





Proceedings of the ICGL12 vol. 2

The International Conference on Greek Linguistics is a biennial meeting on the study and analysis of Greek (Ancient, Medieval and Modern), placing particular emphasis on the later stages of the language.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE ICGL12 ПРАКТІКА ТОҮ ICGL12

Thanasis Georgakopoulos, Theodossia-Soula Pavlidou, Miltos Pechlivanos, Artemis Alexiadou, Jannis Androutsopoulos, Alexis Kalokairinos, Stavros Skopeteas, Katerina Stathi (Eds.)

PROCEEDINGS OF THE 12TH INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON GREEK LINGUISTICS

ΠΡΑΚΤΙΚΑ ΤΟΥ 12^{ογ} ΣΥΝΕΔΡΙΟΥ ΕΛΛΗΝΙΚΗΣ ΓΛΩΣΣΟΛΟΓΙΑΣ

VOL. 2

© 2017 Edition Romiosini/CeMoG, Freie Universität Berlin. Alle Rechte vorbehalten. Vertrieb und Gesamtherstellung: Epubli (www.epubli.de) Satz und Layout: Rea Papamichail / Center für Digitale Systeme, Freie Universität Berlin Gesetzt aus Minion Pro Umschlaggestaltung: Thanasis Georgiou, Yorgos Konstantinou Umschlagillustration: Yorgos Konstantinou

ISBN 978-3-946142-35-5 Printed in Germany

Online-Bibliothek der Edition Romiosini: www.edition-romiosini.de

ΠΕΡΙΕΧΟΜΕΝΑ

Σημείωμα εκδοτών7
Περιεχόμενα9
Peter Mackridge:
Some literary representations of spoken Greek before nationalism(1750-1801)17
Μαρία Σηφιανού:
Η έννοια της ευγένειας στα Ελληνικά
Σπυριδούλα Βαρλοκώστα:
Syntactic comprehension in aphasia and its relationship to working memory deficits75
Ευαγγελία Αχλάδη, Αγγελική Δούρη, Ευγενία Μαλικούτη & Χρυσάνθη Παρασχάκη- Μπαράν:
Γλωσσικά λάθη τουρκόφωνων μαθητών της Ελληνικής ως ξένης/δεύτερης γλώσσας:
Ανάλυση και διδακτική αξιοποίηση
Κατερίνα Αλεξανδρή:
Η μορφή και η σημασία της διαβάθμισης στα επίθετα που δηλώνουν χρώμα
Eva Anastasi, Ageliki Logotheti, Stavri Panayiotou, Marilena Serafim & Charalambos Themistocleous:
A Study of Standard Modern Greek and Cypriot Greek Stop Consonants: Preliminary
Findings
Anna Anastassiadis-Symeonidis, Elisavet Kiourti & Maria Mitsiaki:
Inflectional Morphology at the service of Lexicography: $KOMOA$ ɛξ, A Cypriot
Morphological Dictionary

Γεωργία Ανδρέου & Ματίνα Τασιούδη: Η ανάπτυξη του λεξιλογίου σε παιδιά με Σύνδρομο Απνοιών στον Ύπνο
Ανθούλα- Ελευθερία Ανδρεσάκη:
Ιατρικές μεταφορές στον δημοσιογραφικό λόγο της κρίσης: Η οπτική γωνία των Γερμανών
Μαρία Ανδριά:
Προσεγγίζοντας θέματα Διαγλωσσικής Επίδρασης μέσα από το πλαίσιο της Γνωσιακής Γλωσσολογίας: ένα παράδειγμα από την κατάκτηση της Ελληνικής ως Γ2
Spyros Armostis & Kakia Petinou: Mastering word-initial syllable onsets by Cypriot Greek toddlers with and without early language delay215
Julia Bacskai-Atkari: Ambiguity and the Internal Structure of Comparative Complements in Greek
Costas Canakis: Talking about same-sex parenthood in contemporary Greece: Dynamic categorization and indexicality
Michael Chiou: The pragmatics of future tense in Greek
Maria Chondrogianni
The Pragmatics of the Modern Greek Segmental Markers
Katerina Christopoulou, George J. Xydopoulos &Anastasios Tsangalidis: Grammatical gender and offensiveness in Modern Greek slang vocabulary
Aggeliki Fotopoulou, Vasiliki Foufi, Tita Kyriacopoulou & Claude Martineau: Extraction of complex text segments in Modern Greek
Αγγελική Φωτοπούλου & Βούλα Γιούλη: Από την «Έκφραση» στο «Πολύτροπο»: σχεδιασμός και οργάνωση ενός εννοιολογικού λεξικού
Marianthi Georgalidou, Sofia Lampropoulou, Maria Gasouka, Apostolos Kostas & Xan- thippi Foulidi: <i>"Learn grammar": Sexist language and ideology in a corpus of Greek Public</i>
Documents
Maria Giagkou, Giorgos Fragkakis, Dimitris Pappas & Harris Papageorgiou: Feature extraction and analysis in Greek L2 texts in view of automatic labeling for proficiency levels

Dionysis Goutsos, Georgia Fragaki, Irene Florou, Vasiliki Kakousi & Paraskevi Savvidou: <i>The Diachronic Corpus of Greek of the 20th century: Design and compilation</i>
Kleanthes K. Grohmann ^{&} Maria Kambanaros: Bilectalism, Comparative Bilingualism, and theGradience of Multilingualism: A View from Cyprus
Günther S. Henrich: "Γεωγραφία νεωτερική" στο Λίβιστρος και Ροδάμνη: μετατόπιση ονομάτων βαλτικών χωρών προς την Ανατολή;
Noriyo Hoozawa-Arkenau & Christos Karvounis: Vergleichende Diglossie - Aspekte im Japanischen und Neugriechischen: Verietäten - Interferenz
Μαρία Ιακώβου, Ηριάννα Βασιλειάδη-Λιναρδάκη, Φλώρα Βλάχου, Όλγα Δήμα, Μαρία Καββαδία, Τατιάνα Κατσίνα, Μαρίνα Κουτσουμπού, Σοφία-Νεφέλη Κύτρου, Χριστίνα Κωστάκου, Φρόσω Παππά & Σταυριαλένα Περρέα: ΣΕΠΑΜΕ2: Μια καινούρια πηγή αναφοράς για την Ελληνική ως Γ2
Μαρία Ιακώβου & Θωμαΐς Ρουσουλιώτη: Βασικές αρχές σχεδιασμού και ανάπτυξης του νέου μοντέλου αναλυτικών προγραμμάτων για τη διδασκαλία της Ελληνικής ως δεύτερης/ξένης γλώσσας
Μαρία Καμηλάκη: «Μαζί μου ασχολείσαι, πόσο μαλάκας είσαι!»: Λέξεις-ταμπού και κοινωνιογλωσσικές ταυτότητες στο σύγχρονο ελληνόφωνο τραγούδι
Μαρία Καμηλάκη, Γεωργία Κατσούδα & Μαρία Βραχιονίδου: Η εννοιολογική μεταφορά σε λέξεις-ταμπού της ΝΕΚ και των νεοελληνικών διαλέκτων
Eleni Karantzola, Georgios Mikros & Anastassios Papaioannou: Lexico-grammatical variation and stylometric profile of autograph texts in Early Modern Greek
Sviatlana Karpava, Maria Kambanaros & Kleanthes K. Grohmann: Narrative Abilities: MAINing Russian-Greek Bilingual Children in Cyprus
Χρήστος Καρβούνης: Γλωσσικός εξαρχαϊσμός και «ιδεολογική» νόρμα: Ζητήματα γλωσσικής διαχείρισης στη νέα ελληνική

Demetra Katis & Kiki Nikiforidou:
Spatial prepositions in early child Greek:Implications for acquisition, polysemy and
historical change
Γεωργία Κατσούδα:
Το επίθημα -ούνα στη ΝΕΚ και στις νεοελληνικές διαλέκτους και ιδιώματα
George Kotzoglou:
Sub-extraction from subjects in Greek: Its existence, its locus and an open issue
Veranna Kyprioti:
Narrative, identity and age: the case of the bilingual in Greek and Turkish Muslim
community of Rhodes, Greece
Χριστίνα Λύκου:
Η Ελλάδα στην Ευρώπη της κρίσης: Αναπαραστάσεις στον ελληνικό
δημοσιογραφικό λόγο
Nikos Liosis:
Systems in disruption: Propontis Tsakonian
Katerina Magdou, Sam Featherston:
<i>Resumptive Pronouns can be more acceptable than gaps: Experimental evidence</i>
from Greek
Maria Margarita Makri:
Opos identity comparatives in Greek: an experimental investigation
Des Thurs
2ος Τόμος
Περιεχόμενα
Vasiliki Makri:
Gender assignment to Romance loans in Katoitaliótika: a case study of contact
morphology
Evgenia Malikouti:
Usage Labels of Turkish Loanwords in three Modern Greek Dictionaries
Persephone Mamoukari & Penelope Kambakis-Vougiouklis:
Frequency and Effectiveness of Strategy Use in SILL questionnaire using an Innovative
Electronic Application

Georgia Maniati, Voula Gotsoulia & Stella Markantonatou:
Contrasting the Conceptual Lexicon of ILSP (CL-ILSP) with major lexicographic examples
-
Γεώργιος Μαρκόπουλος & Αθανάσιος Καρασίμος: Πολυεπίπεδη επισημείωση του Ελληνικού Σώματος Κειμένων Αφασικού Λόγου
Πολθεπιπεθή επισήμειωση του Ελληνικου Ζωματός Κειμενών Αφαδικου Λόγου
Πωλίνα Μεσηνιώτη, Κατερίνα Πούλιου & Χριστόφορος Σουγανίδης:
Μορφοσυντακτικά λάθη μαθητών Τάξεων Υποδοχής που διδάσκονται την
Ελληνική ως Γ2
Stamatia Michalopoulou:
<i>Third Language Acquisition. The Pro-Drop-Parameter in the Interlanguage of Greek</i>
students of German
Vicky Nanousi & Arhonto Terzi:
Non-canonical sentences in agrammatism: the case of Greek passives
Καλομοίρα Νικολού, Μαρία Ξεφτέρη & Νίτσα Παραχεράκη:
Το φαινόμενο της σύνθεσης λέξεων στην κυκλαδοκρητική διαλεκτική ομάδα
Ελένη Παπαδάμου & Δώρης Κ. Κυριαζής:
Μορφές διαβαθμιστικής αναδίπλωσης στην ελληνική και στις άλλες βαλκανικές
γλώσσες
Γεράσιμος Σοφοκλής Παπαδόπουλος:
Το δίπολο «Εμείς και οι Άλλοι» σε σχόλια αναγνωστών της Lifo σχετικά με τη
Το οποπο «Σμείς και οι Ππποι» σε σχοπια αναγνώσταν της Σησ σχετικά με τη Χρυσή Αυγή
Ελένη Παπαδοπούλου:
Η συνδυαστικότητα υποκοριστικών επιθημάτων με β' συνθετικό το επίθημα -άκι
στον διαλεκτικό λόγο
Στέλιος Πιπερίδης, Πένυ Λαμπροπούλου & Μαρία Γαβριηλίδου:
clarin:el. Υποδομή τεκμηρίωσης, διαμοιρασμού και επεξεργασίας γλωσσικών
δεδομένων
Maria Pontiki:
Opinion Mining and Target Extraction in Greek Review Texts
Anna Roussou:
The duality of mipos

Αλεξιάννα Τσότσου:
Η μεθοδολογική προσέγγιση της εικόνας της Γερμανίας στις ελληνικές εφημερίδες 1095
Anastasia Tzilinis:
Begründendes Handeln im neugriechischen Wissenschaftlichen Artikel: Die Situierung
des eigenen Beitrags im Forschungszusammenhang1109
Κυριακούλα Τζωρτζάτου, Αργύρης Αρχάκης, Άννα Ιορδανίδου & Γιώργος Ι. Ξυδόπουλος: Στάσεις απέναντι στην ορθογραφία της Κοινής Νέας Ελληνικής: Ζητήματα ερευνητικού σχεδιασμού
Nicole Vassalou, Dimitris Papazachariou & Mark Janse:
The Vowel System of Mišótika Cappadocian
Marina Vassiliou, Angelos Georgaras, Prokopis Prokopidis & Haris Papageorgiou:
Co-referring or not co-referring? Answer the question!
Jeroen Vis:
The acquisition of Ancient Greek vocabulary
Christos Vlachos:
Mod(aliti)es of lifting wh-questions
Ευαγγελία Βλάχου & Κατερίνα Φραντζή:
Μελέτη της χρήσης των ποσοδεικτών λίγο-λιγάκι σε κείμενα πολιτικού λόγου
Madeleine Voga:
Τι μας διδάσκουν τα ρήματα της ΝΕ σχετικά με την επεξεργασία της μορφολογίας 1213
Werner Voigt:
«Σεληνάκι μου λαμπρό, φέγγε μου να περπατώ …» oder: warum es in dem bekannten
Lied nicht so, sondern eben φεγγαράκι heißt und ngr. φεγγάρι
Μαρία Βραχιονίδου:
Υποκοριστικά επιρρήματα σε νεοελληνικές διαλέκτους και ιδιώματα
Jeroen van de Weijer & Marina Tzakosta:
The Status of *Complex in Greek
Theodoros Xioufis:
The pattern of the metaphor within metonymy in the figurative language of romantic love
in modern Greek

USAGE LABELS OF TURKISH LOANWORDS IN THREE MODERN GREEK DICTIONARIES Evgenia Malikouti¹ University of Goettingen, Germany evgenia.malikouti@stud.uni-goettingen.de

Περίληψη

Η παρούσα εργασία πραγματεύεται συγκριτικά τους λεξικογραφικούς χαρακτηρισμούς (labels) που συνοδεύουν τα λήμματα λεξικών δανείων από την Τουρκική σε τρία γενικά μονόγλωσσα λεξικά της Νέας Ελληνικής: στο "Λεξικό της Κοινής Νεοελληνικής" του Ιδρύματος Μανόλη Τριανταφυλλίδη (1998), στο "Λεξικό της Νέας Ελληνικής Γλώσσας" του καθ. Γ. Μπαμπινιώτη (1998), και στο "Χρηστικό Λεξικό της Νεοελληνικής Γλώσσας" της Ακαδημίας Αθηνών (2014). Η ποσοτική και ποιοτική ανάλυση των χρηστικών σημαδιών που αναφέρονται σε θεματικά πεδία (fields) και επίπεδα λόγου (register) παρέχουν στοιχεία για τις διαφορετικές λεξικογραφικές πρακτικές και τη θέση των τουρκισμών στο λεξιλόγιο της Νέας Ελληνικής.

Keywords: lexicography, labeling, usage labels, Turkish loanwords, Greek dictionaries

1. Introduction

The present paper aims to comparatively examine the lexicographical labels used for Turkish loanwords in three major general-purpose monolingual dictionaries of Modern Greek. A quantitative and qualitative approach to the field and usage labels

¹ The present paper is part of my PhD research at the University of Goettingen supervised by Prof. Dr. Jens Peter Laut, to whom I am greatly indebted for his support. I would like to thank the attendees of my talk for their useful remarks. I am also thankful to Prof. G. Xydopoulos and Prof. D. Chila-Markopoulou for their help in bibliographic and methodological issues.

of the respective lemmas in the selected dictionaries provides insights into the lexicographical practices on Turkish loanwords and the classification of Turkisms into different levels of "markedness" or divergence from the norm. It sheds light to the status of these items within Greek vocabulary, as well as to their distribution across registers. Although lexicographical labels are widely intuitive and subjective, their investigation reflects speakers' attitudes towards the denotations and connotations of these words.

In the present paper, lexicographical labels are firstly defined and tentatively classified. Some limitations concerning the application of labeling systems are mentioned. The general characteristics and typology of the selected dictionaries follow. A delimitation of the terms "Turkish loanwords" and "usage labels" precedes the description of the methodology used to collect the data. Then, statistical information on the lemmatized Turkish loanwords, the labeled and unlabeled entries, the field and the usage labels assigned to the entries are presented. A commentary on the findings gives insights on the different labeling systems of the dictionaries and the status of Turkish loanwords in their wordlist. In conclusion, the hypotheses of the research are discussed and pathways for further research are suggested.

2. Definition, Classification and Limitations of Labels

Labels are defined as special symbols or abbreviated terms used in dictionaries to mark a lexical item or phrase as deviating in a certain respect from the main bulk of items described, as having a meaning restricted to a particular usage or language variety (Burkhanov 2003; Hartmann & James 1998: 80; Svensén 2009: 315; Verkuyl, Janssen, & Janssen 2003). A dictionary entry accompanied by a label represents an element of some form of marked language usage (Beyer 2011). Absence of label means that a lexical item can be widely used by every speaker in every circumstance. As a higher-level instruction and a meta-linguistic device, labels provide important pragmatic guidance to the dictionary user, thereby promoting communicative success.

Labels have not only become a lexicographical tradition, but also an indispensable instrument of description for the lexicographer. Despite the superficial similarities among the proposed typologies of lexicographical labels, there are significant differences in deeper classifications and sub-classifications (Beyer 2011). Usage labels provide specific information about the domain of application of the definitions.

Verkuyl, Janssen, and Janssen (2003: 299) distinguish two sorts of domain: *group* labels and *register* labels (Table 1). Group labels concern regional, professional or social domains or a temporal restriction on the application of the word or word sense. Register labels guide a language user to choose between alternatives with a different pragmatic load.

Group labels	Register labels
geographical: διαλεκτικό / dialectal, ιδιωματικό / idiomatic	level of formality: επίσημο / formal, οικείο / familiar
field: ιστορία / history, θρησκεία / religion	kind of text: λογοτεχνικό / literary
temporal: παρωχημένο / obsolete, παλαιότερο / older	attitude: ειρωνικό / ironic, χιουμοριστικό / humorous
frequency: σπάνιο / rare, συνήθως / usually	offensive use: μειωτικό / disparaging, χυδαίο / vulgar

Table 1 | Examples of Group and Register Labels from the selected dictionaries' inventory

Hausmann (1985: 377) raises concerns about the lack of theoretical foundations of marking systems in general language dictionaries. There is neither consensus on the number of usage labels and the content of pragmatic parameters they represent nor a theoretical basis for their standardization (Beyer 2011; Burkhanov 2003: 106). The categories represented by the labels may have different ranges and the boundary lines between the members of categories are not clear, e.g. *familiar/popular, dialectal/idiom-atic* (Svensén 2009: 316). The divergence of dictionaries in respect of labeling is a result of the lack of theoretically supported empirical principles (Hausmann 1989: 650). Lexicographers follow their intuition and overall perception of language (Niebaum 1989: 665). Verkuyl, Janssen, and Janssen (2003) also question the usability of label terms. Empirical investigations of dictionary use indicate that labels are overlooked, not correctly recognized and not easily interpreted because of their abbreviated form, typo-graphical presentation and unclear meaning.



Figure 1 | Typology of the selected dictionaries

3. Hypotheses, Data and Methodology

The dictionaries examined for their practices about Turkish loanwords are the 'Dictionary of Standard Modern Greek' by the Manolis Triandafyllidis Foundation (1998) of the University of Thessaloniki (hereafter TD)², the 'Dictionary of Modern Greek language' by Prof. G. Babiniotis (1998) (hereafter BD), and the 'Utilitarian Dictionary of Modern Greek' by the Academy of Athens (2014) (hereafter AD). These reference works are recent, single volume, general-purpose dictionaries of approximately the same size and address a wide audience.

Labels in all three dictionaries are included in the table of abbreviations of each dictionary and precede the definition, word form or phrase. They are truncated and in parenthesis. Field labels are presented in small capitals in TD and in capitals in AD. Only TD offers a detailed description of the content of usage labels used. In AD, labels are classified according to various criteria (historical-chronological, geographical, statistical, experiential-emotional, semantic etc.) (Academy of Athens 2014: 15).

² The electronic form of TD was used here. Available online: http://www.greek-language.gr/greekLang/ modern_greek/tools/lexica/triantafyllides/index.html

According to the dictionary typologies of Zgusta (1971: 198-221) and Landau (2001: 7-42) (Figure 1 on the previous page), the selected dictionaries are linguistic (rather than encyclopaedic), monolingual, synchronic, general, standard and unabridged (Xy-dopoulos 2008: 287-294). Dictionaries are hybrid in nature and defy such unambiguous classifications (Swanepoel 2003: 48). Even linguistic dictionaries may have encyclopaedic features, e.g. BD contains proper names and some selected encyclopaedic lemmas (Xydopoulos 2008: 291, 332).

The first hypothesis discussed regards labeling systems. It has been argued that dictionaries widely differ in the scope and consistency of their labeling practices (Hartmann & James 1998: 150). Previous research on Modern Greek dictionaries (Anastassiadis-Symeonidis 2009; Trapalis 2008; Trapalis & Katsouda 2009) shows that labeling systems differ in respect to the number and use of lexicographical labels.

The second hypothesis refers to the status of Turkish loanwords in Modern Greek. In his seminal article on the status of Turkisms in the Balkan languages, K. Kazazis argues that they have been unevenly but gradually relegated to what are commonly regarded as 'lower' styles of speech:

"Turkisms [...] have been considerably lowered on the stylistic scale or become historical words" (1972: 88)

Despite vigorous puristic movements against Turkish loanwords after the end of the Ottoman rule and the establishment of Balkan nation states

"the avoidance and replacement in higher styles of a number of Turkisms [...] did not necessarily push them OUT of the language, but merely DOWN stylistically" (1972: 95).

In order to examine these two hypotheses, the first step was to manually index all Turkish loanwords in each dictionary. As Turkish loanwords were considered all lemmas with an etymology from Turkish. No distinction is made between words of Turkic origin and Turkish words borrowed from Arabic, Persian or another source, since Turkish served as the intermediary through which most of these words entered Greek (Friedman 1990: 138). Reborrowed words (*Rückwanderer*, avτιδάνεια) are taken into account. However, affixes of Turkish origin (e.g. $\kappa \alpha \rho \alpha$ -, $-\tau \zeta \dot{\eta} \varsigma$), derivatives with affixes of Turkish origin (e.g. $\kappa \alpha \rho \eta \gamma \tau \iota \lambda i \kappa \iota$ (jocular, ironic) 'teaching profession'), derivatives

and compounds of the root [τουρκ] (e.g. *Τουρκαλάς* (disparaging, pejorative) 'Turk'), and compound words with a component of Turkish origin (e.g. *λαχανοντολμάς* 'cabbage roll') are not listed. In most cases only one word for each Turkish root is indexed. Some derived words are listed as well when the dictionary's etymology refers to the equivalent word in Turkish; therefore derivation preceded direct borrowing, like καΐκι 'boat' - καϊξής 'boatman' from *kayık*, *kayıkçı*.

Following the indexing of Turkish loanwords in each dictionary, common entries of the wordlists were extracted. The present paper focuses on usage labels, as opposed to formal grammatical labels, such as $\dot{\alpha}\kappa\lambda\iota\tau\sigma$ 'uninflected'. Only labels located before the main and secondary meanings -not in usage notes or within definitions- are taken into account. No statistical information is provided for labels about frequency (e.g. $\sigma\upsilonv\eta\theta\omega\varsigma$ 'usually'), evolution of meaning (e.g. $\mu\epsilon\tau\alpha\phi\rho\mu\kappa\dot{\alpha}$ 'figuratively', $\epsilon\iota\delta\kappa\dot{\sigma}\epsilon\rho\alpha$ 'more specifically') and use of words with animates/inanimates etc.

4. Statistics and Discussion

There are 700-800 Turkish loanwords listed in the selected dictionaries (see Table 2).

Dictionaries	Triandafyllidis	Babiniotis	Academy
Total Turkish Loanwords	799	737	698
Labeled Turkish Loanwords	273	329	487

Table 2 | Lemmatized and Labeled Turkish Loanwords

Interestingly many of the words listed as Turkish loanwords in TD and BD have no etymology or a different one in AD. For 47 words no earlier origin than "medieval etymology" is given. In the preface it is stated that

"for words attested since the ancient, late ancient and medieval times, no etymology is provided, as it can be searched in exclusively etymological dictionaries" (Academy of Athens 2014: 16, my translation³).

³ All translations are mine, unless otherwise indicated.

From the total number of Turkish loanwords, 551 words are lemmatized in all three dictionaries. TD lists most Turkish loanwords (799) but assigns labels to the least of them (273). In the preface of AD it is stated that

"most headwords are not marked with style-pragmatic labels, as a great part of the vocabulary is stylistically neutral" (Academy of Athens 2014: 15, translation).

From Figure 2, however, it can be deducted that more than half of the lemmatized Turkish loanwords are not stylistically neutral.



Figure 2 | *Labeled and Unlabeled Turkish Loanwords in the dictionaries*

4.1. Field Labels

Field labels refer to a specific scientific, technological, artistic or professional field. The three dictionaries have only two labels in common: history and music (see Table 3 on the next page). The first denotes the so called "administrative Turkisms" referring to artifacts and institutions of the Ottoman period. Some of them were eliminated or re-

placed due to puristic tendencies and the change of historical and social conditions. Others remained as historical words used in order to lend a more authentic flavor to historical accounts or works of fiction dealing with "the time of the Turks" (Kazazis 1972: 92). The label "music", as well as those concerning food, sweets, religion and folklore, allude to the Greek-Turkish cultural contacts due to proximity and the long common history. It is remarkable that with 152 total labels the field labeling is much more detailed in the most recently published AD. The number of words marked with field labels is constantly increasing due to scientific and technical progress (Fedorova 2004: 270).

Triandafyllidis Dictionary	Babiniotis Dictionary	Academy Dictionary
History (4)	History (7)	History (18)
Music (1)	Music (4)	Music (17)
Cookery (5)		Cookery (30)
Nautical term (1)		Nautical term (2)
	Religion (4)	Religion (9)
	Folklore (1)	Folklore (8)
	Technology (1)	Technology (3)
	Chemistry (1)	Chemistry (1)
Sewing (1)		
		Food technology (19)
		Botany (14)
		Confectionery (11)
		Building (6)
		Zoology (4)
		Ichthyology (3)
		Ornithology (2)
		Meteorology, Mine- ralogy, Military term, Pharmaceutics (1)
12	18	152

Table 3 | *Field labels used for Turkish loanwords in each dictionary. Numbers in parenthesis: lemmas marked with each label.*

4.2. Usage Labels

Usage labels provide lexicographical data of pragmatic nature and are intended to specify the limitations on the use of lexical items according to time, place, and/or circumstances of communicative interaction (Burkhanov 2003: 105). All three dictionaries use approximately the same number of labels (13 to 20), but the marking is again more elaborated in AD (534 total labels). From the inventory of usage labels, $\alpha\pi\alpha\rho\chi\alpha\iota\omega\mu\acute{e}vo$ 'antiquated', $\epsilon\pii\sigma\eta\mu o$ 'formal', $\epsilon\pi\iota\sigma\tau\eta\mu ov\iota\kappa\acute{o}$ 'scientific', $\pi\alpha\iota\delta\iota\kappa\acute{o}$ 'child language' in TD and $\alpha\rho\chi\alpha\iotaon\rho\epsilon\pi\acute{e}\varsigma$ 'archaic', $\lambda o\gamma\iota\acute{o}\tau\epsilon\rho o$ 'more learned' in BD are not used for the common Turkish loanwords. It is not surprising that Turkish loanwords are not marked with labels pertaining to earlier periods of Greek and to advanced, formal vocabulary (see Table 4 on the next page).

4.3. Common and Different Labels

The dictionaries use largely different labels, and only seven in common: $\lambda \alpha \ddot{\kappa} \dot{\kappa}$ 'popular', $o\iota\kappa\epsilon io$ 'familiar', $\mu\epsilon\iota\omega\tau\iota\kappa \dot{o}$ 'disparaging', $\epsilon\iota\rho\omega\nu\iota\kappa \dot{o}$ 'ironic', $\nu\beta\rho\iota\sigma\tau\iota\kappa \dot{o}$ 'offensive', $\lambda o\gamma o\tau\epsilon\chi\nu\iota\kappa \dot{o}$ 'literary', $\lambda \dot{o}\gamma\iota o$ 'learned'. The last one is assigned to the word $\tau\nu\phi\epsilon\kappa\iota o$ 'rifle', the alternative form of the word $\tau ov\phi\epsilon\kappa\iota$, created by hypercorrection and first attested in 1834 (Babiniotis 1998: 1840). In Table 4, labels referring to the same parameters are grouped, e.g. $\chi v \delta \alpha io$ 'vulgar', the exclamation mark (!) and $\lambda\epsilon\epsilon\eta \tau \alpha\mu\pi ov$ 'taboo word'. BD and AD have six more labels in common: $\pi\alpha\lambda\alpha\iota o\tau\epsilon\rho o$ 'older', $\alpha\rho\gamma\kappa o$ 'argot', $\delta\iota\alpha\lambda\epsilon\kappa\tau\iota\kappa o$ 'dialectal', $\theta\omega\pi\epsilon\nu\tau\iota\kappa o/\chi\alpha\"aloe\tau\iota\kappa o$ 'tender', $\epsilonv\phi\eta\mu\iota\sigma\tau\iota\kappa o/\kappa\alpha\tau'$ $\epsilonv\phi\eta\mu\iota\sigma\mu o$ 'euphemistic', $\lambda\alpha\"a\kappa o\tau\epsilon\rho o$ 'more popular'. The labels $\pi\rho o\phi o\rho\iota\kappa o$ 'spoken' and $\pi\alpha\rho\omega\chi\eta\mu\epsilon vo$ 'obsolete', common between TD and AD, are respectively assigned to

"words opposed to those used in written language. *Spoken* is very close to *fa-miliar*, they are sometimes interchangeable or coexist, the limits between them are not always discernible. Their use in written language is not out of question"

"words denoting something that existed in the past; it still exists today but there is another synonymous word used to refer to it" (Institute of Modern Greek Studies (Manolis Triandafyllidis Foundation) 1998: η', translation).

Triandafyllidis Dictionary (13)	Babiniotis Dictionary (18)	Academy Dictionary (20)
)	αϊκό / popular (36 - 215 - 212)	
	οικείο / familiar (91 - 9 - 5)	
μει	ωτικό / disparaging (21 - 16 - 29)
	ειρωνικό / ironic (10 - 7 - 17)	
υ	οβριστικό / offensive (6 - 9 - 14)	
λ	αογοτεχνικό / literary (3 - 3 - 9)	
	λόγιο / learned (1)	r
χυδαίο / vulgar (2)	! (5)	λέξη ταμπού / taboo word (3)
συναισθηματικό / emotional (2)	εκφραστικό / expressive (13)	
	 παλαιότερο / older (22 - 54) αργκό / argot (10 - 16) διαλεκτικό / dialectal (8 - 7) θωπευτικό-χαϊδευτικό / tender (3) ευφημιστικό-κατ'ευφημισμό / euphemistic(ally) (1) λαϊκότερο / more popular (5 - 1) 	
προφορικό / spoken (42)	προφορικό / spoken (12	
παρωχημένο / obsolete (36)		παρωχημένο / obsolete (24)
λαϊκότροπο / widely known dialectal (69)		
χλευαστικό / derisory (2)		
	καθημερινό / vernacular (29)	
	κακόσημο / pejorative (8)	
	σκωπτικό / jocular (5)	
		αρνητική συνυποδήλωση / negative connotation (6)
		εμφατικό / emphatic (2)
		ιδιωματικό / idiomatic (2)
		χιουμοριστικό / humorous (2)
321	369	534

Table 4 | Usage labels of Turkish loanwords in each dictionary. Numbers in parenthesis: lemmas marked with each label.

According to the Style Guide of the dictionaries, the label $\lambda \alpha \ddot{\kappa} \dot{\kappa} \dot{\kappa}$ popular' in TD includes widely known argot and slang words, words from the jargon and sociolects. The label $\lambda \alpha \ddot{\kappa} \dot{\kappa} \tau \rho \sigma \pi \sigma$ 'widely known dialectal' refers to words widely dialectal, known in big cities and used in Greek literature. Words marked with this label in TD are assigned the 'popular' and 'dialectal' labels in the other two dictionaries. The label $\kappa \alpha \theta \eta \mu \epsilon \rho \iota \kappa \dot{\sigma}$ 'vernacular' is not used in AD, because its meaning is covered by the labels $\lambda \alpha \ddot{\kappa} \dot{\sigma}$ 'popular', $o \iota \kappa \epsilon i \sigma$ 'familiar', and $\pi \rho \sigma \rho \rho \rho \iota \kappa \dot{\sigma}$ 'spoken' (Academy of Athens 2014: 15). BD and AD agree on the most common label: $\lambda \alpha \ddot{\kappa} \dot{\sigma} \rho \rho \mu lar'$, and on the frequency of the labels $\mu \epsilon \iota \omega \tau \iota \kappa \dot{\sigma}$ 'disparaging' and $\pi \alpha \lambda \alpha \iota \dot{\sigma} \epsilon \rho \sigma$ 'older'. The labels $o \iota \kappa \epsilon i \sigma$ 'familiar' and $\lambda \alpha \ddot{\kappa} \dot{\sigma} \tau \rho \sigma \sigma$ 'widely known dialectal' have a high frequency in TD but are not used in the other two dictionaries (Figure 3).

Triandafyllidis Dictionary	Babiniotis Dictionary	Academy Dictionary
familiar (91)	popular (215)	popular (212)
widely known dialectal (69)	vernacular (29)	spoken (126)
spoken (42)	older (22)	older (54)
popular (36)	disparaging (16)	disparaging (29)
obsolete (36)	emotional/expressive (13)	obsolete (24)



Figure 3 | The most frequent usage labels of each dictionary. Numbers in parenthesis: lemmas marked with these labels.

Label Groups	Examples	Triandafyllidis Dictionary	Babiniotis Dictionary	Academy Dictionary
1. Popular [popular, familiar, more popular, spoken, vernacular, dialectal, idiomatic, widely known dialectal, emo- tional/expressive]	γιορντάνι ,necklace' καρντάσης 'mate' κιμπάρης 'largehearted' καζαντίζω 'profit (v)' ντουγρού 'straight ahead' μαχμουρλής 'bleary'	74.8%	75.6%	65.9%
2. Pejorative [dispara- ging, offensive, vulgar, taboo word, derisory, pejorative, negative connotation, ironic]	ζουμπάς ,shorty' λαπάς 'wuss, wimp' μπάτσος 'cop' ουστ 'shoo' κολομπαράς 'bugger' τσογλάνι 'bastard'	12.8%	16.3%	15.9%
3. Old [older, obsolete]	ασκέρι ,troops' τόπι 'ball' φαρφουρί 'fine porcelain' κάλφας 'qualified workman'	11.2%	6%	14.6%

Table 5 | Label groups and percentages of lemmas marked with the respective labels

4.4. Label groupings

To further examine the second hypothesis, usage labels are grouped in three wider categories: popular, pejorative and old. The first group includes labels marking words usually not used in the written language and bearing the feature [-learned]. According to Anastassiadis-Symeonidis and Fliatouras (2004: 4), the distinction [+/- learned] is wider in common Modern Greek than in other European languages. One of the reasons behind this expansion is the influence of Turkish, from which Greek borrowed elements marked with the [-learned] feature. The percentage of words marked with these labels is high in the three dictionaries (Table 5 above).

The second group includes attitude labels with negative connotations. The intention of the speaker is to show contempt, dislike or disapproval, to convey a low opinion or

cause personal offense. The first two groupings are eloquently alluded in P. Kyranoudis' argument that

"there is a remarkably high presence of Turkisms in the speech of grass-roots classes, often with an expressive, usually negative or ironic meaning" (2009: 36, translation).

The label αργκό 'argot', common between BD and AD, was not included in either group, as in TD argot words are assigned the label $\lambda \alpha \ddot{i} \kappa \dot{o}$ 'popular' and the limits between the «popular» and «pejorative» connotations of this label in the other two dictionaries are blurred.

The third group has a temporal character and it includes the labels $\pi\alpha\lambda\alpha\iota \delta\tau\epsilon\rho o$ 'older' and $\pi\alpha\rho\omega\chi\eta\mu\dot{\epsilon}vo$ 'obsolete' assigned to historical words no longer in current use (see Table 5 on the previous page).

5. Discussion

The data supports both hypotheses tested. As expected, labeling systems in Modern Greek dictionaries differ in the number of labels, the inventory, their content and the treatment of each label. This finding is consistent with previous research. The dictionaries use largely different labels for the Turkish loanwords with a few common ones among them. Variation of etymological information provided in the three dictionaries inevitably restricts the number of common labels. Different labels have the same content in different dictionaries, e.g. $\pi\rho o \varphi o \rho \iota \kappa \delta$ 'spoken' in TD and $o \iota \kappa \epsilon i o$ 'familiar' / $\kappa \alpha \theta \eta \mu \epsilon \rho \iota v \delta$ 'vernacular' in BD, $\kappa \alpha \theta \eta \mu \epsilon \rho \iota v \delta$ 'vernacular' in BD and $\lambda \alpha i \kappa \delta$ 'popular' / $o \iota \kappa \epsilon i o$ 'familiar' / $\pi \rho o \varphi o \rho \iota \kappa \delta$ 'spoken' in AD. No labels are used in one dictionary for words labeled in the other two. Different labels describe the same entries. The spectrum of meaning of every term and the limits between usage labels are not clear (Dubois & Dubois 1971: 24).

Differences are due to social heterogeneity, absence of scientific definitions for usage labels, and imprecise definition of the norm according to which labels are defined. The language is constantly evolving and the norm is changing as well. Vocabulary is always in a state of flux, with new terms being coined or borrowed while others fall into disuse (Norri 2000: 73). The lack of a corpus or a large-scale sociolinguistic study, however,

deprives labels of any empirical grounding that could make them an authoritative resource, or provide practical advice for those learning Greek (Tseronis & Iordanidou 2009: 175). Lacking an internationally accepted labeling system scientifically defined and based on a socio-linguistic theory, lexicographers rely on their intuition and subjective judgement. Accumulating more than one usage label under one lemma may be indicative of lexicographers' insecurity and precautious position (Anastassiadis-Symeonidis 2009: 609).

As for the status of Turkisms, K. Kazazis' statement formulated in 1972 is confirmed. "Popular" is by far the most frequent label. As the high percentage of the label group "popular" testifies, many Turkish loanwords are assigned labels pertaining to lower styles. The fact that labels designating high, formal and scientific vocabulary are not used for Turkish loanwords is also indicative of the stylistic demotion most of these vocabulary items have undergone in Modern Greek. Despite discrepancies in label frequency, there is a high percentage of words of everyday spoken language and with negative connotation.

6. Conclusion

The present paper aimed to describe the treatment of Turkish loanwords in three Modern Greek dictionaries in terms of lexicographical labels. The selected dictionaries were comparatively examined in respect to the Turkish loanwords included in their wordlists, the labeled and unlabeled lemmas, the field labels and the usage labels assigned to their common loanwords.

According to the results of the present study, the dictionaries under question exhibit differentiated lexicographical practices. There is neither unanimity on the name and number of used labels, nor uniform treatment of each label, as the width of meaning and the limits between labels are unclear. The more recently published AD features the least unmarked lemmas and the most elaborated labeling system both in terms of field and usage labels. The data suggests that the most frequent usage labels assigned to Turkish loanwords bear the [-learned] feature. Most stylistically marked Turkisms of the dictionaries are labeled with terms such as "popular", "spoken", "vernacular", "familiar", sometimes with pejorative connotations (ironic, offensive, vulgar etc.).

The abovementioned approach of Turkish loanwords through major general Modern Greek dictionaries covers the standardized aspect of their position in the Greek language. Further research on the same topic could examine the combination of labels, the labels indicating the evolution of meaning, as well as labels in derivatives, compound words and words with affixes of Turkish origin. The study of dictionaries may be complemented by a corpus-based analysis in various spoken and written styles to examine the diffusion and role of Turkisms in different registers, and by a sociolinguistic survey aiming to account for the speakers' stance, usage preference and evaluation of Turkish loanwords in Standard Modern Greek. Despite variations in the degree of acceptability and use in different registers, their divergent stylistic profile and multilevel relations with their native counterparts, Turkisms not only form a well anchored part of Modern Greek vocabulary, but also offer a distinctive expressive and stylistic potential, whose usability and productivity comprise an additional factor in their survival and vitality.

References

Academy of Athens. 2014. Christiko Lexiko tis Neoellinikis Glossas. Athens: Ethniko		
Typografio.		
Anastassiadis-Symeonidis, Anna. 2009. "Lexikografia kai Christika Simadia." In Pro-		
ceedings of the 8 th International Conference on Greek Linguis-		
tics, Ioannina, 30 August-2 September 2007, 601–615.		
Anastassiadis-Syméonidis, Anna, and Asimakis Fliatouras. 2004. "The Distinction		
[±Learned] in Modern Greek-Definition and Typology."		
In Proceedings of the 6th International Conference of Greek		
Linguistics, edited by Georgia Katsimali, Alexis Kalokairi-		
nos, Elena Anagnostopoulou, and Ioanna Kappa, 110–120.		
Rethymno: Linguistics Lab.		
Babiniotis, George. 1998. Lexiko tis Neas Ellinikis Glossas. Athens: Center of Lexico-		
logy.		
Beyer, Herman L. 2011. "'N Algemene Tipologie van Leksikografiese Etikette." Tyd-		
skrif vir Geesteswetenskappe 51(3):419–446.		
Burkhanov, Igor. 2003. "Pragmatic Specifications: Usage Indications, Labels, Ex-		
amples; Dictionaries of Style, Dictionaries of Collocations."		
In A Practical Guide to Lexicography, edited by Piet G. J. van		
Sterkenburg, 102–113. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.		

- Dubois, Jean, and Claude Dubois. 1971. *Introduction à la Lexicographie Le Dictionnaire*. Paris: Larousse.
- Fedorova, Irina V. 2004. "Style and Usage Labels in Learner's Dictionaries: Ways of Optimization." In *Proceedings of the 11th Euralex International Congress*, edited by Geoffrey Williams, and Sandra Vessier, 265–272. Lorient, France: Université de Bretagne-Sud, Faculté des lettres et des sciences humaines.
- Friedman, Victor A. 1990. "On the Turkish Lexical Component in Romani Dialects and their Relationship to Romani Language Planning." In 100 Years of Gypsy Studies, edited by Matt T. Salo, 137–143. Cheverly, MD: The Gypsy Lore Society.
- Hartmann, Reinhard R. K., and Gregory James. 1998. *Dictionary of Lexicography*. London: Routledge.
- Hausmann, Franz Josef. 1985. "Lexikographie." In *Handbuch der Lexikologie*, edited by Christoph Schwarze, and Dieter Wunderlich, 367–411. Königstein.
- Hausmann, Franz Josef. 1989. "Die Markierung im Allgemeinen Einsprachigen Wörterbuch: eine Übersicht." In Wörterbücher/ Dictionaries/ Dictionnaires. Ein Internationales Handbuch zur Lexikographie. An International Encyclopedia of Lexicography. Encyclopédie Internationale de Lexicographie, edited by Franz Josef Hausmann, Oskar Reichmann, Herbert Ernst Wiegand, and Ladislav Zgusta, 649–657. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Institute of Modern Greek Studies (Manolis Triandafyllidis Foundation). 1998. *Lexiko tis Koinis Neoellinikis*. Thessaloniki: Ziti Publishers.
- Kazazis, Kostas. 1972. "The Status of Turkisms in the Present-Day Balkan Languages." In Aspects of the Balkans: Continuity and Change. Contributions to the International Balkan Conference held at UCLA, October 23-28, 1969, edited by Henrik Birnbaum, and Speros Vryonis, 87–116. The Hague: Mouton.
- Kyranoudis, Panagiotis. 2009. *Morfologia ton Tourkikon Daneion tis Ellinikis Glossas*. Thessaloniki: Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, Institute of Modern Greek Studies, Manolis Triandafyllidis Foundation.
- Landau, Sidney I. 2001. *Dictionaries: The Art and Craft of Lexicography*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Niebaum, Hermann. 1989. "Diatopische Markierungen im Allgemeinen Einsprachigen Wörterbuch." In *Wörterbücher/ Dictionaries/ Diction*naires. Ein Internationales Handbuch zur Lexikographie. An International Encyclopedia of Lexicography. Encyclopédie Internationale de Lexicographie, edited by Franz Josef Haus-

mann, Oskar Reichmann, Herbert Ernst Wiegand, and Ladislav Zgusta, 662–668. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter. Norri, Juhani. 2000. "Labelling of Derogatory Words in some British and American Dictionaries." International Journal of Lexicography 13(2):71-106. Svensén, Bo. 2009. A Handbook of Lexicography: The Theory and Practice of Dictionary-Making. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Swanepoel, Piet. 2003. "Dictionary Typologies: A Pragmatic Approach." In A Practical Guide to Lexicography, edited by Piet G. J. van Sterkenburg, 44-69. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. Trapalis, Georgios. 2008. "Lexikographikoi Charaktirismoi sta Neoellinika Lexika. Typologia kai Syngritiki Exetasi." In Linguae Gratia. A Volume Dedicated from the Department of Linguistics to Prof. Georgios Babiniotis, edited by Amalia Moser, Ekaterini Bakakou-Orphanou, Christophoros Charalabakis, and Despina Chila-Markopoulou, 664–678. Athens: Ellinika Grammata. Trapalis, Georgios, and Georgia Katsouda. 2009. "Syngritiki Meleti tou Systimatos Lexikografikon Charaktirismon se Ellinika kai Xena Monoglossa Lexika," In Proceedings of the 8th International Conference on Greek Linguistics, Ioannina, 30 August-2 September 2007, 1168-1183. Tseronis, Assimakis, and Anna Iordanidou. 2009. "Modern Greek Dictionaries and the Ideology of Standardisation." In Standard Languages and Language Standards: Greek, Past and Present, edited by Alexandra Georgakopoulou, and Michael Silk, 167-185. London: Ashgate. Verkuyl, Henk, Maarten Janssen, and Frank Janssen. 2003. "The Codification of Usage by Labels." In A Practical Guide to Lexicography, edited by Piet G. J. van Sterkenburg, 297-311. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins. Xydopoulos, George. 2008. Lexikologia. Eisagogi stin Analysi tis Lexis kai tou Lexikou. Athens: Patakis Publications. Zgusta, Ladislav. 1971. Manual of Lexicography. Prague: Academia, Publishing House of the Czechoslovak Academy of Sciences.