

A Brief Diachronic Overview Of The Romanian Lexicography Of Literary Terms

Dana-Mihaela Dinu
Mădălina Strehie

*Universitatea din Craiova**

Abstract: This article aims to give a brief overview of the main stages of the development of literary terms repertoire, especially of Greco-Latin origin, in the Romanian lexicography. To achieve this intention, the content of the article was structured in three parts. In the first part we consider appropriate to make a short digression about the European lexicographic tradition of inventorying poetic and rhetorical terms to show, firstly, the length and extent of this practice and, secondly, to have a comparative overview of both European and Romanian phenomena and consequently, to see the similarities and differences between them. Thus, the second part is a brief outline of the historical and cultural context that specifically marked the beginnings and development of the Romanian general lexicographic activity. The last part is a diachronic description and evaluation of a number of lexicographic works dedicated to Romanian literary terms. The conclusion to which this research leads is that, in order to establish a genuine literary practice to support the creation of literary theory, the poetic and rhetoric terminology had an occasional and limited repertoire, but in the last century it is fully synchronized to current trends.

Key words: lexicography, dictionary, glossary, poetic and rhetoric terminology.

Resumen: El presente artículo intenta presentar una breve visión general de las principales fases de la evolución de los términos literarios, sobre todo los de origen griego-latino, en la lexicografía rumana. Para llevar a cabo este objetivo se ha estructurado el contenido en tres partes. En la primera consideramos oportuno hacer una digresión sucinta

* Special thanks to: Prof. Marco Antonio Gutiérrez Galindo, who last summer kindly invited us to submit an article on this subject, and Prof. Marta Gómez Martínez for her goodwill. We are grateful to both professors for their insistent patience in allowing us to finish this article.

sobre la constitución de la tradición lexicográfica europea especializada de repertoriar los términos poéticos y retóricos para mostrar, por un lado, la extensión de esa práctica, y por otro, para obtener una visión general comparativa de los fenómenos europeos y rumanos y por consiguiente, para distinguir las semejanzas y diferencias entre ellos. Así, en la segunda parte se hace una breve delineación del contexto literario y cultural que marcó de manera específica los comienzos y el desarrollo de la actividad lexicográfica rumana de carácter general. La última parte contiene una descripción cronológica y una breve evaluación de algunos trabajos lexicográficos rumanos consagrados a la terminología literaria.

Palabras clave: lexicografía, diccionario, glosario, terminología poética y retórica.

1. EUROPEAN TRADITION OF LITERARY TERMINOLOGY AND SPECIALIZED DICTIONARIES

The stages lexicography went through, and here we shall only refer to the European tradition, before reaching the present abundant theory and practice are not many, despite the considerable age of the beginnings and multitude of practical achievements. As in other areas, the empirical level based on an intuitive pre-theoretical conception surpassed the institution of theoretical lexicography, or metalexicography. Generally, one can see a parallel between the evolution of cultural and scientific history of societies and the stages of formation of lexicography as a practice and theory, which is after all natural, because it is a symptom of an abundance of knowledge that needs to be systematized and ordered to be more easily and readily accessible. Until modern times, in which all types of dictionaries coexist, earlier stages are characterized by a dominant type of lexicographical work, with plenty of variety within each type (Ray, 1970: 48), although we can not say that once a progress of a method or technique is set down, older forms of cataloging sign-units are out of use.

1.1. The tradition of poetic, rhetoric and grammar terminology is founded by the Greeks and, together with the additions made by the Romans, represents the main resource around which current literary terminology has developed and continues to develop. There is a long line of glossographers and compilers of classical antiquity (Dickey, 2007: 87-106), who have paved the way for further development of lexicography. One of the oldest works, about which we only have indirect information, dates from the fourth century B.C. and shows Democritus' preoccupation for dialectal

lexicology. The dialectal diversity of the Greek language, the difficulties arising from understanding archaic stages of the birth of literary genres based on ancient dialects, and the variants of the same text that were generated by the manuscript transmission, were the most important causes that led to the shaping of philological science, which in turn created the indispensable auxiliary of the glosses, comments, scholia, annotations, etymologies, text explanations. Since these practices were the object of literary written texts, accessible only to cultivated people, this type of glossography is a scholarly, erudite variant. There was a long period of time characterized by homoglossia because the explanation and definition of the difficult terms was done within the same language, Greek or Latin. Latin extended its influence beyond the boundaries of antiquity and had total supremacy in Western medieval culture, that's why the explicative transfer was done in this language. The Greek authoritatively dominated the Byzantine area. Bilingual glossaries of Greek-Latin or Latin-Greek begin to appear after the first century of the Christian era.

Thus, the core terminology of poetics and rhetoric was formed in Greek, mainly from the sophist era onwards and culminating with works of great authority as Aristotle's *Rhetoric*, who had Greek continuators who enriched its inventory terms. In the Roman phase, the process continued through lexical calques, loans or terms created in Latin, Cicero and Quintilian being among the most active in this respect. *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, attributed to Cicero, but in fact of unknown authorship, is by far the most important and influential Latin rhetoric textbook wholly preserved, a technical and systematic manual, uninterruptedly used from antiquity up to the Renaissance. The same thing happened in poetic terminology, also strongly influenced by Aristotle's commanding contribution and by subsequent adherents to his ideas. The most important metric treaty belongs to Hephæstion of Alexandria, in the 2nd century, an important source of specialized terminology. Grammar in antiquity meant the complex study of texts, which included rhetoric and poetics, and had an important repository of specialized terms of its own. The design of these grammars and their very systematic character replaced the possible need for specialized glossaries.

1.2. There is an important number of glossographers in the Middle Ages. The object of their compilations was extremely varied, but poetic and rhetorical terminology is never treated separately. Terms which belong to these fields are indexed among those of the other cultural fields,

according to the thematic organization of the work or the extent of interest or association connection with the investigated subject. Within the development of general lexicography, an inventory of the poetic and rhetoric terms that antiquity and the subsequent era brought forth in more than thousand years, became more than necessary. The special vocabulary used in these fields was defined and explained in textbooks, poetic and rhetorical arts and grammar books¹. The scholastic need to systematize, categorize and clarify in a bushy area, commonly full of ambiguities and misuse led to the creation of descriptive-normative works. Some of them are encyclopedic, as in the case of the well-known compilation of the seventh century *Etymologiae* of Isidore of Seville, where the notions of grammar, poetics and rhetoric, which are part of the trivium, are dealt with in a thematic order in the first two of the twenty books. In the tenth century Byzantine Middle Ages provide a major encyclopedic work, *Suda Lexicon*, where the words are indexed in alphabetical order, including Greek literary terms. Obviously, these examples are selective, the list including prestigious names of ancient and Medieval Greek and Latin poets, rhetoricians and grammarians.

1.3. The periods of Renaissance and post-Renaissance lexicography are marked by the consequences of two important events. One event is similar to the impact of computer technology on contemporary lexicography, namely the invention of printing in the fifteen century, which brings substantial changes throughout the culture and the technology and hence the design of dictionaries. The other event is the evolution of the way of promoting culture and refers to the creation of academies in different areas, including language and literature, aiming to create tools to cultivate language, such as the famous Academy Della Crusca founded in 1612 to cultivate the Italian literary language, actually of the Tuscan, language of the greatest authors, such as Dante. «Rinascimental rhetorical reversal» (Florescu, 1973: 117-138) meant the recovery of a tremendous interest in Greek and Latin authors, so the creation of new textbooks and other learning tools for rhetoric and poetics became very necessary. Under various titles, thesaurus, dictionary, clavis, encyclopedia, index, glossary,

1 Cf. for example, *Revista de Poética Medieval* that has among its objectives to focus on the theory of medieval literary language, devotes the seventeenth issue to «Rhetorical and Poetic Elements in Grammars and Philological Commentaries: from Isidore of Seville till Nebrija», n° 17, 2006.

handbook (Kalivoda, 2001), a large amount of lexical material was gathered. Georgius Trapezuntius' treatise *Rhetoricorum Libri V*, 1433-1434, is considered the most complete of all the works occurring before. In 1541, other important work of great influence was published and later many times republished, *Epitome troporum ac schematum et grammaticorum et rhetorum* by Ioannes Susenbrotus. It contains 132 alphabetical ordered tropes and figures, discussed and illustrated with ancient texts. But strictly lexicographically speaking, *Thesaurus Rhetoricae* of Giovanni Battista Bernardis, published in Venice in 1599, is considered the first specialized dictionary in this field (Zinsmaier, 2000).

1.4. The seventeenth century is particularly important in the area of lexicography, since from now on some aspects that mark its ontology get more clarified: the socio-cultural, the cognitive and the normative. The typological diversification continues with thematic dictionaries. Also, in this period the specialized dictionaries appear, of personal names, synonyms, antonyms, neologisms. With the emergence of vernacular languages in the area of religion, culture and education, lexicography enters a new dimension of its existence and is challenged to find new criteria and methods to repertory words.

1.5. The eighteenth and the nineteenth centuries are centuries of the great dictionaries of the European languages and a period of modernization of this area. This is a stage dominated by great national unilingual dictionaries. Some of them are sponsored by academies, others are private initiatives. They are also centuries of universal and encyclopedic dictionaries in which the literary terms are indiscriminately embedded. The process of typological differentiation continues with an increased momentum in the next century. What happens now in the evolution of linguistic conception, in establishing the corpus of lexical units, is of particular importance to later lexicography. Typologically, this stage is defined as one of the unilingual dictionaries from which modern lexicography develops (Rey, 1970: 48). Spain is the repository of a remarkable tradition of lexicography. It is during this period that on its territory academies flourish, and the major event for literature and cultivation of Castilian language is the foundation of Real Academia Española, in 1713, under the auspices of which *Diccionario de la lengua Castellana* or *Diccionario de Autoridades*, will be published between 1726 and 1739. This dictionary has an exemplary value for the Spanish language and culture up to the modern times.

In 1730, a valuable theoretical and practical contribution, with great influence on rhetorical education, belongs to Du Marsais, who in the second part of his treatise entitled *Des Tropes* analyzes and comments a number of tropes (Du Marsais, 1981: 58-147). This work does not belong to lexicography, as neither do the two works of Pierre Fontanier, *Manuel classique pour l'étude des tropes* (1821) and *Des figures autres que tropes* (1827), but at the end of each of them there is an alphabetical inventory of terms with definitions and etymological explanations.

Later, in 1795 and 1797, both appeared in Leipzig, J. Chr. Ernesti is the author of two lexicographic reference works entitled, respectively, *Lexiconum technologiae graecorum rhetoricae* and *Lexiconum technologiae latinorum rhetoricae*, still of great benefit today.

We should mention here, without insisting, some massive works involving Greco-Roman antiquity as a whole, initiated in the nineteenth century and continued for many decades, in the next century. They contain articles relating to terms of rhetoric and poetics, such as Pauly-Wissowa, *Realencyclopädie der Classischen Altertumswissenschaft*, which began in 1839 and continues today in a revised form, Daremberg-Saglio, *Dictionnaire des Antiquités Grecques et Romanes* started in 1873 and finished in 1919, and other such works in the English space, or Latin and Greek *Thesauri* of monumental proportions, in which researchers can find the best information. But some of these lexicographic monuments are accessible only to the public specialized in classical philology.

1.6. The twentieth century must be mentioned for some important lexicographic works in the field of poetics and rhetoric such as: *Dictionnaire de poétique et rhétorique* by Henri Morier, in 1961; the vast project *Dictionnaire international des termes littéraires (DITL)*, began in 1960 under the coordination of Robert Escarpit till 1988, which continues today and has an electronic version. The researchers and authors of literary terminology dictionaries also can consult the fundamental work of H. Lausberg, *Handbuch der literarischen Rhetorik*, first published in 1960, in two volumes, reprinted in a second edition, also translated into English in 1998, which includes an impressive list of literary terms. The most recent project of a large scale was started in 1987 at the University of Tübingen, under the coordination of Gert Ueding. It is called *Historisches Wörterbuch der Rhetorik (HWRh)* and will have ten volumes, of which till now nine already published; the tenth is to appear in 2011.

As we approach modern times, the need and utility of this kind of dictionaries is becoming more obvious, especially since the literary terms and criticism concepts gain extension, diversify, get richer, but often lose clarity, rigor and precision. On the other hand, the literature and literary criticism brought a great deal of new concepts and terms, so that modern dictionaries cannot be simple repetitions of the old ones, but must reflect the contemporary stage of literary criticism and theory.

2. CULTURAL AND LINGUISTIC CONTEXT OF THE BEGINNINGS AND DEVELOPMENT OF THE ROMANIAN LEXICOGRAPHY. THE SHAPING OF THE ROMANIAN LITERARY TERMINOLOGY AND THE FIRST LEXICOGRAPHIC REFERENCES

The issue of specialized lexicon in the Romanian lexicography is an old and interesting research topic not only for the linguists, but also for language, literature and culture historians. The Romanian lexicography in the broader sense of the word began to develop in the context of historical, geographical, cultural, linguistic and religious factors of the society in the sixteenth century, specifically marked by the centuries that preceded it. Thus, the eccentric geographical and historical location in relation to Rome, which provided culture to entire Western Europe, made the old age of Romanian history to be almost isolated from the source that could contribute to the highest level in its cultural development, given the Latin origin of the Romanian language. The North-Balkan position and the proximity of the Greek world were not more favorable to an early development, especially due to Slavonic ecclesial and cultural absolutism, which blocked the access of the Romanian language to the status of religious language and therefore of culture language. The Cyrillic alphabet, inappropriate to its Roman character, was imposed for a long time and forced the Romanian language to accept foreign patterns.

2.1. So, in this long period of time, the Romanian language and culture were in the proximity, but still outside the direct influence of the two great ancient cultures which founded the European culture. Therefore, Romanian ancient and medieval periods took each of them a few centuries longer in comparison to the evolution of the rest of Europe, hence the gap that cultivated Romanian people which began to feel especially in the sixteenth century and more acutely in the following. They tried to compensate the lack of dynamism of their culture and provide it with writings in Romanian language, which initially were Slavonic Biblical translations.

Original poetry arises with some delay and is at the edge of religious writings, taking into account that the first writers are either clergy or very close to religious life and mentalities. During this time, the phenomenon of Slavic-Romanian diglossia, rather Romanian-Slavic, is more frequent among educated people in the principalities of Valachia and Moldavia, but, in fact, Romanian was the current language at all levels of society.

2.2. At a certain point, in the second half of the eighteenth century, when the pre-Enlightenment period starts in the Romanian principalities, the Romanian language that had evolved in the shadow of Slavonic begins to be considered by Romanian scholars capable of performing autonomously the hitherto denied cultural function and as such they start to promote it with an increasing insistence. For two of the Romanian principalities, Moldavia and Valachia, both of Orthodox religion, Slavonic represented for a long time the dominant cult language, and therefore that of the culture. In Transylvania, due to the greater proximity to the West and the ties with Rome through the Catholic religion, the wish to promote Romanian language and writing with Latin alphabet became active earlier. Thus, in the eighteenth century a strong cultural Latinist movement developed, with beneficial effects on Romanian culture in all provinces. Transylvania also knew the bilingualism and even multilingualism, because of the coexistence of Romanian, Hungarian and German nationalities on its territory.

The broadening of the cultural horizon of scholars in the two others principalities was made through contacts with mainly three major cultural areas: Poland, which facilitated the access of Moldavian boyars to the Latin culture in Jesuit circles, Italy, especially Padua, closer to Valachian boyars, and Constantinople, which had important ties with the cultures of modern Europe. All these connections opened the access to documents of Romanian history and contributed to a stronger awareness of the Latin origin of the Romanian language and the wish to affirm it by withdrawing from under the Slavonic tutelage. So, the Romanian language and culture emerged from a latent and minor status by emulating the more advanced European cultures and gradually increasing the number of Romanian writings, in translation as well as in original, of eclectic nature. This revealed more acutely the precarious and insufficient possibilities of the Romanian language, especially regarding the lexical and specialized vocabularies, and pushed the scholars to look for models in order to create the resources they needed. Naturally, for the Romanian language, Latin and Romance

languages were the most important sources of enrichment, helping to its «reromanization» (Puscariu, 1972b: 375) and beneficial process of «occidentalization» (Lupu, 1999).

The development of the education made necessary the creation of textbooks, the development of Romanian literary production, both artistic and scientific, amplified relationships with classical and modern languages and literatures, and, particularly, the emergence and growth of the press produced a large amount of lexical material in all areas and created the need to systematize it in Romanian dictionaries. Gradually, starting from the nineteenth century, the general as well as the specialized lexicography began an ascending trend, in both practical and theoretical fields, overcoming the delay of the previous centuries. Towards the end of that century, through several projects of monumental proportions, the Romanian culture was almost adjusted to the European trends. In recent decades, Romanian lexicography shows a great dynamism, an explosive typological and thematic diversification as well as a qualitative and quantitative improvement. It is a symptom of the growing interest for this form of condensation and organization of knowledge and also of the Romanian cultural and scientific maturity and vitality, where lexicography draws from and to which it gives back a systematical and easy to consult instrument. This phenomenon is present not only in the Romanian culture, but all contemporary cultures display the same vertiginous proliferation of the activity of indexing words, terms, concepts, phrases, nomenclature, to refer only to the dictionary of «words», except for the ones of «things» that are in a no less spectacular expansion. Undoubtedly, this is the «golden age» for lexicography (Bailey, 1996).

2.3. The attested age of the Romanian lexicography hardly approaches five hundred years. In this period of time, Romanian culture has undergone accelerated steps in every cultural domain and has created its own tradition, which is not yet known well enough or studied in all its aspects. Documentary resources that could increase the dimension in time and space of our knowledge are still not entirely reevaluated or discovered. Modern research reveals forgotten manuscripts and introduces them into the scientific circuit. Anyway, there is a similarity between the evolution of European and Romanian lexicography, with the only remark that, taking into account the age of Greco-Latin literary terminology, there is a gap of almost two millennia that had to be bridged in about two hundred years.

2.4. The first stage that of glossaries for words difficult to understand, known in other European cultures several centuries before, begins with the so-called *Bogdan Glosses*, dating from the first half of the sixteenth century. It contains marginal or interline explanations in Romanian of a Slavonic version of the Greek religious normative work entitled *Syntagma (Pravila)* by Matei Vlastaris (Mihăilă, 1969). The translator ordered the material alphabetically, which shows his intention to make a kind of lexicographic systematization. Although in that period, the language of the cult and culture was the Slavonic, and continued to be for a while, the presence of these glosses indicates that Slavonic started to be less known and Romanian was considered capable to offer a better and understandable version. The inventory of 662 Romanian glosses in the Slavonic text compared to the 70 Slavonic homoglosses attests the Slavic-Romanian bilingualism phenomenon among cultural elites, but at the same time, that these texts were meant and expected to be received in Romanian. Although of these glosses none belongs to poetics or rhetoric field, we mention them here as a starting point of the Romanian lexicography.

2.5. What happens in the next period still retains the same characteristics. In the late sixteenth and the whole of the seventeenth century, directly associated with an increased volume of translation of many Church Slavonic texts, an intense lexicographical activity takes place, which left a fair amount of fragments of glossaries, glossaries, vocabularies and dictionaries, preserved in manuscript form. Very soon, sometime between the late seventeenth and early eighteenth century, Latin or a Romance language, Italian or French, replace Slavonic in bilingual or multilingual dictionaries. The connection established between the Romanian language and Latin or Romance languages put into forward motion the efforts of bringing Romanian into line with Western culture and towards modernization.

A kind of glossary of literary terms was put together in 1673 by chronicler Miron Costin, author of the first Romanian cultivated poem of a «notable» value (Ivaşcu, 1969: 185) entitled *Viaţa lumii* (Costin, 1958: 318-319). Two paratexts of theoretical and practical value precede it, *Predoslovie-Voroavă la cetitoriu (Foreword)* and *Înţelesul stihurilor, cum trebuie să citească (Meaning of verses, how to read)*, containing the explanation for some terms of poetics. Given the novelty of the poem, Costin feels the need to clarify a number of concepts, elementary for a person trained in classical literature as himself, but not for those confronted for the

first time with a versified poem in Romanian. Clearly, the terminology regarding both etymology and Romanian form is not yet clearly established. Thus, the Greek term *ritmos* is clarified by the Greek-Slavonic synonym *stihoslovie*. The syllable is called *silava*, according to the Greek-Byzantine pronunciation. To express the notion of verse, the author uses the Greek term *stih*, which he defines as «a [kind of writing] related to numbered syllables», as opposed to prose that is «a loose kind of writing». These explanations seem to be a Romanian transposition of Latin definitions extracted from a textbook of poetics. For some terms he does not use Greek or Slavonic words, but periphrases or explanations, as when he wants to explain notions such as rhyme, elision, syneresis and dieresis. Although these two writings contain only a few poetic terms, those considered by the author as necessary for an adequate hermeneutical reading of his poem, but not alphabetically ordered nor following a method of indexation, they can be considered a first step towards the establishment of the Romanian lexicographic tradition specialized in literary terms.

2.6. In 1705, the Moldavian prince and scholar Dimitrie Cantemir, whose erudition and encyclopedic knowledge were not equaled by any other Romanian scholar in his time, wrote the literary work *Istoria ieroglică* (*The Hieroglyphic History*), an allegorical roman à clef. At the beginning of his novel, the author provides the reader with a *Hermeneutical table for foreign names and words used in the text* («Scară a numerelor și cuvintelor streine tâlcuitoare»), i.e. a glossary of terms, mostly of Greek origin, generally in forms adapted to Romanian. The words are arranged in alphabetical order, not of the Latin, but of the Greek alphabet. The origin of the terms is indicated in parentheses, followed by their definitions. The «table» includes 286 words, among which about 40 are poetic and rhetoric terms, such as: *apofasticos*, *apofthegma*, *argument*, *vatologhie*, *comedie*, *diathesis*, *dialectic*, *dialog*, *eleghii*, *enthimema*, *exighisis*, *interiecție*, *ironic*, *palinodie*, *paradigma*, *paradosis*, *paremie*, *period*, *proimion*, *proposit*, *protasis*, *ritor*, *solichismos*, *strofă*, *sofisma*, *siloghismos*, *sinonim*, *simperasma*, *tragodic*, *tropuri*, *teatru*, *oxia*, *ypervolicești*, *ypothesis*. Some of these terms are attested here for the first time in the Romanian language. The manner in which this glossary is conceived clearly shows the author's intention to apply lexicographic criteria in organizing the lexical material. That's why it may be considered as the first really important contribution to the creation of Romanian literary terminology.

Another leading figure in Romanian humanism of the second half of the seventeenth century and the first half of the next one is the High Steward Constantin Cantacuzino. The studies he made abroad, especially those in Padua, the relationship with many cultural personalities of his time and the opportunity to acquire an impressive library formed the building ground for his intellectual personality, opened to culture and cultural creation. Even though his lexicographic contribution is of no great interest for the literary terminology, nevertheless this overview cannot leave out the manuscript of the Italian-Romanian dictionary he wrote around 1700, because it represents a premier in two respects. One, it is the first Romanian bilingual dictionary with Italian as second language, and second, it is the first attempt to make a specialized dictionary of scientific terms, i.e. geographic terms (Seche, 1962: 9; Ursu, 1962).

2.7. During this period, there is a growing interest in establishing a literary language by adopting grammar, spelling and pronouncing rules and by creating a modernized and enriched lexicon through borrowings. These aspects preoccupy mostly Transylvanian scholars, strongly influenced by Latin culture and language and more open to Western culture. Transylvania now becomes the center of changes in attitude, due to the direct influence of Western cultural models. The dictionaries created in this period assume, besides their role of indexing old and new words and explaining them, a normative role by indicating the place of the word stress and some grammar information. Thus, Slavonic is replaced by Latin in dictionaries of major importance for the history of Romanian language, such as *Lexicon Marsilianum* (Tagliavini, 1929), a trilingual dictionary Latin-Romanian-Hungarian from around late seventeenth and early eighteenth century, by Luigi Fernando Marsigli, hence the name of the dictionary. Another dictionary is Teodor Corbea's *Dictiones latinae cum Valachica Interpretatione* (Corbea, 2001) „the largest Romanian lexicographical work written before the end of the nineteenth century. With its 37.254 entries (Corbea, 2001: IX), this was a model and inspiration for other authors of dictionaries in the following century. Next, we must mention the *Lexicon Compendiarium Latino-Valachicum* (Tagliavini, 1932; Corbea, 2001: X-XVI), attributed to Grigore Maior and containing about 14 000 words. The dictionary of Teodor Corbea occupies an outstanding place due to the very strict lexicographical method and quite exceptional richness of the Romanian lexical inventory, as well as for the ability to order the material. The direct Latin source

of Teodor Corbea's dictionary was the Latin-Hungarian dictionary of Albert Molnár Szenci, based in its turn on the famous Calepino. As for the Romanian language, it is clear that the author is very well informed about the spoken Romanian in all the provinces and has a solid linguistic knowledge. On the other hand, driven by the Latin model and by his sense of the Romanian language, Corbea introduces an impressive number of Latin neologisms, more or less adapted to Romanian phonetic and morphology rules, and even creates Romanian derivatives starting from these neologisms. The next generation of lexicographers will draw great benefit from the merits of his dictionary.

For the same period, we should mention the *Dictionarium Valachico-Latinum* (Chivu, 2008), the first dictionary based on Romanian, written with Latin characters, possibly from 1650, according to the most recent research (Chivu, 2008: 20). This marked the beginning of a range of dictionaries based on Romanian in combination with various languages: German, Italian, French, Turkish or Greek, which will broaden the source of lexical innovation of the Romanian language, and consequently, for the literary terminology.

2.8. The phenomenon of westernization under the Latin and Romance influence of the Romanian language acquires momentum between 1760 and 1860 (Lupu, 1999), as shown by the research of the amount of dictionaries from this period. There are three dictionaries written after 1800 with genuine scientific value, but only two of them exerted an outstanding influence on the evolution of the Romanian language and culture, because the third remained in manuscript. These dictionaries mark the modern phase of the Romanian lexicography. The first in chronological order is *Dictionariu rumânesc, lateinesc și unguresc* published in two volumes in 1822-23, under the supervision of bishop Ioan Bobb. The second is the *Lesicon românescu-latinescu-ungurescu-nemțescu* or *Lexicon latino-valachicum-hungarico-germanicum*, as result of the work of several authors for more than thirty years. It appeared in 1825 in Buda, that's why it is known as *Buda Lexicon*. Besides these two dictionaries in printed form, there is *Condica limbii românești* by Iordache Golescu, which, although completed in 1830, was not published. All three are general dictionaries. The first two are multilingual, the third is unilingual. The proportion of neologisms within the lexical mass differs between these dictionaries. Golescu's *Condica* contains the most neologisms; compared to Ioan Bobb's *Dictionary* with slightly less, and *Buda Lexicon* which is quite moderate in

listing them. But none of the three has a greater number of entries, and numerous neologisms among them, than Teodor Corbea's *Dictiones*. It is significant that Bobb drew extensively from this last one, to such an extent «that we can say with certainty that more than four-fifths» of the articles of his dictionary are «inversed» definitions of the *Dictiones* (Corbea, 2001: XVI). Thus, the abundance of neologisms in Bobb's dictionary is a reflection of their abundance in Corbea's dictionary.

There are about 100 literary terms in the three dictionaries. Comparing the number of literary terms within the number of neologisms, we find that in each dictionary they are proportionally represented. Some terms are common to both dictionaries with the most neologisms; others appear only in one of them, more often in *Condica*, which contains the most first attestations of poetic and rhetorical terms. Most words are phonologically and morphologically adapted to Romanian, and some of them have a quite rich Romanian derivation such as: *retor / ritor, retorică, retoricesc, retoricește* (*Buda Lexicon*), or *satiră, satirist, satiriza, satirograf* (*Condica*). The list includes terms such as: *alegorie, anacreontic, anagramă, anaforic, anapest, apocop, atelana, bariton, cacofonie, clasic, comedie, comic, dialectică, dialog, diatribă, dieresis, diftong, discurs, disputatie, dramatic, dramă, epigramă, epilog, epistolă, fabulă, glosă, hexametrul, hiperbolă, imn, liric, litotă, parimie, poet, poeticesc, poezie, proimion, prolegomenă, prolog, retor, ritm, satiră, silogism, stil, strofă, sublim, temă, tragedie, vers, versifica*. On the other hand, Latin literary terms registered in the two multilingual lexica are more numerous, for example: *Camenae, paeon, oda, psalma, apologus, metaphora, poethica, poetria, poetris* etc. Obviously, the list of Romanian literary terms in these lexica does not comprehend all literary terms known or used at that time.

An important project for an encyclopedic dictionary listing alphabetically ordered terms from the field of philology and arts was launched by Heliade Rădulescu. It was announced in 1847 under the title of *Curs de literatură* (*A Course of Literature*) and should have had six volumes. The letter A was to include about 90 terms such as: *abondanță de stil, academie, academician, accent, accord, act, actor, adagio, Adonai, aestetică, affectație, allessandrin, allegorie, allegro, allocuție, allusie* (Seche, 1962: 78-79). Unfortunately, from the announced project only a single sample-article was achieved: *academie*.

2.9. But dictionaries do not bring help about the development of literary terminology, they only register words. Grammars and rhetoric handbooks are the primary sources for the study of poetical and rhetorical terms. As the education and original literary production advances, there is a growing need for textbooks and normative works. The Romanian language grammars and various writings of literary theory and versification are often provided with glosses or explanatory notes. Almost all Romanian grammars, inspired by Greek, Latin or Slavic models, include notions of metric and prosody, beginning with the first grammar, which belongs to Dimitrie Eustatievici Braşoveanul, in 1757².

Over time, poetic and rhetorical aspects become autonomous and form a distinct field of theoretical preoccupations and practical applications. A major rhetorical treatise (Florescu, 1973: 246) from an historical point of view was written by Ioan Molnar-Piuariu. Entitled *Retorică adică învăţătura şi întocmirea frumoasei cuvântări (Rhetoric or Teaching and Preparing Beautiful Speeches)*, it is based on the best references and it was published in 1798. This is the first Romanian work of rhetoric in printed form, which had an important contribution to the modernization, enrichment and usage of the Romanian technical vocabulary.

The first writing about the Romanian versification called *Meşteşugul stihurilor româneşti (The Art of Romanian Verses)* dates from 1800-1830 and is written by Costache Conachi (Conachi, 1963: 3-30). To a great extent he upholds the old terminology of Dimitrie Cantemir: *silavă, ocsie, tonos, stihurgos, slove glăsuitoare, slove neglăsuitoare, noimă, macroschelic, ptosis atichi, ptosis onomastichi, ifen, apostrof, ihon* etc., later regarded as obsolete by different authors. But it is not without qualities. It offers a very well systematized explanation, the terms are defined and exemplified with Romanian verses, so that the treatise could also serve as a glossary of thematically grouped terms. However, it did not achieve its purpose because it was not published in its time.

Here we should also mention *Arta retorică*, a compilation work in Greek, written in 1815 by Constantin Vardalah for his students at the Greek Academy in Bucharest, which enjoyed great success and appreciation. It

2 Cf. D. Popovici, «Primele manifestări de teorie literară în cultura română», in *Studii Literare*, II, 1948, pp. 1-25; Idem, *Cercetări de literatură română*, Sibiu, 1944, pp. 170-175; I. Ştefan, „Din istoricul terminologiei literare în secolul al XIX-lea”, in *Contribuţii la istoria limbii române literare în secolul al XIX-lea*, II, Bucureşti, 1958, pp. 135-166. George Ivaşcu, *Din istoria criticii şi teoriei literare româneşti*, I, 1967, pp. 5-72.

is mainly an adaptation of Hugues Blair's *Lectures on Rhetoric and Belles Letters* published in 1783, which had an important impact on European literary ideology. In 1834, *Curs de retorică (Course of Rhetoric)* by Simeon Marcovici was published, who has Aristotle, Cicero, Quintilian, Longin, Rolin, Du Marsais, La Harpe «and many others, old and new» as a model (Ivaşcu, 1967: 176). Another work intended for teachers is *Ritorică română pentru tinerime (Romanian Rhetoric for Youth)* by Dimitrie Gusti, first published in 1852 and reprinted in 1875 under a slightly different title.

But a real leap towards terminological modernization and theoretical clarification of the Romanian versification is made by the contribution of Radu Meledon, professor of rhetoric and poetics, who in 1858 wrote *Regule scurte de versificaţiune română (Short Rules for Romanian Versification)*. All the terminology he uses belongs to the Greco-Roman classical tradition, conveyed through Romance languages and the necessary adaptation to Romanian.

In 1860, Timotei Cipariu, leading cultural personality of his time, philologist and scholar, produced the first treatise on poetics worth of an academic level, under the title *Elemente de poetică, metrică şi versificaţiune (Elements of Poetics, Metric and Versification)*, written in a rigorous manner and using a great amount of poetic terms. In 1868, Ion Heliade Rădulescu brings poetic theory and terminology at a higher level in the chapter *Versificaţiune* of his *Curs întregu de poezie generale (Complete Course of General Poetry)*, II, 1868, which makes «his contribution to modernization of this discipline of the greatest importance» (Berca, 1976: 85). About two decades later, G. I. Ionescu-Gion writes *Manual de poetică română (A Handbook of Romanian Poetics)*, very modern in his conceptions about Romanian poetry and at the same time, a perfect master of versification technology and its terms.

We should not forget *Vocabulariu sau lămurirea unor cuvinte întrebuinţate în aceste versuri (Vocabulary or Explanation of Words Used at These Verses)* which is added at the end of the volume of poetry written by Gheorghe Asachi in 1836. It is a glossary of neologisms where we find some literary terms such as: *anacreontice, antic, eleghia, epitaf, idil, imn, imitaţie, oda, prolog, sonnet* (Asachi, 1991: 447-448). Their explanation includes not only simply technical, but also some literary and historical information. Literary critic and theorist Adrian Marino believes that «the concern for explanation and clarity is evident, though implicit and elementary», and some words «are pure literary ideas», such as those treated

in his own dictionary, and therefore he somehow considers Asachi among his precursors (Marino, 1973: 17).

All these handbooks and treatises demonstrate that the old fashioned Greco-Slavic forms definitively lost ground in the competition with Greco-Latin terms.

3. MODERN DICTIONARIES OF LITERARY TERMS

Over time, the literary phenomenon develops and takes new forms, new literary movements and trends emerge. Thus, criticism and literary theory are challenged to keep pace with it. The meaning of the old terms goes through restrictions or expansions, their content is no longer the same. Consequently, throughout the second half of the nineteenth and during the twentieth century, literary critics and historians, aestheticians and writers seek to analyze and define literary terms; there is a preoccupation and a lively debate in the press and literary studies. However, a dictionary marking a functional distinction of literary vocabulary from the general lexicon does not yet exist. It will take several decades for one to appear.

3.1. The first sign hitherto is detected by Adrian Marino (Marino, 1973: 19) in the initiative of the critic and aesthetician Tudor Vianu, who published a kind of dictionary of aesthetic terms in a section of the literary magazine «Symmetry» entitled «Dictionary». Vianu felt it necessary to bring clarifications in the literary vocabulary by preparing a specialized dictionary. To this purpose, in 1960 he wrote an article about the *Formation and Transformation of the Terms of History of Literature (Formarea și transformarea termenilor de istorie literară)*.

3.2. As a result of an increased attention on the need to define the operational concepts of criticism and aesthetics in a systematic and clear way, thus avoiding terminological ambiguity and chaos, from 1970 onwards the first lexicographic projects dedicated to literary terminology were launched, the eighth decade yielding the most achievements. Thus, after a long period of preparation, the *Dicționar de terminologie literară (Dictionary of Literary Terminology)* is published, as result of a collective work coordinated by Emil Bogdan, however not equally well received by all specialists. A. Marino, for instance, believes that it is «of an entirely inadequate level, orientation and documentation» (Marino, 1973: 20).

It is shortly followed by two dictionaries, *Dicționar de terminologie poetică*, in 1973, and *Dicționar de terminologie literară*, in 1975, authored by C. Fierăscu and Gh. Ghiță. These works, revised and improved by the two, are edited in a single title in 1979, *Mic dicționar îndrumător în terminologia literară* (*Small Guide to Literary Terminology*). It contains about 400 articles arranged in seven chapters, each with its own alphabetical order. The purpose of this new dictionary is primarily didactic, but it is rigorous enough for the specialized user. The authors meticulously followed the lexicographic method they advance. The entries have the following structure: the origin of the term, the definition, the history, bibliographic references, quotations, examples. These dictionaries, although they are inevitably overtaken by further developments in literature and terminology, still retain their informational value and can be accessed by those interested in culture.

3.3. Gh. N. Dragomirescu produced lexicographic works of great scientific rigour. In 1975 he wrote *Mică enciclopedie a figurilor de stil* (*Small Encyclopedia of Figures of Speech*), and twenty years later *Dicționarul figurilor de stil. Terminologia fundamentală a analizei textului poetic* (*Basic Terminology for the Analysis of Poetic Texts*). This latter includes 270 species of figures of speech, «exceeding by about 20 the number known in antiquity. This difference results from some modern structures, discovered in French, and a few more that we determined in Romanian» (Dragomirescu, 1995: 61). «The dictionary registers, describes and classifies, its «strictly limited» purpose being to accurately communicate the definition of the figures, without concern for their literary or historical aspects. The author stresses that his «dictionary is not a common one, but to a large extent an original attempt, which, although the material is quasi lexicographic exposed, it includes however comments and observations with the aim to show our contribution to the definition and classification of figures» (p. 16). The dictionary has a very important theoretical component presented in the first part, regarding basic problems (pp. 15-60). One of the original contributions, which the author deliberately mentions and which he also stressed in the first edition (Dragomirescu, 1975: 27-28) refers to figures of repetition, with structures based on the *technique* of repetition, of «cardinal importance in the whole stylistic of figures». The author identifies 34 structures of repetition, at each level of the language: phonological, grammatical, lexical, and for each of these levels he finds criteria of classification (p. 51).

Gh. N. Dragomirescu's dictionaries are generally recognized as valuable instruments in the analysis of the poetic text.

3.4. A large project, but a completely different approach, proposes Adrian Marino in 1973, through *Dicționar de idei literare (Dictionary of Literary Ideas)*, set to appear in three volumes, but stopped after the first one which includes the letters A-G. The impact does not come from the quantity of the terms entered, on the contrary, «by practicing a strictly selective criticism», it includes only «key ideas, fundamental ones, currently the most widely used, most frequently encountered in our literary criticism, setting aside, for example, the *allegory*, but copiously making room for *anti-literature* or *avant-garde*» (Marino, 1973: X). Thus, the 28 articles span seven hundred pages of a volume of thousand pages: *actualitatea*, *antiliterala*, *autenticitatea*, *avangarda*, *barocul*, *biografia*, *clasic*, *clasicismul*, *clasicitatea*, *clasic* and *modern*, *comedia*, *comica* (genre), *comical*, *creația*, *curentul literar*, *decadentismul*, *drama*, *dramatic* (genre), *dramaticul*, *epic* (genre), *epical*, *eseul*, *estetismul*, *experimentalul*, *fantasticul*, *formalismul*, *genurile literare*, *gustul*. The structure, the method adopted, the intentions and basic ideas are exposed in the manifesto-chapter entitled «Pentru o «nouă critică»: critica ideilor literare» («For a New Criticism: the Criticism of Literary Ideas») (pp. 1-82), which opens the dictionary. The references are also extremely rich, diverse and comprehensive. Through his rigorous and critical attitude towards literary ideas which he approaches synchronously, Adrian Marino achieves a unique synthesis in the Romanian culture.

3.5. The most complete (as far as it can be in this area) and complex dictionary of literary terms until now is *Dicționarul de termeni literari* published in 1976 at the Publishing House of the Romanian Academy. It was the result of the work of a team of researchers from the Institute of History and Literary Theory «G. Călinescu», under the supervision of Al. Săndulescu. It was first mentioned in the article «Dictionary of Literary Criticism», published in 1966 in the literary magazine «Luceafărul», by the literary critic and theorist Vladimir Streinu, who was its original coordinator. It includes over 550 terms related to: fundamental literary concepts: *curent literar*, *critică literară*, *figură de stil*, *istorie literară*, *limbaj poetic*, *metrică*, *poezie*, *poetică*, *proză*, *retorică*, *specie*, *stil*, *stilistică*, etc.; concepts referring the structure of literary work: *act*, *conflict*, *compoziție*, *dialog*, *erou*, *imagine*, *intrigă*, *motiv*, *personaj*,

subiect, etc.; concepts referring to social and national character of the literary work: *accesibilitate*, *militantism*, *specific național*, etc.; concepts referring to literary creation: *ficțiune*, *imaginație*, *invenție*, etc.; literary movement: *clasicism*, *romantism*, *baroc*, *realism*, *naturalism*, *expresionism*, *suprarealism*, etc.; genre: *epic*, *liric*, *dramatic*; species: *odă*, *sonet*, *pastel*, *comedie*, *dramă*, *tragedie*, *epopee*, *fabulă*, etc.; notions of metric and prosody: *adonic*, *alexandrin*, *cezură*, *dactil*, *hexametru*, *ritm*, *rimă*, *strofă*, etc.; figures of speech: *alegorie*, *antiteză*, *comparație*, *epitet*, *hiperbolă*, *metaforă*, *metonimie*, *parabolă* etc.; technical terms used in literary criticism and history: *analiză*, *antologie*, *aparatură critică*, *bibliografie*, *ediție*, *izvor*, *manuscris*, *monografie*, *recenzie*, etc.; terms created by Romanian literary criticism: *anticalofil*, *balcanism*, *mutația valorilor* etc.; terms still in use or provided with new meanings in modern criticism: *ambiguitate*, *cod*, *conotație*, *denotație*, *diacronie*, *lectură*, *mesaj*, *paradigmatic*, *sincronie*, *semn*, *scriitură*, etc. (pp. 5-6). The lexicographic structure of each entry is also common in other dictionaries: etymology, definition, important meanings, history, circulation, example, citations. This dictionary has a remarkable scientific accuracy and modernity, that's why it continues to be an important tool for Romanian specialists.

3.6. Another project for a dictionary was outlined in 1983, but ended up in an «experimental» form in 1994, bearing the title *Terminologie poetică și retorică*. It is the result of the activity of a group of specialists from the University of Iași led by Val. Panaitescu. It does not compete with the other dictionaries, because it has a distinct profile, both regarding the structure of the lexicographic material and the content. The first formal observation distinguishes it from the other mentioned dictionaries, namely that the entries are arranged in columns, as customary in dictionaries. From the beginning, the authors aimed to approach the literary terminology from the perspective of the changes that structuralism and semiotics induced in the thinking of the twentieth century, a dictionary's initial objective being to achieve a synthesis of poetic, rhetoric and semiotic terminology. The abundance of old and new terms in the specialized literature and especially the abuse or confusion of the interpretation of meanings compelled the authors to produce a dictionary that «consequently returns to sources» and indicates exactly the circumstances where an author used a certain term with a certain sense. Therefore each article contains frequent sigla of the references with the signification decoded in the comprehensive, relevant and modern bibliography at the end.

Anyway, the tendency to modernize does not exclude the use of traditional vocabulary, because many words express open concepts and have the capacity to acquire meanings different from the original. The list of over 750 terms indicates the scale of the final version of the anticipated dictionary, from which the volume we present contains only a part, including terms such as: *Academism, Acțiune, Adjonctiune, Afabulație, Agramaticalitate, Alegorie, Aliteratie, Ambreior, Anaforă, Antimetabolă, Basm, Biografie, Calambur, Clișeu, Conotație, Context, Critică, Discurs narativizat, Erou, Eufemism, Fabulă, Figurabilitate, Figură, Fonem, Funcție, Funcții ale limbajului, Hiperbolă, Ingambament, Insolitare, Intertextualitate, Metabolă, Metafonă, Metataxă, Metrică, Narațiune, Neoretorică, Onirologie, Oximoron, Paleoretorică, Parataxă, Permutare, Personaj, Poetică, Poezie, Prozodie, Quadripartita ratio, Roman, Roman picaresc, Satiră, Semantică, Semnal, Sincronie, Stilistică, Text, Transretorică, Trop, Tropologie, Vers liber*. The mere enumeration of these selected terms reveals the interdisciplinary vision and the connection of traditional poetic and rhetoric terms with the modern language sciences: linguistics, semiotics, narratology, new-rhetoric. This dictionary fills a gap in Romanian lexicography specialized in literary terminology.

A dictionary first published in 1995 and reprinted in 2007 bears the title *Dicționar de termeni literari*. It is the work of three authors, Cristina Ionescu, Gh. Lăzărescu and Mircea Angheliescu. The last of them is an experienced lexicographer, also co-author of the first dictionary of literary terms in 1970 and of the next one in 1976. The dictionary includes terms of literary criticism, history and theory of literature and it is primarily intended for literary studies, thus demonstrating an important pragmatic component.

3.7. Another dictionary with didactical qualities, very useful for students, but especially for teachers, is entitled *Teoria literaturii. Curente literare. Figuri de stil. Genuri și specii literare. Metrică și prozodie*, a dictionary-anthology by Irina Petraș, published in 1996. This edition represents the aggregation of the revised and enlarged four dictionaries-anthologies published independently between 1992 and 1996. Each of the four sections has two parts. The first is an anthology of texts fundamental for the understanding of the concepts in the second part, which represents in fact the dictionary itself, with literary terms alphabetically ordered. For this compilation, the author used a vast bibliography and carefully selected relevant fragments for each concept or notion. It should be noted that

for the illustration and explanation of some terms, the author does not hesitate to revive and to quote from old treatises, from the beginnings of the Romanian poetics and rhetoric, such as *Ritorica* of Dimitrie Gusti or *Versificațiunea* of Heliade Rădulescu. Despite its real qualities, this dictionary has a disadvantage which makes it difficult to use, because it lacks an index of terms and the table of contents makes no indication of the page.

3.8. In the last decade there is an array of dictionaries of literary terminology, mainly for didactic purposes. They bring nothing new with respect to contents or method and are generally restricted to the area of interest in the curriculum, with concepts and terms selected from textbooks. For mere information, we can mention some of these dictionaries: *Dicționar de termeni literari*, 2001, by Corneliu Crăciun, with about 80 entries, in a rather traditionalist vision, but useful for the students; Victor Drujinin, *Concepte operaționale. Dicționar de termeni literari*, 2007, which lists 74 literary terms. An attentive reader discovers here, on the one hand, that the author aims at didactic accessibility and, on the other hand, his attempt to modernize the terminological repertoire of the students by the new acquisitions of current language and literature sciences, such as: *câmpul semantic, elemente ale situației de comunicare, neomodernismul, naratorul, perspectiva narativă, secvența narativă, textul literar* etc. A better one is *Dicționar de stilistică* by Mihaela Popescu, published in 2007. The author considers it as the first Romanian dictionary of stylistics for students. The dictionary «orders alphabetically terms or concepts which are necessary for texts analysis, as well terms designating figures of speech and tropes» (p. 5), such as: *abatere, absurd, accent, antiteză, clișeu, cod, colaj, destinat, hipalagă, hiperbat, limbaj, locutor, metalimbaj, narator, oralitate, parodiere, receptor, repetiție, stil, stilistică, tautologie, zeugma* etc. Unfortunately, the index necessary for a synoptic image of the terms and their number is not provided. Otherwise, this dictionary accurately fulfills the mission for which was created.

3.9. We cannot conclude this overview of the evolution of the Romanian lexicography specialized in literary terminology without saying something about how great contemporary cultural phenomena are reflected. The complex social, cultural, intellectual phenomenon of postmodernism preoccupies Romanian critics, writers and intellectuals since the eighties and particularly after 1990.

A rich literature of critical ideas, concepts and terms, based on imports as well as on original contributions, takes shape and introduces concepts and expressions belonging to this new paradigm of the thought. The use and the meanings of these new concepts and critical ideas need accurate determination and clarification. Hence it became necessary to create synthetic information tools, to order terminological and conceptual acquisitions, beginning precisely with the concept of postmodernism, emphasizing their interdisciplinary relationship. Several ongoing academic studies aim to create databases for such relevant concepts and themes in the form of electronic repertoires or printed dictionaries.

An example of such academic research is *Dicționar de postmodernism. Monografii și corespondențe tematiche* (*Dictionary of Postmodernism. Monographs and Thematic Correspondences*), published in 2005 at the European Institute in Iassy, under the coordination of Sorin Pârvu. We mention here a few monograph-articles: *Alegoria, Dialogismul, Era Vărsătorului, Fabulația, Identitatea, Inteligența artificială, Metafizica, Politicul, Postmodernismul, Scriitura, Subiectul, Textul*.

Another research project is called «Bază teoretică de date pentru studiul interdisciplinar al fenomenelor culturale contemporane. Tendințe actuale în științele socio-umane și creația literar-artistică. Teme și concepte postmoderne» (*Theoretical Database for Interdisciplinary Study of Contemporary Cultural Phenomena. Current Trends in Social Sciences and Literary and Artistic Creation. Postmodern Themes and Concepts*) and was proposed by Gh. Crăciun in 2007³. At present this research project is coordinated by Caius Dobrescu and Andrei Bodiu. Of all the types of dictionaries presented so far, it shares the same monographic approach of the concept only with the *Dictionary of Literary Ideas* of Adrian Marino and the *Dictionary of Postmodernism*. The project also differs from previous dictionaries which define «constant concepts of rhetoric, poetics, stylistics and literary theory without extending them to other areas of the humanities, such as philosophy, anthropology, sociology, theory of ideas, visual arts». The aim of this dictionary is mainly didactic, that is «to offer a terminological paradigm, a taxonomy, an organized table of concepts in order to facilitate learning and assimilation of what would be a hypothetical (if not phantasmal) ...model of the postmodern world». To this purpose the authors have developed a *Repertor de termeni postmoderni. Concepte-instrument* (*Repertoire of Postmodern Terms. Instrument-Concepts*), an

3 Cf. <<http://www.unitbv.ro/postmodernism/i.html>>.

electronic database of current terms and concepts such as: *a textua, textuare, anticanon, antimodern, arheologie, așteptare-realizare lingvistică, autoficțiune, autor, autoreferențialitate, cadrul, categorie, deconstrucție, dezordine, diferență, discurs, enunț, epistemă, genealogie, gramaticalizare, habitus, happening, hipermodernitate, interdiscursivitate, joc de limbaj, logocentrism, lumi ficționale, metaficțiune, mimesis personal, modalizare, modular, neomodernism – experimentul literar al anilor '60-'70 – postmodernism, pasișă, postmodernism, prototip, punct zero al scriiturii, scriere / scriură, științe umane, text, tipicalitate, transavangardă, zgomotul istoriei* etc. The *Repertoire* was published under the same title and under the same coordination at Transylvania University Publishing House, in 2008.

In the same year 2007, started another academic research project, entitled *Dicționar de critică și teorie literară. Valori românești și valori europene ale secolului XX. Concepte teoretice, tendințe, personalități* (*Dictionary of Literary Criticism and Theory. Romanian and European Values of the Twentieth Century. Theoretic Concepts, Current Trends, Personalities*), under the direction of Professor Iulian Boldea. It is an interdisciplinary investigation which includes literary criticism, literary history, poetics and stylistics along with other related disciplines.

4. BRIEF CONCLUSIONS

It is obvious that this is only a brief survey of the stages of formation of the Romanian literary terminology and its introduction in specialized dictionaries. Unfortunately, many aspects and authors were left out of this presentation. But we believe we have put together a fairly realistic and convincing picture of the development of the Romanian lexicography specialised in literary terminology. From the late and poor beginnings to full synchronization with contemporary trends in literary theory and criticism, the distance was covered at a relatively fast pace.

REFERENCES

- ASACHI, Gheorghe (1991): *Opere*, I, Ediție îngrijită de E. Levit, Editura Hyperion, Chișinău.
- BAHNARU, Vasile (2008): *Bazele lingvistice pentru o teorie generală a lingvisticii românești*, Teză de doctor habilitat în filologie, Academia de Științe a Moldovei, Institutul de Filologie, Chișinău, <<http://www.cnaa.md/files/theses/2008/12483/>> vasile_bahnaru_thesis.pdf.> [08/01/2010].

- BĂGIU, Lucian Vasile (2006): *First Works on Romanian Lexicography*, <http://english.agonia.net/index.php/essay/1750543/First_Works_on_Romanian_Lexicography> [17/01/2010].
- BAILEY, Richard W. (1996): «Old Dictionaries, New Knowledge», in *Computing in the Humanities Working Papers*, B. 28, November, 1996, <<http://www.chass.utoronto.ca/epc/chwp/bailey/>> [10/01/2010].
- BERCA, Olimpia (1976): *Poetici românești*, Editura Facla, Timișoara.
- BOBB, Ioan (1822, 1823): *Dictionariu Rumânesc, Lateinesc și Unguresc*, I-II, Cluj.
- BOLDEA, Iulian (coord.) (2007): *Dicționar de critică și teorie literară. Valori românești și valori europene ale secolului XX. Concepte teoretice, tendințe, personalități* <<http://www.upm.ro/cercetare/CentreCercetare/DictionarCritica/index.html>> [15/11/2009].
- CANTEMIR, Dimitrie (1983): *Istoria Ieroglifică*, I-II, Editura Minerva, București.
- (1990): *Cărți românești de artă oratorică*. Simeon Marcovici, Alexandru Aman, I. Benescu, Nicolae Vasile. Ediție de Mircea Frînculescu, Editura Minerva, București.
- CHIVU, Gheorghe (2008): *Dictionarium valachico-latinum. Primul dicționar al limbii române*, Editura Academiei Române, București.
- CORBEA, Teodor (2001): *Dictiones Latinae cum Valachica Interpretatione*, Ediție de Alin-Mihai Gherman, I, Clusium, Cluj-Napoca.
- COSTIN, Miron (1958): *Opere*, Ediție critică, Editura de Stat pentru Literatură și Artă, București.
- DICKEY, Eleanor (2007): *Ancient Greek scholarship. A Guide to Finding, Reading, and Understanding Scholia, Commentaries, Lexica, and Grammatical Treatises, from Their Beginnings to the Byzantine Period*, Oxford University Press, pp. 87-106.
- (1972): *Dicționar de estetică generală*, Editura Politică, București.
- DOBRESCU, Caius and Andrei BODIU (coord.) (2007): *Bază teoretică de date pentru studiul interdisciplinar al fenomenelor culturale contemporane. Tendințe actuale în științele socio-umane și creația literar-artistică. Teme și concepte postmoderne* <<http://www.unitbv.ro/postmodernism/i.html>> [November-December/2009].
- (coord.): *Repertor de termeni postmoderni* <<http://www.unitbv.ro/postmodernism/i.html>> [November-December/2009].
- (coord.) (2009): *Repertor de termeni postmoderni*, Editura Universității Transilvania Brașov, Brașov.
- DRAGOMIRESCU, Gh. N. (1995): *Dicționarul figurilor de stil*, Editura Științifică, București.

- DU MARSAIS (1981): *Despre tropi* (translated into Romanian by Maria Carpov), Editura Univers, București.
- EUSTATIEVICI BRAȘOVEANUL, Dimitrie (1969): *Gramatica românească*, Editura Științifică, București.
- FIERĂSCU, C., GHIȚĂ, Gh. (1979²): *Mic dicționar îndrumător în terminologia literară*, Editura Ion Creangă, București.
- FLORESCU, Vasile (1973): *Retorica și neoretorica. Geneză, evoluție, perspective*, Editura Academiei Române, București.
- FONTANIER, Pierre (1977): *Figurile limbajului* (translated in Romanian by Antonia Constantinescu), Editura Univers, București.
- GHEȚIE, Ion (1978): *Istoria limbii române literare. Privire sintetică*, Editura Științifică și Enciclopedică, București.
- (1961): «Glosare de neologisme la sfârșitul secolului al XVIII-lea și începutul secolului al XIX-lea», *Limba română* X, 6, pp. 557-566.
- (coord.), E. BUZĂ, G. CHIVU, M. GEORGESCU, I. GHEȚIE, A. MAREȘ, A. ROMAN MORARU, F. ZGRAON (1982): *Texte românești din secolul al XVI-lea*. I. *Catehismul lui Coresi*. II. *Pravila lui Coresi*. III. *Fragmentul Todorescu*. IV. *Glosele Bogdan*. V. *Prefețe și epiloguri*. Ediții critice, Editura Academiei Române, București.
- GUSTI, Dimitrie (1984): *Ritorică pentru tinerimea studioasă*, Ediție îngrijită de Mircea Frânculescu, Editura Științifică și Enciclopedică, București.
- HELIADÉ RĂDULESCU, Ion (1979): *Critica literară*, Editura Minerva, București.
- ILIESCU, Ion (1972): *Geneza ideilor estetice în cultura românească. Secolele XVI-XIX*, Editura Facla, Timișoara.
- IVAȘCU, George (1967): *Din istoria teoriei și a criticii literare românești. 1812-1866*, Editura Didactică și Pedagogică, București.
- (1969): *Istoria literaturii române*, I, Editura Științifică, București.
- KALIVODA, Gregor (2001): *Rhetorik-Lexicographie* <http://www.uni-tuebingen.de/fileadmin/Uni_Tuebingen/Fakultaeten/Neuphilologie/Seminar_f%C3%BCr_Allgemeine_Rhetorik/Projekte/hwrh/Dokumente/textkal.pdf> [27/01/2010]>.
- (1825): *Lesicon Românescu-Latinescu-Ungurescu-Nemțescu*, Typis et Sumptibus Typographiae Universitatis Hungaricae, Budae.
- LUPU, Coman (1999): *Lexicografia românească în procesul de occidentalizare latino-romanică (1780-1860)*, Editura Logos, București.
- MARINO, Adrian (1973): *Dicționar de idei literare*, Editura Eminescu, București.

- MIHĂILĂ, George (1969): *Sintagma Pravila lui Matei Vlasteris și începuturile lexicografiei românești*. Studii de slavistică, I, București.
- PANAITESCU, Val (coord.) (1994): *Terminologie poetică și retorică* (TPR), Universității «Al. I. Cuza», Iași.
- PETRAȘ, Irina (1996): *Teoria literaturii. Curente literare, Figuri de stil, Genuri literare, Metrică și prozodie*. Dicționar-antologie, Editura Didactică și Pedagogică, București.
- PÂRVU, Sorin (coord.) (2005): *Dicționar de postmodernism*, Institutul European, Iași.
- POPESCU, Mihaela (2007²): *Dicționar de stilistică*, All Educațional, București.
- POPOVICI, D. (1972): *Studii literare*, I, Editura Dacia, Cluj.
- (1935): *Ideologia literară a lui I. Heliade Rădulescu*, Editura Cartea Românească, București.
- PUȘCARIU, Sextil (1976²), *Limba română. Privire generală*, vol. I, Editura Minerva, București.
- REY, Alain (1970): «Typologie génétique des dictionnaires», *Langage*, Volume V, Numéro 19, pp. 48-68.
- SASU, Aurel (1976): *Retorica literară românească*, Editura Minerva, București.
- SÂNDULESCU, AL. (coord.) (1976): *Dicționar de termeni literari* Editura Academiei Române, București.
- SECHE, Mircea (1962, 1969): *Schiță de istorie a lexicografiei române*, I, II, Editura Științifică, București.
- TAGLIAVINI, Carlo (1932): *Despre «Lexicon Compendiarium Latino-Valachicum»*, Imprimeria Națională, București.
- (1929): *Despre «Lexicon Marsilianum», dicționar Latin-Român-Maghiar din secolul al XVII-lea*, Cultura Națională, București.
- URSU, N. A. (1962): *Formarea terminologiei științifice românești*, București.
- ZINSMAIER, Thomas (2000): *Der Beginn der rhetorischen Lexikographie: Giovanni Battista Bernardis «Thesaurus rhetoricae»* (Venedig 1599), *Neulateinisches Jahrbuch/Journal of Neo-Latin Language and Literature*, Bd. 2 (2000), pp. 241-258, <http://www.uni-tuebingen.de/fileadmin/Uni_Tuebingen/Fakultaeten/Neuphilologie/Seminar_f%C3%BCr_Allgemeine_Rhetorik/Projekte/hwrh/Dokumente/textzin.pdf [27/01/2010]>.

