

**ΠΛΗΡΩΜΑ ΚΑΜΠΙΝΑΣ, ΘΕΣΕΙΣ ΓΙ' ΑΠΟΓΕΙΩΣΗ: ON THE LANGUAGE OF AIRLINE  
ANNOUNCEMENTS<sup>1</sup>**

Costas Canakis

UNIVERSITY OF THE AEGEAN

**Περίληψη**

Η μελέτη αυτή εστιάζει στην γλώσσα των αεροπορικών ανακοινώσεων στην ελληνική αντλώντας από ένα corpus δεδομένων που συλλέχθηκαν σε αεροδρόμια και πτήσεις εσωτερικού. Οι ανακοινώσεις αποτελούν ενδιαφέροντα χώρο διερεύνησης της (εναλλαγής) υφολογικών ποικιλιών (registers), όπως φαίνεται από τις σχετικές μορφοσυντακτικές και λεξικές επιλογές: είναι εγγενώς επίσημες, δεδομένου του δημόσιου χαρακτήρα τους, και έτσι αναμένονται επιλογές υψηλού ύφους. Παρόλα αυτά, παρατηρούμε εξαιρετική εναλλαγή στο ύφος, το οποίο ποικίλει από χαμηλό ως και επιτηδευμένα υψηλό· και αυτό στα πλαίσια ενός ομοιογενούς σώματος δεδομένων αναφερόμενο σε μια οριοθετημένη γλωσσική δραστηριότητα. Θα επιχειρήσω να δείξω ότι αυτό αφορά: α) στη διγλωσσική (diglossic) κατάσταση που επισήμως μεν μπορεί να διευθετήθηκε αλλά άφησε μια καθ' όλα απτή διγλωσσική κληρονομιά· και β) λιγότερο, στην επιρροή από τυποποιημένες ξένες γλώσσες (κυρίως την αγγλική) με τις οποίες η ελληνική συνυπάρχει στις αερομεταφορές. Έτσι, θεωρώ τα δεδομένα ενδεικτικά μιας γενικότερης τάσης: ως στιγμές στην συνεχιζόμενη ανάπτυξη μιας τυποποιημένης ελληνικής στην οποία η υφολογική ποικιλότητα θα είναι ανεξάρτητη από μια διγλωσσία τύπου Ferguson.

**Λέξεις κλειδιά**

υφολογική ποικιλία (registers), ανακοινώσεις, (κοινωνική) διγλωσσία, καθαρεύουσα, λόγιοι τύποι, δημοτική

**1. Introduction**

This study focuses on the language of airline announcements in Modern Greek, drawing on data collected in terminals and on board domestic flights. Announcements constitute an interesting locus for the investigation of recurrent topics in the study of Modern Greek, especially register<sup>2</sup> variation as manifested through syntactic, morphological, and lexical choices. They are inherently formal, given their public character, and thus linguistic choices consonant with high registers are expected. However, one cannot fail to notice the considerable variation in the data, with register ranging from relatively low to stilted high – and that within a uniform corpus relating to a highly demarcated activity type. This, I propose, is related to a) the diglossic situation which is officially resolved but has bequeathed an altogether palpable post-diglossic heritage (notably, an understanding of high register as positively correlating, if not coinciding, with the diglossic high mode, *katharevousa*),<sup>3</sup> and b) less centrally, to influence from highly standardized foreign languages with which Greek co-exists in the travel context.

Because of their diglossic heritage, Greek speakers are often at a loss when faced with register choices in formal contexts; even if the relevant choices are made in institutionalized settings. We are dealing here with the interaction among three distinct factors: i) institutional setting, ii) a continuum of formality, and iii) a continuum ranging from public/ transactional to private/ interactional. Public language is, predominantly, positively correlated with high

formality and a public-formal variety of language is, in turn, positively correlated with institutional settings. Moreover, given time, the linguistic choices made within institutional settings tend to become standardized, a process implying homogenization and some degree of permanence. In a sense, then, standardization spells *prestige*.<sup>4</sup>

Register variation is attested in both diglossic and non-diglossic linguistic communities; the two are different things (Georgakopoulou & Spanaki, 2001: 9, 13-14).<sup>5</sup> However, in diglossic communities different registers are inextricably connected to one of the two diglossic modes, “high” (H) or “low” (L), the choice being essentially preempted by the context (Ferguson, 1971: 5-6). This is traditionally understood as a division of labour motivating the two varieties. Greece is now admittedly a *post*-diglossic community. However, the interdependence between high registers and H and low registers and L is not extinct. Note that, rather than confusing synchrony with diachrony, I am concerned with the effects diglossia has had on present day Greek.

I will argue that there is a tension between two tendencies. First, as demotic Greek is being progressively standardized, Greek speakers make L, yet standard, choices even in formal contexts;<sup>6</sup> this is in itself a reflex of a post-diglossic stage. Second, H choices are still inextricably connected to learned origins (cf. *katharevousa*). Thus, the data I will focus on may be considered as indicative of a more general phenomenon: as instances in the ongoing development of a standard, elaborate demotic Greek in which register variation will be increasingly dissociated from the erstwhile diglossic modes (register variation being, in principle, distinct from diglossia). This is in accordance both with the understanding the two modes as interpenetrating (Alexiou, 2001: 93) and with the prediction that “the general trend will ultimately and inevitably be towards Demotic” (*ibid.*: 114).

## **2. A word on the data**

This study is based on selections from original material collected between March and September 2002. The present data consist of terminal and in-flight announcements recorded at Makedonia Airport of Thessaloniki (SKG), Odysseas Elytis Airport of Mytilene (MJT), and on board domestic flights mostly between these two destinations. Initially, I recorded announcements in pen and paper, but subsequent use of a micro-chip recorder afforded me access to much longer, and commensurately more elaborate, in-flight announcements. Moreover, I have realized, through less systematically recorded maritime and railroad announcements, that similar phenomena are characteristic of Greek travel announcements regardless of modality.<sup>7</sup> Such data will serve an auxiliary purpose.

## **3. Register variation in announcements: Analyzing the data**

I will discuss register variation from two perspectives: a) the linguistic situation as it has developed in the aftermath of the language question, focusing on post-diglossic effects, and b) apparent influence from standardized foreign languages with which Greek co-exists in the

travel context. According to Alexiou (2001 [1982]: 95), the variety used in public announcements was *katharevousa* before 1976 and has been “adulterated demotic” ever since. Moreover, according to the same source, *katharevousa* “is in fact still [i.e., 1982] fairly widespread, especially for public notices, official announcements and on road signs” (ibid.: 91). In what follows, we will have the chance to determine whether this is still the case. Consider (1) below:

- 1) Παρακαλούνται οι επιβάτες που ταξιδεύουν με Ολυμπιακή Αεροπορία, πτήση 983 για Λήμνο, όπως προσέλθουν στον έλεγχο εισιτηρίων. (MJT, 15/4/02)

Although overall the register is high, as evidenced by the passive verb form *παρακαλούνται* and vocabulary of learned origin (*προσέλθουν*), there are several features that strike me as peculiar:

- i) The absence of the definite article before nominals such as *Ολυμπιακή Αεροπορία* and *Λήμνο*, which is, if anything, characteristic of lower registers (cf. *Πάμε Mercedes*, *Πάμε Πλατεία*; *Πήγες μνημόσυνο*; cf. Makri-Tsilipakou 2002). This may be explained as an instance of telegraphic speech due to requirements of brevity.
- ii) The nominative form *πτήση* instead of the competing construction favoring the genitive, i.e. *αριθμός πτήσης/πτήσεως*. Whereas the nominative is register-neutral in itself, its choice in this context is a compromise towards lower register. Moreover, when the construction *αριθμός* + *Nominal<sub>Gen.</sub>* is used choice is split between *πτήσης/πτήσεως*. For those skeptical about whether *πτήση* in (1) is a *bona fide* nominative, as opposed to a reduced form of, say, *(με την) πτήση* and thus accusative, subsequent examples will clarify matters.
- iii) And to top it all off, we have the stilted H complementizer *όπως*, a vestige of old standardization which, albeit effectively dead in this use, keeps creeping up in announcement language.<sup>8</sup> This is not to say, however, that it has ever threatened the well-established use of *να* in the relevant context.

These points will be the foci of this investigation. My working hypothesis is that (i) can be potentially explained as influence from English in the attempt to standardize (and simplify/ shorten) announcement Greek, whereas (ii)-(iii) are instances of “schizoglossia” (cf. Kazazis 1982, Babinotis 1982) and more or less direct consequences of the linguistic insecurity bequeathed by erstwhile full-blown diglossia to speakers of post-diglossic Greek—especially when high register is at issue.

This is not a strict quantitative study and thus it shall make no pretense to definitive answers. Rather, its goal lies in identifying tendencies and providing suitable evidence to support the aforementioned hypotheses. To this end, I will select instances from my data to establish that the points made for (1) above do not pertain to isolated occurrences.

### 3.1. The definite article

The state of affairs described in 3(i) above is further supported by the following examples:

- 2) Άφιξη Ολυμπιακής Αεροπορίας, αριθμός πτήσης 983 από Ρόδο, Μυτιλήνη και Λήμνο. (SKG, 24/4/02)
- 3) Άφιξη Ολυμπιακής Αεροπορίας, πτήση 164 από Βερολίνο. (SKG, 24/4/02)
- 4) Αναχώρηση Ολυμπιακής Αεροπορίας, αριθμός πτήσης 191 για Στουτγάρδη. (SKG, 24/4/02)
- 5) Τελευταία αναγγελία της πτήσεως 810 της Αυστριακής Αεροπορίας για Βιέννη. (SKG, 24/4/02)

These examples have one thing in common: there is no definite article before nominals referring to air-carriers<sup>9</sup> or place-names. Thus, we have NPs of the form NP→NN<sub>Gen</sub> and, especially, PPs of the form PP→PN. These prepositional constructions resemble fixed expressions such as *για μπάνιο*, *για φαγητό*, etc. denoting habitual activities. The difference is that the latter are part of a VP, habitually introduced with a form of *πηγαίνω*, and that their meaning undergoes changes when accompanied by the definite article (cf. Makri-Tsilipakou, 2002: 210). Here, these PPs are part of a more elaborate nominal expression headed by *άφιξη/αναχώρηση*. What is common in all such expressions is that the absence of the article results in an unmediated relation between the preposition or verb and the nominal, thus signaling a closer relation between the two: a habitual link. Clearly, in an airport setting, *για/από* + place-name is motivated.

However, there are two more factors to be co-estimated. First off, the absence of the definite article in all expressions examined correlates with low register, which is not the case here: that is, register is high. Thus, we could consider this a vagary of airlinese, a concession of register to the functional criterion of high information content, i.e., densely packed information as emblematic of telegraphic speech. Yet, there is a second factor to consider: (2)–(4) translate word-for-word<sup>10</sup> into English, the commonest language to be heard in airports around the globe. It is probable that most of these standard announcements have been molded on English. Therefore, the existence of similar native patterns and foreign influence combine forces and exercise pressure that seems to prevail over the formality of the occasion.<sup>11</sup> As a result, absence of the definite article with these two classes of nominals becomes emblematic of airlinese, with deviations from this pattern being rare.

### 3.2. Πτήση vs. πτήσης vs. Πτήσεως

Considering examples (1)–(5) above and (6) below, we notice that there are alternative ways of referring to a flight. First, there is a choice between use of the nominative (1, 3) and the genitive (2, 4, 5, 6). Second, there is further choice between two forms of the genitive, i.e., *πτήσης* (2, 4) and *πτήσεως* (5, 6). This means three alternatives in all for the same immediate context of use.

- 6) Η Ολυμπιακή αεροπορία αναγγέλλει την άφιξη της πτήσεως 983 από Ρόδο στις 1:10. (MJT, 15/4/02)

In (3) it becomes clear that *πτήση* is a nominative form functioning as a label or proper name, an emerging convention of airlinese: the name of the flight is *πτήση 164*.

A quick look at the data, reveals that the nominative is used approx. 30% to refer to a flight

number. This makes one wonder whether it is an old form on its way out or a new one on its way into announcement language. Nevertheless, the appositive construction featuring the nominative, just like the absence of the definite article, seems to be gaining ground. Now, there are several aspects to this preference. First, we get the nominative by eliminating *αριθμός* ‘number’, which is redundant and at odds with the requirements of telegraphicness. The nominative is thus motivated by economy. At the same time, influence from English could be seen as a corroborating factor here: translating (3) in English we end up with the strikingly analogous *Arrival Olympic Airways, flight 164 from Berlin*. Yet the English version is telegraphic too; it is again as if *of* is missing and *Olympic Airways* is functioning as a label. The only difference between Greek and English lies in the marking of *Ολομπιακής Αεροπορίας* as genitive, an inescapable result in this construction. Last, using the appositive construction allows one to dodge not the genitive so much as the choice between *πτήσης/πτήσεως*; a choice which is still loaded for some speakers (but cf. Babiniotis 1982). These three factors, then, collude against the genitive at this stage; the genitive being part and parcel of the lengthier construction *αριθμός + Nominal<sub>Gen.</sub>*. Again, high register seems to be compromised;<sup>12</sup> but could it be that these changes in (both Greek and) airline announcements are redefining the appropriate choices for high registers?

Whereas nominative appositive constructions may be gaining ground, the genitive construction remains strong, as evidenced by its overall prevalence. It is used approx. 70%, counting only occurrences of *αριθμός + Nominal<sub>Gen.</sub> x* or *πτήση x* (where the genitive is optional). These occurrences are split between *πτήσης* and *πτήσεως*. This inflectional split is a reflex of the post-diglossic legacy of Greek, despite the fact that *πτήση* is a word of learned origin, anyway. The former, which I will call “low” (L), is currently the commonest form. The latter, which I will call “high” (H), is currently less common and sociolectally marked due to its archaic inflection, still often associated with purist leanings (cf. Babiniotis 1982).

Counting only instances of the word for ‘flight’ in the relevant context, I found 18 instances of *πτήσεως* and 8 of *πτήσης*. Thus, the H form is clearly prevalent occurring over twice as often. However, this is counting only terminal announcements. The H form is more frequent in terminals, while the L form is almost exclusively used in in-flight announcements. On the other hand, counting only obligatory contexts we have 8 instances of *πτήση* and 3 of *πτήσεως*. Moreover, counting occurrences of the two forms in all contexts (i.e., obligatory and optional occurrences), we have 16 instances of *πτήσης* and 21 instances of *πτήσεως*. In other words, *πτήσης* is the preferred form in contexts such as *άφιξη/αναχώρηση/διάρκεια/αναγγελία + πτήση<sub>Gen.</sub>* where the genitive is obligatory.

The picture is undoubtedly complex, but we could gain some insight by considering how these alternatives<sup>13</sup> correlate with register choice. I will maintain that opting for the H genitive form is a concession to high register. In post-diglossic Greece, despite increasing standardization of the demotic and a cooler outlook on the erstwhile “language question”, H *πτήσεως* still correlates significantly with high register. Moreover, L genitive forms, being stylistically unmarked, may be used in high registers but not unequivocally. Thus, use of L *πτήσης* does not correlate with low register. So, where does this leave us? My suggestion is twofold: a) first, the diglossic heritage seems to urge some speakers to use H forms in high

registers, a (weak) reflex of the division of labor of the two varieties; b) second, as demotic Greek is being progressively standardized, people feel safe to use L yet standard forms in official contexts. Of course, the situation I describe is still close to “schizoglossia” on the surface, but there is a crucial difference: before 1976, L genitive forms in public announcements would have raised many an eyebrow, whereas now they do not. Indeed, I have often overheard passengers voicing ironic remarks upon hearing *πτήσεως* and *όπως* + Vs.

To conclude, I need to address the different distribution of H forms in terminal vs. in-flight announcements. A plausible explanation lies in the relative formality of the two settings (cf. also section 3.3). Terminal announcements are higher on the formality scale and closer to the transactional pole of the transactional-interactive continuum: the targeted audience is typically a small subset of the recipients of the message. In in-flight announcements, by contrast, all passengers are typically addressed as members of the immediately targeted audience. Thus, in the latter, the language used is often more conversational for passengers are greeted and treated as guests (cf. Marmaridou 1987). In in-flight announcements there is physical proximity creating a sense of “in-groupness”: passengers and crew are on the same plane, anything that happens to the traveler will also happen to the crew, and they, moreover, engage in service encounters. These translate into increased solidarity motivating positive politeness (Sifianou 1992).

### 3.3. Όπως-complementation

As we see in examples (1) and (7)-(10), this is variation on the lexical level, as it involves choice of one complementizer instead of another without further syntactic consequences for the construction.

- 7) Παρακαλούνται οι επιβάτες που ταξιδεύουν για Λήμνο και Θεσσαλονίκη με Ολυμπιακή αεροπορία, αριθμός πτήσεως 983, όπως περάσουν στον έλεγχο χειραποσκευών. (MJT, 22/04/02)
- 8) Προσοχή παρακαλώ. Επιβάτες που ταξιδεύουν με Aegean Cronus, πτήση 717 για Θεσσαλονίκη, παρακαλούνται όπως περάσουν από τον έλεγχο χειραποσκευών. (MJT, 15/4/02)
- 9) Προσοχή παρακαλώ. Αναχώρηση Aegean Cronus πτήση 717 για Θεσσαλονίκη. Παρακαλούνται οι επιβάτες με αριθμό [θέσης] από 1 ως δέκα να περάσουν από τον έλεγχο εισητηρίων στην έξοδο 4. (MJT, 15/4/02)
- 10) Προσοχή παρακαλώ. Η κυρία Ασκητίδη παρακαλείται να επικοινωνήσει με το counter<sup>14</sup> των Κυπριακών Αερογραμμών. Η κυρία Ασκητίδου παρακαλώ. (SKG, 24/4/02)

Unlike with the competing genitive forms, here we have a much clearer distinction, so that *όπως* can be said to be a remnant of *katharevousa* (H) in current standard Greek, a frozen form and stilted H at that (cf. Alexiou 2001, Kazazis 1982, Kostoula-Makraki 2001, Archakis & Kondyli 2002). Nevertheless, *να* is standard, rather than markedly L, and its use is now generalized

across contexts and registers. Thus, in idiomatic Modern Greek, *ὅπως*-complementation is not productive except in the language of church leaders. However, such constructions appear as complements to the verb *παρακαλώ* ‘to kindly request’ in the data with a frequency that is far from negligible. Indeed, I dare say that many young speakers are acquainted with it only in the context of announcements. Branding *ὅπως* a frozen form, however, is not accounting for its current use in announcements. *Ὀπως*-complementation is a vestige of old standardization—it has enjoyed permanence in time—and is thus prestigious. Whereas *να*-complementation is now more or less standardized, its use is not yet homogenized and, therefore, it is not (yet) prestigious.

Given the post-diglossic continuum that is Greek, one can provide an interpretation drawing on linguistic attitudes towards H and L forms, linguistic insecurity, and perceptions of appropriateness across registers in light of a still developing standard Greek—and this is a handful, to be sure. First, it is safe to assume that announcers are aiming for linguistic choices consonant with high registers, given the inherently formal setting. Second, they are aware of the old division of labor between H and L and of the prestige accorded to each while, at the same time, having their own attitudes. Third, like most heirs of a diglossic heritage, they are insecure, “schizoglossic” speakers. Last, given that standard demotic Greek is now acceptable, indeed expected, in most contexts, some announcers feel it is proper to use *να* (cf. ex. 9, 10), while others (or the very same?) use *ὅπως* (cf. ex. 1, 7, 8) in order to unequivocally mark the register as high—probably thinking it is better to be “safe” and thus being branded linguistically insecure. Thus, there are two opposing forces at work yet only one larger issue: the abolition of *katharevousa*<sup>15</sup> and the recognition of *dimotiki* may have paved the way for a standard Greek, but no such was magically created overnight. Granted, the language is progressively being standardized. Yet, public speakers, in particular, have every reason to feel like casualties in this process; especially since the *norm* seems to diverge from the *standard* when it comes to learned elements (Iordanidou, 1999: 835-836, 840). This is the very locus of linguistic insecurity.

I have not sought to relate linguistic choices with specific groups. However, after examining the data, I realized there is a pattern. As for terminal announcements, the ones recorded in Mytilene feature many more H forms (notably *ὅπως*-complementation) than the ones recorded in Thessaloniki. This could be attributed to a correlation of linguistic choices and urban vs. non-urban values as well as attitudes. I have nothing to say on values, for this would entail a different line of research; but as for attitudes, the fact that Thessaloniki has connected its name with the demotacist movement may not be irrelevant. Kazazis (1992: 68) speculates on the possibility that rural speakers are more conservative, “it may have taken them longer to adopt the old, *katharevousa*-derived norm, but once they adopted it, they may be slow in replacing it with the new norm.” If this is so, then we may have an explanation for the choices at Mytilene airport.

Ending this section, I will draw your attention to my favorite example, (10), in which one can almost hear an agonizing announcer calling *κυρία Ασκητίδη* ‘M(r)s. Skitidis’, using a L genitive form, only to change her mind seconds later and switch to *Ασκητίδου*, the H form, as she falters on the use of *counter*—an unassimilated loan from English, which is part of her active

vocabulary as a Greek travel industry employee<sup>16</sup> but has still not superseded the commoner assimilated French loan *guichet*; she stops short at the first syllable and re-begins, apparently at a loss for a more suitable term.

#### 4. Concluding remarks

I have examined some peculiarities of the language of airline announcements, prompted by a variation that I deemed worth investigating in a circumscribed context where formulaic language is expected. I have shown that whereas absence of the definite article may be explained by the demand for brevity and influence from English, inflectional variation in the genitive and *όπως*- vs. *να*-complementation pertain to post-diglossic effects.

Moreover, I have pointed out that there is differential formality between terminal and in-flight announcements; a difference which goes some way towards accounting for the motivation behind some choices. Consider, however, examples (11) – (14).

- 11) Πλήρωμα καμπίνας, θέσεις γι απογείωση παρακαλώ. (On board OA 983, MJT-SKG, 22/4/02)
- 12) Σας πληροφορούμε ότι για λόγους ασφάλειας [πρέπει] να κλείσετε το κινητό σας [...]. (On board OA 983, MJT-SKG, 22/4/02)
- 13) Σας πληροφορούμε ότι για λόγους ασφάλειας επιβάλλεται η απενεργοποίηση των κινητών τηλεφώνων μέσα στο αεροπλάνο. (On board OA 576, ATH-MJT, 28/6/02)
- 14) Η Ολυμπιακή Αεροπορία σας γνωρίζει άφιξη της πτήσης [...] από Αθήνα στις 10:05. (MJT, 07/03/03)

Example (11) is an informal in-flight announcement meant for the crew and thus in stark contrast to terminal announcement (14). These examples are valuable in illustrating the two poles of the formality continuum correlating with low and high register, respectively. Yet, (12) and (13), produced on board and addressed to passengers, are also in stark contrast. While their semantic content is identical, (12) is in low register and (13) in high as manifested by lexical and syntactic choices, despite some interpenetration (e.g., *ασφάλειας*). I propose that use of one or the other by the flight attendant has to do with: a) construal of the setting regarding its relative position on the formality continuum and b) choice of appropriate register for this socially positioned activity. The latter is crucially dependent on language attitudes (often reflected as linguistic insecurity, given that Greek is a post-diglossic continuum) and language attitudes are the building blocks of linguistic ideology (cf. Tsitsipis, 2001; Arapoglou, 1996; Sella-Mazi, 2001: 87).

If one should risk a prediction at all, this is that today's so-called L or "lower" forms will eventually prevail in airline announcements (as in most other areas). Moreover, as the demotic is being progressively standardized, it will be increasingly possible to mark register choice without resorting to (rather odd, if not plain funny<sup>17</sup>) attempts at reviving *όπως*-complementation, but by making choices from *within* an elaborated standardized demotic (cf. Arapoglou, 1996: 156). However, standardization, which presupposes codification, is

complicated in Greek, again because of its diglossic past (Iordanidou, 1996: 140 and 1999). Incidentally, if this happens, Ferguson's predictions on Greek diglossia will have been taken a step further: not only will diglossia have been essentially "resolved", but post-diglossic effects will have been minimized as well. Yet, for the time being, this is pushing developments far ahead.

## Notes

---

<sup>1</sup> I would like to thank Mary Sifianou and Eleni Antonopoulou for carefully perusing earlier drafts of this paper and making insightful comments. Thanks also go to Athena-Apostolou Panara and Amalia Mozer. However, the usual disclaimer holds: responsibility for all remaining shortcomings rests entirely with me. I would like to dedicate this paper, humbly, to the memory of my teacher and mentor Kostas Kazazis (1934-2002) who gave me the *grande tour* of the vagaries of Greek diglossia.

<sup>2</sup> I will be using *register* as "a variety of language defined according to its use in social situations, e.g., a register of scientific, religious, formal English" (Crystal 1985); in other words, as a *functional variety*. Cf. also Kazazis (1992: 68) and Archakis & Kondyli (2002: 91).

<sup>3</sup> See Yannoulopoulou (2001) for a brief discussion of post-diglossic Greek.

<sup>4</sup> Paradoxically, linguistic prestige or *distinction* goes through homogeneity.

<sup>5</sup> Georgakopoulou & Spanaki (2001: 10 & passim) use *register variation* and *diglossia* interchangeably. However, it would be uncharitable to attribute conflation of the two notions to these authors, as they specifically mention that "[i]n the case of Greek, the two phenomena are linked" (ibid.: 13).

<sup>6</sup> Cf. Ferguson (1971) and Schiffman (1997: 206-208) for distinctive characteristics of "narrow" diglossia in general, and Alexiou (2001: 89-92) for Greek.

<sup>7</sup> See Canakis (forthcoming). If anything, maritime travel announcements are more conservative as the following example demonstrates: *Συνεχιζομένης της κακοκαιρίας, το λιμεναρχείο Μυτιλήνης απαγορεύει τον απόπλου* (On board F/B *Mytilene*, 20/12/2002).

<sup>8</sup> It is less common in air travel, while it practically monopolizes complementizer role in maritime announcements cf. Canakis (forthcoming).

<sup>9</sup> With the exception of (5), included here for comparison, as the structure makes the presence of *της* necessary before *Αυστριακής Αεροπορίας*. Incidentally, this is the only pre-recorded announcement in the data.

<sup>10</sup> With (5) being a very close match to the English equivalent.

<sup>11</sup> The presence of the definite article can be considered a shibboleth of high register, a linguistic reflex of formality.

<sup>12</sup> Consider also *στις 1:00* in (6) instead of *στη 1:00*. The former is often deemed an error and, if anything, sociolectally low. This contrasts with *Η πτήσεως*.

<sup>13</sup> For obvious reasons, I do not consider them free variants; not at this stage in the development of the language.

<sup>14</sup> The announcer stopped short after the first syllable and repeated—as if monitoring herself and momentarily questioning the appropriateness of the unassimilated English loan.

<sup>15</sup> Philippaki-Warburton (1999: 95) notes that one unexpected consequence of the abolition of *katharevousa* is the concomitant abolition of the ideological and emotional halo that characterized *dhimotiki*. I consider this *in se* a major development informing language attitudes in Greece after 1976 (for more on attitudes cf. Antonopoulou & Sifianou, 2003). Kazazis (1982) and Babinotis (1982) also seem to be pointing to the same direction. See, however, Frangoudaki (1996) and Christidis (1995) on the ideologically informed linguistic mythologies on Greek after 1976 and the representation of Greece as a linguistic dystopia. Last, see Sella-Mazi (2001: 84-93 & esp. 87) for a brief review of Greek diglossia and its ideologically charged nature.

<sup>16</sup> cf. Canakis (forthcoming).

---

<sup>17</sup> *Funny*, in the sense of awkward, but ending up *funny*, in the sense of ludicrous. For an account of how the erstwhile diglossic modes can be manipulated for humorous effect, see Canakis (1994).

## References

- Alexiou, Margaret. 2001 [1982]. "Diglossia in Greece." *A Reader in Greek Sociolinguistics: Studies in Modern Greek Language, Culture and Communication*, ed. by Alexandra Georgakopoulou & Marianna Spanaki, 89-118. Oxford: Peter Lang.
- Αντωνοπούλου, Ελένη & Μαρία Σηφτιανού. 2003. «Γλωσσική καλλιέργεια στην Ελλάδα.» *Perspectives on Language and Literature: Essays in Honour of M. B. Raizis*, ed. by William R. Schultz, 1-29. Athens: National and Kapodistrian University of Athens.
- Αραποπούλου, Μαρία. 1996. ««Δημοτική», «καθαρεύουσα» και οι στάσεις των νέων.» «*Ισχυρές*» και «*Ασθενείς*» γλώσσες στην Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση: Όψεις του γλωσσικού ηγεμονισμού. *Πρακτικά ημερίδας, Θεσσαλονίκη, 25 Απριλίου 1996*, 149-159. Θεσσαλονίκη: Κέντρο Ελληνικής Γλώσσας.
- Αρχάκης, Αργύρης & Μαριάννα Κονδύλη. 2002. *Εισαγωγή σε ζητήματα κοινωνιογλωσσολογίας*. Αθήνα: Νήσος.
- Γιαννουλοπούλου, Γιαννούλα. 2001. «Η νέα ελληνική μετά τη διγλωσσία.» *Εγκυκλοπαιδικός οδηγός για τη γλώσσα*, ed. by Αναστάσιος-Φοίβος Χριστιδης με Μαρία Θεοδωροπούλου, 160-164. Θεσσαλονίκη: Κέντρο Ελληνικής Γλώσσας.
- Canakis, Costas (forthcoming) "Welcome to Mytilene's Airport: Investigating New English in the Greek Public Transport Context." *Proceedings of the Symposium on New Englishes*. Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, 2000.
- Canakis, Costas. 1994. "Diglossia as an Agent of Humor in the Writings of Helena Akrita." *Journal of Modern Greek Studies* 12. 221-237.
- Crystal, David. 1985. *A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics*. Second edition. Oxford: Basil Blackwell & Andre Deutsch.
- Ferguson, Charles. A. 1971 [1959]. "Diglossia." *Language Structure and Language Use: Essays by Charles A. Ferguson*, ed. by Anwar S. Dil, 1-26. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Φιλιππάκη-Warburton, Ειρήνη. 1999. «Η μεταρρύθμιση του 1976: Μια κοινωνική, γλωσσική και γλωσσολογική απελευθέρωση.» *Συνέδριο για την ελληνική γλώσσα 1976-1996: Είκοσι χρόνια από την καθιέρωση της Νεοελληνικής (Δημοτικής) ως επίσημης γλώσσας*. *Πρακτικά συνεδρίου*, 93-99. Αθήνα: Τσιβεριώτης.
- Φραγκουδάκη, Άννα. 1996. «Καθαρεύουσα-δημοτική: Τα ιδεολογικά αίτια της ιστορικής διαμάχης για τη γλώσσα.» *Η Ελληνική γλώσσα*, 29-36. Αθήνα: Υπουργείο Εθνικής Παιδείας και Θρησκευμάτων.
- Georgakopoulou, Alexandra & Marianna Spanaki, (eds.). 2001. *A Reader in Greek Sociolinguistics: Studies in Modern Greek Language, Culture and Communication*. Oxford: Peter Lang.
- Ιορδανίδου, Άννα. 1999. «Ζητήματα τυποποίησης της σύγχρονης νεοελληνικής.» «*Ισχυρές*» και «*Ασθενείς*» γλώσσες στην Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση: Όψεις του γλωσσικού ηγεμονισμού. *Πρακτικά Διεθνούς Συνεδρίου, Τόμος Β΄*, ed. by Αναστάσιος-Φοίβος Χριστιδης, 835-844. Θεσσαλονίκη:

---

Κέντρο Ελληνικής Γλώσσας.

- Ιορδανίδου, Άννα. 1996. «Standard κοινή νεοελληνική: απόπειρα καθορισμού.» «*Ισχυρές*» και «*Ασθενείς*» γλώσσες στην Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση: Όψεις του γλωσσικού ηγεμονισμού. Πρακτικά ημερίδας, 139-147. Θεσσαλονίκη: Κέντρο Ελληνικής Γλώσσας.
- Kazazis, Kostas. 1992. "Sunday Greek Revisited." *Journal of Modern Greek Studies* 10. 57-69.
- Kazazis, Kostas. 1982. "Partial Linguistic Autobiography of a Schizoglossic Linguist." *Glossologia* 1. 109-117.
- Κωστούλα-Μακράκη, Νέλλη. 2001. *Γλώσσα και κοινωνία: Βασικές έννοιες*. Αθήνα: Μεταίχιμο.
- Μακρή-Τσιλιπάκου, Μαριάνθη. 2002. «Οι τρέχουσες αλλαγές στην κοινή νεοελληνική.» *Selected Papers on Theoretical and Applied Linguistics from the 14<sup>th</sup> International Symposium*, 198-222. Thessaloniki: School of English, Aristotle University of Thessaloniki.
- Marmaridou, A. Sophia A. 1987. "Semantic and Pragmatic Parameters of Meaning: On the Interface Between Contrastive Text Analysis and the Production of Translated Texts." *Journal of Pragmatics* 11. 721-36.
- Μπαμπινιώτης, Γεώργιος. 1982. ««Κατάσταση» εναντίον «καταστάσεως»: Δομική ανάλυση των τύπων γενικής ενικού των θηλυκών ουσιαστικών σε -i\*.» *Glossologia* 1. 119-127.
- Schiffman, Harold. 1997. "Diglossia as a Sociolinguistic Situation." *The Handbook of Sociolinguistics*, ed. by Florian Coulmas, 205-216. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Σελλά-Μάζη, Ελένη. 2001. *Διγλωσσία και κοινωνία: Η κοινωνιογλωσσολογική πλευρά της διγλωσσίας. Η ελληνική πραγματικότητα*. Αθήνα: Προσκήνιο.
- Sifianou, Maria. 1992. *Politeness Phenomena in England and Greece: A Cross-Cultural Perspective*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Τσιτσιπής, Λουκάς. 2001. «Στάσεις απέναντι στη γλώσσα.» *Εγκυκλοπαιδικός οδηγός για τη γλώσσα*, ed. by Αναστάσιος-Φοίβος Χριστίδης με Μαρία Θεοδωροπούλου, 78-80. Θεσσαλονίκη: Κέντρο Ελληνικής Γλώσσας.
- Χριστίδης, Αναστάσιος-Φοίβος. 1995. «Γλωσσικές μυθολογίες: Η περίπτωση της ελληνικής.» *Σύγχρονα Θέματα* 54. 21-26.

This document was created with Win2PDF available at <http://www.daneprairie.com>.  
The unregistered version of Win2PDF is for evaluation or non-commercial use only.