

THE DICTIONARY OF REGIONAL ROMANIAN SPOKEN IN HUNGARY – ISSUES AND CHALLENGES¹

MARIA MARIN, DANIELA RĂUȚU²

Abstract. The article deals with some issues encountered during the elaboration of *The Dictionary of Regional Romanian Spoken in Hungary* (DGRU) which concern the selection and organization of dialectal material, the choice of the form-title in relation to its variants (lexical, phonetic, accentual, morphological), especially the case of words with multiple etymology, the choosing of a literary form for terms with local pronunciation, the difficulties of establishing synonymous series, etc. The solutions proposed for some of these issues are relevant, but for others the difficulties concern subjective criteria for interpreting the material extracted from different sources, more or less scientific.

Keywords: regional varieties of Romanian in Hungary, dialect dictionary, dialect research.

1. Preliminary remarks. The dialectal researches undertaken, in the period 1991–2009, by the teams of dialectologists from the Institute of Phonetics and Dialectology “Al. Rosetti”, currently included in the “Iorgu Iordan – Alexandru Rosetti” Institute of Linguistics of the Romanian Academy, had as priority objective the study of the regional varieties of Daco-Romanian spoken in Romanian communities from the Romania’s neighboring countries (Republic of Moldova, Ukraine, Hungary, Serbia, Bulgaria). The material obtained during the dialectal surveys in these regions has been published in dialectal collections, containing texts rendered in phonetic transcription, accompanied by glossaries – constituting repertoires of representative terms for each place – and most often, preceded by extensive linguistic studies with descriptions of the specific features of these varieties (one of these collections is TD–Ung.).

2. The idea of carrying out another type of work on regional varieties of Daco-Romanian spoken outside the country’s borders, namely *Dicționarul graiurilor românești din Ungaria* (DGRU), was first suggested by our colleague Daniela Răuțu, and was took over gradually. The proposal of this theme was supported by the experience gained during the elaboration

¹ This article appeared in the bilateral project *Dicționarul graiurilor românești din Ungaria* [Dictionary of Regional Romanian Spoken in Hungary] PROJEKT 2017–55 (MTA–NKM – 115/2018, 37/2019, 8/2020) between the Romanian Academy and the Hungarian Academy of Science in Budapest. The English version was provided by Marinela Bota (“Iorgu Iordan – Alexandru Rosetti” Institute of Linguistics, Bucharest), to whom we would like to thank this way as well.

² “Iorgu Iordan–Alexandru Rosetti” Institute of Linguistics of the Romanian Academy, Bucharest; dialectologie@yahoo.com, danarautu@yahoo.com.

of *Dicționarul graiurilor dacoromâne sudice* (DGDS), whose two of the authors, Maria Marin and Iulia Mărgărit, are part of the collective development of this dictionary, but also by the innovative vision of the younger researchers, Carmen-Ioana Radu and Daniela Răuțu, to whom lately joins in order to develop the program that underpins e-DGRU³, Marinela Bota. The team from the Institute of Linguistics of Bucharest is completed by Ana Borbély (Senior Researcher at the Hungarian Research Center for Linguistics, Budapest), specialist in sociolinguistics and a native connoisseur of regional Romanian spoken in Hungary, with remarkable contributions in the field.

2.2. DGRU represents a novelty in the domain of lexicography, in general, and of dialectology, in particular, since it is one of the first studies of this kind, dedicated to Northwest Romanian dialectal varieties spoken in an environment where another language is spoken. The study addresses both the specialists in different domains (dialectology, lexicography and lexicology, the history of Romanian language, sociolinguistics, ethnology and ethnography, etc.), and those who are interested in aspects regarding the knowledge of the language, of customs and traditions from the research area.

2.3. One of the issues discussed related to this paper was the title itself, which is motivated by a dialectal glossary, by the way the material is treated and, especially, by the type of information to be provided.

2.3.1. The necessity of such a dictionary, compared to the existing glossary in TD–Ung. or with other glossaries published by Romanian specialists in various fields in Hungary, arises for several reasons:

- the two types of works, the dictionary and the glossary, are different in terms of their conception and role, the dictionary being an independent work, while the glossary was made, with few exceptions, based on the terms encountered in the collected texts, and it represents a necessary working tool for the correct understanding and decoding of these texts;

- compared to the network of localities investigated for the TD–Ung. glossary, and compared to other glossaries that are limited as a rule to the terms from a certain place, the dictionary will include material from villages where the Romanian language was used in the past as means of communication (the village Pocei = P) or which still preserves, even partially, the habit of using the Romanian language (the nine villages included in TD–Ung.: Bedeu = B, Apateu = A, Săcal = S, Micherechi = M, Jula = J, Otlaca-Pustă = OP, Chitighaz = C, Bățania = Bt, Cenadul Unguresc = CU, to which is added Crâstor = Cr, Aletea = Al and Leucușhaz = L) (see *ANNEX*: Map of Romanian localities in Hungary);

- the material on the basis of which the dictionary will be drawn up is much richer, the sources being constituted by: linguistic atlases which also have in their network villages from Hungary; collections of ethno-folkloric texts completed and published in the last 150 years (such as Hoțopan 1977); collections of dialectal texts (TD–Ung.); studies published in journals (*Izvorul*, *Lumina* etc.), in collections of articles (*Annales*) or presented in communication sessions (*Symposium*); published word lists and glossaries for various places (e.g. Borza 1999). To these are added the materials obtained from sociolinguistic surveys (conducted by Ana Borbély, since 1990) or from our own dialectal research, carried out within the project.

³ The dictionary will be published in both printed and electronic version (e-DGRU), based on a program offered by the Institute of Linguistics with the courtesy of Ana Barbu, Senior Researcher at the Department of Romance Studies and adapted to the needs of the dictionary by Marinela Bota.

2.3.2. Comparing some of the material already excerpted for the dictionary with the one included in the TD–Ung. glossary we observe that:

– a series of words that were not recorded in the glossary TD–Ung. appear; among these we mention *bălă* ‘old horse, jade, nag’, *fărină*, *a ~* ‘to sprinkle with flour’, *lougău* ‘part of the cart to which the side horse is attached’, *motroășcă* ‘rudimentary soother’, *pălăscăr* ‘bride’s witness’, *toliș* ‘paved street’, and others;

– terms previously attested for certain villages within the glossary are also recorded in others, such as *căuac(i)* ‘blacksmith’, encountered not only in A and CU but also in C and OP; *drod* a variant of *drot* ‘wire’ also attested in OP along with B, S, Bt; *hintéu* ‘carriage’ also recorded in OP, and not only in Bt; *șiréglă* ‘rear (to a cart)’ attested for M but also for C and OP; *tăniár* ‘dwelling’ found not only in A but also in C; *zoálă* ‘toil’ also recorded for OP together with S, etc.;

– the dictionary is enriched with new meanings, not attested in the glossary: *a țipá*⁴ has also in addition to the basic meaning of ‘to throw, to fling’ the semantics of ‘going fast (and for a short time); to rush in, to dash, to charge in’ of the reflexive form *a se țipá*, attested in C and OP: *Muiere, ferbe numa aluatu, că mă țin aci la Arad, să-m cumpăr o pipă dă spumă* [‘Woman, boil only the dough because **I’m rushing in**, here to Arad, to buy me a foam pipe’] (OP; Hoțopan 1977: 53).

3. The choice of regional varieties of Romanian spoken in Hungary as an object of study for the dictionary is supported by a series of reasons:

3.1. The circumscription of the area where one can speak of traditional Romanian historical communities on the territory of Hungary is relatively easy, and the idiom spoken by these communities is characterized by a remarkable unity of structure, attesting their obvious status as components of Northwestern Daco-Romanian territorial ramifications (cf. Marin 2004: 163). This unity is not refuted by the division into two groups of the regional varieties spoken in the Romanian-speaking localities in Hungary: one of them is characteristic for the villages from Hâjdú-Bihar county, to which are added Micherechi from Békés county, and another one is spoken in the localities of Békés and Csongrád counties (Cosma 1985: 26; Borbély 1990: 8 – see also *ANNEX*), respectively in three dialectal types related to regions that are usually extensions of the Romanian territorial ramifications: the Oradea area is extended over wider areas of Crișana and Transylvania (Bedeu, Apateu, Săcal, Micherechi localities), the Arad area (Jula, Otlaca-Pustă, Chitighaz) and the Timișoara area (Bătania, Cenadul Unguresc) (see Borbély 2013: 36–37). The situation is explicable (scientifically) from a geographical and socio-historical point of view⁵.

⁴ The term is inserted in most dictionaries as a regionalism with the meaning ‘to throw’, homonym of the verb *a țipa* ‘to shout’, both with unknown etymology for which various etymological solutions have been proposed over time (see CDER, s.v. *țip*). The geographical distribution of the word plus the semantic considerations that the two homonymous verbs have in common support the theory that this is an old term, which is why A. Avram (2000: 176–181) proposes the Latin origin (*suppare* ‘to stretch down, to throw’).

⁵ Leaving aside the fact that “unity is always relative” including in terms of language / speech (Coșeriu 2005: 135) throughout history, the relations between the areas with Romanian villages, some of them located to the north, and others south of Giula, they were in general very weak or even non-existent compared to those on the horizontal axis west-east, therefore with the neighbors from the areas surrounding the cities of Oradea, Arad, Timișoara. In fact, a similar situation is noted for the

3.2. The richness and variety of particularities attested in the Romanian regional varieties spoken in Hungary ensured by their status as marginal dialects (cf. Pușcariu 1959: 322), but also the ability to develop their own means (especially lexical but also artistic) of enriching the expression in their mother tongue is often noted qualities (Borbély 2006; Marin 2007; Mărgărit 2014; 2016).

3.3. The current situation of Romanian speakers in Hungary which is at least in some localities in an advanced stage of unstable and substitute bilingualism (Borbély 2008; 2013). The Romanian language, losing first its social functions, gradually restricts its sphere of use to the family environment, and later, almost exclusively, to the strictly religious one (cf. Borbély 2001: 238; 2013: 18), the next phase being the loss of the habit of speaking Romanian (Marin 2016: 112): “The tendency to abandon the mother tongue is not a result of deficiencies, of its inability to serve as a means of communication” (Marin 2016: 114) but occurs through abandonment, when the idiom is abandoned by everyone, which occurs only in conditions of bilingualism: *Și știți că limba asta română, cum am zis, dacă noi om muri, ar muri și limba română aice cu noi cu tăt* [‘You should know that this Romanian language, as I said, if we die the Romanian language would also die here with us’] (TD–Ung.: 18).

In these conditions, the creation and publication of a dictionary of regional varieties spoken in Hungary seems to us a scientific necessity and a moral obligation to the generations of speakers who resisted as long as they could, keeping alive a beautiful and rich language, which they leave only with their own life.

4. Another issue on which we insist, invoking previous interventions on this topic (Király 1984: 59; Mării 2004 [1988]: 143; Marin 2009: XXIII; Marin, Răuțu 2017: 224) is that of the repertoire of words that would be included in the dictionary.

4.1. Since it is a dialect dictionary and because we have as a model similar works elaborated in Romania or in other countries, it is necessary to include the following fundamental types of lexical elements: **a) dialectal terms per se**, loanwords or internal creations such as: *ai* ‘garlic’, *clop* ‘hat’, *curéchi* ‘cabbage’, *ducheán* ‘village store’, *hénțeș* ‘butcher’, *mintoni* ‘immediate’, *mieriu* ‘blue’, *rátotă* ‘scraps of eggs’, *sămăchișă* ‘sour milk’, *videre* ‘bucket’; **b) dialectal terms by form**, representing various forms with phonetic accidents, conservative stages of inherited words or variants justified by the neighboring languages: *ardică*, *a ~ = ridica* ‘to raise’, *beșice = bășici* ‘bladders’, *corindă = colindă* ‘carol’, *a demică = dumica* ‘to mince, to crumble’, *fărmă = fermă* ‘farm’, *imple*, *a ~ = umple* ‘to fill’, *lerijie = religie* ‘religion’, *minós = miroș* ‘smell’; **c) dialectal terms by meaning**, acquired following the natural evolution of the regional varieties or by semantic calque according to Hungarian or Serbian models: *culége*, *a ~* ‘to gather the cream from the milk’, *bănuí*, *a ~* ‘to worry; to regret’, *dormí*, *a ~ 1°* [about land, field] ‘to rest during winter’; **2°** [about milk] ‘to coagulate’, *greoáie* ‘pregnant’.

Two more important categories, which ensure the individuality of the regional varieties taken into consideration, namely: **d) dialectal terms by form and meaning**: *dóbă* ‘oven in a stove’, *gherá*, *a ~* [about food] ‘to produce burns on throat; to burn, to itch’, *hărănă* ‘raw meat preserved in brine’, *impúnge*, *a ~* ‘to stab (the pig)’, *medic* ‘drug’.

Moldavian regional varieties west and east of the river Prut, where all linguistic isoglosses “are horizontal isoglosses, cut the Prut across” (*ibidem*).

medicine'; **e) phraseological units and phrases, expressions** specific to the Northwestern-type of Daco-Romanian regional varieties or with local circulation, representing structural calques or creations that often replace the absence of neologism terms: *ápă ácră* 'sifon' ['soda water'] (after the Hungarian *borviz*), *cále de neáuă* 'pârtie' ['slope'], *cása sátului* 'primărie' ['village town hall'], *cócie de jéle* 'dric' ['mortuary cart'], *țúcur praf* 'zahăr pudră' ['powdered sugar'].

Therefore, one of the basic criteria in selecting the terms to be included in the dictionary refers to the specificity of the lexemes for the considered area and to their belonging to the category of non-literary lexical facts (cf. Mării 2004 [1988]: 143). Unlike other lexicographical works which record the entire existing lexical fund in a certain area or locality, DGRU will not retain literary terms only insofar as they have specific regional meanings (see for example *rugăminté* 'prayer, request, petition'). Words belonging to the standard language such as *ciobán* 'shepherd', *fasóle* 'bean', *oréz* 'rice', *porúmb* 'corn', *slănină* 'lard, bacon', *a tăiá (mărunt)* 'to cut (finely)', *a tocá* 'to chop', *vărzá* 'cabbage', etc. will not be inserted, their meanings being usually rendered in these words by the lexemes: *păcurár/boitár*, *păsúlă*, *rișcás*, *cucurúz/tenchi*, *clisă*, *a dărăburi*, *a dăráli*, *curéchi*, etc.

4.2. The dictionary will therefore include a series of categories of words, meanings and forms, representing the lexical substance of the regional varieties under investigation, which ensures their individuality and motivates our approach:

– **archaic elements** (words, forms, meanings) or considered to be **obsolete** in relation to the literary language: *alés* 'especially', *arină* 'sand', *deaúnă* 'immediately, right away', *păsá*, *a ~* 'to leave' (used only as an imperative), and others; if one of the features of the Romanian regional variety spoken by Romanians in Hungary is its archaic character, it must be clearly perceived as a quality, as one of the positive features that we manage to highlight as an element of stability and resistance;

– **elements** considered in dictionaries to be **popular**, which in the regional varieties spoken in Hungary have a very high frequency, and represent specialized terms for certain meanings (different or at most close to the common meanings); therefore the regional varieties preserve by the extent and frequency of their use, terms such as: • *astupá*, *a ~* 'to cover', found in almost all localities: *Amu ie-ț mițála ta și m-o ie și p-a me și te-astupă la uăti și la ureti* ['Now take your fur hat and take mine as well and cover your eyes and years'] (OP; Hoțopan 1977: 60), *Dacă iară o murit micuțu dîn jolju acela o trăbuit și facă urzăcare cu care astupă mortu* ['If the little one from that veil also died, he had to make a warp with which he covers the dead'] (M; Izv. 1997: 24). The meanings of the lexeme evolved by extension from 'to cover', 'to wrap (with a blanket, a cloth)' to 'to cover the dead with a cloth (before closing the coffin)'; the subsequent development of the meaning of 'burying the dead' thus becomes transparent; • *frige*, *a ~* 'to fry, to cook food by frying', used especially in the past with the participle *fript* or *frit*: *Dimineața i-am dus uoauă și cașă, mai târzău când s-o întărit oleacă i-am dus clisă frită* ['In the morning I brought him eggs and coffee, later when he recovered I brought him fried bacon'] (M; Izv. 1997: 16) it is much more common than its Slavic counterpart *a prăji*, which is exclusively used in some localities in Hungary to mean 'to roast (the pig)'. The semantics of the word coincide in some places with that of the verb *a coace (pe jar)* 'to bake (on embers)': *Alta o zăs că-și face cucuruz fript și-l pune la cap... și cu cine s-a visa cela i-a fi data* ['Another [woman] said that she cooks fried corn and place it at her head... and who she dreams of that one will be given to her'] (C; TD-Ung., *Glosar*, s.v. *cucuruz*);

– **novel words**, often representing internal creations (derivatives, compounds, etc.): *dăici*, *a* ~ ‘to care for a small child left without a mother’ < *dăică* ‘nanny’, *lucraș*, noun and adjective, ‘worker’, ‘hardworking’, *spurcățânie* ‘filth’;

– **loanwords** (especially from Hungarian, Serbian and German), with a wide dialectal circulation: *alipuí*, *a se* ~ ‘to sit in the right place’, *corház* ‘hospital’, *cóțcă* ‘square or cube-shaped piece’, *firáng* ‘curtain’, *iágă* ‘glass’ or ‘glass container’, *léveșă* ‘soup’, *rúdă* ‘perch, pole’, *sucuí*, *a* ~ ‘to accustom’, etc. or known in small areas: *belci* ‘cradle’, *cocioáne* ‘aspics’, *horgolí*, *a* ~ ‘to crochet’, *întărgăți*, *a* ~ ‘to race, to chase’, *orvoșág* ‘drug, medicine’, *pédig* ‘although, even though’, adapted to the Romanian language system.

There will not be included the Hungarian terms present in discourse as a result of the phenomenon of *code switching*, specific to bilingualism: *Stau la masă și primesc vendégek* [‘I sit at the table and receive **the guests**’] (Borbély 2001: 203); *Mâncat-o pită moale așa hazai kenyér* [‘He ate soft bread like **home bread**’] (*idem*: 205); *Așa ești dă olyan rendes vogy* [‘You are so **normal, you’re fine**’] (*idem*: 207); *O trăbuit să fie uomu figyelmes cu muierile care or fost în altă stare* [‘He had to be **careful** with women who were pregnant’] (Izv. 1997: 17). A difficult problem to solve in terms of Hungarian words is the spelling that reflects the stage of adaptation to the Romanian language system (for example *mentő* ‘ambulance’ will not appear in the dictionary, but will be included instead forms such as: *mentéu* and *ménte*).

5. The structure of articles in the dictionary. For the efficiency of the activity in making the dictionary, since the phase of compiling the corpus it is of special importance to establish the data that the paper will provide, respectively what will be *the structure* of the articles. Each word is treated in a separate article, in a strictly alphabetical order and consists of three parts: a) **the word-title itself**, rendered in its literary form together with the marking of the accent is followed by: phonetic notation, grammatical indications, data related to attestations and the area of distribution, definition of the term, illustrative quotes, synonyms; b) **phonetic and / or morphological variants**; c) **etymology**.

5.1. *The word-title* will appear with a literary form (see *infra*), with the indication of the nominative singular form for nouns, of the masculine singular for adjectives and the infinitive for verbs, followed by I pers. sg. indicative present tense; some of these forms will be reconstructed based on the flexionary forms encountered in the investigated material.

5.1.1. The selection of the *form-title* in the case of words with several variants will be done taking into account on the one hand the criterion of closeness to the etymon, and on the other hand that of frequency. For example, for the notion that designates *spital* ‘hospital’ we find a series of forms, some of them considered to be obsolete in Romanian (*șpital*, *șpitai*), others motivated by the Hungarian influence in terms of pronunciation, respectively in writing the etymology *ispítál*; depending on the frequency of the forms encountered in the regional variety: *ispítál*, *ispítái*, *ispítál*, *ispítái*, *ispítár*, *ispítáre* the form-title will be chosen.

Derivatives will be considered independent units, even if the suffix or prefix does not change the meaning of the word, such as the case of *a (se) chinzuí* ‘to torment’: *Și când să apropie armata dă iel, iel să tinzuie cu băla ș-o scoată dîn tină* [‘And when the army approaches him, he **struggles** with his old horse and pulls it out of the ground’] (OP; Hoțopan 1977: 50); *Cine ști inde o murit pruncu, o ști inde să tinzuiește* [‘He who knows where the baby died knows where **to mourn**’] (S; TD-Ung., *Glosar*, s.v. *chinzuiască*) and

a (se) întinzuî: Şi-i crepe jinjina şi iasă mai iute ghinfi şi nu-l întinzuiască atâta [‘May his gum crack so that his teeth would come out faster and not **to torment** him so much’] (M; Izv. 1997: 17), both meaning ‘to suffer, to be in pain, to be tormented’.

5.1.2. A difficult problem to solve concerns the establishment of attestations for words accentuated differently from one locality to another or even in the same locality, given the fact that most of the sources do not note the accent. For example, for the word *cocie* ‘cart (of different sizes and with different uses)’ accentuated *cócie* (frequently) or *cocie*, we have texts rendered in the standard alphabet, without marking the accent:

*No, ajung acasă împăratu, împărăteasa, fetele şi grădinaru şi drept la grădină să duc cu **cocie** cu patru cai* [‘Well, the emperor, the empress, the girls and the gardener arrive home and go straight to the garden with the four-horse **cart**’] (OP; Hoţopan 1977: 43);

*D-apu, nunta la noi o fost cu **cocie** cu patru cai* [‘Well, our wedding was with a four-horse **cart**’] (Bt; Izv. 1983: 84);

*Că umblă ca **cocie** / Ca **cocie** fără roate* [‘That he walks like a **cart** / like a **cart** without wheels’] (M; Izv. 1997: 49).

Probably, in this situation we will take into account the frequency of a certain accentuated form from that locality, because the Hungarian etymon *kocsi*⁶ (or the Serbian one *kôčija*) does not help us, the accentuated forms on *i* being explained by analogy with the oxytone nouns ending in *-ie* (like *pălărie* ‘hat’).

5.1.3. The difficulties of establishing synonymous series concern various aspects, starting from the fact that, as is well known, perfect synonymy does not exist, and each speaker has the tendency to establish his own nuances of meaning or style (cf. Puşcariu 1940: 20), whence the weight to decide whether or not certain terms are synonymous. Examples of this situation can be words like *beţáu* and *corhêi* or *beteág*, *bólnav*, *nimuríc*, each one of them covering different intensities, stages or modes of ‘drunk’, respectively of ‘sick’.

The richness of synonymous chains can often be explained by:

– different origin of terms; for example, for ‘fashion, custom, tradition’ we have words originated from different languages: *obiceáie*, pl. of *obiceái* < Bg. *običaj*; *rând* < Sl. *rendŭ*: *O fost care-o ştiut **rându*** [la tăierea porcului] [‘There were those who knew the **tradition** to cut the pig’] (OP; TD–Ung., *Glosar*, s.v. *rând* 2°); *súcă* < Hung. *szokás* (see also *infra*): *Fata me, da’ şi nu gândeşti că leveşe, carne frită, tortă, bere şi nu ştiu io ce, ca cum ũ amu **suca*** [‘My daughter, don’t think that soup, fried meat, cake, beer and I don’t know what else, as it is now the **custom**’] (M; Izv. 1997: 16); *divót* < Hung. *divat*: *Am venit aci chiar la sălaşu aiesta aci, d-aci m-am şi măritat, doi ani am sclujit şi-ntr-a treilea am fugit şi eu, ca cum a fost **divótu*** [‘I came here right to this house here, from here I got married, I served for two years and in the third I ran away, as it was the **fashion**’] (OP; TD–Ung., *Glosar*, s.v. *divot*).

– the creative capacity of the speakers who, not having a Romanian term at hand (especially when it is a loan or a neologism in literary Romanian), are forced to use their own terms, combining known elements: *înţepenitór* (B) ‘starch’, *nerveálă* (S) ‘anger’,

⁶ Originally the term denoted the name of the locality Kocs, with reference to the carriages that provided transportation between Buda and Vienna over the XV–XVI centuries (see DELR II₂, s.v. *cocie*).

pierzeală [perzălă] (C) ‘loss’, *zdrobitură* (A) ‘shavings’; the terms are frequently derived from dialectal words of Hungarian origin to which Romanian derivative elements are added: *feștitoare* (C) ‘woman who paints’ < *a fești* ‘to paint’; *loptă*, *a se* ~ (Bt) ‘to play with a ball’ < *lóptă* ‘ball’ or, rarely, Hungarian elements: *dívatoșe* (M) adj. pl. ‘fashionables’ < *dívot* ‘fashion, custom’; *boabonoașág* (C) ‘superstition’ < *bábona* ‘superstition’.

5.2. A difficult step is represented by the *determination of the variants*. These will be indicated for each meaning of the word and will also appear with a separate entry in the dictionary, but with a cross-reference to the word-title.

5.2.1. Depending on the grammatical category and the status of the words in relation to the literary forms or to the regular / accidental evolution of the features they contain, the dictionary will include:

– **accidental phonetic variants**, which even if they are explicable by certain particularities of pronunciation, they are not due to regular evolutions. This category includes accent changes, diphthong forms, gaps that involve changing the number of syllables, variants that have an accidental phonetic evolution (metathesis, apheresis, anticipation, etc.): *crăpăst* = *căpăstru* ‘bridle’, *invalid* = *invalid* ‘invalid’, *pedrică*, *a* ~ = *predica* ‘to preach’, *pirostie* = *pirostrie* ‘trivet’, etc. Instead, it will not be included, with small exceptions susceptible of several interpretations, those that contain “predictable” features, in the sense of regular and specific to this dialectal area, starting with the transposition of the forms with palatalization (*abd’ê* = *abia* ‘hardly, barely’, *p’ătră* = *piatră* ‘stone’, *mîrăsă* = *mireasă* ‘bride’), those with a harsh utterance (*șasă* = *șase* ‘six’, *fraț* = *frați* ‘brothers’) or those with softened utterance (*grîje* = *grijă* ‘care’, *mășe* = *moașă* ‘midwife’)⁷.

– **morphological variants** take into account:

• **to nouns, a)** declension changes (*funingină* = *funingine* ‘soot’, *vôlbure* = *volbură* ‘whirlwind, field bindweed’); **b)** different genres from the literary language, either as a result of their preservation from the old language (as the masculines *cătănă* ‘soldier’, *slugă* ‘servant’), either produced at a dialectal level, such as the transition of neutral nouns to the feminine series ending in *-ă* in old words (*flúieră* = *fluiet* ‘flute’ – M, Bt, *descântecă* = *descântec* ‘spell’ – C, *animălă* = *animal* ‘animal’ – C) or in loanwords (*agăță* = *agaț* ‘acacia’ – Bt, *magazină*, with the variant *măgăzină* = *magazin* ‘store’ – in Bt and CU) or of feminine nouns to neutrals (*bluz* = *bluză* ‘blouse’ – A, Bt, *problem* = *problemă* ‘problem’ – Bt)⁸. We also mention the older or newer borrowings for which, in addition to the gender variants in the loan language, new forms of different gender have been created: *alitău* n. n. ‘lid (made of burnt clay) for covering the mouth of the oven’ < Hung. *elitő*, and also *alităuă* f. n., *lăboș* n. n. ‘saucepan’ – *lăboșă* f. n., etc.; **c)** numerous variants attesting to different plural types, such as the feminine ones in *-e*: *găine* = *găini* ‘hens’, *gúre* = *guri* ‘mouths’, *núce* = *nuci* ‘nuts’, in *-i*: *ăți* = *ațe* ‘threads’, *măși* = *mese* ‘tables’ or ending in *-uri*: *plăcinturi* = *plăcinte* ‘pies’, *șcôluri* = *școli* ‘schools’;

• for verbs we notice among other things conjugation changes: *acoperă*, *a* ~ = *acoperi* ‘to cover’, *înjosă*, *a* ~ = *înjosi* ‘to degrade’, *îndestuli*, *a* ~ = *îndestula* ‘to satiate’,

⁷ These forms will be written down phonetically immediately after the word-title or can be “retrieved” from illustrative quotes.

⁸ The phenomenon is most likely due to a foreign, Serbian, Hungarian or German influence (*bluz* < Hung. *bluz*) and exceptionally to the morphological re-framing (cf. Răuțu 2013: 408).

nărvî, *a se ~ = enerva* ‘to annoy’, *băteá*, *a ~ = bate* ‘to beat’, *torceá*, *a ~ = toarce* ‘to spin’, etc. or changes of verbal regime: *bănui*, *a-și ~ = a bănui* ‘to be sorry’, *învăță*, *a se ~ = a învăța* ‘to learn, to study’, *făli*, *a ~ = a se făli* ‘to praise’, *proști*, *a ~ = a se proști* ‘to fool’, *ráde*, *a ~ (pe cineva)* ‘to laugh at someone’, etc.

As variants will be listed forms such as *andăli*, *andăluí*, *îndăli*, *îndăluí* ‘to start, to leave’, all from Hung. *indulni*, created by analogy and not by derivation, therefore they cannot be considered independent units, as they are for example *hăznui* and *hăznăli* ‘to use’ < *hazná* ‘use’ with Hungarian origin (*haszon*).

5.2.2. At the same time, given the specifics of the dictionary and the non-inclusion of literary terms (see *supra*), some words considered to be variants in dictionaries will appear as entries in DGRU, as they are for example *fărină = făină* ‘flour’, *nîme = nimeni* ‘nobody’, *nîma = numai* ‘but’, ‘only’, *oără = oră* ‘hour’, etc., to which other variants will be assigned. To these there are added a series of neologisms representing etymological doublets which can be borrowed from Hungarian, Serbian and / or German, where the standard language has usually received the word through French; we mention *ghimnázie* (Bt) ‘gymnasium’, *gheneráție* (Bt) ‘generation’, recorded in TD–Ung., *Glosar*, s.v., and entered the language through German influence (Germ. *Gymnasium*, *Generation*).

5.3. Related to the etymology, the major difficulties concern in particular terms with multiple variants, likely to be of different origins; under this category there are, for example: *lóbdă* ‘ball’ (< Hung. *labda*) and *lóptă*, encountered in the speech of the Southern localities, Bt and CU, which is said to belong to the Banat subdialect (see *supra*), so they plead for the Serb. loan *lopta* (cf. TEW, s.v., Gămulescu 1974: 149); *fîrhóng* ‘curtain’ < Hung. *fîrhang*, but *fîrăng* and *fîráng* would be rather explained by the German-Austrian influence (*Fierhank*) (TEW, s.v. *fîrhong*) and/or Serbian (*fîranga*).

Along with the formal and semantic criteria, the dialectal distribution of terms must be taken into account in order to establish the etymology. Even in these conditions it is difficult, if not almost impossible, to determine the origin of terms that have homonymous forms in two or even three languages with which Romanian came into language contact in this region (we especially refer to Hungarian, German and Serbian), as they are for example: *fras* ‘childhood disease; epilepsy’ may be of Hungarian origin *frasz*, Austr. Germ. *Frass* or Serb. *fras* (cf. Gămulescu 1974; TEW, s.v. *fras*); *métăr* ‘meter’ is explained with both Hung. *méter* and Germ. *Meter* (TD–Ung.: CLXI); *țelăr* ‘celery’ comes from Hung. *celler* or from dialectal Germ. *Zäller* (DLR, s.v. *țeler*).

Another problematic category refers to loanwords of various origins in relation to the possibility of deriving them from words already existing in the language: *dunstuí*, *a ~* ‘to sterilize (cans)’ is either a loanword from the Austrian German *dünsten*, or derived from *dunst* ‘steam bath’, and *súcă* (see *supra*) represents the Hung. reflex *szokás* or postverbal of *sucuí*.

For words with uncertain or unknown etymology, for which various solutions have been proposed, the paper that certifies the most proposals will be mentioned; such an example is the verb *îmburdá*, *a ~* with multiple meanings: ‘to overturn’, ‘to fall’, ‘to turn on another side’ with unknown etymology (see CDER, s.v.), for which Latin or Hungarian origin was proposed, and both rejected by Al. Ciorănescu which considers it an expressive creation from *hurduc-burduc*.

5.4. With the specification that for each term in the dictionary the editing can only be completed once the expected material has been arranged, we offer some provisional samples:

BICIULÍ [*biçulí*] vb. IV tranz., 1 sg. biciulésc C – Borbély 1988: 188; Al – Fen. pov.: 226; M – Izv. 2002: 22; C, OP – TD–Ung.: 244 „a aprecia, a respecta, a stima”: Că-n lume câte-or trăi, / Și să știe *biciulí*, / Unu p-altu d-a iubi (M – Izv. 2002: 22); Tare l-am *biçulit* [pe ginere-meu], c-o fost străin, săracu, apoi și el o fost cuminte (OP – TD–Ung: 144); cf. o m e n í.

Et. magh. *becsül*ni.

ȘPARHÉRT [*șparhért*] s.n., pl. *șparhérturi* 1° C – Izv. 1996/2: 32 „mașină de gătit cu plită”: Lucrurile din bucătărie le fac numa lângă celelalte lucruri. Nu pre am vreme și stau ore întregi lângă „*șpor*” (S – Izv. 2003: 32).

2° var. **șpórhert** A, OP – TD–Ung.: 254 „plită”.

var. **șpor** 1° S – Izv. 2003: 32; **șpor** 2° B, A – TD–Ung.: 254.

Et. germ. *Sparherd*, magh. *sporhelyt*, *spór*.

6. One of the important and difficult issues considered is the literary form adopted for the forms kept for the final paper and concerns on the one hand the word-title, and on the other hand the illustrative quote.

6.1. Regarding the word-title which must represent the archetypal form of the word, recognizable both by a standard language speaker and by speakers of the regional variety, the difficulties encountered are mainly phonetic and can be explained by at least two types of features of some of the excerpt texts.

6.1.1. **The objective difficulties** concern the phonetic peculiarities of the Romanian idioms in Hungary, most common with the Northwestern Daco-Romanian regional varieties, in this case with the ones from Crișana, with some of the Transylvanian ones and less frequently with the Banat ones. This type of features specific to the regional phonetics includes particularities of a general character, found in all or the vast majority of the regional varieties spoken in Hungary, such as:

a) the presence of **dental palatalization** [t], [d'] which is the result of several types of phonetic evolution:

– the actual palatalization of the dentals [t], [d]⁹, encountered in both Latin or Slavic words (including derivatives): *cárte* ‘letter’, *țină* ‘mud, soil’, *gređiniță* ‘small garden’, *inde* ‘where’, as well as in loanwords, in this case of Hungarian origin already adapted to the Romanian system: *femetéu* ‘cemetery’ < Hung. *temető*, *fistaș* ‘clean’ < Hung. *tiszta*, *hidéde* ‘violin’ < Hung. *hegedű*;

– the confusion between [k] and [t], respectively [g] and [d']¹⁰, due to the fact that *t* and *d'* have a pronounced palatal timbre in these varieties (the consonants are marked as *t'* and *d'*), very close to that of the palatal consonants *k* and *g*; so *róke* ‘dress’ > *róte*, and also the reverse *țină* > *kindă* ‘kitchen’, with the diminutives *kinduța*, *ținăse* > *kinăse* ‘dusty’ and *gem* > *dem* ‘ball of thread’, and also the reverse *đinți* > *ginți* ‘teeth’. Here too, we can

⁹ The dental palatalization is specific to the entire Northwestern area: Crișana – excluding Țara Oașului (see *Tratat* 1984: 295, 393), Maramureș, Transylvania and Banat – where is produced with the phase *ć*, respectively *đ* (*idem*: 250).

¹⁰ The phenomenon of confusion between the two types of consonants covers Crișana, Transylvania, except for the Southeastern area, and Maramureș (*Tratat* 1984: 295, 329, 365).

include the secondary transformations of *k* and *g* to *ʃ* and *dʲ*, where the former is the result of the palatalization of the velar occlusives *c* and *g*, which also determines the transition of the central vowels *ă*, *î* to the series of the front vowels *e*, *i*; this way *căpiță* > *kepiță* > *ʃepiță* ‘haystack’, *cămese* > *kimese* > *ʃimese* ‘shirt’, *scântéje* > *sķintéje* > *ʃintéje* ‘spark’, and *găină* > *gină* > *gină* > *đnă* ‘hen’;

– the palatalization of the bilabial occlusives [p] and [b] to the phase of *pt* and *bdʲ* (*pterdút* ‘lost’, *ptéle* ‘skin’, and *abdʲe* ‘hardly, barely’, *bdʲută* ‘poor, unfortunate’, etc.) and subsequently, in certain phonetic contexts such as the bilabial-free stage, thus registering the palatalization phase *t* and *dʲ*: *tălt* ‘feet, soles’, *ʃipăi*, *a ~* ‘to touch, to fondle’, *đili*, *a ~* ‘to bleach’, etc. (cf. *Tratat* 1984: 326);

– *dʲ* can also be the reflex of the palatalization of the voiced labiodental fricative [v], a phenomenon that occurs very rarely and only in the north of the researched area, as in some regions of Maramureș (v. *Tratat* 1984: 327): *vije* > *ʒije* > *đije* ‘grapevine’ / ‘alive’, *vjer* > *zer* > *đer* ‘boar’, *vjerm* > *zerm* > *đer* ‘worm’.

b) the stages [m̃], [ñ] may be the reflex of palatalization of the nasal bilabial [m], as in *mháză* ‘amiază’ ‘noon’, *mheriy* ‘blue’ (see *supra*), *mhiră*, *a se ~* ‘to wonder’, *hírásă* ‘bride’ (see *supra*), and **[ñ]** of the palatalization of the dental occlusive [n] in *nevástă*, having the meanings ‘wife’, and ‘daughter-in-law’, *pońávă* generally denotes a ‘coverlet, bedspread’;

c) the affricate [g̃] is usually realized in these varieties as **the fricative [j]**¹¹: *sclug* > *scluj* ‘servants’, *ujég* with the variant *jeég*, plural of (*u*)*jágă* > (*u*)*jej* ‘bottles’, *vojoáge* > *vojoáje* ‘adobe’, etc.

6.1.2. The second category of difficulties consists of **subjective** features, related to the ways of interpretation, to render in writing the phonetic peculiarities specific to dialectal speech, which although they are the result of realities, and of transformations explainable differently, at first sight may seem or look identical. Starting from the features mentioned above and considering the limited possibilities offered by the standard alphabet, regarding the transcription, the researcher (folklorist, ethnographer, ethnologist and even linguist, etc.) facing some dialectal phonetic forms for which he has no adequate possibilities for written reproduction, unlike a dialectologist who has the advantages offered by the *phonetic transcription*, he has to find his own ways of transposing them into the written version. Thus, for a series of sounds from different origins pronounced identically or almost identically in real speech, the transcriber, knowing certain rules more frequently encountered, assigns them the same correspondent in writing:

a) such a case is represented by the palatalized dentals [tʲ], [dʲ], explained by various transformations (see *supra*) and interpreted as a rule as reflexes of the dentals [t], [d]:

– *t* is marked as *t*, there where it originates from *t*: *mestecă*, *a ~* ‘to mix’, *minte* in *a-i pică în ~* ‘to remember’, and also from *k*: • *curit* (S; Izv. 2003: 37) is the form noted for *curit* = *curék* ‘cabbage’ (with the closure *e* > *i*); • *diuătet* (C; Izv. 2012: 21) < *diuătet* =

¹¹ The transformation of the affricate *g̃* in *j*, by losing the occlusion, it is one of the specific features of the Crișana varieties, which was the base for the division of the Daco-Romanian dialect into four and later into five dialectal subunits. The phenomenon was either attributed to the Hungarian influence, or it was explained by the internal laws of development of the Romanian language (for details see *Tratat* 1984: 294, 363; Borbély 1990: 28–29).

diuăKĕt ‘enchanted’ (with the specific particularities $e > i$, $o > uă$ and the diphthong ea pronounced as e); • *întipuitor* (Bt; Izv. 1983: 84) < *întipuitor* < *îŋĕipuitór* ‘photographer’ (< pref. Rom. *în-* + vb. *chipui* + suf. rom. *-tor*, where *chipui* is derived with the suf. *-ui*, from Hung. *kép* ‘picture, image’); • *mănunțeși* (OP; Izv. 2003: 23) < *mănunțeși* = *mănunĕșĭ*, diminutive plural form of the noun *mănunchi* ‘bundle, bunch’; • *rătie* (OP; Hoțopan 1977: 55) < *rătie* = *răĕie* ‘brandy’; • *țișcă* represents the word *ĕișcă* (S; Izv. 2003: 36) = *ĕișcă* ‘pig’s stomach’, etc.; the letter *t* can also represent *k* of Hungarian loanwords: *telsig* (M; Izv. 2003: 53) is actually *ĕelsig* ‘expense’ (< Hung. *költseg*), and *să tinzuie* (Hoțopan 1977: 50) is *să ĕinzuie* ‘to struggle, to agonize’ refl. (< Hung. *kinozni*) (see also *supra*);

– *t* captures *ĕ*, originating from *ĕ*, which is the result of palatalization of the velar *c*: the form *să întepă* (C; Izv. 2003: 27) < *să inĕapă* < *să inĕapă* < *să inĕapă* ‘to fit in’;

– *t* is also used instead of *ĕ* originating from the palatalization of *p*: *teptu* (S; Izv. 2003: 35) < *teptu* < *pĕteptu* < *pĕteptu* ‘chest’; *ai terdut* (OP; Hoțopan 1977: 55) < *ai terdut* < *ai pĕterdut* < *ai pĕterdút* ‘you have lost’.

– in the same situation is *d*, reflex of *d*’ originating either from the palatalization of *d*: *dindĕ* ‘from where’, *lipidĕu* ‘bed sheet’, either the result of confusion with *ĝ*: *hidede* (OP; Hoțopan 1977: 55) < *hidede* < *higĕge* ‘violin’ or obtained from the palatalization of *b*: *jdera* (C; Izv. 2012: 27) < *zĕdera* < *zbĕdera* < *zbĕjerá* ‘to yell’; *dept* (M; Izv. 1997: 15) must be decoded *biet* ‘poor’, has transited the palatalization phase *bĕĕt*, then with metathesis has become *ĕĕbt* > *ĕĕpt* > *dept*, also found in the diminutive form *depuț* (*idem*: 15);

b) relatively less complicated and consequently with less problems is the interpretation of the written forms with *mn* which indicate *mń*, as a result of the palatalization of *m*: *o mnezăzat* (M; Izv. 2002: 47) < *o mĕnezăzat* < *o mezăzat* ‘he ate at noon/ he ate lunch’; *mnezi* (M; Izv. 2002: 48) < *mĕzezi* < *miezi* ‘bread crumbs’; forms as *mnemți* (Al; Raliade, Nubert Chețan 2004: 226) and *mnemțască* (*idem*: 226) appeared after softening the *n* at the stage of *ń* and its interpretation as a result of the palatalization of *m*, and not of *n*: *mnemți* < *mĕnemți* < *ĕnemți* < *nĕmĕĕ* ‘Germans’; *mnemțască* < *mĕnemțască* < *ĕnemțască* < *nemțască* ‘German’ adj.;

c) the difficulties in pronouncing (and writing) *j* instead of *ĝ* interfered by interpreting the fricative as a phenomenon of the standard language, especially in the case of words with regional circulation: if *jinjinele* (C; Izv. 2012: 24) does not create problems in the recovery of the etymon < *ĝinĝinele* ‘the gums’, in the case of *jilău* (S, OP; TD–Ung., *Glosar*, s.v.) < *ĝilău*¹² (adapted with prepalatal affricate < Hung. *gyalu*) ‘cabbage grater’, next to the verb with the local pronunciation *jelui* (*jilui*) < *ĝelui* (*ĝilui*) ‘to grate the

¹² Some dictionaries include the forms with *j*, *jealău*, *jilău*, as variants of *gealău* (DA, s.v. *gealău*, MDA, s.v. *gealău*²), given the fact that the fricativization of *g* corresponds in the Transylvanian varieties (considered as a whole) to the sound *j* written as in the literary language; these forms reproduce the local pronunciation, therefore is not about a primary *j*, and it should not appear in the dictionary, just as no such forms as *injer*, *jem* are inserted for their affricate correspondents. The meaning of the term is ‘router, woodworking tool (big)’, developing in the Romanian regional varieties spoken in Hungary a subsequent semantics ‘grater (for cabbage)’.

cabbage' or to the noun *jirădă* (Borbély 1990: 28; TD–Ung., *Glosar*, s.v. *jireadă*) < *ġirădă*¹³ 'herd', the fricative decoding is susceptible to different interpretations.

Therefore, all these forms that appear in writing as a result of the transcriber's desire to reproduce the local pronunciation, using the limited means of the standard alphabet, will not appear as dictionary entries or as variants (with small exceptions involving some irregular transformations), but will be found at most in the illustrative quotations.

6.2. Related to the illustrative quotes, the lack of a unitary transcription system of the sources from which we extract the material prevents us from using the same criteria in selecting the examples. Thus, for the quotations rendered with the standard alphabet, we will reproduce the quotation as it is found in the original source, our interpretation being reflected in the spelling of the word-title.

„*Joie te du la peġit c-atunce ĩ ave noroc la fete. Atunce ĩ bine sã faci mulãtșaguri*” (C; Izv. 2001: 21) [‘On Thursday go to date because then you are lucky with the girls. Then it’s good to have **parties**’];

Copilașul l-am ĩmbrãcat ĩn chimeșușã, ĩn cap i-am pus o ceapsã (S; Izv 2001: 55) [‘I dressed the baby in a shirt, I put a **cap** on his head’];

Haba-mbrece minciuna ĩn hane mĩndre, adevãratã nu sã face (Izv. 2007: 42) [‘**In vain** you dress the lie in proud clothes, it won’t make it true’].

In the case of phonetically transcribed texts (which are not all based on the same transcription system – see Borbély 1995), the quotations will be written with the literary form, while retaining irregular local peculiarities and respecting the orthographic norms of the Romanian language, and the word that is to be exemplified is rendered with the form from the basic source.

*Apu dacã cãnd ĩ gata [afumãturile]... cã pãstã ziuã numa dimineãta **sucuġim** sã bem oleacã dã rãchie, dã bere* (C; Borbély 1990: 86) [‘Well, when there are ready [the smoked products]... because during the day only in the morning we **use** to drink a little bit of brandy, of beer’];

*Eu am avut o nevastã, alta, și **n-am dãzvorțat*** (A; TD–Ung.:21) [‘I had a wife, another one, and we **got divorced**’].

The literary form in this case, is far from being a “translation” of the texts in the current Romanian literary language, but usually follows the principles presented in Marin *et alii* 2016: 14–16, Marin 2017 of which we will list only a few types of dialectal phenomena preserved in transcription: phonetic phenomena specific to the old Romanian language (*farinã* = *fãinã* ‘flour’, *mãne* = *mãine* ‘tomorrow’, *ĩmblã* = *umblã* ‘he/she walks’), phonetic accidents (*bãtãrn* = *bãtrãn* ‘old’, *sclugã* = *slugã* ‘servant’), atypical phonetics (*pin* = *prin* ‘through’, *pãngã* = *pe lãngã* ‘besides’), morpho-phonetic peculiarities that aim at various types of alternations which appeared by analogy in flexion (*brezde* = *brazde* ‘furrows’,

¹³ In contrast to *gilãu*, *gireadă* appears in dictionaries with unknown etymology, so it is even more difficult to establish the primary form, but in all probability is related to the dialectal distribution of the term in Moldova and Transylvania, and implicitly to the phonetics specific to each area (DLR, s.v. *gireadă*) where the situation is similar.

gremezi = *grămezi* ‘piles’, *închig* = *închid* ‘I close’), morphological phenomena (the preservation of iotacised forms, and of the morpheme *și* for the subjunctive), etc.

A special issue is the cases of syntactic phonetics, namely the interpretation of utterances with syneresis or elision at the junction between the final vowel of a word and the initial vowel of the following: *mic-așa* = *mic așa* or *mică așa* ‘small so’, *suc-atunce* = *suc atunce* or *suca atunce* ‘tradition then’, *albușala* a feminine derivative of *albuș* or *albuș(u)-ala* [‘(that) egg white’]; all examples involve ambiguity in text decoding.

7. Final remarks. The difficulties encountered during the extraction of the material from various sources and its organization in order to achieve *The Dictionary of Regional Romanian Spoken in Hungary* addresses various issues which we have tried to systematize in this article, in order to find some solutions, which has been a real challenge. The ascertainments we can make are mostly related to the transcription of the material, using various systems (standard alphabet, transcription based on a phonetic system similar to that used in the *Romanian Linguistic Atlas* or, sometimes, a combination of them in the attempt to render the local pronunciation) and its different interpretation, given the multitude of phonetic phenomena involved in these regional varieties. The process of establishing a word-title, considered an *archetype*, is often difficult because of the diversity of forms of different origins, which brings into question on the one hand the relationship between variants and synonyms, and on the other hand their etymology. The formal and semantic criteria in establishing the etymology will be combined with the information regarding the dialectal distribution (in these regional varieties and on the entire Daco-Romanian dialect’s territory), taking into account at the same time the effects of influences exerted over time in the area (Hungarian, German and Serbian), facts that will highlight numerous cases of multiple etymology.

We hope that the elaboration and publication of *The Dictionary of Regional Romanian Spoken in Hungary* will be a testimony of a still living language which preserves, beyond the many predictable phenomena in the environment where several languages are spoken, a linguistic purity which we can call it spectacular.

REFERENCES

- Avram, A., 2000, *Probleme de etimologie*, Etymologica 4, București, Editura Univers Enciclopedic.
- Borbély, A., 1990, *Cercetări asupra graiurilor românești din Ungaria (Chitighaz, Micherechi, Otlaca-Pustă)*, Budapesta, Cărțile “Dunărea”, Tankönyvkiadó.
- Borbély, A., 1995, “Observații cu privire la transcrierea textelor dialectale românești din Ungaria”, in: M. Berényi (ed.), *Simpozion. Comunicările celui de al IV-lea Simpozion al cercetătorilor români din Ungaria*, Giula, Institutul de Cercetări al Românilor din Ungaria, Mozi Nyomda Bt., 77–88.
- Borbély, A., 2001, *Nyelvsere. Szociolingvisztikai kutatások a magyarországi románok közösségében*, Budapest, Készült az MTA Nyelvtudományi Intézetének Élőnyelvi Osztályán.
- Borbély, A., 2006, “*Așe-i zâsa*. Expresivitatea limbii române vorbite în Ungaria”, in: M. Berényi, (ed.), *Simpozion. Comunicările celui de al V-lea Simpozion al cercetătorilor români din Ungaria*, Giula, Institutul de Cercetări al Românilor din Ungaria, Mozi Nyomda Bt., 117–128.
- Borbély, A., 2008, “Bilingvismul”, in: L. Botoșineanu, E. Dănilă, C. Holban, O. Ichim (eds.), *Distorsionări în comunicarea lingvistică, literară și etnofolclorică românească și contextual european*, Iași, Editura Alfa, 33–42.

- Borbély, A., 2013, *Limba română și identitate românească în Ungaria. Aspecte dialectologice, sociolingvistice, onomastice și demografice*, Giula, Institutul de Cercetări al Românilor din Ungaria.
- Borza, L., *Graiul românilor din Chițighaz. Glosar*, 1999.
- Coseriu, E., 2005, *Limba română – limbă romanică*. Texte manuscrise. Editate de N. Saramandu, București, Editura Academiei Române.
- Cosma, M., 1985, *Situația limbii noastre materne*, Gyula.
- Gămulescu, D., 1974, *Elementele de origine sârbocroată ale vocabularului dacoromân*, București, Editura Academiei Române, Pančevo, Novinsko Preduzeće “Libertatea”.
- Hoțopan, Al., 1977, *Povestirile lui Mihai Purdi*, Budapesta.
- Király, Fr., 1984, *Dicționarul subdialectului bănățean*, in: Caietul “Cercului de studii”, II, Timișoara.
- Marin, M., 2004, “Locul graiurilor românești din Ungaria în structura dialectală a dacoromânei”, in: M. Berényi (ed.), *Simpozion. Comunicările celui de al XII-lea simpozion al cercetătorilor români din Ungaria*, Giula, Institutului de Cercetări al Românilor din Ungaria, 163–181.
- Marin, M., 2007, “Creativitate populară reflectată în graiurile românești din Ungaria”, in: M. Berényi (ed.), *Simpozion. Comunicările celui de al XVI-lea simpozion al cercetătorilor români din Ungaria*, Giula, Institutului de Cercetări al Românilor din Ungaria, 110–119.
- Marin, M., 2009, “Introducere”, in M. Marin (coord.), *Dicționarul graiurilor dacoromâne sudice*, vol. I, VII–XXVIII.
- Marin, M., 2016, “Despre situația actuală a graiurilor românești din Ungaria”, in: M. Sala, M. Stanciu Istrate, E. Timotin (eds.), *Pagini alese. Omagiu domnului Alexandru Mareș la împlinirea vârstei de 80 de ani*, București, Editura Univers Enciclopedic, 106–116.
- Marin, M., 2017, “Probleme ale literarizării formelor și a textelor dialectale”, in: M. Stanciu Istrate, D. Răuțu (eds.), *Lucrările celui de-al șaselea simpozion internațional de lingvistică, București, 29–30 mai 2015*, București, Editura Univers Enciclopedic Gold, 219–225.
- Marin, M., D. Răuțu, 2017, “De ce un dicționar dialectal al graiurilor românești din Ungaria?”, in: M. Berényi (ed.), *Simpozion. Comunicările celui de al XXVI-lea Simpozion al cercetătorilor români din Ungaria*, Giula, Institutul de Cercetări al Românilor din Ungaria, Mozi Nyomda Bt., 220–230.
- Marin, M., C.-I. Radu, D. Răuțu, M. Tiugan, 2016, “*Harta sonoră*” a graiurilor dacoromâne vorbite în afara granițelor României, București, Editura Academiei Române.
- Mărgărit, I., 2014, “Evoluții semantice speciale în graiurile românești din Ungaria”, in: M. Berényi (ed.), *Simpozion. Comunicările celui de al XXIII-lea simpozion al cercetătorilor români din Ungaria*, Giula, Institutului de Cercetări al Românilor din Ungaria, 56–63.
- Mărgărit, I., 2016, “Comentarii lexical-etimologice asupra unor cuvinte din vocabularul comunităților românești din Ungaria”, in: M. Berényi (ed.), *Simpozion. Comunicările celui de al XXV-lea simpozion al cercetătorilor români din Ungaria*, Giula, Institutul de Cercetări al Românilor din Ungaria, Mozi Nyomda Bt., 171–182.
- Mării, I., 2004 [1988], “Pe marginea unui dicționar dialectal”, in: *Contribuții la lingvistica limbii române*, [Cluj-Napoca], Editura Clusium, 140–165.
- Pușcariu, Sextil, 1940, 1959, *Limba română*, vol. I. *Privire generală*, București, Fundația Regală pentru Literatură și Artă; vol. II. *Rostirea*, București, Editura Academiei.
- Raliade, R., M. Nubert Chețan, 2004, *Lecturi identitare. Români din Ungaria. Studii de caz*, București, Editura România Pur și Simplu.
- Răuțu, D., 2013, “Aspecte ale variației morfologice substantivale în graiurile dacoromâne din Vojvodina”, in: D. Răuțu, A. Rezeanu, D.-M. Zamfir (eds), „*Cuvinte potrivite*”. *Omagiu doamnei Maria Marin la aniversare*, București, Editura Academiei Române.

ABBREVIATIONS

- CDER – Al. Ciorănescu, *Dicționarul etimologic al limbii române*, București, Editura „Saeculum I. O.”, 2001.
- DA – *Dicționarul limbii române*, București, Librăriile Socec & Comp. and C. Sfetea/Tipografia Ziarului “Universul” S. A., 1913–1948.

- DELR II₂ – *Dicționarul etimologic al limbii române*, Vol. II, Litera C, Partea a II-a (*Clac-Cyborg*), București, Editura Academiei Române, 2018.
- DLR – Academia Română, *Dicționarul limbii române* (DLR), serie nouă, redactori responsabili: acad. Iorgu Iordan, acad. Al. Graur, acad. Ion Coteanu, acad. Marius Sala, acad. Gheorghe Mihăilă, București, Editura Academiei, 1965–2010.
- Izv. – Izvorul. Revistă de etnografie și folclor. Publicație a Uniunii Democratice a Românilor din Ungaria, Giula, 1980.
- MDA – *Micul dicționar academic*, I–IV, București, Editura “Univers Enciclopedic”, 2001–2003.
- TD–Ung. – Maria Marin, Iulia Mărgărit, *Graiuri românești din Ungaria. Studiu lingvistic. Texte dialectale. Glosar*, București, Editura Academiei Române, 2005.
- TEW – Lajos Tamás, *Etymologisch–Historisches Wörterbuch der Ungarischen Elemente im Rumänischen* (unter Berücksichtigung der Mundartwörter), London / The Hague / Paris, Mouton & Co, 1967.
- Tratat* 1984 – Valeriu Rusu (coord.), *Tratat de dialectologie românească*, Craiova, Editura “Scrișul Românesc”.

ANNEX: Map of Romanian Localities in Hungary



