<http://www.diva-portal.org>

Postprint

This is the accepted version of a paper published in *Language Problems and Language Planning*. This paper has been peer-reviewed but does not include the final publisher proof-corrections or journal pagination.

Citation for the original published paper (version of record):

Tseronis, A. (2002)

Diglossic past and present lexicographical practices: The case of two Greek dictionaries
Language Problems and Language Planning, 26(3): 219-252

<https://doi.org/10.1075/lplp.26.3.02tse>

Access to the published version may require subscription.

N.B. When citing this work, cite the original published paper.

Permanent link to this version:

<http://urn.kb.se/resolve?urn=urn:nbn:se:oru:diva-70098>

Diglossic past and present lexicographical practices

The case of two Greek dictionaries

Assimakis Tseronis

Universiteit van Amsterdam, Graduate School for Humanities

The publication of a dictionary is a means to describe, codify and ultimately standardise a language. This process becomes even more complicated with regard to the lexicographer's own attitude towards the language one sets to describe and the public's sensitivity towards language matters. The case of the recent publication of the two most authoritative dictionaries of Modern Greek and their respective lexical coverage prove that the underlying ideologies of the two publishing institutes concerning the history of the Greek language, as well as their opposing standpoints on the language question over the past decades, still survive, some 25 years after the constitutional resolution of the Greek diglossia, and affect the way they describe the synchronic state of language. Thus the two dictionaries proceeding from opposing starting points attempt to influence and set a pace to the standardisation of Modern Greek by presenting two different aspects of the synchronic state of Greek; one which focuses on the long history of language and thus takes the present state to be only a part in the uninterrupted chain dating from antiquity, and another which focuses on the present state of Greek and thus takes this fully developed autonomous code to be the outcome of linguistic processes and socio-cultural changes of the past in response to the linguistic community's present needs. The absence of a sufficiently representative corpus has restrained the descriptive capacity of the two dictionaries and has given space for ideology to come into play, despite the fact that both dictionaries have made concessions in order to account for the present day Greek language.

Introduction

The constitutional establishment of Modern Greek (Demotic) as the official language of the Greek State as of 1976 could not extinguish completely the traces or the effects of the diglossic past of Greece (Ferguson 1959; Browning 1982). Speakers still use purist forms together with demotic ones interchangeably and unconsciously, whereas scholars still argue about the quality of the language spoken today. Throughout the whole period of diglossia and even earlier, dictionaries were compiled in an attempt to reflect the synchronic state of Greek at the time (Alissandratos 1980). Actually, what lexicographers did, either consciously or unconsciously, was to describe and reflect language under the prism of their own ideologies and the current political aspects of the language question, choosing therefore to include or to leave out vernacular forms.

This paper will examine the echo of the diglossic past and of the language question as reflected in the two most recent and authoritative dictionaries, published by

lexicographers who come from the two academic institutions that were most engaged in the language debate: the *Dictionary of Modern Greek Language* (DOMGL), by G. Babiniotis, professor of Linguistics at Kapodistrian University of Athens, and the *Dictionary of Common Modern Greek* (DOCMG), by a team of lexicographers working in the Manolis Triandafilidis Foundation at Aristotelian University of Thessaloniki.

The first part of the paper gives a brief historical background on Greek diglossia, relating it to the social changes and the political ideologies prevailing at the time, and making reference to the most important and influential dictionaries published. The second part of the paper provides a description and comparison of the two dictionaries, in greater detail. Bearing in mind the different ideological standpoints of the lexicographers, the author will try to show how their programmatic statements do or do not apply to the actual treatment of the entries, as far as the choice of vocabulary and stylistic labelling, the phonological and morphological variables, and the etymology and spelling are concerned.

The analysis will show that the two dictionaries present a different and conflicting image of the synchronic state of Greek, which indicates that twenty-four years after the 1976 Reform, the standardisation process is not over yet. The lack of a representative corpus on which their claims could rest has ultimately left their ideologies lead their choices in the respective attempts to set the pace.

Diglossia, past and present

Purism and dictionaries in the past

Greek diglossia as described in Ferguson's seminal paper (Ferguson 1959) has emerged from historical and linguistic processes dating back to the 1st century BC. The purist movement developed at that time favoured the structural and functional differentiation of two codes, a superposed written code and a vernacular spoken code (Browning 1982; Christidis 1996). This long tradition of superposition lasted throughout Middle Ages till Modern Era and resulted in proper diglossia after the establishment of the H-variety as the official language of the Independent Greek State in 1834.

'Atticism' was an aesthetic and defensive purist movement (Thomas 1991), which reacted against the 'vulgarisation' of the language due to the Roman influence, and the 'adulteration' of Hellenistic Koine, which was used as a lingua franca among peoples whose native language was not Greek (Alexiou 1982). From that period onwards, the spoken and the written tradition evolve in parallel and competing terms, the former elaborating the vernacular Koine and the latter planning a classicising language close to the Attic dialect. The Byzantine Empire (324-1453 AD) inherited this diglossic situation, in which high literature was written in a classicising language and even the spoken language of rhetoric and preaching was prescribed according to classical models. During that period dictionaries in the form of thesauri were compiled in a conscious attempt by scholars to safeguard and perpetuate the 'high' and 'pure' language of their ancestors.

Under the Ottoman Empire (1453-1821) the linguistic situation in each part of Greece differed greatly according to the prevailing political situation at each stage. In

Crete, Corfu and Cyprus, which were under Venetian domination, local dialects were mixed with foreign elements to produce a new vernacular also used in the literary production of the respective places. In places under the Ottoman yoke there was no literary production to elaborate the language used at the time. Greek scholars in European countries, as well as the Orthodox Patriarchate, used a classicising literary language which rejected any colloquial features and varied according to the proficiency of each speaker in using the ancient Greek Attic dialect (Browning 1982, 1983).

The first dictionaries to describe the Greek language in modern times appeared in the seventeenth century and were all published in Western Europe by clergymen.¹ They included archaic and learned words together with some vernacular ones, but the definitions were given in Latin, Italian or French. The lack of any monolingual dictionary and the prevalence of archaic or ancient words attest the dominance of the classical, Atticist tradition.

During the Enlightenment (1750-1821) the language question is for the first time officially related to the question of national identity and the fight for independence from the Ottomans. The Greek scholars were divided into two opposing camps² in the debate concerning the linguistic code to be favoured as the language of instruction of the people and ultimately as the official language of the reborn state. On the one side were the scholars who believed that the regeneration of the nation would only be guaranteed by the archaisation of language. They proposed the adoption of Attic Greek vocabulary and morphosyntax, in a way that would explicitly mark the bonds of the new-born state with its glorious past (Alexiou 1982; Liakos 1996). On the opposite side were intellectuals who proposed the use of a language close to the vernacular spoken by lay people (=demos> Demotic). They argued that the only way to achieve national integrity and emancipation from the Ottoman domination was to educate people in a common language, intelligible to all – that is, their native language.

In between the two extreme positions, Adamantios Korais (1748-1833) proposed the 'middle way' option, by creating a 'purified language', Katharevousa (Liakos 1996). Following a reformist purism (Thomas 1991), he proceeded with the eradication and replacement of as many foreign words as possible (Turkish, Albanian, Slavic, and other). Demotic vernacular forms, which he considered to be vulgar, were also excluded. He replaced foreign words with Greek equivalents, either by reintroducing and expanding the meaning of words that already existed in Ancient Greek or by coining new ones based on ancient forms (see Petrounias 1997, on loan translations). He emphasised the relationship between language and national identity focusing on the continuity of Greek language from antiquity to modern times. He was the first Greek scholar to promote the compilation of a monolingual dictionary as a means for the codification and propagation of the purified language so that it could be used by all speakers in all registers homogeneously. Even though his plans to compile a Dictionary of Modern Greek were never accomplished, the data he collected in his work called *Miscellanea* (1825-1835) constitute the first attempt at a synchronic description of Modern Greek.

As Frangoudaki (1992) points out, the compromise of Katharevousa was the only viable solution for the language question at that time, given the political goals of independence that the Greeks wanted to achieve. Indeed, Katharevousa was recognised as the official language of the Independent Greek State in 1834 because it enjoyed the

prestige of being close to the highly admired language of classic antiquity, thus underlying the new born nation's ancient roots. The fact that the Modern Greek State defined its formation and marked its cohesion on the basis of a common national language, dating back to antiquity, categorises Greece as a 'linguistic state' following Rustow's patterns of state formation (Rustow 1968, cited in Joseph 1987:47). This categorisation, illustrated in the best way by the gravity of linguistic matters and their relation to politics still prominent in recent years too, explains the susceptibility of the Greek community to 'linguistic mythologies' (see below, and Christidis 1999; Frangoudaki 2001).

The first dictionaries published under the independent state could not but follow the aforementioned ideology of purism (= *katharismos* > Katharevousa). The first dictionary setting out to describe the Greek language as it was spoken in 19th century is the *Dictionary of Present-day Greek Dialect*, compiled by Scarlatos Vyzantios and published in 1835, in Athens. Despite the fact that the compiler acknowledged the use of what he called "present-day Greek", he ended up including mostly ancient and archaic words. It was a trilingual dictionary whose definitions were given in ancient Greek and in a later edition in French as well. What is most striking about the purist ideology of its compiler, reflecting the predominant ideology of his time, is that words of foreign origin, Turkish, Italian, Venetian or French were all grouped aside from the main entries, in an Appendix under the title "Foreign Words To Be Banned".

For almost a century (1835-1933), no other important general-purpose dictionary of Modern Greek was published,³ apparently due to the unstable linguistic situation of superposition provoked by the co-existence of the popular vernacular language (Demotic) and the purist language (Katharevousa). As a matter of fact, in the first decades after Independence, such a great linguistic variety in dialects and languages existed that it was almost impossible for people from one place to communicate with those from another without major misunderstandings (Liakos 1996; Papatzikou-Cochran 1997).⁴ From that time onwards the language question caused heated conflicts in the Greek linguistic community, coinciding with the society's slow transition to the capitalist and industrial era towards the end of the nineteenth century (Frangoudaki 1992, 1996).

The demoticist movement

From the time of the establishment of the independent Greek State, Katharevousa prevailed as the H-variety, in administration, newspapers and education (Ferguson 1959; Liakos 1996) enjoying the status of the official language. Demotic was used in everyday spoken communication among equals and in the home, enjoying the covert prestige of the mother tongue. The speakers were thus learning the former only by means of formal education, whereas they were acquiring the latter naturally.

Soon it became evident that "the idea of national revival would need to be replaced with the idea of national continuity" (Liakos 1996:79). Especially after the publication and repercussions of a treatise entitled *Geschichte der Halbinsel Morea während des Mittelalters* [History of the Peloponnesian Peninsula during the Middle Ages] by J.P. Fallmerayer in 1830, who maintained that present day inhabitants of

Peloponnese bore no genetic or other connection to Greeks who lived there in antiquity, due to the admixture of the population with Slavic tribes in the centuries under the Ottoman empire and well before (Vitti 1987²). In the quest for counter-evidence, an 'ethnographic purism'⁵ set in, seeking vernacular words in the Greek folk tradition, connecting the language with the Byzantine religious tradition, and reviving the uninterrupted practice of customs and traditions from ancient and medieval times. The literary and academic writing of the time mostly employed an archaising and classical style, following the tradition of the western Romantic school with its interest in the revival of antiquity and the imitation of classical models, and opting for a code that was allegedly more accurate, homogeneous and less analytic.

Demotic, however, unlike the L-variety in other typical diglossic communities described by Ferguson (1959), never ceased to be used in literature, and poetry in particular, before taking over the official registers of education, press and later on that of politics. The use of the spoken vernacular in Solomos's (1798-1857) poems and in works by poets from the Ionian Islands,⁶ too, paid tribute to the tradition of popular poetry and acknowledged Demotic as the only means to communicate messages of revolt to people (Vitti 1987²). K. Palamas (1859-1943) and the poets grouped around him were the first to acknowledge the impact of Solomos's poetry. They consistently and consciously used Demotic in their works, contrary to the Romantic poets in Athens, elaborating thus the poetic functions of the vernacular code. Jean Psycharis (1854-1929), a Greek linguist educated in Paris and a professor at the Sorbonne, supported scientific Demotic and promoted its use in literary prose as well. With his book *The Journey*, published in 1888 - both a scientific treatise and a nationalist manifesto - he established an extreme demoticist opposition to the purist tradition, adapting Demotic phonological patterns to words of learned origin in an often untypical way. This type of 'anti-purism'⁷ succeeded in initiating heated debates on the language question among scholars and in making a great impact on society.

The language question from this point onwards began to bear explicit political and ideological connotations, which linked the linguistic polarisation to the social and political groupings at the time. Demoticists represented economic and social progress, industrialisation, aggressive nationalism and educational reform (Frangoudaki 1992; Liakos 1996). Despite the fact that their agenda on educational matters and social reform was considered to share a common ground with rising communism, demoticists at this point distinguished themselves from such an affiliation (Frangoudaki 2001:42). Purists have been falsely relating the demoticist movement with communism and foreign interventionism almost from the start, in an attempt to blunt the demoticists' social and political impact. They considered them a threat to the cohesion of the nation and a rebellious reaction against the political and social status quo. The violent and bloody protests that broke out on the occasion of the translation of the Gospels and Aeschylus's trilogy the *Oresteia* into Demotic, in 1901 and 1903 respectively, illustrate eloquently the extent to which the language question stimulated political conflict and was instigated by it (Browning 1982; Alexiou 1982:160, n.4; Frangoudaki 2001:131).

Even though Demotic was excluded from the 1911 Constitution, which explicitly named Katharevousa as the official language of the state and forbade its falsification (Frangoudaki 1996), demoticists began to work towards an Educational Reform in order

to introduce Demotic in public schools. In 1910, Manolis Triandafilidis (1883-1959), a moderate demoticist, takes the initiative to found the Educational Society, *Ekpedeftikos Omilos*, and group demoticists who would work in this direction by making concessions in order to codify and standardise Demotic, a form of language planning, which Psycharis did not subscribe to. Moreover, the foundation of the Philosophical School of the University of Thessaloniki in 1929 established the academic bulwark of the demoticist movement, grouping scholars who elaborated the use of Demotic in scientific and argumentative texts as well.

Demotic began to be used in formal registers in parallel with Katharevousa, producing latent messages of revolt and social unrest. In the next few decades the difference in the use between Demotic and Katharevousa signified social distance and bore latent social messages of formality and seriousness. Setatos (1973) argues that there was no such thing as a consistent and unified Katharevousa code, only a mixture more or less of purist elements in vocabulary and morphosyntax with a basically Demotic discourse. Such a mixed discourse attempted to identify the speaker as educated and of high social rank, but ended up unveiling a person who aspired to achieve social status through grandiloquence, opacity and ostentation (Frangoudaki 1996, 1997).

In 1938 Colonel I. Metaxas (1936-1940) commissioned the compilation of the first official grammar of Modern Greek (Demotic) to M. Triandafilidis, in an attempt to project a populist profile and gain people's concession to his dictatorship (Frangoudaki 1992; Liakos 1996). In this way Triandafilidis was given authority to codify standard Demotic through prescription in a grammar book first released in 1941.⁸ His grammar together with Tzartanos's book on Demotic syntax, first published in 1928, remain still the two most authoritative reference books on Modern Greek some 60 years since.⁹ Even though Demotic was described as a standard language and codified as such since the middle of 20th century, the lasting diglossia would leave its traces both in the linguistic choices and the metalinguistic beliefs and attitudes of the speakers.

During the Civil War (1946-1949), Demotic was stigmatised as being typical of Communist discourse and progressive ideology, whereas Katharevousa connoted respect for the traditional values of 'fatherhood, religion and family'. At the same time Katharevousa was used, misused and practically abused by authorities and politicians lacking real power and acknowledgement by the public, who wanted thus to mislead and manipulate them. On the other hand, demoticists' attempts for educational reform succeeded in generalising the teaching of Demotic throughout primary and secondary education in parallel with Katharevousa, under the 1964 Reform. The beneficial results were not left to prosper, because the military junta abrogated the law in 1967.

The 1967 Dictatorship was the coup de grace for Katharevousa (Joseph 1987). The misuse and abuse of its grandiloquence and opacity linked it to totalitarian politics, which no one wanted to be identified with after the collapse of junta in 1974 and the restoration of the democratic parliament. The 1976 Reform, interestingly enough under a conservative government, put an official end to diglossia without, however, guaranteeing the end of the language problem.

The release of authoritative dictionaries of Modern Greek from 1933 to 1967, which included Demotic forms together with more purist ones, shows that a process of standardisation of Modern Greek had begun. The L-variety was described in parallel with

the H-variety, reflecting the ongoing transitional period, during which words of learned origin were still described in parallel with those of vernacular, popular origin. Such dictionaries still used Katharevousa as their lexicographical metalanguage and were influenced by the purist tradition of the past in their attempt to directly relate Modern Greek vocabulary with Ancient Greek roots (Petroounias 1985; Anastassiadis 2000). One such dictionary was the *Historical Dictionary of Modern Greek – the common spoken language and its dialects*, compiled since 1933 by a committee of linguists working at the Centre for the Historical Dictionary at the Academy of Athens. This ambitious project was launched by G. Hatzidakis (1848-1941), professor of Linguistics at the University of Athens, initially aspiring to cover all the periods of Greek language dating from antiquity, but eventually, due to technical and financial problems, its scope was confined to Common Modern Greek and regional dialects as they were recorded since 1800. Until 1989 only five volumes have appeared including entries up to the letter 'Δ-delta'.

The overall lexicographical production of the time is evaluated as deficient with respect to the variety of Modern Greek described and the morpho-semantic and etymological information provided.¹⁰ *Proia: Dictionary of the Modern Greek Language*, published in 1933, is considered to be “the only serious lexicographical effort” (Petroounias 1985: 409), which treated Demotic entries with the due respect and attention. Besides, it is during that period that the first in their category specialised dictionaries appear. The *Etymological Dictionary of Common Modern Greek* by N.P. Andriotis, professor of Linguistics at the University of Thessaloniki, was first published in 1951; the second edition was published in 1967 by the Manolis Triandafilidis Foundation. The 1983 posthumous revised and extended edition remains the work on which almost all subsequent lexicographical products have drawn their etymologies. It is the first exclusively etymological dictionary and the first to use Demotic as its lexicographical metalanguage. In 1967 the first *Reverse Dictionary of Modern Greek* also appeared, compiled by G.I. Kourmoulis, professor of Linguistics at the University of Athens.

The *Great Dictionary of the whole Greek Language* in 9 volumes published from 1936 till 1950 by the publisher D. Dimitrakos, who grouped a large number of contemporary scholars for the first time, attempted to realise Hatzidakis's dream for a thesaurus dictionary, which would illustrate the unified and long history of the Greek language since antiquity. It however went no further than draw its entries and lexical information on previous authoritative dictionaries of the respective periods of Greek. The dictionaries published after 1976 continued to draw their entries on *Proia* and *Dimitrakos's* dictionaries, making only minor additions and going no further than actually translating or modifying its contents into Demotic.

The situation from 1976 onwards

As Alexiou (1982) points out, the transition from Katharevousa to Demotic following the 1976 Reform was in no way a simple process. Greek speakers in their fifties and older are still confused whether to opt for Katharevousa or for Demotic forms and end up making inconsistent and incorrect use of both.¹¹ Almost all functions reserved for Katharevousa, the H-variety before 1976, were now served by Demotic (Ferguson 1959;

Alexiou 1982), with the exception of the church liturgies, the official communication of the Patriarchate, one extreme right-wing newspaper, *Hestia*, and particular registers in the armed forces, politics, medicine, and law.

This confused and confusing situation, and especially the first halting attempts to use Demotic in more formal registers (science, philosophy, political rhetoric), particularly during the first years following the reform, exposed the inadequacies of Demotic and gave an impression of poor linguistic style (Pavlidou 1991; Kakava 1997; Frangoudaki 1997). From the beginning there was hot debate in the columns of daily newspapers as to whether the language should be described as Demotic, the vernacular code, which won the battle of the language question over Katharevousa in 1976, or should be regarded as a synthesis which was neither Demotic nor Katharevousa but a new system integrating both purist and vernacular elements (Babiniotis 1978; see also Alexiou 1982:157, n.1). The advocates of the first position (Em. Kriaras and other professors at the Aristotelian University of Thessaloniki), referred to the previous linguistic situation as 'diglossia' (Setatos 1978), whereas the principal advocate of the second position (G. Babiniotis, professor of linguistics at the Kapodistrian University of Athens) called it '*dimorphia*': two different forms of one and the same language, not two different codes or languages with distinct systems (Babiniotis 1978). Papatzikou-Cochran (1997:52) claims, on the basis of empirical research, that the current language situation is neither diglossic nor dimorphic.¹²

In March 1982, the foundation of the Greek Language Society, *Hellenikos Glossikos Omilos*, by professor G. Babiniotis was an overt reaction of Athens scholars and intellectuals¹³ to "the impoverishment and decline of the Greek language" (Babiniotis 1984; Pavlidou 1991). According to them, Greek was threatened by the alteration of its Hellenic character and "pidginisation" [sic]¹⁴ due to the influx of foreign loanwords coming from British and American English (Frangoudaki 1992, 2001). The 'linguistic mythology' of the endangered language was based on the partial observation of the poor and restricted vocabulary that teenagers used, and the inflexible ('wooden') language of political parties, disregarding completely the potential social meanings and communicative purposes of such a linguistic performance (Frangoudaki 1996, 1997; Christidis 1999). The reason for this defective linguistic quality was supposedly the cutting off from the ancient roots of language. The present dispute, like the one in the past, was mainly carried out between scholars from the two most important academic institutions, the Kapodistrian University of Athens and the Aristotelian University of Thessaloniki.

In this dispute, the advocates of the theory of language decline argue for the uninterrupted, unique history and wealth of the Greek language, covering forty centuries of spoken and thirty-five centuries of written tradition. The proposed remedy against the 'dehellenisation of Greek' is the study of the history of language and its past periods (Ancient-Medieval-Purist) at school (see Pavlidou 1991). On the opposite side, scholars like Christidis (1996, 1999) and Frangoudaki (1997, 2001) explain that Modern Greek has drastically changed since Hellenistic Koine, which was its source, and that it is constantly undergoing a natural process of change and mutual exchange through contact with other European languages.

The linguistic reasons for this debate lie in the fact that Greek, unlike Latin and other Indo-European languages, did not break up in the course of its history into different languages (Christidis 1996). In addition, the various purist and regressive movements throughout its history have contributed to the maintenance of archaic elements and their resurrection from previous phases of the language (see above, Korais's language planning). This continuity, in conjunction with the particularity of Greek diglossia (see Alexiou 1982), namely that the L-variety rather than the H-variety was codified in a grammar book at a very early stage¹⁵ and was used as a literary language in poetry, accounts for the present-day situation. For some, the presence of purist or ancient loanwords in today's vocabulary is evidence for a diachronic relation of Modern to Ancient Greek, unique to this language (Babiniotis 1984, 1998:17-26). For others, this is a matter to be dealt with in the history of language and of no significance to the present use of the language or to its quality and prestige (Christidis 1999; Petrounias 2000).

The social and political reasons for the debate lie in the fact that for many Greek society is obliged to present a modern and worthy image of itself in the face of the linguistic, and above all economic, hegemonisms within the European Community, and in addressing the various threats coming from the North or the East. A sense of the uniqueness of the Greek language adds to the nation's coherence and superiority over its neighbours and fellow-members in Europe. Others choose to accept the fact that Greek belongs to the 'smaller' and 'weaker' languages of Europe, and try to demystify the past and elaborate both on the present contemporary state of the language and on its contact with other neighbouring 'weak' languages (Frangoudaki 1997, 2001; Christidis 1996, 1999).

The persistence and recurrence of such phenomena in Greece could tentatively be explained by the susceptibility of the linguistic community to an ideological and political treatment of language matters, inflated by a linguistic sensitivity expressed by the majority of Greeks.¹⁶ This particularity, combined with the absence of a well-defined norm in Modern Greek, is reflected in the lexicographical production of the last decades. The compilers of dictionaries are still at odds over which purist loanwords to include in a descriptive dictionary of the synchronic state of Modern Greek and which archaisms to leave out (see Iordanidou 1996, 2002). Hence, they end up being prescriptive and normative about which words constitute the Modern Greek vocabulary, mostly on the basis of their personal standpoint and ideology, and due to the lack of an official and reliable Greek corpus.

The two dictionaries

It is under the circumstances and social context described above that the two most recent dictionaries of Modern Greek have been published. The DOMGL was published in May 1998 by the newly established Centre of Lexicography under the supervision of G. Babiniotis, professor at the University of Athens, while the DOCMG was published in December 1998, by a team of lexicographers from the University of Thessaloniki.¹⁷

Because of what happened between the release of the first dictionary and the second,¹⁸ and given the past relations of the two institutions, the public and the critics consider the two dictionaries as being antagonistic. The hasty release of the DOMGL surprised both scholars and public and preceded that of the DOCMG, which had been long awaited since the pre-release of a short sample in 1987, comprising a mere four letters (Institute of Modern Greek Studies 1987; see also Petrounias 2000 and Anastassiadis 2000). In this part of the paper the writer will try to show to what extent the two dictionaries reflect two different and sometimes conflicting ideologies concerning language, by commenting on a limited but illustrative number of cases, relating to the collection and choice of entries, stylistic labelling, morphological and phonological variability, etymology and spelling.¹⁹

Purpose

A dictionary's preface and introductory notes often give a fairly good idea of the lexicographer's intentions and the underlying ideology, serving as a starting point to compare what is claimed with what is actually practised. Overall, both dictionaries aspire to describe the synchronic state of the Greek language as comprehensively as possible, in order to satisfy the linguistic needs and curiosities of their public.

The DOMGL introduces itself as a completely new and original dictionary, following the tradition of the previous authoritative dictionaries of Modern Greek (see previous sections), and contemporary European ones, and yet going one step further. Its basic aim and contribution to the Greek language and society is "to make the lexical wealth of contemporary Greek explicit, through the emphasis given to the depth and the extensive and variable usage of words and phrases" (p.13).²⁰ It is the first dictionary ever to include usage notes and tables on various matters concerning language use. The compiler states clearly that "our concern was to collect all the vocabulary of Modern Greek that is in use today [...], irrespective of origin -- purist, popular or foreign" (p. 27).

On the other hand, the DOCMG introduces itself as the official State Dictionary compiled, though delayed, in response to the Ministry of Education's commission for a Dictionary of Modern Greek, in 1976 (p.vii). Its purpose, according to the Introduction to the profile of the Dictionary, is "to describe contemporary Modern Greek as it is spoken by the average educated Greek in urban centres, as it is written in modern Greek prose and periodicals, and as it is heard on the radio and on T.V." (p. xi). The editors' concern is to satisfy present educational needs as well, by appealing to students, teachers and professors of Modern Greek, native or foreign. It is the only monolingual dictionary of Modern Greek that gives a phonetic transcription of the entries (see Petrounias 1985; Anastassiadis 2000).

The DOCMG is thus a general-purpose language dictionary, neither a thesaurus nor an encyclopaedia (Anastassiadis 2000). According to Ev. Petrounias (1997:792), the linguist in charge of the etymology section, "the dictionary represents the linguistic variety of Common Modern Greek, with a bias towards the learned idiom within the linguistic community". The DOMGL, by contrast, is an encyclopaedic language dictionary, a reference book that includes a wide range of information on facts of usage of the words, and their context of use in its broadest sense. It is noteworthy that whereas

the compiler of the DOMGL avoids any reference to his dictionary as an encyclopaedic one, his critics as well as the compilers of the DOCMG underline its encyclopaedic features and character (see Anastassiadis 2000 and Petrounias 2000).

The very titles of the two dictionaries are also a telling example of their constitutive view on the Greek language.²¹ The title *Dictionary of Modern Greek Language* implies that the dictionary aspires to describe the modern, synchronic state of Greek, regardless of dialects and registers (Petrounias 2000:86, n.18). The compiler himself exaggerates in stating that his dictionary “includes all the words in use today” (p.27). On the other hand, the *Dictionary of Common Modern Greek* opts for the term ‘Common’ in order to imply that it deals with the variety of Modern Greek which is free of dialectal and idiomatic features. The choice of one name or the other hints at the compilers’ aspirations to standardise Modern Greek by simply describing and naming it ‘Common’ or ‘Standard’ Modern Greek, respectively.

The number of entries

Jackson & Ze Amvela (2000) rightly note that the desire of dictionary compilers is to maximise any count of their dictionary’s contents. This is the case with the DOMGL, which states right on the cover that “it includes 150,000 words-phrases, 500,000 meanings-uses” [sic].²² It is not clear, though, whether the lexicographer counts references (all the words in bold typeface) or headwords. In the latter case, the actual number of proper linguistic entries, excluding the encyclopaedic ones, should be much lower. Besides, it includes names of places and people, abbreviations and ancient Greek and Latin phrases as main entries, something which considerably increases the total number. The DOCMG includes approximately 80,000 references, around 50,000 headwords, without including any abbreviations or proper names. The compilers have moreover included prefixes, suffixes, and combined forms as headwords in a way that gives the reader a comprehensive idea of the compounding and derivational system of Modern Greek, something which is done in an ad hoc and inconsistent way in the DOMGL.

Collection of facts of usage

One of Barnhart’s (1980: 34) criteria for the authority of a dictionary is “the adequate collection of facts of usage”. This point is related to the collection of a sizeable and adequate number of citations taken from a large corpus of texts that will provide the lexicographer with evidence about the meaning and the context of use of the words included in the dictionary (Jackson & Ze Amvela 2000).

As to the corpus and the examples and citations of usage in each of the two dictionaries, both argue that they describe the vocabulary in present use, although they have made choices as to what words and how many to include from specific registers.²³ The DOMGL has thus excluded words that are not in use anymore, unlike other contemporary dictionaries, which misleadingly augment their entries by including

obsolete words. The DOCMG has included only the words that are in frequent use within the linguistic community, irrespective of their origin (learned or vernacular), granted that they are in use by the majority of speakers in urban centres. This however was based more on the compilers' consensus and sense of language rather than on the use of an extended corpus (Petrounias 1985, 2000).

The collection of facts of usage helps the lexicographer to decide on the frequency and commonness of use of one type, word or meaning rather than another. The question of what linguistic corpus can yield reliable information on such queries is a thorny matter in Greek lexicography (Goutsos et al. 1995). Up to the present time there is no large collection, electronic or other, of linguistic data.²⁴ What most dictionary compilers do is to collect usages and examples as they are found in previous dictionaries and reuse or modify them, something that the dictionaries in question also do to a lesser or greater extent.

The DOMGL collected "utterances from everyday spoken or written language, proverbs, song lyrics and literary works ... and [sic] 'other linguistic sources'" (p.32). Apart from that, it made extensive use of the Lexicographical Archive of the Linguistics Library at Athens University, which was compiled in the 1970's. The DOCMG (p.xix) lists three sources from which the compilers drew their examples and usages: "a) literature, b) the press (editions, newspapers, magazines) and T.V. and radio, c) the lexicographer's own intuition and introspection". The dictionary's compilers have also used the extensive corpus of words and their usages as they are found in the corpus of the literature of the eighteenth century onwards, offered by professor L. Politis.

It becomes evident that both dictionaries have recourse to literary texts, a lexicographical method that Kahane & Kahane (1967:252-253) clearly consider inadequate for the collection of lexicographical data, and to outdated linguistic corpora, a practice that eventually risks misleading the lexicographers, leaving introspection and opinion to lead their choices.

Choice of vocabulary

Detailed examination of the entries of each dictionary reveals words that have been included in the one but not in the other. In the absence of a reliable and updated Greek corpus, it seems that the lexicographer's intentions and personal choices determine the final selection of vocabulary, regardless of the evidence yielded by the collection of citations and facts of usage. Given the dispute over language in the past century and after the 1976 reform (see above), vocabulary has been affected the most and still bears salient traces of the diglossic past. The inclusion/exclusion and treatment of obsolete, archaic words, and words of learned origin, can thus betray the lexicographer's standpoint.

For example, such purist words as *ayelidon* ('in hordes'), *amitor* ('with no mother'), *anafandon* ('suddenly'), *anir* ('man'), *aroura* ('earth'), *δapsilis* ('abundant'), *ekpomastron* ('cork-screw'), *hemeis* ('we'), *hymeis* ('you', pl.), *kalipiyos* ('having well-shaped buttocks'), *kiðome* ('take care of'), *kisostefis* ('ivy crowned'), *klitis* ('slope'), *kimvalizo* ('play the cymbals'), *kinoktonia* ('dog killing'), *lixo* ('leak'), *mitir* ('mother'), *mitrothen* ('from the mother'), *omilo* ('speak'), *oro* ('see'), *ostis* ('whoever'), *periayo*

(‘draw round’), *perialifo* (‘smear all over’), *periapton* (‘charm’, n.), *periavvazo* (‘illuminate’), *poliistor* (‘very learned’), *pous* (‘foot’), *rinomkatron* (‘handkerchief’), *ripto* (‘throw’), *talas* (‘wretched’), *xame* (‘on the ground’), *xiroktio* (‘gloves’), and many more are included in the DOMGL but not in the DOCMG. But such words could by no means be considered as part of the synchronic vocabulary of standard Modern Greek, and thus included in such a dictionary.²⁵

On the other hand, it is true that the DOMGL includes more foreign loanwords and neologisms than the DOCMG does. Words like *bras-de-fer*, *beatnik*, *manage+aro* (<manager + Greek verb ending), *globalisation*, *rap* (music), *rockabilly*, *snack*, *skateboard*, *in*, *techno* (music) are included in the DOMGL but not in the DOCMG. The latter includes words like *yuppie*, *manager*, *management*, *tabloid*, which are also included in the DOMGL. This is clearly an attempt by the compilers of the DOMGL to be seen as up-to-date by including recently coined words, without however checking first on their frequency of use and popularity among speakers. It excludes, however, other foreign loanwords, like *limit-up*, *crash test*, *new wave*, *franchising*, with no obvious reason. Nonetheless, the fact that the compiler uses cross-references to words of Greek origin in his attempt to propose Greek equivalents for foreign loanwords such as *management*, *montage*, *black out*, *shock*, *cheque*, *goal*, *scanner*, *tanker*, *press conference*, *multimedia*, *internet*, *interview*, *debraillage*, *ascenseur*, etc. is a practice which illustrates in a certain way the prescriptive tendencies of the particular dictionary. For the same entries, the DOCMG uses no cross-references between the two entries.

Overall, the fact that the DOMGL chooses to include tables and usage notes concerning the rules which apply when using the ancient Greek accent marks (polytonic system), the aspirated words,²⁶ and conjugates the personal pronouns of Modern Greek in parallel with those of Ancient Greek, presents a fuzzy image of what really is Modern Greek and what not. The compiler presents the linguistic information on the entries and the notes in a diachronic continuum, without clearly distinguishing the boundaries between Attic, Hellenistic, Medieval, Purist and Modern Greek, thus illustrating his thesis on the uninterrupted history of Greek language (see above). On the basis of the above evidence one could then argue that the object of description, that is Modern Greek, is ill defined in the DOMGL.

Stylistic Labelling

Despite the fact that both dictionaries use a long list of labellings in order to define the context of use for each entry, they apply this in a rather inconsistent way and certainly not on the basis of concordance tables or contexts of use provided by corpus search. Therefore, the stylistic labelling of the entries in both dictionaries shows marked disagreement in the categorisation of words and their context of use.

It seems odd to come across the category label *arxeoprepes* (‘archaic’) as a comment on the use of words like *pediothen* (‘from a child’), *amitor* (‘with no mother’), or *vroxidon* (‘unceasingly’), in a dictionary of Modern Greek like the DOMGL. The DOCMG uses the label *loyio / aparxeomeno* (‘learned / obsolete’) instead, for words that

both dictionaries include and which the DOMGL describes as 'archaic', such as *hemeteros* ('ours'), *kion* ('dog'), *ikos* ('house'), *pas* ('everybody').

The description of Greek vocabulary in its present state becomes even more obscured and confusing when the reader comes across words labelled *arxeos* ('ancient') in the DOMGL: *aroura* ('earth, ground'), *anir* ('man'), *kisostefis* ('ivy crowned'), *perialifo* ('smear all over'). There are even some cases -- presumably due to oversight -- where there is no stylistic labelling at all for words used admittedly only in purist and formal or obsolete contexts, like: *δρις* ('oak'), *δiname* ('be strong enough'), *isxis* ('strength'), *periskeliða* ('leg-band'), *pilos* ('a close fitting cap'), *γiras* ('old age').

There seems to be confusion over the 'learned origin' of a word and its use in a 'purist/learned/formal' context. It should be noted for the history of Greek vocabulary that "a word that is of learned origin is not necessarily used in a learned/formal context at present" (Petrounias 1985:398). The origin of words is dealt with in the etymology section of the entry, whereas the style and context of use of a word is part of the main entry, where it is a valuable source of information for the user (Jackson & Ze Amvela 2000). The DOMGL uses rather fuzzy criteria in order to determine what the difference among 'archaic', 'rare' and 'purist' is. The DOCMG on the other hand clearly states its policy and agenda in determining the origin and use of words (see Petrounias 1985). There are however cases where the labelling is not consistent in the DOCMG either, especially with regard to the feminine names of nouns referring to professions.

Overall, the DOMGL attempts to validate the presence and synchronic use of more purist types than the DOCMG does. It is important to note here that the DOCMG includes a lot of purist types too -- also included in the DOMGL -- something which attests the fact that elements of learned origin have irreversibly been incorporated into Modern Greek vocabulary over the years (Iordanidou 1996, 2002). The lexicographers seem to opt for words that they believe the speakers use in their everyday communicative interactions or suggest that they should use, rather than words that the speakers actually utter.

Phonology and morphology

On the level of phonology and morphology the two dictionaries present a conflicting image as to what linguistic types are still used, and which ones are more common than others. Both dictionaries appear to end up following a prescriptive rather than a descriptive approach, emanating from their different standpoints on language and their wish to put an order to the rather complex present morpho-phonological system of Greek (Iordanidou 1996, 2002).

In the phonological system of Katharevousa, consonant clusters with two fricatives like [fθ], [χθ] and [sχ] were typical in the beginning or in the middle of words. However, in Demotic, they were replaced, through the process of dissimilation, by the combination of a fricative and a plosive, that is [ft], [xt] and [sk] respectively (Triandafilidis 1941; see also Browning 1983). With this in mind, the description of the actual practice and the choices of the two dictionaries reveals quite a lot about their respective tendencies. The DOMGL puts the [fθ], [χθ] and [sχ] variables first, when it

includes the phonological doublet, whereas the DOCMG does exactly the opposite: *fθinos~fiinos* ('cheap'), *xθes~xtes* ('yesterday'), *sxrara~skara* ('grill'), *fθano~ftano* ('arrive'), *sxizo~skizo* ('tear'). Nonetheless, the search in the HNC (28,026,366 words) proves that the [fθ], [xθ] and [sχ] variables are far more frequent for the words *fθinos*, *xθes* and *sxara*, whereas the results are quite the opposite in the case of the verbs *ftano* and *skizo*.²⁷ The criteria for the preference of one over the other variable are not clear in either dictionary and there is no comment on the stylistic effects of their respective use. The choice to put the one before the other variable in the dictionary entry could only be decided on the basis of a corpus frequency index, which is lacking in both.²⁸

Another typical consonant cluster in Katharevousa consisted of two plosives like [pt] and [kt], which were replaced in Demotic, according to the dissimilation process, into [ft] and [χt] respectively: *epta~efta* ('seven'), *okto~oxto* ('eight'), *vaptizo~vaftizo* ('christen'), *ktizo~xtizo* ('built'). The DOMGL puts the purist variables first, followed by the demotic ones, whereas the DOCMG presents them in the reverse order. The results of the HNC search, however, validate the DOMGL's choice only in the case of the numerals *epta* and *okto*, but not in the case of the verbs *vaftizo* and *xtizo*.²⁹ Again both dictionaries fail to describe the actual use and end up prescribing the purist or the demotic variable in turn. In cases where both dictionaries accept the same order in presenting the phonological doublets, on the ground of their established use, the DOMGL chooses to label one or the other type. When the purist type is presented first, the demotic type is labelled as *laikoteros* ('more popular') or *kaθimerinos* ('colloquial'), whereas when the demotic type is presented first, the purist type is labelled as *loyioteros* ('more purist'). In all cases, the DOCMG presents the doublets with no labelling of either type.

There are even cases where the DOMGL chooses to present both variables, while the DOCMG has only one, the demotic: *nixterinos~(nikterinos)* ('nocturne'), *kaθreftis~(kaθreptis)* ('mirror'), *xtena~(ktena)* ('comb'), *xtipos~(ktipos)* ('beat'). The frequency lists in the HNC prove indeed that the purist variables in parenthesis for the words *xtena* and *xtipos* are no longer used in Modern Greek, whereas *nikterinos* and *kaθreptis* still occur, only seldom.³⁰ In this case, the DOCMG chooses to omit the purist variables on no obvious basis, whereas the DOMGL by assigning to one of the two variables a stylistic label not based on frequency of use, limits the use to a particular style, and thus marginalises it, rather than completely eradicating it, something which still falls within purist and prescriptive practice (Thomas 1991).

The same applies to the morphological variables of nouns and verbs. The DOMGL gives ad hoc morphological information about the conjugation of nouns and verbs, whereas the DOCMG includes in an appendix the conjugation tables of nouns, adjectives and verbs (pp.1515-1532). The DOMGL chooses to indicate the purist forms of some nouns, by including them as sub-entries in the dictionary. It thus gives the alternative forms of nouns, labelled as 'more purist' or simply 'purist' like: *vasilias*, *GEN. vasileos*, **NOM. vasilefs* ('king') // *erotideas* **NOM. erotidefs* ('young Eros') // *iyemonas* **NOM. iyemoon* ('one who leads') // *presviopas* **NOM. presviops* ('long sighted'). The DOCMG does not include these doublets at all, since their purist endings have been morphologically transformed into demotic ones, thus: -efs > -eas or >-ias, -oon > -onas, etc. (Triandafilidis 1941; see also Browning 1983 and Iordanidou 2002).

Morphological doublets can be found in the verb system, mainly for the endings of the past passive: -st- instead of -sθ-, -xt- instead of -xθ-, -ft- instead of -fθ- and -V+ti- instead of -V+θi-. Those consonant clusters with two fricatives are purist. It is not easy to claim which of the two types is more frequent among speakers, unless the lexicographer has indeed recourse to an electronic corpus of Greek, which would provide one with frequency lists.³¹ At present, the choices of the two dictionaries are based on the compilers' consensus. The DOMGL generally tends to give the purist ending together with the demotic one, whereas the DOCMG generally omits the purist one except for some rare cases. DOMGL thus gives the alternative purist forms for the past passive of verbs like *embistevome* ('trust') > *embisteftika* & (purist) *embistefθika* // *kataskevazome* ('be constructed') > *kataskevastika* & (purist) *kataskevasθika* // *aspazome* ('embrace') > *aspastika* & (purist) *aspasθika* // *orizome* ('be defined') > *oristika* & (purist) *orisθika* // *isxirizome* ('claim') > *isxiristika* & (purist) *isxirisθika*, but not for verbs like *xriazome* ('need'), *anakatevome* ('interfere'), *onomazome* ('be named'), *gremizome* ('be demolished'), without a clear reason behind this preference.³² Interestingly, the DOMGL puts the purist type first for some verbs like: *listevome* ('be robbed') > *listeftika* & (colloq.) *listeftika* // *talandevome* ('waver') > *talandefθika* & (colloq.) *talandeftika* // *pezome* ('be played') > *pexθika* & (colloq.) *pextika*. Such a choice is not at all confirmed by HNC search, which proves the preponderance of the demotic ones instead. In fact *listefθika* and *talandefθika* are non existent in the HNC.³³

Overall, the DOCMG opts for an overgeneralised preponderance of the demotic endings regardless of the register and actual use, becoming thus prescriptive on its own right. The DOMGL does not seem to use any consistent criteria that could explain the preponderance of one variable over the other and justify the lexicographer's choices. Hence, the phonological and morphological variables that still exist in Modern Greek are treated in both dictionaries in an inconsistent and haphazard way that obscures the information on their frequency of use and the registers in which they are more likely to occur (Iordanidou 2002).

Etymology

Even if the etymology of words is irrelevant to the functioning of the vocabulary in a language, as Jackson & Ze Amvela (2000) maintain, it can still betray the lexicographer's intention to prove and verify the rootedness and historicity of a particular language (Gallardo 1980). This has been the case with past dictionaries, evaluated by Petrounias (1985), where the origins of Greek words were directly traced back to Ancient Greek and no foreign loanwords would be easily recognised as such. Overall, the etymology was heavily based on orthography and exclusively on the form of words (Petrounias 1985, 1997).

Apart from a large number of words that Modern Greek has directly inherited through the popular tradition, from Hellenistic Koine ('inherited words'), there is an even larger number of words that have been coined in modern times under the purist tradition. These words were the product of extensive borrowing, either from internal resources, in an attempt to accommodate new meanings coming from abroad by expanding the

meaning of ancient words that were thus reintroduced into the modern vocabulary ('semantic borrowing'), or from external resources by translating foreign words into Greek, and thus concealing the foreign nationality of the lender language ('loan translations'). The case of loan translations in Modern Greek is even more complicated because the original word could be an 'internationalism', initially coined abroad on the basis of Greek and/or Latin elements, thus giving an Ancient Greek outward appearance, but in reality being a foreign word translated into Modern Greek (Petrounias 1997).

Internationalisms like *athlitismos* ('athletics'), *anthropologia* ('anthropology'), *komounismos* ('communism'), *mikrovio* ('microbe'), *pragmatologia* ('pragmatics'), *psixologia* ('psychology'), and *sosialismos* ('socialism'), are described in the etymology section of the DOMGL as "Greek origin foreign words" or "the rendering of a foreign word in Greek". This practice obscures their true foreign origin and makes no reference to the learned tradition of those words, unlike the practice followed in the DOCMG that ascribes them directly to the foreign lender language, usually French or English. The same happens with semantic borrowings like: *eknevrizo* ('irritate'), *enθima* ('infix'), *efimerida* ('newspaper'), *kaθikon* ('duty'), *kendro* ('centre'). The DOMGL gives the reader the false impression that these words and their meanings come directly from Ancient Greek by relating them to the form of the ancient word and going even further to do a morphological analysis of it within the Ancient Greek system, disregarding completely the change of its meaning over the centuries.

With regard to loan translations, both the DOMGL and the DOCMG, unlike other previous dictionaries, attribute rightly the origin of words like *akoustiko* (<earphone), *diavatrio* (<passport), *kinoniologia* (<sociology), *ouranoksistis* (<sky-scraper), and *politismos* (<civilisation), to loan translation (Petrounias 1985, 2000). At the same time, however, the DOMGL takes many more words than the DOCMG does, to be 'Rückwanderungen', that is Greek origin words that foreign languages borrowed through the medium of Latin and later on were reintroduced into Greek, usually with a different form and meaning.³⁴ For example the DOMGL takes words like *ambari* ('container'), *varka* ('boat'), *yalotsa* ('galoshes'), *jambon* ('ham') and *penalti* ('penalty'), to originate in Ancient Greek words, something which the DOCMG does not accept and simply attributes them to a foreign lender language.

Another feature of the etymology section in the DOMGL is that it traces the history of words back to their ultimate root in the Indo-European language and gives cognates in other related languages.³⁵ This is presumably done in accordance with the lexicographer's thesis on the continuity and diachronic unity of the Greek language (see above, and Frangoudaki 1997, 2001). As a matter of fact, the lexicographer ends up confusing the reader about the description and history of Modern Greek. The DOCMG states right from the start (pp.xxi-xxii) that the extent of the etymological history of Modern Greek vocabulary should not go any further than the Hellenistic period, from which Modern Greek originates (Petrounias 1985; Christidis 1996).

The etymologies of the DOCMG prove that the purist tradition of the past century was allegedly trying to purify Greek from foreign elements, but in reality ended up borrowing foreign words or their meaning and concealing their true origin under an ancient Greek form.³⁶ At the same time, the dictionary acknowledges the learned origin of a great number of words which nowadays are part of the Modern Greek vocabulary

and can either be formally or informally used in everyday interaction. Moreover, it succeeds in comprehensively informing the reader on the derivational and combining mechanisms and rules of Modern Greek, by including prefixes, suffixes and combining forms as main entries in the dictionary. The DOMGL, on the other hand, does so to a less satisfactory extent and sometimes gives the reader the false impression that the phonological and morphological system of Modern Greek is haphazard and fuzzy, having recourse to that of Ancient Greek.

Spelling

Another level on which purism and prescription can easily be traced is the orthography of words. Greek, with a long tradition that can be traced back to antiquity, has inevitably undergone changes in its phonological system that resulted in a gap between the way words are spelled and the way they are pronounced. Even though there have been attempts to simplify the orthography of some words and especially that of foreign loanwords in Modern Greek, there still exists a number of words that are spelled in different ways and cause confusion to native and foreign speakers alike.

In the name of uniformity and etymological correctness, the compiler of the DOMGL proposes for a large number of words a different spelling from the one which has already been established among the members of the linguistic community (Kalioris 1998). Following the ancient root and etymology of the words, he opts for a spelling that retains their 'etymological origin', an etymologically motivated orthography which relates them directly to their ancient cognates. He proposes therefore the spelling *γλικysma* –with -y- for the word *γλικισμα* ('pastry') in order to maintain the Hellenistic orthography of the word. The same for the word *mitria* ('stepmother'), spelled *mitryia* in the DOMGL as in the ancient word, and *lianos* ('thin') spelled *leianos* –with -ei- as the ancient word from which it derives.³⁷

The DOCMG accepts the spelling of words as prescribed in the Grammar of Modern Greek (Demotic) by Triandafilidis (1941), except for minor deviations. It opts for a more simplified historic orthography and for a simplified spelling of 'Rückwanderungen' that have been reintroduced to Modern Greek through the popular tradition, except for those that have been introduced through the learned tradition, and thus retain their historic spelling. The former are thus spelled in a simplified way: *γarifalo* ('carnation'), *γoma* ('latex'), *kanela* ('cinnamon'), *tsiroto* ('plaster'), whereas the DOMGL chooses to spell them in a way that copies their ancient Greek cognates, thus *γaryfallo* [<AG *karyofyllon*], *γomma* [<AG *kommi*], *kannela* [<AG *kanni*], *tserooto* [<AG *kerooton*]. This choice is related to the DOMGL compiler's attempt to trace ancient Greek origins to a larger number of words than what the DOCMG accepts (see above).

As far as foreign loanwords are concerned, overall, both dictionaries agree on a simplified orthography, closer to the phonetic rather than the foreign spelling. Foreign loanwords like 'train' and 'style' are therefore spelled *treno* instead of *traino* and *stil* instead of *styl*.

Final remarks

The overall impression, given the entries included and the alternative types provided, is that the variety and richness that the DOCMG tries to describe lies in different registers and styles, whereas the variety which the DOMGL sets out to describe is more historically directed, either towards the past of the Greek language or towards the future, since numbers of words in current use are included that might only last temporarily.

The DOMGL tries to give an up-to-date description of Modern Greek by including a large number of neologisms and foreign words that have only recently been introduced and whose viability is doubtful. At the same time, the lexicographer manifests and underlines in every possible way, for example through choice of vocabulary and the information provided on the morphology and etymology of words, the continuous, uninterrupted and unique history of Greek, without however clearly distinguishing Ancient Greek from the Hellenistic and Medieval periods. The DOCMG, in accordance with its programmatic statements, ends up being more a prescriptive than a purely descriptive dictionary of Modern Greek, dropping the purist variables for the demotic ones in the morpho-phonological section, disregarding therefore the fact that speakers still choose them in some cases in the real use of language, as the HNC search has proved. At the same time, to the surprise of some radical demoticists, it acknowledges the presence of a large number of words of learned origin within the present Modern Greek vocabulary in the etymology information it provides.

According to Gallardo (1980: 61) the function of dictionaries is twofold, they are a reflection of the characteristic way in which a language has been standardised and at the same time an influence on this process. The compilation of a dictionary of Modern Greek is no longer a question of describing two co-existing codes, which reflect the social, political and ideological standpoints of their speakers. It is rather a matter of setting out to describe the Modern Greek vocabulary and its co-existing morpho-phonological variables so as to explain the exact context of use and the level of formality for each. Granted that the two recently published dictionaries claim to be the most authoritative and comprehensive ones since 1976, it is quite revealing to remark that their compilers have reached a different consensus concerning the origin of words constituting the Modern Greek vocabulary, their morphological doublets and their use.

This proves that the process of standardisation is not over yet, and that the two dictionaries attempt to affect and in some way or another lead this standardisation process -- the DOMGL by describing Greek as a language that bears 4,000 years of uninterrupted history and thus fears no foreign linguistic imperialisms, and the DOCMG by describing Greek as a standard language that has since Hellenistic times inevitably inherited a number of words of learned origin in the process of its constitution as a standard language.

Finally, the fact that some critics of the DOMGL would have expected it to include more purist words in use today and even to use the older accentuation system (see Kalioris 1998), and that those of the DOCMG commented on the dictionary's tolerance to words of learned origin, indicates that the dictionary-buying public and therefore the speakers of a language have expectations which might reflect a completely different attitude towards the present day linguistic situation. The speakers' expectations about, and attitudes towards the language they speak and use should ultimately be taken seriously in the compilation of a contemporary dictionary. In this respect, the use of an

extended electronic corpus of Modern Greek could be of great value for the description of the present linguistic situation.

Conclusion

Even though “the existence of a dictionary in and of itself is not normally sufficient for the designation of a language as standard”, as Joseph puts it (1987:72), it is obvious from this paper that the two lexicographers intended to influence the standardisation process in Greek. Nonetheless, they proceeded from opposite starting points. The DOMGL, being more prescriptive than it programmatically states, adopts a purist tolerance, whereas the DOCMG chooses to simply record the existing variables, but with a bias towards Demotic morphology and phonology that makes it prescriptive too, in its own way.

The two institutions behind the dictionaries have long engaged in a public dispute on language, especially in the years following the 1976/1982 reforms. It is thus only to be expected that they would reflect their views in their respective dictionaries. In standing up for their respective ideologies, they were nevertheless forced to make compromises to take into account the actual use of the Greek language among its speakers.

As a consequence, the DOMGL has included far more neologisms and foreign terms than the DOCMG has, even though its compiler has criticised in the past the low standards of language spoken by teenagers and has argued against the allegedly high number of foreign words, mostly English, colonising Greek (Babiniotis 1984). He nonetheless follows a lexical purism, targeting loanwords and internationalisms, either by proposing the Greek equivalent next to the foreign entry or by obscuring the foreign origin of loan translations of learned origin in the etymology section.

The DOCMG takes a rational stand, acknowledging the presence of purist words in use today as well as the learned origin of a large number of words, something which radical demoticists of the past would be reluctant to accept. At the same time, the dictionary, coming as it does from the same institute that released the official State Grammar of Modern Greek (Demotic), by M. Triandafilidis, some sixty years ago, chooses to follow almost without deviation the orthographic principles set out there, and attempts to establish the Demotic morphology as the norm among the speakers.

The almost simultaneous publication of the two dictionaries confirms that the Greek linguistic community is no longer diglossic. It thus proves Ferguson's (1959:340) tentative prognosis, that the future of Greek is “the full development to unified standard based on L of Athens”, right all along the line. Besides it indicates a maturing standardisation process that wavers, however, in the prescription-description continuum. As it stands, both dictionaries have admittedly raised the standards despite their respective contradicting choices and henceforth prepared the ground for a prosperous lexicographical production in Modern Greek.

References

- Alexiou, M. 1982. "Diglossia in Greece". Haas, W., ed. 1982: 156-192.
- Alissandratos, G. 1980. "Τα νεοελληνικά λεξικά. Συνοπτικό διάγραμμα [Ta neolinika leksika. Sinoptiko diagrama]". *Diavazo*, 32: 26-36 (Part 1) & 34: 30-44 (Part 2).
- Anastasiadis, A. 2000. "Το λεξικό της Κοινής Νεοελληνικής: σχεδιασμός – συμβολή – χρήση [To leksiko tis Kinis Neolinikis: sxediasmos – simvoli – xrisi]". *The Teaching of Modern Greek*, 5th annual symposium: 47-56. Thessaloniki: Kodikas.
- Babinotis, G. 1978. "Πέρα της καθαρευούσης και της δημοτικής [Pera tis katharevousis ke tis dimotikis]". Panou, S., ed. 1978: 149-158.
- Babinotis, G. 1984. "Νεοελληνική γλώσσα: Μέριμνα, αμεριμνησία και υπερπροστασία [Neoliniki glossa: Merimna, amerimnesia ke iperprostasia]". Hellenikos Glossikos Omilos. 1984. *Eliniki Glossa*, Vol.1: 138-161. Athens: Kardamitsa.
- Babinotis, G. 1998. *Λεξικό της Νέας Ελληνικής Γλώσσας [Leksiko tis Neas Elinikis Glossas]*. Athens: Kendro Leksikologias.
- Barnhart, C.L. 1980. "What makes a dictionary authoritative". Zgusta, L., ed. 1980: 33-42.
- Browning, R. 1982. "Greek Diglossia yesterday and today". *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 35: 49-68.
- Browning, R. 1983. *Medieval and Modern Greek*. Second Edition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Christidis, A.Ph. 1996. "The Modern Greek language and its history". *The Greek Language*. 1996: 71-74.
- Christidis, A.Ph. 1999. *Γλώσσα, Πολιτική, Πολιτισμός [Glossa, Politiki, Politismos]*. Athens: Polis.
- Coulmas, F., ed. 1991. *A language policy for the European Community: Prospects and Quandaries*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Evangelatos, S., ed. 1990. *Δ.Κ. Βυζάντιος. Η Βαβυλωνία [D.K. Vyzantios: Babylonia]*. Athens: Hermes.
- Ferguson, C.A. 1959. "Diglossia". *Word*, 15: 325-340.
- Frangoudaki, A. 1992. "Diglossia and the present language situation in Greece: A sociological approach to the interpretation of diglossia and some hypotheses on today's linguistic reality". *Language in Society*, 21: 365-381.
- Frangoudaki, A. 1996. "On Greek diglossia: the ideological determinants of a long-standing social conflict over language". *The Greek Language*. 1996: 83-89.
- Frangoudaki, A. 1997. "The metalinguistic prophecy on the decline of the Greek language: its social function as the expression of a crisis in Greek national identity". *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 126: 63-82.
- Frangoudaki, A. 2001. *Η Γλώσσα και το Έθνος, 1880-1980: Εκατό χρόνια αγώνες για την αυθεντική Ελληνική Γλώσσα [I glossa ke to Ethnos. 1880-1980: Ekato xronia agones gia tin afthendiki Eliniki Glossa]*. Athens: Alexandria.
- Gallardo, A. 1980. "Dictionaries and the standardization process". Zgusta, L., ed. 1980: 59-69.
- Goutsos, D., Philip, K. & Chadjidaki, R. 1995. "Η χρήση των corpus στη λεξικογραφία και η περιγραφή της Νέας Ελληνικής [I xrisi ton corpus sti leksikografia ke I perigrafi tis Neas Elinikis]". *Studies in Greek Linguistics: Proceedings of the 15th annual meeting*: 843-854. Thessaloniki: Kyriakides.
- Haas, W., ed. 1982. *Standard languages: spoken and written*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Householder, F.W. & Saporta, S., eds. 1967. *Problems in Lexicography*. Indiana University.
- Hudson, R. 1988. "The linguistic foundations for lexical research and dictionary design". *International Journal of Lexicography*, 1: 287-312.
- Institute of Modern Greek Studies (Manolis Triandafilidis Foundation). 1987. *Λεξικό της Νέας Ελληνικής Γλώσσας. Δείγμα Ζ-Η-Θ-Ι [Leksiko tis Neas Elinikis Glossas. Digma Z-H-Θ-I]*. Thessaloniki.
- Institute of Modern Greek Studies (Manolis Triandafilidis Foundation). 1998. *Λεξικό της Κοινής Νεοελληνικής [Leksiko tis Kinis Neolinikis]*. Thessaloniki: ZHTH Publishers.
- Iordanidou, A. 1996. " 'Standard' Κοινή Νεοελληνική: απόπειρα καθορισμού ['Standard' Kini Neoliniki: apopira kathorismou]". *Strong and Weak languages in the EU: Aspects of linguistic hegemonism*:

- Proceedings of the meeting, Thessaloniki, 25 April 1996: 139-147. Thessaloniki: Centre for the Greek Language.
- Iordanidou, A. 2002. "Η Κοινή Νεοελληνική σε σύγχρονα λεξικά και γραμματικές [I Kini Neoliniki se sigxrona leksika ke gramatikes]". *Terminologie et Traduction*, 3. (to appear).
- Jackson, H. & Ze Amvela, E. 2000. *Words, Meaning and Vocabulary: an introduction to modern English Lexicography*. London: Cassell.
- Joseph, J.E. 1987. *Eloquence and Power: the rise of language standards and standard languages*. London: Francis Pinter.
- Kahane, H. & Kahane, R. 1967. "Problems in Greek lexicography". Householder, F.W. & Saporta, S., eds. 1967: 249-262.
- Kakava, Chr. 1997. "Sociolinguistics and Modern Greek: past, current, and future directions". *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 126: 5-32.
- Kalioris, G.M. 1998. "Το λεξικό Μπαμπινιώτη [To leksiko Babinioti]". *Nea Estia*, 1706: 1056-1082.
- Liakos, A. 1996. "Language and history in modern Greece". *The Greek Language*. 1996: 75-82.
- Mikros, G., Gavrielidou, M., Lambropoulou, P. & Doukas, G. 1996. "Χθες ή χτες; Μια ποσοτική μελέτη φωνητικών και μορφολογικών στοιχείων σε κείμενα της Νέας Ελληνικής [Xthes i xtes? Mía posotiki meleti fonitikon ke morfologikon stixion se kimena tis Neas Elinikis]". *Studies in Greek Linguistics: Proceedings of the 16th annual meeting*: 645-656. Thessaloniki: Kyriakides.
- Panou, S., ed. 1978. *Για τη Δημοτική Γλώσσα [Gia ti Dimotiki Glossa]*. Athens: Grigoris.
- Papatzikou-Cochran, E. 1997. "An instance of triglossia? Codeswitching as evidence for the present state of Greece's 'language question' ". *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 126: 33-62.
- Pavlidou, Th. 1991. "Linguistic nationalism and European Community: the case of Greece". Coulmas, F., ed. 1991: 279-289.
- Petrounias, E. 1985. "Τα λεξικά της Νέας Ελληνικής, οι ετυμολογίες τους και οι ετυμολογίες του λεξικού του Ιδρύματος Τριανταφυλλίδη [Ta leksika tis Neas Elinikis, i etimologies tous ke i etimologies toy leksikou tou Idrimatos Triandafilidi]". *Studies in Greek Linguistics: Proceedings of the 3rd annual meeting*: 307-416. Thessaloniki: Kyriakides.
- Petrounias, E. 1997. "Loan translations and the etymologies of Modern Greek". *Greek Linguistics '95: Proceedings of the 2nd International Conference on Greek Linguistics, Salzburg 1997* ed. by G. Drachman, M. Malikouti-Drachman et al., vol.II: 791-801. Graz: W.Neugebauer Verlag GmbH.
- Petrounias, E. 2000. "Οι ιδιαιτερότητες της νεοελληνικής ετυμολογίας [I idieterotites tis neolinikis etimologias]". *The Teaching of Modern Greek*, 5th annual symposium: 57-89. Thessaloniki: Kodikas.
- Setatos, M. 1973. "Φαινομενολογία της Καθαρεύουσας [Fenomenologia tis Katharevousas]". *Epistimoniki Epetirida Philosophikis Scholis Panepistimiou Thessalonikis*, 12: 43-80.
- Setatos, M. 1978. "Το γλωσσικό ζήτημα και η καθιέρωση της δημοτικής στα πλαίσια της γενικής γλωσσολογίας [To glossiko zitima ke i kathierosi tis dimotikis sta plesia tis genikis glossologias]". Panou, S., ed. 1978: 81-87.
- The Greek Language*. 1996. Trilingual Edition (Greek-English-French) of the Ministry of National Education and Religions. Athens.
- Thomas, G. 1991. *Linguistic Purism*. London: Longman.
- Triandafilidis, M. 1941. *Νεοελληνική Γραμματική (της Δημοτικής) [Neoliniki Gramatiki (tis Dimotikis)]*. Athens: Organismos Ekdoseos Didaktikon Vivlion.
- Vitti, M. 1987². *Ιστορία της Νεοελληνικής Λογοτεχνίας [Istoria tis Neolinikis Logotexnias]*. Athens: Odyseas [transl. of Vitti, M. 1971. *Storia della letteratura Neogreca*. Torino:ERI/RAI].
- Zgusta, L., ed. 1980. *Theory and method in lexicography: western and non-western perspectives*. Columbia, S.C.: Hornbeam.

La publication d'un dictionnaire est un moyen pour décrire, codifier et finalement normaliser une langue. Ce processus devient même plus compliqué par rapport à l'attitude propre du lexicographe envers la langue et par rapport à la sensibilité du public vers les questions de langage. Le cas de la publication récente des deux dictionnaires les plus prestigieux du Grec Moderne, et leur traitement des informations lexicales divergent, prouvent que les tendances idéologiques de deux instituts d'édition à propos de l'histoire du Grec, et que leurs oppositions face à la question de la langue pendant les dernières décennies survivent toujours, 25 années après la résolution constitutionnelle de la diglossie en Grèce, et affectent encore la façon dans laquelle ils décrivent l'état synchronique du langage. Ainsi, les deux dictionnaires procédant à partir de points de départ différents, essaient d'influencer et régler l'allure de la normalisation du Grec Moderne, en présentant le public avec deux aspects différents de la synchronie : l'un qui se concentre sur l'histoire longue de la langue et ainsi prend l'état actuel pour être seulement une partie dans la chaîne ininterrompue datant de l'antiquité ; l'autre qui se concentre sur l'état actuel du Grec et ainsi prend ce code entièrement autonome et développé pour être issu des processus d'évolution linguistique et des changements socio-culturels du passé en réponse aux besoins actuels de la communauté linguistique. L'absence d'un corpus suffisamment représentatif a retenu la capacité descriptive de tous les deux dictionnaires et a donné espace pour que l'idéologie émerge, malgré le fait que tous les deux ont fait des concessions afin d'expliquer la langue grecque d'aujourd'hui.

Assimakis Tseronis
Universiteit van Amsterdam
Graduate School for Humanities
Spuistraat 210
1012 VT Amsterdam
The Netherlands

e-mail: assimoste@yahoo.fr

Assimakis Tseronis

Born in 1975, in Athens, Greece. B.A. at Kapodistrian University of Athens on Philology and Linguistics (1993-1998). M.A. at Lancaster University on Language Studies: Critical Discourse Analysis (1999-2000). Main areas of interest: Sociolinguistics and Discourse Analysis, Language contact, Minority languages, Linguistic rights, Language and Ideology. Currently research student at Universiteit van Amsterdam, Graduate School for Humanities, funded by the State Scholarships Foundation of Greece (I.K.Y.).

Notes

This paper is an extended, partially revised and updated version of an essay initially written for the Sociolinguistics course during my MA at Lancaster. I am indebted to Mark Sebba for supporting me

throughout and commenting on earlier drafts. I am grateful to Anna Frangoudaki and Anna Iordanidou for critical comments on the first and second part of the paper respectively. I wish to thank Pavlina Markomichali for the discussions we had. All errors and omissions are wholly my responsibility.

¹ All the information concerning Greek dictionaries (titles, dates, compilers and entries) is based on an article in two parts by G. Alissandratos (1980) and on the Lexicographical Appendix on "Dictionaries of Modern Greek" by G. Babiniotis (1998) included in his dictionary, pp.2033-2064. Information, mostly regarding their etymological coverage, was also drawn on a paper by Petrounias (1985).

² See Papatzikou-Cochran (1997:56, n.16) for the linguistic parties and their actual political power.

³ Except for two specialised dictionaries: *Collection of scholarly new words created from 1453 up to our time* by St. Koumanoudis published in 2 volumes in 1900, and *Synonyms and word families* by P. Vlastos published in 1931.

⁴ Two plays that bear no other similarities whatsoever, one written in 1813 and the other in 1836, made fun of the variety of languages and dialects spoken at the time, which made everyday communication an adventure. The former, entitled *Korakistika*, was written by I.R. Neroulos and criticised Korais's 'middle way' language as well as the other geographical dialects, and eventually supported the archaisation of language as the only way that a unified code could prevail (Vitti 1987²). The latter, entitled *Babylonia*, was written by D.K. Vyzantios and criticised the linguistic situation at that time, by presenting characters original from Peoloponnese, Chios, Crete, Cyprus and Asia Minor who could not understand each other and ended up fighting due to a misunderstanding (Evangelatos 1990).

⁵ I use the term following Thomas's typological framework of puristic orientations (Thomas 1991:75-81).

⁶ The Ionian Academy in Corfu founded and inaugurated by Frederick North, count of Guilford, in 1824 was the first official academic establishment to accept the spoken vernacular as the language of instruction (Vitti 1987²: 238-239).

⁷ See note 5 above.

⁸ The commission was made on 14 December 1938 by the Ministry of Religions and National Education to a committee of scholars coming from the Aristotelian University of Thessaloniki under M. Triandafilidis. The first edition of the *Modern-Greek Grammar (of Demotic)* appeared in 1941, and it was reprinted with corrections in 1978 and became known as the *Triandafilidis Grammar*. In 1975 a second and abridged edition was published known as *Short Grammar of Modern Greek*, translated in many languages and used as a reference grammar book in compulsory education ever since.

⁹ *Modern-Greek Syntax (of Common Demotic)* by Achilleas Tzartzanos was first published in 1928. A second revised edition appeared in 1946. Let us note here, for the record, that A. Tzartzanos was also a member, among other prominent linguists like N.P. Andriotis (see below), of the committee for the compilation of the *Modern-Greek Grammar (of Demotic)*.

¹⁰ See Petrounias (1985) for a detailed analysis and evaluation of thirty five dictionaries of Modern Greek, and pp.409-413 for an English summary.

¹¹ Alexiou (1982: 172) uses an imaginary example of the linguistic development of an average student from a northern provincial town, born in 1952, who graduated from the University in 1974, to show the cognitive implications of diglossia.

¹² It is noteworthy that the question “what is the language we speak today?” has recently reappeared in 1999 newspaper articles by the same advocates of the two positions on the occasion of the release of the two dictionaries.

¹³ Among the members of the Society were the Nobel Prize winning poet O. Elytis, the writer G. Chimonas and the painter N. Chadjikiriakos-Ghikas. The Society published two volumes on the Greek language, in 1984 and 1986, under the title *Greek Language: quests and arguments*.

¹⁴ This emotive term was used in its non-technical sense by G. Babinotis in his papers published by the Greek Language Society in 1984 and 1986, in an attempt to draw attention on the status of the Greek language and its alleged threat by the influx of foreign terms. See Christidis (1999) for a critique.

¹⁵ The first grammar of Modern Greek was the *Grammar of the Common Language of Greeks*, written by N. Sofianos, from Corfu, and published in 1870. Katharevousa has never been codified or described as such in any grammar book. It was through the use of grammar books of the Ancient Greek Attic dialect that it was taught at school.

¹⁶ One such massive expression of concern about language was the public discussion on language, organised by the Greek Communist Parties in a stadium on 19th January 1985, which was attended by more than 3,500 people!

¹⁷ Both dictionaries have been reprinted, the DOMGL in July 1998, and the DOCMG in March 1999, with only minor corrections that do not affect the validity of the points made in this paper. In January 2002 the second edition of the DOMGL appeared. All references to the entries and introductory texts of both dictionaries made in this paper are taken from their first edition.

¹⁸ The compiler of the DOMGL was accused and brought to trial because the inclusion of the second meaning of the word *Boulgaros* ('Bulgarian'), in its pejorative and abusive usage as an insult for the supporters of a football team from Thessaloniki, was considered as racist and offensive by the majority of Northerners and fans of the team. He agreed to withdraw this pejorative meaning of the word from the second printing of his dictionary, in July 1998.

¹⁹ The categories are drawn from Hudson's checklist (1988, cited in Jackson & Ze Amvela 2000). The discussion draws its structure and commentary on the final chapter in Jackson & Ze Amvela (2000).

²⁰ The translation of extracts from the prefaces of both dictionaries cited in this paper is the author's.

²¹ It has always been a problem to translate '*Kini Neoliniki*' or '*Neoliniki Kini*' in English (see also Papatzikou-Cochran 1997:52). To opt for the term 'Common Modern Greek' would either refer to the variety of Greek spoken in urban centres, unaffected by dialectisms and special registers (Setatos 1978; Petrounias 2000), or imply a synthesis of the two previous codes, that is Demotic and Katharevousa, in a new one (Babinotis 1978). The term 'Standard Modern Greek' used by Browning (1982) presupposes the existence of a truly and fully standardised code, which apparently is not yet the case for Greek. In this paper the writer chose the term 'Common Modern Greek' for the title of the dictionary published by the Triandafilidis Institute because this is the way its compilers translate the term in their own papers published in English (see Petrounias 1997).

²² The cover in the second edition, published in 2002, only states “richer in meanings, uses and usage notes”.

²³ It is important to bear in mind throughout the analysis in this part of the paper that a close investigation of the way the two dictionaries were compiled shows a rather ad hoc lexicographical methodology and the lack of a long-term and solid policy on dictionary compilation. The inconsistencies in the stylistic labelling

and morpho-phonological variability in the entries of both dictionaries is just one example, which may eventually blunt any claims on underlying ideologies that have affected their respective lexical coverage (thanks to Iordanidou, personal communication, for this point).

²⁴ In the last couple of years the first attempts to compile electronic corpora of Modern Greek accessible on the Internet have been made by the Institute of Speech and Language Processing (ILSP) in Athens (www.corpus.ilsp.gr) and by the Centre for Greek Language (CGL) in Thessaloniki (www.komvos.edu.gr). In certain cases below (see the Phonology-Morphology section), only partial use is made of the Hellenic National Corpus (HNC) by ILSP in order to support the author's claims or check the claims of the lexicographers against the real use of language.

²⁵ The English translation of these words comes from the on-line Ancient Greek-English Dictionary by Liddel-Scott-Jones at the web site of the Perseus Project on Antiquity (www.perseus.tufts.edu).

²⁶ All these accentual marks (sharp~heavy accent and circumflex, smooth~rough/aspirate breathing) were abolished under the 1982 Reform, in favour of the monotonic (one accent) accentuation system. Nonetheless, one can still nowadays come across books, newspapers and magazines which continue to use the polytonic typeface.

²⁷ 'fθinos' (988 occurrences) ~ 'ftinos' (505), 'xθes' (27291) ~ 'xtes' (375), 'sxara' (61) ~ 'skara' (9). BUT 'ftano' (11206 occurrences) ~ 'fθano' (5788), 'skizo' (211) ~ 'sxizo' (69).

²⁸ A recent study of the distribution of consonant clusters in Modern Greek written texts proved that there is a consonant variability which reflects the stylistic variability of text types (Mikros et al. 1996). According to this study, the Demotic consonant clusters seem to be more frequent.

²⁹ 'epta' (1499 occurrences) ~ 'efta' (800), 'okto' (1306) ~ 'oxto' (542). BUT 'vaftizo' (302 occurrences) ~ 'vaptizo' (75), 'xtizo' (969) ~ 'ktizo' (393).

³⁰ 'xtena' (6) ~ 'ktena' (0), 'xtipos' (41) ~ 'ktipos' (0), 'nixterinos' (505) ~ 'nikterinos' (102), 'kaθreftis' (407) ~ 'kaθreptis' (39).

³¹ The quantitative study by Mikros et al. (1996) concluded that the Demotic consonant clusters are far more frequent in the case of Past Passive, something which is also confirmed by the HNC search (see below).

³² The HNC search proves that both variables of all the verbs cited are still in use, with the demotic ones by far more frequent, however: 'embisteftika' (84) ~ 'embistefθika' (67), 'kataskevastika' (579) ~ 'kataskevasθika' (156), 'aspastika' (34) ~ 'aspasθika' (25), 'oristika' (140) ~ 'orisθika' (95), 'isxiristika' (488) ~ 'isxirisθika' (96), 'anakateftika' (36) ~ 'anakatefθika' (12), 'xriastika' (2628) ~ 'xriasθika' (316), 'onomastika' (311) ~ 'onomasθika' (52), 'gremistika' (86) ~ 'gremisθika' (6).

³³ 'listeftika' (4) ~ 'listefθika' (0), 'talandeftika' (5) ~ 'talandefθika' (0), 'pextika' (301) ~ 'pexθika' (139).

³⁴ See for example the history of words like *aria* < ital. *aria* < AG *aer*, *diamandi* < ital. *diamante* < AG *adamas* -andos, *palavra* < span. *jew palavra* < Lat. *parabola* < AG *parabole*.

³⁵ This is not the case for all the entries. In fact, there are some entries that have no etymology information, despite the compiler's statement in the preface (p.34) that, "all the entries have their etymologies given". Sometimes the lexicographer gives only a chronological indication of the first appearance of the word in Greek, which is not reliable; in fact it is questioned by other linguists.

³⁶ See for example the case of the replacement of the allegedly foreign looking word *familia* for the Greek looking word *ikoyenia* in Petrounias (1997). The former is a direct loan from Latin *familia-ae*, dating from Hellenistic times, which has been used ever since. The latter is a loan translation of the nineteenth century of the Italian *famiglia*, coined on the basis of the Hellenistic Greek word *oikogeneia* < *oikos* + *genos*, which meant however 'certificate of origin of a homebred slave', not 'family'!

³⁷ He even proposes the spelling *plemmyra* for the word 'tide' instead of *plemyra* following the false etymology of the word in ancient Greek and disregarding the fact that the word was correctly spelled with one 'm' later on, during Hellenistic period and throughout medieval times! In the reprint as well as in the second edition of his dictionary the lexicographer gives the established orthography of those words in parenthesis, under the label 'school orthography'.