

Being this a research which aims only partially at the Romanian lexis, it is absolutely natural that the opinions should have a certain degree of relativity, but they still can be representative, with an adaptation level similar to the relation between the investigated lexis and the general lexis of the language.

No matter the influencing source/sources, we may say that all the borrowed lexical elements are the consequence of the contact that Romanian has had with other languages throughout its evolution.

In establishing the corpus, we chose the main borrowed terms belonging to the most important fields of science and culture, wishing to show the way in which the languages of the European territory have been influencing the Romanian language. The etymological variety, as well as the diversity of the borrowed terms, represent the effect of the social changings, of the evolution of the man's social life, which illustrates by using words and by involving its knowledge, the personal perception of the world it lives in.

For the proposed etymological solutions, we took into consideration the main attestations mentioned in the studied dictionaries, as well as the history of the analyzed lexical items. In certain cases, we made our option for multiple etymology

instead of single etymology, precisely in order to obtain a more adequate determining of the explanation of the origin of the analyzed borrowing.

For some neologisms we either chose single, complementary or additional etymology instead of the multiple one within the multiple etymology. After consulting the most important dictionaries, we came to the conclusion that some neological terms had French single etymology. In some cases, we thought of taking into consideration both French and Germanic multiple etymology (the Germanic source not sharing the same importance in the dictionaries), an idea that we sustain with arguments in each case, in order not to neglect this aspect of the cultural influence that Germanic culture had over Romanian culture, aspect that also finds the scholars' linguistic attitude to be of great significance, especially if we take into account the fact that during the making of the Romanian language, many personalities received their education in German schools, and a lot of the Germanic borrowings had, in the majority of the cases, a Latin etymon.

The fact that we sometimes considered that the solutions offered in a dictionary could be corrected or not, does not necessarily represent a deep background for considering either the dictionary or the dictionaries as lacking of valuable elements;

in fact, it proves that, in terms of scientific knowledge, there is always a need for some argumentative and informative revitalizing elements.

In our study, we also approached the aspect, not necessarily new, but which needed a detailed research, with reference to the place and the role of the multiple etymology in stimulating the enrichment of the vocabulary with internal means, as well as that of the lexical-semantic relations between neologisms.

The creation of new words, through derivation or through compounding, is a valid manner of lexical enrichment for any language. Romanian has often proved to be creative in the process of lexis formation when using internal instruments, and at the same time expressing preference in using certain derivation or compounding methods. We analyzed the neological affixes, the compounding (although diminished, if regarded as a phenomenon of lexical enrichment) and the linguistic calque, all having multiple etymology, as internal instruments used in the enrichment of the Romanian vocabulary.

As for the existing semantic relations between neologisms, we insisted to underline the fact that neologization has significant consequences in all levels of the Romanian language.

Romanian cannot be conceived without the neologisms that are vital to Modern Age, and whose linguistic conduct varies according to the regulations of language. From all the types mentioned above, we are interested in the neologisms with multiple etymology and we will try to outline a monographical view of these, thus, offering an objective and well-structured image of this category of lexical items.

For the purpose of identifying the multiple etymology of the linguistic units from letters D,U and V in the most known Romanian dictionaries, our intention was to bring back to light the topic concerning the evolution process of the Romanian language, above all that of neologization from the Modern Ages which served as a guide in the etymological configuration of the contemporary Romanian, both with the help of the massive Latin-Romance borrowings and with that of illustrations from Neo-Romance languages.

The dynamics of the neologization has affected all levels of the Romanian language, succeeding by means of adoption, adaptation, synonymization, specific lexical creation etc. in reaching the linguistic assimilation and globalization required both by Romanian and foreign speakers in trying to obtain a quality psycho-social and cultural interaction by sending

information in optimal conditions, by the alignment of the Romanian language to the international scientific inventory, created especially on Latin and Greek bases (the latter often taken over also via scientific Latin).

The fact that the number of the neologisms which originally have a Latin etymon is extremely large does not surprise us. It really turned out that in all scientific fields Romanian massively borrowed Latin terms, directly or by means of other languages of culture, their number representing a major percentage, and the lexical items analyzed in our thesis belong to this category.

Therefore, the following question arises: knowing that all these terms have Latin etymons, wouldn't it be more adequate to consider them Latin borrowings? Is it not somehow useless or irrelevant to indicate, in dictionaries, all the sources used by the respective lexemes in their process of entry into Romanian, since they are, after all, Latin words?

The investigations and the analyses that we have been doing over the last years, as well as the information exposed in the present thesis, guided us to the following conclusion: the only possible answer to the above question is undoubtedly a negative one.

If in the case of the direct borrowings from Latin, the formal and semantic similitude of the Romanian neologism is obvious, it is not the same with the indirect borrowings with multiple etymology. Each language that functioned as a link in the borrowing process from Latin to Romanian left its mark on the respective lexemes, remodelling them from a formal point of view, and what is more, enriching their content with new acceptances or contributing to their semantic specialization. Therefore, each of these source-languages has its own contribution in the biplane reconfiguration of these lexical items, creating for them a special identity and separating them from their Latin etymons, and which, by comparison, display a diverging evolution.

Looked at from this point of view, the neologisms with Latin-Romance multiple etymology are sometimes characterized by semantic richness, having at the same time the possibility to express a more varied range of meanings than in Latin or even in the Romance languages.

Identifying the right history of the words, of the "directions" they follow from one language to another, in fact identifying the real etymologies of the respective lexemes is neither an easy nor a very visible step to make. The formal analysis of the words which pays attention to the phonetic

changes specific for a certain language and in a determined period, can give information regarding a borrowing source which, otherwise, could pass unnoticed. To the same degree, the semantics of these lexemes could guide the research to other source-languages, which developed particular meanings for the respective words. All these investigations should take into consideration the cultural and political reality belonging to the borrowing period and to the first attestations of the matters in question; taking into consideration all these factors, the linguist is offered the possibility to identify, more or less accurately, the most probable details that should be analyzed in the attempt of establishing the etymology of a word.