

ETYMOLOGY AND DIALECTAL LEXICOGRAPHY

THE *DICTIONARY OF THE MINOR ASIA DIALECTAL VARIETIES OF KYDONIES, MOSCHONISIA AND EASTERN LESVOS (DKMEL)**

SIMEON TSOLAKIDIS
ANGELA RALLI
University of Patras

This paper is a contribution to the study of etymology with the use of dialectal lexicography, as illustrated by the design of a medium size dictionary, such as DKMEL, which contains ca. 2.300 lemmas from the dialectal varieties of Kydonies, Moschonisia and Eastern Lesbos. In this paper, we discuss the principles of building DKMEL, its similarities and its deviations as compared to the principles set by large-scale dictionaries, such as the *Historical Dictionary of Modern Greek*, the *Dictionary of Medieval Vulgar Greek Literature* and the *Dictionary of Standard Modern Greek*. For an illustration of our choices, we provide samples of DKMEL entries, and present the criteria used for the etymological research conducted within the frame of DKMEL.

1 Introduction

1.1 Dialectal lexicography and etymology in Greece

Modern Greek (MG) dialectal lexicography has a long tradition in Greece. According to Dimela (in press), we can distinguish three periods: an early period (from the end of the 19th century until about the middle of the 20th century), a modern one (about the 2nd half of the 20th century) and the current one (in the 21st century). The last period is characterized by works that methodologically follow to a large extent the current developments in the field of lexicography¹.

This research has been co-financed by the European Union (European Social Fund – ESF) and Greek national funds through the Operational Program "Education and Lifelong Learning" of the National Strategic Reference Framework (NSRF) - Research Funding Program: Thalis. Investing in knowledge society through the European Social Fund.

Corresponding Authors: tsolakidissimeon@gmail.com (Simeon Tsolakidis), ralli@upatras.gr (Angela Ralli)

¹ On the other hand, Katsoyanou (2008: 654) argues that since the 80s, the Greek dialectal lexicography was mostly taken over by amateurs who are empirically connected with a certain dialect.

Thus, they are more systematic concerning the explanatory part, grammatical markers (noun, verbs etc.), etymology and examples.

When it comes to the etymological part of a dialectal dictionary, Xydopoulos (2011: 101) asserts its significance, since in this kind of dictionaries, etymologies can help the user understand the influence that various language systems may have on a certain dialect, either synchronically or diachronically. As Petrounias (2001: 360-361) argues, MG etymologies show particularities that are not present in other European languages due, amongst others, to the origin of MG, since it is usually considered to go back to Homeric or even to Mycenaean Greek. If the history of a language is (ideologically or scientifically) extended to a long period of more than 3.500 years, it should be taken into account in the way etymologies appear in a dictionary, because they may reflect the ideas and the attitudes that the users have developed towards their language system(s)². We believe that this holds true not only in the case of the monolingual dictionaries of Standard Modern Greek (SMG) but also in the case of dialect dictionaries, since these dictionaries have a wide range of justifications and purposes: they do not exist for purely scientific reasons but (often independently from their compilers' intentions) are considered to help the dialectal speakers be (more) aware of the richness or the remote origins of their own dialect³.

Assuming that the etymological part of a dictionary plays a crucial role in the formation of attitudes towards language, then, it is important that modern dialectal lexicography adopts a scientific methodology which depicts the history of the words included in the dictionary, as systematically and as objectively as possible. According to Katsouda (2012: 854), dialectal dictionaries compiled by professionals, are based on scientific principles, the oldest testimonies of the headwords are searched for, every phonological and morphological change is explained, etymology is given for every morphological element of a headword (suffixes, prefixes etc.), and references are given to relevant scientific works⁴.

DKMEL aims to follow this concept of design as far as its etymological part is concerned. In this paper, after a brief description of DKMEL, we focus on the presentation of the etymological principles in comparison with those of major lexicographic reference works, such as the *Dictionary of Standard Modern Greek* of the Institute of Modern Greek Studies (DSMG)⁵, the *Historical Dictionary of Modern Greek* of the Athens Academy (HD)⁶ and E. Kriaras' *Dictionary of Medieval Vulgar Greek Literature* (DMVGL)⁷. Then, we refer to the criteria which are given priority for discovering and formulating the etymologies of DKMEL.

1.2 A brief description of DKMEL

Dialectal dictionaries could be regarded either as monolingual or as bilingual⁸. Assuming that in a dialectal dictionary the entry-words do not belong to the same functional code as the language of explanation, DKMEL should be considered as a rather bilingual dictionary⁹; moreover, it is

² In our case, a big percentage of the population of Eastern Lesvos use Standard Modern Greek alongside with their dialectal varieties.

³ See Barbato and Varvaro (2004: 429) for the Italian dialect dictionaries.

⁴ See also Liberman (1998: 459-460).

⁵ See http://www.greek-language.gr/greekLang/modern_greek/tools/lexica/triantafyllides/etymology.html.

⁶ See vol. 1, p. ιβ-ιγ.

⁷ See vol. 1, p. ια'-ιβ' and ιε'-ιστ'

⁸ Geeraerts (1989: 294), Béjoint (2000: 39)

⁹ See also Xydopoulos (2011: 96-97; 2012).

not a synchronic one (in the sense of Rey-Debove 1971, 98), because it contains entries from different time periods of the dialects of Kydonies, Moschonisia and Eastern Lesvos (KMEL)¹⁰. Its macrostructure includes collected dialectal material from the oral language tradition (ca. 2,300 entries) regardless of its age.

The microstructure of DKMEL includes indications about the pronunciation, grammar, origin, meaning and usage. DKMEL uses the IPA characters for each entry, together with the orthographic form¹¹ spelled with lowercase letters and stress diacritics. The MG spelling of the headwords and the citations is canonized and, consequently, user-friendly to anyone familiar with the SMG spelling¹². Grammar in DKMEL microstructure contains information about category, inflection and syntax. Usage labels indicate, whenever necessary, the thematic area for each entry, as well as pragmatic information¹³. Entry definitions in DKMEL are synonymic (with equivalent words in SMG) or sentential (for entries with dialect-specific meaning)¹⁴.

The following examples illustrate two sample entries of DKMEL:

απίζιρβα (Επ) /a'pizirva/ Παμφ: παράμερα, πιο πέρα, απόμερα. «Καθόνταν απίζιρβα για να μλουν τσι να μη τς βλέπιν». [απι-+μσν. ζερβά «αριστερά» (<ζερβ(ός) (<ζαρβός (με [a>e] ίσως από επιδρ. του [r])<*ζαβρός (με μεταθ. του [r])<ζαβός «άμυαλος, ανόητος, τρελός, παλαβός, αγκύλος, κυρτός»<τουρκ. *sav(a)* «αφελής, βλάκας, ανόητος» (με ηχηροπ. του αρχικού [s>z] από συμπροφ. με το άρθρο στην αιτ. [ton-s>ton-z]))+(-ός)+(-ά)].

απουλ'(υ)τό (Ο, ουδ) /apuɫ'to/: ειδ.λεξ. απλό σχέδιο ύφανσης στον αργαλειό. «Απουλ'τό να φάν'ς, όχ' βαγιόφλου». [ουσιαστικοπ. ουδ. του μσν. ε. *απολυτός* «ελεύθερος, αδέσμευτος» <αρχ. *ἀπολυ-* (ἀπολύω)+(-τός)].

1.3 The etymology in major Greek dictionaries

1.3.1 HD

The ultimate objective of HD was to illuminate the history, folklore and culture of the Greek people by means of their language¹⁵. So, the scope of HD was the spoken MG language, "both the commonly spoken one and its dialects". According to G. Chatzidakis, the founder of HD, the historical overview of each lexical item should be provided. Thus, the investigation of MG dialects was judged to be essential, since linguistic history is often more easily detectable through dialectal material, whereas it is obscured in the standard language. Through spatial linguistic variation it is possible to establish the changes that affect a language, not only on the level of lexicon and semantics, but also on the phonological and morphological levels. Consequently, for the compilation of HD a double form of investigation was adopted, both historical and comparative dialectal¹⁶. Since the content of HD was not reduced only to the commonly spoken language, it should be considered as a dialectal dictionary. As far as we know, it is the first of its kind in Greece, where the etymological principles are relatively clearly

¹⁰ See also Giakoumaki, Karantzi and Manolessou (2004), Xydopoulos (2012).

¹¹ See also Giakoumaki, Karantzi and Manolessou (2004), Atkins and Rundell (2008: 206).

¹² For the advantages of orthographic canonicity of the headwords, see Xydopoulos (2011: 100; 2012).

¹³ See also Markus and Heuberger (2007: 357-358), Xydopoulos (2012).

¹⁴ See also Geeraerts (2003: 91), Xydopoulos (2012).

¹⁵ Charalambakis (2003: 208)

¹⁶ Bassea-Bezantakou (2010: 10, 12, 13), Giakoumaki, Karantzi and Manolessou (2004)

described in its introduction¹⁷ and for every headword, data is provided, concerning its predecessor(s), derivation or compounding, and sometimes the phonological changes which led to its appearance. This dictionary is important for the Greek lexicography, because one of the main problems of older etymological dictionaries was the lack of etymological principles. Besides, the analysis of Modern Greek words was usually either rudimentary or non-existent, though quite often a rudimentary analysis of words inherited from Ancient Greek (AG) was offered¹⁸. On the contrary, the etymology of every HD word is given, independently from the period of its formation¹⁹.

1.3.2 DMVGL

DMVGL is a lexicon of the vocabulary employed in the text of vulgar literature of the period that goes between 1100 AD and 1669 AD. According to Baker (1974: 171), from 1100 AD, the under-current of “vulgar” Greek slowly comes to surface, even though in the form of writing. E. Kriaras, the founder of DMVGL, believes that around 1100 AD the Greek language starts developing into MG and until 1669 AD an important part of the Greek literature reflects the byzantine tradition²⁰. Therefore, DMVGL could be related with MG and this relation is obvious in the etymological section, where the history of the (head)words is tracked down, whenever possible, to Common MG or to MG dialects. For this purpose, HD and the N. Andriotis’ *Etymological Dictionary of Standard Modern Greek*, as well as works published after HD, are utilised.

1.3.3 DSMG

DSMG was compiled under the supervision of the *Institute of Modern Greek Studies* of the Aristotle University of Thessaloniki and it is intended to be a dictionary of MG, as spoken by today’s average Greek, written in Modern Greek prose and the daily and periodical press, as heard on the radio and television. Apart from those words making up the core of MG, it includes all grammatical words, prefixes, suffixes, as well as first and second parts of compound words. In the etymological part, every headword is annotated, in its phonological, morphological and semantic aspects. It is always clarified whether the word originates from AG or from the Hellenistic period or even from Medieval Greek (MedG), and whether it is a borrowing of Medieval or Modern Greek. DSMG pays particular attention to derivational affixes as well as to the rules or patterns governing the development of the forms involved, so that the user could better understand how SMG evolved and continues to develop. There is always the danger of someone being intimidated by the amount of quite scholarly information provided, but this information seems appropriate for a dictionary intended not only for medium users who want to know in a simple, straightforward manner where the words of their language come from, but also for scholars²¹.

¹⁷ see vol. 1, pp. ιβ-ιγ.

¹⁸ Petrounias (2001: 364)

¹⁹ For a criticism of the way that the etymological principles of HD are applied, see Charalambakis (2003: 209). See also Petrounias (1985: 352).

²⁰ see vol. 1, pp. ι’, ια’.

²¹ Tzivanopoulou (2003: 201, 204). See also Mackridge (2001: 257-258) and Burke (1989: 160, 162-164).

1.3.4 Summarizing

The above mentioned Greek dictionaries are characterized by the following basic similarities: a) the adopted etymological principles which are described in their introductions, and b) the etymology of every word which is given, independently from the period where the word was formatted. In the following chapter, we will describe in detail how (b) is applied in DKMEL, and which elements of these major dictionaries have been used.

2 The etymologies in DKMEL

2.1 Basic elements of the etymological part of DKMEL

For every headword of DKMEL an etymological part is provided, where (i) its predecessor(s), (ii) derivation or compounding, and (iii) phonological or semantic changes which led to its appearance, are presented. With respect to the etymological part, DKMEL mainly follows DSMG. Reference to DMVGL is only indirectly made with respect to (iii), by mentioning works which provide details about the etymology of certain headwords. HD entries are also taken into account, also with respect to (iii).

2.1.1 The predecessor(s) of the words

According to Petrounias (1985: 308-309, 378-381), MG vocabulary is made up of words of popular and learned origin²². The headword list of DKMEL consists almost exclusively of the former ones, the majority of them being of AG, Hellenistic Greek (HG) or MedG origin. Concerning the time limit between MedG and MG, DKMEL follows E. Kriaras' view that until 1669 an important part of the Greek literature reflects the Byzantine tradition (see ch. 1.3.2). Consequently, language elements characterized in DKMEL as *μσν* are attributed to the period after the 15th century and up to 1669.

Following DSMG, if a MedG or MG predecessor does not appear as a headword, its etymology is listed in the etymological part of the entry where it appears²³. Compare the following examples²⁴:

απουμουν'(ι)κός (E) /apumun'kos/ Παμφ: υπομονετικός. «Τί τραβά αυτός-η-γ' -άθριπους έ λέγιτι. Πουλ'ύ απουμουν'κός είνυ». [*απουμουν(ή)+-ικός*]

and

πλουμ(ι)δάτους (E) /plu'mdatus/: χρωματιστός και λουλουδάτος. «Φόργι ένα πλουμδάτου πκάμσου» [νελ. *πλουμίδ(ι)* «διακοσμητικό σχέδιο, συνήθως κεντητό ή ζωγραφιστό» (<μσν. *πλουμ(ίον)* (υποκορ. του ελνστ. *πλοῦμον*)+-ίδι)+-άτος].

In *απουμουν'(ι)κός*, there is no etymology of its predecessor, because users can see it in the entry of *απουμουν'ή*²⁵, while in *πλουμ(ι)δάτους*, the etymology of its predecessor *πλουμίδι* is provided,

²² See also Petrounias (1999: 363).

²³ See Petrounias (1985: 371-372).

²⁴ From now on, due to shortage of space, we will not provide full entries as examples, but only those parts related to the topics under discussion.

²⁵ *απουμουν'ή* (O, θηλ) /apumun'i/ Παμφ: υπομονή. «Η-γ' -απουμουν'ή έχ' τσι τα όρια-τς». [μσν. *απομονή* <αρχ. ὑπομονή (με [i>a] από συμπροφ. με το αόριστο άρθρο και ανασυλλ. [mia-ip>miar>mi-ap])]

since there is no independent entry *πλουμίδι* (as in the case of DSMG). This way of etymological statement sometimes leads to entries with a relatively extended etymological part, which could not be considered as user-friendly, as in the following cases:

δειχνουκόλ'(η)ς (Ο, αρσ) /δῖχϋ'kols/: αυτός που του αρέσει να γυρνά με τολμηρά ρούχα. «Μουρή δειχνουκόλα, έ ντρέπισι λ'ίγου να γυρίγ'ς γυμν'ή;». [μσν. δείχν(ω) (<αρχ. δεικνύω (με αλλαγή με βάση το συνοπτ. Θ))+ο-+μσν. κώλ(ος) (ελνστ. σημ. 'πρωκτός')<αρχ. κῶλον 'μέλος του σώματος' (με αλλαγή με βάση την αιτ.))+ης]

and

έδουνα (Επ) /'eðuna/: εδώ πέρα. «Έδουνα πάτσα τσι γλ'ύστρησα». [μσν. εδώ (<ίσως ελνστ. ὤδε (αρχ. σημ. 'προς τα εδώ') και μετακ. του τόνου αν. προς άλλα επιρρήματα όπως το έδιου)+μσν. να (<*ηνά (με αποβολή του αρχικού ατ. φων.)<αρχ. ἦν. Οι μετασχηματισμοί που οδήγησαν από το ἦν στο να ίσως οφείλονται σε αναλογική επίδραση του ἴνα (από το οποίο προήλθε ο σύνδεσμος να, όταν κατά τη μεσαιωνική περίοδο το ἴνα είχε εξελιχθεί σε *ινά*, οπότε και αποβλήθηκε το αρχικό άτονο φωνήεν). Η αναλογία, που κινητοποιήσε τόσο τη μετακίνηση του τόνου *ἦνα>*ηνά όσο και την προσθήκη του τελικού -α, οφείλεται στο ότι πιθανό κοινό χαρακτηριστικό των ἴνα και ἦν είναι ο δεικτικός τους χαρακτήρας (στην περίπτωση του ἴνα (που προέρχεται από ένα δεικτικό/κατευθυντικό τοπικό επίρρημα) έχουμε ενδογλωσσική/ενδοφορική δείξη). Μια άλλη πιθανή εκδοχή για την προέλευση του -α είναι να οφείλεται σε επίδραση του παρακελευσματικού *για*)].

However, it serves the purpose of familiarizing users with the processes of language creativity by which KMEL (or generally MG) evolved. For example, in the case of

αγγαρεύγου (Ρ) /aga'renɣu/: αγγαρεύω, επιβάλλω σε κάποιον εργασία. «Τούτου του μουρό είναι πουλ'ύ άξου, ούλου τ-αγγαρεύγιν τσι δε βγάζ άχνα». [μσν. αγγαρεύγω <ελνστ. άγγαρεύω (με [w>vɣ])],

by mentioning data such as the MedG mid-stage *αγγαρεύγω* or the development [w>vɣ], users obtain a clear view about the developments which led from HelG forms to their MG counterparts (through MedG).

Besides, with this kind of etymological statement, the user who wishes to follow the history of KMEL words does not need a separate etymological dictionary of MedG or MG. On the other hand, according to dictionaries mentioned in ch. 1.3, there are no data about the formation of AG or HelG predecessors. For example in the case of

βόλους [...] [αρχ. βῶλος 'σβόλος χῶμα'].

and

βουρδουνάρ(ι) [...] [ελνστ. βουρδωνάριον "μουλαράκι" (με [o>u] από επιδρ. του [r], -ιον>-ιν και αποβολή του τελικού -ν)],

the etymology of *βῶλος* and *βουρδωνάριον* is absent.

The different treatment of the predecessors, on the basis of the era of their formation, reflects the fact that the immediate predecessor of MG and its dialects (one of them being KMEL) is MedG, which is based on HelG and is indirectly related to AG. Consequently, in a medium size dialectal dictionary such as DKMEL, the etymological history of Modern Greek and Medieval

predecessors should be given priority; the more we diverge to the Greek linguistic past, the less etymological details should be given²⁶.

2.1.2 Derivation and compounding

Derivation and compounding are the two major processes of Greek word formation²⁷. According to Petrounias (1985, 310), in an etymological dictionary, word formation should be clearly presented and lexemes should be given, as well as prefixes and suffixes. In every compound headword of DKMEL, etymological information is provided for the whole, as well as for its components. For example, in the case of *βαγιόφ(υ)λλου*

βαγιόφ(υ)λλου [...] [νελ. *βάγι(ο)* (εν. του *βάγια* πληθ. του ελνστ. *βάϊον*, υποκορ. του *βάϊς* 'φύλλο φοινικιάς' με συνιζ. για αποφυγή της χασμωδ.)+ο-+μσν. *φύλλο* (<αρχ. *φύλλον* (με αποβ. του τελ. [n]))]

there is etymology for the components, *βάγιο* and *φύλλο*.

On the other hand, since DKMEL is not intended to be a morphological dictionary, there is no etymology for bound morphemes. For example, in

βάθλακας [...] [<μσν. *βαθουλ(ός)* (αρχ. *βαθ(ύς)*+*ουλός*)+*ακας*],

no reference is made to the origin of the suffix *-ακας*.

2.1.2 Phonological and semantic changes

Following Petrounias (1985, 309-310), in an etymological dictionary, reference should be made to phonological rules, and semantic changes should be highlighted. In DKMEL, in accordance with DSMG, every headword is accompanied by information about the phonological and the semantic changes. For example,

αγκαθούρα [...] [μσν. *αγκάθ(ι)* (<*ακάθιν* με ηχηροπ. του μεσοφ. [k>g])<αρχ. *άκάνθιον* (με αφομ. [nθ>θθ], απλοπ. του διπλού συμφ. [θθ>θ] και *-ίον>-ιν*) υποκορ. του *άκανθα*)+*-ούρα*]

is presented as created by combining the theme of *αγκάθι* and the productive suffix *-ούρα*. Moreover, there is reference to the phonological change which led to the development of AG *άκάνθιον* into *αγκάθι* (voicing of intervocalic [k] and assimilation of [n] to [θ], followed by a simplification of the double [θ:]).

As for

βιζιγάντ(ι) (Ο, ουδ) /vizi'ɣad/ Αϊβ/Μοσχ: είδος μικρού έμπλαστρου [...] [βεν. *vesigant(e)* "φλυκταινογόνοσ ουσία, εκδόριο"+*-ι*. Μαρτυρία για το ενδιάμεσο στάδιο της σημασιολογικής εξέλιξης μας παρέχει το κοζανίτικο *βιζικατόρι* (<ιτ. *vescicatorio* «εκδόριο») «χόρτο που χρησιμοποιούταν προκειμένου να προκληθεί πληγή σε πονεμένο

²⁶ For DSMG, see Petrounias' (1985, 390) etymological statement and see also Liberman (1998, 460).

²⁷ Ralli (2005; 2013)

σημείο του σώματος, η οποία πίστευαν ότι θα βοηθούσε να φύγει ο πόνος μαζί με τα υγρά που θα έτρεχαν»],

there is explanation about how the meaning “kind of small patch” came from “vescicant”, i.e. from its Venetian predecessor *vesigante*, by assuming an intermediate stage meaning “a weed used in order to cause blisters on a sore spot of body, because it was believed that the blisters would also drain out the pain”, like *βιζικατόρι* (from Kozani), coming from the Italian *vescicatorio* “vescicant”²⁸.

In such cases, DKMEL benefits from previous works like HD, Andriotis (1974), or other dialectal sources (mentioned in one of the appendices of DKMEL), where phonological, morphological and semantic information is detected concerning dialectal data. Thus, for example, in

ανιλώ (P) /ani'lo/ [...] [νελ. *ανελώ* <*αναλώ* (μαρτυρείται στη Στερεά Ελλάδα, τη Θεσσαλία και την Ήπειρο) (με σχηματισμό ενός καινούργιου ενεστώτα *ανελώ* με βάση τον αόριστο *ανέλυσσα* κατά το σχήμα *αμέλησα-αμελώ*) <ελνστ. ή μσν. *ἀναλύω* (αρχ. σημ. “χαλαρώνω, ελευθερώνω”) (με αλλαγή -ώ με βάση το συνοπτ. Θ)],

the MG regional form *αναλώ* is mentioned, as the intermediate phase between KMEL *ανιλώ* and HelG or MedG *ἀναλύω*, and a clear picture of the phonological and morphological changes which led to the appearance of KMEL form²⁹ is given. For this type of etymological statement, HD and DMVGL are taken into consideration, which often relate the headwords to some of their MG dialectal counterparts.

Concerning the phonological changes, there is no mention of every single change that led to a particular KMEL form. For instance, no reference is made to developments which systematically led to the MG pronunciation of a word of AG or HelG origin³⁰, such as the monophthongisation of diphthongs, the shortening of long vowels, the change of aspirates to fricatives, the change of voiced stops to voiced continuants and that of double consonants to simple ones³¹. Following Petrounias (1985, 312), reference to general rules related to the phonological development of AG (only the HelG is added) – such as the ones just mentioned above – could be omitted from the description of the etymological history of a headword. Besides, an etymological statement such as

αντήλιους (O, αρσ) /a'dílius/: μικρό φίδι. «Του δάγκασι αντήλιους τσ-έπισι στου στρώμα». [αρχ. *ἀντήλιος* “στραμμένος προς τον ήλιο” (με [e:>i])]

would probably seem peculiar to the vast majority of Greek users of DKMEL, since (with the exception of the ending which changed from *-ος του* *-ους* because of the raising of unstressed [o]) the form of the word had remained orthographically unaltered and thus, users do not feel the necessity of being informed about the raising of [e:]. However, in the introductory part, all these changes are briefly presented, since, as already said, a dictionary should reflect ideas and

²⁸ HD, vol. 3, p. 531

²⁹ See also Rys and Van Keymeulen (2009, 131).

³⁰ After the Hellenistic period, the evolution of Greek was relatively slow, to such an extent that in 19th century the fundamentals of MG pronunciation are already found in HG (Petrounias 2007, 601).

³¹ See Petrounias (2007, 602, 606, 607).

attitudes that the users develop towards their language system, and it should avoid creating false impressions about changes from older stages. For instance, there will be reference to three basic developments which took place after the Ancient or Hellenistic Greek period and appear as highly systematic in KMEL, i.e. deletion of unstressed high vowels, raising of unstressed mid vowels and palatalization of [l] and [n]³².

2.2 Hierarchy of the etymological criteria applied in DKMEL

Moisiadis (2011, 46) points out that in order to judge an etymological conjecture, the etymologist could or should have in his disposal a hierarchy of criteria of his/her etymological research. Giannakis (2005, 90) considers as very important the principles of: (i) economy (the best etymological solution is the one which presupposes the simplest developments), (ii) complement (the best etymological solution is the one which explains the most of the data under investigation), and (iii) historicity (the best etymological solution agrees with the data concerning the historical development of the language). We believe that (ii) and (iii) are hierarchically superior to (i). More specifically, the solutions adopted for DKMEL would not be the simplest ones if they do not take into account the regularities of the development of KMEL and MG for the majority of data. A typical illustration of this hierarchy is the entry

σ(ι)ντιρουσίν'(ι) (Ο, ουδ) /zdiru'siŋ/ (Αϊβ./ Μοσχ.): ανοιχτό ταψί μεγάλου μεγέθους [...] [σιδερο- (με κώφωση, ηχηροπ. [s>z] από επιδρ. του ηχηρού [δ] και ανομ. τρόπου αρθρ. [zδ>zδ])+σινί με μετακ. τόνου για ένδειξη συνθ.].

Actually, a simple solution is suggested by Kretschmer (1905, 443), who argues that σ(ι)ντιρουσίν'(ι) comes from σιδηροσύνη (maybe from σίδηρ(ους) “iron”+οσύνη). However, Andriotis (1958, 37) proposes a better solution, which has been adopted by DKMEL, according to which σ(ι)ντιρουσίν'(ι) is formed by combining σιδερο- “made by iron” and σινί “a kind of pan” (σ(ι)ντιρουσίν'(ι) is an iron pan). Andriotis’ proposal is more accurate because it presupposes a formation which regularly appears in Greek, both synchronically (e.g. SMG σιδερόβεργα “a kind of iron bar” (<σιδερο-+βέργα), and regional MG σ(ι)ντιρουγούδ(ι) “an iron mortar” (<σιδερο-+γούδ(ι)) and diachronically (e.g. HelG σιδηροτρύπανον “iron borer” (<σιδηρο-+τρύπανον), and MedG σιδηροπέδη “iron fetter” (<σιδηρο-+πέδη)). Note that a noun denoting an object could not be based on the combination of σίδηρ(ους) and -οσύνη, because the suffix –οσύνη is used for the formation of nouns denoting an attribute (e.g. AG άδαημοσύνη “ignorance, unskillfulness”, HelG αίδυμοσύνη “modesty”, MedG αγρισσύνη “savagery”, MG νοικοκυροσύνη “domesticity, housecraft”) or a job or art (e.g. AG and HelG μαντοσύνη “the art of divination”, MedG (ο)ψαραδοσύνη “the job of fisherman”, MG μαραγκοσύνη “the job of carpenter”).

Furthermore, the creation of DKMEL is based on a hierarchy of criteria related to different levels of linguistic analysis (phonology, morphology, semantics)³³. In the etymologies of DKMEL, morphology is given priority over meaning and phonological similarity. For instance, as already shown for σ(ι)ντιρουσίν'(ι), the etymologies adopted in LEKMAL should follow the regularities of the morphological evolution of (M)G, i.e. those of derivation and compounding, and there is an effort to make users be aware of these regularities by presenting the formation of

³² See Kretschmer (1905, 65-80, 84-87, 155, 156), Sakaris (1940, 79, 81, 84, 85-86)

³³ See the relevant discussion in Moisiadis (2005, 237-240; 2011, 46-49)

every headword, even in cases where the formation is so apparent that there is no need to be mentioned. For example, in

αβτζής (O, αρσ) /av'dzis/: πολύ έξυπνος. «Έ μπουρείς να τουν ξιγιάγ'ς, τσ-είνι αβτζής άθριπους». [τουρκ. *ανει* «κυνηγός, ψαράς»+*-ς*],

the user could argue that mentioning the addition of the inflectional suffix *-ς* is superfluous, since it constitutes an obvious inflectional ending.

As far as the meaning is concerned, we believe that sometimes, it should be given priority over the pure form (presupposing that there is no deviation from the morphological regularities). For example, in

πατώνου (P) /pa'tonu/: πιάνω πάτο, ακουμπώ στον πάτο. «Πουλ'ύ βαθειά είναι τούτινια η θάλασσα. Κουλ'μπώ, κουλ'μπώ τσ'ακόμα να πατώσου». [μσν. *πάτ(ος)* (αρχ. σημ. 'βήμα, πατημένος δρόμος')+*-ώνω* (διαφ. το μσν. *πατώνω* «καλύπτω, στρώνω με πλάκες το έδαφος»)],

it would be better to propose that the verb “to touch bottom” derives by combining the MedG *πάτος* “bottom” and *-ώνω*, than to consider MedG *πατώνω* “cover the ground with plates” as the predecessor of *πατώνου*. Although we agree with Szemerényi (1996, 16) that “if two forms correspond exactly or according to the rules, this compensates for some degree discrepancy in meaning”³⁴, we also believe that a different etymological solution should be invoked if a discrepancy in meaning cannot be explained³⁵.

3 Concluding remarks

In this paper, we presented the etymological principles applied in DKMEL. For the formulation of these principles, we took advantage of previous works, such as HD, DMVGL, and mainly DSMG. For building DKMEL our main goal has been that for every headword an etymology should be provided, obeying the same rules as all the other etymologies of DKMEL with respect to its content and appearance. We believe that this is of crucial importance for the future users of DKMEL (and of every dictionary with an etymological part), since they are influenced by the way the history of certain words is presented. In fact, this constitutes the basic principle on which the design of the etymological part of DKMEL was based: “treat all headwords in the same objective and scientific way, independently of their origin”.

References

- Andriotis, Nikolaos. 1958. Remarks on Lesbian dialect. In *Lesviakon Imerologion 1958*, ed. Panagiotis Samaras, 36-41. Athens (in Greek).
 Andriotis, Nikolaos. *Lexicon der Archaismen in neugriechischen Dialekten*. Wien: ÖAW.

³⁴ See also Moisiadis (2011, 48).

³⁵ as in the case of *πατώνου-πατώνω* where the semantic shift from “to touch bottom” to “cover the ground with plates” is not explainable

- Atkins, Sue and Michael Rundell. 2008. *The Oxford guide to practical lexicography*. Oxford: OUP.
- Baker, Willem F. 1974. Review of Emanuil Kriaras' *Dictionary of Medieval Vulgar Greek Literature, 1100-1669, vol. 1-3*. *Ellinika* 27:167-181.
- Barbato, Marcello and Varvaro, Alberto. 2004. Dialect dictionaries. *International Journal of Lexicography* 17: 429-439.
- Bassea-Bezantakou, Christina. 2010. Research Center for Modern Greek Dialects – Historical Dictionary. In *Proceedings of the 4th MGDLT (Chios, 11-14/6/2009)*, ed. Angela Ralli et al, 10-15. Patras: University of Patras (www.philology.upatras.gr/LMGD/el/research/downloads/MGDTL4_Proceedings.pdf).
- Béjoint, Henri. 2000. *Modern lexicography: an introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Burke, John B. 1989. Lost for words: vocabulary and usage in Modern Greek and the dictionary of the Triandafilidis Institute. *International Journal of Lexicography* 2:157-165.
- Charalampakis, Christoforos. 2003. The *Historical Dictionary* of the Athens Academy. In *The lexicography of Ancient, Medieval and Modern Greek literature. Conference proceedings*, ed. Ioannis Kazazis, 207-219. Thessaloniki: CGL.
- Dimela, Eleonora (in press). The dialect dictionaries. In *Introduction to lexicography*, ed George J. Xydopoulos et al. Athens: Patakis (in Greek)
- DMVGL. 1969-2012: *Dictionary of Medieval Vulgar Greek Literature*, vol. 1-18. Thessaloniki: the author & Center for the Greek Language (in Greek)
- DSMG. 1998: *Dictionary of Standard Modern Greek*. Thessaloniki: IMGS (in Greek)
- Geeraerts, Dirk. 1989. Principles in monolingual lexicography. In *Dictionaries: an international encyclopedia of lexicography*, ed. Franz Joseph Hausman et al., 287-296. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Geeraerts, Dirk. 2003. Meaning and definition. In *A practical guide to lexicography*, ed. Piet van Sterkenburg, 83-93. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Giakoumaki, Eleftheria, Chrisula Karantzi and Io Manolessou. 2004. HDMG and electronic lexicography. In the *Proceedings of the 6th ICGL (in Greek)* (<http://www.philology.uoc.gr/conferences/6thICGL/ebook/a/manolessou&giakoumaki&karantzi.pdf>).
- Giannakis, Georgios 2005. *The Indo- Europeans. Part I: language and culture*. Athens: Kardamitsas.
- HD. 1933-1989: *Historical Dictionary of Modern Greek*, vol. 1-5. Athens: Athens Academy (in Greek).
- Katsoyannou, Marianna. 2008. Dialect dictionaries of Modern Greek. For the shake of language, ed. Amalia Moser et. al., 649-663. Athens: Elinika Gramata (in Greek).
- Katsouda, Georgia. 2012. The etymology in dialectal glossaries and dictionaries: examples from the dialect of Kythira. In *Selected papers of the 10th ICGL*, ed. Zoi Gavriilidou et al., 853-860. Komotini: Democritus University of Thrace (<http://www.icgl.gr/files/greek/80-853-860.pdf>) (in Greek).
- Kretschmer, Paul. 1905. *Der heutige lesbische Dialekt*. Vienna: Kaiserliche Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Lieberman, Anatoly. 1998. What can we expect from a new dictionary of English etymology. In *Euralex 1998 Proceedings*, 459-465.

- (http://www.euralex.org/elx_proceedings/Euralex1998_2/Anatoly%20LIBERMAN%20What%20Can%20We%20Expect%20from%20a%20New%20Dictionary%20of%20English%20Etymology.pdf)
- Mackridge, Peter. 2001. Review of the *Dictionary of Modern Greek* and the *Dictionary of Standard Modern Greek*. *Journal of Greek Linguistics* 2:254-259.
- Markus, Manfred and Reinhard Heuberger. 2007. The architecture of Joseph Wright's *English Dialect Dictionary*: preparing the computerized version. *International Journal of Lexicography* 20:355-368.
- Moisiadis, Theodoros. 2005. Etymology: an introduction to the Mediaeval and Modern Greek etymology. Athens: Ellinika Grammata (in Greek)
- Moisiadis, Theodoros. 2011. A hierarchy of criteria for etymological research. *Glossologia* 19:45-55 (in Greek)
- Petrounias, Evangelos. 1985. The dictionaries of Modern Greek, their etymologies and the etymologies of the dictionary of Triandaphyllidis Foundation. In *Studies in Greek Linguistics. Proceedings of the 3rd Annual Meeting of the Department of Linguistics, A.U.Th*, 307-416. Thessaloniki (in Greek)
- Petrounias, Evangelos. 2001. The special state of Modern Greek etymology. In *Proceedings of the 4th ICGL*, ed. Georgia Agouraki et al, 360-366. Thessaloniki: University of Cyprus.
- Petrounias, Evangelos. 2007. Development in pronunciation during the Hellenistic period. In *A history of Ancient Greek: from the beginnings to late antiquity*, ed. Anastasios-Fivos, Christidis, 599-609. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ralli, Angela. 2005. Morphology. Athens: Patakis (in Greek)
- Ralli, Angela. 2013. Compounding in Modern Greek. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Rey-Debove, Josette. 1971. *Étude linguistique et sémiotique des dictionnaires français contemporains*. Paris: Mouton.
- Rys, Kathy and Jaques Van Keymeulen. 2009. Intersystemic correspondence rules and headwords in Dutch dialect lexicography. *International Journal of Lexicography* 22: 129-150.
- Sakaris, Georgios. 1940. On the dialect of Kydonies. *Mikrasiatika Hronika* 3:74-141 (in Greek)
- Szemerényi, Oswald. 1996. *Introduction to Indo-European linguistics*. Oxford: OUP.
- Tzivanopoulou, Anastasia. 2003. The *Dictionary of the Common Modern Greek Language* of the Institute of Modern Greek Studies (Manolis Triandafyllidis Foundation) of the Aristotle University of Thessaloniki. The lexicography of Ancient, Medieval and Modern Greek literature. Conference proceedings, ed. Ioannis Kazazis, 201-205. Thessaloniki: CGL
- Xydopoulos, George J. 2011. Metalexigraphical comments on the dialect dictionaries of M. Benardis and A. Syrkou. *Patras Working Papers in Linguistics* 2:96-113 (<http://xantho.lis.upatras.gr/pasithee/index.php/pwpl/article/view/66>) (in Greek).
- Xydopoulos, George J. 2012. Greek dialects in Asia Minor: setting lexicographic principles for a tridialectal dictionary. Paper presented in the 5th MGDLT (Gent, 20-22/9/2012).