

Studii  
și  
cercetări  
LINGVISTICE



ACADEMIA  
ROMÂNĂ

BUCUREȘTI 5  
Calea 13 Septembrie nr. 13

I – LXX – 2019  
ianuarie – iunie

APAR  
2 NUMERE PE AN

## SUMAR

### **Construcțiile incidente**

(p. 3-31)

**ANDRA VASILESCU**

(Universitatea din București, Facultatea de Litere; Institutul de Lingvistică „Iorgu Iordan – Al. Rosetti”,  
[vasilescu.andra@gmail.com](mailto:vasilescu.andra@gmail.com))

### **PARENTHETICALS**

#### **Abstract**

The article has two interrelated parts. The first part includes a definition and a characterization of parentheticals in an integrated syntactic-pragmasemantic-discursive-cognitive perspective, which leads to a classification into informational parentheticals, organizers, evaluative parentheticals, allocutives, metacommunicative parentheticals, and perlocutionary parentheticals. The second part is a discursive analysis of parentheticals in a corpus of several regional varieties of nonstandard Romanian which reveals their most important features in oral interaction.

### ***Scripta volant, verba manent* in the Transition from Latin to Romance Languages**

(p. 32-39)

**SIMONA GEORGESCU**

(Universitatea din București, Facultatea de Limbi și Literaturi Străine,  
[simona.georgescu@lils.unibuc.ro](mailto:simona.georgescu@lils.unibuc.ro))

### ***SCRIPTA VOLANT, VERBA MANENT* IN THE TRANSITION FROM LATIN TO ROMANCE LANGUAGES**

#### **Abstract**

The reversed form of the Latin adage *uerba uolant, scripta manent*, which we have employed as a title, refers to not quite unusual cases where Romance languages failed to inherit basic Latin words known from preserved ancient texts (*scripta uolant*). On the other hand, the Romance languages may inherit Latin words which are not attested or appear as hapax legomena (*uerba manent*). We shall exemplify these two situations by considering the case of a few terms describing ‘child’ in Latin. Actually, to explain how recorded words disappeared, while, paradoxically, non-attested ones came to be inherited, we need to draw a line between Latin and Proto-Romance

## **Dezvoltări sintactice ale apozitiei restrictive în unele limbi romanice**

(p. 40-57)

**ANA-MARIA BARBU**

(Institutul de Lingvistică „Iorgu Iordan – Al. Rosetti”; Universitatea din București, Facultatea de Litere; [anamaria.barbu@g.unibuc.ro](mailto:anamaria.barbu@g.unibuc.ro))

### **SYNTACTIC EXPANSIONS OF THE RESTRICTIVE APPPOSITION IN SOME ROMANCE LANGUAGES**

#### **Abstract**

This study examines the nominal structure N1 N2 in juxtaposition, in which N2 modifies the head N1 directly, without a functional element (determiner or preposition), as in the examples element cheie ‘key element’, oraș fantomă ‘phantom town’ or stat membru ‘member state’. This pattern is found in Romance languages since the 16th–17th centuries, but it becomes productive at the half of the 19th century and since then it has diversified more and more. In the grammars of Romance languages, this type of constructions is constantly treated in morphology as a compounding pattern. Only recent academic grammars for French and Spanish admit the syntactic character of this pattern as well, but without detailing its syntactic characteristics. In these circumstances, we try to offer here as much data in the corpus as possible in order to highlight the syntactic expansions of the pattern components N1 and N2, in Romanian, French, Italian, Portuguese and Spanish. The complexity of corpus data makes it problematic to treat them in morphology, as we try to show, and it urges us to recognize a new type of syntactic apposition, a restrictive one, even if originally it was a compound pattern.

## **On the Romanian translation of Chaucer’s *Canterbury tales***

(p. 58-73)

**RUXANDRA VIȘAN**

(Universitatea din București, Facultatea de Limbi și Literaturi Străine, [ruxandra.visan@lls.unibuc.ro](mailto:ruxandra.visan@lls.unibuc.ro))

### **ON THE ROMANIAN TRANSLATION OF CHAUCER’S *CANTERBURY TALES***

#### **Abstract**

This article focuses on the Romanian translation of Chaucer’s *Canterbury Tales* by Dan Duțescu, the only Romanian version of Chaucer’s well-known text, one that has achieved iconic status in Romanian culture. Taking as a point of reference concepts such as the ageing of translation and the retranslation hypothesis (Berman 1990), the article examines this Romanian target text, centring (a) on the way in which this text illustrates the translational norms and the ideologies of its time; (b) on the reception of this translation (made in the late 1950’s and maintaining its prominence in subsequent decades) by a new generation of readers.

## **Lexicografia slavonă și slava veche și intrarea ei în era digitală**

(p. 74-87)

**VLADISLAV KNOLL**

(Institutul de Studii slave al Academiei de Științe a Republicii Cehe, [knoll@slu.cas.cz](mailto:knoll@slu.cas.cz))

### **CHURCH SLAVONIC AND OLD CHURCH SLAVONIC LEXICOGRAPHY, AND ITS ENTRANCE TO THE DIGITAL AGE**

#### **Abstract**

The aim of the paper is to present a short overview of basic tendencies in the history of the (Old) Church Slavonic Lexicography and to show the role of the Czech lexicographic school within this evolution. The sketch begins already at the end of the 16th century in order to show the roots of the discipline and it illustrates the gradual changes of approaches and targets of the depicted lexicographic attempts. The focus of the paper is a description of various lexicographical “schools” active since the 20th century until now. These include mainly the Russian school, which continues the 19th century tradition of Sreznevskiy’s largely conceived „Old Russian approach”, the Czech School, which has had the leading role in the international lexicographic cooperation, and the specific Bulgarian School. Besides further projects, we also provide basic data on the unfinished project of a Romanian Slavonic Dictionary, which, in

spite of being inspired by the previous projects, chose an original lexicographic method. The second part of the paper is dedicated to the description of two pioneering works of the digital Old Church Slavonic lexicography that differ in goals and methodology. The first one is Histdict, the follow up of the Bulgarian lexicographic school, and the 2nd one is the Gorazd Project, the continuator of the Czech lexicographic school. As the article was written mainly from the perspective of the Czech lexicographic school, the projects realized in the Czech Lands are described in more details. Despite this fact, the paper tries to put the Czech lexicography school into the context of the (Old) Church Slavonic Lexicography in both its analogue and digital eras

### **Terminologia culorii „albastru” în limbile slave**

(p. 88-96)

**MIHAIL-GEORGE HÂNCU**

(Institutul de Studii Sud-Est Europene al Academiei Române, [mihailhancu@gmail.com](mailto:mihailhancu@gmail.com))

#### **THE TERMINOLOGY OF THE COLOR “BLUE” IN SLAVIC LANGUAGES**

##### **Abstract**

One of the most well-known traits attributed to Slavic languages is the rich terminology for the color “blue”, with some Slavic languages (namely those from the Eastern group) recognizing two types of blue as basic color terms. The aim of this article is to provide an overview of this rich terminology, both in terms of etymology and semantics, in order to give an account of the evolution that took place in Russian, Belorussian and Ukrainian. Finally, the situation from the East Slavic group is compared to a recent development in Japanese, which saw the appearance of a second basic color term for blue in the last three decades.

### **Note lexical-etimologică**

(p. 97-106)

**IULIA MĂRGĂRIT**

(Institutul de Lingvistică „Iorgu Iordan – Al. Rosetti”, [inst@lingv.ro](mailto:inst@lingv.ro))

#### **NOTES LEXICALES ET ÉTYMOLOGIQUES**

##### **Résumé**

L'article contient des notes lexicales axées surtout sur des termes régionaux. La majorité sont apparus par contamination, procès spécifique à l'oralité, mais aussi par analogie, agglutination des constructions prépositionnelles, dérivation répétée ou dérivation postverbale. Tous cela ensemble illustre la créativité de la langue roumaine au niveau dialectal.

\*

### **MISCELLANEA**

(p. 107-133)

IOANA VINTILĂ RĂDULESCU, CRISTIANA ARANGHELOVICI (Institutul de Lingvistică „Iorgu Iordan – Al. Rosetti”, [ioana.vintila.radulescu@gmail.com](mailto:ioana.vintila.radulescu@gmail.com), [cristianaaran@icloud.com](mailto:cristianaaran@icloud.com)), Schiță de istorie a studiilor despre ortografia limbii române

MONICA BUSUIOC, DAN CARAGEA (Institutul de Lingvistică „Iorgu Iordan – Al. Rosetti”, [monica.busuioc@yahoo.com](mailto:monica.busuioc@yahoo.com), [dccaragea@yahoo.com.br](mailto:dccaragea@yahoo.com.br)), Romtext: flux de obținere și tratare a textelor electronice

IOANA VINTILĂ RĂDULESCU (Institutul de Lingvistică „Iorgu Iordan – Al. Rosetti”, [ioana.vintila.radulescu@gmail.com](mailto:ioana.vintila.radulescu@gmail.com)), *Dieceză sau/și dioceză?*

\*

## RECENZII

(p. 135-156)

Pârvu Boerescu, Elemente de substrat (autohtone) ale limbii române: compendiu, București, Editura Academiei Române, 2018, 216 p. (Ionuț Geană, Institutul de Lingvistică „Iorgu Iordan – Alexandru Rosetti”, [ionut.geana@litere.unibuc.ro](mailto:ionut.geana@litere.unibuc.ro))

Ruxandra Vișan, Landmarks in the History of the English Language, București, Editura Ars Docendi, 2018, 209 p. (Daria Protopopescu Universitatea din București, Facultatea de Limbi și Literaturi Străine, [daria.protopopescu@lils.unibuc.ro](mailto:daria.protopopescu@lils.unibuc.ro))

Dana-Luminița Teleoacă, Limbajul bisericesc actual între tradiție și modernitate. Literatura didactică și literatura beletristică, București, Editura Universității din București, 2017, 410 p. (Iulia Barbu-Comaromi, Institutul de Lingvistică „Iorgu Iordan – Alexandru Rosetti”, [juliaximena@yahoo.com](mailto:juliaximena@yahoo.com))

Florin-Teodor Olariu, Variație și varietăți în limba română. Studii de dialectologie și sociolingvistică, Colecția Academica 289, Seria Științele Limbajului, Iași, Institutul European, 2017, 260 p. (Ana Borbély, Institutul de Cercetări Lingvistice al Academiei Ungare de Științe, Budapesta)

Alina-Mihaela Pricop (coord.), Lexicografia poliglotă în secolele al XVII-lea – al XXI-lea: liste, glosare, vocabulare, dicționare, lexicoane, tezaure care conțin limba română. Bibliografie, Iași, Editura Universității „Alexandru Ioan Cuza”, 2017, 363 p. (Ștefania Vulpe, Institutul de Lingvistică al Academiei Române „Iorgu Iordan – Alexandru Rosetti”, [vulpe.steffania@yahoo.com](mailto:vulpe.steffania@yahoo.com))

Adam Ledgeway, Ian Roberts (eds.), The Cambridge Handbook of Historical Syntax, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2017, 729 p. (Mădălina Botez, Școala Doctorală a Facultății de Litere, Universitatea din București, [madalynabotez@yahoo.com](mailto:madalynabotez@yahoo.com))

W. Leo Wetzels, João Costa, Sergio Menuzzi (eds.), The Handbook of Portuguese Linguistics, Malden, MA, Wiley-Blackwell, 2016, 616 p. (Irina Lupu, Institutul de Lingvistică „Iorgu Iordan – Alexandru Rosetti”, [irina.lupu@lingv.ro](mailto:irina.lupu@lingv.ro))