

Food As a Research Topic in the Romanian Linguistic Questionnaire-Based Inquiries

GABRIELA VIOLETA ADAM, COSMINA-MARIA BERINDEI,
VERONICA-ANA VLASIN

THE QUESTIONNAIRES, as the primary research tools for the institutional linguistic inquiries, dedicate a quite large number of questions to the investigation of food terminology, which is an important aspect in each family's economy and in the rural economy in general. During the daily rural activities, supplying the food and then cooking it took a lot of time and, in the ethnographic reality of the household, the space, tools and equipment dedicated to cooking were extensive. Having as their purpose, among others, to precisely register as many linguistic facts referring to these realities as possible, the linguistic inquiries we refer to were differently developed, closely connected to the purpose they were created for and mostly emphasizing the method's evolution in time. Consequently, the results have been different, and so was the manner in which they have become accessible to the research referring to food.

Our work aims to present the way in which food has been configured as a research topic in these inquiries, focusing on the research tools that have been developed and proposing a thematic and quantitative evaluation of their results. Answering a challenge coming from the ethnological and anthropological sciences, our research also wishes to verify to what extent information on food in its triple form (ritual food, therapeutic food and basic food) can be identified in these inquiries.

Our research refers to four major dialectal inquiries based on a questionnaire, done in the Romanian area. Two of them were indirect (the indirect linguistic inquiry carried out by B. P. Hasdeu in 1884¹ and the linguistic inquiry conducted at the Romanian Language Museum between 1922 and 1939²) and the other two were direct (the first one was done by the Romanian Language Museum for the project of the *Romanian Linguistic Atlas*, ALR I and ALR II, carried out between 1930 and 1938 and the other one con-

This work was supported by Romanian Academy Grants within the project *Digital Library of the Romanian Language Museum's Questionnaires' Corpus: Integrated System of Metadata Management* (BIBLIO-MLrom), a research grant financially supported by Recurring Donor Fond, available to the Romanian Academy and managed by PATRIMONIUM Foundation, GAR-UM-2019-I-1.5-5, contract number 359c/15.10.2019.

cerned another linguistic geography project, *The New Romanian Linguistic Atlas*, NALR, devised during the conference of the dialectologists in Bucharest, Cluj and Iași in 1958³).

Further on, we present the information regarding the dimension and the specificity of each inquiry and also the quantitative relationship between the size of each questionnaire and the number of questions on food and its tools. We also refer to the number of survey points concerning the direct inquiries and to the number of answers received for the indirect inquiries that meet the expectations of the researcher from the field of cultural studies, interested in how the information on this topic was collected during the linguistic inquiries.

We will try, in what follows, to show for each inquiry how the questions on food were constructed and what gastronomic aspects they refer to. Finally, we will show how and what research effort is needed to access the information collected for each inquiry and if there are research tools conceived to facilitate the access to the information on food in these archives.

The first institutional linguistic inquiry coincides with the first systematic collection of dialectal language information for the *Romanian Language Dictionary*. This approach was initiated by B. P. Hasdeu as *Programa pentru adunarea datelor privitoare la limba română* (The program for the collection of data about the Romanian language) in 1884 and was a part of his dictionary project *Etymologicum Magnum Romaniae*. The questionnaire sent to the intellectuals in the Romanian villages contained 206 questions, out of which only eight questions directly concerned food. According to these, an inventory of the local gastronomy based on specific terminology can be attempted (120. *What are the names of dishes specific to this area?*; 121. *What are the names of drinks specific to this area?*), but, sequentially, aspects referring to the tools were investigated (127. *What are the names for kitchenware and the utensils for cooking, serving, and transporting dishes to the fields*; 128. *Which are the words regarding cooking and everything related to it in this area?*). An important place in the questionnaire is dedicated to grapes and wine and their specific names (58. *What are the different names of grapes and the thorough description of each variety?*; 59. *Which are the words referring to vine, vine growing and harvesting?*; 60. *What are the names of the wines, and the words referring to the color, taste and alcohol percentage of wine?*).

A question with multiple ethnographic connections with the food universe is the one regarding shepherding. It asks for an inventory of the words referring to dairy products and the methods used in processing them (94. *What words do the people there use for shepherding . . . for pasturing, cheese and dairy products and the way they make them?*).

Two other categories of questions in Hasdeu's questionnaire indirectly refer to food. One of them, involving the linguistic and ethnographic inventory of the raw materials for food, refers to vegetables, fruits and grains, and the other, having an ethnographic character, refers to the description of the calendar customs or of the customs belonging to the cycle of life and the beliefs about mythological beings. Thus, the questions on caroling, on the customs preceding the fasting periods or those about Destiny or the Walking Dead could generate answers with reference to ritual food.

As it is generally known in the literature, Hasdeu's questionnaire asked the questions in such a way as to facilitate the recording of "unusual," "less used" words having a regional, restricted circulation, thus implicitly expecting the informant to know more

dialects or at least two in order to decide whether a certain word in their vernacular is present in other dialects, too. This is why it is possible that the gastronomic inventory of the material collected in this inquiry may miss some widely known dish names.

Out of the documentary stock generated by Hasdeu's indirect inquiry some material was recorded in the *Romanian Language Dictionary*, but there is no glossary of the dialectal terms in it. Most of the 773 answers came from the Romanian Old Kingdom. The political conditions in the areas inhabited by Romanians in Transylvania, Banat or Bessarabia did not allow the intellectuals to be involved in an inquiry having national implications, thus the number of answers from these areas is very small. The answers were collected in 19 volumes and are kept in the Romanian Academy Library in Bucharest.⁴

Regarding the documentary stock resulted from this inquiry, we should also mention that it served as a subject of a research on the typology of the folklore initiated by Ion Muşlea and completed by Ovidiu Bârlea. Its results were materialized in the publication of a very useful tool guiding the researcher through the thousands of manuscript pages. In the first edition of *Tipologia folclorului din răspunsurile la chestionarele B. P. Hasdeu* (Typology of folklore from the answers to the questionnaires of B. P. Hasdeu), published in 1970, food is not part of the typology.⁵ Thus, the tool does not facilitate the consultation of the documents in the archive collection in order to identify information on food. It appears rather tangentially to other subjects such as going caroling or customs in the family life cycle, and it especially refers to ritual food. The second edition, published in 2010, contains a very short chapter, half a page long, entitled "Mâncarea, alimentele" (Food, dishes).⁶ This new chapter was included in the second edition most probably as a completion of the first edition based on the files initially excerpted then left out by Ion Muşlea. We can argue that Muşlea had the intention of introducing this topic in the typology, but later changed his mind, the second edition offering a sample of the project initiator's lab work but leaving out the result of the selection from the whole archive stock. The information on food is, thus, spread throughout the thousands of manuscript pages, the researcher not having, at the moment, an instrument to facilitate an advanced search.

The indirect inquiry carried by the Romanian Language Museum in Cluj was initiated shortly after the institution was founded as the first research center of the Romanian university in the capital of Transylvania, created in the context following the Great Union in 1918. It was a context favorable to conducting a linguistic inquiry with informants on the whole territory within the borders of Greater Romania. Sextil Puşcariu, the first rector of the university and the director of the Romanian Language Museum, who brought to Cluj the project of the *Romanian Language Dictionary* entrusted to him by the Romanian Academy since 1904, considered it urgent to conduct a more extensive linguistic inquiry than Hasdeu's, meant to record the local dialects before the new socio-economic changes would erase the differences between them. The inquiry lasted from 1922, the year the first questionnaire was sent out, until January 1939, when the last answer received was recorded. The inquiry was done using eight thematic questionnaires handed out with the help of church administration units and school inspectors. The eight questionnaires totaled 1,598 questions and, according to the records, 1,719 answers were received. The number of received answers was very different from one

questionnaire to another and, according to the areas where they were handed out, they unevenly covered all the provinces of Greater Romania.

The assumed purpose of the Romanian Language Museum linguistic inquiry was to collect data on spoken Romanian for use both as a lexicographical resource for the *Romanian Language Dictionary* and for a Romanian linguistic atlas, which was a very important project in Sextil Pușcariu's opinion.

The way in which the questions in the eight questionnaires of the Romanian Language Museum were conceived demonstrates a refinement of the method as compared to the one used by B. P. Hasdeu. Sextil Pușcariu knew both Hasdeu's questionnaire and its results, and the linguistic inquiries conducted in Europe, so he devised the questionnaires by assimilating all the previous experiences.⁷ As the instrument of research was meant to get information that could be processed according to the linguistic geography method, the questions were topical and precise, many of them focused on one word. This was the only way the material could be later used for lexical maps. But the questionnaires also contain questions having an ethnographic character, sometimes inviting the informant to describe objects, activities, customs, or asking information on superstitions or folkloric texts. The answers to these questions offered the linguists information on dialectal syntax and morphology. These answers are most likely to be interesting for ethnology researchers. As the questions are precisely thematic, the identification of information on a certain topic in the archive is not difficult and the questionnaire is useful in this process.

AS OUR purpose in the present study is to analyze the research instruments of these linguistic inquiries from the perspective of the way they investigate food, we must mention from the beginning that the last of the indirect questionnaires of the Romanian Language Museum was exclusively dedicated to food. Thus, *Questionnaire VIII. Food and Drinks*⁸ laid the foundations of institutionalized food research in the Romanian cultural space. As Pușcariu underlined in his letter to the informants at the beginning of the brochure containing the questionnaire, the purpose of the inquiry, launched in 1937 and ended on 9 January 1939, when the last answer was received and recorded, was a dual one: "a *linguistic* one, meant to gather all the food and dish names known by our peasants, and a *social* one, meant to identify the way our peasants eat."⁹ For this questionnaire 69 answers were received, out of which 34 are still kept in the archive collection of answers to the *Questionnaires of the Romanian Language Museum* at Sextil Pușcariu Institute of Linguistics and Literary History in Cluj-Napoca. As compared to the number of answers received for other questionnaires, for *Questionnaire VIII. Food and Drinks*, fewer answers were received. The causes for the smaller number of informants were multiple, and among them we can mention the increasingly difficult political and economic situation in the country and the greater and greater number of correspondent inquiries initiated by numerous institutions in the period between the two world wars. Thus, if for *Questionnaire I. The Horse*, 670 answers were recorded, their number constantly decreased later. For *Questionnaire II. The House*, 439 answers were received and for the following three their number dropped under 200, while the last three questionnaires received fewer than 70 answers each.

Among the eight questionnaires, *Questionnaire VIII. Food and Drinks* was launched when the idea of linking the answers to the indirect questionnaires to the project of the *Romanian Linguistic Atlas* was not only abandoned, but the direct inquiries for the *Romanian Linguistic Atlas I and II* were almost finished. The eighth questionnaire is the first one whose cover letter specifies that the material would be used for the *Romanian Language Dictionary*, but nothing refers to its use for the atlas.

Regarding the content of this questionnaire, we must underline the fact that it is less comprehensive than the ones that preceded it, having only 113 questions.¹⁰ If we analyze the questions, we notice that they do not accurately cover the food topic the way *Questionnaire II. The House* covers the topic of daily life, for instance. Food is well investigated, but the drinks are not. The questionnaire contains a question referring to strong drinks and another one referring to drinking customs and practices (103. *What kind of spirits do the peasants drink and what are they made of?*; 104. *How are different drinks consumed?*), but there is no question referring to wine or other kind of drinks: mead, unfermented wine, or cider. Likewise, there are no explicit questions referring to sweets, or salt, pepper and other spices. There are no questions referring to the storage spaces or to the inventory of tools and instruments for preparing food. Anyway, the questionnaire covers the gastronomy, following the basic food, bread, hominy, the ways of serving food in various circumstances¹¹ (regular days, holidays, in the fields, during a trip) and the gastronomic inventory evaluation of the food obtained from different kinds of meat,¹² fish,¹³ vegetables,¹⁴ fruits,¹⁵ milk, eggs,¹⁶ mushrooms¹⁷ or cereals.¹⁸ Sometimes, the questions on different dishes inventory are followed by questions referring to the way they are cooked.

If we analyze the other questionnaires, we observe that they cover better the topical aspects referring to food, when their approach reaches this point. Thus, *Questionnaire V. Sheepfold, Shepherding and Milk Processing* contains 44 questions approaching food¹⁹ and other 22²⁰ with reference to the tools, instruments and spaces destined to milk processing and the storage of dairy products.

Questionnaire VIII. Food and Drinks, which was no longer structured with the purpose of obtaining uniform data for lexical map processing, did not rely on creating complete inventories. Yet, the material is valuable and useful to the researches on food, offering, alongside recipes and gastronomic inventories, information about culinary habits, about food for fasting and meat days, but also about the food served at weddings or offered as funeral repast.²¹ None of the questions directly approached the ritual food, but information of this kind is present in many of the answers to this questionnaire.

Regarding the therapeutic food, *The Questionnaires of the Romanian Language Museum* contain both implicit and explicit questions. Thus, *Questionnaire III. The Thread* has one explicit question: 52. *For what diseases and how is flax used?* Two other questions in this questionnaire refer to food and the answers may possibly contain information on therapeutic food: 51. *Do they eat hemp?*; 92. *What dishes do they make of hemp seeds?*

Questionnaire VI. Beekeeping contains the most numerous questions on therapeutic food, seven in number, explicitly formulated: 174. *For what diseases do they use bee honey? How?*; 176. *Do they give honey to the people having toothaches? Sore throats? Earaches?*; 176. *Do they give honey to constipated people? When? How much? How?*; 177. *Do they mix honey*

with other medicine? With which ones?; 179. How do they preserve the honey kept for medicines?; 180. What diseases do they use the beeswax for? How do they make the medicine? How do they charm away the disease?; 184. Do the people believe that honey is healthy? Do children, the old, the sick especially eat honey or others do, too? During the day or at meal times? Before or after the meal? Do they eat it filtered or with the honey comb? *Questionnaire VI. Beekeeping* also contains two questions referring to food, generally speaking 157. *What dishes do they cook from honey?; 162. a). How do they prepare the hydromel and what is it used for?; b). What dishes can they make of it?*

An important aspect that must be underlined when talking about food as a research topic in the *Questionnaires of the Romanian Language Museum* is that these research instruments also paid attention to phraseology.²² Thus, the collected data are interesting and important for research on food from the perspective of cultural studies, as the way in which a language articulates its linguistic imagery and acquires over time its fixed expressions tells a lot about the culture in which it is developed. Food phraseology is investigated in *Questionnaire VIII. Food and Drinks* with reference to the way language expresses the relationship between an individual and his/her food or drinks, underlining especially the excesses, insatiability, or exaggerated appetite for eating.²³ In *Questionnaire VI. Beekeeping* there are also two questions approaching food phraseology.²⁴ They are questions about the known expressions related to honey and a kind of honey drink. Beside the above questions, the questionnaires did not explicitly aim at collecting information on food phraseology, but they are significant for the Romanian linguistic imaginary.

Subsequent to the two indirect linguistic inquiries mentioned above, the Romanian culture benefited from two great direct institutional linguistic inquiries meant to collect information for the editing of linguistic atlases. The working tools devised for the direct linguistic inquiries based on questionnaires were meant to obtain diatopic terminological inventories which obviously contained terms referring to food. If we consider all the questionnaires of the direct inquiries, we see that the number of questions was much greater than the one in the working tools of the indirect inquiries. Moreover, the structure of the questionnaires marks a perfecting stage in the development of the instruments for collecting data to be processed by linguistic geography as maps editing. Thus, the inquiry conducted by the Romanian Language Museum is homogeneously conceived, but it is based on two questionnaires, in different network points, the larger questionnaire maintaining the open questions inviting to descriptions, even though they are not so many. In the second inquiry for *The New Romanian Linguistic Atlas*, the questions were meant to record mainly the lexical variety for different notions in different areas. It was very important to record the terms for the same notion in all the cartographic points, so the questions in the questionnaire had to be accurately formulated. Along with the answers to the questions, during both the inquiries dialectal texts were collected, some of them describing food processing or culinary customs.

The two direct linguistic inquiries are the largest ones ever conducted on the Romanian territory, using specific tools, connected to the atlas experience in the Romance area, as far as the first one is concerned, and the second one having as starting point the ALR (*Romanian Linguistic Atlas*) and the Romance atlases. We are going to refer to each of them, underlining the place of the food topic in the questionnaires used to collect the

data and in the dialectal texts published as a supplement to these inquiries. The questionnaire of the *Romanian Linguistic Atlas* and the inquiries were devised on the model of two major Romance atlases at that time, the French ALF and the Italian-Swiss AIS,²⁵ but with innovations that made it one of the most remarkable Romance atlases. The questionnaires contain a significant number of questions resembling those in the other Romance atlases questionnaires, thus enabling the Romance researcher to make comparisons for all the Romance area. The direct inquiries were conducted between 1930 and 1938 by two inquirers using two questionnaires. We won't insist on the way the questionnaires²⁶ used to collect data for the interwar project of the *Romanian Linguistic Atlas* were devised, we will only specify that there was a first inquiry done by Sever Pop for ALR I, using a "regular questionnaire" of 2,160 questions in 301²⁷ settlements²⁸ and Emil Petrovici's inquiry was complementary for ALR II, using a "larger questionnaire" of 4,800 questions in 85²⁹ cartographic points.³⁰

The entries in the questionnaire meant to obtain different terms for a notion were not all devised as questions. Thus, we do not have certain data on the way the inquirer asked the subject to name the investigated realities, except for the ones published in the volumes edited by the inquirers themselves.³¹ For the rest of the entries in the questionnaires, not having the question specified, we can only know for sure if it was an indirect question, a direct question, if the object was indicated in the extra linguistic reality,³² etc. However, ALR II questionnaire kept some questions similar to the ones in the indirect linguistic inquiry. As the questionnaires for the *Romanian Linguistic Atlas I and II* were different (though complementary), their results were also different and marked by the personalities of the two inquirers, but they also reflect the way in which the whole project was conceived. For instance, Sever Pop accurately noted the answer to the investigated question and separately the dialectal texts, while Emil Petrovici, due to the complexity of the questionnaire and to the character of some questions which asked for descriptions, noted down comprehensive answers, sometimes published in the dialectal texts volume (ALRT II) supplementing the atlas (ALR II/I).

The questions referring to food in ALR II are 117 out of 2,160 investigated. 101 of them refer to basic³³ food and drinks, dairy products,³⁴ meat and derived products,³⁵ but also fruit, vegetables, imported spices, salt, pepper and wine.³⁶ At the same time, 17 notions were projected for investigating the utensils and equipment dedicated to cooking.³⁷ The dialectal texts collected by Sever Pop contain little information on food and they are mostly tangential to the subject, as he didn't plan to record food processing methods.

The "larger questionnaire" used to obtain data for ALR II contains 295 questions referring to food. 233 of them refer to dishes and drinks, raw materials, spices, and tinned food. The other 62 questions investigate the utensils and equipment dedicated to cooking. Complementary to ALR II, a collection of dialectal texts was published, which contains information on food, most of them referring to dairy products,³⁸ but also products of sheep meat,³⁹ of hemp seeds,⁴⁰ or on brandy making.⁴¹

The New Romanian Linguistic Atlas is a national project⁴² of tremendous magnitude in the Romanian dialectology and the linguistic geography research, unlikely to be equaled in the future, involving impressive resources (in financial terms, research wise, in terms of time). The regional atlases represent one of the most extensive investigations on the

Daco-Romanian subdialects following the already well-established tradition of Sever Pop and Emil Petrovici's ALR I and II and materializing Sextil Pușcariu's idea prefigured in the way the network of cartographic points had been numbered.

In 1957 Emil Petrovici brought into discussion the creation of *The New Romanian Linguistic Atlas* and, in 1958, during the first Conference of the Romanian dialectologists, a questionnaire was created by Ion Ionică, Valeriu Rusu, Teofil Teaha, Petru Neiescu, G. Rusu, Ionel Stan, coordinated by E. Petrovici and B. Cazacu between 1958 and 1960.⁴³

Initially projected as an eight areas/eight regional atlases (Oltenia 100, Muntenia and Dobruja 250, Moldavia and Bukovina 225, Transylvania 250, Crișana 120, Maramureș 20, Banat, the Balkan Peninsula 80), the cartographic network for Daco-Romanian has 998 entries.

The entire network for Gustav Weigand's *Linguistischer Atlas des dacorumänischen Sprachgebietes*, ALR I and II is part of *The New Romanian Linguistic Atlas* network which is 4 to 6 times denser than in ALR I and II. The linguistic mutations caused by the evolution of society, as well as the economic and cultural development can be more accurately observed and studied.

The questionnaire, which mentions the question and its type along with the investigated notion, has 2,543 questions.⁴⁴ Among these, 210 refer to food, out of which 70 investigate the utensils and equipment for cooking,⁴⁵ and about 80 investigate the ingredients: fruit, vegetables, cereals, honey, milk, oil, and others. The collection of data was conducted in the 60s and 70s by large teams of researchers. The inquirers also tape-recorded dialectal texts, along with the answers to the questions in the questionnaire. The published texts offer information on food, describing the way people cook different dishes,⁴⁶ culinary habits or some descriptions of ritual meals.

Both in the material collected during the direct inquiries in the interwar period for ALR I and ALR II and in the one resulted after the inquiries for *The New Romanian Linguistic Atlas*, the most substantial information, from the cultural studies perspective, is contained in the dialectal texts recorded for dialectal morphology and syntax. The attention of the linguist when recording information on food is not focused on the complexity of the cultural phenomenon, thus he does not conduct the discussion with the informant in a certain direction in order to obtain information, but the subject is allowed to speak freely. Many times, the anthropologist can feel frustrated when faced with these texts, but the information they offer, fragmented as it is, remains precious for the research in the field of cultural studies. Even the inventories of dialectal terms registered by linguists can be important and useful to ethno-linguistic research.

It could seem meaningless to ask ourselves if the information in the linguistic inquiries can be valorized by ethnologic research or if the data obtained in ethnographic inquiries can supply material for study to linguists, if we didn't know the pathos with which, in Romanian culture, boundaries have been set between the two sciences, mostly motivated by inter-institutional competition for access to financing resources. A perfect example for this approach of artificially delimiting the linguistic data and the ethnologic ones is the following fragment written by I. Mușlea in the preface to *Tipologia folclorului din răspunsurile la chestionarele B. P. Hasdeu*:

Generally, Hasdeu's questionnaire was—and still is—considered a purely linguistic questionnaire. This interpretation is due especially to its title (The Program for the Collection of Data about the Romanian Language). But if we examine closely the questions, we find out that the number of those with reference to folklore is considerable: about 65 of 205 [sic!], so, more than one fourth.⁴⁷

The statement was contradicted before it was made by the initiator of the inquiry himself. Hasdeu showed in the foreword to his dictionary, *Etymologicum Magnum Romaniae*, that this questionnaire was devised for the lexicographical work to comprise

The personal beliefs of the people, their customs and occupations, their sorrows and joys, everything which today is designated—for want of a more suitable word—by the English term folklore. I wanted to know the Romanians as they are in all that they live, as the result of 18 centuries of development, as bearers of thousands and thousands of ethnic, topic and cultural influences.⁴⁸

All that is expressed through words is a bearer of meaning, consequently, it is a bearer of the feelings, emotions, knowledge, and experience of those who express themselves on any topic, including gastronomy. Thus, the data collected by linguists may be subjected to anthropological analysis: they can complete an ethnographic landscape, or they can bear evidence over decades of the existence of a reality in a geographical area at a certain time. Equally, all the data collected through ethnographic inquiries or through anthropological research can, in turn, be exploited by linguists. Identifying a certain term in an ethnographic inquiry can be, for a linguist, the equivalent of discovering a treasure. Each of the two sciences created its own instruments to facilitate the collection of information to be valorized as easily as possible using the specific research methods adapted to the expected result. In linguistics, Hasdeu's inquiry wanted to collect especially the words unknown in other areas, as he wanted to introduce the terms in his dictionary. The indirect inquiry of the Romanian Language Museum was mainly targeted at obtaining words for lexical maps, but it was also open to collecting ethnographic details. The direct inquiries for the two great linguistic institutional projects on linguistic geography were carried out for the publication of linguistic atlases, so they diatopically recorded words and collected dialectal texts which can offer ethnographic information, too. In their turn, the ethnographic questionnaires were aimed at obtaining little monographs of a traditional custom or of an occupation, collecting folklore texts or information regarding beliefs or superstitions. They all contain linguistic data that can be put to use with instruments and methods specific to the language sciences. The linguistic and ethnologic information is there for all those who read it, depending on the eye that sees it and the scientific spirit that values it.

Nowadays, when the archives are more and more valued and when digitization facilitates access to them, the challenge for the researchers in both research fields we referred to should be to produce tools which would allow intersectional approaches to these information corpora.



Notes

1. The first Romanian indirect institutional linguistic inquiry was carried out by B. P. Hasdeu, initiated in 1884 with the publication of *Programa pentru adunarea datelor referitoare la limba română* (Bucharest: Tipografia Academiei Române, Laboratorii români, 1884).
2. We take into consideration the whole period of the indirect linguistic inquiry of the Romanian Language Museum, from the moment the first questionnaire was launched to the moment the last document was received and registered.
3. *The New Romanian Linguistic Atlas Questionnaire* was published in 1963 and the inquiries took place afterwards, until the end of the '70s.
4. I. Taloş, "Cuvânt înainte: Culegeri de folclor cu ajutorul corespondenţilor în Europa: Stadiul valorificării lor," in I. Muşlea and O. Bârlea, *Tipologia folclorului din răspunsurile la Chestionarele B. P. Hasdeu*, 2nd edition, rev. and enl. by I. I. Muşlea (Bucharest: Editura Academiei Române, 2010), 9.
5. I. Muşlea and O. Bârlea, *Tipologia folclorului din răspunsurile la chestionarele B. P. Hasdeu* (Bucharest: Minerva, 1970).
6. Muşlea and Bârlea (2010), 427.
7. For more information on the methodological aspects referring to the inquiries of the Romanian Language Museum, see C.-M. Berindei, "Ancheta lingvistică indirectă a Muzeului Limbii Române—câteva considerații asupra metodei de cercetare", *Dacoromania* (Cluj-Napoca) 25, 2 (2020): 173–189.
8. *Chestionarul VIII. Mâncări și băuturi* (Cluj: Muzeul Limbii Române, Tipografia Ardealul, 1937).
9. *Chestionarul III. Firul* (Cluj: Muzeul Limbii Române, Tipografia Ardealul, 1929), 3.
10. The number of questions in the first 7 questionnaires: *Chestionarul I. Calul* (Cluj: Muzeul Limbii Române, Tipografia Ardealul, 1922): 142 questions; *Chestionarul II. Casa* (Sibiu: Muzeul Limbii Române, Dacia Traiană, 1926): 489 questions; *Chestionarul III. Firul*: 132 questions; *Chestionarul IV. Nume de loc și nume de persoană* (Cluj: Muzeul Limbii Române, Tipografia Ardealul, 1930): 164 questions; *Chestionarul V. Stâna, păstoritul și prepararea laptelui* (Cluj: Muzeul Limbii Române, Tipografia Ardealul, 1931): 182 questions; *Chestionarul VI. Stupăritul* (Cluj: Muzeul Limbii Române, Tipografia Ardealul, 1933): 190 questions; *Chestionarul VII. Instrumente muzicale* (Cluj: Muzeul Limbii Române, Cartea Românească, 1935): 168 questions.
11. Questions regarding eating meals in different circumstances: 1. *How many times a day do the peasants eat (on feast days and on weekdays)?*; 2. *What do they call the morning, noon and evening meals? What time do they eat these meals?*; 7. *What does the peasant eat during fasting days?*; 8. *What does the peasant eat on the occasion of the great holidays: at Easter, at Christmas, on New Year's Eve?*; 11. *What food do they serve to the reapers and rearers?*; 12. *What food do they serve to the mowers?*; 13. *What food do they serve to group workers?*; 14. *How do they name the food that the people take with them when travelling? What food do they take with them when travelling?* (*Chestionarul VIII. Mâncări și băuturi*).
12. The questionnaire contains 22 questions on meat dishes. Some examples: 40. *What do they prepare from beef?*; 43. *What do they prepare from fresh pork?*; 50. *What dish do they cook from sheep meat?*; 51. *What dish do they cook from lamb meat?*; 52. *What dishes do they cook from goat meat?*; 55. *When do the peasants eat poultry and how do they cook the meat?*; 56.

- What dishes do they cook from poultry: chicken, duck, goose, etc.?*; 60. *How do they eat venison?* (Chestionarul VIII. Mâncări și băuturi).
13. The questions regarding fish dishes: 58. *What dishes do they make of fresh fish?*; 59. *What dishes do they make of salted fish and how do they call them?* (Chestionarul VIII. Mâncări și băuturi).
 14. The questionnaire contains 20 questions on food obtained from vegetables and legumes, such as: 69. *What dishes do they make of green beans?*; 72. *How do they eat the cabbage?*; 84. *What dishes do they make of tomatoes?*; 85. *What dishes do they make with peppers?*; 89. *What dishes do they make (and how they make them) of mixed vegetables and legumes?* (Chestionarul VIII. Mâncări și băuturi).
 15. Questions referring to the use of fruit as food: 97. *What dishes do they make of fruit?*; 98. *Describe in detail how they preserve the fruits for winter: plums, apples, cherries, etc.* (Chestionarul VIII. Mâncări și băuturi).
 16. The questionnaire contains 3 questions on food obtained from eggs, such as: 63. *How do they eat the eggs?*; 64. *What are the names of different dishes made of eggs and how do they cook each of them?* (Chestionarul VIII. Mâncări și băuturi).
 17. The question regarding the food made of mushrooms: 82. *What dishes do they cook from mushrooms? How do they cook them?* (Chestionarul VIII. Mâncări și băuturi).
 18. The questionnaire contains 15 explicit questions on cereals: 23. *What do they use bran for?*; 91. *How do they call the food made of boiled wheat grains?*; 93. *What do they make of rice flour?*; 94. *What do they make of millet?* (Chestionarul VIII. Mâncări și băuturi).
 19. Some examples of questions referring to food in *Questionnaire V. Sheepfold, Shepherding and Milk Processing*: 5. *What products do they make of milk?*; 79. *What do they make of the milk from the cows in the first days after they give birth?*; 81. *What do they use to coagulate the milk?*; 84. *How do they make the soft cheese?*; 86. *What do they make of sour milk?*; 87. *How do they make the butter?*; 88. *How do they make the yoghurt?*; 95. *Which is the best cheese and in what season do they make it?*; 119. *What do they call the liquid that remains after they extract the butter?* (Chestionarul V. Stâna, păstoritul și prepararea laptelui).
 20. Questions regarding the tools used for processing dairy products and their storage spaces: 130. *What vessel do they use at the sheepfold to keep the filtered milk?*; 135. *What do they call the vessel in which they extract the butter?*; 121. *What do they call that part of the sheepfold where they keep the milk and the dairy products?* (Chestionarul V. Stâna, păstoritul și prepararea laptelui).
 21. The questions referring to the wedding food and funeral repast: 9. *What dishes do they eat at weddings, what are their names and how do they cook them?*; 10. *What dishes do they eat at the funeral repast, what are their names and how do they cook them?* (Chestionarul VIII. Mâncări și băuturi).
 22. *The Questionnaires of the Romanian Language Museum* are unique research instruments as far as the interest in the phraseology units in the subdialects of the Romanian language is concerned. A phraseological unit is a more or less fixed expression, having an expressive value and being stable in language and its use. Cf. A. Pop, *Unitățile frazeologice cu termeni religioși în română și spaniolă: O analiză comparativ-contrastivă* (Cluj-Napoca: Casa Cărții de Știință, 2015), 19.
 23. Questions referring to food phraseology: 99. *How do you mock somebody who eats a lot?*; 100. *What funny names do the peasants use to show that they are very sated?*; 101. *With what do the peasants compare a hungry man? (hungry as a dog/wolf, etc.)*; 102. *What do they call*

- someone who is a loud eater?; 111. What funny names do they use about people who drink too much? (Chestionarul VIII. Mâncări și băuturi). For more information on food phraseology in the 8th Questionnaire, see A.-N. Pușcaș, “Frazeologia gustului: Din răspunsurile la Chestionarul VIII. al Muzeului Limbii Române,” *Caietele Sesiunii Pușcariu V. Actele Conferinței Internaționale “Zilele Sesiunii Pușcariu”*. Ediția a V-a, Cluj-Napoca, 9–10 septembrie 2021 (Cluj-Napoca) (2021): 454–468.
24. Questions on food phraseology in *Questionnaire VI. Beekeeping: 161. What expressions do you know about honey? (E.g. “the honey on the drum”)*; 164. *What expressions do the people know about hydromel (E.g. “as sweet as hydromel”)*. For more information about expressions based on the word “honey” in *Questionnaire VI. Beekeeping*, see C.-M. Berindei, “Cuvântul miere în expresii lingvistice consemnate în răspunsurile la Chestionarul VI. Stupăritul al Muzeului Limbii Române,” *Caietele Sesiunii Pușcariu III. Actele Conferinței Internaționale “Zilele Sesiunii Pușcariu”*. Ediția a III-a, Cluj-Napoca, 14–15 septembrie 2017 (2017): 58–66.
25. There is a series of similarities between *The Romanian Linguistic Atlas* (ALR) and the *Linguistic and Ethnographic Atlas of Italy and Southern Switzerland* (AIS), but there are also differences: the thematic ordering of questions in the inquiry, unlike *The Linguistic Atlas of France* (ALF) where there is an alphabetical ordering of notions; the use of two inquiries (ALR) or three (AIS), instead of one (ALF); the net for ALR (and AIS) consists of villages and towns (cities), unlike ALF, where there are only villages; the inquirer is a linguist (ALR, AIS), while for ALF, E. Edmont did not have a linguistic specialization. See AIS: K. Jaberg and J. Jud, *Sprach- und Sachatlas Italiens und der Südschweiz*, 8 vols. (Zofingen: Ringier, 1928–1940); ALF: J. Gillieron and E. Edmont, *Atlas linguistique de la France* (Paris: Champion, 1902–1910).
26. For more information on the way the two questionnaires were created, see S. Pop and E. Petrovici, “Din atlasul lingvistic al României,” *Dacoromania* 7 (1931–1933): 55–102; G. V. Adam, “Din arhiva Muzeului Limbii Române: Chestionarele de probă ale *Atlasului lingvistic român*,” *Caietele Sesiunii Pușcariu IV. Actele Conferinței Internaționale “Zilele Sesiunii Pușcariu”*. Ediția a IV-a, Cluj-Napoca, 12–13 septembrie 2019 (2019): 37–51; V. A. Vlasin, “Din arhiva Muzeului Limbii Române: Ancheta de probă din Săliște (jud. Sibiu),” *Caietele Sesiunii Pușcariu IV*: 288–298.
27. 292 Dacoromanian, 2 Ukrainian, 2 Hungarian, 5 Aromanian, 2 Meglenoromanian, 2 Istroromanian, and 3 for the inquiries with representative Romanian writers: M. Sadoveanu, I. Agârbiceanu and I. Al. Brătescu-Voinești.
28. I. Mării, “Cuvânt înainte” to S. Pop, *Chestionarul Atlasului lingvistic român I*, edited by D. Grecu, I. Mării, R. Orza, and S. Vlad (Cluj-Napoca: Universitatea din Cluj, 1988), III–VII.
29. 71 Dacoromanian, 1 Aromanian, 1 Meglenoromanian, 1 Istroromanian, 3 Hungarian, 2 Bulgarian, 2 Serbian, 2 Ukrainian, 2 Saxon and 1 Romani.
30. I. Mării, “Notă introductivă” to E. Petrovici, *Atlasul lingvistic român II. Introducere*, edited by D. Grecu, I. Mării, and R. Orza (Cluj-Napoca: Universitatea din Cluj, 1988), VII–XV.
31. See ALR I/I, ALR I/II, ALR II/I. Full citations: ALR I = S. Pop, *Atlasul lingvistic român*, Pt. 1, vol. 1, *Părțile corpului omenesc și boalele lui* (Cluj: Muzeul Limbii Române, 1938); vol. 2, *Familia, nașterea, botezul, copilăria, nunta, moartea* (Sibiu: Muzeul Limbii Române; Leipzig: Otto Harrassowitz, 1942); ALR II = E. Petrovici, *Atlasul lingvistic român*. Pt. 2, vol. 1, *A. Corpul omenesc, boale (și termeni înrudiți)*; *B. Familia, nașterea, copilăria, nunta,*

- moartea, viața religioasă, sărbători; C. Casa, acareturile, curtea, focul, mobilierul, vase, scule* (Sibiu: Muzeul Limbii Române; Leipzig: Otto Harrassowitz, 1940).
32. Other methods of inquiry: gestures (for words like: to sneeze); partial suggestion of the word; use of a herbarium for the name of plants; use of sketches, photos, etc.
 33. Here are some examples of questions proposed for investigating staples: 765. *wheat flour bread*; 734. *millet with milk*; 1845. *bread*, pl.; 730. *polenta* (Pop, *Chestionarul Atlasului lingvistic român II*).
 34. Examples of questions proposed for investigating dairy products in *Chestionarul ALRT I*: 1810. *green cheese*; 1812. *maize porridge balls with cheese*; 1819. *soft cheese (how it's made)* (Pop, *Chestionarul Atlasului lingvistic român I*).
 35. Questions proposed for investigating meat products in *Chestionarul ALRT I*: 743. *lard*; 744. *lard rind*; 745. *pig's trotters, meat jelly*; 746. *pig's bladder*; 747. *pig's organs sausages (minced liver, lungs, etc.)*; 748. *meat sausage*; 749. *pig lard (the greasiest part of the pig)*; 750. *grease (obtained of lard)*; 751. *pig's bowls* (Pop, *Chestionarul Atlasului lingvistic român I*).
 36. For more information on the investigated gastronomic universe in ALRT I, see: G. V. Adam et al., "Construcția hranei ca temă de cercetare în anchetele lingvistice instituționale românești bazate pe chestionar," *Caietele Sextil Pușcariu V*: 399–417.
 37. Questions proposed for investigating the utensils for preparing food in *Chestionarul ALRT I*: 693. *plate*, pl. (*what is it made of?*); 694. *mug*, pl. (*what is it made of?*); 696. *small mug*, pl. (*what is it made of?*); 697. *wooden platter for polenta*; 698. *funnel*; 703. *knife*; 704. *wooden spoon*, pl.; 708. *salt pot*.
 38. The dialectal texts published by E. Petrovici contain the following information on dairy products: how green cheese is made (ALRT II, 165–166, 216); how cheese is made (ALRT II, 72–73, 232–233); how butter is made (ALRT II, 96, 181, 227, 303), but also about coagulant (ALRT II, 219, 221), sour milk and curdled milk (ALRT II, 122–123, 182, 199, 219, 228, 270). Full citations: ALRT I = *Texte dialectale*, collected by Sever Pop, for *Atlasul lingvistic român I*. Novel material in the *Romanian Linguistic Atlas archive* at Sextil Pușcariu Institute of Linguistics and Literary History from Cluj-Napoca; ALRT II = *Texte dialectale* culese de Emil Petrovici, *Supliment la Atlasul lingvistic român II* (ALRT II) (Sibiu: Muzeul Limbii Române; Leipzig: Otto Harrassowitz, 1943).
 39. ALRT II, 82, 211.
 40. ALRT II, 45.
 41. ALRT II, 81, 96.
 42. The idea of regional atlases belongs to A. Dauzat who initiated *Le nouvel atlas linguistique de la France par régions* (NALF).
 43. E. Petrovici and B. Cazacu, "Chestionarul noului Atlas lingvistic român," *Fonetica și dialectologie* (Bucharest) 5 (1963): 157–271.
 44. The questions are grouped into 3 major parts: the introductory part—57 questions regarding general information on the cartographic point and the subject of the inquiry; the general questionnaire—1,943 questions thematically grouped in 14 chapters, and the special questionnaire—543 questions referring to special terms in different domains, thematically grouped in 7 chapters.
 45. Some questions in *The New Romanian Linguistic Atlas Questionnaire* referring to the utensils and equipment dedicated to cooking: 802. *wicker bottle*, pl. *What do you call the big glass vessel of 5–10 kg, covered in braded willow twigs, where you keep wine or brandy?*; 806. *knife*, pl. *What do you call the instrument you cut bread with?*; 807. *penknife*, pl. *What about*

the small one, with a blade or two, that you carry in your pocket?; 810. spoon, pl. What do you call the cutlery you eat soup with out of a plate or bowl?; 811. fork, pl. What about the one made of iron, with four spikes; 921. strainer, pl. What do you call the piece of cloth that you pour the milk through?; 1431. trough, pl. What do you call the long wooden vessel where you knead the dough?; 1439. shovel (for bread), pl. What do you call that wide object, with a long handle, that you put the bread on to introduce it into the oven? (Petrovici and Cazacu).

46. To illustrate the rich information about food in dialectal texts collected during the inquiries for the *New Romanian Linguistic Atlas* we will mention the ones referring to butchering the pig, meals given as gift occasioned by pig butchering, and products made of pork: GPF, 82–85 94–95, 139–143, 198–202; TDO, 7–8, 78–80, 87–88, 96, 126–127, 137, 144, 171–172, 181, 185, 190–191, 195–196, 215–216, 258–259, 284–285, 289–290, 301–302, 315–316, 376–377, 378, 382–383, 406–407; TDM I, 1973, 42–43, 54–55, 98–99, 107–108, 113–114, 184, 204–205, 226, 258–259, 269–290, 281–283, 292, 304, 313–314, 324–325, 342, 349–350, 359–360, 389–391, 405–406, 440–442; TDM II, 6–7, 53–54, 105–106, 135–138, 152–154, 16–168, 191–193, 236, 287–289, 326, 356–357, 399–401, 418–419, 465–466, 478–480, 614–615, 646–647, 747, 763–764, 782–784, 853–854, 883–884; TDM III, 147, 165–167, 176–179, 210, 212, 229, 230, 339–340, 368–370, 493–494, 700–701, 784–785, 836–837, 849–851, 869–871, 903–905 989–990, 1041–1–42, 1072–1074, 1082–1084, 1098–1109, 1114–1115; TDD, 64–65, 79–81, 105–107, 120–123, 127–130, 194–196, 203–204, 260–261, 293–295, 317, 337–337, 411, 421–422, 459–461; TDMB I/1, p. 24–25, 145–146, 297–299; TDMB I/2, 26–27, 61–62, 90–91, 137–138, 225–226; TDMB II/1, 111–113, 131–132, 148–149, 194; TD–BN, 60–63, 109–111, 166–169, 193–194, 197–199, 235–237, 251–253; TD–Bas., N. Bucov., Transn., 84–86, 102–107, 177–178, 192, 206–208, 230–231, 272–275, 283, 309–311, 329–330, 359–361. Full citations: TD–Bas., N. Bucov., Transn. = M. Marin et al., *Graiiuri românești din Basarabia, Transnistria, nordul Bucovinei și nordul Maramureșului: Texte dialectale și glosar* (Bucharest: n.p., 2000); TD–BN = M. Marin and M. Tiugan, *Texte dialectale: Bistrița-Năsăud* (Bucharest: n.p., 1987); TDD = P. Lăzărescu et al., *Texte dialectale și glosar: Dobrogea* (Bucharest: n.p., 1987); TDM = *Texte dialectale: Muntenia*, vol. 1, edited by B. Cazacu (Bucharest: Editura Academiei, 1973); vol. 2, edited by B. Cazacu (Bucharest: Editura Academiei, 1975); vol. 3, published by C. Bratu et al. (Bucharest: n.p., 1987); TDMB = S. Dumistrăcel, D. Hreapcă, and I.-H. Bârleanu, *Noul atlas lingvistic român pe regiuni: Moldova și Bucovina: Texte dialectale*, vol. 1, part 1; vol. 1, part 2 (Iași: Editura Academiei Române, 1993–1995); vol. 2, part 1 (Bucharest: Editura Academiei Române, 2002); TDO = *Texte dialectale Oltenia*, edited by B. Cazacu (Bucharest: Editura Academiei, 1967); GPF = C. Coșuș and M. Vulpe, *Graiiul din zona Porțile de Fier, I. Texte. Sintaxă* (Bucharest: Editura Academiei, 1973).
47. I. Mușlea, “Importanța materialului folcloric din răspunsurile la Chestionarul Hasdeu și problema valorificării lui,” in Mușlea and Birlea, *Tipologia folclorului* (1970), 71–72.
48. The statement in the original work showing that this questionnaire had been devised so as to serve the lexicographical work. B. P. Hasdeu, “Prefață” to B. P. Hasdeu, *Etymologicum Magnum Romanic: Dicționarul limbei istorice și populare a românilor*, vol. 1 (Bucharest: Stabilimentul Grafic Socec & Teclu, 1887), XVIII.

Abstract**Food As a Research Topic in the Romanian Linguistic
Questionnaire-Based Inquires**

Our work aims at presenting the way in which food as a research subject was configured in the Romanian linguistic questionnaire-based inquiries. We will focus on the creation of the linguistic inquiries as research instruments, approaching the four major Romanian institutionalized dialectal inquiries. The first two inquiries were indirect: B. P. Hasdeu's linguistic inquiry started in 1884 for collecting dialectal terms for a dictionary of the Romanian language and the linguistic inquiry conducted by the Romanian Language Museum between 1922 and 1939. The following two institutional inquiries were direct: the first one was conducted by Sextil Pușcariu at the Romanian Language Museum for the *Romanian Linguistic Atlas* (ALR I and ALR II) between 1930 and 1938 and the other one following the project *The New Romanian Linguistic Atlas* (NALR), for which the inquiries took place in the 60s and 70s.

Keywords

linguistic inquiry, linguistic questionnaire, food, The Romanian Language Museum, *The Romanian Linguistic Atlas*, research methodology