
The Lexicon of Buda. A Glimpse into the Beginnings of Mainstream Romanian Lexicography

Bogdan Harhata, Maria Aldea, Lilla Marta Vremir & Daniel-Corneliu Leucuta

Keywords: *Romanian lexicography, Transylvania, academic, tradition.*

Abstract

This paper is the result of a project aimed to e-ready a dictionary dating back to 1825, namely the *Lexicon of Buda* (1825) that is often referred to as the starting point of Romanian modern lexicography. The expressed aim of this paper is to illustrate that The Lexicon of Buda anticipates a long tradition in the academic Romanian lexicography. In order to provide a better understanding of why this lexicon holds its place among lexicographers and linguists, there is a brief description of the status of Romanian lexicography previous to 1800, followed by a short historical development. The second part illustrates the technical novelties inherited by Romanian Academy's lexicographic works, and shows that what this lexicon and the academic dictionaries have in common are the central position in the Romanian cultural establishment and the fact that they are normative and aim to unify the linguistic norm of Romanian.

1. Why the Lexicon?

This paper is the result of a project that attempts to e-ready a Romanian dictionary dating back to 1825, namely the *Lexicon românesc-lătesc-unguresc-nemțesc care de mai mulți autori, în cursul a trizeci și mai multor ani s-au lucrat seu Lexicon Valachico-Latino-Hungarico-Germanicum, quod a pluribus auctoribus decursu triginta et amplius annorum elaboratum est* [*Romanian-Latin-Hungarian-German Lexicon, elaborated by thirty authors over more than thirty years*] (LB). According to Romanian linguist and philologist Lazăr Șăineanu, author himself of a dictionary of Romanian language largely disseminated (ȘDU),² this lexicon marks the birth of modern Romanian lexicography; see Șăineanu (1982: 184). Despite its prestige,³ though, little is known nowadays of the LB outside a rather narrow circle of lexicographers and historians of language. Why then Romanian lexicographers, especially over the last decades, when newer progress in computing science gained an essential role in editing dictionaries already published, some of which quite old, haven't tried yet to actually meet the challenges our Lexicon presents? Well, beyond the more trivial reason that Romanian lexicographers are quite few,⁴ and that most of the efforts gravitate round Romanian Academy's *Dictionary of the Romanian Language* (DA-DLR), the LB raises a number of technical issues that are difficult to address. Labelling our dictionary as a Romanian one is, to begin with the most obvious traits, rather inaccurate an assertion, since our LB is actually a dictionary written in four languages: Romanian, Latin, Hungarian and German, with frequent cross-references in Italian, Spanish and French, for the most part, and, sparsely, in classical Greek. One should, also, mention the fact that the LB is technically (i.e. from a practising lexicographer's point of view) uneven, in that the lexical, grammatical and encyclopaedic information varies largely from one entry to another.⁵ There are, furthermore, the purely linguistic difficulties one encounters when dealing with texts old enough and dialect-biased enough to differ substantially from what standard-educated linguists are trained to recognize. Briefly, the array of problems the LB raises is so vast, that it spans from the immediate text criticism to dialectology, history of language, historical grammar etc., all of which at least threefold, since one should take into account the fact that the Hungarian and German versions are rather old themselves, too, and not without hitches. Yet, despite all such difficulties, to which the project this paper refers to is trying to remedy, at least in part, all those who mention it agree upon the fact that the LB stands for both a turning-point in the

history of Romanian cultural establishment and the onset of Romanian mainstream lexicography.

Our aim here is to try to illustrate how the LB is more than just a starting point in Romanian *mainstream* lexicography, that is to show that, in fact, our lexicon set a path followed by the *academic* lexicography until today, despite the fact that from the publication of the LB, one had to wait a full 41 years until the foundation of ‘Societatea Literară Română’ [The Romanian Literary Society] that was to become, in 1879, the Romanian Academy.⁶

2. Before 1800

Before moving on illustrating in which way and to what extent the LB turned out to be such a major crossroad in the history of Romanian lexicography, as well as in the history of Romanian culture, in general, one needs to understand what the status of Romanian lexicography was before 1800. The best authorized reference, in this respect, with the due amendments, is the first volume of Mircea Seche's *Schiță de istorie a lexicografiei române* [*Brief History of Romanian Lexicography*] (Seche I, 1966), where the author provides detailed information on the evolution of the lexicographical works of interest for the Romanian language.⁷ We shall not, therefore, give here a list of the glossaries and dictionaries previous to 1800, instead, we'll invite the reader to consult the copiously documented volume.⁸

The lexicographic activity in the then Romanian Principalities has a starting point in Valachia or Muntenia, and consists of mere bilingual glossaries, in Old Church Slavonic and Romanian.⁹ They served the immediate need of understanding, later translating a rich religious literature, as well as writing up official documents. They were used to improve the linguistic competence of the Romanian cultural elite in Slavonic, still official language of the church and of the state, but already undermined in this function by the beginning of writing in Romanian, and their importance is certainly related to the tradition of the translations from Slavonic into Romanian.¹⁰ By the end of the XVII and the beginning of the XVIII centuries, one observes in Romanian lexicography that, in the bilingual or multilingual dictionaries, the Slavonic tends to be replaced by Latin, a Romance language or by another living language. There is, also, a dramatic increase in the number of dictionaries.¹¹

Round this time, once with the flourishing of Romanian culture in the Hungarian parts of the Habsburg Empire, the centre of gravity in Romanian lexicography begins to shift from Muntenia toward Transylvania, and to a lesser extent to Banat, which, for a period stretching well over two centuries, will give a particularly significant contribution to Romanian historiography and philology, and especially to lexicography. Two major lexicographic works must be mentioned here: the *Dictiones latinae cum Valachica interpretatione* [*Latin Words with their Translation into Romanian*], dated round the year 1700, by Teodor Corbea of Brașov (Teodor Corbea), and the first bilingual dictionary that takes Romanian as source language, namely *Dictionarium valachico-latinum* (cca. 1700), work of an anonymous author, identified philologists with Mihail Halici the father, Romanian intellectual of Calvinistic religion, director of the Reformed School of Orăștie, in Transylvania (Anonymus Caransebensis).¹²

Between 1704 and 1780 there is a decline in the production of dictionaries: for a period spanning over more than seven decades, we have a modest number of 8 lexicographic works, of which one is particularly interesting: the *Lexicon compendiarium Latino-Valachicum*, (Tagliavini 1932 and *Lexicon compendiarium*) written most probably between 1762 and 1776. It is written in a rather clean Romanian language, sparsely coloured by Transylvanian words, uses as a basis the *Dictionarium Latino-Hungaricum* (Tyrnaviae, 1762) by Francisc Páriz-Pápai, and impresses by the number of word entries, round 14,000.¹³

By the middle of the century, there are signs that in Transylvania, among the Greek-catholic clergy came into being the idea of a major project: a monolingual explicative dictionary. Round the middle of the XVIII century, in 1759, the bishop Petru Pavel Aron suggests Grigore Maior (author of the *Lexicon compendiarium* mentioned above), who shall later be seated himself in the bishop's chair, to collaborate with Silvestru Caliani, professor at the Theological Seminary in Blaj, in writing up such lexicon.¹⁴ Unfortunately, such project was to wait for a long time before being put into practice.¹⁵

After 1780, toward the end of the century, there is a more conspicuous lexicographic production. One can count here a botanical dictionary¹⁶, the first lexicographic work that was actually printed¹⁷, a dictionary particularly interesting for the orthographic choices of the author¹⁸, along with a technically very interesting *Romanian-Turkish Dictionary* by Ienăchiță Văcărescu.¹⁹

One can notice, then, that until the end of the XVIII century, the Romanian lexicographic production rarely surpasses the stage of a modest bi- or multi-lingual glossary (with the notable exception of Corbea's *Dictiones*), and, equally rarely does it take Romanian as source language (the *Dictionarium Valachico-Latinum* of M. Halici and the Romanian-Turkish part of the dictionary by Văcărescu are quite isolated examples). There is no monolingual dictionary, or any truly explicative dictionary in Romanian lexicography (such assertion cannot, certainly, be contradicted by Cantemir's *Table*). Such lexicographic tradition appears, thus, heavily influenced by the need to understand texts written in foreign languages, rather than understanding texts written in Romanian. Such tradition was born to remain unpublished, since it is, in the largest majority of cases, closely bound to the individual needs of those whom nowadays we may call 'operators' in the field: translators and copyists, or reflecting the mere curiosity of isolated scholars and inquisitive minds. Attempts of broader amplitude, like Corbea's *Dictiones latinae*, the *Anonymus Caransebensiensis*, the *Lexicon compendiarium Latino-Valachicum* by Grigore Maior, the dictionary in four languages of Paul Iorgovici, or even the Romanian-Turkish-Romanian dictionary of Ienăchiță Văcărescu remain solitary, often incomplete, and, more importantly, acknowledged little or not at all by their contemporaries.

3. Why Transylvania? Why now?

The second half of the XX century rediscovered multiculturalism. Transylvania has always been multicultural. It is already a truism saying that Transylvania can only be understood as a result of a intermingling of three major cultures: Romanian, German (Saxon, Austrian, Swabian), and a particularly rich and well represented Hungarian one (that includes the Szeklers), with a touch of Slavic (Ukrainian, Serbian, Bulgarian, Slovak), Armenian, and Jewish. Although ethnically the Romanian population represents, at least numerically, the most important part of it, history has seen things different. The instruments of power have been for centuries in the hands of the Hungarian gentry and of the Saxon bourgeoisie, while Romanians were denied access to rights. Understandably, Romanians had to engage in a movement of emancipation that lasted for centuries. Its result was mainly noticeable in cultural field, and made possible the movement that was to be later called 'Școala Ardeleană' [The Transylvanian School].

The roots of the political and social situation that urged Romanians to seek emancipation are to be found far back in the Middle Ages. During the reign of Mathias Corvinus, the Transylvanian gentry continues a trend set by Ioan Corvinus (father of the Hungarian king), and seeks autonomy from the Hungarian kingdom. The documents register ever more frequently the wording 'partes Transsylvaniae' used to denote the parts occupied by

Hungarians, Saxons and Szeklers, and later, the relative populations. The leaders of the privileged nations, in their effort to ally against the central pressure from the king, entered the 'fraterna unio' in Căpâlna, in 1437. Almost simultaneously to the agreement, the wording 'tres nationes' replaces the wording 'tres partes Transsylvaniae', hence the 'Unio Trium Nationum'; see IST. TRANSILV. (I, 2009: 283-284). This agreement, renewed periodically over the centuries, between the privileged nations of Transylvania, which excluded the Romanian population from any kind of privilege or right, was one of the main factors that lead to the foundation of the 'Principatus Transsylvaniae' [The Principality of Transylvania].

Under such circumstances, the Romanian emancipation in the parts of Transylvania (and Banat) took over time two different paths that proved to be convergent on cultural ground. One was the Reform, when the Calvinist rule over Banat and Transylvania gave Romanians, still 'tolerated', that is marginalized, the opportunity to express themselves, either by way of confessional assimilation, or as a means of the Transylvanian Princes to counteract the influence of the Catholic church; see IST. TRANSILV. (II, 2007: 290).²⁰ The most salient examples are the (religious) printings of Filip Moldoveanul in Sibiu and of Coresi in Braşov, which continued an already established tradition of writing in Romanian in the southern parts of Transylvania. Equally important are the writings in Romanian produced in Romanian Calvinist communities, where we have the very first examples of Romanian texts written in Latin alphabet: the oldest preserved dates back to 1570-1573 and is the so-called *Fragment Todorescu* [*The Todorescu Fragment*], see Pantaleoni (2007: 40).²¹ The keyword here is 'Latin alphabet', and it is not by accident that it came to be within Calvinist Romanian communities: it served as a means to assert the religious identity, since the rest of Romanians in Banat and Transylvania, but mostly in Valachia and Moldavia, remained of orthodox confession, and continued to use the Cyrillic letters.²²

The other path that favoured the emancipation of Romanians in Transylvania came from the return to the catholic church, a hundred years later.²³ In fact, the union of the Romanian Church to the See of Rome, was seen by the Romanian elites of the time as a means to break the ancient and discriminating 'constitutional' monopoly held by the Hungarian gentry, Saxons and Szeklers, while the House of Habsburg, in need to establish stronger positions in the newly annexed and mostly reformed Transylvania, desired an effective 'instrumentum regni', by giving the largest Transylvanian ethnic group access to rights never granted before; see IST. TRANSILV. (II, 2007: 388).

In such political and social context Romanians were granted, if not the material means, then at least the opportunity to begin a true movement of emancipation. It took a full hundred years for the newly born movement to mature, and its instruments were cultural. This slow but steady growth accounts for the fact that at the dawn of the XIX century, the Romanian cultural establishment in Transylvania was ready to give its greatest works.

4. The Lexicon of Buda

In the beginning of the XIX century the entire Romanian lexicographic production moves to a Transylvania, where, over the first three decades, one can count ten dictionaries. Along with the lexicographic production, the Romanian culture in Transylvania produces, also, noteworthy historiographical works, grammars, and literature. All these appear in a social and cultural environment 'engaged' in the long-awaited emancipation of Romanians. The ideological answer aimed to justify the parity of rights among Romanians and Transylvania's (and Empire's) nations, and that underlines all the cultural products of that time was the rediscovery of the Latin roots: what other reason could better serve such purpose than claiming origin from the noblest people of Europe?²⁴ On linguistic field, one can observe a

strong current of thought that tried to ‘relatinize’ the Romanian language. We have now, a return to the Latin alphabet and orthographic norms that aimed to ‘let see the Latin root of the Romanian words’, along with some radical options on a lexical level, that is systematic attempts to purge the language of non-Latin words, and massive imports of Latin neologisms. Mircea Seche rightfully noticed that ‘Cele mai importante dicționare care apar sau se proiectează în această perioadă năzuiesc, prin spectul lor general (alegerea cuvintelor și a formelor, indicațiile etimologice etc.) să demonstreze latinitatea lexicului limbii române, de obicei prin sacrificare realității obiective’ [The most relevant dictionaries issued or in project in this period aim, through their general aspect (choice of words and of forms, etymological indications etc.) to demonstrate the latinity of Romanian language's vocabulary, usually sacrificing the objective reality]; see Seche (I, 1966: 21). It is understandable that, like in any cultural movement that has a strong ideological imprint (needless to say that the XIX century was one of the ideologies), some exaggerations would have found way to come forward; it is neither our place, nor the occasion to discuss them here. What remains is the cultural value of the works written during this period.

From 1800 until 1825, the year the LB was published, there is a series of lexicographic works, all noteworthy because each of them sets a first in terms of lexicographic technique or conception. Brief mention of them is due here, in order to better understand the technical nature of our LB. We have, therefore:

- a) *Dictionarium Valachico-Latinum* by Samuil Micu-Klein (Clain) that shall be later used as part of the LB – deemed to be the ‘basis’ of our lexicon, it remained unpublished.²⁵ It provides transcription in Latin alphabet of the Romanian words.²⁶
- b) the *Lexicon Walachico-Latino-Hungaricum* by Ștefan Crișan (Körösi), cited by the author himself in his *Orthographia Latino-Valachica* (Cluj, 1805) – the first dictionary to provide etymological information to some entries.²⁷
- c) *Vocabularium pertinet ad tria regna naturae* (1808-1810) by Gheorghe Șincai. - It consist of a list containing 427 word entries, with the equivalents in Latin-Romanian-Hungarian-German and Romanian-Latin-Hungarian-German, which was never published, still, probably used in the redaction of LB.
- d) *Lexicon romănesc-nemțesc [Romanian-German Lexicon]* by Ioan Budai-Deleanu, ready for print in 1818, after some 30 years of work, but unfortunately remained unpublished. The importance of the *Lexicon* of Budai-Deleanu stands in the fact that we have, with it, the very first “scientific” Romanian lexicographic work, which means that the author pertinently explains, in a *Foreword*, his own linguistic ideas and brings motivation to his choices, most importantly, in what regards the list of voices; it is, also, the first Romanian dictionary in which the lexical material (over 10,000 entries) was obtained through quotations from text adequately indicated in a *Bibliography*; furthermore, the *Lexicon* of Budai-Deleanu provides primary senses of the words, as well as secondary ones, arranged according to a historical and etymological criterium; it is, also, a dictionary where each entry has indicated: accent, morphological class, gender (in nouns), voice (in verbs), geographical circulation and stylistic values. The *Lexicon* also contains precious etymological indications given as tables annexed at the end of the manuscript, which seem to be particularly objective.
- e) *Wörterbuchlein deutsch und walachisches*, by Andreas Clemens, printed in Hermannstadt (Sibiu), it was particularly popular.²⁸ - It is the first printed lexicographic work of the XIX century.

- f) *Wörterbuchlein deutsch und wallachisches. Vocabularium nemțesc și românesc*, Ioan Piuariu-Molnar (Sibii, 1822).²⁹ It is a dictionary containing over 8,000 entries, of which a rather rich specialized vocabulary (Molnar was a physician), written in Latin alphabet (in German orthography) and in Cyrillic.
- g) *Dictionariu rumanesc, lateinesc si unguresc [Romanian, Latin and Hungarian Dictionary]* published at the order of bishop Ioan Bobb, in two volumes (Cluj, 1822 and 1823).³⁰ - it is the first large dictionary of Romanian that was printed.

Note is to be made that, leaving aside the technical innovations they bring, all the dictionaries mentioned above differ from those of the period before (with the notable exception of Mihail Halici) in that, still being (most of them) bilingual dictionaries, they take Romanian as source language (either the unidirectional ones: Micu-Klein, Crișan-Körösi, Budai-Deleanu and Bobb, and the bidirectional ones: Clemens and Piuariu-Molnar).

Closing, chronologically, this series, the LB was printed in 1825. At a first glance, one can notice that it is different than all the dictionaries before it, that, somehow, it is better, that even to our eye, trained with the practice of contemporary dictionaries, it appeals in a manner much similar to the way in which most of our usual dictionaries do, that is it works silently, tool-like, without requiring too much concentration, and yet providing a lot of information. The factors that explain why it is so are two, and are both seen in the title. The first one is ‘a pluris auctoribus’ [by several authors]. Romanian lexicography has, thus, its first collective dictionary. If two minds are better than one, then our LB is, in this respect, the result of the meeting of ideas, the confrontation of experience, practice, and expertise put to work together by some of the greatest minds of the Transylvanian School. The second factor, also contained in the title, is ‘decursu triginta et amplius annorum’ [over more than thirty years]. We won't detail here the long history of LB's elaboration;³¹ suffice to say that the first three decades of the XIX century were a time of experimentation. The several authors of our lexicon had the time to put to practice different technical innovations, with each new redactor. If these three decades marked Romanian lexicography's passing to maturity, then all the advances made by the other dictionaries of that time meet in the LB, which rises suddenly as a perfectly mature product in the long line of lexicographic works before it.

Due to its particular historical and technical nature, the LB is seen both as a philological document, and provides valuable information for the history of language, as well as a turning point in the evolution of Romanian lexicography, because it has provided a model followed by mainstream dictionaries ever since. Its relation with the subsequent academic lexicographic tradition has, also, a double nature: it interests the technical conception of a modern dictionary applied to the vocabulary of Romanian, on one hand, while on the other it regards its role and position in the cultural establishment as an instrument of culture.

For what regards the lexicographic conception, the lexical inventory, which is the centre of gravity of each dictionary, is one of the first things that come forward. In our lexicon, it is particularly rich. When we say richness, we don't mean sheer numbers, although a number of cca. 13,000 entries is rather generous in comparison with both previous and contemporary dictionaries.³² The most interesting is the quality of the lexical material contained in the LB: it counts usual words circulating in Transylvania at the time, along with neologisms. These latter are much fewer than one would expect, which denotes a reserved attitude of the authors in relation to status of words in language, and are almost always justifiable by the existence of the extra-linguistic objects of reality. The authors of the LB, also, pay particular attention to the treatment of lexical families, as well, that is it is likely to find in our lexicon more than one member of the same family, and derivatives are, usually, listed separately. In these aspects, it is followed by the academic lexicography, there are, though, some that were amended later: the modern Romanian academic lexicography adopted

the etymological criterion for establishing the number of entries in a dictionary, i.e. there is a unequivocal parity: one etymon – one entry (one entry may have multiple etymologies, yet, more entries cannot share the same etymology, unless justified by diachronic stratification). In the LB, there are frequent the cases in which the same word, with different grammatical values, is registered as separate entries (e.g.: *Dirept*¹, n.m; *Dirept*², adj.; *Dirept*³, adv.; *Dirept*⁴, prep.). Another aspect related to the word-list corrected by later development of lexicology and lexicography regards the phraseological units, that appear in the LB as separate entries, while in modern dictionaries are listed under the first term of the unit (or under the semantic predication, according to case).

If in relation to the word-list, the most characteristic aspect inherited by the academic lexicography from the LB is, surprisingly, the rather reserved attitude towards the neologic elements of the vocabulary, things become much more noticeable when it comes to the structure of the article under the voice. In fact, all academic dictionaries follow the pattern first seen in the LB: voice, followed by grammatical indication field, semantic field, and etymological field.³³ Due to the fact that our LB doesn't provide a direct etymology or an etymological affiliation to every entry, the last field may be absent, yet, whenever it is present, the order is strictly observed. Another innovation first inherited by the academic lexicography from the LB regards the structure of the semantic field under the voice: in the case of words with multiple meanings, the first differentiation applied is according to the grammatical value (voice in verbs, shift of grammatical class in nomina etc.). Still here, mention is to be made that it is interesting to note that in LB, much unlike in the dictionaries of its time, the content of encyclopaedic information within the semantic field is limited, and in most cases, it is absent. Such very technical approach, is a particularly modern trait, since the dichotomy lexical vs. encyclopaedic information wasn't to become mandatory in defining the typology of a certain lexicographic work until much later. The rule doesn't apply, instead, to word-list content, since one may notice in the LB words of encyclopaedic nature, like names of places, persons, regions etc., yet the definitions provided contain, in general, only lexical information (e.g. *Abrud*, subst. Un oraş în Ardeal [*Abrud*, noun. A town in Transylvania]). It is equally interesting to notice that some of Romanian Academy's dictionaries took a rather different approach: the HEM is par excellence an encyclopaedic dictionary, while in the DA, for which Sextil Puşcariu prescribed particularly austere criteria of admission to the word-list, one may notice that under some entries, the semantic field may contain encyclopaedic definitions; see DA (Julfă), where the author adds immediately after the lexical information under 2. 'Meal for the feast days made of hemp seeds' the recipe and how it is best consumed. Another element that was inherited from the LB by the academic dictionaries regards the grammatical information field, since the authors of our lexicon are careful to provide accurate and complete indications of grammatical nature pertaining to each entry.

If in technical terms, the matter of the heritage the LB left the mainstream dictionaries of Romanian language is largely debatable and subject to changes in lexicographical technique, the LB is undeniably the true 'foregoer' of the academic lexicographic tradition in its role of central and centralizing instrument of a cultural establishment. It has been shown that the cultural products of the Transylvanian School gravitate round the movement of emancipation of the Romanian population in Transylvania, and that the instruments it had put to work were cultural. Unlike all the other cultural products of its time, the LB gathered the contribution of an entire generation and managed to absorb and assimilate the efforts of the most representative members of the Transylvanian School. In this aspect, it functioned as gravitation centre of an entire cultural establishment and gave voice to its most intimate purposes, which regarded the linguistic emancipation. In a much similar manner, The Romanian Academy, since the days that was still called The Academic Society, was born with the project of a Thesaurus of Romanian language, that would absorb and express what is of

essence to Romanian culture; see, also, DA (Tomul I. Partea I: A-B, 1913: i).³⁴

Furthermore, just like the dictionaries of the Romanian Academy that was to be founded 41 years later, our LB is, before all, a normative dictionary, that tries to unify the language of all Romanians under a single linguistic norm. If most dictionaries observe a status of language by means of its vocabulary, the normative dictionaries take a step ahead and provide models to follow, set rules. It is in that normative aspect, too, that the LB is truly part of the academic lexicographic tradition, which incorporated it not only because of its prestige, but because it anticipated with almost half a century³⁵ the response to an already existing need of giving the Romanian language a unified form.

Notes

¹ This work has been supported by a grant of the Romanian National Authority for Scientific Research, CNCS - UEFISCDI, project number PN-II-RU-TE-2011-3-0170.

² Such is the authority of Lazăr Şăineanu among Romanian lexicographers, that one of the newer dictionaries, namely the *Noul dicţionar universal al limbii române* (NŞDU) is even called ‘the new Şăineanu’, to which attests the quotation system of Romanian Academy’s DLR, which adds the letter N, for ‘noul’, i.e. the new, before the old reference given Şăineanu’s dictionary, that is ŞDU, despite the fact that the NŞDU is a completely new dictionary (in terms of word-list, technically etc.). The authors themselves are careful to indicate the affiliation in the first lines of the Foreword to it: ‘*Noul dicţionar universal al limbii române* continuă tradiţia lexicografică românească a descrierii semantice ilustrate cu citate din literatura cultă şi populară, după modelul promovat de Lazăr Şăineanu la sfârşitul secolului al XIX-lea şi în prima jumătate a secolului al XX-lea’ [*The New Universal Dictionary of Romanian* continues the Romanian lexicographical tradition of the semantic description illustrated by quotations from literature and folklore, according to the principles established by Lazăr Şăineanu at the end of XIX and in the first half of the XX centuries]; see NŞDU (2009: 7).

³ The LB is often quoted by Romanian lexicographers and is used as a source of information included in newer dictionaries (mostly in the field of academic lexicography). It, also, enjoys good visibility and consideration among specialists of Romanian abroad – it is, for example, mentioned by Friedrich Diez, who, none the less, deemed it largely perfectible, and by Jernej Bartholomäus Kopitar.

⁴ Anecdotaly enough, acad. Marius Sala, in the Foreword to the MDA, when speaking of the new series of Academy’s dictionary, counts a total number of 92 [*sic!*] lexicographers who compiled the 20 volumes of the DLR, from 1958 to 2001; see MDA (I, A-C: vii).

⁵ This observation regards solely the technical uniformity of the work, like variability in abbreviations, in the formulation of grammatical information, notes etc. The structure of the lexical information provided and the fields identified under each voice are present throughout the entire lexicon.

⁶ Since the foundation of the Romanian Academy, in 1866, one can follow two main directions in Romanian lexicography: that of the Academy which produced the LM, HEM, DA-DRL, MDA etc., and a non-academic one that produced generally acknowledged dictionaries: the formerly mentioned ŞDU, along with a number of different dictionaries, like those of Aurel Căndrea, Hariton Tikin etc. are part of it.

⁷ Despite the fact the two volumes of Mircea Seche became somewhat old, and that some details have been amended by later research, his work is still the only bibliographical reference that encompasses the entire history of Romanian lexicography, therefore it is a mandatory source of information.

⁸ Suffice to say that we owe Mircea Seche, among other things, a more accurate identification of the first lexicographical works involving Romanian. Previously, it had been common knowledge that the first lexicographic attempts in Romanian are datable between the end of the XVII and the beginning of the XVIII centuries; see Iordan (1956: 123-124). In fact, the first examples of such attempts, namely two bilingual Slavonic-Romanian glossaries, of which only fragments have been preserved, date back to the XVI century.

⁹ The oldest preserved are a *Serbian-Romanian Biblical Vocabulary*, where ‘Serbian’ stands for ‘Slavonic’, dated round 1630 and a *Slavonic-Romanian Lexicon* (Mardarie Cozianul) compiled by Mardarie, ‘pisar’, i.e. scribe, in the monastery of Cozia. This latter is the first lexicographic work that survived entirely until today.

¹⁰ Such glossaries were by no means original, in fact their obvious source of inspiration was Pamvo Berynda’s *Slavonic-Russian Lexicon and the Translation of Names*; see Seche (I, 1966: 8). The foreword to the second edition of Berynda’s lexicon, published in 1653 at the Kutejins’kyj on the Orša monastery, in nowadays Belarus, the author hints to the popularity of the work, and notes that it had been used in compiling two Romanian glossaries.

- ¹¹ We have now an Italian-Romanian dictionary (cca. 1700, compiled by the ‘stolnic’, i.e. High Stewart Constantin Cantacuzino), a Latin-Romanian-Hungarian vocabulary (*Lexicon Marsilianum*), a draught of a Romanian-Greek dictionary, along with a specialized one: i.e.: a Dictionary of neologisms (*Scara a numerelor și cuvintelor streine tâlcuitoare* [*Explicative Table of Numbers and Foreign Words*] annexed by Dimitrie Cantemir to his *Istoria hieroglifică* [*Hieroglyphic History*] in 1704).
- ¹² The Halici family is particularly significant in Romanian culture. The son of Mihail Halici, named, also, Mihail, is known for the long time friendship with Francisc Páriz-Pápai, Hungarian humanist, to whom he dedicated an Ode written in Romanian, in Latin alphabet with Hungarian spelling, published in 1674 at Basel; see Radosav (2003: 191).
- ¹³ Despite the not so impressive volume, are, none the less, particularly interesting two dictionaries that were written in Moldavia by two Franciscan missionaries: the *Breve vocabulario italiano-moldavo* by Fra Silvestro Amelio (Silvestro Amelio) and the glossary projected by Francantonio Minotto, which has been lost; see Ferro (2004: 296). It is interesting to notice that, at that time, despite the fact that Moldavia had already given Romanian language and culture some of its most prominent names, there hadn't been a particular interest in lexicographic works.
- ¹⁴ Apparently, Gheorghe Șincai, also, thought of a similar project, from what one can read in the *Praefatio* to the *Elementa linguae Daco-Romanae sive Valachicae* (Vienna, 1780¹) by Samuil Micu and Gheorghe Șincai.
- ¹⁵ Such was the imprint of the bilingual or multilingual lexicography in Romanian culture, that until 1958, the academic dictionaries provided a translation of the word entries. The DA, for example, provides only the French translation, although by project it should have provided the Latin equivalents as well, because taking care of the exact translation in Latin would have simply required too much time.
- ¹⁶ The *Nomina vegetabilium* published by Benkő József in «Magyar Könyvház», Poszony [Bratislava], II, 1873; it is a trilingual glossary (Latin-Hungarian-Romanian) containing phytonyms in number of 620, with the Romanian equivalents written according to the Hungarian orthography, and arranged not alphabetically, yet taxonomically.
- ¹⁷ *În scurta adunare a numero după capetele ce s-au așezat, în doao limbi, întru folosul celor ce vor a învăța limba rusească și moldovenească* [*Brief numbered list according to the chapters established, to the use of whomever shall deem to learn Russian and Moldavian*] by protopope Mihail Strilbițchi, published in Iași, in the year 1789; it contains 1,500 words arranged onomasiologically. The glossary of Strilbițchi enjoyed a certain fame in its own time, and it was reprinted, with a different set of characters, a different pagination and different title, as an annex to the *Moldavian-Russian Grammar* (1879) by Toader Școleriu. It was later taken as model by the glossary to the *Russian-Romanian Grammar* (Sankt Petersburg, 1827) of Ștefan Margela; see Seche (I, 1966: 17-18).
- ¹⁸ *Dicționar în patru limbi (român-german-francez-latin)* [*Dictionary in four languages (Romanian-German-French-Latin)*] compiled by Paul Iorgovici before 1800, until the letter *M*. This dictionary is of particular interest because Iorgovici, who was, also, author of a grammar quite authoritative in its own time (Iorgovici, 1799), expressed here the will to replace the ‘foreign’ words with ancient Romanian or classical Latin terms.
- ¹⁹ This is actually a bidirectional dictionary: there is a Turkish-Romanian part to it, as well, which remained in the first stages of the work; it consists of a simple list of words, where both Romanian and Turkish equivalents are written in Cyrillic. The interesting, and rather exotic element for the Romanian lexicography is that entries are grouped under a ‘root’ (e.g.: under the root *seč* we find: *seceră, seceriș, secerător* etc.); see Seche (I, 1966: 22).
- ²⁰ Acad. Ioan-Aurel Pop provides here a laconic, yet comprehensive description of the facts: ‘Este astăzi cert că Reforma a favorizat nu numai trecerea la scrisul românesc, dar și tipărirea cărților în românește’ [It is certain nowadays that the Reform not only made possible beginning to write in Romanian, but, also, made possible printing in Romanian].
- ²¹ Romanian is the only Romance language of a vastly orthodox population, which meant that all circulating religious texts and the official documents issued by the state (in Valachia and Moldavia) were written at first in Slavonic, than in Romanian, with Cyrillic letters. Such was the church commended imprint on writing tradition that the Cyrillic alphabet was officially preserved until 1926.
- ²² Later on, once with the rise of the Latin idea and the recovery of the Latin roots of Romanians, the use of Cyrillic letters would be seen as a reason of decay, as a means to loosen the fabric of national identity. Scholars of the time did not care for the neat distinction nowadays linguistics operates between language and its written form. Their positions vary greatly. On one hand, we have the rather anecdotal story told by Dimitrie Cantemir, who asserts that Moldavians used to write in Latin alphabet before the Council of Florence, in the times of Alexandru cel Bun, who ordered that all writings in Latin alphabet be burned as a response to the aggressive propaganda of the Catholic church, and that all new writings be done in Cyrillic ‘orthodox’ alphabet; see Cantemir (transl. 1973: 371) and Pantaleoni (2007: 39). On the other hand, we have the severe words of Petru Maior: ‘Sicut enim in exterminandis e republica literaria Valachorum Cyrillicis

- characteribus, qui densissimas tenebras Valachicae linguae offuderunt [...] inter se omnes conveniunt' [Everyone agrees, thus, to the fact that the Cyrillic letters that brought a deep darkness upon Romanian language need to be eradicated from the literary republic of Romanians]; see LB (1825: iii).
- ²³ The Union took place as a result of a process that lasted well over a decade, started in 1689 by initiative of Leopold Kollonich, the Kaiser's advisor; see IST. TRANSILV. (II, 2007: 379).
- ²⁴ It has been established that the birth of Romanians as a people was a rather complex and long-lasting phenomenon that stretched well over ten hundred years, the official doctrine of the Transylvanian School was, in its most vehement stages, that Romanians are of pure Roman breed, with no foreign element whatsoever. An assertion like that published by Petru Maior in his *Praefatio* to the *Ortographia Romana, sive Latino-Valachica, una cum clavi, qua penetralia originationis vocum resserantur* (Buda, 1819), reported in the LB some 6 years later, may seem naïve to the nowadays reader, yet, ideologically, was fully justified at that time: 'Dum autem praemissis figuris Dictionibus sub quavis Litera ostendo, qui differentia non paucarum vocum per mutationem literarum, aut syllabarum etc. Latinam inter et Valachicam linguam inducta sit; eo ipso clavim supposito, qua penetralia originationis vocum resserantur, pluresve proprietates antiquae linguae Latinae, quae hodie in docta sive Grammaticali lingua Latina vix aut ne vix quidem visuntur, apud Valachos hodieum vigere detego, ita ut vix dubitari possit, linguam Valachicam longe antiquiore esse Marci Tulli Ciceronis aetate [*sic!*], qua docta sive Grammaticalis lingua Latina ad supremum culmen perfectionis elucata fuit. Ex quo pronò alveo fluit, Vlachicam linguam Latinis sive Romanis dialectis utpote Hispanicae, Galiccae et Italicae modernae antecellere vetustate' [While I show in the spelling of the words under whichever letter that no few differences have occurred between Latin and Romanian, by a mutation of letters or syllables, I also give a key that opens the secrets of the words' origins, and demonstrate that numerous properties of the ancient Latin language, of which some are difficulty noticeable nowadays, are still alive in Romanian, so as no one could even doubt that the Romanian language weren't even older than the times of Marcus Tullio Cicero, when the grammatical (read literary) Latin was brought to perfection. It results from here clearly that Romanian is older than the Latin or Romance languages like Spanish, French and Italian]; see LB (1825: vii).
- ²⁵ As early as the spring of 1801, Micu-Klein had ready for print a bilingual lexicon, with Romanian as source language. Acad. Gh. Chivu suggests that Micu-Klein had probably had the work ready prior to 1800, since LB's authors counted that their *Lexicon* was the fruit of an effort spanning well over three decades; see Chivu (2008: 27, Note 8); The first version of the *Dictionarium* was discovered and published by Gáldi László; see Klein (ed. 1944). By 1803, the author wanted to transform it into a multilingual dictionary, by adding the equivalents in German and Hungarian, with the aid of proff. I. Molnar-Halitzki and Virág Benedek. By 1805 the new version of the *Dictionarium* is print-ready, yet, upon request of the director of the Romanian School in Timișoara, Micu-Klein adds the transcription of the part in Romanian in Latin alphabet. Alas, before accepting printing the dictionary, the King's Publishing House of the University of Buda demands a certain number of subscriptions be met, which, despite the active implication of Ioan Corneli, fails to happen. None the less, in 1806 the publishing house accepts to print the manuscript and releases an "Advertisement" containing an extract of the work, aimed to inform the interested of the imminent publication of the *Dictionarium*, still on condition the number of subscriptions be met; the death of the author puts a halt to the publishing efforts, and the work, in its final version given by the author, remains unpublished. It is the first multilingual lexicographic work that provides, sparsely, some explicative definition, in the case of rare or unusual words.
- ²⁶ Klein 'authored' an orthographic norm later used and adapted by Ștefan Crișan-Körösi. In the beginnings of the XIX century, although the Latin alphabet had already spread, there were few Romanian intellectuals to actually use it. Stands witness of its poor and difficult circulation the rather anecdotal story of the *Vestire despre războiul lui Napoleon* [*News on the Napoleonic War*], written on the 23rd of May 1809 by captain Căpolceanu Laurențiu Domocos and translated into Romanian by Ioan Corneli. It was meant to be sold in the cities and villages of Western Transylvania, in order to be read and explained to the population. After a first edition at Oradea, printed with Latin characters (not necessarily in order to observe the wish of the readers, but for the fact that the printing house did not possess Cyrillic letter sets), since Samuil Vulcan and the local authorities came to acknowledge that this would have been a factor of poor distribution in rural areas, it was urgently reprinted in 300 copies, in Buda, and with Cyrillic letters.
- ²⁷ The work was ready in 1803, and it appears that the print, financed in part by bishop Ioan Bobb had already been granted, but was arrested when the issue of Klein's dictionary was announced. The manuscript was bought from the widow of Körösi by Gheorghe Asachi, and was transported Iași, where it is still preserved, but where it remained unpublished. None the less, it appears to have been used in the redaction of Bobb's dictionary (see below). The *Lexicon* of Crișan-Körösi contains well over 10,000 Romanian word entries, written in the Latin alphabet orthography of Micu-Klein. There is obvious intervention in the spelling of words, in order to make the Latin origin more easily noticeable, while some words, deemed 'unnatural' are omitted and replaced with 'more adequate' terms, which is to say that, for the most part, they are borrowed

directly from Latin.

- ²⁸ The dictionary of Clemens seems to have been quite a sales' success: it was republished, under the title *Kleines walachisch-deutsch und deutsch-walachisches Wörterbuch* (Hermannstadt & Kronstadt, 1823^{II}), the year immediately after the first edition, and again, as *Walachisch-deutsch und deutsch-walachisches Wörterbuch* (Hermannstadt, 1936^{III}). Each part counts cca. 5,000 entries, with numerous phraseological units counting as separate entries. The words in Romanian are written in both Cyrillic and Latin alphabet, contains some grammatical indications, and is organized (only in the first part) by lexical families.
- ²⁹ The linguistic interests of Piuriu-Molnar found yet another expression in his grammar: *Deutsch-walachische Sprachlehre* (Vienna, 1788), republished in 1810 and 1923 in Sibiu.
- ³⁰ It counts cca. 11,000 entries (recent counts have revealed that the number of voices in LB is actually slightly higher), including numerous Latin neologisms and regional terms, counts proper nouns and whole phraseological units listed as separate entries, and, sparsely, some definitions. The words in Romanian are written in Latin alphabet. At the end of the second tome, it has an Index of popular words of foreign origin, for which proposes a 'genuine' Romanian term.
- ³¹ For a succinct development of LB's stages prior to its printing, see Seche (I, 1966: 30-32).
- ³² Previous calculations were only estimative, and the results circled round the figure of 11,000 entries. Our project that consists of editing each entry separately shall be able to give an exact number, yet, until now, intermediate estimations show that such number of entries is more likely to be closer to 13,000 than 11,000.
- ³³ Some circumstantial information is in order here. Mircea Seche states that the LB is the first explicative and etymological dictionary of Romanian language that was ever printed; see Seche (I, 1966: 32). Newer research tried to detail such affirmation. Acad. Gheorghe Chivu has, actually, demonstrated quite pertinently that one cannot speak of LB in terms of an etymological dictionary *stricto sensu*; see Chivu (2007: 65). Indeed, if seen with the eyes of a specialist accustomed to the modern etymological dictionaries, our LB cannot be one, since it fails to provide an explicit etymology to each entry. If judged so, the description 'explicative' would be incorrect, also, since there is a number of entries where the definition in Romanian is absent. Nevertheless, in its own context, due to the fact that the authors tried to provide words with either with a direct, explicit etymology, or, more importantly, with an indirect one, by means of the spelling, we think it is safe to say that *for its own time*, the LB was an etymological dictionary.
- ³⁴ A brief look into the References list of the DLR would be more than illustrative.
- ³⁵ The first tome of the LM, as the first in series of Romanian Academy's dictionaries, would be printed in 1973, although the year indicated on the title page is 1971.

References

A. Dictionaries

- Amelio, S. 1719 (ed. 1982).** G. Piccillo, *Il glossario italiano-moldavo di Silvestro Amelio (1719)*. *Studio filologico-linguistico e testo*. Catania: C.U.E.C.M. (Quaderni di filologia medievale V.)
- Anonymus Caransebensis cca. 1700 (ed. 2008).** *Dictionarium valachico-latinum. Primul dicționar al limbii române*. Studiu introductiv, ediție, indici și glosar de Gheorghe Chivu. București: Editura Academiei Române.
- Anonymus Caransebesiensis cca. 1700 (ed. 2003).** *Dictionarium valachico-latinum [Anonymus Caransebensis]*. Studiu filologic și indice de cuvinte de Francisc Király, ediție îngrijită de Maria Király and Alexandru Metea. Timișoara: Editura First.
- Berynda, P. 1653^{II} (ed. 1961).** *Leksykon slovenoros'kij Pamvy Beryndy*. Anastatic edition by V.V. Nimčuk. Kiev.
- Bobb, I. (ed.) 1822-23.** *Dictionariu rumanesc, lateinesc si unguresc, dein orenduiala excellentii sale preasfintitului Ioan Bobb, vladeicul Fagarasului asediat și cu venitu cassi clerului typarit in doao tomuri. I. A-L, II. M-Z*. In Clus: Cu typariul Typografii Collegiumului Reformatilor prin Stephan Török.
- Budai-Deleanu, I. 1818.** *Lexicon romănesc-nemțesc*. Unedited manuscript.
- Clemens, A. 1823^{II}.** *Kleines walachisch-deutsch und deutsch-walachisches Wörterbuch*. Hermannstadt: bei W.H. Thierry, Buch- und Kunsthändler.
- Corbea, T. cca. 1700 (ed. 2001).** *Dictiones latinae cum Valachica interpretatione*. I. Ediție de

- Alin-Mihai Gherman. Cluj-Napoca: Clusium.
- DA.** (Academia Română) *Dicționarul limbii române*. Sub conducerea lui Sextil Pușcariu. Tomul I. Partea I: A-B, 1913. București: Librăriile Socec & Comp. și C. Sfetea; Tomul I. Partea II: C, 1940. București: Tipografia Ziarului „Universul”; Tomul I. Partea III. Fascicula I: D – de, 1949. București: Universul, Intreprindere Industrială a Statului; [Fascicula II: de–deștina; galley proof. 1948]; Tomul II. Partea I: F–I, 1934. București: Monitorul Oficial și Imprimeriile Statului. Imprimeria Națională; Tomul II. Partea II. Fascicula I: J – lacustru, 1937. București: Tipografia Ziarului „Universul” S. A.; Tomul II. Partea II. Fascicula II: Ladă–lepăda, 1940. București, Tipografia Ziarului „Universul” S. A.; Tomul II. Partea II. Fascicula III: Lepăda–lojniță, 1948. București: Tipografia Ziarului „Universul” S. A.
- DLR.** (Academia Română) *Dicționarul limbii române*. Serie nouă. Redactori responsabili: acad. Iorgu Iordan, acad. Alexandru Graur și acad. Ion Coteanu. Din anul 2000, redactori responsabili: acad. Marius Sala și acad. Gheorghe Mihăilă. București, Editura Academiei. Tomul VI. Litera M, 1965–1968; Tomul VII. Partea 1. Litera N, 1971; Tomul VII. Partea a 2-a. Litera O, 1969; Tomul VIII. Litera P, 1972–1984; Tomul IX. Litera R, 1975; Tomul X. Litera S, 1986–1994; Tomul XI. Partea 1. Litera Ș, 1978; Tomul XI. Partea a 2-a și a 3-a. Litera T, 1982–1983; Tomul XII. Partea I. Litera Ț, 1994; Tomul XII. Partea a 2-a. Litera U, 2002; Tomul XIII. Partea I și a 2-a și a 3-a. Litera V și literele W, X, Y, 1997–2005; Tomul XIV. Litera Z, 2000; Tomul I. Partea a 3-a. Litera D. D – Deînmulțit, 2006; Tomul I. Partea a 4-a. Litera D. Deja – Deținere, 2006; Tomul I. Partea a 5-a. Litera D. Deținut – Discopotiriu, 2007; Tomul I. Partea a 6-a. Litera D. Discord–Dyke, 2009; Tomul IV. Litera L. L–Lherzolit, 2008; Tomul V. Litera L. Li–Luzulă, 2008; Tomul I. Partea a 7-a. Litera E. E–Erzaț, 2009; Tomul I. Partea a 8-a. Litera E. Es–Ezredeș, 2010; Tomul III. Literele J, K, Q, 2010. București: Editura Academiei Române.
- HEM.** Bogdan Petriceicu Hasdeu, *Etymologicum Magnum Romaniae. Dicționarul limbei istorice și poporane a românilor*. Tom. I-II, 1887, tom. III, 1893. București: Stabilimentul grafic Socec și Teclu.
- Klein, S. 1801 (ed. 1944).** *Samuelis Klein Dictionarium valachico-latinum*. Bevezető tanulmányal közzéteszi Gáldi László. Budapest: Királyi Magyar Egyetemi Nyomda.
- LB 1825.** *Lexicon Valachico-Latino-Hungarico-Germanicum, quod a pluribus auctoribus decursu triginta et amplius annorum elaboratum est*. Budae: Typis et Sumtibus Typographiae Regiae Universitatis Hungaricae.
- Lexicon compendiarium (ed. 1994-1995).** Grigore Maior, *Lexicon compendiarium Latino-Valachicum complectens dictiones ac phrases Latinae cum Valachicam earum interpretatione*. Edizione critica, introduzione e indice a cura di M. Gherman. Roma: Università la Sapienza. (Romania Orientale VII-IX)
- Lexicon compendiarium (ed. 2001).** Grigore Maior, *Institutiones linguae Valachicae și Lexicon compendiarium*. Ediție, studiu introductiv, indice și note de Alin-Mihai Gherman. Alba-Iulia: Universitatea „1 decembrie 1918”.
- Lexicon Marsilianum (ed. 1930).** Carlo Tagliavini, *Il «Lexicon Marsilianum»*. *Dizionario latino-rumeno-ungherese del sec. XVII*. Studio filologico e testo. București: Cultura națională. (Academia Română. Études et recherches V.)
- LM.** A.T. Laurian și I.C. Massim, *Dicționarul limbei romane*. După însărcinarea dată de Societatea Academică Română. Elaborată ca proiect. Tomu I (A-H), 1871 (actually printed in 1873); tomu II (colaboratori Iosef Hodoș și G. Barițiu: I-Z), 1876; tom. III: *Glossariu, sau care cuprinde vorbele din limba română străine prin originea și forma lor, cum și cele de origine înduioasă*, 1871 (actually

- printed in 1877). București: Noua tipografie a laboratorilor români.
- Mardarie Cozianul 1649 (ed. 1900). *Lexicon slavo-românesc și tâlcuirea numelor din 1649*. Publicate cu un studiu, note și indicele cuvintelor românești de Grigorie Crețu. București: Carol Göbl.
- MDA. (Academia Română) *Micul dicționar academic*. Vol. I–IV. Volumul I: A–C, 2001; volumul al II-lea: D–H, 2002; volumul al III-lea: I–Pr, 2003; volumul al IV-lea: Pr–Z, 2003. (First edition.) București: Editura Univers Enciclopedic.
- NȘDU 2009. Ioan Oprea, Carmen-Gabriela Pamfil, Rodica Radu, Victoria Zăstroiu. *Noul dicționar universal al limbii române*. (Third edition). București: Editura Litera internațional.
- ȘDU. Lazăr Șăineanu, *Dicționar universal al limbii române*. (First edition in 1896, Craiova. The standard edition of the dictionary is the eighth, published in 1930). Craiova: Editura Scrisul românesc.

B. Other literature

- Cantemir, D. 1714-1716 (transl. 1973). *Descrierea Moldovei*. Traducere după original latin de Gh. Guțu. București: Editura Academiei Republicii Socialiste România.
- Cheie, P. 1983. 'Neologismul de origine latino-romanică în Lexiconul de la Buda.' *Limba română* XXXII.3: 206–215.
- Chivu, Gh. 2007. 'Este Lexiconul de la Buda un dicționar etimologic?' In S. R. Rîpeanu and I. Vintilă-Rădulescu (eds.), *Limba Română, limbă romanică. Omagiu acad. Marius Sala la împlinirea a 75 de ani*. București: Editura Academiei Române, 61–65.
- Chivu, Gh. 2008. 'Lexiconul de la Buda – primul dicționar modern al limbii române.' In *Limba și literatură. Repere identitare în context european – Lucrările celei de-a VI-a conferințe internaționale a Facultății de Litere, Pitești, 23-25 mai 2008, Volumul I*. Pitești: Editura Universității din Pitești, 26–29.
- Ferro, T. 2004. 'La scrittura della lingua romena in caratteri latini nelle opere dei missionari italiani in Moldavia tra XVII e XIX secolo.' In I.-A. Pop and C. Luca (eds.), *Quaderni della Casa Romena, 3/2004, Studi di storia, di critica e di teoria letteraria*. București, Editura Institutului Cultural Român, 291–199.
- Huțanu, M. 2003. 'Sistemul ortografic aplicat în redactarea Lexiconului de la Buda.' *Ovidiu University Annals of Philology* XIV: 133–139.
- Jordan, I. 1956. *Limba română contemporană*. (First edition.) București: Editura Ministerului Învățământului.
- Iorgovici, P. 1799. *Observații de limbă rumânească...* Buda: Tip. Crăiasca Universitate.
- IST. TRANSILV. (Academia Română) *Istoria Transilvaniei*, Vol. I-III. Volumul I (până la 1541), 2009; volumul al II-lea (de la 1541 până la 1541), 2007; volumul al III-lea (de la 1711 până la 1918), 2008. Ioan-Aurel Pop, Thomas Năgler, Magyari András (eds.). Cluj-Napoca: Centrul de Studii Transilvane.
- Lungu, I. 1995. *Școala ardeleană. Mișcare culturală națională iluministă*. (Second edition.) București: Editura Viitorul românesc.
- Lupu, C. 1999. *Lexicografia românească în procesul de occidentalizare latino-romanică a limbii române moderne (1780-1860)*. București: Editura Logos.
- Pantaleoni, D. 2007. *Observații asupra textelor românești vechi cu alfabet latin (1570 – 1703)*. *Philologica Iassyensia* III.1: 39–56.
- Pervain, I. and M. Protase 1970. 'Petru Maior și Lexiconul de la Buda.' *Cercetări de lingvistică* XV.1: 11–22.
- Protase, M. 1973. *Petru Maior: un ctitor de conștiințe*. București: Editura Minerva.
- Radosav, D. 2003. *Cultură și umanism în Banat. Secolul XVII*. Timișoara: Editura de vest.

Șăineanu, L. 1892. *Istoria filologiei române.* București: Editura librăriei Socec & Comp.
Seche, M. 1966-1969. *Schiță de istorie a lexicografiei române.* Vol. I. *De la origini până la 1880,* 1996. Vol. II. *De la 1880 până astăzi,* 1969. București: Editura Științifică.
Tagliavini, C. 1832. *Despre Lexicon compendiarium Latino-Valachicum* (broșură, 8p.). București: Monitorul Oficial și Imprimeria Statului; Imprimeria Națională.