great moments of history (let us think, first of all, about the Union of 1 December 1918) are celebrated starting from their legislative promulgation, even if their implementation took some time. In the case of the Museum, there was a premise of continuity, namely the fact that Sextil Puşcariu had been commissioned by the Romanian Academy, in 1906, with compiling the *Dictionary of the Romanian Language*, after the failed attempts of A. T. Laurian and I. C. Massim, followed by B. P. Hasdeu's and Al. Philippide's. The main research theme preceded, therefore, the establishment of the museum's infrastructure, and the handing over of leadership from Chernivtsi to Cluj occurred naturally, without major hindrances, upon the inauguration of the University.

The idea of creating such a laboratory for the research of the Romanian language had preoccupied Professor Puşcariu, a man of Transylvanian extraction who had been teaching in Chernivtsi, as he confessed in his memoirs. In the winter of 1917, on the Italian front, while he let himself be "carried away by dreams for the future", he glimpsed, with visionary strength, the entire configuration of his work:

> "When the *Dictionary* is ready, I would like to have only five more years of work to put together that institution, which seems to me one of the most beautiful institutions and which would remove all the mistakes and fill all the gaps of the present work. It would be called the Romanian Language Museum. Four collaborators would suffice for it" (Puşcariu 1978, p. 190).

Of course, it was a project that had just started, that did not have a tradition behind it, that had been minimally imagined, but that had every chance to grow. The very "juxtaposition" of the words "museum" and "language" seemed shocking and unprecedented then, as the memorialist testified (*ibidem*, p. 536), although the paternity of that collocation was also claimed by other linguists. The unnamed colleague, evoked by Puşcariu in his *Memoirs* (*ibidem*) was none other than Iosif Popovici, the phonetician who had not been integrated in the Cluj collective. The latter boasted in his work *Orthoepia and Phonetics* about a petition aimed at the establishment of a "museum" of this kind, a museum of a narrower scope, however, but appropriate to his "phonographic" concerns; he claimed to have sent that petition to Astra in early 1905 (Popovici 1923, p. 66–70). The fact is that Puşcariu assumed the new humanist construction as a spiritual work, conceived in the smallest of details: a research centre meant to fully revitalize the study and cultivation of the Romanian language.

BDD-A30817 © 2019 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.31 (2026-11-27 13:00:16 UTC)

The one who linked his name to this unparalleled institution of Romanian philology had already become, by that time, a scientific authority. Although he was barely 40 years old, Puşcariu had distinguished himself through a great openness towards innovative linguistic currents and ideas, which gave him indisputable fame in European academic environments. Having been trained at the school of the famous Romanist Wilhelm Meyer-Lübke, he succeeded in 1904, with support from the latter, to lay the foundation of the first Romanian language Seminar at the University of Vienna. Suffice it to mention one of his most important works in Romance studies, first published in 1905, at Heidelberg (republished in 1975), *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der rumänischen Sprache*, I. *Lateinisches Element*, a work awarded the "Ion Heliade-Rădulescu" Prize by the Romanian Academy, or his assiduous contributions, at the end of the nineteenth century, to important foreign publications, such as the "Jahresbericht des Instituts fürrumänische Sprachezu Leipzig" (where he submitted a monographic study in 1898, *Der Dialekt der oberen Olthales/The Dialect on the Upper Valley of the Olt*), "Literaturblatt für germanische und romanische Philologie", "Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie", "Kritischer Jahresbericht über die Fortschritte der romanischen Philologie" or "Zeitschrift für vergleichen de Literatur geschichte".

Founded in 1919, according to the plan conceived by its initiator, who had also become the first rector of the new University of Cluj, the Museum had been organized around a handful of key objectives, thoroughly laid down and designed to inform the future syntheses: the gathering and scientific processing of lexicographic material from all time periods and all areas inhabited by the Romanians; the drawing up of studies relating to the unification of the literary language and of specialized terminology; the awakening of "communal interest" for the study and the cultivation of the Romanian language; the education and training of Romanian philologists. The operations the under consideration were detailed with equal rigorousness: the systematization of the lexicographical material of the Romanian language; the establishment of a specialized library; conducting dialectal and lexicographical research, on the basis of questionnaires; the publication of monographs, special dictionaries, glossaries, studies, bibliographies, and a specialized journal. These aims, set out in the "statutes" of the Museum, were launched in the editorial of the first issue of the "Dacoromania" journal, under the signature of Sextil Puşcariu. The scientist's motivation was exposed with utter clairvoyance:

> "Not even the Romanian Language Museum can seek exemption from this national duty and requirement of the times; especially since the scientific interest for the mother tongue actually exists in almost every individual. If philological studies are no longer of interest to the large public today to the extent that they were for our parents and forefathers, the fault lies, above all, with the philologists themselves. Having commendably broken away from the romanticism that had governed the last generation, instead of maintaining the interest for the study of language by popularizing the scientific

BDD-A30817 © 2019 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.31 (2026-11-27 13:00:16 UTC)

means of the new school, they have shut themselves inside their ivory tower, losing themselves in research details that dilettantes could no longer pursue" (DR, I, p. 2).

The Romanian Language Museum soon established itself as "the most authentic research institute in today's sense", as Iorgu Iordan was to put it later (Iordan 1978, p. 105). Not by chance, at the International Universal Exhibition held in Brussels in 1935, he was awarded an honorary Diploma for his research work. The new institution was to become, above all, a privileged workshop for the compilation of the *Dictionary of the Romanian Language* (DA), after Sextil Puşcariu, who was still teaching at the University of Chernivtsi, had fully devoted himself to this monumental lexicographic enterprise and managed to publish, in 1913, the first volume, comprising the letters *A–B*. Moving now to Cluj, he immersed himself in the "main work" of his life (Puşcariu 1968, p. 335), coagulating around him a diverse but committed group of philologists, consisting mainly of Constantin Lacea and Theodor Capidan, who were seconded, in different stages, by Nicolae Drăganu, C. Diculescu, D. Evolceanu, Teodor Naum, Ştefan Paşca, Ion A. Rădulescu-Pogoneanu, Al. Procopovici, DimitrieMacrea, Iorgu Iordan, Lia Manoilescu Puşcariu, Ipolit Tarnavschi, Silvia Bălan, Aurel Vasiliu, Zorica Laţcu, N. Tcaciuc-Albu, Vica Procopovici, Petre Grimm, Yves Auger and H. Lolliot, names that were better or lesser known, but who devoted part of their career to the *Dictionary of the Academy*. In a communication with this title, delivered at the Romanian Academy on June 4, 1926, Puşcariu reminded the audience that the Museum "had been envisaged from the beginning as a collaborative institute for the *Dictionary of the Academy*" (Puşcariu, 1926, p. 228). An outstanding collective work, the thesaurus dictionary captured the interest of most of the permanent or temporary members of the museum. Even if they were not actually engaged in compiling the dictionary, they participated in its making indirectly, through lexical and etymological notes, an area in which Vasile Bogrea was especially skilled. Those notes were presented in weekly sessions of communications and published, then, in "Dacoromania". For over four decades, until 1949, Sextil Puşcariu and his team published over 3 000 pages, encompassing 60,000 words and variants, respectively the segments of letters *A–de*, *F–lojniță*, giving shape to "one of the summits of national lexicography" (Seche 1969, p. 72). Conceived as a historical and general dictionary, the work included both old, popular and regional words, and neologisms and terms that had recently entered the language. In the *Report to the Dictionary Commission*, first drafted in December 1906 and then used as an introduction to the first volume, Puşcariu gave a complex outline on the manner in which lexical material had been gathered and selected, the establishment of the list of words, the choice of extracts from literary texts, as well as from other sources and different eras, followed by the definition of words and their etymology. His statements are relevant for the criteria underlying the work, as it appears from two short contexts: "We aimed to give popular words unrestricted pride of place, for they are the true elements of the dictionary of the Romanian language: the genius

BDD-A30817 © 2019 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.31 (2026-11-27 13:00:16 UTC)

of our language is reflected in them" (Puşcariu 1913, p. XVI). To this he added: "In such circumstances, neologisms must be received unreservedly, for they complete the language" (*ibidem*, p. XX). Aware that one cannot compile an "ideal dictionary", the professor from Cluj was convinced that the present "hesitations" would be overcome in a future edition, both by adopting a more coherent spelling and, most of all, by extending the illustrative material from literary works and the one collected from the spoken language. Due to the vicissitudes of the times, the work remained unfinished, being passed onto the shoulders of the generations that followed.

The second large-scale scientific axis of the Institute founded and led by SextilPuşcariu was the compilation of a general linguistic atlas of the Romanian language. Designed in the smallest details by the founder of the Museum, the *Romanian Linguistic Atlas* was outstandingly put into practice by two exceptional dialectologists, Sever Pop and Emil Petrovici; the latter was assisted, for the South-Danube dialects, by Ştefan Paşca and Theodor Capidan. In advance, eight partial thematic questionnaires were prepared and launched for indirect, epistolary surveys: I. *The horse* (1922); II. *Thehouse* (1926); III. *The thread* (1929); IV. *Place name and Person Name* (1930); V. *The sheepfold, shepherding and milk preparation* (1931); VI. *Beekeeping* (1933); VII. *Musical instruments* (1935); VIII. *Food and drink* (1937). The 1598 issues, formulated by S. Puşcariu, together with other collaborators, including Sever Pop, ŞtefanPaşca, Ion Chinezu, Petre Coman and Augustin Bena, were organized by fields, providing an invaluable documentation base, both for atlases and especially for the thesaurus dictionary. This kind of indirect surveys were meant to save the "treasure house of words, phrases, and fortunate collocations that our ancestors have left behind and that our parents have perfected in all of the regions inhabited by Romanians" (*Chestionar I*, p. 3). The impact of launching the first Questionnaire in November 1922 rose to the expectations, 670 answers being recorded in a few years (DR, V, p. 904). The intervention of Lucian Blaga, in the Cluj newspaper "Patria", was significant for the intellectuals' responsiveness. He stated that:

> "We heartily urge our readers to contribute, each according to their possibilities, to gathering this invaluable material of the Romanian language. Those who did not receive the questionnaire can request it in writing from the Romanian Language Museum. The work that is done here is for all ages and who is not proud to lay a brick in this great edifice?" (Blaga 1923, p. 1).

This was the third major field investigation conducted through correspondents, after those launched by B. P. Hasdeu and Nicolae Densuşianu in the last decades of the nineteenth century. Thus, the premises of rigorous dialectal research were founded, and they were soon to bear fruit. Between 1930–1938, 389 direct surveys were carried out in parallel, using two questionnaires, within a network of complementary points: namely 301 points for the *Romanian Linguistic Atlas*, Part I (the Sever Pop survey) and 88 points for the *Romanian Linguistic Atlas*, Part II (the

BDD-A30817 © 2019 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.31 (2026-11-27 13:00:16 UTC)

(the Emil Petrovici survey). It should be noted that at DCaracostea's suggestion, Sever Pop had administered surveys before with representative writers from the three Romanian provinces: Mihail Sadoveanu, Ion Al. Brătescu-Voineşti and Ion Agârbiceanu. Ten volumes of the atlases were originally expected to appear: six of ALR I, of which five volumes with maps and one with uncharted material, in literary transcription, as well as four volumes of ALR II. However, between 1938 and 1943, there appeared successively only two large volumes and two small volumes from Sever Pop's survey (the first received the Paris Society of Linguistics Award), and three volumes from Emil Petrovici's linguistic survey (a large volume, a supplement with terms considered obscene and a small volume), together with a volume of *Dialectal Texts.* What the attention of specialists has retained is the fact that for each of the large analytical volumes there is a synthetic volume, with coloured maps, called the *Small Romanian Linguistic Atlas* (ALRM I and II), which contains aspects of phonetics, morphology and lexicology, this way of working being considered "*l'innovazionepiù utile apportatadai Rumeni*" (Tagliavini 1959, p. 28).

The Atlas had a really strong echo in the European scientific world, which led the Swiss Romanist dialectologist Kark Jaberg to write down the following:

> "No public library with a scientific profile, which takes very seriously the provision of resources for fundamental research, and no romance institute of enough credibility will wish to do without this work, which gives new directions to the geolinguistic image of Europe, broadening our perspective and deepening our understanding" (Jaberg 1940, p. 50–51)[1].

Alongside the two priority research directions, lexicography and linguistic geography, new topics, not at all marginal, were approached: for instance, the Romanian *Onomasticon* and *Toponomasticon*, with the participation of Ştefan Paşca. A bibliographic section became particularly active during this period. In May 1930, the *Folklore Archive* was added to it, under the supervision of Ion Muşlea. Although it did not prevail among the institutionalized themes of research, literary history established itself as a coordinate of the concerns of "museists", attracted primarily by old literature. We may invoke, in this regard, Sextil Puşcariu's *History of Romanian Literature*, I. *The Old Era* (1921, re-edited in 1930 and 1936); Nicolae Drăganu's *Histoire de la literature roumaine de Transylvanie des origines à la fin du XVIII^e siècle* (1938); or the edition compiled by Ştefan Paşca, entitled *An Unknown Wallachian Printed Text from the Seventeenth Century. The Oldest Romanian Horologion* (1939). Other well-known literary historians who worked in the Museum

[1] Here is the passage from "Vox Romanica" in the original: "Keine öffentliche wissenschaftliche Bibliothek, die es mit der Bereitstellung der grundlegenden Forschungsmittel ernst nimmt, und kein romanisches Seminar, dem genügende Kredite zur Verfügung stehen, wird das Werk entbehren wollen, das dem sprach geographischen Bild von Europa neue Züge verleiht, unsern Blick weitet und unsere Einsicht vertieft".

BDD-A30817 © 2019 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.31 (2026-11-27 13:00:16 UTC)

include Ion Breazu, Ion Chinezu or the bibliographer N. Georgescu-Tistu, "devoted museists", as the founder of the institution considered them (Puşcariu 1978, p. 543). Later on, an important scholar who joined the group was the literary ideologist D. Popovici, a true school creator (who contributed to the magazine from the ninth volume on, 1936–1938). Yet, the latter didn't joined the movement, being interested instead in founding an Institute of Romanian Literary History, as he himself affirms in the preface of the first volume of "Studii literare" (Popovici 1942, p. VII).

We may observe, therefore, from this retrospective, that the Museum became associated with a derivative concept that naturally imposed itself in the era and that we have already circulated: the *museists*. They gravitated around the museum and represented a plethora of researchers from several generations (three, according to some opinions), some only temporarily, others becoming "faithful *museists*" (*ibidem*, p. 537), who ennobled philological research. The portraits which the memoirist draws sympathetically capture the main characteristics of his collaborators, starting with the "scrupulous" Nicolae Drăganu, continuing with the "sparkling" scholar Vasile Bogrea (whom he regrets not having been able to draw into work on the dictionary), and with the most loyal, Constantin Lacea and Theodor Capidan, or the "ingenious" Romance scholar, George Giuglea. Moreover, his disciple and successor as head of the museum, Alexe Procopovici, was a "*museist*, heart and soul" (*ibidem*, p. 541), supported by his mentor unswervingly, despite the animosities he had caused in various milieus in the capital. This gallery could be completed with the Germanists Gustav Kisch and Ion Gherghel (the latter was mentioned as author in the preface to DA, vol. I, Part II, *C*), or with the classicists Ştefan Bezdechi (he wrote an extensive review of Kr. Sandfeld's *Balkanfilologien*, in DR, IV, Part II) and Teodor Naum, the latter being the translator of Theocritus, Virgil (Publius Vergilius Maro) and Tacitus, but also the "stylistic reviser" of the dictionary, with whom Puşcariu would co-author, in 1932, an *Ortographic Handbook and Vocabulary*, a book that was reedited five times since then.For a period, the group was joined by Leca Morariu, from Chernivtsi, considered "of great help in the first organizational work or as secretary of meetings" (Puşcariu1978, p. 541). Morariu defended, in 1921, under the guidance of his professor, his doctoral thesis entitled *The Morphology of the Romanian Predicative Verb*. The Italianist Giandomenico Serra cannot be overlooked, his signature being found in 11 of the 13 volumes of "Dacoromania". His works, as Ştefan Paşca rightfully believed, belong to the "scientific nucleus of Cluj" (DR, VII, p. 395). For a long time, one who was always present at the sessions of communications was the historian and archaeologist Constantin Daicoviciu, a curator assistant at the Museum in the beginning (AUC, III, 1922–1923, p. 125). Afterwards, he signed brief etymological notes and reviews in the magazine, so his presence in a commemorative album of the *museists* in 1937 cannot be deemed circumstantial. In the same manner, the botanist Alexandru Borza, the doctor Valeriu Bologa and the epigraphist philologist I. I. Russu (author of the study

BDD-A30817 © 2019 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.31 (2026-11-27 13:00:16 UTC)

Autochthonous Words in the Romanian Language, in DR, XI, 1948) would gravitate around the Museum and around the magazine. Finally, the third generation of *museists* – taking into account the contributions to the latest volumes of the publication – includes names such as D. Macrea (whose debut occurred in vol. VII, 1931–1933), Vladimir Drimba, Mircea Zdrenghea, Romulus Todoran, Liviu Onu, Ioan Pătruț, Iosif Pervain (alias I. Verbină) and Eugen Tănase.

What were the criteria by which the status of a *museist* could be conferred? It would seem that acceptance in this eclectic but well-knit group was not the result of a severe examination. A communication presented at the meetings held initially on Monday, then on Tuesday evening, even a simple intervention in the heated discussions surrounding a communication seemed to permit entry into this exclusive club of scholars. However, an authentic *museist* was validated, in the first instance, by his contributions to the great linguistic works of the Museum, to which were added, on a voluntary basis, published articles in "Dacoromania". Reflecting the pulse of the Museum, weekly meetings fuelled scientific debate. They represented events in the academic life of Cluj. Upon Nicolae Drăganu's death, Sextil Puşcariu commented on the necessity of these meetings:

> "We took advantage of each other through mutual – sometimes fierce, most of the time spiritual, never but bitter – criticism, because the spirit of criticism never arose from a pleasure of destroying, but from a desire to complete, and the joy from the discovery of the others was always greater than the temptation to persist in error. In this atmosphere true emulation could grow among us. It produced the volumes «Dacoromania» and those published by most of us at the Romanian Academy" (DR, X, p. 6).

References throughout these pages to "Dacoromania", the Bulletin of the Museum, were not few. In many respects, the magazine became one with the institution itself. Justly considered to be "the greatest and most important journal of Romanian linguistics between the two world wars" (Macrea 1957, p. 17), the publication created, from 1921 to 1948, through its 11 volumes (i.e., 13 massive tomes), totalling approximately 9 000 pages, an impressive reputation. The journal focused, in a programmatic way, on publishing materials "especially of a methodical and principial nature" (DR, I, p. 7). It included studies, notes, and extensive reviews from the major areas of linguistics (lexicology, dialectology and linguistic geography, linguistic history, onomastics, general linguistics, grammar, phonetics and phonology) and philology; occasionally, research from the domains of literary history and criticism, cultural history and folklore was also published. The bibliographic information on the writings of linguistics, philology and the history of literature, published in the country and abroad between 1921–1944, is presented in a special column, bearing various titles along the way ("Periodicals Review", "Bibliography of Periodicals", "Bibliography of Publications", "Bibliography of Publications on the Romanian Language", a working tool in which specialized writings were analytically inventoried. Starting from vol. IV, Part II, Sextil Puşcariu launched a personal column "On Books", an "impressionist" reading journal, but one that devoured

BDD-A30817 © 2019 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.31 (2026-11-27 13:00:16 UTC)

hundreds of universal philology titles. Among the contributors were consecrated Romanian authors or beginners, all of whom had passed, as a rule, through the filter of the periodic sessions of communications, and several authorities on linguistics, such as W. Meyer-Lübke, Leo Spitzer, Petar Skok, and Carlo Tagliavini. In addition, the journal had been awarded, in 1926, the prize of the Paris Society of Linguistics, as "the richest publication of a Romance language".

We can see now, on the eve of the centennial anniversary, that almost every one of the axes of scientific research established at that time – the *Dictionary*, the *Atlas*, the "Dacoromania" journal was adopted and enhanced by the current generation. Continuity at the level of fundamental research and in the study of the Romanian language and literature confirms, ultimately, the exceptional intuitions that Sextil Puşcariu, the school founder, had one century ago.

An appropriate conclusion to this anniversary historiographic overview seems to be a reproduction of an unpublished letter sent to Puşcariu by the famous German linguist Hugo (Ernst Mario) Schuchardt, in 1922, in which eulogized the journal from Cluj. Here is the translation of the text[2]:

Graz, 28 Febr. 1922

Beloved colleague and friend!

Because, in the past few weeks, I've been caught up in a never-ending and dizzying epistolary maelstrom (exacerbated by a long and arduous proofreading process), I don't know at this point when I last wrote to you, or if I gave you thanks, as I should have. Now, in any case, as a German saying goes: sewn twice, it will hold better. It was only in the latter days that I managed to thank your Academy (whose current

[2] Let us reproduce the letter in the original. It can be found in the Sextil Puşcariu Archive of the "Sextil Puşcariu" Institute of Linguistics and Literary History in Cluj:

Graz, 28 Febr. 1922

Lieber Kollege und Freund!

Während der letzten Wochen durch eine massenhafte und verwirrende Briefschreiberei (verschärft durch eine lange, schwierige Korrektur) in Anspruch genommen, weiß ich in diesem Augenblicke nicht wann ich Ihnen zum letzten Mal geschrieben und ob ich Ihnen meinen pflichtschuldigen Dank ausgesprochen habe. Nun, auf jeder Fall: wie ein deutsches Sprichwort sagt, zweimal genäht, hält besser. Erst in den letzten Tagen bin ich dazu gekommen Ihrer Akademie (deren jetzigen Präsidenten ich einst in Mehadia kennen gelernt zu haben glaube) für ihren in jeder Hinsicht wunderschönen Glückwunsch zu danken. Dabei habe ich natürlich auch der wertvollen Beilage: *Din perspectiva dicţionarului* gedacht. Aber das darf mich nicht davon abhalten, dem Verfasser persönlich meinen Dank auszudrücken, und nicht bloß diesen, sondern auch meine Bewunderung, und nicht bloß dafür, sondern für alles was Sie in der letzten Zeit geschaffen haben. Leider habe ich, besonders meiner Augen wegen, von von diesem Reichtum nur erst einen keinen Teil genießen kommen. Aber schon ein Durchblättern der "Dacoromania" wie ich es gestern vornahm, lässt mich erkommen welche fruchtbare Initiative, welche weite Umblick sich hier offenbar. Ja wahrlich nun gibt es auch in wissenschaftlichen Sinn ein Großrumänien!

Mit Herzlichem Gruß,

Ihr ergebener,

M. Schuchardt

BDD-A30817 © 2019 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.31 (2026-11-27 13:00:16 UTC)

president I think I once met in Mehadia) for the wonderful wishes, in every respect. What was also on my mind, of course, was the wonderful adage: *From the dictionary's perspective*. But this does not stop me from personally bringing my thanks to the author, and not only my thanks, but also my admiration, not only for this, but also for everything that you have created lately. Unfortunately, most of all because of my sight, I have only got to enjoy some of your many creations. But as soon as I had the respite to browse "Dacoromania" yesterday, I was surprised at its fruitful élan, at its broad perspective. Now, indeed, there is a Greater Romania also from the perspective of science!

Cordial wishes,
Yours faithfully,

M. Schuchardt

REFERENCES

AAR = "Analele Societății Academice Române", Bucureşti, I, 1867 sqq; as of 1879, "Analele Academiei Române".

AUC = "Anuarul Universității din Cluj", I, 1919–1920 and *passim*.

Blaga 1923 = LucianBlaga, *De la Muzeul Limbii Române*, in "Patria", V, no. 23, 2 February 1923, p. 1.

Chestionar I = Chestionar pentru un atlaslingvistic al limbei române, I. *Calul*, Cluj, Tiparul Institutului de Arte Grafice "Ardealul", 1922.

CL = "Cercetări de lingvistică", Cluj, I–XXXVIII, 1956–1993.

DA = Academia Română, *Dicționarul limbii române*[Romanian Academy. *Dictionary of the Romanian Language*]. Compiled and published as suggested by and at the expense of His Majesty King Carol I, Volume I, Part I. *A–B*, Bucureşti, Librăriile Socec & Comp. şi C. Sfetea, 1913; Part II. *C*, Bucureşti, Tipografia ziarului "Universul", 1940; Part III, Fasc. I. *D–DE* [without the mention concerning the King's contribution], Bucureşti, Universul. Întreprindere Industrială a Statului, 1949; Volume II, Part I. *F–I*, Bucureşti, Monitorul Oficial şi Imprimeriile Statului. Imprimeria Națională, 1934; Part II, Fasc. I–III. *J–Lojniță*, Bucureşti, Tipografia Ziarului "Universul" SA, 1937, 1940, 1948.

DR = "Dacoromania", Cluj, I–XI, 1920/1921–1948; new series, I, 1994–1995 and *passim*.

Iordan 1978 = *Istoria lingvisticii româneşti*, edited by Iorgu Iordan, Bucureşti, Editura Ştiințifică şi Enciclopedică, 1978.

Jaberg 1940 = Karl Jaberg, *Der rumänische Sprachatlas und die Struktur des dacorumänischen Sprachgebiets*, in "Vox Romanica", V, 1940, no. 1–2, p. 49–86.

Macrea 1957 = D. Macrea, *Lingvistica românească între cele două războaie mondiale. Şcoala clujeană*, în CL, II, 1957, p. 9–22.

Manoilescu 1930 = Lia Manoilescu, *Muzeul Limbii Române*, in "Boabe de grâu", I, 1930, no. 2, p. 85–91.

Popovici 1923 = Iosif Popovici, *Ortoepia şi fonetica*, Cluj, Institutul de Arte Grafice "Ardealul", 1923.

Popovici 1942 = D. Popovici, *Prefață*, in "Studiiliterare", I, 1942, p. VII–VIII.

Puşcariu 1913 = Sextil Puşcariu, *Raport către Comisiunea Dicționarului*, in DA, Tomul I, Partea I. *A–B*, p. VIII–XLI.

Puşcariu 1926 = SextilPuşcariu, *Dicționarul Academiei*, în AAR, Mem. secț. lit., series III, volume III, 1926, p. 195–229.

Puşcariu 1968 = Sextil Puşcariu, *Călare pe două veacuri. Amintiri din tinerețe (1895–1906)*, Bucureşti, Editura pentru Litreratură, 1968.

Puşcariu 1978 = Sextil Puşcariu, *Memorii*. Edited by Magdalena Vulpe. Foreword by Ion Bulei. Notes by Ion Bulei and Magdalena Vulpe, Bucureşti, Editura Minerva, 1978.

BDD-A30817 © 2019 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.31 (2026-11-27 13:00:16 UTC)

Seche 1969 = Mircea Seche, *Schiță de istorie a lexicografiei române*, vol. II, Bucureşti, Editura Ştiinţifică, 1969.
Tagliavini 1959 = Carlo Tagliavini, *Le origini delle lingue neolatine. Introduzione alla filologia romanza*. Terza edizione ampliata e aggiornata, Bologna, Casa Editrice Riccardo Pàtron, 1959.

REFLECȚII LA CENTENARUL MUZEULUI LIMBII ROMÂNE (1919–2019)
(*Rezumat*)

Acest excurs istoriografic este prilejuit de împlinirea unui secol de la înființarea Muzeului Limbii Române din Cluj (actualul Institut de Lingvistică şi Istorie Literară „Sextil Puşcariu"). El a fost întemeiat în ziua de 1 octombrie 1919, prin Hotărârea Consiliului Dirigent al Transilvaniei din 27 august 1919, fiind conceput de Sextil Puşcariu ca o „şcoală de studii înalte" pe lângă Facultatea de Litere şi Filosofie a Universității Daciei Superioare (numită ulterior Universitatea „Regele Ferdinand I"). „Statutele" Muzeului au fost lansate în editorialul primului număr al revistei „Dacoromania", sub semnătura lui Sextil Puşcariu. În principal, se urmăreau intensificarea studiului şi cultivării limbii române, pregătirea şi formarea de filologi, precum şi inițierea unor cercetări dialectale şi lexicografice în vederea elaborării marilor sinteze: *Dicționarul limbii române* şi *Atlasul lingvistic român*. Muzeul Limbii Române s-a impus în scurt timp drept „cel mai autentic institut de cercetări în sensul nostru de astăzi", după expresia de mai târziu a lui Iorgu Iordan. În jurul Muzeului a gravitat o pleiadă de cercetători destoinici, aparținând mai multor generații, începând cu Constantin Lacea, Theodor Capidan, Nicolae Drăganu, Ştefan Paşca, George Giuglea, Al. Procopovici, Sever Pop sau Emil Petrovici, pentru a aminti doar numele cele mai reprezentative. Prin elaborarea marilor lucrări de referință, la care se adaugă organizarea şedințelor săptămânale de comunicări, precum şi publicarea buletinului Muzeului, „Dacoromania", din care au apărut, între 1921 şi 1948, 11 volume, în 13 tomuri masive, s-a creat o inegalabilă şcoală lingvistică, asumată ca model de generația actuală. Rândurile lui Hugo Schuchardt din 1922 adresate lui Puşcariu sunt cea mai bună confirmare a prestigiului câştigat în scurt timp de muzeu şi de revista sa: „Acum, într-adevăr, există o Românie Mare şi din perspectiva ştiinței".

Cuvinte-cheie: *centenar*, *Sextil Puşcariu*, *dicționar*, *atlas*, *Dacoromania*.
Keywords: *centenary*, *Sextil Puşcariu*, *dictionary*, *atlas*, *Dacoromania*.

The "SextilPuşcariu"
Institute of Linguistics and Literary History
of the Romanian Academy
Cluj-Napoca, 21 E. Racoviță St.
eug.pavel@yahoo.com

BDD-A30817 © 2019 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.31 (2026-11-27 13:00:16 UTC)