GLOSSOLOGIA 1 (1982) 109-117

PARTIAL LINGUISTIC AUTOBIOGRAPHY OF A SCHIZOGLOSSIC LINGUIST

KOSTAS KAZAZIS

> *"What we remember lacks the hard edge of fact. To help us along we create little fictions, highly subtle individual scenarios which clarify and shape our experience. The remembered event becomes a fiction, a structure made to accomodate certain feelings". (Jerzy Kosinski, as quoted in Jong 1973:113).*

The author discusses some of his vacillations in speaking and writing his native Greek (e.g., "Do I use τῆς κυβερνήσεως or τῆς κυβέρνησης?") and tries to account for some of the shifts which have occurred in his idiolect since early childhood.

To the best of my knowledge, the term *schizoglossia* was coined by the American linguist Einar Haugen. This is how he defines it in Haugen 1966:280: "[...] *schizoglossia* [is] a personality split which leaves many persons linguistically divided and uncertain. It is not to be identified with the situation described (by Ferguson [1959]) as *diglossia,* the existence of a "high" and a "low" form of the same language within a political unit, as in Greece or German-speaking Switzerland". Actually, anyone familiar with modern Greek linguistic affairs could vouch that diglossia and schizoglossia are far from being mutually exclusive, but of course Haugen's point was merely that Norway is characterized by schizoglossia though not by diglossia. In fact Haugen is aware that schizoglossia is very widespread in the world, since it is "a linguistic malady which may arise in speakers and writers who are exposed to more than one variety of their own language, [and thus] exists in every complex civilized society" (Haugen 1962:63). He adds that "the victims of schizoglossia are often marked by a disproportionate, even an unbalanced interest in the form rather than the substance of language" (*ibid).*

Robert Browning (1969:19-20) says this about ancient Greek diglossia: "This diglossy is not a simple matter of the coexistence of a literary and a spoken version of the same language, but of the presence of an abnormally wide choice of alternative modes of expression in the spoken language, plus a varying degree of admixture of lexical, syntactical and morphological elements belonging to, or thought by writers to belong to, an archaising and relatively unchanging language". Browning hints at the existence of a state of schizoglossia, caused by Atticism, already during the second century A.D. He writes, à propos of Galen and others, about "the difficulty which men felt in choosing the correct linguistic form for public or formal utterances" (1969:52).

I suspect that the difficulty mentioned by Browning extended beyond the domain of

public and formal utterances and into that of relatively informal speech, let alone informal writing –just as in modern Greek. Again according to Browning (1969:52): "The young Marcus Aurelius, writing in Greek to his mother, asks her to excuse him for any incorrect or barbarous or unapproved or un-Attic word which he may have carelessly used. The same Marcus Aurelius[,] in the philosophical diary which he kept as an emperor, is no longer concerned with such trivialities, but writes in literary Koine–the *Meditations* were not written for publication–and the Stoic philosophers of the Roman empire in general despised the preoccupations of rhetoricians".

Indulging in a linguistic autobiography, even a brief one, is no doubt presumptuous. One would not expect others to be interested in one's autobiography, linguistic or otherwise, unless one is terribly famous or unless there is at least some guarantee that there will be passages likely to arouse morbid interest in one's readers, such as messy divorces and other scandalous matters. In the real world, of course, there are presumptuous things which people over a certain age do which appear a trifle less presumptuous than they would have if their perpetrators had been somewhat younger. Since I am now in my late forties, maybe I qualify. As to the prerequisite that there be at least some scandalous material in the autobiography, I can only remind the reader that this is the partial linguistic autobiography of a G r e e k linguist, i.e., of a diglossic person, so that even if it cannot hope to hold its own against the memoirs of former madams, it promises to be a shade more eventful than if the autobiographee had not grown up in a diglossic speech community.

Many professional linguists come from diglossic backgrounds, and an even greater number from schizoglossic ones–if we assume that schizoglossia is more widespread than diglossia. It is a pity that such linguists do not as a rule share with their colleagues i n a p u b l i c f o r u m the story of some of their diglossic and schizoglossic experiences. Their being professional linguists is not in itself a guarantee of objectivity; nonetheless, they must have thought a great deal about their diglossia or schizoglossia, and what they have to say about those matters might be of some interest to other linguists. I have therefore written this paper partly in the hope of inspiring other linguists to write about some of their linguistic vacillations, traumas, and the like.

Even though I alone am responsible for the largely free-associating style used here, the topic of this paper is by its very nature eminently susceptible of a subjective treatment. To begin with, there are severe limits to one's capacity for introspection. "You can't have such a thing as straight autobiography or confessional writing because even if you t r y to write down literally what you remember, memory i t s e l f fictionalizes and orders and structures" (Jong 1975:6, where the author is paraphrasing Jerzy Kosinski). Moreover, the autobiographical sketch attempted here may very well be highly atypical. For even if we assume that there is such a thing as a typical middle-class Greek–a bold assumption at best–, still someone who, like me, leaves Greece at the age of eighteen, settles permanently abroad, and becomes a linguist specializing in among other things Modern Greek can hardly claim to be typical.

In what follows, I use a great deal the terms *High* and *Low* abbreviated as H and L, respectively. These labels are used here purely as technical terms referring to approximate areas in the diglossic continuum (as in Ferguson 1959) and are not meant as value judgements.

Anyone growing up in an educated urban middle-class setting in Greece is exposed at an early age to a great many High (or "Katharevousa", i.e., puristic) linguistic elements. Many of those High elements become part of one's primary linguistic patterns, so that in effect such originally High (i.e., learned) forms can be regarded as synchronically Low, since they are part of the vernacular of some, and sometimes of most, speakers of Greek—the High mode is by definition never used as a vernacular in diglossic speech communities (Ferguson 1959:329 and *passim).*

The combinations of originally High elements present in the speech of educated Greeks differ from one idiolect to another. It is said in Greece that "there are as many demotics and as many katharevousas as there are speakers of the language". Even if we were to dismiss that statement as a mere quip, we would still have to admit that, like so many of its fellow-quips, it is not entirely devoid of truth, for there is indeed in spoken Modern Greek "an abnormally wide choice of alternative modes of expression" (Browning 1969:19-20). We shall leave aside the question of the numerous lexical borrowings from the High mode of Greek into the Low mode and shall concentrate instead on whether or not such borrowings are normalized on the basis of some idealized—and thereby largely fictional—morphological system of the Low mode, such an idealized system being sometimes called "pure demotic". Since Greek diglossia is by now by and large close to becoming a thing of the past, it is precisely this question of what constitutes standard (or "good") demotic (Low) that is the most lively sociolinguistic issue in present-day Greece.

The morphological elements of High origin in the vernacular of middle-class Greeks are legion, so I shall limit myself to the discussion of a very few of them. I do so with some regret, since one will thereby be getting a deceptively simple picture of the actual state of affairs, but then I do not wish this paper to assume the proportions of a monograph—for a relatively detailed discussion of the differences between the High and the Low mode, see Householder 1962.

I was born in Athens in 1934 as the only child in a middle-middle class family. Americans would probably say that our family was upper-middle class. Nevertheless, and even though I make no pretense to being sociologically sophisticated, I have demoted our family by one notch—to middle-middle classhood—simply because there were virtually no books in our home other than my own books.

The sort of Greek that I was mostly exposed to could be described as a variant of so-called "Common Modern Greek", which in turn is a minicontinuum within the indeterminate boundaries of the Low mode and which is spoken, as their vernacular, by the more or less educated members of the bourgeoisie.

To convey some idea of the sort of family I grew up in, I shall relate a seemingly trivial anecdote. At the age of eight or so, I was presented with several works by Jules Verne in the luxurious Sideris editions which Greek old-timers may remember. The pictures were marvellous, but the language was High (katharevousa). I had read virtually nothing in katharevousa till then, but I could not resist the temptation of tackling the Jules Verne novels. It was hard work, and since I had no access to a katharevousa-to-demotic dictionary, I don't think I could have done it had not my paternal grandmother been willing—and able—to serve as my dictionary. The following purports to be a typical exchange between the two of us, although I cannot claim to be reproducing exactly what was said: "Γιαγιά, τι εἶναι *ἄνθρακος;*" 'Grandmother, what is *anthrakos?*' "*Ἄνθρακος; Ὁ ἄνθραξ,*

τοῦ ἄνθρακος. Ἄνθραξ εἶναι τὸ κάρβουνο". (freely translated:) *'Anthrakos? Anthrakos* is the genitive of *anthrax. Anthrax*$_H$ means *"karbouno*$_L$*"* ["coal"]'. Anyone familiar with Greece can well imagine that a grandmother with that kind of diglossic versatility must have been a relatively rare bird in the Athens of the early 1940's.

Like my contemporaries with a similar social background, I grew up using an enormous amount of originally High elements in my everyday speech. For instance, I used High-like augments in the historical tenses of many verbs: thus, always ἀνέλαβα$_H$ 'I undertook' and ἤλπιζα$_H$ 'I was hoping', never ἀνάλαβα$_L$ or ἔλπιζα$_L$; always φύσεως$_H$ 'of nature' and κυβερνήσεως$_H$ 'of government', never φύσης$_L$ or κυβέρνησης$_L$; always δικασταί$_H$ 'judges (nominative)' and δικαστάς$_H$ 'ditto (accusative)', never δικαστές$_L$ 'ditto (nominative and accusative)'.

An impressionistic labelling of the forms with the H subscript above might go like this: (1) ἀνέλαβα$_H$ is not completely High (High would have ἀνέλαβον$_H$) and is found in the form of Low which can be called "Common Modern Greek"; (2) ἤλπιζα$_H$ is indeed High but is also found in Common Modern Greek; (3) φύσεως$_H$, κυβερνήσεως$_H$, δικασταί$_H$, δικαστάς$_H$: High but also conservative Common Modern Greek. On the other hand, for me all the forms labelled with the L subscript above (ἀνάλαβα$_L$, ἔλπιζα$_L$, φύσης$_L$, κυβέρνησης$_L$, δικαστές$_L$) were marked. The nature of their marking differed according to the linguistic or situational context, including the identity of the speaker or writer using them. Such forms could be marked as "uneducated", which in the rather snobbish environment of urban middle-class Greece is (or was until a few decades ago) often coterminous with "rural". Or they could be marked as "poetic" or "literary", since red-blooded practitioners of Greek artistic literature, at least in those days (ca. 1930-ca. 1960), in general tried to avoid syntactic or morphological patterns of High origin, however widespread such patterns may have been in Common Modern Greek—for a fuller discussion, see Kazazis 1976. Finally, such Low forms could also be marked as "leftist", a label which was anathema in the social milieu in which I was raised.

In what follows, I shall limit myself to the oppositions -αί$_H$ / -άς$_H$ versus -ές$_L$ (as in δικασταί$_H$ / δικαστάς$_H$ versus δικαστές$_L$) and -εως$_H$ versus -ης$_L$ (as in φύσεως$_H$ versus φύσης$_L$). In the High mode of Modern Greek, as well as in what I have—rightly or wrongly—chosen to call "conservative Common Modern Greek", isosyllabic masculine nouns ending in stressed -τὴς and designating mostly practitioners of various professions or followers of some *-ism* or other distinguish in the plural between a nominative in -αί$_H$ (e.g., δικασταί$_H$) and an accusative in -άς$_H$ (e.g., δικαστάς$_H$). Other forms of Greek, including most people's conception of "pure demotic", use one single form ending in -ές$_L$ (e.g., δικαστές$_L$) for both the nominative and the accusative plural of such nouns. A similar statement could be made, *mutatis mutandis,* about the High and conservative Common Modern Greek forms φύσεως$_H$ and κυβερνήσεως$_H$ and their "pure demotic" counterparts φύσης$_L$ and κυβέρνησης$_L$.

At least as early as we entered secondary school at age twelve (in my case, in 1946), some of my fellow-students and I began to change our attitudes towards Low forms like δικαστές$_L$ or φύσης$_L$. (Since I attended a secondary school for boys, *we* refer here only to males). As far as I can reconstruct what brought about this change of attitude, I think it was partly connected with the more favourable light in which we gradually began to look upon the rural segments of the Greek nation. Most of the poetry and much of the

prose which we read at school or on our own were written in "pure demotic", or some approximation thereof, and were set in rural Greece, which has traditionally been regarded as more "heroic" or "manly" or "wholesome" than its urban counterpart. It was apparently irrelevant to us that the rural Greece we were reading about was typically that of several decades before our own time: its heroic character appealed to us all the same, and so did the language which we associated with the rural population of our country.

I can still remember the exaltation with which we used extreme Low forms in those of our compositions for which flights into literary-like styles were appropriate, i.e., condoned or even encouraged. Whether or not our idealization of rural Greece and its speech was as important a factor as I have made it sound, our increased awareness of the diglossia (High versus Low) around us resulted in increasing distaste for the High mode (katharevousa) and its more salient inroads into conservative Common Modern Greek, i.e., into the Low mode which was our native form of Greek. Many originally High forms, when used in the Low mode, now began to strike us as not only pretentious but also effete and sissy, two unpardonable flaws in the eyes of most male adolescents growing up in as androcentric a society as ours was.

In using the kinds of Low linguistic forms which were stigmatized by our parents and their friends, we felt brave and manly —and almost heroic— ourselves. We also felt naughty and somewhat wicked: it felt good to tamper with the linguistic umbilical cord which tied us to our social milieu. (This phenomenon is hardly unique to Greece or to diglossic linguistic communities). Our parents listened proudly or at least indulgently, when we read them our compositions: those were after all attempts at literature, and everybody knew that "rabid demoticist" (i.e., super-Low) language was appropriate in literature. On the other hand, when we tried to use those same extreme Low forms in our everyday communication with our family, the grown-ups would often respond angrily and say things like: "Μιλᾶς σὰν βαστάζος τοῦ Πειραιᾶ" 'You talk like a stevedore down at Piraeus' or "Μιλᾶς σὰν κουκουές" 'You talk like a damned Communist'.

I shall now take leave of my peers and go back to the first person singular. In 1952, at the age of eighteen, I went abroad, ostensibly to study for a few years, but as it turned out I have not lived in Greece ever since. In fact, during the seventeen-year period between 1956 and 1973 I did not visit Greece at all. From 1952 to 1959, I studied political science. Unfortunately, I do not remember to what extent I used super-Low forms in my s p o k e n Greek, just as I cannot recall whether my primary linguistic patterns (i.e, my spontaneous speech until I reached adolescence) had, say, forms like ἑπτὰ_{H} 'seven' and ὀκτὼ_{H} 'eight', or ἑφτὰ_{L} and ὀχτώ_{L}, or both. I do know, however, that my letters home contained a host of learnedisms (i.e., originally High forms), including items of the type φύσεως_{H}, κυβερνήσεως_{H}, δικασταί_{H}, δικαστάς_{H}. I had always been afraid of my father and tried as much as possible to avoid irritating him in any way, including through my use of linguistic forms which he might frown upon —which is not to say that my efforts to avoid arousing his displeasure through my linguistic behaviour were necessarily conscious.

My switch to linguistics in 1959 inaugurated a new period of superdemoticist activity on my part. I did realize, of course, that some variation was in order in any idiolect, and that there were such things as styles and registers to enliven the idiolectal scene. All the same, somewhere in the back of my mind, there lingered the suspicion that the conser-

vative Common Modern Greek with which I had grown up was somehow not a system. Still, my militant demoticism after 1959 was not connected only with professional linguistic considerations but also with my ideas about social justice. I would ask myself: "How can this form of Greek [conservative Common Modern Greek] spread to the masses, if it has one and a half morphologies and one and a fourth syntaxes? How can anyone master it who has not grown up with it? And if one has to grow up with it in order to master it, then this is one big, ugly, undemocratic linguistic mess".

I may have been right about the undemocratic part, but in my naïveté as a newcomer to linguistics, I had failed to notice the extent of English bidialectalism around me or to remember how competently so many of my Greek acquaintances had handled conservative Common Modern Greek, even though they had acquired it in their late teens or early twenties, since they were raised in the villages or in social milieus in which it was not the current vernacular. In any event, shortly after I became a graduate student in linguistics, I gradually began to use super-Low forms in both my spoken and my informal written Greek. (Later on, especially after a military dictatorship was established in Greece (1967-1974), I started using super-Low forms even in my correspondence with official agencies of the Greek Government—call that a form of political protest, if you will).

A signal exception was that I never eliminated the stressed internal augment in verbs. I continued using ἀνέλαβα$_{H}$ 'I undertook' (not ἀνάλαβα$_{L}$) but ἀναλάβαμε$_{L}$ 'we undertook' (without the internal augment; not ἀνελάβαμε$_{H}$, which is generally regarded as so High as to be marked).

Another exception were my letters to my father, in which I was rather slow to introduce the new look in my linguistic usage. I do not have sufficient documentation to ascertain whether or not there were other similar exceptions in my correspondence, whereas since my father's death in 1974 I have had access to a good portion of my letters to him written between 1952 and 1974. Nevertheless, with time even my letters to my father show an increasing number of super-Low forms, until by the early 1960's the language in those letters is indistinguishable from my written usage in general. It would be interesting to know whether I introduced superdemoticisms in those letters because I was becoming more self-confident in my dealings with my father or whether I had been exposed to the super-Low forms in question for so long (in my own usage, as well as in that of others, especially fiction writers and activists of demoticism) that I had become desensitized to them, i.e., they had become unmarked for me. Perhaps both factors were at work.

It may be worth noting that I used masculine plural forms in -ές$_{L}$ (δικαστὲς$_{L}$ instead of δικασταί$_{H}$/δικαστὰς$_{H}$) more readily than I used feminine genitive singulars in -ης$_{L}$ (κυβέρνησης$_{L}$ instead of κυβερνήσεως$_{H}$). I have noticed that I am not alone in this, and that there are many Greek speakers and writers for whom feminine genitives in -ης$_{L}$ are more marked as "Low" than are masculine plurals in -ές$_{L}$.

In adopting a number of superdemoticisms, I was violating my primary linguistic patterns, which, as I mentioned earlier, contained a great number of originally High elements. People who shift their primary linguistic patterns are certainly no rarity. What may seem peculiar in the case of Greeks who, like me, shift those patterns downwards is that they exchange a form of Greek which is generally regarded as prestigious for one which is by and large considered less prestigious. (There is, of course, always the possibility that stan-

dards of prestige may themselves shift and that something similar is currently taking place in the Greek-speaking world). We find this phenomenon in all those Greek intellectuals committed to some so-called "pure" form of demoticism, as well as in all Greek leftists, who are by definition supposed to be in favour of Low-er forms of the demotic. I have descussed in Kazazis 1976 how a good number of Greek writers revert to High-er forms of the demotic while relaxing with their family and friends, and I know that the same is true of many Greek leftists with middle-class backgrounds.

In 1973 I returned to Greece for a summer vacation, after an absence of seventeen years. I was immediately struck by the difference between my own speech and that of my family and friends. On the whole, their Greek was closer to the primary linguistic patterns which I had partly abandoned, i.e., closer to conservative Common Modern Greek. My contemporaries and former classmates now spoke a form of Greek which was replete with originally High forms. They spoke as if the infatuation with heroic-sounding "pure demotic" which had gripped us during adolescence had never taken place.

For what it's worth, here is my assessment of what had happened. After completing their secondary and university education, my friends had entered "the real world" as full-fledged adults. Their preoccupations were now quite different from those of the relatively sheltered teenagers that we had all been several years earlier. As teenagers, we had dreamt of heroic and manly deeds, or at the very least had tried to free ourselves to some extent from the tutelage of our parents. Like adolescents everywhere, we had defied some of the conventions under which our families operated. One of the manifestations of that defiance had been the adoption of Low-er linguistic forms than those of our primary linguistic patterns.

For a time, we had basked in what we perceived as the rugged beauty of "pure demotic"; we had shocked and sometimes angered the "establishment" – of which we were junior members, mind you–, and we had felt awfully brave. But whereas my friends had stayed in Greece, *I* had left the country at the age of eighteen, long before my adolescent linguistic behaviour had petered out. That I had subsequently entered the field of linguistics in my mid-twenties did little to reverse my arrested sociolinguistic development: in 1973, at the age of thirty-nine, I was still in many respects linguistically a Greek teenager.

I don't think I have ever felt the symptoms of the linguistic ailment which Haugen (1962:63) calls "schizoglossia" as acutely as during my six short visits to Greece between 1973 and 1981. Time and time again I would hesitate between my relatively new Low-er patterns (those I had adopted during my teens and later) and my native High-er patterns. Whereas during the period of my militant demoticism Greek friends would often compliment me on my "beautiful (read: more or less "pure") demotic", after the summer of 1973 I would suddenly start worrying that my Low-er linguistic patterns might brand me as some of the things I felt I was not. I did not worry so much about being branded as uneducated as about being branded as disrespectful, vulgar, or a Communist.

On the other hand, I was at first rather averse to "letting myself go", as it were, in the direction of the fancy Greek that I had grown up with as a child, when I was perhaps too young to be linguistically insecure. Now I was afraid that by giving free rein to my katharevousa-spangled primary linguistic patterns, I might sound sociopolitically conservative or appear to be betraying the demoticist cause.

The result has been all sorts of false starts and hesitations, as well as some instances where I would utter two competing forms successively. For example, I might say the High-er form ἤλπιζα$_{H}$ 'I was hoping' and immediately afterwards its Low-er counterpart ἔλπιζα$_{L}$ —or vice versa. Thus: "Ἤλπιζα... ἔλπιζα..." or "Ἔλπιζα... ἤλπιζα..." (Those non-native speakers who have not quite decided which mode of English they should adopt sometimes find themselves in similar situations. For instance, I often catch myself speaking to an American and saying things like "By then the situation had got out of hand" (where *had got* is more British than American). Then I think: "Confound it! This American will think I don't know English. I wish I had said 'had gotten out of hand' instead").

After this public spilling of my linguistic guts, the reader may well wonder if there is a happy ending to our story. Not really, for there is no easy cure for schizoglossia.

I notice that some of my previously repressed (high-er) primary linguistic patterns have been creeping back. Nowadays I seldom feel guilty or ill at ease when I use High-er feminine genitives in -εως$_{H}$ (e.g., κυβερνήσεως$_{H}$ instead of κυβέρνησης$_{L}$). Note, however, that I had never felt perfectly at ease using the Low-er forms in -ης$_{L}$, even though I may occasionally still use them to this day, if I deem them to be more appropriate in a given linguistic or situational contex. On the other hand, I have begun using the High-er masculine plural forms in -αί$_{H}$ (nominative) and -άς$_{H}$ (accusative), which I had for years just about eliminated from my usage in favour of their lower counterparts in -ές$_{L}$ (both nominative and accusative).

At the time of my first trip back to Greece in 1973 and immediately afterwards, I would splurge in my fancy-Greek (High-er) patterns—with the "right" interlocutors, of course—and I would find that liberating. I sometimes reasoned like this: "It may not be awfully 'democratic', but it's s t a n d a r d, it's p r e s t i g i o u s, it's m e, and it certainly f e e l s g o o d".

Was it— i s it—the "real" me, though? Or had I simply forced myself to take what I t h o u g h t was a liberating stance? Had I in other words compelled myself to do what I took to be what is sometimes called "my own thing"? But aren't compulsion and the concept of "being oneself" (or "doing one's own thing") contradictory notions? I still vacillate a great deal, for instance, between -αί$_{H}$/-άς$_{H}$ and -ές$_{L}$, but then so do many Greeks living in Greece. I wonder, however, whether my formerly unmarked High-er pattern -αί$_{H}$/-άς$_{H}$ may not by now have become marked for me. For I now often feel more self-conscious saying the High-er δικασταί$_{H}$/δικαστάς$_{H}$ than the Low-er δικαστές$_{L}$. (When I think that prior to the period when I used (almost?) exclusively the Low-er forms in -ές$_{L}$, those Low-er forms made me cringe, I must agree with the saying "familiarity breeds acceptance"). There was a time when using -ές$_{L}$ was for me something like a political statement: "See if I care what y o u think of my language. I do as I please". Or: "I'll use the demotic, the language of the Greek people, whether y o u like it or not". In those days I did not pause to worry about some bothersome questions that ought to be taken seriously by Greek linguists, namely "Who are the Greek people?" and "Do the Greek people, whoever they are, really use -ές$_{L}$ rather than -αί$_{H}$/-άς$_{H}$?" Nowadays it is, if anything, the other way around. It is when I use my earliest (High-er) -αί$_{H}$/-άς$_{H}$ patterns that I often feel most self-conscious, again depending on who my interlocutor or intended reader is—schizoglossics lead a largely chamaeleon-like existence. Sometimes, when I use -αί$_{H}$/-άς$_{H}$, I think: "See,

I'm using my native forms, the forms I grew up with, and I don't care whether or not y o u think I'm bourgeois, or undemocratic, or an enemy of what y o u choose to call 'the demotic' "

One can readily see that all this leaves very little room for spontaneity, but then spontaneity is a prime victim of schizoglossia.

It is a moot question whether or not my renewed (post-1973) acquaintance with my native language as it is used in Greece itself has had any "liberating" effect on me. To the extent that I am now once again comfortable in using the High-er forms in -αί$_{H}$/-άς_{H} part of the time (i.e., in some contexts), there seems to have been a certain amount of "liberation" or loosening up. The same goes for set phrases of High origin but which abound in the vernacular, especially in that of educated people—see Kazazis 1979. Ever since 1973 I have been using many such phrases once again without feeling guilty for not automatically "demoticizing" them, namely translating them into Low-er Greek—e.g., turning the originally High locution ἀφ' ἑνός... ἀφ' ἑτέρου... 'on the one hand... on the other...' into a Low-er ἀπ' τὴ μιὰ... ἀπ' τὴν ἄλλη... This loosening up, though, has so far affected only some matters of detail, for on the whole I am still painfully schizoglossic and rather confused as to the proper language-planning duties of a Greek linguist who on the one hand does not want to confuse description and prescription (cf. the idealized "pure demotic" mentioned earlier in this paper) but who on the other hand wishes to remain sensitive to such issues as social justice and equal accessibility of education to all citizens.

Kostas Kazazis
The University of Chicago
The Department of Linguistics
1010 East 59th Street
Chicago-Illinois 60637

U.S.A.

References

Browning, Robert. 1969. Medieval and modern Greek. London: Hutchinson University Library.

Ferguson, Charles A. 1959. "Diglossia". Word 15, 325-340.

Haugen, Einar. 1962. "Schizoglossia and the linguistic norm". Georgetown University Monograph Series on Languages and Linguistics 15. Washington: Georgetown University Press, 63-69.

Haugen, Einar. 1966. Language conflict and language planning: the case of modern Norwegian. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

Householder, Fréd W., Jr. 1962. "Greek diglossia". Georgetown University Monograph Series on Languages and Linguistics 15. Washington: Georgetown University Press, 109-129.

Jong, Erica. 1973. Fear of flying. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Jong, Erica. 1975. Here comes and others poems. New York: New American Library. (The interview with Erica Jong from which I quote in this paper first appeared in New York Quarterly 16 and was reprinted in William Packard, editor, The craft of poetry, New York: Doubleday, 1974).

Kazazis, Kostas. 1976. "A superficially unusual feature of Greek diglossia". Papers from the Twelfth Regional Meeting, Chicago Linguistic Society. Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society, 369-373.

Kazazis, Kostas. 1979. "Learnedisms in Costas Taktsis's *Third wedding*". Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies 5, 17-27.