Atticist lexica and Modern Greek dictionaries: a brief comparison of (negative) lexicographical labelling

Emmanuel Roumanis[1]

> Dictionaries tend to cultivate the heritage. The emphasis of the "roots" is quite evident in Greek lexicography, which in singular ways reaches from Antiquity into the present.
>
> Kahane and Kahane, "The dictionary as ideology: sixteen case studies" (1992: 20)

The ubiquity of dictionaries causes us to take for granted the circumstances under which they were compiled, and to overlook the ideological imperatives that inform(ed) their editors' choices. In the (curious) case of Modern Greek, whose lexicographical tradition can be traced back to the Atticist manuals of the Second Sophistic, particular historical and linguistic developments have ensured that the art of dictionary making has not yet completely freed itself from the prescriptive constraints of its classical straitjacket. On the one hand, unlike most modern European languages, Greek has never come under the aegis of a national academy that has the responsibility of planning and codifying a standard variant of the national language, like the Académie française of France or Real Academia Española of Spain.[2] Yet, on the other, it has undergone two temporally distant, but nevertheless deeply influential episodes of linguistic purification and standardisation that are partially responsible for the comparatively late adoption of modern lexicographical principles by the editors of dictionaries of Modern Greek. At one end is postclassical Atticism. At the other is the 'language question', the struggle of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries between 'katharevousa', a written form of Greek consisting of both ancient and modern features, and 'Demotic', the spoken form of Modern Greek.[3]

[1] My work was funded by the European Research Council (Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme, Starting Grant Nr 756487).

[2] Established in 1635 and 1713, respectively; Wright 2016: 61.

[3] The label 'Demotic' is also used to refer more specifically to various standardised versions of the spoken language; this was distinct from the καθομιλουμένη (*kathomilouméni*), a "slightly archaized version of the vernacular" Mackridge 2009: 337.

The conflict between prescription (and sometimes proscription)[4] and description, and the constant pressure of standardisation and linguistic nationalism exerted by wider social and political factors – excessively pertinent in the case of Modern Greek – ensured that dictionaries of Modern Greek had until very recently not yet fully caught up with the standards set by authoritative tomes such as the *Oxford English Dictionary* (*OED*). Two of the most widely consulted, and well-known, (monolingual) dictionaries in Greece were published in 1998: the *Dictionary of the Modern Greek Language* (*LNEG*)[5], which bears the name of its chief editor, the linguist Georgios Babiniotis, on its cover; and the *Dictionary of Common Modern Greek* (*LKNE*)[6], inextricably linked with the *Institute of Modern Greek Studies* of the Aristotle University of Thessaloniki.[7] These dictionaries' ubiquity in Greece is such, that they are almost always referred to as the *Babiniotis* and *Triantaphyllidis* dictionaries respectively. Since 2014, with the publication of the *Utilitarian Dictionary of the Modern Greek Language* (*HLNG*)[8], under the auspices of the *Academy of Athens* and the chief editorship of the linguist Christoforos Charalambakis, users of Modern Greek lexica have had access to a third, modern alternative.

Previous studies have examined and compared *LNEG* and *HLNG*, and other widely-used Modern Greek dictionaries preceding these, on the basis of their editors' linguistic ideologies, for example their tendency towards standardisation.[9] In what follows, I will contribute to the ongoing and lively lexicographical discussion around dictionaries of Modern Greek by comparing the *LNEG* – whose chief editor's very public ideological stance is reflected in its lemmata – and *HLNG*, which constitutes a welcome addition to the descriptive turn in Modern Greek lexicography. After a brief introduction to Atticism, Phrynichus' *Ecloga* (the strictest of the Atticist lexica), and the legacy of the classical heritage and purism ('katharevousa') in Modern Greek lexicography, I will briefly examine the aforementioned Modern Greek dictionaries, with regards to the (negative) evaluative label[10] εσφαλμένος "incorrect".

4 That is, prohibition: the condemnation of certain usages.

5 Λεξικό της Νέας Ελληνικής Γλώσσας 2002. I have used and referenced the second edition, as I did not have access, print or digital, to later editions. This is still the edition referenced in the lexicographical literature, including reviews of other dictionaries, e.g. Goutsos 2015.

6 Λεξικό της Κοινής Νεοελληνικής 1998.

7 The dictionary was produced under the aegis of the of the *Institute of Modern Greek Studies* (*Manolis Triantaphyllidis Foundation*) between 1968 and 1998.

8 Χρηστικό Λεξικό της Νεοελληνικής Γλώσσας 2014.

9 See e.g. Tseronis 2002 and Tseronis and Iordanidou 2009.

10 These are labels used in lexical entries to indicate the (stylistic) context in which a word's given sense is used, e.g. λόγιος "literary" or καταχρηστικά "departing from conventional usage".

In spite of the clearly modern principles utilised in the production of dictionaries in Greece in the last few decades, I will demonstrate that the tendency to actively (and artificially) intervene in the language by prescribing, albeit mildly, betrays certain attitudes around linguistic 'decline', and competing ideologies that have survived the end of diglossia.[11] The *HLNG* dictionary, however, is evidence that, since Tseronis' and Iordanidou's (2009: 168) statement a decade ago that it was "too early to judge [Modern Greek] dictionaries published so far on strictly lexicographic criteria", much progress has been made in developing a more descriptive (less subjective), corpus-based approach to Modern Greek lexicography.

Atticist lexica and pre- and proscriptive labels

The first episode of linguistic purification in the Greek language took place during the Second Sophistic, a (postclassical) movement that witnessed the revival of classical rhetoric and teaching and, more generally, a cultural flowering in the Greek East of the Roman Empire during the first three centuries CE.[12] Typically conceptualised as a dyad with distinct rhetorical and linguistic strands, Atticism – as this puristic tendency came to be termed by both its adherents and critics in antiquity – was vigorously, though unsystematically, codified in various manuals by whom we might today call lexicographers or grammarians.[13] These manuals, or lexica, through the prescription (and proscription) of specific words and phrases, sought to set rules regarding the correct (sc. approved) employment of Attic Greek.[14] Ranging from dictionary-like word lists that made sharp distinctions between Attic and non-Attic usages of (mostly individual) words, to manuals with wide-ranging, encyclopaedic entries that discussed various topics without seeking to prescribe specific forms or definitions, Atticist manuals varied in their range and scope. Of the latter type of manual, a prime example is Julius Pollux's *Onomasticon*, which has come down to us only as an epitome (Dickey 2009:

[11] That is, when Common (or Standard) Modern Greek, based on the demotic variant used by most Greek speakers, became the official language after the final abandonment of 'katharevousa' in 1976.

[12] On the different uses and definitions of the phrase and its periodisation, for which there is no compelling *communis opinio*, see Swain 1996: 1, Whitmarsh 2005: 4-5, and Johnson and Richter 2017: 3-8.

[13] The boundaries between the rhetorical and linguistic variants of Atticism, just like those between Atticism and Asianism, are disputed among scholars. See Whitmarsh 2005: 41-3, 49-52 and Kim 2017: 41-60.

[14] See Swain 1996: 51-6, Whitmarsh 2005: 43-5, and Kim 2017: 44-6 for succinct overviews of Atticist manuals.

96), while for the former, Phrynichus' *Ecloga*[15] and Moeris' *Attic Words*[16] are two of the most frequently cited, and perhaps most well-known examples of such prescriptivising works.

Naturally, given both their differing aims and their authors' capacity to use and recycle existing older manuals' material, we find that they have differing levels of prescriptiveness: Phrynichus uses different evaluative terms, almost invariably negative, to formulate his entries, while Moeris, partially due to the highly epitomised nature of his manual, only once employs a term in a similarly judgemental (and negative) manner.[17] Notwithstanding the absence of overt prescriptiveness and condemnation in Moeris' language, his entries nevertheless display a clear Atticising aim by comparing "Hellenic" and "common" usages against Attic counterparts.[18] Phrynichus uses various negative adjectives, adverbs, participles, and verbs (and verb phrases) to label his entries. For example, in the following gloss he instructs his readers by means of a commonly used adjective to avoid using a proscribed form, while prescribing the Attic orthographic variant:

> ἱκεσία· καὶ τοῦτο **ἀδόκιμον**, ἱκετεία δὲ λέγε. (Phryn. *Ecl*. 3)
>
> ikesía [supplication]: this is also **not approved**, but you say iketeía.

Such Atticistic *dicta* were likely formulated on the basis of the condemned word's widespread use in contemporary Koiné Greek. In the documentary papyri we find eight instances of ἱκετεία between III-I BCE, while the censured ἱκεσία occurs twenty-four times from the end of III CE up to VI CE. This frequency thus accords well with the fact that the Attic form was peculiar to the region of Attica and its dialect, and, if attested after I CE, would very likely represent an artificial revival in line with the peak of the Atticist lexicography at the end of II CE, a *change from above*.[19] Of course, this does not hold for all of Phrynichus' (or Moeris') pre- and proscriptions, of which at least half do not return any instances in the papyrological and epigraphic material (inscriptions). There are also some entries that confirm the continued

15 *Ἐκλογὴ Ἀττικῶν ῥημάτων καὶ ὀνομάτων* (Selection of Attic words and phrases).

16 *Λέξεις Ἀττικῶν καὶ Ἑλλήνων κατὰ στοιχεῖον* (Attic and Hellenic words in alphabetical order).

17 With specific reference to the semantic region of *judgement* in Martin's and White's 2005: 42-3, 52-6 (discourse semantic) resource of *appraisal*, viz. one's attitude towards other people and their behaviour.

18 Moeris' usage of social labels (Ἀττικοί-Ἕλληνες-κοινόν and πρῶτοι/μέσοι/δεύεροι Ἀττικοί) is not entirely clear. See Strobel 2011: 195-208 and Lee 2013: 293-4.

19 A linguistic form "introduced by the dominant social class" that is more likely to manifest itself in "careful speech", but does not have an immediate impact upon the spoken language Labov 1994: 78.

or revived usage of Attic(ist) forms throughout the Roman and Early Byzantine period in the Greek East (I-VIII CE), though they are infrequent and almost invariably pertain to specialised or technical terms characteristic of Attic literature and prose, which are highly unlikely to turn up in documentary texts. It needs to be borne in mind that Atticist lexicographers were seeking to provide clear guidance around the boundaries of Attic Greek, for which purpose the use of evaluative and social labels was key in drawing sharp distinctions between static literary forms and the regular, innovative variants used by supposedly careless users of the everyday language, the ἀμαθεῖς "(the) ignorant":

> ὑπάλλαγμα **ἀμαθῶς** τινες ἀντὶ τοῦ ἐνέχυρον. (Phry. *Ecl*. 274)
>
> hypállagma [mortgage] (is used) **ignorantly** by some, instead of enékhyron.

The contemporary textual evidence for this lexical pronouncement requires more sifting than ἱκεσία/ἱκετεία, since the lexicographer is here making a finer distinction between the employment of each word in a particular sense (mortgage).[20] There is some papyrological evidence from the second century, e.g. *P. Turner* 23.7 (144/5 CE) περὶ ὑπαλλαγμάτων εἰσφερομέν[ων] "regarding mortgages brought in", and the third century, e.g. *P. Ryl.* II 177.13: (246 CE) [ἐξ αὐτοῦ τοῦ ὑπαλλάγμ]ατος "from the mortgage itself", while for ἐνέχυρον there are only examples of the formula ἐνεχύρου λόγῳ καὶ ὑποθήκης δικαίῳ "as a pledge and by right of mortgage" (or variations thereof) that occur almost exclusively after the fifth century, e.g. *P. Lond.* V 1660.45-6 (c. 553 CE) ἐνεχύρο(υ) λόγου (l. λόγῳ) καὶ ὑποθήκης | δικαίῳ. This comparative scarcity of evidence is illustrative both of the difficulty inherent in tracing such 'dicta' through the texts that have come down to us, and of their specialised nature – most are simply not to be found in our ancient corpora and archives because they were evidently not being used in any of the registers represented by these non-literary documents.

Although most other labels used by Phrynichus are overwhelmingly negative, such as σολοικίζω/σολοικισμός "speak incorrectly/incorrectness"[21] and οὐκ ὀρθῶς λέγεται "not said/used correctly", we do find a few positive labels. These typically serve to emphasise the primacy of Attic Greek – as selected

[20] Noted by the *Greek-English Lexicon* (LSJ) s.v. ὑπάλλαγμα I.2 "*mortgaged property* ... a usage censured by Phryn. [*Ecl*. 274]."

[21] Whence the term 'solecism' and its derived forms in English (and other modern European languages e.g. Dutch 'solecisme') via French 'solécisme'.

by the lexicographer – by reminding the user that a given word's association with antiquity is what lends it its authority. For example, in the following gloss Demosthenes is cited as a positive model:

> ἔγγιον ἐπὶ τοῦ ἐγγύτερον μὴ λέγε, ἀλλ' ἐγγύτερον· ἐπὶ δὲ τοῦ ἐν τῇ γῇ, οἷον "ἔγγειον κτῆμα", εἴ τις χρῷτο, **ἄριστα ἂν χρήσαιτο**, ὡς καὶ **Δημοσθένης** "ἔγγειον τόκον" λέγει. (Phryn. *Ecl*. 264)
>
> Don't say éngion [nearer] instead of engúteron [nearer], but (say) engúteron. And if one uses it of land, for instance "éngeion ktêma" [real property], **one should use it excellently**, just like **Demosthenes** says "éngeion tókon" [mortgage].

Demosthenes is treated comparatively well by Phrynichus – he is cited seven times in the *Ecloga*, of which only one instance is negative – and it may surprise some modern readers to see that otherwise canonical Attic writers, such as Lysias and Menander, are referenced negatively at all. The inclusion of Homer in the same work, who is cited twice positively and twice negatively, reinforces the general priority of style over dialectal considerations. Moeris, by comparison, is much more accepting of Attic writers as good models. Among the shared literary models between these two lexica, we find only nine instances in *Attic Words* where they are cited negatively (versus sixty-eight positive ones), of which four are of Xenophon.[22] Ultimately, however, it is Phrynichus who emerges as the final arbiter of good Attic diction in the *Ecloga*, with the result that the proscription of Attic writers such as Aristophanes (Phryn. *Ecl*. 371 (τι) χρέος 'thing' instead of χρέως) or Menander (Phryn. *Ecl*. 304 ἡ θέρμα 'heat' instead of ἡ θέρμη) is largely a symptom of his overtly subjective stance.

Language, ideology, and labelling in Modern Greek dictionaries

The statement that 'katharevousa' has its roots in the Atticistic movement is a prerequisite for most examinations of both the linguistic variant and the broader historicolinguistic context of the language question[23], since the influ-

[22] Xenophon is referenced twice by Phrynichus, both times negatively; Moeris also has four positive citations. In the *Ecloga*, we find overall twenty-eight positive and nineteen negative citations for shared literary models.

[23] Cf. e.g. Horrocks 2010: 135; Papanastassiou 2010: 228; and Babiniotis 1979: 15-7. For a succinct and informative account of the language question up to 1976, including example texts, see Horrocks 2010: 438-62.

ence of Atticism on the development of the Greek language has been profound.[24] The diglossic state that steadily emerged during the Middle Koine period (I-III CE), and had become entrenched by the end of the Early Byzantine period (VI-VIII CE)[25], continued to be a salient, and often divisive factor up until the official abolition of 'katharevousa' as an official language in 1976. The language question of the 19th and 20th centuries was a complex sociolinguistic struggle[26] that was, in part, driven by the desire of some, particularly during its early stages, to introduce the structure and lexis of Attic Greek. Although genuine inroads were never made in altering the syntax and grammar of contemporary Greek, a large number of calques and semantic loans, based on the ancient (and sometimes Koine) vocabulary were introduced into 'katharevousa'.[27]

Many of these words and phrases have been inherited by Standard Modern Greek (SMG), but their presence in a reputable dictionary of Modern Greek may not actually, in certain cases, be indicative of true historical continuity. The tendency of 'katharevousa' to borrow and create anew on the basis of ancient models has lent SMG a substantial lexical inventory that gives it a patina of historical continuity, though in reality one must take care to distinguish between Atticism's long term artificial influence and the part of the Modern Greek lexis that has been inherited through the vernacular and its literature. As Swain (1996: 36-40) has demonstrated, there are certain similarities between 'katharevousa' and the program of the Atticist lexicographers. Petrounias (2007: 359) defines 'katharevousa' as "the systematic change of linguistic rules and vocabulary on the basis of real or assumed foreign models to denote linguistic or social superiority"[28]; while Papanastassiou (2010: 230) notes that the prestige attached to the purifying variant prompted "disdain for inherited linguistic forms" – both (modern) dialectal and oral vernacular.

[24] Atticism's contribution to the diglossia that affected Greek up until the 1980s is well noted in studies dealing with the topic, which often stress its diachronic intensity by referring to its ultimate development in the 'katharevousa'. This is, indeed, a useful way of demonstrating how long-lived the (basic) distinction between low and high registers was; see e.g. Whitmarsh 2005: 42, Markopoulos 2009:15, and Horrocks 2010: 99-100; for an overview of the influence of 'katharevousa' on SMG (primarily through 'learned' vocabulary) see Papanastassiou 2010: 227-48.

[25] See Browning 1983: 47-50.

[26] For a comprehensive account of the issue of linguistic identity in modern Greece see Mackridge 2009, esp. 27-31 for the long-term impact of diglossia).

[27] See Papanastassiou 2010: 239-242 for a brief overview of the lexical borrowing categories of 'katharevousa', including direct (phraseological) loans from Ancient Greek, that have influenced SMG.

[28] (Translation is mine): Καθαρεύουσα είναι η συστηματική αλλαγή των γλωσσικών κανόνων και του λεξιλογίου με βάση πραγματικά ή υποθετικά ξένα πρότυπα για δήλωση γλωσσικής και κοινωνικής ανωτερότητας.

Among contemporary Greek linguists more generally, we find that this view of 'katharevousa' as a 'Kunstsprache' constitutes a 'communis opinio', although, as Frangoudaki (1997: 69) notes, Babiniotis is alone among this group in maintaining that 'katharevousa' and Demotic Greek are not different linguistic systems.[29] Babiniotis was at the centre of the 'language problem' during the 1980s and 1990s – which replaced the language question that had ended with the reform of 1976 (Frangoudaki 1992: 370-2) – a debate that revolved around the issue of language 'quality', including: (a) the accusation that contemporary Greek was of a 'defective linguistic' quality (Babiniotis 1984: 147)[30]; (b) the charge that the Triantaphyllidis grammar[31] was normative and prescriptive, and could not adequately describe the 'synthesis' of SMG, which is equally distinct from both 'katharevousa' and Demotic (Babiniotis 1979: 7, 15-6); and (c) the questioning of the boundaries between Attic, Koine, Medieval, Purist and Modern Greek, on the basis that the Greek language is unified and that the lexical similarity between SMG and Ancient Greek is evidence of a unique diachronic relationship.[32] Of particular interest is the last claim, since it is one that Babiniotis makes repeatedly in the preface of *LNEG*, and it feeds directly into its underlying ideological structure.

For *LNEG*, its ideological framework is intimately bound with that of its chief editor, Babiniotis. Much criticism[33] has been levelled at the claims he has made both in the preface of *LNEG* and elsewhere: on the diachronic unity of Greek; that speakers of Modern Greek can 'more or less' and 'with the appropriate guidance' read a text of Xenophon, Plato or Plutarch; that the lexical purification of Modern Greek (from Turkish and Italian loanwords) during the 19th century was justified on the grounds that it saved the language

29 Babiniotis 1979: 7-8 claims that the "artificial polarization" between 'katharevousa' and Demotic was, in fact, a "pseudo-dilemma" that did not actually correspond to a linguistic reality, but, rather, to a situation wherein they were merely two different forms of the same language. Such a statement stands in marked contrast to the typical reference elsewhere to 'katharevousa' as a language, and, more pertinently, seemingly contradicts the distancing influence ascribed to it to explain the differences between SMG today and the Demotic folk tradition (e.g. Horrocks 2010: 411).

30 See Mackridge 2009: 324-5, 330. On the 'language decline' theory see excellent treatments by Moschonas 2004, esp. 181-2 and Frangoudaki 1997, esp. 66 for Babiniotis; see also Charis 2001 for a response to what are considered to be "linguistic mythologies" cf. Christidis 1999.

31 The *Modern Grammar* (*of Demotic*) was produced by a committee chaired by the linguist Manolis Triantaphyllidis on the orders of the dictator Ioannis Metaxas, and published in 1941. Although a grammar of Demotic, it prescribed a standardised literary variety based on the folk songs and Demotic literature, not the contemporary spoken language, Mackridge 2009: 301-2. An abridged and revised version of Triantaphyllidis' grammar is still in use today, having been reintroduced into the education system in 1976 with the abolition of 'katharevousa' Mackridge 2009: 319. It is noteworthy that Demotic was first among the modern variants to be codified in a grammar, while 'katharevousa' was taught from Ancient Greek grammars, thus vitiating the need for the production of contemporary ones.

32 See Babiniotis 1994: xxv-vi, xxxii-iv.

33 See Tseronis and Iordanidou 2009: 170, Tseronis 2002: 20, and Christidis 1999: 103-9.

from becoming 'creolised'; and for the positive contribution that puristic interventions, including 'katharevousa' and Atticism, made to the present situation of the language by connecting the lexis of Ancient Greek to that of Modern Greek in a manner "unique in the history of languages" (*LNEG*, 13-21). One could add more points to this list, but it suffices to show the problematic approach of *LNEG*'s editors, which is liable to claims that make unnecessary value judgements.[34]

It is in the domain of linguistic periodisation that such an ideology of uninterrupted continuity is most perceivable, since it invariably leads, in the absence of well-defined models, to an approach that keenly emphasises a temporally far-reaching diachronic continuum.[35] This, of course, is not in itself unproblematic: not only does it not provide a reliable *terminus post quem* for a dictionary's etymologies; it misleadingly blurs the lines between non-adjacent stages of Greek and fails to adequately account for the strong, inter-registerial diachronic influence of Atticism.[36] Unclear labelling, which does not impart accurate information on words' origin, increases the potential that one might erroneously ascribe historical continuity. Both *LNEG* and (to a lesser extent) *LKNE* use systems that are not entirely precise, presenting in certain cases confusion as to a word's particular status in SMG. In *LNEG* we find the labels λόγιος "learned" and αρχαιοπρεπής "archaic". The difference in application between the two is never very clear, though the latter is assigned to words that appear in *LNEG* only, and which seem out of place in a dictionary of SMG, like ήμαρ (τὸ ἦμαρ, the commoner form of ἡμέρα "day" in Homer). As Tseronis and Iordanidou (2009: 175) note, the label αρχαίος "archaic" is used deliberately by *LNEG* for obsolete, purist words to validate their presence by placing them within an elite, elaborate level of discourse (Tseronis 2002: 21). For *HLNG*, as Goutsos (2015: 54) remarks, the inclusion of an index that categorises usage labels under different criteria[37] is a useful

[34] Babiniotis continues to intervene in public discourse around the supposed danger of not checking the influx of English loanwords. During the Covid-19 pandemic he repeated his complaint of creolisation in *The Guardian* newspaper, adding that "'[f]or Greeks, language has always been a sensitive issue. I know what I say troubles some, but it is the duty of a linguist to speak out." (!) (https://www.theguardian.com/world/2021/jan/31/the-greeks-had-a-word-for-it-until-now-as-language-is-deluged-by-english-terms; consulted on 2/2/21)

[35] As Lee 2004: 67 rightly notes, it is important to emphasise the concept of the continuum – "of a gradually evolving language, not a series of disparate entries" – for the purposes of a lexical study, though in the case of Modern Greek lexicography the emphasis lies more in defining a norm for SMG and disambiguating it from previous periods, and not, unintentionally or otherwise, passing off Atticistic (and 'katharevousa') influences as direct historical continuations.

[36] On *LNEG* and Babiniotis see Tseronis 2002: 13, 20.

[37] *HLNG* 2014: 15 uses the following criteria: historical-chronological; geographical; indicators of social behavior or integration; statistical; experiential-emotional; regulatory; utilitarian-pragmatic; semantic.

contribution to the art of Modern Greek lexicography, and its ρυθμιστικά κριτήρια "regulatory criteria" category is particularly pertinent for us, since it is here that the label εσφαλμένος is to be found.[38]

In contemporary Greece, the issue of language continues to be intimately bound with that of national identity[39]; popular metaphors that seek to connect Modern Greek and Ancient Greek – with the implication that the former cannot exist and thrive without the latter – sustain views that emphasise the abovementioned unique diachronic continuity of SMG.[40] This, in turn, has resulted in the ascription of a significant amount of linguistic prestige to Ancient Greek[41], which has been facilitated by the strong claim laid to the 'symbolic capital' of European Neoclassicism.[42] Although these linguistic attitudes may seem similar enough to the 'dicta' of the Atticist lexicographers to warrant a direct comparison, we must nonetheless be wary of overextending such an analogy, and instead place Modern Greek dictionaries within their immediate sociolinguistic context. Swain (1996: 37-8), in concluding his comparison between linguistic purity in Ancient Greek and Modern Greek, highlights several contrasts between the ancient and modern cases, including: (a) the absurdity of 'katharevousa' vis-à-vis the Atticising program of antiquity, noting the ability of the former to be ridiculed even by other Atticists of the time;[43] and (b) the continuous study of Attic literature between V-IV BCE and the Second Sophistic, as opposed to the 'entirely artificial introduction' of 'katharevousa'.

With respect to the objectives of the Atticist lexicographers the similarities are too few, and the dissimilarities too strong to draw parallels with modern lexicographers' objective aims of prescriptiveness – the lexica and manuals of the Atticists were structured *exclusively* around the principle of defending what they believed to be correct, educated Greek[44], a pure and extreme aim which stands in contradistinction to the modern, more descriptive (though in

38 While this label is also, and much more frequently, used by *LNEG*, it is not employed by *LKNE*.

39 For an analysis of the language decline theory through the lens of nationalism following the abolition of 'katharevousa' see Frangoudaki 1997.

40 See Christidis 1999: 79-98 for a strong critique of the 'uniqueness' theory, with particular reference to Babiniotis; Mackridge 2009: 326-7.

41 Christidis 1999: 11; see Mackridge 2009: 333 for a translation into English of the relevant passage. See also Ferguson 1959: 330, who notes the earlier influence of religion upon the prestige of 'katharevousa', especially the riots instigated in 1901 (Ferguson 1959 incorrectly states 1903) by the commissioning of a 'mildly archaized' translation of the New Testament; cf. Mackridge 2009: 247-52.

42 Mackridge (2009: 333).

43 Swain (1996: 38), writes that "[w]ith *katharevousa*, on the other hand, it often seemed as if purification would reach unchecked further and further heights of idiocy".

44 Swain 1996: 40.

practice sometimes prescriptive) objectives of both *LNEG* and *LKNE*. Nevertheless, in the modern dictionaries linguistic ideology is present, except it is embedded within their application of the principle of descriptiveness, and this principle is not always immune *inter alia* to the linguistic attitudes of their editors. It is a notable consequence of the post-diglossic substitution of 'katharevousa' with Ancient Greek as a language of cultural prestige, that Greek linguists and lexicographers have only in the last two decades begun to deal with the task of producing dictionaries along more modern lexicographical principles. *HLNG*'s relatively sober, pragmatic approach marks another positive step for Modern Greek lexicography in embracing the use of modern, representative corpora[45] and, consequently, seeking to describe natural usages, rather than proscribing them on stylistic or ideological grounds.

Given that 'katharevousa' was abandoned as recently as 1976, and that Modern Greek lexicography had until that point been heavily influenced by a puristic tendency, it is sensible to assume a cautious approach to the critique of Modern Greek dictionaries. As Tseronis and Iordanidou (2009: 167-8) note, Modern Greek lexicography is at too nascent a stage for its dictionaries to be judged along (very) strict lexicographical criteria. It has not yet, they claim, applied itself fully "to the strictly scientific lexicographical principles that dictionaries of French, English, German, Italian or Dutch have been following for decades". In light of their role as cultural monuments this approach is understandable, since a critical examination of their lexicographical shortcomings may fail to take into account the recent history of the Greek language question. This, however, does not diminish the need for both their theoretical underpinnings and the content of their entries to be scrutinised where necessary.

Labelling (erroneous) usage

Like any authoritative dictionary every produced, *LNEG* and *HLNG* are lexicographical products of their time. They reflect not only the prevailing scientific approaches, but also the influence of previous, typically prescriptive, traditions of lexical analysis. In the case of Greek, its historical baggage is substantial, owing to its long attestation and rich literary (and documentary) history. As we saw above, the precedent for linguistic exceptionalism and purity was set rather early, with the result that for most of its recorded history

[45] According to the dictionary, its 75.000 entries were composed from a database containing 120.000 lemmata.

even the lower registers of Greek have been under various degrees of puristic, high-register influence. This influence, via the classical (Greek) tradition, was imported to Western Europe, where even as late the nineteenth century Phrynichus was being cited in preliminary plans for the creation of what would eventually become the *OED* – but, crucially, not in the context of adopting strict, prescriptivising principles. In 1857, while outlining his vision for a new dictionary of English 'ex novo' before the Philological Society in London, Richard Chenevix Trench urged his audience not to ignore the kinds of words and phrases "condemned by Phrynichus and other Greek purists" in creating their new historical dictionary of the English language (Trench: 1857: 5). Their dismissal, he argued, would not be in the interests of a dictionary that explicitly sought to make an inventory of the contemporary language as spoken and written by its users. This was a seminal moment in the history of lexicography, a turn towards description that opened up dictionaries to more diverse kinds of texts, but, at the same time, started the debate around the quality of texts that should make up their corpora (Mugglestone 2016: 555) – it remains to this day a controversial issue.

In the earliest edition of the *OED*, however, the tendency to prescribe is still present. Particularly notable in this regard is James Murray's use of a symbol to indicate "catachrestic and erroneous uses, confusions, and the like" (Brewer 2016: 491), which may surprise the modern user, since the *OED* is often held to be the exemplar of modern, descriptive lexicography. It is inescapable that even someone like Murray would have resorted to light touches of proscription when composing the early volumes, given the strong influence that the classical Greek tradition exerted during the Victorian period; and so it is perhaps not surprising then to find the great lexicographer in 1908 and 1909, in the fascicles of the letter *p*, condemning the dropping of initial *p* in words of Greek origin beginning with *ps-* that retained their original form (e.g. psyche). In a tone not dissimilar to Phrynichus' he urges the pronunciation of both elements of this cluster, particularly in scientific terms, "which have not been irretrievably mutilated by popular usage" (Brewer 2007: 262), a clear signal from the editor that such prescription is equally important as sober description. Directives of this sort, naturally, were dropped from the second edition of the *OED*, and negative labels like 'catachrestic'[46] are no longer used. However, if we compare our two dictionaries of Modern Greek, *LNEG* and *HLNG*, the label καταχρηστικά "departing from conventional usage", which implies a judgement value less negative than the English cat-

[46] See *OED* s.v. catachrestic "wrongly used, misapplied, wrested from its proper meaning".

achrestic, is used to indicate usages that do not conform to what may be considered standard usage – these are marked as "nonstandard" since the second edition of the *OED*. For the marking of stronger disapproval, equivalent perhaps to Murray's admonition, these two dictionaries use εσφαλμένος "incorrect". In what follows, we will see how *LNEG*, and by extension its editors, use this label much more frequently than *HLNG*, including in explanatory glosses (σχόλια) that serve a similarly prescriptive and educational function to Murray's commentary.

The label *εσφαλμένος* in *LNEG* and *HLNG*

Creating usage labels for a dictionary is, perhaps, one of the most difficult aspects of modern lexicography. There are various criteria that editors must consider in choosing what exactly their labels represent, not to mention the problems that arise from a general lack of unity in their approaches. Inconsistency in such usage labels, as Namatende-Sakwa (2011: 306-7) notes, arises from the fact that they are given to words "according to the lexicographer's discretion", since lexicographers are generally not operating within the bounds of an entrenched 'communis opinio'. For a language like Modern Greek, however, which is not as geographically or dialectally diverse as a pluricentric language like English, the expectation should be that labels are more or less consistently applied (although the case of Cypriot Greek is the obvious exception in this case)[47]; as we saw above, *HLNG* has already provided a useful template for building greater consistency, and less subjectivity, on the issue of usage labelling. In this regard, *HLNG*'s εσφαλμένος label, a ρυθμιστικό κριτήριο "regulatory criterion", which finds its counterpart in the *OED*'s erroneous(ly) label, corresponds with a similar criterion in F. J. Hausmann's labelling categories, 'normativity':[48]

Table 1: Diasystematic marking in a contemporary general-purpose dictionary (Svensén 2009: 316)

Criterion	Type of marking	Unmarked centre	Marked Periphery	Examples of labels
11. Normativity	dianormative	correct	incorrect	non-standard

[47] On the issue of linguistic identity and language planning in Cyprus see Karoulla-Vriki 2009. Modern Greek dialects, insofar as they diverge from SMG, are dealt with by the *Historical Dictionary of the Modern Greek Language* (1933-). On the issue of Standard vs Dialect in Modern Greek lexicography see Kahane and Kahane 1975: 253-5.

[48] Adapted by Svensén 2009: 316 in a similarly tabular form; cf. Brewer 2016: 499.

For the descriptive lexicographer such a category is, and should be, unnecessary – according to Atkins and Rundell (2008: 2), for example, modern dictionaries should not be seen as prescriptive texts, and they consequently do not include a similarly normative category in their types of lexicographical linguistic labels (226-33) – and dianormative aspects (e.g. acceptability, normativity), are *ipso facto* antithetical to a comprehensively descriptive approach. Nevertheless, for our case study both *LNEG* and *HLNG* make use of the εσφαλμένος label, but the latter does so in a much more restricted manner than the former. Including non-label uses of the adjective εσφαλμένος, there are approximately eighty instances in *LNEG* where words, phrases, or related usages have been labelled as "incorrect". I have compared these examples against the same words in *HLNG*: there are seven instances where *HLNG* uses the label εσφαλμένος for the same (head)word[49], and eight where it uses the milder καταχρηστικά label instead. The label καταχρηστικά, which can be translated into English as "departing from conventional usage"[50], is perhaps closest to the *OED*'s "nonstandard" label, since it does not imply editorial disapproval of a given form's usage.

A truly descriptive approach, one that does not seek to impart any kind of judgement or prescribe, would adopt the practice of the *OED*, as illustrated by its inclusion of a separate headword in the instance of the verbal form *of*. This verbal form, a substitute for auxiliary have ('ve) in English perfect modals and an egregious solecism for many,[51] is labelled simply as "nonstandard" and its origin given as a "variant or alteration of another lexical item". The practice of *HLNG* is similar in that the dictionary does not add additional information that that might be construed as prescriptive, simply employing the καταχρηστικά label to indicate non-standard usages. *LNEG*, on the other hand, for each of the eight instances where *HLNG* uses this label, labels usage as εσφαλμένος (or λανθασμένος "wrong"; see below) and for four of them includes an explanatory gloss (σχόλιο) where the editors get the chance to explain in greater detail why the usage is so unacceptably incorrect. This practice, which Goutsos (1999: 168-9) has likened to Phrynicus' 'dicta', lends

[49] *HLNG* s.v. δικαίος 3. ΦΡ.: '(βρέχει) επί δικαίους και αδίκους (λογ.) & (εσφαλμ.) επί δικαίων και αδίκων'; s.v. έωλος '(εσφαλμ.) αίολος'; s.v. ανημέρωτος 2. '(εσφαλμ.) ανενημέρωτος'; s.v. αποποιούμαι '(+ αιτ./εσφαλμ. γεν.)'; s.v. αφορά 'ΦΡ.: όσον/σε ό,τι/καθόσον αφορά ... (επίσ.) αναφορικά, σχετικά με: *Όσον ~ (εσφαλμ. ως αναφορά) την εξωτερική πολιτική*'; s.v. βλίτο '(εσφαλμ.) βλήτο; s.v. δέων 1. υπέρ το δέον & πέραν του δέοντος (εσφαλμ. υπέρ του δέοντος)'.

[50] See *LKNE* s.v. καταχρσητικός 2. 'που γίνεται ή που λέγεται κατά παρέκκλιση του συνηθισμένου, κατ' εξαίρεση του κανόνα' "that happens or that is said by way of deviation from the conventional, by exception to the rule".

[51] It may surprise many speakers of English that the earliest example cited in the *OED* (s.v. of, *v.*) is from 1773, with more examples from the following two centuries.

LNEG a firmly prescriptive bent that betrays Babiniotis' interventions against the alleged misuse of the Greek language. The following examples – ανεξαρτήτως "regardless (of)", which we may compare to the non-standard irregardless in English; and διγλωσσία "bilingualism/diglossia" – are illustrative of the contrasting approaches of the two dictionaries. It is also noteworthy that in the first example, the allegedly incorrect usages are not even treated in the entry itself, and that in place of the usual εσφαλμένος we find the synonym λανθασμένος "wrong".

ανεξαρτήτως[52]
LNEG: ανεξαρτήτως [ανεξαρτήτως, όχι ανεξαρτήτου κ.λπ. Συχνά αντί του επιρρήματος ανεξαρτήτως με γενική ονόματος ... χρησιμοποιείται εσφαλμένα ο τύπος του επιθέτου (*ανεξάρτητος*) σε γενική πτώση και με γενική ονόματος· *ανεξαρτήτου κόστους!* ... **Είναι προφανές ότι τέτοιες χρήσεις είναι λανθασμένες και θα πρέπει να αποφεύγονται.**][53]
ανεξαρτήτως [ανεξαρτήτως, not ανεξαρτήτου etc. Frequently (used) instead of the adverb ανεξαρτήτως with the genitive ... the adjectival form (*ανεξάρτητος*) is used incorrectly with the genitive; (literally) *of independent cost!* ... **It is clear that such usages are wrong and should be avoided.**]
HLNG: ανεξαρτήτως ... || (καταχρ.) *Ανεξαρτήτου κόμματος/φίλου*.
ανεξαρτήτως ... || (non-standard) *Regardless of (political) party/friend*.

διγλωσσία

LNEG: διγλωσσία 1. ... (β) (καταχρ.) ... ορθότ. *διμορφία* [διγλωσσία – διμορφία ... **Η χρήση τού όρου είναι προφανώς εσφαλμένη, διότι η καθαρεύουσα και η δημοτική υπήρξαν δύο *μορφές* τής ίδιας γλώσσας.**]
διγλωσσία 1. ... (b) (non-standard) ... more correct *dimorphia* [διγλωσσία – διμορφία ... **The use of the term is clearly incorrect, since 'katharevousa' and Demotic were two forms of the same language.**]
HLNG: διγλωσσία 3. ΓΛΩΣΣ. (καταχρ.) διμορφία
διγλωσσία 3. LING(UISTICS) (non-standard) dimorphia

[52] Glosses (σχόλια) in *LNEG* are indicated by square brackets in the following two entries.
[53] Emphasis is mine.

In the latter example, we can see how Babiniotis' aforementioned position on the relationship between 'katharevousa' and Demotic, namely that they constituted different *forms* of the same language, not necessarily different systems, has fed directly into the formulation of this injunction. While it is safe to claim that the use of διγλωσσία to render the English 'bilingualism' (instead of διμορφία "dimorphia") is inaccurate and even misleading, it is perhaps a step too far to condemn this particular usage in such strong terms. Its relative frequency in the corpus should, rather, suggest that it is in widespread enough use to warrant its labelling as non-standard, regardless of the editors' views on the matter. For the former, we may note that an apparently frequent usage has been proscribed – such frequency (although it is unclear to what corpus or database this claim corresponds) should, ideally, guarantee the usage's lexical legitimacy, as a non-standard form.[54] In the etymological description of another word in *LNEG*, βρόμα, we even find the lexicographer Phrynichus cited as a noteworthy example of the early proscription of words written with ω, while in *HLNG* the form βρώμα is simply treated as an orthographic variant, and given equal headword status:[55]

> **βρόμα/βρώμα**
> *LNEG*: βρόμα ... [ΕΤΥΜ. μεσν. < αρχ. *βρομώ* (υποχωρητ.) Η εσφαλμ. γρ. με *-ω- (βρώμα*) οφείλεται σε παρετυμολ. σύνδεση με το ουσ. βρώμα (τό) < βιβρώσκω «τρώγω» **Σημειωτέον ότι γραμματικοί όπως ο Φρύνιχος καταδίκαζαν ήδη από την Αρχ. τη γρ. με *-ω-*.**]
>
> βρόμα ... [ETYM(OLOGY) medieval < ancient *βρομώ* (regressive assimilation) the incorrect spelling with *ω* (*βρώμα*) is due to the paretymological connection with the noun βρώμα (το) < βιβρώσκω 'I eat'. **It should be noted that grammarians like Phrynichus were already condemning the spelling with *ω* in antiquity.**]
> *HLNG*: βρόμα & βρώμα

For *LNEG*, as Tseronis and Iordanidou (2009: 178) rightly note, the etymologies given throughout reflect the dictionary's (clearly) pedagogical approach, of which a major part is demonstrating the Greek language's long and glorious past, "a truly cultural monument and a direct tribute to the Greek lan-

[54] Cf. e.g. *LNEG* s.v. ψήφος '(η) (συχνά εσφαλμ. ο ψήφος)' "[fem.] (often incorrectly ο ψήφος [masc.])".
[55] Cf. *HLNG* s.v. βρομώ & βρομάω "I stink".

guage as a treasure that Greeks should be proud of". The citation of the arch-Atticist Phrynichus in a lemma, not merely the preface, shows its editors' commitment to prescription; in contradistinction to the descriptive, inclusive objectives of *HLNG*.

Concluding remarks

From the puristic 'dicta' of the Atticist lexicographers, to the prescriptivising tendency of *LNEG*, it is remarkable that dictionaries of Modern Greek have only really begun to embrace more scientific, descriptive lexicographical principles in the last few decades. While it is perhaps still too early to judge *LKNE* and (particularly) *HLNG* on their outwardly objective criteria, it is abundantly clear that the normative, subjective approach of *LNEG* will continue to look more and more out of place as *HLNG*, and hopefully other dictionaries based on corpora and transparent lexicographical principles, are updated and move ever closer towards the total abandonment of negative dianormative labels such as εσφαλμένος. It is noteworthy that Phrynichus' anxiety around egregiously 'un-Attic' usages is reflected in *LNEG*'s glosses, which, in reality, are mostly those of Babiniotis. His interventions in the public sphere, which brought him to the forefront of the 'language problem' in the 1980s, need to be taken into account when examining *LNEG*, but should nevertheless not obscure some of its positive aspects, like its mostly sound, if unnecessary etymologies. The problem lies mainly in Babiniotis' tendency towards approving or condemning usages based solely on their etymological worth (cf. βρόμα above) – an approach that is at odds with accepting a widely-used form as legitimate. If the criteria developed by *HLNG* can be refined and replicated in future dictionaries of Modern Greek, overtly subjective strategies such as that of *LNEG* can gradually be relegated to the puristic past of the Greek language.

Bibliography

Atkins, B. T. Sue & M. Rundell. 2008. *The Oxford Guide to Practical Lexicography*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Babiniotis, G. 1979. "A linguistic approach to the 'language question' in Greece', in: *Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies* 5: 1-16

Babiniotis, G. 1984. "Νεοελληνική γλώσσα: μέριμνα, αμεριμνησία και υπερπροστασία", in: *Ελληνική Γλώσσα*, vol. 1, *Ελληνικός Γλωσσικός Όμιλος*. Athens: Kardamitsa, 138-61.

Babiniotis, G. 1994. *Η γλώσσα ως αξία*, vol. 1. Athens: Gutenberg.

Brewer, C. 2007. "Pronouncing the "P": Prescription or description in 19th- and 20th-Century English Dictionaries?", in: *Historiographia Linguistica* 34: 257-80.

Brewer, C. 2016. "Labelling and Metalanguage", in: P. Durkin (ed), *The Oxford Handbook of Lexicography*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 488-500.

Browning, R. 1983. *Medieval and Modern Greek*, 2nd edn. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

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

Christidis, A. 1999. *Γλώσσα, Πολιτική, Πολιτισμός*. Athens: Polis.

Dickey, E. 2007. *Ancient Greek Scholarship: A Guide to Finding, Reading, and Understanding Scholia, Commentaries, Lexica, and Grammatical Treatises, from Their Beginnings to the Byzantine Period*. Oxford?& New York: Oxford University Press.

Ferguson, C. 1959. "Diglossia", in: *Word* 15: 325-40.

Frangoudaki, A. 1992. "Diglossia and the present language situation in Greece", in: *Language in Society* 21: 365-81.

Frangoudaki, A. 1997. "The metalinguistic prophecy on the decline of the Greek language: its social function as the expression of a crisis in Greek national identity", in: *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 126: 63-82.

Goutsos, D. 1999. "Georgios D. Babiniotis. Γεώργιος Δ. Μπαμπινιώτης, Λεξικό της νέας ελληνικής γλώσσας" (review), in: *Journal of Modern Greek Studies* 17: 163-70.

Goutsos, D. 2014. "Ακαδημία Αθηνών 2014. Χρηστικό λεξικό της Νεοελληνικής γλώσσας. (Σύνταξη-επιμέλεια Χριστόφορος Γ. Χαραλαμπάκης)" (review), in: *Γλωσσολογία / Glossologia* 23: 51-6.

HLNG = Ακαδημία Αθηνών 2014. *Χρηστικό λεξικό της Νεοελληνικής γλώσσας*, (ed. in chief: C. Charalambakis). Athens: National Printing House.

Horrocks, G. C. 2010. Greek: *A History of the Language and its Speakers*, 2nd edn. Maldon, Mass., Oxford & Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.

Johnson, W. A. & D. S. Richter 2017. "Periodicity and Scope", in: D. S. Richter & W. A. Johnson (eds), *The Oxford Handbook to the Second Sophistic*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 3-9.

Kahane, H & R. Kahane 1975. "Problems in Modern Greek Lexicography", in: F. W. Householder & S. Saporta (eds), *Problems in Lexicography*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 249-62.

Kahane, H. & R. Kahane 1992. "The dictionary as ideology: sixteen case studies", in: L. Zgusta (ed), *History, Languages, and Lexicographers*. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer, 19-76.

Karoulla-Vriki, D. 2009. "Greek in Cyprus: Identity Oscillations and Language Planning", in: A. Georgakopoulou & M. Silk (eds), *Standard Languages and Language Standards: Greek, Past and Present*. Surry: Ashgate, 187-209.

Kim, L. 2017. "Atticism and Asianism", in D. S. Richter & W. A. Johnson (eds), *The Oxford Handbook to the Second Sophistic*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 41-66.

Labov, W. 1994. *Principles of Linguistic Change: Internal Factors*. Oxford & Cambridge, Mass.: Wiley-Blackwell.

Lee, J. A. L. 2004. "The Present State of Lexicography of Ancient Greek", in: B. A. Taylor, J. A. L. Lee, P. R. Burton & R. E. Whitaker (eds), *Biblical Greek Language and Lexicography: Essays in Honour of Frederick W. Danker*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 66-74.

Lee, J. A. L. 2013. "The Atticist Grammarians", in: S. E. Porter & A. W. Pitts (eds), *The Language of the New Testament*. Leiden: Brill, 283-308.

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

LNEG = Babiniotis, G. 2002. *Λεξικό της Νέας Ελληνικής Γλώσσας*, 2nd edn. Athens: Centre for Lexicography.

Mackridge, P. 2009. *Language and National Identity in Greece: 1766-1976*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Martin, J. R. & P. R. R. White 2005. *The Language of Evaluation: Appraisal in English*. Basingstoke & New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Moschonas, S. A. 2004. "Relativism in Language Ideology: On Greece's Latest Language Issues", in: *Journal of Modern Greek Studies* 22: 173-206.

Mugglestone, L. 2016. "Description and Prescription in Dictionaries", in: P. Durkin (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Lexicography*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 546-60.

Namatende-Sakwa, L. 2011. "Problems of Usage Labelling in English Lexicography", in: *Lexikos* 21: 305-15.

Papanastassiou, G. 2010. "Katharevousa: Its Nature and Contribution to Modern Greek", in: C. C. Caragounis (ed.), *Greek: A Language in Evolution. Essays in Honour of Antonios N. Jannaris*. Hildesheim: Georg Olms, 227-48.

Petrounias, E. B. 2007. "Νεοκαθαρεύουσα και εξαγγλισμός της ελληνικής: γραμματικό σύστημα", in: *Studies in Greek Linguistics* 27 (In Memoriam A.-F. Christidis), 348-60.

Strobel, C. 2011. *Studies in Atticistic Lexica of the Second and Third Centuries AD,* DPhil thesis. Oxford: University of Oxford.

Svensén, B. 2009. *A Handbook of Lexicography: The Theory and Practice of Dictionary-Making*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Trench, R. C. 1860. "On some Deficiencies in our English Dictionaries", in: *Transactions of the Philological Society* 4/2: 1-70.

Tseronis, A. 2002. "Diglossic past and present lexicographical practices: the case of two Greek dictionaries", in: *Language Problems and Language Planning* 26: 219-52.

Tseronis, A. 2009. "Modern Greek Dictionaries and the Ideology of Standardization", in: A. Georgakopoulou & M. Silk (eds), *Standard Languages and Language Standards: Greek, Past and Present*. Surry: Ashgate, 167-85.

Swain, S. 1996. *Hellenism and Empire: Language, Classicism, and Power in the Greek World, AD 50-250*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Whitmarsh, T. 2005. *The Second Sophistic*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Wright, S. 2016. *Language Policy and Language Planning: From Nationalism to Globalisation*. Basingstoke & New York: Palgrave Macmillan.