

## **Aspects of the Neologism in the Literary Romanian Language**

SAUCIUC Cristina-Eva  
Stefan cel Mare University of Suceava, Romania  
eve\_cristinne@yahoo.com

Received 12.06.2014; Accepted 18.07. 2014

### **Abstract:**

*Our study aims to analyze the neologisms from their entry in the language and up to their certificate in a specialized dictionary. There are several opinions in the literature in what concerns the useful neologic character of a created or lent word from a language, but also from the time when there is a discussion about a new word in the language. The neology problem of a word remains so vague and poorly defined, as it is necessary a detailed study on this topic. In the second part of the study we approached the problem of neologic loans adaptation from one language a problem that led to numerous controversies and which becomes a fundamental element in the modernization and cultivation of Romanian language process.*

**Keywords:** *neologisms, loan, linguistic unit, duration, frequency, adapting.*

### **1.Introduction**

About the criterion which determines the appearance of a neologistic loan in a language, Louis Deroy establishes four indices: historical, phonetic, morphological and syntactic (Deroy, 1956). The historical criterion refers to the history of the borrowed linguistic element, possibly, and of the designated object; the phonetic criterion is catalogued by the author as decisive and the most significant, because is intended to highlight the history of that word; the morphological criterion allows the discovery of the source of a word or the discovery of the intermediary through which it was imposed in the language system, and the semantic criterion seems to be the most insufficient, because the semantics evolution of a word must be demonstrated with evidence from the texts and historical documents in order to avoid the occurrence of several similar variants.

### **2.The neologism quality of a word**

In a dictionary dedicated of neologisms, the authors, A. Adelstein, I. Kuguel and G. Resnik proposed a series of parameters in order to determine the neologistic character of the words: the chronological parameter, the psycholinguistic parameter and the lexicographical parameter. The chronological parameter takes into account the history of a word, the neologistic character of this settling according to the its first written attestation. The psycholinguistic parameter considers neologisms those words the speaker (specialized or unspecialized) perceives as novelty items. Not least, the lexicographical parameter involves the delimitation of the neological particularities of a lexeme depending on its insertion in the dictionaries; if the respective lexeme is not included in dictionaries, neither in any work of lexicography, then it can be considered a neologism. More than that, dictionaries shows in a diachronic vision the some terms evolution, putting into evidence so,

their neologistic character and their degree of formal instability (graphic, phonetic, morphological or semantic).

It's considered that a word is new from the moment of its appearance in a language and until its registration in a general dictionary. In this sense, Marie-Françoise Mortureux sees in neologism "a word recognized as new and liable to become a lexical item" (Mortureux, 1997)), and Maria Teresa Cabré claims that a term loses its neologistic character when it is inserted into a dictionary, because it crosses several stages of adaptation in the target language: firstly it appears as an individual act, then, through repeated acts, it is installed in language and, finally, it is a lexical item, becoming word with full statute in the receivers language" Cabré, 1998).

Analyzing, by the comparative-historical method, the Romanian neologisms from the XIXth century, Iorgu Iordan specifies that a word is a neologism as long as it is perceived as new. But, from the perspective of language evolution, the neologistic character of the words knows various degrees, gradation that should be analyzed according to the respective language, and not by its speaker. In its opinion, must take into account two criteria, in order to establish of such a gradation: the time criterion and the frequency criterion, aspect which can justify this thing: "as a loan gets old and has wide circulation, the more it loses its appearance of innovation" (Iordan; Robu, 1978).

Since 1984, Teodor Hristea claimed that all international terms need be treated like neological words. In this sense, the author saying that "any word so-called international must be considered neologism, regardless of its age in language. Thus, philosopher and philosophy... are attested in Romanian since the XVII<sup>th</sup> century, but this doesn't prevent us from including them in the category of neologisms, since (in a identical or very similar form) they met... in many languages of culture and civilization "(Hriste, 1948).

A similar view meeting at Constantin Manea who stated that "between neologisms, it is worth noting that lexical borrowing of Latin-Romanic origin don't lose the quality of neologism than when these go out of use", this trend of internationalization of the Romanian vocabulary having as a consequence and "enhancing the systematization of the language" (Manea, 2004).

Theodor Hristea comes and argues about the fact that the linguistic units entered more than 200years in Romanian language are neologisms for the following reasons: a) Latin-Romanic origin (direct or indirect through Greek and Russian languages); b) the quality of terms of culture and civilization; c) membership in the international linguistic background; d) their persistence to contemporary language. So, in the view of the linguist, a word that loses its quality of "neologism" can reach either a usual term, either even an archaism. It is the case of Turkish and Greek elements which are glinting into Romanian literary language in the XVII<sup>th</sup> and XVIII<sup>th</sup> century, of which the author mentions: *agă*, *pașă*, *diată*"testament", *caimacam*"locțiitor de domn", *epistat*"polițai", *catagrafie* "inventar, recensământ" etc. In contrast to these elements, "the lexical borrowings of Latin Romanic origin don't lose the quality of neologisms in Romanian language only if they cease to be used". This is possible, says Th. Christ, because "becoming the international words and being terms of culture and civilization, these loans continue to be neologisms in terms of Romanian linguistic, although some of them have in our language a length of at least two centuries" (Ibidem, pp.28-29).

Latin-Romanic terms appear since the XVII<sup>th</sup> century in the Romanian writings: philosopher and philosophy (to the mitropolitans Varlaam and Dosoftei), the above-mentioned examples, *motherland* (in the Bible from Bucharest), but we can also talk about other words with multiple etymologies which found in other Romanic languages: *analiză, caracter, dietă, lampă, magnet, organism, ortografie, telescop, teorie* etc. T. Hristea performed an analysis of the words *coroană* and *cunună*, the first belonging to the neologistic vocabulary, and the second belonging to the popular vocabulary, justifying this by the fact that the term *cunună* is inherited from the Latin *corona*, that supported the action of the phonetic laws in the transition from Latin to Romanian. Also, the term *corona* was borrowed as neologistic part, therefore *coroană* hasn't lost this quality despite his attestation 300 years ago (Chivu; Buză; Moraru, 1992: 155).

Even if it happens that such neological loans be assimilated by the popular language of the Romanian language, via multiple factors, they keep their status of neologisms “for the simple reason that they represent Latin-Romanic loans and, rarely, Germanic loans, which entered in Romanian after the contact's resumption with Latinity and Romanity occidental, so when it started and the modernization of our language process” (*Ibidem*, p. 29). Here are some examples of words already assimilated by the popular language: *agricultură, armată, birou, certificat, clasă, coleg, depozit, deputat, document, elev, exemplu, familie, fotografie, guvern, instrument, internet, libertate, muzică, parlament, paln, recoltă, reformă, senator, taxă, telefon, vacanță, vaccin* and many others.

The “duration” of the neologism status for a word is taken into discussion also by Elena Dănilă and Gabriela Haja, authors who consider this aspect “a thorny problem” for the Romanian language, proposing in this sense, a possible solution, namely the achieving a relative periodisation at the level of lexical correspondences: “If we could use, as a current working tool, an accessible and complete database, the absolute chronology could become a source of new information, at least interesting, facilitating the accurate research of the linguistic processes, including the determination of the length of a word neologism status” (Dănilă; Haja, 2005:71-78).

Lack of an “electronic library” for Romanian language is a disadvantage and significantly affects the Romanian lexicographic analysis at all its levels, considers E. Dănilă and G. Haja, because, at European level, the databases which are formed either from the contemporary literary texts, either from the print media, contribute greatly to neologistic element analysis from its first appearance until the contexts in which it is used. Louis Guilbert find the difficulty to specify exactly the moment when a term loses its quality of neologism: „Selon notre conception, un terme d'origine étrangère cesse d'être néologique à partir du moment où il est entré dans le système linguistique de la langue d'accueil, c'est-à-dire quand, précisément, il cesse d'être jugée du point de vue des processus linguistiques qui conduisent à cette intégration plutôt que décidée sur le seul critère de la mention dans les dictionnaires de la langue” (Guilbert, 1975: 95-96).

Quoting Guilbert, Maria Cabré is of the same opinion, considering that a term loses its neologistic character when it is introduced in a dictionary (Cabré, 2008: 18). This fact happens because, before being passed through normative work, a neologism goes through certain stages of adaptation in the target language: it initially appears like an individual act, then through repeated acts it installs in the

language and, finally, it is lexicalized, becoming a stable element in the language. Interesting is that if, in some linguistic schools, the neology is perceived as a synchronous element, that is the neologism status ceases through integration of the respective lexeme in a general dictionary of the language, in the Romanian linguistic “the neologism tag is definitively glued to the respective words” (Vintilă-Rădulescu, 2006: 442-455).

Sure that the dictionary attests the novelty of the words recently entered into language, but it can't determine the duration of their neologistic character. In this sense, Boubakeur Bouzidi trying to present the factors which determine the neologistic character of the new lexical units, notes that “dictionaries don't create new words and nor invent unused meanings. They remove the neologism from anonymity, put on it in circulation and legitimize on it” (Bouzidi, 2010: 27-36).

Some neologisms are becoming more common in language in a very short time (the English loans, for example) and get to lose “neological's feeling” that accompanies the neologisms. Other lexical units may stagnate for a certain period of time after that they start to enter in the circulation. Here are found, usually, terms that extend beyond the realm of belonging, being met under the name of “repeated neologisms”, or in some literary creations of the writers. So, the neologism quality of a lexical element will depend on several factors, among which the lexical void or the lexical deficit, the degree of adaptation to the language system, or the absence of competing forms.

Another important aspect in determining the neologistic status of a word is “frequency”. In Boubakeur Bouzidi's opinion “the frequency by usage can be both a consolidation element as well as the one of the erosion of the neologistic character of a lexical unit, the author considering that “the duration of the neologistic character remains fluid, and the neological's feeling is relative. However, the neologistic character is a reality, being the defining characteristic of neologisms” (*Ibidem*).

Some experts suggest and other names for the new elements entered into the language (loans), or for the lexical creations formed on Romanian land. Thus, at Florica Dumitrescu (Dumitrescu, 1997) we encounter for neologism the name “recent word”, and at D.N. Uritescu the name “current term” (*Ibidem*). Considering the quality of neologistic element of a word, Vasile Bahnaru proposes that the term *neologism* be used only for words “recently borrowed from other languages or formats within the Romanian language, and the words that have entered into the language of a few hundred years or decades be called *savant words*” (Bahnaru, 2008:126).

Once they enter into the system language, the neologisms are subject to changes or modifications as a result of general processes (the adapting to the rules of the language, the changes in form or meaning). Accordingly, we will say that essential for establish the quality of neologism of a linguistic unit are the two criteria: a) the chronological criterion (the ingress or the formation of a term in the modern era); b) the cultural criterion (which entails at least three aspects: the origin from languages of culture and civilization, the creation of cults models and the membership to a certain level of culture).

### **3.Adaptation of the neological loans**

The process of the neological loans adaptation from a language always represented a controversy issue, especially if we have the same opinion as Louis Deroy who thinks that “l'emprunt est un intrus” (Deroy, 1956: 215). There can be noticed adaptation difficulties to almost all the levels of the literary language that accepts the terms from another language: phonological, morphological, syntactically and semantically. Also, it must be also taken into consideration the speakers' attitude who, knowing the features of the term borrowed from the source- language, they tend to keep them in the mother language. With certainty, the base for adapting and adopting a term from another language is represented by a series of linguistic, social and psychological factors. Concerning this aspect, L. Deroy speaks about three degrees of adaptation of a borrowed element (Ibidem : 215-234). First of all, we can talk about a meaning loan, when it is not borrowed a new term, but when to an already existing word is added a new meaning, then a second degree of adaptation would mean that a term from a foreign language can be ciliated, meaning it can be created an indigene term according to a lexical correspondence. In this meaning, the calculus is seen as a “loan through translation”, this one being motivated by creating a bilingual situation, either by the desire to avoid the foreign form and try to express an idea by appealing to the means available the original language. Not the least, the borrowing of a term can be considered a total loan if we take into consideration the two existing categories: the xenisms and the proper loans, the first ones being misfitted, keeping the graphic and the pronunciation way of the source language, and the other ones adapting to the system of that language, evolving after the model of words from the old fund.

The phenomenon of neologisms adaptation is also approached by Marcel Diki-Kidiri, but according to a linguistic community, in the context in which the innovation element could come from the outside or from the inside. If we take into consideration an element borrowed from another community in which it is already integrated, it can be accepted as it is or on the contrary it can be compared to the other “inland” elements, from the same semantic area. The cultural differences between the two linguistic communities have repercussions on the exchange of information and produce that “wave of cultural shock” Diki – Kidiriki speaks about, that means, in his own opinion, “l'ensemble des transformations necessaire pour que le nouveau integer la culture de la communaute receptrice. Ces transformations concernent aussi bien la reconceptualization du nouveau, la reformulation de son expression, que la revision des prejudices qui, au sein de la communaute receptrice, peuvent generer meme empecher son appropriation”.

The neologisms adaptation also represented a subject of analysis and discussion in the Romanian specialty works, most of the researchers paying an increased attention to this aspect. Thus, Alexandru Philippide thinks that as a liquid takes the shape of its recipient, in the same way the borrowed elements enter a process of immediate transformation that enters a new language: “any linguistic element is borrowed, either it is a word, grammar form or sound, it never remains in its original form, it modifies it by analogy according to the nature of the borrower language” (Philippide, 1894: 158).

An essential element in the process of neologisms adaptation is represented, in his opinion, by the linguistic knowledge of the individual that borrows a term from another language, adapting it to the specific of his language, the resembling degree between the two languages determining at the same time the adaptation degree of the borrowed elements. In case a word is absorbed, but it is not

adapted to the language, then it “remains isolated, until it is either suddenly incorporated by a group it has nothing to do with it and to which is adapted by violent analogies, or it is exposed in a state of isolation and strong sliding of sound and meaning” (Ibidem, 162).

Another philologist preoccupied with the borrowings adaptation in Romanian is Gh. Adamescu, this one supporting the idea that only by borrowing, the new terms can penetrate the thesaurus of the language that accepted them: “the words that enter a new language receive modifications and only in this way they can enter the common thesaurus of the new language or live completely isolated and are written between inverted commas” (Adamescu,1836-1938: 72).

For a foreign term to penetrate the Romanian language system, it must respect certain conditions that, according to Gh. Adamescu refer to replacing the sounds that are missing in the language that borrows the receiving of the appropriate accent and grammar form. For example, the author tries to justify that a neological loan introduced in the Romanian language can be adapted under the aspect of shape, in two ways: “keeping, in most of its part, its volume, its original form and accepting only Romanian grammar endings, or continuing itself with a Romanian prefix or suffix or with another word, creating a hybrid form, from the point of view of the origin” (Ibidem, 92). Eventually, the author ascertains, the criterion of necessity remains the most important criterion in which concerns the loan from other languages, taking into consideration taking over those terms that define new cultural and social realities.

The neologisms adaptation did not always represent a preoccupation for the Romanian intellectuals: “in the old literature, the neologism issue does not form a collective preoccupation, but each writer solves it according to his own reason” (Pușcariu, 1940:38) according to Sextil Pușcariu. This attitude would change through “the sudden orientation towards the West” towards the Neolatin people, transformation that made neologism to become “a linguistic and literary issue” for most of the Romanian intellectuals. That is why” the Latin or Neolatin origin neologism produced a Reromanization of our language, enriching it with a number of Romanic elements that filled in the gaps created by the natural running out and loss of the ancestor words, these ones being replaced by foreign words”. In the process of neologization, the most affected seems to be the cult language because “the cultural words and that vocabulary the literate class had borrowed in different eras from the neighboring peoples had also been replaced, totally or partially, by Romanic neologisms” (Ibidem, 370). In order to highlight the different evolution of the neological elements from a language, S. Pușcariu carries out an interesting comparison inspired by reality:

“The neologisms that invade the language can be resembled with the trains loaded with foreigners that enter the train stations of the big cities. Some travelers step out so shortly after to get in the train again and leave further: these are neologisms with a temporary life that do not manage to get naturalized in the language. But there are travelers that enter the city and stay there. Some of them are alone and step by step they get used to their new home, keeping the foreign character for the rest of their lives. Others are waited on in the train station by family and friends, who hug them at the arrival and in the company of whom they will remain forever. These are the neologisms that at their entrance in the language were assimilated to the native element and entered the family of the words etymologically related” (Ibidem, 401).

The issue of neological loans that influenced the Romanian literary language during the time was also analyzed by Al. Graur who, in an article dedicated to cultivating the language, he said that “the loans are not such a big problem, more precisely he said that they have not been so far, because the new words always replaced each other, the contact with a new population introduced new terms, but at the same time they eliminated a big part of the previous loans so that the main fund, which is very old, remained mostly the same” (Graur, 1978: 40).

It must be mentioned that today we can no longer speak about the same situation, a thing also confessed by Al. Graur, because “the vocabulary becomes international, the same for all the peoples”. The language continues to evolve, taking over new elements and giving up the old ones, but “there will be no more competition between the languages from which they are borrowed, so most of the new terms will be kept with those from the main fund” (Ibidem, 41). In which concerns the adaptation process of neological loans in the Romanian literary language, Iorgu Iordan mentions that there are a few cases in which they do not manage to adapt, keeping their phonetic-phonological and lexical status they had in the original language, usually due to the fact that they cannot be included in a morphological paradigm. Sure that there are other cause in the neologisms adaptation process, among which the articulatory habits of the speakers, a certain base of articulation that shapes the form of borrowed words, distancing from the pronunciation way in the original language. That is why, “a big part is represented by the analogy, meaning getting closer to the formal aspect of the words existing in the language that borrows” (Iordan, 1978: 314), highlights the linguist. More than that, this process is also determined and influenced by the Romanian intellectuals preoccupied with the modernization and cultivation of the language.

The biggest number of fluctuations in the adaptation process of neological elements was registered in the XIX<sup>th</sup> century, until the moment in which it was imposed a unitary norm, nowadays the adaptation being carried out according to the system of the Romanian literary language. In which concerns this aspect, Gavril Istrate mentions: “We are, probably, one of the languages with the biggest power to assimilate neologism. It is due only to the alliance with the languages from which we borrow or it is also determined by the differentiating character of our language, in comparison with some European languages that enrich their vocabulary by composition (German, Russian, Hungarian)? Whatever the explanation, we must conclude that the Romanian language has an almost unlimited possibility to borrow neological elements, that due to this fact the words inherited from Latin no longer occupy the first position, statistically, as part of the Romanian vocabulary; they can be found on the third position, after the Romanian formations and the Latin-Romanic neologisms. The reference is not also for the frequency of these words, where the Latin elements continue and will continue, for a long period of time, to hold the first position” (Istrate, 1977-1978: 42).

To Stefan Munteanu, the neologisms adoption phenomenon is an issue of culture, while their adaptation to the Romanian language is an issue related to linguistics, and this thing must be explained and “through other factors than the simple transfer of notions from one language to another” (Munteanu; Țărea, 1983: 255). The neologisms adoption is determined by the fact the loans from other languages bring with them new semantic values generated by another way of thinking the connections between notions and the realities represented by them.

Another important aspect that must be taken into consideration in the adaptation process of the neological elements is establishing their etymology. The one who carried out lots of studies about this subject is Theodor Hristea, who considers that “most of the neological loans from the Romanian language have a multiple etymology” (Hriste, 1968:104). For this reason, “especially for the correct use of the neologisms, the etymological knowledge is often of an undisputable utility... even indispensable” (Hristea, 2000: 335), underlines the author, and, in addition to this, it is necessary to the knowledge of Latin language. Hristea lays down the required criteria by which it is possible to select the new elements which should be inserted in dictionaries and in other didactic papers, namely: to be attested by a number of times, in at least two times of literary language and to designate one thing or a concept that does not exist or previously unknown in the language for which could not be found an appropriate limit as the neologic one. In addition to these criteria, the author may add another four aspects that should be taken into account: “a. the presence of the respective neologism in languages other than the one in which has been borrowed, and therefore its tendency to become an international lexical item; b. The acquisition to be easily adaptable to our fonologic and morphologically system; c. the ability to give rise to derived and composed words or to fit, without difficulties, in a pre-existed lexical family; d. the trend which is manifested to develop new light, as a result of the frequency of uses” (Hristea, 1972: 185-186). A great interest manifests the linguist on spelling and graphical aspects of neologism which breaks down into three categories, the way in which are written:

- a) Spelled as pronounced (i.e. phonetically reproduced);
- b) Etymologically spelled (i.e. written as in the language in which they originate);
- c) Spelled in a hybrid way ( which combines the etymological spelling and the foreign pronunciation resulting a shapes which are removed, more or less, from both the writing and the original saying- (Hristea, 1995: 36-53)).

#### **4. Conclusions**

The neologisms phonetically reconstructed shall be geared in most Romanian loans and the fact that they are written as pronounced "constitutes one of the huge advantages of our spelling". The neologic elements adapt fairly easy to our phonetic and morphological language system and they are seen quite often in at least two functional styles of the language. Marius Sală considers that the way in which a language adapts the neologic elements from other languages actually describes that language culture and attitude toward foreign words. In this way, the "ease or difficulty with which a culture supports loans in the vocabulary may indicate its relatively or compassionate conservatism and also a relative strength of the two cultures. A very traditional and eccentric culture may refuse the loans, if it accepts them, and then submit them to great phonologic, semantic and syntactic changes, adapting them to their grammatical structure.” (Sala, 1997: 236) Thus, it is required a careful study of the loans, for both to reveal cultural influences exerted on Romanian literary language, as well as for the reason in which these influences manifests themselves.

## References

- [1] Adamescu, Gheorghe. (1938). *Adaptarea la mediu a neologismelor*. Bucharest: Cartea românească.
- [2] Adelstein, Andreina, Kuguel, Inés, Resnik, Gabriela. (2008). *1300 neologismos en la prensa argentina*, Los Polvorines: Universidad Nacional de General Sarmiento.
- [3] Bouzidi, Boubakeur. (2010). “Néologité et temporalité dans le processus néologique”. In *Synergies Algérie*, (9), 27-36.
- [4] Cabré, Maria Teresa. (2008). “La neologia efimera”. In *Lèxic i neologia*, Institut Universitari de Lingüística Aplicada: Universitat Pompeu Fabra.
- [5] Cabré, Maria Teresa. (1998). *La terminologie. Théorie, méthode et applications*, Paris : Armand Colin.
- [6] Chivu, Gheorghe, Emanuela Buză, Alexandra Roman Moraru. (1992). *Dicționarul împrumuturilor latino-romanice în limba română veche (1421 – 1760)*, Bucharest: Editura Științifică.
- [7] Dănilă, Elena, Haja, Gabriela. (2005). “Neologismul din perspectivă lexicografică”. In *Studii și cercetări lingvistice*, LVI, (1-2), 2005. (pp.71-78).
- [8] Deroy, Louis. (1956). *L'emprunt linguistique*, Paris: Société d'Édition Les Belles Lettres.
- [9] Diki-Kidiri, Marcel. (2008). *Le vocabulaire scientifique dans les langues africaines. Pour une approche culturelle de la terminologie*, Paris: Editions Karthala.
- [10] Dumitrescu, Florica. (1997). *Dicționar de cuvinte recente* (ediția a doua), Bucharest: Logos.
- [11] Guilbert, Louis. (1975). *La créativité lexicale*, Paris: Librairie Larousse.
- [12] Graur, Alexandru. (1978). “Probleme ale cultivării limbii”. In *Limbă și literatură*, (1), Bucharest.
- [13] Hristea, Theodor. (2004). “Conceptul de neologism”. In *Tradiție și inovație în studiul limbii române*, Bucharest, (pp. 23-36).
- [14] Hristea, Theodor. (2007). “Etimologia în principalele lucrări lexicografice românești. Considerații critice”. In *Limba Română*, Bucharest: Editura Universității din București, (pp. 23-40).
- [15] Hristea, Theodor. (1972). “Împrumuturi și creații lexicale neologice în limba română contemporană”. In *Limba română*, Bucharest: Romanian Academy Edition, (3), (pp. 185-199).

- [16] Hristea, Theodor. (2000). "Neologisme de origine latino-romanică impropriu folosite". In *Linguistic Studies and Researches*, Bucharest, (2), (pp. 335-348).
- [17] Hristea, Theodor. (1995). "Ortografia și ortoepia neologismelor românești (cu specială referire la împrumuturile recente)", In *Limba și literatură*, Bucharest, (2), (pp. 36-53).
- [18] Hristea, Theodor. (1968). *Probleme de etimologie: studii, articole, note*, Bucharest: Scientific Edition.
- [19] Hristea, Theodor. (1984). *Sinteze de limba română*, Ediția a treia, revăzută și din nou îmbogățită, Bucharest: Albatros Edition.
- [20] Iordan, Iorgu, Robu, Vladimir. (1978). *Limba română contemporană*, Bucharest: Editura Didactică și Pedagogică.
- [21] Istrate, Gavril. (1978). "Neologismul latino-romanic în cadrul vocabularului limbii române". In *Anuar de lingvistică și istorie literară*, Iasi, (26).
- [22] Manea, Constantin. (2004). *Structura etimologică a vocabularului neologic (cu specială referire la anglicismele din limba română)*, Pitesti: Pitesti University Edition.
- [23] Mortureux, M.F. (1997). *La lexicologie entre langue et discours*, Paris: Editions Sedes.
- [24] Munteanu, Ștefan, Țâra, Vasile D. (1983). *Istoria limbii române literare. Privire generală*, Bucharest: Editura didactică și pedagogică.
- [25] Philippide, A. (1984). "Istoria limbii române", In *Principii de istoria limbii*, Iasi: Tipografia națională.
- [26] Pușcariu, Sextil. (1940). *Limba română, Privire generală*, (1), Bucharest: Fundația pentru literatură și artă „Regele Carol II”.
- [27] Sala, Marius. (1997). *Limbi în contact*, Bucharest: Editura Enciclopedică.
- [28] Uritescu, D.N. (1993). *De la chioșcuri la vesternizare. Mic dicționar de termeni actuali*, Bucharest.
- [29] Vintilă-Rădulescu, Ioana. (2006). "Cuvinte străine în enunțuri românești". In *Studii de gramatică și de formare a cuvintelor*, Bucharest: Editura Academiei Române.