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Abstract

Language ideology as a field of inquiry (Woolard et al. 1998: 3) involves, among others, the critical analysis of inequalities manifest in discursive and textual practices. This paper deals with folklore practices and language ideologies related to the project for the collection and publication of oral traditions in 1930s Greece. The institutionalization of this project relied heavily on G. Chatzidakis (1890-1923), Professor of Linguistics and N.G. Politis (1852-1921), Professor of Comparative Mythology at the University of Athens whose works arguably created an orthodox model of folklore text-making. Instead, though, of focusing on the orthodox metadiscourse or practices of these two central figures to the project, I will turn to their localization by a philologist engaged in the collection of vernacular forms in a Maniat village (Southern Peloponnese). The turn to local practices seeks to uncover features of orthopraxy (Blommaert 2003), that is adaptations which although guided by the orthodox model at the surface level, can be related to acts of identity, expressing resistance to hegemonic ideologies, revealing inequality in the distribution of resources or in gate-keeping restrictions. The analysis draws on the personal archives of I. Strilakos from the period 1930-35, which include three notebooks and a manuscript collection of Maniat lament verbal art. The approach of the archives is based on the examination of Strilakos' entextualization practices, a term that refers to the way that textual 'shape' is given to extracted stretches of discourse (see Bauman and Briggs 1990). The systematic examination of local folklore entextualization practices sheds light on the mediated ways in which ‘authentic’ voices become indexes of nationally subsumed regional identities.
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1. Introduction

Language ideology as a field of inquiry focuses on "representations, whether explicit or implicit, that construe the intersection of language and human beings in a social world" (Woolard et al. 1998: 3). In sociolinguistics, this field of inquiry has taken the classic predilection for the legitimation of marginal 'authentic' speakers and 'authentic' communities (Coupland 2003: 418) a step further, namely to the critical analysis of inequalities manifest in discursive and textual practices.

The making of modernities relied on the shaping and naturalization of inequalities through a set of discursive and textual practices. Bauman and Briggs (2003: 14-18), for instance, have shown how, from the writings of Francis Bacon in the 17th century through to Franz Boas' charter of anthropology in the 20th century, language ideologies and textual practices of purification and hybridization were carved out, creating spaces for imagining and naturalizing language and tradition. It is within such spaces that the project of the collection and publication of oral traditions was developed.
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In the West, helping to shape ways of speaking and writing which legitimized power relations, by making subalterns seem to speak and write in ways that necessitated their subordination and marginalization.

In terms of practices, the project of the collection and publication of oral traditions involved the selective extraction of stretches of discourse (decontextualization) in the form of a text that was rendered meaningful beyond any particular spatio-temporal frame (entextualization). In this way, such texts became potentially transferable in new contexts (recontextualization) and across social boundaries, e.g. generations (Bauman and Briggs 1990). The acknowledgment of the pivotal role of the interrelated decontextualization, entextualization and recontextualization practices in discourse circulation has made it clear that culture cannot be equated with its resultant texts; rather cultural texts are the product of complex histories of discourse, whose study offers a critical perspective on the creation of a sense of shared culture (Silverstein and Urban 1996: 1-17).

Engagement with the entextualization of oral traditions becomes manifest in the practice of transcribing a fragment of local verbal art or vernacular speech and converting it into a decontextualizable, written form with a seemingly durable meaning across its recontextualizations in writing (cf. idem: 2). This paper will be concerned with a socio-culturally and spatio-temporally specific instantiation of such entextualizing activity. The discussion focuses on manifestations of entextualization in the following interrelated practices, which have emerged from the analysis of data and constitute the organizing backbone of this paper:

a. Practices of selection and organization of collectables: The specific choices on what to include in notes or in a collection indicating what is considered as worthy of being extracted and collected.
b. Extraction practices: The practices relevant to the process of decontextualization, namely the circumstances of the encounter between the collector and the informant where the artefact is being 'originally' entextualized.
c. Resetting practices: The practices relevant to the process of its recontextualization(s), in this case the transfer of the extracted material to the new context of the written page.
d. Editing practices: The practices relevant to the process of entextualization, i.e. the set of transcription choices and linguistic interventions on the collected vernacular forms, which qualify certain forms as entextualizables and others as non-entextualizables.

1.1. Orthodox models of text

Entextualizing oral traditions is not an ideologically neutral activity, but it is rather related to acts of identifying practices of the self and the Other within "polycentric and stratified systems" (Blommaert 2005: 207). At the top level of stratified systems, entextualization not only potentiates the situated reiteration of texts, but also conditions the canonization of cultural texts, in other words the objectification of stretches of discourse into texts that can serve as an image of the durability and shared-ness of a culture. Such practices involve the freezing or framing of past and future providing a potential template, a model or a canonical textual exemplar (Silverstein and Urban
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The creation of canonical textual exemplars means that, when joined with hegemonic ideologies, these regimented 'shapes' of textuality disseminate through orthodox (i.e. high-status or institutionalized) models of text in a particular cultural order and come to dominate it.

Here, the focus is on verbal art entextualization in the region of Mani (Laconia, Southern Peloponnese) and its relation to the orthodox models of text that emerged at the start of the 20th century alongside the institutionalization of Folklore and Linguistics as academic fields. The intensification and systematization of the project for the collection and publication of oral traditions had been a predominate concern within both these fields towards the construction of a shared language and culture appropriate for a Modern Greek nation (cf. Mackridge 2004).

The foundations of this project lay in the works of the folklorist Nikolaos Politis (1852-1921), the Professor of Comparative Mythology at the University of Athens from 1882 and the linguist Georgios Chatzidakis (1848-1941), the first Professor of Linguistics at the University of Athens from 1890, hailed, respectively, as the "father of Greek Folklore" and the "father of Greek Linguistics". Both Professors were members of The Hellenic Folklore Society (founded in 1908), pointing to their scholarly affinities and co-operation in the endeavour of the collection and publication of vernacular forms. Politis, on the one hand, put forward a set of metadiscursive practices (Politis 1920: 6-12), that is methods for locating, extracting, editing and interpreting oral traditions (see Briggs 1993) and created a forum - the review Laographia, first published in 1908 - for the publication and critical reviewing of such work, the latter being mainly performed by himself. Chatzidakis, on the other hand, set out to articulate the phonological rules of Modern Greek (Chatzidakis 1883) and describe its historical development drawing on the pool of dialects. Their authoritative work became the yardstick for the literarization of oral traditions from different regions of Greece, i.e. their preservation for a modern readership. Literarization was grounded in the literization of the local languages in which such traditions were articulated, that is the admission of spoken languages to literacy (cf. Pollock 1998; quoted in Bauman & Briggs 2003: 15). The model of 'traditional' text shaped by Politis’ and Chatzidakis’ metadiscursive practices in the context of the aforementioned processes of literarization and literization was envisaged ideally, as an 'authentic' oral text faithfully representing the local dialect and mores, while being addressed to a middle-class readership. In practice, however, this model required an 'expert's' - namely, a philologist’s - mediation between the text and its modern readership at the formal, linguistic and pragmatological levels, which was erased in the final stages of entextualization. By virtue of its institutional validation and its usefulness for nationalising ends, this model can be considered as the orthodox model of Greek 'traditional' text during the first half of the 20th century.

2. Data

The data used in the analysis have been drawn from the personal archives of Ioannis Strilakos, a Greek Pholology graduate (University of Athens) who was born in 1996: 1-2).
Gerolimenas in 1911 and died in Athens in 1948. His archives cover the period of his student years and the brief period following his graduation and his return to his native village, waiting for his appointment as a teacher. They include, more specifically, the following:

1. One notebook (80-sheet type), written recto-verso and covering 86 pages. It is entitled *Words of Mani* and mainly contains lemmas replicated from a Maniat glossary apparently compiled by Kostas Nestoridis, a headmaster in Githio (Outer Mani) at the start of the 20th century.

2. One notebook (60-sheet type), dated 1930, written recto-verso and covering 27 pages. It is entitled *Peri Manis* (On Mani) and is divided into two parts: a. *Expressions or proverbs and elder talk handed to me by Tradition* that contains few popular sayings and proverbs with brief glosses and b. *Tsitakismos in Mani*, where 102 lemmas illustrating the phonological phenomenon of tsitakismos have been recorded.

3. One notebook (50-sheet type), covering 90 pages recto-verso. It is entitled *Diary by Giannis Gialotis*, philology graduate. It starts on the 1st May 1934 and ends in March 1935.

4. A set of 34 unbound sheets, where 64 texts, separated by titles, have been recorded, counting 10,180 words in total, with a mean of 159 words per text. The texts have been numbered in ascending order from 1-65 with 15 in-between texts missing, while texts recorded as variants have been numbered separately as 1st, 2nd, 3rd. The first sheet bears the hyper-arching title *Mirologia* (Laments). Explicit references to the time of elicitation have been observed in four texts, referring either to 1932 or to 1934.

The archives offer a glimpse of the young graduate’s engagement with the collection of verbal forms from his "particular homeland", as he refers to his native village, Gerolimenas, in his second notebook. The analysis to follow is concerned with the complexities of local folklore practices and the acts of identity involved, by focusing on the entextualization of vernacular forms by this philologist in terms of local meanings that may have been added to supplement the conventional hegemonic ideologies underlying the orthodox model of 'traditional' text-making. Such meanings are, arguably, manifest in features of *orthopraxy*, i.e. adaptations which although guided by the orthodox model at the surface level, can be related to acts of identity, expressing resistance to hegemonic ideologies, revealing inequality in the distribution of resources or in gate-keeping selections (see Blommaert 2003).

---

1 Gerolimenas is a port-settlement of Mani created after 1870, a period which has been described as a period of change from armed patrilineal kin-based social structures and of transition to the new conditions of peace engendered by the Greek state (Diktio Mousion Manis 2004: 75).

2 Nestoridis had received in 1892 one of the six awards in the linguistic contest of the Society *Korais* for a collection of proverbs. There is a reference to his intention to publish a Maniat glossary in Patsourakos (1910: 10) regarding the difficulties he faced at the initial stages of his project, due to his status as a non-Maniat. However, in Vagiakakos’ Laconic Bibliography no such glossary has been recorded.
3. Entextualization practices

3.1. Practices of selection and organization of collectables: The concern with literization

At the level of selection and organization of collectables, Strilakos’ folklore activity involves the entextualization of the following types of language material: a. words, b. popular sayings or proverbs and c. verbal art texts.

Words are included as lemmas in the two notebooks entitled *Words of Mani* and *On Mani*, respectively (see §2). In the former, the lemmas have been replicated from an already existing glossary, while the lemmas in the latter appear to have been collected by Strilakos himself. Evidence for such activity is provided in the preface of the word list where Strilakos acknowledges one of his professors at the University of Athens (Professor N. Veis3) as having prompted him to engage with the collection of dialect words in his place of origin. This acknowledgment is followed by a statement of 'good faith' on the part of Strilakos, who affirms his intention to record the words that he has managed to collect and which are relevant to the phonological phenomenon of *tsitakismos*. The included lemmas are glossed and illustrated with popular sayings as well as folk lament fragments. A few popular sayings and their interpretation are found in a separate section in the notebook entitled *On Mani*, while a total of sixty-five (65) texts drawn from the local verbal art of lamentation were more systematically collected and recorded in his manuscript sheets.

Selecting collectables which span from lower to higher level items of language (words - phrases - texts) and from oral to written sources, Strilakos interrelates different types of *monuments of speech*, encoded in Politis’ grid as "songs" and "words and phrases from the language repository" (Politis 1910: 10-11). His selections are linked in manifold and circular ways: Copying from compilations of words serves as a platform for bringing together glosses compiled by different people; popular sayings or proverbs provide evidence for the meaning and usage of a word or offer descriptions of a custom or belief, which may prove useful in rendering intelligible lament texts or Maniat ways of life, more broadly; finally, verbal art texts can point to further lemmas that need to be recorded and glossed or can serve as illustrations in glossings.

The selection and organization of the aforementioned linguistic items indicate an attempt towards a wide-ranging and systematic collection of vernacular forms that can transfer across different contexts within the philologist’s own writings. His practices suggest not only a concern with the recording of vernacular forms for others to deal with them in 'expert' ways, but also with their management in ways that could eventually produce linguistic or cultural artefacts, such as a glossary or a folklore collection of Maniat laments, supported by and supporting the philologist’s own expertise on issues of his native language and culture.

The transferability of the collected material is related to the call of Greek linguistics for the literization of dialects, which constituted the condition for the literarization of the local oral traditions expressed in them. This concern is also observed in other Maniat philologists-folklorists, who have articulated more explicitly

---

3 Professor of Byzantine Philology, University of Athens at the time of Strilakos’ attendance there.
the conditions for its local reproduction. In Koutsilieris ⁴ (1990: 11), the local
reproduction relied on the identification of Maniat philologists as the only competent
for the task, thus defining the political economy of practices, that is who is entitled to do
what within local spaces of folklore and linguistics. As the call for dialect literization
moved from national to local spaces of practice, a shift from orthodoxy to orthopraxy
was signalled in that the call became supplemented with local economies of meaning
that sought to reinforce local expertise and reserve the transfer of linguistic and cultural
artefacts as well as the potentially entailed professional prestige to local practitioners.

3.2. Extraction practices: Features of orthopraxy

The practice of literization was conceptualized in orthodox and orthopractic
metadiscourse as a practice that relies solely on the careful perception as well as on the
faithful and skilled recording in writing of the sounds of a dialect (back then, without
even the assistance of recording equipment). This conceptualization rests on specific
assumptions articulated in orthodox metadiscourses, in particular with regard to the
suggested way of recording folk songs.

According to the orthodox model of folklore text-making, the recording of
vernacular forms was allocated to literate practitioners (mainly teachers) originating
from or working in different regions of Greece in order to provide the 'expert'
folklorists, like N.G. Politis, with vernacular material for further study and possibly
inclusion in a published national anthology of oral traditions. In his call for the
collection of monuments of speech, Politis (1920: 12) suggested that the collector should
record them directly from the mouth of the folk, avoiding to acknowledge that the
practice of collection involved not only the practice of recording but also the practice of
elicitation of verbal art or to be more specific, the practice of discourse extraction.

As a matter of fact, in the aforementioned articulation, the emphasis on the
practice of keeping a written record of vernacular forms accorded the collector with a
privileged position and added prestige to the activity, especially when the informants
were illiterate. Furthermore, underlying Politis’ call was the assumption that the
informant could occupy the position of the 'authentic' voice or the voice of tradition
taking on a special value, as it was to be preserved for 'others'. The underlying
delineation of interactants' roles based on the practice of recording indexes the
assumption of social distance between the informant and the collector and in addition,
erases the ideologies that mediate such practices.

Based on an entry in Strilakos’ diary, an extraction encounter can be reconstructed
as it may have taken place in local practice, shedding light on the complexities involved
in processes of literization and practices of extraction in a local context. The entry (dated
6th February 1935) is part of a sequence of entries framed in the context of Strilakos' trip
to Pylos from the 25th of January 1935 until the 10th of February 1935, where he was
being hosted by a colleague, together with his sister, her husband and two other persons,
probably friends. The entry reads as follows:

Το απόγευμα πήγα στο καφενείο και γύρισα νωρίς. Φάγαμε χόρτα-μπακαλιάρο
[unintelligible word] και κατόπιν είπα και γράψαν κανένα δυο μοιρολόγια.

⁴ Koutsilieris is a philologist, contemporary to and personal friend of Strilakos, who has
produced significant amount of work on Maniat language, tradition and history.
'In the afternoon I went to the kafenio and came back early. We had greens and cod [unintelligible word] and then I told them to write down a few laments'.

The context of extraction that can be reconstructed based on the above quote involves a multi-participatory literacy event, in the sense that the event constitutes "an occasion in which a piece of writing is integral to the nature of the participants' interactions and their interpretative processes" (Heath 1982; quoted in Street 1995: 2). In this context, Strilakos apart from prompting the literacy event does not appear to have actually played a central role in the practice of recording.

The reconstructed context suggests a shift in the orthodox emphasis on the collector recording and the informant reciting. More specifically, we observe a shift in the configuration of power in the extraction encounter, as the participants are embedded in social relationships of proximity. Instead of the collector taking the lead in recording, the informants are asked to write down, not just to perform verbal art material. This kind of extraction practice suggests that proximity between the collector and the interactants may lead to an overall different configuration of entitlement to rights and appropriations of power (cf. Shuman 1993: 247). Extracting vernacular forms within a multi-participatory context, such as the one presented here, suggests the localization of orthodox principles, as it forges spaces where the qualities of the 'authentic' and the 'traditional' can be locally enacted and orally negotiated, before they become affirmed in writing through final practices of resetting and editing.

Unfortunately, the lack of direct evidence of collaborative writing in the collection leaves the graphic-visual composition of the verbal artefact and the kind of writing used (standard or non-standard) an issue of speculation. This form of encounter may have given rise to non-privileged practices of writing, pointing to multiple layers of entextualization and involving the literization of dialect by different hands which have not been acknowledged by the collector. Therefore, dialect literization cannot be considered as the product of a one-off practice of faithful and accurate recording. Rather, the mediation of different hands and their ideologies needs to be acknowledged. However the final decisions on the recontextualization and entextualization of the recorded forms rested upon the local 'expert', in this case Strilakos, and his resetting and editing practices which entailed his distancing from the context of multi-participatory or other local extraction sites.  

3.3. Resetting practices: The concern with literarization

Resetting practices constitute an integral part of the process of literarization (Pollock 1998; quoted in Bauman & Briggs 2003: 15) that involves the rendering of vernacular forms as literature for a literate audience. This process goes hand in hand with the process of literization discussed above which also aims to render the vernacular communicable to literate audiences.

5 Kafenio: the epoch’s equivalent of a coffee-house, only that it was mainly a place for the gathering of men.
6 The collector explicitly acknowledges the extraction of the recorded text from a named informant in three instances (i.e. X said it to me).
In terms of resetting practices, Politis (1920: 12) advised the collectors to note down the place (village or region) and in some cases the name of the informant, even though for some kinds of verbal monuments such as tales and traditions also the gender, the age and the social status of the informant was deemed important to record. These guidelines make up a key part of folklorists’ purifying rhetorics: By foregrounding an ‘original’, ‘authentic’ voice for the recorded text, they hybridizing effects of practices of collection and recording are being erased. On the other hand, Politis’ resetting practices as manifest in his influential *Selections of the songs of the Greek folk* (1914) resulted in:

a. the objectification of texts through their generic regimentation as individual, titled and thematically organized texts and b. their expropriation, since no details about the informants, the collectors or the extraction sites are provided (see Herzfeld 1996).

In Strilakos’ manuscript collection, resetting practices appear to gain consistency as the level of editing increases. More specifically, three texts placed at the beginning of the collection, appear to be at the stage of preliminary editing and one text at the stage of editing in process (i.e. including visible rearrangement of text, corrections, deletions and addition of brief comments), differing from the rest of the texts with regard to their graphic representation. Whereas Strilakos makes a consistent choice to represent the oral texts in writing by placing line breaks after eight-syllable word strings, in the first two texts line breaks coincide with the end of available space on the page, whereas in the following two line-breaks are placed after 16-syllable word strings.

In these texts, Strilakos appears to experiment with the written representation of the oral texts in a way that arguably indexes his own listening engagement with the texts: A conception of the oral text as continuous speech flow perhaps emanating from the usual practice of reciting rather than singing the laments outside ritual contexts and a sense of laments’ being composed in couplets.

Meaning-making of laments in couplets is reinforced by the use of punctuation, where it is found that commas (46%) are more often placed at the end of two consecutive lines. In such cases, punctuation markers serve as discourse punctuation markers (DPM) which indicate a change in the topic, signalling either continuity or discontinuity to what has come before and marking a unit’s closure. Punctuation in Strilakos is not used as a standardizing medium intending to mark grammatical relations between phrases and sentences and create texts readable for a highly literate audience, but serves as a device of local meaning-making. Such experimentation with textual representation gives rise to orthopraxy, revealing the way the collector perceives the local verbal art and the difficulties he was facing with the task of representing them and adapting them into regimented shapings of written text.

However, Strilakos attempts systematically to shift these orthopraxies to a more orthodox form, in order to assign a recognizable value to the texts. Following the first four texts, the consistent choice of eight-syllable word strings representing the acknowledged eight-syllable metre of Maniat laments prevails and it also becomes a feature of his editing practice manifest in the indication of the poetic metre through dashes. Finally, at the apparently most edited texts we can see that they appear on the page as individual artefacts, accompanied by brief explanatory comments and a separate section of vocabulary.

Finally, the fact that there are only three explicit references to informants’ names in the collection amounts to the expropriation of their voices, which renders the natural history of the verbal art and the intricate web of clan entitlements to laments transparent. This expropriation, coupled with the addition of brief comments on the
lament and glosses allows the conversion of laments into decontextualized texts that can stand on their own and be received by literate audiences that are not extensively acquainted with the Maniat language and culture.

3.4. Editing practices: Vernacularization

The most challenging stage in the process of entextualizing verbal art as an artefact has been the transfer of oral speech in writing. In Greece of the 1930s this act of transfer across modes involved the transcription of spoken vernaculars which had been in extended contact with 'common' Modern Greek since the 19th century (Triantafillidis 1938: 65 §66). The vernaculars lacked a literate tradition, while the writing system of the 'common' Modern Greek, which constituted since the 19th century a site of contention for forms of the purified variety that drew on the ancient Attic (katharevousa) and the spoken variety (demotic), was in the process of standardization, resulting in a lack of consensus on orthographic conventions, on the one hand and the ideologization of orthographic choices, on the other.

The difficulties involved in the transcription of the vernacular are evidenced in Strilakos’ literization practices which involve the mixed use of orthographic conventions and phonetic transcriptions as well as in his interventions on the lament texts. Editing practices in the corpus, which are visible thanks to the manuscript and semi-edited form of the collection, mainly involve additions and deletions of letters, words, lines or verses. The examination of specific transcription and editing choices across the recorded texts-data is therefore important for emphasising their ideological, rather than neutral character.

The particularities of the spoken vernacular of the Maniat laments which created problems for their written recording are described in Mirambel’s study of the Maniat idiom (Mirambel 1929: 251-254) and can be summed up into features of archaisms and phonological phenomena evidenced, among others in:

1. the pronunciation of the phoneme υ, [i] and ω, [o] as άυ, [u]:
   e.g. (Greek) σκυλία, sk[i]lia (Maniat) σκουλία, sk[u]lia, 'dogs'
   e.g. (Greek) φωλία, f[o]lia, (Maniat) φουλία, f[u]lia, 'nest'

2. the use of the pronoun τι with the meaning of άτι, 'that' and γιατί, 'because':
   e.g. (Greek) ποιδία, poδ[j]a, (Maniat) ποϊδά, po[i]da, 'smock'

3. the epenthesis of the semi-vowel ι, [i]:
   e.g. (Greek) ποσίδα, poσ[j]a, (Maniat) ποσίδα, po[i]da, 'smock'

4. the development of consonants:
   e.g. (Greek) αμαρτωλή, (Maniat) amartoli (Maniat) γαμαρτωλή, [j]amartoli, 'sinned'
   e.g. (Greek) πάντα, panda (Maniat) πάντα, pada, 'always'
   e.g. (Maniat) πάντα, pada, 'smock'

5. the dropping of the final -ς (-s):
   e.g. (Greek) δεν πάω, ðe mbao (Maniat) δεν πάω, δε bao, 'I am not going'.

   The retention or deletion of the final -ς (-s) in the transcription and editing practices manifest in the manuscript will serve as an illustration of the transcriber’s

---

7 Mirambel’s work is descriptive, based on direct observations from the author’s repeated trips to the region, but also and rather problematically so on earlier published laments, especially Pasayannis 1928, which have been extensively criticised for their transcriptions.
choices. The retention or deletion of the final -v (‘-n’) has been a thorny issue in the writing and description of Greek (see Tsopanakis 1987). Claude Fauriel, the first to publish Greek folk songs (in 1824) had observed Greeks’ tendency to avoid pronouncing the final -v (‘-n’). In his notes, though, he reported that after consultation with his Greek friends, he finally decided to add it where missing, in order not to record what was considered for the Greeks of the time a disturbingly unorthographic form (Politis 1984: 291). Later on, in one of the few descriptions of spoken Greek at the start of the 20th century, the optionality of the final -v (‘-n’) was stated and prescribed upon a set of phonological rules (Filintas 1907: 118, §346). This set of rules made it to our time through the grammar of Triantafillidis, the influential demoticist, who prescribed that the final -v (-n) is dropped before continuant consonants, but retained before consonant stops (Triantafillidis 1978 [1941]: 83, §187).

8 In the Maniat dialect the same phonological rule has been said to apply, though with a different effect in the voicing of the consonant stops (non-nasal instead of nasal) (Mirambel 1929: 155).

Fauriel’s problematisation on the retention or deletion of the final -v (‘-n’) shows clearly that the choice for its transcription was also an ideological one: the retention of the final -v (‘-n’) was indexically associated with katharevousa, the written variety of Greek, while in Modern Greek its orthography was determined by a set of phonological rules. Its absence, on the other hand, was indexically associated with vernacular speech (cf. Tsopanakis 1987: 22).

The following examination of transcriptions of the negative particles δεν, den and μην, min in the manuscript will illustrate the way Strilakos deals with the issue of the final -v (‘-n’) and point to his transcription preferences. As Tables 1a and 1b illustrate, both variants of the forms δεν, den and μην, min have been recorded, suggesting that there has been no final decision on the deletion or retention of the final -v (‘-n’). In the case of the particle δεν, den, the final -v (‘-n’) tends to be retained, while in the case of the particle μην, min it tends to be omitted. Editing interventions indicate deletions, rather than additions of the consonant in question (in the case of the particle δεν, den), suggesting that the transcriber prefers variants that lack the final -v (‘-n’). Such a preference can be qualified as an ideological one that denotes his opting for forms that can index oral vernacular speech, even if they are not orthographic.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Particle</th>
<th>Frequency of occurrence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>δεν, den</td>
<td>49.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δε, de</td>
<td>44.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δε<em>ν</em>, δε<em>ν</em></td>
<td>6.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1a. Frequency of occurrence for variant forms of the negative particle den

[Asterisks indicate forms where the final –v; (-n) is deleted]

8 See Tsopanakis 1987 for an overview of the issue and suggestions for doing away with Triantafillidis’ phonological rules in favor of its re-regulation as a final consonant of the Greek language, rather than as an optional feature.
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Table 1b. Frequency of occurrence for variant forms of negative particle μην, min

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>μην, min</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μη, mi</td>
<td>86.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above suggestion is further grounded on the following analysis of the distribution of the retention, dropping or deletion of the final -ν (‘-n’), as illustrated in the distribution of the particles δεν, den and μην, min and their variants (Tables 2a-2b). More specifically, the findings of the analysis suggest that the retention or dropping of the final -ν (‘-n’) is not consistently in accordance to the prescribed phonological rules. So, although the majority of δεν, den forms occur before vowels (78.5%) and stops (16%), and the majority of δε, de forms occur before continuants (71.1%) in accordance to the phonological rules, δεν, den forms have also been sometimes recorded before continuants (5.3%) and δε, de forms before stops (24.9%) and even before vowels (3.8%), contrary to the phonological rules. In the case of the particle μην, min, the final -ν (‘-n’) is retained mainly before vowels (75%) and stops (25%) and dropped before continuants (49.9%) in accordance with phonological rules, but it is also sometimes dropped before vowels (7.6%) and very often before stops (42.3%), contrary to the relevant phonological rules.

Table 2a. Distribution of forms of particle δεν, den

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>+ vowels</th>
<th>+ continuants</th>
<th>+ stops</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>δεν, den</td>
<td>78.5%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δε, de</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>71.1%</td>
<td>24.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δεν<em>ν</em>, de<em>n</em></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
<td>85.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2b. Distribution of variant forms of particle μην, min

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>+ vowels</th>
<th>+ continuants</th>
<th>+ stops</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>μην, min</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μη, mi</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>49.9%</td>
<td>42.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The observed pattern of overriding phonological rules before stops is further evidenced in the deletions of the final -ν (‘-n’) which predominantly occur before stops (85.7%) as illustrated in eg. (1), rather than continuants (14.2%) as illustrated in eg.(2), that would be expected if such interventions were motivated by orthographic corrections of the transcription:

(1) δεν*ν* τα μοιράζων
    de*n* ta mirazu
    'I will not divide them'

(2) δεν*ν* ματακλάιουν
    de*n* matakleu
'I will not cry again'

These findings show an inconsistent adherence to the phonological rules and a tendency to produce orthopractic forms predominantly when the particle is followed by a stop consonant. This pattern could be due to the phonological particularity of Maniat pronunciation vis-à-vis Modern Greek that obtains in the case of the final -ν ('-n') before stops, whereby its retention produces a non-nasal voicing of the stop [b], [d], [g] rather than the nasal pronunciation [mb], [nd], [ng] of the standard. The transcriber’s attempted solution, which is not however systematised in the corpus, is first to delete the final -ν ('-n') from the particle and attach it to the following word, as in eg. (3):

(3)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strilakos’ form</th>
<th>Orthographic form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>δε ντονε εγνοριζετε</td>
<td>δεν τονε εγνοριζετε</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δε ntone gnorizete</td>
<td>den tone egnorizete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘you don’t know him’</td>
<td>‘you don’t know him’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nonetheless, the production of similar forms in two additional cases which involve a vowel, and therefore do not imply a Greek pronunciation (see eg. 4-7) seem to suggest that the transcriber was primarily concerned with the omission of the final -ν ('-n') from the particles in question, in order to produce forms that indexed oral, vernacular, rather than written speech.

(4)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strilakos’ form</th>
<th>Orthographic form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>δε νεζήλεψα</td>
<td>δεν εζήλεψα</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>de nezilepsa</td>
<td>den ezilepsa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘I wasn’t jealous’</td>
<td>‘I wasn’t jealous’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(5)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strilakos’ form</th>
<th>Orthographic form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>δε νήςασι</td>
<td>δεν ηθασι</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>de nithasi</td>
<td>den ithasi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘they didn’t come’</td>
<td>‘they didn’t come’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(6)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strilakos’ form</th>
<th>Orthographic form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>να μη ν’έναι</td>
<td>να μην έναι</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>na mi n’ene</td>
<td>na min ene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>’isn’t he there’</td>
<td>’isn’t he there’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(7)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strilakos’ form</th>
<th>Orthographic form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>που να μη νηθθε87ε γεννηθείς</td>
<td>που να μην ήθε γεννηθείς</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pou na mi nithe gennithis</td>
<td>pou na mi nithe gennithis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘may you hadn’t been born’</td>
<td>‘may you hadn’t been born’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To sum up, the transcriber’s adherence to phonological rules for the distribution and pronunciation of the final -ν (’-n’) in grammatical descriptions of Modern Greek and Maniat evidenced his awareness of language issues and his problematization regarding the orthographic transcription of the vernacular. On the other hand, the choice of qualifying the final -ν (’-n’) as non-entextualizable was an ideological one, which has been related to the transcriber’s preference for forms that index the Maniat vernacular, rather than 'correct' written Greek.

Similar editing practices that attempt to restore the particularities of the Maniat vernacular are further evidenced in his manuscript, involving a number of different phenomena. Examples of the different types of such interventions are listed in the following table, also including the corresponding Greek variant and the vernacular particularity that is being restored, as stated in extant descriptions of the Maniat idiom:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vernacular particularities</th>
<th>Strilakos’ transcription</th>
<th>Greek orthographic variant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Suppression of final -ς, (’-s’) in the accusative of plural before a word starting with a consonant</td>
<td>του λαγούς tou lagous 'the rabbits'</td>
<td>τους λαγούς tous lagous 'the rabbits'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phenomenon of epenthesis: the change of the phoneme i into a semi-vowel and its co-pronunciation in front of the consonants δ, ντ, ρ, θ, τ with the vowel preceding the consonant</td>
<td>εγδίαικε egdiaike 'went'</td>
<td>εδιάηκε ediaike 'went'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voicing of consonants λ (l) changes into ρ (r)</td>
<td>αδέρφοι aderfí 'brothers'</td>
<td>αδίσλοι adelfí 'brothers'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>σ (s) becomes ζ (z)</td>
<td>σταροζμίγαδα starozmigada (wheat product)</td>
<td>σταροτσία papoutsia 'shoes'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consonant changes ψ (ps) into πχ (pc)</td>
<td>μυζαροπχιάσματα mizaropχιάσματα (insulting word)</td>
<td>μυζαροψιάσματα mizaropψιάσματα (insulting word)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τσ (ts) into κχ (kc)</td>
<td>παπουκχια papukχιa 'shoes'</td>
<td>παπούτσια papoutsia 'shoes'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>χ (c) into κ (k)</td>
<td>μοσκοσάπουνο moskosapuno 'soap'</td>
<td>μοσχοσάπουνο moskosapuno 'soap'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voicing of consonantal diphthongs μπ (mp), γκ (gk) as [b] or [g]</td>
<td>καβί kabi 'land'</td>
<td>καμπί kampi 'land'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archaisms in vocabulary</td>
<td>είτε ite 'neither'</td>
<td>ούτε oute 'neither'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Restoring features of the vernacular in the transcription of Maniat forms
The above interventions indicate that the transcription of the vernacular involved practices of purification and hybridization aimed at creating 'authentic' and 'traditional' forms, while erasing in the process features that indexed contact with Greek. The transcriber’s editing practices produce orthopractic forms, in the sense that they constitute deviations from Greek orthography that seek to index particularities of Maniat speech. From a broader perspective, however, such orthopraxies do not challenge, but rather serve the call of orthodox linguistics and folklore of the time for vernacularization aimed at objectifying local languages as repositories of the past in contradistinction to the construction of Modern Greek as the language of the present.

4. Conclusions

To sum up, in this paper I have analyzed the entextualization of vernacular forms from Mani (Southern Peloponnese, Greece), as practised by a philologist in the 1930s and as manifest in the interrelated levels of (a) selection and organization of collectables, (b) extraction, (c) editing and finally, (d) resetting. The analysis has pointed to features of orthopraxy in the making of local folklore text mainly at the level of extraction. At this level, entextualization is not dependent on the manipulation of written sources only (as in the practice of 'expert' folklorists) but also on multi-participatory oral contexts within relations of social proximity, whereby members of the community can define both the entextualizables and the way of their entextualization. At the level of resetting practices, however, a gradual shift from an orthopractic use of punctuation to a more orthodox one has been observed as the degree of editing becomes higher. Orthopractic uses of punctuation, here, involve the representation of discourse units instead of grammatical ones revealing, arguably, the local collector's internalization of ways of telling laments. Finally, at the level of editing practices, observed deviations from orthographic norms have been related to the indexing of oral vernacular speech. The aforementioned set of practices suggests the philologist’s engagement with the shaping of an 'authentic' vernacular that fitted scholarly shapes of 'traditional' texts: Represented in the poetic metre, glossed and rendered in a pure vernacular. In other words, his practices do not challenge the hegemonic ideologies of homogenization shaped by and shaping the orthodox models of text-making of the time.

In the context of such homogenizing language ideologies, shifts from orthopraxy to orthodoxy were not an option for the local collector-transcriber, but a condition for the transferability of the linguistic and cultural artefacts and the potential assignment of professional prestige to him as a young philologist. His entextualizations and recontextualizations of local vernacular forms indicate that on the one hand, orthodox models of folklore served as the means to configure a localized and relational identity in culturally recognised and recognisable ways. Orthopraxies, on the other hand, served as a way to shape linguistic and cultural indexes of regional particularity, contributing to the fixation of regional identities as 'traditional' and 'authentic', and thus as something that belongs to the past, rather than the present.

The cross-cultural examination of localizations of orthodox models in the fields of folklore and linguistics can shed light on the complexities of configuring peripheral identities in nationalizing contexts.
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