THE CONCEPT OF NEOLOGISM: A COMPARATIVE STUDY FOR ROMANIAN AND EUROPEAN CULTURE

Marius-Radu Clim, PhD, Scientific Researcher, Romanian Academy, Iași Branch

Abstract: The present analysis aims at briefly presenting the neologism issue in the representative Romanian and European studies from a historic perspective. We are trying to analyze the meanings of the neologism concept in the specialized works and in the dictionaries belonging both to the Romanian and to the European linguistics. In the linguistic works the difficulties of classifying the new words in a language are obvious. we have mentioned authors in the Romanian linguistics field, such as Gh. Adamescu, S. Puşcariu, I. Iordan, Th. Hristea, but also others, that provide a diversity of approaches to this area. Several representative studies on neologism within the European linguistics are also pointed out, namely the works of L. Guilbert, L. Bloomfield, L. Hjelmslev, Maria T. Cabré, John Humbley and others. This comparative study mentions the meanings of neologism, but also its lexical family, in the Romanian dictionaries, starting from the first attestation in 1832 in Iordache Golescu's work entitled Condica limbii rumâneşti (The Romanian language register) and continuing with Vocabular franţezo-românesc (French-Romanian vocabulary) elaborated by P. Poenar, F. Aaron and G. Hill, the dictionaries of Negulici, Stamati, Laurian and Massim, DLR and ending with the editions of the Dictionary of Neologisms elaborated by Florin Marcu.
The neologisms raise important problems to the authors of dictionaries. The problems are due to both the lack of attestations and to the differences in approaching neologisms in specialized works.

Keywords: neologism, Romanian lexicography, dictionary, borrowing, language history

We intend to pursue the analysis of the concept of neologism in language researchers' work and then illustrate the definitions found in lexicographical works. Through this approach we seek to highlight specific nuances offered by neologism analysis and the personal contribution of Romanian linguists to understand this linguistic phenomenon. Etymologically, the term *neologism* (< fr. *néologisme*, cf. gr. *νέος* şi *λόγος*) designate a new word entered in a language, regardless the way of formation and origin. This transparent etymology can offer a very convenient definition of the concept. But if we approach this issue in its entirety, we find that the very concept of neologism is more complex and requires a deeper analysis. In addition, the notion of neologism was and is extensively discussed by philologists, who gave multiple semantic values.

Philological debates prove that there are obvious difficulties in classifying new words. One of the experts who highlighted this difficulty was Gh. Adamescu, a scientist concerned about the concept of multiple etymology, claiming that "numirea de ‚neologism', ‚cuvânt nou' este o însuşire foarte relativă şi care se poarte pierde[1]" (Adamescu, p. 49). He points out that generally, people have the awareness that some words are new and others old, but

[1] "the appointment of 'neologism', as 'new word' is a very relative attribute and it can be lost" (our translation).

BDD-A22314 © 2014 "Petru Maior" University Press
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 08:56:33 UTC)

"însuşirea de noutate a neologismelor este relativă[2]" (*ibidem*, p. 50), the loans being considered new entrants in the language only for a certain period of time. The frequent use and their passage from literary or scientific register in the usual language speakers lead to their assimilation in the current vocabulary.

In the first volume of *Limba română*, Sextil Puşcariu distinguishes several types of loans. Based on the demarcation made by the Swiss linguist Ernst Tappolet, S. Puşcariu discerns the *loan luxury* ("Luxuslehnwort") from the *loan needed* ("Bedürfnisslehnwort"). The latter enters the language with the concept designated by, that is called *cultural term* ("Kulturwort"). These needed terms are determined by social and cultural development, therefore "asemenea împrumuturi se găsesc în toate limbile şi le găsim în număr mare mai ales în epoci în care starea culturală a unui popor a făcut salturi mari, sau când civilizaţia a pătruns în straturile largi ale populaţiei[3]" (Puşcariu[1], p. 366). Once in language, the words adapt to the lexical system of the Romanian language and form new families of words or derivatives on land language, thus leading to no longer be able to distinguish between these cultural terms and loans made to people to people contact day ("Lehnwörter"). If the loan is made only in the cultivated stratum of society and it is employed only when we are dealing with *neologisms* ("Fremdwörter"). Users of these neologisms - usually the educated bilingual or trilingual speakers, - recognize their foreign origin. Thus, Puşcariu makes a distinction between borrowing *cultural terms* which is achieved by continuous contact between the two nations and spreads to all the social levels, in opposition to the *neologism* that is used only by the educated stratum of society. The latter is recognized as a new term and has a precise etymology for those who use it, as they are connoisseurs of the source language. Finally, regarding the neologism, the Romanian linguist also highlights those terms that are perceived as "un corp străin în organismul limbii"[4] and they are treated as such, called *barbarisms*.

However, this distinction cannot be rigid, since the language evolves and the vocabulary is constantly transformed. This change of language also produces a change of the statutes of certain terms. Thus, a *neologism* can become a *cultural term*, if it is taken also by other social fields. Moreover, a *barbarism* can become a loan ("Lehnwörter") and even a luxury one, finally adapting to the specific of the receiving language. In conclusion, such a typology is necessary for understanding the phenomenon of language borrowing and the processes of adaptation of terms, but it cannot describe exhaustively all the innovations in the vocabulary.

Iorgu Iordan, like other philologists, moreover, claims that neologisms are "elemente lingvistice împrumutate, începând cu primii ani ai veacului XIX, câteodată poate şi ceva mai înainte, din limbile de circulaţie occidentală[5]" (Iordan, p. 3). This delimitation is motivated by the fact that the linguist refers to a certain stage of evolution of the Romanian language, characterized by a large number of loans in that time of history, justified by the fact that the Romanian language had entered into a long process of cultivation and transformation, as modern literary language.

Referring to the meaning of the term *neologism*, the author states that two meanings could be assigned to it: "în sens larg, este *neologism* orice cuvânt nou, împrumutat sau creat prin mijloace interne; în sens restrâns, numai cuvântul străin, împrumutat la o dată nu prea

[2] "that assimilation of the novelty of the neologisms is relative" (our translation).
[3] "such loans are in all languages and we find them in large numbers especially in the era in which cultural condition of a people make big jumps or when civilization has penetrated the wider layers of population" (our translation).
[4] "foreign bodies in the language body" (our translation).
[5] "linguistic elements that were borrowed from the Occidental languages starting with the early years of the XIXth century, sometimes maybe a little earlier" (our translation).

BDD-A22314 © 2014 "Petru Maior" University Press
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 08:56:33 UTC)

îndepărtată, se numeşte *neologism*". Therefore, on the land of Romanian language *neologisms* could only be considered "cuvintele împrumutate în perioada de timp acoperită de conceptul *limba română contemporană* şi despre care vorbitorii au conştiinţa că sunt cuvinte noi"[6] (Iordan–Robu, p. 310). The Romanian linguist admits that even before the nineteenth century there were many borrowed words into the Romanian language and "au avut la început un regim asemănător cu al neologismelor, pe care însă datorită uzajului, l-au pierdut"[7].

The diversity of definitions offered to this concept is highlighted by Rodica Zafiu. The author considers, in an article entitled *Neologismul şi purismul (Neologism and purism)*, that means of defining neologism in the Romanian linguistics was determined by the process of adaptation to the Western culture, developed in the second half of the nineteenth century. Therefore, R. Zafiu believes that in the definition of neologism a subdomain is almost exclusively selected from the "din accepţia lui ‚internaţională' (de ‚cuvânt nou'), e selectat aproape exclusiv un subdomeniu, constituit din împrumuturile moderne, culte"[8] (Zafiu, Neologismul, p. 11). This restriction in use is justified by the fact that the loans and the internal creations at a smaller scale are actually new lexical elements.

Another trend is to consider as neologisms also the terms that entered the language since the seventeenth century "în măsura în care fac parte din sfera culturii moderne"[9]. This delimitation is justified by the fact that these terms had a limited circulation, being reintroduced into the language and the public use only in the nineteenth century.

R. Zafiu points out that through these delimitations, the concept of neologism leaves at an important scale its etymological and internationally accepted meaning. Yet, for the Romanian linguistics, the neologism becomes a well-defined label: "diferenţa dintre o cultură a elitei, pro-occidentală şi recentă – şi una populară, tradiţională"[10].

A final trend for interpreting the neologism in the Romanian area is the observation that the neologism "e mai puţin poetic, mai puţin literar, având mai puţine conotaţii, ecouri, ambiguităţi şi fiind asociat de obicei cu sfera comunicării eficiente şi impersonale". Although, as mentioned by R. Zafiu, this "attitude" has changed during the recent decades, "nostalgia sau prestigiul purismului continuă să acţioneze şi azi" [11] (*ibidem*, p. 11). What is worth being highlighted is the fact itself that these different ways of defining the neologism emphasize the effects of adopting neologic terms in Romanian language.

Theodor Hristea, concerned with the lexical creations of the Romanian language, has proven to be a critical and profound analyst of the problems of the Romanian vocabulary. In a chapter that refers to the loan in the Romanian language, he admits that from an etymological point of view, the neologism should be considered every new word in a certain language either borrowed or created with the internal means of the language, but acknowledges that "în lingvistica românească sunt socotite neologisme în special împrumuturile pe care română le-a făcut din limbile apusene ori direct din latină pe cale savantă"[12] (Hristea 1984, p. 50). Among

[6] "in a broad sense, the *neologism* represents any new word, borrowed or created through internal means; in a restricted way, only the foreign word, borrowed not very long time ago, is called *neologism*"… "the words that were borrowed during the period covered by the concept of *contemporary Romanian language* of whom the speakers are aware that they are new words" (our translation).
[7] "at the beginning they were treated similarly to neologisms, but because of usage, they lost this treatment" (our translation).
[8] "international" acceptation (of new word), which is formed of modern, studied loans" (our translation).
[9] "under the condition that they are part of the modern culture field" (our translation).
[10] "the difference between a culture of the elite that is pro-occidental and recent, and popular, traditional one" (our translation).
[11] "is less poetic, less literary, with fewer connotations, echoes, ambiguities and is usually associated with the area of efficient and impersonal communication"… "the nostalgia or prestige of purism continue to operate even nowadays" (our translation).
[12] "in the Romanian linguistics the neologisms are considered especially the loans that the Romanian language has made either from the Western languages or directly from Latin by scholastic influence" (our translation).

BDD-A22314 © 2014 "Petru Maior" University Press
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 08:56:33 UTC)

the articles of the author, a special study is devoted to the concept of *neologism* where there are mentioned different perceptions of the linguists regarding this issue. In the work *Conceptul de neologism...*, (*The concept of neologism*) Th. Hristea believes that although there are many studies on lexical borrowing, the concept of neologism was not such an important concern for the researchers of the Romanian vocabulary.

He makes a summary of the studies of the neologism proving that, for example, in French, some lexicographers avoid using the term of *neologism*, even if it is attested in French since 1735 (cf. Robert, s.v.). Thus, the author emphasizes the relativity of the concept of neologism and, therefore, lexicographers avoid using the *neologism* brand, being more concerned with the dating of words.

The term neologism is replaced by many linguists with various periphrases: "new word", "recent word", "contemporary word". For instance, Leonard Bloomfield in his famous work *Language*, uses other terms to define neologism, namely *cultural borrowing*, *intimate borrowing* and *dialectal borrowing*. Some authors of dictionaries prefer to use synonyms in order to explain the term of *neologism*. For example, Hartmann and Gregory James define neologism very briefly as "a word or phrase which has entered the language (as a BORROWING or a COINAGE or through SEMANTIC CHANGE)" (Hartmann–James, s.v. *neologism*). Yet, for the term *borrowing*, the authors develop the definition, providing a broad analysis of the concept. The dictionary article concludes with a list of synonyms, and the last mentioned is "neologism". In another dictionary, entitled *A Glossary of Historical Linguistics*, the authors consider the *neologism* as a general concept that comprises all the lexical innovations of a language, whether borrowed from other languages, or words invented by the speakers, without being able to reveal the lexical source (Campbell–Mixco, s.v. *neologism*). Nevertheless, the authors also describe other concepts, namely *borrowing*, *lexical borrowing*, *lexical innovation*, *language contact* and *loanword*.

In the mentioned study, Th. Hristea makes a summary of researches on neologisms in the European languages. Thus, he notes that the German language has evolved from a very open attitude towards borrowing from French, Italian and Spanish, to a refractory attitude in the nineteenth century, preferring the semantic borrowing and the internal creations. Although in the German language the word *Neologismus* exists, in the literature of specialty the terms *Fremdwort* and *Lehwort* are preferred. The first represents the borrowed and integrated in the language, that are adapted to its phonetic and morphological system. By *Fremdwort* the specialists understand the neologisms or "foreign words", which are still not adapted to the language system.

As we have already mentioned, this diversity of approaches is also found in the European literature of specialty. Further we shall highlight some of the most representative contributions regarding the definition of neologism. In the European linguistics, many linguists refuse or carefully avoid using the term of *neologism*. Instead, they use different collocations and synonyms: *mot nouveau*, *mot contemporain*, *emprunt*, *borrowing*, *Fremdwort* and others. Moreover, as Th. Hristea observes in the study of neologism, this concept is understood differently in our country compared to how it is perceived in the European linguistics.

In the work entitled *Le langage...* Louis Hjelmslev defines the neologism in a very restrictive manner, namely: „former des signes complètement nouveaux qui ne sont ni des transformations d'autre signes ni des introductions venues de l'extérieur" (Hjelmslev 1966, p. 94). Thus, the Danish linguist considers neologisms only the absolutely new creations of a language, creations that should not copy other models or should not be adaptations of them. He makes the distinction between *mots d'emprunt* and *mots étrangers*. The first ones represent

BDD-A22314 © 2014 "Petru Maior" University Press
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 08:56:33 UTC)

words that were borrowed and adapted to the phonetic and morphological system of the "receiving" language, while mots étrangers are the terms whose form does not harmonize with the rest of the vocabulary. Foreign words are not subject to the specific rules of the structure of the receiving language, but to those of the original language. Thus, as mentioned by Hjelmslev, they are „des minoritaires pour lesquels il existerait une législation spéciale" (*ibidem*, p. 87).

Louis Guilbert, analyzing the lexical creativity of the French language, defines the lexical neology as „la possibilité de création de nouvelles unités lexicales, en vertu des règles de production incluses dans le système lexical" (Guilbert, p. 31). Depending on the creative intent of the speakers of a language, he divides neology into two big types: denominative neology and stylistic neology.

We have to mention here the basic idea of the study of L. Guilbert, namely the idea that only the term created in a language according to the system of that language can be considered „le véritable néologisme, que nous ne confondons pas avec le terme emprunté" (*ibidem*, p. 93). Therefore, he believes that most of the time, keeping a borrowed term in a the language is due not to a real need to express something new and to the impossibility of means in the used language, but rather to the fact that between the members of the same community there is a tendency towards uniformity. Thus, the use of a borrowed term by a speaker may be motivated by the simple imitation of others in the community.

Other researchers, lexicographers or terminologists have been particularly concerned with defining the field f neology as science that examines the changes in a language. For example, Maria Cabré highlights the dynamic nature of neology and its role of demonstrating the evolution of society. Therefore, neology is considered a „fenomen consistent a introduir en una llengua una unitat lèxica o un altre recurs lingüístic nous, que o poden haver estat creats aprofitant els recursos interns de la pròpia llenqua o bé manvellats a una llenqua forana" (Neologia, p. 14).

John Humbley states that neology is born by default within the speech „et si on cherche à l'implanter dans la langue, il convient naturellement de bien étudier les conditions qui président à sa naissance". He considers neology a much broader field that includes all the lexical creations: „la néologie ce n'est pas seulement les créations possibles et réalisées, mais aussi les créations impossible et néanmoins réalisées" (Humbley, p. 176). The same statement is supported by Pruvost and Sablayrolles which emphasize the fact that the discursive nature of neologisms itself represents the cause for which neologisms have not been treated in the structuralism linguistic studies. Since the structuralists analyzed especially the language rather than the speech and the synchronic operation of the language to the prejudice of language evolution, the concept of neologism is almost missing in the grammar and linguistic studies (Pruvost–Sablayrolles, p. 59).

By presenting these acceptations[13] of the concept of *neologism*, first of all, we can observe the heterogeneity of the approaches that demonstrate the diversity itself of the changes within a language. In the European specialty literature, the structuralism vision has imposed an attitude of neglect or rejection of neologisms, because they were considered deviations or accidents that disrupt the stability of the system at a certain time. For the Romanian culture, an attitude of rejection of neologisms has characterized some of the intellectuals during the period of modernization of the literary language, when the language was enriched with a large number of loans, especially from the Romance languages. What is

[13] More acceptations from linguistic works and dictionaries are presented in an extended Romanian version of this article, in CLIM, pp. 51-85.

BDD-A22314 © 2014 "Petru Maior" University Press
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 08:56:33 UTC)

unanimously accepted nowadays is that neologisms also represent a trademark of the culturalism of a people. Thus, a large number of neologisms entered into a language in a given period of time is the evidence of a cultural progress for the speakers of that language.

But perhaps the biggest problem that the researchers faced when analyzing neologisms is precisely the character of "novelty" of the words. Since the novelty feature of the neologic terms is relative, this matter has been discussed by linguists in a different manner. A first reaction was the reluctance to using the term of *neologism* and replaces it with other synonyms, less ambiguous. In the Romanian linguistics, through *neologism* we understand, in most cases, only terms those were borrowed from other languages. But a limitation of the meaning of this concept is not typical only to the Romanian linguistics. As we have already proven, if in Iorgu Iordan's opinion the neologism is represented only by the Latin-Romance terms integrated into the Romanian language during its process of modernization, for Louis Guilbert the true neologisms are only the words formed within the French language. L. Hjelmslev is even more restrictive in his approach, considering neologisms only the *ex-nihilo* terms which are neither loans nor creations according to internal models of a language. Another difference is between keeping and loosing the status of neologism for the new lexical terms. In conclusion, the diversity of innovations in a language has determined the apparition of acceptations of neologism that differentiated among themselves both according to the characteristics of the analyzed language and also because of the attitude of linguists towards the changes in a language.

In the Romanian dictionaries, the *neologism* term was first mentioned in 1832, in Iordache Golescu's work *Condica limbii rumâneşti*. A particular concern for explaining and adapting the words is found in *Vocabular franţezo-românesc* (*Romanian-French Vocabulary*) realized by P. Poenar, F. Aaron and G. Hill. The authors try to define the French term by the corresponding neologic Romanian term, followed by a periphrasis which explains in Romanian words the meaning of that term. We observe both the interest to introduce as many neologisms from the French language as possible, but also the care to adapt them to the specific of the Romanian language. Terms are taken, as the authors mention, from the *Dictionnaire de l'Académie Française*, second edition, but also from other foreign dictionaries. The authors wanted the Romanian neologic terms to be as close to the foreign etymons as possible. Here are the acceptations given to the *neologism* term by some Romanian dictionaries listed chronologically:

néologisme „neologism, obişnuinţă, nărăvire de a întrebuinţa ziceri nouă, sau de a da zicerilor obişnuite înţelesuri nouă; se ia spre rău" (Poenar–Aaron–Hill)

neologism „căutare de espresii şi de vorbe nuoe" (Negulici)

neologism „plecare, patimă de a tot înoi, a reforma (limba)" (Stamati)

„espresione, covent, intorsura, sens sau forma de covent neusitata inco in limba populare" (Laurian–Massim, s.v. *neo*-).

Another view of this concept is found in the *Dicţionarul limbii române* (*Romanian language dictionary*). Unlike the explanatory dictionaries, where the use determines the order of the meanings, in the academic dictionary that we mentioned, the meanings of this term are listed according to the chronological order of the first certifications, because this word itself is considered to be a "neologism". By this lexicographical technique, the historical evolution of the meanings of this term is emphasized. In the dlr, the *neologism* is defined as:

„**NEOLOGÍSM** s. n. **1.** (Învechit) Neologie. Cf. negulici, stamati, d. *Neologhismul nesocotit aşa ne-au învălătucit, încît nu mai putem zice cele mai simple lucruri... fără amestecare de vorbe străine*. russo, s. 93, cf. prot.-pop., n. d., costinescu, barcianu, alexi, w.

BDD-A22314 © 2014 "Petru Maior" University Press
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 08:56:33 UTC)

2. Cuvînt nou împrumutat sau format de curînd într-o limbă cu mijloace proprii; (neobişnuit) novicism. *Logofătul Conachi are neologisme, dar hultuite pe tulpină românească*. russo, s. 52, cf. pontbriant, d. *Cel din urmă semn caracteristic în stilul direcţiei nouă... este depărtarea neologismelor celor de prisos*. maiorescu, cr. i, 384, cf. ddrf, şăineanu, d. u. *Traduse... o istorie universală, sau, cum îi zice el, care nu prea întrebuinţează neologisme: „Istorie de toată lumea”*. iorga, l. i, 509. *Eram prigonitor pînă la exces al neologismelor şi găseam în literatura populară şi în popor o perspectivă de noutate*. sadoveanu, o. xvi, 439, cf. id. e. 34. *Neologismele oferă cazuri mai numeroase de şovăire a accentuării*. iordan, l. r. 152, cf. 82. *Numele autorului glumeţ al atîtor cuvinte stîlcite şi fraze pompoase... suferea soarta neologismelor rostite de cetăţenii din Obor*. arghezi, t. c. 21. *A putut exista la un moment dat impresia că neologismele exprimă mai bine, în orice împrejurare, nuanţa gîndirii*. vianu, s. 189, cf. id. m. 181. *Nu totdeauna neologismele zdruncină situaţia cuvintelor vechi, ci sînt cazuri cînd, dimpotrivă, o consolidează*. graur, f. l. 196, cf. 109. *Studiul conţine o transcriere a neologismelor recoltate din majoritatea operelor lui A. Pann*. scl 1957, 210. *Pentru operaţia alegerii buştenilor din care se construieşte o plută... se foloseşte neologismul „a asorta”*. arvinte, term. 63. ◊ (La sg. cu valoare de pl.) *Dar dacă stilul scriitoarei e numai inegal, limba e uneori supărătoare prin goana frenetică după neologismul nearmonic şi inutil*. lovinescu, c. vii, 83. *În limba literară, neologismul intră firesc, acolo unde e nevoie de el, pentru conciziune şi precizie*. sadoveanu, e. 34. *După 1835..., neologismul îmbracă o formă adecvată, integrîndu-se în fonetica specifică a limbii noastre*. contribuţii, ii, 96. ◊ (Atribuind calitatea ca un adjectiv) *Verbele neologisme de conjugarea I*. iordan, g. 13, cf. 70.

– Pronunţat: *ne-o-*. – Pl.: *neologisme*. – Şi : (învechit) **neologhísm** s. m.

– Din fr. **néologisme**”.

We chose to present the entire article of the dictionary, because the cited examples also emphasize the evolution of the attitude of the cultivated people over time, regarding this concept.

An interesting semantic development is illustrated in the editions of the *Dicţionarul de neologisme* (*Dictionary of neologisms*) of Florin Marcu. Since its first edition in 1961 to the edition written in 2008, this dictionary offers various conceptions regarding the *neologism* and also new terms from the family of words that were formed within the language or were borrowed. A first conceptual difference is observed even from the second edition. In dn, the *neologism* is defined as „cuvânt nou într-o limbă, împrumutat dintr-o limbă străină sau format prin mijloace proprii în limba respectivă”[14]. The authors note that this acceptation is mainly used in the linguistics field. The second edition does not keep the “linguistic” mention, defining the term as: „cuvânt împrumutat dintr-o limbă străină sau creat prin mijloace proprii în limba respectivă[15]” (dn^2, s.v. *neologism*). As we can see, the authors give up the term “new word”, perhaps their justification being the ambiguity created by this appellation itself. But by this second definition, the concept of neologism is greatly expanded, because in their vision it would appear that we can consider as *neologism* every word, borrowed or formed in Romanian. This view is supported by the etymology of the term itself, which the authors mention after the definition.

In the following editions we observe a much greater concern both regarding the definitions given to the concepts of the lexical family and also regarding the etymology of words. Thus, in *Noul dicţionar de neologisme* (*The New Dictionary of neologisms*), who was

[14] “a new word in a language, borrowed from a foreign language or format by intrinsic means in that language” (our translation).

[15] “word borrowed from a foreign language or created by their own means in that language” (our translation).

BDD-A22314 © 2014 “Petru Maior” University Press
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 08:56:33 UTC)

elaborated only by Florin Marcu, the neologism is defined as „cuvânt nou, împrumutat dintr-o limbă străină sau creat prin mijloace proprii în limba respectivă; (*p. restr.*) împrumut lexical recent. ● accepţie nouă a unui cuvânt”[16] (ndn, s.v. *neologism*). The lexicographer gives up again to the mention “in linguistics”, but we see an increase of the complexity of the definition by adding a new semantic distinction: “new acceptation of a word”. The author was motivated by the semantic enrichment of the *neologism* concept and, due to the fact that in his work he introduces old Romanian terms with new acceptations, namely “exclusively semantic” neologisms, as Th. Hristea calls them (in Hristea 2004, p. 33).

Despite the difficulties caused by the tentative to clearly define the concept, we observe the author’s concern to adapt the definition of both to the situation in the Romanian language and to the linguists’ vision regarding this issue.

The acceptations of the concept of neologism in the Romanian dictionaries presented here highlight the semantic, orthographic and orthoepic evolution in the Romanian language. By the definitions offered by the lexicographers, they emphasized both the history of perceptions of the speakers regarding this concept and also the ambiguities generated by it. Also, you may notice a difference between the way in which the term *neologism* is defined in the Romanian dictionaries and how it is treated in the works in the field of Romanian vocabulary research. Although form a conceptual point of view the neologism is understood as a new word borrowed from a foreign language or format the field of that language, in general, in the Romanian linguistics only the loans are considered to be neologisms.

In conclusion, in the Romanian culture there are multiple differences in defining neologism. As we have already presented, in the European cultural area there are also various visions regarding the concept of neologism. Nevertheless, globalization and especially standardization lead to the smoothing or rather, to the internationalization of the way in which neologism is defined. The Romanian culture will adapt to the European culture in this area, too.

Bibliografie

Adamescu = Adamescu, Gh., *Adaptarea la mediu a neologismelor*, în „Analele Academiei Române. Memoriile secţiunii literare”, seria a III-a, tom VIII, Bucureşti, 1936–1938, p. 49-78.

Campbell–Mixco = Lyle Campbell, Mauricio J. Mixco *A Glossary of Historical Linguistics*, Edinburgh, Edinburgh University Press, 2007.

Clim = Marius-Radu Clim, *Neologismul în lexicografia românească*, Iaşi, Editura Universităţii „Alexandru Ioan Cuza”, 2012.

Guilbert = Louis Guilbert, *La créativité lexicale*, Paris, Librairie Larousse, 1975.

Hartmann–James = R.R.K. Hartmann, Gregory James, *Dictionary of Lexicography*, Londra, Editura Routledge, 1998.

Hjelmslev 1966 = Louis Hjelmslev, *Le langage. Une introduction*, Traduit du danois par Michel Olsen. Préface de Algirdas Julien Greimas, Paris, Les Editions de Minuit, 1966.

Hristea 1984 = *Sinteze de limba română*, Mioara Avram, Grigore Brâncuş, Gheorghe Bulgăr, Georgeta Ciompec, Ion Diaconescu, Theodor Hristea, Rodica Bogza-Irimie şi Flora

[16] “new word borrowed from a foreign language or created by intrinsic means in that language; recent lexical borrowing. ● new acceptation of a word” (our translation).

BDD-A22314 © 2014 “Petru Maior” University Press
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 08:56:33 UTC)

Şuteu. Coordonator: Theodor Hristea. Ediţia a treia, revăzută şi din nou îmbogăţită. Bucureşti, Editura Albatros, 1984.

Hristea 2004 = Theodor Hristea, *Conceptul de neologism (cu specială referire la limba română)*, în volumul *Tradiţie şi inovaţie în studiul limbii române. Actele celui de-al 3-lea Colocviu al Catedrei de Limba Română (27–28 noiembrie 2003)*. Coordonator: Gabriela Pană Dindelegan, Secretari de redacţie: Oana Uţă Bărbulescu, Cristian Moroianu, Bucureşti, Editura Universităţii din Bucureşti, 2004, pp. 23-36.

Humbley = John Humbley, *La Néologie: Avenir des Langues*, în volumul *La neologia en el tombant de segle*, Edició a cura de M. Teresa Cabré, Judit Freixa i Elisabet Solé, Barcelona, Observatori de Neologia, Institut Universitari de Lingüistica Aplicada, Universitat Pompeu Fabra, 2000, pp. 175-179.

Iordan = Iorgu Iordan, *Sufixe româneşti de origine recentă (Neologisme)*. Extras din Buletinul Institutului de Filologie Română, vol. VI, Iaşi, Tipografia Alexandru A. Ţerek, 1940.

Iordan–Robu = Iorgu Iordan, Vladimir Robu, *Limba română contemporană*, Bucureşti, Editura Didactică şi Pedagogică, 1978.

Neologia = Maria Teresa Cabré, *La neologia efímera*, în volumul *Lèxic i neologia*. Edició a càrrec de M. Teresa Cabré, Judit Freixa i Elisabet Solé, Barcelona, Observatori de Neologia, Institut Universitari de Lingüística Aplicada, Universitat Pompeu Fabra, 2008, pp. 13-27.

Pruvost–Sablayrolles = Jean Pruvost, Jean-François Sablayrolles, *Les Neologismes*, Paris, Presses Universitaires de France, 2003.

Puşcariu[1] = Sextil Puşcariu, *Limba română*, vol. I, *Privire generală*. Bucureşti, Fundaţia pentru literatură şi artă „Regele Carol II", 1940.

Zafiu, Neologismul = Rodica Zafiu, *Neologismul şi purismul* în „România literară", anul XXXIV, 21–27 noiembrie 2001, numărul 46, p. 11.

Dicţionare

dlr = *Dicţionarul limbii române (DLR)*. Serie nouă. Redactori responsabili: acad. Iorgu Iordan, acad. Alexandru Graur şi acad. Ion Coteanu. Bucureşti, Editura Academiei. Tomul VII. Partea 1. *Litera N*: 1971.

dn = Florin Marcu, Constant Maneca, *Dicţionar de neologisme*, Bucureşti, Editura Ştiinţifică, 1961.

dn[2] = Florin Marcu, Constant Maneca, *Dicţionar de neologisme*, ediţia a II-a revăzută şi adăugită, Bucureşti, Editura Ştiinţifică, 1966.

Laurian–Massim = A. T. Laurian şi I. C. Massim, *Dicţionariul limbei române*. După însărcinarea dată de Societatea Academică Română. Elaborat ca proiect. Tomu I *A–H*, 1871 [în realitate: 1873]; tomul II (colaboratori Iosef Hodosiu şi G. Barițiu) *I–Z*, 1876; tom. III: *Glosariu, care cuprinde vorbele din limba română străine prin originea sau forma lor, cum şi cele de origine îndoioasă*, 1871 [în realitate: 1877], Bucureşti, Noua Tipografie a Laboratorilor Români.

Negulici = I. D. Negulici, *Vocabular român de toate vorbele străbune reprimite până acum în limba română, şi de toate cele ce sunt a se mai primi d-acum înainte, şi mai ales în ştiinţe*, Bucureşti, Tipografia Colegiului, 1848.

ndn = Florin Marcu, *Noul dicţionar de neologisme*, Bucureşti, Editura Academiei Române, 1997.

BDD-A22314 © 2014 "Petru Maior" University Press
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 08:56:33 UTC)

Poenar–Aaron–Hill = P. Peonar, F. Aaron şi G. Hill, *Vocabular franţezo-românesc, după cea din urmă ediţie a Dicţionarului de Academia Franţozească, cu adăogare de multe ziceri, culese din deosebite dicţionare de*…, tomul I: *A–H*, 1840; tomul II: *I–Z*, 1841, Bucureşti, în tipografia Colegiului Sf. Sava.

Stamati = Pah. T. Stamati, *Disionăraş românesc de cuvinte tehnice şi altele greu de înţeles*. Întâia ediciune, Iaşi, Tipografia Buciumului Român, 1851.

BDD-A22314 © 2014 "Petru Maior" University Press
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 08:56:33 UTC)