***Research proposal***

Although the science of linguistics and Greek philology has advanced in recent decades, much of the history of interaction between Ancient Greek and Modern Greek still requires further study. One particularly interesting area which demands a thorough study of literary and documentary sources is the Greek lexicon. The campaign to purify the language undertaken in the 19th century following independence and the constitution of a Greek state (1821) went hand in hand with the rediscovery of terms and styles from Classical Greek, which made a comeback during the nationalistic atmosphere of the time. This process of returning to the past often involved combatting Demotic Greek, which for centuries had been open to the influence of foreign languages, Turkish among others. While many of these attempts were ill-fated (just think of νηφοκοκκόζυμον for καφές “coffee”), others were more fortunate and entered the spoken language, successfully replacing their Demotic equivalents. For example, the classical αδιέξοδον 'cul de sac' replaced the compound τυφλοσόκακο, which committed the sin of having a Turkish second noun element (Horrocks 2010).

This, in a nutshell, is the disease from which Greek has suffered over the last two centuries and it cannot be said that it has been cured. As Geoffrey Horrocks indicated in a recent conference on Greek linguistics in Riga (*A corpus and usage-based approach to Ancient Greek,* April 12-14, 2018) recent decades have seen the revival of ancient grammatical forms which would have been unthinkable until a few decades ago (for example, in newspaper articles the expression πληχθείσα περιοχή, "the affected region" with an ancient aorist passive participle, previously considered unacceptable).

The aim of my research is to compile a repertory of classical Greek terms which came back into daily use in spoken Greek between 1821 and 1922, year of the μεγάλη καταστροφή, an event which had a major impact on the linguistic history of Greek, stirring up the two opposing shores of the Aegean like nothing had before. This period, encompassing a century, may be defined as an epoch of resurgence for Greek’s ancient past, which corresponded to the birth of Standard Modern Greek. Such a study will involve evaluating the importance of the archaizing initiative of writers and scholars. Moreover, it will entail taking a census of the appearance of returning words by consulting archival sources, newspapers, periodicals and literary sources. During the years that Georgios Khatzidakis taught at the University of Athens (1848-1941), Psykharis, lecturer in Linguistics at the Sorbonne and author of a Demoticist agenda, made an important contribution to the discussion concerning the lexical heritage of Greek, which was decidedly against the views of Panayotis Soutsos, advocate of the birth of the *katharévousa*.

An example of this intervention is the term ἄλγος, a word from the Homeric language which became increasingly less common during the Classical period in favour of other derived nominals (ἄλγημα, which later became obsolete) or synonyms with a different etymology (for example λύπη) which came back into use in Modern Greek and is listed in contemporary dictionaries. Indeed, clarification is needed of the precise moment and context in which this action of repechâge took place. For research of this kind one needs to consult newspaper archives and undertake lexical surveys, a project which would benefit greatly from a trip to Athens.

Another emblematic case, for which it would be useful to research attestations since 1871, the year it was documented for the first time, is that of the neuter πραξικόπημα 'coup d’état', taken from the potent French expression, which benefited at the time from the prestige French conferred on voices within political science. The original verb πραξικοπέω ‘to launch a surprise attack' was introduced by Hellenistic Greek, formed from the suffix -κοπέω beloved by the historian Polybius (De Foucault 1972: 32).

One drawback of lexical studies is that innovations can often be ignored by the written language and Greek is particularly prone to problems of this kind. Albio Cesare Cassio recently and instructively drew attention to what happened to the verb ἀλληλογέω ‘to change one's mind’. The reading of a Christian text from the middle years of the 4th Century, traditionally entitled *Confessio Cypriani*, subject of Francesco Mauro’s doctoral thesis, offered up a use of the verb ἀλληλογῶ which was much earlier than the first attestation generally noted in the 11th Century. "The verb ἀλληλογῶ was already in use at that time – perhaps in restricted circles – and came into wider use later, even though it was rejected by purists" (Cassio 2014: 47).

Limiting the inquiry to the period after 1821 means, to a certain extent, reducing the risk, given that one can use a more abundant, more comprehensive network of testimonies from newspapers and periodicals (although the latter in Greek were written in *katharévousa* for a long time), of running into difficulties with tradition which happens with ancient texts.

In reality, the problem of intra-linguistic dialogue does not end with vocabulary. A second chapter of my work in Athens and Greece would concentrate on the revival of grammatical forms of Ancient Greek in Standard Modern Greek. A list of the main occurrences can be found in Geoffrey Horrocks’s book *Greek. A History of the Language and its Speakers*. I will restrict myself to mentioning here:

a) the use of ancient morphology in many, previously Demotic, verbal forms such as certain aorist passives in -θην/ -θης/ -θη in place of –θηκα (συνελήφθην from συλλαμβάνω or ανεβλήθη in place of αναβλήθηκα);

b) for nouns, the use of neuter nouns in the third declension in -ον / -οντος, such as ενδιαφέρον;

c) the use of genitive plurals, otherwise restricted in the Demotic in previous epochs;

d) the revival of active and mediopassive declined participles in an adjectival role (for example οι εργαζόμενες γυναίκες).

These occurrences of morphological remodeling still require a comprehensive study which places their appearance chronologically in literature and in documentary texts, and where possible cites the reasons and the people who are responsible in their various ways for this work of linguistic archaeology.