Depending on what one means by “historical dictionary”, a list of Italian dictionaries which may be or have been qualified as such\(^1\) includes the five editions of the glorious \textit{Vocabolario degli Accademici della Crusca} (the first of 1612, the last interrupted in 1923), as well as its so-called “unofficial editions”, the last of which is the second edition of the \textit{Vocabolario della Lingua Italiana} edited by Giuseppe Manuzzi (1859-1865). To these can be added the dictionaries edited by Francesco d’Alberti di Villanuova (1797-1805) and by the Neapolitan printing house Tramater (1829-1840): these derived their main body from the \textit{Crusca}, but were ground-breaking in that they dealt also with the current language. The list continues with the \textit{Dizionario} edited by Niccolò Tommaseo and Bernardo Bellini (1861-1879), the most important achievement of Italian nineteenth-century lexicography, and ends with the \textit{Grande Dizionario della Lingua Italiana} popularly known as \textit{Battaglia} (1961-2002), directed by Salvatore Battaglia and, after his death in 1971, by Giorgio Bàrberi Squarotti.

All these dictionaries, with the notable exception of the \textit{Battaglia}, are now readable on the Web; the first four editions of the \textit{Vocabolario degli Accademici} are also searchable as a database, the fifth only by entries, thanks to a program recently carried out by the Crusca Academy\(^2\). I am not aware of any digitization program concerning the \textit{Battaglia}: of course an electronic edition of this important work would be the most useful of all.

Strictly speaking, none of the above-mentioned dictionaries, from the first \textit{Crusca} to the \textit{Tommaseo-Bellini} included, can really be defined as “an Italian dictionary on historical principles”, to paraphrase the title of the first edition of the \textit{Oxford English Dictionary}. This cannot be surprising, because historical lexicography is a part of historical linguistics, and this new science of the nineteenth century arrived in Italy too late to influence the design of the fifth \textit{Crusca} and the \textit{Tommaseo-Bellini}.

The first \textit{Crusca} (1612) documented most of its vocabulary with examples taken from fourteenth-century authors, but of course its concern was not to make a history of Italian language, but to define a model of language for Italian writers, according to Bembo’s theory as developed and modified by Leonardo Salviati.

\(^1\) See the list in the Appendix.
\(^2\) \textit{La lessicografia della Crusca in rete} and \textit{Biblioteca digitale}, both at www.accademiadella-crusca.it
Furthermore, as Giovanni Nencioni stated in an essay of 1980, the *Crusca* dictionary was the main source of all the following dictionaries “of the same dimension and of the same type”, even if the *Tommaseo-Bellini* displays a good deal of further lexicographical evidence taken from a huge number of authors. So, in a sense, Nencioni wrote, when it comes to search dictionaries in order to study the language of Italian writers from the seventeenth to the twentieth century A.D., one could say that the available dictionaries were no more than one, that is of course the *Crusca* dictionary³.

Nencioni’s statement included the *Battaglia*, which at that time was still in progress, 10 volumes of 21 being then published: it is currently considered the most important Italian historical dictionary. Whether or not the completed *Battaglia* can really be so defined is a questionable matter, yet there are good reasons to state that an Italian historical dictionary, or anyway a new one, is still needed.

Actually the first Italian dictionary explicitly based “on historical principles” was planned by the Crusca Academy in the 1950s. The rationale and a first outline of the project can be seen in the report by Giovanni Nencioni, secretary of the board in charge of the preparatory study, published in 1955⁴.

The project received funding from the Italian National Research Council after 1963, got started in 1965, underwent a crisis at the beginning of 1970s and another at the end of the same decade. Between 1983 and 1985 the dictionary team was separated from the Crusca Academy and became a research unit of the Italian National Research Council, called «Opera del Vocabolario Italiano» or, «The Italian Dictionary».

In 1973 the dictionary project was split in two sections, corresponding to the periods before and after the symbolical date of 1375, the year of Giovanni Boccaccio’s death. Since then the work has been concentrated on the oldest section, which requires a different methodology than the more recent section (moreover, a much larger funding stream would be needed to deal at the same time with both). Thus, the work presently in progress is the *Tesoro della Lingua Italiana delle Origini*, a historical dictionary of the early Italian language. “Italian” means in this case “Italo-Romance”, that is the entire system of medieval Italian linguistic varieties, from Piedmont to Sicily, not only Florentine and Tuscan (i.e., the oldest
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phase of modern Standard Italian). The online publication of the TLIO began in 1997.5

A parallel attempt to create a dictionary of early Italian must be mentioned here, the Glossario degli Antichi Volgari Italiani by Giorgio Colussi, whose publication started in 1983.6 The GAVI is an idiosyncratic work in many ways, partly a dictionary, partly a collection of essays, partly a “conversation on the lexicon” between the author and his readers. At the beginning Colussi, who had no collaborators, intended to produce a versatile working tool within a reasonable time frame and planned a kind of super-glossary, aiming to collect together data from the glossaries and indices of the major editions of early Italian texts encompassing all the Italian linguistic varieties. Growing more ambitious, he enriched his entries with a wider range of material. At this point, he decided to move ahead and compile the final alphabetical sections, at the time still incomplete in the Battaglia. When, in 1998, it became possible to consult the OVI database of early Italian on the Internet, Colussi decided to re-examine and enhance the entries of the GAVI, starting once again with the letter A, and taking into consideration also the available entries of the TLIO; consequently many of the revised GAVI entries include commentaries on the corresponding TLIO entries. Progress on the GAVI was eventually interrupted by the death of Colussi, with whose personality it is linked, in 2006.7

The first Crusca dictionary can only be qualified as the common ancestor of historical dictionaries, as Luca Serianni stated in 1999, if one is content with a definition such as that Serianni offers in the same paper: ‘The goal of an historical dictionary is to record the written heritage of a literary tradition, supplying the various meanings of authors’ samples able to shed light on the usage of any word’ (examples: the fifth Crusca and, more than this, the Tommaseo-Bellini).8 This definition cannot be considered erroneous, yet it defines more closely dictionaries

8 Luca Serianni, Dizionari di tire e di oggi. Milano: Garzanti, 1999:6 and 8 ‘Il Vocabolario della Crusca è il diretto capostipite dei dizionari storici’; ‘Lo scopo del dizionario storico è quello di registrare il patrimonio scritto di una tradizione letteraria fornendo le varie accezioni di passi d’autore che illustrino la sfera d’uso di una parola’.
of Italian, than what in European lexicography is intended, since the nineteenth century, by “historical dictionary”. Actually, Italian dictionaries from the first *Crusca* to the *Battaglia* are only historical in the sense that definitions are demonstrated by quotations or, meanings are extracted from quotations.

When outlining the standards of his projected dictionary, in a working paper of 1951 later published by Francesco Bruni in 1992, Salvatore Battaglia pointed out that the use of documenting entries with quotations taken from authors came to modern lexicography from Italy. Obviously, he was alluding to the first *Crusca*, the first benchmark of the European modern language dictionaries, even if the editors of the French *Dictionnaire de l’Académie*, published some eight decades after (1694), preferred to create on purpose samples of cultured Parisian spoken language (as it is well known, the reason is the very different history and situation of the French language). In Battaglia’s opinion, the *Tommaseo-Bellini* owed its success to the wealth and variety of its quotations, so the new dictionary was to display the same feature. Battaglia’s statement concerning quotations is revealing: through them, the dictionary can “assume a historical and living profile” (‘acquistare una fisonomia storica e viva’). “Historical” means here “living in history” rather than “documenting historical facts”. Given that lexicographical definitions are abstract and schematic, Battaglia continues, there is a need to show every word in its background, in its situation, in a sentence or phrase (literally: ‘in a syntactic circle’), because a reader cannot realize the significance of a word, of a meaning, of an idiom unless he can, so to speak, see each definition take form and revive in an individual expression that constitutes an organic whole (note: Battaglia’s language is no less difficult to translate in current Italian than in English!)

From the first *Crusca* to the *Battaglia*, quotations have changed their meaning and function. In the *Crusca* a quotation is an authority, singled out from a selected canon of authors and texts, because the dictionary is intended to promote a type of language, in a sense also to create it. As the Preface explains, the list of head-
words includes all the words used by major writers (Dante, Petrarca, Boccaccio, Giovanni Villani “and some others”), and in addition a number of words that these writers had no need to use, but which are necessary to complete the vocabulary and are taken from the writings of other approved writers. Of course, the quotation is an evidence of the existence of a word or meaning, but this is less important than the fact that the word in question can be found in the vocabulary of the selected authors of the period deemed to be “the best” in the history of the Italian language. Here, “history” means “progress and decline”, the fourteenth century being considered the Golden Age of the language.

The Tommaseo-Bellini accumulates as much evidence as possible of words, expressions, idioms and meanings. In a paper presented to the International Conference on Romance Linguistics and Philology held in Brussels in 1998, Fabio Marri asserted that the order of meanings by the Tommaseo-Bellini is better than in Battaglia’s first volumes. As a matter of fact, the order of the definitions is questionable in both dictionaries, Tommaseo-Bellini and Battaglia, but Marri was right in pointing out that the Tommaseo-Bellini records expressions that are missing in the Battaglia, and this is true not only for the first letters of the alphabet, but also for volumes far from the beginning of the work (it is a well known fact that, in traditionally printed dictionaries, the last volumes are usually better than the first ones, while an electronically online published dictionary may render the quality of its entries uniform during its progress)\(^\text{11}\). The Tommaseo-Bellini is selective, rather than in accepting or refusing “good” and “bad” writers, in that it takes into consideration mostly the literary language (in a wider sense). Its authoritarian attitude, which is not less evident than in the Crusca, appears mostly in comments.

Also in the Battaglia a quotation is evidence of a word’s existence, but above all quotations are considered a means to the end of shedding light on, so to speak, a “living” meaning of any word in a given occurrence. The selection does not regard authors or periods of the history of language, but rather sections of the vo-

cabulary (for instance scientific words used only by specialists are excluded, as is quite normal in any dictionary of a living language), with a pointed preference for the literature, but also with an increasing importance given to the non-literary language from the first volumes to the last ones (for example, Salvatore Battaglia spoke in favour of the examination of the newspapers when planning the dictionary). The goal of collecting lexicographical evidence, still by default the reason to quote an example, is less important than that of showing a wide range of usages: Battaglia’s lexicographers are clearly inclined to increase the number of quotations, frequently defining meanings which belong to the quoted example rather than to the occurrence of the entry word, and quoting as many examples as possible taken from twentieth-century authors. To quote recent authors becomes something of a goal in itself, even if a given word and a given meaning are already well documented in the entry. A critical reviewer of the first volume, Gianfranco Folena, pointed out that some entries seemed to him to be like little anthologies of modern literature. It is also revealing that the conference held in 2002 in Turin and Vercelli to celebrate the completion of the dictionary included in its schedule a panel discussion of contemporary writers whose texts had been quoted in the last volumes.

The philological concern for the used texts is a major characteristic of the lexicographical tradition begun by the Crusca Academy (the philological attitude of the Academicians being demonstrated, for instance, by an influential edition of Dante’s Comedy). The proceedings of the first edition published by Severina Parodi in 1974 show how the Academicians created an exhaustive corpus of the selected authors by copying each text sentence by sentence (if in prose), or metrical unit by metrical unit (if in verse), onto sheets of paper folded in sixteen. Of each sample, the first word in alphabetical order was underlined, and cards were subsequently sorted according to the underlined words (one can suppose that the same was made with quotations singled out of texts which were only partially indexed). After a card had been used to edit the dictionary entry, the second word in alphabetical order was underlined, and the card was moved to the new position in order to prepare a further entry. Each dictionary in this tradition became a repository of samples to be used and increased in order to edit new dictionaries. What remained controversial was the selection of authors to be included, whether examples chosen from non-literary texts or even spoken language should be included or rejected, whether obsolete words should be kept in the dictionary or expelled and so on. This process continued not only until the epoch of the compila-
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12 Gianfranco Folena, review in Lingua Nostra 22 (1961): 52-57.
tion of the *Tommaseo-Bellini*, which was very much enriched by Tommaseo’s own lexicographical investigations, but also until the *Battaglia*. Actually Battaglia’s project was to take advantage of textual editions based on philological studies from the first half of the twentieth century in order to reverify and renew traditional quotations, and this was put into practise, the scrutiny of new editions being continued throughout the process of compiling the dictionary. Yet new quotations and inherited material still coexist in the *Battaglia* dictionary with no clear distinction between them, and more than one reviewer has criticized its philological weaknesses (of course in relation to modern philological standards).

The lexicographers of the first *Crusca* had no reason to attach any importance to the chronology either of the meanings or of the quoted lexicographical evidence, and neither did the editors of the dictionaries belonging to the tradition that originated from the *Crusca*. Therefore it is not surprising that still in the *Tommaseo-Bellini* no attempt to state which is the oldest occurrence of a word or meaning can be found, even though this dictionary shows accuracy in distinguishing old and new, obsolete and living usages.

As for the *Battaglia*, in the already quoted paper of 1951 Salvatore Battaglia argued against the chronological order of meanings: first of all, in his opinion, one may doubt whether the oldest meaning is the one with the earliest evidence or the one nearest to its etymon; second, even if one could ascertain the chronology, to order the entry according to it can only allow one to trace its history, but is of no use for the reader, who has to look for the current meaning of a word after the oldest and obsolete meanings. Therefore, quotations are listed in chronological order under each meaning, the meanings themselves being ordered according to their grade of familiarity to modern readers. The purely historical information was intended by Battaglia to be provided in the etymological note at the end of each entry, but these notes, in the complete dictionary, merely state the actual etymon. To deal with the various groupings of senses in chronological order according to the quotation evidence, as the *Oxford English Dictionary* does, is not the only way to structure an historical dictionary, as one can realize comparing the *Oxford* dictionary with the *Trésor de la Langue Française*, which gives reliable historical information in entries whose order is based on purely semantic and syntactic principles. Yet the entries of the *Battaglia* give in general little help to reconstruct the chronology (not to speak of the fact that references are made with no explicit date, which has to be searched for in the separate bibliography volume). Sometimes, for instance, the earliest piece of evidence may be hidden in a reference to an anthology of early texts quoted as a whole (for instance: “Florentine texts of the thirteenth century”). In spite of this, the *Battaglia* is now the main or, at least, the first
source used to date the earliest attestations of words, as has become usual in current language dictionaries.

The most important achievement of recent Italian lexicography is the *Grande Dizionario dell’Uso* edited by Tullio De Mauro in 1999, which is ground-breaking in many aspects (for instance in its exhaustive classification of usages, as “fundamental”, “very frequent”, “common”, “obsolete”, “technical and scientific”), but which is not a historical dictionary\(^\text{14}\). Furthermore, the *GRADIT*, in accordance to its structure and aims, does not bear quotations, except those few that it has become traditional to insert also in current language dictionaries. The *GRADIT* gives the date of the earliest attestation of the entries, according to the *Battaglia* and to a number of scholarly publications, but normally not the date of each meaning; furthermore, for instance, when giving a date for a masculine noun it fails to give a date for the feminine equivalent, and when giving a date for a verb it fails to give any date for the participle, when this has got its own entry as an adjective or a noun.

The branch of Italian historical lexicography which seems most lively in recent times, besides the elaboration of the *Battaglia* and after its completion, is the special one which occupies itself with recent words and neologisms. I record here only the two Supplements to the *Battaglia* edited by Edoardo Sanguineti in 2004 and 2008 (provided with quotations, in the same style of the *Battaglia*)\(^\text{15}\), and the ones appended to De Mauro’s dictionary in 2003 and 2007\(^\text{16}\); however, numerous dictionaries of Italian neologisms have been published in recent decades.

Mention must be made also of etymological dictionaries. The well-known *Lessico Etimologico Italiano* founded by Max Pfister and edited by him since 1979 (initially alone, later in collaboration with Wolfgang Schweickard), is the most important lexicographical work in progress concerning Italian.

An etymological dictionary needs historical dictionaries as its sources; accordingly, the *LEI* makes extensive use of the dictionaries I already mentioned (notwithstanding their weaknesses). As for early Italian, Max Pfister has repeatedly stated that the lack of a specific historical dictionary constitutes a problem for the etymological research. Since 1999, however, the *LEI* quotes the existing entries of the *TLIO* in progress and the online OVI Early Italian database. Conversely, etymology is addressed by the *TLIO* only through cross-references to the


existing entries of the LEI in progress (waiting for the LEI’s entries to be published, other etymological dictionaries are quoted, first of all the second edition of the Cortelazzo-Zolli, DELI)\textsuperscript{17}. As can be seen, a very fruitful collaboration in Italian lexicography is in course between Florence and Saarbrücken.

Let me now return to the project of an historical dictionary outlined by Necioni in 1955. Its benchmark was not the Italian tradition of dictionaries, but what had been produced by the nineteenth and twentieth century international historical lexicography, in particular the Oxford English Dictionary and the Thesaurus Linguae Latinae (the Deutsches Wörterbuch also being taken into consideration). Its aim was to deal with all levels of language, literary and non-literary to the same degree, and it was to be neither selective nor prescriptive. Account was to be taken of the fact that at least until the end of the fourteenth century (when Florentine had become the most important Italian variety), if not until the beginning of the sixteenth century (when a well established national language came into existence), the history of Italian was not that of an unique language, so the dictionary had to be twofold. The ambition was to achieve a completely new and fresh, philologically-driven examination of the evidences, in order to create a great lexicographical archive to be of even better use to scholars than the dictionary in itself.

When the project started, in 1965, it was decided to make use of the new computerised methods in order to build such an archive, and the Early Italian corpus of the OVI is a further development of this farsighted decision, taken when computer science for humanities was at its first steps. It must also be mentioned that a number of texts later included in the Letteratura Italiana Zanichelli, the most influential database of literary Italian from the origins up to the twentieth century before the Web, were first digitized by the Crusca Academy in collaboration with the research unit led by Antonio Zampolli which later was to become the Institute of Computational Linguistics in Pisa.

The TLIO is designed to constitute the first chronological section of the complete historical dictionary of Italian (the ultimate goal of the OVI Institute) rather than an autonomous dictionary of early Italian. Therefore, for instance, modern word forms are preferred as headwords of entries even when documented only once; when modern word forms are not documented, cross-reference entries allow the reader to search any modern form existing in the available dictionaries. Nevertheless, the TLIO is clearly distinct from the modern section of the planned dic-

\textsuperscript{17} Manlio Cortelazzo – Paolo Zolli, Dizionario Etimologico della Lingua Italiana, 2\textsuperscript{nd} ed. by Manlio Cortelazzo and Michele A. Cortelazzo. Bologna: Zanichelli, 1999.
tionary by the fact that it is in fact multilingual (as I already pointed out): the modern section will deal only with the national language.

In some respects, the TLIO is an historical dictionary similar to the Trésor de la Langue Française: it covers a limited period of the language’s history, its definitions are presented in a non-chronological order, but an exact chronological indication of the entry and of each meaning is available. The order of definitions allows one to connect meanings to each other, and depends, at least partially, on the editor’s judgement. Some rules are given: for instance, proper meanings must come before extended and metaphorical ones and so on, and space-related meanings must precede time-related ones. The need for uniformity is met, at least to some degree, by making it a duty of the chief editor to revise all entries at least once – and do this every time a published entry is changed or updated. The possibility of updating entries, not only in order to emend errors, but also, for instance, in order to take into account new textual evidences, is maybe the most effective – and exciting – characteristic of a real online dictionary, as distinct from electronic versions of previously printed ones.

As for chronological information, a paragraph in the first part of the entry states which text (identified by an abbreviation, date and linguistic variety) contains the earliest occurrence of the word; another paragraph lists the texts containing the earliest occurrences in each of four large linguistic areas (“Tuscany [and possibly Corsica]”, “Northern Italy”, “Central and Southern Italy [excluding Tuscany]”, “Sicily”) and, in each of these, in each variety (normally identified by an urban centre: “Florentine”, “Milanese”, “Neapolitan”, “of Palermo” and so on). Below each definition, samples are listed in chronological order, the earliest first, then a selection of later, synonymous samples. Quotations from different linguistic varieties are not listed separately, but included in chronological order.

Meanings are of course defined through the interpretation of the occurrences listed by the OVI Early Italian database. The TLIO is made from scratch, through a fresh examination of a corpus of texts written in any Early Italian variety before the end of the 14th century and available in editions (in principle reliable editions). At present, the corpus contains a little less than 2,000 texts and about 22 million occurrences. Leaving aside the numerous philological problems, I stress only the fact that the 19,000 existing TLIO entries contain more than 160,000 samples which have been freshly interpreted in order to quote them exactly. Only a few samples are taken from existing dictionaries, and only a small percentage of entries are documented only by this kind of sample; this happens for various reasons, normally because a text is still missing in the corpus. However, in order to avoid any confusion between samples derived from the corpus and samples de-
rived from the lexicographical tradition, every quotation that comes from a source different from the corpus is explicitly marked as such.

The online publication software allows the reader to display all the occurrences of the consulted entries through an automatic search in the corpus database (in this case, all occurrences are displayed, including homographs pertaining to other lemmas). Of course the OVI Early Italian database is also consultable directly, with the use of numerous search functions and, above all, the lemmatization. The database is open access and free of charge, exactly like the TLIO, and is used by scholars for researches in Italian philology and language history, as is shown by the high number of citations (partially listed in the OVI website). In a certain sense, the database can be used as a provisional historical dictionary for entries still missing in the TLIO.

Much information about the OVI corpus can be retrieved from the articles I quote in the footnote 4. The most important feature, which allows one to use this corpus as a quasi-dictionary, is the lemmatization, a work of interpretation carried out by the OVI researchers alongside the editing of the dictionary. All (or almost all) graphic forms are linked to their respective headwords, and about 3,5 million occurrences are explicitly interpreted.

At the end of 1998 the TLIO comprised 1,000 entries, the result of a long period of elaboration of the OVI Early Italian database, and of an initial experimental period, the first entries having been edited in 1996. Since then, 2,000 entries per year have been edited up to the end of 2006, in 2007 and 2008 this number was halved because of problems of funding. Today perspectives look better, and at least 2,000 new entries will be ready at the end of 2009: hopefully, the pace of the editing will increase in the following years. It is a well known fact that a large dictionary is a matter not only of lexicography, but also of organization and funding. Nevertheless, I am confident that the OVI Institute will be able to successfully carry out the first historical dictionary of early Italian – a part of which is currently available and open to assessment by the scholars on the Web – which hopefully will be the core of the first modern historical dictionary of Italian.

APPENDIX
A LIST OF ITALIAN (HISTORICAL?) DICTIONARIES.

LCR = Lessicografia della Crusca in rete (www.accademiadellacrusca.it).

BD = Biblioteca digitale (Crusca Academy, same address).

1st Crusca = Vocabolario degli Accademici della Crusca, Venezia, Giovanni Alberti, 1612 (1 volume). LCR


V. d. A. d. C. ... Venezia: Iacopo Turrini, 1680 (1 volume). BD

V. d. A. d. C. ... Venezia: Stefano Curti, 1686 (1 volume). BD

V. d. A. d. C. ... Venezia: Gio. Francesco Valvasense, 1697. BD


Compendio del Vocabolario degli Accademici della Crusca [4th ed.], Firenze: Domenico Maria Manni, 1739 (5 volumes). BD


V. d. A. d. C. ...Venezia: Pitteri, 1741, BD

V. d. A. d. C. [4th ed.] Napoli: Giuseppe Ponzelli – Giovanni Di Simone, 1746-1748 (6 volumes); Giunta di vocaboli... 2nd ed., 1751. BD

V. d. A. d. C. ... Venezia: Pitteri, 1763 (5 volumes). BD


V. d. A. d. C. ..., Verona: Dionigi Ramanzini, 1804-1806 (7 volumes). BD

Dizionario della lingua italiana [ed. by Paolo Costa, Francesco Cardinali and Francesco Orioli], Bologna: Fratelli Masi, 1819-1826 (7 volumes). BD

Dizionario della lingua italiana [ed. by Luigi Carrer and Fortunato Federici], Padova, Tipografia della Minerva, 1827-1830 (7 volumes). BD

Tramater = Vocabolario universale italiano compilato a cura della Società tipografica Tramater e C., Napoli: Tramater, 1829-1840 (7 volumes). BD

Vocabolario della lingua italiana già compilato dagli Accademici della Crusca..., ed. by Giuseppe Manuzzi, Firenze: Passigli, 1833-1840 (4 volumes). BD

V. d. A. d. C. [ed. by Paolo Zanotti], Verona: Paolo Libanti, 1836 (3 volumes). BD


Tommaseo-Bellini = Dizionario della lingua italiana ed. by Nicolò Tommaseo and Bernardo Bellini, Torino, Unione Tipografico-Editrice Torinese, 1861-1879 (4 volumes, each in 2 parts). BD


TLIO = CNR-Opera del Vocabolario Italiano, Tesoro della Lingua Italiana delle Origini (edited online in progress: www.vocabolario.org), 1997- (printed samples in the yearly Bollettino dell’Opera del Vocabolario Italiano, Alessandria: Edizioni dell’Orso).