EURALEX XIX

Congress of the European Association for Lexicography

Lexicography for inclusion

7-9 September 2021
Virtual

www.euralex2020.gr

Lexicography for inclusion
625
PAPERS • Historical and Scholarly Lexicography and Etymology

Drawing the line between synchrony and diachrony in historical and dialectal lexicography

Manolessou I., Katsouda G.

Academy of Athens, Greece
manolessou@academyofathens.gr
katsouda@academyofathens.gr

Abstract

The purpose of the article is to discuss the interaction between synchrony and diachrony in the domain of historical and dialectal lexicography. The discussion is organized on the basis of the various components/"information slots" of a dictionary entry, and more specifically: a) the headword or lemma form (selection of a form belonging to a specific synchrony vs. creating an artificial 'a-chronic' form), b) the formal section, where the variant forms of the word are listed (belonging or not to the 'same' synchrony, presented or not in 'chronological' order), c) the etymological section, where the origin and the morphological analysis of the word is given (by definition the locus of diachronic presentation), and d) the semantic section, where the various senses of the word are listed (again, belonging or not to the same synchrony, and presented or not in chronological order). The discussion is based principally on the *Historical Dictionary of Modern Greek* (ILNE) of the Academy of Athens, the largest on-going lexicographic project in Greece.

Keywords: historical lexicography; dialectal lexicography; synchrony; diachrony, morphology

1   Introduction

A historical dictionary is by definition the *par excellence* type of lexicographic work which is based on the notion of diachrony. Nevertheless, it is in several cases necessary to view its subject-matter in a synchronic way (or more specifically as a present synchrony being investigated regressively towards the past; on the notion of "gegenwartsbezogene historische Lexikographie" see Reichmann (2012: 19-21).[1] Conversely, dialectal dictionaries by definition deal with synchronic data (e.g., *in situ* fieldwork with native speakers of extant dialects). However, it is almost always the case that this data must also be viewed diachronically (especially in the case of obsolescent dialects with terminal speakers). The present paper aims to discuss this interaction between synchrony and diachrony, on the basis of specific historical and dialectal lexicographic works on the Greek language, and principally the *Historical Dictionary of Modern Greek* of the Academy of Athens.

The *Historical Dictionary of Modern Greek, both of the Standard Language and the dialects* (Ἱστορικὸν Λεξικὸν τῆς Νέας Ἑλληνικῆς, τῆς τε κοινῶς ὁμιλουμένης καὶ τῶν ἰδιωμάτων), or ILNE for short, is the national lexicographic enterprise of Greece, published by the Academy of Athens over a period of several decades (Manolessou & Bassea-Bezantakou 2013, Manolessou & Katsouda forthcoming b). The first volume appeared in 1933, and since then 7 volumes have been published intermittently, with a several years' gap between each volume, due to consecutive changes in the institution's research and publishing policies. The last volume (up to the entry *δόγης* [ˈðojis] 'doge') was published in 2021. Currently, work is under way for the publication of the volume 7b, which will end the treatment of the letter Δ (delta), and is due to appear in the coming year.

The *ILNE* is primarily a "classic" historical dictionary, conceived as a plan in the early 20th c., by the founder of the discipline of linguistics in Greece, Georgios Chatzidakis. As such, its content and entries include the standard components identified in the typology of historical dictionaries (Reichmann 1990: 1594): a headword, variant forms, part-of-speech and inflectional information, etymology and word history, frequency, collocations, examples from everyday language, quotations from press and literature, synonyms/antonyms and bibliography. So, in many respects it resembles "traditional" historical dictionaries such as the *Oxford English Dictionary* (*OED*), *Wörterbuch der bairischen Mundarten in Österreich* (*WBÖ*), the *Deutsches Wörterbuch* (*DWB*), the *Woordenboek der Nederlandsche Taal (WNT)* and the *Svenska Akademiens Ordbokhttp (SAOB)*, which are all long-term multi-volume enterprises, aiming to document the national language in all its detail and in its diachronic dimension.

Despite its categorization as a historical dictionary, the ILNE differs substantially from other national lexicographical enterprises in one crucial respect: as its title reflects, it covers not only the standard language, but all its dialects as well. This objective multiplies considerably the size of the corpus and consequently lengthens, even more considerably, the time required for the completion of the project. However, it was and remains a necessary decision, rendered inevitable by the special sociolinguistic circumstances of Greek linguistic history.

Modern Greek has a great number of dialects, all deriving from the Hellenistic Koine, which in turn descends from the

---

[1] In a similar vein, current approaches to etymology in historical dictionaries reject the traditional approach of "forward" presentation of a word's history, in favour of a "regressive" investigation starting from the present form (Petrequin & Andronache 2008: 1167-1168).

Attic dialect of Ancient Greek. There is no national dictionary covering all the dialects (i.e., the equivalent of the *English Dialect Dictionary* (*EDD*)). This renders historical research, both on a formal and a semantic/lexicographical level difficult, since by definition diachronic linguistics requires comparative data. But quite apart from this problem, the main reason behind the necessity of including dialectal data in the historical dictionary of Modern Greek lies in the dual nature of linguistic history of Greek. Since the first centuries AD, the oral and the written tradition of the language had begun to diverge, eventually leading to a state of diglossia: a contrast between a high-level (conservative, written, official) and a low-level (vernacular) language variety, which would last for more than 2000 years. In the relevant literature on the topic (e.g., Ferguson 1959), Greek is in fact frequently considered as a paradigm case of diglossia.

For linguistic research, again, reliance on the high-level variety is not conducive to reliable results concerning diachronic evolution (mechanisms, causes and patterns of change). But at the time of the *Historical Dictionary*'s inception, the "national language" was just such a high-register, learned, archaic, and to a certain extent "artificial", diglossic variety, something which was evident on levels of analysis: phonology, morphology, syntax and vocabulary. Therefore, for the reliable and in-depth investigation of the history of Greek, recourse to the dialects was inevitable. For example, it frequently happens that a phonetic change appears only sporadically in Standard Modern Greek, under the influence of the learned high register language, whereas the examination of dialectal data might reveal the great degree of regularity than one would normally expect from a phonetic change. After the resolution of the so-called 'language question' in the last decades of the 20th c. (Mackridge 2007), the Standard Modern Greek language which emerged was based on the "low", "vernacular" variety, but had admitted in its structure

In the case of Modern Greek, therefore, the 'admixture' of synchrony and diachrony is an element of the structure of the language itself, on all levels (phonology, morphology, syntax and especially vocabulary – see e.g., the list of 'learned' elements in Standard Modern Greek given in Anastasiadi-Symeonidi & Fliatouras 2019). Up to a point, consequently, the lexicographic treatment even in general dictionaries of Modern Greek only entails the penetration of diachrony in all slots of the dictionary entry (forms, etymology, senses). When one attempts to treat the dialects as well, the diachronic admixture increases as dialects preserve many archaic features no longer surviving in the Standard.[2]

In what follows, we shall discuss in more detail the interaction of synchrony and diachrony in the *Historical Dictionary of Modern Greek*, with examples taken from the two more recent volumes, 6 and 7a.

2   Headword/ Lemma Form

In a dictionary of the standard language, the selection of headword poses no problems: it is the 'quotation form' of the (most common variant) of the standard language in its current synchronic stage. But both in historical and in dialectal lexicography, such a selection is far from obvious, due to the great number and potentially great divergence of the variant forms than need to be subsumed under the same heading. The result is often a form which 'mixes' synchrony and diachrony. More specifically, the solutions which may be adopted in headword selection may be the following (Katsouda 2012: 124-127):

- The oldest – most conservative variant, from which all other variants may be derived through diachronic processes of phonological or morphological change. In this case, the irruption of diachrony into synchrony is obvious, since the headword belongs to an earlier stage than many of the variant forms.
- An a-chronic artificial variant, which subsumes all 'real' variants. This is for example the solution adopted for the Flemish dialect dictionary (Rys & Keymeulen 2009), as well as in several other dialectal dictionaries.
- The Standard form, without regarding the stage of its diachronic evolution

In the case of the *ILNE*, the headword is selected on the basis of both synchronic and diachronic criteria, as described in detail in its Manual of Regulations (*ILNE- MR*):

-If the word belongs only to Standard Modern Greek, no difficulty arises when it presents only a single variant. For example, in the case of relatively high-register words like δεινοπαθῶ [ðinopaˈθo] 'suffer' or δεινόσαυρος [ðiˈnosavros] 'dinosaur', the only attested form is the one given as headword.

-When a Standard word, however, presents two or more, usually phonological, variants, a diachronic criterion enters into the picture: the headword takes the form which is closer to the original etymon of the word, i.e., the diachronically older form. For example, given the two variants δεκαοκτώ [ðekaoˈkto] and δεκαοχτώ [ðekaoˈxto] 'eighteen', the headword will assume the more conservative form δεκαοκτώ [ðekaoˈkto], which does not display the manner dissimilation of consecutive stop consonants.[3] Sometimes of course the language presents two variants which do differ phonologically, but are not distinguished graphematically, since the spelling system does not make sub-phonemic distinctions. As two typical examples one may mention δεκαπέντε [ðekaˈpende] / [ðekaˈpede] 'fifteen', where the spelling system cannot differentiate between a pre-nasalized and a non-presalized realization of voiced stops, or διάφανος [ðiˈafanos] / [ˈðjafanos] 'transparent', where the spelling system does not distinguish between a monosyllabic and a bisyllabic realization of high+low vowel sequences (with vs. without synizesis).[4]

---

[2] Here the term 'archaism' is employed in a specialized dialectological meaning, not as an 'an old word or phrase no longer in general spoken or written use' to be found in the Standard language (as per the definition in Crystal 2008, s.v.), but as 'phonological, morphological or lexical features of earlier linguistic phases, not surviving in the Standard language, but present in the dialects', as employed e.g., in Andriotis (1974) and Tzitzilis (2013), and defined in the *ILNE-MR*.

[3] On this phonetic change, datable to the medieval period and appearing with variable regularity both in Standard Modern Greek and the Modern Greek dialects see Newton (1972: 106-112), Holton et al. (2019: 185-193) and references therein.

[4] For this landmark change in the history of Greek, which has the value of a distinctive feature for learned/high-register vocabulary as

Lexicography for inclusion
627
PAPERS • Historical and Scholarly Lexicography and Etymology

-When a word belongs both to the Standard and to the dialects, the criterion for headword selection is again primary synchronic, since the standard form is always preferred for reasons of findability, even though the dialects may preserve several variant forms which are closer to the original etymon. For example, for the verb 'to beat, thrash' δέρνω [ˈðerno] with an added nasal formant is the headword form, despite the fact that many dialects preserve the original Ancient Greek form δέρω [ˈðero] < [déro:]. Similarly, for the verb 'to give', δίνω [ˈðino] is the headword form, despite the dialectal attestation of more archaic variants like δίδω [ˈðiðo], closer to AG δίδωμι [dído:mi]. In such cases, the diachronic precedence of the the dialectal variants is expressed through their relative ordering in the formal section of the dictionary entry: As discussed below in (3), variant forms are listed in chronological order in this section of the dictionary, which entails that the conservative variant forms will appear in the list before the Standard form; see fig. 1 for an exemplification of this practice from the above-mentioned entries of the ILNE.

Figure 1: The formal section of the entry **δέρνω** [ˈðerno] 'to beat up' (ILNE, vol. 6).

-When a word is not part of the standard language, but is only to be found in dialects, the primary criterion, based on findability again, is that of frequency: the most widespread variant becomes the headword. A characteristic instance of this principle occurs in the case of loanwords whose original etymon is a word starting with [d], but which are adapted into Greek in a form with initial [ð], which becomes more widespread than the (also extant) [d]-initial variant. One may mention in this conjunction examples like δεπουτάτος [ðepuˈtatos] vs. ντεπουτάτος [depuˈtatos] 'church official' (< Latin *deputatus* or Italian *deputato*), δερβίσαγας [ðerˈvisaɣas] vs. ντερβίσαγας [derˈvisaɣas] (< Turk. *derviş ağa*) 'Ottoman military or religious official', δεσένιο [ðeˈseɲo] vs. ντεσένιο [deˈseɲo] (< Venetian *dessegno*) 'blueprint'. To give another example, the dialectal word διαρμίζω [ðjarˈmizo] 'to tidy' appears in this form in most island dialects (Cyclades, Dodecanese, Crete), and so this variant has been chosen as headword, despite the existence of the form διορμίζω [ðjorˈmizo] from the island of Kasos, which is closer to the medieval etymon διορμῶ [ðiorˈmo] attested in the Lexicon of Photius. In this case, the preservation of an earlier variant in a single sub-dialectal variety does not weigh sufficiently against the wide distribution of a diachronically more "altered" variant attested throughout three dialect groups.
-When no form has quantitative precedence over the others, i.e., when each geographic area presents a different variant, then diachrony enters into the picture again, and the form closest to the original etymon becomes the headword. To give a simple example, when having to choose between the two forms διπλόφουχτα [ðiˈplofuxta] 'quantity which can fit into the two palms' and διπλόχουφτα [ðiˈploxufta] with consonant metathesis, both of which have roughly equal distribution, the first form takes precedence due to its relative closeness to the original etymon φούχτα [ˈfuxta] < AG πυγμή [pugmɛːˈ]. As a more composite instance, consider the entry for the dialectal noun διασκέλι [ðjaˈsceli] 'step, stride', as depicted in fig. 2 below: although the specific form [ðjaˈsceli] is attested only in a single area (the island of Thera/Santorini), it is selected as headword over the more than 20 other variants (such as [ðraˈsceli], [ðjaˈseli], [draˈʃcel], [traˈscil], [draˈɟiʎ] etc.) some of which are more widely attested. This primarily solves the problem of having to measure quantitatively the distribution of each variant (an impossible task given the chronological spread and the uneven nature of the dictionary's sources, as

well as for the delimitation of dialectal isoglosses see Newton (1972: 30-41), Holton et al. (2019: 98-109) and references therein.

described below in section 3) but also guarantees the findability of the entry: when appearing as headword, the more conservative variant, being closer to the original etymon (the verb *διασκελίζω* [ðiaskeˈlizo] 'to stride, to step' with back-formation), ensures that the entry will appear, in the alphabetical ordering of the dictionary, adjacently to the etymon, and together with all other entries which make up the whole word-family.

διασκέλι (I) τό, διασκέλι [ðjascéli] Θήρ. διασκέλ’ [ðjascél] Ἔβρ. (Σουφλ.) Ἤπ. Λῆμν. διασκέλ [ðjaʃcéλ] Α.Ρουμελ. Ἔβρ. (Σουφλ.) δασκέλ’ [ðascél] Ἔβρ. (Κα-ρωτ. Κορνοφ.) διασκίλι [ðjascíli] Russiades (1834: ΙΙ, 208, γρ. διασκήλι) δασκίλ’ [ðascíl] Καστορ. (Βογατσ.) δισκέλ’ [ðiscél] Ἔβρ. (Καρωτ.) δρασκέλι [ðrascéli] Θε-σπρωτ. (Μαργαρίτ.) — Γεωργ.Μ. Μτφρ. Γέδικε, σ. 95 Χρηστοβασ. Διηγ. Θεσσαλ., σ. 19 δρασκέλ’ [ðrascél] Α.Ρουμελ. (Καβακλ.) Ἤπ. Πιερ. (Μοσχοπ.) δρασκέλ’ [ðrascéλ] Φθιώτ. (Ἀνάβρ. Καμένα Βούρλ.) δρασκέλ’ [ðraʃcél] Ἤπ. (Σαρακατσ.) δρασκίλ’ [ðrascíλ] Γρεβεν. (Δασοχ. Δεσκ.) Καρδίτσ. (Μοσχᾶτ.) Κοζ. (Βλάστ.) Πιερ. (Λιτόχ. Ρητ.) Σερρ. (Ἀηδονοχ.) Φθιώτ. Φωκ. (Μαυρολιθ.) δρασκίλ’ [ðraʃcíλ] Γρεβεν. Ἰωανν. (Δω-δών.) Καστορ. (Γέρμας) ντρασκέλ’ [draʃcél] Ἰωανν. (Ζαγόρ.) ἀδρασκέλ’ [adraʃcél] Ἰωανν. (Ζαγόρ.) ντρα-σκίλ’ [drascíλ] Γρεβεν. (Γήλ. Παλιούρ.) Πιερ. (Κο-λινδρ.) τρασκίλ’ [trascíl] Θεσσαλον. (Χαλ.) ντραϊλ’ [drajíλ] Σερρ. (Δάφν.) γιασ-σέλι [jas:éli] Εὔβ. (Κάτω Κουρ.) γιασέλι [jaséli] Εὔβ. (Κονίστρ.) γασέλι [γaséli] Εὔβ. (Ἀνδρων. Κονίστρ.) διασέλι [ðjaséli] Ἀρκ. Ἀχαΐας (Καλάβρ.) Ἠλ. (Φιγάλ.)

Ἀπὸ τὸ ρ. διασκελίζω, ὅπου καὶ τύπ. δρα-σκελῶ, δρασκιλῶ, καὶ τὸ παραγωγ. ἐπίθμ. -ι. Γιὰ τὴν παραγωγὴ πβ. διακόπτω > διακόπι, δοκι-μάζω > δοκίμι, κυνηγῶ > κυνήγι (Φιλήντας 1924-1927: Γ΄, 76-77).

Figure 2: The formal and etymological section of the entry **διασκέλι** [ðjaˈsceli] 'stride, step' (ILNE, vol. 7a).

3   Formal Section

It is a well-known issue in dialectal lexicography that the listing of variant forms may conceal an admixture of synchrony and diachrony, since these forms are drawn from a variety of sources, not all of which belong to the same synchrony (Katsouda 2016). In the case of Greece, this is exacerbated by the abrupt and large-scale changes in the geographical spread and demographic composition of the Greek-speaking world during the 20th c. due to major political events (wars resulting in border expansion, exchange of populations etc.). As a result, Greek dialectal lexicography functions, in any case, with the tacit assumption that the dialectal picture it describes is not truly "synchronic", but rather represents a past synchrony of the late 19th-early 20th c. (cf. Trudgill 2003: 48).

As a result, the *ILNE* in fact treats sources which cover a period of roughly 150 years as belonging to the same synchrony: the oldest written fieldwork recordings come from the mid-19th c., while a large of material also predates the war of 1922 which resulted in the massive population exchange with Turkey and in the relocation of all the Greek (dialectal) speakers of Asia Minor in mainland Greece. Furthermore, data collection through fieldwork continued uninterrupted throughout the 20th c from all Greek-speaking areas. To take a single example, for the island of Sifnos, there are 10 manuscript collections in the *ILNE* archive, the earliest dating from 1912 and the latest from 2017. This long process of consecutive documentation allows the researcher to acquire a picture of local variants decade-by-decade, and thus to observe their gradual processes of change or (usually) attrition and obsolescence. This is occasionally reflected in the formal section of *ILNE* entries, in the case when two variant forms from the same location are listed (Manolessou 2012, 28-29). As an instance one may mention the case of dialectal forms from the South-Eastern dialect area (Dodecanese, Cyprus), where,

due to the phenomenon of voiced fricative deletion and subsequent hypercorrect restitution,[5] many lexical items from the same island present simultaneously three variant forms: one with the original voiced fricative intact, one with deletion of the fricative, and one with the "wrong" fricative restituted. Examples include *διπλός* [diˈplos] – *ʾιπλός* [iˈplos] – *γιπλός* [jiˈplos] 'double' or *δικάντζω* [ðiˈkandzo] – *ʾικάντζω* [iˈkandzo] – *γικάντζω* [jiˈkandzo] 'to judge' (Karpathos; entry *δικάζω*). In Fig. 1 above, one may see this variation as presented in the case of the verb *δέρνω* [ˈðerno]: the dictionary entry lists attestations for both [ˈðerno] and [ˈerno] from the island of Rhodes, for both [ˈerno] and [ˈjerno] from the island of Karpathos, and for both [ˈerno] and [ˈʑerno] (< *[ˈʑerno] < *[ˈʝerno] with additional palatalization) from the island of Kalymnos.

However, a diachronic explanation for synchronic variation of forms is not the only possibility; variation may be due to factors like the informant's code-switching between a standard and a dialectal form, the existence of intra-dialectal differentiation/microvariation within the same variety, or to sociolingustic causes such as sex, age or class differentiation (Manolessou, Beis & Bassea-Bezantakou 2012: 182). As has already crucially been observed in the case of the Romance languages (Banniard 2002: 782):

"Des prononciations et des réalisations distinctes pouvant cohabiter sur une même aire dialectale, il est imprudent d'étirer mécaniquement des successions de changements en leur attribuant des indices générationnels. Les phénomènes de tuilage et de chevauchement ont autant de probabilité de s'être produits en diachronie qu' en synchronie."

The admixture of synchrony and diachrony in the formal section of a historical dictionary is therefore unavoidable, since reasons of lexicographic economy do not permit the interpretation of the observed and recorded variation. The variation is always presented, for reasons of lexicographic economy, as a diachronic phenomenon, i.e. the variant forms are listed in the formal section in "chronological" and not in geographical order (depending on the number of phonetic and morphological changes each variant presents with respect to the original etymon).[6] Nevertheless, the dictionary user needs to be aware that if a certain geographic area presents variation between earlier and later forms, this may be due to more factors than the gradual nature of the spread of linguistic changes. It is left upon the dictionary user to draw their own conclusions concerning the synchronic or diachronic causes of variation of the described data, something which can only be achieved if the dictionary provides full documentation for the data presented, so that recoverability of information on the basis of the dictionary archive can be ensured (on the necessity of recoverability of dialectal data in the *ILNE* see Katsouda 2016: 155-156).

4   Etymological Section
4.1 Diachrony-in-Synchrony in Morphological Analysis

The etymological section of standard, historical and dialectal dictionaries is of course the main locus of presentation of diachronic data. However, it may also be a locus where synchronic analysis of lexical items also takes place, especially when a morphologically complex (derived/compound) word needs to be segmented into its composing parts. In such cases, it is frequently possible to assign alternative analyses, depending on whether one wishes to assume a synchronic or diachronic viewpoint, both with competing claims to "reality": the first on the actual, active, linguistic capacity of the native speaker and the second on the non-falsifiable, passive, record of the written text (Manolessou 2012). Nevertheless, an absolute distinction is often difficult to draw, as the relevant data are frequently lacking (e.g. the dating of the creation of an innovative suffix, the productivity of an affix during a certain chronological period or in a certain dialect, or, similarly, the productivity of a morphological mechanism such as backformation or conversion in a certain period or dialect).[7] Furthermore, the segmentation decision may depend on the overall morphological system one assumes for a specific time period or a specific dialectal variety, although it is hardly possible for any lexicographical enterprise to have developed a fully-fledged morphological model for the linguistic varieties it treats.

This difficulty in the synchronic vs. diachronic etymological treatment of morphologically complex dictionary entries is in fact a quite well-known issue in theoretical morphological discussions, and usually takes the form of problems in the synchronic analysis of a series of words which were derived via affixation with no longer extant derivational affixes or via no longer productive inflectional or derivational processes. Typical English examples include:

- The suffix *-ful* normally attaches to nominal bases in order to form adjectives, e.g.: *care → careful, beauty → beautiful, shame → shameful, thought → thoughtful*, etc. However, there are a number of cases where the suffix *-ful* synchronically seems to attach to verbal bases, as an exception to the rule: *forget → forgetful, resent → resentful, mourn → mournful*. Viewed from a diachronic viewpoint, the problem disappears, since at the time of formation of the relevant lexical items the English vocabulary did contain corresponding nominal forms which served as the derivational basis (example from Ruszkiewicz 1997: 96-100).
- Determinative compounds denoting actions are formed with the suffix *-er* on the basis of apparent "verb + object" combinations, e.g., *pay tax: taxpayer*, *own land: landowner*, *maw lawn: lawnmower*. However, there are instances where no such combination exists, such **say sooth*: *soothsayer*. The problem arises "as productive derivation is confused with historical derivation", since the noun *sooth* 'truth' did exist at the time of formation of the compound (example from Pilch 1985: 409-410).

---

[5] For a description of this phenomenon see Newton (1972, 60-73) and Holton et al. (2019, 153-154).

[6] On this methodological issue, and on the difference between assumed chronological precedence based on comparative reconstruction vs. 'real' chronological precedence based on historical attestation/documentation see Manolessou (2012: 54-58).

[7] For such processes in the diachrony of Greek see Manolessou & Ralli (2015).

4.2 Greek Lexicographic Examples

It is indeed the case that the Modern Greek vocabulary contains a number of morphologically complex lexical items, the result of non-apparent morphological processes or derived on the basis of no longer extant or productive affixes; these problematic cases receive variable lexicographical treatment. As exemplification, may mention the following instances: The word *φοβητσιάρης* [foviˈtsçaris] "fearful, coward" has as its base some form of the Standard word *φόβ-ος* [ˈfov-os] 'fear' or the verb *φοβ-άμαι* [fov-ame] "to fear", while the adjective-forming suffix is the equally Standard and common *-άρης/ -ιάρης* [ˈaris]/[jaris] (fom Lat. < *arius*). However, this leaves unexplained the sequence [ts] in the middle of the word. There are no forms of the nominal or the verbal stem ending in [t] or [ts], and there is no suffix [ˈtsiaris] in Greek. Furthermore, in Standard Modern Greek there are no other adjectives ending in [ˈtsjaris], except those where [ts] is part of the stem, such as (1):

(1a) *γλίτσα* [ˈɣlitsa] 'slime' → *γλιτσ-ιάρης* [ɣliˈtsçaris] 'slimy',

(1b) *γκριμάτσα* [griˈmatsa] 'grimace' → *γκριματσ-ιάρης* [grimaˈtsçaris] 'habitual mugger'

(1c) *κλωτσιά* [ˈklotsça] → *κλωτσ-ιάρης* [kloˈtsçaris] 'habitual kicker'.

In order to interpret the form, the Modern Greek etymological dictionary of Andriotis (1983), followed by all Standard Modern Greek dictionaries, provides an interpretation which brings the diachrony-in-synchorny problem to the fore: It suggests that *φοβητσιάρης* [foviˈtsçaris] is a Medieval adjective, made up by the Ancient adjective *φοβητός* [phobɛːˈtos] > [foviˈtos] and the Modern suffix *-ιάρης* [ˈjaris]. Such an analysis is quite problematic both from a theoretical and a lexicographic viewpoint: *φοβητός* [foviˈtos] or even *φοβητικός* [fovitiˈkos] does not exist in Medieval or Modern Greek, and the two parts of the word never co-existed synchronically. To compound the problem, the authoritative general Standard dictionary *LKN* adds an extra step in the derivation: an assumed "strengthening of the articulation" [t] > [ts] before the semivowel /j/ and its allophones [j]/[ç], i.e., *φοβητός* [foviˈtos] > **φοβητιάρης* [foviˈtçaris] > *φοβιτσιάρης* [foviˈtsçaris]. However, the articulatory fronting (affrication)[8] [t] > [ts] is not a phonetic rule of Standard Modern Greek; among other things, it would have resulted, in the case of similar derivatives, in unattested forms like *μεροκάματο* [meroˈkamato] 'daily wage' → *μεροκαματιάρης* [merokamaˈtçaris] 'day labourer' > **μεροκαματσιάρης* [merokamaˈtsçaris], *έρωτας* [ˈerotas] 'love →*ερωτιάρης* [eroˈtçaris] 'amorous' > **ερωτσιάρης* [eroˈtsçaris].

As already pointed out above, methodological works on historical lexicography, and the practice of major historical dictionaries internationally, are clear on this point: an etymology, or a morphological analysis provided in a dictionary should consider the word in the specific synchrony when it was created, and analyse it only on the basis of elements and processes available at the time (as discussed at length in e.g., Chauveau 2005). This is also the principle followed by the *ILNE*, as stated in its *Manual of Regulations* (*ILNE-MR*).

For the interpretation of the lexical item *φοβητσιάρης* [foviˈtsçaris], an alternative analysis must therefore be sought. Of course, in the case of the *ILNE*, the solution to the problem is not a primary responsibility, since the word is already attested before the Modern period (in fact, its first attestation occurs in the *Erotokritos*, a Cretan Renaissance literary work dated around 1600), and a historical dictionary of a specific period should have as its task to fully analyse only the words which fall within its period of examination. So, in the case of Modern Greek and the *ILNE*, only words attested after 1800, the start of the Modern period, are provided with a full morphological analysis, which takes the place of an etymology. In other words, for "modern", post 1800- words, diachronic etymology and synchronic morphological analysis coincide, something which cannot be true for past phases of the language (any language).

Nevertheless, even if the specific Standard word *φοβητσιάρης* [foviˈtsçaris] need not be treated etymologically in the *ILNE*, the process responsible for its creation does have to be addressed, since there are several other lexical items, belonging to various Modern Greek dialects, that present the problematic suffix [ˈtsjaris]. In the already published volumes of the *ILNE* one may find the forms *γέλιο* [ˈjeʎo] 'laughter': *γελατσιάρης* [jelaˈtsçaris] 'mirthful' and *δειλία* [ðiˈlia] 'cowardice': *δουλιατσάρης* [ðuʎaˈtsaris] 'cowardly'. One may also add a couple of Standard words which are not attested before 1800, such as *θυμός* [θiˈmos] 'anger': *θυμωτσάρης* [θimoˈtsaris] 'irritable' (listed in Anastasiadi-Symeonidi 2003).

It is in fact the dialectal words treated by the *ILNE* that point the way towards the solution to this etymological problem: *γελατσιάρης* [jelaˈtsçaris] and *δουλιατσάρης* [ðuʎatsaris] are not treated as dictionary entries *per se*, but as mere dialectal variant forms of the more widely attested words *γελασιάρης* [jelaˈsçaris] and *δειλιασιάρης* [ðiʎaˈsçaris]. This reveals the derivational path leading to their creation: the forms are derived from verbal stems, and specifically perfective (aoristic) stems augmented by the aoristic formative [-s-] denoting perfective aspect, in a pattern which is productive both in the Standard and in the dialects. Characteristic examples are common words like (2):

(2a) *ξεχνώ* [kseˈxno] 'to forget': *ξέχασ-α* [ˈksexas-a] 'I forgot (past perfective)' → *ξεχασιάρης* [ksexaˈsçaris] 'forgetful'

(2b) *(ε)παινώ* [epeˈno] 'to praise': *(ε)παίνεσ-α* [eˈpenesa] 'I praised (past perfective) → *παινεσιάρης* [peneˈsçaris] 'braggart'

(2c) *αγαπώ* [aɣaˈpo] 'to love': *αγάπησα* [aˈɣapisa] 'I loved (past perfective) → *αγαπησιάρης* [aɣapiˈsçaris] 'sentimental'

The pattern appears also with deponent (medio-passive) verbs which do not present an active past perfective, but where the perfective formative [s] can be seen in derived nouns, e.g. (3):

(3a) *σιχαίνομαι* [siˈçenome] 'to be disgusted': *σιχασ-ιά* [sixaˈsça] 'disgust' → *σιχασιάρης* [sixaˈsçaris] 'squeamish'

(3b) *καυχιέμαι* [kaˈfçeme] 'I brag': *καυχησ-ιά* [kafçiˈsça] 'bragging' → *καυχησιάρης* [kafçiˈsçaris] 'braggart'.

It becomes obvious, therefore, that the apparently isolated and problematic derivational process leading to the formation of the word *φοβητσιάρης* [foviˈtsçaris] is in fact part of a well-established and productive pattern. Furthermore, the phonetic change responsible for the creation of the problematic affricate [ts], has so far been misunderstood: it is indeed a fronting process triggered by the semivowel [j] (the initial sound of the suffix /jaris/), but the effect caused by it is not the

---

[8] On the phenomenon see Holton et al. (2019: 122-123) and references therein.

"strengthening of [t]", but the palatalisation/affrication of [s].[9]

The comprehensive 'retrograde-regressive' investigation of current Standard vocabulary, only available in a large-scale historical dictionary like the *ILNE*, would also eventually have led to the solution of the problem, and avoided the perpetuation of the error in Modern Greek lexicography. As already described in section 1.2 above, the *ILNE* is called upon to provide a dating for the first appearance of its entries and all their variant forms, and does so through primary research both in textual corpora and in the earlier lexicographic tradition, thus serving as a sort of 'linguistic registry office' for Modern Greek.[10] Such an investigation, in the case of *φοβητσιάρης* [foviˈtsçaris] would have revealed that in the early 19th c. dictionaries it is still possible to find the earlier variant *φοβησιάρης* [foviˈsçaris] minus the affrication process; see e.g. the relevant entries in the Dictionaries of Gazis (1835) and Skarlatos Byzantios (1835).

So, the previous discussion aimed to demonstrate the following: On a first and obvious level, the "correct" etymological analysis of a word, even a well-known common word, cannot be achieved without a comprehensive historical investigation, which, in the case of Modern Greek, should also include the Modern Greek dialects. But more importantly, and generally, that it should be and is a principle of both historical lexicography and theoretical morphology that segmentation into morphemes only takes into account elements extant in the same synchrony.

Of course, it is not possible to oust diachrony completely from any lexicographical treatment of synchrony. In reality each lexicographic "synchrony" takes up several decades, often centuries. In the case of the *ILNE*, as discussed above, it takes up 200 years (from 1800 onwards); in the case of the *Medieval Greek Dictionary* (Kriaras 1968-) it takes up 600 years (1100-1669), and Ancient Greek dictionaries, ranging from Homer until the Hellenistic period take up even longer, covering about a thousand years. Within these periods, many phonetic and morphological changes operate, and these will appear, in the dictionaries, as "synchronic variation" whereas in fact they are the result of diachronic variation. Nevertheless, it is necessary to cut up time in larger chunks, otherwise we would need a different dictionary for every 50 years or so; and it is quite possible, in fact it is always being done both in Greek and in international lexicographic practice, to allow for a more general notion of "synchrony", as more extended time periods, delimited by basic major linguistic changes.

To turn now to a different example, the mingling of synchrony and diachrony also becomes evident in cases where the etymology and the dating of a modern dictionary entry is achieved, due to the lack of direct historical attestations of the simplex word, with the assistance of derivatives or compounds which do happen to be attested in earlier phases of the language, but which are not included in the *ILNE* as they are no longer extant.

One may mention as a typical instance the word *διάτανος* [ˈðjatanos] 'devil', which is not attested before the 19th c. The lack of attestations is to be expected, given the 'vulgar' nature of the lexical item, normally employed as a swear-word (it is in fact a taboo deformation, a blend of the Koine words *διάβολος* [ˈðjavolos] 'devil' and *σατανάς* [sataˈnas] 'Satan'). Although the oldest attestations of the word that research has uncovered come from theatrical plays of the early 19th c., it should be assumed that the word was formed sometime during the Dedieval period, given that there does exist a *hapax* medieval attestation of the derived noun *διατανοσύνη* [ðjatanoˈsini] 'devilry, evil' dated to the late 15th c. (see Kriaras 1968-, s.v.). A similar example is the dialectal adjective *διαρμιστής* [ðjarmiˈstis], feminine *διαρμίστρα* [ðjarˈmistra] 'tidy, orderly, neat', both derived from the verb *διαρμίζω* [ðjarˈmizo] 'to tidy up, clean, do housework'. Neither form of the derived adjective is attested before the modern period; however, 17th c. literature again contains a *hapax* attestation of a compound form of the feminine, *κακοδιαρμίστρα* [kakoðjarˈmistra] 'bad housewife', which leads one to conclude that the word was in existence since the Early Modern period despite the lack of attestations.

As a third instance of diachrony-in-synchrony, one should also consider the issue of morphological segmentation. It has already been claimed that a basic lexicographic principle is to provide a morphological analysis involving only the elements extant in the same synchrony, and in the form they had in that specific synchrony. But this can be quite difficult, because it is not always possible to be certain about the actual form that a formative element had in a specific period. In other words, especially when one is dealing with derivational affixes, which diachronically undergo reanalysis and grow larger (through accretion) or smaller (through truncation), it is not always possible, in historical lexicography, to know where to set the morpheme boundary.[11] The "same" word, i.e. a lexical item that retains the same phonological shape in different periods, may have a different morphological analysis in each period, without one being able to ascertain when the boundary "moved". To give a concrete example:

A very common and productive Ancient Greek adjective-forming suffix is *-ρός* [ˈros], with a multiplicity of vowels that may precede it[12] (4):

(4a) *πόνος* [pónos] 'toil, trouble, pain' → *πονηρός* [ponɛːrós] 'painful > base, cowardly'
(4b) *τόλμη* [tólmɛː] 'courage, boldness' → *τολμηρός* [tolmɛːrós] 'bold, daring'
(4c) *κράτος* [krátos] 'might' → *κρατερός* [krateros] 'mighty'
(4d) *ἰσχύς* [iskʰýs] 'power' → *ἰσχυρός* [iskhyrós] 'powerful'

At some point in Medieval Greek, the suffix was reanalyzed as *-ερός* [eˈros], so although the above words survive in Modern Greek as [poniˈros], [tolmiˈros], [krateˈros], [isxiˈros], innovative derivatives created through the suffix only present the vowel /e/ (5):

(5a) *λάδι* [ˈlaði] 'oil' → *λαδερός* [laðeˈros] 'oily'

---

[9] For this phenomenon and its geographical distribution see Holton et al. (2019: 122) and references therein.

[10] On the issue see Manolessou & Katsouda (forthcoming a). In fact, the comprehensive diachronic investigation of Standard vocabulary, not provided in any other major general dictionary of Modern Greek, leads to the revision both of the etymology and of the dating of dozens of words.

[11] For the diachronic changes affecting derivational suffixes, with various examples also taken from Greek, see Haspelmath (1995).

[12] On the suffix *-ρός* [ros] and its productivity and variants in Ancient Greek see Probert (2006: ch. 6).

(5b) *λίγδα* [ˈliɣda] 'grime, gunk' → *λιγδερός* [liɣðeˈros] 'grimy, full of gunk'

(5c) *βαμβάκι* [vamˈvaci] 'cotton' → *βαμβακερός* [vamvaceˈros] 'made of cotton'

(5d) *σούβλα* [ˈsuvla] 'roasting spit' → *σουβλερός* [suvleˈros] 'sharp'

(5e) *σίχαμα* [ˈsixama] 'disgust' → *σιχαμερός* [sixameˈros] 'disgusting'

As a next evolutionary step, which leads to a modern lexicographic problem of synchronic vs. diachronic analysis, at some point the suffix underwent accretion and acquired a variant form *-τερός* [teˈros], on the analogy of stem forms ending in [t] such as (6):

(6a) *μύτη* [ˈmiti] 'nose, tip' → *μυτερός* [miteˈros] 'pointed, sharp'

(6b) *αστράφτω* [aˈstrafto] 'to sparkle' → *αστραφτερός* [astrafteˈros] 'sparkling.

Consequently, a number of innovative derivatives show a suffix [teˈros], without the presence of final [t] in the stem. Examples include (7):

(7a) *γυαλίζω* [jaˈlizo] 'to shine': *γυάλισ-α* [ˈjalisa] 'past perfective → *γυαλισ-τερός* [jalisteˈros] 'shiny'

(7b) *διαβάζω* [ðjaˈvazo] 'to read': *διάβασ-α* [ˈðjavasa] 'past perfective → *διαβασ-τερός* [ðjavasteˈros] 'book-worm'

(7c) *γαμώ* [ɣaˈmo] 'to fuck': *γάμησ-α* [ˈɣamisa] 'past perfective' → *γαμησ-τερός* [ɣamisteˈros] 'fucking good'

But the dating of the morpheme boundary shift is difficult to determine. The Medieval Greek Dictionary (Kriaras 1068-) includes very few such forms, The earliest seems to be *λυπώ* [liˈpo] 'sadden' → *λυπητερός* [lipiteˈros] 'saddening' .

However, in the case of verbs which also might form verbal adjectives in -*τός* [tos], it is difficult to decide which variant of the derivational suffix is involved, [eˈros] or [teˈros]. For example (8):

(8a) *βράζω* [ˈvrazo] 'to boil' → *βραστός* [vrasˈtos] 'boiling' → *βραστ-ερός* [vrasteˈros] 'easily boiled' or

(8b) *βράζω* [ˈvrazo] 'to boil' → *έβρασ-α* [ˈevrasa] 'past perfective' → *βρασ-τερός* [vrasteˈros] 'easily boiled'

As a result, in cases like these the irruption of diachrony, in the guide of "older form of a suffix" in the synchronic morphological analysis, cannot be avoided.

5   Semantic Section

The mingling of synchrony and diachrony in historical and dialectal lexicography is also to be met with in the semantic section. This is to be expected, to a certain extent, in that historical dictionaries need to provide a dating for each listed sense, and the examples and quotations are often presented in chronological order. Cf. the similar concerns about the presence of both synchronic and diachronic descriptions in the semantics sections of the *SAOB* expressed by Stille (2001: 228-229).

In the case of the ILNE, the connection to earlier phases of linguistic history is not achieved only through the fact that all senses are assigned a dating as to the overall period of the language they first appear (i.e., ancient, postclassical, medieval, early modern, or modern), but also frequently through quotations. These are deemed indispensable, as they serve to corroborate or justify the dating of a sense, in cases when the ILNE provides a different dating than that usually assumed in the major general dictionaries of the Standard language.

To give an example among many, for the entry *δικέφαλος* [ðiˈcefalos] 'two-headed' the ILNE needs to document that the attestation of this adjective with specific reference to muscles is already medieval, with a textual excerpt from a medical work of the 7th c. Similarly, for the entry *δευτερόλεπτο* [ðefteˈrolepto] 'second' the ILNE again needs to document that the attestation of this adjective with reference to a measure of time is medieval, with a textual excerpt from a Byzantine astronomer. In both cases, general dictionaries of Greek consider these senses to be recent translation loans from French *biceps* and *seconde* respectively. The issue is discussed in more details and further examples in Manolessou (2016) and Manolessou & Katsouda (forthcoming a).

Given the Dictionary's time-frame, 1800-today, the diachronic dimension also makes its presence strongly felt in the case of senses which were current in the 19th c., but are no longer to be met with (except, of course, in historical accounts or narrations). A typical example is constituted by the names of various types of coinage, see e.g., the entries *δεκάρα* [ðeˈkara] 'coin of ten cents of the drachma', *δεκάρικο* [ðeˈkariko] 'coin of ten drachmas', *δεκαχίλιαρο* [ðekaˈciʎaro] 'banknote of ten thousand drachmas', *δίφραγκο* [ˈðifrago] 'coin of two francs', *δίλεπτο* [ˈðilepto] 'coin of two cents', *δίλιρο* [ˈðiliro] ' coin of two pounds or liras', *δίγροσο* [ˈðiɣroso] 'coin of two piasters', *διόβολο* [ðiˈovolo] 'coin of two alms' in the latest volumes of the *ILNE*. In certain cases, the whole entry does not belong to the modern synchrony, as the coin in question is no longer in use, but is included in the dictionary as it was current in the standard language during the 19th and (part of the) 20th c. In other cases, the coin in question is no longer in use, but a semantic change has taken place and its name has been retained in order to refer to a new coin (e.g., *δίλεπτο* [ˈðilepto] 'two cents of a drachma' > 'two cents of a euro'). Of course, it is also the case that in various dialectal sources names of outdated coins are frequently to be found, both because the dialectal material may date as early as the mid-19th c. and because it is retained through oral tradition in popular songs, games, sayings, nursery rhymes etc. Indeed, the preservation of older coin names in set phrases and proverbs (e.g., *δε δίνω δεκάρα* [ðe ˈðino ðeˈkara] 'I don't give a damn', or *τέρμα τα δίφραγκα* [ˈterma ta ˈðifraga] 'end of story', 'game over') necessitates the inclusion of such entries even in the general dictionaries of Standard Modern Greek.

6   Conclusions

On the basis of the above discussion, the mingling of synchrony and diachrony is an inevitable facet of historical and dialectal lexicography. It is deemed necessary in order to present and interpret the evolution of words, forms and senses, so long as the reader is forewarned and made fully aware of this principle. This can be ensured in the lexicographical work's introduction or manual of regulations, where the methodology adopted is set out, and the entry slots where it

occurs are noted. The systematic application of a parallel synchronic and diachronic examination of each entry emerges, then, not as an accidental byproduct, but rather as a conscious methodological tool.

7   References

Anastasiadi-Symeonidi, A. (2003). *Αντίστροφο Λεξικό της Νέας Ελληνικής* [Reverse Dictionary of Modern Greek]. Thessaloniki: Institouto Neoellinikon Spoudon, Manolis Triantafyllidis Foundation.

Anastasiadi-Symeonidi, A. & Fliatouras, A. (2019). Το λόγιο επίπεδο της σύγχρονης Νέας Ελληνικής: Συγχρονικές και διαχρονικές τάσεις [The learned register in Standard Modern Greek: synchronic and diachronic tendencies]. In A. Fliatouras & A. Anastasiadi-Symeonidi (eds), *Το λόγιο επίπεδο στη Νέα Ελληνική*. Athens: Patakis, pp. 15-56.

Andriotis, N. P. (1974). *Lexikon der Archaismen in neugriechischen Dialekten.* Wien: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften.

Andriotis, N.P. (1983). *Ἐτυμολογικὸ λεξικὸ τῆς κοινῆς Νεοελληνικῆς* [Etymological dictionary of Standard Modern Greek] (3ʳᵈ edition). Thessaloniki: Institute of Modern Greek Studies [Manolis Triantafyllidis Foundation].

Banniard, M. (2002). Sur la notion de fluctuation langagière en diachronie longue (IIIe+VIIIe s.) à la lumière des enquêtes dialectologiques contemporaines. In *Revue belge de Philologie et d'Histoire, Année* 80(3), pp. 779-788.

Chauveau, J.-P. (2005). Remarques sur la dérivation dans les notices historiques et étymologiques du Trésor de la langue française. In E. Buchi (éd.), *Actes du Séminaire de méthodologie en étymologie et histoire du lexique (Nancy/ATILF, année universitaire 2005/2006).* Accessed at: www.atilf.fr/wp-content/uploads/manifestations/seminaires/atilf_seminaire_melh_Chauveau_2005-11-16.pdf [10.4.2021].

Crystal, D. (2008). *A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics*. Blackwell.

DWB: Grimm, J. & W. Grimm 1854-1960. *Deutsches Wörterbuch,* Vol. I-XVI. Leipsig.

EDD: Wright, J. (1898-1905). *English Dialect Dictionary*, vol. 6. Oxford: Henry Frowde.

Ferguson, C. A. (1959). Diglossia. In *Word,* 15(2), pp. 325-340.

Gazis, A. (1835). *Λεξικὸν τῆς ἑλληνικῆς γλώσσης τρίτομον [...] νῦν δὲ τὸ δεύτερον ἐπεξεργασθέν, διασκευασθὲν [...] καὶ εἰκοσιτέσσαρσι περίπου χιλιάσι λέξεων προσεπαυξηθὲν* […]. [Three-volume dictionary of the Greek language, in second revision and with the addition of about 24.000 new words], Wien.

Haspelmath, M. (1995). The Growth of Affixes in Morphological Reanalysis. In Booij, G. & J. van Maarle (eds.) *Yearbook of Morphology* 1994, pp. 1-29.

Holton, D., Horrocks, G., Janssen, M., Lendari, T., Manolessou, I. & Toufexis, N. (2019). *The Cambridge Grammar of Medieval and Early Modern Greek.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

ILNE: *Ἱστορικὸν Λεξικὸν τῆς Νέας Ἑλληνικῆς, τῆς τε κοινῶς ὁμιλουμένης καὶ τῶν ἰδιωμάτων.* [Historical Dictionary of Modern Greek, both of the Standard and the dialects] Vol. 1-7, α-δόγης. Athens: Academy of Athens, 1933.

ILNE-MR: *Manual of Regulations of ILNE*: *Κανονισμὸς Συντάξεως του Ιστορικού Λεξικού της Νέας Ελληνικής.* Λεξικογραφικὸν Δελτίον Παράρτημα 6. Athens: Academy of Athens, 2012.

Katsouda, G. (2012). Διαλεκτική Λεξικογραφία: Επισκόπηση και Ζητήματα [Dialectal lexicography: Overview and issues]. In *Λεξικογραφικόν Δελτίον*, 26, pp. 77-159.

Katsouda, G. (2016). Ο νέος τόμος του Ιστορικού Λεξικού της Νέας Ελληνικής της Ακαδημίας Αθηνών: συγχρονικές προοπτικές [The new volume of the Historical Dictionary of Modern Greek of the Academy of Athens: synchronic perspectives]. In *Studies in Greek Linguistics*, 36, pp. 151-160.

Kriaras, E. (ed.) (1968-). *Λεξικό της Μεσαιωνικής Ελληνικής Δημώδους Γραμματείας 1100-1600* [Dictionary of Vernacular Medieval Greek Literature, 1100- 1600). Thessaloniki: Centre for the Greek Language.

LKN = Ινστιτούτο Νεοελληνικών Σπουδών (Ίδρυμα Μανόλη Τριανταφυλλίδη). 2007.⁷ *Λεξικό της Κοινής Νεοελληνικής* [Dictionary of Standard Modern Greek]. Θεσσαλονίκη: Αριστοτέλειο Πανεπιστήμιο Θεσσαλονίκης.

Mackridge, P. (2007). *Language and National Identity in Greece 1766–1976*. Oxford: OUP.

Manolessou, I. (2012). Το Ιστορικόν Λεξικόν της Νέας Ελληνικής ως ιστορικό λεξικό. [The Historical Dictionary of Modern Greek as a historical dictionary]. In *Λεξικογραφικόν Δελτίον*, 26, pp. 9-75.

Manolessou, I. (2016). Ο νέος τόμος του Ιστορικού λεξικού της νέας ελληνικής της Ακαδημίας Αθηνών: διαχρονικές προοπτικές [The new volume of the Historical Dictionary of Modern Greek of the Academy of Athens: diachronic perspectives]. In *Studies in Greek Linguistics,* 36, pp. 239-349.

Manolessou, I. & Bassea-Bezantakou, Ch. (2013). The Historical Dictionary of Modern Greek: dialectological issues. In *Dialectologia*, Special issue IV, pp. 25-48.

Manolessou, I., Beis, St. & Bassea-Bezantakou, Chr. (2012). Η φωνητική απόδοση των νεοελληνικών διαλέκτων και ιδιωμάτων [The phonetic transcription of Modern Greek dialects]. In *Λεξικογραφικόν Δελτίον* 26, pp. 161–222

Manolessou, I & Katsouda, G. (forthcoming a). Η ετυμολογία στο Ιστορικό Λεξικό της Νέας Ελληνικής [Etymology in the Historical Dictionary of Modern Greek]. In *Proceedings of the 2ⁿᵈ International Conference in Greek Etymology (2-3 November 2018),* Thessaloniki.

Manolessou, I. & Katsouda, G. (forthcoming b). The making of the Historical Dictionary of Modern Greek: Problems and solutions in the domain of historical and dialectal lexicography. In *Proceedings of the 10ᵗʰ International Conference on Historical Lexicography and Lexicology* (12-14 June 2019), Fryske Akademy, Leeuwarden.

Manolessou, I. & Ralli, A. (2015). From Ancient Greek to Modern Greek. In P. O. Müller, I. Ohnheiser, S. Olsen, Fr. Rainer (eds.), *Word-Formation. An International Handbook of the Languages of Europe*. Berlin: De Gruyter, pp. 2041-2061.

Newton, B. (1972). *The Generative Interpretation of Dialect: A Study of Modern Greek Phonology.* Cambridge: CUP.

OED: *Oxford English Dictionary*. Accessed at: http://public.oed.com/how-to-use-the-oed/glossary/ [06/04/2020]

Petrequin, G. & Andronache, M. (2008). Le programme TLF-Étym: apports récents de l'étymologie comparée-reconstruction. In E. Bernal and J. DeCesaris (eds.), *Proceedings of the 13th EURALEX International Congress*. Barcelona: Institut Universitari de Linguistica Aplicada, Universitat Pompeu Fabra, pp. 1165-1173.

Pilch, H. (1985). The synchrony-diachrony division in word-formation. In J. Fisiak (ed.) *Historical Semantics - Historical Word-Formation*. Berlin/New York: Mouton De Gryuter, pp. 407-434.

Probert, Ph. (2006). *Ancient Greek Accentuation: Synchronic Patterns, Frequency Effects, and Prehistory*. Oxford: OUP.

Reichmann, O. (1990). Formen und Probleme der Datenerhebung I: Synchronische und diachronische historische Wörterbücher. In Hausmann et al. (1989–1990), vol 2, pp. 1588–611.

Reichmann, O. (2012). *Historische Lexikographie. Ideen, Verwirklichungen, Reflexionen an Beispielen des Deutschen, Niederländischen und Englischen*. Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter.

Ruszkiewicz, P. (1997) On the diachrony-in-synchrony analysis in morphology. *Folia linguistica historica* 31. In *Historica,* 18 (1-2), pp. 81-118.

Rys, K. & Van Keymeulen, J. (2009). Intersystemic Correspondence Rules and Headwords in Dutch Dialect Lexicography. In *International Journal of Lexicography* 22, pp. 129-150.

SAOB: *Svenska Akademiens Ordbokhttp*. Accessed at: http://g3.spraakdata.gu.se/saob/ [29/6/2021]

Skarlatos Byzantios, D. (1835). *Λεξικὸν τῆς καθ'ἡμᾶς ἑλληνικῆς διαλέκτου μεθηρμηνευμένης εἰς τὸ ἀρχαῖον ἑλληνικὸν καὶ τὸ γαλλικόν*. Athens.

Stille, P. (2001). Working on a Historical Dictionary: The Swedish Academy Dictionary Project. In *Lexikos* 11, pp. 222-230.

Trudgill, P. (2003). Modern Greek dialects: a preliminary classification. In *Journal of Greek Linguistics,* 4, pp. 45-64.

Tzitzilis, Ch. (2013). Archaisms in Modern Dialects. In G. Giannakis (ed.) *Encyclopedia of Ancient Greek Language and Linguistics*. Leiden/Boston: Brill, pp. 158-171.

WBÖ: Kranzmayer, E. (ed.) (1963-). *Wörterbuch der bairischen Mundarten in Österreich* vol. 5. Wien: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften.

WNT = Woordenboek der Nederlandsche Taal (1864-1998). Rotterdam: AND Publishers b.v. Online version 1999, Accessed at: https://ivdnt.org/onderzoek-a-onderwijs/lexicologie-a-lexicografie/wnt [29/6/2021]