

**DOCTORAL SCHOOL OF HUMANITIES  
OF THE NATIONAL CONSORTIUM ADMINISTARTED BY  
THE STATE UNIVERSITY OF MOLDOVA**

Cu titlu de manuscris  
C.Z.U: 811.135.1'37(478)(043.3)

**BOTNARI LILIANA**

**THE THEORY OF VARIABILITY AND ITS APPLICATION TO  
THE ROMANIAN OF REPUBLIC OF MOLDOVA**

**621. 04. LEXICOLOGY AND LEXICOGRAPHY; TERMINOLOGY AND  
SPECIALIZED LANGUAGES; TRADUCTOLOGY (ROMANIAN)**

Summary of doctoral thesis in philology

**CHIȘINĂU, 2020**

The thesis was elaborated in the Doctoral School of Humanities of the State University „Dimitrie Cantemir”

**PhD supervisor:**

**BAHNARU Vasile**, Dr. habil. in Philology, university professor, IFR

**Composition of the Doctoral Committee:**

**HANGANU Aurelia**, Dr. habil. in Philology, associate professor, USDC, president

**CONSTANTINOVICI Elena**, Dr. habil. in Philology, university professor, IFR, reviewer

**MANOLI Ion**, Dr. habil. in Philology, university professor, ULIM, reviewer

**ZGARDAN Aliona**, Dr. habil. in Philology, associate professor, UPSC, reviewer

**BAHNARU Vasile**, Dr. habil. in Philology, university professor, IFR, member

The public defense will take place **October 22, 2020, 11.00** in the meeting of the Doctoral Committee from the doctoral School of Humanities, the Senate Hall, block A of the student campus, Academy str. 3/2, Chişinău, Republic of Moldova.

The doctoral thesis and the summary can be consulted at the National Library of the Republic of Moldova, the Scientific Library „Andrei Lupan”, SUDC Library and on the ANACEC website: <http://www.cnaa.md> and on the SUDC website: <http://edu.asm.md> .

The summary was submitted on 22.09.2020.

PhD supervisor

BAHNARU Vasile, Dr. habil. in Philology,  
university professor



Author

BOTNARI Liliana



© Botnari, Liliana, 2020

## CONTENTS

KEYWORDS	3
THE PURPOSE AND THE OBJECTIVES OF THE RESEARCH	4
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY	5
SUMMARY OF CHAPTERS	6
INTRODUCTION	6
1. THE THEORETICAL FOUNDATIONS OF THE LANGUAGE VARIABILITY PHENOMENON	7
2. THE VARIATION OF THE ROMANIAN IN THE LIGHT OF THE GRAMMAR BOOKS OF THE EAST OF PRUT	11
3. THE VARIABILITY PHENOMENON IN THE LANGUAGE OF THE PERIODIC PRESS OF THE 1946-1992 YEARS	16
GENERAL CONCLUSION	21
SELECTIVE BIBLIOGRAPHY	24
LIST OF AUTHOR'S PUBLICATIONS	29
ANNOTATION (IN ROMANIAN AND IN ENGLISH)	31

**Keywords:** *variability, variation, variety, variant, invariant, literary language, autonomous language, diachronicity, diatopia, diastration, diaphasia, diamesia, diegenia, Romanian language, „Moldavian language”, lexical variation, index of variation, lexical and semantical analysis.*

## THE PURPOSE AND THE OBJECTIVES OF THE RESEARCH

The research of the phenomenon in question concerns the variability within the limits of the lexical system and the variability within all the subsystems of the language and has a multidisciplinary character, interconnecting the domains: sociolinguistics, phonetics, lexicology, grammar, stylistics, onomasiology, semiotics, etc. In this manner, the present work analyses an actual problem, which needs a more complex study. The relevance of the investigation also consists in the scientific importance of the language varieties study through the synchronic and diachronic dynamics of the language.

The multiaspectual approach to the variability (phonetic, morpho-syntactic and, above all, lexical peculiarities of the Romanian in diachronicity, their confrontation and the establishment of the variation degree), as well as the determination of variation indices (diachronic, diatopic, diastratic, diaphasic, etc.) represent the fundamental benchmarks of our study, their research being essential for understanding the functioning of different types of language varieties.

Thus, **the purpose of the research** consists in: the analysis of the language varieties, their functionality in some Romanian grammars (edited in 1827-1989) and in the Soviet printed press in Bessarabia (1946-1992).

In our research, we focus on the situation of the Romanian language from 1827 to 1989, especially from the Soviet period, on the evolution of the Romanian, on its forced and artificial „transposition” into „Moldavian language”. The factual material includes the Bessarabian grammars and the Transnistrian ones, published in 1827-1989, as well as the daily press from the Soviet period. We analyze the sociocultural conditions in which our language functioned, the causes of replacing the gluttony „Romanian” with the syntagm „Moldavian language”.

Depending on the purpose, our **research objectives** are:

- identifying the key concepts and directions of the theory of language variability;
- specifying the criteria of the theory of language variability application;
- specifying the criteria of determining the autonomy of a language;
- determining the taxonomies of language varieties;
- determining the specificity of the internal variability of Romanian according to the territorial, temporal, sociocultural or stylistic differences;
- description of the temporal aspects of the Romanian language variability in the Bessarabian grammars;
- the complex research on grammatical norms and into the phonetic, lexical and grammatical differences detected in various grammars;

- describing the variability functioning mechanism at all the levels of Romanian by identifying the main contrasts or similarities of the Romanian/„Moldavian” grammars;
- analysing the language variations at all the levels in the texts of the Soviet communist press;
- establishing the equivalence between the norms of the „Moldavian language” and those of Romanian.

Examining the language varieties and the functioning of the variability mechanism in Romanian, we will refer to the particularities and indices of variation relevant for demonstrating the equivalence between the norms of the Romanian language in the Republic of Moldova and those of the Romanian in Romania. Therefore, when we refer to the Republic of Moldova, we consider not only the state that declared its independence on August 27, 1991, after the collapse of the Soviet Union, but the Bessarabian territory between the Prut and the Nistru as well, including the eastern bank of the Nistru. We research the functioning of the Romanian language and its varieties in Bessarabia during the years 1827-1992.

The research was based on the **hypothesis** that the phenomenon of variability is an active process in the Romanian language, which generated the language varieties, formed because of the extralinguistic factors. At the same time, we aim to demonstrate the absurdity of the debates regarding the existence of two East-Romanic languages – Romanian and „Moldavian”, interpreting the Moldavian idiom as a territorial variety of the historical Romanian language.

### **METHODOLOGY OF SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH**

As methodological and theoretical-scientific support, we have used the studies of the well-known linguists, such as: E. Benveniste, B. Havranek, M.-D. Glessgen, W. Labov, W. Chafe, E. Coşeriu, V. M. Solnţev, V. Bahnaru, F. Gadet, T. Bulot, L. Gudrun şi I. Léglise, L. Flydal, F.-T. Olariu, S. Berejan, V. Pavel, I. Coteanu, I. Condrea, D. Irimia, R. Zafiu, A. Ştefănescu, F. Rossi, G. Berruto, E. Pistolesi, Vl. A. Plunghean, L. Colesnic-Codreanca, etc., who researched the phenomenon of language variability and the mechanism of language functioning from the perspective of its variants.

Depending on the purpose and the objectives set, we selected the research methods and tools. First of all we established the theoretical-scientific support, by applying **the method of the bibliographic study**, by consulting the specialized works, which approach to the variability theory, and by establishing the mechanism of language functioning, of its variants functioning, insisting, in particular, on the insufficiently elucidated aspects of the problem.

In order to achieve all the established objectives, the present research had as **methodological support** the following theoretical research methods: **the method of comparative analysis**, by performing a comparative research between the Romanian literary language of the Republic of Moldova and that of Romania, which allowed us to identify the (in)disputable similarities and differences between them and the research of the Romanian evolution from the point of view of the grammar books from the East of Prut; **the descriptive method**, by the descriptive approach to the variability phenomenon and the systematic analysis of the collected information; **the typological classification of the language variants**; **the inductive method** that, in our study, consists of several stages: observation, which focused on the information provided by the studied bibliographic sources; retrospection – not only the study of the documents, but their comparison, the identification of similarities and differences from the perspective of the Romanian evolution over time; **the lexical and semantic analysis** of words, **the stylistic-functional analysis** of the Romanian vocabulary and **the contextual analysis**, through which we examined the language's property of varying and the varieties of the Romanian language.

### **SUMMARY OF THE THESIS CHAPTERS**

The thesis includes the introduction, three chapters, general conclusions and recommendations, the bibliography of 199 titles, 14 annexes, 178 basic text pages, 14 figures, 4 tables. The results of our research have been published in 12 scientific papers.

### **INTRODUCTION**

The **Introduction** describes the actuality and the importance of the researched problem, as well as the degree of concordance between them and the international and national concerns, in inter- and transdisciplinary context. We also present the main purpose and the objectives of the research, the hypothesis on which the work was structured, the research methodology, the theoretical and applicative importance of the thesis, the obtained results and the summary of the thesis chapters.

**The scientific novelty and originality:** resides in the analysis of the phenomenon of variability, of its multiple aspects: diachronic, diastratic, diatopic, diaphasic, diamesic and diegenic variations. A multi-conceptual approach to the investigated phenomenon has been proposed in order to observe the functioning mechanism of the different types of varieties of the Romanian language.

**The results that contribute to the solving of an important scientific problem:** we performed a complex research on the variability phenomenon; we proposed a classification of

the types of language varieties, which allowed us to reveal the functioning mechanism of the variability in the Romanian language diachronically and synchronically, in some Romanian grammars and the printed press in Soviet Bessarabia.

**The theoretical significance** derives from the investigated theoretical problems, which allows us to explain the causes and the criteria of the phenomenon of variability application to the Romanian language from the point of view of two research directions – internal and external, to study the diachronic and synchronic functioning of the Romanian language from the ontological and gnoseological perspectives.

**The applicative value of the thesis:** the results of the research can serve as a support for a diachronic study on the variation of the Romanian language, on the typology of the factors that generate the formation of the language varieties and their particularities. The multidisciplinary character of the explored subject could act as an impetus for further research, for the elaboration of sociolinguistic, lexicological, grammatical studies etc.

**The results of our investigation** were disseminated in reports presented during national and international scientific events (conferences, colloquiums) and were published in specialized journals and thematic collections from the Republic of Moldova and Romania.

## 1. THE THEORETICAL FOUNDATIONS OF THE LANGUAGE VARIABILITY PHENOMENON

In the **first chapter**, we define the concept of language **variability**, as well as the **invariant/variant** duality, the mechanism of their functioning through the prism of the linguists who have previously investigated the researched problem. We have identified the basic concepts necessary for analyzing the theory of variability and its mechanism of functioning: the metasigns of variability, variable, variant/invariant duality, variation, variety.

Based on the research of the linguists: E. Coșeriu (1995), M.-D. Glessgen (Glessgen), V. M. Solnțev (= СОЛНЦЕВ 1982), Ch. Meunier (2005), Em. Vasiliu (1959), Al. Graur (1971), V. Bahnaru (2009; 2013), C. Moroianu (1998) etc., we have defined the **variant/invariant dichotomy** (Botnari 2017a), as well as the notions of **variety**, **variation** and others.

The majority of linguists propose a five-dimensional ensemble: **diachronicity**, **diatopia**, **diastration**, **diaphasia**, and **diamesia**, with their variables: historical, social, geographical, interactional, and the channel variable, each dimension being correlated with a certain (external) factor – time, space, social group, interaction. The current linguistics approaches the theory of variability through the prism of 2 research directions: internal and external, the internal

variability of the language having 4 fundamental types of differences, according to the scientist Eugen Coșeriu (2000, p. 263): 1.) differences in the geographical space, **the diatopic variety** which generates the syntopic units or the territorial variants such as: dialects, subdialects, idioms; 2.) differences between the socio-cultural layers of a linguistic community – **the diastratic variety**, the synstratic units, the so-called social dialects: professionalisms, jargonisms, slangs, vulgarisms, technical and scientific terms, etc.; 3.) differences between different types of expressive modalities, represented by **the diaphasic variety** (also called situational or stylistic variety), which designates the synphasic units – the stylistic-contextual variants; 4) chronological differences, **the diachronic variety**, less mentioned by the illustrious philologist.

The French and Italian linguists propose 2 more variational dimensions: **diamesia** – the differences between the spoken language and that written and **diegenia**. However, from a functional point of view, all these varieties interact harmoniously creating the unity of the language, functioning simultaneously or alternately, depending on the speaker and the context of the speech.

We adhere (Botnari 2018c) to the opinion of the above-mentioned linguists, differentiating the language varieties from the perspective of the 5 variational dimensions: *diachrony*, *diastratia*, *diatopia*, *diaphasia* and *diamesia*, which gives us an overview of the state of the researched problem and of the main theoretical reflections of linguistic variation. At the same time, we argue that the diegenic variety is not a new variational dimension, but rather a subvariety of the diastratic variety.

Next, we have analyzed and have elucidated the problem of the functioning mechanism of these 5 variational dimensions in the language and, especially, in the Romanian. Referring to the diachronic variation of the language, to the temporal varieties, we find that the delimitation of a language in varieties can only be methodical, or, the functioning of a language includes all its aspects, the complete perspective: the realization in time, in space, depending on the modalities of expression, of use and depending on social environment, etc. Therefore, the analysis of a language through the prism of the diachronic variety (archaic vocabulary versus neological vocabulary) represents the opposition between 2 variants of the language: the standard variant and the de facto one, individualized by using outdated lexical structures or, conversely, neological ones.

Referring to the dialectal configuration of the Romanian, to the varieties of a language from the perspective of the **diatopic dimension**, we conclude that the Romanian comprises the



dialects: Daco-Romanian, Megleno-Romanian, Aromanian and Istro-Romanian. The Daco-Romanian dialect has 5 territorial varieties: the Wallachian, the Moldavian, the Banat variety, the Crișana variety and the Maramureș variety, which we have previously analyzed (Botnari 2017b).

Another elucidated aspect concerns **the language distribution according to the sociolinguistic criteria**, the dissimilarities between different social classes, between cultural or professional environments, in other words, differences according to the *diastratic dimension*, which generates the social dialects or the diastratic variation of a language. **The diastratic varieties** are the sociolectal varieties that differentiate a linguistic community according to the social layers or groups, being characterized by a strong function of social inclusion and exclusion. Analysing the language from this point of view, we distinguish the following sociolectal varieties, previously researched (Botnari 2019e): **the slangs** which, most of the times, are borrowed from other prestigious languages, especially from English: *cool, horror, loser*, written also in the form *luzer, party* or the slangs borrowed from Russian, words attested especially in the Bessarabian space: *a gani* „to speak silly, to hyperbolize”, *a se materi* „to speak vulgarly”, as well as by metaphorizing different words: *mardeală* „beating”, *mol* „wine”, *a pili* „to drink”, *a vrăji* „to tell lies”; **the jargon** – the use of a specific vocabulary that include concepts which designate some routine activities, objects or technologies currently used in the practice of the profession, the use of abbreviations or substitutions of different terms, registered by the specialized dictionaries, with others newly formed terms or with loans from other languages. Currently, both on the territory of Romania and in the Republic of Moldova, it is attested the spread of the jargonisms especially of English origin: *hi, bye-bye, O.K., job, speech, software, feeling*, etc., but also the French jargonisms: *bonsoir* „good evening”, *madame* „madame”, *come ți, come șa* „relatively fine”, the Italian: *ciao* „hello”, *arivederci* „goodbye”, *ragazza* „girl”, *tesoro* as addressing formula „darling”; **the technical-professional language** – the sociolect used by some socio-professional categories, an inventory of terms characteristic of a certain quota of speakers, exceeding the actual linguistic competence of a „regular” speaker, implying another type of knowledge, more advanced, scientific and specific to different fields of activity: medicine, industry, typography, cosmetology, sports, politics, etc.

**The diaphasic variation** is a variation generated by the communication situation, by the situational context, based on which the speaker uses various variational possibilities: in his cultured speech, he introduces marks of popular language or some dialectal or regional elements which form a pronounced local stylistic manner of speech, and vice versa – a communication or a text written in an popular/oral stylistic manner includes some borrowed neologisms or lexical

units, intentionally used to produce a certain stylistic purpose. In the opinion of the linguist Lilia Răciulă (Răciulă 2010), a communication, an idea that is designed for a **receiver** generates in his mind another idea or an „**interpreter**” that is constituted within the limits of the human experience of the receiver. In turn, the respective interpreter can be an immediate one – equivalent to the semantic invariant or the denotative meaning, a dynamic one, depending on the context, or a final interpreter, which includes the two types mentioned above, targeting the collateral experience, both of the transmitter, as well as that of the speaker or the meaning offered by the dictionary. The receiver, the person who listens and receives written or oral information, reconstructs the meaning according to his linguistic competence, interpreting it based on his own experiences. Therefore, both the speaker and the receiver determine the interpretation of the meaning, the stylistic option. The stylistic diversity of a language is manifested through the **registers of the language: literary, standard, familiar, popular, vulgar**, which are differentiated according to the formality criterion that characterizes a certain communication situation.

In the subchapter *Other types of language varieties: diamesic and diegenic*, we have presented some arguments in order to establish whether or not diamesic variation and diegenic variation are new variational dimensions (Botnari 2019f). We have concluded that the first mentioned is viable and we have demonstrated that, in fact, it constitutes the basis of all the other types of varieties. **The diamesic variation** refers to the language variation according to the communication channels: oral or written. The diamesia represents the distinction between the channels of the communication transmission: the written and the oral code or, in other words, the sound and graphic code. The linguistic variation at the oral level is more frequent, or, at the writing level, the language has been relatively stabilized through 2 modalities of fixing the variants of a language: *grammars*, which establish the standard language, preserving its homogeneity and ensuring the understanding between the different generations; *the dictionaries* – encompass all the language varieties, classifying and ordering the vocabulary.

The analysis of the functioning mechanism of these 2 possible variational dimensions allows us to find that **the diegenic variation** is an incomplete or, rather, not current variational dimension or it is built on subjective or historically outdated criteria and arguments. Surely, differences between the women language of that of men exist, but these differences are quite subjective, being largely subjugated to the social ones. Therefore, **the diegenic variety** is, in fact, a sub-variety of the diastratic one, the gender differences being easily included in the sociolectal differences – varieties depending on social class, level of culture, style, age, etc.

## 2. THE VARIATION OF THE ROMANIAN IN THE LIGHT OF THE GRAMMAR BOOKS OF THE EAST OF PRUT

In the chapter 2, we analyze the variation of the Romanian language from the Republic of Moldova throughout the history, namely, from the appearance of the first relevant grammars in the Bessarabia until the post-period of the Soviet regime. Thus, we will research the functioning of the Romanian language and its varieties during the period 1827-1992, analyzing the old grammars, written by Ștefan Margela, Ioan Doncev etc., which faithfully reflect the linguistic situation of that period, the opposition between the gluttonies „Romanian language” – „Moldavian language”.

In this regard, we have established some fundamental theoretical benchmarks for our research. Especially, we identified (Botnari 2019b) the differences between a language and a dialect, as well as the criteria of determination of a language autonomy (the existence of a common language, the mutual intelligibility, the territorial distribution of a language, the national independence, the speaker consciousness et al.), demonstrating their irregularity and asymmetry when they are considered individually.

We researched the correlation between the norm and the literary language and their property to vary over time, we revealed the acceptances on the respective subject from the perspective of some notorious linguists and researchers: E. Coșeriu (1995; 1997), R. A. Budagov (= Будагов 1967), I. Gheție (1982), I. Iordan (1954), I. Coteanu (1973; 1975), B. Gaetano (1993), L. Martinet (2011), J. Kabatek (1998), D. Irimia (2011), T. Bulot (2011) and others.

A language, in addition to its variability in time (in diachronicity), through the norms, demonstrates that it also have a fixed character, being accompanied by „an attribute of invariability”, which ensures its continuity and the possibility of always remaining the same language, to be understood over the years and centuries, to preserve their unitary character. We consider that **the norm** is a product of the writers, the scholars of all times, on which it works continuously, being always modified and yet invariable at a given moment of the language: the transformations of the norm take place in time, gradually and cannot be attested in a present time. In fact, the necessity of the norm has been imposed by the different variants of the language, or they offer too many means of expression, accepting the new elements, which must be systematized and selected, restructured and correlated with the norm and the correct use, known by all the speakers of the language.

In the subchapter 2.2., *The linguistic conflict from the Republic of Moldova. The glotonames „Moldavian language” – „Romanian”*, we initiate a general approach to the theory of the two glotonames, the Romanian and the „Moldavian language”, establishing their coincidence and basing our opinion on the studies of some illustrious authors, such as: D. Cantemir, E. Coşeriu, S. Berejan, V. Bahnaru, C. Stamati-Ciurea, L. Colesnic-Codreanca, because a language variety cannot receive the status of autonomous language unless it has, first of all, a written, a normative, a proper form, if it is not standardized by **the grammars**. Only these criteria being accomplished, two languages can be considered two separate entities.

Consequently, through **the subchapter 2.3., *The literary norm and its variants in the grammar books of the East of Prut***, we analyse the Romanian through the prism of the grammars elaborated on the territory of Bessarabia, *Gramatica ruscă și rumâniască* by Ștefan Margela (1827), *Cursulu I. Abecedă Rumână* by Ioan Donceș (1865), *Gramatica limbii moldovenești* by Leonid Madan (1929) and *Gramatica limbii moldovenești. Fonetica, morfologia și sintaxa* by the same author (1932), *Gramatica limbii moldovenești* by Ion D. Ciobanu (1949) and others grammars elaborated after 1944. We also made a comparison of them with the norms of the grammars elaborated on the territory of the West Prut or with the nowadays grammars. The phonetic, grammatical and lexical peculiarities of the language throughout history are analyzed by identifying the essential differences, the coincidence or non-coincidence of some grammatical categories, the orthoepic rules, the metalanguage used, by establishing the degree of language variation, of the Romanian from Bessarabia from one decade to another, depending on historical, socio-political or cultural factors.

In this sense, we mention that we focused especially on the analysis of the metalanguage used in these grammars, of the linguistic terminology of Romanian, this, still starting with the grammars written by Ștefan Margela and Ioan Donceș, being at the stage of constitution and attesting a explainable variation. Nevertheless, in the Soviet period, this variation is less perceived, the differences are attested according to the glottopolitics of that time. Most of the time, we identified a metalanguage calqued from Russian, which is the same from one edition of grammar to another, varying within the limits imposed by the regime. The lexical level presented the biggest fluctuations, and the analysis of the metalanguage shows us that the variation was sometimes artificial, being consciously induced to promote the dialectal pronunciation and the distancing from the standard Romanian. I. Vintilă-Rădulescu observes that „most of the differences reported in the lexical field concerned the modern aspect and, within it, the specialized terminologies, in which, during the Soviet period, numerous borrowings and calques

from the Russian were included; the Russian language became the main language of education, research and professional activity in S.S.M.R. It was deliberately and demonstratively omitted, so that, after August 23, 1944, such elements penetrated in considerable numbers, even if much smaller, into the Romanian language from Romania” (Vintilă-Rădulescu 2003, p. 115). Therefore, we tried to prove the identity of our language both ontologically (as a functioning language) and gnoseologically (as the study object of linguistics, referring, especially, to the linguistic terminology used in various grammars and works).

In this manner, we researched the functioning of the Romanian language in Bessarabia during the period of 1827-1992, especially in schools, distinguishing the conditions in which it was taught, the variation depending on extralinguistic factors, its particularities, in order to demonstrate the inconsistency of the theory regarding the 2 distinct languages: Romanian and „Moldavian”. The study of the metalanguage helped us to determine the linguistic norms recommended for the teachers in the process of editing textbooks and bilingual Russian-Romanian dictionaries, for the students in the process of learning the Romanian, „baptized” most often „Moldavian” in that period.

Both Ș. Margela's grammar, printed in Saint-Petersburg, as well as that of I. Heliade Rădulescu, appeared in Bucharest, have a common point, strongly sustained: the recommendations to reduce the Romanian Cyrillic alphabet. Evidently, the reforms proposed by them differ, because the linguistic reality from which Ș. Margela starts is represented by the Russian language, the author presenting the phonetic features based on it. The idea to reform the alphabet proposed by Ș. Margela was revolutionary at that time, placing the Bessarabian linguist among the important grammarians of the time, which shows us that the literary norm in Bessarabia at that time was following a course of standardization and fixation similar to that of the Romania, a similar evolution, which could not have given birth to a new language, different from the Romanian, hypothesis researched also on other occasions (Botnari 2018b). Comparing the grammar of Ș. Margela from 1827 and the grammar of Ion Heliade Rădulescu (2018b), we notice that they are quite close, both in terms of the phonetic reduction principle promoted and pursued, as well as in terms of the classifications of the grammatical categories presented, with some exceptions.

Therefore, we analyse the **Ioan Doncev's grammar**, of which L. Colesnic-Codreanca writes: „Ioan Doncev's grammar is the only grammar from Bessarabia of the 19th century published in Romanian with Latin letters and, in parallel, in Russian text” (Colesnic-Codreanca 2003), with a grammatical metalanguage similar to the modern Romanian one.

Forthwith, we researched and confronted Leonid Madan's grammars: *Moldavian grammar* of 1929, written in Cyrillic alphabet, and that of 1932, *Moldavian grammar. Phonetics, morphology and syntax*, with Latin alphabet. There are two practically different grammars, especially from the point of view of the used metalanguage (Botnari 2018a). In the 1929 grammar, the parts of the speech appear written in Russian, while in the 1932 grammar, L. A. Madan already „remembers” the names of the Romanian cases, their equivalents being presented in the following table.

1929	1932
1. Numili starnic	Substantivul
2. Numili alăturalnic	Adjectivul
3. Numărătoriu	Numeralul
4. Locdinumili	Pronumele
5. Graiu	Verbul
6. Sprigraiu	Adverbul
7. Sprinumili	Prepoziția
8. Legătoriu	Conjunția
9. Strigātu	Interjecția

Confronting these 2 grammars, we observe the enormous differences at all the language levels, especially at the phonetic and lexical levels. L. Madan even elaborated a small Russian-Moldavian dictionary of „elementary grammar terminology” and not only, which includes terms created by phonetic adaptation, by the imitation of the Russian, the exact translation. We have presented some more significant units: *unaltic* that substituted the word from Romanian „reciproc” /reciprocal, *unoneamnic* or *unofelnic* – rom. „de același gen” / of the same kind, *fațnic* – rom. „personal” / personal, *unoslognic* – rom. „monosilabic” / monosyllabic, *urmatic* – rom. „succesiv” / successive, *fărăformnic* – rom. „amorf” / amorphous, *dinaintnici* – rom. „precedente” / previous, *buznici* – rom. „labiale” / labial, *napoiucernici* – rom. „velare” / velar etc. Moreover, L. A. Madan did not prove to be original even in the field of his lexical inventions, since many of them have been invented in Transylvania since the first half of the 19th century (conf. *mâneștergură* „towel”).

Until 1967, the researched grammars did not differ much, presenting the same orthographic and orthoepic rules, the same phonetic principles and borrowings or calques from Russian. The literary „Moldavain” of the post-Second World War, fixed in the grammars of Ion D. Ciobanu (1949), V. A. Comarnițchii (1951) or F. D. Lazariuc (1959) and others, was practically identical with the literary Romanian, with except the use of the Cyrillic alphabet and the acceptance of some artificial lexical units created or borrowed from Russian. Analyzing **the phonetic principles** and the writing norms fixed by Ion Ciobanu, we identify the closure of *e* not emphasized in the medial position in *ă*: „însămna”, „deosăbită”, „păreche”; the diphthong *ea*

becomes *a*: „cu samă”, „sara”, „visază”; the form „sîngur faptul ista” substituted the pronouns of reinforcement *itself* (*însuși*); *g* in open syllable passes in *j*: „lejile limbii” (Ciobanu 1949, p. 9); the outdated forms: „întîiaș dată”, „s’au scoborît” or the writing together of some words: „pedeplin” = full, „usually” = usually and so on. However, we notice a slight variation from some norms insistently promoted in L. Madan's grammar, namely, the disappearance of some palatalizations of the labials *b, p, m*: „bine”, „visază”.

Apart from the phonetic features, the classifications and grammatical categories of the „Moldavian” from 1932-1967 almost coincide with those of the literary Romanian of that time. Therefore, the non-essential phonetic, lexical and grammatical differences did not lead to the creation of a new language – in post-war Bessarabia there was spoken and written the Romanian with a Cyrillic alphabet.

The Decision no. 201 on the introduction of the letter „ж” (*gi*) in the Moldavian alphabet (**Hotărârea nr. 201 despre introducerea literei „ж” (*gi*) în alfabetul limbii moldovenești**) was signed in 1967, in order to „render more accurate the «dj» sound” (May 17, 1967). In addition to the new orthographic and orthoepic rules, this Decision intended „to provide until January 1, 1968, all the typefaces of newspapers and magazines with the necessary characters and fonts”. *The Moldavian grammar. Phonetics. Morphology* (*Gramatica limbii moldovenești. Fonetica. Morfologia*) (Berejan 1970), *The Moldavian language. Grammar, spelling, speech development. Class 1* (*Limba moldovenească. Gramatica, ortografia, dezvoltarea vorbirii. Manual pentru clasa 1*) (Guțan 1983), *The contemporary Literary Moldavian. The lexicology* (*Limba moldovenească literară contemporană. Lexicologia*) (Corlăteanu 1982) are the manuals that implement the new norms, which, in fact, are not so new, except for the introduction of the letter mentioned above.

The evolution of the Romanian from the Bessarabia between the end of the 19th and the early 20th attests insignificant deviations in the internal structure in comparison with the Romanian from Romania: some regroupings of the parts of speech, in the way of forming and naming the categories of gender, number, declination of nouns and conjugation of verbs, without affecting the standardized structure of grammatical categories. In fact, the only language level that has presented more pronounced changes is the lexical system, which has been „prolifically enriched”, often forcibly, with new lexical units borrowed from the Russian. The coincidence of the grammatical classes and categories identified by Ș. Margela and I. Heliade-Rădulescu demonstrates that the Romanian from Bessarabia still had the same historical course as that of the literary Romanian, and the grammar of I. Doncev from 1867 confirms that the linguists from

Bessarabia knew the grammatical norms of the Romanian and were following the elaboration grammar books on the territory beyond Prut.

### 3. THE VARIABILITY PHENOMENON IN THE LANGUAGE OF THE PERIODIC PRESS OF THE 1946-1992 YEARS

In the **chapter 3**, we analyze the mechanism of functioning of the „Moldavian language” in the Republic of Moldova in the post-war period, from the point of view of the periodic press. Firstly, we establish the nature of the relationship between the Romanian and the so-named „Moldavian” and the repercussions of the imposed bilingualism on the language of the Bessarabian population. Secondly, we refer to a variety of the Romanian from the period of the Soviet communist regime, **the wooden language**, a universal notion, specific not only to the Romanian language. For this reason, we defined the wooden language: the product of the imminent socio-political changes, a rigid, cliché and ideologized language, which serves as a tool for manipulating and distorting the reality, being at the service of the political objectives of an established totalitarian regime. In this context, evidently **the indices of the diaphasic** and **the diamesic variety** can practically not be identified in the Soviet wooden discourses, in which the written and the oral styles can be separated.

Another aspect analyzed in this chapter concerns the linguistic variability of the post-war periodical press, represented in our thesis by the newspapers: *the Socialist Moldova (Moldova Socialistă)*, *the Youth of Moldova (Tineretul Moldovei)* and *the Leninist ray of light (Scânteia leninistă)*. Consequently, we focus in particular on the study of phonetic and orthographic (Botnari 2019c), morphosyntactic (Botnari 2019d), lexical-semantical peculiarities of the language and on establishing the degree of implementation of the grammatical norms, fixed in the grammars investigated in the chapter 2, in the press language.

The dynamicity and the permeability of the language usually refers to the vocabulary, which is most vulnerable to the influence of extralinguistic conditions, especially when these conditions are artificially created and preserved. The „enrichment” of the new lexical units’ inventory, as well as their meanings and their appropriation in the fundamental vocabulary of the language, was the primary purpose of the Soviet governing bodies, which was possible to accomplish not only through the grammars printed under the rigorous control of the communist ideology, but also through the propaganda of the periodical press, of certain newspapers which had become practically the only source of information of the population.

Researching **the lexical-semantical peculiarities of the press language** from 1944-1989 from the perspective of the lexical-functional criterion, we presented, consecutively, the lexical



differences, the indexes of variation of the vocabulary through the prism of the variational dimensions: **diachronic** – the archaic vocabulary versus the neological lexicon, **diatopic** – the literary lexicon versus that regional, **diastratic** – the literary lexicon versus the specialized languages/jargonisms/slang, **diaphasic** – the stylistically marked lexicon.

Through the lexical-semantic analysis of the Soviet press' titles and subtitles we have identified an inventory of archaisms, borrowings from Russian, lexical, grammatical or semantic calques, various tautological and pleonastic constructions, comparisons and metaphors, hyperbolizations and antithetical formations, etc. The lexical variety of the daily press represented by *The socialist Moldova* and *The youth of Moldova* includes terms that correspond to some social-political concepts of the time, a lexicon specific to the Soviet period. Therefore, we have listed as **indices of diachronicity and diatopia** of the periodical press from 1946-1965: the abusive presence of the archaisms or the Russianisms: *peatiletcă, voczal, temp, oloi, remont, prezident, norodnic, tovarăș, totunional, colhoz, slobozâre, trudozî, călcare, zablă, zvenie, pud* a. o. The lexical units such as: *soviet, colhoz, pionier, ocrug, comsomol* etc., terms referring to historical-political realities, to the state or economic administration of the Soviet Union, have acquired evocative functions, becoming **diachronic or diatopic indices**. In this manner, we can identify a semantic text or context and classify it as belonging to the Romanian from the period of the Soviet socialism or to the „Moldavian idiom” of the Republic of Moldova. Obviously, the lexical units of the formal or the static register, as well as the neological words are practically absent in the periodic press of 1946, and in the newspapers of 1965-1976 they are attested with an extremely low frequency (1976): *principialitate, cincinal, mobilizator, multinațional*. Analyzing the inventory of archaic or Russian borrowed terms observed in the 1965 newspaper, we notice that it is much reduced than the inventory from the 1946 language press. This observation constitutes an index that the „Moldavian” was still developing, it has an evolution, even if it was a very slow one.

Currently only some lexemes of Russian etymology have been preserved, which presence was recorded even during the Tsarist period, such as: *brigadă, oloi, norod, tovarăș, pionier, slobozîre, obște, călcare, osăbit* ș.a., terms that, moreover, are attested by the Romanian dictionaries, as regional or popular variants.

From the perspective of **the diastratic variety**, we attest the excessive and repeated use of the technical-scientific terms, in this manner insisting on the „evolution and progress” stage, on the aim to diminish the receiver's vigilance in the process of the objective analysis of reality. The Soviet Bessarabian press of the respective period abounds in lexical units that refer to

various fields of the daily and material life of the Soviet man, but also to the activities of the Soviet Party and administration. Performing a thematic classification, the nouns in the analyzed discourses, which, in most cases, are abstract nouns, refer to: human relations and actions, social and ideological realities, human and Party occupations, plans and achievements, etc.: *plan, restabilire, dezvoltare, sarcini, peatiletică, industrie, transport, orânduială, norod, muncă, năzuință* etc. The words such as: *dezvoltare, progres, zădire, creștere* forms a lexical paradigm, the respective terms being repeated periodically in the text, in the same semantic circumstances, rendering the same idea, with a little and redundant lexical variation. The texts excerpted from the periodical press of 1940-1980 contain **indices of diastaty**, but in a poor variation, referring only to some fields of activity: *terms of popular trades, terms of daily activities and practices* of the population trained in „the building of the great socialism”, new *terms referring to the administrative hierarchy* of the Soviet governing bodies, calques or lexemes borrowed from the Russian.

The results of the lexicometric study show that the language of the press of 1946 is one of communism and ideological socialism. From the ‘60s, it became somewhat more temperate, representing the essence of the political program of those periods, the key notions and the doctrine with which the governing bodies operated. In addition, we find that the variation is not so radical, or a series of overlaps of the lexical units that are characteristic of both periods confirm this fact, as the realities always valid for those decades of the Soviet regime: *tovarăș, socialism, comsomol* ș. a. The authors of political speeches recruit their lexical inventory from the social sphere: *clasă, egalitate, colectivitate*; from the economic sphere: *industrializare, progres, gospodărie obștească*; from the agricultural sphere: *muncă, cincinal, colhoz, brigadă, truditor* etc.

From the perspective of **the diaphasic dimension**, the variation focuses on report of **the transmitter**, in our case the author of the analyzed articles, and **the receiver**, to whom the information is intended. The transmitter elaborates his speech in such a manner that the message he wants to convey to be correctly interpreted, the correctness regarding „**the final interpreter**” (Răciulă 2010). Any transmitter’s **text** is elaborated by a deliberate **manipulation of the expression**, requesting a certain attitude or a certain **feedback** from the receiver. For this reason, referring to the wooden language of the communist press and to the authors of political articles, intended for the general public, we cannot speak precisely of an individual style or an individual variability, as the motivational factors of the transmitter are, in fact, political orders. They have a

collective and ideological character, which „guide” the written discourse to correspond to these orders and to produce a certain attitude or interpretation on the part of the receiver.

The language of the Soviet press is an official language, imposed by the communist propaganda system, a language that gravitates around **the cult of the personality of the communist leader** (Manicheism), legitimizing his actions and decisions. The semiotic constants of the Communist Party leader's portrayal are the metaphorization and the excessive hyperbolization, these being the favourite stylistic figures of the communist press. The cult of the communist leader personality is presented in several forms: *the leader, the wise governor, the revolutionary-genius, the creator*, etc.

The language of the communist press follows the sequence of **homage – accession – report – commitment** (R. Zafiu 2007), which is achieved through a rich **metaphorical and metonymic register**: „**anatomical**” metaphors and metonymies – *a crescut din sânul norodului; îndrumate de mâna puternică și încercată a partidului comunist; în fruntea armatei noastre*; „**military**” metaphors – *țara s'a prefăcut într'un lagăr unic; pășesc pe prima linie a construcției comuniste în țara noastră; în avangarda construcției economice și culturale*; „**the power source**” metaphors – *Patriotismul sovetic dătător de veață; izvoarele puterilor nesăcate ale norodului nostru*; „**evolutionary**” or „**path**” metaphors – *greutățile care stau în calea lui; Pe calea socializmului; Drumul Cărții; Drum spre inimi; Un pas spre belșug*; „**October**” metaphors and metonymies – october being a cliché symbol, referring to October 1944, to the Churchill-Stalin Agreement, when the process of Sovietization and formation of the „new man” began: *cei educați de Octombrie; Ne luminează flacăra marelui octombrie!* ș. a. Therefore, the lexical variation through the prism of the diaphasic dimension includes various lexical parallels based on a Manichean conception, for example, *progress – regress, new world – old world, new man – old man, socialism – capitalism*, etc. The lexical units outlining these Manichean antagonisms distribute the individuals-subjects in a certain „camp”, either in the one faithful to the Soviet ideology – *the socialist society*, or they become enemies, the followers of *the capitalist bourgeoisie*.

No less important did we find the differences, especially at the lexical level, of the Romanian **after 1989**, determined on the basis of the same daily, but titled *Moldova Suverană*, the variation according to the socio-political juncture. The press takes on a new vector, the communist and Soviet clichés are gradually disappearing, being replaced by other lexical expressions, innovations then, which, in time, also become dogmas. However, in the early 1990s,

even in 1992, some Soviet cliché structures were still persisting, for example, the modal operator *must* could be found in newspaper headlines and articles.

In contrast to the wooden language of the years 44-89, period when the communist and socialist society was ideal, representing the superior, exemplary, demagogic authority, in the analysed texts of 1992 the authors doubt the correctness of some state decisions. The articles are addressed more to the governing bodies, than to the masses, shocking by presenting the harsh reality, putting different important questions through a chain of deliberate satirical titles or euphemisms, used consciously, to highlight the intended meaning, for example: *Vremuri care ne mai dor. Pîine multă tuturor!* (*Moldova Suverană*, 24 june 1990, Nr. 145) – the author refers exactly to those titles that called for a more hard and continuous work, for the fulfilment of the five-year plan, etc.

The Romanian in Bessarabia don't respect anymore the imposed limits, the lexical level comprising a wide spectrum of words, both stylistically marked: popular words, archaic units, slang or familiar words, as well as some neologisms for that period, especially abstract nouns and adjectives: *epicentru, deficit, mancurtizare, pauperizare, monopolism*. Thus, the authors of *Moldova Suverană (Sovereign Moldova)* renounce a part of the lexical-stereotype constructions and the party ideology or they use them only with the intention of evoking, of ironizing those principles.

Another feature specific to the language of the 1990s is its permeable character: the easy access to terms from various registers of the language. The language of the press can borrow some lexemes from the familiar or popular vocabulary, the writing variant of the media can easily use some elements of jargon. This phenomenon can be explained by the desire of the authors of articles and printed materials to be free, to get rid of the imposed prohibitions and accepted compromises and to intervene with lexical innovations, used according to the spheres of interest specific to the period.

By identifying the essential differences of the language from the „Moldavian” periodical press during the communist Soviet regime period, we can distinguish some evolution stages of the Romanian in the RSSM: 1. **from 1944 to 1960, the aggressively „moldovenization” of the Romanian** by infiltrating Russian loans, archaisms and words specific to the popular language, by implementing in practice Soviet principles and social structuring; 2. **1960 – 1967, the slow „awakening” of the Romanian**, a period in which some of the Soviet lexical „innovations” gradually disappear; some realities lose their significance, giving way to others, their names being replaced by Romanian equivalents. It is not a period of a real language development, but

one of an „initiation into the return to the literary Romanian”, to the natural state of things up to the Soviet regime. From now until 1989 we can speak that the language written in Bessarabia was nothing more than the Romanian language written in Cyrillic alphabet, a variant of the Romanian literary language, with some specific features in phonetics (respectively in spelling) and in lexicon (the abuse of Russianisms); 3. **1967 – 1989, the language of „rebirth”**, the return to the Latin spelling and to the true norms of the Romanian, the awakening of the national consciousness, the open access to the Romanian sources from which the „Moldavian language” was deprived until then. In 1992, the lexicon of the Romanian from Bessarabia becomes much wider, identifying itself with that of the Romanian from the space over the Prut, and the authors gain the right to write without being censored or self-censored.

All things considered, we attest that not all the grammatical norms set by the specialized grammar books developed during that period were implemented and that despite all the phonetics and lexical Russian constructions or calques, the Romanian language in Bessarabia was the standard Romanian language, written in Cyrillic alphabet.

### **GENERAL CONCLUSIONS**

The linguistic corpora used in the paper validated the hypothesis of our study, regarding the prolific character of the phenomenon of variability in the Romanian and the correlation between the types of language varieties and the extralinguistic factors of influence. In this context, to summarize the results of our research, we formulate the following **conclusions**:

1. A language, throughout its evolution, knows a continuous process of transformation, of substituting its peculiarities with others, of differentiation in several varieties. The language variability is a property of any natural language to vary in terms of diachronic and synchronic dimensions, materializing through several linguistic varieties.

2. The linguistic variety is a product of the phenomenon of variability in language, functioning through various uses of the same language depending on linguistic and extralinguistic factors, differentiated by a series of linguistic variants, which are manifested at all language levels.

3. Any linguistic unit is manifested by the variant/invariant dichotomy. The invariant is the virtual unity of the language, unusable, which becomes functional, materializes in speech under different forms selected according to different factors (chronological, geographical, social, cultural, stylistic or ideological- policies etc.), and the variant represents one of the multitude of forms by which that unit of language works.

4. We find that the description of the variations of a language is not possible without resorting to the correlation of diachrony – diatopia – diastratia – diaphasia – diamesia. According to these variational dimensions there are classified the varieties of a natural language and those of the Romanian especially: diachronic varieties – the temporal differences of the language, the diachronic and synchronic differences; diatopic – the territorial differences, according to the geographical space; diastratic – the differences between the sociocultural layers of a linguistic community; diaphasic – the differences between the expressive, stylistic modalities, depending on use and speaker; diamesic – the differences between the written and the spoken forms of the language. In the modern linguistics, a language needs to be studied from two perspectives simultaneously: the study of the internal variability of the language according to the linguistic factors – variations at different levels of the language and according to the extralinguistic factors, which generate the types of varieties mentioned above.

5. Examining the historical process of the literary Romanian evolution, we find that it has a unitary and homogeneous character, not a massive fragmentation in dialects and grammars, and the „Moldavian language” is an idiom, its literary norms being identical with the Romanian’s norms. In this manner, the „Moldavian” is the national variant of the Republic of Moldova language, even if we attest opposite opinions.

6. Through the sociolinguistic criteria, the Romanian has a dynamic vocabulary, in full evolution and with permeable boundaries, the lexical gaps being filled either by words borrowed from other languages, or by naming these new realities with some words already existing in the language, but polysemizing them, giving them new meanings. At the same time, the Romanian in Bessarabia has a total access to the standard Romanian from Bucharest, its vocabulary becoming practically identical in all the areas of human activity.

7. We consider that there are no pure diatopic, diastratic, diaphasic or diamesic varieties, but rather, variational indices depending on diatopia, diastratia, diaphasia and diamesia, which function simultaneously, being differentiated only from a theoretical point of view. The diamesic variety, the oral/written opposition, represents the support on which the other types of varieties are highlighted, or, in the written form of the language, these can be identified less, being more prolific in the spoken variant of the language.

8. The diegenic variation is not a self-contained variational dimension. The linguistic differences based on gender are quite subjective, because the verbal interactions are diverse and can take place in different social contexts, which allows these differences to be included in the diastratic variety.

9. In addition to its property of varying in time, the language shows a stable character, fixed by the norms regulated and established during the historical evolution of the language, norms that continue to be regulated even now. Namely, the literary norms, included in grammars, constitute „an attribute of invariability” of the language, which ensures its continuity and the possibility of always remaining the same language, of being understood over years and centuries, becoming the communication tool of a linguistic community.

10. The evolution of the Romanian has always been disturbed by the absurd attempt to raise the „Moldavian” to the rank of literary, autonomous language, an attempt that had its origin in the political-ideological substrate of the „Moldavian language” problem. Even in 1818 there were attempts to outline a new language, the „Moldavian”. In fact, the idea that the „Moldavian” is another language than the literary Romanian has its base on the attempts to „literalize” a narrow dialectal basis of the Moldavian idiom, „enriched” with some popular, archaic creations, to „baptize” it into „Moldavian language”.

11. After 1960, both in the „Moldavian” grammars and in the periodical press, we attest a tendency to support the literary language, to exclude from the written language the popular and archaic elements, the regionalisms, to eliminate some artificially formed Russianisms. There were created the necessary premises for the events that were to happen in 1989. However, the grammars elaborated following the annexation of Bessarabia to the Soviet Union, even though they were written in Cyrillic alphabet and abounded in dialectal spellings, set the same grammatical norms, the same orthoepic rules of the Romanian.

12. The evolution of the Romanian on the territory of Bessarabia between the end of the 19th century and the beginning of the 20th century attests insignificant deviations in the internal structure compared to the Romanian beyond Prut, aiming at some groupings in the category of speaking parts, in the form of training and denomination of gender categories, number, declension of nouns and conjugation of verbs, without affecting the standardized structure of the grammatical categories, the lexical level presenting the most essential fluctuations.

13. The phenomenon of variability in the Romanian of the Soviet-Bessarabia was attested, but, given the socio-political juncture of that period, it knew a limited register of topics and problems addressed, due to the censorship and the ideological manipulation. There are phonetic, morpho-syntactic and, above all, specific lexical peculiarities in the language of the Stalinist period, the renunciation of some of them being possible only from 1967. However, from a linguistic point of view, we cannot talk about essential differences, but rather, about a gradual

return to the natural status of the Romanian of the period until the establishment of Soviet communism.

14. At the lexical level, we have identified a considerable inventory of lexical archaisms, borrowings or calques from Russian. Nowadays these are totally or partially out of the language use, being assimilated into the passive vocabulary of the language or functioning in the colloquial version. Currently the Romanian of the Republic of Moldova retains a slightly outdated and popular coloration in the spoken language, because of the bilingualism of the Soviet-Communist period. Even these phonetic peculiarities or regional vocabularies are increasingly rare and optional, being specific to a certain quota of speakers, to the rural population or to those with a lower level of culture and education. The literary Romanian of Bessarabia is not different from the standard of the Romanian of Romania, the usual lexicon of the Bessarabian Romanian is common with that of the Romanian of Romania, only the recent Russianisms making differentiation, and the name of „Moldavian” is, in fact, politically conditioned.

15. The obtained results and conclusions confirm **the research hypothesis**, according to which the phenomenon of variability is an active process in Romanian, which has generated the varieties of language, depending on the extralinguistic, geographical, socio-cultural, ideological-political, stylistic factors, etc. However, the unity of the Romanian was preserved, without the formation of another autonomous language, the „Moldavian” being only an idiom of the Romanian, the grammar being unitary.

Our research shows a „radiography” of the Romanian literary language from a sociolinguistic, historical, stylistic and semiotic perspective. Some concepts approached in the paper may serve as a reference for further detailed research of each type of Romanian language variety, of the variational dimensions, of the diachronic, diatopic, diastratic, diaphasic and diamesic varieties, of the diegenic differences, etc. based on some literary works or on the today's press, etc. Additionally, the research opens up prospects for study and comparative analysis of the press language, pointing out the phonetic, morphosyntactic and lexical features of today's mass-media language and comparing them with those of the communist regime's language until 1992, analysed in the present paper.

#### **BIBLIOGRAPHY (selective)**

1. BAHNARU, V. *Elemente de semasiologie*. Chişinău: Editura Ştiinţa, 2009. 286 p. ISBN 978-9975-67-641-0.



2. BAHNARU, V. (red. resp.). *Lexicologia practică a limbii române*. Chișinău: Profesional Service, 2013. 490 p. ISBN 978-9975-4460-4-4.
3. **BOTNARI, L.** Conceptul de variant/invariant în lingvistica modernă [online]. În: *Philologia*. 2017a, nr. 1-2 (289-290), pp. 91-96. ISSN 0236-3119. [citat 28.11.2019]. Disponibil:[https://ibn.idsi.md/sites/default/files/imag\\_file/91\\_96\\_Conceptul%20de%20variant\\_invariant%20in%20lingvistica%20moderna.pdf](https://ibn.idsi.md/sites/default/files/imag_file/91_96_Conceptul%20de%20variant_invariant%20in%20lingvistica%20moderna.pdf)
4. **BOTNARI, L.** Varietățile diatopice ale limbii române. Situația „limbii moldovenești”. În: *Lecturi in memoriam acad. Silviu Berejan, Colocviu științific național*, ediția a III-a, 2017b. Coord.: MINCU E. Chișinău: S. n. (Tipogr.), p. 35-42. [citat 28.11.2019]. Disponibil: [https://ibn.idsi.md/sites/default/files/imag\\_file/35-42\\_4.pdf](https://ibn.idsi.md/sites/default/files/imag_file/35-42_4.pdf)
5. **BOTNARI, L.** „Limba moldovenească” prin prisma gramaticilor lui Leonid Madan [online]. În: *Philologia*. Septembrie-decembrie 2018a, Nr. 5-6 (299-300), Chișinău: Pro Libra. pp. 90-96. ISSN 1857-4300. [citat 28.11.2019]. Disponibil: [https://ibn.idsi.md/sites/default/files/imag\\_file/90-96\\_3.pdf](https://ibn.idsi.md/sites/default/files/imag_file/90-96_3.pdf)
6. **BOTNARI, L.** Particularitățile fonetice ale limbii române prin prisma gramaticilor lui Ștefan Margela și Ion Heliade Rădulescu [online]. În: *Tendențe contemporane ale dezvoltării științifice: viziuni ale tinerilor cercetători* (cu participare internațională). 15 iunie 2018b, ediția a VII-a, volumul II. Chișinău: Universitatea de Stat „Dimitrie Cantemir” (Tipogr. „Biotehdesign”), pp. 12-17. ISBN 978-9975-108-44-7. [citat 28.11.2019]. Disponibil: [https://ibn.idsi.md/sites/default/files/imag\\_file/12-17.pdf](https://ibn.idsi.md/sites/default/files/imag_file/12-17.pdf)
7. **BOTNARI, L.** Varietățile de limbă: factori și criterii de clasificare [online]. În: *Philologia*. 2018c, nr. 1-2 (295-296), Chișinău: Pro Libra, pp. 23-29. ISSN 0236-3119. [citat 28.11.2019]. Disponibil: [https://ibn.idsi.md/sites/default/files/imag\\_file/23-29.pdf](https://ibn.idsi.md/sites/default/files/imag_file/23-29.pdf)
8. **BOTNARI, L.** The criteria of determination of a language autonomy [online]. În: *Identity and dialogue in the era of globalization. Language and discourse*. 2019b, Târgu-Mureș: Arhipealeg XXI Press, pp. 436-440. ISBN: 978-606-8624-19-8. [citat 28.11.2019]. Disponibil: <https://old.upm.ro/gidni/GIDNI-06/GIDNI%2006%20Language.pdf>
9. **BOTNARI, L.** Limba presei comuniste a anilor 1944-1980. Particularități fonetice și ortografice. În: *Philologia*. 2019c, nr. 5-6 (305-306), Chișinău: Pro Libra, pp. 92-97. ISSN 1857-4300. [citat 02.01.2020]. Disponibil: [http://ifr.md/reviste/philologia\\_5-6--2019.pdf](http://ifr.md/reviste/philologia_5-6--2019.pdf)
10. **BOTNARI, L.** Limba presei comuniste a anilor 1944-1980. Particularități morfo-sintactice. În: *Filologia Modernă: realizări și perspective în context european. Spiritus loci: interferențe, confluență, rezistență*. 10-11 octombrie 2019d, ediția a XIII-a, Chișinău: Pro Libra, pp. 25-33. ISBN 978-9975-3289-6-8.
11. **BOTNARI, L.** Argotismele și jargonismele – varietăți sociolectale ale limbii. În: *Studia Universitatis Moldaviae*. 2019e, Seria „Științe umanistice”, Nr.10 (130), categoria B. Chișinău: CEP USM, pp. 72-76. ISSN 1811-2668, ISSN online 2345-1009. [citat 25.01.2020]. Disponibil: <http://studiamsu.eu/wp-content/uploads/11.-p.72-76.pdf>
12. **BOTNARI, L.** Varietățile diamezică și diegenică – noi dimensiuni variaționale? În: *Caietele Sextil Pușcariu. Actele Conferinței Internaționale „Sextil Pușcariu”*. 12-13 septembrie 2019f, ediția a IV-a, Cluj-Napoca: Institutul de Lingvistică și Istorie Literară „Sextil Pușcariu”, pp. 82-91. ISSN 2393 – 526X. ISSN-L 2393 – 526X. [citat 05.02.2020]. Disponibil: [http://www.inst-puscariu.ro/SextilPuscariu/SPIV/pagini/CSP%20IV%20\[Pages%2082%20-%2091\].pdf](http://www.inst-puscariu.ro/SextilPuscariu/SPIV/pagini/CSP%20IV%20[Pages%2082%20-%2091].pdf)

13. BULOT, T. Variations et normes d'une langue [online]. În: BULOT, T., BLANCHET, P. *Dynamiques de la langue française au 21<sup>ème</sup> siècle: une introduction à la sociolinguistique*. 2011. [citată 10.09.2017]. Disponibil: <http://www.sociolinguistique.fr/cours-4-1.html>
14. COLESNIC-CODREANCA, L. *Limba română în Basarabia (1812-1918). Studiu sociolingvistic pe baza materialelor de arhivă*. Chișinău: Museum, 2003. 152 p. ISBN 9975-906-79-6.
15. COȘERIU, E. *Introducere în lingvistică / Traducere din limba spaniolă de E. Ardeleanu și E. Bojoga*. Cluj: Editura Echinox, 1995. 143 p.
16. COȘERIU, E. *Sincronie, diacronie și istorie. Problema schimbării lingvistice*. Versiune în limba română de N. SARAMANDU. București: Editura Enciclopedică, 1997. p. 254. ISBN 973-45-0203-4.
17. COȘERIU, E. *Lecții de lingvistică generală*. Trad. E. BOJOGA. Chișinău: Editura ARC, 2000. p. 263. ISBN 9975-61-146-X M-157-126.
18. COTEANU, I. *Stilistica funcțională a limbii române. Stil, stilistică, limbaj*. București: Editura Academiei R.S.R., 1973. 202 p.
19. COTEANU, I., BIDU-VRĂNCEANU, A. *Limba română contemporană. Vol. II. Vocabularul*. București: Editura Didactică și Pedagogică, 1975. 304 p.
20. GADET, Fr. La variation: le français dans l'espace social, régional et international. În: YAGUELLO, M. *Le grand livre de la langue française*. Paris: Editions du Seuil, 2003. pp. 91-150.
21. GAETANO, B. Varietà diamesiche, diastratiche, diafasiche [online]. În: *Introduzione all'italiano contemporaneo: la variazione e gli usi*. A. A. SOBRERO (a cura di). Bari: Laterza, 1993. pp. 37-92. [citată 17.05.2018]. Disponibil: [http://www.treccani.it/enciclopedia/variet%C3%A0\\_\(Enciclopedia-dell'Italiano\)/](http://www.treccani.it/enciclopedia/variet%C3%A0_(Enciclopedia-dell'Italiano)/)
22. GHEȚIE, I. *Introducere în studiul limbii române literare*. București: Editura Științifică și Enciclopedică, 1982. 192 p.
23. GLESSGEN, M.-D. *Lingvistică romanică. Domenii și metode în lingvistica franceză și romanică*. Iași: Editura Universității „Alexandru Ioan Cuza”, 2014. 654 p. ISBN 978-973-703-999-6.
24. GRAUR, A., STATI, S., WALD, L. *Tratat de lingvistică generală*. București: Academia Republicii Socialiste Romania, 1971. 558 p.
25. IORDAN, I. Despre „limba literară”. În: *SCL*. 1954, vol. V, nr 1-2, p. 154.
26. IRIMIA, D. *Curs de lingvistică generală*. Ediția a III-a, Iași: Editura Universității „Alexandru Ioan Cuza”, 2011. 468 p. ISBN: 978-973-640-649-2.
27. KABATEK, J. La variation linguistique dans le domaine des langues romanes: théorie et réalité empirique [online]. În: *Actes du XXII Congrès International de Linguistique et de Philologie Romanes*. 1998, Volumul III, Bruxelles: Niemeyer, pp. 215-223. [citată 15.03.2017]. Disponibil: <https://publikationen.uni-tuebingen.de/xmlui/bitstream/handle/10900/46344/pdf/C26.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y>
28. MARTINET, L. *Variabilité linguistique et situations de contact de langues: Modélisation de l'influence de la structure des réseaux sociaux* [online]. 2011. [citată 06.09.2017]. Disponibil: <http://perso.ens-lyon.fr/lucie.martinet/recherche/interet/fr/GrapheSociauxLinguistique.pdf>
29. MEUNIER, Ch. Invariants et Variabilité en Phonétique [online]. În: *Phonologie et phonétique: Forme et substance. Cognition et Traitement de l'Information*. Nguyen, N.,

- Hermès, 2005. pp. 349-374. [citat 02.10.2016]. Disponibil: <https://hal.archives-ouvertes.fr/hal-00142955/document>
30. MIONI, A. Italiano tendenziale: osservazioni su alcuni aspetti della standardizzazione. În: *Scritti linguistici in onore di G. B. Pellegrini*. Vol. I, Pacini: Pisa, 1983. pp. 495–517.
  31. MOROIANU, C. *Tipuri de variante* [online]. 1998, pp. 25-34. [citat 02.10.2016]. Disponibil: [http://cachescan.bcub.ro/Cristian\\_Moroianu/Tipuri\\_de\\_variante.pdf](http://cachescan.bcub.ro/Cristian_Moroianu/Tipuri_de_variante.pdf)
  32. RĂCIULĂ, L. *Variabilitatea diafazică în cadrul unor serii stilistico-istorice*. Chișinău: Bons Offices, 2010. 189 p. ISBN 978-9975-80-322-9.
  33. VASILIU, Em. Limbă, vorbire, stratificare. În: *Studii și cercetări lingvistice X (3)*. București: Editura Academiei, 1959. pp. 466-469. p-ISSN: 0039-405X.
  34. VINTILĂ-RĂDULESCU I. Limba moldovenească și limba română. În: *Limba Română*. Nr. 6-10, anul XIII, 2003. pp. 113-118. [citat 19.09.2019]. Disponibil: <http://www.diacronia.ro/ro/indexing/details/A20901/pdf>
  35. ZAFIU, R. *Limba și politică* [online]. București: Editura Universității din București, 2007. 284 p. ISBN 978-973-737-307-6. [citat 17.09.2019]. Disponibil: <http://essaydocs.org/rodica-zafiu-limbaj-si-politic.html>
  36. БУДАГОВ, Р. А. *Литературные языки и языковые стили*. Москва, 1967, 376 p.
  37. СОЛНЦЕВ, В. М. Вариативность как общее свойство языковой системы. В: *Вариантность как свойство языковой системы (тезисы докладов)*. Часть II [online], Москва: Академия Наук СССР, Издательство «Наука», 1982. pp. 71-73 [citat 02.06.2017]. Disponibil: [http://issuesinlinguistics.ru/pubfiles/1984-2\\_31-42.pdf](http://issuesinlinguistics.ru/pubfiles/1984-2_31-42.pdf)
  38. СТЕПАНОВ, Г. В. *Типология языковых состояний и ситуаций в странах романской речи*. Москва: Наука, 1976. 224 с.

#### Surse utilizate în teză

1. BEREJAN, S., DÎRUL, A. *Gramatica limbii moldovenești. Fonetica. Morfologia*, Chișinău: Editura Lumina, 1970. 227 p.
2. CIOBANU, I. D. *Gramatica limbii moldovenești. Partea I. Fonetica și morfologia. Manual pentru școala de șapte ani și cei mijlocie*. Chișinău: Școala Sovietică, 1949. 247 p.
3. CIOBANU, I. D. *Gramatica limbii moldovenești. P. 1 : Fonetica și morfologia* [online]. Chișinău: Editura de Stat a Moldovei, 1945. [citat 05.05.2018]. Disponibil: <http://www.moldavica.bnrm.md/biblielmo?e=d-01000-00---off-0carti--00-1----0-10-0---0---0direct-10---4-----0-11--11-cs-50---20-preferences---00-3-1-00-0-0-11-1-0utfZz-8-00&a=d&cl=CL1.6&d=JD4398.64>
4. CIORNĂI, I. P., EȘAN, L. I. et. a. *Gramatica limbii moldovenești. Sintaxa, clasele VII-VIII*. Chișinău: Lumina, 1967. 180 p.
5. COMARNIȚCHII, V. A., MELNIȚCAIA, S. G. *Gramatica limbii moldovenești, partea a doua. Sintaxa. Manual pentru școala de șapte ani și cei mijlocie*. Ed. 1. Chișinău: Editura de Stat a Moldovei, 1946. 132 p.
6. CORLĂTEANU, N. G. *Limba moldovenească. Partea I. Lexicologia, fonetica, morfologia*. Manual pentru clasele VIII-IX, Chișinău: Editura Pedagogică de Stat a RSS Moldovenești „Școala Sovietică”, 1959. 234 p.

7. CORLĂTEANU, N. G. *Limba moldovenească literară contemporană. Lexicologia*. Chișinău: Lumina, 1982. 238 p.
8. DONCEV, I. *Cursu primitivă de limba rumână: compusă pentru șolele elementare și IV clase gimnasiale* [online]. Chișinău, 1865. [citat 17.03.2018]. Disponibil: <http://www.moldavica.bnrn.md/biblielmo?e=d-01000-00---off-0carti--00-1----0-10-0---0---0direct-10-DC--4-----0-11--11-ro-50---20-about-Doncev--00-3-1-00-0-0-11-1-0utfZz-8-00&d=JC27.27&cl=search&gp=1>
9. GUȚAN, E. P. *Limba moldovenească. Gramatica, ortografia, dezvoltarea vorbirii*. Manual pentru clasa 1, ediția a 5-a. Kiev-Cernăuți: „Radianska Șkola”, 1983. 159 p.
10. LAZARIUC, F. D. *Limba moldovenească. Manual pentru clasa a III. Limba moldovenească. Manual pentru clasa a III*. Chișinău: Editura pedagogică de stat a RSS Moldovenești „Școala Sovietică”, 1959. 155 p.
11. MADAN, L. A. *Gramatica limbii moldovenești, scrisă cu alfabet chirilic* [online]. Tiraspol: Editura de Stat a Moldovei, 1928. [citat 17.04.2018]. Disponibil: <http://www.moldavica.bnrn.md/biblielmo?e=q-01000-00---off-0carti--00-1----0-10-0---0---0direct-10-DT--4-----0-11--11-ro-50---20-about-gramatica--00-3-1-00-0-0-11-1-0utfZz-8-00&a=d&c=carti&srp=0&srn=0&cl=search&d=JD4706>
12. MADAN, L. A. *Gramatica limbii moldovenești. Fonetica, morfologia și sintaxa* [online]. Tiraspol: Editura de Stat a Moldovei, 1932. 94 p. [citat 05.05.2018]. Disponibil: <http://www.moldavica.bnrn.md/biblielmo?e=q-01000-00---off-0carti--00-1----0-10-0---0---0direct-10-DC--4-----0-11--11-ro-50---20-about-Gramatica--00-3-1-00-0-0-11-1-0utfZz-8-00&a=d&c=carti&srp=0&srn=0&cl=search&d=JD4707>
13. MARGELA, Ș. *Gramatică ruscă și rumâniască* [online]. Sankt Petersburg: Departamentul obștesc de învățare. 1827. 702 p. [citat 11.04.2018]. Disponibil: <http://www.moldavica.bnrn.md/biblielmo?e=d-01000-00---off-0carti--00-1----0-10-0---0---0direct-10-DC--4-----0-11--11-ro-50---20-about-margela--00-3-1-00-0-0-11-1-0utfZz-8-00&a=d&cl=search&d=JD4237.3>
14. *Moldova socialistă*, 1946.
15. *Tineretul Moldovei*, 1946.
16. *Scânteia leninistă*, 1946.
17. *Moldova socialistă*, 1965.
18. *Moldova socialistă*, 1976.
19. *Moldova suverană*, 1990.
20. *Moldova suverană*, 1992.

## LIST OF AUTHOR'S PUBLICATIONS

### Publications in scientific journals

1. BOTNARI, L. Conceptul de variant/invariant în lingvistica modernă. În: *Philologia*. 2017, nr. 1-2(289-290), pp. 91-96. ISSN 0236-3119. **Categoria C**. Disponibil: [https://ibn.idsi.md/sites/default/files/imag\\_file/91\\_96\\_Conceptul%20de%20variant\\_invariant%20in%20lingvistica%20moderna.pdf](https://ibn.idsi.md/sites/default/files/imag_file/91_96_Conceptul%20de%20variant_invariant%20in%20lingvistica%20moderna.pdf)
2. BOTNARI, L. „Limba moldovenească” prin prisma gramaticilor lui Leonid Madan. În: *Philologia*, 2018, nr. 5-6(299-300), pp. 90-96. ISSN 0236-3119. **Categoria C**. Disponibil: [https://ibn.idsi.md/sites/default/files/imag\\_file/90-96\\_3.pdf](https://ibn.idsi.md/sites/default/files/imag_file/90-96_3.pdf)
3. BOTNARI, L. Varietățile de limbă: factori și criterii de clasificare. În: *Philologia*. 2018, nr. 1-2(295-296), pp. 23-29. ISSN 0236-3119. **Categoria C**. Disponibil: [https://ibn.idsi.md/sites/default/files/imag\\_file/23-29.pdf](https://ibn.idsi.md/sites/default/files/imag_file/23-29.pdf)
4. BOTNARI, L. Varietatea lexicală în opera lui Ion Creangă. În: *Philologia*. 2019, nr. 1-2(301-302), pp. 63-69. ISSN 0236-3119. **Categoria C**. Disponibil: [https://ibn.idsi.md/sites/default/files/imag\\_file/63-69\\_4.pdf](https://ibn.idsi.md/sites/default/files/imag_file/63-69_4.pdf)
5. BOTNARI, L. Limba presei comuniste a anilor 1944-1980. Particularități fonetice și ortografice. **Categoria C**. În: *Philologia*. 2019, nr. 5-6(305-306), pp. 92-97. ISSN 0236-3119. 10.5281/zenodo.3566692 Disponibil: [https://ibn.idsi.md/sites/default/files/imag\\_file/92-97\\_14.pdf](https://ibn.idsi.md/sites/default/files/imag_file/92-97_14.pdf)
6. BOTNARI, L. Argotismele și jargonismele – varietăți sociolectale ale limbii. În: *Studia Universitatis Moldaviae*, (Seria Științe Umanistice). 2019, nr. 10(130), pp. 72-76. ISSN 1811-2668. **Categoria B**. Disponibil: [https://ibn.idsi.md/sites/default/files/imag\\_file/11.%20p.72-76.pdf](https://ibn.idsi.md/sites/default/files/imag_file/11.%20p.72-76.pdf)
7. BOTNARI, L. Considerații privind varietatea diafazică a limbii române. În: *Studia Universitatis Moldaviae*, (Seria Științe Umanistice). 2020, nr. 4(134), pp. 8-11. ISSN 1811-2668. doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.3984810 **Categoria B**. Disponibil: [https://ibn.idsi.md/sites/default/files/imag\\_file/02.%20p.08-11.pdf](https://ibn.idsi.md/sites/default/files/imag_file/02.%20p.08-11.pdf)

### Conference Proceedings and Abstracts

#### national:

8. BOTNARI, L. Engleza americană ca variantă a limbii engleze. În: *Tendințe contemporane ale dezvoltării științei: viziuni ale tinerilor cercetători*. Ediția 5, Vol.3, 15 martie 2016, Chișinău: Universitatea Academiei de Științe a Moldovei, 2016, pp. 24-29. Disponibil: [https://ibn.idsi.md/sites/default/files/imag\\_file/24-29\\_6.pdf](https://ibn.idsi.md/sites/default/files/imag_file/24-29_6.pdf)
9. BOTNARI, L. Varietățile diatopice ale limbii române. Situația „limbii moldovenești”. În: *Lecturi in memoriam acad. Silviu Berejan*. Coord.: Eugenia Mincu. Ediția a 3-a, 9 noiembrie 2017, Chișinău. Chișinău: Tipogr. „Pro Libra”, 2017, pp. 35-42. ISBN 978-9975-4371-7-2. Disponibil: [https://ibn.idsi.md/sites/default/files/imag\\_file/35-42\\_4.pdf](https://ibn.idsi.md/sites/default/files/imag_file/35-42_4.pdf)
10. BOTNARI, L. Particularitățile fonetice ale limbii române prin prisma gramaticilor lui Ștefan Margela și Ion Heliade Rădulescu [online]. În: *Tendințe contemporane ale*

*dezvoltării științifice: viziuni ale tinerilor cercetători*. Ediția 7, Vol.2, 15 iunie 2018, Chișinău. Chișinău, Republica Moldova: Tipogr. „Biotehdesign”, 2018, pp. 12-17. ISBN 978-9975-108-46-1. Disponibil: [https://ibn.idsi.md/sites/default/files/imag\\_file/12-17.pdf](https://ibn.idsi.md/sites/default/files/imag_file/12-17.pdf)

11. BOTNARI, L. Limba presei comuniste a anilor 1944-1980. Particularități morfo-sintactice. În: *Filologia Modernă: realizări și perspective în context european. Spiritus loci: interferențe, confluență, rezistență*. Ediția a XIII-a. 10-11 octombrie 2019, Chișinău: „Tipocart Print” SRL, 2019, pp. 25-33. ISBN 978-9975-3289-6-8. Disponibil: [https://ibn.idsi.md/sites/default/files/imag\\_file/Filologia\\_moderna\\_Vol132\\_2019\\_pp25\\_33.pdf](https://ibn.idsi.md/sites/default/files/imag_file/Filologia_moderna_Vol132_2019_pp25_33.pdf)

#### **international:**

12. BOTNARI, L. The criteria of determination of a language autonomy/ Criteriile de determinare a autonomiei unei limbi. În: *Identity and dialogue in the era of globalization. Language and discourse*, ed.: Boldea, I., Sigmirean, C. Târgu-Mureș: Arhipeleag XXI Press, 2019, p. 436-440. ISBN: 978-606-8624-19-8. Disponibil: <https://old.upm.ro/gidni/GIDNI-06/GIDNI%2006%20Language.pdf>
13. BOTNARI, L. Varietățile diamezică și diegenică – noi dimensiuni variaționale? În: *Caietele Sextil Pușcariu. Actele Conferinței Internaționale „Sextil Pușcariu”*, ediția a IV-a, 12-13 septembrie 2019. Cluj-Napoca: Institutul de Lingvistică și Istorie Literară „Sextil Pușcariu”. ISSN 2393 – 526X. ISSN–L 2393 – 526X. Disponibil: [http://www.inst-puscariu.ro/SextilPuscariu/SPIV/pagini/CSP%20IV%20\[Pages%2082%20-%2091\].pdf](http://www.inst-puscariu.ro/SextilPuscariu/SPIV/pagini/CSP%20IV%20[Pages%2082%20-%2091].pdf)
14. BOTNARI, L. Indices of the diaphasic variation in the RSSM Soviet press / Indici ai variației diafazeice în presa sovietică din RSSM. În: *Identities in globalization. Intercultural perspectives. Language and discourse*. ed.: Boldea, I., Sigmirean, C. Târgu-Mureș: Arhipeleag XXI Press, 2020, p. 294-299. ISBN: 978-606-8624-10-5. Disponibil: <https://old.upm.ro/gidni/GIDNI-07/GIDNI-07%20Language.pdf>

## ADNOTARE

**Botnari Liliana. Teoria variabilității și aplicabilitatea ei la limba română din Republica Moldova. Teză de doctor în filologie, Chișinău, 2020**

**Structura tezei:** Teza este alcătuită din: introducere, 3 capitole, concluzii generale și recomandări, bibliografie din 193 de titluri, 14 anexe, 172 de pagini de text de bază, 14 figuri, 4 tabele. Rezultatele cercetării sunt publicate în 14 lucrări științifice.

**Cuvinte-cheie:** *variabilitate, variație, varietate, variantă, invariantă, limbă literară, limbă autonomă, diacronie, diatopie, diastratie, diafazie, diamezie, diegenie, limbă română, „limbă moldovenească”, variație lexicală, indice de variație, analiză lexico-semantică.*

**Domeniul de studiu:** *621-04-Lexicologie și lexicografie; terminologie și limbaje specializate; traductologie (limba română)*

**Scopul lucrării:** studiul funcționalității varietăților lingvistice în limba română prin prisma unor gramatici tipărite pe teritoriul basarabean de-a lungul anilor 1827-1989, precum și a presei din perioada regimului sovietic (1946-1992).

**Obiectivele cercetării:** identificarea conceptelor-cheie și a direcțiilor teoriei variabilității în limbă; precizarea criteriilor de aplicare a teoriei variabilității limbilor și a celor de determinare a autonomiei unei limbi; delimitarea criteriilor esențiale de clasificare a varietăților de limbă; determinarea specificității variabilității interne a limbii române în funcție de diferențele teritoriale, temporale, socioculturale sau stilistice ale limbii; descrierea aspectelor temporale ale variabilității limbii române prin prisma gramaticilor elaborate pe teritoriul basarabean; cercetarea complexă a normelor gramaticale și a diferențelor fonetice și lexico-gramaticale depistate în gramaticile consultate; descrierea mecanismelor funcționării variabilității la toate nivelurile limbii române prin stabilirea principalelor diferențe sau similitudini ale gramaticilor limbii române/„moldovenești”; analiza variațiilor limbii la toate nivelurile limbii în textele presei periodice a regimului comunist sovietic; stabilirea echivalenței dintre normele „limbii moldovenești” și normele limbii române.

**Noutatea și originalitatea științifică:** rezidă în analiza fenomenului variabilității, a aspectelor sale multiple: variațiile diacronică, diastratică, diatopică, diafazăică, diamezică și diegenică. A fost aplicată o abordare pluriaspectuală a fenomenului cercetat în vederea observării mecanismului de funcționare a diverselor tipuri de varietăți în cadrul limbii române.

**Rezultatele obținute care contribuie la soluționarea unei probleme științifice importante:** A fost realizată o cercetare complexă a fenomenului variabilității, a fost propusă o clasificare a tipurilor de varietăți de limbă, astfel relevând mecanismul de funcționare a variabilității în limba română în diacronie și sincronie, prin prisma gramaticilor elaborate de-a lungul timpului în Republica Moldova și a presei din perioada regimului sovietic.

**Semnificația teoretică:** derivă din problemele teoretice abordate, ceea ce permite să identificăm cauzele și criteriile de aplicare a fenomenului variabilității la limba română prin prisma celor 2 direcții de cercetare ale ei – internă și externă –, să studiem funcționarea diacronică și sincronică a limbii române din perspectivă ontologică și gnoseologică.

**Valoarea aplicativă a lucrării:** Rezultatele cercetării pot servi drept suport pentru elaborarea unui studiu privind variația limbii române în diacronie, tipologia factorilor care generează formarea varietăților de limbă și a particularităților fiecărei varietăți. Caracterul pluridisciplinar al subiectului cercetat constituie un catalizator pentru cercetări ulterioare, pentru elaborarea unor studii sociolingvistice, de lexicologie, de gramatică etc.

**Implementarea rezultatelor științifice:** Rezultatele cercetării noastre au fost diseminate în rapoarte prezentate în cadrul mai multor manifestări științifice (conferințe, colocvii) naționale și internaționale și au fost publicate în reviste de specialitate, în culegeri tematice editate în Republica Moldova și România.

## ANNOTATION

**Botnari Liliana. *The theory of variability and its applicability to the Romanian language of the Republic of Moldova*. PhD thesis in philology, Chişinău, 2020**

**Thesis structure:** introduction, 3 chapters, general conclusions and recommendations, bibliography of 193 titles, 14 annexes, 172 basic text pages, 14 figures, 4 tables. The results of the research are published in 14 scientific papers.

**Keywords:** *variability, variation, variety, variant, invariant, literary language, autonomous language, diachronic variety, diatopic variety, diastratic variety, diaphasic variety, diamesic variation, diegenic variation, the Romanian language, the „Moldavian language”, lexical variation, index of variation, lexical-semantic analysis.*

**Field of study:** 621-04-*Lexicology and lexicography; terminology and specialized languages; traductology (Romanian)*

**The purpose of the research:** the analysis of the language varieties, their functionality in some Romanian grammars and the Soviet printed press in Bessarabia over time (1946-1992).

**Objectives of the research:** identifying the key concepts and directions of the theory of language variability; specifying the criteria of the theory of language variability application and those of determining the autonomy of a language, the taxonomies of its varieties; determining the specificity of the internal variability of Romanian according to the territorial, temporal, sociocultural or stylistic differences; description of the temporal aspects of the Romanian language variability in the Bessarabian grammars; the complex research on grammatical norms and into the phonetic, lexical and grammatical differences detected in various grammars; describing the variability functioning mechanism at all the levels of Romanian by identifying the main contrasts or similarities of the Romanian/„Moldavian” grammars; analysing the language variations at all the levels in the texts of the Soviet communist press; establishing the equivalence between the norms of the „Moldavian language” and those of Romanian.

**The scientific novelty and originality:** resides in the analysis of the phenomenon of variability, of its multiple aspects: diachronic, diastratic, diatopic, diaphasic, diamesic and diegenic variations. A multi-conceptual approach to the investigated phenomenon has been proposed in order to identify the functioning mechanism of the different types of varieties of the Romanian language.

**The results that contribute to the solving of an important scientific problem:** we performed a complex research on the variability phenomenon; we proposed a classification of the types of language varieties, which allowed us to reveal the functioning mechanism of the variability in the Romanian language diachronically and synchronically, in some Romanian grammars and the printed press in Soviet Bessarabia.

**The theoretical significance:** derives from the investigated theoretical problems, which allows us to explain the causes and the criteria of the phenomenon of variability application to the Romanian language from the point of view of two research directions – internal and external, to study the diachronic and synchronic functioning of the Romanian language from the ontological and gnoseological perspectives.

**The applicative value of the thesis:** the results of the research can serve as a support for a diachronic study on the variation of the Romanian language, on the typology of the factors that generate the formation of the language varieties and their particularities. The multidisciplinary character of the explored subject could act as an impetus for further research, for the elaboration of sociolinguistic, lexicological, grammatical studies etc.

**Implementation of scientific results:** the results of our investigation were disseminated in reports presented during national and international scientific events (conferences, colloquiums) and were published in specialized journals and thematic collections from the Republic of Moldova and Romania.



**BOTNARI LILIANA**

**THE THEORY OF VARIABILITY AND ITS APPLICATION TO  
THE ROMANIAN OF REPUBLIC OF MOLDOVA**

**621-04 LEXICOLOGY AND LEXICOGRAPHY; TERMINOLOGY AND  
SPECIALIZED LANGUAGES; TRADUCTOLOGY (ROMANIAN)**

Summary of doctoral thesis in philology

---

Approved for printing: 16.09.2020

Offset paper. Offset typing.

Print Sheets: 2,0

Paper Size 60x84 1/16

Circulation: 40 copies

Order no. 66/20

---

Centrul Editorial-Poligrafic al USM  
str. A. Mateevici 60, Chişinău, MD-2009, Republica Moldova