

wanna come to airport? no need la!! Thanks!!!  
just want to say: pls give me 'hand letter' as u come back  
!!! what's that? I've never heard about such a thing worrrrr

復活おめでと〜♪良かつ

# The Multilingual Internet

LANGUAGE, CULTURE, AND COMMUNICATION ONLINE

ecou t no woman no cry ca te rap l ril kiss maê

baha..... 喂, 諗唔諗 到 [啲] Fill in 比 Reali

السلام عليكم ورحمة الله وبر

Penso que não vivemos num estado totalita

叫我唔好[係]佢[地]面前提起佢,驚佢[地]唔會接受佢[既]建議

a den katalaveno Na ton kleisoume sto PSIH

EDITED BY

Brenda Danet  
Susan C. Herring

be ich jetzt was gewonnen? 8-) und was ist es?

e all inclusive mit dem webmaster fidchi-inseln :-)) :-)) :-))

o Dalia, 7amdellah 3ala el-salama ya Gameel. we

couk 3ala el-shahada el-kebeera.. Keep in touch

# The Multilingual Internet

*This page intentionally left blank*

# The Multilingual Internet

Language, Culture, and Communication Online

Edited by Brenda Danet and Susan C. Herring

**OXFORD**  
UNIVERSITY PRESS



Oxford University Press, Inc., publishes works that further  
Oxford University's objective of excellence  
in research, scholarship, and education.

Oxford New York

Auckland Cape Town Dar es Salaam Hong Kong Karachi

Kuala Lumpur Madrid Melbourne Mexico City Nairobi

New Delhi Shanghai Taipei Toronto

With offices in

Argentina Austria Brazil Chile Czech Republic France Greece

Guatemala Hungary Italy Japan Poland Portugal Singapore

South Korea Switzerland Thailand Turkey Ukraine Vietnam

Copyright © 2007 by Oxford University Press, Inc.

Published by Oxford University Press, Inc.

198 Madison Avenue, New York, New York 10016

www.oup.com

Oxford is a registered trademark of Oxford University Press

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced,  
stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means,  
electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise,  
without the prior permission of Oxford University Press.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

The multilingual internet: language, culture, and communication  
online / edited by Brenda Danet and Susan C. Herring.

p. cm.

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 978-0-19-530479-4; 978-0-19-530480-0 (pbk.)

1. Communication—Data processing 2. Internet.

3. Multilingualism—Data processing

4. Written communication—Data processing

5. Sociolinguistics—Data processing

6. Language and culture—Data processing

I. Danet, Brenda, 1937- II. Herring, Susan C.

P96.D36M85 2007

302.20285—dc22 2006043764

9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

Printed in the United States of America

on acid-free paper

We dedicate this collection to Jacques Anis (January 8, 1953-December 16, 2005), whose research on computer-mediated communication in French was perhaps the first large, coherent body of work to apply linguistic methods of analysis to online communication in a language other than English.

*This page intentionally left blank*

# Preface

This book marks the culmination of the second stage of a two-stage project initiated in 2002. In that year, we co-edited a special issue of the *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication* about multilingualism on the Internet (published in 2003). Our call for papers, distributed online, yielded far more proposals than we had expected, and many of high caliber. Because of this evident interest in online multilingualism, and knowing that we could include only a limited number of articles in the special journal issue, we conceived the idea of an extended volume.

This book reproduces the eight articles originally published online, some in slightly abridged or modified form. These studies were authored by David Palfreyman and Muhamed Al Khalil, Yukiko Nishimura, Hsi-Yao Su, Dimitris Koutsougiannis and Bessie Mitsikopoulou, Salvador Climent and colleagues, Mercedes Durham, Sandi de Oliveira, and Siriporn Panyametheekul and Susan Herring.

Most of the other chapters were commissioned by us in response to proposals submitted by authors, with a few exceptions. Two pioneering attempts to investigate aspects of multilingualism online that had previously been published elsewhere are reprinted here, with minor modifications—these are the chapters by Mark Warschauer and colleagues about online communication in Egypt and by Ann-Sofie Axelsson and her collaborators on attempts to switch languages in a graphical chat environment. We invited several other scholars to submit articles based on their expertise in relevant areas. Ruth Wodak agreed to prepare a chapter about her work on multilingualism in Europe and in the European Union; she was joined by Scott Wright, whose doctoral dissertation at Lancaster University proved relevant. Jannis Androutsopoulos contributed a study of language choice and code switching



online in a German-speaking context. The chapter by the late Jacques Anis on deviant spelling in French SMS (short message service) messages makes accessible to English-speaking readers the work of an established researcher in the French-speaking world. We also commissioned a chapter from cultural anthropologists Hirofumi Katsuno and Christine Yano on *kaomoji*—“face marks” (the Japanese equivalent of “smiley” icons)—in Japanese online communication. Finally, while gathering material for a review of the literature on multilingual computer-mediated communication (CMC), we encountered a paper by Carmen Lee, now a doctoral student at Lancaster University, on CMC in Hong Kong based on her master’s thesis and invited her to rework her analysis for this book.

In our introductory chapter, we aimed to survey linguistic studies of Internet communication in languages other than English and in non-English-dominant contexts. In the past few years, the amount of available research on the topic has expanded considerably, and we discovered more work than we previously thought existed. As a result, the introduction provides only an overview, rather than exhaustive coverage of the body of research currently available.

This book was made possible by the medium that is fundamental to its subject matter—the Internet, especially email. While we had met at several conferences in the past, we had worked together only once before (to co-organize a panel at the 1993 International Pragmatics Conference in Kobe, Japan), and that collaboration took place entirely via email. The present book was also produced almost exclusively via email, because we live nearly 1,000 miles apart, including all correspondence between us as co-editors and correspondence with prospective and actual authors around the globe and with outside reviewers. The story of how email facilitates academic collaboration is a fascinating topic in its own right, one that deserves another book.

We thank our authors for their patience and cooperation as we asked for yet further revision of their drafts. We also thank the external reviewers of chapter drafts and of the book proposal, who provided important feedback and suggestions. Deborah Anderson, head of the Script Encoding Initiative in the Department of Linguistics at the University of California-Berkeley, made useful comments on a draft of the section in our introduction on writing systems and the Internet. John Paolillo read and commented on a draft of the entire introduction. Finally, we extend our thanks to Peter Ohlin, our editor at Oxford University Press, for his enthusiastic support of this project.

# Contents

Contributors	xiii
1 Introduction: Welcome to the Multilingual Internet <i>Brenda Danet and Susan C. Herring</i>	3
Part I Writing Systems and the Internet	
2 “A Funky Language for Teenzz to Use”: Representing Gulf Arabic in Instant Messaging <i>David Palfreyman and Mubamed Al Khalil</i>	43
3 The Multilingual and Multiorthographic Taiwan-Based Internet: Creative Uses of Writing Systems on College-Affiliated BBSs <i>Hsi-Yao Su</i>	64
4 Neography: Unconventional Spelling in French SMS Text Messages <i>Jacques Anis</i>	87
5 “It’s All Greeklsh to Me!” Linguistic and Sociocultural Perspectives on Roman-Alphabeted Greek in Asynchronous Computer-Mediated Communication <i>Theodora Tseliga</i>	116

6	Greeklish and Greekness: Trends and Discourses of “Glocalness”	142
	<i>Dimitris Koutsogiannis and Bessie Mitsikopoulou</i>	
Part II Linguistic and Discourse Features of Computer-Mediated Communication		
7	Linguistic Innovations and Interactional Features in Japanese BBS Communication	163
	<i>Yukiko Nishimura</i>	
8	Linguistic Features of Email and ICQ Instant Messaging in Hong Kong	184
	<i>Carmen K. M. Lee</i>	
9	Enhancing the Status of Catalan versus Spanish in Online Academic Forums: Obstacles to Machine Translation	209
	<i>Salvador Climent, Joaquim Moré, Antoni Oliver, Míriam Salvatierra, Imma Sànchez, and Mariona Taulé</i>	
Part III Gender and Culture		
10	Gender and Turn Allocation in a Thai Chat Room	233
	<i>Siriporn Panyametheekul and Susan C. Herring</i>	
11	Breaking Conversational Norms on a Portuguese Users’ Network: Men as Adjudicators of Politeness?	256
	<i>Sandi Michele de Oliveira</i>	
12	<i>Kaomoji</i> and Expressivity in a Japanese Housewives’ Chat Room	278
	<i>Hirofumi Katsuno and Christine Yano</i>	
Part IV Language Choice and Code Switching		
13	Language Choice Online: Globalization and Identity in Egypt	303
	<i>Mark Warschauer, Ghada R. El Said, and Ayman Zobry</i>	
14	Language Choice on a Swiss Mailing List	319
	<i>Mercedes Durham</i>	
15	Language Choice and Code Switching in German-Based Diasporic Web Forums	340
	<i>Jannis Androutsopoulos</i>	
16	Anyone Speak Swedish? Tolerance for Language Shifting in Graphical Multiuser Virtual Environments	362
	<i>Ann-Sofie Axelsson, Åsa Abelin, and Ralph Schroeder</i>	

## Part V Broader Perspectives: Language Diversity

17 The European Union in Cyberspace: Democratic Participation via Online Multilingual Discussion Boards	385
<i>Ruth Wodak and Scott Wright</i>	
18 How Much Multilingualism? Language Diversity on the Internet	408
<i>John C. Paolillo</i>	
Index	431

# 6 Greeklish and Greekness

## *Trends and Discourses of “Glocalness”*

The turn from page to screen has positioned the computer and the Internet at the center of the new postmodern communication ecosystem and has brought changes to the communication landscape and to language- and communication-related fields of study. Several studies have already attempted to outline the new communicative order and to analyze its consequences (Crystal, 2001; Herring, 2001). However, although much discussion has focused on computer-mediated discourse (CMD) and globalization, most theoretical analyses and empirical investigation have exclusively focused on the English language. Except for a “phobic” approach that views the Internet as a threat to less widely spoken languages (Crystal, 2001, pp. 1–2), there has been little research on social attitudes towards CMD, on specific discursive practices of CMD, or on the effects of the Internet on other languages.

Paolillo (1996) found that the use of South Asian languages online is rather restricted among native speakers. He notes, however, that the situation may change due to technological advances and the change from colonial heritage within the home culture. Yoon (2001) suggests that the symbolic power of technology in combination with the commercialization of the mass media leads to an uncritical acceptance of the dominance of English online. Hawisher and Selfe (2000) challenge the view of the Web as a culturally neutral literacy environment, in which, liberated from geographical, linguistic, cultural, and technical constraints, people enjoy the advantages of unimpeded contact and communication. They propose an alternative version of the global village narrative and note the emergence of a postmodern identity whose literacy practices are characterized by dynamic hybridity.

Acknowledging that there has been little attention to culture and communication in relation to computer-mediated communication (CMC), Ess and Sudweeks (2003) show that cultural values and communication preferences have played a significant role in the design and implementation of CMC. Using the example of Arab-speaking countries, they argue:

CMC technologies operate less as the vehicles for intractable homogenization and more as catalysts for significant processes for hybridization, as individuals are able to consciously choose for themselves what elements of “the west” and their own local cultural identities and traditions they wish to hold to.... The powers of globalization and new technologies are not absolute; rather, they can be refracted and diffused through the specific values and preferences of diverse individuals and local cultures. (p. 3)

Warschauer, Said, and Zohry (2002) examined the interaction of the English and Arabic languages in online practices and found that, parallel to the English language, a romanized version of colloquial Egyptian Arabic is used extensively in informal email messages and online chats. They analyzed this tendency as an attempt by users to participate in the global, taking into account their local identity. A similar explanation is offered for the extensive use of Singlish (the colloquial dialect of English spoken in Singapore) in literacy practices on the Internet, despite systematic efforts by education policy makers and government officials to promote use of a standard variety of English (Warschauer, 2002).

The phenomenal growth of the Internet has also raised concerns regarding the future of local identities in some Asian countries. Arguing that the globalizing trend of the Internet is tempered by local sensitivities and concerns, Hongladarom (2000) suggests that local cultures are finding ways to cope with the impact of the Internet and are absorbing it without losing their identity. Hongladarom analyzed a Thai cybercommunity, showing that its participants do not wish to shut themselves off completely from the world, yet they do not want to become “mere blank faces in the globalized world.”

Explanations for cross-cultural and cross-linguistic literacy practices on the Internet and social attitudes toward CMD practices often reference a contradiction noted in postindustrial societies between global networks and local identities, leading to the construction of hybrid postmodern identities. The concept of “glocal” has recently been employed as a refinement of the concept of “global” and a more descriptive term for what is happening today. It assumes a view of global culture not as a “unified” or a “socializing” institution into which local cultures integrate, but as a contradictory phenomenon, entailing a dialectical relationship between the global and the local. To describe this process, Robertson (1995) coined the term “glocalization,” “the universalization of the particular and the particularization of the universal.” We view glocalization as a dynamic negotiation between the global and the local, with the local appropriating elements of the global that it finds useful, at the same time employing strategies to retain its identity.

Recent research has also paid little attention to electronic literacy environments as “cultural maps” that represent the culture and the ideology of their origins (Selfe & Selfe, 1994). It is well known, for example, that the choice of ASCII (American Standard Code for Information Interchange) as the character set for the first personal computers and online communication created less serious problems for languages whose writing system is based on the Roman alphabet, such as German, French, and English, but greater problems for non-Roman-based languages, such as Greek and Chinese (Yates, 1996).<sup>1</sup> This long-standing difficulty goes beyond technical constraints and is related to ideological factors having to do with the use of English on the Internet (Koutsogiannis, 2004).

An example of a discursive phenomenon that developed in a non-Latin-based language is the use of “Greeklish” among Greeks in CMC contexts. Despite advances to overcome the technical constraints of the ASCII code, and despite the fact that Unicode has been designed to support the Greek writing system, problems persist with the use of the Greek alphabet in online communication. To avoid this problem, Greek Internet users began to make extensive use of the Roman alphabet in their writing of Greek, transliterating Greek with Roman characters, producing what is commonly known as “Greeklish” (Greek + English). Greeklish is characterized by spelling variation in which Greek alphabet characters may be transliterated with one or more Roman equivalents. It is used quite extensively in emails and chat groups and tends to become a script register among young people. Although it is used more in social than professional communication, Greeklish is also found in formal electronic communication (e.g., in government departments and universities), where both writing systems—Greek and Greeklish—are often employed to avoid communication problems due to technical constraints (e.g., varied technological platforms, or international communication in Greek).

Greeklish has become the focus of linguistic and sociolinguistic research (Georgakopoulou, 1997; Androutsopoulos, 2000; Tseliga, Chapter 5 this volume). However, Greeklish is not merely a new variety of writing but a wider sociocultural and ideological phenomenon that causes heated debates in the media and divides intellectuals, academics, and the public. This is understandable considering that writing is not simply a means of recording the spoken word but is also a cultural symbol, one that, in the case of Greece, has been in use since ancient times.

The issue of language has long been a minefield of confrontations and conflict in Greek social and political life. As we argue further below, the duration and intensity of this conflict are not due to issues of language as such, but to ideological, social, and political questions at stake in critical periods of Greek history. Moreover, although in the past the debate was primarily at the level of language planning, in recent years discussions concerning the Greek language have focused on the effects of Greece joining the European Union and on the effects of extensive use of English. Since the end of the last century, like a number of other countries on the (European) periphery, Greece has been in a critical transitional stage regarding full membership

in the European Union and the more general economic and sociopolitical changes that globalization entails. This new reality means new challenges and an overall reexamination of what has hitherto been regarded as given. We argue that, just as issues of the country's increasingly global orientation have found expression in language debates in critical historical periods in the past, the same process can also be traced in today's debate about Greeklish.

## The Greek Language and Alphabet as Ideological Signs

### The Language Issue

Positioning Greeklish within its wider sociocultural context entails an understanding of age-old confrontations about the Greek language, known as the “language issue”—confrontations with broader ideological, social, and political content (Christidis, 1999). The history of these confrontations provides the context for our discussion of Greeklish. It is our contention that attitudes and positions concerning Greeklish today have the same origin as positions in past debates concerning the Greek language.

Already in the first century B.C., a linguistic “schism” was evident between spoken and written Greek. The written language, used by the intellectuals of the age, ignored the spoken language, regarding it as the result of a process of corruption and thus inferior to its ancestor, and sought to imitate classic Attic language. This continued in the following centuries and during the Byzantine period.

In modern times, conflict over language made its appearance for the first time in the early nineteenth century, within the context of efforts of intellectuals to discover an appropriate vehicle for the dissemination of ideas of the Enlightenment (Delveroudi, 2000) and to establish a national language for the modern Greek state. It was then that *Katharevousa* was adopted as the official language.<sup>2</sup> The choice was not random but expressed specific ideological and political tendencies (Fragoudaki, 2001) that aimed to prune out foreign influences and to link modern to ancient Greek. This option was also a declaration of Greece's European orientation, given the high regard for the ancient Greek heritage in Europe. This resulted in diglossia (Ferguson, 1972), a linguistic split between *Katharevousa*, which was closer to ancient Greek and was used in administration and education, and the everyday language spoken by the majority of the population, *Demotic* Greek.

After 1870, when an attempt at broader modernization of the Greek state began (Terzis, 1998), diglossia began to fuel acute confrontations between the supporters of the two differing approaches to the country's official language: supporters of *Katharevousa* versus those of *Demotic* Greek. With the passage of time, these two poles came to be the expression not simply of two different approaches, but of two different worlds upholding entirely different views on education and the general orientation of the country (Stavridi-Patrikiou, 1999). Although the debate officially ended in 1976 in favor of the spoken



language, fierce confrontations over issues of language—conflicts that are in essence about the broader orientation of education and of the country—continue today, to such an extent that some people talk about the creation of a “new language issue” (Fragoudaki, 2001).

## The Greek Alphabet

It is estimated that the alphabet as a system of writing was first used by the Greeks in the eighth century B.C.<sup>3</sup> and was an adaptation of the Phoenician system of writing (Woodard, 1997). In spite of the changes that took place in the meantime in the pronunciation of Greek, the alphabet had already acquired its own authority, since it was in this that ancient Greek thought had been set down and remained to a significant degree unchanged down to the ninth century A.D. (Byzantium). Then, together with the introduction of lowercase script, diacritics,<sup>4</sup> which had already been used since the second century B.C. by the grammarians of Alexandria, came to be employed more extensively.

The accent system of Greek was simplified in 1982, retaining only one accent and abolishing the two breathings (see note 4). This reform also provoked resistance and has not been adopted universally even today (Hatzisavvidis, 1986). Generally, the introduction of the single-accent system was seen as a transitional stage that could lead to abandonment of the Greek alphabet, and for this reason was regarded by many as an “antinational” act.

A symbolically and ideologically charged attitude toward the alphabet is not exclusive to Greeks. It is well known that the choice of writing systems by various communities is often an ideological sign of national orientation and identity<sup>5</sup> and that attempts at spelling reforms in various languages have encountered major opposition, deriving from a view that the historicity of the languages is being lost (Karantzola, 1999). Consequently the emergence of Greeklish could not have remained merely that of a new writing variety for electronic environments, but sooner or later would turn into a new ideological and political issue. This is precisely the stance of the Academy of Athens, which deplors the phenomenon and warns of the wide-ranging dangers with which it is fraught.

Moreover, from the brief review presented above, it becomes clear that the question of the language and its alphabet is not an exclusively linguistic issue. It has provided a fertile field in which serious confrontations of ideas and behaviors have been cultivated in crucial phases of the development of Greek society. These confrontations expressed the ideological conflicts of society as a whole and have crystallized into two clearly distinguishable trends: one devoted to the greatness of the past, and the other open to new explorations.

The words and symbols with which we grow up and that we inherit shape us as specific historical and sociocultural subjects (Bakhtin, 1986). In this reasoning, the views that have been argued on the “language issue” during

its long history have played and continue to play a determining role in the shaping of modern Greek identity. Thus, discussions about the authenticity of the language have been, at a deeper level, discussions about the authenticity of Greek identity (Fragoudaki, 2001), on the basis of which the “linguistic mythology of the nation” (Christidis, 1999, p. 156) has been created.

The “language issue” bequeathed to Greek society ready-made patterns of interpretation of linguistic phenomena, a repertoire or “tool kit” of habits and beliefs from which people construct “strategies of action” (Swidler, 1986). These ready-made patterns of interpretation are the key to understanding any new attitude to questions of language from that point on (e.g., simplification of the Greek accent system, threats from the dominance of English, romanization of the Greek alphabet).

## Description of the Study

In January 2001, the Academy of Athens, a prestigious Greek social body known for its conservative orientation, issued a statement concerning the rise of Greeklsh and the possible substitution of the Greek by the Roman alphabet, as a result of increased use of Greeklsh on the Internet. This statement, which was signed by 40 distinguished members of the Academy of Athens, was released to the press and gave rise to a heated debate in the media.

The corpus used in this study consists of 58 newspaper texts that appeared between January and March 2001 in the Greek press, all written as a reaction to the Academy’s text on Greeklsh. It makes available a condensed expression of a variety of views, put forward in the heat of the moment in a very short period. In order to ensure that the corpus is representative of the different types of texts that appeared in the Greek press, we used the archive of the Greek Language Center (GLC), a research institute of the National Ministry of Education and Religious Affairs, which is located in Thessaloniki. The GLC uses a press clipping service that searches in the Greek daily and Sunday press nationwide on a daily basis and locates all publications concerning the Greek language.

The texts in the corpus are drawn from 23 different newspapers. Twelve texts come from morning newspapers (*Avgi*, *Vima*, *Kathimerini*, *Makedonia*, *Ellinikos Vorras*), 25 from evening papers (*Vradini*, *Elefteri Ora*, *Eleftheros*, *Eleftherotipia*, *Estia*, *Thessaloniki*, *Nea*), 2 from the daily financial press (*Express*, *Naftemporiki*), 14 from Sunday papers (*Apogevmatini tis Kiriakis*, *Avgi tis Kiriakis*, *Ethnos tis Kiriakis*, *Prin*, *To Paron*, *Tipos tis Kiriakis*) 1 from a weekly newspaper (*Nei Anthropi*), and 2 from provincial papers (*Eleftheria Larissas*, *Tipos Chalkidikis*). These texts cover a variety of newspaper genres—articles, editorials, interviews, readers’ letters, statements by professional organizations—and vary in length. They were written by linguists, philologists, journalists, professors from various fields, computer experts, and a few laypeople.

This study is a Critical Discourse Analysis of views of Greeklish in the texts. Adopting a critical discourse-analytic perspective from Fairclough (1992, 2003), the study views discourse both as action, a form of social practice, and as a social construction of reality, a way of representing social practice. Viewing discourse as interaction relates discourse to other social practices, thus establishing a relationship between the discursive event and the social practice. It promotes an understanding of discourse as always social and cultural, thus excluding a view of language as a purely individual activity. Viewing discourse also as constructing social reality allows an understanding of discourse as representing forms of knowledge and aspects of social reality. Our analysis of the corpus subsumes both uses of the term, attempting to bring them together. It starts with the analysis of “discourses,” defined as the language used in representing social practice from a particular point of view. This analysis reveals the various heterogeneous and conflicting representations of Greeklish online.

The next section presents the three main trends identified, with the purpose of examining the various elements of their stances and attitudes. At the same time, we investigate the degree to which these views reflect deeper upheavals and aspirations that are the result of new situations and quests worldwide. We are also concerned with the following questions: To what extent do attitudes toward Greeklish highlight the phenomenon of “glocalness,” which recent literature has pinpointed as predominant in the age of globalization? To what extent is this phenomenon truly recent? What are its main features in the case of Greeklish?

## Analysis

### First Trend: A Retrospective View

This seems a rather strong and solid view that is developed in 38 of the total of 58 texts in the corpus. It is “retrospective” in the sense that it is shaped by national, religious, and cultural narratives (Bernstein, 1996) that are recontextualized to ensure the stability of the past into the future. What primarily characterizes this trend is the use of the glorious past as a reference point to provide answers for the future.

The texts following this trend come from 15 different, mainly conservative, newspapers, support the Academy’s view and provide further argumentation in its favor. They praise the Academy for the specific initiative that they often view as an act of resistance to the threat of globalization. The Academy is represented as the “guardian of our language” (*Vradini* 18.1<sup>6</sup>). Two metaphorical discourses hold a prominent position in this trend. The first is a metaphorical discourse of resistance whose traces are frequently found in formulations such as “we should extol the vigorous resistance of the Supreme Intellectual Institution of our country” (*Vradini* 18.1), “forty

Academics express their intention to resist” (*Kathimerini* 7.1), “angry reaction” (*Tipos Chalkidikis* 7.1), and “to fend off the threat and ward off the dangers” (*Vradini* 15.1).

This discourse of resistance is embedded within a metaphorical discourse of military attack. Greeklsh is construed as a threat against the Greek language that needs to be protected from “foreign” invasion: “standing guard over the Greek language,” “we are called upon to defend it with vigor” (*Ellinikos Vorras* 21.1), “they [academics] draw attention to the major danger of a very heavy blow” (*Estia* 31.1), “others too will wake up to this national danger” (*Vradini* 18.1), “in the battle for Greek” (*Tipos tis Kiriakis* 6.1). The Academy’s statement was primarily about the danger of substituting the Roman for the Greek alphabet. However, in texts of this trend, discussion about the Greek alphabet soon moves on to discussion about defending the Greek language and consequently Greek culture and the country. As stated in one of the articles, “throwing off the national system of writing is a betrayal of the national ethos” (*Tipos tis Kiriakis* 6.1):

The Academy of Athens ... sounds the warning bell and calls upon the people in a reveille sounded against this unholy and senseless movement ... [The language] is the breakwater for every foreign influence and propaganda. “If you want a people to lose its national consciousness, make it lose its language,” Lenin used to say.

The nation is living through critical times. What is needed is watchfulness, alertness, planning, A REPLY.

**We have nothing “save Liberty and Language.” Solomos. Let us do it !!!** (*Nea* 16.1g) (emphasis and bold in original)

Formulations such as “[the language] is the breakwater for every foreign influence and propaganda,” “[the Academy] sounds the warning bell and calls upon the people in a reveille,” “The nation is living through critical times,” “What is needed is watchfulness, alertness, planning,” together with the reference to Lenin and to the national poet Dionysios Solomos strongly evoke a national discourse. The language needs to be defended in the same way that a country needs to be defended from an external threat. According to this view, Greeklsh constitutes a threat to the language and to the country. We must protect the Greek language, the argument goes, from any “external” invasion that threatens it. This metaphorical discourse of national threat is also found in the titles of articles, as lexical items such as “danger signal,” “attack,” “guard,” and “protection” indicate: “Warning signal from 40 Academics” (*Kathimerini* 7.1), “The attack upon our language” (*Estia* 7.3), “For the protection of the Greek Language” (*Eleftheri Ora* 23.3).

Other prominent discourses in this trend are historical. In many new s-paper texts, the theme of ancient Greek history is prominent: “Our language ... has for 3,000 years enlightened the whole world” (*Apogevmatini tis Kiriakis* 14.1g), “Our language, the most ancient, but always contemporary

and alive, this language may not suffer degradation by the abolition [of the alphabet] at our own hands” (*Ellinikos Vorras* 21.1). The ethnocentric view developed here is based upon the importance of Ancient Greek culture:

The Greek language has deep historical roots which it has maintained throughout its age-old history and development, and it is neither conceivable nor permissible for us to adulterate our pronunciation by the introduction of Latin characters.... This language of ours has preserved our culture and history in the multifarious vicissitudes of the nation, and, moreover, under harsh Ottoman tyranny. (*Vradini* 18.1)

Within the ethnocentric historical discourse, a number of comparisons are made that are important for their ideological underpinnings. For instance, the Greek language is praised for its aesthetics: “The Greek alphabet takes precedence over the Latin because it comes from the Phoenician and the Phoenicians were among the first civilized peoples upon earth. Consequently, there is also chronological precedence” (*Eleftheros* 15.1). Moreover, the Latin (or Roman) alphabet was not only the second to appear but is also a “sub-product” of the Greek alphabet: “Now, in the very nature of things we are obliged also to use the Latin alphabet, which is, of course—as everybody knows—a subproduct of the Greek alphabet; and this too is Greek, it is the Chalcidian alphabet of Aeolian Cyme” (*Apogevmatini tis Kiriakis* 14.1g).

Embedded in the historical discourses is a religious discourse that connects the Greek Orthodox tradition with Greek history: “The Greek communities with a holy zeal maintained Greek schools to preserve our language, with the Church as protagonist, under the aegis of the Ecumenical Patriarchate” (*Eleftherotipia* 22.1). The Church is construed as the “protagonist,” the main institution that at difficult times in Greek history served as a connecting link of Hellenism. The diachronic element is often stressed, and the connection between the ancient Greek spirit and Christian tradition is represented as strong: “From the works of Plato, Aristotle, Sophocles, Socrates, Thucydides, and the other classical authors, but also from texts of the Fathers of our Christian religion, the Gospels, the Byzantine hymnographers and of all the other written texts of our Church, the Greek language took on a universal character, of diachronic importance” (*Ellinikos Vorras* 21.1). Moreover, the role of the Greek language, in which most books of the New Testament were written, in the spread of Christianity is stressed: “The Greek language was the world of the Gospel and the means of preserving Christian ideas” (*Vradini* 18.1).

New technologies are represented as threatening the extinction of the Greek alphabet and consequently of the Greek language: “Our language ... is being displaced by the new technology,” “Computers have now forced us in our everyday life to use the Latin alphabet” (*Apogevmatini tis Kiriakis* 14.1g). A distinguished member of the Academy of Letters, when asked by a journalist: “Is what you are saying above all that the main danger comes from computers?” replied: “Yes. I’m not going into these mechanical means, I’m going

into the issue itself, which is precisely what is being cultivated. And what is being cultivated is not only the replacement of the alphabet, but even of our spelling” (*Apogevmatini tis Kiriakis* 14.1b).

Of particular interest are conflicting representations of globalization in this trend. In the Academy’s text and in the newspaper texts that support the Academy’s view, globalization is construed negatively in the case of Greeklish and the spread of new technologies. On the other hand, globalization is construed somewhat positively in the case of ancient Greek as the global language of its time: “The universality of the Greek language is demonstrated by the conception, the originality, the profundity and the wealth of ideas and by its globalization through Alexander the Great” (*Vradini* 18.1), “The Greek language has been for thousands of years the instrument of the intellectual cultivation and development of the whole of humanity” (*Ellinikos Vorras* 21.1). The role of the Greek language, the “source and mother of other languages” (*Nea* 16.1g), in the foundation of important fields of study such as philosophy and mathematics is praised, and so is its contribution to world literature: “At its very first historical steps it produced the two immortal Epics the Iliad and the Odyssey” (*Ellinikos Vorras* 21.1). It is of considerable interest that whereas the importance of the Greek language at a global level is praised, and Greek culture is construed as the main element of global culture, the current globalization phase is construed negatively as a threat to the Greek language.

## Second Trend: A Prospective View

Texts in this trend position themselves against the Academy’s statement and attack its arguments that Greeklish is a threat to the Greek language. They generally adopt a positive stance toward technology. They minimize the importance of arguments presented in the Academy’s statement by criticizing the rhetoric of the Academy’s text, the language features selected, the exaggeration embedded in the arguments, and the technophobia that seems to penetrate the text. Interestingly, there is frequent reproduction of the arguments of the first trend. This reproduction, however, serves as a starting point in the process of refuting these arguments as wrong or lacking in importance. The Academy’s text is called a “panic-stricken” statement and “a monument of language-defensive frenzy” (*Vima* 21.1).

It is often suggested in texts in this trend that the Academy’s text involves traditional rhetoric concerning the Greek language, which represents it as ancient, as having “enriched Latin and all main European languages” and “transmitted culture all over the world.” This rhetoric, also supported by historical and religious discourses as mentioned in the preceding section, is not new. It views Greeklish as a threat and has been present in other discussions concerning the Greek language in the past (e.g., discussions concerning *Demotic* and *Katharevousa*). The language used in the Academy’s text is also a target of criticism. The use of *Katharevousa* expressions and vocabulary not used today is mentioned in a number of different texts in this trend:

“Moreover, [the Academy’s text] employs a spelling of other times (not the official spelling taught in schools today) and a vocabulary which arbitrarily lapses into *Katharevousa*” (*Nea* 20.1).

At this point, it is worth drawing attention to some differences concerning the language features selected in the texts of the first two trends. Whereas texts in the first trend to a great extent draw upon vocabulary that has its origins in *Katharevousa*, texts in the second trend are characterized by a tendency toward conversationalization and informalization of discourse (Fairclough, 1992), as the following formulations indicate: “I’ll explain that right away” (*Thessaloniki* 15.1), “let’s say this once and for all” (*Vima* 28.1b), “I hope the ladies and gentlemen of the Academy will forgive me, but I think ...” (*Nea* 20.1).

Another point of criticism of the original text refers to the use of exaggeration. The argument that is developed in a number of texts in the second trend is that the Academy’s text deals with a nonexistent problem: “Do we, perhaps, like worrying? Do we, perhaps, feel better when we are in danger?” (*Vima* 28.1a), “the concern is unjustified” (*Kathimerini* 1.2), “the Academy of Athens has invested the issue with its authority and elevated it into a serious matter which is in essence non-existent” (*Vima* 28.1b).

Moreover, it is repeatedly stressed that the Academy’s text is imbued with technophobia: “some kind of phobia has afflicted these distinguished intellectuals” (*Kathimerini* 1.2), “the careful reader can detect certain misunderstandings or imperfect knowledge of the actual facts—even a veil of technophobia” (*Kathimerini* 14.1). It is suggested that this technophobia is the result of misunderstanding or inadequate knowledge of technological advances. It is also pointed out that the Academy’s text came late, when the problem with Greek fonts no longer existed: “Instead of proposing solutions, they denounce ... computers and world-wide communication, instead of helping to deal with a technical problem” (*Nea* 20.1).

Two types of discourses are mainly employed in this trend. The first is an instrumental technical discourse that identifies the source of the problem: “The reason why this form of Greek is widely used has to do with computer software, which initially did not make it possible to use the Greek alphabet” (*Makedonia* 14.1), and offers solutions: “Today, in all the software commonly in use on the Internet you can use the complete alphabet, in accordance with ISO-8889-7 standards. Also, very soon, when the international Unicode standard is in general use, the Greek alphabet (and the polytonic system) will be inherently supported” (*Kathimerini* 14.1).

Moreover, unlike the texts in the first trend, which approach the global from the point of view of the glorious (global) past that provides (or should provide) the basis for the local today, the texts in this trend develop a view of glocalization that relates primarily to the localization of technology. The issue of localization of the software interface is predominant in these texts. As is pointed out in one of the texts: “This is a purely technical problem. In order to communicate in Greek on the Internet, our interlocutor’s computer must have uploaded the appropriate software, which is of Greek manufacture....”

Even in Greece, compatibility is lacking between the systems of the different companies” (*Elefteria Larissas* 18.1). This technical discourse employs a view of technology as value neutral and ideology free.

Second, there are traces of sociolinguistic discourses in the second trend. A descriptive sociolinguistic discourse identifies elements of what is referred to as a “technological idiolect”:

E.g., “θ” is written not with “th” but with “8”. “Ξ” not with “x” but with “3”, and so on.... Even English on the Internet has undergone similar syntactical and grammatical changes. E.g., the prepositions “to” and “for” are rendered by the arithmetical symbols “2” and “4”. The purpose of these alterations is to ensure speed. (*Vima* 28.1a)

On another occasion, Greeklish is seen as a kind of “glossary” used by the young among themselves (*Nea* 16.1f) or as a “jargon” that distinguishes insiders and outsiders: “it operates as a jargon in which the initiated are differentiated from the uninitiated who enter the Internet” (*Vima* 28.1a). Elements of this new “language variety” are described: “Electronic script is halfway between written and oral conversation” (*Vima* 28.1a), “Greeklish does not have rules ... It is a spontaneous script and everybody formulates it in his own way ... For example, the Greek letter ‘beta’: Some write it as ‘b’ and others as ‘v’ ” (*Makedonia* 13.1).

### Third Trend: A Resistive View

Texts in this trend differentiate themselves from the Academy’s text, yet they take the opportunity to raise a number of critical issues concerning the challenges the Greek language faces today within the context of global change. Although they share some views with texts in the second trend, they do not merely attempt an explanation of Greeklish. They also raise issues such as the pressure of the dominant English language on the Internet on the “small languages” and the role of English on the Internet, and they generally develop a resistive view of the effects of globalization. The catalytic changes brought about by globalization, the changing European dynamic, and advances in information and communication technologies are seen to have led to a restructuring of social identities and to concerns about the role “weaker” languages are expected to play in the future. Proposals are also put forward concerning initiatives to be taken in the new situation.

As with texts in the first trend, here, too, there is a metaphorical discourse of resistance, which is, however, differently realized. Specifically, this discourse of resistance is not based on a retrospective discourse that has its origins in the greatness of history or in ethnocentric views concerning the importance of the Greek language. Neither is it inspired by “a fear of every change, every discovery ... and a nostalgia for the past” (*Nea* 3.3) that is always considered to be better than the present and the future. On the



contrary, it originates from an interest in the “weaker” languages, an interest in preserving “small” languages such as Greek, and the need to struggle for linguistic equality. Moreover, as is stated in one of the texts, “resistance is legitimated by a principle similar to that which is supported in the natural environment. A need to preserve biodiversity. Just as for balance in nature, the variety of biological species must be maintained, so in culture, differences need to be maintained by positive measures” (*Vima* 28.1a). According to this view, it is a matter of “linguistic ecology” to protect languages from extinction in the same way that we preserve the various living species around us.

The same text also comments on the Academy’s statement, notes its contradictory arguments, and suggests that any distinction between more important and less important languages leads toward homogenization and the dominance of English, which the Academy strongly opposes:

The Greek language, it is stated in the text “has enriched not only Latin, but the principle European languages.” It fails to mention, however, that the Greek language has also been enriched by other languages ... Anyway, what is this argument suggesting? That the small languages which have not enriched others are worth less protection? (*Vima* 28.1a)

Resistance in the texts in this trend is motivated by the need to promote linguistic diversity through a multilingual, heteroglossic, and polyphonic ethos (Dendrinos, 2001). Although the use of the Roman alphabet in CMC is not a real threat since “nobody has ever suggested the adoption of the Latin alphabet” (*Nea* 16.1e-f), it is acknowledged that “This does not mean that the absolute dominance of English and, as a consequence, of the Latin alphabet should not be faced up to. Many countries promote specific measures for the presence of their languages in cyberspace” (*Nea* 16.1d). Resistance becomes a result of pressure that the weaker languages undergo today, primarily as “a result of globalization” (*Prin* 14.1): “in recent years, the Greek language has undergone ‘pressures’ at a multiplicity of levels, both in the spoken and the written word” (*Avgi tis* 21.1). Most important, the discourse of resistance that is proclaimed here is not a retrospective but a prospective one, which looks into the future using the past as a base, and which attempts to “create appropriate attitudes concerning current change” (Bernstein, 1996, p. 77). As stated in one text:

If, then, there is this strong trend towards English-speaking, and, even more so, towards techno-English which will steam-roller national languages, and in fact there is, there is just as much an equally strong trend on the part of cultures and languages not to submit, to resist, to preserve themselves, not as romantic nostalgia, but an active value towards their present and their future. (*Avgi tis Kiriakis* 14.1)

There is a strong urge to resist the homogeneity brought about by globalization and its promoted monolingual, monoglossic, and uniphonic ethos.

After all, it is argued, “Culture ... is the result of relations. Communication relations, but also conflict relations in which opposing tendencies, opposed values, different ways of life, social relations and interests which do not come out of the mold of a uniformity dictated from above are expressed” (*Avgi tis Kiriakis* 14.1). We cannot, therefore, remain “passive witnesses of a world cultural re-ordering which tends to strike a blow especially at Greek, mainly because of the particularity, the rarity, but also the prestige of its alphabet” (*Nea* 16.1a). However, this resistance cannot be restricted to the Greek language since “if, then, our language is in danger, are not all the languages of the world in danger, and with them local cultures, from the whirlwind of globalization and cultural homogenization?” (*Elefteria Larissas* 18.1).

At a surface level, it might seem that texts in this trend adopt a rather negative stance toward globalization and its avant garde instrument, the Internet. Formulations such as “steam-rolling” and “setting aside history, culture” evoke a pessimistic discourse of globalization and express a negative stance toward it: “The steam-rolling brought by globalization, a levelling which sets aside history, culture, traditions, manners, and customs, the identity, that is, of each state, disturbs many Greek citizens as to the ‘day after’ of our country” (*Paron* 21.1). Several texts in this trend note the concern that the Greek language might become a victim of globalization. It is even suggested that “national languages, particularly those of small nations, like the Greek nation, are condemned to deterioration and final annihilation in the melting-pot of globalization” (*Avgi tis Kiriakis* 14.1). On the other hand, an optimistic discourse of globalization is evoked through formulations that recognize existing linguistic imperialism, but which also argue that

other ages have experienced similar forms of linguistic imperialism which have wiped out linguistic particularities within the sphere of their influence. And Greek, like Latin, was once in the position now occupied by English. Printing and nation-states annihilated hundreds of dialects, and a good deal more effectively than the Internet. (*Vima* 28.1a)

Moving away from the deterministic position of the first trend, which does not offer any solutions, and from the restricted view of the second trend, which approaches English as a technical problem, the texts in the third trend place Greeklsh within its sociohistorical context, attempt an analysis of its ideological underpinnings, and provide suggestions for the future by looking into possibilities offered by the electronic communications media. Most important, texts in this trend do not revert to grand narratives of the past, but turn to history to develop “a social, historical understanding of current reality” (*Nea* 16.1d). Here, languages are viewed as “open communications systems,” language users as active social agents who “often borrow, appropriate, assess and re-assess, or even reject various linguistic sources” (*Avgi* 21.1), and new technologies and the Internet as “working tools” (*Nea* 16.1e).

Against the “ideology of linguistic (and more general) conservatism which has marked Greek history” (*Nea* 16.1d) and the “ahistorical,

ethnocentric, conservative, and, in the end, misleading footing on which the issue is placed” (*Nea* 16.1f) in texts in the first trend, skepticism is expressed as to the “replacement of the Greek alphabet by the Latin and the production of this *sui generis* linguistic idiom” (*Avgi* 21.1) of Greeklis and its ideology. “The preservation of particularity—including national particularity” (*Nea* 16.1d) is considered important. However, the position here is not one against globalization “but against Americanization and their value of money and consumption. Against the culture of Macdonald’s French fries and of Coca Cola” (*Elefteria Larissas* 18.1).

Technology is not here to destroy us (*Nea* 16.1f). On the contrary, “The use of the Latin alphabet to write Greek in communication on the Internet is not only not a bad thing, but, rather, a good one, since even when we cannot write in Greek, because of technical difficulties, we find a way of doing it. We insist by every means upon our language” (*Elefteria Larissas* 18.1). Turning the Academy’s argument around, a text argues: “we know, however, from history that the only way of surviving for a culture at such critical periods is creative assimilation of the new challenges to its benefit, and not its obstinate isolation on the pretext of non-existent dangers” (*Nea* 16.1e). It is therefore important to explore how “technology can be used as a tool for the dissemination and spread of our language to the ends of the earth” (*Elefteria Larissas* 18.1).

In fact, texts in this trend are the only ones that consider this “creative assimilation of new challenges” and move a step forward to propose specific initiatives that must be taken in this direction. Suggestions include that “the whole of ancient literature should be digitized and made available in cyberspace, so that anyone can have direct access to any text,” “the world-wide electronic library should be supplemented with Greek texts of all periods” (*Nea* 3.3), the Academy “should put the whole of Greek poetry, the whole of ancient Greek literature on a site on the Internet” (*Elefteria Larissas* 18.1). Other suggestions concern the financing of programs to teach Greek through the Internet, and the financial support of a program to provide software for communicating in Greek, free of charge.

## Conclusions

From the above analysis it can be seen that attitudes toward the use of Greeklis are deeply embedded in the Greek sociocultural context, where, from its beginning as a nation-state in the nineteenth century, questions about the official language and the graphic system have been central to long, heated social and political debates. Responses to Greeklis are linked to a view of the Greek graphemic system as inseparable from the Greek language and national identity. Among the three main trends that have been identified (retrospective, prospective, and resistive), the *retrospective* view is numerically the strongest. Its arguments do not differ substantially from those used in the past in support of *Katharevousa* and, to a large degree, in support of other meta-linguistic views after 1980. Its roots deep in the past make it a

clear-cut point of view, to which a solid shape has already been given. Analysis of the corpus suggests that this view serves as a powerful pole that attracts supporters from the full range of Greek society: intellectuals, university teachers, journalists, those engaged in politics, and lay people. It views the issue of Greeklsh as one of exceptional importance, as the “thin end of the wedge” for further risk to the Greek language and the Greek identity, which are under direct threat. The elegiac tone is marked, as is the note of protest and indignation that imbues most of the texts. References to history are frequent, not only to bring out the magnitude of the “good” that is at risk but also to demonstrate the resilience of the Greek alphabet, which, in spite of the dangers, has survived. To the urgent question of the reorientation of the country’s role in this critical period the answers are ready to hand—answers drawn from the well-stocked quiver of the past (Swidler, 1986).

The *prospective* view minimizes the importance and extent of the issue by approaching it either in terms of technology (a technical weakness that will be overcome) or in terms of sociolinguistic factors (a new variety of script). This stance may also be seen as a reflex reaction to the Academy of Athens itself, an institution tinged with specific conservative linguistic and political ideologies. This is the second important viewpoint in quantitative terms. There can be no doubt that it expresses part of the ideas that were expressed by Demoticism in the past, particularly that part which had to do with the rebuttal of retrospective arguments. Moreover, supporters of this view—particularly the older generations—take care to point out the close link with this tradition (democratic principles, linguistic options). This is an outward-looking trend, prospective and future oriented, which, in no circumstances, however, denies the importance of the Greek alphabet. In light of the observations in the literature reviewed above, it is perhaps the most authentic trend of glocalness.

The *resistive* view dissociates itself from the observations of the Academy but takes the opportunity to raise issues that touch on the crucial problems that Greek is facing in this critical transitional period. Views held by the prospective trend are frequently found in its argumentation. The difference is that the resistive view does not confine itself to a description of Greeklsh. Subjects debated include pressure on “small languages” because of the dominance of English on the Internet, and in some cases proposals for options, plans, and the undertaking of initiatives in the new world situation are put forward. This is a combative viewpoint that does not ignore particularity but regards it as a starting point for an outward-looking stance. In place of an American-dominated globalization, texts in this trend propose a more critical, multicultural, and multilingual world. This view is related to the part of the *Demotic* movement that was associated with innovative options in educational matters.

The two differing approaches that came into intense conflict over the country’s political orientation in the past, again with language issues as the point of departure, are condensed in these three viewpoints. The extent to which retrospective arguments and in part prospective arguments are a reformulation of similar arguments from the past is particularly striking. The

phenomenon of Greeklish seems to serve, like similar phenomena in the past, as a stimulus for highlighting sharp differences over the country's orientation and the shaping of modern Greek identity at a critical moment.

However, despite the disagreements that are recorded, none of these texts raised any question about the introduction of the Roman alphabet to write Greek routinely. It is interesting that sporadic voices raised in the past to urge the adoption of the Roman or the phonetic alphabet in the writing of Greek have not found a single echo in this debate. In this respect, there is a closing of ranks despite disagreements as to the absolute acceptance of the use of the Greek alphabet both in conventional and in electronic environments of literacy practices. Both in this example and in the discussions as a whole, the dimension of localness is apparent. However, the content of localness is not unified; it differs significantly in the three views.

Matters seem to be equally complex in the case of globalness. In the retrospective trend, it can be observed that the "international" is passed over in total silence, while there is absolute dedication to the "local"—as this approach apprehends it. Nevertheless, more research is needed to discover to what degree this viewpoint is a form of self-absorption and denial of the international, as it would seem from many of the texts in the present analysis, or a trend that looks for the international only in terms of the local. But in the case of the resistive view also, there could be no question of speaking of a simple trend toward globalness, but rather of a trend toward a reappraisal of its content.

One conclusion to be drawn from the foregoing analysis is that the pattern of glocalness that characterizes many practices of contemporary societies— particularly in relation to CMD practices—seems a good deal more complex than it is usually represented. Another conclusion is that the tug-of-war between local and global is not just a contemporary but an ongoing phenomenon that has *always* been related to the political and ideological orientations of various countries, and that manifests itself most forcibly in critical periods of transition. At the same time, we do not underestimate the changes that are taking place today, or their effects on countries, cultures, and social groups. A historically contextualized, diachronic approach may make a significant contribution toward a more comprehensive, deeper understanding of the significance of the changes of our age and of CMC practices in the context of a multilingual Internet.

## Acknowledgment

A previous version of this chapter was published in the *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication* (volume 9, issue 1, 2003).

## Notes

1. See the discussion of writing systems and the Internet in Chapter 1.
2. Three proposals were suggested in that period (Christidis, 1999): the adoption of Ancient Greek as the only form of "pure" and "uncorrupted" Greek; the adoption of Demotic, the spoken language, as first-born daughter of Ancient Greek (Skopetea, 1998); and the adoption of *Katharevousa*, which recognized the importance of the spoken language but held that it had undergone "corruption" and aimed at "purifying" and "correcting" it.
3. The oldest system of writing used for Greek, the syllabic Linear B script, had already been abandoned by the twelfth century B.C.
4. These included mainly three accents (which indicated the raising and lowering of the voice) and two breathings (which showed the presence or absence of the aspirate [h]). They were used to show changes in pronunciation and were addressed mainly to fellow grammarians rather than to the general public. Their use in the writing of Greek was widely adopted in Western Europe after the invention of printing (Petrounias, 1984).
5. The examples of Romania, Albania, Turkey, and the countries that resulted from the dissolution of the former Yugoslavia are typical.
6. The numbers that follow the name of the newspaper indicate the date of publication of each text. Since all texts were published in 2001, the year has been omitted. In cases where there is more than one text in the same newspaper and the same day, the letters a, b, c, and so on, are used to identify each text.

# References

- Androutsopoulos, J. (2000). Latin-Greek spelling in email messages: Usage and attitudes (in Greek). *Studies in Greek Linguistics*, 20, 75–86.
- Bakhtin, M. (1986). *Speech genres and other late essays* (C. Emerson & M. Holquist, Eds.; V. W. McGee, Trans.). Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Bernstein, B. (1996). *Pedagogy, symbolic control and identity: Theory, research, critique*. London: Taylor & Francis.
- Christidis, A.-F. (1999). *Language, politics, culture* (in Greek). Athens: Polis.
- Crystal, D. (2001). *Language and the Internet*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Delveroudi, R. (2000). *La variation linguistique et la formation de la langue nationale Grecque*. In A.-F. Christidis (Ed.), *La langue Grecque et ses dialects* (pp. 117–126). Athens: Ministère de l'Éducation et des Cultures.
- Dendrinou, B. (2001). Language education to meet the new social challenge: Linguistic diversity in Europe. In B. Dendrinou (Ed.), *The politics of ELT* (pp. 63–84). Athens: National and Kapodistrian University of Athens.
- Ess, C., & Sudweeks, F. (2003). Technologies of despair and hope: Liberatory potentials and practices of CMC in the Middle East. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 8(2). Retrieved December 5, 2005, from <http://jcmc.indiana.edu/vol8/issue2/essandsudweeks.html>.
- Fairclough, N. (1992). *Discourse and social change*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Fairclough, N. (2003). *Analyzing discourse*. London: Routledge.
- Ferguson, C. (1972). Diglossia. In P. P. Giglioli (Ed.), *Language and social context* (pp. 232–252). Harmondsworth, UK: Penguin.
- Fragoudaki, A. (2001). *Language and the nation* (in Greek). Athens: Alexandria.
- Georgakopoulou, A. (1997). Self-presentation and interactional alliances in email discourse: The style- and code-switches of Greek messages. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 7, 141–164.
- Hatzisavvidis, S. (1986). Ideological and political quests in the field of accentuation marks. *Anti*, 322, 47–49.
- Hawisher, G., & Selfe, C. (Eds.). (2000). *Global literacies and the World-Wide Web*. London: Routledge.

- Herring, S. C. (2001). Computer-mediated discourse. In D. Schiffrin, D. Tannen, & H. Hamilton (Eds.), *The handbook of discourse analysis* (pp. 612–634). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Hongladarom, S. (2000). Negotiating the global and the local: How Thai culture co-opts the Internet. *First Monday*, 5(8). Retrieved December 5, 2005, from [http://www.firstmonday.dk/issues/issue5\\_8/hongladarom/index.html](http://www.firstmonday.dk/issues/issue5_8/hongladarom/index.html).
- Karantzola, E. (1999). Spelling reform in the “strong” and “weak” languages in the EU. In A.-F. Christidis (Ed.), *“Strong” and “weak” languages in the European Union* (Vol. 2, pp. 825–833). Thessaloniki: Center of the Greek Language.
- Koutsogiannis, D. (2004). Critical techno-literacy and “weak” languages. In I. Snyder & C. Beavis (Eds.), *Doing literacy online* (pp. 163–184). Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.
- Paolillo, J. C. (1996). Language choice on soc.culture.Punjab. *Electronic Journal of Communication*, 6(3). Retrieved December 5, 2005, from <http://www.cios.org/www/ejc/v6n396.htm>.
- Petrounias, E. (1984). *New Greek grammar and comparative analysis*. Thessaloniki: University Studio Press.
- Robertson, R. (1995). Glocalization: Time-space and homogeneity-heterogeneity. In M. Featherstone, S. Lash, & R. Robertson (Eds.), *Global modernities* (pp. 25–44). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Selfe, C., & Selfe, R. (1994). The politics of the interface: Power and its exercise in electronic contact zones. *College Composition and Communication*, 45(4), 480–504.
- Skopetea, E. (1998). *The “model kingdom” and the great idea* (in Greek). Athens: Polytypo. Stavridi-Patrikiou, R. (1999). *Language, education and politics* (in Greek). Athens: Olkos.
- Swidler, A. (1986). Culture in action: Symbols and strategies. *American Sociological Review*, 51, 273–286.
- Terzis, N. (1998). *The pedagogy of Alexandros Delmouzos* (in Greek). Thessaloniki: Kyriakidis.
- Warschauer, M. (2002). Languages.com: The Internet and linguistic pluralism. In I. Snyder (Ed.), *Silicon literacies. Communication, innovation and education in the electronic age* (pp. 62–74). London: Routledge.
- Warschauer, M., Said, G., & Zohry, A. (2002). Language choice online: Globalization and identity in Egypt. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 7(4). Retrieved December 5, 2005, from <http://jcmc.indiana.edu/vol7/issue4/warschauer.html>.
- Woodard, R. (1997). *Greek writing from Knossos to Homer*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Yates, S. J. (1996). English in cyberspace. In S. Goodman & D. J. Graddol (Eds.), *Redesigning English: New texts, new identities* (pp. 108–140). London: Routledge, in association with the Open University.
- Yoon, S. (2001). Internet discourse and the habitus of Korea’s new generation. In C. Ess (Ed.), *Culture, technology, communication* (pp. 241–260). Albany: State University of New York Press.