References

Banks-Smith, N. (2003), 'What not to swear', *The Guardian, G2*, 7 July 2003: 22.

Beaton, R.M. (2003), *George Seferis: Waiting for the Angel: A Biography*, New Haven, Conn., and London.

Cavafy, C.P. (1935): Κ.Π. Καβάφης, *Ποιήματα*, ed. Ρίκα Σεγκοπούλου, artistic ed. Τάκης Καλμούχος, Alexandria (post-1980 undated reprints from more than one publisher).

Cavafy, C.P. (1963a): Κ.Π. Καβάφης, *Ποιήματα*, 2 vols.: Α' *(1896–1918)*, Β' *(1919–1933)*, ed. Γ.Π. Σαββίδης, Athens.

Cavafy, C.P. (1963b): Κ.Π. Καβάφης, *Πεζά*, ed. Γ. Παπουτσάκης, Athens.

Cavafy, C.P. (1968): Κ.Π. Καβάφης, *Αὐτόγραφα ποιήματα (1896–1910): τὸ Τετράδιο Σεγκοπούλου σὲ πανομοιότυπη ἔκδοση*, ed. Γ. Π. Σαββίδης, Athens.

Cavafy, C.P. (1991): Κ.Π. Καβάφης, *Τὰ ποιήματα: νέα ἔκδοση*, 2 vols.: Α' *(1897–1918)*, Β' *(1919–1933)*, ed. Γ.Π. Σαββίδης, Athens.

Cavafy, C.P. (2007), *The Collected Poems*, ed. A. Hirst, tr. E. Sachperoglou, intr. P. Mackridge, Oxford.

Cavafy, C.P. (forthcoming): Κ.Π. Καβάφης / *C.P. Cavafy*, ed. S. Ilinskaya, tr. A. Hirst, Βιβλιοθήκη Κλασσικών Νεοελλήνων Συγγραφέων 2, Granada.

Coleridge, S.T. (1990), *Table Talk*, 2 vols., Collected Works 14, Bollingen Series 75, Princeton, NJ.

Dimitrakos, D.V. (1933–52): Δ.Β. Δημητράκος (ed.), *Μέγα λεξικὸν τῆς ἑλληνικῆς γλώσσης*, 9 vols., Athens.

Ekdawi, S. and Hirst, A. (1999), 'Left out, crossed out and pasted over: the editorial implications of Cavafy's own evaluations of his uncollected and unpublished poems', *Modern Greek Studies (Australia and New Zealand)*, 5 (1997–99): 79–132.

Hardy, T. (1982), *The Complete Poetical Works of Thomas Hardy*, vol. 1, ed. S. Hynes, Oxford.

Hirst, A. (1995), 'Philosophical, historical and sensual: an examination of Cavafy's thematic collections', *Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies*, 19: 33–93.

Hirst, A. (2000), 'C.P. Cavafy: Byzantine historian?', *Κάμπος: Cambridge Papers in Modern Greek*, 8: 45–74.

Hirst, A. (2002), 'Cavafy's Cavafy versus Savidis's Cavafy: the need to de-edit the "acknowledged" poems', in e-journal *greekworks.com*, 1 March 2002 (http://www.greekworks.com/content/index.php/weblog/archives).

Hopkins, G.M. (1986), *Gerard Manley Hopkins*, ed. C. Phillips, Oxford and New York.

Karaoglou, C.L. (1985): Χ.Λ. Καραόγλου, *Ἡ ἀθηναϊκὴ κριτικὴ καὶ ὁ Καβάφης*, Athens.

Larkin, P. (1988), *Collected Poems*, ed. A. Thwaite, London and Boston, Mass.

Savidis, G.P. (1966), Γ.Π. Σαββίδης, *Οἱ καβαφικὲς ἐκδόσεις (1891–1932)*, Athens (repr. 1991).

Skokos, K.P. (1923): Κ.Φ. Σκόκος, *Νεοελληνικὴ ἀνθολογία ἀπὸ τὰ ἐκλεκτώτερα ποιήματα τῆς νεώτερας Ἑλλάδος (μετ' εἰκόνων καὶ βιογραφιῶν)*, vol. 2, no. 11, Athens.

Tennyson, A. (1909), *Enoch Arden* and *In Memoriam*, ed. H. Tennyson, London.

Tennyson, A. (1973), *In Memoriam: An Authoritative Text: Backgrounds and Sources: Criticism*, ed. R.H. Ross, New York and London.

Zevgolis, G. (1933–4): Γ. Ζευγώλης (ed.), *Λεξικὸν τῆς ἑλληνικῆς γλώσσης*, 4 vols., Athens.

9

Modern Greek Dictionaries and the Ideology of Standardization*

Assimakis Tseronis and Anna Iordanidou

Introduction

As Kahane and Kahane observe: 'The lexicon with its many facets is a mirror of its time, a document to be understood in sociolinguistic terms'.[1] In this chapter, we propose a discourse analysis of dictionaries as texts produced by an identifiable authority or institution, addressed to a certain public, at a given time and with a specific goal in mind.

We have chosen four of the most recent and authoritative dictionaries of Modern Greek, each illustrating a different approach to the lexicographical description of the language: the *Greek Dictionary* by Tegopoulos–Fytrakis publishers (*Ελληνικό Λεξικό*), the *Modern Greek Dictionary of the Contemporary Demotic Language, Written and Spoken* by E. Kriaras (*Νέο Ελληνικό Λεξικό της Σύγχρονης Δημοτικής Γλώσσας, Γραπτής και Προφορικής*), the *Dictionary of the Modern Greek Language* by G. Babiniotis (*Λεξικό της Νέας Ελληνικής Γλώσσας*), and the *Dictionary of Common Modern Greek* by the Aristotelian University of Thessaloniki's Triandaphyllidis Institute of Modern Greek Studies (*Λεξικό της Κοινής Νεοελληνικής*).[2] Despite their differences, all four dictionaries considered together lay the foundations for a proper lexicographical treatment of the Greek language.

We do not intend to evaluate the four dictionaries on the basis of technical aspects of lexicography, even though a good deal has been said about this.[3] Modern Greek lexicography has only begun to develop in the last decade, and there are, as

yet, no full-scale institutes for the publishing of dictionaries. Accordingly, it is too early to judge the dictionaries published so far on strictly lexicographical criteria. Despite their claims to the contrary, current lexicographical treatments of Modern Greek cannot be considered to be committed wholly to the strictly scientific lexicographical principles that dictionaries of French, English, German, Italian or Dutch have been following for decades. Our aim is not to review the dictionaries in question, something that has already been done on various occasions in academic journals, at conferences and in the press.[4] We do not aspire to illustrate the extent to which each dictionary influences language use or to assess its impact on language change either. Our claim is that we can demonstrate the profile of each dictionary and uncover the lexicographer's aspiration to contribute to the standardization of Greek by comparing the choices made with regard to the essential steps and decisions involved in the compilation and circulation of a dictionary. Whether their attempts will be successful or not is to be decided and evaluated by the public and by experts in due course.

We look at a dictionary both as a cultural monument and as a commodity. As a cultural monument, a dictionary is the treasury of the language and enjoys a certain authority and prestige among the members of a linguistic community. As a commodity, a dictionary is an artefact produced and distributed within a linguistic community and circulated in a publishing market that serves a particular purpose.[5] A compiler of a dictionary of a language such as Greek, which has a long written and spoken history, and which has undergone various phases of purist movements and has a recent past of diglossia,[6] is likely to face problems and will have to make decisions regarding the inclusion, exclusion and overall representation of the vocabulary of the language. In this decision-making process, the lexicographer and the publisher must also take into consideration the public which they address, and the particular purpose their dictionary aims to fulfil – educational, commercial, general, or other.

We shall first place the four dictionaries in the historical and social contexts surrounding their publication and circulation, and then look in detail at their choices as regards the inclusion or exclusion of words and variants, the labels used, the etymological information given, and the spellings favoured. By comparing the choices that the lexicographers make and by relating them to the character of each dictionary, we propose a textual analysis of the respective dictionaries as discourses contributing to the ideology of standardization.[7]

---

[4] See e.g. Alissandratos (1995), Kalioris (1998), Maravelias (1999), Goutsos (1999), Kexagioglou (1999), Kriaras (2000), Iordanidou (2000) and Mackridge (2002).

[5] See the discussion in Cameron (1995).

[6] See Alexiou (1982), Browning (1983), Christidis (1996), Frangoudaki (2001) and Tseronis (2002).

[7] We follow Milroy and Milroy (1991) and Cameron (1995) in understanding the ideology of standardization as the illusion of an idea of standard language, which the dictionary compilers as 'language guardians' wish to sustain or, in the case of Greek lexicography, seek to construct.

The lexicographers, their dictionaries and their time

Of the four dictionaries discussed in this chapter, two were published under the name of the linguist or lexicographer in charge of the project (Kriaras, Babiniotis), one under the name of the publishing house (Tegopoulos–Fytrakis), and the other under the name of the academic institution and the research institute affiliated to it that undertook the work of compilation (University of Thessaloniki). In all four cases, there is a group of people, trained lexicographers, linguists or philologists, who have worked on the project, and whose names are mentioned and acknowledged in the foreword.

The *Greek Dictionary* published by the publishing house of Tegopoulos and Fytrakis was the first of the four dictionaries to appear, in 1988. It has been reprinted many times since. In 1997 an extended version of the same dictionary appeared, entitled *Magnum Greek Dictionary (Μείζον Ελληνικό Λεξικό)*, by the same publishers. There is hardly anything known about the status and scholarly authority or theoretical stance of the compilers of this dictionary, except for the little that can be deduced from the four-page introduction. The introductory note lacks any reference to a general statement about the Greek language or the compilers' perspective on it, except for a section where they justify their choice to include purist words or variants of the demotic entries:

Αυτό έγινε για δύο λόγους: πρώτον, για να γίνει φανερό στο χρήστη του λεξικού πόσο αξεδιάλυτα είναι, συνήθως, τα όρια λόγιας και δημοτικής γλώσσας και πόσο λανθασμένη είναι η αποφυγή λέξεων με φανερό σημασιολογικό πεδίο, με την αιτιολογία της λόγιας προέλευσης, και δεύτερον, για να βοηθήσει ιδ. τους μαθητές να αναγνωρίζουν τους λόγιους τύπους της λέξης, όταν τους συναντούν σε παλιότερα κείμενα.

[We have included purist words and variants,] first in order to make it apparent to the user of the dictionary how unclear the boundaries between the purist and demotic language usually are, and how wrong it is to avoid words that belong to a particular semantic field because of their purist origin. Secondly, [we have done so] in order to help students in particular to recognise such items when they meet them in reading older texts.[8]

Interestingly, they have chosen to call their work a 'Greek' Dictionary, in contradistinction to a Dictionary *of* French, or English, thus evading the issue of designating their object of description as Modern Greek, Demotic, Neohellenic, or Common Modern Greek.

Emmanuel Kriaras, Professor Emeritus of Medieval Greek at the University of Thessaloniki, has long been known in the Greek linguistic community for his outspoken support for demotic Greek. In 1995, he published his *Modern Greek Dictionary of the Contemporary Demotic Language (Written and Spoken)*, on the compilation of which he had worked with a group of experts in Greek philology. He formulates the aim of his dictionary as follows:

---

[8] The excerpts from the four dictionaries discussed in this chapter are translated by the authors.

Με τη δημοσίευση του λεξικού τούτου ελπίζω ότι παρέχεται στο ευρύτερο κοινό βοήθημα που μπορεί και αυτό να συμβάλλει ώστε να αποκατασταθεί υγιής γραπτός και προφορικός λόγος στον τόπο μας, που για μακρό χρονικό διάστημα ταλαιπωρήθηκε με την ύπαρξη της γνωστής μας διγλωσσίας, προβλήματος που ευτυχώς ξεπεράστηκε στις μέρες μας.

I hope that the publication of this dictionary provides the general public with a helpful tool that can contribute to the restoration of a sound language, written and spoken, in our land, something that has long been lacking on account of the well-known diglossia, a problem that we have fortunately overcome.

According to Kriaras, language is to be valued and treated with care, attention and due respect, even affection, as is also clear from the 'General and Practical Guidelines for the Proper Use of the Language' that are included in the introductory part of his dictionary.

In 1998, Georgios Babiniotis, Professor of Linguistics at the University of Athens, published his *Dictionary of the Modern Greek Language (with comments regarding the proper use of words)*. This lexicographer became known to the academic and general public through his engagement in the so-called language question early in the 1980s and later on in the 1990s. Babiniotis is an advocate of a historical approach to the Greek language that views it as a unified, centuries-old system, which underwent only minor changes in its various phases, from ancient to medieval to modern. The following quotation illustrates Babiniotis' belief that his dictionary duly serves this peculiarity of the language:

Αυτό που θεωρώ ξεχωριστή προσφορά του Λεξικού στην ελληνική γλώσσα και στα πνευματικά μας πράγματα γενικότερα, είναι ότι μέσα από αυτό, έτσι όπως έχει συνταχθεί με έμφαση στο βάθος, την έκταση και την ποικιλία των σημασιών των λέξεων και των φράσεων, αναδεικνύεται ζωντανός και ανάγλυφος ο πλούτος της σύγχρονης ελληνικής γλώσσας.

What I consider to be this Dictionary's exceptional contribution to the Greek language and to our intellectual affairs in general is the fact that through the Dictionary, thanks to the way it has been compiled, namely by putting the emphasis on the depth, the extent and the variety of the meanings of words and expressions, the wealth of present-day Greek becomes salient and vivid.

Such an approach, however, obscures the social and political, as well as the linguistic, roots of language change. There is a reluctance here to assess present-day Greek on its merits, as a fully-fledged code with its own morphological and phonological rules. Instead, we find a superficial identification of the purist code with the use of language in written speech and of the vernacular code with spoken discourse, in abstraction from all other social, political or communicative considerations that may come into play when one is using one or the other code.[9] The conception of language in general, and of the Greek language in particular,

_____

[9] See the discussions in Frangoudaki (1992), (1997), Christidis (1995), and the study by Setatos (1973) of the phenomenology of *katharevousa*.

as a value that stands above the everyday need of individual language users to communicate, has led Babiniotis at times to deplore the present state of Greek as a language misused and abused by the media, by political parties and by young people; also to warn against the massive invasion of foreign usages into the Greek vocabulary, mainly from English, and to advocate the study of Ancient Greek and, in general, of older periods of the language in an attempt to improve the present use of Greek in everyday communication.[10]

Ten years after the publication of the *Tegopoulos–Fytrakis Dictionary*, Babiniotis succeeded in making a dictionary the topic of public discussion and media publicity, and in introducing a new conception of a dictionary as user-friendly and calculated to appeal to a wide public regardless of their linguistic preferences and attitudes. The dictionary was even distributed in exchange for coupons by an established daily and Sunday newspaper, *To Βήμα*.

The *Dictionary of the Common Modern Greek Language* was brought out later in the year 1998 by the University of Thessaloniki and a lexicographical team working in the Triandaphyllidis Institute of Modern Greek Studies. The Institute had already assigned the planning for a compilation of a dictionary of Modern Greek to a committee of linguists who had supported demotic back in 1968. After the constitutional establishment of demotic Modern Greek in 1976, the Ministry of Education officially commissioned the compilation of a dictionary, mainly for school purposes, from the Institute, which took more than twenty years to complete its assignment. It is noteworthy that the same Institute publishes the *Grammar of Modern Greek (Demotic)* written by the linguist M. Triandaphyllidis in 1941.[11]

In the introduction, the lexicographer-in-chief describes the dictionary as a general-purpose work addressed, in particular, to students and teachers of Greek, native and foreign alike. Its stated aim is to describe present-day Greek as spoken and written by the average educated user of the language in the big urban centres of the country, without regionalisms, or extreme dialectal or sociolectal usages or any scientific jargon. The publication of this dictionary was followed by the launch of an electronic version in an educational portal hosted by the Centre for the Greek Language.

The dictionaries and their lists of entries

The number of headwords included in a dictionary is not only a way for the publisher to promote a dictionary in the market as more authoritative and comprehensive, but also a way for the lexicographer to accommodate a language's history, in which sense the dictionary becomes a cultural monument in its own right.[12] In the case of Greek, the lexicographer needs to tackle the thorny issues regarding which lexical entries of purist origin that abounded in dictionaries of the previous century should

_____

[10] See Babiniotis (1978), (1984) and the discussion in Pavlidou (1991).

[11] An abridged and revised version of the *Short Grammar*, which is based on the original *Grammar of Modern Greek (Demotic)*, has been distributed in schools as the official school grammar since 1976.

[12] Barnhart (1980).

still be included, and how, and which foreign loanwords and neologisms should make it to the list of entries. A glance at the entries in the four dictionaries reveals a good deal of variation in their respective choices.

Both *Tegopoulos–Fytrakis* and *Babiniotis* excel in including obsolete words that could hardly be considered to belong to the treasury of present-day spoken or written Modern Greek: *αγεληδόν, ανήρ, άρουρα, γηθοσύνη, δαψιλής, εκπώμαστρον, ελλύχνιον, εναβρύνομαι, έννους, ήμαρ, καλλίπυγος, κάττυμα, κισσοστεφής, λευχειμονώ, μελανειμονώ, μήτηρ, μητρόθεν, ορώ, οτρηρός, πεφυσιωμένος, ρινόμακτρον, ρίπτω, σεισοπυγίς, σίζω, σκόλοψ, συνωδά, τάλας, χαμαί, χθων, χους.* The *Babiniotis Dictionary* even includes the words *αμήτωρ, θως, κλιτύς, ολοσηρικός, πολυΐστωρ* and *σαρδεληδόν*, which do not appear in *Tegopoulos–Fytrakis*. The dictionaries by *Kriaras* and the *University of Thessaloniki* include none of these words.

As far as neologisms and foreign loanwords are concerned, the entries in *Babiniotis* outnumber those in the other three, including words such as: *γκλάμουρ, δημοσιοσχετίστας, ζαργκόν, ίματζ, ίματζ μέικερ, ιν, κιτσάτος, λουκ, μουλτιμίντια, μουράτος, παγκοσμιοποίηση.* The *Tegopoulos–Fytrakis Dictionary* at the time of its publication was quite open to foreign loanwords such as *αντεργκράουντ, γκολκίπερ, ζουμάρω, ιντερβιού, κυριλέ, μόνιτορ, πανκ, πάνελ, πρες κόνφερανς, σικάτος, τεκνατζού, τεκνό* and *φαστφουντάδικο,* which are also found in the other two dictionaries but not in the *Kriaras Dictionary.* Indeed, Kriaras adopts a stricter and more purist policy when he says:

> Αδικαίωτους νεολογισμούς που κυκλοφορούν στα γραπτά και στο στόμα μας δεν καταχωρίσαμε. Ο νεολογισμός για να γίνει δεκτός σε ένα λεξικό πρέπει να έχει ήδη συναντήσει κάποια γενικότερη αποδοχή, και αυτό δεν συμβαίνει για πολλά αυθαίρετα σημερινά νεολογικά κατασκευάσματα.

> Unjustified neologisms that circulate in written and spoken discourse have not been included. For a neologism to be included in a dictionary, it needs to enjoy a certain degree of recognition already, and this is not the case with a number of arbitrarily constructed contemporary neologisms.

The issue here is who decides whether a language change or a new word is sufficiently widespread to be considered or accepted as normal. On the face of it, such a decision seems to imply a prescriptive and conservative practice quite unlike the one assumed by Babiniotis, as far as neologisms are concerned. But only on the face of it: the treatment of those words included in the *Babiniotis Dictionary* involves just another form of prescriptivism and purism, with cross-references used to suggest the 'Greek' equivalent.[13]

---

[13] On prescriptivism and purist practices, see Joseph (1987) and Thomas (1991).

Morpho-phonological variants

The prolonged diglossia in the history of Greek has contributed to the preservation of certain archaic consonant clusters and endings alongside those that have a colloquial origin in the Greek verb system.[14] The lack of any large-scale sociolinguistic research that would show the distribution of purist and vernacular variants across speakers of differing social and educational background or across registers, coupled with the lack of a large and reliable corpus of spoken and written Greek,[15] have left it up to the lexicographer to decide which variants to include and in what order. Once the decision is made to include both variants, the labelling of one or the other or both, and then the presenting of one before the other, are choices that reflect the lexicographer's own preference about what *should* be the norm, rather than a description of what the norm really is.

The *Tegopoulos–Fytrakis Dictionary* opts for the lexicographically unjustifiable and confusing practice of including in parentheses next to the main entry the purist form of a word and marking it with 'Κ' for *katharevousa*. The compilers justify their decision with a seemingly linguistic reason, but also a practical and pedagogical one, namely that the boundaries between the two forms are often unclear, and that students should be aided in identifying the purist forms when they come across them in texts. The dictionary thus includes entries with alternative forms like *βασιλεύς, γονεύς, ερωτιδεύς, ηγεμών, πόλις, πρεσβύωψ, σκαπανεύς, φλεψ*, as the *katharevousa* variants of the headwords *βασιλιάς, γονέας, ερωτιδέας, ηγεμόνας, πόλη, πρεσβύωπας, σκαπανέας, φλέβα*. The *Babiniotis Dictionary* also includes these variants under the demotic headword, but rightly chooses not to distinguish between *katharevousa* and demotic. Instead, *Babiniotis* labels these variant forms on the basis of registers of use, as 'λόγιο' ('learned') or 'λογιότερο' ('more learned'), without, however, following any specific criterion for the assignment of these labels, and without grounding such a labelling or the existence of those forms in a corpus search. The *Kriaras* and *University of Thessaloniki* dictionaries do not include the above forms at all.

As far as the past passive forms of verbs are concerned, the *Tegopoulos–Fytrakis Dictionary* records only the demotic endings (with -τηκα), contrary to its practice of including purist forms of nouns and adjectives. The *Kriaras Dictionary* does not systematically include information about the morphology of verbs, but one can deduce the compiler's preference for the demotic forms in the examples cited. The *Babiniotis Dictionary* gives the purist ending after the demotic one, labelling it as 'learned' or 'more learned'. Interestingly, it mentions the purist form first, followed by the demotic one, which is labelled as 'καθημερινό' ('colloquial'), for the verbs *ληστεύομαι, ταλαντεύομαι, παίζομαι*, whereas it gives no purist variants for the past passive of the verbs *χρειάζομαι, ανακατεύομαι, ονομάζομαι* and *γκρεμίζομαι*. The *University of Thessaloniki Dictionary* refers the user to an appendix that includes conjugation tables for nouns, adjectives and verbs, where

---

[14] See Browning (1982) and Holton *et al.* (1997).

[15] Iordanidou (1996), (1999), (2002).

the demotic forms as prescribed in the Triandaphyllidis *Grammar* are generally followed.

Deciding whether to include, or not include, words (or morphological or phonological variants) in the list of entries is not a matter that is exclusively dependent on the lexicographer's own preference and stance. It is also an issue affected by the factors of the market and of time.[16] Nonetheless, the way in which words are treated once they are included in a dictionary's list of entries, and the information given about their use and history, becomes a matter of choice that is dependent on personal ideologies and is affected by the lexicographer's stance on the fundamental issues of standardization.

Labelling

Assigning stylistic labels to the entries of a dictionary is a complicated task, especially when there can be no general agreement about a systematic theoretical or empirical basis for the number or distribution of such labels.[17] Scrutiny of the introductory notes of the four dictionaries regarding their labelling practice reveals a variety of approaches and criteria – more or less systematic or clear – which the respective lexicographers claim to have used in marking the stylistic and usage status of their entries.

What strikes one as odd in the *Tegopoulos–Fytrakis Dictionary* is the lack of any label distinguishing between uses in written and spoken, formal and informal, discourse. The few labels mentioned in the list of abbreviations concern text type, geographical variation, attitude and technical field. There is no labelling at all to distinguish the context of use for any of the words of purist origin, the foreign loan words or the purist morpho-phonological variables that the dictionary includes, such as ιχθνόεις, καταιονητήρ, μελανειφορώ and γιαβρί.[18] When faced with the thorny task of assigning usage labels to words of present-day Greek, which originate in either purist or demotic or even foreign traditions, the lexicographers have chosen the easy way out: that is, not to commit themselves to anything, but simply to record the purist forms of the entries they have chosen to include, marked with 'K' for *katharevousa*.

The list of labels in the *Kriaras Dictionary* is no more elaborate either, but here the lexicographer does make the effort to distinguish between his use of 'λόγιος' ('learned') and 'λαϊκός' ('popular') in the foreword to his dictionary:

Για μια λέξη σημειώνεται ότι είναι λόγια όχι αν απλώς προέρχεται από τη λόγια παράδοση, αλλά αν χρησιμοποιώντας την έχομε το αίσθημα ότι πρόκειται για λέξη όχι της κοινής γλώσσας, αλλά για λέξη που χρησιμοποιείται για την ανάγκη της στιγμής. [. . .] Σημειώνονται ως 'λαϊκές' μόνο οι κατεξοχήν λαϊκές λέξεις και όχι κάθε λέξη που σώζεται στη γλώσσα μας από την προφορική παράδοση.

---

[16] On language change see Aitchison (1991).

[17] On labelling see Hausmann (1989) and Corbin (1989).

[18] None of these words appears in this purist form in any of the other three dictionaries.

A word is labelled as 'λόγια' not simply because it originates in the learned tradition, but because when using it one feels that it does not belong to the common language, but is a word used out of the necessity of the moment. [. . .] The words labelled as 'λαϊκές' are the proper 'λαϊκές' and not any word that survives in the language through popular tradition.

The *Babiniotis Dictionary* makes use of a more elaborate labelling system for the headwords, which informs the user about style (archaic, learned, colloquial, familiar, etc.), context of use (dialectical, slang, literary, etc.) and attitude (ironic, insulting, derogatory, emotional, etc.). It even distinguishes two degrees of 'λόγιος' and 'λαϊκός' labels, namely 'λόγιος' ('learned') and 'λογιότερος' ('more learned'), and 'λαϊκός' ('popular') and 'λαϊκότερος' ('more popular'). Of the four dictionaries, this is the only one that uses the label 'αρχαιοπρεπής' ('archaized'). The label is assigned to words that appear in this dictionary alone, such as αμήτωρ, ημείς, πολυΐστωρ, and to words like γεληδόν, γηθοσύνη, ήμαρ, ίσταμαι, κάττυμα, κήδομαι, λείχω, μητρόθεν, ορώ, παιδιόθεν, πεφυσιωμένος, χθων, χους, which also appear in *Tegopoulos–Fytrakis*, as well as to words like βροχηδόν, καθαίρω, καθεύδω, κύων, μέλας, όμμα, πας, στέαρ, υπνώττω, which appear in the *University of Thessaloniki Dictionary* too.[19] The labels 'λόγιος' and 'λογιότερος' appear to be assigned in a rather arbitrary fashion, however. It seems that by assigning the label 'αρχαιοπρεπής' to words that could hardly qualify as being part of the Modern Greek vocabulary, the *Babiniotis Dictionary* seeks to validate the presence of such obsolete words by attributing to them a distinct level of use, that of an elaborate and sophisticated discourse.

The *University of Thessaloniki Dictionary* has made an effort to label every headword and every reference within a headword by indicating the context in which a word is most appropriately and effectively used. Given its primary pedagogical aim, the dictionary presents in detail the different types of labels used, intending such labels to guide the user in choosing the right word in a particular context. It distinguishes uses as 'formal', 'scientific', 'vernacular', 'popular', 'learned', 'literary', 'familiar', 'child language', 'outdated', 'spoken' and 'vulgar'. The lack of a corpus or a large-scale sociolinguistic study, however, deprives these labels of any empirical grounding that could make them an authoritative resource, or indeed could provide practical advice, for those learning Greek. A number of words are invariably labelled as 'learned', leaving the user to decide whether they would be effective in a formal as well as a familiar context, and what their communicative effect might be.[20]

As Petrounias remarks,[21] it should be the job of a dictionary of Modern Greek to clarify the confusion over the 'learned or purist origin' of a word and its use in

---

[19] None of these words appears in the *Kriaras Dictionary*. Those that appear in the *Tegopoulos–Fytrakis Dictionary* are not labelled, while those that appear in the *University of Thessaloniki Dictionary* are labelled as 'learned'.

[20] See, for example, the entries άνευ, γεώμηλο, ενταύθα, κύων, οίκος, πατήρ, ύδωρ, υιός, χείρα.

[21] Petrounias (1985) 398.

a 'learned or formal context'. The origins of the words should be dealt with in the etymology section of each entry, whereas the usage and stylistic status of the word should be part of the main entry. This is a practice that the *Kriaras Dictionary* tries to follow, whereas the *Babiniotis Dictionary* confuses the reader about the frequency and context of certain of the words it includes, when a number of them (like γηράσκω, γήρας, δρυς, νέαση, όστρεον, πίλος) are not labelled at all, and others (like άρουρα, κισσοστεφής, οποσάκις, ουδαμώς, πατήρ, πτύω) receive only an etymological indication, 'ancient' or 'medieval', in brackets.

Etymological information[22]

Information about the history of words included in the etymological part of an entry enhances the sense of dictionaries as cultural monuments, within which clues to the history of a particular culture and its relationship to others are provided. Keeping the balance between unduly specialized etymological information and information about the history of words that may concern the wider public can also be an efficient way of targeting a larger readership for a dictionary.[23] In his detailed study of the etymologies in Modern Greek dictionaries, Petrounias[24] concludes that the morpho-semantic and etymological information they provide is deficient, because it is based solely on the form and spelling of the words and invariably seeks to trace the root of as many words as possible back to Ancient Greek, disregarding broad internal and external borrowing practices, during the diglossia period in particular.

In the *Babiniotis Dictionary*, it is clear from the extent of etymological information, and the number of usage notes referring to the history of words, that etymology plays a crucial part not only in the way the entries are organized but also in the way they are spelled. As the compiler acknowledges in the introduction:

> Σε μια γλώσσα δε όπως η Ελληνική, όπου ισχύει η ιστορική ή ετυμολογική ορθογραφία των λέξεων [. . .], η ετυμολογία αποκτά πρόσθετη βαρύτητα, υπό τον όρο, βεβαίως, ότι στηρίζεται στις αρχές της γλωσσικής επιστήμης και όχι σε εμπειρικές ετυμολογήσεις ή παρετυμολογήσεις («λαϊκή ετυμολογία») των λέξεων.

> In a language like Greek, where historical or etymological spelling of words arises [. . .], etymology has acquired an additional importance, on condition that it is based on the principles of linguistic science and not on the folk etymology of words.

Here, the lexicographer has chosen to trace the history of words from their earliest roots, with reference to Indo-European origins, through intermediate steps and

---

[22] In this section, we focus on the discrepancies between the *Babiniotis* and the *University of Thessaloniki* dictionaries alone, as far as the scope of the etymological information and the origin of the words included in their lists are concerned. The *Tegopoulos–Fytrakis Dictionary* merely copies the etymology of words already proposed in Andriotis' *Etymological Dictionary* (1983), while the *Kriaras Dictionary* refers to the ancient or foreign origin of words only occasionally.

[23] Drysdale (1989).

[24] Petrounias (1985).

significant cognates. The reason for this, according to the compiler, is practical, utilitarian and educational; since it is not easy for the ordinary language-user to have access to the specialized dictionaries needed for this, and it also satisfies the ordinary user's curiosity about historical information. Again, such a choice is not immune to the lexicographer's own position on the historical roots of the Greek language and its uninterrupted continuity.

On the other hand, the etymological information in the *University of Thessaloniki Dictionary*, compiled throughout by Petrounias, is programmatically restricted to cover the history of words dating back to what is seen as the historic and linguistic basis of Common Modern Greek, namely the Hellenistic *koine* as it developed from the end of the fourth century BC onwards. The compiler chooses not to give redundant morphological information about the compounding and derivation of words of Ancient Greek origin, but rather to focus on a detailed description of the history of more recent loanwords and neologisms. In addition, special attention has been paid to grammatical entries such as prefixes and suffixes that illustrate how the compounding and derivational system of Modern Greek works. Overall, the *University of Thessaloniki Dictionary* makes use of a more detailed marking system for describing the history of words, distinguishing between loan translations, semantic borrowings and 'Rückwanderungen' ('αντιδάνεια': 'reborrowings').

Unlike other dictionaries of Modern Greek, both the *Babiniotis* and the *University of Thessaloniki* dictionaries agree that words like ακουστικό, κοινωνιολογία, ουρανοξύστης and πολιτισμός are loan translations of foreign words, originally coined in English or French, and made up of Greek lexical items. Nonetheless, whereas both dictionaries acknowledge that internationalisms such as αθλητισμός, ανθρωπολογία, βιολογία, μικρόβιο, πραγματολογία, have a foreign origin, the *Babiniotis Dictionary* describes them as 'Greek-origin foreign terms' ('ελληνογενής ξένος όρος'). Such a designation seeks to underline the fact that the form of the words is drawn from Greek and to play down the consideration that such words were originally coined in a foreign language and only later borrowed into Greek through the learned tradition. The etymological information in the *University of Thessaloniki Dictionary*, by contrast, indicates clearly that these words have come from a foreign language into Greek through the learned tradition.[25]

There are also a number of other words, labelled as 'semantic borrowings' ('μεταφραστικά δάνεια')[26] in the *University of Thessaloniki Dictionary*, which the *Babiniotis Dictionary* relates directly to Ancient Greek cognates: words like εκνευρίζω, ένθημα, επίθημα, εφημερίδα, καθήκον, κέντρο. Again, by focusing entirely on the form of the words, which have an Ancient Greek appearance and which can sometimes be related to words that actually existed in Ancient Greek,

---

[25] To add to the confusion about the history of internationalisms, the *Babiniotis Dictionary* states that words like βιταμίνη, κομουνισμός, σοσιαλισμός, υφολογία are the 'rendering in Greek of a foreign word' ('απόδοση/μεταφορά στην Ελληνική ξένου όρου'), and rightly so – but contrary to the labelling for other internationalisms in the same dictionary.

[26] On words coined in the purist tradition that make use of Ancient Greek forms, or re-use already existing words in order to render the meaning of foreign loan words, see Petrounias (1997).

the *Babiniotis Dictionary* fails to make clear that a new meaning has been added to the word in modern times in order to address the need for a newly imported concept or referent.

The inclusion of etymological information has a clear ideological function, if anything in a more telling way, in the case of 'Rückwanderungen' ('reborrowings'). Both dictionaries rightly trace the origin of such words as άρια, αφιόνι, γαζία, διαμάντι, δράμι, κάμαρα, καναπές, παλάβρα, φιντάνι back to Ancient Greek. The *Babiniotis Dictionary*, however, accepts as 'Rückwanderungen' a number of other words whose etymological origin is either still disputed or clearly assigned to a foreign origin in the *University of Thessaloniki Dictionary*: αμπάρι, βάρκα, γκράφιτι, γκροτέσκος, ζαμπόν, μπράβος, ουτοπία, πέναλτι, τσόκαρο, φιστίκι. Such insistence on not only the roots of present-day Greek words in a distant and glorious past, but also on the impact that the classical Greek tradition has had on other languages, as a source of inspiration for the invention of new words, originates in the compiler's own conviction that Greek has the potential to reinvent itself.[27] The etymological treatment of the words included in the *Babiniotis Dictionary* and the attention paid to the narrative of their long history stamps this particular dictionary as – in aspiration, at least – a truly cultural monument and a direct tribute to the Greek language as a treasure that Greeks should be proud of.

Spelling and orthography

The extent and accuracy of the information about spelling that a dictionary provides constitutes one of the main reasons, perhaps the primary reason, that dictionary users have for choosing between one dictionary and another and for consulting it after making their choice.[28] Where Greek dictionaries are concerned, lexicographers are faced with the thorny issue of deciding how close to be to the orthographic prescriptions of the state and school grammar by Triandaphyllidis, and how consistent they need to be when proposing alternative spellings or more simplified ones. Triandaphyllidis proposed guidelines for the spelling of words, which sought to establish a simplified historic orthography that is easy to teach and memorize without the need for recourse to Ancient Greek cognates of the words in question.[29] His orthographic standardization has been much debated, and the variety of positions is reflected in the dictionaries under review.

Of our four dictionaries, the *Tegopoulos–Fytrakis Dictionary* is the one that follows the orthographical prescriptions of the Triandaphyllidis *Grammar* to the letter. This does not seem to be the outcome of a conscious theoretical stance on this much-debated issue, but rather of commercial practicalities, in that the dictionary is primarily addressed to students and office workers, in whose milieux the Triandaphyllidis *Grammar* is the one officially recognized. The *Babiniotis Dictionary* makes etymology the primary criterion in prescribing the correct

---

[27] For a discussion see Frangoudaki (1992), (1996), (1997) and Christidis (1995), (1999).

[28] Whitcut (1989).

[29] Iordanidou (1997).

spelling of all words included. The compiler in effect overgeneralizes the validity of the historical principle and applies it to the orthography of all words originating in Ancient Greek or Latin. He thus writes καλοιακούδα, κολλήγος, κουκκί, μάννα, φύσκα, instead of καλιακούδα, κολίγος, κουκί, μάνα, φίσκα. In the same way, the dictionary proposes spelling 'Rückwanderungen' according to their original (Ancient Greek) spelling, disregarding the fact that they have been introduced to Modern Greek at a later stage through the medium of a foreign language, and should thus follow a simplified orthography too – at least in the case of those coming through the popular tradition, which actually form the majority. He thus writes γαρύφαλλο, γόμμα, τόννος, τσαννάκι, τσηρώτο, φυντάνι. By contrast, the *University of Thessaloniki* and the other dictionaries register the simplified spellings for such words: γαρίφαλο, γόμα, τόνος, τσανάκι, τσιρότο, φιντάνι.

Up to a point, the *Kriaras Dictionary* appears to favour a conservative spelling for words that are closer to their ancient cognates, neglecting the simplified orthographic principles of the Triandaphyllidis *Grammar*: κάππα, λειανός, λειχούδης, λειώνω, ξενιτειά, πασσαλείφω, ρωδάκινο, στρυμώχνω.[30] The problem, however, is that the same principle is not applied to other words, which makes the spelling practice of the *Kriaras Dictionary* appear to be less consistent than the disputed spellings in the *Babiniotis Dictionary*. What is most confusing and problematic about both the *Kriaras* and the *Babiniotis* dictionaries is that neither gives any explicit statement or explanation of the principles for recording a specific spelling: their practice is to seek to establish an orthographic standard *de facto* without any prior discussion or justification. The preference for spellings that relate Modern Greek words directly to their ancient cognates *pro forma* goes hand in hand with the emphasis on the history of the words as discussed above. This practice confirms the status of both dictionaries as would-be cultural monuments, at times to the detriment of the practical needs of users and without reference to established language use.

The ideology of standardization

The compilation and circulation of a dictionary is a social practice that contributes to the processes of standardizing a language, regulating variability in the language system and ultimately prescribing usage by means of a codification of language.[31] Dictionary compilers, then, act as 'language guardians', who are burdened with the task of cataloguing the great variety of forms and meanings encountered in language use. The decisions they take when recording the various forms, meanings and expressions reflect both their particular assumptions about what a standard should look like and their own aspirations for the contribution that their dictionary is to make in the linguistic community.

---

[30] The *Babiniotis Dictionary* favours the same spelling, while the other two dictionaries follow the simplified spelling of these words: κάπα, λιανός, λιχούδης, λιώνω, ξενιτιά, πασαλείφω, ροδάκινο, στριμώχνω.

[31] For a discussion about standardization and codification, see Milroy and Milroy (1991), Downes (1998), Aitchison (1991) and Cameron (1995).

From the discussion so far, it is obvious how much the four dictionaries under review differ from each other, as regards both the treatment of entries and the presentation of information provided. The discrepancies should not be seen as the result of an accurate description of different object-languages or codes, for all four dictionaries claim to have described the Greek language as spoken and written in present-day Greece. In addition, their almost simultaneous circulation in the second half of the last century[32] would have resulted in commercial failure had their readerships supposed that all four dictionaries were presenting the same description of the Greek language. Their differences lie not in *what* they describe but in *how* they describe it. And this variability is determined not only by the individual lexicographer's reaction to the intellectual climate of his time, as Zgusta puts it, but also – to a larger or smaller extent – by considerations of marketing and 'brand image', as Cameron suggests.[33]

The study of dictionary compilation and circulation as a mechanism and symptom of standardization in a linguistic community relates directly to the discussion of prescriptivism in language and invites a systematic scrutiny of the phenomenon from a linguistic perspective, as Milroy and Milroy, and Cameron, have convincingly argued.[34] For Cameron, the question is not 'should we prescribe?', but 'who prescribes for whom, what they prescribe, how and for what purposes'.[35] Depending on the authority and status of the 'language guardians' and on the means they use to publicize their ideas, the prescribed spellings, forms, uses and word narratives can be more or less convincing and can reach a broader or less broad audience. At the same time, the effectiveness of such prescriptivism depends on how well the 'language guardians' accommodate the needs of the language users and the current linguistic situation, and on the willingness of the community to endorse their proposals. In assessing the influence of dictionaries on the standardization process, Zgusta observes:

> There is no doubt that dictionaries do influence the linguistic behaviour of their users. They cannot stop change, nor can they cause changes disapproved of, or not accepted by, the user. They can and do stabilise the usage, particularly in the written language and in the related formal styles of spoken language; they do clarify meanings and make them more systematic.[36]

As far as the Greek linguistic community is concerned, 'Standard Modern Greek' is not a code that is homogeneously used in formal and official registers and from which deviations can readily be identified, as is arguably the case with

---

[32] Note that, although the *Tegopoulos–Fytrakis Dictionary* was first published in 1988, its enlarged edition entitled *Magnum Greek Dictionary* appeared in 1997, only two years after the publication of the *Kriaras Dictionary* and just one year before the simultaneous publication of the *Babiniotis* and the *University of Thessaloniki* dictionaries.

[33] Zgusta (1992) 7; Cameron (1995) 49.

[34] Milroy and Milroy (1991); Cameron (1995).

[35] Cameron (1995) 11.

[36] Zgusta (1989) 77. See also Gallardo (1980).

English, German, French or Arabic. The compilers of the four dictionaries under review were faced with the task of choosing which words and forms to register from those inherited from the purist tradition of the past and those borrowed from foreign languages, and how to label them and record their history.[37] They also had to account for the fact that the public to which each dictionary was addressed included people brought up and educated during the diglossic situation before 1976, and people who had been taught Greek at school through the Triandaphyllidis *Grammar* after that. In addition, the lack of a large and scientifically compiled corpus of written and spoken Modern Greek left the lexicographers to decide how best to reconcile the cultural function of a dictionary with its commercial aspect, in the light of their own attitudes towards language and language change. In their case, there was no standard language to merely describe and elaborate by means of publishing their dictionary. Instead, the aim was to propose a standard language and contribute towards the making of one.

According to Zgusta, linguistic communities that go through the slow and somewhat generational process of overcoming diglossia, like the Greek linguistic community at the beginning of the twentieth century, tend to show a pattern whereby 'archaizing' dictionaries are replaced by 'standard-descriptive' dictionaries. Among the difficulties with the compilation of a 'standard-descriptive' dictionary, Zgusta mentions the problem of distinguishing which words and usages fall under the standard variety and which under the non-standard, and making a selection from the vast vocabulary and the possible variants already in use, as well as the dilemma about whether to include or not include lexical units from earlier phases of the history of the language that are still in use.[38] In terms of Zgusta's typology,[39] all four dictionaries under review belong to the 'standard-descriptive' type as opposed to those published during the period of diglossia, which were more of the 'antiquating or archaizing' type.[40] In each of the four, however, certain repercussions of the historic type of dictionary can be seen.

Depending on their respective authority and aspirations, each dictionary pursues a goal of controlling and regulating the linguistic behaviour of the Greek community either from a historical perspective or else from a perspective of standardization proper. In both cases, the acknowledged aim is to improve the standards of linguistic behaviour in speech or writing. The *Kriaras* and *Babiniotis* dictionaries seek to do that by applauding the vast richness and depth of the Greek vocabulary and by being explicitly prescriptive. Both lexicographers value language as a treasure that lies beyond the everyday use and communicative needs of Greek speakers and should thus be treated with care. They both emphasize the

---

[37] See the study by Kahane and Kahane (1967) of the problems that Greek lexicographers face as a consequence of the diglossic past of the Greek language.

[38] Zgusta (1989) 74–5.

[39] Zgusta (1989) distinguishes the following four types of dictionaries that influence standardization: 'standard-creating', 'modernizing', 'antiquating or archaizing', and 'standard-descriptive'.

[40] For an overview of Greek dictionaries, see Alissandratos (1980). For a brief discussion of the general monolingual dictionaries published in the period of diglossia, see also Tseronis (2002).

roots of the language, *Kriaras* from a more demotic standpoint, *Babiniotis* from a more puristic standpoint. Of the two, the *Babiniotis Dictionary* is the one which also addresses commercial needs, by providing a work of reference that is easy to use and includes a significant number of foreign words and neologisms. The *Kriaras Dictionary* remains devoted to the principles of demotic Modern Greek that are advocated by its compiler.

The *Tegopoulos–Fytrakis Dictionary* is the most commercial of the four. It is the first one to address the market need for a user-friendly and reliable dictionary, exploiting the prestige associated with a language dictionary as a cultural monument. The compilers and publishers of this dictionary have avoided taking any theoretical stance on the issues of language change and standardization. Their contribution is simply to record as many forms and variants as possible (whether of purist, popular or foreign origin) and let time and the users decide on their use and viability. The *University of Thessaloniki Dictionary*, by contrast, bears the marks of the institutional and educational role it has been commissioned to play since 1976. In terms of prestige and authority within the Greek linguistic community, the *Babiniotis* and *University of Thessaloniki* dictionaries are competing points of reference: the one representing the private, commercial perspective of an individual but established linguist; the other, the product of a collective, institutional project that enjoys the status of a national dictionary. In these two dictionaries, Standard Modern Greek is invested with the prestige of a prominent 'language guardian' and with the authority of an institution, respectively.

Given the lack of an extended and reliable corpus of present-day spoken and written Greek, there can be no objectively defined linguistic reality that the dictionaries under review could claim to describe. What each of these dictionaries has done, in a more or less convincing manner, is construct one possible version of what the linguistic reality of Modern Greek is or should be, given the lexicographer's own stance on the matter and under the constraints of the market or the attitudes of prospective users. This is not to suggest that there is some deplorable anarchy within the Greek linguistic community, as some commentators would have it.[41] The point is rather that the compilation of a dictionary is not a private individual's own business – even if it does indeed take an individual mind and commitment to get a team of people working together. The compilation of a dictionary is a public project that addresses a certain linguistic community and should thus be open and sensitive to public debate about what is *not* to be included, as well as what *is*, and *how*.

---

[41] On language mythologies surviving in the Greek linguistic community, and the media coverage of language-related issues in Greece after 1976, see Charis (2001) and Moschonas (2004).

References

Aitchison, J. (1991), *Language Change: Process or Decay?*, 2nd edn, Cambridge.

Alexiou, M. (1982), 'Diglossia in Greece', in W. Haas (ed.), *Standard Languages: Spoken and Written*, Manchester: 156–92.

Alissandratos, G. (1980), 'Τα νεοελληνικά λεξικά. Συνοπτικό διάγραμμα', *Διαβάζω*, 32: 26–36 (Part 1) and *Διαβάζω* 34: 30–44 (Part 2).

Alissandratos, G. (1995), 'Το Λεξικό της Σύγχρονης Δημοτικής Γλώσσας του Εμμ. Κριαρά', *Αντί*, 586: 54–7.

Anastassiadi-Simeonidi, A. (2000), 'Το Λεξικό της Κοινής Νεοελληνικής: σχεδιασμός – συμβολή – χρήση', *Teaching Modern Greek: Proceedings of the Fifth Annual Meeting*, Thessaloniki: 47–56.

Andriotis, N.P. (1983), *Ετυμολογικό Λεξικό της Κοινής Νεοελληνικής*, 3rd edn, Thessaloniki.

Babiniotis, G. (1978), 'Πέραν της καθαρευούσης και της δημοτικής', in S. Panou (ed.), *Για τη Δημοτική Γλώσσα*, Athens: 149–58.

Babiniotis, G. (1984), 'Νεοελληνική γλώσσα: Μέριμνα, αμεριμνησία και υπερπροστασία', in Ελληνικός Γλωσσικός Όμιλος, *Ελληνική γλώσσα*, vol.1, Athens: 138–61.

Babiniotis, G. (1998), *Λεξικό της Νέας Ελληνικής Γλώσσας*, Athens.

Barnhart, C.L. (1980), 'What makes a dictionary authoritative', in Zgusta (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*, 2nd edn, Cambridge.

Burke, J.B. (1989), 'Lost for words: vocabulary and usage in Modern Greek and the Dictionary of the Triandaphyllidis Institute', *International Journal of Lexicography*, 2: 157–65.

Cameron, D. (1995), *Verbal Hygiene*, London.

Charalambakis, C. (1990), 'Κριτήρια επιλογής σε ένα χρηστικό λεξικό. Παρατηρήσεις στο υπό έκδοση Λεξικό της Νέας Ελληνικής Γλώσσας του Ιδρύματος Μ. Τριανταφυλλίδη', *Studies in Greek Linguistics: Proceedings of the Tenth Annual Meeting*, Thessaloniki: 439–59.

Charis, G.I. (ed.) (2001), *Δέκα Μύθοι για την Ελληνική Γλώσσα*, Athens.

Christidis, A. (1995), 'Γλωσσικές μυθολογίες: η περίπτωση της Ελληνικής', *Σύγχρονα Θέματα*, 54: 21–6.

Christidis, A. (1996), 'The Modern Greek language and its history', *The Greek Language*, Athens: 71–4.

Christidis, A. (1999), *Γλώσσα, Πολιτική, Πολιτισμός*, Athens.

Corbin, P. (1989), 'Les marques stylistiques / diastratiques dans le dictionnaire monolingue', in Hausmann *et al.* (1989–90): 673–80.

Downes, W. (1998), *Language and Society*, 2nd edn, Cambridge.

Drysdale, P.D. (1989), 'Etymological information in the general monolingual dictionary', in Hausmann *et al.* (1989-90): 525–30.

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: 365–81.

Frangoudaki, A. (1996), 'On Greek diglossia: the ideological determinants of a long-standing social conflict over language', in Frangoudaki, *The Greek Language*, Athens: 83–9.

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*, Athens.

Gallardo, A. (1980), 'Dictionaries and the standardization process', in Zgusta (1980): 59–69.

Goutsos, D. (1999), 'George D. Babiniotis. Γεώργιος Δ. Μπαμπινιώτης, Λεξικό της νέας ελληνικής γλώσσας' (review), *Journal of Modern Greek Studies*, 17: 163–70.

Hausmann, F.J. (1989), 'Die Markierung im allgemeinen einsprachigen Wörterbuch: eine Übersicht', in Hausmann *et al.* (1989–90): 649–57.

Hausmann, F.J., Reichmann, O., Wiegand, H.-E. and Zgusta, L. (eds.) (1989–90), *Wörterbücher–Dictionaries–Dictionnaires: An International Encyclopedia of Lexicography*, vol. 1, Berlin.

Holton, D., Mackridge, P. and Philippaki-Warburton, I. (1997), *Greek: A Comprehensive Grammar of the Modern Language*, London.

Institute of Modern Greek Studies (Triandaphyllidis Foundation) (1998), *Λεξικό της Κοινής Νεοελληνικής*, Thessaloniki.

Iordanidou, A. (1996), '"Standard" Κοινή Νεοελληνική: απόπειρα καθορισμού', *Strong and Weak Languages in the EU: Aspects of Linguistic Hegemonism*, Thessaloniki: 139–47.

Iordanidou, A. (1997), 'Η ορθογραφία στα νεοελληνικά λεξικά', *Terminologie et Traduction*, 2: 190–210.

Iordanidou, A. (1999), 'Ζητήματα τυποποίησης της σύγχρονης Νεοελληνικής', *Strong and Weak Languages in the EU*, vol. 2, Thessaloniki: 835–54.

Iordanidou, A. (2000), 'Σύγκριση και αξιολόγηση των τεσσάρων λεξικών', *Η Καθημερινή*, 6 November 2000.

Iordanidou, A. (2002), 'Η κοινή νεοελληνική σε σύγχρονα λεξικά και γραμματικές', *Terminologie et Traduction*, 3: 111–24.

Joseph, J.E. (1987), *Eloquence and Power: The Rise of Language Standards and Standard Languages*, London.

Kahane, H. and Kahane, R. (1967), 'Problems in Greek lexicography', in F.W. Householder and S. Saporta (eds.), *Problems in Lexicography*, Indiana: 249–62.

Kahane, H. and Kahane, R. (1992), 'The dictionary as ideology: sixteen case studies', in Zgusta (1992): 19–76.

Kalioris, G.M. (1998), 'Το Λεξικό Μπαμπινιώτη', *Νέα Εστία*, 1706: 1056–82.

Kexagioglou, G. (1999), 'Ένα Λεξικό διεθνών προδιαγραφών. Βιβλιοκρισία του Λεξικού της Κοινής Νεοελληνικής', *Διαβάζω*, 395: 30–2.

Kriaras, E. (1995), *Νέο Ελληνικό Λεξικό της Σύγχρονης Δημοτικής Γλώσσας Γραπτής και Προφορικής*, Athens.

Kriaras, E. (2000), 'Το Λεξικό Μπαμπινιώτη και η Δημοτική', *Η Καθημερινή*, 6 November 2000.

Mackridge, P. (2002), 'G. Babiniotis, Λεξικό της νέας ελληνικής γλώσσας, and Λεξικό της κοινής νεοελληνικής' (review), *Journal of Greek Linguistics*, 2: 254–9.

Maravelias, Ch.E. (1999), 'Α μεν συνήκα πρόχειρα. Βιβλιοκρισία του Γ. Μπαμπινιώτη, Λεξικό της νέας ελληνικής γλώσσας', *Διαβάζω*, 395: 33–5.

Milroy, J. and Milroy, L. (1991), *Authority in Language. Investigating Language Prescription and Standardization*, 2nd edn, London.

Moschonas, S.A. (2004), 'Relativism in language ideology: on Greece's latest language issues', *Journal of Modern Greek Studies*, 22: 173–206.

Pavlidou, T. (1991), 'Linguistic nationalism and European Community: the case of Greece', in Coulmas, F. (ed.), *A Language Policy for the European Community: Prospects and Quandaries*, Berlin: 279–89.

Petrounias, E. (1985), 'Τα λεξικά της Νέας Ελληνικής, οι ετυμολογίες τους και οι ετυμολογίες του λεξικού του Ιδρύματος Τριανταφυλλίδη', *Studies in Greek Linguistics: Proceedings of the Third Annual Meeting*, Thessaloniki: 307–416.

Petrounias, E. (1997), 'Loan translations and the etymologies of Modern Greek', *Greek Linguistics '95: Proceedings of the Second International Conference on Greek Linguistics*, vol. 2, Salzburg: 791–801.

Setatos, M. (1973), 'Φαινομενολογία της καθαρεύουσας', *Επιστημονική Επετηρίδα Φιλοσοφικής Σχολής Πανεπιστημίου Θεσσαλονίκης*, 12: 43–80.

Tegopoulos–Fytrakis (eds.) (1988), *Ελληνικό Λεξικό*, Athens.

Tegopoulos–Fytrakis (eds.) (1997), *Μείζον Ελληνικό Λεξικό*, Athens.

Thomas, G. (1991), *Linguistic Purism*, London.

Triandaphyllidis, M. (1941), *Νεοελληνική Γραμματική (της Δημοτικής)*, Athens.

Tseronis, A. (2002), 'Diglossic past and present lexicographical practices: the case of two Greek dictionaries', *Language Problems and Language Planning*, 26: 219–52.

Vavadzani, P. (1997), 'Ο πίνακας των παραγωγικών καταλήξεων στο Ελληνικό Λεξικό', *Studies in Greek Linguistics: Proceedings of the Seventeenth Annual Meeting*, Thessaloniki: 130–44.

Whitcut, J. (1989), 'The dictionary as a commodity', in Hausmann *et al.* (1989–90): 88–94.

Zgusta, L. (ed.) (1980), *Theory and Method in Lexicography: Western and Non-Western Perspectives*, Columbia, SC.

Zgusta, L. (1989), 'The role of dictionaries in the genesis and development of the standard', in Hausmann *et al.* (1989–90): 70–79.

Zgusta, L. (ed.) (1992), *History, Languages, and Lexicographers*, Tübingen.