ROMANIAN TERMINOLOGY OF MASS MEDIA. TYPES OF DEFINITIONS IN THE ENCYCLOPEDIC AND LINGUISTIC DICTIONARIES

Roxana JOIȚA KHALIFA
University of Bucharest

Abstract

Given that the Romanian terminology of mass media (TMM) is still in progress, we have noticed the inconsequence of the lexicographical entries in the encyclopedic dictionaries, corresponding to the lexical units which are specialized in TMM and have high frequency in use. Concerning the selected corpus, we have come to the conclusion that the corresponding definitions in the encyclopedic dictionaries (DEXI, MDN, DCR[3]) are descriptive, approximate and variable. The definitions in the terminological dictionary (DEJ) have an encyclopedic and ranking character, in order to classify the defined lexical units following the scheme hyponym/hyperonym, the proximate genre and less according to the relations of synonymy developed with other lexemes.

Key words: *terminology of mass media, lexicographical/terminological definitions, substantial/relational definitions, encyclopedic dictionaries, terminological dictionary*

Résumé

Étant donné que la terminologie roumaine des médias (TMM) est en processus de formation, nous avons remarqué l'inconséquence des entrées lexicographiques dans les dictionnaires encyclopédiques, correspondantes aux unités lexicales spécialisées dans TMM avec grande fréquence d'usage. En ce qui concerne les unités lexicales sélectées, nous avons conclu que les définitions dans les dictionnaires encyclopédiques (DEXI, MDN, DCR[3]) sont descriptives, approximatives et variables. Les définitions dans le dictionnaire terminologique ont un caractère encyclopédique, classificateur et hiérarchisant, pour placer l'unité lexicale défini après le schéma hyponyme/ hyperonyme, le genre proximale et moins après les relations de synonymie développées avec d'autres unités lexicales.

Mots-clés: *terminologie roumaine des médias, définitions lexicographiques/ terminologiques, définitions substantielles/relationnelles, dictionnaires encyclopédiques, dictionnaire linguistique*

0. This article purposes to get a general view on the types of definitions corresponding to the lexical units specific to the terminology of mass media (TMM) in Romanian dictionaries. As the Romanian TMM is still in progress[1], we have noticed that many terms specific to this domain have not been included in the dictionaries,

---

[1] The domain of reference being recently professionalized - see Coman, 1999, p. 185.

even if they have been identified with high frequency in use. Besides, most of the lexicographical records and the correspondent definitions are inconsequent and heterogeneous. Therefore, a rigorous analysis could not be accomplished at this phase, but our research aims to point out the actual stage of the TMM lexical entries in Romanian dictionaries, as well as the general trends regarding the specialized lexical units of TMM. We kept on track the lexical records in the encyclopedic dictionaries - *Dicţionarul explicativ ilustrat al limbii române*[2] (DEXI), *Marele dicţionar de neologisme*[3] (MDN), *Dicţionarul de cuvinte recente, third edition*[4] (DCR[3]) and in the terminological dictionary corresponding to the domain - *Dicţionar explicativ de jurnalism, relaţii publice şi publicitate* (DEJ). The analysed terms have been selected according to the criterion of conceptual importance and the prevalence in the corpus we have chosen (see *Sources*).

1. Common lexicon/specialized lexicon. The relation word/term

The lexicon, as the entirety of the words in a natural language, is an abstract entity, hard to be marked off and analysed, not only for quantitative reasons, but also because of the mobility and the variety of words in a given language. Its concrete representation is found in monolingual dictionaries that classify and mark off the lexical units in a given language[5].

Therefore, we get to the distinction between common lexicon (LC) and specialized lexicon (LS), dissociation that makes the general concept less abstract, even though it represents a potential system[6].

The demarcation LC/LS is first made out of the frequency in use of the words and taking into consideration the functional-stylistic factor that concerns the interest of speakers in relation to their profession and their socio-cultural status. Therewith, the segmentation of the general lexicon determines the limitation of the object in lexical research and, as a consequence, a much more rigorous subsequent scientific approach[7].

In the general dictionaries, the rating of the lexical units and their distribution to LS or LC are made by mentioning the diastratic marks or the stylistic/semantic indications. The meaning is decoded by the proper reading of the definitions in the dictionaries.

The general dictionaries "sort the meanings, organise them and, only indirectly, form them, the last objective being fundamental for the specialized dictionaries"/ „triază sensurile, le organizează şi, numai indirect, le formează, ultimul obiectiv fiind fundamental pentru dicţionarele specializate"[8]. For the common

---

[2]Our preference for DEXI, up against DEX, is motivated by its higher rigour by which the delimitation of the lexical units from the perspective LC/LS has been operated.

[3]MDN is a lexicographical work with high importance in establishing the meaning and the status of the lexical units of TMM, given that the Anglo-American influence is one of the essential traits of TMM in current Romanian language.

[4]DCR[3], up against the other dictionaries, introduces new entries in current language and gives the contexts where they appear. This fact is essential in the analysis of *the relational definitions* (see *infra*).

[5] Bidu-Vrănceanu; Forăscu, 2005, p. 13.

[6]A. Lehmann and F.Martin-Berthet limit the general lexicon from the specialized ones, related to certain domains (Lehmann, Martin-Berthet, 1998, p. 3-4, *apud* Bidu-Vrănceanu, 2005, p. 13). The interpretation of the lexicon as a potential system is also formulated by F. Gaudin and L. Guespin (Gaudin, Guespin, 2002, p. 15, *apud* Bidu-Vrănceanu, Forăscu, 2005, p. 13).

[7] Bidu-Vrănceanu, 2000, p. 9.

[8] Bidu-Vrănceanu, 2000, p. 11.

speakers, the degree of accessibility to the codes represented by different terminologies is a very important aspect of the analysis. That is why comparing different types of specialized lexicon in general dictionaries is an essential argument in marking off the *alternative definitions*[9]. Identifying the specialized meaning is determined by the linguistic context and by the proportion between liberties and restrictions of use. The precision of the specialized meaning leads to *decontextualization* in most of the terminologies where important conceptual subdivisions are expressed by stable collocations.

In TMM, this phenomenon is illustrated by constructions such as *lead – rezumat/abstract lead, lead-şoc/shock-lead, lead-bombă/bomb-lead, lead narativ/ narrative lead, lead-raport/report-lead, lead-etichetă/label-lead, lead-out/lead out*; *ştire flash/flash news, ştire amplă/ample news, ştire în curs/news in progress* versus *lead/lead, ştire/news*. We have also noticed that in long texts, the terms can have liberties or other contextual preferences that involve modifications concerning the dynamics of the meaning. The relation to the specialized *hard core* (see *infra*) is an important element in the syntagmatic analysis[10].

The demarcation of the specialized meaning from the common one is made by lexicographical records preceded by diastratic marks, which are a definite sign of delimitation. In general dictionaries, the stylistic/diastratic marks represent an important issue from the perspective of the relation LC/LS. In the case of LC, they appear as a syntagmatic explanation of the meaning. In specialized dictionaries, the diastratic marks are very important for the common speaker given that "they preliminarily indicate the extralinguistic situations and the linguistic situations of correct communication, as complex contextual information (syntagmatic), concerning either the scientific terminology to which the term belongs or only a special field of reference" /"indică preliminar atât situaţiile extralingvistice, cât şi situaţiile lingvistice de comunicare corectă, fiind, deci, informaţii contextuale (sintagmatice) complexe, ele privind fie terminologia ştiinţifică anume căreia îi aparţine termenul, fie numai un domeniu mai special de referinţă"[11].

P. Corbin defines diastratic marks as information between brackets before the lexicographical definition that are explicit value judgements of the lexicographer, related to the precepts and the socio-cultural conditions of use, specific to some words and meanings[12]. Therefore, the diastratic marks for the specialized lexicon are essential, the fulfilment of the coherence and consistency conditions, rigour and non-contradiction being absolutely necessary in the precise lexicographical description.

The *word*, as a lexical unit of the common vocabulary, represents a stable phonic and graphic structure, that can be recognized as belonging to a certain natural language, even without knowing its meaning. Hence, we infer that the *form* is stronger than the *meaning* of a lexical unit. From this perspective, the first distinction between *word* as a unit of the common lexicon, on the one hand, and *word* as a unit of the specialized lexicon, on the other hand, is set up – knowing the meaning that determines

---

[9]The differences in defining the specialized lexicon in the general and specialized lexicographic works lead to the establishment of some parallel definitions, called *alternative definitions* (Bidu-Vrănceanu, 2000, p. 11).

[10] Bidu-Vrănceanu, 2007, p. 27.

[11] Bidu-Vrănceanu, 2000, p. 12.

[12] Corbin, 1980, 1989, *apud* Bidu-Vrănceanu, 2000, p. 12.

the modification of the lexical status (unit of LC or term of LS), clearly distinguishing the *sign* and the *signifier*[13].

From the various definitions of the *word* we keep that of *linguistic sign*, as a union of the image representing the object – *sign* and the image of the phonetic body of the sign – *signifier*[14]. We will not insist on the properties of the word as a linguistic sign, but we enhance that the distinction *signification/meaning*[15] is absolutely necessary in the delimitation of the words as units of the common lexicon or of the specialized lexicon. For this, the distinction between denotation and connotation is needed, the former supposing a social, cultural, common code of the speakers and concerning the specialized lexicon.

Angela Bidu-Vrănceanu notes that "when the *term* gets, besides the denotative dimension, specific to the specialized meaning, a connotative one (getting to concrete polysemy), its proximity to the word is maximum"/„în momentul în care termenul capătă, pe lângă dimensiunea denotativă, proprie sensului specializat, şi una conotativă (ajungând la polisemie propriu-zisă), apropierea lui de cuvânt este maximă"[16]. This phenomenon is not prevalent in the Romanian TMM, as this terminology is classified as *open code* (see *infra*).

1.1. Lexicology and terminology

As a science, *terminology* deals with the specialized communication in a scientific, technical, professional field. This discipline structures the notional system of a specialized field[17]. Different from *lexicology* (that studies the entirety of words in a natural language as the object of the analysis), *terminology* deals only with the study of terms – words with specialized meanings in a certain field – and places the *notion* in the centre of the research, this could be represented independently from denomination or from the word that it designates[18]. The trait of interdisciplinarity in terminology results from the complexity of the term that belongs to linguistics, logic, ontology, computer science and science of things[19], but also from the complexity of the analysis that supposes the hierarchy of concepts, linguistic and non-linguistic coding and the enrichment of the specialized lexicon[20].

The perspectives of terminological analysis are different from the linguistic ones, from at least two points of view, as Wüster notes: approaching the forming of the terms and the characteristics of the linguistic or terminological lexicographic works[21]. While *lexicology* focuses on the inherent meaning of the word, *terminology* places the concept before the word and independently of its form or its lexical representation. *Lexicology* is as well related to grammar, the articles in dictionaries being described while respecting their contextual occurrence. *Terminology* studies the term isolatedly,

---

[13]Eugen Coşeriu states that the *sign* of a given terminology could be known as far as the domain is known, not as far as the language is known (Coşeriu, 1967, p. 17).

[14] Bidu-Vrănceanu, Forăscu, 2005, p. 16.

[15]*Signification* is interpreted as a generalizing image with certain particularities accomplished *in* and *through* circumstantial contexts; the method consists in focusing the word on the object, regarding it as one of its possible representations comprised in the significance (Bidu-Vrănceanu, Forăscu, 2005, p. 18).

[16] Bidu-Vrănceanu, 2010, p. 23.

[17] Bidu-Vrănceanu, 2000, p. 64-65, 2007, p. 19.

[18] Cabré, 1998, p. 7.

[19] Wüster, 1981, p. 57, *apud* Cabré, 1998, p. 61.

[20] Bidu-Vrănceanu, 2000, p. 64, 2007, p. 21.

[21] Wüster, *apud* Cabré, 1999, p. 33.

independently of the morphological or syntactic regime. More than this, *linguistics* differentiates the traits of words diachronically and synchronically, while *terminology* treats the lexical unit only synchronically[22].

M. T. Cabré uses as arguments the distinctive character of *terminology* as compared to *lexicology* and the nature of the objective: *terminology* aims to denominate and standardize, while *lexicology* deals only with the description of words[23].

1.2. Internal terminology (T1) *vs.* external terminology (T2)

Terminology admits various interpretations, M.T. Cabré bringing into discussion, in 1991, the existence of *terminology* – in a general view – and of *terminologies*, as subdivisions specific to each field[24]. This perspective of analysis also appears with different authors that have pointed out that *terminology* develops in *tendences* and *subtendences*[25].

M. T. Cabré proposes two perspectives of terminological analysis: that of common speakers who use specialized lexical units in current discourse and that of specialists who use terms in scientific communication[26]. This distinction leads to the delimitation of the *internal terminology* – used by the specialists in the scientific communication, from the *external terminology* – the adequate use of a specialized lexical unit by a common speaker, through the extension of many specialized terms in the common lexicon, in the current stage[27]. This linguistic phenomenon, defined as "democratization and socialization of knowledge"/ "democratizare şi socializare a cunoaşterii"[28] or as "laicization of sciences"/"laicizare a ştiinţelor"[29], lead to the external terminology. This is descriptive and based on textual analysis.[30] In TMM, the phenomenon of *terminologization* is more salient than the phenomenon of *determinologization*, given that the migration of the lexical units takes place from LC towards LS - words from LC migrate to LS where they semantically specialize. This fact classifies TMM as *open code/cod deschis*, compared to the terminologies classified as *closed code/cod închis* (such as the terminology of mathematics, the terminology of medicine), where the lexical migration takes place in the opposite direction, from LS to LC.

1.3. Terminological analysis

The terminological analysis treats "the lexical units of the specialized lexicon, as a part of the general lexicon and its follow-up"/„unităţile lexicale ale limbajului specializat, parte a limbajului general şi continuare a acestuia"[31] and directly relates the specialized lexicon and the common one. As a consequence of this relation, an extension of the terms beyond the specialized lexicon is noticed, a phenomenon that attracts the semantic-conceptual approximation (*determinologization*), in different

---

[22] Cabré, 1999, p. 33.

[23] Cabré, 1999, p. 33.

[24] Bidu-Vrănceanu, 2007, p. 19.

[25] Béjoint, Thoiron, 2000, p. 17, *apud* Bidu-Vrănceanu, 2007, p. 19.

[26] Cabré, 1998, p. 32.

[27] Bidu-Vrănceanu, 2007, p. 23.

[28] Gaudin, 1992, p. 151, *apud* idem.

[29] Rastier, 1995, p. 45, *apud ibidem*.

[30] Rastier, 1995, p. 38-40, *apud ibidem*.

[31] Depecker, 2000, p. 63, *apud* Bidu-Vrănceanu, 1997, p. 104.

forms and stages. Therefore, the non-scientific texts, where lexical units and contexts appear, have an essential role in the extension of the specialized lexicon[32].

M. T. Cabré defines specialized communication as a completely different form from the general communication, as scientific knowledge is not homogenous or separated from the general one.[33] The distinction general language – specialized lexicon/common lexicon is hard to set, given the interdisciplinarity of the domains, the lexical dynamics as a result of the variety of the concepts and the frequency in use of the words specific to a certain domain in mass media.

The accurate and unambigous definiteness of the meaning essentially depends on the framing of the lexical unit in the field it belongs to[34]. The lexical unit becomes *term* only in a certain domain and according to the conceptual system[35].

2. Types of definitions

2.1. The typology of *definitions*[36] is various, as they depend on the perspective and on the possibilities of decoding. The latter is the source of the *alternative definitions* that are elaborated according to the semantic equivalences made by the reader, the professional competence of the speaker and the type of the context wherein the lexical unit appears. Angela Bidu-Vrănceanu notes that in this situation the circumstantial contexts and the linguistic ones are reversed and considers that this phenomenon is one more motivation for the *alternative definitions*[37].

One delimitation of the definitions is that according to the type of lexicon which the defined unit belongs to. Therefore, we identify the *natural/lexicographical definitions* that especially concern the common lexicon (the definitions in lexicography and semantics) and the *terminological/conventional definitions* applied to the specialized lexicon. The semantic equivalences included in the first category have a descriptive, approximate and changeable character, according to the conditions of communication, while the second category includes definitions with a rigorous, non-ambiguous prescriptive and conventional character. The peculiar characteristics of the type of specialized lexicon corresponding to a certain domain consist in the relations between the *conventional* and *natural*[38]. From this perspective, the trait of *open code* that characterizes Romanian TMM (see *supra*) is also reflected in the proportion between the definitions in the encyclopedic dictionaries and those in the linguistic dictionaries, most of the lexical units specific to TMM (even if they are frequently used in specialized works), they neither appear in the encyclopedic dictionaries nor are preceded by diastratic/stylistic marks in order to be placed in a distinct, specialized domain.

The lexicographical definitions always depend on the contexts wherein the

---

[32] Bidu-Vrănceanu, 2010, p. 11.

[33] Cabré, 2000, p. 13.

[34] Mortoureux-Pétiot, 1990, p. 116; Gaudin, 2003, p. 156, Depecker, 2002, p. 145, *apud* Bidu-Vrănceanu, 1997, p. 105.

[35]B. de Bessé shows that the *term*, *concept*, *domain* and *definition* form the *conceptual system* (Bessé 2000, p. 182, *apud* Bidu-Vrănceanu, 1997, p. 105).

[36]We treat the *definition* as an analysis or description of the meaning, on which the *sign* could be identified and correct linguistic messages could be built/ „ o analiză sau o descriere a sensului unei unități, pe baza căreia se poate identifica referentul și se pot construi mesaje lingvistice corecte" (Bidu-Vrănceanu, 2000, p. 15).

[37] Bidu-Vrănceanu, 2000, p. 15.

[38] Bidu-Vrănceanu, 2000, p. 16.

lexical units for which a semantic equivalence is looked for appear, getting to the point where the type of context is more important than the definition, even if the monolingual dictionaries do not offer illustrative contexts[39]. The lexicographical definitions also get, by including the contextual descriptions in the description of the meaning or of the word's use, a complex prescriptive character, not only descriptive, including the extralingual circumstances, besides the linguistic ones[40].

Addressing common speakers, the lexicographical definition has an open social character and supposes the use of a metalanguage[41]. Given that it is applied to a preexistent sign in language, the lexicographical definitions are explanatory and they approximate the use of the word. This implies the linguistic competence of the reader and his practice as well, herein the differences of the potential among the speakers inverting – fact best proved in the case of LS[42]. Synonymy is one of the linguistic means of describing the use of a lexical unit. But, the definition by synonymy has a series of disadvantages. In this case, the analysis of the meaning is made under another lexicographic entry and leads to some circularity of the definitions. This fact is a disadvantage for the reader even in LC, while in LS this type of definition is undesirable, weakening the trait of specialized lexical unit. Angela Bidu-Vrănceanu considers that LS should use the definitions by synonymy only in objectively limited circumstances, as the specialized lexicon is not generally characterized by this type of semantic relation[43]. Synonymy is weakly represented in TMM. This fact is a trait of *closed code* type, given that synonymy is generally rejected by the specialized lexicons. There are yet some lexical units in TMM whose definitions are accomplished by synonymy, the semantic delimitation being done syntagmatically. *Lead/lead*, for instance, is recorded in DEJ as *synonym to news/sinonim cu ştire* [44], but the entry in the dictionary also mentions the semantic-conceptual differences that individualize this term in TMM. Angela Bidu-Vrănceanu also enhances that antonymy and hyperonymy, another ways of defining the use of words, could be involved in LC and LS, as well. Hyponymy and hyperonymy are semantic categories that most of the lexical units in TMM manifest. This type of lexical relation is two-term structured, but one-side influenced – only the hyponyms are included in the hyperonym[45]. This is a consequence of various taxonomies absolutely necessary in LS for setting the semantic-conceptual relations among the terms. The way of expressing the semantically-conceptually submitted hyponyms by adding some determiners to the hyperonyms in the syntagmatic structure is usual in most of terminologies[46]. In TMM, this type of syntagmatic way of expression is recurrent, given the large number of conceptual subcategories supposed by the subdomains of mass media. Hyperonyms in TMM generally have a stable position in the semantic-conceptual hierarchy and they

---

[39] From this perspective, DCR³ (up against other monolingual dictionaries) exclusively presents the advantage of including a large series of illustrative contexts, nearby each lexicographical entry.

[40] Bidu-Vrănceanu, 2000, p. 18.

[41] Regarding the definitions in general dictionaries, the language of description is a natural language, that uses frequent words and allows the reformulations of the definitions by the reader (Bidu-Vrănceanu, 2000, p. 17).

[42] Vasiliu, 1982, p. 184; Vasiliu, 1980, p. 633, *apud* Bidu-Vrănceanu, 2000, p. 17.

[43] Bidu-Vrănceanu, 2000, p. 17.

[44] DEJ, 192.

[45] See Bidu-Vrănceanu, 2007.

[46] Bidu-Vrănceanu, 2007, p. 136.

are familiar to the majority of common speakers, in most of the cases. The degree of specialization is very important in the external terminology, as it could influence the decoding process of the specialized meaning. Terminology, in any domain, regards *the term* and the relation *term/word*. The extensions of meaning admitted by the specialized terms in common texts determine modifications that lead to polysemy. The operation of putting them in direct relation with the strictly specialized term establishes the relation towards the *hard core*. The semantic deviations could lead to the polysemy itself when the relation between the *term* and the *word* is not strong. Antonymy is also a trait of TMM, especially at the level of terms, and less contextually. Based on the semantic relations of antonymy some differentiated semantic-conceptual entities are constructed - *ştire hard/ştire soft* (*hard news/soft news*), *informaţie pe bandă/ informaţie în afara înregistrării* (*information on the record/information off the record*), *sursă on the record/sursă off the record* (*source on the record/source off the record*), that follow the Anglo-American pattern of structuring the denoted categories. Having admitted that the lexicographical definitions should concern only the words, but without neglecting the relation between meaning and object[47], the necessity of limiting the linguistic definitions from the encyclopedic/ostensive definitions is required. This encourages the terminological definitions, which are referential, classifying and with a clear hierarchy trait. We should also consider that there are no criteria to distinguish the definition of the word from that of the designated object[48].

Besides the limitation *natural/lexicographical definitions – conventional/ terminological definitions*, the categorization *substantial definitions*[49] – *relational definitions*[50] is distinguished. The *substantial definitions* are elaborated according to the Aristotelic formula of the proximate genre[51] and by virtue of the specific differences[52], between these two components of the defining scheme interfering an inversely proportional relation: the more general or weaker the proximate genre is, the more numerous and accurate the specific differences that complete it should be[53]. Appealing to stereotyped definitions, of effective representation of the object according to an assembly of properties, the real/primary signifier is described. In this situation, a relation sign, that includes the subjective factor (the reader), interferes. Therefore, we get to one more motivation of the alternative definitions, especially in the case of LS[54]. The *relational definitions* express once the entry-word and do not appeal to the hierarchy based on the proximate genre. This type of definitions is applied only in the case of the relation whole/part or of membership, in the case of the relation of similarity and antonymy. In the analysis of LS, the preference for the substantial definitions or for the relational definitions is a modality of semantic and lexicographical characterization. Unlike the lexicographical definitions, the semantic/semic definitions are more accurate and systematic. Therefore, not only a part

---

[47] Vasiliu, 1982, 1983, p. 184-185, *apud* Bidu-Vrănceanu, 2000, p. 17.

[48] See Bidu-Vrănceanu, 2000.

[49]The substantial definitions are generally applied to nouns, except the derivative ones.

[50]The relational definitions are applied to adjectives, adverbs and derived lexical units.

[51]The limitation of this type supposes a hierarchy by hyperonym, archsememe or achylexeme (Bidu-Vrănceanu, 2000, p. 18).

[52] This type of differences regard the descriptive, causative, purpose or functional marks (*ibidem*).

[53] Bidu-Vrănceanu, 2000, p. 18.

[54] Bidu-Vrănceanu, 2000, p. 18.

of the semantic information in the lexicographical definitions can be transferred to a semic definition, by reinterpretations and transcodings[55].

The *terminological definition* treats the *term* as a member of a determined whole called *terminology*, a definitional system wherein a relation of interdependency interferes regarding the *concept*, *term*, *definition* and *domain*. This type of relation is found in the terminological triangle, in the centre of which there is a *concept*. We get, therefore, to the point that the term has as traits monosemy and monoreferentiality, that is the unambiguity of meaning, and the definition is made prescriptively, stipulatively and conventionally. Therewith, the terminological definition highly depends on the reader, according to the source of placing the semantic equivalence. As a consequence, different levels of the terminological definition appear, depending on the type of lexicographical work. This fact is applied especially in LS in the general dictionaries, where the terminological definitions should be elaborated in an *open code*, easy to be decoded by common readers[56].

2.2. The *definition* in DEXI, MDN, DCR³ and DEJ

In DEXI, the *definition* is generally analytical and comprises the proximate genre and the specific differences. The indicated synonyms are a part of the lexical family of the entry word or of the literary language. The operation of placing it in a specialized field is accomplished either by mentioning some field-brackets in the lexicographic article (DEX, p.VII) or by explicitly relating it to a specialized field (DEXI, p.IX).

MDN – a dictionary addressed to the common public, irrespective of the reader's education level - appeals to the concise, clear and correct definition of the meaning, especially in the case of scientific terms. The prevalent procedure of defining is analytical, without neglecting the definition by synonymy (MDN, p. 9).

In DCR³, a descriptive dictionary by its specifics, the definitions are simple, by synonyms or explanations meant to easily clarify the meanings for the large public, mentioning the quotations with the contexts where the lexical unit appears (DCR³, p.16).

DEJ – a terminological dictionary – presents the meaning of the entry words by ample syntagmatic descriptions that sometimes unfold over several pages. The entry article is always joined by the indication of the subdomain which that term belongs to and comprises, where needed, the definitions of the corresponding semantic-conceptual subcategories/reference to the corresponding entry article, according to the Aristotelic scheme of the proximate genre[57].

2.3. Types of definitions specific to the lexical units in TMM

Concerning the analysed lexical units specific to TMM, we generally observe that the definitions in the encyclopedic dictionaries (DEXI, MDN, DCR³) are descriptive, approximate and variant. The definitions in the terminological dictionary (DEJ) are encyclopedic (offering narrative information about the designed object by the word which the semantic equivalence is looked for), classifying and hierarchical, in

---

[55]Angela Bidu-Vrănceanu observes that in establishing the relations between the lexicographical and the semantic metalanguage, the transcoding/reinterpretation interferes. The meaning of the lexeme that designates the object is interpreted at the level of the lexicographical metalanguage set in order by the semantic metalanguage (see Bidu-Vrănceanu, 1993, 2000).

[56] See Bidu-Vrănceanu, 2000, 2010.

[57] See *ştire* p. 379-389.

order to set the defined lexeme according to the scheme hyponym/hyperonym, proximate genre and less according to the relations of synonymy developed with other lexemes. From this perspective, we appreciate that DEJ is an accessible dictionary not only for the specialists, but also for common speakers.

The general typology of the selected definitions concerning Romanian TMM appears as follows: *știre /news*– under *știre₂*, DEXI sets the semantic affiliation of the lexeme to the domain of mass media, also mentioning under *știre₂*, the hyponym *buletin de știri/newscast*, with a descriptive and accessible definition. DCR[3] mentions *știre-bombă/bomb-news* under the title-word *știre*, with the explicit definition referring to the field of mass media, with the explicit description of the meaning and contexts that semantically clarify the term. The high degree of semantic specialization of *știre* in TMM in current Romanian is also illustrated by the semantic-conceptual subdivisions– *știre bună de folosit* (perfect total structural calque/calc structural total perfect < Engl. *news to use* – Coman, 2001a: 47), *știre complexă/complex news*[58], *hard news/știre-șoc/știre-bombă*,[59] *știre soft/soft news/știre blândă*[60] (*ibidem*), *știre politică/political news, știre medicală/medical news, știre culturală/cultural news, știre socială/social news, știre sportivă/sports news*,[61] *știre anticipatoare/anticipating news, știre postfactum/postfactum news*[62]. These have not been recorded in any dictionary; *feature* – appears in DEJ as *termen polisemantic în limbajul american de specialitate. 1. În presa tipărită și în radio, fapt divers. 2. Reportaj consacrat unui fapt divers/polysemantic term in the American specialized language. 1.In the printed press and radio, news in brief. 2. Coverage dedicated to a piece of news. Feature* is recorded in syntagmatic constructions such as *standing feature, feature de culise/stage feature, feature strălucitor/bright feature*, mentioned in DEJ. DEXI, MDN and DCR[3] have not recorded this lexical unit. In specialized texts, *feature* appears as a member in the total structural calque of perfect type *știre-feature/feature-news*[63]; *breaking news/breaking news* is recorded in DEJ with an ample terminological definition, from which we keep *știri care întrerup emisiunea în derulare, eveniment transmis în direct/news that break the live broadcast*. Herein, the description of the meaning by hyponymical hierarchy is noticed, the hyperonym *știre/news* being deduced. The explanatory elements are clearly enounced, the definition being accessible to the common speakers as well, not only to the specialists. DCR[3] offers a descriptive definition, by contexts of illustrating the use of this terminological collocation (DCR[3], p. 107). *Breaking news* does not appear either in MDN (that records other words formed with the lexical sequence *break*) or in DEXI. This fact expresses the status of strictly specialized collocation in TMM; *insert* – appears in DEJ in the collocation *insert postsincron/postsyncron insert*, with the definition *înregistrare ulterioară a unei secvențe/subsequent record of a sequence*. The hyperonym is ignored, as it is not mentioned as a separate entry article. This fact constitutes a deficiency regarding the operation of defining the terms recorded in a terminological dictionary as DEJ is. DEXI mentions the lexicographical entry *insert, inserte, s. n. Inserție (1).* ♦ *Spec. Cadru fix sau scurtă scenă animată*

---

[58] Coman, 2001a, p. 227.
[59] Coman, 2001a, p. 247.
[60] These structures are used either as total/partial calques or as lexical borrowings.
[61] Zeca-Buzura, 2005, p. 37.
[62] Zeca-Buzura, 2005, p. 38.
[63] See Coman, 2001b, p. 127.

inclusă în acţiunea unui film./ Spec. Fixed frame or short animated scene included in the action of a film. The semantic/stylistic refers generally to LS, but does not enhance the affiliation to TMM[64]. The substantial descriptive definition offers information about the designated referential entity. The same lexical description appears in MDN *II. s. n. inserţie (1). ◊ (cinem.) plan destinat a pune în valoare un detaliu descriptiv necesar pentru înţelegerea scenei, în desfăşurarea acţiunii cinematografice./(cinem.) layout meant to make the most of a descriptive detail necessary for understanding the scene, in the unfolding cinematographic action* (< Engl., Fr. *insert,* It. *inserto*). The stylistic/semantic indications refer to the field of mass media - ◊ *(cinem.).* Specialized works use this term with a meaning to be deduced out of the contexts or of the glossaries –„Buletinele informative (…) mai pot conţine şi microinterviuri, reportaje sau relatări. (…) În cazul jurnalelor de ştiri (…) introducerea *inserturilor*[65] este aproape strict necesară"/ "The newscasts (…) could suppose microinterviews, feature reports or narrations. (…) In the case of the newscasts (…) introducing *inserts* is almost strictly necessary"[66]; *off/off* – is mentioned in DEJ as a component of the complex lexical unit *off the record,* but is not lexicographically treated in a separate entry: *off the record –* amer. *în afara înregistrării, neoficial/off the record, unofficial.* DEXI and MDN offers a lexicographical definition of this lexical unit in separate entries. DEXI defines *off* as *s. n., adv. (Cin.) 1. S. n. Voce, dialog, zgomot produse în afara ecranului sau a scenei/ 1. S. n. Voice, dialogue, noise produced off the screen or the stage.* MDN repeats the lexicographical definition from DEXI, including it in the morphological class of adjectives; *teaser /teaser–* is not recorded in DEJ or DEXI, but appears in MDN as *s. n. anunţ publicitar fără menţionarea produsului sau a mărfii, urmărind interesul publicului/advertising without mentioning the product or the merchandise.* In the specialized texts, the definition for *teaser* is deduced out of the contexts, by the subsequent explanatory retrieves, that define it as "un text care să incite la lectură", „pe lângă titlu"/ "a text that makes you read on", "in addition to the title"[67]. The semantic disambiguation is accomplished by the reference to the developed semantic relations of synonymy – "*teaser-ul* trebuie să fie scris aşa încât să ofere o idee despre ce conţine articolul"/ "the *teaser* should be written so that it offers an idea about the content of the article " (*idem*); *script/script* – appears in DEJ as *redactarea ştirii/reportajului de televiziune pe hârtie /writing the news for television on paper.* MDN records *script* with the meaning *s. n. scenariul unui film, al unei emisiuni/the scenario of a film, of a broadcast.* The same lexicographical specifications also appear in DEXI. In the specialized texts, *script* designates *scrierea textului/the writing of the text*; *talk-show/talk-show* – DEJ defines this neological borrowing as *format de emisiune, în principal în televiziune, cu invitaţi/personalităţi, cu public în platou/format of show, especially of telecast, with guests in the studio.* MDN specifies the meaning *conversaţie între un moderator şi mai mulţi invitaţi şi pe o anumită temă/conversation*

---

[64] This fact is justified by the interdisciplinarity that characterizes most of the lexical units in TMM.

[65]The direct attachment of the definite article to the lexical corpus illustrates the complete assimilation of this neological borrowing (this phenomenon could be explained by the multiple etymology). Besides, one more argument could be the final consonant [i], recognized by speakers as a characteristic of the final sequence of the masculine gender in Romanian.

[66] See Coman, 2001a, p. 230.

[67] See Coman, 2001b, p. 269.

of the host with the guests, on a certain topic, while DEXI indicates the meaning of this term as *emisiune de radio sau televiziune în care au loc discuţii pe o anumită temă între un moderator şi una sau mai multe persoane invitate/broadcast or telecast with discussions of the host with the guests.*

The lexicographical descriptions suggest the affiliation of this term to the field of mass media. Specialized works use *talk-show* as a programme that supposes a controversial, polemic debate[68]; *prime time/prime time* – appears in DEJ, DEXI and MDN with the meaning *ora maximă de audienţă în televiziune/maximum hour of audience in TV*, mentioning the specialized meaning in mass media - *audienţă în televiziune/audience in TV*; *editor /editor–* is recorded in MDN and DEXI with the meaning *persoană care editează o operă/person that edits a work* (DEXI)/ *1. persoană, societate care editează cărţi, reviste etc. ◊ persoană care pregăteşte publicarea unor texte, o emisiune de televiziune etc. 2. cel care efectuează editarea programelor pe un ordinator. II. s. n. (inform.) parte a unui calculator care face editarea programelor/person, society that edits books, magazines etc. ◊ person who prepares the publishing of texts, a telecast etc. 2. who edits the programmes on a PC. II. s. n. (inform.) partition of a PC that edits the programmes* (MDN). DEJ mentions this lexical unit with the semantic specification of the press institutions– *IP* and the terminological definition *persoana (grupul) care suportă financiar apariţia publicaţiei, funcţionarea postului de radio, de televiziune etc./ the person or group that financially supports the issue, the radio or TV station etc..* Specialized works use *editor/editori* in parallel with the English equivalent *gate-keeper/gate-keepers– păzitori de porţi*[69]. DEJ provides an vast space to the lexicographical presentation of this term; *reporter/reporter* – appears in DEXI without a diastratic mark, but with the explicit meaning formulated as belonging to the domain of mass media.

This definition is also found in the definition in MDN, respectively DCR[3], with the specification that in DCR[3] the semantic-conceptual subcategories appear as well – the proof of the exclusive semantic specialization in the field of mass media: *reporter-documentarist/documentarist reporter*, *reporter-fotograf/photo-reporter*, *reporter-operator/cameraman*. Specialized works also record *reporter-generalist/general reporter*,[70] *reporter de front/war-reporter*[71]; *cameră/camera* – DEXI records under *cameră₄*, the meaning specific to TMM *cameră de televiziune/TV camera*. MDN mentions under *cameră*₁.₂.ᵦ) *aparat complex pentru captarea imaginii şi transformarea ei în semnale video/complex device for capturing the image and converting it into video signals*, definition that concerns the domain of mass media. The lexicographical entry in MDN does not include diastratic marks, but explicit specifications concerning the technical field. DCR[3] records under *cameră²*, the total structural imperfect calque *cameră digitală*, after the English *digital camera*.

3. Conclusions

From the perspective of the typology of definitions corresponding to the lexical units in the current Romanian TMM, the syntagmatic definitions are prevalent in relation to the paradigmatic ones. This fact strengthens the status of specialized lexical

---

[68] See Coman, 2001b, p. 185.
[69] See Coman, 1999, p. 200.
[70] Coman, 2001a, p. 32.
[71] Zeca-Buzura, 2005, p. 21.

units of the terms in Romanian TMM, besides the semantic-conceptual subcategories developed by certain terms, with the definitions mentioned under the lexicographical entry of the hyperonym.

Given, as well, the actual stage of terminology in progress specific to TMM, the absence of diastratic/stylistic marks is generally observed in the encyclopedic dictionaries. As a consequence, we consider tolerable the fact that, in the current linguistic stage of Romanian TMM, many specialized lexical units have not been consequently recorded in the Romanian dictionaries and that the definitions are not rigorous and do not reflect the semantic core described in the specialized contexts where the terms have been identified.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bidu-Vrănceanu, Angela (coord.), *Lexic comun, lexic specializat*, Bucureşti, Editura Universităţii Bucureşti, 2000.

Bidu-Vrănceanu, Angela; Forăscu, Narcisa, *Limba română contemporană. Lexicul*, Bucureşti, Editura Humanitas Educaţional, 2005.

Bidu-Vrănceanu, Angela, *Aspecte ale determinologizării lexicului specializat în relaţia cu limba comună*, in *Limba română. Aspecte sincronice şi diacronice* (coord. Gabriela Pană-Dindelegan), Bucureşti, Editura Universităţii Bucureşti, 2006, p.

Bidu-Vrănceanu, Angela, *Lexicul specializat în mişcare. De la dicţionare la texte*, Bucureşti, Editura Universităţii Bucureşti, 2007.

Bidu-Vrănceanu, Angela (coord.), *Terminologie şi terminologii*, Bucureşti, Editura Universităţii Bucureşti, 2010. Campo, Angela; Cormier, Monique, *The Role of Communicative Approach for the Development of Terminology*, in „Meta", vol.50, nr. 4, Cédérom, 2005, www.googlebooks.com.

Cabré, Maria, Teresa, *Terminology: theory, methods and applications*, Philadelphia, Benjamin North America, 1998.

Cabré, Maria Teresa, *Terminologie et linguistique: La théorie des portes*, in "Terminologies Nouvelles", 21, 2000, p. 10-15, www.googlebooks.com.

SOURCES

I – Theoretical books/Specialized works

Bălăşescu, Mădălina, *Manual de producţie de televiziune*, Iaşi, Editura Polirom, 2003.

Coman, Mihai, *Introducere în sistemul mass-media*, Iaşi, Editura Polirom, 1999.

Coman, Mihai (coord.), *Manual de jurnalism. Tehnici fundamentale de redactare*, vol.I-II, ediţia a II-a, Iaşi, Editura Polirom, 2001.

Zeca-Buzura, Daniela, *Jurnalismul de televiziune*, Iaşi, Editura Polirom, 2005.

II - Dictionaries

DCR[3] = Dimitrescu, Florica (coord.), *Dicţionar de cuvinte recente* (third edition), Bucureşti, Editura Logos, 2013.

DEJ = Popescu, Cristian, Florin, *Dicţionar explicativ de journalism, relaţii publice şi publicitate*, Bucureşti, Editura Tritonic, 2002.

DEXI = *Dicţionar explicativ ilustrat al limbii române*, Institutul Phillipide şi Universitatea Alexandru Ioan Cuza din Iaşi, Editura Arc&Gunivas, 2007.

MDN = Marcu, Florin, *Marele dicţionar de neologisme*, Bucureşti, Editura Saeculum Vizual, 2008.