

## Historein

Vol 16, No 1-2 (2017)

Greek Historiography in the 20th Century: Opening a Research Agenda



### On the historiography of the language question in post-1974 Greece

*Alexandra Patrikiou*

doi: [10.12681/historein.10249](https://doi.org/10.12681/historein.10249)

Copyright © 2017, Alexandra Patrikiou



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/4.0/).

#### To cite this article:

Patrikiou, A. (2017). On the historiography of the language question in post-1974 Greece. *Historein*, 16(1-2), 102-119. <https://doi.org/10.12681/historein.10249>

# *On the historiography of the language question in post- 1974 Greece*

**Alexandra Patrikiou**

Panteion University

The restoration of democratic and, by the autumn of 1974, parliamentary rule in the wake of the demise of the military dictatorship had a significant impact on almost every aspect of Greece's political, economic and intellectual life. The so-called *Metapolitefsi*<sup>1</sup> was a period of tying up loose ends that long predated the establishment of the dictatorship:<sup>2</sup> for example, legalising the Communist Party (KKE), which had been outlawed since 1947; ending the burdensome constitutional issue by establishing a parliamentary republic; adopting demotic as the official language (1976); and introducing the single-accent system (1982). This period of transitions<sup>3</sup> created the suitable context so as to boost the academic interest on the language question, which led to the publication of the main canonical texts on that same issue. The works of Alexis Dimaras, Rena Stavridi-Patrikiou and Anna Frangoudaki have undeniably shaped, each in a different way but positively all together, the framework within which the historiography of the language question evolved from the early years of the *Metapolitefsi* onwards.<sup>4</sup> The aim of this article is to examine these works as products of their time and to demonstrate how, in a period of transitions and ideological redefinitions, a renewed relation to the past was developed. By commenting on the different interpretations and exposing the main convergences and divergences between these works, one will be able to reflect on their contributions to historiography and to scholarly thought in general. In addition, later studies that engage with aspects of the framework set in these years are covered by this contribution, thereby offering an overview of the related historiography of the last 40 years.<sup>5</sup>

The language question refers to the diverse and multilayered disputes over which form of the language should be the official state language:

the more archaic *katharevousa* that sounded like ancient Greek, or demotic, an incomplete form of spoken language derived from different dialects. *Katharevousa* (literally “of a pure form”) was an early nineteenth-century construction, a language form based on the idea of a compromise between ancient Greek and the vernaculars spoken at the time, which was articulated by Adamandios Korais, a major figure of the Greek Enlightenment.

For Dimaras, the language question was practically identified with language reform, that is, the enforcement of the demotic, which constituted part of the broader educational reform that had repeatedly failed in the Greek case notwithstanding the great changes already achieved in education.<sup>6</sup> Similarly, Frangoudaki’s perspective was also primarily political.<sup>7</sup> She too considered language reform part of educational change<sup>8</sup> and her focus on legislation relating to language and education is evidence of this attitude; especially when one of her two books was dedicated to the 1911 constitution when *katharevousa* was named the official state language. For Stavridi-Patrikiou, the language question was a social as much as it was a political matter and it was defined as the quest for achieving the ideal of a unified language.<sup>9</sup> She looked for the symbolic value of language as a carrier of ideas and mentalities.

The choice of language and the subsequent debates over its specific form was an integral part of the process of nationhood and statehood – and not only in Greece.<sup>10</sup> A look into the historiography of the language question should be included in the broader field of the history of cultural politics of nationalism, since it is undisputable that language was and still is the “psyche of the nation”,<sup>11</sup> even though each of these three scholars may have placed different emphasis on the construction of national identity and the role of the language in this process. Defending the language, archaic or demotic, meant defending the nation. In this respect, it is no accident that the focus of this paper is on the 1970s.<sup>12</sup> The early *Metapolitefsi* was a period of redefinitions, including and especially that of national ideology. The fall of the Colonels signalled the end of the so-called *ethnikofrosyni*, that is, an ideological system of the right-wing parties, and hence created the impression that national ideology could be rebuilt.<sup>13</sup>

I would distinguish two broad pathways between these three scholars, despite the similarity in their stances towards their discipline: one that identifies the demotic language with progress and the process of modernisation (Dimaras, Frangoudaki) – an argument used by the demoticists themselves and especially Manolis Triantafyllidis<sup>14</sup> – and one that sees deep-rooted ideological and social differentiations in the disputes on the language itself (Stavridi-Patrikiou). This categorisation is based on the emphasis each of these scholars placed on the social role of the language, despite the fact that one may have used the conclusions of the other. In the late 1970s Dimaras and Frangoudaki placed less emphasis on the relation between nationalism and language, whereas Stavridi-Patrikiou elevated nationalism into a major focal point of her work.<sup>15</sup> While Dimaras has not changed his perspective that much on this point,<sup>16</sup> Frangoudaki has significantly altered hers.<sup>17</sup>

The first different views on variant forms of the modern Greek language began to appear in the mid-eighteenth century, articulated by prominent figures of the Greek Enlightenment, such as Eugenios Voulgaris (1716–1806), who supported the more archaic form, and Dimitrios Katartzis (1730–1807), who was in favour of the demotic.<sup>18</sup> After the establishment of the Greek state, the

issue of choosing the nation's language turned into a state matter and, therefore, a matter that required central planning and the involvement of state institutions. From the War of Independence to the 1870s, the prewar disagreements did not crystallise into specific conflicting parties.<sup>19</sup> In the meantime, *katharevousa* was becoming even more archaic in its form, while the demotic was penetrating literature. In 1853 Panagiotis Soutsos suggested the "return" (that is, the enforcement) of ancient Greek in the school education system and in 1856 a royal decree regarding the school medium of instruction dictated that ancient Greek grammar was the only Greek grammar.<sup>20</sup> Meanwhile, the importance of the role of demotic in the formation of the nation was being inscribed in the work of Dionysios Solomos, the national poet, in his work *The Dialogue* (1824).

In the latter half of the nineteenth century, languages began to be identified with a specific cultural and political space, thus rendering each national language into one of the main pillars of national identity.<sup>21</sup> Even so, the framework set in the late 1970s placed more emphasis on the early twentieth-century developments. Of the three, Dimaras is the only one who systematically dealt with the nineteenth century. His two-volume work, practically one volume for each century, consisted of a wide collection of documents, with a short (considering the span covered) introductions, starting from the War of Independence going all the way to the start of the Colonels' dictatorship in 1967. He essentially let the documents speak for themselves. This is not to say that it lacked an overall interpretation, just that he was making a significant methodological statement regarding the importance of publishing original sources so as to build his argument.<sup>22</sup> Since the history of education constituted the link between all these documents, the book became one of the founding texts of the respective field of research. He gathered previously unused sources, so much so that new aspects of the history of education were revealed.<sup>23</sup> The language question, albeit dominant,<sup>24</sup> was not the main common thread.

By the end of nineteenth century, the language question had reappeared as a dividing conflict regarding not solely the language form but also the type of society one could aim for. This does not imply that there were only two clear choices. Broadly speaking, there were at least four:<sup>25</sup> a) further archaisation of *katharevousa* (advocated by Konstantinos Kontos),<sup>26</sup> b) the gradual but inescapable return to the vernacular (Dimitrios Vernardakis),<sup>27</sup> c) the preservation and beautification of *katharevousa*, while waiting for the evolution of the spoken language (Georgios Hatzidakis),<sup>28</sup> and d) the implementation of the demotic in all aspects of life (Psycharis).<sup>29</sup> The latter's work in particular marked the beginning of the demoticism; a complex and multifaceted movement that demanded the use of the demotic as the one and only national language. Psycharis' famous first words on why he wrote his manifesto emphasise just that: "Language and fatherland are one and the same. Fighting for one's fatherland or one's national language is fighting the same battle. Always defend the fatherland."<sup>30</sup> At the same time, the demoticist movement aimed at the modernisation of society. It goes without saying that there were different interpretations of how this modernisation would or should take place. In any case, however, throughout the twentieth century, the demotic could simultaneously stand as proof of the nation's relation to the "glorious" ancient Greek language (hence culture), the language of the people and a tool for the working class.<sup>31</sup>

The fact that three of the four canonical texts analysed here are included in the history of education demonstrates the inextricable link between language and educational issues and the identi-

fication of educational reform with demoticism. This identification was not made in the 1970s but in the early part of that century: educational reform after the rise of the demoticist movement acquired specific content –the enforcement of the demotic form at school– and from then onwards the demand for modernisation and national integration, for the demoticists could not be conceived without the demotic language.<sup>32</sup> One of Dimaras' main contributions was his input of the concept of "educational reform". He built his argument around the question of what qualifies for educational reform, whether educational reform had actually occurred and why did it fail. One knows it failed, according to Dimaras, from page one. Its title gives away the ending: the reform that hasn't happened. It should be noted that it is an argument (a pattern in historiography) originally expressed by Triantafyllidis after the suspension of the 1917 changes; a sense of a failed or postponed reform leading to a sense of vanity.<sup>33</sup> Educational reform was perceived to be closely intertwined with the overall modernisation of Greek society and, thus, its suspension was interpreted, consciously or unconsciously, as a failure of any modernisation attempt.<sup>34</sup> Within the field of education after the 1970s, much discussion has focused on the concept of "reform".<sup>35</sup> The aim of the reform, for the Greek case in the *Metapolitefsi*, was urban modernisation and school democratisation.<sup>36</sup>

According to Stavridi-Patrikiou, the focus of the demoticists' demands on education is that it turned demoticism into a movement and therefore a potential national and social threat:<sup>37</sup> a movement towards modernisation, that is, social mobility, emancipation from archaic living patterns, scientism, secularism, etc, which would eventually be identified with Europeanisation.<sup>38</sup> Dimaras' main argument regarding the failed reform and the lack of modernisation became a "firm conviction" that inspired a number of researchers in the field to examine the causes of the failure itself.<sup>39</sup> One of these studies, more sociological in nature, is an early work by Anna Frangoudaki, *Educational Reform and Liberal Intellectuals*, which claims right from the start that "educational reform is still pending", following Dimaras' interpretational scheme of a failed or at least insufficient educational reform due to reactionary and dictatorial governments. She states, however, that the "enemy" of each reform was not only the so-called reactionary forces, but that the demoticists themselves were also partly to blame.<sup>40</sup> Frangoudaki's second book, published in the same year, focused on a very specific aspect of the language question; the establishment of *katharevousa* as the official language of the state in the 1911 constitution. Despite the very specific aspect of the subject, she included her work within the framework of insufficient reform, but this time she also incorporated Stavridi-Patrikiou's research regarding the extremely problematic identification of demoticists with progress and the purists with conservatism.<sup>41</sup> Frangoudaki, like Dimaras, essentially subscribed to the argument that what was missing from Greek society led to repeated failures; that is, she turned to a history of absences;<sup>42</sup> a tendency which was not confined to the field of history of education but rather characterised much of the Greek historiography of the early *Metapolitefsi*.<sup>43</sup> However, it should be noted that the quest for reform is a presence in itself, since before any change one may detect the voluntary or involuntary pursuit of that reform. "Language reform failed, educational reform failed, all the dreams of organic intellectuals of the bourgeoisie, the demoticist-reformists, were betrayed", Frangoudaki concludes.<sup>44</sup> Dimaras also explicitly wrote: "the aim of the collection [his entire book, that is] is to describe the image of motionlessness, the impression of immovability" prevailing in educational issues.<sup>45</sup> This attitude did indeed demonstrate a deep desire for political, social and ideological change in their present.

Stavridi-Patrikiou's extended introduction to the collection of documents regarding the public debate on Georgios Skliros' book in the main demoticist journal, *O Noumas*, incorporates her research in the field of the social history of ideas. Skliros' book on the basic principles of Marxist theory, published in 1907, provoked a debate on the future course of the demoticist movement that lasted at least until 1909. Her research revealed the profoundly opposing philosophical, political and social beliefs among demoticists, thereby ending the impression of a solid and compact demoticist movement. In addition, connecting the demotic with social needs and examining the relationship to socialism, which hesitantly appeared in Greece in the first decade of the twentieth century, revealed the complexity of the language issue and the demoticist movement. Stavridi-Patrikiou, while making the same methodological statement as Dimaras as far as the publishing of original sources is concerned, intended to comprehend the intellectual transformations of the demoticist movement at the turn of the twentieth century and how the movement was trying to find a way out of the "national deadlock" after repeated national disappointments, like the lost war of 1897 and the annexation of Crete.<sup>46</sup> A wide range of opinions and attitudes could be found within the demoticist movement, but all converged on the promotion and eventual predominance of the demotic.<sup>47</sup>

The demoticists, even as an internally diversified group, worked mostly outside the state's official institutions but tried to penetrate and/or change them. Their efforts were greatly supported by the Greek diaspora. As a result, they formed numerous associations (such as I Etaireia i Ethniki Glossa (National Language Society), Ekpaideftikos Omilos (Educational Association), Foititiki Syntrofia (Student Fellowship) and published journals (*Noumas* and *Deltio tou Ekpaideftikou Omilou*). It is during this period that all these efforts were turned towards the use of the demotic at school and the movement became known as educational demoticism. The purists, more often than not, had the main institutions of power, like the government, the university and the church, on their side. Consequently, the demotic was gradually perceived as revolutionary discourse while *katharevousa* as a symbol of power and authority.<sup>48</sup> Indeed, as a reaction to the increasing dynamism the demoticist movement, *katharevousa* became the official state language with the adoption of article 107 of the 1911 constitution, even though *katharevousa* had been developed in an empirical and unsystematic fashion.<sup>49</sup>

The beginning of the twentieth century was marked by a series of severe public disputes, starting with the bloody clashes concerning two translations: the translation of the Gospels (*Evangelika*), in 1901 and of Aeschylus' three-part tragedy *Oresteia* (*Oresteiaika*) in 1903.<sup>50</sup> Additionally, Kostis Palamas was dismissed twice (1908, 1911) from the University of Athens for being openly a demoticist,<sup>51</sup> the Volos Girls' School was brought to an hasty closure and its director Alexandros Delmouzos (1911) was prosecuted along with his associates for promoting atheism, communism and generally inflicting "moral damage". In 1917, the Eleftherios Venizelos' government was the first to employ the pioneers of the educational demoticism movement, Triantafyllidis, Glinos and the recently acquitted Delmouzos, who wrote the first school textbooks in demotic. In 1920, Venizelos' effort was brought to an abrupt end after his electoral defeat. A specially appointed committee withdrew the school books, calling them malicious and suggesting they should be burned. In 1925 and 1928, Delmouzos, as the director of the Marasleio Didaskaleion Athens (a primary teacher's training college) and Miltos Kountouras, as the director of Thessaloniki's *Didaskaleio*, were persecuted for immoral, unpatriotic and antireligious teaching. They were both eventually acquitted

but removed from their posts.<sup>52</sup> The dissolution of the main demoticist association, *Ekpaideftikos Omilos*, in 1927 due basically to the dispute between Delmouzos and Glinos over its future course, denoted more or less the decline of educational demoticism. For some, like Delmouzos, the language question had become a solely national issue. For him and his followers, modernisation was now not necessarily intertwined with democratisation. Hence, it comes as no surprise that some demoticists, like Delmouzos, Triantafyllidis and Ioannis Kakridis, despite their firm beliefs in parliamentarism, decided to go along with Metaxas and his regime (1936–1941) for the sake of promoting the demotic language. Delmouzos openly supported the regime at first, but resigned his post at the University of Thessaloniki in 1937 after disagreeing with the regime's policies. Kakridis, an important classist scholar, managed to get a position in Athens University, one of the main bastions of purism, thanks to a changed statute by Metaxas regime.<sup>53</sup> Most importantly, Metaxas assigned Triantafyllidis to prepare a grammar for the demotic, which, published in 1941, remains in use.

One of the main common elements between these quite diverse studies is their stance towards history as a discipline. These studies constitute seminal works exactly because they complied with contemporary research methodology. Their authors insist on using various documents and conduct arduous research. Years later, Stavridi-Patrikiou explicitly promoted this approach against what she called postmodern quests to theorise theory, despite their admittedly significant contributions to history.<sup>54</sup> They used all kinds of sources, avoided rigid schemes and interpretive orthodoxies but strongly believed in the process of contextualisation. They offered pluralist and diversified viewpoints. They sought to identify the complex processes behind the facts and not merely to describe the events themselves. Although all three strongly supported the demotic, none was swept away by his ideological positioning or resorted to overgeneralisations or oversimplifications. The personal choices made by the authors, such as studying abroad (Britain and France), shaped them politically and culturally and defined their research interests and professional attitudes. Dimaras, who completed his PhD thesis at King's College London, brought with him the commitment to empirical research, which was badly needed in Greek historiography.<sup>55</sup> Frangoudaki, like Dimaras and Stavridi-Patrikiou, was also committed to the sources; that is, laws, transcripts, correspondence, articles and books of the period under examination were used to comprehend the social phenomena. Stavridi-Patrikiou, following the French example, significantly contributed to the field of the history of ideas, a central figure in which was the historian of the generation of the 1930s,<sup>56</sup> Konstantinos Th. Dimaras. And this stance, which treated history as a discipline, was the trademark *par excellence* of modernisation.

All three, following K. Th. Dimaras, believed that with the Greek Enlightenment the process of the Europeanisation of Greek society had acquired a noble past, since the process itself had been associated with a web of modernising values.<sup>57</sup> Much has been written on the relationship between Europe and Greece and how this has shaped modern Greek national identity. What is of interest here is that the Greek Enlightenment was one of the main rhetorical topoi of "westernisation", whereby Europe is obviously identified with the west.<sup>58</sup> So, they employed a narrative, according to which one side comprised renewal, Europeanisation and modernisation, while the other inertia, conservatism and antiwesternism; this was indeed a dilemma of their present.<sup>59</sup> All three were influenced by this two-axis scheme, but it was Dimaras and Frangoudaki who mostly employed it, while revealing its complexities and its various shades. Stavridi-Patrikiou and Frangoudaki's later

work can be found on the verge of this narrative since they focused more on the multi-dimensional features of the demoticist movement and liberal education. This scheme didn't cease to be of use even to younger researchers.<sup>60</sup>

The modernised view of history they all offered constitutes an indication of the need for the modernisation of Greek society during the early years of the *Metapolitefsi*. Besides, the identification of educational reform with demoticism is considered to be one of the basic characteristics of the arguments made in favour of the educational reforms of the late 1970s.<sup>61</sup> Dimaras' and Frangoudaki's entanglement with education implies policy-making; where specific education policies are required to achieve modernisation. Hence they offered a more tangible and regulatory perspective on language matters. For Stavridi-Patrikiou, too, language, education and politics are inextricably intertwined, as the title of her later work suggests.<sup>62</sup>

In this sense, however Stavridi-Patrikiou, in her early work, differentiates herself from Dimaras and Frangoudaki; not because she didn't believe in the modernisation of society through the demotic. On the contrary, she believed that the seven-year military dictatorship brought together a new group of intellectuals for whom theory and practice went hand in hand.<sup>63</sup> Contemporary research on the long 1960s confirms that the foundations of the reshaping of the Greek political culture are to be found during the military dictatorship.<sup>64</sup> However, her perspective included tracing the various and fluid ideological transformations in society; a less tangible or regulatory issue by nature. She saw education as part of the issue at hand and not the other way around.<sup>65</sup> Her work, which focused on revealing the complex ideological nature of the demoticist movement, implies how multidimensional ideological constructions can be. And in this sense, her work is a reminder of how important it is to clearly define vague, but attractive, concepts, like modernisation and Europeanisation. It also meant that society could choose what kind of modernisation and Europeanisation it wanted: nationalist and narrow-minded or renewed, western-like and patriotic.

According to Stavridi-Patrikiou, the historiographical output that stemmed from the junta experience, like her own and that of Dimaras and Frangoudaki, did not aim solely to make theoretical academic constructions.<sup>66</sup> They all intended to reshape and re-educate society itself through their work. Dimaras explicitly wrote that he decided to prepare this collection of documents because, as was undisputed common knowledge, educational matters in Greece in the mid-1970s needed radical reform to change it from national pedagogy to social engineering.<sup>67</sup> Frangoudaki also summed up her introduction, explaining the "usefulness" of her research. She argued that the discovery of the causes of this strange phenomenon, that is, the social definition of reactionary forces, as well as the interpretation of the reasons that prevented liberal intellectuals from fighting effectively, were obviously useful, not only for understanding history, but also for understanding current affairs.<sup>68</sup>

All three scholars focused more on the first half of the twentieth century and less on the second.<sup>69</sup> They believed that therein lies the heart of the issue. That is not to say they ignored or underestimated later developments. After the Civil War (1946–49), demotic and *katharevousa* were broadly identified with the left- and the rightwing blocs, respectively. In 1952, the constitution, apart from the article on *katharevousa*, included an article defining the principles of "Helleno-Christian civilisation" as the fundamental purpose of primary and secondary education. Later, in 1967, the military



dictatorship heavily stigmatised its use by fanatically supporting *katharevousa* as the only “national language” and as the fundamental element of “Hellenic-Christian civilisation”.<sup>70</sup> The practically ridiculous use of *katharevousa* by the Colonels greatly facilitated the everyday use of demotic.<sup>71</sup> Therefore, the end of the military junta marked the end of the official use of *katharevousa*; the symbolic value of which remains. In popular perception, the one who abuses the Greek language and simultaneously threatens the national identity is never the one who misuses *katharevousa*, but always the one who makes mistakes – possibly terrible ones – in demotic.<sup>72</sup> The efforts, collective or individual, promoting the use of the demotic language did not cease until the removal of article 107 from the constitution in 1975 and the adoption of subsequent laws determining demotic as the official state language for education,<sup>73</sup> rendering it the official *national* language form.

Given that governmental intervention was indeed needed to establish the use and the form of the demotic, the analysis of linguistic nationalism involves the fields of language planning and state nationalism. This need for a *pure* national language was evident in Law 309/1976, according to which modern Greek was established as the language form for education. The article describing the “Neohellenic language” (standard modern Greek), written in perfect *katharevousa*, is as follows: “Modern Greek is perceived as the Panhellenic language tool used by the Greek people and important authors of the Nation and based on the demotic form, devoid of idioms and excesses.”<sup>74</sup> Georgios Rallis, the conservative education minister who tabled and supported the law in parliament, clarified that these “idioms and excesses” were basically any foreign words and diminutives.<sup>75</sup> According to Frangoudaki, the language question, as it evolved after junta, revealed a problematic national identity in the *Metapolitefsi*, in that modern Greek was perceived to be insufficient and less valuable in comparison to other European languages.<sup>76</sup>

Until 1976, the language form was an apple of discord, as the issues at stake were the character of the nation and the determination of national ideology.<sup>77</sup> The late 1970s were spent preparing the process of the EEC’s enlargement and Greece’s accession to the community. Reminding Europe that the modern Greek was an “ancient language” was vital for acquiring a place in the European family and “proving” its superiority in comparison to other European languages. The discarding of the polytonic system in favour of a single accent in 1982, which generated a public debate but did not induce moral panic, is considered the “last but not least” phase of the language question.<sup>78</sup> Its handling – from the constitution of 1911 until 1982 – confirms the victory of a standardised and unified language over a variety of dialects, ethnic impurities and language hybridities, thereby verifying the significant role of linguistic uniformity in building national identity and achieving social cohesion both in the past and in the present.<sup>79</sup> The multifaceted relations between Greece and Europe were being renegotiated, even in literature. The reconsideration of the literature generation of the 1930s, as a generation which in its time saw Greece’s relation to Europe not as subordinate but as equal, demonstrates the tendency of renegotiating this fundamental relationship.<sup>80</sup>

The dispute between purists and demoticists as presented in the late 1970s inevitably concealed the question of which language form works best, *katharevousa* or demotic. This concealed question came in a period of language canonisation, that is, a period of choosing and deciding specific language types. The answer to the question can only be found in relation to the kind of national community each side aimed for. Therefore, the discussion relating to this disputes offers insight

into the different viewpoints and goals regarding the construction of an imagined community in the *Metapolitefsi*.

If we accept that national bonds are formed and reformulated precisely because there is a corresponding social need, then a fundamental question arises: which social need in relation to the formulation of the national community was met with the historiographical output on the language question. First of all, in the period of the early *Metapolitefsi* the collapse and delegitimisation of the junta created a gap that allowed the evolution of such redefinitions. In addition, with the benefit of hindsight, Greek society apparently longed for in-depth knowledge of its past and a kind of modernisation, that for some meant conformity with Europe. The dictatorship was seen as a period of decadence and isolation and, hence, during the *Metapolitefsi* Greek society and politics had a lot of catching up to do. These authors attempted to highlight any past modernisation effort, even failed ones. Dimaras' choice of title, *The reform that hasn't happened*, called for the reforms that should happen. For him, Greek society was trapped between modernisation and tradition and the history of education was very clear about that.<sup>81</sup> For Stavridi-Patrikiou, demoticism, for nationalist as well as socialist demoticists, was primarily a modernising movement that in the early twentieth century was expressed politically through Eleftherios Venizelos.<sup>82</sup> The need was to achieve modernisation, as each of them defined it, in the present through the usage of the demotic.

It goes without saying that they all worked prior to the redefinition of the language question, as it occurred in the early *Metapolitefsi*. And at the same time, they and their work contributed to that same redefinition. As they are part of their era, they also constituted active intellectuals; they could and did play an active role in the renewal of society.<sup>83</sup> In Stavridi-Patrikiou's last book, in a self-reflection mood, she specifically described this active sociocultural role of her generation as new public intellectuals, where they tried to generate a discipline respected within society and therefore legitimate a "new political discourse"<sup>84</sup> and, hence, a new political strategy for historiography. The research of the late 1970s is in fact part of the history of the language question itself.<sup>85</sup> Their goal was, inter alia, and without sacrificing their academic integrity, to solidify the victory of the demotic. The *Metapolitefsi*, as a period of transition, was a period of redefining the content of national ideology. And these scholars, along with other historians of their generation, introduced the theme of the "construction of national ideology" in their field. Indeed, they managed to protect the Greek history community from the winds of nationalism for decades to come.<sup>86</sup> According to Stavridi-Patrikiou, historical research flourished during the military junta, while in the *Metapolitefsi* researchers overcame basic fears, such as fear of change and of self-knowledge.<sup>87</sup> Besides, after 1974 the country was headed towards a new national narrative by expanding the country's cultural orientation, redefining national identity and integrating European norms. A working hypothesis could be that a golden opportunity appeared for them: to contribute to developing the idea of patriotism as a part and parcel of modernisation and Europeanisation through the usage of demotic.

The framework set in the 1970s, unknowingly perhaps, promoted research on the demoticist side. It is a fact that later historiographical research on the language question has also mainly focused on the demoticists. The purists' side is basically investigated as a reaction to the demoticists. Research on conservative intellectuals supporting *katharevousa* has been limited.<sup>88</sup> This one-sided perspective is quite problematic since it doesn't offer much to the comprehension of purists'

thoughts and actions or to the evaluation of their role in the construction of Greek nationalism. In addition, putting too much emphasis on the one side may render the analysis more biased than what the research methodology requires. Nevertheless, as Spyros Moschonas puts it, the history of the language question was not written by the winners, but by those who temporarily lost.<sup>89</sup>

In this respect, a few years later Dimitris Tziovas<sup>90</sup> attempted to highlight the legacies created by the discussions and the controversies between demoticists and purists together rather than addressing at each one individually. Nevertheless, his focus was also on the demoticists and how they contributed in the process of constructing the Greek national identity, seen here as a discursive construct which emerges through public debate and discussion. He adopted Stavridi-Patrikiou's views of a pluralist and internally conflicting demoticist movement (12) and explored the formation of a literary past through the general canonisation of the historical and cultural past. Drawing on Michel Foucault and Hayden White's work, he placed his work in the field of literary history (13).

Not only Tziovas, but Elli Skopetea also noticed this historiographic imbalance in favour of the demoticists, which led her to conclude that there are hidden aspects of the language question, such as linguistic modernisations (neologisms) produced thanks to *katharevousa* that are completely neglected or that demotic and *katharevousa* worked side by side to build on national ideology or on policies to hellenise other Balkan peoples. Skopetea distances herself from what we could call this modernisation narrative of the 1970s. Her research shows that at the end of the nineteenth century, the rivalries between Balkan peoples for the same territories and multilingual populations reduced the importance of language as the sole element of the nation and elevated the notion of "national consciousness".<sup>91</sup> Dimitris Stamatopoulos' research is also an example of an effort to avoid the two-axis scheme by focusing on the role of the Greek community and the patriarchy in Istanbul that had to support the unity of the Ottoman empire and the unity of the Orthodox people at the same time.<sup>92</sup> He convincingly maintained that there was a time at the beginning of the twentieth century when the patriarchy argued for a "middle path" regarding the language question, thereby revealing connections between demoticists beyond the dichotomy of nationalists versus socialists as well as connections between demoticists and supporters of *katharevousa*.

Yet, the historiographical framework set in the 1970s remains largely unchallenged, even though new aspects have been researched and disagreements have been expressed. For example, Peter Mackridge attempts, quite successfully, to tell the whole story from the beginning in his *Language Question and National Identity*. For this reason, it is characterised as an essential reference work<sup>93</sup> and an admirable historiographic accomplishment.<sup>94</sup> The emphasis is on nationalism, as he analysed the disputes over language as disputes over what kind of national ideology and identity was being constructed. In this sense, it is an account on the multiple and complex ways national consciousness has been built. It demonstrates how a number of prominent intellectuals, several institutions and the state itself contributed in manufacturing national ideology.

As an overall history, the emphasis in Mackridge's book is on the grand narrative, encompassing as much as possible; it is not on revealing small distinctive details<sup>95</sup> that divulge the complexities of the phenomena. However, not only did Mackridge acknowledge the detailed research of both Stavridi-Patrikiou and Frangoudaki (4), but also described the two alternatives as a "continuum of

linguistic registers ranging from 'pure' demotic to 'extreme' *katharevousa*, with hybrid varieties in between" (29). In short, he tried to maintain a precarious balance between the grand narrative and detail, between history and linguistics, between the theory of nationalism and literature. This interdisciplinarity, such a crucial desideratum of contemporary historiography, fulfils a current need of seeing history as a social and cultural practice and not only as cognitive process.<sup>96</sup> In this sense, the contemporary questions regarding the past relate to historical culture and the multiple ways the past lives in the present. A 200-year-old dispute has its vivid remains in today's everyday life and it has continued to "exercise the minds and pens of intellectuals, politicians and many other Greeks".<sup>97</sup> The importance of his book lies, inter alia, in that he examined the historical course of a current popular mentality, according to which modern Greek is important today mainly due to its historical past,<sup>98</sup> a view that has been criticised by Moschonas, who claims that language nowadays is no longer the object of the ideological dispute but the precondition of any ideological dispute on language, that is, the subterrain of disputes about various "minor" language issues.<sup>99</sup>

Dimaras, Stavridi-Patrikiou and Frangoudaki did not pay much attention to the language question as an individual case of a European phenomenon. Mackridge, as well as Tziouvas, draw on international academic work, thus contextualising the Greek case within a wider theoretical framework. They both perceive the construction of national literature as a European phenomenon and they examine the Greek case based on that same assumption. This is evidence of a characteristic element of the first generation of historians in the *Metapolitefsi*; the effort to create a new national history that seldom speaks with international academia;<sup>100</sup> an attitude that gradually changed towards the end of the twentieth century.

Mackridge also noted that in the last 70 years an almost complete homogenisation of the modern Greek language took place.<sup>101</sup> Indeed, the quest for one single language, either for demoticists or for purists, effectively concealed the ideal of uniformity<sup>102</sup> –an ideal that none of the works of the 1970s essentially disputed. Their focus was more on the debates themselves, rather than on their common attributes, like the desideratum for a common language. In effect, that meant that no one disputed the sanctity of a single homogeneous language and hence the sanctity of a single homogeneous nation. The need for a single unified nation and for "Europeanisation" was in fact bigger compared to the need for recognition of any internal language differences. In addition, the standardised language through which a common culture is diffused within society is considered a basic element for modernisation.<sup>103</sup> And, in this respect, the role of public intellectuals becomes crucial for the dissemination of a common language and a national consciousness, as both Anderson and Gellner claim.<sup>104</sup> Dimaras and Stavridi-Patrikiou were such active intellectuals, while Frangoudaki remains one.

After 1974, the focus of the public discussions regarding the language shifted towards the so-called decline of modern Greek.<sup>105</sup> Objections to the accent simplification were often combined with reservations about any orthographic change that removed the language from its glorious past.<sup>106</sup> In 1986, the national baccalaureate exams caused widespread disappointment, when many students appeared not to understand two words, *αρωγή* and *ευδοκίμηση* (to offer relief and to flourish). National concern for the youth (and their lack of a rich vocabulary) led to a major change in education policy: to teach ancient Greek from the age of 12 instead of 15. The language question may have

completely changed its content, but the fears connected to it remained. Old and well established concerns, such as the threat to national identity by altering the language, were added to new ones, such as the decline of the language and the poor vocabulary of the youth. The result was now completely different. According to the dominant perception since the fall of the dictatorship, there is only one language, that of the state, which is sacred, regardless of whether it had to be altered or not.<sup>107</sup>

The enforcement of the demotic ended the quarrel regarding the form of the language, but it did not prevent other disputes on language issues. However, none of the public disputes on language that took place after 1974 created the upheaval of the early 1900s, as the distress that these disputes generated had subsided. Yet, concerns for the “survival” of the national language in a universalised world and fears of a small, but historically great, nation being lost, persist. The complex relation to Europe and the quest for the modernisation of the society were also important themes raised with respect to language matters. These desiderata (irrespective of the different interpretations employed) are closely interlinked with the language question but they were not solved or forgotten just because the institutional phase of the language question was over. The language question was never an issue about the language alone. It mainly touched on social, political, cultural, ideological and educational issues. It is also clear that when *katharevousa* was delegitimised by the military dictatorship, academics tried to understand its historical course.

The framework set in the late 1970s by Dimaras, Stavridi-Patrikiou and Frangoudaki put the emphasis on certain aspects of the language question while mostly focusing on the first half of the twentieth century; they revealed a dynamic and pluralist demoticist movement and exposed multiple aspects of modernisation. Their perspectives reveal to us today the strong will for modernisation that existed and how this will contributed in developing a renewed national identity in the *Metapolitefsi*. At the same time, they revealed the relation to the past these three had during a transitional period. It was obvious that they longed for a modernising and pluralist past. They did not question the patriotic role of a single national demotic language. On the contrary, they elevated it as a constituent part of modernisation and Europeanisation. I believe they may have aimed for a modernised and modernising patriotism.

## NOTES

- \* The research of this paper was made possible thanks to Aristeia research project, in which I participated in 2014. I would like to thank Effi Gazi, Philip Carabott and the anonymous reviewer for their insightful comments. I am also grateful to Phoebe Fronista and Harry van Versendaal for their help in editing earlier versions of this paper.
- 1 Literally, “changing the system of government”. It now characterises the entire period of transition to democratic and parliamentary rule from 1974 at least to the beginning of the economic crisis in 2008.
- 2 Antonis Liakos, “Η δικτατορία 1967–74: τι θέλουμε να μάθουμε;” [The dictatorship of 1967–74: what do we want to know?], in *Δικτατορία 1967–1974, Η έντυπη αντίσταση, Κατάλογος Έκθεσης Ντοκουμέντων*, [Dictatorship, 1967–74: resistance press. Exhibition catalogue] (Thessaloniki: Journalists’ Union of Macedonia and Thrace Daily Newspapers (ESIEMTH), 2010), 88–92.

- 3 The term “transition” here is used to describe the period and denote noteworthy processes and not to elaborate whether these transitions have actually failed to bring European modernity 30 years later. On a brief but insightful discussion on the transitology model, see Kostis Kornetis, “Introduction: the end of a parable? Unsettling the transitology model in the age of crisis,” *Historein* 15 (2015): 5–12, doi:10.12681/historein.322. For a discussion on the moment of transitioning, see the newly published book by Vangelis Karamanolakis, Ilias Nikolakopoulos and Tassos Sakellaropoulos, eds., *Η Μεταπολίτευση '74–'75. Στιγμές μιας μετάβασης* (Metapolitefsi '74–'75: moments of transition) (Athens: Themelio, 2016).
- 4 Alexis Dimaras, *Η μεταρρύθμιση που δεν έγινε* (Τεκμήρια ιστορίας) [The reform that hasn't happened: historical documents] vols 1 and 2 (Athens: Ermis, 1973 & 1974); Rena Stavridi-Patrikiou, *Δημοτικισμός και κοινωνικό πρόβλημα* [Demoticism and social problem] (Athens: Ermis, 1976); Anna Frangoudaki, *Εκπαιδευτική μεταρρύθμιση και φιλελεύθεροι διανοούμενοι. Άγονοι αγώνες και ιδεολογικά αδιέξοδα στο μεσοπόλεμο* [Educational reform and liberal intellectuals: lost causes and intellectual deadlocks in the interwar period] (Athens: Kedros, 1977) and *Ο εκπαιδευτικός δημοτικισμός και ο γλωσσικός συμβιβασμός του 1911* [Educational demoticism and the linguistic compromise of 1911] (Ioannina: University of Ioannina, 1977).
- 5 To name but a few: in the mid-1980s, Dimitris Tziovas' research from the point of view of literary theory made a significant contribution, while in the 1990s, Elli Skopetea focused on the role of the language in shaping a nation deriving from a multicultural empire. Finally, in the late 2000s, Peter Mackridge provided an overall history of the language question from the late eighteenth to the late twentieth centuries. Dimitrios Tziovas, *The nationalism of the demotacists and its impact on their literary theory (1888–1930)* (Amsterdam: Adolf M. Hakkert, 1986); Elli Skopetea, *Το “πρότυπο βασίλειο” και η Μεγάλη Ιδέα. Όψεις του εθνικού προβλήματος στην Ελλάδα (1830–1880)* [The “model kingdom” and the Great Idea: aspects of the national problem in Greece, 1830–1880] (Athens: Polytypo, 1988); Peter Mackridge, *Language question and national identity in Greece, 1766–1976* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009).
- 6 Dimaras, *Η μεταρρύθμιση*, κ–κα' [xx–xxi].
- 7 Frangoudaki, *Εκπαιδευτική μεταρρύθμιση*, 13
- 8 Frangoudaki, *Ο εκπαιδευτικός δημοτικισμός*, 8.
- 9 Stavridi-Patrikiou, *Δημοτικισμός*, η' [viii].
- 10 For a brief contextualisation of the Greek case, see Peter Mackridge, “A language in the image of the nation: modern Greek and some parallel cases,” in *The making of modern Greece: nationalism, romanticism and the uses of the past (1797–1896)*, ed. Roderick Beaton and David Ricks (Farnham: Ashgate), 177.
- 11 E. J. Hobsbawm, *Nations and nationalism since 1780: programme, myth, reality* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), 90–100.
- 12 Christina Koulouri, “Η ιστοριογραφία της νεοελληνικής εκπαίδευσης. Συνέχειες και ρήξεις (1967–2002) [Historiography of modern Greek education. Continuities and discontinuities], in *Ιστοριογραφία της νεότερης και σύγχρονης Ελλάδας (1833–2002)* [Historiography of modern and contemporary Greece (1833–2002), ed. Paschalis Kitromilidis and Triantafyllos Sklavenitis, vol. 1 (Athens: Centre for Neohellenic Research/National Hellenic Research Foundation (KNE/EIE), 2004), 495–510; Apostolis Andreou, “Ιστοριογραφία της νεοελληνικής εκπαίδευσης. Μια περιοδολόγηση” [Historiography of modern Greek education: a periodisation], *Theseis* 45 (1993), accessed 16 Jan. 2017, [http://www.theseis.com/index.php?option=com\\_content&task=view&id=431](http://www.theseis.com/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=431).
- 13 Effi Gazi, “Μεταπλάσεις της ελληνικής εθνικής ιδεολογίας και ταυτότητας στη Μεταπολίτευση” [Transformations of Greek national ideology and identity in the Metapolitefsi], in *Μεταπολίτευση. Η Ελλάδα στο*

μεταίχμιο δύο αιώνων [Metapolitefsi: Greece between two centuries], ed. Manos Avgeridis, Effi Gazi and Kostis Kornetis (Athens: Themelio, 2015), 247.

- 14 Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, *Άπαντα Μανόλη Τριανταφυλλίδη* [Manolis Triantafyllidis: Collected Works], vol. 6: *Δημοτικισμός και αντίδραση* [Demoticism and reaction] (Institute of Modern Greek Studies/Manolis Triantafyllidis Foundation, Thessaloniki, 1988 (1960).
- 15 Stavridi-Patrikiou, *Δημοτικισμός*. But also her later work, *Γλώσσα, εκπαίδευση και πολιτική* [Language, education and politics] (Athens: Olkos, 1999) and *Οι φόβοι ενός αιώνα* [The fears of a century] (Athens: Metaichmio, 2007).
- 16 Alexis Dimaras, *Ιστορία της Νεοελληνικής Εκπαίδευσης. Το “ανακοπτόμενο άλμα”. Τάσεις και αντιστάσεις στην ελληνική εκπαίδευση, 1833–2000* [History of modern Greek education: the broken leap. Attitudes towards modern Greek education] (Athens: Metaichmio, 2013).
- 17 Anna Frangoudaki, *Η γλώσσα και το έθνος, 1880–1980. Εκατό χρόνια αγώνες για την αυθεντική ελληνική γλώσσα* [The language and the nation, 1880–1890. A 100-year struggle for original modern Greek] (Athens: Alexandria, 2001); “Η δημοτικιστική ‘ιδέα’, ο Δελμούζος και η αξία του έθνους” [The demotacist “idea”, Delmouzos and the nation’s significance], in *Αλέξανδρος Δελμούζος, Ανάλεκτα: Η γλώσσα είναι μόνο μέσον* [Alexandros Delmouzos, collected texts: language is only a means to an end], ed. Alexandra Patrikiou (Thessaloniki: Institute of Modern Greek Studies/Manolis Triantafyllidis Foundation and Society for the Study of Neohellenic Culture and General Education, 2014), 21–47.
- 18 Mackridge, *Language Question*, 80–101.
- 19 Stavridi-Patrikiou, *Γλώσσα*, 10–11.
- 20 Panagiotis Soutsos, *Νέα σχολή του γραφομένου λόγου ή ανάστασις της αρχαίας ελληνικής γλώσσης εννοουμένης υπό πάντων* [New essay on written language or the resurrection of ancient Greek language understood by everyone], Royal Decree, 23 Jul. 1856, quoted in Dimaras, *Η μεταρρύθμιση*, vol. 1, 136.
- 21 Stephanos Pesmazoglou, “Εθνική και γλωσσική κυριαρχία: Θεωρίες του εθνικισμού και γλώσσα” [National and linguistic sovereignty: theories of nationalism and language], in *Θέρμη και φως. Αφιερωματικός τόμος στη μνήμη του Α.Φ. Χριστίδη* [Warmth and light in memory of A.F. Christidis] (Thessaloniki: Centre for the Greek Language, 2013), 8.
- 22 Dimaras, *Η μεταρρύθμιση*, vol. 1, [xviii].
- 23 Koulouri, “Η ιστοριογραφία,” 499.
- 24 “The issue that will dominate from then [the late nineteenth century] onwards on the disputes over educational matters is the language question itself.” In Dimaras, *Η μεταρρύθμιση*, vol. 1, κζ’ [xxvii]. Haris Athanasiadis has similar view on the matter: “Ιστορική έρευνα για τον εκπαιδευτικό δημοτικισμό” [Historical research on educational demoticism], *6ο Επιστημονικό Συνέδριο Ιστορίας Εκπαίδευση: Ελληνική Γλώσσα και Εκπαίδευση* [Proceedings of the 6th scientific conference on the history of education: modern Greek and education] (Patras: Gutenberg, 2012), 55–59.
- 25 Stavridi-Patrikiou, *Γλώσσα*, 25–26.
- 26 Konstantinos Kontos, *Γλωσσικά παρατηρήσεις* [Linguistic observations] (Athens, 1882).
- 27 Dimitrios Vernardakis, *Ψευδαττικισμού έλεγχος* [Pseudo-atticist control] (Trieste, 1884).
- 28 G.N. Hatzidakis, *Μελέτη επί της Νέας Ελληνικής ή βάσανος έλεγχος ψευδαττικισμού* [A study on modern Greek or arduous control of check of pseudo-atticism] (Athens, 1884).
- 29 Psycharis, *Το ταξίδι μου* [My journey] (Athens, 1888).

- 30 Psycharis, *Το ταξίδι μου*, α' [i].
- 31 Stavridi-Patrikiou, *Δημοτικισμός*, πς' [lxxxvii].
- 32 Christina Koulouri, "Ιστορία και ιστοριογραφία της εκπαιδευτικής μεταρρύθμισης: διλήμματα και στερεότυπα" [History and historiography of educational reform: dilemmas and stereotypes], in *Η Ελλάδα της νεωτερικότητας. Κοινωνικές κρίσεις και ιδεολογικά διλήμματα (19ος–20ός αιώνας)* [Greece of modernity: Social crises and ideological dilemmas, 19th–20th centuries], ed. Kaiti Aroni-Tsichli, Stefanos Papageorgiou and Alexandra Patrikiou (Athens: Papazisis, 2014), 219.
- 33 Spyros Moschonas, "Αφηγηματικά σχήματα στο έργο του Μανόλη Τριανταφυλλίδη" [Narrative schemes in the work of Manolis Triantafyllidis], *Μελέτες για την ελληνική γλώσσα* [Studies for the Greek Language] 30 (2010), 407.
- 34 Koulouri, "Ιστορία και ιστοριογραφία," 208.
- 35 For an overview of the bibliography exploring the concept "educational reform", see Koulouri, "Η ιστοριογραφία."
- 36 Koulouri, "Ιστορία και ιστοριογραφία," 215.
- 37 Stavridi-Patrikiou, *Γλώσσα*, 26, and *Οι φόβοι*, 127.
- 38 Stavridi-Patrikiou, *Γλώσσα*, 179–80.
- 39 Koulouri, "Ιστορία και ιστοριογραφία," 214.
- 40 Frangoudaki, *Εκπαιδευτική μεταρρύθμιση*, 11.
- 41 Frangoudaki, *Ο εκπαιδευτικός δημοτικισμός*, 8.
- 42 Antonis Liakos, "Modern Greek historiography (1974–2000): the era of tradition from dictatorship to democracy," in *(Re)Writing History. Historiography in Southeast Europe after Socialism*, ed. Ulf Brunbauer (Münster: LIT Verlag, 2004), 359.
- 43 "Σύγχρονα ρεύματα στην ιστοριογραφία του νέου ελληνισμού [Modern trends in the historiography of modern Hellenism]," *Synchrona Themata* 35–37 (1988): 3–6. The journal dedicated three issues published in one volume (35–37, 1988) on the subject of modern Greek historiography. In its introduction, it is specified that Greek historiography attempts to follow the European paradigm, that historical knowledge can and should be liberating and promote pluralism. See also George Dertilis' brief account on Greek historiography in the same issue.
- 44 Frangoudaki, *Εκπαιδευτική μεταρρύθμιση*, 150. Cf. *Ο εκπαιδευτικός δημοτικισμός*, 5.
- 45 Dimaras, *Η μεταρρύθμιση*, κα' [xxi].
- 46 Stavridi-Patrikiou, *Δημοτικισμός*, ια' [xi].
- 47 Ibid. Stavridi-Patrikiou continued her research on Skliros' works and the introduction of socialist ideas and their entanglement with the demoticist movement. See Rena Stavridi-Patrikiou, *Ο Σκληρός στην Αίγυπτο* [Skliros in Egypt] (Athens: Themelio, 1988). An extensive look on this book can be found in Panagiotis Noutsos, "Εκπαιδευτικός δημοτικισμός και κοινωνική μεταρρύθμιση: από τον Σκληρό στην ιδρυτική γενιά του ΣΕΚΕ" [Educational demoticism and social reform: from Skliros to the founding generation of the Socialist Labour Party of Greece (SEKE)], *Ta Istorika* 10 (Jun. 1989), 186–98.
- 48 Stavridi-Patrikiou, *Γλώσσα*, 179–85.
- 49 Mackridge, *Language Question*, 164.



- 50 For these clashes, see *Ευαγγελικά 1901 – Ορεσטיακά 1903: νεωτερικές πιέσεις και κοινωνικές αντιστάσεις* [Evangelika 1901–Oresteika 1903: Pressures of modernity and social hindrance] (Athens: Society for the Study of Modern Greek Culture and General Education, 2005) and Philip Carabott, “Politics, Orthodoxy and the language question in Greece,” *Journal of Mediterranean Studies* 3/1 (1993), 117–38.
- 51 Venetia Apostolidou, “Ο Κωστής Παλαμάς και το Πανεπιστήμιο” [Kostis Palamas and the university], in *Πρακτικά του Διεθνούς Συμποσίου Πανεπιστήμιο: Ιδεολογία και Παιδεία–Ιστορική διάσταση και προοπτικές* [Proceedings of the international symposium University: Ideology and Education] (Athens: Historical Archive of Greek Youth/National Hellenic Research Foundation (IAEN/EIE), 1989), 557–63.
- 52 Maria Repousi, *Τα Μαρασλειάκα 1925–27* [The Marasleio events, 1925–27] (Athens: Polis, 2012); *Μίλτος Κουντουράς. Κλείστε τα σχολεία (εκπαιδευτικά άπαντα)* [Miltos Kountouras: close down the schools (collected texts on education)], ed. Alexis Dimaras, vol. 1 and 2 (Athens: Gnosi, 1985).
- 53 Alexandra Patrikiou, “Ξαναδιαβάζοντας τη ‘Δίκη των Τόνων’ στη συγκυρία της Κατοχής” (Reconsidering the “trial of the accents” in the context of the Axis occupation), in *Η Ελλάδα της νεωτερικότητας. Κοινωνικές κρίσεις και ιδεολογικά διλήμματα (19ος–20ός αιώνας)* [Greece of modernity: social crises and ideological dilemmas, 19th–20th centuries], ed. Kaiti Aroni-Tsichli, Stefanos Papageorgiou and Alexandra Patrikiou (Athens: Papazisis, 2014), 197–98.
- 54 Stavridi-Patrikiou, *Γλώσσα*, 16–17.
- 55 Kitroeff distinguished this exact element for those who studied in Britain in the 1970s. Alexander Kitroeff, “Continuity and change in contemporary Greek historiography,” *European History Quarterly* 19 (1989): 272.
- 56 For a connection between the 1930s generation and how it was perceived during the last quarter of the twentieth century and K. Th. Dimaras’ role, see Dimitris Tziouvas, *Ο μύθος της γενιάς του τριάντα. Νεοτερικότητα, ελληνικότητα και πολιτισμική ιδεολογία* [The myth of the generation of the 1930s. Modernity, Greekness and cultural ideology] (Athens: Polis, 2011), 530–39.
- 57 Liakos, “Modern Greek historiography,” 352–54.
- 58 Constantine Tsoukalas, “The irony of symbolic reciprocities: the Greek meaning of ‘Europe’ as a historical inversion of the European meaning of ‘Greece,’” in *The Meaning of Europe* ed. Mikael af Malmborg and Bo Stråth (Oxford: Berg, 2002), 27–50.
- 59 Liakos, “Modern Greek historiography,” 356.
- 60 Lina Ventura, “Η νομοθεσία περί διδακτικών βιβλίων. Μια εστία συγκρούσεων εκπαιδευτικού δημοτικισμού και αντιμεταρρυθμιστών (1907–1937)” [Legislation on schoolbooks: an area of conflict between educational demoticists and counter-reformists], *Mnimon* 14 (1992): 91–114.
- 61 Koulouri, “Ιστορία και ιστοριογραφία,” 211–13.
- 62 Stavridi-Patrikiou, *Γλώσσα*.
- 63 D.N. Maronitis, “Απολίτιστα μονοτονικά: Οδός Φειδίου [Uncivilised single accent: Feidiou street],” *To Vima* (21 Apr. 2002), A64.
- 64 Kostis Kornetis, *Children of the dictatorship: student resistance, cultural politics and the “long 1960s”* (New York: Berghahn, 2013).
- 65 Stavridi-Patrikiou, *Δημοτικισμός*, ια’ [xi]. Angelos Elefantis also suggested that this was the new trend in historiography and that Stavridi-Patrikiou rightfully claims that demoticism and purism were part of broader ideological constructions. *Ο Πολίτης* 8 (1977): 70.
- 66 As cited in Maronitis, “Απολίτιστα μονοτονικά.”

- 67 Dimaras, *Η μεταρρύθμιση*, vol. 1, ιζ' [xviii].
- 68 Frangoudaki, *Εκπαιδευτική μεταρρύθμιση*, 13.
- 69 For Frangoudaki and Stavridi-Patrikiou, it is self-evident. For Dimaras, two-thirds of his second volume is focused on the period from 1895 to 1939. Besides, he detected the “first concluded educational reform” in the interwar period (1929). Dimaras, *Η μεταρρύθμιση*, vol. 2, μς' [xlv].
- 70 Nikos Sarantakos, “Η γλώσσα στη Μεταπολίτευση” [Language during the Metapolitefsi], *Archeiotaxio* 15 (2013): 48–52.
- 71 Mackridge, *Language Question*, 318.
- 72 Stavridi-Patrikiou, *Οι φόβοι*, 124–25. Cf. Mackridge, *Language Question*, 332–3 and Alexis Politis, *Τα ρομαντικά χρόνια. Ιδεολογίες και νοοτροπίες στην Ελλάδα του 1830–1880* [The romantic years: Ideologies and mentalities in Greece, 1830–1880] (Athens: Society for the Study of Neohellenism–Mnimon, 2009), 130–34.
- 73 Article 2, Law 309/1976 (FEK A' 100/30 Apr. 1976). On 28 Jan. 1976, a government announcement was issued, according to which the demotic was being enforced at all levels of education. This announcement was transformed into a binding law (309/1976).
- 74 In Greek, “[η] Νεοελληνική γλώσσα [που καθιερώνεται ως γλώσσα διδασκαλίας, αντικείμενο της διδασκαλίας και γλώσσα των διδακτικών βιβλίων] νοείται η διαμορφωθείσα εις πανελλήνιον εκφραστικόν όργανον υπό του Ελληνικού Λαού και των δοκίμων συγγραφέων του Έθνους Δημοτική, συντεταγμένη, άνευ ιδιωματισμών και ακροτήτων”. Article 2, Law 309 (FEK A' 100/30 Apr. 1976).
- 75 Hellenic Parliament, *Official Proceedings*, session 111, 7 Apr. 1976, 4119.
- 76 Frangoudaki, *Η γλώσσα και το έθνος*, 16.
- 77 Antonis Liakos, “Γλώσσα και έθνος στη νεότερη Ελλάδα” [Language and nation in modern Greece] (2007), accessed 19 Mar. 2015, [http://www.greek-language.gr/greekLang/studies/history/thema\\_18/](http://www.greek-language.gr/greekLang/studies/history/thema_18/).
- 78 Dimaras, *Το ανακοπτόμενο άλμα*, 285.
- 79 Dimitris Tziouvas, “Heteroglossia and the Defeat of Regionalism,” *Κάμπος, Cambridge Papers in Modern Greek* 2 (1994): 119.
- 80 Tziouvas, *Ο μύθος της γενιάς του τριάντα*, 234–85, 526.
- 81 Koulouri, “Ιστορία και ιστοριογραφία,” 207–8.
- 82 Stavridi-Patrikiou, *Δημοτικισμός*, πς'–πθ' [lxxxvi–lxxxix].
- 83 Liakos, “Modern Greek historiography,” 357.
- 84 Stavridi-Patrikiou, *Οι φόβοι*, 281.
- 85 Athanasiadis, “Ιστορική έρευνα,” 56.
- 86 Liakos, “Modern Greek historiography,” 355.
- 87 Stavridi-Patrikiou, *Οι φόβοι*, 272–76.
- 88 Athanasiadis, “Ιστορική έρευνα,” 55. Cf. Effi Gazi, Πατρίς, θρησκεία, οικογένεια [Fatherland, religion and family] (Athens: Polis, 2011). A notable exception is the recent work of Effi Gazi, which focuses on the role of the church in the formation of conservative ideological constructions.
- 89 Spyros Moschonas, “Το γλωσσικό ζήτημα ως ιστορία ιδεών,” review of *Language Question and National*

- Identity in Greece, 1766–1976* by Peter Mackridge, *The Athens Review of Books* 40 (May 2013): 61–62.
- 90 Tziouvas, *The nationalism*.
- 91 Skopetea, *Το “ηρότυπο βασίλειο”*, 99–118. Cf. Elli Skopetea, “Έθνος και γλώσσα” [Nation and language], in *Εγκυκλοπαιδικός Οδηγός για τη γλώσσα* [Reference guide to language], ed. A. F. Christidis (Thessaloniki: Centre for the Greek Language, 2011), 75–77.
- 92 Dimitris Stamatopoulos, “Τα όρια της ‘μέσης οδού’: Οικουμενικό Πατριαρχείο και Γλωσσικό Ζήτημα στις αρχές του 20ού αιώνα” [The confines of the “middle path”: The Ecumenical Patriarchate and the language question at the beginning of the 20th century], *Ο ελληνικός κόσμος ανάμεσα στην εποχή του Διαφωτισμού και στον εικοστό αιώνα* [The Greek world between the age of Enlightenment and the twentieth century], vol. II, ed. Konstantinos Dimadis (Athens: Ellinika Grammata, 2007), 287–300. “From Cratylus to Herder: dimensions of the language question in the Ottoman empire (late 19th century),” in *Language, society, history: the Balkans*, ed. A. F. Christidis (Thessaloniki: Centre for the Greek Language, 2007), 253–64.
- 93 Notis Toufexis, review of *Language Question and National Identity in Greece, 1766–1976* by Peter Mackridge, *Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies* 35/2 (2011): 239–41.
- 94 Moschonas, “Το γλωσσικό ζήτημα,” 61.
- 95 For example, as Athanasiadis has pointed out, Mackridge mistakenly based his analysis on the second and ratified edition of the textbook “Τα Ψηλά Βουνά” (High mountains), ignoring important alterations. Haris Athanasiadis, *Τα αποσυρθέντα βιβλία. Έθνος και σχολική Ιστορία στην Ελλάδα, 1858–2008* [Withdrawn books: nation and school history in Greece, 1858–2008] (Athens: Alexandria, 2015), 212.
- 96 Antonis Liakos, “From poetics of history to history as practice” (paper presented at the conference “The future of the Theory and Philosophy of History,” Ghent, 10–13 Jul. 2013).
- 97 Mackridge, *Language Question*, 321.
- 98 Ibid., 327. Cf. Alexis Politis, “Γλώσσα και εθνική ιδεολογία,” *Avgi* (17 Jan. 2010).
- 99 Moschonas, “Το γλωσσικό ζήτημα,” 62. For a more detailed analysis of Moschonas’ arguments, see Spiros Moschonas, “‘Language issues’ after the ‘language question’: on the modern standards of standard modern Greek,” in *Standard languages and language standards: Greek, past and present*, ed. Alexandra Georgakopoulou and Michael Silk (Farnham, Ashgate), 293–320.
- 100 Maria Couroucli, “Παρίσι–Αθήνα: Aller simple. Μια διεπιστημονική άποψη,” in *Συναντήσεις της ελληνικής με τη γαλλική ιστοριογραφία από τη Μεταπολίτευση ως σήμερα*, ed. Vangelis Karamanolakis, Maria Couroucli, Triantafyllos Sklavenitis (Athens: Centre for Neohellenic Research/National Hellenic Research Foundation (KNE/EIE), 2015), 245–58.
- 101 Peter Mackridge, *The Modern Greek Language. A Descriptive Analysis of Standard Modern Greek* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1985), 1.
- 102 Tziouvas, “Heteroglossia,” 98.
- 103 Pasmazoglou, “Εθνική και γλωσσική κυριαρχία,” 10.
- 104 Pasmazoglou, “Εθνική και γλωσσική κυριαρχία,” 10. He refers to their famous books: Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities* (London: Verso, 1984); Ernest Gellner, *Nations and Nationalism* (London: Blackwell, 1983).
- 105 Frangoudaki, *Η γλώσσα*, 94–100.
- 106 Moschonas, “‘Language issues,’” 311.
- 107 Moschonas, “‘Language issues,’” 294.