

30. Modern Greek

1. Introduction

Modern Greek, called *eliniká* by its some 13,000,000 speakers, is the descendant of Ancient Greek, and thus is part of the Greek or Hellenic branch of Indo-European. Greek speakers are located mostly in the nation of Greece itself, with some 10,000,000 living there, but large numbers are to be found also in Cyprus (c. 500,000) and parts of the diaspora (e. g. 1,000,000 in Australia, chiefly in Melbourne). Historically, Greek speakers have settled all over the eastern Mediterranean, in Southern Italy, along the Black Sea coasts, in Egypt, the Levant, Cyprus, and much of Asia Minor. This geographical spread continued throughout the Hellenistic period and on through the Byzantine and Medieval periods, and is valid to some extent even into the Modern era, though most of the Greek inhabitants of Asia Minor (present-day Turkey) were removed to Greece (and many Greek-speaking Muslims from Greece to Turkey) after the population exchanges of the early 1920s in the wake of Greece's unsuccessful expansionist forays.

Within Greece, the greatest concentration of speakers, some 4,000,000 or more, lives in the greater Athens area alone, most of them speakers – and shapers – of the current standard language.

Depending on how one decides the difficult question of distinguishing between dialects of a language as opposed to separate languages, the highly divergent modern form of Greek known as Tsakonian, spoken still in the eastern Peloponnesos (in Greece), could well be considered now a separate language from the rest of Modern Greek, and the Pontic dialects once spoken along the Black Sea coast of Asia Minor but now spoken in many parts of Greece due to the 1923 population exchanges are divergent enough to warrant consideration now as a separate language from the rest of Greek. Similarly, modern Cypriot shows significant differences on all levels (phonological, morphological, and syntactic) that invite classification as a separate language, though this judgment is perhaps a more difficult one than in the case of Tsakonian or Pontic.

Still, it is customary to treat Modern Greek as a unified language with a range of

dialects, much as was the case with Ancient Greek. While the dialect complexity of Ancient Greek was largely levelled out in Hellenistic times with the emergence of the relatively unified variety of Greek known as the Koine (see chapter on Ancient Greek), the natural forces of language change led to new dialect diversity in the Byzantine period, with the modern regional dialects emerging after about the 10th to 12th centuries (AD). The main exception to this characterization is Tsakonian (as mentioned above), which derives more or less directly from the ancient Doric dialect, though with an admixture of standard Modern Greek in recent years; in addition, the Greek of Southern Italy, still spoken, for instance, in some villages in Apulia and Calabria, seems to have ancient Doric roots. The Pontic dialects (mentioned above) may derive more directly from the Hellenistic Koine.

The major modern regional dialects stemming from the later Byzantine form of the Koine are (following Newton 1972): Peloponnesian-Ionian, Northern, Cretan, Old Athenian, and South-eastern (including the Greek of the Dodecanese islands and, traditionally at least, Cypriot Greek as well). Peloponnesian-Ionian has formed the basis historically for what has become the contemporary Standard language, and is the basis for the Greek of modern Athens, as by far the leading population center in Greece; the Old Athenian dialect was the Greek of Athens before the 1821 War of Independence, and is still found elsewhere in Greece due to various resettlements.

A key aspect of the development of Modern Greek pertains to its external history, namely the fact that throughout post-Classical Greek, the language and its speakers was never able to escape the important cultural influence of the Classical Greek language and Classical Greece itself. The importance of Classical Greece – in the Mediterranean, the Balkans, parts of the Middle East, and even Western and Central Europe – meant that Classical Greek was taken as the prescriptive norm against which speakers of later stages of Greek generally measured themselves. This situation led to a “two-track system” for the language, in which a high-style consciously archaizing variety that speakers and writers modeled on Classical Greek was set against a vernacular innovative variety. After the War of Independence from the Ottoman Empire in 1821 and the founding of a new nation-state of Greece, this distinction crystallized into a significant register and stylis-

tic difference between what has come to be known as *Katharevusa* (“Puristic”, literally “(the) purifying (language)”) as the high-style variety associated with official functions, i. e. those pertaining to government, education, religion, and such, and *Dimotiki* (“Demotic”, literally “(the) popular (language)”) as the language of the people in ordinary, day-to-day, mundane affairs. This socio-linguistic state of affairs was the basis for the formulation of the notion of *diglossia* (Ferguson 1959), and struggles between advocates of each type of Greek, carrying with them certain social attitudes and political positions, continued throughout most of the 20th century. After a number of governmental acts and actions in 1976, *Dimotiki* became the official language, and the diglossic situation is resolved, at least from an official standpoint. Significant for understanding variation in Greek is the fact that all throughout both the official and unofficial periods of diglossia, speakers’ usage was actually somewhat mixed, with borrowing between the two varieties, especially with Puristic forms incorporated into Demotic. The present state of Demotic, what has emerged as “Standard Modern Greek”, hereafter SG, based on the everyday Greek of the largest city and capital of Greece (Athens), reflects a number of such borrowings from *Katharevusa*, involving both grammar (morphology and syntax) and pronunciation, as well as the lexicon, as discussed below.

Relevant also along with these stylistic/register differences is the effect of orthography. There is a long tradition of written forms of Greek, with the familiar Greek alphabet being the most enduring writing system for the language; as is so often the case, written forms tend toward the conservative, especially as concerns the representation of pronunciation. There is thus within Greek, especially regarding phonology a basis for influence from the written language, and the potential for variation there from. Moreover, spelling reforms of the late 1970s and early 1980s, leading to the so-called *monotoniko* (“monotonic”) system, changed certain aspects of Greek orthography, in particular doing away with several phonetically irrelevant accent marks and diacritics that reflected Ancient Greek orthography; still, the old orthography can be encountered in books published before 1981 and in private use (e. g. personal letters), so that there is variation to be found in the form of written Greek even today.

What the long-term diglossia and associ-

ated influence from a written language have meant for Greek is the emergence of dialect differences that are not just regional (geographic) in nature. Rather, there are important socially based distinctions that have been fed by diglossia and by associations between conservative social and political attitudes and conservative linguistic usage on the one hand, and progressive attitudes and innovative linguistic usage on the other. Thus within Greek one has to reckon with mixing of varieties and borrowing among them of both a regional and stylistic/social nature.

Other types of socially based variation can be found too, though, beyond the omnipresent one based on the Katharevusa versus Dimotiki distinction. From a functional standpoint, mention should be made of the existence of certain institutionalized trade jargons, e.g. that of coppersmiths, and several varieties of “disguised languages” (e.g. one involving switching of syllables in a word with some distortions of vowels). Especially well-known in this regard is *καλιαρντά* /kaliar'da/, the lect of the gay community that is characterized especially by a large number of Turkish loan words and divergent meanings for SG words (see Petropoulos 1971). One might also mention here conventionalized child-language forms (e.g. with sibilants for SG dental fricatives θ/ð, and various lexical items, as for bodily functions) that all (adult) speakers know and are able to use in appropriate situations (e.g., talking with young children).

Of importance also for the issue of the mixing of varieties in Greek is the presence of other languages in Greece and in the territory surrounding Greece in the Balkans down through the ages and even into modern times. These circumstances have led to the steady entry of numerous foreign words into Greek over the years, from Balkan, Middle Eastern, and more recently Western European languages, setting the stage for variation in the use and integration of loan words on the part of Greek speakers. In the modern era, there have been periods of reaction against the influx of loanwords, with sometimes Italian but especially Turkish words being the prime targets for purging and replacement by “native” Greek elements. These efforts have met with varying degrees of success but in any case, there are still large numbers of Turkish words in the language today, especially at the most colloquial and everyday levels of usage.

Thus for a number of historical reasons

having to do in large part with the geographic distribution of Greek speakers and with the particular circumstances of the relationship of later Greek speakers to their cultural past and heritage, Modern Greek today shows considerable variety in its realizations. Regional differences cut across social differences, and all this has come despite the existence in most periods of various strong centralized standard forms of the language (e.g. archaizing varieties in Medieval and early modern times, the demotic standard of today, etc.) that have provided norms for prescriptive usage.

255 2. Basic Typology

256 2.1. Phonology

258 A description of the contemporary Standard language, essentially based on Athenian usage, provides a useful starting point for understanding the range of linguistic diversity and variation to be found in the Hellenic world.

264 The consonantal inventory of SG is given in Table 1, and the vowels are given in Table 2, though some of the entries, bracketed and in italics, require additional commentary (given below); some of the major allophones of these elements are discussed in Section 3:

271 Tab. 30.1: Consonants of Modern Greek

	Labial	Palatal	Dental	Velar
280 Stops				
284 voiceless				
286 unaspirated	p		t	k
290 <i>[voiced</i>	<i>b</i>		<i>d</i>	<i>g]</i>
297 Nasals	m		n	
302 Fricatives				
308 voiced	v	<i>[j]</i>	ð z	ɣ
309 voiceless	f		θ s	x
314 Affricates				
316 <i>voiced</i>			<i>[dʒ]</i>	
319 <i>voiceless</i>			<i>[tʃ]</i>	
323 Liquids				
326 Flap			r	
327 Lateral			l	

332 Tab. 30.2: Vowels of Modern Greek

333	i	u
334	ε	ο
335	ɐ	

336 The status of the voiced stops is controversial because for one thing they occur as morphophonemic alternants of voiceless stops when a nasal comes to precede (as

in ο πατέρας /o pa'teras/ 'the father (NOM.SG)' vs. τον πατέρα /tom ba'tera/ 'the father (ACC.SG)') and moreover for many speakers (see below regarding variation with these) they occur in word-medial position only after nasals (and no voiceless stops occur in that context), inviting the analysis whereby seemingly independent word-initial occurrences (as in μπαίνω /'beno/ 'I-enter', μπαστούνι /ba'stuni/ 'cud-gel') are derived from underlying clusters with a nasal (thus, e. g. /mpeno/ for ['beno], etc.). The fact that most word-initial voiced stops are found in loan words (as with bastuni, from Venetian, though not beno), together with the fact that in Greek orthography the voiced stops in any position are represented by combinations of a letter for a nasal and one for a voiceless stop (e. g. mp for [b]), has made this analysis appealing. Still, the existence of minimal pairs such as δίνω /'ðino/ 'I give' and ντύνω /'dino/ 'I dress (someone)' and of speakers now who have no nasal medially with voiced stops (see below) makes the cluster analysis somewhat problematic.

Similarly, the sounds labeled as affricates above are, as in many languages, susceptible of analysis as clusters (e. g. /t/ + /s/) instead of unitary but complex segments. However, again as in many languages, there is evidence pointing in both directions (see Joseph/Philippaki-Warburton 1987, 230–240 for discussion) and a clear resolution is probably not possible.

Finally, there are alternations between the voiced velar fricative /ɣ/ and the palatal fricative [j] (with the palatal occurring before front vowels, e. g. ανοίγω /a'niɣo/ 'I open' vs. /a'niɣi/ 'he opens'), as well as between the vowel /i/ and the palatal fricative [j], e. g. καράβι /ka'ravi-Ø/ 'boat (SG)' vs. καράβια /ka'ravj-a/ 'boats (PL)', allowing for an analysis whereby the j is derived and not a distinctive segment. However some instances of [j] are not in alternation (e. g. γιατρός /ja'tros/ 'doctor') and there are some apparent minimal pairs (e. g. γιατί /ja'ti/ 'why' vs. γατί /ɣa'ti/ 'kitten'); moreover, in any case, the choice of which segment to derive initial independent [j] from would be arbitrary, so that any such analysis is not at all clear-cut.

There are several typologically noteworthy aspects to the consonants. For one, there is an imbalance in the number of fricatives as opposed to stops, with there being far more fricatives than stops. Also, the voiced stops have a marked status in the system; even if they are taken to be distinc-

tive (cf. the discussion above), they are far less frequent in terms of their lexical occurrence than the voiceless stops, and are a “soft spot” for variation in ways the voiceless stops are not (see below). Finally, the affricates figure prominently in various phonosymbolic and generally affective lexical groupings and thus are functionally skewed with respect to other sounds in terms of their lexical distribution (see Joseph 1994a for discussion and references). With regard to the vowels, while the system seems to be the typologically balanced and quite common 5-vowel “triangle”, the balance is disrupted somewhat by differential height realizations of the mid-vowels; in particular, there is some variation (see below, section 3) in the range of phonetic values shown by the mid-vowels with no direct parallelism to the fluctuations in the front and the back vowels (cf. Fourakis et al. 1999).

With regard to accent, Standard Greek shows a stress accent (generally involving intensity – see Arvaniti 2000) whose appearance in a word is governed in some part by phonological conditions and in large part by morphological conditions. That is, the accent can appear only on one of the final three syllables in a word but the question of which of the syllables bears the stress is largely determined by the morphological make-up of the word; particular suffixes or grammatical categories demand certain stress placements or shifts. Thus, for instance, the past imperfective suffix *-ούσ-* /-us-/ is always accented; the genitive plural ending *-των* /-ton/ of certain neuter nouns always has the accent on the syllable immediately preceding it, e. g. *ὄνομα* /'onoma/ ‘name/NOM’ vs. *ονομάτων* /onomaton/ ‘of names/GEN.PL’; the genitive singular *-ου* /-u/ of i-stem neuter nouns attracts the accent, as in *σπίτι* /'spiti/ ‘house/NOM’ vs. *σπιτιού* /spi'tɕu/ ‘of a house/GEN’; and so on). With such morpholexical stipulations, one can treat all antepenultimate accents as the default, even when they characterize a grammatical category (as is the case with most past tenses, being accented on the antepenultimate syllable, e. g. *διάβαζα* /'ðjavaza/ ‘I was reading’ vs. *διαβάζαμε* /ðja'vazame/ ‘we were reading’).

2.2. Morphology

In terms of its morphological make-up, Modern Greek is basically a fusional inflecting language, with relevant grammatical information generally being marked via the endings of inflected words, i. e. nouns,

pronouns, adjectives, articles, and verbs. Each ending typically encodes values for several categories simultaneously. In traditional accounts of Greek, there is only one grammatical prefix, the past-tense marker ϵ - / ϵ -/ (η - / i -/ with a few verbs), conventionally referred to as the “augment”, but relatively recent developments with some originally independent words that served grammatical functions may well have led to some new grammatical prefixes in the language, e. g. the element $\theta\alpha$ / θa / that marks the future tense.

Even with such synthetic tendencies, analytic structures are well represented in the language, to some extent in nominal morphology but especially so in the verb. Periphrastic structures are found with the marking of indirect objects (via prepositions as opposed to case-marking alone), the perfect tense system, and, under some analyses, the future tense, verbal complementation, and various types of verbal modality. Adjectival degree is also analytical, optionally so in the comparative, where there is variation with synthetic forms, e. g. $\omicron\mu\omicron\rho\phi\acute{o}\tau\epsilon\rho\omicron\varsigma$ / $\omicron\mu\omicron\rho$ ' $f\omicron$ teros/ vs. \omicron $\pi\iota\omicron$ $\omicron\mu\omicron\rho\phi\acute{o}\tau\epsilon\rho\omicron\varsigma$ / $\rho j\omicron$ 'omorfos/ ‘more beautiful’ (and note that “double” comparatives, mixing the two types, occur, e. g. $\pi\iota\omicron$ $\omicron\mu\omicron\rho\phi\acute{o}\tau\epsilon\rho\omicron\varsigma$ / $\rho j\omicron$ $\omicron\mu\omicron\rho$ ' $f\omicron$ teros/) but regularly in the superlative, which consists of the definite article plus the comparative, e. g. / \omicron $\omicron\mu\omicron\rho$ ' $f\omicron$ teros/~ \omicron $\rho j\omicron$ 'omorfos/ ‘the most beautiful’ (two more constructions are possible in the superlative: \omicron $\pi\iota\omicron$ $\omicron\mu\omicron\rho\phi\acute{o}\tau\epsilon\rho\omicron\varsigma$ / \omicron $\rho j\omicron$ $\omicron\mu\omicron\rho$ ' $f\omicron$ teros/ and also the less frequent archaizing katharevusa type: \omicron $\omicron\mu\omicron\rho\phi\acute{o}\tau\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma$ / \omicron $\omicron\mu\omicron\rho$ ' $f\omicron$ tatos/).

2.3. Syntax

With regard to its basic syntactic patterning, Greek can first of all be classified as a free word order language as far as the major constituents are concerned, though there is a tendency towards Subject – Verb – Object order in informationally unmarked contexts. Similarly, there is some freedom of ordering within phrasal groups, as between verbs and their objects and various adjuncts, but also some rigidity (e. g. the definite article is phrase-initial except when a demonstrative is present). Pronouns occur as subjects only when emphatic or focused (thus Greek is, generally speaking, a “Pro-Drop” or “Null Subject” language), and indefinite object pronouns can be suppressed as well. Major grammatical relations are indicated by case-marking on nouns and pronouns, though prepositions

520 are used for most oblique relations, as well
521 as being an option for indirect object
522 marking.

523 In general, Greek has a large number of
524 what might be called “little” words, ele-
525 ments that are word-like in some respects
526 that serve grammatical and/or discourse
527 functions. While some of these elements,
528 often referred to in the literature as “clit-
529 ics”, may be better, though somewhat con-
530 troversially, analyzed as affixes, their wide-
531 spread use and thus their important role in
532 Greek syntax cannot be denied. Especially
533 noteworthy (and much discussed in the lit-
534 erature) are the weak pronouns for direct
535 and indirect objects (and note the occur-
536 rence of lexically restricted weak subject
537 pronouns with two and only two predi-
538 cates, presentational *vá* /n'a/ ‘here is/are
539 ...!’ and the locative interrogative *πούν*
540 /'pun/ ‘where is/are ...?’, elements that clash
541 with the otherwise quite general pro-drop
542 character of Greek (see Joseph 1994b)). The
543 weak object pronouns figure in “doubling”
544 structures, co-occurring with full noun
545 phrase objects under conditions of empha-
546 sis or discourse topicality. Other key ele-
547 ments of this sort include the definite arti-
548 cle, the locative/directional preposition *σε*
549 /s(e)/, negation markers, various verbal
550 modifiers such as the future tense marker
551 *θα* /θa/ or the subjunctive marker *να* /na/,
552 the attitudinal marker *ντε* /(n)de/ signaling
553 impatience, and the like.

554 Greek, as suggested above, is a case-
555 marking language, where the relevant gov-
556 ernance of case is by prepositions and by
557 verbs. In addition to nominative, accusa-
558 tive, and genitive cases, all of which are
559 used in marking major grammatical rela-
560 tions, there is a distinct vocative case for
561 some noun classes e.g. *άνθρωπος* /a(n)-
562 θροπος/ ‘human, man/NOM.’, *άνθρωπε!*
563 /'a(n)θροpe/ ‘man!/VOC.’.

565 3. Phonemic Variation

566 3.1. Introduction

568 The phonological system of Modern Greek
569 exhibits both regional and social variation
570 due, as noted above, to a complex of geo-
571 graphical, and historical factors. To the ex-
572 tent that such judgments are possible, the
573 divergence among regional varieties phono-
574 logically can be said to be greater than that
575 between the High (Katharevusa) and Low
576 (Dimotiki) styles of SG. Many regional dia-
577 lects exhibit phonemic contrasts not found
578 in SG, for example /s/ vs. /ʃ/ as well as un-
579 paralleled phonological processes such as

vowel deletion and consonant gemination. On the contrary, the phonological variation between Dimotiki and Katharevusa is limited to a few phonotactic differences and the resistance of Katharevusa to some forms of consonant clusters that represent pan-Hellenic historical developments, such as voiceless obstruent dissimilation (pt ~ ft, fθ ~ ft), and postnasal stops in place of fricatives (nð ~ nd, mv ~ mb – AG voiced stops did not change into fricatives after nasals. The Katharevusa pronunciation of such clusters is essentially an orthographically derived one, due to “spelling pronunciation”; cf. (Kath.) *ἀνδρας* /anðras/ vs. (Dim.) *άντρας* /andras/ ‘man’). Phonemic variation in MG is found in both the phonetic realization of segments and also to a more limited extent in lexical stress assignment, in the intonation of phrases, and in the types of permissible syllable onsets and codas. However, there is no variation in vowel length, as the phonemic distinction between long and short vowels found in the ancient dialects is absent in all modern ones. However, some dialects spoken today have maintained or even expanded phonemic consonant length distinctions, such as the Southeastern dialects spoken in the Dodecanese and also in Cyprus (e. g. CYG *τον νομόν* /ton ‘nomon/ ‘the law/ACC.’ vs. SG /to ‘nomo/.

As noted earlier, SG is based on the Ionian-Peloponnesian dialects, which have diverged the least phonologically from the Hellenistic Koine. It is thus a good starting point for investigating regional phonemic variation in MG to compare other phonological systems with the standard Athenian variety, especially since it is spreading rapidly throughout the Greek-speaking world and thus presenting a new type of “diglossia” in various regions in the tension between SG and local varieties. As for social phonemic variation, factors such as economic class and extent of education seem still to determine largely the stylistic choice of grammatical elements in the phonology of speakers especially as to phonotactic patterns and consonant cluster pronunciation. Some evidence for social stratification of phonological variation in and around Athens is beginning to emerge out of a few socio-phonetic studies that have concentrated in that area (Arvaniti/Joseph 2000). This section on phonemic variation can thus be naturally divided into two categories: variation due to the geographical distribution of speakers, and variation due to stylistic or register choices by speakers.

Evident in this latter type are pressures on and by speakers still familiar with distinct Katharevusa types as well as variation in the present-day vernacular representing a fusion of the two varieties in a post-diglossic linguistic re-synthesis that allows for much more variation than either the traditional Dimotiki or Katharevusa registers did. Less is known about the socio-functional varieties discussed above as secret languages, though these registers vary mostly on the lexical level; further investigation will likely reveal some systematic variation in pronunciation and intonation for even these.

3.2. Regional variation phenomena

A major aspect of regional phonological variation is observed in the pronunciation of vowels. Modern Greek dialects can be divided phonologically along a major, but admittedly fuzzy, isogloss separating northern varieties from southern varieties. This isogloss has to do with variation in the pronunciation of stressed and unstressed non-low vowels (i. e. all except /a/). Northern varieties tend to exhibit the phenomenon of mid-vowel raising and high-vowel deletion when these vowels are not the carriers of lexical or derived stress. For example, the SG form *μουλάρι* /mu'lari/ 'mule' would exhibit deletion in the north of unstressed /u/ and /i/, thus being realized as [mlar]. Some slight rounding of the /m/ and palatalization of the final /r/ as co-articulatory remnants of the underlying vowels /u/ and /i/ respectively might be evident as well. The underlying final /i/ in [m^(w)lar^(j)] (or [m^hlar^j], with an epenthetic voiced stop between /m/ and /l/) indeed surfaces in the plural as a fricative /j/ when it is 'protected' by the unaffected final /-a/ marking plural [mlarja] 'mules'. Unstressed mid vowels /e/ and /o/ for their part are raised to /i/ and /u/ respectively. For example the word *μελέτω* 'I study' pronounced as /mele'tao/ in southern varieties would be pronounced as /mili'tau/ in the north. These vowel phenomena represent the main phonological characteristic of these northern dialects spoken in many areas north of the Peloponnese and Athens and in some of the islands of the northern Aegean. These vowel deletions have also given rise to new phonotactic patterns, allowing for consonants other than /s/ and /n/ to surface as codas and additional consonant clusters to surface as complex onsets, e. g., *πγαδ* /pγαδ/ 'water well' for SG /pi'γαδι/. Unstressed /i/ deletion is not restricted only to these dialects

but rather can be sporadically attested in all regional varieties, especially in pre-stress position; for example *αμερικάνος* /amerikanos/ ‘Greek American’ can be pronounced as [amer’kanos], *περισσότερο* /peri’sotero/ ‘more’ as [per’sotero] or *ημέρα* /i’mera/ ‘day’ as [i’mera]. This variation is perhaps sociolinguistic in nature reflecting an interaction between casual stylistic choices (Dim.) /mera/ vs. (Kath.) /imera/, regional tendencies (e. g. /perisotero/ ~ /per-sotero/) and even speech tempo (with deletions more common in fast speech).

Consonantal context in addition to stress seems to affect the phonetic realization of vowels, cross-dialectally. When unstressed, high vowels tend to be reduced, either devoiced or even deleted between voiceless consonants and especially /s/. For example the word *θέση* /thesis/ ‘seat/GEN.’ can be realized as [’θesɪs] or even [’θes:] with a geminate /s:/. This variability does not seem to be either regionally or socio-linguistically conditioned but is a general tendency within MG. However it may reflect similar earlier historical changes in the northern varieties in which geminates have arisen due to high vowel deletion as in *μέση* /’mesis/ ‘middle (FEM.GEN)’, pronounced as [mes:], and thus contrasting with the form *μέση* in nominative or accusative, pronounced as [mes]. Less frequent and possibly lexically restricted (thus perhaps a matter of morphological variation in stem shape) is the deletion of unstressed /i/ when it is realized as a fricative after an /s/ in the plural of neuter nouns (cf. /mularia/ above), as for instance in *διακόσια* /ðja’kosja/ *two hundred* pronounced as /ðja’kosa/ and in certain dialects as /ðja’koʃa/.

Vowel coalescence phenomena can also vary between dialects. In casual speech, when two vowels are adjacent across morpheme boundaries, one of them can be deleted e. g. *από αύριο* /apo ’avrio/ ‘from tomorrow’ becomes *απ’αύριο* /a’pavrio/ and not /ap’ovrio/, that is /a/ is “stronger” than /o/. In some dialects though, the resulting vowel can vary e.g. *που έχω* /pu exo/ ‘that I have’ can be realized as /’poxo/ (/u/ + /e/ = /o/) vs. standard Greek /’puxo/, /u/ being “stronger” than /e/. There are no notable qualitative differences for vowels in any of the regional varieties of modern Greek. The five vowel system seems to be pan-Hellenic. However, the phonetic realization of the mid-vowels /e/ and /o/ can range between speakers and dialects from very closed [e]/[o] to very open [ɛ]/[ɔ] depending on prosodic position, stress, and segmental

context. It can be noted as well that old Athenian, Megaritic and Aeginitic, not spoken anymore, were dialects in which ancient Greek υ [y] had given rise to [u] and not [i] as in all other dialects and some individual lexemes in SG show this outcome as the result of earlier dialect borrowing, e.g. φούσκα /'fuska/ 'bubble' instead of the expected φύσκα /fiska/.

Another major isogloss, but even fuzzier geographically than the vowel raising one, is that of palatalization of velar stops and fricatives before the front vowels /i/ and /e/. It is mostly found in the peripheral dialects of the Ionian, Cretan and Dodecanese, but is not uncommon even in some mainland and central dialects. The velar fricatives /x/ and /ɣ/ and velar stops /k/ and /g/ have regular allophones of [ç], [j] and [c], [ɟ] respectively before front vowels in all dialects. However in the palatalizing dialects these allophones are realized as palatal fricatives [ʃ], [ʒ] and affricates [tʃ], [dʒ] respectively. For example in Cretan dialects the word χέρι (SG ['çeri]) 'hand' is pronounced as ['ʃeri] and the word κερι (SG [ce'ri]) 'candle' as [tʃe'ri]. Many southern varieties in the Peloponnese and also in Crete have palatal allophones of the nasal /n/ and lateral /l/ before stressed /i/, for example Νίκος /'nikos/ pronounced as /'ɲikos/. In SG this happens only before an unstressed /i/ that subsequently gets deleted, as in χωνιά /xo'ɲa/ 'funnels', which is an obligatory process in most dialects.

Similarly with the lateral /l/ there is variation between non palatalized and palatalized realizations before front vowels, e.g. /'selino/ in SG vs. /'seɫino/ 'celery' in the southern varieties. A very distinct realization of /l/ as a velar or "dark" /ɫ/ after /a/, on the other hand, characteristic of northern varieties, including the one spoken in the major northern urban center and second largest city in Greece, Thessaloniki. For example the word καλά pronounced by SG speakers and non-northern dialect speakers as /ka'la/ 'well' is realized as /ka'ɫa/ in the north. This pronunciation serves as a regional identifier for northern speakers, along with the morphological choice of the accusative instead of the genitive for indirect objects (see below section 3.). In some regions in Crete and the Dodecanese /l/ can be also realized either as an approximant [ɹ] or as a doubly articulated [l^d].

/ɣ/, or its allophone [j] before front vowels, can be inserted to prevent hiatus between vowels in many disparate dialects.

Alternatively the deletion of intervocalic /γ/ or [j] is attested in others; with (historical) insertion, for example, κλαίω /'kleo/ in SG, 'I cry' can be pronounced as /'kleɣo/ in many varieties, and αέρας in SG /a'eras/ 'wind' can be pronounced with an epenthetic [j] as /a'jeras/ again not particularly localized geographically. By the same token, with (historical) deletion, one finds τρώγω /'troɣo/ 'I eat' pronounced as /'troo/. Final /n/ is preserved to a greater extent in the southeastern varieties and has spread even in words that normally did not end in /n/ in early ancient Greek; thus πρόγραμμα /programa/ 'program' is pronounced as /program:an/ in the Dodecanese and Cyprus.

Post-nasal voicing of obstruents is also universal, but the fate of the preceding nasal varies from dialect to dialect. In Cretan it is always deleted whereas in most other varieties it can be preserved even in absolute word initial position. For example, αντί *landil* 'instead' is pronounced [a'di] in Crete but [andi] or [ãdi] in other regional varieties. In SG there seems to be a tendency for nasal deletion in the direction of the Cretan pattern, but this regional variation seems to be also somewhat socio-linguistically and stylistically conditioned at least in the area of Athens. That is, in emphatic speech the nasal might surface even for speakers that normally denasalize voiced stops even though some younger speakers seem to lack the nasal categorically. However, the influence of the orthography is perhaps an important factor for the maintenance of the variation even in denasalizing varieties, since the only way to represent a voiced stop in the Greek alphabet is by the combination of nasal plus voiceless stop e. g. μπ /mp/, ντ /nt/, γκ-γγ /gk-gg/ for b, d, g respectively; for example, the words κάμπος /ka(m)bos/ 'field', or πέντε /pe(n)de/ 'five' have an orthographic nasal μ and ν respectively.

– The grapheme γ can be used for either the velar fricative [ɣ] or the velar nasal [ŋ] before κ /k/. The digraph γγ has the same phonetic value as γκ (that is the AG voiced stop [g], which how γ was pronounced, was preserved after a nasal [ŋ] the same way the pronunciation of β and δ as stops was preserved after [m] and [n] respectively e. g. εμβαίνω /-(m)beno/ 'I enter', and άνδρας /andras/ 'man', also spelled μπαίνω and άντρας.

Finally, with regard to segmental variation, geminate consonants are attested in the southeastern varieties spoken in the Do-

decanese and in Cyprus. For example, corresponding to SG *αλλά* /a'la/ 'but' one finds /a'l:a/. Geminate voiceless stops seem also to be heavily aspirated by speakers of these dialects cf. SG *λάκκος* /'lakos/ 'pit' and Dodecanese /'lak:^hos/.

With regard to accent, the most notable variation is that there are some dialects that violate the otherwise quite general and widespread "three-syllable" limitation that restricts the accent to one of the last three syllables in a word. For example, northern Greek dialects in the Crimea have forms such as *τοιμάζαντινι* /ti'mazandini/ 'they were preparing' (SG. *ετοιμάζαν* /e'timazan/ or /eti'mazane/) and Rhodian Greek has *έρκουμεστον* /'erkumeston/ 'we were coming' (SG. *ερχόμασταν* /er'xomastan/). Variation in intonation also exists among different regional varieties, e. g. the rising contour of Ionian statements or the distinct vowel lengthening of penultimate stressed syllables in Cretan questions and requests are clearly identifiable still, however they have not been studied adequately yet. It should be noted in general that the term "isogloss" is very loosely applied in the case of modern Greek regional variation, since the main distinctions between northern, western-southern, and eastern varieties have been substantially blurred both because of internal migration (and immigration of Asia Minor and Pontic speakers) and also because of the leveling influence of SG as spoken in the capital of Athens. However, distinct accents can still be heard throughout Greece. Stereotypes of the vowel deleting northerner, the velar consonant palatalizing Cretan, and so on, are still very powerful among SG speakers in the area of Athens.

922 3.3. Social variation phenomena

923 As noted earlier, the denasalization of
924 voiced stops seems to be a phenomenon
925 that is spreading in SG as spoken in Athens,
926 with younger speakers showing more fre-
927 quent pronunciations of plain voiced stops
928 than older speakers. At the same time, pro-
929 cesses such as dissimilation of two voiceless
930 stops or two voiceless fricatives, e. g. *επτά*
931 /epta/ 'seven' pronounced as [e'fta] or *χθες*
932 /xθes/ 'yesterday' pronounced as [xtes],
933 seem to be much more a matter of socio-
934 linguistically conditioned variation. Speak-
935 ers seeking to achieve a more formal style,
936 reminiscent of the Katharevusa forms,
937 might choose to not dissimilate such se-
938 quences, even though in a large portion of
939 the lexicon, dissimilated clusters are found

in more frequent, mostly everyday, Dimotiki words such as φτηνός /fti'nos/ 'cheap' for [fθi'nos] or λεφτά /le'fta/ 'money' for [le'pta]. In very low frequency Katharevusa words, non-dissimilated clusters are almost obligatory for most SG speakers e.g., ελικόπτερο /eli'koptero/ 'helicopter' (cf. φτερό /fte'ro/ 'feather' with the dissimilated cluster in historically the same morpheme). It is important to point out that, unlike voiced stop denasalization, dissimilation is clearly apparent in the spelling of the language as noted in the examples given above. Similarly, the deletion of nasals before voiceless fricatives, e.g. άνθρωπος /'anthropos/ 'human' pronounced as /'aθropos/ or /'ãθropos/ is more probable in high frequency words than in low frequency words with Katharevousa origin. The pronunciation of the fricative [j] as a glide [j] seems to be a gradient phenomenon, with many speakers producing a fricative invariably and others exhibiting more variation in their pronunciation. The [j] allophone in the past perhaps was geographically conditioned, but in SG today, to the extent there is any variation, it seems to have an affected flavor to it (sounding somewhat more elegant). The pronunciation of vowels does not seem to exhibit any socio-linguistically conditioned variation except for vowel coalescence. In more careful styles vowel hiatus is tolerated more as opposed in the more casual and informal speech in which vowel sequences tend to either degeminate or merge e.g. τα αυγά /ta a'vɣa/ 'the eggs' pronounced as /ta'vɣa/.

978 4. Morphological Variation

980 4.1. Introduction

981 Similarly to the phonemic variation, varia-
982 tion in morphology has also regional and
983 socio-linguistic dimensions. For the most
984 part the declension systems of Katharevusa
985 have failed to replace the Dimotiki ones, es-
986 pecially in the verbal but for the most part
987 in the nominal system as well. In the lexi-
988 con however, a multitude of Katharevusa
989 content and function words have become
990 part of SG along side Dimotiki counter-
991 parts, creating etymological doublets that
992 are now functionally or stylistically dif-
993 ferentiated. In some instances the phonol-
994 ogy, meaning and distribution had changed
995 significantly over time, e.g. (Kath.) /ði'a/
996 διά 'through' vs. (Dim.) για /ja/ 'for', or
997 λεπτά /le'pta/ 'minutes' vs. λεφτά /le'fta/
998 'money'. The majority of regional variation
999 is found mostly in inflectional suffixes in

1000 the verb, which as noted earlier has main-
1001 tained most of its AG complexity. Nominal
1002 case markings seem to be uniform across
1003 dialects, with the exception of the genitive
1004 which, especially in the plural, has been lost
1005 for many lexical items and has been re-
1006 placed by the periphrasis *από* /a'po/ 'from'
1007 + N (Acc.). Some regional variation in the
1008 gender of nouns exists, e.g. *η άμμος* ~ *ο*
1009 *άμμος* /i 'amos/(FEM.) ~ /o 'amos/(MASC.)
1010 'the sand'.

1011 More specifically, regional variation is
1012 the result of diachronic changes that were
1013 localized geographically as opposed to so-
1014 ciolinguistic variation, which is the result of
1015 stylistic choices in the post-diglossia situa-
1016 tion but also reflects exposure to formal
1017 education. That is the more educated the
1018 speaker, the more likely he or she is to use
1019 Katharevusa words and morphemes, and
1020 the less educated the more likely to ignore
1021 them or to hypercorrect. In summary
1022 though, it is evident that the purists
1023 attempts up to 1974 to resurrect dead forms
1024 such as the dative case or the infinitive did
1025 not succeed, and SG is largely devoid of
1026 them except in some fossilized construc-
1027 tions e.g. *δόξα τω θεώ* /'ðoksa to θe'o/
1028 'glory to god/DAT'.

1029 4.2. Regional variation

1031 Morphological variation does not exactly
1032 correspond to whatever phonemic iso-
1033 glosses there may be, but there are some
1034 strong correlations involving some forms
1035 with some dialects as described in the previ-
1036 ous section. Again, it is convenient to com-
1037 pare regional typological deviations with
1038 the Ionian-Peloponnesian based SG. Most
1039 regional variation is found in the verbal in-
1040 flection, in particular the 2nd person singu-
1041 lar and the 3rd person plural but also in the
1042 other persons as well, even though not as
1043 regular. For example in the Athens area,
1044 most speakers form the past imperfect with
1045 the suffix *-αγ-* /-aγ-/ e.g. *αγάπαγα* /a'γα-
1046 *παγα* /'I was loving', whereas in most north-
1047 ern varieties the suffix *-ούσ-* /-us-/ is used,
1048 e.g. *αγαπούσα*. Of course, even in the area
1049 of Athens, there is variation between these
1050 two suffixes since internal migration to the
1051 capital had been intense until relatively re-
1052 cently. The 3rd person plural in the past im-
1053 perfect exhibits considerable variability,
1054 with forms crisscrossing many traditional
1055 dialect boundaries, but the most common
1056 form in SG is *-όντουσαν* /-ondusan/ and
1057 less frequently /-ondan/ and /-otan/, the last
1058 one being homophonous to the 3rd person
1059 singular, e.g. *αγαπιόντουσαν*, *αγαπιόνταν*,

1059
1059

1059

1060 αγαπίοταν ‘they were loving’. In some
1061 southern varieties the form -οσαντε /-osan-
1062 de/ is also found. In the 1st person plural
1063 present, the SG suffix is /-ame/ e.g. περνάμε
1064 /pername/ ‘we cross’ but in various other
1065 regional varieties the suffix /-ume/ is used
1066 e.g. περνούμε /per'nume/. In the present
1067 tense 3rd person plural, many dialects have
1068 retained the AG suffix /-usi(n)/ e.g. SG
1069 τρέχουνε /'trexune/ ‘they run’ vs. Cretan
1070 τρέχουσι /trexusi/. The ancient Greek past
1071 tense prefixed augment /e-/ has been re-
1072 tained even when unaccented by most
1073 southern and eastern varieties, including
1074 Cretan and Cypriot, e.g. SG. μίλαγα /'mi-
1075 laγα/ ‘I was talking’, Cretan εμιλούσα /emi-
1076 'lusa/ (whereas in SG its presence is largely
1077 determined by its being stressed cf. έτρωγα
1078 /'etroγα/ ‘I was eating’ vs. τρώγαμε
1079 /'troγαμε/ ‘we were eating’). Also in the
1080 past tense, some dialects use the suffix -κα
1081 /-ka/ instead of the SG -σα /-sa/ e.g. έδωκα
1082 /'eðoka/ vs. SG έδωσα /'eðosa/ ‘I gave’.

1083 In the nominal system, most variability is
1084 found in the diminutive suffixes, /-uli/, in
1085 the Peloponnese (but now largely out of
1086 use), /-eli/ in the island of Lesbos, /-ui/ in
1087 the Dodecanese, and /-aki/ in SG and also
1088 Cretan. e.g. σπιτούλι, σπιτέλι, σπιτάκι,
1089 σπιτούι /spit-uli, -eli, -aki, -ui/ ‘little house’.

1090 Another typological distinction usually
1091 drawn to classify MG regional varieties is
1092 the form of the neuter interrogative pro-
1093 noun what. In mainland varieties (both
1094 north and south) and in the Ionian islands
1095 the form is τι /ti/, whereas in the rest of the
1096 islands, including Crete and Cyprus the
1097 form is είντα /'i(n)da/. As far as the lexicon
1098 is concerned, many regional elements exist
1099 both in terms of form and in meaning e.g.
1100 Cretan κοπέλλι /ko'peli/ vs. SG αγόρι
1101 /aγori/ ‘boy’, or Southeastern λαλώ /lalo/
1102 vs. SG μιλάω /milao/ ‘I speak’. Some of
1103 them reflect local culture or animal and
1104 plant species, but also semantic extensions
1105 (e.g. Athenian σουβλάκι /suvlaki/ ‘any pita
1106 wrapped meat’ vs. the Northern more re-
1107 stricted meaning ‘pita wrapped skewered
1108 pork’) or reductions (e.g. Northern τυρί
1109 /tiri/ ‘feta cheese’ vs. Athenian ‘any kind
1110 of cheese’).

1112 4.3. Social variation

1113 SG exhibits much more morphological vari-
1114 ability than other European languages due
1115 to the extended period of diglossia. Many
1116 speakers have still very good command of
1117 Katharevusa and even young speakers are
1118 aware of many morphological doublets es-
1119 pecially in the nominal system. Doublets

1120 such as λέων ~ λέοντας /'leon/ ~ /'leondas/
 1121 'lion/MASC', or λέξις ~ λέξη /'leksis/ ~
 1122 /'leksɪ/ 'word/FEM' abound in the lan-
 1123 guage. These are mostly nouns and other
 1124 nominals such as participles that belonged
 1125 in the AG 3rd declension (see chapter about
 1126 AG) and had diachronically changed to
 1127 conform to the regular "isosyllabic" nouns
 1128 of AG. This has created a large number of
 1129 doublets in SG that can be used by speakers
 1130 to denote more formal as opposed to more
 1131 casual speaking or writing styles. For exam-
 1132 ple the genitive of the word λέξη (Dem.)
 1133 /leksɪ/ ~ λέξις (Kath.) /leksis/ can be respec-
 1134 tively της λέξης (Dem.) /tis leksis/ or της
 1135 λέξεως (Kath.) /tis lekseos/. There is, how-
 1136 ever, no isomorphism between morphologi-
 1137 cal choices, that is, speakers who might say
 1138 λέξη /leksɪ/ in the nominative might still
 1139 use λέξεως /lekseos/ in the genitive. The
 1140 younger and less educated the speaker
 1141 though, the less likely he or she is to use
 1142 Katharevusa-based morphology in their
 1143 speech. However, in the plural of nouns like
 1144 λέξη, the Katharevusa forms have largely
 1145 replaced whatever Dimotiki forms existed
 1146 e. g. οι λέξεις /i leksis/ *the words*; one does
 1147 not hear now the form οι λέξεις /i lekseos/
 1148 which some dialects in the past had used for
 1149 words of this morphological class, e. g. η
 1150θύμηση /i θimisi/ (fem.) *the memory*, οι
 1151θύμησες /i θimises/ *the memories*.

1152 In terms of the lexicon, social variation
 1153 can be divided into two categories. One re-
 1154 flects knowledge of Katharevusa forms be-
 1155 longing to a more formal style, e. g. (Kath.)
 1156 οξύνοος /o'ksinus/ 'intellectually sharp' vs.
 1157 (Dim.) μυαλό-ξυράφι /mnia'lo ksi'rafi/
 1158 'with a razor-sharp brain'. The other has to
 1159 do with slang and lexical items clearly
 1160 marked as colloquial and της πιάτσας /tis
 1161 piatsas/ 'of the street' e. g. SG αστυνόμος
 1162 /astinomos/ 'policeman' vs. Slang μπάτσος
 1163 /batsos/ 'cop' (from Turk. bağ 'tax collec-
 1164 tor'). Also the adaptation of loanwords, es-
 1165 pecially from English, seems to be condi-
 1166 tioned by stylistic choices; that is, speakers,
 1167 depending on their attitude towards for-
 1168 eignisms, might choose to assimilate mor-
 1169 phologically foreign words, e. g. τα σιντιά
 1170 /ta sindja/ 'the CDs (NEUT/PL)' or τα
 1171 σιντί /ta sindi/. To some extent, the choices
 1172 reflect the age of the loanword (when it en-
 1173 tered Greek) and the knowledge of the
 1174 source language on the part of Greek
 1175 speakers (increasingly English now instead
 1176 of the widespread knowledge of French
 1177 among elites in the early 20th century for
 1178 example; see also in section 5 below).

1180 5. Syntactic Variation

1181 Some of the variability noted in the mor-
1182 phology section (§ 3) impinge on syntax,
1183 e. g. in the prepositional periphrasis for var-
1184 ious genitive functions. Still, of the three
1185 major aspects of syntactic structure high-
1186 lighted in the above sketch of Greek syntax
1187 in § 1.3, – word order, the use of “little”
1188 words, and case-marking – the last two
1189 show regional and/or style-based variation
1190 that is particularly worthy of attention.

1191 With regard to the “little” words, signifi-
1192 cant variation is found regionally in the
1193 placement of the weak object pronouns. In
1194 SG, these pronouns occur pre-verbally with
1195 all finite (person/number-marked) forms
1196 and post-verbally with the nonfinite (imper-
1197 ative and participial) forms; thus, for exam-
1198 ple, μου δίνεις /mu 'ðinis/ ‘to-me you-are-
1199 giving’, μου έδωσες /mu 'eðoses/ ‘to-me
1200 you-gave’ vs. δώσε μου /'ðose mu/ ‘give to-
1201 me!’, δίνοντάς μου /'ðino(n)'das mu/
1202 ‘(while) giving to-me’. In some dialects,
1203 however, such as that of Crete and many
1204 south eastern varieties, weak pronouns oc-
1205 cur postverbally even with finite forms, e. g.
1206 έδωσές μου /'edos^(s)es mu/ ‘to-me you-
1207 gave’. There are even a few frozen expres-
1208 sions in SG that show post-verbal weak
1209 pronouns, most likely as the result of dia-
1210 lect borrowing, e. g. πατείς με πατώ σε
1211 /pa'tis me pa'to se/ ‘a crush or scrimmage’
1212 (but literally “you-step-on me, I-step-on
1213 you”).

1214 Another significant parameter for syn-
1215 tactic variation also affects the weak pro-
1216 nouns. In SG, while indirect objects can be
1217 expressed with a periphrasis of the preposi-
1218 tion σε /s(e)/ ‘in, at, on to’ plus the accusa-
1219 tive case (e. g. δίνω στον Γιάνη /'ðino s ton
1220 'jani/ ‘I-give to the John’ – note that Greek
1221 uses the definite article with proper names),
1222 as noted earlier this usage varies with the
1223 use of the genitive case alone (e. g. δίνω του
1224 Γιάννη /'ðino tu 'jani/ ‘I-give to-the-John’)
1225 largely for matters of style or disambigua-
1226 tion (since the genitive is also used to mark
1227 possession). This SG use of the genitive oc-
1228 curs with the weak pronouns also, as in the
1229 above examples (μου /mu/ of μου δίνεις
1230 /mu 'ðinis/ being the genitive weak first sin-
1231 gular pronoun). In northern dialects, how-
1232 ever, the accusative is found in place of the
1233 genitive for indirect objects, both in the
1234 pronouns and in full noun phrases, e. g.
1235 με δίνεις /me 'ðinis/ ‘me/ACC you-give’,
1236 δίνεις τον Γιάννη /'ðinis ton 'jani/ ‘you-
1237 give the-John/ACC’. The isogloss for this
1238 feature runs through the central Greek
1239 mainland, along the ridge of Mt. Pindus

1239
1239

1239

1240 and south of the province of Thessaly, and
1241 extends into the Aegean islands as well run-
1242 ning sound of the Sporades and Lesbos.
1243 North of this line one typically finds accu-
1244 sative usage and genitive south of this line.
1245 The SG use of the genitive is known to
1246 northern speakers and can be heard in the
1247 north, due to the spread of the influence of
1248 the standard language, but this remains a
1249 salient northern feature, one that character-
1250 izes – and serves as an identity marker
1251 for – the otherwise standard Greek of
1252 Thessaloniki, the major northern urban
1253 center and second largest city in Greece.

1254 Thus, to the extent that SG competes in
1255 outlying regions with the local regional dia-
1256 lect, there is a stylistic/register dimension to
1257 the above syntactic variation as well as a
1258 regional basis.

1260 6. Tendencies

1261 There are several propensities in the lan-
1262 guage as a whole especially in the area of
1263 phonology and morphology. The tendency
1264 to avoid coda consonants other than /-s/
1265 seems to be an on-going process in SG.
1266 Many speakers tend to epenthesize a final
1267 /e/ in the 3rd person plural verbal endings
1268 that end in /-n/ e. g. τρέχουν /'trexun/ 'they
1269 run' vs. /'trexune/. The same phenomenon
1270 can be found in many dialects in the geni-
1271 tive plural of nominals e. g. των παιδιών
1272 /ton peðjon/ 'the children/GEN' vs. /ton
1273 pe'ðjone/. For many nouns, the genitive
1274 plural is altogether missing, especially the
1275 ones with diminutive suffixes e. g. το
1276 παιδάκι /to pe'ðaki/ 'the little child/NOM',
1277 *των παιδακιών /ton peða'kion/ 'the little
1278 children/GEN'. Instead a periphrasis is
1279 used (preposition από /a'po/ 'from' +
1280 ACC.).

1281 Many speakers with imperfect knowl-
1282 edge of Katharevusa types also tend to reg-
1283 ularize adjectives and participles that do
1284 not conform with the regular declensions of
1285 SG, e. g. the participle derived adjective 'in-
1286 teresting' has three distinct endings corre-
1287 sponding to three genders each in its own
1288 declensional paradigm: ο ενδιαφέρων, η
1289 ενδιαφέρουσα, το ενδιαφέρον /o enðia'fe-
1290 ron/ (MASC), /i enðia'ferusa/ (FEM.), /to
1291 enðia'feron/ (NEUT.). Speakers tend to use
1292 the masculine by default to refer to the
1293 other genders, and furthermore to not in-
1294 flect the masculine form in the oblique for
1295 the otherwise overt case marking of SG in
1296 nominals e. g. μια ενδιαφέρων ταινία /mia
1297 enðia'feron te'nia/ 'an interesting/MASC
1298 movie/FEM'. This indeclinability of such

forms is perhaps strengthened by the existence of numerous recent loanwords, mainly from English and French that have not been morphologically assimilated and are thus indeclinable both adjectives and nouns, e.g. *μπεζ* /bez/ 'beige', *το μποξ* /*(m)boks*/ 'boxing' etc. It is interesting that even with borrowings that would fit perfectly in an existing declensional paradigm in Greek, for example feminine nouns in /-a/, speakers seem to increasingly resist assimilating them. e.g. *της Ατλάντα* /tis at-la(n)da/ 'Atlanta/GEN' instead of /tis a'tlandas/. This can be viewed perhaps as an attempt of the speaker to show off his or her knowledge of the source of this word (as a foreign one) and by extension achieve status elevation. In the opposite direction, many loanwords tend to get morphologically assimilated (and thus stripped of their foreignness) by means of suffixation especially with the diminutive suffix /-aki/ for nouns and the verb-stem forming /-aro/ for verbs: e.g. *το μπαράκι* /to baraki/ 'the little bar', or *κουλάρω* /ku'laro/ 'I am cool'. Another tendency is to analogically incorporate the past tense augment prefix /e-/ in forms that in earlier Greek did not take the augment such as the imperative and deverbal nouns e.g. *η απέκρουση* /i a'pekru-si/ 'the blocking' vs. *η απόκρουση* /i a'po-kru-si/ from the verb *αποκρούω* /apo'kruo/ 'I block', past tense: *απέκρουσα* /apo + ek-rusal/.

Many speakers seem to want to stabilize the lexical stress of nouns that normally shifts one syllable to the right according to AG rules of accentuation that are for the most part carried over in modern Greek, e.g. *ο άνθρωπος* (NOM) /o 'anθropos/ 'the human', *του ανθρώπου* (GEN) /tu an'θro-pu/ vs. /tu 'anθropu/. This tendency has become, for the most part, the rule in adjectives e.g. *του πράσινου* /tu 'prasinu/ 'the green (GEN.MASC)' vs. the awkward /tu pra'sinu/, despite centuries of purist prescriptivism. In terms of the phonetic realization of segments it is interesting to note that the pronunciation of the /r/ as a uvular fricative [ʁ] instead of the common flap [r] trill [r̥] is not unheard of even though extremely rare. Syntactically, the tendency again is to normalize any idiosyncratic construction. For example many verbs that came into popular use from Katharevusa took the genitive case as a direct object e.g. *αμύνομαι της τιμής μου* /aminome tis timis mu/ 'I defend my honor/GEN' vs. *αμύνομαι για την τιμή μου* /aminome ja ti(n) dimi mu/ 'I defend for my honor/

1358
1358

1358

1359

1360

1361

1362

ACC'. There is in general a tendency against the use of the genitive case which, as noted earlier, is very uncommon in the plural for many nouns.

1363 Literature

1364

1365

1366

1367

1368

1369

1370

1371

1372

1373

1374

1375

Listed below are some of the standard reference works on and extended treatments of aspects of Modern Greek. Included here are descriptive grammars (Mirambel 1939, Householder et al. 1964, Eleftheriades 1985, Joseph/Philippaki-Warburton 1987, Holton et al. 1997); state-of-the-art overview sketches (Mirambel 1959, Mackridge 1985); histories, with discussion of modern dialects (Browning 1983, Horrocks 1997), and dialectological studies (Newton 1972, Kontosopoulos 1994); in addition, a few key articles referred to in the text are given as well.

1376

1377

1378

Arvaniti, Amalia: The Phonetics of Stress in Greek. *Journal of Greek Linguistics* 1, 2000, 9–39.

1379

1380

1381

1382

1383

1384

Arvaniti, Amalia/Joseph, Brian D.: Glossologia, A Greek Journal for General and Historical Linguistics 11–12, 2000, 131–166 (Preliminary version in *Historical Linguistics: Ohio State University Working Papers in Linguistics* 52, 1999, 203–233).

1385

1386

Browning, Robert: *Medieval and Modern Greek*. Cambridge 1983.

1387

1388

Eleftheriades, Olga: *Modern Greek. A Contemporary Grammar*. Palo Alto 1985.

1389

1390

1391

Fourakis, M./Botinis, A./Katsaiti, M.: Acoustic characteristics of Greek vowels. In: *Phonetica* 56, 1999, 28–43.

1392

1393

1394

1395

Holton, David/Mackridge, Peter/Philippaki-Warburton, Irene: *Greek. A Comprehensive Grammar of the Modern Language*. London/New York 1997.

1396

1397

1398

Horrocks, Geoffrey: *Greek. A History of the Language and its Speakers*. London/New York 1997.

1399

1400

1401

Householder, Fred W./Kazazis, Kostas/Koutsoudas, Andreas: *Reference Grammar of Literary Dhimotiki*. Bloomington 1964.

1402

1403

1404

1405

Joseph, Brian D.: Modern Greek ts: beyond sound symbolism. In: *Sound Symbolism*. Edited by Hinton, L./Nichols, J./Ohala, J. Cambridge 1994a, 222–236.

1406

1407

1408

1409

Joseph, Brian D.: On Weak Subjects and Pro-Drop in Greek. In: *Themes in Greek Linguistics*. Ed. by Philippaki-Warburton, I./Nicolaidis, K./Sifianou, M. Amsterdam 1994b, 21–32.

1410

1411

Joseph, Brian D./Philippaki-Warburton, Irene: *Modern Greek*. London 1987.

1412

1413

Kontosopoulos, Nikos: *Dialektoi kai Idiomata tes Neas Ellinikes*. Athens 1994.

1414

1415

Mackridge, Peter: *The Modern Greek Language*. Oxford 1985.

1416

1417

Mirambel, André: *Précis de grammaire élémentaire du grec moderne*. Paris 1939.

1417 60/02 Variationstypologie

1417 Rev 16.04x / gesp. unter: VARTYPSS30 / letzter Rechenvorgang: 28-03-03 09:19:44

1417
1417

1417

1418 Mirambel, André: La langue grecque moderne,
1419 description et analyse. Paris 1959.1420 Newton, Brian: The Generative Interpretation of
1421 Dialect. Cambridge 1972.1422 Petropoulos, Elias: Kiliarnta: Erasitechnike
1423 Glossologike Ereuna. Athens 1971.1424 *Brian D. Joseph/Georgios Tserdanelis,*
1425 *The Ohio State University*
1426