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ABSTRACT – Attributing the origin of the agricultural, horticultural and agro-food terms of the Romanian language is a controversial domain. The latest two etymological dictionaries analysing thousands of the Romanian words in terms of their origin include an approximately equal number of more than 300 terms from the above-mentioned domain. The etymological dictionary elaborated by Ciorănescu Al., 2002, gives these terms a Latin, Slavic origin or other European languages, which belong to some peoples with whom Romanians had historical relationships. This dictionary does not estimate the amount of words coming from substratum to more than 2%. The etymological dictionary elaborated by Vinereanu M., 2008, found that most of the mentioned words belonged to the pre-Latin, Thracian-Getic and Thracian-Illyrian substratum. The Latin or Slavic origin terms are found at a less proportion, as well as the mentioned terms from diverse European languages.
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ceva mai mică, la fel ca şi termenii menţionaţi din diversele limbi europene.

**Cuvinte cheie:** origine, termeni agricoli, horticoli şi agroalimentari, dicţionare etimologice, limba română

**INTRODUCTION**

The etymology of some words belonging to a language may sometime give important information related to their origin or history, though there is not all the time a direct relationship. The more we study this field, the more there appear nuances, which may affirm or invalidate some initial or even preconceived knowledge. On the other hand, the specialized literature is sufficiently important to distinguish a national dominance, but also a foreign literature that does not know our language.

We should not forget that linguistics was also considered a war weapon. I. V. Stalin, in his famous definition of nations, mentioned the language unity among the first attributes. That is why there is a Romanian-Moldavian dictionary written by V. Stati, who tries to translate the difference between the two dialects as a difference between the two languages. There is no German - Austrian dictionary or a Serbian – Croatian one.

In the elaboration of an etymological dictionary of a certain language, one must not have preconceived ideas. Alexandru Ciorănescu has initially published his etymological dictionary in Spain, La Laguna University (Tenerife), in seven distinct fascicles that issued within an interval of 13 years (1954-1966). The Romanian edition issued at *SAECULUM I. O.* Printing House, Bucharest, 2002, according to the author’s wish, who remained “deeply attached in spite of the distance and almost 50 years of exile”, as the translators (Tudora Şandru-Mehedinţi and Magdalena Popescu Marin) said. The author contributed by indications to the achievement of the Romanian version that issued post-mortem (he died in November 1999).

The etymological dictionary of the Romanian language by Al. Ciorănescu has 1055 pages and analyses 9532 words, followed by an index of words by their origin (190 pages) and an impressing bibliography. In the preface of his dictionary, the author says that he did not think of a final evaluation of his work, which was done in more decades, but finally, when he faced the result, he realized that as a linguist, he created a work exceeding this frame. We quote: “Looking backward, we may however draw general conclusions from the results of our work. These conclusions, which were not studied and checked as working hypotheses, came out naturally from the presented material and are for us safer than the truth defended and proclaimed before being proved. They have however the drawback of not having been used systematically or generalized as they deserved. To be more explicit, we should better...
examine these ideas, as they seem to appear by purely statistical means and acknowledge at the same time that we could not take too much advantage of them, because we discovered them a posteriori. These ideas refer mainly to the substratum problems, to the relationships of the Romanian language with the Albanese language and the spontaneous creations. As for the pre-Romanian substratum of the Romanian language, we did not have preconceived ideas. The proof of this fact is that we proposed some original etymologies, based on previous layers of Latin. Despite all, our research does not lead to satisfactory results from the viewpoint of the presence of a primitive substratum in the Romanian language. The usually given examples did not seem to us proper to be taken into account; sometimes, the different etymons drew our attention more insistently. Quite reasonably or not, the substratum does not exist practically in the statistics of the Romanian language, based on our results. Thus, it is obvious that a supplementary precaution should have urged us to more reserve in establishing some connections. To deny the presence of substratum and to reconstitute etymons based on it represents a patent contradiction. However, in both cases, the author continues to be of good faith: first of all, because it is a result obtained by the effectuated investigation and that he cannot foresee beforehand; secondly, because his explanation started from generally accepted suppositions, taking into account a working method that seemed correct for him (etc)."

The Romanian etymological dictionary, based on the research on Indo-European languages (Alcor Edimpex Printing House, Bucharest 2008) was elaborated by Dr. Mihai Vinereanu. It has 936 pages, contains a number of about 6000 words (5000 words from the old or traditional basic word stock and about 1000 neologisms).

Dr. Mihai Vinereanu has the originality of having studied more deeply the foreign literature in the field, as he brings his own interpretation of the etymology of Romanian words in the Indo-European perspective. Starting from several fundamental scientific papers (Ciorănescu, Cihaș, etc), which he quotes from the beginning, the author adds his own comments on Indo-European studies, capable to underline or invalidate the naturalized conceptions related to the origin of the Romanian words.

Dr. Vinereanu is aware that he opened new ways to the Romanian linguistics, focusing on the re-discussion of the etymologies studied so far by his predecessors. His approach is bold and categorical, able to change the classification of the Romanian language as a Romanic language.

Professor C. Frâncu, chief of the Romanian and general linguistics department from the Faculty of Letters, “Al. I. Cuza” University of
Iaşi, in his Foreword to this dictionary (3.30.2008) refers to several basic landmarks of the Dictionary of Dr. Vinereanu:

- The author wants to bring a new vision on the Romanian language, starting from the phonologic system. Based on a historical comparative method, he tried to reconstitute the phonologic system of the Thracian - Dacian language, the Romanian language, respectively;

- By comparison to the phonologic system of other Indo-European languages, he concluded that the Romanian language belonged to the Italic – Celtic – Illyrian - Thracian group, a group that spoke one language 4000 years ago, differentiated by dialects. The Central and Eastern European dialect became the Illyrian - Thracian – Dacian language, which was spoken 2000 years ago farther than the Azov Sea, the Thracian – Dacian people being the most numerous people in Europe;

- The author disagrees to the hypothesis of the Romanization of Dacia, bringing arguments related to time, space or socio-linguistic order;

- The reviewer appreciates this work as being based on firm principles, the result of an impressive work, but suggests that it will be accepted under reserve by some researchers. In any case, the conclusion of Professor C. Frâncu is that this work could not be ignored.

From the dictionary’s Argument, signed by the author in August 2008, we quote the followings:

This paper includes 5000 words from the old or traditional basic word stock and about 1000 neologisms, as we have already mentioned. From the author’s calculations, after the final classification, the common elements to the Latin language do not exceed 13%, the Slavic ones, about 8%, the Turkish ones, about 4.5%, the Greek ones, 3%, the Magyar ones, 1.5% and the German ones, 1%. The words of uncertain origin represent 6.5%, while those of onomatopoeic or imitative origin represent 6%. By difference, the pre-Latin or Thracian – Dacian word stock of the Romanian words would be about 56.5-58%. The author assesses that the native word stock represents in fact 65%, if we justly evaluate the oldness of lexical elements of imitative nature.

By enumerating three hypotheses regarding the origin of the Romanian language (Latin origin with 80% loan words, Latin origin with many Thracian-Dacian or Slavic elements, Thracian-Dacian origin with Latin-Slavic influence, etc.), Dr. Vinereanu has chosen the third one. He considers that the similarities with Latin resulted mainly from the common Thracian-Italic-Celtic word stock. Many of the elements characterized by the author as “so-called Latin” are not of Latin origin, in his opinion, but they represent a common word stock. He considers that the Thracian-Dacian elements exceed 70% of the traditional lexis. The
native elements, if we also consider derivations, would represent 84-85% of 25000 words.

They remind N. Densușeanu’s hypothesis of about one century ago on the Thracian-Dacian origin of the Romanian people and language. The author considers that a “refreshing of the theory with new data and arguments about the origin of the Romanian people and language” is necessary. In 41 pages, he presents his opinions and studies. The space and specificity of this paper do not allow us to summarize them, but we appreciate that this argument represents a clear viewpoint.

Of course, his paper will not remain unconsidered, but it will trigger the appearance of some constructive opinions. We do not refer to the apologetic assessments of protochronic type, but to scientific papers based on critical studies, unbiased to preconceived ideas.

One of the unknown aspects of an etymological dictionary is the immediate (direct) origin, namely the paternity of a word, followed by the study of farther kinships. The similarity or kinship with other farther or more hypothetic languages always trigger discussion related to accuracy and correctness. For instance, sometimes, the children in a family may resemble more their grandparents than their parents. There are cases where the family heredity is recombined in an unknown way. In the same way, the direct origin of a term from one language or another does not always appear obvious, discussion continue and there is a significant degree of uncertainty.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The basis of this study is represented by the Etymological Dictionary of the Romanian Language by Ciorănescu Al. (SAECULUM I.O. Printing House, Bucharest, 2002, 1055 pages), respectively, the Etymological Dictionary of the Romanian Language, based on the Indo-European research carried out by Dr. Mihai Vinereanu (Alcor Edimpex Printing House, Bucharest, 2008, 936 pages).

We have identified the terms in the agricultural, horticultural, agro-food fields or tightly related terms. We did not take into consideration the regionalisms with a limited circulation or the notions of minor interest. We found that in dictionaries there are only a few of the consecrated agricultural and horticultural terms.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

According to Ciorănescu Al. (2002), the 331 words are of the following origins:

Latin origin: afin (from Greek), afumat, alună, anin, a ara, arbore, arțar?, balsam, burete, bute (through Greek), butuc?, carpen, castan, cătină, ceapă, cerosul, cicoare, cânepă, ciorchine, cireasă, ghindă, ghimpe (autohton) grăunț, grâu, gutui, iarbă, iască, iederă, ienuper, jneapăn, lăptucă, legumă, lemn, leuştean, măghiran (through Italian, Greek or
Slavic languages, măr (through Greek), mei, mestecăcn (from Greek), moare, mugur (Indo-European-Dacian? languages), must, nap, neghini?, nuc, orz, păduel, pădure, paltin, păr, păstaie (Latin?), pătlugină, pepene, piersic, pin, poamă, pom, prun, rădăcină, ridicică, salcie, salvie, sămanță, saramură, scoarță, secă, a semănă, sămbure (Thracian?), soc, spânz (Thracian), spic, spin, spumă, sulfină, tei, a treiera, trifo, tufă, ulm, urzică, usturoi, verbină, vie, vin, viță, zadă

**Magyar origin:** agriș (from German), alto, arpacas (from Turkish), boroană (from Russian), butaș, calarabo (from German), cormană (from Slavic), ghimbir, hașma, muștar, paprica, perje

**Slavic origin:** agud, bălărie, bob, boștină, boz?, brazdă, breabăn, brusture (from Latin?), bujor, buruiană, călin (from Latin), cărcel (from Latin), cetină, chisellită, ciuperca, coajă, coasă, cosor, crâng, drojdie, gard, gordin (Dacian), gorun, grapă (Bulgarian), hamei, hrean, hrib, hrișcă (Ruthenian-Polish), loboda, lozniță, lubeniță, mac, mâces?, mălin, măslin, mență, ogor, oțet, ovâz, păiște, palincă, păstarnac (from Latin), pelin, piper, pir, pârgă, a plivi, ploșcă, plug, potbal, podgorie, posete, povarnă, , a prăși, praz, a pritoci, răchită, rapiță, rod, rogoz, roșcovă, romanită?, sad, scoruș, slad – sladnină, smeură (Slavic?), stievie, stânjenel, stejar (Dacian), șir, susai, tărățe, tătâneasă, tigvă, trestie, troscot, ulei, velniță, vâzdoagă, zârnă (Dacian?)

**Greek origin:** aguridă, anghinare, arac, boboc (through Albanian), borhot (through Magyar), calomfir, chimen, chiparos, clondır, conopidă, crin, dafin, fasole, garoafă, iasomie (from Turkish), isop, lămâie, livadă (through Slavic), mărar?, mătrăgănă, migdal, orez (through Slavic), pălămîdă, păpădă, pătrunjel, platan, rodie, sfâclă, smirnă, sparanghel, stafidă, tămâie (from Latin), țelină, tîrigie, trandafir, trufă (from Latin), zărâră (from Turkish)

**Turkish origin:** anason (from Greek), arpagic, asmațchi, bomă (through Bulgarian), basamac (through Serbian), boia (from Greek), bostan, cais (from Greek), ceai (through Russian from Chinese), ciuin, curmală, dud (from Persian), dovleac, fistic, enibahar, harbus, iorgovan, lilic, maia, magiun, mați, marulă (from Greek), micușnea (from Persian), naramă (from Persian), năut (from Persian), nufăr (from Persian), pălăgea (from Persian), peltea, pergamută (through Greek), pistil, rachi (from Arabic), salcăm, salep, șerbet, susan, tabac, tarhon, trufanda, tutun, vișină (through Slavic), zambilă, zarnacadea, zarpzavat (from Persian)

**Russian origin:** balercă (from Polish), bors, holercă – horilcă

**French origin:** banană, bergamotă (from Italian), boschet (from Italian), buchet (from Greek), bulion, butelie, cidru, lichior (from Italian), limonadă (from Italian), mastic (from Greek), paciuli, șampanie, tomată, tuia
Unknown or uncertain origin: 
*brad* (from substratum), *brândeșă* (native origin), *cimbru* (pre-Latin = pre-Roman), *leurdă* (Greek-Latin?), *strugure* (Latin?), *țuică*

**Serbian origin:** busuioc (from Magyar), colilie, șliboviaț, trupiță

**German origin:** butnar, cartof, cramă, gherghină, ghințură, leandru (from Italian), șaț, mușcată (through Magyar), șpriț, țintaură

**Bulgarian origin:** castravete, creangă (native origin?), gâmza, grădina (Serbian?), gule (from Greek), măcriș, morcov, obsigă, prăștină, rariță, răzor (Serbian), schinduf, tulpină (Serbian)

**Albanese origin:** copac (native origin?)

**Native origin:** curpen, mazăre (Thradian - Balkan)

**Italian origin:** damigeană, pasta (from Greek), rozmarin (through Magyar)

**Polish origin:** povidlă, rostopască

**Persian origin:** șofran (from Arabic), spanac (through Greek)

(Parallel to the proposed origin – Latin or Slavic, they also discussed a possible native origin:)* brad, brândeșă, buruiană, cimbru, copac, creangă, curpen, ghimpe, gordin, leurdă, mazăre, mugur, sâmbure, spânz, stejar, strugure

According to Vinereanu M. (2008), the 5000 words were classified as follows:

**Pre-Latin origin:** afin, aguridă, alună, arin, bălărie, borhot, breabăn?, brusture, bute, butuc, căpșună, cătină, cetoaia, cicoare, cimbru, ciorchine, ciupercă, cocean, comină, cramă (German), cucuruz, cuciță, doagă, dolevac, gogonea, gordin, grăunte, iască, leurdă, mac, mâceș, mâlin, mărăc (Balkan), mănătârcă, mesteacăn (Indo-European), mur, ovăz, papură, pajiște (Slavic), păducel, pipirig, pir, saramură, a sădi, scai, scoruş, stejar, susai, șir, tărate, troscoț, tuță, tulpină, vin, viță

**Pre-Latin origin under discussion:** brăhișă, breabăn, borhot, burete, colilie, fag, ghindă, greblă, măr

**Pre-Romanian origin:** agriș, agudă/dudă, alac

**Turkish and Persian origin:** anason, arpașic, boa, borceag, bostan, caisă, ceai (Chinese), curmală, dud, fistic, harbus, lalea, liliac, magiun, maia, micșunea, naramță, năut, nufăr, pătlăgea, pelta, rachi, salcăm, spanac (through Greek), susan, șerbet (Arabic), tarhon, tutun, vișină, zambilă, zarzavat

**Green and neo-Greek origin:** anghinare, busuioc (Balkan), chimen, conopidă, crin, dafin (Latin), fasole, garoafă, gule (Bulgarian), gutūie? (Latin), hrean (Balkan, Slavic), iasomie (Persian), izmă, lămăie (Persian), leandru, livadă (Slavic), mătrăgăună, mixandă, oree, piper, portocal, praz, specă, sparanghel, stafole, tâmaie, trandăfiri, țelina (proto-Thracian), zarzără

**Latin origin:** a ara (pre-Latin?), arbore, balsam (from Greek), carpen (Indo-European), castan (from Greek and an Asian language), cânepă,
ceapă, cedru, coriander (from Greek), corn (Indo-European),
curechi, feriga (Indo-European),
floare (Indo-European), fragă (Indo-European),
frasin (Indo-European), frunză (Thracian - Dacian?),
grâu (Indo-European),
tarbă (Indo-European),
iederă (Indo-European),
jneapă, lăptucă (Romanian), legumă (Indo-European),
lemn, leuștean, linte, moare, murături, must (Indo-European),
nap (Indo-European),
nuc (Indo - European),
ors (Indo-European),
păr, pătlagină (Indo-European),
pătrunjel, pepene, pierisc, plantă, poamă, pom, prun (Greek,
Thrácian – Dacian),
ram, rădăcină, salcie, sâmnăță, sânzăiană, secere (Indo-European),
scoartă, soc?, sorb, spic (Indo-European),
spin? (Getic – Dacian?),
spumă (Getic – Dacian),
tei (Indo-European),
a treiera, trifoi,
trunci, tufă (Indo-European),
ulei, ulm, usturoi, urzică, varză, vie, zădă

Thrácian-Getic-Dacian origin:
artăr, bragă (Celtic), cărcel, cireșă (Latin),
coasă, cosor (through Slavic),
coacăză, gard, gorun, grădină, nalbă,
eghină, mei, mied, pădure, păstaie,
plug, a semnă, spânz, strugure,
ștevie, vâzdoagă (Indo-European),
zârnă, zmeură

Thrácian-Illyrian origin:
boabo, boz?, brad, bujor, copac,
curpen, grapă, mazăre, mugur, ogor,
paltin (Latin), a prăşi, rapiță, râchită,
salcie, sămbure

Uncertain origin:
barabule,
costreti, hrișcă (Slavic),
hrib (Slavic),
jorgovan (Turkish),
lăstar, măghirian (Greek-Latin),
mranță, negără,
pășărnac (Slavic),
pin (Latin, Indo-
European),
rostopască (Getic - Dacian),
secără (Latin),
siminoc,
sulfină, tigvă (Slavic, Greek),
tisă, țuică (Dacian?)

Slavic origin: bob, boroană
(Ukrainian),
bors (Indo-European),
brasă (Indo-European),
buruiană (Romanian?),
câlin, chisăliță (Romanian?),
coajă (Romanian?),
drojdie, hamei, lujer?, măslină,
mlădiță, morcov (Indo-European),
omag, oțet, pârgă, pelin, pivniță, a
plivi, ploască (Indo-European),
pojgorie, a pritoci, răzor, ridiche
(Italian),
rogoz (Indo-European),
romaniță, smochină (old German),
roșcovă, teasc, trestie (Indo-
European),
trupiță

Bulgarian origin: castravete
(Albanese – Indo-European),
ciuşcă, măcriș? (Romanian)

French origin: boschet, buchet,
bulteie, cublu (Latin - Greek),
lîchior (from Latin),
mustar (through Magyar),
parc, a presa, tomată
(Spanish - Nahuatl)

Italian origin: damigeană, pastă
(from Latin),
ridiche, rosmarin (from Magyar),
salată

Magyar origin: arpaçaș, butaș,
cormán (Indo-European),

German origin: butnar
(Romanian),
cartof, leandru (from Italian),
malț

Serbian-Croatian origin:
lubeniță (Latin?)

Spanish origin: banană (or
Portuguese, from an African
language),
tabac (through French or
German)
ORIGINS OF SOME AGRICULTURAL, HORTICULTURAL AND AGRO-FOOD TERMS

After counting and percentage calculation of the term groups depending on their origin, we found the comparative situation (Table 1).

**Table 1 - Comparative situation for the classification of agricultural, horticultural, agro-food terms, depending on the language of origin**
(according to Ciorănescu Al., 2002 and Vinereanu M, 2008)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain or unknown pre-Latin substratum</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Latin substratum</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thracian – Getic substratum</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thracian – Illyrian substratum</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin + Latin under discussion</td>
<td>95+4</td>
<td>29.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slavic + Slavic under discussion</td>
<td>77+3</td>
<td>24.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Romanian/ autochthonous language</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkish</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magyar</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgarian</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>42.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serbian</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other languages</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>331</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At a first glimpse, we noticed the net classification difference of the selected terms. Ciorănescu Al., 2002, attributes 42.3% of these words as being from Turkish, Greek, French, Magyar, Bulgarian, German, Serbian, Italian languages, etc. The Latin origin words represent about 30% and those of Slavic origin represent about 24%. The words coming from substratum represent about 2% of the total.

According to Vinereanu M, 2008, this proportion has changed a lot. The words coming from the above-mentioned languages represent 30.1%, the Latin word stock represents 21.5%, the Slavic word stock represents 11.4% and the words coming from substratum represent the significant proportion of 36%.
CONCLUSIONS

Attributing the origin of agricultural, horticultural and agro-food terms from the Romanian language is a controversial domain.

The latest two etymological dictionaries that analyse thousands of Romanian words, in terms of their origin comprise an approximately equal number of more than 300 terms from the above-mentioned field.

The etymological dictionary, elaborated by Ciorănescu Al., 2002, gives these terms a Latin, Slavic origin or other European languages, which belong to some peoples with whom the Romanians had historical relationships. This dictionary does not estimate the amount of words coming from substratum to more than 2%.

The etymological dictionary, elaborated by Vinereanu M., 2008, assesses that most of the above-mentioned words belong to the pre-Latin, Thracian-Getic and Thracian-Illlyrian substratum. The Latin or Slavic origin terms are found at a less proportion, as well as the mentioned terms from the diverse European languages.
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