Introduction

Brian D. Joseph

Issues of power and freedom, as well as the ideologies which form their underpinnings and thus to a certain extent determine them, impinge on all aspects of human existence, and language is no exception. As Fairclough has put it in one of the most recent treatments of the complex relationships holding among language, power, and ideology:[1]

> Ideologies are closely linked to power, because the nature of ideological assumptions embedded in particular conventions, and so the nature of those conventions themselves, depends on the power relations which underlie those conventions . . . Ideologies are closely linked to language, because using language is the commonest form of social behaviour, and the form of social behaviour where we rely most on 'common-sense' assumptions.
>
> (1989: 2)

Human social interaction, therefore, will necessarily reflect and be affected by the power relationships—equal or unequal, class based or economically based, etc.—holding among the participants. Language, moreover, as "the commonest form of social behaviour" and as the primary medium by which social interaction is carried out, will necessarily also be reflective of and affected by these relationships.

While it is important to keep in mind, as Wodak (1989: xv) reminds us, that "language is not powerful 'per se' . . . [it] only gains power in the hands of the powerful," nevertheless there are numerous ways in which the interaction of language and power and of language and freedom is played out in the dynamics of social exchanges. Most basically, a "tension" is to be found between the language of a powerful group and the language of a less powerful group—in a broader sense, then, between that of a dominant group and that of an oppressed group. One frequent concomitant of such situations is the expression of solidarity among group members through language use.

Some of the more obvious ways in which this tension is manifested linguistically are those listed in (1):

(1) a. stereotypical adult-child interaction
    b. the use of polite address forms
    c. the existence of secret languages
    d. dialect differences
    e. diglossic language use
    f. minority language questions.

Some comments on these manifestations will serve to locate them within the realm of discourse concerning language and power. The first two involve ways in which socially imposed conventions reflecting relative power operate within a given linguistic code, with social distinctions, most typically differences in social power, being overtly marked linguistically. Regarding stereotypical adult-child interaction, for instance, both the frequency of certain speech acts—namely, commands—and the ways in which adults typically adjust their speech when talking to children—lots of repetition and simple constructions in the syntax, lexical choices with shorter and more frequent words, etc.—are indicative of the asymmetrical power relationship obtaining between adults and children. Similarly, the use of such overt markings in a language as the polite versus familiar address forms found in many European languages, described in the landmark study by Brown and Gilman 1960, is a means for indicating the relative social standing of participants in a conversation, and, as such, may—but need not always—reflect the relative power of one participant over the other, as, for instance when students use the polite form to teachers but receive the familiar form from the teachers.

The remaining manifestations in (1) involve the occurrence of different linguistic codes within a given speech community or society. Regarding secret languages,[2] it should be noted that while one does find rather trivial disguised speech systems, such as English Pig Latin, that are typically used for playful ends, there are other systems, such as Cockney Rhyming Slang,[3] that are sociolinguistically more interesting and more revealing with regard to language and power, in that one of their primary functions, originally at least, involves protecting a group that is socially and socioeconomically powerless and weak from the possibility of abuses of power by the more powerful group. Fairclough's (1989: 90) characterization of secret languages in terms of a "dominated" discourse type set in opposition to a "dominant" is appropriate. A by-product of the disguising is the creation of solidarity within the using group; knowing or being able to use certain expressions can become, as it were, a marker of group membership, knowledge being indeed a form of power here.

The next area concerns dialect differences, whether they be evident in standard versus nonstandard dialects, in men's versus wom-

en's speech, or in virtually any other set of systematic varieties of the language in question. Perhaps more significant here is the perception by others of the value of one variety or the other, typically referred to as the "prestige" enjoyed by one variety at the expense of the other.

Diglossic language use—where a distinction exists, within a single speech community, between what may be roughly characterized as "high-style" versus "low-style"[4] —in a sense presents a situation akin to that described above for dialects. While it is clear that diglossia is virtually institutionalized in some speech communities—the Arab world providing one of the standard examples of such a situation, as Ferguson 1959 argues—, it is significant for matters of language and power in general that something akin to a "high" versus "low" register distinction may be found in virtually all speech communities, not just literate ones with a long written tradition to draw upon. Moreover, values are attached by users to the different varieties, so that use of the appropriate register can be an index of a speaker's place within society, i.e., a marker of social power or the lack thereof.

Finally, minority language questions are relevant here, for they can involve politico-linguistic issues such as official governmental sanction of one or more languages in a nation. Decisions in this sphere may also affect matters of educational policy, such as whether to have instruction in a child's native language even if it is not the majority language. In addition, since the minority speech community always lives in the shadow of the dominant group, it generally encounters problems of language maintenance, and ultimately perhaps of language death, in the face of often overwhelming influences from the majority language and the culture associated with it.

Of the various "tensions" mentioned here, some may be innocuous and may even be forced on groups, to a certain extent, by relationships that are at least temporarily immutable. Children, for example, grow up and thus take on a different power relationship to adults; students, over the course of time, may be "permitted" to use informal means of address with a teacher. Moreover, such usage varies considerably with individuals, with some teachers welcoming informal address from the start and some students never being comfortable with it. Other tensions of this sort may have truly destructive consequences for the weaker of the parties involved, as has been seen again and again with minority language issues in many nations, and as can even be the case in adult-child interaction if it develops into a series of conventionalized teasing.

The above brief catalogue and commentary, as well as some of the examples given to illustrate these areas of interaction between language and power, suggest that linguistic dimensions to matters of

power and freedom are to be found in all societies. It is equally clear, though, that some of these dimensions are specific to individual speech communities or are given a particular realization in the context of a specific community; for instance, in a country like Switzerland with geographically clustered linguistic and cultural diversity, the official language question has been played out differently from the way it has in the United States, where linguistic minorities are more scattered and there are different historical antecedents regarding language use.

Within the Greek context, some of these dimensions have fairly obvious manifestations. The existence of καλιαρντά, the slang and virtually secret language of the Greek gay community (see Petropoulos 1971), attests to the relevance of (1c) in Greece. The ways in which relationships of power (and also solidarity) are expressed through the use of the second person pronouns εσύ versus εσείς and through various terms of address provide a Greek counterpart to the Brown and Gilman findings for Western European languages.[5] Indeed, Greek has entered the discussion of the value attributed to different linguistic registers owing to the much debated γλωσσικό ζήτημα, whether in its pre-1976 form that set καθαρεύουσα in opposition to δημοτική—a form considered by Ferguson (1959) to be a classic case of diglossia— or in the post-1976 form that asks which version of δημοτική should be employed. Finally, the existence of such linguistic minorities as speakers of Arvanítika, Romany (the language of the Gypsies), Judezmo,[6] Turkish, Macedonian, and Vlach in modern Greece[7] means that Greece as a country, a geographic domain, is also an area in which minority language questions are relevant. Conversely, the presence of significant numbers of Greeks abroad, i.e., the Hellenic diaspora— whether as part of the *Gastarbeiter* community in Germany and else- where or in longer established communities in the United States, Canada, Australia, and other countries—shows that Greeks also face minority language issues as the minority group.[8]

Other manifestations of language-power issues in Greece and involving Greeks, while no less real, require a bit more development to be fully appreciated, perhaps because they are not easily labeled. Examples are the ritualized taunting of children as an expression of dominance, and male-female differences in the use of language. Some of these areas—both the obvious ones and the less obvious—are dis- cussed in the papers in this issue, each of which elucidates an aspect of the ways in which language and power interact in the Greek context. In keeping with the recent practice of the *Journal of Modern Greek Studies,* the thematic grouping of this special issue is complemented by a commentary aiming at some critique, some synthesis, and some prediction of future directions.

The selection of specific topics was left up to the authors. Thus, what is presented here is representative of the issues relevant to Greek and Greece in the area of language and power, but should not be taken as exhaustive. Issues pertaining to language and power that are not treated here are no less significant; in fact they constitute areas in which important contributions can still be made.

In this collection, several examples involving power relationships within the Greek context are presented and discussed. The paper by Deborah Tannen and Christina Kakava explores the complementarity of power and solidarity as these factors pertain to strategies of agreement and disagreement in conversation. The authors isolate several "linguistic markers of solidarity . . . [and] of disagreement," documenting their use in naturally occurring conversations. Among their findings are the observations that different individuals employ different conversational strategies in agreeing and disagreeing, and that the use of solidarity markers "is a way to redress the power imbalance" inherent in disagreement.

Renée Hirschon examines the manifestations of the Greek concern with power and freedom in the realm of adult-child interaction. She pays particular attention to a general "lack of accountability for . . . verbal utterances" that adults make to children, including unfulfilled promises, threats, outright lies, and other types of verbal "play," suggesting that adults retain a sense of power and autonomy through such speech acts. Placing this analysis in the wider context of verbal play as part of "the process of socialization" that Greek children undergo, she maintains that such a process, "in effecting an existential consciousness of imperfections of the phenomenal world . . . works in accord with the tenets of Orthodox Christianity, the underlying framework of cultural tradition" in Greek society.

The next two papers treat power in relation to the values assigned to different dialects, where the term "dialect" is to be understood in its broadest sense of any linguistic variety. The paper by Kostas Kazazis, for instance, examines one dimension of the γλωσσικό ζήτημα, recounting how the stylistic tension in Greek between a high register and a low register manifested itself in the speech of a particular Greek individual—how the existence of an institutionalized high-style variety of Greek exerted pressure (a type of linguistic power) on this individual to conform to certain linguistic norms. The paper by Brian D. Joseph presents evidence showing that Greek displays normative pressures concerning standard versus nonstandard dialects that affect speakers' usage; in addition, it argues that a similar situation can be found in the values that speakers attach to the use of native Greek linguistic elements as opposed to non-native or foreign ones.

The final paper is by Lukas Tsitsipis, who uses data from speakers of the dying Albanian dialect known as Arvanítika that is still spoken in parts of Greece to develop a paradigm for studying the ways in which speakers of minority languages react to their status in a larger speech community. While providing interesting examples of the lexical and structural encroachments by Greek upon Arvanítika, Tsitsipis is more concerned with the question of who is in control of a discourse in traditional narrative performance and how this control is expressed when—owing to the dominance of Greek in Arvanítika communities— the speaker and audience have vastly differing levels of proficiency in the language: what he terms "heteroglossic distance." Incipient language death has created a new dialectic of authoritative discourse, with "Arvanítika [standing for an] earlier state of affairs, Greek for the new order."

These five papers are followed by a commentary written by Peter Mackridge, who was provided with prepublication versions. In a wide-ranging review-critique-synthesis, Mackridge draws together some of the common themes in the papers, comments on a number of the individual points made, and relates them all to significant shifts in the use of particular languages—Greek and non-Greek—and particular registers of Greek that have taken place in Greece during the past 200 years.

*****

The papers contained herein (excluding Mackridge's commentary) were all presented at the Modern Greek Studies Association symposium held in Minneapolis, Minnesota, 19–22 October 1989, which had as its organizing theme "Power/Freedom: Politics, Social Life, and the Arts in Modern Greece." All except Hirschon's were part of a special panel at the symposium focusing on "Language, Power, and Freedom in Greek Society." Hirschon's paper was part of a different panel at the same symposium, although clearly in keeping with the theme of the former panel and thus appropriate for this issue.

This special issue of *JMGS* is dedicated to the memory of my father, Edward D. Joseph (1919–1991).

THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY

NOTES

[1] In recent years, there has been a veritable explosion of publications, quite apart from Fairclough's book, dealing with topics relating to language and power, among them Wolfson and Manes (1985), Jernudd and Shapiro (1989), Wodak (1989), and Lakoff (1990).

[2] Halliday 1978 has referred to such "conscious alternatives to the dominant or established discourse types" (Fairclough 1989: 91) as "anti-languages."

[3] Some examples of the rhyming disguise are the use of *apples and pears* for *stairs, lump of lead* for *head,* etc. See Partridge 1950 for some discussion and further examples. Even though a secret language to a certain extent in its origins, Rhyming Slang now has mainly a jocular function.

[4] The notion of diglossia was introduced by Ferguson 1959 and has been widely discussed in the sociolinguistic literature, as well as in the literature on the specific cases—including Modern Greek—that he referred to.

[5] A recent discussion of the value of Greek terms of address with regard to various sociological parameters is to be found in Makrí-Tsilipáku 1984.

[6] Judezmo is also known (perhaps erroneously) as Ladino or Judeo-Espagnol; see Wexler 1981 for some discussion (with extensive literature) of the nature of Jewish languages in general, with some reference as well to the situation in Greece.

[7] While this is not the place to provide a full bibliography on any of these languages, a few recent works of different kinds (a lexicon, a grammar, and texts, respectively) can be mentioned: for Romany, see Messing 1988; for Vlach, see Katsanis and Dinas 1990; for the Judezmo of Thessaloniki, see Nar 1985 and footnote 6, above; for Macedonian within Greek borders, see Hill 1991.

[8] There is much linguistic work still to be done on the Greek of the Hellenic Diaspora. For a discussion of the Greek language in America, see Seaman 1972.

REFERENCES CITED

Brown, Roger and Albert Gilman
    1960 "The Pronouns of Power and Solidarity." In *Style in Language,* edited by Thomas A. Sebeok, 253–276. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Technology Press of Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Fairclough, Norman
    1989 *Language and Power.* Language in Social Life Series. London and New York:
        Longman.

Ferguson, Charles
    1959 "Diglossia." *Word* 15: 325–340.

Halliday, Michael Alexander Kirkwood
    1978 "Anti-language." In *Language as Social Semiotic: The Social Interpretation of
        Language and Meaning.* London: Edward Arnold. Baltimore: University Park
        Press.

Hill, Peter
    1991 *The Dialect of Gorno Kalenik.* Columbus, Ohio: Slavica.

Jernudd, Björn H. and Michael J. Shapiro, editors
    1989 *The Politics of Language Purism.* Contributions to the Sociology of Language
        54. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Katsanis, Nikos and Konstandinos Dinas
    1990 Νίκος Κατσάνης και Κωνσταντίνος Ντίνας, *Γραμματική της κοινής
        κουτσοβλαχικής.* Αρχείο Κουτσοβλαχικών Μελετών 1. Thessaloniki.

Lakoff, Robin Tolmach
    1990 *Talking Power: The Politics of Language in Our Lives.* New York: Basic Books.

Makrí-Tsilipáku, Marianthi
    1984 Μαριάνθη Μακρή-Τσιλιπάκου, «Απόπειρα περιγραφής της νεοελληνικής
        προσφώνησης». In *Studies in Greek Linguistics. Proceedings of the 4th Annual
        Meeting of the Department of Linguistics, Faculty of Philosophy, Aristotelian
        University of Thessaloniki 16–18 May 1983,* 219–239. Thessaloniki: Afon.
        Kiriakídi.

Messing, Gordon
    1988 *A Glossary of Greek Romany As Spoken in Agia Varvara (Athens).* Columbus,
        Ohio: Slavica.

Nar, Alvertos
    1985 Αλβέρτος Ναρ, *Οι συναγωγές της Θεσσαλονίκης. Τα τραγούδια μας.*
        Thessaloniki: Israïlitikí Kinótita.

Partridge, Eric
    1950 *Slang Today and Yesterday, with a Short Historical Sketch; and Vocabularies of
        English, American, and Australian Slang.* New York: Bonanza Books.

Petropoulos, Elias
    1971 Ηλίας Πετρόπουλος, *Καλιαρντά.* Athens.

Seaman, P. David
    1972 *Modern Greek and American English in Contact.* Janua Linguarum, Series
        Practica, 132. The Hague: Mouton.

Wexler, Paul
    1981 "Jewish Interlinguistics." *Language* 57 (1): 99–149.

Wodak, Ruth, editor
  1989 *Language, Power and Ideology. Studies in Political Discourse.* Amsterdam and
       Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Wolfson, Nessa and Joan Manes, editors
  1985 *Language of Inequality.* Contributions to the Sociology of Language 36. Berlin
       and New York: Mouton.