

**„OVIDIUS” UNIVERSITY OF CONSTANȚA  
DOCTORAL SCHOOL OF HUMANITIES  
DOCTORAL FIELD: PHILOLOGY**

**THE FORMATION OF THE ROMANIAN PHILOSOPHICAL  
LANGUAGE IN THE ENLIGHTENMENT PERIOD  
PHD THESIS SUMMARY**

**PhD Supervisor**

Prof. univ. dr. habil. Florentina Nicolae

**Phd supervisory Committee**

Prof. univ. dr. Domnița-Emiliea Tomescu

Prof. univ. dr. habil. Silvia Pitiriciu

Prof. univ. dr. habil. Marina Cap-Bun

**PhD Student**

Flaut Ana-Theodora

**CONSTANȚA, 2025**

# CONTENT

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS.....	1
INTRODUCTION.....	5
1. Argument.....	5
2. Prerequisites of the Doctoral research.....	5
3. Research Objectives and Corpus.....	7
4. Research Methods and Techniques.....	12
CHAPTER I. THE HISTORY OF SPECIALIZED LANGUAGE RESEARCH.....	14
I.0. Introduction.....	14
I.1. The Evolution of Research from Philosophical Perspectives on Language to Philosophical language.....	14
<i>I.1.1. The Philosophical Approach to Language in Antiquity.....</i>	15
<i>I.1.2. Philosophical Concepts of Language Developed in the Middle Ages.....</i>	19
<i>I.1.3. The Evolution of Linguistic Concepts from the Renaissance to the 19th Century.....</i>	20
<i>I.1.4. New Linguistic Theories and Models, Emerging in the 20th Century.....</i>	26
<i>I.1.5. Language Research in the Romanian Cultural Space.....</i>	28
I.2. Concepts Used in the Research of Scientific Terminology.....	30
<i>I.2.1. Specialized Languages.....</i>	30
<i>I.2.2. Scientific Terminology and Traditionalist Interpretations of Terminology.....</i>	31
<i>I.2.3. Research Directions and Trends in Terminology and Specialized Languages.....</i>	36
I.3. The History of Terminological Research in Romanian Culture.....	40
I.4. Means of Enriching the Common Vocabulary, and Specialized Lexicon of the Romanian Language.....	42
<i>I.4.1. Derivation.....</i>	42
<i>I.4.1.1. Derivation with Prefixes.....</i>	42
<i>I.4.1.2. Derivation with Suffixes.....</i>	43
<i>I.4.2. Composing.....</i>	43
<i>I.4.3. Conversion.....</i>	46
<i>I.4.4. Linguistic Loan.....</i>	46
<i>I.4.5. Linguistic Calque.....</i>	48
<i>I.4.6. Transfer between Common and Specialized Lexicon.....</i>	48
I.5. Translation and Adaptation of Borrowed Scientific Terms.....	50
Partial Conclusions.....	53
CHAPTER II. THE FORMATION OF MODERN ROMANIAN PHILOSOPHICAL TERMINOLOGY.....	55
II.0. Introduction.....	55
II.1. Historical Premises.....	56
II.2. The Crystallization of Modern Romanian Philosophical terminology.....	58
Partial Conclusions.....	66
CHAPTER III. POPULARIZATION OF SCIENCE AND CULTURE IN THE ENLIGHTENMENT CONTEXT.....	67
III.0. Introduction.....	67
III.1. Cultural Factors that Prepared the Emergence of the Enlightenment.....	68
<i>III.1.1. Cultural Renaissance.....</i>	68
<i>III.1.2. Intellectual and Philosophical Humanism.....</i>	69
III.2. The Enlightenment in the 18th Century.....	72

III.2.1. <i>The Enlightenment in the Romanian Countries</i> .....	73
III.2.2. <i>The Dynamics of Religious Life in Transylvania</i> .....	75
III.2.3. <i>The Activity of Ioan Inocențiu (Inochentie) Micu-Klein</i> .....	76
III.2.4. <i>The Transylvanian School</i> .....	78
III.2.5. <i>The Prominent Figures of the Transylvanian School</i> .....	82
III.2.6. <i>The Phanariot Regime in Moldova and Wallachia. Historical Context</i> .....	85
III.2.7. <i>The Enlightenment Movement in Moldova and Wallachia</i> .....	88
III.2.8. <i>Representatives of the Enlightenment in Other Areas of the Romanian Cultural Space</i> ....	92
III.2.8.1. <i>The Enlightenment Thinkers from Banat</i> .....	92
III.2.8.2. <i>The Enlightenment Thinkers from the Intracarpathian Area</i> .....	93
III.2.8.3. <i>The Enlightenment Thinkers from Wallachia</i> .....	96
III.2.8.4. <i>The Enlightenment Thinkers from Oltenia</i> .....	97
III.2.8.5. <i>The Enlightenment Thinkers from Moldova</i> .....	98
III.2.9. <i>The Consequences of Spreading the Enlightenment Ideas into the Romanian Space in the 18th Century</i> .....	99
Partial Conclusions.....	101
CHAPTER IV. THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE ROMANIAN PHILOSOPHICAL LANGUAGE IN THE ENLIGHTENMENT CONTEXT.....	103
IV. 0. Introduction.....	103
IV.1. <i>The Appearance of the First Philosophical Writings in the Romanian Space</i> .....	104
IV.2. <i>The Philosophical Language and Philosophical Terminology Used by Dimitrie Cantemir</i> .....	106
IV.3. <i>The Philosophical Language and Philosophical Terminology Used in the Works of the Enlightenment Scholar Samuel Micu</i> .....	109
IV.3.1. <i>The Philosophical Language and Philosophical Terminology Used in the Work 'A filozofiei cei lucrătoare. Partea a-III-a. Etica sau învățătura obiceiuilor'</i> .....	112
IV.3.2. <i>The Philosophical Language and Philosophical Terminology Used in the Work 'Învățătura politicească'</i> .....	119
IV.3.3. <i>The Philosophical Language and Philosophical Terminology Used in the Work 'Învățătura metafizicii'</i> .....	122
IV.3.3.1. <i>Part II of the Work 'Învățătura metafizicii: A Metafizicii partea a II-a Cosmologia prestatot, pescurt Cosmologia'</i> .....	131
IV.3.3.2. <i>Part III of the Work 'Învățătura metafizicii: A metafizicii partea a III-a care cuprinde pneumatologia, psihologia si teologia firească'</i> .....	139
IV.3.4. <i>The Philosophical Language and Philosophical Terminology Used in the Work 'Loghica'</i> .....	148
IV. 3.5. <i>Preface 'Cătră Cetitori'</i> .....	168
Partial Conclusions.....	170
CHAPTER V. PHILOLOGICAL ANALYSIS OF PHILOSOPHICAL LANGUAGE IN THE WORKS OF SAMUIL MICU.....	171
V.1. <i>Etymological and Semantic Analysis of Philosophical Lexicon</i> .....	171
V.1.1. <i>The Dynamics of Terminological Research in Etymology and Semantics</i> .....	171
V.1.2. <i>Etymological and Semantic Analysis of Philosophical Terms Identified in the Works of Samuil Micu</i> .....	173
V.1.2.1. <i>Philosophical Terms in Formation</i> .....	173
V.1.2.2. <i>Common Lexical Items with Philosophical Contextual Meanings</i> .....	186
V.1.2.3. <i>Specialized Terms from Other Fields</i> .....	198
V.1.3. <i>Conclusions Regarding the Etymological Research of Terms</i> .....	199
V.2. <i>Romanian Terms, Obtained Through the Derivation Process</i> .....	201
V.2.1. <i>Derivation with Suffixes</i> .....	202
V.2.2. <i>Derivation with Prefixes</i> .....	206
V.2.3. <i>Conclusions Regarding the Derivation Process</i> .....	206
V.3. <i>Compound Words, Idioms and Expressions</i> .....	207

V.4. Loans.....	211
V.5. Calques.....	214
V.6. The Orthography.....	219
V.6.1. <i>Diachronic Considerations</i> .....	219
V.6.2. <i>The Romanian Transitional Alphabet</i> .....	220
V.6.3. <i>Formal Analysis of the Philosophical Terminology Introduced by Samuil Micu</i> .....	222
V.6.3.3. <i>The Orthography of Philosophical Terms in Formation</i> .....	225
V.7. Morphological Analysis of Philosophical Terms in Samuil Micu's work.....	229
Partial Conclusions.....	231
CONCLUSIONS.....	234
REFERENCES.....	240

## SUMMARY

**Key words:** *philosophical language, specialized language, lexicon, terminology, Enlightenment, Transylvanian School, Samuil Micu, Friedrich Christian Baumeister.*

### **The main objective of the research**

The doctoral research entitled *The formation of the Romanian philosophical language in the Enlightenment Period* aims to study the emergence and crystallization of Romanian philosophical terminology during its formative stage – namely, the Enlightenment. To achieve this objective, we analyzed the significance of Samuil Micu's philosophical work in the cultural context of his time, as well as his role in shaping the modern Romanian philosophical terminology.

The doctoral research aimed to analyze the diachronic development of the Romanian philosophical language as a specialized language, from its origins to the modern era, with the focus on the the following aspects:

- the formation of the Romanian philosophical language during the Transylvanian School period, particularly through the contributions of Samuil Micu;
- the process of crystallization of philosophical language in the Romanian cultural space and its consolidation as a specialized language.

We started from the general premise that, on the one hand, language research must be circumscribed geographically, historically and culturally; on the other hand, studying languages offers a broader perspective on the internal dynamics of a given language. This doctoral research focused on a specific type of discourse – philosophical language – originating in the Transylvanian School period, and considered its evolution throughout the modern period up to the present day.

The principles of research ethics were fully observed, with constant care taken to ensure that the interpretations provided did not, in any way, distort the ideas or realities conveyed by scholars in their works from that period. The scientific objectives of the present research are clearly defined, precise and fully aligned with ethical and legal standards.

## **The theoretical framework**

In our analytical approach, the research initially focuses on the cultural, historical, political and social contexts that led to the emergence of the Enlightenment movement. Chronologically, we begin with the Renaissance – a political and cultural movement marking the transition from the Middle Ages to the Enlightenment and the modernity, and a symbol of medieval society's transformation. We continued with the presentation of the humanist movement, which arose within the Renaissance and was shaped by it. Humanism emphasized humanity in general, and individual creative genius, in particular. Through its core ideas, Humanism influenced Enlightenment thought, promoted progress, and defended individual freedom and independence. As a result, philosophy gradually detached itself from religious dogma and the authority of theology as a science. We also outlined the main characteristics of the French Enlightenment of the 17th Century and the broader Enlightenment of the 18th Century – a period marked by the rise of revolutionary ideas and the advancement of scientific disciplines.

We presented the Enlightenment from the Romanian territories, where the movement arrived relatively late due to social and political circumstances. Special attention was given to the representatives of the Transylvanian School, who promoted the printing of textbooks, fostered interest in literature and science, supported the founding of schools, and campaigned for the replacement of Cyrillic scripts with Latin characters in Romanian writing. Our research emphasized the specific features of the Transylvanian School movement and the influence on Romanian culture and social life.

In the 18th Century, the political context in Central and Southeastern Europe underwent major changes. Although the Ottoman Empire was in decline, it succeeded in imposing Phanariot regimes in Moldavia and Wallachia at the beginning of the 18th Century, thereby increasing the political dependency of these principalities on the Sublime Porte. These circumstances largely explain why Enlightenment ideas reached the Romanian territories later than they did in Transylvania. Despite the conservative nature of the Phanariot regime, some rulers were influenced by Enlightenment principles and initiated reforms aimed at modernizing Romanian society – such as Nicolae Mavrocordat, Grigore Ghica II, Constantin Mavrocordat, Grigore Ghica III, Alexandru Ipsilanti. Their reformist policies sought to modernize state institutions by implementing administrative and fiscal changes, abolishing serfdom, and strongly promoting education. It is also important to emphasize that the Phanariot rulers, who governed both Moldavia and Wallachia, succeeded to establish

similarly structured institutions in both principalities. This contributed to the homogenisation of Romanian society and laid the groundwork for the unification of the two states in 1859.

All these cultural, historical, political, and social factors contributed to the delayed emergence philosophical writings and the development of a specialized terminology within the Romanian cultural space. Moreover, religious ideology remained dominant for a long time, while the official language and the script in use were Church Slavonic, and the Cyrillic alphabet.

The crystallization of philosophical language in the Romanian space extended into the second half of the 19th Century. The transmission and dissemination of philosophical terminology were achieved primarily through the translation and adaptation of philosophical works.

The modern Romanian philosophical lexicon had diverse origins, including Latin, Ancient Greek, Byzantine Greek, and Modern Greek. After 1860, French and German contributed a significant number of neologisms to Romanian, particularly enriching its philosophical and specialized terminology.

In the 18th Century, representatives of the Transylvanian School movement made significant contributions to the development of philosophical language within the Romanian cultural space. Among them, the work of Samuil Micu stands out. Beginning in 1781, Samuil Micu translated and interpreted philosophical texts from the writings of the German philosopher Friedrich Christian Baumeister – an effort all the more remarkable given the restrictive printing policies imposed by the Habsburg Empire.

In his writings, Micu was particularly concerned with ensuring clarity of expression, as the Romanian language at that time had limited resources for articulating philosophical concepts. He successfully overcame these limitations, especially in the case of newly introduced terms and expressions, often relying on vernacular language and phrases used in everyday speech. Believing that philosophy was the most important tool for building a national culture, Micu aimed to present contemporary philosophical ideas as clear as possible, making them intelligible to a broader Romanian audience.

The analytical approach adopted in this doctoral research includes the identification and classification of philosophical language, followed by its philological analysis from etymological, semantic, orthographic, and morphological perspectives. Another research direction examines vocabulary enrichment – on the one hand, through lexical borrowings identified primarily in the studied works; on the other hand, through the semantic enrichment of some pre-existing Romanian words. Composition and derivation were frequently

employed by Samuil Micu in his efforts to develop a Romanian philosophical lexicon. The creation of new terms through compounding – a method characteristic of the German language, well known to Samuil Micu – was less common in Romanian. As a result, numerous semi-fixed structures or free word combinations emerged in Romanian through processes of translation and calquing.

As G. Ivănescu observed, a genuine Romanian philosophical terminology began to take shape in the second half of the 18th Century, particularly after 1780, when printed translations contributed significantly to its consolidation (Ivănescu, 1974: 126). During the period 1829-1870, the Romanian literary language underwent profound changes and evolved into its modern form, the older philosophical lexicon – including the one used by Dimitrie Cantemir and Samuil Micu – was gradually abandoned.

The development of philosophical terminology is generally divided into two stages: the first lasting until approximately 1830-1840, and the second, the modern stage, beginning after 1840. The emergence of new social structures brought strong Latin and French influences into Romanian, leading to the adoption of new terms and expressions to the expense of older ones. The early philosophical vocabulary relied heavily on linguistic calques and included numerous neologisms of Neo-Greek origin. In contrast, post -1830 terminology featured far fewer calques but saw a significant influx of neologisms and lexical loans from French and Latin.

Although many of the philosophical terms used after 1830 are similar to those in use today, the philosophical terminology from the period between 1830 and 1880 is not entirely identical to the contemporary lexicon. That period was marked by variation and fluctuation in Romanian scientific terminology, including the philosophical domain. This process began to stabilize between 1870 and 1880, coinciding with the maturation of the Romanian literary language. During this period, Romanians from Transylvania played a crucial role in shaping Romanian philosophical terminology. Many served as philosophy professors in the Romanian Principalities or were among the first to translate philosophy textbooks into Romanian. Their contribution also rooted in the fact that Transylvanian philologists had solid knowledge regarding philosophical language not only because of the close connection between philosophy and linguistics at that time, but also due to the Austrian educational system they attended, in which philosophy was a discipline given considerable attention.



## **Research methods and techniques**

The research methods and techniques employed in this doctoral research fall primarily within the field of philology and, where necessary, history. The main methods used include the qualitative research method (contextualization, formal, structural, and semantic analysis of words), the historical research method, the descriptive method, and the document study method. As research techniques, the study relied on the analysis of reference works, comparison of the information they contain, and close reading of selected texts from relevant sources.

The historical research method was applied to establish and contextualize the historical context of the topic under investigation. This involved consulting specialized literature and comparing multiple sources to ensure the accuracy of the data.

Qualitative research is defined as a 'multidisciplinary and transdisciplinary, pluriparadigmatic and multimodal approach, which involves studying a subject or phenomenon in its natural setting, with the aim of understanding and interpreting it based on the meanings that individuals assign to it' (Băban, 2002: 12). Therefore, qualitative research focuses on the complexity of everyday social interactions, their impact on those involved, and the organization of cultural information (Butaru, 2022: 146).

Using the qualitative research method, I analyzed the philosophical language present in various works dating from the pre-modern period to the mid-19th Century, in order to gain a better understanding of the conceptual frameworks and linguistic expressions employed by the authors studied in the doctoral thesis.

The descriptive research method was used to examine and classify the lexical material, allowing me to develop statistics according to specific criteria: etymological, semantic, orthographic, and morphological.

The present research sets out to present the development and configuration of philosophical language during the Enlightenment period. The broad nature of this topic allows for the integration of cultural and historical dimensions with linguistic analysis, providing considerable freedom in the research process.

## **Corpus of texts**

The present research focuses on a corpus of texts translated and adapted by Samuil Micu from the work of Friedrich Christian Baumeister: *Învățătura metafizicii, A filozofiei cei lucrătoare. Partea a-III-a. Etica sau învățătura obiceirilor, Învățătura politicească*. These Romanian versions were analysed in comparison with their Latin version, *Elementa*

*philosophiae recentioris: usibus iuventutis scholasticae, accommodata et pluribus sententiis exemplisque ex veterum scriptorum Romanorum monimentis illustrata* (Leipzig, 1755).

### **The structure of the thesis**

The doctoral thesis is organized into five chapters, followed by the research conclusions and the bibliography, which I divided into primary and secondary sources. Each chapter concludes with a synthesis of the partial findings specific to that section of the doctoral thesis.

In chapter I, titled *The history of research of specialty*, we started from the premise that the reflections of Greek philosophers on language – its connections to knowledge and the reality it expresses – stimulated the evolution of linguistic concepts during the Renaissance, Humanism, and Enlightenment.

The emergence of specialized languages in the Romanian cultural space can be traced back to the literary activity of Dimitrie Cantemir, who, at the beginning of the 18th Century, compiled the first Romanian glossary of neologisms, from various scientific fields, in his allegorical work, *Istoria ieroglifică*, in the chapter titled *Scara a numerelor și a cuvintelor streine tâlcuitoare*. By the end of the 18th Century and the early decades of the 19th Century, the first technical books and manuals in Romanian were printed. These played a significant role in introducing a substantial number of new scientific terms. Thus, during the first half of the 19th Century, the foundations of Romanian scientific terminology were laid, a process that took place at the same time as the appearance of the first Romanian periodicals and the institutionalization of education in Romanian.

If in the 18th and 19th centuries, the direction of terminology was given by scientists, in the second half of the 20th century, the evolution of terminology was taken over by the technical, engineering side, something required by the strong development of technology that needed appropriate terminology. Terminology thus becomes the vocabulary associated with a certain field of activity, scientific or professional. This led to the enrichment of the lexicon through borrowings from other languages or by forming new words starting from already existing words. Thus, in the Romanian language, together with linguistic loan, composing and derivation became the main processes for obtaining new words.

In chapter II, *The Formation of Modern Romanian Philosophical Terminology*, I analyzed the mechanisms through which a specialized philosophical language was formed after the end of the 17th century, from which the true Romanian philosophical terminology would develop starting with the second half of the 18th century, especially after 1780.

Between 1780 and 1830, we identified a period of transition from the old philosophical language to the modern one, during which lexical elements from both types coexisted and were used simultaneously. After 1830, as the Romanian principalities began to align closely with Western cultural values, Romanian philosophical terminology underwent processes of consolidation and modernization. In the period between 1830 and 1880, fluctuations were observed in the use of Romanian scientific and philosophical terminology, with a tendency toward stabilization beginning around 1870-1880, coinciding with the maturation of the Romanian literary language. We can observe that the process of crystallization of philosophical terminology in the Romanian space took place until the second half of the 19th Century and gained momentum toward its end. This development was shaped by the philosophical climate of the time and supported by the translation, adaptations and publication of philosophical works originating in Western Europe.

In chapter III, *Popularization of science and culture in the enlightenment context*, the focus is placed on Enlightenment thinkers whose primary aim was to challenge religious dogma and promote trust in human reason and its innovative capacity. In Transylvania, the main objective of Romanian intellectuals was the struggle for equal rights. To this end, the scholars of the Transylvanian School founded schools, authored and printed textbooks, and encouraged the pursuit of literature and science. Their didactic mission was most clearly manifested in their efforts to replace the Cyrillic script with the Latin alphabet. Through their contributions to philology, philosophy, and history, the representatives of the Transylvanian School not only defined our national identity but also provided scholarly arguments for the Latinity of the Romanian people.

In the 18th Century, Enlightenment ideas reached Moldavia and Wallachia through the influence of Phanariot rulers, who played a significant role in the modernization of the Romanian territories and initiated a series of major reforms. This process contributed to the establishment of the Princely Academies in both principalities, institutions that fostered a growing interest in book printing and education. The Romanian struggle for emancipation – culturally, ideologically, politically, and religiously – ultimately led to the creation of the unified national state, through the union in 1859 of the two principalities, Moldavia and Wallachia, in 1918, a process crowned by the formation of România Mare (Greater Romania), in 1918. The Enlightenment thus acted as a catalyst for national and social emancipation among Romanians, fostering the development of culture, the emergence of a national modern identity and the promotion of the fundamental individual rights.

In chapter IV, titled *The Development of the Romanian Philosophical Language in the Enlightenment Context*, I conducted an in-depth analysis of the translations produced by Samuil Micu. His philosophical work is the result of an extensive adaptation of Baumeister's work, *Elementa philosophiae recentioris: usibus iuventutis scholasticae, accommodata et pluribus sententiis exemplisque ex veterum scriptorum Romanorum monumentis illustrata*. This elaboration process took place between 1781 and 1800. We conducted a comparative analysis between Samuil Micu's Romanian texts and the Latin original, identifying linguistic solutions through which Micu overcame the challenges imposed by the limited expressive resources of the Romanian language at that time – resources which had not yet evolved enough to accommodate Western philosophical neologisms. The guiding principle in Micu's work was the clarity of expression. He prioritized adapting neologisms to Romanian rather than using them uncritically. Often, he provided several synonyms from the common lexicon for each new term and, when meanings remained unclear, he created Romanian equivalents. For example: *filozofia cei lucrătoare* for *philosophia moralis*; *isteție* for *intellectus*; *înțelegere* for *intelligentia*; *măiestrie* or *meșteșug* for *ars*. Throughout the text, I emphasized expressions that were not translated *ad litteram* from the Baumeister' *Elementa*, but were interpreted and rendered in an original manner by Samuil Micu: the term *hotărâre* with the meaning of „definire”, *definitio*: „definirea lucrului prin indicarea semnelor lui caracteristice”, „definirea lucrului prin indicarea motivelor și a modului care-i permit existența” (Baumeister, 1755: 36; Pavel, 2018: 1430); the phrase *ideea plină* which refers to „un lucru concret”, in contrast to *ideea neplină*, meaning „un lucru abstract”: „Deaca ai sau numeri atâtea seamne câte sînt de ajuns ca lucrul ce ți-l închipuiești oriunde și totdeauna să-l poți cunoaște și de toate alte lucruri să-l osibești, atunci ideea cea aleasă să chiamă plină, iară de nu sînt de ajuns seamnele care le ai, zicem că iaste idee neplină” (Micu, 2007: 52). Micu also extends the meaning of these terms metaphorically, suggesting that events happen for a reason and everything unfolds in its own time. What is destined to happen to you is referred as *ideea plină*, whereas what is not meant for you is *ideea neplină*. We thus observe how Samuil Micu translated and adapted these abstract philosophical notions using accessible Romanian equivalents: *plină* și *neplină*. Another example is the phrase *începutul zicerii împrotivă* which Samuil Micu uses as the equivalent of „principiul contradicției”, *principium contradictionis*, as found in *Elementa*, and *începutul pricinei destulă*, which corresponds to „principiul rațiunii suficiente”, *principium rationis sufficientis*, in the Latin version: „Dregătoria ontologiei este a așeza și a pune începuturile sau temeiurile cele mai preste tot ale cunoștinței omenești. Iară două sînt începuturile sau temeiurile a toată cunoștința

omenească: unul este începutul zicerii împrativă, al doilea este începutul pricinei destule. Toate adevărurile care le cunoaştem sînt de două feluri: unele sînt trebuincioase, (...) altele sînt întîmplătoare (...). Adevărurile cele trebuincioase să proptesc pre începutul zicerii împrativă. Cele întîmplătoare să zidesc pre temeiul pricinei destule”. Other relevant examples include semi-fixed structures such as *arătare analiticească* equivalent to *spunere, gândire analitică* (saying, thought, analytical thinking) and *arătare sintheticască* equivalent to *spunere, gândire sintetică* (saying, synthetic thinking). Therefore, the philosophical texts translated by the scholar became accessible to a broader audience. All the philosophical themes presented, human reason, ethics, education, were inscribed in a harmonious vision, that balanced rational inquiry with religious faith.

In chapter V, *Philological Analysis of Philosophical Language in the Works of Samuil Micu*, we examined the language used and how it served to convey abstract philosophical concepts. Samuil Micu constantly favored solutions rooted in the Romanian language, opting for structural and semantic calques over direct borrowings. When he did adopt foreign terms, his primary sources were the classical languages – Latin and Greek. For such neologisms, Micu frequently added explanatory glosses or illustrative comparisons. For example, he explains *înţelesul limpede* (clear meaning) in correlation with „ceriul cînd să rîsipe toată negura” („the sky when all the fog has dispersed”), while *înţelesul nelimpede* (unclear meaning) is compared with „norii așa acoperă lumina” („the sky when all the fog cover the light”) (*A metafizicii partea a III-a care cuprinde pneumatologia, psihologia si teologia firească*).

Following the study of the text corpus, we identified 191 philosophical terms and common lexical elements with contextual meanings specific to philosophical language. Statistically, nouns are the most frequent lexical category in Samuil Micu's works: 124 nouns in total, of which 101 are feminine, 5 masculine, and 18 neuter.

The morphological analysis reveals that most of the terms are common nouns (124), accounting for 64,92%, followed by semi-fixed structures (23) at 12,04%, adjectives (22) at 11,52%, noun phrases (10), at 5,24%, verbs (7), at 3,66%, adverbial phrases (3) at 1,57%, and verbal phrases (2), which represent 1,05%.

Feminine nouns make up 81,45% of all nouns identified and 52,88% of the total lexical items analyzed.

From a statistically and etymological perspective, most of the philosophical terms identified in the analyzed corpus are formed within the Romanian language, followed by terms of Latin origin (inherited or borrowed), Greek, Slavic, unknown etymology, Bulgarian,

Hungarian. Words with multiple etymologies were also found, most commonly of both Greek and Latin origin. Among the 153 simple terms analyzed, the largest group consists of terms formed in Romanian, 57 (37,25%), followed by Latin-origin terms 45 (29,42%), terms of Greek origin, 15 (9,81%), Slavic, 15 (9,81%), of unknown etymology, 2 (1,3%), Bulgarian, 1 (0,65%), and Hungarian, 1 (0,65%).

In addition, we also identified words with multiple etymology, including:

- Greek and Latin, 15 (9,81%);
- Bulgarian and Serbo-Croatian, 1 (0,65%);
- Greek and Turkish, 1 (0,65%).

Samuil Micu made use of words from the existing Romanian lexical fund, enriching them with philosophical meanings, through various methods. The most frequently employed process was derivation, using the internal resources of the Romanian language – primarily through the extensive use of suffixes, to a lesser extent, prefixes – based on words already known and in use. Among the derived terms, most are formed by adding suffixes such as: *-atec*; *-eală*; *-esc*; *-(ic)esc*; *-iciune*; *-ie*; *-ime*; *-ință*; *-itor*; *-itură*; *-nic*; *-os*; *-re*. As for prefixation, the author used a single prefix: *ne-*.

Another process is compounding, through which new expressions were created by skillfully joining words – often of different etymological origins – thus enriching the Romanian philosophical vocabulary. Borrowings and calques are also processes frequently employed in his works. Samuil Micu's mastery lies in the fact that he managed to render these expressions accessible to a wider public, many of whom were unfamiliar with Western philosophical thought and terminology.

The texts studied were written between 1780 and 1799. From an orthographic perspective, formal variations can be observed from one work to another and from one edition to the next. For example: *autarkeia* s. f. (< gr. *autárkeia* ‘the quality of being self-sufficient, content with what one has’): “*autarkeia* is the right desire to have wealth” (SFAFCL, 219), “*Autarkeia* means that a man should be of a calm mind and unafraid of losing his wealth” (SFAFCL, 222). The term taken over by Samuil Micu preserves the original Greek graphic form, including the letter *k*, which represents the same sound as *c*.. Another example is *spațiu* (*space*), after lat. *spatium*. In this case, a phonetic rule outlined by Micu is applied consistently in both versions of the work *Elementa*, the transition of *t* into *ț* „*T, t*, before *i* is pronounced as *tz* by Germans and Hungarians or as *z* by Italians”: “*Spațiu* is a Latin word, that we can define as the empty place between two composed syllables that exist simultaneously.” (SFIMO, 109; Micu & Șincai, 1980: 15; Micu & Șincai, 1980: 121).

The use of the phonetic principle in relation to loans from Greek and Latin explains why certain terms were spelled differently than their current forms: *cosmologhia*, *etica* / *itica* / *ithica*, *etimologhia*, *gheometria*, *iconomica*, *ipothetică* / *ipotheticească* / *ipotheticește*, *îns*, *loghica*, *omonimia*, *onomatologhia*, *ontologhia*, *psihologhia*, *silloghism*, *simvolic*, *sinonimia*, *spația*, *teologhia*.

## Conclusions

It can be concluded that the process of crystallizing philosophical language in the Romanian cultural space took place during the Enlightenment period, continuing until the second half of the 19th Century. The framework of this process was shaped both by the philosophical spirit of the time and by the translation, adaptation, and publication of philosophical works, such as those of Samuil Micu: *Învățătura metafizicii*, *A filozofiei cei lucătoare. Partea a-III-a. Etica sau învățătura obiceirilor*, *Învățătura politicească și Loghica*. The manner in which he employed and integrated philosophical concepts into his works was highlighted, as well as the influence these concepts had on the development of Romanian philosophical terminology and of the modern Romanian language as a cultural language. We demonstrated that, in order to accurately convey corresponding meanings, Samuil Micu introduced new philosophical terms, using linguistic loans, especially from Latin and Greek. At the same time, to make the complex philosophical concepts, circulating in Europe at the time more accessible to the Romanian public, he employed semantic and structural calques applied to existing Romanian words. He thus introduced essential new terms into the Romanian lexicon, contributing to the shaping of philosophical and intellectual thought during that period. Also, through structural and semantic calques, Samuil Micu clarified philosophical concepts and brought them within the reach of an audience not yet familiar with Western philosophical thought and its terminology.

Samuil Micu's philosophical activity extended beyond the dissemination, translation, and interpretation of the philosophical ideas of Christian Wolff or Friedrich Christian Baumeister; he was a true creator of culture within the Romanian space. Through his work, he modernized and enriched the Romanian language, proving its capacity to express philosophical ideas. In this regard, Micu followed the model of Wolf, who was among the first to write philosophical works in German, by choosing to write philosophical texts in Romanian. Samuil Micu succeeded in making philosophical ideas accessible to the Romanian audience, striving to understand and adapt universal concepts to the local context. He played a crucial role in the development and appropriation of a Romanian philosophical terminology

capable of expressing new ideas. His works are not just simple translations – they include clarifications and definitions absent from the original texts, reflecting Micu's consistent efforts to find the most accurate and comprehensible ways to express and explain complex philosophical subjects.

Therefore, the efforts of Samuil Micu and the other representatives of the Transylvanian School led to the adoption of the Latin alphabet in writing, replacing the Cyrillic script, and to the search for the most appropriate forms of expression – both orthographic and phonetic – for all the words in the Romanian language, ensuring their accurate representation using the Latin alphabet. This was essential for the formation and development of the literary Romanian language within the Romanian cultural space, as it enabled the establishment of a clear and accessible language, capable of coherently and intelligibly expressing theological, philosophical, and scientific concepts. This effort contributed to the consolidation of a common linguistic identity among Romanians and significantly influenced the development of Romanian culture, education and national identity. The representatives of the Transylvanian School translated, adapted and interpreted the works of the major scholars of the time, thereby contributing to the emergence of a Romanian scientific language. The Romanian language became a vehicle for promoting education, thought, and critical spirit – core values of the Enlightenment. Since the Romanian language was not standardized in writing at the time, with various regional forms and foreign influences (Hungarian, German, Slavonic), the Transylvanian scholars played a crucial role in promoting of a clear, unified, and accessible language capable of expressing a wide range of scientific, philosophical, and theological concepts.

The analysis of the crystallization of philosophical language in Romanian opens up new research directions, such as the relationship between rationality and religion in Samuil Micu's vision. A theologian by training, Micu succeeded in harmonizing religious principles with rational thought, thereby contributing, through the philosophical language he employed, to the transition from a theological language to a rational one, specific to the Enlightenment.

Since the Enlightenment marked a foundational moment for the development of all scientific fields, the scientific languages and terminologies that emerged during this time were subject to constant change and modernization. This explains why much of the philosophical lexicon used by Samuil Micu is no longer in use today. However, Samuil Micu was a pioneer and, thanks to his efforts, philosophy began to be studied as a didactic discipline, marking the beginning of Romanian scientific research in this field. His



contributions laid the foundation for future generations to continue and expand upon his work.

Samuil Micu's efforts were continued by prominent intellectuals, such as Gheorghe Lazăr, Simion Bărnuțiu, August Treboniu Laurian, but none of them achieved, in their works, the same level of complexity and breadth as Samuil Micu in the creation of a Romanian philosophical terminology.

## REFERENCES (SELECTION)

### Primary sources

Baumeister, Friedrich Christian, 1755, *Elementa philosophiae recentioris: usibus iuventutis scholasticae accommodata*, Leipzig.

Cantemir, Dimitrie, 1969, *Divanul*, ediție îngrijită și studiu introductiv de Virgil Cândea, București: Editura pentru Literatură.

Cantemir, Dimitrie, 1973, *Opere complete Vol. IV*, ediție critică publicată sub îngrijirea lui Virgil Cândea, București: Editura Academiei Republicii Socialiste România.

Cantemir, Dimitrie, 2017, *Icoana de nezugrăvit a științei preasfinte; Pasaie neclare în Catehism; O cercetare naturală a monarhiilor; Elogiu pentru autor; Mic compendiu de logică*, editarea textului latinesc, aparatul critic și indicele de Florentina Nicolae, traducerea din limba latină de Ioana Costa, studiu introductiv de Ștefan Afloroaei, Academia Română, București: Editura Fundației Naționale pentru Știință și Artă.

Comșa, Nicolae, 1944, *Manuscrisele românești din Biblioteca Centrală de la Blaj*, Blaj: Tipografia „Lumina” Miron Roșu.

Eminescu, Mihai, 2014, *La steaua*, București: Editura Grup Media Litera.

Micu, Samuil, 1966, *Scrieri filozofice*, studiu introductiv și ediție critică de Pompiliu Teodor și Dumitru Ghișe, București: Editura Științifică.

Micu, Samuil, 2007, *Loghica*, ediție îngrijită și studiu introductiv: Mihai Alin Gherman, Cluj-Napoca: Editura Argonaut.

Micu, Samuil, 2018, *Istoria și lucrurile și întâmplările românilor*, ediție critică de Ioan Chindriș și Niculina Iacob, Cluj-Napoca: Editura Napoca Star.

Micu, Samuil, Gheorghe Șincai, 1980, *Elementa linguae Daco-Romanae sive Valachicae*, Studiu introductiv, traducerea textelor și note de Mircea Zdrengea, Cluj-Napoca: Editura Dacia.

Newton, Isaac, 1686, *Philosophiae naturalis principia mathematica*, S. PEPYS, Reg. Soc. PRÆSES, ediție apărută în martie 2009, în cadrul proiectului Project Gutenberg Ebook.

Newton, Isaac, 1846, *The Mathematical Principles of Natural Philosophy*, New York: Editura Daniel Adee, [https://redlightrobber.com/red/links\\_pdf/Isaac-Newton-Principia-English-1846.pdf](https://redlightrobber.com/red/links_pdf/Isaac-Newton-Principia-English-1846.pdf), accesat la data de 14.12.2021, ora 12:06.

Newton, Isaac, 1956, *Principiile matematice ale filozofiei naturale*, traducere și adnotări de prof. Victor Marian, București: Editura Academiei Republicii Populare Române.

Pavel, Eugen (coord.), 2018, *Școala Ardeleană*, vol IV, București: Editura Fundației Naționale pentru Știință și Artă.

## **Secondary sources**

### **Historical and cultural context**

Bobâna, Gheorghe, 2005, *Umanismul în cultura românească din secolul al XVII-lea - începutul secolului al XVIII-lea*, Chișinău: Editura Epigraf.

Cassirer, Ernst, 2003, *Filosofia luminilor*, traducere și tabel cronologic de Adriana Pop, Pitești: Editura Paralela 45.

Chindriș, Ioan, 2001, *Cultura și societatea în contextul Școlii Ardelene*, Cluj-Napoca: Editura Cartimpex.

Chindriș, Ioan, Niculina Iacob, 2010, *Samuil Micu în mărturii antologice*, Târgu Lăpuș: Editura Galaxia Gutenberg.

Drișcu, Andreea, 2021, „*Elementa linguae Daco-Romanae sive Valachicae* (1780) și gramaticile ulterioare”, *Transilvania*, nr. 4, 73-78.

Duțu, Alexandru, 1974, *Umaniștii români și cultura europeană*, București: Editura Minerva.

Nicolescu, Aurel, 1971, *Școala Ardeleană și limba română*, București: Editura Științifică.

Papadima, Ovidiu, 1975, *Ipostaze ale Iluminismului românesc*, București: Editura Minerva.

Teodor, Pompiliu, 1984, *Interferențe iluministe europene*, Cluj-Napoca: Editura Dacia.

Teodor, Pompiliu, 2000, *Sub semnul luminilor. Samuil Micu*, Cluj-Napoca: Editura Presa Universitară Clujeană.

### **Linguistics and lexicology**

Bidu-Vrănceanu, Angela, 2001, *Lexic științific interdisciplinar*, București: Editura Universității din București.

Bidu-Vrănceanu, Angela, 2007, *Lexicul specializat în mișcare de la dicționare la texte*, București: Editura Universității din București.

Bidu-Vrănceanu, Angela, 2011, „Diacronia în terminologie”, *Analele Universității Dunărea de Jos din Galați*, fascicula XXIV, anul IV, nr. 1(5), 11-23.

Căprioară, Cosmin, 2014, *Limbaajul popular medical românesc*, Cluj-Napoca: Editura Mega.

Căprioară, Cosmin, 2015, *Contribuții la studiul limbajului medical românesc*, Cluj-Napoca: Editura Mega.

Căprioară, Cosmin, 2017, „O problemă de istoria și de metodica limbii române”, în *Centrul de Cercetare și Dezvoltare Profesională „Studiile românești în context internațional” (STUR), Centrul de Cercetare „Metacogniție și Transdisciplinaritate”, Studiile românești în context inter- și transdisciplinar*. In memoriam Marin Mincu, coord.: Marina Cap-Bun, Iuliana David, Corina Apostoleanu, București: Editura Universitară, 188-200.

Pitar, Mariana, 2004, „Terminologia: concepte de bază”, *The Electronic Journal UNITERM*, nr. 1, 1-7.

Pitiriciu, Silvia, 2009, „Din terminologia cromatică: verde în limba română”, *Analele Universității de Vest din Timișoara*, seria științe filologice, nr. 47, 115-120.

Pitiriciu, Silvia, 2010, „Din terminologia cromatică: galben în limba română”, *Limba Română*, nr. 3-4 (177-178), 103-110.

Pitiriciu, Silvia, 2010, „Din terminologia cromatică: albastru în limba română”, *Buletin de Lingvistică*, nr. 11, 136-143.

### **Philosophy and history of philosophy**

Blackburn, Simon, 1999, *Oxford. Dicționar de Filosofie*, traducere de Iricinschi, Cătălina, Kertesz, Laurian, Sabin, Torres, Liliana și Czobor, Mihaela, București: Univers Enciclopedic.

Cassin, Barbara (coord.), 2020, *Vocabularul european al filosofiilor*, traducere și adăugiri la ediția în limba română coordonate de Anca Vasiliu și Alexander Baumgarten, București: Polirom.

Cazan, Gh. Al. 1984, *Istoria filosofiei românești*, București: Editura Didactică și Pedagogică.

Clement, Elisabeth, Demonique Chantal, Hansen-Loeve Laurence, Kahn Pierre, 1999, *Dicționar enciclopedic de filosofie. Filosofia de la A la Z*, traducere de Cojocă-Mărculescu, Magdalena; Cojocă, Aurelian, București: ALL EDUCATIONAL.

Coșeriu, Eugen, 2011, *Istoria filosofiei limbajului. De la începuturi până la Rousseau*. București: Editura Humanitas.

### ***Romanian language dictionaries***

Academia Română, 2010, *Dicționarul limbii române* [DA/DLR], ediție anastatică, vol I-XIX, București: Editura Academiei Române.

Academia Română, 2022, *Dicționarul limbii române* [DA/DLR] (1965–2010), ediție digitală anastatică în CLRE. *Corpus lexicografic românesc electronic*, <https://clre.solirom.ro/>

Bidu-Vrânceanu, Angela, Cristina Călărașu, Liliana Ionescu-Ruxăndoiu, Mihaela Mancaș, Gabriela Pană Dindelegan, 1997, *Dicționar de științe ale limbii*, București: Editura Științifică.

Bursuc, Alina-Mihaela, Marius-Radu Clim, Mioara Dragomir, Cristina Florescu, Gabriela Haja, Laura Manea, Mariana Nastasia, Elena Isabelle Tamba, Claudius-Marian Teodorescu, (coord), 2021, *Corpus lexicografic românesc electronic*, Filiala Iași: Departamentului de lexicologie și lexicografie de la Institutul de Filologie Română „Alexandru Philippide” al Academiei Române, <https://clre.solirom.ro/>.

Ciorănescu, Alexandru, 2007, *Dicționarul etimologic al limbii române*, ediție îngrijită și traducere din limba spaniolă, de Tudora Șandru Mehedinți și Magdalena Popescu Marin, București: SAECULUM I. O.

Coteanu, Ion, Luiza Seche, Mircea Seche. (coord.), 1975, *Dicționarul explicativ al limbii române*, București: Editura Academiei R.S.R.

Coteanu, Ion, Luiza Seche, Mircea Seche. (coord.), 1998, *Dicționarul explicativ al limbii române*, ediția a II-a, București: Editura Univers Enciclopedic.

Giurgea, Ion, Cristian Moroianu, 2021, *Dicționarul etimologic al limbii române*, [Ediție online]; ediția digitală, <https://delr.lingv.ro/>.

Macrea, D. (coord.). (DLRM), 1958, *Dicționarul limbii române moderne*, București: Editura Academiei Republicii Populare Române, <https://dm.solirom.ro/>.

Pană Dindelegan, Gabriela (coord.), 2023, *Dicționar de termeni gramaticali și concepte lingvistice conexe*, București: Editura Univers Enciclopedic Gold.

### **Related fields**

Băban, Adriana, 2002, *Metodologia cercetării calitative*, Cluj-Napoca: Editura Presa Universitară Clujeană.

Butaru, Lucian T., 2022, *Introcere în metodologia cercetării calitative*, Cluj-Napoca: Editura Presa Universitară Clujeană.