

Posted 27 January 2006, Updated 13 June 2007

## Wikipedia on Greek Phonology

As is well-known the articles of the Internet 'encyclopaedia' called *Wikipedia*, are written by several persons who take an interest in a particular subject irrespectively of whether they have competence in the particular area or not.

On the CNN news on the 13 June 2007, there was an interview with Andrew Keen, author of *The Cult of the Amateur*. Mr Keen speaks in no uncertain terms of the illiteracy, the superficiality, the bias, the unreliability and the fraudulence of bloggers and particulalry of the Wikipedia.

He speaks of bloggers as "millions of exuberant monkeys". With regard to Wikipedia, he says "People go to it thinking that it is reliable" when "it is a biased, unreliable source of information, whose editors are anonymous and, often, fraudulent". He speaks both of illiteracy which is dumbing us down, as well as of dishonesty.

Keen's description of the Wikipedia seems to fit well the group of persons who write the article on "Greek Phonology". One of them, User Andreas (alias Andreas Schwab), is a chemist, another one, User Macrakis, is a computer (developer ?). Their latest acquisition is one, Luke Pietsch, a linguist specializing in English. None of them nor any of the rest of them is an expert Greek scholar, who, moreover, in order to tackle such a diachronic question as Greek pronunciation, ought to be conversant with the entire history of the Greek language, its literature, and its evidence. No one of them has studied the historical circumstances, the phenomena, or the evidence for the pronunciation of Greek. They understand neither ancient Greek nor Neohellenic *Katharevousa* (they admit themselves that they cannot understand Hatzidakis' writings). Yet they presume to write on Greek Pronunciation! Worst, still, they have no scientific understanding in linguistic matters; they cannot weigh nor evaluate linguistic evidence and arguments. One has only to read the

"cashed" document of their wranglings in order to see their incompetence. They just count how many authors support this or that position and the view that gets most supporters wins!