30. Modern Greek

1. Introduction

Modern Greek, called elinikà 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 stylis-
tic difference between what has come to be
known as Katharevusa (“Puristic”, literally
“(the) purifying (language)”) as the high-
style variety associated with official func-
tions, i.e. those pertaining to government,
education, religion, and such, and Dimotiki
(“Demotic”, literally “(the) popular (lan-
guage)”) 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 digllos-
sia (Ferguson 1959), and struggles between
advocates of each type of Greek, carrying
with them certain social attitudes and polit-
ical positions, continued throughout most
of the 20th century. After a number of gov-
ernmental acts and actions in 1976, Dimot-
iki became the official language, and the di-
glossic situation is resolved, at least from an
official standpoint. Significant for under-
standing variation in Greek is the fact that
all throughout both the official and unoffi-
cial periods of diglossia, speakers’ usage
was actually somewhat mixed, with bor-
rowing between the two varieties, especially
with Puristic forms incorporated into De-
motic. 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 borrow-
ings from Katharevusa, involving both
grammar (morphology and syntax) and
pronunciation, as well as the lexicon, as dis-
cussed below.

Relevant also along with these stylistic/
register differences is the effect of orthogra-
phy. There is a long tradition of written
forms of Greek, with the familiar Greek al-
phabet being the most enduring writing sys-
tem 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 phoneti-
cally irrelevant accent marks and diacritics
that reflected Ancient Greek orthography;
still, the old orthography can be encon-
tered in books published before 1981 and in
private use (e.g. personal letters), so that
there is variation to be found in the form
of written Greek even today.

What the long-term diglossia and associ-
ated influence from a written language have
meant for Greek is the emergence of dialect
differences that are not just regional (geo-
graphic) in nature. Rather, there are impor-
tant socially based distinctions that have
been fed by diglossia and by associations
between conservative social and political at-
titudes 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 om-
ipresent one based on the Katharevusa
versus Dimotiki distinction. From a func-
tional standpoint, mention should be made
of the existence of certain institutionalized
trade jargons, e.g. that of coppersmiths,
and several varieties of “disguised lan-
guages” (e.g. one involving switching of
syllables in a word with some distortions of
vowels). Especially well-known in this re-
gard is καλιαρντα /kaliar’da/, the lect of the
gay community that is characterized espe-
cially 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 ter-
ritory surrounding Greece in the Balkans
down through the ages and even into mod-
ern 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 re-
action against the influx of loanwords, with
sometimes Italian but especially Turkish
words being the prime targets for purging
and replacement by “native” Greek ele-
ments. 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 col-
loquial 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.

2. Basic Typology

2.1. 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>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Labial</th>
<th>Palatal</th>
<th>Dental</th>
<th>Velar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stops</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

468 voiceless
469 unaspirated
470 \[ p \] t k 
471 \[ b \] d g 
472 | Nasals |
|--------|
473 | m n |
474 | Fricatives |
475 | voiced v \[ j \] \[ z \] y |
476 | voiceless f \[ θ \] s x |
477 | Affricates |
478 | voiced \[ d \] |
479 | voiceless \[ r \] |
480 | Liquids |
481 | Flap r |
482 | Lateral l |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vowels of Modern Greek</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ο</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 ὁ πατέρας /o pa’teras/ ‘the father (NOM.SG)’ vs. τον πατέρα /ton 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 μπαινω /mpeno/ ‘I enter’, μπαστουνι /ba’stni/ ‘cuddle’) 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 /dino/ ‘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 /ʝ/ and the palatal fricative [ʝ] (with the palatal occurring before front vowels, e.g. ανοιγω /a’niyo/ ‘I open’ vs. /a’nijji/ ‘he opens’), as well as between the vowel /i/ and the palatal fricative [ʝ], e.g. καραβί /ka’ravi-O/ ‘boat (SG)’ vs. καραβία /ka’ravi-ja/ ‘boats (PL)’, allowing for an analysis whereby the j is derived and not a distinctive segment. However some instances of [ʝ] are not in alternation (e.g. γιατρός /ja’tros/ ‘doctor’) and there are some apparent minimal pairs (e.g. γατί /ga’ti/ ‘why’ vs. γατί /ya’ti/ ‘kitten’); moreover, in any case, the choice of which segment to derive initial independent [ʝ] from would be arbitrary, so that any such analysis is not at all clear-cut.

There are several typologically noteworthy aspects to the consonants. For one, there is an imbalance in the number of fricatives as opposed to stops, with there being far more fricatives than stops. Also, the voiced stops have a marked status in the system; even if they are taken to be distinc-
tive (cf. the discussion above), they are far less frequent in terms of their lexical occurrence than the voiceless stops, and are a “soft spot” for variation in ways the voiceless stops are not (see below). Finally, the affricates figure prominently in various phonosymbolic and generally affective lexical groupings and thus are functionally skewed with respect to other sounds in terms of their lexical distribution (see Joseph 1994a for discussion and references).

With regard to the vowels, while the system seems to be the typologically balanced and quite common 5-vowel “triangle”, the balance is disrupted somewhat by differential height realizations of the mid-vowels; in particular, there is some variation (see below, section 3) in the range of phonetic values shown by the mid-vowels with no direct parallelism to the fluctuations in the front and the back vowels (cf. Fourakis et al. 1999).

With regard to accent, Standard Greek shows a stress accent (generally involving intensity – see Arvaniti 2000) whose appearance in a word is governed in some part by phonological conditions and in large part by morphological conditions. That is, the accent can appear only on one of the final three syllables in a word but the question of which of the syllables bears the stress is largely determined by the morphological make-up of the word; particular suffixes or grammatical categories demand certain stress placements or shifts. Thus, for instance, the past imperfective suffix -ουσ-/ 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. óνομα /'onomá/ ‘name/NOM’ vs. ονοματον /onomaton/ ‘of names/GEN.PL’; the genitive singular -ου/ of i-stem neuter nouns attracts the accent, as in σπιτί /'spiti/ ‘house/NOM’ vs. σπιτιου /spi'tíu/ ‘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 /'djavaza/ ‘I was reading’ vs. διαβάζεμε /'dia'vázame/ ‘we were reading’).

2.2. Morphology

In terms of its morphological make-up, Modern Greek is basically a fusional inflecting language, with relevant grammatical information generally being marked via the endings of inflected words, i.e. nouns,
pronouns, adjectives, articles, and verbs. Each ending typically encodes values for several categories simultaneously. In traditional accounts of Greek, there is only one grammatical prefix, the past-tense marker ε- /e- (ή- /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 ὧν /ĥa/ 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 analytic, optionally so in the comparative, where there is variation with synthetic forms, e.g. ὁμορφότερος /omor'hoteros/ vs. ὅ πιο ὁμορφός /pjo omorfos/ ‘more beautiful’ (and note that “double” comparatives, mixing the two types, occur, e.g. πιο ὁμορφότερος /pjo omor'hoteros/) but regularly in the superlative, which consists of the definite article plus the comparative, e.g. ὁ ὁμορφότατος /ĥa omor'hotatos/ (two more constructions are possible in the superlative: ὅ πιο ὁμορφότερος /ĥa pjo omor'hoteros/ and also the less frequent archaizing katharevusa type: ὅ ὁμορφότατος /ĥa omor'hotatos/).

2.3. Syntax

With regard to its basic syntactic patterning, Greek can first of all be classified as a free word order language as far as the major constituents are concerned, though there is a tendency towards Subject – Verb – Object order in informationally unmarked contexts. Similarly, there is some freedom of ordering within phrasal groups, as between verbs and their objects and various adjuncts, but also some rigidity (e.g. the definite article is phrase-initial except when a demonstrative is present). Pronouns occur as subjects only when emphatic or focused (thus Greek is, generally speaking, a “Pro-Drop” or “Null Subject” language), and indefinite object pronouns can be suppressed as well. Major grammatical relations are indicated by case-marking on nouns and pronouns, though prepositions
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 να /na/ ‘here is/are …!’ and the locative interrogative που /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 /se/, negation markers, various verbal modifiers such as the future tense marker θα /tha/ or the subjunctive marker να /na/, the attitudinal marker ντε /nde/ 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)-thropos/ ‘human, man’/NOM.’, άνθρωπε /a(n)-trope/ ‘man!/VOC.’.

3. Phonemic Variation

3.1. 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. /l/ 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 ~ mb – AG voiced stops did not change into fricatives after nasals. The Katharevusa pronunciation of such clusters is essentially an orthographically derived one, due to “spelling pronunciation”; cf. (Kath.) ὀνδρας /andrəs/ vs. (Dim.) ὀντρας /andras/ ‘man’). Phonemic variation in MG is found in both the phonetic realization of segments and also to a more limited extent in lexical stress assignment, in the intonation of phrases, and in the types of permissible syllable onsets and codas. However, there is no variation in vowel length, as the phonemic distinction between long and short vowels found in the ancient dialects is absent in all modern ones. However, some dialects spoken today have maintained or even expanded phonemic consonant length distinctions, such as the Southeastern dialects spoken in the Dodecanese and also in Cyprus (e.g. CYG τον νομον ‘the law/ACC.’ vs. SG /to nomon/).

As noted earlier, SG is based on the Ionian-Peloponnesian dialects, which have diverged the least phonologically from the Hellenistic Koine. It is thus a good starting point for investigating regional phonemic variation in MG to compare other phonological systems with the standard Athenian variety, especially since it is spreading rapidly throughout the Greek-speaking world and thus presenting a new type of “diglossia” in various regions in the tension between SG and local varieties. As for social phonemic variation, factors such as economic class and extent of education seem still to determine largely the stylistic choice of grammatical elements in the phonology of speakers especially as to phonotactic patterns and consonant cluster pronunciation. Some evidence for social stratification of phonological variation in and around Athens is beginning to emerge out of a few socio-phonetic studies that have concentrated in that area (Arvaniti/Joseph 2000). This section on phonemic variation can thus be naturally divided into two categories: variation due to the geographical distribution of speakers, and variation due to stylistic or register choices by speakers.
Evident in this latter type are pressures on
and by speakers still familiar with distinct
Katharevusa types as well as variation in
the present-day vernacular representing a
fusion of the two varieties in a post-diglos-
sic linguistic re-synthesis that allows for
much more variation than either the tradi-
tional Dimotiki or Katharevusa registers
did. Less is known about the socio-func-
tional varieties discussed above as secret
languages, though these registers vary
mostly on the lexical level; further investi-
gation will likely reveal some systematic
variation in pronunciation and intonation
for even these.

3.2. Regional variation phenomena
A major aspect of regional phonological
variation is observed in the pronunciation
of vowels. Modern Greek dialects can be di-
vided phonologically along a major, but ad-
mittedly fuzzy, isogloss separating northern
varieties from southern varieties. This iso-
gloss has to do with variation in the pro-
nunciation 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 /mule/ would
exhibit deletion in the north of unstressed
/u/ and /i/, thus being realized as [mlar].
Some slight rounding of the /m/ and pala-
talization 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] (or
[m³lar³], with an epenthetic voiced stop be-
tween /m/ and /l/) indeed surfaces in the
plural as a fricative /ʎ/ when it is ‘protected’
by the unaffected final /-a/ marking plural
[mlarj] ‘mules’. Unstressed mid vowels /e/
and /o/ for their part are raised to /i/ and
/u/ respectively. For example the word
Μελέτω ‘I study’ pronounced as /mεlεtou/
in southern varieties would be pronounced
as /miliτau/ in the north. These vowel phe-
omena represent the main phonological
characteristic of these northern dialects
spoken in many areas north of the Pelopon-
nese and Athens and in some of the islands
of the northern Aegean. These vowel dele-
tions have also given rise to new phonotac-
tic patterns, allowing for consonants other
than /s/ and /n/ to surface as codas and ad-
ditional consonant clusters to surface as
complex onsets, e.g., πυάδι /pyaði/ ‘water
well’ for SG /piˈaði/. Unstressed /i/ dele-
tion is not restricted only to these dialects
but rather can be sporadically attested in all regional varieties, especially in pre-stress position; for example 
\( \alpha \mu \varepsilon \rho \iota \kappa \alpha \nu \varsigma \) /amerikanos/ ‘Greek American’ can be pronounced as [amer'kanos], \( \pi \varepsilon \rho \iota \varsigma \epsilon \o\iota \rho \) /peri'sotero/ ‘more’ as [perisotero] or \( \iota \mu \varepsilon \rho \alpha \) /i'mera/ ‘day’ as [mera]. This variation is perhaps sociolinguistic in nature reflecting an interaction between casual stylistic choices (Dim.) /mera/ vs. (Kath.) /imeral/, regional tendencies (e.g. /perisotero/ ~ /perisotero/) 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 /sl/. For example the word \( \theta \varepsilon \sigma \varsigma \varsigma /\theta \varepsilon \sigma \varsigma \varsigma \) /thesis/ ‘seat/GEN.’ can be realized as [\( \theta \varepsilon \sigma \varsigma \varsigma \)] or even [\( \theta \varepsilon \sigma \varsigma \varsigma \)] 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 \( \mu \varepsilon \sigma \varsigma \varsigma /\mu \varepsilon \sigma \varsigma \varsigma \) /messis/ ‘middle (FEM.GEN)’ pronounced as [mesː], and thus contrasting with the form \( \mu \varepsilon \sigma \varsigma \varsigma /\mu \varepsilon \sigma \varsigma \varsigma \) /mesi/ 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 \( \delta \varepsilon \alpha \varsigma \sigma \varsigma /\delta \varepsilon \alpha \varsigma \sigma \varsigma \) /a/kosa/ and in certain dialects as /a/kosa/.

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. \( \alpha \pi \alpha \omega \rho \pi \alpha \ /\alpha \pi \alpha \omega \rho \pi \alpha \) ‘from tomorrow’ becomes \( \alpha \pi \alpha \omega \rho \pi \alpha \ /\alpha \pi \alpha \omega \rho \pi \alpha \) and not /\alpha \pi \alpha \omega \rho \pi \alpha \/ ‘from tomorrow’, that is /\alpha / is “stronger” than /\i/ /\o/. In some dialects though, the resulting vowel can vary e.g. \( \tau \varepsilon \alpha \rho /\tau \varepsilon \alpha \rho /\tau \varepsilon \alpha \rho \) /avrio/ ‘from tomorrow’ becomes \( \tau \varepsilon \alpha \rho /\tau \varepsilon \alpha \rho /\tau \varepsilon \alpha \rho \) and not /\alpha \rho / ‘from tomorrow’, that is /\alpha / is “stronger” than /\i/ /\o/.

In some dialects though, the resulting vowel can vary e.g. \( \pi \varepsilon \rho \alpha \rho /\pi \varepsilon \rho \alpha \rho /\pi \varepsilon \rho \alpha \rho \) /poxi/ /\pi / ‘that I have’ can be realized as /\pi /oxi/ /\pi / + /\i/ /\o/ = /\pi /oxi/ /\pi / + /\i/ /\o/ vs. standard Greek /\pi /oxi/, /\i/ /\o/ being “stronger” than /\i/ /\o/. 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 /\i/ and /\o/ can range between speakers and dialects from very closed [\( \varepsilon \)] to very open [\( \varepsilon \)] 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. φουσκα /fuska/ ‘bubble’ instead of the expected φοσκα /fiskal/.

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 [s], [j] and [c], [ç] 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 χερί (SG [ʃeri]) ‘hand’ is pronounced as [ʃeri] and the word κερί (SG [ceʃiri]) ‘candle’ as [tʃeri]. Many southern varieties in the Peloponnesse and also in Crete have palatal allophones of the nasal /n/ and lateral /l/ before stressed /i/, for example Νίκος /nikos/ pronounced as /nιkos/. In SG this happens only before an unstressed /i/ that subsequently gets deleted, as in χωνιά /xoʃi/ ‘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. sexino/ ‘celery’ in the southern varieties. A very distinct realization of /l/ as a velar or “dark” /l/ 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 /kaʃa/ ‘well’ is realized as /kaːla/ 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 [ɔ] or as a doubly articulated /٪]. /ly/, or its allophone [j] before front vowels, can be inserted to prevent hiatus between vowels in many disparate dialects.
Alternatively the deletion of intervocalic /y/ or [j] is attested in others; with (historical) insertion, for example, κλατο/κλεο/ in SG, ‘I cry’ can be pronounced as /kleyo/ in many varieties, and αυρας in SG /a’eras/ ‘wind’ can be pronounced with an epenthetic [j] as /a’eras/ again not particularly localized geographically. By the same token, with (historical) deletion, one finds τρωγο /’troyo/ ‘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 προγραμμα /program/ ‘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, αντι /andi/ ‘instead’ is pronounced [a’di] in Crete but [andi] or [a’di] in other regional varieties. In SG there seems to be a tendency for nasal deletion in the direction of the Cretan pattern, but this regional variation seems to be also somewhat socio-linguistically and stylistically conditioned at least in the area of Athens. That is, in emphatic speech the nasal might surface even for speakers that normally denasalize voiced stops even though some younger speakers seem to lack the nasal categorically. However, the influence of the orthography is perhaps an important factor for the maintenance of the variation even in denasalizing varieties, since the only way to represent a voiced stop in the Greek alphabet is by the combination of nasal plus voiceless stop e.g. μπ /mp/, ντ /nt/, γκ-γγ /gk-gg/ for b, d, g respectively; for example, the words καμποσ /ka(m)bos/ ‘field’, or πεντε /pe(n)de/ ‘five’ have an orthographic nasal μ and ν respectively.

The grapheme γ can be used for either the velar fricative [ɣ] or the velar nasal [ŋ] before κ /kl/. The digraph γγ has the same phonetic value as γ (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. εμβαινο /(m)beno/ ‘I enter’, and ανδρας /’andras/ ‘man’, also spelled μπαινο and αντρας.

Finally, with regard to segmental variation, geminate consonants are attested in the southeastern varieties spoken in the Do-
decanese and in Cyprus. For example, corresponding to SG αιλα /a'ila/ ‘but’ one finds /a'ila/. Geminate voiceless stops seem also to be heavily aspirated by speakers of these dialects cf. SG λάκκος /lakos/ ‘pit’ and Dodecanese /lak:xos/.

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 τοιµαζαντιν /ti'mazandi/ ‘they were preparing’ (SG. τοιµαζαν /ti'mazan/ or /eti'mazane/) and Rhodian Greek has ἐρχομεστον /e'rkumeston/ ‘we were coming’ (SG. ἐρχομασταν /e'rkxomastan/). 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.

3.3. 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. επτα /epta/ ‘seven’ pronounced as [e'ta] or χθεσ /xthes/ ‘yesterday’ pronounced as [xtes], seem to be much more a matter of sociolinguistically 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 /el'i'koptero/ ‘helicopter’ (cf. φτερό /fte'rō/ ‘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. ανθρώπος /anthro'-pōs/ ‘human’ pronounced as /a'nθropos/ or /a'θropos/ is more probable in high frequency words than in low frequency words with Katharevousa origin. The pronunciation of the fricative [j] as a glide [ʝ] seems to be a gradient phenomenon, with many speakers producing a fricative invariably and others exhibiting more variation in their pronunciation. The [ʝ] 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'vgα/ ‘the eggs’ pronounced as /ta'vgα/.

4. Morphological Variation

4.1. 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'α/ 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 /'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. δοξα το θεο/δοξα το θεο/ ‘glory to god/DAT’.

4.2. Regional variation

Morphological variation does not exactly correspond to whatever phonemic isol-glosses 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 -αγα-/αγα-/ e.g. αγαπαγα/αγαπαγα/ ‘I was loving’, whereas in most northern varieties the suffix -ουσα-/ουσα-/ is used, e.g. αγαπουσα. 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 perfect exhibits considerable variability, with forms crisscrossing many traditional dialect boundaries, but the most common form in SG is -οντουσαν/-οντουσαν and less frequently /-ονταν/ and /-οταν/, the last one being homophonous to the 3rd person singular, e.g. αγαποντουσαν, αγαπονταν.
they were loving’. In some southern varieties the form -οσαντε /-osan-
de/ 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 /pernume/. In the present tense 3rd person plural, many dialects have retained the AG suffix /-usi(n)/ e.g. SG τρεχούσι /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 μιλα /milala/ 'I was talking', Cretan εμπλυόσα /emi-
lusa/ (whereas in SG its presence is largely determined by its being stressed cf. έτρωγα /etrouga/ 'I was eating' vs. τρόγαμε /trogame/ 'we were eating'). Also in the past tense, some dialects use the suffix -κα /-ka/ instead of the SG -σα /-sa/ e.g. εδωκα /edoka/ vs. SG εδωσα /edsa/ 'I gave'.

In the nominal system, most variability is found in the diminutive suffixes, /-ul/, in the Peloponnese (but now largely out of use), /-ul/ in the island of Lesbos, /-ui/ in the Dodecanese, and /-aki/ in SG and also Cretan. e.g. σπιτούλι /spiti-ul/, σπιτέλι /spiti-eli/, σπιτάκι /spiti-aki/, σπιτου /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 ειντα /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 μιλα /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 /trim/ 'feta cheese' vs. Athenian ‘any kind of cheese’).

4.3. 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 λέγων ~ λέγοντας /leon/ ~ /leondas/  
‘lion/MASC’, or λέγει ~ λέγη /leksis/ ~  
/leksi/ ‘word/FEM’ abound in the lan-
guage. 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 exam-
ple the genitive of the word λέξη (Dem.)  
/leksi/ ~ λέξη (Kath.) /leksis/ can be respec-
tively της λέξης (Dem.) /tis leksis/ or της  
λέξεως (Kath.) /tis lekseos/. There is, how-
ever, no isomorphism between morphologi-
cal 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 λέξεως /i lekses/; one does  
not hear now the form οι λέξεως /i lekseos/  
which some dialects in the past had used for  
words of this morphological class, e.g. η  
θύμησή /thimisi/ (fem.) the memory, or  
θύμησες /thimises/ the memories.  

In terms of the lexicon, social variation  
can be divided into two categories. One re-
fers knowledge of Katharevusa forms be-
longing to a more formal style, e.g. (Kath.)  
οξύνους /o’ksinos/ ‘intellectually sharp’ vs.  
(Dim.) μυαλό-ζηράφι /mnia’lo ksr’aﬁ/  
‘with a razor-sharp brain’. The other has to  
do with slang and lexical items clearly  
marked as colloquial and της πιατσας /tis  
piatsas/ ‘of the street’ e.g. SG στατσόμος  
/astinomos/ ‘policeman’ vs. Slang μπατσός  
/batsos/ ‘cop’ (from Turk. baç ‘tax collec-
tor’). Also the adaptation of loanwords, es-
pecially from English, seems to be condi-
tioned by stylistic choices; that is, speakers,  
depending on their attitude towards for-
eignisms, might choose to assimilate mor-
phologically foreign words, e.g. τα σιντα  
/tα sindjα/ ‘the CDs (NEUT/PL)’ or τα  
sιντρι /tα sindi/. To some extent, the choices  
reflect the age of the loanword (when it en-
tered 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).
5. 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 /μου ‘δίνεις/ ‘to-me you-are-giving’, μου ἑδοσες /μου ἑ’doses/ ‘to-me you-gave’ vs. δώσε μου /δώσε μου/ ‘give to-me!’, δίονυτας μου /δίονυτας μου/ ‘(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. ἑδοσες μου /’edos’es μου/ ‘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. πατέει /’pati’s 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 /δίνω στον Γιάννη/ ‘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 τον Γιάννη /’dinos ton/ ‘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 /μου/ of μου δίνεις /μου ‘δίνεις/ ‘me/ACC you-give’, δίνεις τον Γιάννη /’dinos 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
sound of the Sporades and Lesbos.
North of this line one typically finds accu-
sative 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 character-
izes — 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 dia-
lect, there is a stylistic/register dimension to
the above syntactic variation as well as a
regional basis.

6. Tendencies

There are several propensities in the lan-
guage 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 /trexun/ 'they
run' vs. /trexune/. The same phenomenon
can be found in many dialects in the geni-
tive plural of nominals e. g. των παιδιών
/ton pei'dion/ 'the children/GN' vs. /ton pei'
dion/. For many nouns, the genitive
plural is altogether missing, especially the
ones with diminutive suffixes e. g. το
παιδάκι /to pei'daki/ 'the little child/NOM'.
*των παιδακίων /ton pei'daki'nion/ 'the little
children/GN'. Instead a periphrasis is
used (preposition από /ap'o/ 'from' +
ΑC.C.).

Many speakers with imperfect knowl-
edge of Katharevusa types also tend to reg-
ularize adjectives and participles that do
not conform with the regular declensions of
SG, e. g. the participle derived adjective 'in-
teresting' has three distinct endings corre-
sponding to three genders each in its own
declensional paradigm: ο ενδιαφέρων, η
ενδιαφέρουσα, το ενδιαφέρον /o en-
dia'feron/ (MASC), /i en'dia'ferusa/ (FEM.), /to
en'dia'feron/ (NEUT.). Speakers tend to use
the masculine by default to refer to the other genders, and furthermore to not in-
flect the masculine form in the oblique for
the otherwise overt case marking of SG in
nominals e. g. μία ενδιαφέρον ταύτια /mi'
en'dia'feron 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
(lm)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 /-al/, speakers seem to increasingly resist assimilating them, e.g. της Ατλάντας /tis atl-
αντ̢ας/ ‘Atlanta/GEN’ instead of /tis a’t-
λαντ̢ας/. 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 morphologi-
cally 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 µπαρακι /to baraki/ ‘the little bar’, or κουλαρο /ku1laro/ ‘I am cool’. Another tendency is to analogically incorpo-
rate the past tense augment prefix /ε-/ in forms that in earlier Greek did not take the augment such as the imperative and dever-
bal nouns e.g. η απεκρουση /i a1pekrusi/ ‘the blocking’ vs. η αποκρουση /apo
krusis/ from the verb αποκρουση /apo
krusis/.

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 ‘anθ̣rapos/ ‘the human’, του ανθρώπου (GEN) /tu anθ̣ropou/ vs. /tu ‘anθ̣ropu/’. This tendency has become, for the most part, the rule in adjectives e.g. του πράσινου /tu ‘prasiunu/ ‘the green (GEN.MASC)’ vs. the awkward /tu pra1sinu/ despite centuries of purist prescriptivism. In terms of the phonetic re-
alization of segments it is interesting to note that the pronunciation of the /r/ as a uvular fricative [s] instead of the common flap [r] is not unheard of even though extremely rare. Syntactically, the tendency again is to normalize any idiosyncratic con-
struction. 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
τιμ̢is 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.
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