

BABEȘ-BOLYAI UNIVERSITY  
FACULTY OF LETTERS  
THE DOCTORAL SCHOOL OF LINGUISTIC AND LITERARY STUDIES

**DOCTORAL THESIS**

**UNITY AND DIVERSITY IN THE DIALECTS OF SĂLAJ**

**(ABSTRACT)**

Supervisor:  
Associate prof. dr. habil. Adrian CHIRCU-BUFTEA

Doctoral student:  
Denisa-Maria TOUT

CLUJ-NAPOCA  
2021

# CONTENTS

EMBLEMS .....	5
ABBREVIATIONS.....	9
LIST OF SURVEYED LOCALITIES AND INFORMANTS .....	11
MAP OF SURVEYED LOCALITIES.....	21
PHONETIC TRANSCRIPTION.....	22
INTRODUCTION.....	25
I. THE ETYMOLOGY OF THE NAME „SĂLAJ” .....	31
II. GEOGRAPHICAL LANDMARKS .....	34
III. HISTORICAL LANDMARKS .....	39
IV. ETHNOGRAPHIC LANDMARKS.....	43
1. The clothing of people from Sălaj .....	44
2. Household organisation .....	47
3. Animal husbandry .....	48
4. Customs .....	48
4.1. Work cusoms.....	48
4.2. Customs and traditions related to important events in human life.....	51
4.3. Customs related to holidays .....	60
5. Sălaj folklore .....	66
5.1. Musical folklore from Sălaj.....	66
5.2. Dis-enchantments from Sălaj .....	69
5.3. Popular beliefs in Sălaj.....	71
V. LINGUISTIC ASPECTS .....	76
1. Phonetic aspects .....	77
1.1. Stress .....	80
1.2. The vowel system.....	81
1.3. Groups of sounds – diphthongs.....	90
1.4. The consonant system .....	92
1.5. General phonetic accidents.....	99

2. Morphosyntactic aspects .....	106
2.1. The noun .....	106
2.2. The article.....	112
2.3. The adjective .....	114
2.4. The pronoun .....	116
2.5. The numeral .....	120
2.6. The verb .....	122
2.7. The adverb .....	132
2.8. The preposition.....	135
2.9. The conjunction .....	136
2.10. The interjection .....	137
3. Lexical aspects .....	139
3.1. Latin elements .....	140
3.2. Hungarian elements .....	144
3.3. Slavic elements.....	159
3.4. German elements .....	165
3.5. Elements from the old local background .....	166
3.6. Elements with Greek and Neo-Greek origin .....	167
3.7. Words with unknown etymology .....	167
3.8. Neologisms.....	169
3.9. The influence of literary language .....	170
4. The formation of words .....	177
4.1. The formation of words by derivation .....	177
4.1.1. Derivation with prefixes.....	177
4.1.2. Derivation with suffixes .....	178
4.2. The formation of words by composition.....	196
VI. FROM THE ANTHROPONYMY OF SĂLAJ .....	197
1. The names and cognomens of the informants .....	197
2. The names and cognomens from the dialectal texts.....	200
3. The congnomens from the texts of Mircea Groza, <i>Rețete tradiționale sălăjene – rețetele socăcițelor</i> .. ..	202
CONCLUSIONS.....	204

BIBLIOGRAPHY .....	208
CORPUS .....	220
I. <i>Dialectal texts</i> .....	221
II. GROZA, Mircea (2017), <i>Rețete tradiționale sălăjene – rețetele socăcițelor</i> .....	282
III. NEAGA, Demetriu a Onii (1930), <i>Ruga zilelor</i> , Zalău, Tipografia „Luceafărul” .....	302

## UNITY AND DIVERSITY IN THE DIALECTS OF SĂLAJ

**Keywords:** *Sălaj dialects, linguistic aspects, etymological perspective, semantics, anthroponymy, dialectal inquiry.*

The present doctoral thesis, entitled *Unity and diversity in the dialects of Sălaj*, highlights, on the one hand, the specific features of Sălaj and, on the other hand, the differentiating *unitary* and *diverse* aspects of *Sălaj dialects* formed on the courses of the main rivers and on the valleys.

For a complete analysis, the proposed subject was approached from several directions. First, it was necessary to consult scientific sources of different nature: 1. linguistic atlases and treatises on dialectology; 2. dialectal monographs; 3. studies on Sălaj, focusing on geographical, historical, cultural, ethnographic and linguistic aspects (toponymy and anthroponymy from Sălaj); 4. articles about local dialects; 5. popular literary texts, local carols, incantations etc.

The field surveys were carried out in 14 localities (2 on each river: Crasna, Barcău, Someș, Almaș, Agrij and 2 on the Sălaj and Zalău valleys), and the dialectal one benefited from the contribution of 25 informants. The discussions with informants (having different degrees of training – most of them 4-8 grades and from different age groups) facilitated the drawing of relevant conclusions about spoken dialects in those regions. They were conducted on topics related to customs, holidays, gastronomy, popular beliefs, agricultural work etc.

Conceived as a monographic study, the present paper follows a judicious plan, being structured in several chapters, following the model of the classical monographs, but also bringing some elements of modernity.

This research opens with a list of *Emblems* and *Abbreviations*, followed by the *List of surveyed localities and informants*, the *Map of surveyed localities*, and the *Transcription of texts* where the signs used in the phonetic transcription of texts are rendered. We believe that this information and explanations are necessary to understand the approach taken.

In the first section of the thesis, *Introduction*, we outlined some points related to: the motivation to choose the subject, the research methodology, indicating the type of approach practised, the sources we used and the directions in which the research was conducted, the corpus of the paper.

For a start, it was considered important to review the etymology of the name of the area in question, which is quite difficult to establish, in the chapter *The Etymology of the name "Sălaj"*.

Even if the specialists (linguists and historians) did not choose to attribute the same origin to the name of the region in question, there are still three directions that explain the genesis of the etymology: “from the Hungarian *szilágy* ‘elm’, the derivative of *szil* ‘elm’ + suffix *-gy* or *ágy*. *Sălăgeni*, Hungarian *Szelezsány* from Arad, and *Sălăgeni* from Botoşani and Fălciu, are interesting evidence for the directions of the spread of the Romanians from Sălăgiu” (Drăganu 1933: 418).

Embracing the same idea, Iorgu Jordan (1963: 104) explains the etymology of his own name *Sălaj* also by the Hungarian *Szilágy*, composed of *szil* (elm) + *-ágy* (riverbed), meaning the Elm Valley.

In the pages of the volume *Toponymic Treasure of Romania: Transylvania (TTRT). Sălaj County*, we find out that the toponym *Sălaj*, with the previous name *Sălāju*, means ‘big depression’, because it is located "next to the Sălaj Valley". Another meaning is "big valley, it comes from Zălau, from Meseş, it flows into Someş" or "depression, the water walks on it, it is flat, it is a valley". In addition, related to the etymology of the name, it is based on the same Hungarian toponym “*Szilágy* (> *Sălăgiu*) < *szil* ‘elm’ + suf. *-ágy*” (Drăganu, *Rom.*, 418; cf. and Jordan, *Top.*, 104., *apud* TTRT. *Sălaj*, *s.v.*).

In his vision (Chende-Roman 2008: 32-33), *Zalău (Ziloc)* and *Sălaj (Zilag)*, are heading towards the same radical: *zil-* (*sil-*), although there are three possible radicals: 1. it could be extracted from the word *zilai*, ‘black, red wine’, from the Dacian language; 2. from the Latin term, *silva*, with the radical → *sil*; 3. “obtained from the Hungarian appellation *szil* ‘elm’ (*sz* being pronounced *s*), the Hungarian radical identical, from a phonetic point of view, with the one of Latin origin” (Chende-Roman 2008: 33).

In the following part, for the spacial setting, we provided some geographic information in the chapter entitled *Geographical Landmarks*. From a geographical point of view, the region in question is in northwestern Romania and mostly overlaps the area between the Eastern Carpathians and the Apuseni Mountains. It covers an area of 3864.38 km<sup>2</sup> and borders four counties: Cluj – to the south and southeast, Bihor – to the west, Satu Mare and Maramureş – to the north. Compared to the current Sălaj county, the former administrative-territorial unit had a different configuration. It included a large part of today's counties: Satu Mare and Maramureş.

Sălaj is made up of mountains, hills, and depressions, being located on the rivers Someş, Almaş, Agrij, Crasna, Barcău and the valleys Sălaj and Zalău. The natural vegetation of the Sălaj

area includes various types of forests (a significant number of toponyms are based on the word "*silvanie* < lat. *silva* meaning "forest": *Șimleu Silvaniei, Cehu Silvaniei, Sighetu Silvaniei, Sâncraiu Silvaniei*" (Abrudan, Daróczy 2007); meadows and agricultural land.

Being covered by extensive forests in both depression and submontane areas, the locals called this region the *Land of Silvania*, and the configuration of the area in 1876 is the one that would be the basis of *Sălaj* County, also known as the *historical Sălaj*.

In the chapter ***Historical Landmarks***, we followed both archaeological discoveries (from the Paleolithic, Neolithic, Bronze or early Iron Age) and direct or indirect contact with other peoples in order to observe to what extent the regional lexicon was influenced.

The presence of the Dacians in the *Sălaj* area is proven by the existence of the fortresses in Moigrad, Șimleu Silvaniei, Marca, Stârciu, Tusa, by the Dacian settlements from Zalău, Panic, Boghiș, Sărmășag, Zalha, Doba, Petrindu, Muncel etc.; but also, through the castra: Romita, Românași, Sutor, Brusturi, Buciumi, Jac, Tihău, Zalău and, the most spectacular, Moigrad-Porolissum.

There are fortresses and medieval castles that belonged to great noble families, in the localities: Dragu, Jibou, Gârbou, Șimleu Silvaniei, etc.

The confrontation between the Romanian army led by Mihai Viteazul and Sigismund Bathory, on August 3, 1601, took place in Guruslău, near Zalău, where a commemorative monument was built.

Many toponyms from *Sălaj* are also related to the name of the great voivode and to the historical circumstances in which he was involved: *Fântâna cornilor* from Bobota, *Gorunul lui Mihai* present in Sighetul Silvaniei, *Podul lui Mihai* located in Zalău and others.

The documents of the time witness an ample movement of the serfs from the localities on the valleys of Almaș and Agrij, in Gîlgău, Gârbou and Chendrea against the social and national oppression, in February 1775.

It is worth mentioning the Revolt of 1784, led by Horea, Cloșca and Crișan, which also passed through *Sălaj* and which was joined by several people from *Sălaj* (Petru Adam from Almaș, Ioan Romitan etc.). Among the historical personalities from *Sălaj*, we mention: Grigorie Maior from Sărăuad, Simion Bărnuțiu from Bocșa, "the morning star of 1848" (Ardeleanu 2016: 15); Ioan Vancea from Vașad; Ioan Alexi from Mălădia, Gheorghe Pop from Băsești, Alecsandru Papiu Ilarian from Bezded, Florian Mărcuș, George Filep, Ioan Maniu (nephew of Simion Bărnuțiu and

father of Iuliu Maniu), Andrei Cosma, Ioan Hendea, Gheorghe Şimonca, Iuliu Maniu, Corneliu Coposu etc.

In the chapter called *Ethnographic Landmarks*, we presented the clothing, household and pursuits of the people of Sălaj, the customs, traditions, popular beliefs, but also the zonal folklore. The ethnography of the region is composed of two areas: a part in the south of the region (one third) includes the Meseş ethnographic area, and the other includes the Sălaj ethnographic area.

Camelia Burgele (2015: 30-31) observes that, towards Cehu Silvaniei, there are several localities that have, from an ethnographic point of view, a special profile; there are villages that are part of the Codru area - a cultural space incorporated in the administrative territory of Satu Mare county.

As for the clothing of the people of Sălaj, it differs from one area to another.

The morphology of the Sălaj peasant household includes: the house, the *poiata* – *barn* (grajd), *şura* (construction attached to the stable), the coop, *coşteiul* (bin for the corn), the summer house that serves to prepare culinary dishes in warm periods and the country house includes: the big room at the front of the house, towards the road, *tindă* (a porch), towards the courtyard and / or the front part which had a *talpă* / *târnaş* (prispa) which was replaced by the hall, and, in the back, there is also a pantry.

In the category of habits, we can distinguish work habits: *claca* and *haba* or *şezătoarea*; the habit of *joining sheep* aimed at *measuring the milk* (establishing the amount of milk that will correspond to each household during the pastoral year); customs and traditions related to important events in the human life: the *wedding* (*mărsul pă didic*, the wedding cries from Sălaj – „chiuituri”, „ptiuituri”, „iuituri”) and *death*.

The wedding in Sălaj has particularities depending on the area where it is organized. Thus, in the area “De sub Codru”, it was said that “the young people got on the board”, “they got on the wire rod (sârmă)”, after which for three consecutive Sundays the wedding was announced at the church” (Borca 2010: 83); in the Someş area, there is a tradition meant to avoid prolonging the period of "virginity"; and, on the Lozna Valley, before the wedding, the bride used to go to church accompanied by the young people of the village. The boys would carry flags made of home-woven towels and adorned with bows, and at the top there was a bouquet of basil, of *sasău* (myrtle) or other flowers; in the wedding on Someş, the "giving of the hen" is offered together with the last dish; the party before the wedding is called “Şiratău” (Zalău Valley, Barcău River), “Tiperi” (Agrij River), “La cunună” (in the “Sub Meseş” area); and, indispensable to the nuptial ceremony, is the flag,

called "zaslău" (in the area "Sub Meseș"); „Laslău” (Barcău River); respectively the "bride's rod" (Agrij River).

Regarding the customs related to the holidays, some differentiating aspects stand out as well. For example, at Christmas and New Year, the groups of carolers walk with the star, the Magi, the *sorcova*, the plow and the goat. In the villages located on the Barcău River, children up to the age of 15 go on the eve of the Epiphany or on New Year's Eve with the *țuraleisa* (chiraleisa'), asking: "Do you receive the *țuraleisa*?" (Burhele 2015: 22-23). On the Epiphany, on the course of the Agrij River, the following custom is known: to put in a *canceu* (large glass cup') the basil sprinkled by the priest at the Epiphany and to keep it all year round, so as to avoid mold and to protect the house from harm. On Flower Sunday, by keeping the catkin in clean spaces (branches / willow flowers), the house is protected from the "demonic" and "all diseases" and, along the Almaș River, an interesting and unique custom is to organize the traditional fair of girls on the third day of Easter. For Sânzieni (Midsummer Day), the people of Sălaj make wreaths of yellow flowers called *sânziene* – lady's bedstraw (symbolizing the destiny of family members) and usually throw them over the house or on the barn.

A diverse and authentic aspect is noticed on the course of the Almaș River, where the wreaths of bedstraws do not represent the family members but are made according to the number of dead and unmarried girls in the house.

Also, within this part of the paper, we presented aspects related to the zonal folklore, especially the musical folklore of Sălaj, the popular dis-enchantments and the popular beliefs of Sălaj.

The chapter *Linguistic aspects* represents the most extensive part of the research and illustrates the linguistic peculiarities, the phenomena encountered in dialects at all levels of the language, the terminology analyzed from etymological and lexico-semantic perspective, the influence of literary language on Sălaj dialects and word formation.

Ion Coteanu (1961: 98) states that the dialects of Sălaj are part of the Crișean subdialect along with the language spoken by the mountain people, and the ones living in the Apuseni Mountains, the dialect in Crișeni Oaș. In addition, the dialects in Sălaj are transitional dialects and "occupy an intermediate position between the two distinct dialectal units in the Transcarpathian area: the Crișean subdialect and the Maramureș subdialect. Apart from phenomena common to the two subdialects (phenomena occurring in many Transcarpathian dialects), the idioms in Sălaj

present a series of phonetic features specific to either the Crișean or Maramureș subdialect” (Marin 2017: 31).

In this section of the thesis, we aimed to illustrate, through the factual material, the main linguistic features (unitary and differentiating aspects) of Sălaj dialects formed on the main rivers and valleys, noting some individual characteristics (phonetic, morphological and lexical), which prove the existence of several speeches, not just one speech.

In addition, it is worth mentioning both the unitary characteristics of the languages in question within the same area, and the common features they have in relation to the neighboring idioms, with those located in the northwest, but also with the Romanian ones from Hungary.

In this chapter, we revealed, at the **phonetic level** (stress, vocal system, groups of sounds – diphthongs, consonant system and general phonetic accidents), both the features common to all Sălaj dialects that are found in neighboring dialects, and the differentiating aspects of treated idioms.

Thus, the phonetic peculiarities common to the Sălaj and the neighboring dialects refer to: the vowel **á**, at the end of the word, as well as the suffix **-ea** from the verbs of the second conjugation, becomes a very closed **e**: *așé* instead of *așa*; the unaccented vowel **ă** turns into unaccented **i** as in: *cămașă* > *chimeșe*; the vowel **ă** closes at **î**: in *mînușe* (*mănușă*) and in *mîncă* (*măncă*); the vowels **e** and **o** are pronounced: **ă**: *tot* > *tăt*, *peste* > *păstă*; the vowel **é**, in the initial position, is pronounced **i**: *a vedea* > *a videia*; the vowel **í**, from the first syllable, passes to **î**: *a zice* > a *zîce*, *a ține* > a *țîne*; the diphthong **oa** is monophthongized to a very closed **o**: *poate* > *póte*; the vowel **u** passes to **o**: *cusut* > *cosut*; palatalization of the labials: *snopt'*, *sábd'je*, *h're*, *mńică*, *d'îie*, *înd'ie*; *bíne*; the African consonant **g** becomes **j**: *geam* > *jam* and the rhotacization phenomenon is present: *fărină*, *corindă*, etc.

As distinct phenomena, in the dialect of Sălaj, in the local sub-dialects of Nadiș and Cheud; but also in the speech from the Zalău Valley, the vowel **á** goes to **ă**: *dácă* > *dăcă*. Another phonetic aspect concerns the transition of **a** to **o** as in: „*mașină de carne*” > „*moșină de carne*”.

In addition, in the sub-dialect of Cheud, in the language spoken on the course of the Someș River, we also observe the transformation of **á** to **e** in the case of the noun *rană* > *renă*; and, in the local subgroup of Nadiș, an unaccented **o** closes at **u**: *omăt* > *umăt*, *oiagă* > *uiagă*.

The variants of the term sickle are also worth mentioning. In this case, we find dissimilation, in the speech on the Zalău Valley (in Bocșa, Derșida) and in the speech on Crasna (in Cizer), where the speakers use *sécire* (*sécere* > *sécire*). Whereas, in the dialects of Sălaj (in Bulgari) and Someș (in

Cheud), the form *sĕcere* appears. And, finally, the form with *ă*, *săcîre* - because of *s*, is found, again, in the speech on the Zalău Valley (in Derșida) - *secere* > *săcere*, *săcîre*.

In the spoken language on the Zalău Valley (in the localities of Bocșa and Derșida), but also in the spoken language on the Barcău (in the Marca – Ip areas), *é* medial aton is registered which is kept as in the old language in *adécă*.

In the speech from Sălaj, there is a special feature, marked by the transition from *b* to *v* (vetacism), to 3rd person plural of the present subjunctive from *a avea* > *să aivă*, instead of *să aibă* and, also to be mentioned, in the speech from Sălaj (in Bulgari), the phenomenon of the transition of *u* to *î*: *sul* > *sîl*.

Regarding the speech from Someș, it is preserved, being similar to the one from the northwest. Within it, the Maramureș influence is visible (Medve 2002: 122), but, in equal measure, there are also specific characteristics of the Crișean and Moldovan subdialects (Timoc 2010: 17-18).

At the **morphosyntactic level**, in general, in the Sălaj dialects, the grammatical categories (flexible and inflexible parts of speech) present similar structures and situations.

As distinct aspects we point out: in the speech on Almaș, there is a special form, *vărvăd*, for the noun *vîrf*, never found in the other Sălaj dialects, and in the speech on Zalău Valley, the variant *vîrv* is registered for the lexeme *vârf*.

The gender change occurs in the nouns: *un abros* ("towel", "tablecloth"), with the feminine form. sg. *o abros* (in the speech on Barcău); *un piciorang*, with the feminine variant sg. *o piciorang* (in the speech on Someș); and *o casă*, with neutral sg. *un cas* (in the speech on the Zalău Valley).

As far as we are concerned, we met, at the same informant, two plural variants of the word *mănunchi*: *mănunt'î* și *mănunt'e*, in the speech from the Zalău Valley.

The change of number was signaled in the words: *casă* – pl. *căsi*, *habă* – pl. *hăbi* ‘șezătoare’ (in the speech on Almaș); *clopot* – pl. *clopoti* (in the speech on the Zalău Valley); *năframă* – pl. *năfrămi*, var. *năfrâmi* (in the speech from the Zalău Valley); *buruiană* – pl. *buruiene* (in the dialect of the Zalău Valley); *moșină* ‘chibrit’ – pl. *moșine* (in the language of Crasna) etc.

In addition, the speech on the Zalău Valley (in Derșida) registers the unique form *un cas*, respectively the structures *da mînrîsî* și *luj maj\_búj prĕt'înĭ*.

In comparison with the other Sălaj dialects, in the Barcău dialect (in Cosniciu de Jos), the unprecedented forms *ôșt'e* și *âșt'ĕ* appear for the demonstrative pronoun of proximity, the third person, the plural number, *acestea* / *aceștia*.

In the speech on Barcău (Cosniciu de Jos), the special form *d'înd'e* remains prevalent, for the adverb *unde*. If, in the Sălaj dialects, the variant *d'et'ilîndi* with the meaning 'separate' circulates, in the Maramureş ones, the form *det'ilîn* is encountered, with the same meaning, as Mircea Farcaş (2011: 209) notices; and the adverb *de măgan* with the meaning of 'slowly', 'on low heat', appears frequently in the texts of Mircea Groza's recipes.

Also, the dialects on the Zalău Valley, on Almaş, on the Someş and the speech from Barcău preserve some authentic phraseological units: *a pica în dragoste* 'to fall in love'; *a pica în păcate* 'to sin'; *a se prinde satu* 'to promise, to make a vow'; *a ține jinău / a ține gându* 'to guess', *a se lua laolaltă* 'to get married' and *a-i sta gându* 'to believe, to think'.

By analyzing the **lexical aspects** of the Sălaj dialects, one can observe, besides the Romance linguistic elements, the important influence of the Hungarian and Slavic languages, including in toponymy and anthroponymy.

In the structure of the vocabulary, one can identify old Slavic elements from the Slavic languages created later: Bulgarian, Serbian, Ukrainian, but, in addition to this, the presence of other languages is also noticeable.

The words borrowed from these languages are found not only in clothing names, in household and agricultural tools, in gastronomy, in toponyms, in flora and fauna, in human qualities and actions, but also in the popular magic pattern, conveying to the Sălaj region a specific feature.

In the dialects of Sălaj, words with different etymologies are common, depending on the geographical area and the historical context. At the same time, the idioms discussed are also influenced by the neighboring languages.

In this sequence of the thesis, we discussed the **Latin elements** (where many regional lexical elements preserved from Latin or formed with elements of Latin origin prevail: *cășună, ciur, cocă, îmbiá* – var. *îndiá, îmbucá, păjí, scoacă* etc.; **Hungarian elements** (*abrós, alduí, arăduí, băncădít, bărnáce* – var. *bărnáci, boboánă, cărălábă, chischinéu* – var. *chișchinéu, chescheneáúă și căscăneá, cinăș, cirigáúă* – var. *ciurigáúă, cóciș, colompíri* – var. *crumpli, dăráb, didicán, fitéu, gúlă, hirîbă, ilistăú* – var. *ilestéu, îlest, jinăú, lepedéu* – var. *lipidéu, léveș* – var. *lévișă și lévișe, palțăú, pogán, príceș* – var. *prîtoș, prícioș, prícej, probăluí* – var. *probălí, probolí, prăbălí, razalăí* – var. *răzălăí, silvoíz, der. silvoíță, șiratăú, ticăzuí* – var. *ticăzí, tichinéu* – var. *tichineáúă, vífél* – var. *vilfél, velfél, zaslăú* – var. *laslăú, zărjăl, zéler* – var. *țéler* etc.).

In the category of **Slavic elements**, along with the elements from the Old Slavic background, in the dialects of Sălaj, we also identify words from the following later constituted Slavic languages:

Bulgarian, Serbian, Ukrainian: *chîșcă* – var. *ptîșcă*, *pacîșă* – var. *paciôșă*, *pirôșcă*, *potrôc*, *clîșă*, *postăvă*, *púhav* – var. *púhab*, *rúje*, *ludăie* – var. *ludău*, *tulúg* – var. *tulúj*, *hulúj* etc.

In the analyzed area, there are several toponyms formed from the Slavic etymology, “a fact that proves unequivocally that the Slavs circulated through these places: *Bezded* < v. sl. *bezŭ* «fără» + *dedŭ* «bunic» (the toponym was formed from an anthroponym, probably a nickname given to an orphaned child); *Cernuc* < v. Sl. *črŭnŭ* «black»; *Crasna* < v. Sl. *krasŭnŭ* «frumos»; *Oaia* < n. pers. *Voja* < v. Sl. *voj* «soldier»; *Doba* < v. Sl. *dobŭ* (or having a nasal character) «oak»; *Dobrin*, at the first attestation 1432 *Debren* < v. Sl. *debrŭ* «forest, woods»; *Dolheni* < v. Sl. *dlŭgŭ*, *dolg* «lung» by means of the anthroponym *Dolha*; *Dolu* < v. Sl. *dolŭnŭ* «infernus», meaning «from below», *dolŭ* «valley»; *Dragu* < v. Sl. *drag* «dear, beloved», also obtained through anthroponymic intermediary; *Moigrad* < v. Sl. *moi* "mine" and " *gradŭ* " citadel, etc. " (Chende-Roman 2008: 107-109).

**Words of German origin** have a low frequency. These are found in the following lexical fields: gastronomy, clothing, qualities and defects, but also interjections: *láibăr*, *fáin*, *pfui* – var. *ptuáj*, *ptîu* etc.

In this chapter, we also pointed out the following: **words from the old local background**, some of which are also present in Albanian: *grumáz*, *țîră* etc.; **words with unknown etymology**: *ciorîng*, *cotozî*, *húdă*, *mărin*, *scotocî* – var. *a scociorî* etc.

In the Sălaj dialects, one can notice the preference for **neologisms**, for the Romanesque loans through the French or sometimes the Italian strand *batóză*, *brodá*, *damigeánă*, *dantélă*, *náilon*, *revizór*, *tuf* – var. *tof* etc. There were a small number of borrowings from other languages, for example English or German.

In addition, during the dialectal survey, we noticed the tendency to use neologisms even in the elderly either due to media influence or due to the degree of education.

The polysemantism of some lexemes present in the Sălaj dialects is also noteworthy, where a word can have different meanings. From the informants' reports, we deduce that, in the speech on Barcău, *dosul* is ‘a smaller and shorter *towel* for wiping dishes’ and *towel* has the meaning of ‘*ștergură* / *ștergar*’, in the speech of Sălaj.

However, in the localities along the Barcău River, *abros* does not have the meaning of ‘towel’, but of ‘tablecloth’. With the same meaning, the term derived from *dosoai* appears, in Derșida, in the speech from Zalău Valley.

Regarding the surface of dissemination of the series: *colompile* – *cartofi* / *piciouci* – *cartofi* / *bărăboi* – *cartofi* / *pere* – *cartofi* / *goață* – *crumpe* – *picioici* – *hiribe* – *corompile* – *barabule*, the

lexemes are distributed according to the area. For example, the pair *cartófî = colompîri* appears in the speech on the Zalău Valley; *cartófî = piçjôuçî* – in the language of Sălaj; *cartófî = bărăbôj* – in the speech on Someș; and *crumpe = picioici = hiribe = corompile = barabule*, in the speech on Almaș.

We also point out the word *rúje* which has the meaning of ‘*flôre-sórelu*’, in most Sălaj dialects, except for the speech on Almaș, where it means ‘rose’.

During the dialectal surveys, we noticed the major influence of literary language on the discourse of the informants. This has a significant impact both among the young generation who attend schools, having cultural backgrounds, and among the elderly, through the media. This influence is felt in the phonetic and lexical compartment.

At the micro level, the most affected thematic groups, where the dialectal words are competing with the literary ones, are represented by food and dishes, household objects, agricultural products respectively; and, at the macro level, in the vocabulary section, the regionalisms of Hungarian origin “lose ground in favor of literary terms” (Farcaș 2009: 151) as in the Maramureș dialects. For example, *bolonzi* (< Hungarian) - *psychiatry*, *cociș* (< Hungarian) – *coachman*.

In addition, besides the influences from the literary language, one can observe the lexemes of Latin origin, “which present a special resistance to literary terms” (Farcaș 2009: 151): *afumătură*, *ai*, *curechi* etc. which proves the vitality of the dialects.

Also, one can see the influence of literary language on the level of derivation with diminutive suffixes. Thus, “if in 1972 I. Faiciuc noticed the diminutive suffix *-uc / -ucă* as having a special frequency, currently, the highest frequency is held by *-uț / -uță* suffix with general spread in Daco-Romanian” (Farcaș 2009: 151): *oluț*, *pocuț* etc., but also the diminutive suffix *-iță*: *gozăriță*, *gubiță*, *rudiță* etc.

Although the imprint of the literary language is visible in the language of the informants, of the surveyed people from Sălaj, we also noticed the preservation of some authentic expressions that offer to the spoken words individuality and originality: *dungă de lume* for the literary form ‘end of the world’; *a pica în dragoste* with the current expression ‘to fall in love’; *a pica în păcate* for ‘to sin’; *a ține jinău* with the meaning of ‘to suspect’; the *estimp* form for the phrase ‘in the meantime’, ‘during this time’, ‘in this time’; the phrase *vét'i bătrînî*, but also the structures that indicate the intensity of the rush: *to hurry fast*, *a se păzi*, ‘a se găbi’ *iute* respectively.

We assume that the regional-literary alternation in the speakers' discourse can be explained by the fact that informants, once they have resorted to the literary form of words, try to clarify their

speech, to avoid possible misunderstandings of regionalisms by the investigator, to give weight to words or to seem educated.

Regardless of the explanation, we appreciated the emotional involvement of the informants in the communicated message, and, through the playful and humorous spirit, they offered vitality to both the narrated events and the local speeches.

Regarding the **formation of words**, we considered both the *derivation with prefixes* and the *derivation with suffixes*, and *the formation of words by composition*, respectively. Thus, in the category of derivation with prefixes, we focused on simple or prefixed verbs (*bolnăvi* ‘îmbolnăvi’); on verbs prefixed in speech, without prefix in literary language (*îmbucura, învrîstăt*); but also, on verbs prefixed in speech, with prefix also in the literary language (*împerinat, îmbăierat* etc.).

Sălaj dialects attest to a significant number of suffixally derived words, noting the preference for diminutives that include different lexical spheres: the human body, physical and moral characteristics, family, gastronomy, clothing, objects, animals, agriculture, horticulture, etc. This feature is common to the Crișan and Maramureș subdialects (Marin 2017: 58).

Among the discussions held on derivation with suffixes, for the study of diminutives we point out Adrian Chircu's articles, "Latin diminutives «cum valachica interpretatione» in Teodor Corbea's dictionary" and "On using the diminutive of neological nouns in modern Romanian", where he states that the suffix *-aș* has multiple origins: “Slavic (*-aš*), Hungarian (*-às*) and, probably, vernacular” (Chircu 2015: 46); and “linguists or philologists who have focused on the detailed study of the origin or use of diminutive suffixes have noticed that, in Romanian, they, in addition to being very old, have, with rare exceptions (for example, *-aș, -iță, -uș*), a Latin origin (for example, *-el, -ic, -ior*), are varied and very often are used in the familiar language, granting a particular feature to the Romanian language” (Chircu 2011: 69).

In the Sălaj and Maramureș dialects, the diminutive suffix *-uț*, with its variants, has a high frequency, being the most productive of the diminutive suffixes, as Maria Marin (2017: 60) and Mircea Farcaș (2009: 54-55) state.

Regarding augmentative suffixes, the *-oi* regime is discussed, about which Marin and Mărgărit (2013: 325-326) state that, although it is an “augmentative suffix par excellence”, it can also have a diminutive meaning.

Regarding the suffix *-ar*, the authors mention that it is a “productive derivative particle at the level of the standard language” (Marin, Mărgărit 2013: 311), which forms nouns that name both the agent and the object made by it.

From the category of suffixes, we focused on nonverbal suffixes: suffixes that name the agent (*prășcár* – var. *prașcău*; *jucás*; *grăitor*; *pețitor* – var. *pețitor*; *zăhăios* etc.); suffixes that name the object (instruments: *zdrobalău*, *mestecău*, *strecurător*, *sucitor* etc.; food and dishes: *vărzare*, *groscior* – var. *groștiór*, *groșitor*; features: *coruță* – var. *curuță*, *groșiorós*, *pricinós* etc.; concrete notions: *coptătură*, *ștergură* etc.; abstract notions: *mulșură*, *strânsură*, *șezătoare* etc.); suffixes indicating origin: *bocșán(-éni)* ‘from Bocșa’, *dărșidán(-i)* ‘from Derșida’, *grozläuán(-i)* ‘from Someș Gurusläu’, *hurezán(-i)* ‘from Hurez’, *jimborán(éni)* / *zimborán(éni)* ‘from Zimbor’, *cheudán(-i)* ‘from Cheud’, *bulgăreán(-éni)* ‘from Bulgari’, *cozniceán(-éni)* ‘from Cosniciu’, *dobrineán(éni)* ‘from Dobrin’; verbal suffixes – participle suffixes (*mezdrăuă*, *pîrgăluțuă*, *pîrlit*, *puđără* etc.) – other verbal suffixes (*chiuă* – var. *ptiuă* și *iuă*, *cuștuluă* – var. *cuștulă* etc.); suffixes that form adverbs (*cruciș*, *curmeziș* etc.); motional suffixes (feminine from masculine: *socăcăuă*, masculine from feminine: *găzdói*, var. *găzdăgói* etc.); suffixes that mark the location in space: *josán(i)*, *susán(i)*, *zorós*; augmentative suffixes that name the person (*bogătán*, var. *bocotán* etc.); name the object (parts of the human body: *picioarăg*, var. *picioarăng*, *căpóc* etc.; household objects: *dosói*, *lădói* etc.; clothing: *mînecoáce*); diminutive suffixes - diminutive suffixes that form nouns (*buburél*, *pumnășél*, *gozărăuă*, *gubăuă*, *brățuăuă*, *coscuăuă*, *gălușcuăuă*, *hirăuă*, *pocuă*; *tipărăușcă* – var. *tipărăușcă* etc etc.); diminutive suffixes that form adjectives (*hedeșél*, *blînduă*, *mărișór* etc.); diminutive suffixes that form adverbs (*încetuă*, *molcuă* – slowly, softly) etc.

For the form *hrujlăuă*, found in the locality of Cizer, on the river Crasna, we assume that it is a derivative – participle form from the etymon *hruj* < E: nct. (MDA I, s.v.).

In the dialects from Sălaj, the derivation with suffixes that include different lexical areas is predominant: professions, the human body, food and dishes, domestic animals, objects, clothing, attributes / characteristics of people and actions, etc.

From the category of suffixes, as Maria Marin (2017: 59) notes, the diminutives prevail, and, in the discussed area, *-uă* / *-uăuă* circulate with a high frequency, as in the neighboring dialects: *brățuăuă*, *gălușcuăuă*, *puicuăuă*, *blînduă*, *molcuă* etc.

Regarding the formation of words by *composition*, we presented the process of *merging* or *fusing*, exemplifying with the lexemes *básamă*, var. *bășamă* and *hârbán* which is an interesting phenomenon, being obtained by contamination from "harbuz" (of Turkish origin – *harbuz*) + "bostan" and means ‘bostan’.

Another process described is the joining where we presented the forms: *făină nulăș(ă)* ‘of the best quality, fine’; the adjective circulates “only in combination with the term *flour*” (Farcaș 2009: 71); *măica bûnă* ‘grandmother’; *măre măica sătului* ‘midwife’ (the construction is found in the localities along the Zalău Valley); *mătu curîli* ‘type of food’ (the structure appears in Mircea Groza's recipes); *pére-n láboș / pére tosoníte* ‘type of food’ and *tipărúșe roșie* ‘red pepper’.

In addition, the present paper shows some aspects related to Sălaj anthroponymy, in the chapter *From the anthroponymy of Sălaj*, where both the names and cognomens of informants and the names and cognomens found in the *Corpus* are listed.

In this part of the research, we touched upon some aspects related to the names and cognomens of the informants, a brief approach to the baptismal names and cognomens registered in the dialectal material, made after the field survey, but also a review of the cognomens encountered in the texts of Mircea Groza, *Traditional recipes from Sălaj - Rețete tradiționale sălăjene – Rețetele socăcițelor*.

Among the informants, not all subjects are individualized in the locality by a cognomen, and, for this category, we reported only their first and last name.

The analysis of the list of names and cognomens reveals that, especially in the anthroponymic system of the surveyed localities, *the baptismal name* or *the first name* are originally names of saints and holidays, flowers and most are taken from Latin and Greek.

*The family names* are formed from toponyms or have Hungarian origin, referring to professions, properties, objects, plants, etc.; and the identification of persons is done through *cognomens* “continuing the old way of naming, outside the official system of conventional anthroponyms” (Vlasin, Adam 2017: 481).

Formally, cognomens consist of: the presentation of ascendants (*the ascendant line includes the family name, usually its genitive form: valerica lui barbúr; mîtru lui móti; the ascendant line includes a nickname developed into a cognomen; culîță a lu ișanăș sfătóĵ; the cognomen includes the reference to the occupation of the ascendant: a pompiéruluĵ; by giving up the ascending line of the husband: vîlma li floriĵán, jenica mîtruluĵ* etc.), joining the nicknames (*completely replacing the ascending line with the nickname: a flútureluĵ; nóra úrsuluĵ; de-a lúpuluĵ*); indication of toponyms (*by giving up the ascending line and replacing it with a toponym: sfătóáĵa d'in boĵán; ĵuliĵána d'e la crúce* etc.); but also *by giving up the ascending line of the parents: ale\_sîn\_mîtruluĵ* etc.

At the morphosyntactic level, “old Romanian phenomena are visible, such as the enclitic articulation of masculine first names or the generalized use of *lui* article (proclitic or enclitic) in the

form *li*” (Vlasin, Adam 2017: 481); the presence of invariable *a* in masculine: (castelul) *a lu jombóri*; (boldu) *a li Lazar*; but also the *-chii /-ki* form of the genitive obtained from the masculine and feminine ending in *-ca*: *ciubálki, diúrki*.

Through all the mentioned aspects, we could notice the high frequency of cognomens and their conservation in the Sălaj area, contributing to the identification and individualization of the person in the rural area.

The final part of our paper includes the **Conclusions**, the **Bibliography** and the **Corpus** composed of: **I. Dialectal texts** - the texts of dialectal surveys collected from the localities along the main rivers and valleys: Agrij River, Almaş River, Barcău River, Crasna River, Someş River, Sălaj Valley and Zalău Valley; **II. Mircea Groza, Traditional recipes from Sălaj - Rețete tradiționale sălăjene – rețetele socăcițelor**, this section includes recipes from different areas of the region in question, including those inhabited by Slovaks and Hungarians; and **III. Demetriu Neaga a Onii** (precentor and parish clerk from Drighiu-Sălaj), *Ruga zilelor* (1930).

Mircea Groza's texts were included in the *Corpus* because their subject represents one of the topics of our investigation, *Traditional recipes from Sălaj*. Also, through its content, the material is authentic and up-to-date, and the recipes are presented on various national and international TV shows by the chef from Sălaj, Mircea Groza. Although not phonetically transcribed, they reproduce, as much as possible, local speech. The first volume of the book, *Traditional Recipes from Sălaj - Rețete tradiționale sălăjene – rețetele socăcițelor*, is being published and the rest are in progress. For this reason, we resorted to the online version of the texts, for which we received the written consent of the author. We followed exactly the posted texts and we did not intervene because, according to the author, in the pages of the published volumes, the same variants of phonetically untranscribed recipes will be found. Thus, the books will be addressed to the public.

The dis-enchantment represents another theme of the investigation and, in this sense, *Descântecul de adus mana sau laptele la vaci, oi și capre*, included in *Ruga zilelor*, published in Zalău, at the “Luceafărul” Printing House, is a precious text that does not benefit from a linguistic approach. It was presented and analyzed by Camelia Burghel (2000: 139-140) only from an ethnological perspective, to highlight the popular beliefs of Sălaj, superstitions, therapy, magic, etc. We respected the authenticity of the material without intervention.

In this monograph, we tried to illustrate, through the factual material, the main linguistic features (unifying and differentiating aspects) of the Sălaj dialects formed on the main rivers and

valleys, noting some individual characteristics (phonetic, morphological, and lexical), which prove the existence of several dialects, not just one dialect.

After drawing the geographical, historical, and ethnographic lines, we determined that the Sălaj area dates back to the Paleolithic period, as evidenced by the numerous material traces and settlements discovered, and the ethnographic spatial division of Sălaj (Meseş ethnographic area and Sălaj ethnographic area). The diversity of the popular clothing, work, life, and celebrated holidays establish, on the one hand, a bridge with the neighboring regions (Cluj, Bihor, Satu Mare, Maramureş) and, on the other hand, highlight the individuality of the researched area.

It was useful to emphasize the main linguistic aspects, as parts of the language spoken in Sălaj overlap with both the Bihor and Someş dialects, which leads to the existence of similarities and linguistic differences within the Sălaj dialects.

In conclusion, by analyzing the phonetic phenomena, the morphosyntactic peculiarities and the lexical elements, we managed to reveal the fact that, in the researched region, well-individualized speeches were formed over the centuries, and the involvement of people in daily life gives them vitality and authenticity.

Thus, by presenting these characteristics, we consider that the realization of a dialectal monograph of the Sălaj space to capture the most important aspects regarding geography, history, ethnography, literature, and linguistic peculiarities of the dialects in the region under analysis was more than necessary.

## SELECTIVE BIBLIOGRAPHY

### Corpus

#### I. *Dialectal Texts.*

II. GROZA, Mircea (2017), *Traditional recipes from Sălaj - Rețete tradiționale sălăjene – Rețetele socăcițelor:*

[https://www.facebook.com/groza.mircea/media\\_set?set=a.1390191654372999.1073742031.100001465322945&type=3](https://www.facebook.com/groza.mircea/media_set?set=a.1390191654372999.1073742031.100001465322945&type=3) (consultat în 9 iulie 2017).

III. NEAGA, Demetriu a Onii (1930), *Ruga zilelor*, Zalău, Tipografia „Luceafărul”.

### Linguistic Atlases

1. PETROVICI, Emil (1940), *Atlasul lingvistic român*, Partea a II-a (A. *Corpul omenesc*; B. *Familia, Nașterea, Copilăria, Nunta, Moartea, Viața religioasă, Sărbători*; C. *Casa, Acareturile, Curtea, Focul, Mobilierul, Vase, Scule*), vol. I, Sibiu–Leipzig, Muzeul Limbii Române & Otto Harrassowitz.

2. PETROVICI, Emil (1943), *Texte dialectale*, Supliment la *Atlasul lingvistic român II*, Sibiu–Leipzig, Muzeul Limbii Române & Otto Harrassowitz.

3. PETROVICI, Emil (coord.) (1956-1972), *Atlasul lingvistic român. Serie nouă*, vol. I-VII, București, Editura Academiei Române.

4. POP, Sever (1942), *Atlasul lingvistic român*, publicat sub conducerea lui Sextil Pușcariu, Partea I, vol. I-II, Sibiu-Leipzig, Muzeul Limbii Române & Otto Harrassowitz.

5. RUSU, Grigore, BIDIAN Viorel, LOȘONȚI Dumitru (1992), *Atlasul lingvistic român. Transilvania*, București, Editura Academiei Române.

6. \*\*\**Szilágysági Nyelvatlasz* (2000), Magyar Nyelvtudományi Társaság: Pázmány Péter Katolikus Egyetem, Budapest; Piliscsaba.

7. URIȚESCU *et alii* (1996-2011), *Noul atlas lingvistic român. Crișana*, vol. I (*Corpul omenesc*), vol. II (*Familia, Casa*), vol. III (*Curtea, Agricultura și Legumicultura; Pomicultura, Viticultura, Apicultura, Cânepa*), București–Cluj-Napoca, Editurile Academiei Române–Clusium.

## Articles and studies

8. ABRUDAN, Ioan, DARÓCZI Iosif (2007), *Județul Sălaj: Geografie și geografii*, Zalău, Editura Școala Noastră.
9. ARDELEANU, Ioan, Senior (2016), *Oameni din Sălaj. Momente din luptele naționale ale românilor sălăjeni*, Zalău, Editura Caiete Silvane.
10. BORCA, Irimia, BORCA Mărioara (2010), *Nunta tradițională românească din Țara Silvaniei și Țara Codrului*, Zalău, Editura Caiete Silvane.
11. BURGHELE, Camelia (1999), *Descânțete: descânțete populare terapeutice din Sălaj*, Zalău, Centrul de Conservare și Valorificare a Tradiției și Creației Populare Sălaj.
12. BURGHELE, Camelia (2006), *Repere de cultură tradițională sălăjeană*, Zalău, Editura Porolissum a Muzeului Județean de Istorie și Artă Zalău.
13. BURGHELE, Camelia (2014), *La nuntă în satele sălăjene. O lectură antropologică a tradițiilor nupțiale*, Prefață de Narcisa Alexandra Știucă, Zalău–București, Editurile Caiete Silvane–Etnologică.
14. BURGHELE, Camelia (2015), *Satele sălăjene și poveștile lor, II, (Ritual, Ceremonial, Sărbătoresc – Bucurie și tristețe în satul sălăjean tradițional)*, Zalău–București, Editurile Caiete Silvane–Etnologică.
15. BURGHELE, Camelia (2015), *Șapte zile în Țara Silvaniei. Un exercițiu de antropologie culturală* – Ediția a II-a, revizuită și adăugită, Zalău–București, Editurile Caiete Silvane–Etnologică.
16. CANDREA, Ion-Aureliu (1895), *Poreclele la români*, București, Editura Librăriei Socec & Comp.
17. CARAGIU-MARIOȚEANU, Matilda (1975), *Compendiu de dialectologie română*, București, Editura Științifică.
18. CARAGIU-MARIOȚEANU, Matilda, GIOSU Ștefan, IONESCU-RUXĂNDOIU Liliana, TODORAN Romulus TODORAN (1977), *Dialectologie română*, București, Editura Didactică și Pedagogică.
19. CARAMAN, Petru (1983), *Colindatul la români, slavi și la alte popoare – Studiu de folclor comparat*, Ediție îngrijită de Silvia Ciubotaru, Prefață de Ovidiu Bîrlea, București, Editura Minerva.
20. CAZACU, Boris (1966), *Studii de dialectologie română*, București, Editura Științifică.
21. CERNEA, Eugenia (1972), *Folclor muzical din Sălaj. Zona sub Meseșului și a Barcăului*, Sălaj, Centrul Județean de Îndrumare a Creației Populare și a Mișcării Artistice de Masă.
22. CHENDE-ROMAN, Gheorghe (2004), „Relația toponime – antroponime; aspecte din Sălaj”, în *Silvania. Cultură. Culte. Patrimoniul*, Serie nouă, An III, nr. 1-4 (9-12), decembrie, pp. 142-152.

23. CHENDE-ROMAN, Gheorghe (2006), *Dicționar etimologic al localităților din județul Sălaj*, Zalău, Editura Silvania, Editura Caiete Silvane.
24. CHENDE-ROMAN, Gheorghe (2008), *Toponimie. Din onomastica Țării Silvaniei*, Zalău, Editura Silvania.
25. CHENDE-ROMAN, Gheorghe (2009), *Antroponimie. Din onomastica Țării Silvaniei*, Zalău, Editura Silvania.
26. CHIRCU, Adrian (2014), „Adverbul de mod în ALR, I, I și în ALRM I. Harta «Merg încet»”, în *Lucrările celui de-al XV-lea Simpozion Internațional de Dialectologie (Cluj-Napoca, 13–14 septembrie 2012)*, Editura Argonaut Scriptor, pp. 51–64.
27. CHIRCU, Adrian (2018), „Cuvinte dialectale în vechi manuale elementare. Observații asupra gramaticii lui Ioan Alexi (*Grammatica Daco-Romana sive Valachica, 1826*)”, în *Anuar de lingvistică și istorie literară*, T. LVII · 2017 (*Verba et res. Studia linguistica in honorem magistri Stelian Dumistrăcel*), București, Editura Academiei Române, pp. 141- 151.
28. CHIRCU, Adrian (2020), „Alteritatea adverbială dialectală românească”, în Veronica Ana Vlasin et alii (eds), *Lucrările celui de-al XVIII-lea Simpozion Internațional de Dialectologie (Cluj-Napoca, 30-31 august 2018)*, Cluj-Napoca, Editurile Argonaut și Scriptor, Societatea Română de Dialectologie & Institutul de Lingvistică și Istorie Literară „Sextil Pușcariu”, pp. 35-58.
29. COȘERIU, Eugenio (1995), *Introducere în lingvistică*, Traducere de Elena Ardeleanu și Eugenia Bojoga, Cuvânt înainte de Mircea Borcilă, Cluj-Napoca, Editura Echinox.
30. COTEANU, Ion (1961), *Elemente de dialectologie a limbii române*, București, Editura Științifică.
31. COTEANU, Ion, SALA Marius (1987), *Etimologia și limba română. Principii – probleme*, București, Editura Academiei Române.
32. DRĂGANU, Nicolae (1933), *Românii în veacurile IX-XIV pe baza toponimiei și a onomasticeii*, București, Monitorul Oficial și Imprimeriile Statului. Imprimeria Națională.
33. DUMISTRĂCEL, Stelian (1978), *Influența limbii literare asupra graiurilor dacoromâne. Fonetica neologismului*, București, Editura Științifică și Enciclopedică.
34. DUNĂRE, Nicolae (1977), „Elemente de unitate și varietate culturală românească în portul popular din Sălaj”, în *Acta Mvsei Porolissensis*, I, pp. 389-392.
35. FARCAȘ, Ioan-Mircea (2009), *Lexicul subdialectului maramureșean*, Cluj-Napoca, Editura Dacia.
36. FARCAȘ, Ioan-Mircea (2011), *Fonomorfologia subdialectului maramureșean*, Baia Mare, Editura Universității de Nord.

37. FARCAȘ, Ioan-Mircea (2011), *Texte dialectale–Maramureș*, Lucrare apărută în cadrul proiectului finanțat de Consiliul Județean Maramureș, contract nr. 3599 din 12.07.2011, Baia Mare, Editura Universității de Nord.
38. FRĂȚILĂ, Vasile (2011), *Toponimie și dialectologie*, Cluj-Napoca, Editura Mega.
39. Felecan, N. (2010), „Categoriile antroponimice: nume, supranume, poreclă”, în *Onomasticon. Studii despre nume și numire*, I, pp. 81–120.
40. FRĂȚILĂ, Vasile (2016), *Studii istroromâne*, Ediție îngrijită și studiu introductiv de Ioan-Mircea Farcaș, București, Editura Universității din București.
41. GHERGARIU, Leontin (1973), *Folclor literar din Sălaj – Centrul de îndrumare a creației populare și a mișcării artistice de masă a județului Sălaj*, Zalău, Centrul de Conservare și Valorificare a Tradiției și Creației Populare Sălaj.
42. GHEȚIE, Ion (1963), „Și, semn al conjunctivului în graiul crișean”, în *Limba română*, Anul XII, nr. 3, pp. 254-260.
43. GHINOIU, Ion (2004), *Sărbători și obiceiuri românești*, București, Editura Elion.
44. GODEA, Ioan (1981), *Zona etnografică Beiuș*, București, Editura Sport – Turism.
45. GOIA, Ioan Augustin (1982), *Zona etnografică Meseș*, București, Editura Sport – Turism.
46. IORDAN, Iorgu (1963), *Toponimia românească*, București, Editura Academiei Române.
47. LOȘONȚI, Dumitru (1969), „Sistemul popular de denotație personală din Bonțida (jud. Cluj)”, în *Cercetări de lingvistică*, XIV, nr. 1, pp. 115–123.
48. LOȘONȚI, Dumitru (2001), *Soluții și sugestii etimologice*, București, Editura Univers Enciclopedic.
49. LOȘONȚI, Dumitru (2007), *Certitudini și ipoteze etimologice*, București, Editura Academiei Române.
50. LUPESCU, Mihai (2000), *Din bucătăria țaranului român*, Prefață de Radu Anton Roman, Studiu introductiv și bibliografie de Maria Rafailă, Postfață de Antoaneta Olteanu, București, Editura Paideia.
51. MARIAN, Simion Florea (2001), *Sărbătorile la români. Studiu etnografic I (Cârnilegile)*, București, Editura „Grai și suflet – Cultura Națională”.
52. MARIN, Maria, MĂRGĂRIT Iulia (2005), *Graiuri românești din Ungaria. Studiu lingvistic. Texte dialectale. Glosar*, București, Editura Academiei Române.
53. MARIN, Maria, MĂRGĂRIT Iulia (2013), *Românii din Ungaria. Texte. Glosar, Studiu lingvistic*, București, Editura Academiei Române.

54. MARIN, Maria (coord.) (2017), *Graiurile din Sălaj. Studiu lingvistic. Texte dialectale. Glosar*, București, Editura Academiei Române.
55. MĂRGĂRIT, Iulia (2011), *Românii din afara României și limba lor. (Perspectivă dialectologică). Articole și note*, București, Editura Academiei Române.
56. MERUȚIU, V. (1929), *Județele din Ardeal și din Maramureș până în Banat. Evoluția teritorială*, Cluj-Napoca, Institutul de Arte Grafice „Ardealul”.
57. MIHAIL, Zamfira (1978), *Terminologia portului popular românesc în perspectivă etnolingvistică comparată sud-est europeană*, București, Editura Academiei Române.
58. MOCANU, Augustin (2007), *Nadiș – 620 – 1387-2007. File dintr-o monografie*, Baia Mare, [s.e.].
59. MOCANU, Augustin (2011), *Folclor literar din zona Codrului. Texte poetice extrase din revista Memoria Ethnologica, anii 2001 – 2011*. Ediție realizată de Augustin Mocanu și Ștefan Mariș, Baia Mare, Editura Ethnologica.
60. MOCANU, Augustin (2013), *Folclor literar din vechiul județ Sălaj. Texte extrase din revista Școala Noastră anii 1924 – 1940*. Ediție realizată de A. Mocanu, Slobozia, Editura Star Tipp.
61. NICOLAU, Irina (1998), *Ghidul sărbătorilor românești*, vol. 2, București, Editura Humanitas practic.
62. NICULIȚĂ-VORONCA, Elena (1998), *Datinele și credințele poporului român*, vol. I, Iași, Editura Polirom.
63. PĂȘTEAN, Camelia, MĂRGINEAN Viorel, *Județul Sălaj – cadrul geografic și istoric*, sursa: <http://oti2013.mihai-viteazul.ro/prezentare/judetul-salaj-cadrul-geografic-si-istoric> (consultat în 19 iulie 2014).
64. PETROVICI, Emil (1941), „Graiul românesc de pe Crișuri și Someș”, în *Transilvania*, anul 72, octombrie, nr. 8, pp. 551-558.
65. POP, Gheorghe (1971), *Elemente neologice în graiul maramureșean*, Cluj, Editura Dacia.
66. POPESCU-MARIN, Magdalena (coord.) (2007), *Formarea cuvintelor în limba română din secolele al XVI-lea – al XVIII-lea*, București, Editura Academiei Române.
67. ROSETTI, Alexandru (1975), *Limba descântecelelor românești*, București, Editura Minerva.
68. RUSU, Valeriu (1977), *Introducere în studiul graiurilor românești*, București, Editura Științifică și Enciclopedică.
69. RUSU, Valeriu (coord.) (1984), *Tratat de dialectologie românească*, Craiova, Editura Scrisul Românesc.

70. STOICA, Dionisie, LAZAR Ioan (1908), *Schița monografică a Sălagiului*, Șimleu–Silvaniei, Institutul Tipografic și de Editură „Victoria”.
71. ȘIȘEȘTEAN, Gheorghe (1999) *Forme tradiționale de viață țărănească. O cercetare etno-sociologică a zonei Sălajului*, Zalău, Editura Caiete Silvane.
72. TEAHA, Teofil (1961), *Graiul din Valea Crișului Negru*, București, Editura Academiei Române.
73. TEAHA, Teofil (2016), *Lexicologie dialectală românească. Evocări*, Ediție îngrijită de Dumitru Loșonți, Nicolae Mocanu, Adrian Rezeanu, Cuvânt înainte de Corneliu-Teofil Teaha, Cluj-Napoca, Editura Scriptor.
74. TIMOC, Crenguța (2010), *Obiceiuri de nuntă de pe Valea Someșului*, Zalău, Editura Caiete Silvane.
75. TIMOTIN, Emanuela (2011), *Descântecetele manuscrise în contextul limbii și literaturii române vechi*, București, Editura Academiei Române.
76. TODORAN, Romulus (1984), *Contribuții de dialectologie română*, București, Editura Științifică și Enciclopedică.
77. TOUT, Denisa-Maria (2017), „«Mărsul pă didic» în Sălaj”, („«Mărsul pă didic» in Sălaj county), în *Buletin Științific*, seria A, Fascicula Filologie, vol. XXVI, pp. 383-390.
78. TOUT, Denisa-Maria (2018), „Din lexicul magiei terapeutice sălăjene”, în *Buletin Științific*, Fascicula Filologie, seria A, vol. XXVII / 2018, pp. 189-200.
79. TOUT, Denisa-Maria (2020), „Din lexicul superstițiilor populare sălăjene”, în *Qvaestiones Romanicae*, VIII. Interferențe și contraste în Romania, VIII/1, pp. 385-392.
80. VASILIU, Gabriel (1988), „Din istoria gândirii lingvistice: Emiliu Bran și Vasile Vaida, printre primii cercetători ai graiului sălăjan”, în *Acta mvsei Porolissensis*, XII, pp. 834-837.
81. VLASIN, Veronica Ana, ADAM Gabriela Violeta (2017), „Supranumele din localitatea Cozla (jud. Sălaj)”, în Oliviu Felecan (ed.), *Name and naming. Sacred and profane in onomastics, Baia Mare, September 5–7, 2017. Proceedings of the fourth International Conference on Onomastics (ICONN 4)*, Cluj-Napoca, Editurile Mega–Argonaut, pp. 466-482.

### Dictionaries

82. CIORĂNESCU, Alexandru (2002), *Dicționarul etimologic al limbii române*, Ediție îngrijită și traducere din limba spaniolă, de Tudora Șandru Mehedinți și Magdalena Popescu Marin, București, Editura Saeculum I. O. (DER).

- 83.** COTEANU, Ion *et alii* (coord.) (2010), *Mic dicționar academic*, vol. I (A-Me), vol. II (Mi-Z), București, Editura Univers Enciclopedic Gold (MDA).
- 84.** \*\*\*(1958), *Dicționarul limbii române moderne*, București, Editura Academiei Române (DLRM).
- 85.** \*\*\*(2010), *Dicționarul limbii române*, tomurile I-XIX, București, Editura Academiei Române (DLR).
- 86.** MOLDOVAN, Silvestru, TOGAN Nicolau (2008), *Dicționarul numirilor de localități cu populațiune română din Ungaria*, București, Editura Scripta.
- 87.** OPREA, Ioan *et alii* (2006), *Noul dicționar universal al limbii române*, București, Editura Litera Internațional (NDULR).
- 88.** PAVEL, Eugen, POP Augustin, ROȘIANU Ion, VASILIU Gabriel (2006), *Tezaurul toponimic al României: Transilvania (TTRT) – Județul Sălaj*, București, Editura Academiei Române (TTRT. Județul Sălaj).
- 89.** SUCIU, Coriolan (1967–1968), *Dicționar istoric al localităților din Transilvania*, vol. I (A-N) – vol. II (O-Z), București, Editura Academiei Române.
- 90.** SZABÓ, Attila (1982), *Erdélyi Magyar Szótörténeti Tár*, <http://mek.oszk.hu/08300/08370/pdf/index.html> (EMSZT) (consultat în 5 mai 2018).
- 91.** TAMÁS, Lajos (1966), *Etymologisch-Historisches Wörterbuch der Ungarischen Elemente im Rumänischen*, Budapest, Akadémiai Kiado (EWUR).
- 92.** \*\*\* (1979), *Új Magyar Tájszótár*, Budapest, Akadémiai Kiado.