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This volume grew out of the Logos Conference, which took place in London on 9–11 September 2004, jointly organized by the Centre for Hellenic Studies, King’s College London, and the Society for the Promotion of Hellenic Studies. The publicity for the conference stressed the exploratory nature of the event: it sought to bring together scholars with a professional interest in the Greek language from different perspectives and, above all, with expertise in very different periods. The goal was to exchange ideas and concerns and engage in the sort of dialogue that disciplinary and chronological boundaries rarely allow.

Many of those involved in the conference were aware then (as the editors certainly have been, throughout the preparation of this volume) that a narrative of exceptionalism, combined with an ideologically charged and often overstated argument in favour of the continuity of the Greek language, has (arguably) encouraged many scholars to shy away from the project of putting the language’s past and present under scrutiny on the basis of a single focal concern. Chronological boundaries have in this case served as demarcation lines par excellence. In opposition to this tendency, our aim in the Logos conference, and by extension in this volume, has been to foreground thematic and analytical affinities on the broad topic of language standardization and standards, precisely at the expense of an approach that would privilege a linear chronological perspective. In this spirit, the volume is organized thematically into three parts – Establishing a Standard, Standardization Practices, Ideologies and Contestations – each of which covers a wide chronological span.

The inclusion of chapters in the volume has been decided on the basis of their representative and illustrative value, and on the understanding that, far from aiming at an exhaustive or monologic account,¹ our intention is to provide ‘snapshots’ from the long and complex history of Greek. In fact, our contributors tend to detect, not seamless transitions or deceptively homogeneous representations, but

¹ Two recent histories of the Greek language in English are notable: a definitive overview by Horrocks (1997) and the monumental edited volume by Christidis (2007), which ostensibly goes up to late antiquity, but in fact ventures much further.
disjunctures, fragmentations and discontinuities in a never-ending and multi-
faceted story of standardization, which subsumes many moves and counter-moves. 
In addition, none of the analyses in our collection falls into the trap of equating 
standardization choices with one particular agenda only or with clearly delimited 
boundaries of ‘before’ and ‘after’; nor have they set out to highlight uniqueness 
and lack of comparability with other languages. Rather, the truism that the Greek 
language, from antiquity to the present day, has had a long and distinctive history 
(of standardization too) serves here as the impetus for documenting the subtleties 
of standardization processes and the often elusive discourses (official and lay) that 
have actively shaped and been shaped by them. In this sense, all the chapters do 
something to uncover the importance of socio-cultural macro-forces (as against 
hard linguistic ‘facts’) for the construction of ideas of correctness and, more 
broadly, value, in respect of the Greek language, at various points in its history. It 
is intriguing to see in this process comparabilities emerging with diverse languages, 
sociolects and genres, from modern standard Arabic to British popular songs. It is 
also instructive to see which interrelationships each analyst seeks to establish and 
how these are relatable to (and arguably motivated by) their various disciplinary 
standpoints.

Standardization, practices of control and perceptions of correctness in Greek 
have been intimately linked with a long history of diglossia and have been – and 
continue to be – implicated in ideological and political projects that many of our 
analysts themselves have been part of. More than three decades after the official 
resolution of the so-called ‘language question’, as the chapters on the Modern 
Greek situation make amply clear, diglossia has not gone away from our analysts’ 
interpretative narratives nor, for that matter, from Greek speakers’ repertoire of 
devices for making sense of their language and their socio-cultural reality. However, 
what this volume makes clear is that the time is ripe for the language question to be 
tackled with dispassionate and reflexive accounts that allow the researcher’s own 
role in the analysis to be problematized and that thereby move the discussion of 
standardization in Greek away from the increasingly unrewarding polarizations of 
the past.

Correlatively, meanwhile, another thread that runs through our collection is a 
theoretical and empirical commitment to situated accounts that accept from the 
outset that language is contextualizing and contextualized, and that any study 
of language should shed light on its interrelationships with the local and socio-
cultural context of its occurrence. Most of the chapters, certainly, are focused on 
‘the context of prescription – who prescribes for whom and for what purposes’\textsuperscript{2} 
– and not on earlier dichotomous views of language description as ‘good’ and 
prescription as ‘bad’.

\textsuperscript{2} Cameron (1995) 11.
Part 1: Establishing a Standard

The authors of the chapters in Part I broadly subscribe to the idea that standardization is a never-ending and gradual process and that crystallizing moments or cases for analysis serve the purpose of affording us glimpses of standardization at work. They would also, no doubt, agree with the familiar claim that a language is a dialect with an army: standardization is mostly the outcome of socio-political and cultural considerations, sometimes accidents as well, and in that process strictly defined linguistic criteria tend to have little impact. In this first set of chapters, too, we may detect operative concepts and themes that will figure prominently throughout the volume as a whole. Among much else, these opening discussions offer us a historical paradigm for the emergence of diglossia by documenting the close links between language standardization and identity building and identification. At various points in the history of Greek, this has involved the routine standardization choice of reviving the language’s past, of looking back for current models of language use. Finally, here as elsewhere in the volume, our analysts are reflexively aware of the fact that it is not only language standardization that is value-laden and ideologically charged; any language-focused analysis of it is bound to be so too.

On this note, Michael Silk asks us as analysts to take seriously the concept of value in language choice and language use, and not to shy away from judgements about different social, or other, varieties. Contrasting the situation of dialects and literary standards in early Greece with later developments, his chapter deplores the fact that the Attic-based koine, institutionalized by the Macedonian kings Philip and Alexander from the latter part of the fourth century BC, was never a literary medium. Put differently, standardization happened in this case (as in many others too) in the direction of a non-literate model that served administrative functions, a development which Silk reads as a loss. Practical considerations always play a role in the choice of a language variety to be standardized, and the very process of standardization, as we shall see in other chapters (Strobel’s, for one), involves a gradual codification and elaboration of the functions of that variety. What is important in this chapter is to see the links between the standardization of the koine, Athens’ political and cultural dominance in the fifth century, and identity-building: this last centred, in the first place, on the linguistic articulation of a collective sense of identification as Hellenes, defined oppositionally (us versus them) after the Persian Wars. Standardizing (we may agree) is interwoven with ‘acts of identity’ that are not always collective or consensual.

In his review of the earlier situation of the Greek dialects, Silk searches for parallels in the Americanizing practices of British popular song-performance in the 1930s, whereas the subsequent use of Attic as the language of the Macedonian elite is seen to be comparable to the use of French in the European courts of a later age. Silk’s term ‘generic dialectalization’ brings to the fore a phenomenon that has been under-represented in sociolinguistic discussion of standardization,
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perhaps as a result of the serious problematizing of the terms language and dialect. Generic dialectalization involves a close association between a particular genre and a particular dialect, such that a non-standardized language variety can assume (covert) prestige and be authenticated through its conventional association with certain ways of telling and acting in certain settings. At the same time, in the Greek case, the ‘particular’ dialect is almost always a highly generalized dialect, rather than a close equivalent of any one speech variety. Generic dialectalization can be seen at work most strikingly in the case of early Greek lyric poetry, which was generally (but not always) in some version of Doric accommodated to the composite dialect of epic. This model of generic dialectalizing is in tune with the view of standardization as presenting degrees and shades rather than being an all-or-nothing matter; different language varieties (to use a more neutral term) may be implicated in standardization in varying ways.

Stephen Colvin’s complementary chapter, more sociolinguistic in character, scrutinizes the factors that led to the rise of the Attic-based koine. Colvin is up-front in acknowledging that sociolinguistic study of the past, unlike any synchronic analysis, is bound to involve imaginative reconstruction on the part of the analyst; up-front, too, in making it clear that the particular model of language change and variation the analyst subscribes to will ultimately shape the results of the analysis. Colvin goes on to critique (albeit in broad terms) conventional (Western) classical scholarship on the history of Ancient Greek, and on several grounds: it prioritizes a chronological reading of standardization as a neat and linear process; it over-privileges literary texts; and it assumes the propriety of ‘reading back’ from the peculiar sociolinguistic contexts of Western Europe and North America, where the prevalent language model is that of nation states with colonial histories and standardized national languages. In striking contrast, Colvin looks to modern standard Arabic for a model to understand the Greek koine: in this light, the koine is seen to have constituted a written standard to which no spoken variety corresponded exactly, while (crucially) adherence to this standard was not necessarily, or not at all, a superimposed coercive process but followed on from the feelings of the speakers in question about their linguistic identity.

Put somewhat differently, Colvin’s discussion presents the koine as the inevitable outcome of the development of writing, and what emerges from it is a notion of diversity and pluralization in the concept of koine itself: from this point of view, we can talk about literary koinai, where Silk for instance would talk about generic dialectalizing. More significantly still, Colvin invites us to include in the analysis of the formation of the koinai texts and sources that have hitherto been under-represented; he provides a prime example of this opening-up with his focus on inscriptions and their phonological or morphological differentiae, along with their public or private status. It is instructive to see the way that, before the ultimate dominance of the Attic-based koine, differences between regional epigraphic standards were deliberately maintained to create and reaffirm distinctiveness. As we shall see in Androutsopoulos’ chapter in Part II, this pattern is strikingly
reminiscent of the way that different contemporary communities of e-mail users choose from the available transliteration options for Greek in Latin characters; they do so not haphazardly, but in ways that index group-belonging.

George Kritikos turns his attention to attempts at standardizing the Greek vernacular of the time through the educational reforms of 1929, when demotic became the language of teaching in all years of the elementary schools for the first time in Greek history. In the historical context of standardization in the Modern Greek nation-state, it was a somewhat unorthodox choice to standardize in the direction of the 'low' variety. The decision is linked by Kritikos to the aim of integrating foreign-speaking and refugee populations and of strengthening a national sentiment amongst them through a language that (by comparison with katharevousa) they had more chance of understanding. Once again, we see that the institutional choice of a language variety as 'standard', which in this case really means 'official', is an act of identity-building interwoven with narratives of nation-building and specific socio-political conditions.

In all three chapters so far, we have also seen how standardization and education go hand in hand; and, as in ancient Greece the koine served the purposes of (and ultimately galvanized) an educated elite, in the case explored by Kritikos an uneasy co-existence of demotic with katharevousa (which was still dominant in secondary education) failed to produce any upward mobility for the populations which the reforms were designed to serve in the first place. It went as far as allowing them to enter the labour market but, as Kritikos' chapter shows, it ultimately served as a mechanism for the (re)affirmation of social and economic inequality. In this chapter too, standardization emerges as a gradient notion, with different degrees and projects of standardization linked to different – and sometimes competing – social and cultural processes and serving different social and cultural groups in different ways.

The last chapter in Part I by Pietro Bortone looks at a remarkable case: a language variety completely lacking in standardization which at the same time is in need of standardization as a means of linguistic revival – or survival. Bortone's focus is on isolated villages in the easternmost part of northern Turkey, where a fast disappearing form of Greek (Romayka) is still spoken. Romayka has had no exposure to Standard Greek or to Greek policies of purism, standardization and archaization, despite preserving numerous archaic elements in its own right, precisely because of its historical isolation. The speakers, of essentially Turkish and Muslim identity, descend in part from Greeks who converted to Islam over 300 years ago. It is instructive to see this dying variety contrasted with the related Pontic dialect. Ever since Pontian Greeks arrived in Greece in 1923 (with the population exchange), their version of Pontic Greek has undergone standardization in the direction of Standard Modern Greek. At the same time, almost as a counter-move, it has undergone a largely hegemonic institutionalization and monumentalization of the regional: a process which we have seen in operation in the last two decades in many other instances outside Greece.
The other noteworthy fact about Romayka is of course that it presents ‘no models, no history, no standard’ (as Bortone stresses), if, but only if, we consider it from the point of view of Greek. In fact, Romayka has been decisively shaped by Turkish in ways that may well remind us of Arvanitika, and in particular the way that Arvanitika too has been shown to be a dying variety with substantial interference from Greek. In a chilling reminder of how little impact linguistic factors are liable to have in any decisions and projects of language standardization, Bortone shows how, although on the basis of linguistic criteria (quantitative, functional, communicative) Romayka could easily be classified as a dialect, and a case for standardization could be made, there is simply no such chance on the basis of socio-political criteria. Bortone’s discussion also neatly exposes the arbitrariness involved in which language variety is labelled as a ‘dialect’, and which as a ‘language’. We are forcibly reminded of the way that the notion of standard became one of the significant apparatuses of the modern nation-state for the creation of boundaries between the ‘national’ and the ‘sub-national’.

Part II: Standardization Practices

In one of the most eloquent accounts of communicative practices, Hanks defines them as essentially socio-cultural moments of synthesis for linguistic forms with the relatively stabilized form of social activity in which they occur and with the ideology that serves as a system of evaluation for those activities. The chapters in Part II document this kind of synthesis with regard to standardization. They bring to the fore the relationships between the significant variables: what gets standardized? how? in what type of activity or social arena? and with what kinds of ideological project? We are shown that it is in everyday regimented practices that macro-processes and social forces are articulated. The small – for instance, the standardization of orthographical minutiae in a literary work (see Ricks and Hirst) – constitutes the big.

Claudia Strobel looks at the lexical Atticism of the Second Sophistic, in particular the developments of the second century AD, as an early but archetypal example of standardization involving codification. As a counter-movement to the koine (the formation of which is debated by Silk and Colvin), Atticism sought to imitate and revive the Attic dialect of the classical period. As we shall see from subsequent contributors too (Tseronis and Iordanidou, among others), going back
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7 Haugen (1966) specified that the route to standardization of a selected variety involves four processes: codification (graphemization and grammatical definition), elaboration (development of vocabulary and stylistic variants), endorsement and implementation by the state (political support), and finally endorsement and implementation by the community (public support). The linear conception of Haugen’s sequence has been subjected to significant problematization in more recent studies, but what is important to note is the unquestionable role of codification in any standardization process.
to older forms of language (archaizing) is in one form or another a leitmotif of the history of Greek. It is characteristic that such archaizing is closely associated with the educated or bourgeois elite (Thoma’s discussion is of special interest here), and it is characteristic too that the archaizing project is wrapped in a narrative of identity-building. The premise of all such attempts is the intimate relationship that all languages develop with specific social meanings: reviving a language of the past is thus aimed at iconically restoring power and prestige, political and cultural.

As Strobel shows, these were precisely the roots of the Second Sophistic: the Greek elite sought to maintain political independence as far as was possible under Roman rule, and in that endeavour language became a way of demonstrating Greekness or cultural identity. Strobel discusses three lexicographers, Phrynichus, Moeris and Pollux. She shows how, in addition to seeing themselves as ‘guardians of language’ who reinforced standards of correctness, these lexicographers recognised the importance of organizing their dictionaries well and themselves producing new ‘designs’ that were not only practical, but aesthetically beautiful in their own right. It may seem unsurprising that these early lexicographical attempts were not informed by any fully articulated linguistic theory, as tends to be the case today (compare Tseronis and Iordanidou’s chapter). Nevertheless, lexicography both then and now is ultimately shaped by the socio-cultural contexts and intellectual milieux in which the lexicographers operate.

Which discourses about language they subscribe to, and which standards of correctness – it will probably be widely circulating discourses and standards – we may trace in their individual choices; but, as these processes are mutually constitutive, their work will (re)shape those discourses and standards in turn.

In Chrystalla Thoma’s chapter, attention shifts to how the use of specific linguistic devices can be related more or less directly to certain aspects of context. Her framework of analysis, systemic functional linguistics, is in fact premised on the idea that the choice of specific language forms is not accidental but rather fulfils specific functions and communicative purposes in the genre and context of occurrence. In similar vein, the frequency of language forms is an important indicator of the kind of genre and the purposes that the genre routinely fulfils. As in the case of Silk’s ‘generic dialectalizing’, but actually in the opposite direction of ‘generic standardization’, Thoma too shows us how genre becomes conventionally associated with a specific kind of language. Her focus is on two versions of the Life of Aesop from the fourteenth century, versions in classicizing Greek written for the educated few. The notion of genre here is intimately linked with that of register, which, within systemic functional linguistics, is seen as the primary concept for explaining linguistic variation and as the composite of three interacting semiotic properties of the situational context of language. In essence, these properties are: field (what the language is about); mode (the channel through which communication is carried out); and tenor (the language users and the level of formality in their relationship). The interactions between these aspects of context define a register as
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8 See e.g. Halliday and Matthiessen (2004).
high or low: in this case, as Thoma shows, high. She reaches this conclusion on the basis of the increased frequency of participles and ‘grammatical metaphor’ in the Lives of Aesop under review: an increased frequency which, in her terms, creates a ‘lexically packed and dense style’ and in turn indexes ‘authority’. Thoma’s analysis reveals an interesting shift, in certain instances of fourteenth-century narrative, from the experiential and largely oral-based style that is normally associated with narrative to a more developed ‘textuality’ (in the sense of literacy-based style) and, in particular, to a style that is currently associated with the scientific register. These findings are in tune with the impressive (and well-documented) co-existence of oral and literate style that is especially characteristic of narrative genres in Greek literary history, and which is mainly attributable to the long-standing tradition of diglossia.9

In David Ricks’s chapter, more recent, and more canonical, specimens of literature come under scrutiny. Ricks takes the example of some ‘Modern Greek classics’, and looks at their orthographic standardization by editors as a set of complex decisions that involve both gain and loss. Standardizing as harmonization to modern norms involves the opposite of what we have seen in previous chapters. Through a situated account, Ricks examines the way that each of the literary works under review – works by Makriyannis, Papadiamandis, Cavafy and Solomos – have presented editors with a different set of orthographical choices, and notes the relevance of the distinctive publication and reception histories of each. With Ricks (as with Strobel), we see both authors and editors as agentive social actors whose attitudes to language use and correctness are individual and biographical on the one hand and, on the other, inextricably linked to the wider contexts in which they operate. It is also instructive to see how different authors have displayed awareness of, or resistance to, the textual control of their work, in varying degrees and in different ways. In particular, Cavafy (as Hirst’s chapter will confirm), is shown to be a case par excellence of a creator who goes to great lengths to police his creation against any editorial intervention.

Throughout our volume, we find standardization involving delicate and complex gauges of calculation regarding decisions that are too often reduced to a simple choice. The issue, again and again, is whether to embrace and legitimize contemporary and (by and large) vernacular uses of language, or, conversely, to ‘monumentalize’ language (one of the metaphors that Mackridge and Gazi discuss in Part III) and, in that respect, to keep the traces of history intact, including the supposed etymological transparency of words. Ricks’s chapter does not offer any easy answers to this dilemma. What he does is critically assess the editorial choices made in each case, while himself leaning towards respect for the individual, even idiosyncratic, style of texts, which have after all succeeded in gaining a place in the Modern Greek literary canon. What Ricks’s chapter also does is mitigate the exceptionalism that usually surrounds such issues in discussions of Greek
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9 See e.g. Tziovas (1989), Georgakopoulou (1997).
by showing, for instance, that any editor of Thomas Hardy, a contemporary of Papadionandis, is faced with similar questions of orthographic standardization.

The issues and the instances presented by Anthony Hirst in his discussion of Cavafy are closely related to those confronted by Ricks. Hirst begins his discussion of ‘editorial assaults’ on Cavafy’s work with the observation that Cavafy left very little for editors to do. His intentions as a poet were clear, and as Hirst’s painstaking analysis shows, his creative uses and manipulations of the small things in language that may have maximum stylistic effect (diacritics, elisions, accents) were frequent and strategic. In this perspective, any editorial standardization in the posthumous editions is bound to be seen as a loss, an intervention and a form of gratuitous control. In effect, Hirst’s fine-grained analysis constitutes a defence of the admitted eccentricities of Cavafy’s style against over-conventionalizing editorial decisions: it shows how non-standard choices (like spellings) in his poems, far from being accidental (or mis-spellings), may be taken as indexes of the poet’s sensitivity to the sound (and the meaning) of his poetry.

In the three chapters of Silk, Ricks and Hirst, we are shown how standardization is anything but a one-size-fits-all process. Different language varieties have the power to invoke and create different social meanings, styles, registers and genres; and the promotion of one language standard, regardless of conventional associations and contextual subtleties, may both stifle creativity and result in linguistic impoverishment.

Assimakis Tseronis and Anna Iordanidou propose an analysis and evaluation of the four most recent and authoritative monolingual dictionaries of Modern Greek, as texts that have contributed to the ideology of standardization. Even the titles of the dictionaries are revealing of the allegiances of each and also the marketing options that they imply. For example, two carry the well-known names of the actual lexicographers, both of them linguists and professors, Kriaras and Babiniotis. By contrast, another is named after the research foundation associated with it, the Triandafyllidis Institute, which in turn was named after the demoticist author of a celebrated grammar of Modern Greek (1941).

Tseronis and Iordanidou place each of their lexicographers in a narrative of standardization and in a context of attitudes to language and professional engagement with language, thereby proposing relationships between their culturally mediated biographical projects and the compilation and circulation of their dictionaries. The analysis focuses on symptomatic choices such as the inclusion or exclusion of entries, particularly with regard to neologisms, etymological information provided, and spelling. Orthography, in this chapter too, emerges as a major aspect of standardization, and the choices available are, here again, broadly classifiable into the two familiar positions: they either lean towards the monumentalization and crystallization of language, by opting for spellings that relate Modern Greek words to their Ancient Greek cognates, or they strive towards modernization and simplification. How far back the actual etymology for each entry is traced is also seen as an important indicator of the lexicographer’s views on standardization.
So too is the treatment of semantic borrowings and re-borrowings (notably Greek-origin foreign terms that were actually coined in a foreign language and later borrowed back into Greek through the learned tradition) and, in particular, the extent to which their Greek origins are stressed. Once again, the history of diglossia and the disjuncture it engendered between the learned and vernacular traditions is drawn upon by the authors as the main interpretative framework for the lexicographers’ individual choices. A revealing comparison between the four dictionaries on the basis of the extent to which they prescribe and seek to improve standards finds Babiniotis and Kriaras to be the most explicitly prescriptive, even if for different reasons and in different ways.

As already indicated, this volume has set out to raise the profile of reflexive approaches to the history of standardization in Greek, and a prime illustration of this aim is the dual status of Kriaras within it, as both researcher and researched, analyser and analysed. In Tseronis’ and Iordanidou’s chapter, Kriaras’ standardization practices are put into context and critically placed, whereas in Part III the roles are reversed: Kriaras discusses his own dictionary and others in relation to standardization and the aftermath of diglossia.

If the Romayka speakers in Bortone’s chapter are not aware of the links between their language and Greek or Greece, the Greek speakers of Cyprus are all too poignantly aware of those links, as Dimitra Karoulla-Vrikki’s chapter shows us. She traces two competing official discourses that also circulate widely as lay meta-representations within Cypriot society and which have been instrumental in shaping language planning: Cyprocentrism, which is based on civic nationalist approaches, and advocates the promotion of the language(s) of the state as the symbol of political and economic supremacy; and Hellenocentrism, which involves the promotion of Standard Modern Greek as the ethno-culturally marked language that contributes to the formation of national consciousness. Karoulla-Vrikki uncovers an ongoing pattern of shifts and fluctuations between the two poles of a continuum of positions that present numerous overlaps rather than a simple dichotomy. She does this by charting the prevalence of one or other pole in the civil service, in the law-courts, and in education. In each of these domains, language planning has followed a distinct trajectory from Cyprocentrism to Hellenocentrism, with Standard Modern Greek becoming gradually more dominant and, in the case of the courts and the civil service, slowly replacing English. It is noteworthy that English, albeit a language associated with the island’s colonial past, has frequently served Cyprocentric interests in the name of practical convenience.

Part II concludes with Jannis Androutsopoulos’ distinctively focused examination of Latin-alphabet Greek, or ‘Greeklish’, on the internet. From a sociolinguistic and discourse-analytic perspective, Androutsopoulos analyses what are demonstrably practices of emergent standardization from below. A brief historical overview of Greeklish shows how the internet provides new instances and opportunities for an old choice that, though initially motivated by practical considerations, has now succeeded in serving as a ‘new literacy’ system which
a majority of young people are familiar with. Androutsopoulos coins the term ‘computer-mediated digraphia’ to refer to the simultaneous use of both the native Greek and the Latin script in computer-mediated interaction. He goes on to flesh out the main characteristics of this digraphia, scrutinizing transliteration practices, the metalinguistic discourses surrounding their use, and the shifting patterns of use and evaluation.

Androutsopoulos’ discussion shows that, despite the lack of a widely shared transliteration standard, internet users create consistent transliteration styles by orienting to either a ‘phonetic’ or an ‘orthographic’ transliteration scheme. In addition, local norms of Latinized spelling emerge among individuals who regularly interact with a user group and wish to identify with that group, through well-attested sociolinguistic processes of convergence and ‘focusing’. Like Ricks’s and Hirst’s chapters, Androutsopoulos’ demonstrates that orthography is not a neutral technology for the representation of spoken language, but rather a set of social practices rooted in specific social and cultural contexts and associated with a multiplicity of symbolic and aesthetic meanings. Furthermore, exactly as with some of the lexicographical choices reviewed by Tseronis and Iordanidou, an imperative to preserve the etymological transparency of words seems to underlie the ideology attached to the orthographic representation. However, in this case, as Androutsopoulos stresses, the practices and ideologies of script choice cannot be fully understood without taking the development and social spread of technology into account.

As we shall see in Part III, and particularly in the chapters by Moschonas and Goutsos, language ideologies very often articulate themselves in linguistic and metalinguistic practices through a process of iconicity, whereby language choices are ‘naturalized’ and become transparently emblematic of social, political, intellectual or moral character. In the case examined by Androutsopoulos, the orthographic representation of words in Greeklish aims at an ideal of visual literacy that presents iconicity with the Greek alphabet. This is standardization from below that is nonetheless informed and shaped by standardization ideologies and practices from above. As Androutsopoulos shows, the participating individuals’ rationalization of orthographic representation has been shaped by public discourses and outbreaks of ‘moral panic’ in Greece, which present Greeklish as a threat to the language. As we shall see in Moschonas’ chapter, these cases of moral panic are manifestations of a new form of purism that has surfaced since the official resolution of diglossia in Greece in 1976, one which involves invoking ‘exterior’ threats to the language from other languages, particularly English, within the framework of globalization. As Androutsopoulos indicates, however, with the increasing linguistic localization of the web, the use of Greeklish is actually on the decline.

Part III: Ideologies and Contestations

Language ideologies are and have been at the heart of standardization practices, and not just in relation to Greek. Language ideologies refer to ‘representations that construe the intersections of forms of talk with forms of social life, that is, link language differences with social meanings’. The importance of such ideologies for standardization practices and attitudes to correctness in Greek – and the importance of uncovering what tends to be registered in language use or language planning in opaque and subtle ways – is the starting-point for the chapters in Part III. The multi-faceted ways of encoding ideologies range from the use of specific vocabulary and lexical associations to images, depictions and metaphors, as well as metalinguistic, rationalizing accounts. They can form part of official or lay discourses alike. They can be invoked as ‘shared’ cultural background or naturalized as ‘universal’ principles. Overall, language ideologies serve as systems of signification that can be conceptualized as interpretative repertoires: available resources for making evaluations and constructing versions of self, action and social structure in language.

The chapter by Emmanuel Kriaras provides a historical overview of the language question, which serves as an interpretative repertoire for many of his fellow-contributors. Kriaras’ aim is to assess the contribution of individuals who acted as regulating agents at various landmark moments in the history of diglossia in Greece. Among much else, Kriaras deplores the lack of intervention and official planning in the aftermath of the official resolution of diglossia in 1976, particularly with regard to two highly contentious language issues: the teaching of Ancient Greek at school and the spelling reform (compare and contrast Moschonas, later in Part III). Orthography once again becomes a fertile site for competing language ideologies, and Kriaras urges the case for further simplification of the current standardized orthography, which largely reflects a historical orthography model. In this spirit he subjects three primary sources to a critical discussion in respect of their orthographic choices: these are, in fact, three of the four dictionaries that Tseronis and Iordanidou examine, including Kriaras’ own. As in this case the analysed is also the analyser, the choices in his dictionary are presented, uncompromisingly, as the model to be adhered to. In a similar vein to Tseronis and Iordanidou, though, Kriaras reports an extensive use of etymological orthographic forms in Babiniotis’ dictionary. The fact that the historical-orthography model still holds some sway in standardization practices in Greece is an indication of the power of the ideological narrative of language continuity for Greek-speakers, which Mackridge now discusses in more detail.

Peter Mackridge’s chapter offers an analysis of the metaphors that have been used by participants in the Greek language controversy (mainly scholars and language professionals) to express the relationship between the Ancient and Modern Greek languages. Mackridge seeks to explicate the ideological assumptions behind their
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11 Ibid.
use in the period 1750–2000, but with special reference to the first 150 years. His discussion traces a path through a plethora of kinship-related metaphors (mother/daughter) and family tree metaphors (roots/branches), along with the metaphor of language as edifice or monument that needs to be preserved (compare Gazi in a later chapter); he thereby highlights the difficulties faced by Greeks in defining the characteristics of their contemporary variety of Greek in its own terms. At the same time, as Gazi too will confirm, such metaphors are seen to have been intimately linked with ideas that enjoyed some currency in the linguistics scholarship of the time. Mackridge rightly associates attitudes to language with issues of self-definition and identity, and scrutinizes the changing use of ‘labels’ for the ‘Modern Greeks’ (‘Romans’?, ‘Hellenes’?), tellingly using the term ‘Modern Greeks’ himself, where other scholars would perhaps have chosen a different one. Not least, like Beaton in the final chapter, Mackridge discusses the views of Korais, as an agent with prescriptive power. He points to the way that Korais’ thinking ultimately opened up to purism, with the undoubted subtleties of his argument (notably that the spoken variety of the time should serve, in a re-Hellenized form, as the language of education) lost in the process. In this chapter, as in Gazi’s and Beaton’s, we have a focus on individuals (in effect, the ‘usual suspects’) and the ways they have shaped the history of standardization; but these are far from accounts of ‘great men’ that take their words and deeds at face value. The contextualization of the analyses offered serves to make familiar distinctions between purists and vernacularists seem crude and monolithic, shedding a necessary light on the shades of competing arguments and views. Above all, the perceived recurrence over time of particular conceptual metaphors and modes of describing and prescribing language-use points to the gradual construction of interpretative repertoires, which are not easily attributable to any single scholar or intellectual, and indeed are not confined to official or scholarly discourses but become part of the national imaginary.

Effi Gazi reviews the career of Georgios Hatzidakis (1848–1941), Professor of Linguistics at the University of Athens, whose views on language not only influenced the politics of standardization, but also shaped the development of modern linguistics in Greece. Specifically, Gazi’s analysis shows how the institutionalization of a distinct science of language, and therefore of the scientific study of the Greek language itself, was seriously implicated in the politics of katharevousa by privileging written linguistic forms and by linking them to class and gender perceptions. As Goutsos will argue in a later chapter in connection with the discourse of the anti-purists, the scientific paradigm, and particularly its ideals of objectivity, rationality and truth, is readily appropriated for a particular kind of language-political cause – above all because scientific terminology tends to conceal ideology or make it opaque. In this way, the findings of historical linguistics regarding rule-bound language-change were drawn upon by Hatzidakis to provide legitimation for the cause of unity and continuity that was prevalent in the Greek national ideology of his day. At the same time, Gazi shows how Hatzidakis could adjust his scientific views so as to align them with the politics
of katharevousa – concealing, but ultimately revealing, the usual ideological apparatuses at work. A notable example is his association of correct language with educated women (iconicity again), an ingenious act of re-appropriation of the demoticists’ naturalization of spoken language as mothers’ language. In turn, this association was projected onto explicit value judgements about different forms of spoken Greek according to the social standing of their speakers. Through a critical discourse analysis that draws on the social theorizing (by Bourdieu in particular) of power relations and the processes of institutionalizing discourses, Gazi sheds new light on the interrelationships between the development of Greek linguistics as a scientific field and forms of nationalistic politics structured around issues of linguistic distinctiveness and exclusivity.

In Spiros Moschonas’ chapter, as in Mackridge’s, perceptions and constructions about the language end up being much more important than linguistic facts. Moschonas examines a range of public, metalinguistic representations and attitudes expressed in the Greek print media and propagated by language professionals, folk ideologists and journalists, in the period following the language reform of 1976 when an official standard based on the demotic was finally established. His discussion shows how post-diglossia language issues form a coherent and collective media narrative – in his terms, a ‘regime ideology’ – which gradually moves away from the long-standing debate on demotic-versus-katharevousa to new forms of purism. In a genre-based analysis, Moschonas creates a typology of these issues, distinguishing for instance between those that provoked a moral panic (like the issue of teaching Ancient Greek in secondary schools) and routine or recurrent issues which never resulted in intense public debate (like the adoption of loan words, mainly from English). He goes on to examine their occurrence in, and their relation to, different genres in newspapers such as features or reportages. In this way, his discussion demonstrates a case of ‘double indexing’: language issues are intertwined with given types of publication, while at the same time subtly and indirectly encoding language ideologies.

Moschonas documents a clear shift from the predominant language issues of the 1980s (the teaching of Ancient Greek in secondary education, the presumed language impoverishment of the younger generation, the influence of English on Modern Greek) to issues of territoriality, language contact, and hegemony, in the 1990s. He visualizes this shift as a move away from a battle in the interior realm of the language (one that has to do with high registers versus low) to a battle between the interior and the exterior (one that has to do with, for instance, threats to the Greek language from alien languages like English). As in Goutsos’ and Mackridge’s chapters, we see how easily language ideologies can be semantically organized on the basis of conceptual metaphors: in this case, the territorial metaphor. Another common thread between Moschonas and Goutsos is a historical reading of the language issues raised in Greece after the 1976 resolution of diglossia: these would

---

be inconceivable without the ideology of purism that marked the history of
diglossia before that date.

Contemporary meta-linguistic accounts in the post-diglossic period also
form the subject of Dionysis Goutsos’ chapter, but in his case, the focus is on
professional scholars, in the shape of Greek professors of linguistics, like the late
Anastasios Christidis. Bringing the works of a number of such scholars together,
Goutsos offers a critical analysis of what he sees as a characteristic anti-purist
discourse. This discourse emerged in recent times as a counter-move to the ‘more
dispersed and less localized’ arguments (compare Gazi and Moschonas) that have
characterized ethnocentric and purist theorizing on Greek, and which (as we have
seen in Mackridge’s chapter, and elsewhere) have historically sought to emphasise
and (if possible) ‘restore’ the continuity of the language. Through a corpus-based
analysis of this discourse, Goutsos identifies its main themes as myth and ideology,
and proposes that these themes are strategically used in argumentative moves so as
to delegitimize the opposing position. Myth and ideology are articulated through
lexical items belonging to their respective word-families, but are primarily deployed
as underspecified, all-encompassing and derogatory descriptors of the purist
discourse. Put differently, the claim is that these descriptors become iconic of a
lack of scientific method and rationality. Goutsos argues that this anti-ethnocentric
and anti-purist discourse is grounded in liberal and essentialist positions and,
furthermore, conceals specific aspirations such as the goal of integration into the
European Union.

In general terms, the thrust of Goutsos’ critique is that no discourse or argument
is devoid of an ideological standpoint, with the practical corollary that the highly
politicized and polarized debate in post-diglossic Greece between purist and
anti-purist scholars has ultimately hindered a dispassionate and socio-historically
informed view of the language. All such situated approaches to language issues,
Goutsos affirms, should become reflexive and enter a serious dialogue with
lay understandings and discourses, including the often-derided discourse of
language continuity: like any others, such a discourse acts as cultural resource and
interpretative framework. But for any progress of this kind, as Goutsos stresses in
conclusion, ‘we must first clear the conceptual ground of the old polarities’ and, in
a critical spirit, ‘search for continuities and ruptures both in the diachrony and the
synchrony of Greek’.

Roderick Beaton’s concluding chapter takes us back to the end of the eighteenth
century, and specifically to Adamantios Korais (1748–1833), who became
synonymous with attempts to reform the Modern Greek language in the nineteenth
and twentieth centuries. Like Mackridge, Beaton argues that the widely held belief
in a close association of Korais’ views with the later development of katharevousa
is to some extent a misconception. Anticipating, in part, the preoccupations of the
Neogrammarians, and their erstwhile disciple Hatzidakis (cf. Gazi), Korais was in
favour of the ‘common language’ as the language that Greek-speakers learnt from
their mothers, but at the same time he advocated a position of classic moderation.
Beaton fleshes out what he acknowledges were neither systematic nor consistent views on language by focusing on a largely unexplored source, Korais’ preface to his edition of Heliodoros’ *Aithiopika* (1804). Close analysis of Korais’ ideas for reforming the Modern Greek language in this preface reveals their metonymic relationship with the *Aithiopika*. Heliodoros, a distinctive representative of the Second Sophistic (Strobel’s discussion has a special relevance here), is put forward by Korais as a model for correct usage in the new age. This project is seen to involve a creative selection from Ancient Greek but not a mindless imitation.

It is in his *Aithiopika* preface that Korais coins the first ever generic term for the novel in Greek, a term still in wide currency in a slightly modified form (μυθιστόρημα instead of the original μυθιστορία). Beaton’s argument is that, in so doing, Korais stakes a claim to Greek ownership of the present-day European genre and aims to pave the way for future achievements in the genre by the revived Greek nation. In this sense, Korais is prescribing both a linguistic and a literary model, and here Beaton detects the crucial influence of Romanticism. Language, literature and the emergent idea of the nation are, for Korais, interconnected (as they never quite were in the days of the Attic-based koine, discussed by Colvin and Silk) – and the interconnection involves genre too. Time and again in this volume, the close links between genre and standardization have come to the fore. In Beaton’s chapter we can locate them at the fundamental level of generic labelling: to construct and offer a genre as a standard, in effect to prescribe it (or prescribe with it), you need to name it first.

*In our collection overall, a wide variety of language phenomena from different periods are exposed to critical analysis from a wide variety of viewpoints and disciplinary perspectives. It is our conviction that these multifaceted elucidations of language standards and standard languages in the Greek example (but standards and languages, always, in pluralized form) will be seen to shed further light on the concepts of a ‘standard’ language and a language ‘standard’ tout court.

Throughout the volume, the aspects and instances analysed and debated by our contributors are documented as elements of complex histories, mediated by socio-cultural constraints. Furthermore, the protagonists of these stories are both contextualized in relation to the dominant discourses of their time and seen as contextualizing and contributing to those discourses. The term ‘discourses’, however elusive and variously used in many chapters, seems to capture the constructionist aspects of standardization processes and practices in the history of Greek. Again and again, correspondence to linguistic and historical facts is seen to be less important and ultimately less influential than language ideologization and the processes of misrecognition and erasure14 that this involves. In this process, we see official and lay attitudes mutually informing one another; we also see the long

---

history of the Greek language ultimately (re)constructed and interwoven into a cultural narrative of continuity and exceptionalism, but also contestations to that exceptionalist premise.

Problematizing and resisting the polarization of the past around master-narrative and counter-narratives of what constitutes good and bad language, the chapters in this volume have unravelled some of the complex ways in which both of these have shaped language ideologies and practices of standardization in Greek. In so doing, the contributors have broadly, and sometimes explicitly, taken the position that any academic treatment of prescriptivism in any language cannot be undertaken as a ‘neutral’ descriptive project. The focus on literary uses of language in several chapters, meanwhile, serves to give this point a special force. The values – the ‘standards’ – that creative literature and its creative language evoke resist any attempt at scholarly neutrality. They too properly call for both a critical and a self-critical response.

As far as the contemporary situation of the Greek language is concerned, this reflexivity – itself implicated in late modern and constructionist views of language – is here brought to bear on modernist conceptualizations of language standards in Greek and (closely related to them) ideas of nation-building, which, as several chapters have shown, are still resonant in Greece today. At a time when processes of de-territorialization and language contact are taking hold of contemporary societies and reshaping their linguistic and socio-cultural landscapes, a continuing determination to interrogate the relevance and (re)formation of long-standing views about the Greek language represents one of the main desiderata for future studies. It is hoped that our volume will make a distinctive contribution to this emerging agenda.
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