

“OVIDIUS” UNIVERSITY OF CONSTANȚA
DOCTORAL SCHOOL OF HUMANITIES
PHD FIELD OF PHILOLOGY

PHD THESIS

SUMMARY

PHD SUPERVISOR

PROF.UNIV.DR. EMILIA DOMNIȚA TOMESCU

PHD STUDENT

ANDREEA-ELENA BÂRZOIU

CONSTANȚA, 2016

“OVIDIUS” UNIVERSITY OF CONSTANȚA
DOCTORAL SCHOOL OF HUMANITIES
PHD FIELD OF PHILOLOGY

**LEXICAL AND ONOMASTIC DERIVATION IN THE
ACTUAL ROMANIAN LANGUAGE**

Derivative series *-oi(u), -oiae, -oaia / -oń(u), -oańe(a), -oń(i)*

PhD Supervisor:

Prof. univ. dr. Domnița Emilia Tomescu

PhD student:

Andreea-Elena Bârzoiu

CONSTANȚA, 2016

CONTENT

Content.....	1
Introduction.....	2
1. Premises and objectives of the paper.....	2
2. Current stage of the research.....	5
3. Documentary sources.....	10
4. Research methods and techniques.....	12
5. Terminological clarifications.....	14
 Chapter I Lexical and onomastic derivation in the actual Romanian language.....	21
 Chapter II Lexical suffix <i>-oi/ -oń (-oiae/ -oană)</i>	63
1. Lexical suffix <i>-oi</i>	63
2. Lexical suffix <i>-oiae</i>	74
3. Lexical suffix <i>-oń/ -oană</i>	75
 Chapter III Lexical-onomastic suffix <i>-oi(u), -oiae, -oaia/ -oń(u), -oane(a), -oń(i)</i>	77
1. Lexical-onomastic suffix <i>-oi</i>	77
2. Onomastic suffix <i>-oiu</i>	82
3. Onomastic suffix <i>-oaia</i>	129
4. Phonetrical alternatives of the suffix <i>-oaia</i> (<i>-oiae, -oae, -oe, -oia, -oie</i>).....	136
5. Complex onomastic suffixes.....	142
Conclusions.....	145
Abbreviations.....	147
General bibliography.....	150

Key-words: lexical derivation, onomastic derivation, lexical-onomastic derivation, onomastic suffixes, lexical-onomastic suffixes, delexical, detoponyms, deonomastics, patronymics, surnames, hypocoristics.

The PhD thesis entitled *Lexical and onomastic derivation in the actual Romanian language. Derivative series -oi(u), -oiae, -oaia / -oń(u), -ońe(a), -oń(i)* proposes the study of an interference zone of the vocabulary, which concerns two linguistic disciplines: lexicology and onomastic. The present subject of our approach has into account the specific establishment of the onomastic derivation by reporting to the lexical one.

The starting point of the thesis is the observation that the onomastic, in relation with the lexicology, does not benefit, till now, of an exclusively dedicated work to the formation of the personal names with the help of derivation, although this is the process through which the Romanian onomastic inventory has considerably expanded.

The benchmarking of the Romanian lexicon and onomastic inventory in the perspective of one of the principal formative means, the derivation, has as a result the first monographic realization of a derivate series, which imposes to the paper a descriptive, historical and analytical character.

We have chosen, in this purpose, as a study case, the derivate series of the suffixes *-oi(u), -oiae, -oaia / -oń(u), -ońe(a), -oń(i)*, because the etymology of these suffixes has caused numerous controversies over time, becoming the subject of many articles of specialty. However, there were neglected some problems that this suffix brings. Firstly, it is necessary to be established in what manner we can discuss the only suffix inherited from Latin, with two different functions, lexical and onomastic, or the two homonym suffixes, one lexical inherited from Latin and one onomastic borrowed from Slavonian, which because of the assimilation was mistaken, being felt as values of the same suffix. Secondly, essential information miss regarding the extension, frequency, productivity and stability of these suffixes, both in lexical and onomastic plan.

Studying the derived name categories, we remark that is imposed a delimitation of the nominal suffixes in four categories:

- a) *Lexical* suffixes, which do not form personal names (*-ătate, -anie* etc.);
- b) *Onomastic* suffixes, which do not form common names (*-așcu, -ina, -ea* etc.);

c) *Lexical-onomastic* suffixes, which form common names, and, through extension, personal names (-esc /-escu, -oi /-oiu etc.);

d) *Onomastic-lexical* suffixes, which form personal names, and, through extension, common names (-ache).

2. Suffixes study in Romanian has an important place in the lexicological researches, because Romanian is between the languages that, from the words formation point of view, appeals predominantly at the derivation process. Romanian words are formed, especially, through the derivation process with suffixes, and lesser, through the other types of derivation: derivation with prefixes, parasyntactic derivation, regressive derivation, derivation through the affixes substitution.

There are more types of research regarding the Romanian suffix derivation. A first category it represents the general lexicological categories which inventorizes and classifies suffixes through which is realized the progressive derivation, describing them from the point of view of origin, form and semantic value (Pascu 1916, Coteanu 1981, Hristea 1981). In the first ample treaty of Romanian words formation (SMFC I-VI 1959), was highlighted the existence of over 800 suffixes, from which half are simple suffixes and the other half are complex suffixes, with the note that suffix inventory “presents an approximation for the non-verbal derivation, especially because of the personal names suffixes” (Avram 1989: 9). The lexicological research highlight a series of unresolved theoretical or applicative aspects of the suffix statute: inventory inclusion or non-inclusion of some archaic suffixes which weren’t productive or aren’t anymore current, considering the different gender forms as the alternatives of only one suffix or as different suffixes, the problem of separate treating of homonym or poly-semantic suffixes, considering the onomastic suffixes as alternatives of the lexical ones or as individual suffixes etc.

The second category are the monographic works, with descriptive and analytical character, which analyses in detail a related suffix or suffixes, from different point of views: etymological, functional, formal, grammatical etc. (Avram 1960, 1967, Carabulea 1959, 1977, Ciompec 1962a,b, Creța 1972, Dănilă 1960, Dominte 1967, Gheorghe 2010, Pietreanu 1960, Popescu-Marin 1960, Rudeanu 1960, Sechea,b,c 1960, Ștefănescu-Goangă 1962, Vasiliu 1960, 2001, 2002).

The third category represents the lexicographical works which identify the derived forms by detaching the suffix (CADE, DER, DCR, DELR, DEX₁, DEX₂ DEXI, MDA, MDN, NDU).

The Romanian derivation research in historical perspective (Asan 1959, Vasiliu 1959, FCLR V 2007) has allowed the derivation evolution observation with some suffixes in the old language. Thus, it was observed that “the number of suffixes that start to derive the words in literary language in 17th and 18th centuries is smaller than of the suffixes that appear in the next century, when the Roman influence, especially, imposes a series of suffixes that become strongly productive” (Popescu-Marin 1966: 50). Also, the dialectal studies (Ivănescu 1965, DRAM 2011) reflect specific particularities which concern the suffix derivation, especially the productivity that varies from an area to another. We ascertain that the meanings of some derivations are kept in some dialectal areas, disappearing from others, that the same suffix has different semantical values from one region to another.

The onomastic derivation has begun to be researched later than the lexical derivation, because the onomastic is a linguistic field that was formed as a later standalone discipline. The onomastic papers that treat suffix derivations are of several types: dictionaries (DOR, MEO, DNFR), historical studies (Reguș 1993, Tomescu 2001) and descriptive studies (Graur 1965, Pătruț 1980, 1984, Tomescu 2006).

The anthroponomical suffixes were described in onomastic suffixes, without being highlighted their specificity in relation with the lexical forms. Thus, it was stressed the comparative study necessity of the lexical and onomastic derivation (Tomescu 2004, 2006). The lexical-onomastic suffix *-oi(u)/-oń(u)* was mentioned in different onomastic collective works (SMO1969) and represented the subject of some scientific articles that treated only some aspects of it, as: regional toponymical value (Petrovici 1970), spreading zone (Goicu, Suflețel 1980), etymology (Hasan 1975) onomastic function (Goicu 1985), grammatical alternatives (Şerban 1977).

We remark that in the mentioned studies, was treated with predilection the suffix *-on (u)*, because of the different opinions regarding its etymology. In some papers it is drawn attention upon the necessity of differentiating the lexical suffixes *-oń/-oańe* și *-oi/-oai* of the corresponding onomastic suffixes *-oi(u)*, *-oaia/ -oń(u)*, *-oańe(a)*, *-oń(i)* and are

suggested some methodological principles necessary to the suffix approach (Tomescu 2004).

We considered that to compose a monography of the derivate series *-oi(u)*, *-oia*, *-oiae/ -oń(u)*, *-ońe(a)*, *-oń(i)* we have to separately study the lexical creations of the onomastic ones, without ignoring the interference zone of the two, delexically onomastic forms. Thus, we could compare the lexical and semantic values of the suffix, studying its behavior in the two compartments of the language, lexicon and onomastic.

3. The researched material in the thesis is constituted from an inventory of common words, realized on the basis of the general lexical dictionaries (CADE, DER, DCR, DELR, DEX₁, DEX₂ DEXI, MDA, MDN, NDU), especially of the ones of inverted type (DI, DILR), of some regional dictionaries (DAR), as well as of onomastic dictionaries regarding the family name, which form with the suffixes, which is the thesis subject (DOR, DNFR).

We cannot pretend that the inventory of common names derived with the suffix *-oi/-oń* and all its versions include all the words, because the language is an open system, subject of the changes owed to the speaker's lexical creativity. Therefore, I used a closed inventory (DILR) so we can realize a quantitative, statistical analyze, both between the different values of the derived common names and also between these and the delexically onomastic forms. Also, we selected a derivative series from other sources in which are found regional and archaic terms (DAR, DRAM) which highlight other aspects of the derivation with the *respective* suffix.

To establish the grammatical and semantical values of the suffix and basis, we had to specify the meanings of the derivatives and bases. In this purpose I used different lexicographical works (DA, DAR, DCR, DER, DEX, DLR, DLRLC, DRAM, MDA, Scriban, Șăineanu etc.). When in the case of some words were suggested different explanations in dictionaries, we gave all the meanings, because these can illustrate different values of the suffix.

For the inventory realization of the onomastic forms derived with *-oi(u)/-oń(u)* we used the DNFR from which we selected all the family names that present the termination *-oi(u)/-oń(u)*, either that this is a suffix or an adapted form of the etymon termination or of the suffix that enters in the composition of a borrowed name. Because the DNFR suggests

arguable etymologies for the Romanian family names, we also used for their clarification the DOR. Where we considered relevant, we suggested also other possible etymologies.

4. To undertake a lexical research, is necessary for us to realize a limited inventory through which we differentiate the material subject to observation, because the vocabulary in its whole, is variable and cannot be subject to a global analyze. The derivation, through its nature way of vocabulary enrichment, is an aspect of language that must be followed in its evolution. The class of derivatives is the infinite potential, permanently open and, therefore, would be unrealistic that someone would propose the recording of all derivative products. Therefore, the material subjected for the analyze is from two inventories: one of the lexical forms derived with the suffixes *-oi/-oń* and one of the onomastic forms derived with the suffixes *-oi(u)/-oń(u)*. In our approach, we will use, firstly, the morphematic analyze of the derived names which supposes “the segmentation operation of a derived word in the component morphemes” (DSL: 50).

We consider as being derived all the words in which composition enters a lexical/onomastic basis that circulates independently in the Romanian language. We will make a difference between the simple bases, derived bases in Romanian and derived bases in the origin language from which were borrowed. We consider necessary to introduce in a distinct category those words that can be double interpreted, as derivatives created in Romanian or as borrowed derivatives, because both the basis and suffix exist and circulate independently in Romanian and the origin language.

The taxonomic approach supposes the classification of words and identified names according to different criteria (grammatical value, semantical value) that concern both the derivative and basis. Also, it will be taken into account the origin of bases, productivity of different alternatives of the suffix *-oi(u)/-oń(u)*, frequency and derivatives timeliness.

Further, we used the lexical statistic, which, as a lexicon research method, it is based on quantitative relations between frequency units (number of appearances in a given inventory) and rank (place that a word occupies in a list in which the units are given in a decreasing order of the frequency).

Regarding the anthroponyms, an important research method it represents the analyzation under the aspect of phonetical and morphological aspect. From this point of

view, the appellation presents a particular interest, because, in their case, creativity plays an important role. Suffixation represents a favorite process in the creation of appellations.

The latter observations have inducted the paper both a synchronic and diachronic character. We have followed the onomastic suffixes evolution throughout their written history till now, moment in which has intervened the structural analysis.

5. The problems that we propose to study in this paper implies concepts from two linguistic fields: the onomastic and lexicology. Regarding the paper's terminology, it does not rises special problems. Terms from the derivatology field are known and defined.

Derivation is the process of vocabulary enrichment which presents three aspects: progressive derivation, regressive derivation and derivation through the affixes substitution.

Derivation is the “formation process of some new lexical units starting from a base word (morpheme independent or semi-independent), which consist in either putting some affixes before, or especially after them” (DSL: 163-164). *Progressive derivation* consists in adding to the base word a prefix or a suffix or, in the case of the parasynthetic derivation, of a prefix and suffix. *Regressive derivation* consists in the suppression of some affixes, and the *derivation by substitution of affixes* consists in replacing an affix. In this paper we are interested, firstly, about the *progressive suffix derivation*, but we will also analyze situations in which we will approach aspects of the regressive derivation or of the affixes substitution.

The *suffix* represents “the affix put after the base, root or independent morpheme” (DSL: 518). Suffixes can be *simple* or *complex*, “when their structure permits the identification of a smaller units, but the whole complex works as a unique element of derivation” (Avram 1989: 8). *Complex suffixes* can be composed (from two simple suffixes) or developed (the suffix combines with other non-suffix elements). The term *derivative series* refers to all suffixes versions, which can be attributed to a single etymon, even if in their evolution have suffered interferences of other suffixes.

In the analysis of the derived word or of the derived onomastic form we made references to the *basis* to designate the word to which radical it attaches the affix, regardless if this is simple or derived. Also, we talked about *derivatives in series* both in the lexicon, and onomastic (*Vlăduțoiu*<*Vlăduțu*<*Vlad*).

Most of the times, the term *radical* is mistaken with the *root*. The term *root* was used with predilection in the traditional grammar, in the post-Saussurean being preferred the term *radical*. The *radical* “designates the sequence obtained after the flective removal, identifying itself with the root in the case of primary words, underived (*floor-*). Despite the root, the radical implies also the derivate affixes (*inflor-*)” (DSL: 421).

We will use the concept *semantic value* to refer to the meaning attributed to the word derived by the suffix. A suffix may assign a lot of meanings, because it has many more semantical values.

For the study of derivation in the onomastic field, we used terms with the following meanings. Through *onomastic* it is understood, on the one hand, all the personal names from the system of a language, and on the other hand, the general study of the personal names of persons, animals, places etc. In both cases, the *onomastic* reclassifies in: *anthroponomy*, as inventory, respectively, study of animals names, *toponymy*, as inventory, respectively, study of places names. Through *anthroponomy* we understand a personal person’s name, either being a primary name (forename), appellation (patronymic or nickname), and family name. Officially, the Romanian’s anthroponomy system is bipartite, but is observed that, in the last two decades, it was developed the custom that a man should have two, three or even four forenames, chosen on several considerations. Parents chose several forenames so as to be preferred by them, one to be chosen by the godfathers, other to be the name of a patron saint etc. The forename does not identify always with the Christian name for several reasons. Firstly, not all people get baptized, even if this situation is rarely seen in Romania, a predominantly Orthodox country. Secondly, are met situations in which one of the names attributed at baptize was not written in the birth certificate.

The *family name* represents the name given based on the membership recognition of an individual to a family, regardless if this thing is happening because of the filiation or other reasons (marriage, adoption, recognition of the individual as heir etc.)

The *appellation* is mistaken often with the *nickname*. The difference between the two terms is the objective character, denotative of the name, respectively, the qualifying and emotional character. Actually, the appellation gets to replace, unofficially, the forename of a person. A part of the forenames have become family names.

Anthroponyms can suffer phonetical modifications (apheresis, apocope, syncope, and reduplication) becoming *hypocoristic*: *Alex*, *Ghiță*, *Luluș*, *Mia*, *Tița* etc.

Aphesis represents a phonetical modification of a name that consists in the dropping of a sound, group of sounds or of a syllable from the start (*Gore* < *Grigore*, *Ghiță* < *Gheorghită* etc.). The *apocope* represents a phonetical modification of a name that consists in the dropping of a sound, group of sounds or of a syllable from the end (*Mihai* < *Mihail*, *Anton* < *Antonie* etc.). The *syncope* represents a phonetical modification of a name that consists in the dropping of a sound or a group of sounds from the middle of it (*Nae* < *Nicolae*, *Nifor* < *Nichifor* etc.). A name can suffer simultaneously several types of phonetical modifications: apheresis and apocope (*Manu* < *Emanuel*).

Hereditary appellations are classified in *patronymic* (formed from the father's name), *matronymic* (formed from the mother's names) and marital (formed from the husband's or wife's name).

After the provenance, all the personal names can be systematized in *delexical* (from common names), *deonomastical* (from personal names), in turn, subdivided in anthroponym (from the person's name) and toponymics (from place names)

The syntagma *onomastic suffixes*, does not exclusively refer to suffixes that derives anthroponyms, but to suffixes that derive any personal name (anthroponyms, zoonyms, toponyms etc.), we will mention this thing through the terms *anthroponym suffix*, *zoonym suffix* or *toponym suffix*.

The problem of resolving the different etymologies of the words with an analyzable structure suggested by the main lexicographical papers. Was signaled in several specialty studies (Hristea 1973, Moroianu 2006, Moroianu 2007).

The concept of *multiple etymology* is used to refer to those onomastic words or forms with an analyzable structure that may have different origins. In most cases, it cannot opt only for one of the multiple etymological solutions. It is ascertained that, from the etymological point of view, it can be given several explanations of the appearance of a word with multiple etymology:

a) The word was borrowed, but its analyzable structure has permitted its interpretation as a Romanian derivative. The latter interpretation may be explained either

through the fact that the base or suffix circulate in Romanian in the period of the word's borrowing or that these were later borrowed;

b) Other possibility is that of the structure of the borrowed word to be detached later the base or suffix through regressive derivation;

c) According to the simultaneity principle, different speakers could have borrowed words, respectively could have recreated them after a foreign type;

d) The coincidence of the form's identity of a word that was created in language from a borrowed basis, without being known the derivative correspondent in the respective language.

There was established the criteria that delimits the borrowings from derivatives. The semantic criteria assumes to exist a correlation between the meaning of its word and etymon, the formal criteria must be taken into account when it is established the base's form, and the chronological criteria can make the difference between an inherited Latin element and a borrowed one (Hristea 1973).

The unknown history of the context in which the words were used for the first time by a Romanian speaker maintains the controversy upon the etymology of some words. A historical study that will specify the date of the first recording of the words in texts, may bring more clarifications to this issue. Also, it should be considered the derivation through suffix substitution that may clarify more forced etymologies (Moroianu 2006).

We consider that in most cases, borrowed words that were derived in the origin language of which basis or suffix circulate in Romanian, were adapted in Romanian in a form that is, also, analyzable, reason of which are felt like derivatives. In this paper, we will classify these words in a distinct category of the forms with multiple etymology, because we consider that is useful mentioning both processes. If in the structure of some semi-analyzable words may be identified only the suffix, we will consider them derivatives from a foreign basis.

Toponyms research is necessary, because in the Romanian onomastic system, the place names have served as derivation bases for anthroponyms. Regarding the toponyms that, apparently, are derivative creations, we think that, in reality, the derivation happened at the level of the common name or anthroponym which was taken as toponym. Thus,

suffixes cannot be considered toponymical, but lexical or anthroponimical: *Culmea Tigăneștilor, Albești, Păduchiosul* etc.

If the person and place names represent an inventory relatively limited and difficult to be changed on short term, except the nicknames, zoonyms are the results of creativity and imagination of people, their creation not being limited by any tradition or rule. A similar statute is seen at the names of the literary characters and nicknames. Regarding these personal names category, we do not propose to insist on them, because the realization of an inventory on the basis of which we can analyze the derived forms, would represent a laborious step. However, we cannot ignore these name categories, because the purpose of the paper is to observe the onomastic suffixes, not only the anthroponomical ones. We will observe that the suffixes like *-et* (*Meret, Bunget*) derive only toponyms, and others like *-ior* produce only zoonyms (*Albior, Vinioara*).

Because the Romanian lexicological researches are developing in the statistic lexicology direction, in the monography realization of the lexical-onomastic and onomastic suffixes we will consider features that concern their frequency, wealth, concentration, productivity and vitality.

5. The presented thesis structure includes an introduction, a theoretical chapter, two applicative chapters and the conclusions analyzation of the proposed derivative series.

The introductory chapter presents the papers objectives, the premises and actual stage of the subject's research, applied methodology, bringing necessary terminological specifications.

First chapter is theoretical and has as objective a presentation of the onomastic derivation in Romanian through reference to the nominal lexical derivation, with the purpose of underlining the necessity of distinct study of the two values, because till now, were treated only lexical suffixes, the onomastic ones being mentioned as a value of lexical suffixes. Romanian suffixes were amply researched in lexicological and onomastic studies, but without being analyzed in a comparative perspective. The novelty of this paper consists exactly in such an approach, but also in the monographic study of a derivative series *-oi(u)*, *-oiae*, *-oaia/ -oń(u)*, *-oańe(a)*, *-oń(i)* controversial, that has the role to highlight the necessity of distinct treating of the onomastic value towards the lexical one in dedicated studies to Romanian suffixes.

Starting from the hypothesis that in Romanian exists specialized suffixes only in the onomastic derivation and others that play a double role, creating both onomastic and lexical derivatives, we proposed to study the onomastic suffixes through comparison with those nominal lexical and lexical-onomastic. In the chapter dedicated to the onomastic derivatives, we will delimit the ones created on Romanian land, with autochthonous suffixes, and the foreign ones that represent borrowings of personal names from other onomastic systems. Thus, the suffix inventory that can be categorized as being anthroponomical suffixes has considerably limited. In this chapter, we realized a general presentation of the Romanian suffixes classified in three categories: 1. Nominal lexical suffixes; 2. Lexical-onomastic suffixes; 3. Onomastic suffixes.

The second chapter presents a monography of the lexical suffix *-oi*, *-oiae/-oní*, *-oană*. The monography of the lexical suffix starts with a theoretical part in which is presented the origin and age of the suffix and continues with the analyzation of the derivatives. The units from the lexical inventory are classified according to the form of the suffix that enter in their formation. Thus, are analyzed separately the formed derivatives with *-oi*, of the ones formed with *-oiae*, with *-on* or *-oană*.

The derivatives are classified according to the grammatical value (substantival, adjectival and substantival-adjectival). In each category, are presented semantical values of the suffix by reference to the meaning it offers to the derivative: augmentative value, qualifying value, motional value, instrumental value etc.

While the lexical suffix *-oi*, *-oiae* is current and productive, the archaic value *-oní*, *-oane*, *-oană* is kept only in some regions. However, we cannot talk about a regionalism, because this form “in the old language, had a bigger extension, being certified in the 15th and 16th centuries” (Goicu 1985: 179-185). Although the suffix *-oní* and its feminine version *-oane* is considered peculiar to the Banat zone, in the Northern idiom (Maramures), we meet regional lexical forms derived with the suffix *-on*. In DILR it is not registered any derived word with such a suffix. Therefore, we used other sources to select some derivatives that can proof that the values of *-oní*, *-oane* are common with the ones of the suffix *-oi*, *-oiae*.

The chapter ends with a series of statistic conclusions that concern the grammatical and semantical values of the derivatives and bases, productivity of each suffix form and frequency.

The third chapter will present the onomastic suffix *-oi(u)*, *-oaia/ -oń(u)*, *-oańea*, *-ońi*. The drafting scheme is similar with the one applied to the lexical suffix. Firstly, we will separate the onomastic derivatives according to the suffix version with the help of which were created: *-oi*, *-oiu*, *-oaia*, *-on*, *-onu*, *-oană*, *-oni* etc. Derivatives are classified, according to the base features, in anthroponomastics, toponyms and delexical. In each category are operated other classifications, according to the following criteria: simple / derivative base, base origin etc. In the case of the anthroponym derivatives, we consider if the base represents a forename or appellation if the name is religious or laic. In the case of the borrowed names, we discussed their origin.

The family names formed with the lexical suffix *-oi* split, according to the basis characteristics, in two categories: anthroponomastics and delexical. After selecting the onomastic forms that do not rise interpretation problems in their analysis and inclusion in each of the two categories, anthroponomastics (1) and delexical (2), all the others name left, we split them on categories of family names that can be interpreted both as delexical and anthroponomastics (3), family names for which the dictionary authors have proposed different etymologies (4), family names in case of which may have been mistakes of transcription (5), family names for which were suggested etymologies considered uncertain (6), family names underived that take derivative forms in lexical plan (7), family names cu unknown etymology, (8), names with derivative aspect for which it couldn't be identified the bases in Romanian, but that were explained as adaptations of foreign names (9).

In DNFR are registered 982 family names that have the termination *-oiu*. Of these, some family names are Romanian derivatives, and some names are unanalyzable.

Family names derived with the suffix *-oiu* divide in two categories, according to the bases from which were formed: onomastic and delexical. The onomastic family names have formed from anthroponyms (anthroponomastics) or from toponyms (toponymics). The anthroponomastics family names have formed from bases that are names or appellations. We preferred to use the term general name, because there isn't a Romanian dictionary forename, which makes impossible the classification of some names as

forenames (Romanian bases of foreign origin) or family names that take names from other languages that didn't give Romanian forenames (foreign bases).

A series of marital names have formed with the feminine suffix *-oaia*. Most of them are anthroponomastics, the rest being delexical. Separately we have analyzed the formed derivatives with different versions of the suffix *-oaia*: *-oaie*, *-oaei*, *-oae*, *-oe*, *-oia*, *-oie*. At the end of the chapter, we presented the derivatives formed with suffixes composed with the help of a suffix from the analyzed series in this paper: *-oaica*, *-iloiu*, *-ițoiu*, *-oianu*, *-oloiu*, *-otoiu*, *-uloiu*, *-uțoiu*.

The last chapter presents the general conclusions after realizing the monography of the suffix *-oi(u)*/ *-oń(u)* which has as purpose the approach of new methodological principles in the study of Romanian suffixes and highlighting the necessity of distinctively treating the lexical suffixes of the onomastic ones. This necessity is imposed by the distinct values of the lexical suffixes (augmentative, qualifying, motional etc.) towards the ones of the onomastic suffixes (patronymic, marital, matronymics).

The originality of the paper concerns that in the Romanian linguistic it does not exist a specially consecrated work for the onomastic derivation. In the Romanian suffix monographies (FCLR IV 2015), the onomastic suffixes weren't treated especially, but in the values analyzation of the lexical suffixes, was mentioned also the onomastic value, to which wasn't given the importance it should have.

The choosing of the lexical suffix *-oi* (*-oaie*)/ *-on* (*-oană*) and its onomastic correspondent *-oi(u)*, (*-oaie*)/ *-on(u)*, (*-oană*) has highlighted the fact that we need to delimit the lexical suffixes of the lexical-onomastic and onomastic ones. The lexical-onomastic suffixes *-oi(u)* (*-oaie*)/ *-on(u)* (*-oană*) form personal delexical names that are appellations and, through their nature, keep the semantic values of the corresponding lexical suffix (augmentative, pejorativ, qualifying etc). When appellations became family names, these values got lost, because the names have desemantized and redefined their value as patronymics or matronymics. The suffix *-oi(u)* (*-oaie*)/ *-on(u)* (*-oană*) has an onomastic value when forming personal onomastic names from religious or borrowed bases. The presentation of the origin and suffix etymology of *-oi(u)* (*-oaie*)/ *-on(u)* (*-oană*) has led to the delimitation of the lexical-onomastic suffix *-oi(u)* (*-oaie*)/ *-on(u)* (*-oană*)<lat. *-onēus*, *-onēa* of the onomastic suffix *-oi(u)*<sl. *-oje*.

The anthroponyms analysis has highlighted other problems of the Romanian onomastic: the lack of a complete dictionary of the Romanian forenames and the necessity of writing a new onomastic dictionary which can offer objective etymological interpretations, given that for the name majority of the two great onomastic dictionaries DOR and DNFR, offer different etymological solutions.

The dialectal monographies study shown the fact that the suffix *-oń*, *-oń(e)* is not productive only in Banat, but also in other areas of the country, like Maramureş, thing we have demonstrated in this paper with the help of an inventory of words derived with *-oń*, *-oń(e)*, realized on the basis of the regionalism dictionary (DRAM 2011). Also, it was highlighted the fact that the suffix *-oi*, *-oiae* is very productive in the area of Maramureş, forming numerous regionalisms: *alboi* “blue”, *bosorcoi* “wizard”, *ciocoi* “lark”, *găzdoi* and *găzdoiae* “host”, *gâlcoi* “the one that has quinsy”, *măsoiae* “tablecloth”, *urdzoi* “stands”. Another area in which was signaled the frequency of the derivatives with the suffix *-oi*, *-oiae* is Țara Crișurilor: *fundoiae* “shutters”, “the rear of the house”, *mărântoi* “tall stature”, *suptoi* “outsole of the house”, *tăcătoi* “quiet, grumpy”, *spurcoi* “carbuncle”.

We found that the suffix *-oi* has different semantical values in certain dialectal areas (check the suffix *-oi*, which in Maramureş has a diminutively value, *căsoi* “cottage from the border”, in contrast to the rest of the country, in which has augmentative value). Thus, it was pointed the study importance of the word formation in the Romanian dialects.

In conclusion, starting from the linguists studies which incorporated in the onomastic and word formations papers observations regarding the lexical-onomastic and onomastic suffixes, in this paper we studied the onomastic derivation related to the lexical derivation, analyzing the derivative series *-oi(u)*, *-oia/ -oń(u)*, *-ońea*, *-ońi*. After analyzing all the lexical and onomastic forms derived with the suffix *-oi(u)/ -on(u)*, it confirms the hypothesis from which has started this thesis: the necessity of comparative study of the lexical and onomastic derivation.

SELECTIVE BIBLIOGRAPHY

Anghel, Șerban 1974 =Anghel, Ioana, Șerban, Felicia, *Probleme ale reconstituirii sistemului de derivare al limbii române*

dintre secolele al IX-lea și al XV-lea, în CL XIX, nr. 1, 67-75.

Anghel, Șerban 1979 = Anghel, Ioana, Șerban, Felicia, 1974, 1979, *Formarea cuvintelor în limba română în secolele IX-XV. Derivarea cu sufixe*, în CL XXIV, nr. 2, 171-178.

Asan 1959 = Asan, Finuța, 1959, *Derivarea cu sufixe și prefixe în „Psaltirea Hurmuzaki”*, în SMFC I, 203-212.

Avram, M. 1960 =Avram, Mioara, 1960, *Sufixe românești -ilă masculin și -llă/-ilă feminin*, în SMFC II, 149-178.

Avram, M. 1967 =Avram, Mioara, 1967, *Contribuții la studierea derivării cu -iv*, în SMFC IV, 87-111.

Avram, M. 1989 =Avram, Mioara, 1989, *Introducere în studiul sufivelor*, în FCLR III, 5-13.

Avram, M. 1999 =Avram, Mioara, 1999, *Formarea cuvintelor în preocupările lui Sextil Pușcariu*, în SUBB, nr. 1-2, 77-87.

Bogrea 1922-1923 =Bogrea, Vasile, 1922-1923, *Contribuții la studiul sufivelor românești*, în DR III, 803-807.

Carabulea 1959 =Carabulea, Elena, 1959, *-ame și -ime în limba română*, în SMFC I, 65-75.

Carabulea 1977 =Carabulea, Elena, 1977, *Nume de locuitori în -ean, -ian, -an*, în LR XXVI, nr. 2, 149-154.

Cazacu 1973 =Cazacu, Boris, 1973, *Folosirea derivatelor cu sufixe -al și -ar*, în LL, nr. 2, 11-13.

Ciobanu 1959 =Ciobanu, Elena, 1959, *Observații asupra formării numelor de familie feminine de la masculine*, în SMFC I, 137-143.

Ciobanu 1962 =Ciobanu, Elena, 1962, *Categoriile semantice create de sufivelul -ar în limba română*, în SMFC III, 143-154.

Ciobanu 1969 =Ciobanu, Elena, 1969, *Unele aspecte ale formării numelor de meserii cu sufixe în limba română contemporană*, în SMFC V, 17-35.

Ciompec 1959 =Ciompec, Georgeta, 1959, *Sufixul -aj* în SMFC I, 51-64.

Ciompec 1962 =Ciompec, Georgeta, 1962, *Variantele sufixelor -ant/-ent, -anță/-ență din limba română*, în SMFC III, 129-141.

Contraș 1962 =Contraș, Eugenia, 1962, *Sufixul -er* în SMFC III, 155-102.

Creța 1967 =Creța, Zorela, 1967, *Sufixe peiorative*, în SMFC IV, 177-194.

Creța 1972 =Creța, Zorela, 1972, *Sufixul -uică*, în SMFC VI, 97-106.

Dănilă 1960 =Dănilă, Ion, 1904, *Sufixul -ard*, în SMFC II, 117-123.

Diaconescu 1979 =Diaconescu, Ion, 1979, *Sufixul -ar în onomastică*, în „Buletin științific”, Pitești, 171-172.

Dimitrescu 1958 =Dimitrescu, Florica, 1958, *Relațiile dintre diminutive și augmentative în limba română*, în „Omagiu lui Iorgu Iordan. Cu prilejul împlinirii a 70 de ani”, București, Editura Academiei, 241-253.

Dimitrescu 1960 =Dimitrescu, Florica, 1960, *Valoarea peiorativă a sufixului -aticus*, în „Studii clasice” II, 321-330.

Dimitrescu 1965 =Dimitrescu, Florica, 1965, *Tendințe ale formării cuvintelor în limba română (Cuvinte noi în presa actuală)*, în LL X, 231-245.

Dominte 1967 =Dominte, Constantin, 1967, *Sufixul -erie în limba română*, în SMFC IV 69-79.

Dominte 2001 =Dominte, Constantin, 2001, *Între vocabular și gramatică: moțiunea - procedeu distinct de formare a cuvintelor*, în LLR XXX, nr. 2, 3-10.

Sala 2001 =Sala, Marius (coord.), 2001, *Enciclopedia limbii române*, Bucureşti, Editura Univers Enciclopedic.

FCLR I - III =*Formarea cuvintelor în limba română*, Al. Graur şi Mioara Avram (coord.). Volumul I, *Componerea* de Fulvia Ciobanu şi Finuţa Hasan, 1970; volumul al II-lea, *Prefixele* de Mioara Avram, Elena Carabulea, Fulvia Ciobanu, Florica Ficărescu, Cristina Gherman, Finuţa Hasan, Magdalena Popescu-Marin, Marina Rădulescu, I. Rizescu, Laura Vasiliu, 1978; volumul al III-lea. *Sufixe*. 1. *Derivarea verbală* de Laura Vasiliu, 1989; [Bucureşti], Editura Academiei.

FCLR V =*Formarea cuvintelor în limba română din secolele al XVI-lea - al XVIII-lea*, 2007, Eugenia Contraş, Cristina Gherman, Finuţa Hasan, Rodica Ocheşeanu, Magdalena Popescu-Marin (coord.), Bucureşti, Editura Academiei Române.

Fischer 1954 =Fischer, Iancu, 1954, *Unele probleme ale formării cuvintelor în limba română*, în SCL V, nr. 3-4, 293-307.

Fischer 1985 =Fischer, Iancu, 1985, *Latina dunăreană. Introducere în istoria limbii române*, Bucureşti, Editura Știinţifică şi Enciclopedică.

Gheorghe 2010 =Gheorghe, Iulia, 2010, *The suffix -bil in Romanian*, în „*Studii şi cercetări de lexicologie*” (SCOL), anul III, nr. 1-2, 257-268.

Graur 1929 =Graur, Alexandru, 1929, *Nom d'agent et adjectif en roumain*, Paris, Librairie ancienne H. Champion.

Graur 1959 =Graur, Alexandru, 1959, *Cu privire la sufixe -abil şi -ibil*, în LR VIII, nr. 5, 59-60.

Graur 1965 =Graur, Alexandru, 1965, *Nume de persoane*, Bucureşti, Editura Știinţifică.

Graur 1968 =Graur, Alexandru, 1968, *Tendințele actuale ale limbii române*, București, Editura Științifică.

Graur 1972 =Graur, Alexandru, 1972, *Nume de locuri*, București, Editura Științifică.

Hasan 1972 =Hasan, Finuța, 1972, *În legătură cu etimologia sufixelor -ac, -ec, -ic, -oc, -uc și -ag, -eg, -ig, -og, -ug*, în SMFC VI, 45-54.

Hreapcă 1976 =Hreapcă, Doina, 1976, *Derivate cu sufixul -aș(ă)* în *graiurile din sudul Moldovei*, în „Anuar de lingvistică și istorie literară” XXV, 121-132.

Ionașcu 1959 =Ionașcu, Ecaterina, 1959, *Sufixele -ar și -aș la numele de agent*, în SMFC I, 77-84.

Ionescu 1978 =Ionescu, Christian, 1978, *Sistemul antroponimic românesc în secolele al XTV-lea și al XV-lea (Țara Românească)*, în LR XXVII, nr. 3, 243-252.

Iordan 1939 =Iordan, Iorgu, 1939, *Sufixe românești de origine recentă*, în BPh VI, 1-59.

Iordan 1956 =Iordan, Iorgu, 1956, *Limba română contemporană*, București, Editura Ministerului Învățământului.

Iordan 1963 =Iordan, Iorgu, 1963, *Toponimia românească*, București, Editura Academiei.

Iordan 1964 =Iordan, Iorgu, 1964, *Unele aspecte ale formării cuvintelor în limba română actuală*, în SCL XV, nr. 4, 401-422.

Iordan 1967 =Iordan, Iorgu, 1967, recenzie la Acad. Al. Graur, *Nume de persoane*, București, 1965, în SCL XVIII, nr. 1, 91-95.

Kis 1960 =Kis, Emese, 1960, *Sufixul -ău în cuvintele de origine maghiară din limba română*, în CL V, nr. 1-2, 75-85.

LRC II =Coteanu, Ion, Bidu-Vrânceanu, Angela (coordonatori), 1975, *Limba română contemporană: Vocabularul*, vol.

II, Bucureşti, Editura Didactică şi Pedagogică; ed.a II-a, Ion Coteanu, Narcisa Forăscu, Angela Bidu-Vrănceanu (coordonatori), 1985.

Moroianu 2006 =Moroianu, Cristian, 2006, *Probleme de etimologie internă. Derivara cu sufixe*, în LR VI, nr. 5-6, 351-372.

Moroianu 2007 =Moroianu, Cristian, 2007, *Aspecte ale derivării în limba română*, în „Studii lingvistice. Omagiu profesoarei Gabriela Pană Dindelegan la aniversare”, Bucureşti, Editura Universităţii din Bucureşti.

Nestorescu 2006 =Nestorescu, Virgil, 2006, *Aspecte ale formării cuvintelor în limba română veche (sec. XIV-XVI)*, în Nestorescu, VCR, 17-64; prima apariţie, în SCL XXVII (1976), nr. 4, 377-388 şi nr. 5, 493-514.

Pascu 1910 =Pascu, George, 1910, *Din Sufixe româneşti. Sufixe -eră, -ete şi -ot* în „Revue de Dialectologie romane”, II, 56-83.

Pietreanu 1960 =Pietreanu, Marieta, 1960, *Sufixul -an*, în SMFC II, 93-100.

Pop 1927-1928 =Pop, Sever, 1927-1928, *Derivate prin sufice augmentative*, în DR V.

Popa 1967 =Popa, Eleonora, 1967, *Sufixe motionale pentru formarea masculinului*, în SMFC IV, 163-176.

Popescu 1958 =Popescu, Magdalena, 1958, *Sufixe productive şi neproductive*, în SCL IX, nr. 2, 243-262.

Popescu 1960 =Popescu-Marin, Magdalena, 1960, *Nume de locuitori derivate de la teme străine*, în SMFC II, 213-224.

Popescu-Marin 1960 =Popescu-Marin, Magdalena, 1960, *Sufixul substantival -ata*, în SCL XI, nr. 3, 669-671.

Popescu-Marin 1966 =Popescu-Marin, Magdalena, 1966, *Din istoria derivării cu sufixe în limba română*, în LR XV, nr. 1, 41-52.

Popescu-Marin 1978 =Popescu-Marin, Magdalena, 1978, *Modele învechite și populare de derivare menținute în numele de familie*, în LR XXVII, nr. 3, 297-303.

Rădulescu 1980 =Rădulescu, Marina, 1980, *Despre moțiunea numelor de agent în -or, -ier*, în LR XXIX, nr. 5, 537-541.

Reguș-Reguș 1974 =Reguș, Corneliu, Reguș, Aspazia, 1974, *Antroponimele masculine în documentele slavo-române emise de cancelaria Moldovei între anii 1388-1456*, în SCL XXV, nr. 5, 497-509.

Reguș-Reguș 1995 =Reguș, Corneliu, Reguș, Aspazia, 1995, *Antroponimia feminină din documentele interne. Sec. XTV-XVI*, în SCO, nr. 1, p. 143-224.

Reguș-Reguș 1999 =Reguș, Corneliu, Reguș, Aspazia, 1999, *Nume de femei în vechi acte istorice (sec. XIV-XVI)*, București, Editura Mustang.

Reinheimer-Rîpeanu 1989 =Reinheimer-Rîpeanu, Sanda, 1989, *Derivat sau împrumut?*, în SCL XL, nr. 4, 373-379.

Rizescu 1972 =Rizescu, I., 1972, *Asupra sufixelor onomastice -a₁ (topoantroponimic) și -a₂ (antroponimic)*, în SMFC VI, 37-43.

Robciuc 1988 =Robciuc, Ion, 1988, *Despre unele cuvinte românești de origine slavă*, în SCL XXIX, nr. 2, 167-170.

Rudeanu 1960 =Rudeanu, Vadim, 1960, *Sufixele -anie și -enie în limba română*, în SMFC II, 101-106.

Rusu 1962 =Rusu, Valeriu, 1962, *În legătură cu derivarea cu sufixe în dacoromână*, în FD IV, 257-268.

Sala 2006 =Sala, Marius, 2006, *De la latină la română*, ed. a 2-a revizuită, București, Editura Univers Enciclopedic.

Sâdeanu 1962 =Sâdeanu, Florența, 1962, *Sufixe colective din limba română cu specială privire asupra repartiției lor*, în SMFC III, 44-87.

Seche 1960a =Seche, Luiza, 1960, *Sufixele -(a/e)nt, -(a/e)nță*, în SMFC II, 107-116.

Seche 1960b =Seche, Luiza, 1960, *Sufixul -iadă*, în SCL XI (1960), nr. 3, 715-718.

Seche 1962 =Seche, Luiza, 1962, *Sufixul -ură ţ-atură, -ătură, -etură, -itură, -sură, -tură*, în SMFC III, 187-196.

SMO =Petrovici, Emil, Pătruț, Ioan (redactori responsabili), 1969, *Studii și materiale de onomastică*, București, Editura Academiei.

SMFC I-VI =*Studii și materiale privitoare la formarea cuvintelor în limba română*, voi. I, 1959 (redactori responsabili: Acad. Al. Graur, Prof. Jacques Byck); vol. al II-lea, 1960 (redactori responsabili: Acad. Al. Graur, Prof. Jacques Byck); vol. al III-lea, 1962 (redactor responsabil: Acad. Al. Graur); vol. al IV-lea, 1967 (redactori responsabili: Acad. Al. Graur, Mioara Avram); vol. al V-lea, 1969 (redactori responsabili: Acad. Al. Graur, Mioara Avram); vol. al VI-lea.

Stoichițoiu-Ichim 2001 =Stoichițoiu-Ichim, Adriana, 2001, *Vocabularul limbii române actuale. Dinamică, influențe, creativitate*, București, Editura ALL Educațional.

Ştefănescu-Goangă 1962 =Ştefănescu-Goangă, Zizi, 1962, *Sufixul -ache*, în SMFC III, 119-127.

Ştefurea 1877 =Ştefurea, Ştefan, 1877, *Sufixe latineşti -aceus, -uceus, -icius în limba românească*, în Conv. lit. XI, nr. 6, 217-223.

Ştefurea 1892 =Ştefurea, Ştefan, 1892, *Sufixul românesc -an*, în Conv. lit., XXVI, nr. 6, 462-477.

Teiuș 1962 =Teiuș, Sabina, 1962, *Sufixe noi în antroponimia românească*, în LR XI, nr. 2, 151-153.

Tomescu 1996

Tomescu 2004 =Tomescu, Domnița, 1996, *Sufixele antroponimice romanești moștenite din latină*, în SCL, XLIV, 2, 34-39.

Tomescu 2004 =Tomescu, Domnița, 2004, *La derivation anthroponymique romane: les suffixes roumains – OŃ(U), - OŃE(A), -OŃ(I)*, în „Novi te ex nomine, Estudos filoloxicos ofrecidos ao Prof. Dieter Kremer”, Fundación Pedro Barrié de la Maza, Santiago de Compostela, 197-203.

Tomescu 2005a =Tomescu, Domnița, 2005, *Derivarea romanească în contextul derivării romanice. Continuitatea sufíxului latin -aria*, în „Limba romană. Omagiu Vasile Frățilă”, Timișoara, Editura Universității din Timișoara, 243- 251.

Tomescu 2005b =Tomescu, Domnița, 2005, *Tipologia numelor de persoană provenite de la numele de locuri*, în „Direcții ale lingvisticii actuale. In memoriam Magdalena Vulpe”, Editura Universității din Ploiești.

Tomescu 2006 =Tomescu, Domnița, 2006, *Derivarea onomastică în limba romană: sufixele antroponimice*, în „Omagiu Gheorghe Bolocan”, Editura Universitară Craiova, 552-559.

Tomescu 2007 =Tomescu, Domnița, 2007, *Derivarea lexicală și derivarea onomastică în limba romană*, în „Limba română. Stadiul actual al cercetării”, Actele celui de al 6-lea Colocviu al catedrei de limba română (29-30 noiembrie 2007), Editura Universității din București, 609-614.

Tomescu 2009 =Tomescu, Domnița, 2009, *Etymologie et onomastique*, în „Studii și cercetări de onomastică și lexicologie” (SCOL), nr. 1-2, anul II.

Trifan 2010 =Trifan, Elena, 2010, *Formarea cuvintelor în publicistica actuală -Derivarea- Perioada 1990-2001*, Cluj, Editura Digital Data.

Tudose 1978 =Tudose, Claudia, 1978, *Derivarea cu sufixe în româna populară*, Bucureşti, Tipografia Universităţii din Bucureşti.

Vasiliu 1959 =Vasiliu, Laura, 1959, *Derivarea cu sufixe și prefixe în „Cartea cu învățătură a diaconului Coresi din 1581”*, în SMFC I, 221-259.

Vasiliu 1960 =Vasiliu, Laura, 1960, *Sufixul -(î)ori* în SMFC II, 179-184.

Vasiliu 2001 =Vasiliu, Laura, 2001, *Etimologia și evoluția sufixelor -ar, -ă, -ară, -are* în SCL LII, nr. 1-2, 63-77.

Vasiliu 2002 =Vasiliu, Laura, 2002, *Structura morfologică și semantică a derivatelor cu sufixele -ar, -ă, -ară, -are*, în SCL LIII, nr. 1-2, 53-63.

Vasiliu 2003 =Vasiliu, Laura, 2003, *Sufixele compuse și dezvoltate ale lui -ar*, în SCL LIV, nr. 1-2, 117-127.

Vârlan 2012 =Vârlan, Mariana, 2012, *Derivarea sufixală nominală în româna actuală*, Craiova, Editura Universitară.

PRIMARY BIBLIOGRAPHY

CADE =Dicționar enciclopedic ilustrat, 1929-1931, Candrea, I.-A, Adamescu, Gh., Editura „Cartea Românească”, Bucureşti.

DAR =Dicționar de arhaisme și regionalisme, 2002, 2 vol., Bulgăr, Gh., Constantinescu-Dobridor, Gh., Bucureşti, Editura Saeculum Vizual.

DCR =Dicționar de cuvinte recente, ediția a III-a, 2013, Dimitrescu, Florica, (coord.), Ciolan, A., Lupu, C, Bucureşti, Editura Logos.

DELR	= <i>Dicționarul etimologic al limbii române</i> , 2011, Volumul I. A B (redactori responsabili: acad. Marius Sala, Andrei Avram, membru corespondent al Academiei Române, Responsabil de volum: Doru Mihăescu), București, Editura Academiei Române, [tiraj nou, revizuit, 2012].
DER	= <i>Dicționarul etimologic al limbii române</i> , Ciorănescu, A., 2002, (ediție îngrijită și traducere din limba spaniolă de Tudora Șandru-Mehedinți și Magdalena Popescu Marin), București, Editura Saeculum I. O.
DEX ¹	= <i>Dicționarul explicativ al limbii române</i> , 1998, ediția a II-a (conducătorii lucrării: acad. Ion Coteanu, dr. Lucreția Mareș), București, Editura Univers Enciclopedic.
DEX ²	= <i>Dicționar explicativ al limbii române</i> , 2009, ediția a II-a, Coteanu, Ion (coord.), Seche, M., Seche, Luiza, ediția a 2-a, revizuită și adăugită, București, Univers Enciclopedic Gold, 2009.
DI	= <i>Dicționar invers</i> , 1957, București, Editura Academiei.
DILR	= <i>Dicționar invers al limbii române & CD-ROM</i> , 2007, Căpățână, Cecilia (coord.), București, Editura Niculescu.
DLRM	= <i>Dicționarul limbii române moderne</i> , 1958, Macrea, D. (coord.), București, Editura Academiei R.S. România.
DNFR	= <i>Dicționar al numelor de familie românești</i> , 1983, Iordan, Iorgu, București, Editura Științifică și Enciclopedică.
DOR	= <i>Dicționar onomastic românesc</i> , 1963, Constantinescu, N.A., București, Editura Academiei.
DSL	= <i>Dicționar de științe ale limbii</i> , 2001, Bidu-Vrânceanu, Angela, Călărașu, Cristina, Ionescu-Ruxăndoiu, Liliana, Mancaș, Mihaela, Pană Dindelegan, Gabriela, București, Editura Nemira.
DRAM	= <i>Dicționar de regionalism din Maramureș</i> , 2011, Ștef, Dorin, Baia Mare, Editura Etimologica.
MDA	= <i>Micul dicționar academic</i> , 4 vol. (redactori responsabili: Acad. Marius Sala și Ion Dănilă; lucrarea a fost începută sub conducerea

Acad. Ion Coteanu), Bucureşti, Editura Univers Enciclopedic, 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).

MDN =*Marele dicționar de neologisme*, 2008, Marcu, F., Bucureşti, Saeculum Vizual.

NDU =*Noul dicționar universal al limbii române*, 2009, Oprea, I., Pamfil, C., Radu, G, Zăstroi, R., ediția a 3-a, Bucureşti, Litera Internațional.

NODEX =*Noul dicționar explicativ al limbii române*, 2002, Bucureşti, Litera Internațional (CD-ROM).