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Dear Editors,

I have read K. Drousioti’s paper “Is the sociolinguistic situation in Cyprus diglossic?” published in the *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies*, 2022 (DOI: 10.1080/15427587.2022.2112531). The paper is a revision and translation in English of Drousioti’s «Διπλογλωσσία στην Κύπρο: Αναπάντητα ερωτήματα και αθέατες πτυχές του ελληνοκυπριακού συγκειμένου» (*Tο Bήμα των Κοινωνικών Επιστημών* ΙΗ’.69, 2018, 90-118). The author’s main goal in both papers is to reject the dominant among sociolinguists view that the relation between Standard Greek and the Cypriot dialect is that of diglossia.

I am afraid that Drousioti’s knowledge of the relevant literature is rather sloppy and her use of it rather selective. My name is mentioned only once, *en passant*, in a fn. (p. 24-25). I am criticized for “naively assert[ing] that the caricature quotes [i.e., the cartoon captions] in the Greek Cypriot Press are exclusively written in Cypriot Greek” and for taking this “to confirm that the sociolinguistic situation in Cyprus is indeed diglossic”. Thus, Drousioti implies that the only criterion I consider in support of the existence of diglossia is the use of the Cypriot dialect in cartoon captions. But this is only anecdotal evidence that falls under the much more general rubric of the specialization of functions of the two varieties in a diglossic situation (cf. Ferguson’s first criterion). In my 2002 paper I cite the Cypriot newspapers (of the period my paper is about) that I have taken into consideration and whose cartoon captions were “written in Cypriot Greek” or, rather, made use of cypriotisms. Drousioti does not provide counter evidence.

My 2002 paper («Κοινή γλώσσα και διάλεκτος. Το ζήτημα της ‘γλωσσικής διμορφίας’ στην Κύπρο», *Νέα Εστία*, 151.1745, 898-928), summarily dismissed by Drousioti, is a 30-pages-long study of diglossia in Cyprus, in which all of Ferguson’s criteria are considered and exemplified. It is the first study that sought to *prove* the existence of diglossia (an earlier study by L. Sciriha, *A Question of Identity: Language Use in Cyprus*, Nicosia: Intercollege Press, 1996, simply *presupposed* its existence). A summary of my work on diglossia in Cyprus was presented as early as 1996 («Η γλωσσική διμoρφία στηv Κύπρo», in *«Ισχυρές»-«ασθενείς» γλώσσες στην Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση: Όψεις του γλωσσικού ηγεμονισμού*, Thessaloniki: Centre for the Greek Language, 1996, 121-128; republished in two wide-circulation periodicals, one in Greece and one in Cyprus). There is also a long line of works after the publication of mine which confirm the existence of diglossia. The authors of these works should speak for themselves.

What I find really preposterous is that Drousioti “incriminates” (to borrow an expression of hers) all those who believe that the situation in Cyprus is – or, at least, *was* – diglossic. We are all presented as supporters of nationalism and post-colonialism. Really? My work – and, from what I know, the work of many other scholars – presents explicit arguments, to those who can read, against linguistic nationalism, either Greek, Cypriot, or Greek-Cypriot. As far as I am concerned, cf. pp. 918 ff. of my work cited by Drousioti.

Sincerely,

Spiros A. Moschonas

*Professor of Linguistics  
and the Philosophy of Language*