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Abstract: With Xenopol, his preoccupations with the Romanian literary language are obvious from the very beginnings of his journalistic work, i.e. the “first on the path of science,” as he called his study The National Culture. A. D. Xenopol considered, in his entire work, language the fundamental element of national culture and an integral part of any work, in the form and content relationship. Appreciating language from these two points of view enabled him to voice his thoughts authoritatively, from the higher position he occupied, with respect to the most important moments of the development of the modern Romanian literary language.
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1. A. D. Xenopol - historical work and his era

Alexandru Dimitrie Xenopol was born on 23 March 1847, in Iaşi, as the son of Dimitrie Xenopol married to Maria Vasiliu. He was formed in a sober, diligent family and with a definite scholarly vocation.

A. D. Xenopol student in Berlin (Family’s collection).

After experiencing great success with the first high school in Iaşi, was sent for higher education in Berlin in the period 1867-1871, where he studied law and philosophy in which he will take his doctorate, but will also hear lectures, and read papers, on history, political economy, sociology and psychology, literature, music, etc.

Between 1871 and 1878, back to the country, he practiced law as a prosecutor and lawyer and then he devoted himself to school, teaching pre- and University courses in Iaşi, whose vice-chancellor he was from 1898 to 1901.

In the context of encyclopaedism specific to his era, A. D. Xenopol dedicated himself to science, writing, over his life, no less than 1774 works, studies, articles and lectures¹ on history, economy history theory, sociology, psychology, pedagogy, aesthetics, literature and literary criticism, which shows his versatility.

Despite his versatility, we can not help noticing the dominant, fundamental field where all the efforts as a scholar focus. On 1 April 1868, in his Xenopol’s he says, the study of the history is: “the natural tendency of my spirit,” “my favourite application.”²

As the author of the first synthesis of the Romanians’ history, Istoria Românilor din Dacia Traiană, he is recognized as a historian both at home and abroad. In his country, he is awarded by the Romanian Academy, being elected a member of this scientific forum, and abroad, the French writer Mailland says that Xenopol “showed us, in his work, the place that Romanians can and should to fill in the concert of civilized nations.”³

In the second half of the nineteenth century and early twentieth century, Xenopol was one of the great personalities, appreciated by some, but disputed by others, especially by those in the country. By the late nineteenth century, it

was rather difficult for the Western scholar to have a general view about what was, for some time, *Romania*.

A scientist first and foremost, for him, the issue of Romanian civilization is organized in a true system of ideas, which he presents in several studies published in "Convorbiri literare," since 1868.

In our approach to set some of the most important features of A. D. Xenopol's work, we rely on his own words, an important autobiography, contained in an unpublished manuscript, entitled *Istoria ideilor mele*.

From Xenopol's autobiography, two guidelines of his mind come out clearly: the *national idea* and the *theory of history*.

The main, explanatory thread of A. D. Xenopol's entire work is formed on the basis of these two elements. National culture, "first outburst of demon of writing," inspired, even later on, all the steps of life, and the *Teoria istoriei*, that crowned his prodigious work, was his main concern from the very beginning, albeit in an unsystematic and fragmentary form.

For nearly five decades, fighting on multiple paths and with numerous means for completing their political unity, following the history of the Romanians in Dacia Traiana, A. D. Xenopol was constantly concerned by Transylvania, and his pen was mobilized relentlessly in support of causes related to the its existence and future.

The history of Transylvania, with its problems, would concern him directly since 1875, when published in "Convorbiri literare" a comprehensive review against the book of R. Rösler, *Românische Studien (Untersuchungen zur älteren Geschiehte Româniuens)*, published in Leipzig in 1871, which, for political reasons, resumed Sulzer's former claims, denying the local Romanian people their autochthonous character in Dacia.

In 1883, Xenopol won professorship with the Romanian history department at the University of Iași, where he began his course in history where he would point out relentlessly the unity of origin, language, and culture and aspirations of all Romanians in Dacia Traiana.

In 1888, the course evolves into the vast synthesis, which, until 1893, after 16 years of preparation and previous studies and 10 years of writing, the author worked "8-10 hours a day," Xenopol is pleased to see the turn of the edition of the six volumes of his "bold enterprise", i.e., the monumental *Istoria Românilor din Dacia Traiană*, which marked a milestone in the history of Romanian historiography. It crowned the efforts of two centuries of history, through an outstanding effort of synthesis and in the same time a grand vision of modern history, which won the Romanian history and historiography its right to exist among the great achievements registered by the national historiography in Europe.

For the first time, the Romanians' past was reconstituted using a new method that breaks with the tradition of simple analysis of isolated documents and their subjective, romantic, interpretation, giving, in addition to serious documenting, the precise insight spirit of the long gone epoch, an internal unit of actual facts and their logical systematization.

Since Dimitrie Cantemir, the Romanians have not seen such an impressive scientific contribution, a work that made such a long career. The creation of modern Romania through the Union in 1859, gaining the independence, brought the long-awaited historical synthesis, which comes as a necessary prelude to the achievement of the ideal of Romanian unity.

In his work, Xenopol aimed to give a special place to the "cultural" development and "settlements" lest the whole history should be flooded with political facts; with Romanian historiography, throughout the historical development Romanian people, he was among the first to study the evolution of the nobility, production and soil richness, state of peasantry, legal and social institutions, guilds, rule, financial status, habits and skills, as well as secular and religious literature, always seeking to establish the connection with what was happening in

---

society. The problem of peasantry finds with Xenopol a broad and comprehensive exposure and interpretation.

A. D. Xenopol during the first years after his return from his studies (Family’s collection).

At the beginning of the first volume of *Istoria românilor*, Xenopol presents a map that marks the smaller triangle of mountains (Carpathians) and a larger triangle of rivers (Danube, Dniester, Tisza) and then developing a whole theory on how these elements, disposed in that manner, have largely influenced the history of the Romanian nation, with a role in both separating Romanians into several “countries” and in protecting the population in historical times of “tribulation” or providing “bridges” of communication, ensuring continuity in language and spiritual life. The influence of the geographical space, where various “nationalities” settled over time, is evident to Xenopol.

Another theme is the inclination towards the historical study of communities, life of cities and villages, the latter often immersed in silence, so that while the apex of the social pyramid lived the day intensely, living life in the fast lane, in many cities and especially in the villages, the inhabitants lived according to other measures, those of long time. With Xenopol, the interest in the throb of the settlements is manifest in *Istoria românilor* in the chapters on Locuintele românilor in munti, Organizarea municipiilor și coloniilor, Așezările țării și dacilor, etc.5

Xenopol did not stay away from debate on history science in Romanian and European science at the turn of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, a time when the field was occupied by philosophers, psychologists, essayists, sociologists. Having seen historians’

the lack of interest in this field, “he himself descends into the arena,”6 as Alexandru Zub writes, and his contribution is constructed around the concept of historic series. By allocating the history of sciences “of succession,” as distinct from those “of repetition,” according to the fact that them (the succession ones) laws do not act, Xenopol develops a theory to accredit the scientific status of the discipline in spite of this handicap, “a science sui generis, of course, because it is based on unique facts, that can be arranged in evolving series rather than laws as in sciences based on facts of repetition.”7

His encyclopaedic formation is also linked to the spirit of the age: “Xenopol was our speaking encyclopaedia, said one of his students; whenever a question of history, geography, political economy, law or arts, which require a competent explanation, arose Professor Xenopol was willing to provide most sympathetically.”8

This opening of the historian towards the related sciences is, in Alexandru Zub’s opinion, not an aspiration to encyclopaedism but interdisciplinarity9, in other words, in his work, we find experienced his methodological principle, a history which, located at the convergence point of lines of interdisciplinary cooperation, has lain among the privileged directions of the new historiography.

2. His attitude towards the literary Romanian language

Xenopol’s interest in the literary Romanian language is present from the beginning of his journalistic activities, i.e., from the “first attempt in the way of science,” as he calls the study *Cultura națională*. A. D. Xenopol considers language, in his work, as a basic element of national culture and as a constituent of any work, in relation between form and content. By considering language from both points of view, led him to give his opinion authoritatively, from the top position where he was, on the most important moments in the evolution of modern literary Romanian.

As such, the great historian believes the language as “one of the objects, even the chief


6 Alexandru Zub, *Studiu introductiv la A. D. Xenopol, Teoria istoriei*, p. XVII.
7 Ibid. p. XVI-XVII.
one"\(^{10}\) of the national culture, reaching conclusions to which we return later. Defining the word as manifestation of the concept, the chapter is interesting and suggests the connection between thought and speech.

Some results in explaining the language, the sporadic concern as a philosopher and the use of the language in demonstration as a historian, can be explained in relation to the general level of science at the time and some aspects, even if they are challenged, must be mentioned in order to try and reveal the components that can complete the profile of A. D. Xenopol as a researcher of the language and as an observer.

He maintains the onomatopoecic theory about the origin of language, a position which can be explained by the direct or indirect influence of Herder. He aimed to demonstrate the thesis, which can not be supported, of the necessary connection between word and concept. His exposure does not lack ingenuity. For the naming of “soundless” realities, the sound is caused by a representation that involves the other senses\(^{11}\), similar to the creation of onomatopoecic words, while for the naming of abstract notions, the cause of “hearing vibration” is within, being “the play itself of representations in the depth of human soul.”\(^{12}\) We must emphasize, without going into details, that exclusivity is not acceptable in support of the onomatopoecic origin of speech, overlooking the social character of its appearance. From this very moment, we can see that Xenopol connected closely the evolution of the language with that of the people speaking it. By stressing the significance of language in human society, the idea will be deepened later on and multiplicity of aspects of this relationship will be expressed subtly. Language as a product of the collective mind\(^{13}\) “evolves with time in a way just as discreet as the ideas it incorporates; [...] it characterises everywhere the thinking form of human groups; it melts in its subtle body all the influences to which the people was exposed; it is the most faithful inventory of all the knowledge gained [...]" it shows better than any other intellectual expression, the character and stage of civilization of a nation. In one word, language is people themselves."\(^{14}\)

It was natural that language would be used to elucidate the problem of formation and development of the Romanian people in an age which no other sources\(^{15}\), because it was designed in a very close relationship with the population speaking it. In this respect, we must emphasize from the very beginning that the principle is well founded and general conclusions are fair in their essential element. The fact that the work where his last view on these matters is recorded, the treatise *Istorie a României*, works the same way and it is conclusive as regards the first aspect. As regards the argument and, in part, the conclusions on differences represent the contribution findings in the field of archaeological research, history, and linguistics over more than seven decades. Of course, if the etymology of most of the toponyms discussed by Xenopol is wrong, the attempt of finding the names of towns held by the Romans does not resist, the explanation of the disappearance of these toponyms is right (according to Xenopol, the vast majority of them) during migration, as entitled as the appeal to the lesser toponym on our territory is. The same is the situation in regard to the arguments derived from the language analysis itself.

Most of the linguistic reasons put forward by Xenopol have been confirmed by later research, such as, for example, for inaccuracies contained in the part on the relations between the Romanian and Hungarian languages (where the weakest point is, again, the etymologies!) and on the exaggeration of the differences between Daco-Romanian and Macedo-Romanian and the misunderstanding of their significance. Also, subsequent research has verified the meaning of common elements to Albanian Romanian, the South Slavic character (Bulgarian) of the old Slavic elements in Romanian and the presence of Bulgarian-type Slavic dialects north of the Danube, as well as the importance of the want of German elements Romanian, whose insertion would also have been possible in the south of the Danube, etc.\(^{16}\)

So far, we could see that A.D. Xenopol’s views on the role of language in human society

\(^{10}\) Cultura națională, in “Convorbiri literare”, II, 1868, chapter IV, p. 211.

\(^{11}\) Lacking an adequate terminology sometimes conveys a naïve tone to the exposition: “... the soul, at the time when the nation was created, seems to hear a sound inside; it seems to receive, at the same time with the impression of the sight etc., one by means of hearing as well; the latter cannot be by analogy but of those the soul used to be accustomed to receive, the impact of the onomatopoecic name. This imaginary sound determines by its action to the organ of voice the word where the notion is fixed.” Ibid. p. 213.

\(^{12}\) Ibid. p. 213.

\(^{13}\) Unitatea sufetului românesc, in “Arhiva” XXI, 1911, No. 5, p. 3.


\(^{15}\) Teoria lui Rösler, Iași, 1884.

\(^{16}\) In a fragment, translated in Romanian and published in *Ilustrația națională*, February 1913, p. 2 in his study *Politique des races*, published in “Cronache della civiltà elleno-latina”, II, 1903, fasc. IX-XVI.
were not merely the result of momentary inclination; this issue was discussed, later on, theoretically, illustrated in research on the history of the Romanian people.\textsuperscript{17} Hence, it is easy to explain the importance the historian gives to the problems in the development of Romanian in the chapters on culture in \emph{Istoria românilor} or in \emph{Cuza-Vodă}. As a result of these concerns, we owe Xenopol important contributions to the introduction of the Romanian language in the church during the reign of Matei Basarab and Vasile Lupu, made in relation to the natural evolution of the Romanian people and then having consequences on it, for his judicious assessment of the cultural events related to the use of Romanian at the time: [Golescu] "he set himself to work and found the right words for his ideas, as the description of the journey is written in a beautiful and healthy Romanian language."\textsuperscript{18}

His openness towards language issues and their approach along the evolution of turn of the Romanian people enables Xenopol to get a good knowledge of the modern Romanian language and the formulation of an ideal for its use. On many occasions, Xenopol stresses the unity of language on the Romanian territories, proven by insignificant difficulties in understanding among people of different historical provinces; particularly valuable is the finding relative to the many occasions, Xenopol stresses the unity of the essential identity of the cultivated language (literary, as we would say today) with the popular dialects from which it derives.\textsuperscript{19} On these issues, Xenopol compares Romanian with German, Italian or French, that have considerable dialectal differences, so that in their schools literary language is taught.\textsuperscript{20}

A. D. Xenopol saw the national language as a powerful means of culture, by enabling the movement of spiritual goods\textsuperscript{21} towards the lower layers of society. We understand that by cultivating the language, he thought of maintaining this unity as far as possible, as a patriotic and moral duty of the scientist.

From the study \emph{Cultura națională}, the idea of language culture emerges, even with this formulation\textsuperscript{22} towards the end of the chapter devoted to language. After making some general remarks, we note that the target of his critique appears immediately, namely, the Latinist trend. The return to Latin is considered to be an absurdity and is condemned: "It means not knowing the power of history, denying the legitimacy of the course of Romanian events, to run after sources that have been dry for centuries in order to get from there cold forms of words and replace with them living forms full of power in the soul of a people. We must not forget that language belongs to a people to express its inner side through it that has value for such people only because they understand it."\textsuperscript{23}

In his work \emph{Studii asupra stării noastre actuale}, the Latinists' action is regarded from the same position of "corruption of language."\textsuperscript{24} Xenopol persists in this attitude until later, when extremist Latinism dies. Wee can also find a strong criticism in his speech on his accession into the Academy in 1895, where the artificial language developed by Latinists is regarded as "a hideous and disgusting ugliness, born from in brains of individuals and not of great spirit, everlasting in time and space, of the development of the people."\textsuperscript{25}

Even in 1868, rising to higher levels of language understanding, Xenopol wrote that this "has a historical development, that is free, therefore nothing is more contrary to its development than arbitrary regulations."\textsuperscript{26} The elimination of words of non-Latin origin is also criticised from the position of the same principle, the more so as they have gained new meanings and have been adopted through usage. For Romanian, their existence is no danger. The defence of the language "by open discussion" should take into account the influences that affect the "nature of language," i.e., its structure. In connection with this idea, Xenopol quotes Maiorescu’s intervention on the Romanian language in the newspapers in Transylvania\textsuperscript{27}, which amounts to the latter’s recognition as one of the inspirational guides in this field. We shall mention, in this respect, without intent to review the whole anti-Latinist movement of the time, too well-known to

\textsuperscript{17} From this point of view, the topic of the inaugural dissertation at the University in Iaşi, in 1893, is significant: \emph{Rolul limbii române în dezvoltarea poporului nostru}, in "Evenimentul", 28 September 1893, No 1984, p. 2.
\textsuperscript{18} \emph{Istoria românilor din Dacia Traiană}, vol. XI, p. 215.
\textsuperscript{19} See \emph{Unitatea sufletului românesc}, \emph{in loc. cit}., p. 3-5, and \emph{L'Intelllectualité roumaine}, excerpts from "Revue Internationale de l'enseignement," \emph{in loc. cit.}, p. 5.
\textsuperscript{20} \emph{Unitatea sufletului românesc}, \emph{in loc. cit.}, p. 5.
\textsuperscript{21} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{22} \textsuperscript{22} Heliade had already used the term \textit{(a cultivi)}, but, in 1868, Xenopol may have not read it at the time. In Xenopol, the term may have been translated from German, i.e. Sprachpflege.
\textsuperscript{23} \emph{Cultura națională}, \emph{in loc. cit}., p. 215.
\textsuperscript{24} Ibid. IV, 1870, No 8, p. 129.
\textsuperscript{25} "Arhiva", VI, 1895, No. 7-8, p. 380.
\textsuperscript{26} \emph{Convorbiri literare}, II, 1868, no 13, p. 214.
\textsuperscript{27} When the chapter referring to language was published in \emph{Cultura națională}, Maiorescu had already published in \emph{Convorbiri literare}, in the same year, the first three parts of his study \emph{Limba română în jurnalele din Austria}; see Xenopol’s note on p. 215, in \emph{loc. cit}. 
understand Xenopol’s formation, the general atmosphere maintained by the magazine “Convorbiri literare”, where Alexandru Lambrior presents his scientific views, too. With the latter, Xenopol converges on fighting against Latinism and on behalf of maintaining a language in which culture can be accessible to all people. Among his forerunners, Eliade, with his position in the first period of his activity, and Kogălniceanu, during this critical phase of development of the Romanian literary language, influenced Xenopol’s attitude, towards which, he was in a scientific, democratic position.

When discussing the changes in the spelling system adopted in 1881, during the Academy meetings between 1895 and 1904, he would again be placed face to face with the Latinist principles under the guise of spelling now complying with etymology “the borders of the Romanian language,” which Xenopol fights justly. His attitude is explained by its membership of the Junimea School, which, after having made a first breach in the etymological spelling system developed by Latinists, by imposing a compromise between etymologism and phoneticism, continues discussion on improving spelling in the direction of phoneticism. Between 1871 and 1873, Xenopol was writing the minutes as Secretary of the Junimea Society. In the course of these meetings, between December 1871 and February 1872, the rejection of “united u” and “diphthongation of consonants,” was decided, as well as the adoption of x and z (instead of d’), spelling with ~e~ the imperfect of verbs of the 4th conjugation (e.g., auzeam), etc. Xenopol, on the other hand, shared his Titkin’s ideas on pure phonetic spelling, so that in the discussion at the Academy about writing the group ~st~, he was of the opinion that it is not good to mix two different principles, because it creates confusion. “Either phoneticism or pure etymologism” said Xenopol and his option in favour of phoneticism is well-founded: “When even the alphabet is based on phoneticism, why make it difficult to write without any need to do so?”

Xenopol urged for this easement to be made in order to remove existing difficulties, as he thought the Romanian spelling had no tradition that could raise significant objections. He was defeated and so the writing of doubles was kept: Târgovişte but Bucureşti (Hasdeu was one of Xenopol’s opponents). By 1904, Xenopol is one of those who support spelling diphthongs -ea-, -aa- (with I. C. Negruzzi, Maiorascu, etc., and against Hasdeu again, supporting almost the same words, his views expressed in 1895, this time successfully.

His fight against the massive intrusion of neologism in Romanian in the second half of the nineteenth century and early twentieth century is another important goal of his work in the cultivation of language, which was made in connection with the ruling classes’ and some sections of the intelligentsia’s French mania. Simultaneously, he began his campaign against Latinism and from here, it seems, in what concerns Xenopol, resulted some confusion. This confusion made it impossible for Xenopol to escape some exaggeration, despite the wholly moderate attitude towards neologisms at Junimea and all the reasonable principles presented later on.

He uses the neologism without abusing it, and also without reservations in his first letters. If we read only a few phrases of Cultura națională we can easily realize this: “Let us examine, thus, the element of culture in the soul of man, the origin of any progress” (op. cit., p. 159); “From this solidarity so obvious, will result that, after the diverse constitution of time, the corresponding changes will also take place in the soul.” (Ibid., p. 181); “Nature must therefore inevitably assign a particular direction to peoples and sets the ways this trend needs to develop” (Ibid., p. 280). In Cuvântarea festivă rostită la Putna in 1871, the language leaves the same impression.

After a hundred years, the frequency of some neologisms such as: sferă, natură, spirit, realizare, noțiune, idee, element, armonie, speranță, caracter, comun, onorat, politic, in an adequate linguistic context, is no longer surprising and the text we seems almost contemporary. Xenopol later would recall that, following criticisms that were made at Junimea, he decided to change his style and avoid the excess of neologisms. However, his writing was in disagreement with the language of most works of members of Junimea. The lesson of Junimea caught easily, since in this matter...

---

28 Convorbiri literare, VIII, 1874, no 2, p. 81.
29 See O corespondență literară între I. Eliade și C. Negruzzi din 1836, în “Convorbiri literare”, VI, 1872, no 5, p. 177.
31 Arhiva, I, 1889-1890, p. 16, 151.
32 Analele Academiei Române Part II, S. II, t. XVII. The administrative part and debates, București, 1895, p. 188.
Xenopol also find support in Heliade’s position of the first period of activity.

From convert, Xenopol soon becomes a partisan oriented against neologisms, combating manifestations that did not differ much, in terms of results, from those of Latinists.

When it comes to his own language, Xenopol applies the indications of Junimea, all too conscious: “I fell, of course, into the opposite to excess, so that my confusion a unanimous laughter as well as protest with Junimea that taught me the exclusion of neologisms teaches me of a moderate proportion.”

Xenopol confesses dissatisfaction with the results obtained and the difficulties he faced in this direction, indirectly, somewhere else, during criticism of bad influence of school, textbook language, translations of French, incorrect language used by teachers: “there is a contribution to the corruption of the Romanian language from school years, so that everyone wishing to rid oneself of foreign forms and find the right ways to express one’s thoughts must committed oneself to a heavy work whose results are rarely the desired ones.”

The problems concerning him were also the solution he envisioned in order to resolve them when he started to write the first of his most important works, Teoria lui Rösler and Istoria românilor din Dacia Traiană, which would make a large-scale application on scientific terminology and even style. The language of his historical writings would be differ very little from that of today, had he followed the path you outlined in his study rich in suggestions, to which we come back again, Cultura națională. In 1868, he wrote that “we must give up that false sense of patriotism and of Romanianism that wants Romanisation (Românizarea) of scientific terminology.” His reasons are in keeping with the spirit in which this issue has been resolved in Romanian culture; “Scientific concepts, being the same in all nations that have them, should be expressed as words that are the same. Scientific terminology should generally be borrowed from the nation that developed the appropriate knowledge. Especially, we need to avoid the translation of technical words of other languages in words of common life [...] for those words, having several meanings in general, obscure the clear and simple concepts of science.”

A.D. Xenopol, Istoria românilor.

However, we saw that in the meantime he changed his mind about the use of neologism. Therefore, the philosophical terminology of the time, perhaps still incomplete but mostly established on the path of modernisation through borrowing from French and Latin, did not satisfy Xenopol or, perhaps, he assumed that this orientation was only momentary. Xenopol confesses that he wrote Principiile fundamentale ale istoriei for the first time in French because of the lack of Romanian philosophical terminology.

Knowing how he saw this problem from an anti-neologist position, we find in Teoria lui Rösler, the terms (a) dezveli, dezvălire (p. 15, 16), (a) lua în privire (p. 35), stăruină (p. 47, 48, 280), tălciure, nerăsturnabil (p. 60), încheiere (passim), (dovezi) încheietoare (p. 232), găcitoare (p. 248), aflare (p. 256), we must admit that they were chosen to avoid the French words that he used while translating this book: “développer, développement (p. 11), indiquer (p. 22, 204), considérer (p. 27), continuité (p. 36, 218), etc.

We note that, with Xenopol, it is not just the use of Romanian words or phrases (e.g. cumpenire, întâmpinare, bătaie de joc) in a simple translation, but in most cases, he copies from German or French or uses copied words

---

36 Istoria ideilor mele, loc. cit., p. 389.
37 Studii asupra stării noastre actuale, loc. cit., p. 288.
40 Istoria ideilor mele, loc. cit., p. 407.
that were in use at the time in the language and or writings of the forerunners.

The Romanian word (a) dezvăli (dezvăliere)\textsuperscript{42} is often used by Xenopol with the meaning added after the French développe, încheiere, «conclusion», also used by other writers of the time\textsuperscript{43} acquired this meaning from the Latin conclusio, concludere; hence, (a se) încheietoare "conclusive" (evidence), and (a se) slei acquires the figurative sense "to harden" of the French word (se) figer.

Interesting to note, however, is assigning abstract meanings to old Romanian words, especially to ad-hoc some derivatives thereof, as the words of German or copies of German words, seen particularly with writers from Bukovina and Transylvania. Among older close copies taken over by Xenopol, we note (a) indegeta, "a indica" and which, according to the Dicționarul Academiei, was created after the German Fingerzeig, "indicatunе".\textsuperscript{44} The same applies to the noun întipărire, which Xenopol seems to hold dear;\textsuperscript{45} it has the meaning of the German Eindruck, nerăsturnabil, "irrefutable", and was created according to the model and with the meaning of the German umstäblich.

In Xenopol’s work, we can also find obsolete words, here are some examples: aprăiat, "see-through, clear");\textsuperscript{46} (a) fățări, "a se preface");\textsuperscript{47} both used by Petru Maior, and some less common derivatives: putincios, "posibil", începător; incipient", prefișire, "deformare");\textsuperscript{48} (piatră) mormântală, (tombstone), scoposelnic, "tendentios".\textsuperscript{49} Apart from the fact that terms like those above point out the novelty in shape or the use made of in any text, their neighbouring, as well as other lexical (and phonetic) curiosities, regionalisms, words belonging to familiar speech with neologisms, frustrates the reader. This can be illustrated by a few phrases from Domnia lui Cuza-Vodă: "Individualities have undoubtedly a role in history, their personality intervention into human darăveri [affairs]." (I, p. 25); "First, by establishing a committee in order to întraloace the uniforms of both armies..." (I, p. 91) “This very adequate asămăluire [resemblance] only too well characterises by the change in the position of Mr...” (I, p. 140; see also Teoria lui Rösler, p. 243); “For proper laws to exist in the development of speech, the most prominent feature of the notion of law should be thrown away...” (Principiile fundamentale, p. 314).

The application, more or less consistent, of the principle of neologism avoidance makes the language of A.D. Xenopol's writings get a unique turn, which we tried to decipher by following the origin and meaning of specific words selected from his writings.

Xenopol does not remain at the level of avoiding neologism in his own work. It mainly engages in publishing, a sustained struggle to explain the neologistic origin and orientation and censor the language writers and magazines that have granted citizenship to neologism. Xenopol recognizes the positive effects of the entry of French language and culture in Romania and he has pointed them out on various occasions. Moreover, he especially appreciates the beneficial influence that French, as a cultivated Romance language, has had in terms of clarity and elegance of the Romanian literary language of the old country, compared to the language of scholars from Transylvania before the Union, influenced by German.\textsuperscript{51} However, the man of culture, believing that is animated by patriotism, finds out that the upper classes despise the Romanian language and literature subject and cultivate the use of French in everyday life, giving it supremacy in salons, theatre and politics. He is worried by its massive intrusion in the terminology of science, the legal one, to ascertain the fact that the excessive influence prevented the development of our native language and literature: “in the sphere of abstract thought, the Romanian language does not exist: "only a French-Romanian jargon,"\textsuperscript{52} he says. Xenopol is convinced that at this level, the problem of language “hangs largely on the future of our culture,”\textsuperscript{53} since there is a danger of creating a means of intellectual communication inaccessible to lower class.

In fact, however, in his practice to combat this threat, Xenopol somewhat assimilated the French mania of the upper classes with the entry of neologism in Romanian modern literature and especially in some of its styles, where the

\textsuperscript{42} In parallel with (a) dezvoltă, dezvoltare. Cultura națională, in loc. cit., p.14; Cuvântare festivă, p. 11; Teoria lui Rösler, p. 291; and frequently in Principiile fundamentale ale istoriei, passim.

\textsuperscript{43} C. Negruzzi, Ion Ionescu de la Brad, etc.

\textsuperscript{44} Dicționarul Academiei, s.v., considers it an “almost obsolete” neologism.

\textsuperscript{45} See also the same word in Istoria românilor, edition quoted, XI, p. 215.

\textsuperscript{46} Teoria lui Rösler, p. 9.

\textsuperscript{47} Ibid. p. 25; Domnia lui Cuza-Vodă, I, p. 26.

\textsuperscript{48} Domnia lui Cuza-Vodă, I, p. 34, 81; II, p. 255.

\textsuperscript{49} Teoria lui Rösler, p. 29, 48.

\textsuperscript{50} Principiile fundamentale ale istoriei, p. 414.

\textsuperscript{51} L’intellectualité roumaine, p. 4; L’influence intellectuelle, p. 11.

\textsuperscript{52} Limba românească in "Arhiva", XVIII, 1906, No 7-8, p. 292.

\textsuperscript{53} See the letter to G. I. Ionescu-Gion, in Cum vorbim, București, 1911, p. 34-35.
presence of neologism was required by the need to express new realities of an appropriate level. Analysing the language of some writers during the reign of Cuza-Vodă, Xenopol, to whom the form of the literary work must serve its content, is more or less entitled to conclude that the language of some of Boițineanu’s ballads “is more and more loaded with neologisms” (Domnia lui Cuza-Vodă, II, 105); “Zamfirescu writes more about the heart’s pain, but in a language fully rotten by unforgivable neologisms.” It should be noted that, during his campaign against neologisms, Xenopol set this issue apart and allowed for the borrowing of foreign words along with introduction of new objects from other peoples, especially after the sometimes violent protests, which his attitude caused in the press of his time. He could not accept that “most scientific research written in Romanian are compositions with French words written with Romanian endings.”

His intransigence rose up to asking, and he was not the only one with this view, for the removal of neologisms in the Dicționarul Academiei, as this is a handbook of language. The criticism of the language used in the journal “Viața românească” actually refers to both the neologisms in the terminology of literary criticism, as well as those in other areas.
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