

MODERN GREEK

by Brian D. Joseph & Georgios Tserdanelis

The Ohio State University

[Prepared for the volume *Variationstypologie. Ein sprachtypologisches Handbuch zu den europäischen Sprachen in Geschichte und Gegenwart*, ed. by Thorsten Roelcke]

0. 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 Moslems 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 stylistic 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 associated 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.

1. Basic Typology of Modern Greek

1.1 Phonology.

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.

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:

Table 1: *Consonants of Modern Greek*

	Labial	Palatal	Dental	Velar
Stops				
voiceless				
unaspirated	p		t	k
<i>[voiced]</i>	<i>b</i>		<i>d</i>	<i>g</i>
Nasals	m		n	
Fricatives				
voiced	v	<i>[j]</i>	ð z	ɣ
voiceless	f		θ s	x
Affricates				
<i>voiced</i>			<i>[dʃ]</i>	
<i>voiceless</i>			<i>[tʃ]</i>	
Liquids				
Flap			r	
Lateral			l	

Table 2: *Vowels of Modern Greek*

i	u
ε	ο
α	

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 pateras/ ‘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/ ‘cudgel’) 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'raɱj-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 distinctive (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'tçu/ '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').

1.2. Basic 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-* /e-/ (*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. $\omicron\mu\omicron\rho\phi\acute{o}\tau\epsilon\rho\omicron\varsigma$ / $\omicron\mu\omicron\rho\text{'}f\omicron\tau\epsilon\rho\omicron\varsigma$ / vs. \omicron $\pi\iota\omicron$ $\acute{o}\mu\omicron\rho\phi\omicron\varsigma$ / $\text{'}\rho\text{j}\omicron$ $\omicron\mu\omicron\rho\phi\omicron\varsigma$ / ‘more beautiful’ (and note that “double” comparatives, mixing the two types, occur, e.g. $\pi\iota\omicron$ $\omicron\mu\omicron\rho\phi\acute{o}\tau\epsilon\rho\omicron\varsigma$ / $\text{'}\rho\text{j}\omicron$ $\omicron\mu\omicron\rho\text{'}f\omicron\tau\epsilon\rho\omicron\varsigma$ /) but regularly in the superlative, which consists of the definite article plus the comparative, e.g. / \omicron $\omicron\mu\omicron\rho\text{'}f\omicron\tau\epsilon\rho\omicron\varsigma$ /~/ \omicron $\text{'}\rho\text{j}\omicron$ $\omicron\mu\omicron\rho\phi\omicron\varsigma$ / ‘the most beautiful’¹

1.3. Basic 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

¹ 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 $\text{'}\rho\text{j}\omicron$ $\omicron\mu\omicron\rho\text{'}f\omicron\tau\epsilon\rho\omicron\varsigma$ / and also the less frequent archaizing katharevusa type: \omicron $\omicron\mu\omicron\rho\phi\acute{o}\tau\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma$ / \omicron $\omicron\mu\omicron\rho\text{'}f\omicron\tau\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma$ /.

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

In general, Greek has a large number of what might be called “little” words, elements that are word-like in some respects that serve grammatical and/or discourse functions. While some of these elements, often referred to in the literature as “clitics”, may be better, though somewhat controversially, analyzed as affixes, their widespread use and thus their important role in Greek syntax cannot be denied. Especially noteworthy (and much discussed in the literature) are the weak pronouns for direct and indirect objects (and note the occurrence of lexically restricted weak subject pronouns with two and only two predicates, presentational *νά* /n'a/ ‘here is/are ...!’ and the locative interrogative *πούν* /'pun/ ‘where is/are ...?’, elements that clash with the otherwise quite general pro-drop character of Greek (see Joseph, 1994b)). The weak object pronouns figure in “doubling” structures, co-occurring with full noun phrase objects under conditions of emphasis or discourse topicality. Other key elements of this sort include the definite article, the locative/directional preposition *σε* /s(e)/, negation markers, various verbal modifiers such as the future tense marker *θα* /θa/ or the subjunctive marker *να* /na/, the attitudinal marker *ντε* /(n)de/ signaling impatience, and the like.

Greek, as suggested above, is a case-marking language, where the relevant governance of case is by prepositions and by verbs. In addition to nominative, accusative, and genitive cases, all of which are used in marking major grammatical

relations, there is a distinct vocative case for some noun classes e.g. *άνθρωπος* /a(n)θropos/ ‘human, man/NOM.’, *άνθρωπε!* /a(n)θrope/ ‘man!/VOC.’.

2. Phonemic Variation.

2.1 Introduction.

The phonological system of Modern Greek exhibits both regional and social variation due, as noted above, to a complex of geographical, and historical factors. To the extent that such judgments are possible, the divergence among regional varieties phonologically can be said to be greater than that between the High (Katharevusa) and Low (Dimotiki) styles of SG. Many regional dialects exhibit phonemic contrasts not found in SG, for example /s/ vs. /ʃ/ as well as unparalleled 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~mb²). 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

² 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.) *άνδρας* /anðras/ vs. (Dim.) *άντρας* /andras/ ‘man’).

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 and 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.

2.2 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)]³ 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 *μελέτᾱω* '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

³ Or [m^blar^j], with an epenthetic voiced stop between /m/ and /l/.

than /s/ and /n/ to surface as codas and additional consonant clusters to surface as complex onsets, e.g., *πγαδ* /pɣað/ ‘water well’ for SG /piˈɣaði/. 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 [amerˈkanos], *περισσότερο* /periˈsotero/ ‘more’ as [perˈsotero] or *ημέρα* /iˈmera/ ‘day’ as [ˈmera]. This variation is perhaps sociolinguistic in nature reflecting an interaction between casual stylistic choices (Dim.) /mera/ vs. (Kath.) /iˈmera/, regional tendencies (e.g. /perisotero/ ~ /persotero/) 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 *θέσης* /θesis/ ‘seat/GEN.’ can be realized as [θes̺is] 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 *μέσης* /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* /ðjaˈkosja/ *two hundred* pronounced as /ðjaˈkosa/ and in certain dialects as /ðjaˈkofa/.

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 *απαύριο* /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], [ʝ] 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 *κερί* (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. /seɲino/ '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 /ɣ/ 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 /andi/ ‘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/⁴, 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.

Finally, with regard to segmental variation, geminate consonants are attested in the southeastern varieties spoken in the Dodecanese and in Cyprus. For example, corresponding to SG αλλά /a'la/ ‘but’ one finds /a'l:a/. Geminate voiceless stops seem

⁴ 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. εμβάινω /(m)beno/ ‘I enter’, and άνδρας /andras/ ‘man’, also spelled μπαίνω and άντρας.

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.

2.3 Social variation phenomena.

As noted earlier, the denasalization of voiced stops seems to be a phenomenon that is spreading in SG as spoken in Athens, with younger speakers showing more

frequent pronunciations of plain voiced stops than older speakers. At the same time, processes such as dissimilation of two voiceless stops or two voiceless fricatives, e.g. *επτά* /epta/ ‘seven’ pronounced as [eʹfta] or *χθες* /xthes/ ‘yesterday’ pronounced as [xtes], seem to be much more a matter of socio-linguistically conditioned variation. Speakers seeking to achieve a more formal style, reminiscent of the Katharevusa forms, might choose to not dissimilate such sequences, even though in a large portion of 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/.

3. Morphological Variation

3.1 Introduction

Similarly to the phonemic variation, variation in morphology has also regional and socio-linguistic dimensions. For the most part the declension systems of Katharevusa have failed to replace the Dimotiki ones, especially in the verbal but for the most part in the nominal system as well. In the lexicon however, a multitude of Katharevusa content and function words have become part of SG along side Dimotiki counterparts, creating etymological doublets that are now functionally or stylistically differentiated. In some instances the phonology, meaning and distribution had changed significantly over time, e.g. (Kath.) /ði'a/ διά 'through' vs. (Dim.) για /ja/ 'for', or λεπτά /le'pta/ 'minutes' vs. λεφτά /le'fta/ 'money'. The majority of regional variation is found mostly in inflectional suffixes in the verb, which as noted earlier has maintained most of its AG complexity. Nominal case markings seem to be uniform across dialects, with the exception of the genitive which, especially in the plural, has been lost for many lexical items and has been replaced by the periphrasis από /a'po/ 'from' + N (Acc.). Some regional variation in the gender of nouns exists, e.g. η άμμος ~ ο άμμος /i 'amos/(FEM.)~/o 'amos/(MASC.) 'the sand'.

More specifically, regional variation is the result of diachronic changes that were localized geographically as opposed to sociolinguistic variation, which is the result of stylistic choices in the post-diglossia situation but also reflects exposure to formal

education. That is the more educated the speaker, the more likely he or she is to use Katharevusa words and morphemes, and the less educated the more likely to ignore them or to hypercorrect. In summary though, it is evident that the purists attempts up to 1974 to resurrect dead forms such as the dative case or the infinitive did not succeed, and SG is largely devoid of them except in some fossilized constructions e.g δόξα τω θεώ /ðoksa to θεο/ ‘glory to god/DAT’.

3.2 Regional variation.

Morphological variation does not exactly correspond to whatever phonemic isoglosses there may be, but there are some strong correlations involving some forms with some dialects as described in the previous section. Again, it is convenient to compare regional typological deviations with the Ionian-Peloponnesian based SG. Most regional variation is found in the verbal inflection, in particular the 2nd person singular and the 3rd person plural but also in the other persons as well, even though not as regular. For example in the Athens area, most speakers form the past imperfect with the suffix –αγ- /-αγ-/ e.g. αγάπαγα /a'ɣapaɣa/ ‘I was loving’, whereas in most northern varieties the suffix –ούσ- /-us-/ is used, e.g. αγαπούσα. Of course, even in the area of Athens, there is variation between these two suffixes since internal migration to the capital had been intense until relatively recently. The 3rd person plural in the past imperfect exhibits considerable variability, with forms crisscrossing many traditional dialect boundaries, but the most common form in SG is -όντουσαν /-ondusan/ and less frequently /-ondan/ and /-otan/, the last one being homophonous to the 3rd person singular, e.g. αγαπιόντουσαν, αγαπιόνταν, αγαπιόταν ‘they were loving’. In some southern varieties the form –οσαντε

/-osande/ is also found. In the 1st person plural present, the SG suffix is /-ame/ e.g. περνάμε /pername/ ‘we cross’ but in various other regional varieties the suffix /-ume/ is used e.g. περνούμε /per'nume/. In the present tense 3rd person plural, many dialects have retained the AG suffix /-usi(n)/ e.g. SG τρέχουνε /'trexune/ ‘they run’ vs. Cretan τρέχουσι /trexusi/. The ancient Greek past tense prefixed augment /e-/ has been retained even when unaccented by most southern and eastern varieties, including Cretan and Cypriot, e.g. SG. μύλαγα /milaga/ ‘I was talking’, Cretan εμιλούσα /emi'lusa/ (whereas in SG its presence is largely determined by its being stressed cf. έτρωγα /'etroga/ ‘I was eating’ vs. τρώγαμε /trogame/ ‘we were eating’). Also in the past tense, some dialects use the suffix -κα /-ka/ instead of the SG -σα /-sa/ e.g. έδωκα /'eðoka/ vs. SG έδωσα /'eðosa/ ‘I gave’.

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

Another typological distinction usually drawn to classify MG regional varieties is the form of the neuter interrogative pronoun what. In mainland varieties (both north and south) and in the Ionian islands the form is τι /ti/, whereas in the rest of the islands, including Crete and Cyprus the form is είντα /i(n)da/. As far as the lexicon is concerned, many regional elements exist both in terms of form and in meaning e.g. Cretan κοπέλλι /ko'peli/ vs. SG αγόρι /agori/ ‘boy’, or Southeastern λαλώ /lalo/ vs. SG μιλάω /milao/ ‘I speak’. Some of them reflect local culture or animal and plant species, but also semantic extensions (e.g. Athenian σουβλάκι /suvlaki/ ‘any pita wrapped meat’ vs. the Northern

more restricted meaning ‘pita wrapped skewered pork’) or reductions (e.g. Northern τυρί /tiri/ ‘feta cheese’ vs. Athenian ‘any kind of cheese’).

3.3 Social variation

SG exhibits much more morphological variability than other European languages due to the extended period of diglossia. Many speakers have still very good command of Katharevusa and even young speakers are aware of many morphological doublets especially in the nominal system. Doublets such as λέων~λέοντας /leon/~leondas/ ‘lion/MASC’, or λέξις ~ λέξη /leksis/~leksi/ ‘word/FEM’ abound in the language. These are mostly nouns and other nominals such as participles that belonged in the AG 3rd declension (see chapter about AG) and had diachronically changed to conform to the regular “isosyllabic” nouns of AG. This has created a large number of doublets in SG that can be used by speakers to denote more formal as opposed to more casual speaking or writing styles. For example the genitive of the word λέξη (Dem.) /leksis/ ~ λέξις (Kath.) /leksis/ can be respectively της λέξης (Dem.) /tis leksis/ or της λέξεως (Kath.) /tis lekseos/. There is, however, no isomorphism between morphological choices, that is, speakers who might say λέξη /leksi/ in the nominative might still use λέξεως /lekseos/ in the genitive. The younger and less educated the speaker though, the less likely he or she is to use Katharevusa –based morphology in their speech. However, in the plural of nouns like λέξη, the Katharevusa forms have largely replaced whatever Dimotiki forms existed e.g. οι λέξεις /i leksis/ *the words*; one does not hear now the form οι λέξεις /i lekseis/ which some dialects in the past had used for words of this morphological class, e.g. η θύμηση /i θimisi/ (fem.) *the memory*, οι θύμησες /i θimises/ *the memories*.

In terms of the lexicon, social variation can be divided into two categories. One reflects knowledge of Katharevusa forms belonging to a more formal style, e.g. (Kath.) οξύνους /o'ksinus/ 'intellectually sharp' vs. (Dim.) μυαλό-ξυράφι /mnia'lo ksi'rafi/ 'with a razor-sharp brain'. The other has to do with slang and lexical items clearly marked as colloquial and της πιάτσας /tis piatsas/ 'of the street' e.g. SG αστυνόμος /astinomos/ 'policeman' vs. Slang μπάτσος /batsos/ 'cop' (from Turk. bac 'tax collector'). Also the adaptation of loanwords, especially from English, seems to be conditioned by stylistic choices; that is, speakers, depending on their attitude towards foreignisms, might choose to assimilate morphologically foreign words, e.g. τα σιντιά /ta sindja/ 'the CDs (NEUT/PL)' or τα σιντί /ta sindi/. To some extent, the choices reflect the age of the loanword (when it entered Greek) and the knowledge of the source language on the part of Greek speakers (increasingly English now instead of the widespread knowledge of French among elites in the early 20th century for example; see also in section 5 below).

4. Syntactic Variation

Some of the variability noted in the morphology section (§3) impinge on syntax, e.g. in the prepositional periphrasis for various genitive functions. Still, of the three major aspects of syntactic structure highlighted in the above sketch of Greek syntax in §1.3, — word order, the use of “little” words, and case-marking— the last two show regional and/or style-based variation that is particularly worthy of attention.

With regard to the “little” words, significant variation is found regionally in the placement of the weak object pronouns. In SG, these pronouns occur pre-verbally with all finite (person/number-marked) forms and post-verbally with the nonfinite (imperative and participial) forms; thus, for example, μου δίνεις /mu 'ðinis/ 'to-me you-are-giving', μου

έδωσες /mu 'eðoses/ ‘to-me you-gave’ vs. δώσε μου /ðose mu/ ‘give to-me!’, δίνοντάς μου /ðino(n)das mu/ ‘(while) giving to-me’. In some dialects, however, such as that of Crete and many south eastern varieties, weak pronouns occur postverbally even with finite forms, e.g. έδωσές μου /edos⁽ⁱ⁾es mu/ ‘to-me you-gave’. There are even a few frozen expressions in SG that show post-verbal weak pronouns, most likely as the result of dialect borrowing, e.g. πατείς με πατώ σε /pa'tis me pa'to se/ ‘a crush or scrimmage’ (but literally “you-step-on me, I-step-on you”).

Another significant parameter for syntactic variation also affects the weak pronouns. In SG, while indirect objects can be expressed with a periphrasis of the preposition σε /s(e)/ ‘in, at, on to’ plus the accusative case (e.g. δίνω στον Γιάννη /ðino s ton 'jani/ ‘I-give to the John’ — note that Greek uses the definite article with proper names), as noted earlier this usage varies with the use of the genitive case alone (e.g. δίνω του Γιάννη /ðino tu 'jani/ ‘I-give to-the-John’) largely for matters of style or disambiguation (since the genitive is also used to mark possession). This SG use of the genitive occurs with the weak pronouns also, as in the above examples (μου /mu/ of μου δίνεις /mu 'ðinis/ being the genitive weak first singular pronoun). In northern dialects, however, the accusative is found in place of the genitive for indirect objects, both in the pronouns and in full noun phrases, e.g. με δίνεις /me 'ðinis/ ‘me/ACC you-give’, δίνεις τον Γιάννη /ðinis ton 'jani/ ‘you-give the-John/ACC’. The isogloss for this feature runs through the central Greek mainland, along the ridge of Mt. Pindus and south of the province of Thessaly, and extends into the Aegean islands as well running south of the Sporades and Lesbos. North of this line one typically finds accusative usage and genitive south of this line. The SG use of the genitive is known to northern speakers and can be heard in the north, due to the spread of the influence of the standard language, but this remains a salient northern feature, one that characterizes — and serves as an identity marker

for — the otherwise standard Greek of Thessaloniki, the major northern urban center and second largest city in Greece.

Thus, to the extent that SG competes in outlying regions with the local regional dialect, there is a stylistic/register dimension to the above syntactic variation as well as a regional basis.

5. Tendencies

There are several propensities in the language as a whole especially in the area of phonology and morphology. The tendency to avoid coda consonants other than /-s/ seems to be an on-going process in SG. Many speakers tend to epenthesize a final /e/ in the 3rd person plural verbal endings that end in /-n/ e.g. τρέχουν /tʁexun/ ‘they run’ vs. /tʁexune/. The same phenomenon can be found in many dialects in the genitive plural of nominals e.g. των παιδιών /ton peðjon/ ‘the children/GEN’ vs. /ton peðjone/. For many nouns, the genitive plural is altogether missing, especially the ones with diminutive suffixes e.g. το παιδάκι /to peðaki/ ‘the little child/NOM’, *των παιδακιών /ton peða'kion/ ‘the little children/GEN’. Instead a periphrasis is used (preposition από /a'po/ ‘from’ + ACC.).

Many speakers with imperfect knowledge of Katharevusa types also tend to regularize adjectives and participles that do not conform with the regular declensions of SG, e.g. the participle derived adjective ‘interesting’ has three distinct endings corresponding to three genders each in its own declensional paradigm: ο ενδιαφέρων, η ενδιαφέρουσα, το ενδιαφέρον /o enðia'feron/ (MASC), /i enðia'ferusa/ (FEM.), /to enðia'feron/ (NEUT.). Speakers tend to use the masculine by default to refer to the other genders, and furthermore to not inflect the masculine form in the oblique for the otherwise overt case marking of SG in

nominals e.g. μια ενδιαφέρον ταινία /mia enðiaferon te'nia/ 'an interesting/MASC 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 atla(n)da/ 'Atlanta/GEN' instead of /tis atlandas/. 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'pokru:si/ from the verb αποκρούω /apo'kruo/ 'I block', past tense: απέκρουσα /apo+ekru:sa/.

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'θropu/ 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 [r] 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/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.

6. Literature

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-Warbuton 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.

Arvaniti, Amalia. 2000. "The Phonetics of Stress in Greek". *Journal of Greek Linguistics* 1.9-39.

Arvaniti, Amalia & Brian D. Joseph. 2000. *Glossologia, A Greek Journal for General and Historical Linguistics* Vol. 11-12.131-166 (2000) (Preliminary version in

Historical Linguistics: Ohio State University Working Papers in Linguistics 52.203-233 (1999.)

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

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

Fourakis, M., Botinis, A., and Katsaiti, M. 1999. Acoustic characteristics of Greek vowels. *Phonetica* 56, .28-43.

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

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

Householder, Fred W., Kostas Kazazis, and Andreas Koutsoudas. 1964. *Reference Grammar of Literary Dhimotiki*. (=International Journal of American Linguistics 30.2/Publication 31 of the Indiana University Research Center in Anthropology, Folklore, and Linguistics). Bloomington: Indiana University.

Joseph, Brian D. 1994a. "Modern Greek *ts*: beyond sound symbolism". In *Sound Symbolism*, edited by L. Hinton, J. Nichols, & J. Ohala. Cambridge: (Cambridge University Press, pp. 222-236.

Joseph, Brian D. 1994b. "On Weak Subjects and Pro-Drop in Greek". In *Themes in Greek Linguistics (Papers from the First International Conference on Greek Linguistics, Reading, September 1993)*, ed. by I. Philippaki-Warburton, K. Nicolaidis, & M. Sifianou. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishers, pp. 21-32.

Joseph, Brian D. & Irene Philippaki-Warbuton. 1987. *Modern Greek*. London: Croom Helm Publishers.

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

Mackridge, Peter. 1985. *The Modern Greek Language*. Oxford, at the Clarendon Press.

Mirambel, André. 1939. *Précis de grammaire élémentaire du grec moderne*. Paris: Société d'éditions "Les Belles Lettres".

Mirambel, André. 1959. *La langue grecque moderne, description et analyse*. Paris: Librairie C. Klincksieck (Collection Linguistique publiée par la Société de Linguistique de Paris).

Newton, Brian. 1972. *The Generative Interpretation of Dialect*. (*Cambridge Studies in Linguistics*, 7). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Petropoulos, Elias. 1971. *Kaliarnta: Erasitechnike Glossologike Ereuna*. Athens, Digamma.