CZU: 81`373.421 **https://doi.org/10.59295/sum10(220)2025_12**

SYNONYMY IN THE INTEGRITY OF THE LEXICAL SYSTEM: A THEORETICAL APPROACH

Viorica COSTIN,
„Nicolae Testemițanu" State University of Medicine and Pharmacy

This study examines synonymy within the framework of the lexico-semantic field, highlighting its structural, functional, and theoretical significance in linguistic analysis. It explores the organization of lexical units into paradigms, groups, and fields, addressing terminological ambiguities related to concepts such as *lexico-semantic group*, *synonymic group*, and *semantic field*. These issues are discussed in relation to theoretical perspectives advanced by E. Coseriu, A. Zalesskaya, and A. Bidu-Vrănceanu. Particular emphasis is placed on semantic oppositions-privative, equipollent, and disjunctive – as fundamental structuring mechanisms of lexico-semantic fields. The study argues that synonymy fulfills a dual function, ensuring systemic coherence and contributing to stylistic and expressive variation. Integrating cognitive and functional approaches, synonymy is conceptualized as a dynamic, context-sensitive mechanism that facilitates differentiated nomination, semantic proximity, and lexical variation in both general and specialized language.

Keywords: *synonymy, lexico-semantic field, semantic opposition, paradigm, lexical system, cognitive linguistics,linguistic variation.*

SINONIMIA ÎN INTEGRITATEA SISTEMULUI LEXICAL: ABORDARE TEORETICĂ

Studiul analizează sinonimia din perspectiva câmpului lexico-semantic, evidențiind dimensiunile sale structurale, funcționale și teoretice. Cercetarea examinează dinamica relațiilor dintre unitățile lexicale și modul lor de organizare în paradigme, grupuri și câmpuri semantice, abordând ambiguitățile terminologice asociate conceptelor *grup lexico-semantic*, *grup sinonimic* și *câmp semantic*. Aceste aspecte sunt discutate în raport cu teoriile formulate de E. Coseriu, A. Zalesskaya și A. Bidu-Vrănceanu. Un rol central îl ocupă analiza opozițiilor semantic-privative, echipolente și disjunctive. Studiul relevă: sinonimia contribuie simultan la coerența sistemului lexical și la diversitatea stilistică, fiind strâns legată de proximitatea semantică și de potențialul comutativ al unităților lexicale. Prin integrarea perspectivelor cognitive și funcționale, sinonimia este concepută ca un mecanism dinamic, dependent de context, care susține variația lexicală și nuanțarea expresivă atât în limbajul specializat, cât și în cel colocvial.

Cuvinte-cheie: *sinonimie, câmp lexico-semantic, opoziție semantică, paradigmă, sistem lexical, lingvistică cognitivă, variație lingvistică.*

Language is not merely a system of signs, but a living reality,
in constant movement and transformation.
Eugeniu Coseriu

Introduction

Language, in its entirety, is a well-organized and rigorously structured system, composed of microsystems and microstructures (language levels). Each microsystem implies a correlation of subordinated units, forming so-called patterns. The linguistic system is characterized by complexity, integrity, stability, and mobility. Consequently, the interplay between the static and the dynamic, between stability and mobility, tradition and innovation, underscores the binary nature of language [1, pp. 58-59].

The language consists of the fundamental vocabulary and the general lexical mass. The fundamental vocabulary includes those words without which communication would not be possible. In contrast, the general lexical mass comprises all the remaining words, without which communication remains possible. This lexical mass encompasses the functional styles: administrative-official, scientific-technical, journalistic, colloquial, and literary. The scientific style represents a linguistic variant used for communication within

the fields of science and technology, and the linguistic processes that unfold within this domain constitute specialized language, including scientific and technical terminology.

Researchers in the field [2, pp. 15-16] point to certain distinctions between specialized language and general language. Unlike general language, which is spontaneous, objective, and motivated, specialized language is a conscious, organized, and planned creation. General language emerges as a product of the people, while specialized language is, to a large extent, artificially constructed, with many of its terms being patterned or formulaic. For instance, the term *synonymy* was first employed by F. Belleforest in 1582 [3, p. 695].

At the level of acceptability and norm, general language adheres to the traditional norms of the language—common and stable—whereas specialized language relies on socialization, that is, an agreement among the stakeholders involved in the use of specialized lexical units.

From a functional perspective, general language encompasses words indispensable for everyday communication, referring to generic designations, while specialized language comprises terms derived from a more precise understanding of “things” and their names, specific to a particular field of activity.

As language is continually updated across various technical and scientific fields, it comes to meet specific professional and communicative needs. Specialized language represents a form of the language’s very existence. In this sense, medical specialized language is the concrete manifestation of language within the field of medicine.

Coherent and well-structured expression, both oral and written, employing expressive and refined language, is an essential condition for producing discourse at an aesthetic level. Synonyms have always served as an indicator of expressiveness in communication. According to scholars, they emerge from the need to diversify, enrich, and highlight both the semantic and stylistic dimensions of verbal and written expression.

From the perspective of aesthetic experience, the use of synonyms – whether in colloquial or terminological language (medical, in our case) – imbues discourse with plasticity and expressiveness, helping to avoid monotony and linguistic impoverishment.

Theoretical Perspectives on Synonymy and Lexical Structures. One indicator of a language’s richness is the presence of synonyms that clarify and nuance expression, carrying various stylistic, affective, and expressive values. As an integral part of language, specialized language also presupposes the existence of synonyms. In general, it is widely accepted that synonyms have a national character, being specific to each people and language. These are often considered untranslatable. In specialized language, however, it is common to encounter synonyms of Greco-Latin scholarly origin, shared across multiple languages, which grants them an international status.

The linguist Ferdinand de Saussure defines synonymy as „the diversity of the sign corresponding to a single signification,” or „the unity of the idea within a diverse sign” [4, p. 56]. Similarly, the Russian linguist A. Reformatsky defines synonyms as “words that denote the same object, yet refer to different aspects of it, and through synonymic naming reveal various characteristics of the respective object” [5, p. 91].

In one of his studies, Iulian Ghiță proposes the following definition of synonymy: „a semantic relationship that links two or more senses belonging to different words, provided that their use is characterized by the same semantic markers” [6, p. 38].

Researcher Cristian Moroianu offers a broader perspective on the phenomenon of semantic equivalence, arguing that „synonymy is a semantic relationship established between words with identical or closely related meanings, which express the same concept in a concrete communicative situation – even when certain chronological, spatial, or stylistic-functional differences are disregarded”. He also notes that, in a narrower and idealized framework, “synonymy is represented by referential identity demonstrable through substitution at the synchronic, syntopic, sinstratic, and sinphasic levels” [7, p. 73].

The most well-known definition of synonymy, according to Narcisa Forăscu, is “that semantic relationship established between words with approximately the same meaning, which can be substituted for one another in context” [8, p. 112].

Liviu Groza observes that “synonymy is the equivalence relationship between the meanings of two or more words whose forms differ. Thus, two or more formally different words are considered synonyms if at least one of their meanings shares the aforementioned relationship” [9, p. 80].

Likewise acknowledging the existence of semantic equivalence among words, linguists Nicolae Corlăteanu and Ion Melniciuc define synonyms as „those lexical units (words, expressions, phrases) which share identical or closely related meanings from a logical-objective perspective (identical significations), but which are expressed through different phonetic complexes (distinct signifiers)" [10, p. 83].

Noting the diversity of definitions for synonymy, Ion Dumeniuc and Nicolae Mătcaș argue that a wide variety of criteria underpin the definition of this semantic phenomenon: „reference to the same concept, the possibility of substituting one word for another in the same context (identical distribution), semantic similarity, etc.". However, in their view, these criteria are „subjective", and they advocate for the theory of semantic fields, which represents „an objective means of establishing the degree of semantic proximity between words—by confronting them semantically and performing sememe analysis" [1, p. 160].

In Romanian linguistics, one of the most prominent synonymists was the late academician Silviu Berejan, who developed the „theory of formal-semantic relationships between lexical units", which underpins the concept of semantic equivalence in the lexicon. He introduced the term homosemy to refine the notion of synonymy, which he considered to have become scientifically diffuse [11, p. 5].

From our perspective, synonymy relies on the capacity of different words to designate the same concept and enrich it through association with other lexical units. Lexemes must meet three essential conditions to be considered synonyms: (a) identity of the referent; (b) a concrete communicative situation; (c) the context.

Lexical Fields, Semantic Opposition, and the Role of Synonymy. Language is an organized and well-defined system. Its use in specific acts of communication constitutes speech.Some characteristics of specialized language, in contrast with general language, include: a) at the level of creativity – it is consciously created; b) at the level of authorship – it is possible to identify its author; c) at the level of acceptability – it presupposes social negotiation, i.e., the acceptance or rejection of a new lexical unit; d) at the level of functionality and necessity – it is operational within a particular domain and fits within the broader vocabulary.

Within the linguistic system, synonymy represents a means of enhancing the expressiveness of ideas, while also intensifying the expressive quality of communication. Numerous definitions of *synonymy* have been proposed, primarily in relation to general language; however, in specialized language, we refer to a specific form of synonymy – *specialized synonymy*.

Synonymy is regarded as a key element in the relational structure of a language's lexicon, contributing to the complexity of the systems (and subsystems) it encompasses. The lexical system itself presupposes the existence of lexical groupings among which specific relationships – synonymic relationships included—are established, thereby necessitating varied approaches (linguistic-semantic, linguistic-pragmatic, etc.).

One of the persistent concerns among linguists continues to be the structure of vocabulary and, consequently, the study of lexical subsystems. In this regard, renewed attention is given to a topic that has long sparked debate in semasiological studies: the terminology employed in the description and analysis of lexical structures (e.g., *lexico-semantic group*, *lexico-semantic field*, *lexico-semantic paradigm*, *group of synonyms*, *group of antonyms*, etc.). For instance, the term *lexico-semantic group* is often used to denote various types of lexical structures.

Several linguists, including A. Kuznetsova [12, p. 43] and F. Filin [13, pp.538-539], maintain that a lexico-semantic group may consist of lexemes that share common semantic properties, such as *groups of synonyms*, *antonyms*, and both *lexical* and *semantic fields*. Meanwhile, L. Vasiliev and N. Dolgikh include the lexico-semantic group – together with other lexical structures—under the broader concept of semantic field [14, p. 112], [15, p. 90]. A. Ufimtseva similarly categorizes such groupings as more complex lexical paradigms [16, pp. 394 - 397].

For his part, V. Kudukhov argues that *the lexico-semantic group* and *the derivational group* encompass *synonymic groups*, *antonymic groups*, *terminological clusters*, and *stylistic groupings* [17, p. 4].

According to linguist I. Karaulov, the improper use of terminology generates difficulties in the process of classifying lexical microsystems [18, p. 314]. In the absence of universally accepted differentiation criteria, we witness, for example, divergent definitions of the same phenomenon: *lexico-semantic group*, *group of synonyms*, *semantic field*.

Various extralinguistic and linguistic objects and phenomena, through continuous interaction, establish

paradigmatic relationships between words and their lexico-semantic variants. According to some scholars, this phenomenon constitutes the primary criterion for distinguishing between different lexical structures.

In one of her studies, researcher A. Zalessskaya, referring to the semantic fields described by J. Trier, observes that lexemes within these structures are grouped based on an extraglossic principle, unlike lexico-semantic groups, which are structured according to a glossic principle. For this reason, she argues that, in line with modern linguistic terminology, such fields should more appropriately be referred to as lexico-semantic fields, rather than semantic fields or conceptual fields [19, pp. 27-28].

This topic is also addressed by scholars S. Berejan [21, pp. 48-58]. and D. Shmelev [21, pp. 100 - 120]. The former notes that „fields differ from the so-called thematic lexical groups and lexico-semantic groups identified by many researchers within the lexical structure in that, in fields, words are associated strictly on the basis of linguistic relationships, whereas in the aforementioned groups, words are associated on the basis of extralinguistic relationships – that is, on the classification of objects and phenomena from reality itself” [21, p. 54].

Clearly, this criterion is not universally accepted among researchers. For instance, G. Shchur, emphasizing the interaction between members of a field – a feature not typically observed among members of a lexico-semantic group—introduces the *principles of invariance* and *function* [22, pp. 85 - 88].

Another point of contention concerns the distinction between the lexico-semantic field and the lexico-semantic group, based on the type of relationships established among the members of a lexical structure – namely, commutation and substitution. According to A. Zalesskaya, commutation is a type of relationship specific to the lexico-semantic field, whereas within the lexico-semantic group or synonym group, both commutation and substitution relationships may occur [19, p. 30]. In the same vein, Romanian scholars A. Bidu-Vrănceanu and N. Forăscu point out that the defining relational types for the lexico-semantic field are commutation and substitution, while these are not characteristic of the lexico-semantic group [8, p. 98].

The lexico-semantic field exhibits the following characteristics: a) the association of its members based on shared semantic properties expressed through a specific set of semes; b) semantic differentiation achieved through variable semes; c) a relationship of mutual contextual exclusion among the members of a class or paradigm, which represent broader, more flexible structures than those of synonymy, antonymy, etc. [23, p. 13].

A field may comprise from several dozen to hundreds of lexical items. The substantial quantity of lexical material undoubtedly creates difficulties in the study of semantic relationships and compels researchers to apply successive quantitative and qualitative reductions. Consequently, a central question arises: does a field represent one paradigm or multiple paradigms?

The eminent scholar Eugeniu Coseriu conflated the two concepts, interpreting the field as a paradigm [24, p. 31]. Subsequently, A. Bidu-Vrănceanu argued that a field constitutes a paradigmatic class in the broad sense. Her claim is grounded in the idea that a lexico-semantic paradigm cannot be subdivided into other paradigms, and thus a field does not necessarily correspond to a single paradigm [25, p. 26].

Another issue that draws the attention of linguists is the inventory of semantic fields, specifically the extent to which lexico-semantic paradigms within a field remain open. Given the dynamic nature of vocabulary, it becomes evident that a lexico-semantic class can be open-ended. This phenomenon occurs less frequently in the case of synonyms and antonyms, and is exceedingly rare in lexico-semantic fields. Although the issue of delimiting the boundaries of a field emerges implicitly in this context, researchers largely agree that determining the limits of a lexico-semantic field is a difficult, if not impossible, task, and recommend the study of fields in the absence of concrete data addressing this specific problem. According to H. Geckeler, however, it remains necessary to develop a detailed inventory of their semantic content [26, pp. 305-306], distinguishing within a given field the core and the peripheral area, the latter being marked by semantic oppositions.

The impossibility of establishing order within the paradigmatic classes characteristic of fields in a large number of cases may be explained, according to E. Coseriu, by the fact that – unlike other linguistic structures – this is a particular feature of the lexical structure, which is less rigid [27, p. 151].

The study of semantic oppositions lends validity to the lexico-semantic field as a semantic structure. In

order to identify oppositions, scholars have drawn upon phonology, where these investigative principles were first introduced by N. Trubetzkoy [28, pp. 33- 61].

Two typologies of oppositions have been proposed: the first concerns the relationships between lexical units (privative, gradual, equipollent oppositions); the second pertains to relationships among oppositions themselves (proportional, isolated, multilateral oppositions).

Thus, two linguistic signs whose signifiers differ give rise to a semantic opposition.

The theory of oppositions was later explored by J. Cantineau [29, pp. 56 -65] and S. Marcus [30, pp. 45-60], who described zero opposition and disjunctive oppositions, as well as by L. Hjelmslev [31, p. 108], who asserted that oppositions may also be neutralized.

Within the lexico-semantic field, the following types of oppositions can be identified:

- *privative opposition* – one of the terms possesses an additional semantic feature compared to the other, while the rest of the features are shared. This phenomenon also occurs among synonyms, where varying degrees of inclusion can be observed, depending on the number of additional features one term exhibits relative to its semantic counterpart;

- *equipollent opposition* – both terms must have at least one distinct semantic feature.

Various degrees of equipollence are distinguished according to the number of differential semes possessed by the two terms, in addition to the shared ones: irst-degree equipollence (one distinctive feature); second-degree equipollence (two distinctive features); third-degree equipollence (three distinctive features); fourth-degree equipollence (four distinctive features), and so on;

- *disjunctive opposition* – none of the characteristic features of the first term are present in the second, and vice versa; the common ground of comparison is null.

Thus, it is not possible to speak of a single vocabulary structure, but rather of differently structured zones. „The differences in structuring across various levels are evidence that, overall, the lexicon is a more flexible and branching system, comprising zones of varying homogeneity, as compared to other levels of language" [32, p. 166].

Silviu Berejan argues that a lexico-semantic field may encompass not only thematic groups, but also analogical, derivational, etymological, and synonymic groupings, among others [33, p. 45]. Hence, inclusion is recommended as the primary criterion for distinguishing between a lexico-semantic field and a lexico-semantic group. While a lexico-semantic group may constitute a substructure of a field, a lexico-semantic field cannot, by definition, be contained within a group.

Synonymy remains a persistent topic of scholarly interest, driven by the capacity of a single signified to have multiple signifiers. This property ensures the continuity of a language's vocabulary and allows integration across its different levels. In defining synonymy's role within the lexical system, scholars describe it as a „connective tissue" that ensures systemic integrity [34, p. 232], as it allows for individually expressive features to surface in the denomination of an objective content.

A particularly original perspective on synonymy is offered by linguist M. Nikitin [35, 647]. This approach rests on the notion of the variable degree of systematicity in a language's vocabulary. Accordingly, some segments appear as conglomerates of lexemes, different in origin, but interrelated by communicative necessity. These are associated in memory and functionally integrated into the lexical system.

In the opinion of M. Nikitin [35, p. 300], synonymic groups possess an independent existence; they generate focal points within segments of the lexical system and are not inherently related to one another. Thus, a core characteristic of synonymy is heterogeneity—a property of language itself—which implies the activation of multiple expressive variants to convey the same meaning, as well as the plurality of stylistic and situational valences within the lexical system.

From an onomasiological perspective, synonymy is understood as a denominative generalizer—that is, as a set of words with identical denotative content (at the level of reference to an object).

From a semasiological perspective, synonymy indicates identity or proximity of meaning at a given level of language. Synonymy involves total or partial commutation of the semantic elements that constitute the meaning structure of a linguistic sign, which are also referred to as semantic variants or lexico-semantic variants [34, p. 229].

In conclusion, synonymic quality is assessed according to the (partial) formal difference of lexical units characterized by identity or similarity of meaning—an aspect that determines the degree of synonymy, whether absolute or relative.

Currently, research in the field proposes a cognitive perspective on synonymy, aligned with the phenomenon of differentiated nomination, whereby the synonymic series is viewed as a mode of objectivizing a concept that encompasses various facets of the nomination process. This leads to the identification of transitional synonymy, characterized by stylistic reduction, which occurs in the shift from a cognitive (recognitive) to a pragmatic (applicative) perspective. In this way, the semantic reconnection of synonymy to the communicative needs of language is achieved.

Bibliography:

1. DUMENIUC, I., MATCAŞ, N. *Introducere în lingvistică*. Chișinău: Editura „Lumina”, 1980. 256 p.
2. MINCU, E. *Terminologia medicinalis Romaniae*. Chișinău: Pontos, 2017. 276 p. ISBN 978-9975-51-861-1
3. DAUZAT, Al. *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue française.* Paris: Librairie Larousse, 1938. 884 p.
4. SAUSSURE, F. *Scrieri de lingvistică generală*. Iaşi: Editura Polirom, 2004. 352 p. ISBN 973-681-436-X.
5. РЕФОРМАТСКИЙ, А. Мысли о терминологии. În: Современные проблемы русской терминологии. Москва: Наука, 1986. 199 с.
6. GHIȚĂ, I. *Sinteze și exerciții lexicale, lingvistice și stilistice*. București: Editura Didactică și Pedagogică, 1995. 300 p. ISBN 973-30-4532-2.
7. MOROIANU, C. Sinonime etimologice . În: *Limba română*. 2005. nr. 1 - 4. p.73 -84. ISSN 0585-5625
8. BIDU-VRĂNCEANU, A., FORĂSCU, N. *Cuvinte și sensuri.* București : Editura științifică și enciclopedică, 1988. 240 p.
9. GROZA, L. *Elemente de lexicologie*. București: Editura Universității din București, 2012. 178 p. ISBN 978-606-16-0090-8.
10. CORLĂTEANU, N., MELNICIUC, I. *Lexicologia*. Chișinău: Editura Lumina, 1992. 225 p.
11. BEREJAN, S. Echivalențele semantice cu același radical în limba română (Clasificare). În: *Revista de lingvistică și știință literară*. 1993. nr. 6. p. 5-12. ISSN 0236-3119.
12. КУЗНЕЦОВА, А. Понятие семантической системы языка и методы ее исследования. Москва: Изд. Московского Университета, 1963. 43 с.
13. ФИЛИН, Ф. О лексико-семантических группах. În: *Езиковедски изследование в чест на акад. Ст. Младенов.* София.1967, с. 537-538.
14. ВАСИЛЬЕВ, Л. Теория семантических полей. În: *Вопросы языкознания.* 1971, № 5. с.105-113. ISSN 0042-8747.
15. ДОЛГИХ, Н. Теория семантического поля на современном этапе развития семасиологии . În: *Филологические науки*. 1973, № 1, с. 89-98. ISSN 0130-4051.
16. УФИМЦЕВА, А. Лексика . În: *Общее языкознание. Внутренняя структура языка*. Москва. 1972, с. 406-436.
17. КОДУХОВ, В. Лексико-семантические группы слов Ленинград: 1955, 28 с.
18. КАРАУЛОВ, Ю. Словарь как компонент описания языков . În: *Принципы описания языков мира*. Москва: Наука, 1976, с. 314 - 319. ISSN 0130-3341.
19. ЗАЛЕССКАЯ, А. К вопросу о природе лексико-семантических групп. În: *Полевые структуры в системе языка*. Воронеж: Изд. Воронежского университета. 1989. 196 с. ISBN 5-7455-0179-0
20. БЕРЕЖАН, С. Теория семантических полей и синонимия. În: *Проблемы языкознания*. Москва: Наука, 1967 . p 48-58 . ISSN 0130-3253.
21. ШМЕЛЕВ, Д. *Проблемы семантического анализа лексики*. Москва: Наука, 1977. 280 с.
22. ЩУР, Г. О месте лингвистических и экстралингвистических семантических признаков при исследовании лексики. În: *Романо-германские языки*. Вып. 94, Ярослав, 1971, с. 81-95.
23. COȘERIU, E. *Einführung in die strukturelle Betrachtung des Wortschatzes*. Tübingen: Narr Verlag, 1973. 124 p. ISBN 978-3-8233-3303-6.
24. COȘERIU, E. Vers une typologie des champs lexicaux . În: *„Cahiers de lexicologie”, Revue internationale de lexicologie et de lexicographie,* volume XXVII, II. 1975. p. 30-51. ISSN 0007-9871.

25. BIDU-VRÂNCEANU, A. *Lexicul specializat în mişcare. De la dicţionare la texte*. Bucureşti: Editura Universităţii din Bucureşti, 2007. 332 p. ISBN 978-973-737-689-4.
26. GECKELER, H. *Semantica estructural y teoria del campo lexico*. Madrid: Editorial Gredos, 1976. 340 p. ISBN 9788424900865.
27. COȘERIU, E. Interdisciplinarita e linguistica. În: *L'accostamento interdisciplinare allî studio del linguaggio* . Milano: Franco Angelo Editore, 1980, p. 43-65. ISBN-10: 8820417340.
28. TROUBETZKOY, N. Grundzüge der Phonologie. În: *Travaux du Cercle Linguistique de Prague*, vol.VII, 1949, p. 5-116.
29. CANTINEAU, J. Les oppositions significatives. În: *Cahiers Ferdinand de Saussure*, vol. 10, 1952. p.55 - 73. ISSN 0008-1142.
30. MARCUS, S. *Lingvistică matematică*. București: Editura Didactică şi Pedagogică, 1963. 160 p.
31. HJELMSLEV, L. Pour une semantique structurale. În: *Travaux du Cercle linguistique de Copenhague*, XII, 1957, p. 105 -121. ISSN 0105-761X
32. БЕРЕЖАН, С. *Семантическая эквивалентность лексических единиц.* Кишинев: Изд. Штиинца. 1973. 372 с.
33. БЕРЕЖАН, С. *Лексическое значение и лексическая сочетаемость.* Кишинев: Изд. Штиинца*,,* 1981. 256 с.
34. ВИНОКУР, Г. *Лексикология и лексическая семантика. Избранные труды.* Москва: Наука, 1977. 496 с.
35. НИКИТИН, М.. *Курс лингвистической семантики.* Санкт-Петербург: Издательство Санкт-Петербургского университета, 2007. 819 с. ISBN 978-5-288-03519-7.

Date despre autor:
Viorica COSTIN, doctorandă, Școala Doctorală Științe Umaniste și ale Educației, Universitatea de Stat din Moldova; asistent universitar, Centrul de Studii Preuniversitare și Educație Lingvistică, USMF „Nicolae Testemițanu"
ORCID: 0000-0003-4428-428X
E-mail: viorica.costin@usmf.md

Prezentat: 04.08.2025