Elena FUIOREA
"Babeş-Bolyai" University of Cluj-Napoca, Romania

ANTONYMY IN THE ROMANIAN MILITARY LANGUAGE

An analysis of the paradigmatic classes that are established at the terminological levels emphasizes the relations of antonymy, synonymy and hyponymy. It can also help to identify the specialized meaning and to confirm the affiliation to a certain domain or subdomain. The scientific development and informational outburst led to a change of Wurster's theory, where words were equivalent to terms only if they had the qualities of an etiquette, that is the relations of polysemy, synonymy or antonymy were not accepted. Terms, as linguistic units of the scientific language are dynamic and have the capacity of migrating easily from one domain to another, mobility also manifested towards the common lexicon. [1]

The methodological support of the paper will be represented by the descriptive method and working with the dictionary. The theoretical-scientific support of the paper is represented by works on linguistics, (Bejoint, H., Thoiron, P. (2000). *Le sens en terminologie*, Sârbu, R. (1977). *Antonimia lexicală în limba română* and dictionaries, Staicu, Stelian. (1980). *Lexicon militar*, Leonid, Cojocaru. (1976). *Dicționar militar englez – român*, DEX.

Antonymy, unlike other semantic relations among terms, is neither beneficial (like hyponymy), nor is it detrimental to a terminology in general (as it is the case of polysemy, for instance). Yet, its presence and frequency within a certain terminology may emphasize a certain type of logical organization of concepts and of lexical organization of terms in the framework of a domain. Thus, it is worth investigating how antonymy works within the military terminology, in order to be able to define the characteristics of this terminology from the point of view of its semantic relations.

Antonymy is a way of defining by opposition the specific features of a certain concept. It is obtained at the level of simple terms and especially at the syntagmatic level: *positive peace/negative peace*. Moreover, it is also encountered in the usage of the negative verbal form, of compound words or in the double negation, with the adverb of negation "neither." [2] The military domain includes a monosemantic, monoreferential and non-ambiguous specialized lexicon, whose qualities are evident at the level of the text. Outside the text or context, military terms can be interpreted as interdisciplinary (with other sciences or with the general language). Antonymy is a paradigmatic relationship that has been defined as "a type of semantic relationship represented by the opposition of meaning between two words with contrary or contradictory referees, not only different." [3] In terminologies, antonymy is quite limited and is more interesting in terms of morphology, i.e. in terms of how the training reflects the terms of the derivation of conceptual oppositions (valid condition actually subsumed into the concept of a field or another), of the type: "Euclidean" – "non-Euclidean." This type of antonyms is present in the military terminology, too: *offensive* - *defensive* weapons – *arming* – *disarmament*, etc.

The term *war* is defined as "the absence of peace." As we can easily notice, the definition makes reference to another military term, which is the antonym of the first one. [4] But this relation of antonymy was considered by the linguist Richard

BDD-A3329 © 2011 Editura Europlus
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 18.97.9.171 (2026-09-12 05:15:16 UTC)

Sârbu to be partial, when the opposition is obtained by only a part of the lexemes' semantic content, caused by their polysemy – "a monosemantic word corresponds as an antonym to a polysemantic word." [5] Nevertheless, the terms *peace* and *war* are perfect antonyms, as they represent the extreme limit of the semantic opposition and manifest independence towards the context. If we take into consideration the morphological structure of the two lexemes, we can observe that they belong to the category of antonyms with different radicals, while at the lexico-grammatical level they become nouns.

Antonymy is the semantic relation frequently encountered in both specialized and general texts. Starting from the notional system, we can notice a type of scalar antonymy, that is new terms, with a medium value can be interpolated between the two terms in perfect opposition *war/peace: peace* **–** 'risk' – 'crise' – 'conflict' – *war*. Antonymy also manifests itself at the level of the specialized syntagms that designate basic concepts of the domain. The relation of total antonymy is achieved in the case of such syntagms as: "pace pozitivă /pace negativă" 'positive peace/negative peace,' "pace stabilă/pace instabilă," 'stable peace/unstable peace,' "război clasic/război modern,' 'classic war/modern war.' As far as the first doublet is concerned, the opposition is due to the adjectival determiners of the noun that designates the semantic dimension common to the two structures, while the differentiating semes are represented by "+" and "-." The second syntagmatic doublet is obtained with the help of the same adjectival determiners, but the opposition *stable/unstable* originates in the same radical, to which the prefix *in* is added. The last pair of antonymous syntagms underlines the diachronic referential opposition of the concept *war*, putting in a partial contrast the adjectival determiners *classic/modern*, where the common semes are "adjective," "type of development" and the incompatible seme is *present* versus *past*. [6]

Another example is that of the syntagms "război general"/ "război local," 'general war'/ 'local war,' as the semantic content refers to a certain type of semantic opposition. The seme of the structure *general war*, that enters in opposition, is "of great dimensions," while that of the structure *local war* is "of small dimensions." These can lead to a gradual opposition, as the syntagm *local war* constitutes the mediator element with the seme "of medium dimension." [7] The antonymy of the structures analyzed above is actually obtained at the level of the noun determiners rendered by adjectives. Antonymy is an important way of organizing the military vocabulary, as it relies primarily on the opposition between the two basic concepts: "peace" and "war."

Antonymy is found within different concepts' definitions by: *antonymous verbal structures*: "Pacea se regăseşte acolo unde se termină violenţa şi începe cooperarea…," [8] 'Peace is to be found there where violence ends and cooperation begins…;' *the usage of compound words by the addition of the affix* "non:" "Pacea este un mod nonviolent," [9] 'Peace is a non-violent way;' *the usage of the negative verbal form*: "Conflictul armat nu este constituit din contre spontane şi sporadice," [10] 'The armed conflict is not represented by spontaneous and sporadic counters;' "Pacea este situaţia în care armatele nu sunt angajate in acţiuni militare," [11] 'Peace is the situation in which the armies are not engaged in military actions;' *the double negation by the adverb of negation* "neither:" "Pacea este acea perioadă de timp în care nu există nici război, nici disponibilitatea oamenilor de a porni unul," [12] 'Peace is that period of time where there is neither war, nor peoples' availability of starting one.'

The study of antonymy at the level of the general lexicon can offer important data for the lexicographical papers. In the case of the specialized language, this

BDD-A3329 © 2011 Editura Europlus
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 18.97.9.171 (2026-09-12 05:15:16 UTC)

semantic relation must be identified in order to correctly specify the terms' meanings with the help of texts and contexts. The lack of ambiguity at the level of the text plays a very important part in the process of emphasizing the specific qualities of terms. Many of these terms originate in the common language and acquire the value of terms only under certain circumstances. [13]

Terms are potentially polysemantic, because their signified can be enlarged and multiplied in other fields of activity, too. The denominations used in the military domain can be partially or totally identical, as far as the semantic value is concerned. According to Bidu-Vrănceanu and Narcisa Forăscu, "variety criteria regarding the interpretation of antonymy results from the combination of the *extralinguistic* ones (logical, on the one hand, and ontological, on the other) with the *linguistic* ones. More precisely, we can talk about an antonymy related to things, i.e. the relation of opposition between words reflects an opposition from the objective reality, for example, *day - night* (...)" [14] This statement supports the morphologically marked cases of antonyms, such as *avant - guard – rear guard*, but also the cases where antonymy "involved in things" is not marked morphologically: *attack – defense*, *peace - war*, *military – civil employee*. It may be noted, however, that in terminologies in general, as in the case of the military terminology, antonymy is an accidental semantic relationship, whose occurrence is not significant, but there are also interesting cases of antonyms.

Interpreted at the level of the semic analysis of words, this definition represents the fact that the antonymy between two words presupposes the existence of semes common to the two terms, as well as the existence of the opposite, incompatible seme. This seme is not variable or differentiating, as in the case of the fellow members that make a distinction between the members of a lexical-semantic field. It is "inconsistent," which translates into the fact that the two terms cannot be used in the same context without a radical change of meaning.This shows what type of opposition is manifested between the two terms: the opposite type.

The opposition between the two antonymous terms and an intermediate term cannot be interpreted as a relation of antonymy. There is *dusk* between *day* and *night*, for example, but this intermediate term is not in a relation of antonymy with either *day* or *night*. [15] In the lexical-semantic fields of arms and ammunition, of military personnel and military vehicles, the only identified case of antonyms is that of the terms *military* and *civil* employee belonging to the paradigm of generic names of military personnel. The term *civil employee* is in opposition with all the other terms of the paradigm/field, but we can speak of antonymy only in the case of the semantic relationship that it has with the term "military," because they differ by only one seme, and that is incompatible. More specifically, the two terms can be defined by the common semes: "employed person" + "in the army of a country" that define the entire lexical-semantic field of the categories of military personnel, and differ by the opposite seme "with/ without a military military degree." [16] This type of antonyms, however, is not the only one existing. Linguists have suggested in their studies on antonymy different classifications, but the interpretations are somewhat different from one author to another. It seems interesting to present here the classification proposed by Niklas-Salminen, who noticed a kind of antonyms which includes certain military terms: the complex semantic relations between the members of a given semantic field. [17]

Linguistics proposes the following classification: 1) - complementary or non-gradable antonyms, such as: *alive / dead*, *woman / man*, that do not have an intermediary or medium term to mark a certain type of gradation between the two antonyms (in the military lexicon, an example of such a pair of opposite terms

BDD-A3329 © 2011 Editura Europlus
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 18.97.9.171 (2026-09-12 05:15:16 UTC)

could be *attack - defense*; 2) - gradable antonyms, such as: *hot / cold*, *little / big*, with one or even more intermediate terms: *little – medium / big*, *hot / lukewarm / cold*; 3) - mutual antonyms, such as: *husband / wife*, *to buy / to sell*, that render the same relationship, but the two terms are different from each other by reversing the order of their arguments (such cases of antonyms are also present in the military terminology for example the pair *avant-guard / rear guard*; 4) – incompatible terms, such as: *Monday / Tuesday / Wednesday / Thursday ...* or, according to Niklas-Salminen, *marshal / general / ... / corporal / soldier*. This second type of antonymy shows the relation between two lexical units (the elements at the ends of the string) and all the other lexical units that form a whole and which are arranged between the other two. This ordering is either serial, (as in the case of *marshal / general / ... / corporal / soldier*, or cyclical (as in the case of *Monday / Tuesday / Wednesday / Thursday ...* [18]

The synonymy of one of the terms belonging to a pair of antonymys with another term can make the relation of antonymy difficult to analyse, because we can question ourselves whether its synonym has the same antonym or not, but this case does not have a high potential to manifest itself in terminologies (it was not observed in the case of the military terms we analyzed so far), and if it occurs, the response can only be learnt after the semic analysis of the terms. The presence of a polysemantic term in a pair of antonyms may be likely to make the relation of antonymy difficult to render. The polysemous nature of an antonym compels us to disambiguate its meaning in the context in which the term is the opposite of the other one in the pair. It is definitely recognized that any semantic relationship of a term is established for only one of the term's meanings in the case of the polysemantic terms.

As we can notice, the only case of antonyms observed within the lexical-semantic fields is represented by the terms *military / civil / employee*. But among the military terms of DEX and print media respectively, [19], other antonymous pairs were also noted: *peace / war*, *to desert / to enlist*, *arming /disarmament*, *defense / attack*, etc. Morphologically speaking, it is only occasionally that we deal with terms specially derived to create a pair of opposite terms (the role of the prefixes "in-" and "dis-" in addition to the noun root "arming"). These are usually different terms which do not have formal antonymy marks, but semic antonymous definitions.

There are cases where it is difficult to determine whether we have to do with a real antonymy between two terms or not. An example in this respect is represented by the terms *offensive* and *defensive*. The comparison between their lexicographic definitions does not provide immediate and obvious clues, as the term *defense*, 'apărare' is defined as follows: "formă de bază a acţiunilor de luptă, care are scopul de a zădărnici ofensiva inamicului, a-i provoca pierderi cât mai mari, a câştiga timp şi a crea condiţiile necesare pentru a trece la ofensivă," [20] 'basic form of warfare, that aims to thwart the enemy attack, to cause big losses, to gain time and create the necessary conditions to start the offensive' while *offensive*, 'ofensivă' is defined as: "formă principală a acţiunilor de luptă, care are ca scop nimicirea forţelor şi mijloacelor inamicului, şi cucerirea terenului pe care îl ocupă," 'basic form of warfare which aims to destroy the enemy forces and means and conquest the land he occupies.' [21] If in the case of the term *defensive* the synonymy with the noun *defense* is obvious, in the case of the term *offensive*, it is not true that "the operations seeking to destroy the enemy force and conquer the land" involve only *attack*, which would place it in a net antonymy with the term *defense* and at the same time with its synonym, *defensive*.

BDD-A3329 © 2011 Editura Europlus
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 18.97.9.171 (2026-09-12 05:15:16 UTC)

Conclusions

Although it is not always easy to determine if an opposition between the military terms is antonymy or not, a sufficient number of antonymous pairs was observed within the military terminology. We can consider this semantic relationship as an important one for the organization of this terminology. Moreover, the presence of this type of relationship (either dichotomous, gradable-opposed or antonymous) reveal a kind of logical and rigorous organization of the military lexicon, observed at other levels of the military terminology, too.

NOTES

[1]. Maria Teresa Cabre. (2000). *La terminologie. Theorie, methode et applications*. Ottawa: Les Presses de l'Universite, 12-15.
[2]. Angela Bidu-Vrănceanu. (2007). *Lexicul specializat în mişcare. De la dicţionare la texte*. Bucureşti: Editura Universităţii Bucureşti, 131.
[3]. Angela Bidu-Vrănceanu, Narcisa Forăscu. (2005). *Limba română contemporană. Lexicul*. Bucureşti: Humanitas Educaţional, 120.
[4]. Richard Sârbu. (1977). *Antonimia lexicală în limba română*. Bucuresti: Editura Facla, 146.
[5]. Ibid: 152.
[6]. Ibid: 153.
[7]. Ibid: 144.
[8]. Ioan Crăciun. (2006). *Prevenirea conflictelor şi managementul crizelor*. Bucureşti: Editura Universităţii Naţionale de Apărare "Carol I," 18.
[9]. Ibid: 19.
[10]. Ibid: 23.
[11]. Ibid: 18.
[12]. Ibid: 19.
[13]. Henri Bejoint, Philippe Thoiron. (2000). *Le sens en terminologie*. Lyon: Presse Universitaire de Lyon, 35.
[14]. Angela Bidu-Vrănceanu, Narcisa Forăscu. (2005). *Limba română contemporană. Lexicul*. Bucureşti: Humanitas Educaţional, 121.
[15]. Ibid: 127-128.
[16]. Stelian Staicu. (1980). *Lexicon militar*. Bucureşti: Editura Militară.
Leonid Cojocaru. (1976). *Dicţionar militar englez – român*. Bucureşti: Editura Militară.
[17]. A. Niklas-Salminen. (2003). *La lexicologie*. Paris: Armand Colin, 114-117.
[18]. Ibid: 119.
[19]. *100 de ore, plus… Irak: jurnal de război*. (2003). Bucureşti: Editura ZIUA, 117.
[20]. Stelian Staicu. (1980). *Lexicon militar*. Bucureşti: Editura Militară, 58.
[21]. Ibid: 470

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL REFERENCES

Bejoint, Henri, Thoiron, Philippe. (2000). *Le sens en terminologie*. Lyon: Presse Universitaire de Lyon.
Bidu-Vrănceanu, Angela. (2007). *Lexicul specializat în mişcare. De la dicţionare la texte*. Bucureşti: Editura Universităţii Bucureşti.
Bidu-Vrănceanu, Angela, Forăscu, Narcisa. (2005). *Limba română contemporană. Lexicul*. Bucureşti: Humanitas Educaţional.
Cabre, Maria, Teresa. (2000). *La terminologie. Theorie, methode et applications*. Ottawa: Les Presses de l'Universite.
Cojocaru, Leonid. (1976). *Dicţionar militar englez – român*. Bucureşti: Editura Militară.
Crăciun, Ioan. (2006). *Prevenirea conflictelor şi managementul crizelor*. Bucureşti: Editura Universităţii Naţionale de Apărare "Carol I.
Niklas-Salminen, A. (2003). *La lexicologie*. Paris: Armand Colin.

BDD-A3329 © 2011 Editura Europlus
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 18.97.9.171 (2026-09-12 05:15:16 UTC)

Sârbu, Richard. (1977). *Antonimia lexicală în limba română*. Bucuresti: Editura Facla.
Stelian, Staicu. (1980). *Lexicon militar*. Bucureşti: Editura Militară.

Internet text sources

www.dexonline.ro
http://www.nato.int/docu/other/ro/facts/ach-summ_rom.htm
http://www.nato.int/docu/other/ro/facts/pfp-enh_rom.htm

RÉSUMÉ

L' ANTONYMIE DANS LE LANGAGE MILITAIRE ROUMAIN

Actuellement, les linguistes ont la tendance d'accepter l'idée que les unités terminologiques ont des caractéristiques similaires avec d'autres unités de la langue naturelle et avec d'autres non-linguistique systèmes symboliques. En outre, la communication spécialisée n'est pas complètement différente de la communication en général, tandis que les connaissances scientifiques ne sont ni uniformes, ni totalement séparées des connaissances générales. Le document met l'accent sur l'analyse de la relation sémantique de l'antonymie comme il se comporte dans la terminologie militaire roumaine. L'antonymie est la relation sémantique fréquemment rencontrée dans les deux textes général et spécialisé. Nous allons essayer de démontrer l'identité des termes par l'importance des différences sémiques, de prouver la dynamique conceptuelle-sémantique du domaine et de distinguer les différences par rapport aux éléments similaires du lexique commun. Nous traiterons de l'antonymie au niveau des termes simples et en particulier au niveau syntagmatique. Une classification des antonymes est également proposée dans le document.

Mots-clés: *antonymie, la communication spécialisée, la communication générale, le langage militaire, les différences sémiques, la dynamique conceptuelle-sémantique.*

BDD-A3329 © 2011 Editura Europlus
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 18.97.9.171 (2026-09-12 05:15:16 UTC)