

# MEDITERRANEAN LANGUAGE REVIEW

edited by  
Matthias Kappler and Werner Arnold

with the editorial assistance of  
Ingeborg Hauenschild

17 (2006–2010)

Harrassowitz Verlag · Wiesbaden

The MEDITERRANEAN LANGUAGE REVIEW is an interdisciplinary peer-reviewed forum for the investigation of language and culture in the Mediterranean. The editors of this periodical welcome articles, reviews, review articles, and bibliographical surveys in English, French, German, Italian, and Spanish relating to the following aspects of Mediterranean languages, past and present:

- linguistic contact and diffusion in the Mediterranean area and its hinterland;
- interaction of language and culture in the region; cases studies of linguistic relativity; culturally determined language behaviour;
- sociolinguistic aspects: dialectology, language policy, koiné and levelling, sociolects, diglossia and bilingualism;
- the historical evolution and present state of languages spoken by small nations and ethnic minorities (e.g. Berber, Albanian in Italy and Greece, Neo-Aramaic, Judeo-Arabic, Judezmo, the languages of Gypsies, etc.); language problems endemic to small spaker communities in the region; ethnolinguistic research on Bedouin;
- religion and language: confessional affiliation and language use; liturgical languages;
- ethnolinguistic studies on island communities in the Mediterranean (Corsica, Sardinia, Cyprus, Malta, the Greek islands, etc.); linguistic obsolescence;
- linguistic stratification: areal typology and the languages of the Mediterranean littoral; substratal phenomena;
- interlinguas: Kultursprachen of the Mediterranean (Greek, Latin, Italian, Arabic, etc.); the lexical impact of globalization; Mediterranean Lingua Franca; maritime linguistics; lexical convergence; relics of colonial and maritime English, e.g. in Maltese, Egyptian Arabic, Cypriot Greek, etc.; marginal language;
- approaches to Mediterranean lexicology (Worte und Sachen); ethnolinguistic studies of traditional professions; the levelling linguistic impact of globalization.

Manuscripts for publication, books for review, and other correspondence should be sent to one of the following addresses:

Prof. Dr. Matthias Kappler, University of Cyprus, Department of Turkish and Middle Eastern Studies, P.O.Box 20537, CY-1678 Nicosia, Cyprus, e-mail: [mkappler@ucy.ac.cy](mailto:mkappler@ucy.ac.cy)

Prof. Dr. Werner Arnold (the Semitic world), Universität Heidelberg, Seminar für Sprachen und Kulturen des Vorderen Orients, Semitistik, Sandgasse 7, D-69117 Heidelberg, Germany, e-mail: [arnold@uni-hd.de](mailto:arnold@uni-hd.de)

© Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden 2011

This journal, including all of its parts, is protected by copyright. Any use beyond the limits of copyright law without the permission of the publisher is forbidden and subject to penalty. This applies particularly to reproductions, translations, microfilms and storage and processing in electronic systems.

Printing and binding by Hubert & Co., Göttingen

Printed on permanent/durable paper

Printed in Germany

[www.harrassowitz-verlag.de](http://www.harrassowitz-verlag.de)

ISSN 0724-7567

## CONTENTS

Preface		V
ARTICLES		
J. Davy & P. Pavlou	<i>Reflections of Osmanli in Cypriot Greek: Epenthesis, Labial-Adjacency and Roundness</i>	1
A. Arvaniti	<i>Linguistic Practices in Cyprus and the Emergence of Cypriot Standard Greek</i>	15
Y. Marom & A. Geva-Kleinberger	<i>One Soul, Two Lifetimes: A Druze Text from Mount Carmel on Reincarnation</i>	47
R. Henkin	<i>Bilingual Humor in Written Negev Arabic and Its Oral Roots</i>	65
V. Ritt-Benmimoun	<i>Knaben- und Männerspiele der Maṛāzīg (Südtunesien)</i>	89
BOOK REVIEWS		
L. Edzard	<i>Arabisch, Hebräisch und Amharisch als Sprachen in modernen diplomatischen Dokumenten. Grammatikalische, lexikalische und stilistische Probleme in synchroner und diachroner Perspektive</i> (M. Waltisberg)	157
L. Edzard & J. Retsö (eds.)	<i>Current Issues in the Analysis of Semitic Grammar and Lexicon I</i> (B. Burtea)	161
S. Gralla	<i>Der arabische Dialekt von Nabk (Syrien)</i> (V. Ritt-Benmimoun)	167
J.-C. Haelewyck	<i>Grammaire comparée des langues sémitiques. Éléments de phonétique, de morphologie et de syntaxe</i> (M. Waltisberg)	169
G. Khan (ed.)	<i>Semitic Studies in honour of Edward Ullendorff</i> (R. Voigt)	180

## PREFACE

After an interruption of several years, the *Mediterranean Language Review* is reborn – with a new editorship! Having retired from academic life at the Wolfgang Goethe University/Frankfurt, Marcel Erdal, who edited the journal for 12 years, has passed it on to us. During his tenure as editor, the *Mediterranean Language Review* attained a high scientific standard and became a recognised forum for contributions and discussion on linguistic issues all around the Mediterranean region. We think that the periodical should continue under its interdisciplinary and probably unique profile to combine structural and sociolinguistic approaches with cultural – in its broadest sense – topics and contexts. We hope to maintain the high standards of this journal, and count on the contributions of numerous colleagues who believe, as we do, that the Mediterranean ('White Sea' / *Mare nostrum*), is a fascinating linguistic subject area worthy of study under a variety of aspects and views that deserves a scientific journal of its own.

The present volume 17 includes contributions submitted under the previous editorship. Thus it represents both a conclusion and an inauguration. It also contains an article under the co-authorship of our Cypriot colleague Pavlos Pavlou, who we tragically lost in the summer of 2010. By placing his contribution at the beginning of this issue, we wish to pay tribute to the memory of this truly Mediterranean scholar.

The editors  
Matthias Kappler

Werner Arnold

AMALIA ARVANITI  
*University of California, San Diego*

## LINGUISTIC PRACTICES IN CYPRUS AND THE EMERGENCE OF CYPRIOT STANDARD GREEK\*

### 1. INTRODUCTION

The past two decades have seen a proliferation of scholarly work on the linguistic situation in Cyprus. This body of work is concerned with several topics: the speakers' awareness of the linguistic varieties spoken on the island (e.g., Karyolemou & Pavlou 2001); the role and extent of borrowing, particularly from English (e.g., Davy, Ioannou & Panayotou 1996); the relationship between education and language (e.g., Papapavlou 2004); the status of Cypriot Greek compared to Standard Greek (Karyolemou 2000; Moschonas 2002), the development of a Cypriot koine and of dialectal leveling in the island (Terkourafi 2005; Tsiplakou & al. 2006); code-switching and code-mixing (Tsiplakou 2009a, 2009b, 2009c); language attitudes among Cypriot speakers (among many, Ioannou 1991; Karoulla-Vrikkis 1991; Karyolemou 1994; McEntee-Atalianis & Pouloukas 2001; Sivas 2003; Tsiplakou 2003). One aspect that has not received as much attention by comparison is the form that Standard Greek<sup>1</sup> takes in Cyprus, where it is the official language (together with Turkish). The

\* The bulk of the data in this article was gathered in Cyprus from 1996 to 2001, with additional data collected since then using a variety of web resources. Thanks are due first to my students at the University of Cyprus, who often discussed with me their views on and reactions to the linguistic situation. Thanks are also due to Brian Joseph, Astrid Kraehenmann, Yoryia Aggouraki, Georgios Georgiou, Yiannis Ioannou, Marilena Karyolemou, Anna Panayotou, Yannis Papadakis, Anna Roussou and Stavroula Tsiplakou for discussing various aspects of this work with me and providing me with data and sources. Finally, I thank Ad Backus and Kit Woolard for comments on an early version of this paper.

1 The term Standard Greek refers to the variety of Greek (based on Dhimotiki but with a Katharevusa component) that emerged as the standard variety in Greece after the abolition of diglossia in 1976. A discussion of this development is beyond the scope of this paper, but see Frangoudaki (1992, 2002).

reason why this topic is largely neglected is to an extent the tacit assumption that the Standard Greek used in Cyprus today is not different from the Standard Greek used in Greece, and therefore merits no special attention (but see Panayotou 1999; Arvaniti 2006a, 2006b).

Here I present data which show that Standard Greek as used in Cyprus has been increasingly diverging from Standard Greek as spoken in Greece to the point that it is now recognizably different from it. The most salient and common features of this new code, which I call *Cypriot Standard Greek*, are presented here in some detail.

What makes the emergence of Cypriot Standard Greek of some interest is that it happened during a period when increased contact between Cyprus and Greece would have been more likely to lead to convergence rather than divergence between the two standards (and indeed existing research suggests that acrolectal Cypriot Greek is influenced by Standard Greek; e.g., Tsiplakou 2009c). It is argued here that one of the reasons why divergence is taking place is that the differences between these two varieties of Standard Greek are not recognized by the Cypriot speakers. It is further argued that this lack of recognition is related to the recursive erasure that characterizes the linguistic situation on the island: the differences between Standard Greek and the Cypriot variety are seen as minimal, while the speakers often report that they speak Standard Greek fluently and “correctly” (e.g., Tsiplakou 2003, 2009c; Papapavlou 2004). In turn, these attitudes further serve to obliterate in the mind of the speakers the differences between Standard Greek as used in Greece and Standard Greek as used in Cyprus and hence to the consolidation of the divergent features.

Before I proceed with the presentation of Cypriot Standard Greek, I provide a brief background to the current situation, since the history of Cyprus, the peculiarities of the Cypriot educational system, and the linguistic situation today directly bear on the emergence of Cypriot Standard Greek. I finally discuss in more detail the reasons for the emergence of this new code.

## 2. BRIEF HISTORICAL AND LINGUISTIC BACKGROUND

### 2.1 Historical background

Cyprus has been populated by Greeks since the Bronze Age (ca. 1400 B.C.), while Turks from Anatolia began settling on the island when

Cyprus became part of the Ottoman Empire, in 1571. In 1878, after their defeat in the Russo-Turkish war, the Ottomans handed control of Cyprus to Britain, and half a century later, in 1925, Cyprus became a British colony.

In 1960 Cyprus gained its independence from Britain, after the long anti-colonial struggle of the Greek Cypriot community which intensified in the late 1950s. Independence did not satisfy either the Greek majority, or the Turkish minority: Greek Cypriots had fought for [enosis]<sup>2</sup> ‘union’ with Greece, while Turkish Cypriots advocated the partition of the island (*taksim*) into a Turkish and a Greek domain that would join Turkey and Greece respectively. Independence was soon followed by interethnic clashes, which in 1974 culminated in a coup by nationalist Greek Cypriots, and the subsequent military invasion of the island by Turkey. The ongoing occupation of the northern third of Cyprus (where the majority of the Turkish Cypriots now live) has led to the de facto partition of the island (a situation that has not been resolved despite the ascension of Cyprus to the European Union in 2004). Here I deal only with the linguistic situation in the non-occupied areas of the Republic of Cyprus, where the majority of the Greek Cypriots now live (on the linguistic situation in the Turkish Cypriot community, see Georgiou-Scharlipp & Scharlipp 1998; Demir 2002; Kurtböke 2004; Kizilyürek & Gautier-Kizilyürek 2004).

## 2.2. Official codes and vernaculars in Cyprus

The official languages of Cyprus are Greek and Turkish,<sup>3</sup> terms that refer to the standards that are also used as official languages in Greece and Turkey respectively. These standards are very different from the Greek

2 Examples, whether oral or written, are presented in broad phonetic transcription, with stress marked only when necessary. Examples are presented in Greek or Cypriot orthography if they concern spelling conventions.

3 Today the use of Turkish in the non-occupied areas is nominal. Vestiges of its official status are evident in some official documents, in passports, and in banknotes, but few Greek Cypriots speak it. Although exact numbers are hard to come by, according to Sciriha (1995) only 4% of the population reported they understand Turkish, and only 1.8% that they speak it; in that study all those reporting some knowledge of Turkish were more than thirty years old. According to the 2001 Cyprus census only 0.05% of the population reported that the language they speak best is Turkish.

and Turkish varieties local to Cyprus (see below). Standard Greek in particular is not spoken as a native language in Cyprus except by Greeks who are either permanent residents (2.5% of the population, according to the 2001 census) or reside in Cyprus for limited periods of time (such as students at the University of Cyprus, teachers, and army officers).

In the non-occupied parts of the Republic of Cyprus, the majority of the population now consists of native speakers of Cypriot,<sup>4</sup> a variety traditionally described as a dialect of Greek (Newton 1972a; Kontosopoulos 2001). Cypriot is often divided into *town speech*, and *village Cypriot* or *village speech* (Newton 1972b). Town speech – also known as *urban Cypriot*, and *local Cypriot Koine* (Karyolemou & Pavlou 2001, and Kolitsis 1988, respectively) is taken by the speakers themselves to be ‘**the Cypriot dialect par excellence**’ (Karyolemou & Pavlou 2001: 119). It is a variety mostly based on the speech of educated speakers from the capital, Nicosia, and can be seen as the standard of the vernacular (cf. Abd-El-Jawad 1987, and Haeri 1997, on the comparable status of Baghdad Arabic in Iraq and Cairo Arabic in Egypt respectively; for a treatment of Cypriot Koine and its historical development, see Terkourafi 2005, 2010). Village speech, on the other hand, is a term used to describe a host of geographically based linguistic varieties (Newton 1972b), though it has been argued that due to dialectal leveling, village Cypriot today is no longer differentiated along geographical lines (among others, Tsiplakou & al. 2006; Tsiplakou 2009c). Village and town Cypriot form a continuum with village Cypriot as the basilect and town Cypriot as the acrolect (see Davy & al. 1996, Karyolemou & Pavlou 2001, and Goutsos & Karyolemou 2004, for similar views).

Although Cypriot is considered a dialect of Greek, Standard Greek and Cypriot are too dissimilar to be mutually intelligible. For example, Papadakis (2000) reports that Greek film distributors felt that a Cypriot film about the Turkish invasion needed subtitles in order to be intelligible to audiences in Greece (and for this reason decided not to distribute it, a point to which I return). Similarly, in Tsiplakou (2003) several Cypriot speakers report that when they were first exposed to television programs from Greece they could not understand what was said, even though they

4 According to the 2001 census, 91.7% of the population responded that the language they speak best is “Greek.” No distinction was made between varieties of Greek, but it is reasonable to assume that most respondents speak Cypriot natively, not Standard Greek.

were taught Standard Greek at school. These statements require some qualification, however. First, lack of intelligibility is not mutual: nowadays Cypriots are familiar with Standard Greek through the media, their schooling and increasing contact with Greece, while Greeks remain unfamiliar with Cypriot, so Greek speakers are less likely to understand Cypriots than vice versa. Second, the Cypriot that is unintelligible to Greeks is that spoken among Cypriots themselves, not the variety used when addressing Greeks, which shows traits of accommodation to the Greek addressees (Papapavlou 1998; McEntee-Atalianis & Pouloukas 2001; Papadakis 2003; Tsiplakou 2009c).

In addition to formal differences, Cypriot and Standard Greek belong to largely different *sprechbunds*. For example, Papadakis (2003) shows that Greeks are seen as *glib* by Cypriots due to their (perceived) eloquence in Standard Greek and ease with repartee. Similarly, the comparative work of Terkourafi on politeness in Cyprus and Greece demonstrates that Greeks and Cypriots do not share politeness strategies, such as the use of diminutives and the T/V distinction, both of which are used extensively in Greece and are considered exaggerated and unfriendly respectively by many Cypriot speakers (Terkourafi 1997, 2001, 2003, 2004).

It is also important to note that although Greek has been an official language of Cyprus since 1960, English is still widely used in many domains. English is employed in administration, banking and health care, and was the exclusive language of the law until 1987 (until 2005 at least, the translation of law documents into Greek was not complete; for details on the use of English and Greek in Cyprus see Karyolemou 2001, 2010; Karoulla-Vrikki 2010). In addition, English is the medium of education in most private secondary schools (where only a limited number of courses on Greek are offered), and in the private tertiary colleges; Standard Greek is the medium of education only in state schools and the state-funded universities (University of Cyprus, Open University of Cyprus and Cyprus University of Technology).<sup>5</sup>

5 This statement is somewhat misleading, as the Open University of Cyprus and the Cyprus University of Technology are very recent developments: both were established in 2004 and admitted the first students in 2007; until then, state-funded tertiary colleges used English as their language of instruction, with the exception of the nursing college.

### 2.3. The relationship between Cypriot and Standard Greek

Cypriot and Standard Greek show clear functional differentiation in Cyprus. Standard Greek, which is learnt through formal schooling, is used in all forms of writing (with a few marked exceptions discussed immediately below), and in some forms of oral discourse, such as news broadcasting; Cypriot, which is acquired at home, is used in all face-to-face interactions among Cypriots (Makridis c. 1999; Karyolemou & Pavlou 2001; Tsiplakou 2009c). Cypriot is also used in the media but almost exclusively for humorous purposes; it is used, for example, in television and radio comedies, in the captions of political cartoons, and in humorous commercials often for local products for which basilectal varieties of Cypriot are preferred (Pavlou 2004). Even television dramas make limited use of Cypriot, typically employing a refined form of town Cypriot to the amusement of local viewers who find this variety artificial and pretentious, as it borrows heavily from Standard Greek. The only non-humorous written use of Cypriot is in poetry.

The way in which Cypriot is used beyond face-to-face interactions indicates that it is not considered as prestigious as Standard Greek, and indeed this is the evaluation that emerges from ethnographic and sociolinguistic studies (Sciriha 1995; Papapavlou 1998; Papadakis 2003). This difference is most probably also reinforced by the negative attitudes of teachers towards the use of Cypriot at school (Tsiplakou 2003; Papapavlou 2004), and by the fact that Cypriot is not standardized. Cypriot does not have a generally accepted orthography, while Newton (1972b) remains the only complete description of (just the phonological) part of its grammar (a complete grammar, however, is now in preparation: Tsiplakou, Coutsougera & Pavlou, forthcoming). In addition, many other works that deal with Cypriot define it in a negative fashion, typically as a set of vocabulary items or expressions that do not exist in Standard Greek (e.g. Yiangoullis 1994, 2002, 2005), thereby unwittingly reinforcing the message that Cypriot is a linguistic variety with limited resources.

The above depict a linguistic situation that bears the hallmarks of Ferguson's (1959) classic diglossia. Indeed Moschonas (1997), Terkou-rafi (2005, 2010) and Tsiplakou (2003, 2009c) do describe it as such. This view, however, is not espoused by all scholars; Davy & al. (1996), Karyolemou & Pavlou (2001) and Goutsos & Karyolemou (2004) argue that the situation is far more complex than a dichotomy would suggest. A full discussion of this issue is beyond the scope of the paper; however, a few

comments are necessary as the lack of recognition of the diglossic situation has a bearing on the emergence of the local variety of Standard Greek.

Arguments to the effect that a linguistic situation is too complex to be seen as dichotomous are not new; they have been used to refute Ferguson's description of Arabic diglossia as well (see Haeri 2000, and references therein). But, as Haeri (2000: 66) points out, following Caton (1991), Ferguson's is "a model of what the community perceives as appropriate usage based on historically and institutionally inculcated norms," not a model of what exact form of every word a speaker will use in any given situation. In this sense, classic diglossia applies to Cyprus, since functional differentiation may not always be obvious to linguists who pay close attention to form, but it is certainly apparent to the speakers themselves who have a clear sense that certain circumstances call for Cypriot and others for Standard Greek and evaluate speakers according to their skill in using both appropriately. Thus, Cypriots use the term [kalamarizo] 'speak like a person from Greece' ([kalamaras] being a derogatory term for mainland Greeks<sup>6</sup>) to describe the linguistic behavior of Cypriots who try to speak Standard Greek in situations that call for Cypriot, a behavior that is considered pretentious and attracts ridicule (Newton 1983). On the other hand, Cypriots are equally ready to deride speakers who use Cypriot in circumstances that call for Standard Greek; such speakers are seen as uncouth, even if they are educated and proficient in another language, such as English, and they are often said "not to know Greek" (for remarks from speakers that support this description see Tsiplakou 2009c; for similar remarks in Egypt about speakers who are not proficient in Classical Arabic, see Haeri 2000).

The fact that Cypriot has a term like [kalamarizo] further implies that for the lay speakers Cypriot and Standard Greek do not form a continuum but are categorically distinct, even though features from urban Cypriot may transfer to Standard Greek and vice versa (for such transfer see Tsiplakou 2009a, 2009b, 2009c). This type of interaction between H and L in a diglossic situation was first noted in Ferguson (1959), but as Haeri

6 The word [kalamaras] literally means 'person with quill/scribbler'; it is believed that it was first used by Cypriots for Greeks because the latter came to the island in the late 19<sup>th</sup> and early 20<sup>th</sup> c. as teachers. According to some, today's pejorative sense of the word derives from the negative feelings that Cypriots developed towards Greeks after the 1974 Turkish invasion for which many hold the Greeks responsible (Papadakis 2003).

(1997: 797) points out, in order for the users to perceive linguistic varieties or styles as distinct, these “must somehow continue to bear a mark of distinctness” even if some mixture is involved. Therefore, since the speakers see Cypriot and Standard Greek as distinct, and agree on which circumstances call for each variety, the situation is best seen as diglossic.

### 3. CYPRIOT STANDARD GREEK

#### 3.1. Data and sources

As already mentioned, an implicit assumption is that the formal variety used in Cyprus is Standard Greek, in other words the code that is also used as the standard in Greece. However, a close look shows that *Standard Greek as used in Cyprus* differs from both acrolectal forms of Cypriot and from *Standard Greek as used in Greece*. These differences pertain to all levels of linguistic structure, and show influences from English and Cypriot. The influence of Cypriot is most evident in phonetics, phonology and morphology, while the influence of English is most evident in the lexicon. These differences are widespread and numerous enough to make Cypriot Standard Greek distinct from Standard Greek as used in Greece.

The data on which this conclusion and the following description of Cypriot Standard Greek are based were collected between 1999 and 2005 and come from a variety of written and oral sources. The data presented here are indicative rather than exhaustive, in that only the more widespread features and limited examples are presented. Most importantly for the view that these features form a new code are the following two traits. First, they were present on repeated occasions in oral and written discourse from unrelated domains. Thus, they cannot be considered simple “mistakes” of different speakers. Evidence that we are not dealing with random mistakes but with deliberate choices also comes from the fact that typically the users are unaware that these features they use are ungrammatical or non-existent in Standard Greek (a point to which I return in section 4). Second, several of these features co-occurred, as illustrated in (1) below. The sentence in (1) contains a word, [etites] ‘applicants’, which does not exist in Standard Greek, and a syntactic construction, [opos] + subjunctive, which is now obsolete; both features are so widespread in Cypriot Standard Greek that in an extensive search of electronically available documents I was unable to find any occurrences of the

Standard Greek word for *applicant*, [eton], or the Standard Greek syntactic construction, subjunctive without [opos].

(1) [i etites ixan zitisi opos to kimeno ton prodiayrafon na ine yrameno stin elinici ylosa] ‘the applicants had requested that the text of the technical specifications be written in the Greek language’ (*Simerini* newspaper, 19 July 2002).

In all cases, data were collected from situations in which the use of Standard Greek is expected, and the choices in the remainder of the text showed clearly that the user was aiming for Standard Greek, not Cypriot. This is evident from syntactic and lexical choices, hypercorrections, and from the situation itself. For the oral data, in particular, only domains that require the use of Standard Greek were chosen, such as news broadcasting; spontaneous data including interviews were avoided as in those circumstances code-switching between Cypriot and Standard Greek is the most frequent outcome even when the speakers intend to use exclusively the latter (Pavlou 2004). Specifically, the data come from the following sources: news bulletins in television and radio; Cypriot newspapers; television and newspaper advertisements, and advertising leaflets; television subtitles; official or semi-official documents, such as memos and minutes of the University of Cyprus, job and tender announcements in the *Official Gazette of the Republic of Cyprus*; government and newspaper websites; telephone directories, and information leaflets of banks and the national air carrier, Cyprus Airways.

### 3.2. Cypriot Standard Greek phonetics

Phonetically there is a tendency to adapt Standard Greek to the phonetics of Cypriot (a tendency reflected in the spelling as well, as shown in 3.7 below). First, Cypriot lacks the Standard Greek voiced stops, [b], [d], [g], which are replaced in Cypriot Standard Greek either by their voiceless counterparts, [p], [t], [k], or by prenasalized voiced stops, [ʰb], [ʰd], [ʰg] (since stops are weakly voiced before nasals in Cypriot; Newton 1972b). Examples include [peticur] ‘pedicure’ (Standard Greek [pe<sup>(n)</sup>dicur]); [turpines] ‘turbines’ (Standard Greek [turbines]); [viteo klap] ‘video club’ (Standard Greek [vi<sup>(n)</sup>deo klab]); [pataria] ‘battery’ (Standard Greek [bataria]). As the Standard Greek forms show, prenasalization occurs in Standard Greek as well; however, prenasalized stops are optional, increasingly rare, and occur only intervocally (Arvaniti 1999; Arvaniti

& Joseph 2000), while there exist lexical items that are never pronounced with prenasalization (Householder 1964). In contrast, in Cypriot Standard Greek, prenasalized voiced stops are not restricted in the same way. For example, in a building society advertisement a little girl asks her father how they are going to acquire the house he describes, by saying [me tin eθnici steyastici mbamba] ‘With National Housing daddy?’ It is clear that the little girl was a native speaker of Cypriot who had been instructed to speak Standard Greek, since in Cypriot she would have addressed her father as [papa], while if she were a native speaker of Standard Greek she would have pronounced ‘daddy’ as [baba]. Similar examples include [ngol] ‘goal’ and [mbar] ‘bar’, while [pambu] ‘bamboo’ (Standard Greek [ba<sup>(m)</sup>bu]) and [osama mbin laten] ‘Osama Bin Laden’ (Standard Greek [osama bin la<sup>(n)</sup>den]) exhibit both strategies together.

Finally, Cypriot Standard Greek uses certain phones that are part of the inventory of Cypriot but not of Standard Greek. Thus, Cypriot Standard Greek has postalveolar fricatives, [ʃ] and [ʒ] in loan words and local and foreign names, such as [reportaʒ] ‘report’ (Standard Greek [reportaz]), [ʃut] ‘shoot’ (Standard Greek [sut]), [aʃa] name of Cypriot village, [proeðros buʃ] ‘President Bush’. Cypriot Standard Greek also has geminate consonants whenever a word is spelt with two identical letters, as in [ecc<sup>h</sup>enoθice] ‘was evacuated’ (Standard Greek [ecenoθice] <εκεκνωθηκε>), or [protassi] ‘proposes’ (Standard Greek [protasi] <προτάσσει>).

### 3.3. Cypriot Standard Greek phonology

In phonology there are both differences in the rules used and in the form of lexical items, with many of the differences reflected in the spelling as well (see section 3.7). First, several lexical items show segmental or prosodic differences between Standard Greek and Cypriot Standard Greek; e.g., [nikaraua] ‘Nicaragua’ (Standard Greek [nikarayua]); [trapanaci] ‘drill’ (Standard Greek [tripani]); [ekaton] ‘one hundred’ (Standard Greek [ekato]); [peran] ‘in addition to’ (Standard Greek [pera]); [kombosto] NEUT. ‘stewed fruit’ (Standard Greek [ko<sup>(m)</sup>bosta] FEM.); [ka'rambola] ‘traffic accident involving several cars’ (Standard Greek [kara<sup>(m)</sup>bola]); [plimira] ‘flooding’ (Standard Greek [pli'mira]).

Second, Cypriot Standard Greek replaces Standard Greek [j] – which does not exist in Cypriot – with [i].<sup>7</sup> In these cases, the use of [i] results in an extra syllable, the presence of which can affect the position of stress, since stress can only appear on one of the last three syllables of a word; e.g., [ɣa.'i.ða.ros] ‘donkey’ (Standard Greek [ˈɣaj.ða.ros]; cf. Cypriot [ˈɣar-ros]); [kar.'ði.a] ‘heart’ (Standard Greek [kar.'ðja]; cf. Cypriot [kar.'ca]); [sa.va.to.ci.'ri.a.ko] ‘weekend’ (Standard Greek [sa.va.to.'ci.rja.ko]; cf. Cypriot [circa'ci] ‘Sunday’).

Third, Cypriot Standard Greek has fricative + stop clusters in learned words in which Standard Greek has stop + stop clusters (a remnant of Katharevusa). Examples include [iðioxtitis] ‘owner’ (Standard Greek [iðioktitis]), [exprosopi] ‘representatives’ (Standard Greek [ekprosopi]), [ex ton uk anef] ‘a must’ (Standard Greek [ek ton uk anef]). Such pronunciations are often reflected in the spelling: for instance, in a letter addressed to the University of Cyprus a student repeatedly spelled the word ‘accepted’ as <δεχτή> (i.e. [ðexti]), instead of <δεκτή> (i.e. [ðekti]) which is the spelling (and pronunciation) Standard Greek calls for, at least in formal styles.

Finally, in Standard Greek when a word is stressed on the penult (or antepenult) and is followed by a disyllabic (or monosyllabic) enclitic, it acquires a second stress (enclitic stress); e.g. [to ti'lefono] ‘the telephone’ but [to ti'lefo'no mu] ‘my telephone’. Cypriot Standard Greek on the other hand lacks enclitic stress, a feature that is transferred from Cypriot; e.g., [tis ta'ftotitas tu] ‘his identity GEN.’.

### 3.4. Cypriot Standard Greek morphology

Morphologically Cypriot Standard Greek shows greater fluctuation in the use of forms inherited from Katharevusa, as well as a more generalized tendency to level paradigms. This tendency exists in Standard Greek too, but it is not observed in formal styles and the speech of educated speakers, while the leveled forms are much more stigmatized in Standard Greek than in Cypriot Standard Greek.

7 This analysis differs from Newton (1972b) which included /j/ in the phonemic inventory of Cypriot. The situation is too complex to describe here; simplifying considerably, in Cypriot, [j] is the palatal allophone of the voiced velar fricative /ɣ/ before the front vowels /i/ and /e/, but not a non-syllabic allophone of /i/; finally note that in Standard Greek /j/ is produced as a voiced palatal fricative [j] except in descending diphthongs such as a [aj].

First, in Standard Greek masculine and feminine nouns with stress on the antepenult and ending in the suffix [os] in nominative singular receive antepenultimate stress in the nominative plural too; e.g. [o 'polemos] ‘the war NOM.’, [i 'polemi] ‘the wars NOM.’. In Cypriot Standard Greek, such nouns receive penultimate stress in the nominative plural (by analogy to the genitive plural, which has penultimate stress). For example: [ðen iparxun ute ðia'ðromi pleon sto patoma] ‘there aren’t even corridors any more on the floor [i.e. the Cyprus Stock Exchange]’ (Standard Greek [ði'aðromi]); [sto aeroskafos iparxun tesaris ek'soði cinðinu] ‘on the aircraft there are four emergency exits’ (Cyprus Airways safety instructions video), or [kaliptonde oles sas i ek'soði] ‘all your outings are covered’ (Bank of Cyprus credit card advertisement; Standard Greek ['eksoði]); [ða xrisimopiiθun tris i'soði os akoluθos] ‘three entrances will be used as follows’ (University of Cyprus Student Welfare Office memo; Standard Greek ['isoði]); [exun simbliroθi i fa'celi] ‘the files have been completed’ (Minister of Health; Standard Greek ['faceli]); [me nices ksecinisan i andi'pali ton omaðon mas] ‘with victories begun the adversaries of our teams’ (televised sports news; Standard Greek [a<sup>(n)</sup>dipali]).

Second, Cypriot Standard Greek shows unrestricted use of the genitive plural of feminine nouns. In contrast, in Standard Greek these genitives are avoided and largely replaced by the periphrastic construction [apo] + accusative. If the genitive is used at all, the stress typically moves to the final syllable, while in Cypriot Standard Greek the stress is kept on the syllable it is found in the nominative; e.g., [ton ka'reklon] ‘the chairs GEN.’; [ton pi'sinon] ‘the swimming pools GEN.’; [ton ko'pelon] ‘the girls GEN.’; [set katsa'rolon] ‘set [of] cooking pots GEN.’ All of these genitives would have been expressed periphrastically in Standard Greek, as in [set apo katsa'roles] lit. ‘set of cooking pots ACC.’.

Third, some irregular verbs (another Katharevusa remnant) are becoming regularized in Cypriot Standard Greek (see also Karyolemou 2010, for a discussion). For example: [isiksame to neo proion] ‘we introduced the new product’ (information leaflet of Cyprus Airways; Standard Greek [isayayame]); [na tus mazepsume ce na tus prosaksume sti ðiceosini] ‘we [should] round them up and bring them to justice’ (Standard Greek [na tus prosayayume]); [ja na paraksun ta ðiilistiria petreleo] ‘so that the refineries may produce oil’ (Standard Greek [parayayun]).

Finally, in Standard Greek, incipient loans from English either lose their plural marker, or (much more rarely) retain it but it becomes opaque;

e.g., [ta kobjuter] ‘the computers’, [ta ceik] ‘the cakes’, but also [to tanks] ‘the tank’ and [to klips] ‘the hairclip’. In contrast, in Cypriot Standard Greek such loans appear with the English plural marker only when plural is required; e.g., the Yellow Pages include headings such as [pet šops] ‘pet shops’ and [viteo klaps] ‘video clubs’, while a supermarket leaflet advertised [slips] ‘underpants’, [ceiks] ‘cakes’, [fails] ‘files’, and [klips] ‘paper clips’.

### 3.5. Cypriot Standard Greek syntax

There are perhaps fewer differences between Standard Greek and Cypriot Standard Greek when it comes to syntax, but such differences exist nonetheless. One such difference relates to negation: although both Standard Greek and Cypriot have double negation, in Cypriot Standard Greek the verb in constructions with [ute] ‘not even’ is not negated. Thus, in Cypriot Standard Greek we find sentences like the following: [ute i pjo nosiri fandasia ða borurse na silavi afto ton polemo] ‘not even the sickest imagination could conceive of this war’ (Standard Greek [ðe ða boruse]); [ute ena poðosferiko ðavma ða itan arceto na anatrepsti to apotelezma] ‘not even a football miracle would be sufficient to reverse the result’ (Standard Greek [ðe ða itan arceto]); [ute na klapso boro] ‘I can’t even cry’ (reported speech in the news; Standard Greek [ute na klapso ðe boro]).

In addition, in certain constructions, Cypriot Standard Greek uses different cases from Standard Greek. For instance, in Standard Greek [opos] ‘like’ takes complements in the nominative, but Cypriot Standard Greek (like Cypriot) uses accusative instead; e.g., [aftos o polemos ðen ine opos tus alus polemus] ‘this war is not like the other wars’ instead of [opos i ali polemi].<sup>8</sup>

Cypriot Standard Greek also uses certain Katharevusa expressions which sound antiquated to Standard Greek speakers. These include [peran] + genitive ‘in addition to’ instead of [pera apo] + accusative; e.g., [peran tu kostus] ‘in addition to the cost’ instead of Standard Greek [pera apo to kostos]. Another such syntactic device, as mentioned earlier, is the use of the conjunction [opos] instead of a simple subjunctive; e.g. [ða sas

8 This construction is altogether unusual in Standard Greek in which the same meaning would be most probably expressed as [aftos o polemos ðen ine san tus alus polemus], i.e. using [san] instead of [opos] to mean ‘like’.

parakalusa opos mas apostilete tis apopsis sas] ‘I would request that you send us your views’ instead of the Standard Greek [θa sas parakalusa nas mas apostilete tis apopsis sas], or [i vuleftes askiosan opos ðiðaskonde ce stis ð io γloses] ‘the members of Parliament demanded that they [new postgraduate programs at the University of Cyprus] be taught in both languages’, instead of [i vuleftes askiosan na ðiðaskonde ...].

Finally, Cypriot Standard Greek uses the past perfect tense (which does not exist in Cypriot proper) with a concrete time reference, something that is ungrammatical for most (though not all) speakers of Standard Greek. For instance: [stis (date) exun jini alajes sto proγrama] lit. ‘on (date) changes have been made to the schedule’ (University of Cyprus webpage; Standard Greek [ejinan alajes]); [simera exete eksipiretiθi apo (name)] lit. ‘today you have been served by (name)’ (quotation form given in a shop; Standard Greek [eksipiretiθikate]); [exo apotaθi sto panepistimio kipru ton aprilio] lit. ‘I have addressed the University of Cyprus in April’ (Standard Greek [apotaθika] ‘I addressed’).

### 3.6. Cypriot Standard Greek lexicon

The lexicon is the area in which the greatest number of differences between Cypriot Standard Greek and Standard Greek are observed. First, in Cypriot Standard Greek many everyday Standard Greek words are replaced by Cypriot terms; e.g., [payopiisi] ‘freezing’ (of an issue) (Standard Greek [payoma]); [frutaria] ‘greengrocer’s’ (Standard Greek *formal* [oporopolio], *informal* [manaviko]); [payotaria] ‘ice-cream parlor’ (Standard Greek [payotadziðiko]); [kapira] ‘toast’ (Standard Greek [friyana]); [ifotis] ‘car body repairer’ (Standard Greek [fanardzis]).

In many cases the differences are due to loans from different sources between the two varieties, and literal translations from English. These have several outcomes. First, English loans may replace in Cypriot Standard Greek items that Standard Greek has borrowed from French (Davy & al. 1996); e.g., [fail] ‘file’ is used instead of Standard Greek [dosje] (cf. French *dossier*), [ndzeli] ‘jelly’ instead of Standard Greek [zele] (cf. French *gelé*), and [ham] ‘ham’ instead of Standard Greek [za<sup>(m)</sup>bon] (cf. French *jambon*). English loans may also replace Standard Greek terms for everyday items; e.g., Cypriot Standard Greek uses [antenna] ‘antenna’ instead of the Standard Greek term [kerea], [pasta tomatas] ‘tomato paste’ instead of Standard Greek [domatopeltes], [karavani] ‘caravan/trailer’ instead of Standard Greek [troxospito], [eksost] ‘exhaust’ instead of

Standard Greek [eksatmisi], and [klip] ‘paper clip’ instead of Standard Greek [sinðetiras].

In addition, the translation of English expressions and words often results in neologisms. Such neologisms include: [ðianoitici iðioktisia], a translation of ‘intellectual property’ (Standard Greek [pnevmatici iðioktisia]); [kocinos sinajermos], a literal translation of ‘red alert’, which does not have a Standard Greek equivalent; [θanatici erevna], a rendition of ‘death inquiry’ (the closest term in Standard Greek would be [iatro-ðikastici eksetasi] ‘medical and judicial inquiry’). Finally, in some cases, translations from English result in the use of common Standard Greek words in inappropriate contexts or with a new meaning. For example, Cypriot Standard Greek renders ‘honourable’ into [endimos], which means *honest* in Standard Greek (the Standard Greek term for *honourable* is [aksiotimos]). Similarly, ‘helpful’ is translated as [voiθitikos], a word that in Standard Greek means ‘auxiliary’ (the Standard Greek term for *helpful* is [eksipiretikos], an adjective that cannot qualify inanimate nouns as [voiθitikos] does in Cypriot Standard Greek).

In addition to influences from English, Cypriot Standard Greek also shows some idiosyncratic vocabulary choices. First, Cypriot Standard Greek often replaces common Standard Greek words with rarer lexical items; examples include [isðoçi] ‘entry’ (e.g., to the University or the Cyprus Stock Exchange), [aneliksi] ‘promotion’, [afipiretisi] ‘retirement’, [tuto] ‘this’, [prosopo] ‘person’. The most commonly used Standard Greek terms are respectively [isayoji], [proayoji], [sindaksi], [afto], and [atomo] or [anθropos] (depending on context). Finally, on occasion, the items used in Cypriot Standard Greek have a different meaning in Standard Greek; e.g. the Cypriot Standard Greek term [psonisma] ‘shopping’ has connotations of soliciting in Standard Greek, in which the usual term for *shopping* is [psona]. In the same way, [sinðetiras] in Standard Greek means ‘paper clip’ but in Cypriot Standard Greek it replaces [siraptiko] ‘stapler’; [civernitikos] is an adjective in Standard Greek meaning ‘governmental’, but in Cypriot Standard Greek it has taken the meaning of ‘civil servant’ (Standard Greek [ðimosios ipalilos] lit. ‘public employee’); [foros] means ‘tax’ in Standard Greek, but in Cypriot Standard Greek is also means ‘tax office’ (Standard Greek [eforia]); [γnosiolojikos] means ‘cognitive’ in Standard Greek (as does the word [γnosiakos]), but in Cypriot Standard Greek it is used in expressions such as [γnosiolojiko epipeðo] ‘level of knowledge’ in which the term [γnostikos] is used in

Standard Greek (i.e. [γnostiko epipeðo]); [ðiastavrono] in Standard Greek means ‘to cross-check’ or ‘to cross’ (e.g. swords), but in Cypriot Standard Greek it means ‘to cross the road’.

### 3.7. Cypriot Standard Greek orthography

Written texts in Cypriot Standard Greek exhibit conventions that do not exist in Standard Greek and reflect aspects of Cypriot phonology adopted by Cypriot Standard Greek. Thus, Cypriot Standard Greek systematically omits enclitic stress (see Phonology); e.g., <παράκληση μας είναι...> (Standard Greek <παράκλησή μας είναι...>), <το οίκημα της> (Standard Greek <το οίκημά της>). In addition, <π>, <τ>, <κ> (which represent [p], [t] and [k] respectively) often replace Standard Greek <μπ>, <ντ>, <γκ/γγ> (which represent [b], [d] and [g] respectively) in the transliteration of foreign names and loan words. For example, <τουρπίνα> ‘turbine’ (Standard Greek <τουρμπίνα>); <βίτεο κλαπ> ‘video club’ (Standard Greek <βίντεο κλαμπ>); <Ναμίπια> ‘Namibia’ (Standard Greek <Ναμίμπια>); <ταπέλλα> ‘sign’ (Standard Greek <ταμπέλα>). Cypriot Standard Greek also uses double letters where Cypriot has a geminate consonant, e.g., <πίττα> ‘pie/pitta bread’, <πέννα> ‘pen’, <Μαρόκκο> ‘Morocco’, <Βρετανία> ‘Britain’, <τουαλέττα> ‘toilet’ instead of Standard Greek <πίτα>, <πένα>, <Μαρόκο>, <Βρετανία>, <τουαλέτα>. Further, Cypriot Standard Greek uses <ι> to reflect the presence of post-alveolars (which, as mentioned earlier, are absent from Standard Greek). For example, <Τσιάντ> ‘Chad’ (Standard Greek <Τσαντ>); <τζιούτο> ‘judo’ (Standard Greek <τζούντο>); <πετ σιοπς> ‘pet shops’ (Standard Greek <πετ σοπ>); Σήλα ‘Sheila’ (Standard Greek <Σήλα>).

Finally, Cypriot Standard Greek uses certain conventions that are completely opaque to Standard Greek speakers. One of these is the use of <X> for the affix [xatʃi] ‘holy man’ found in many surnames; e.g., a surname like [hatʃipetru] can be spelt <X”πέτρου> instead of Standard Greek <Χατζηπέτρου>. The second convention is the acronym <ΛΤΔ>, which is a transliteration of *Ltd* and is of course devoid of meaning in Greek (the equivalent Standard Greek acronym is <ΕΠΕ> for *Εταιρεία Περιορισμένης Ευθύνης*, literally ‘Company [of] Limited Responsibility’).

#### 4. REASONS FOR THE EMERGENCE OF CYPRIOT STANDARD GREEK

The data presented above clearly show that Cypriot Standard Greek is sufficiently different from Standard Greek as used in Greece to be recognized as a distinct linguistic variety. As has been shown, the differences pertain to all levels of linguistic structure and are systematic in the sense that they (co)occur in various unrelated sources that require the use of the standard.

There are several reasons for the emergence of these features. First, Standard Greek is now spreading to domains in which English was used almost exclusively until a few years ago, such as the courts, banking, and administration (Karyolemou 2010; Karoulla-Vrikki 2010). In addition, Standard Greek is now used extensively in the media and in advertising, domains that were very limited in scope until relatively recently. The electronic media in particular were a state monopoly until 1990 (radio) and 1992 (television), and included just three radio programs and two television channels. By 2005, however, Cyprus had six local and eight island-wide television channels, and 38 local and twelve island-wide radio stations. Today there are eight local and seven island-wide channels, nine island-wide radio stations and 42 local ones.<sup>9</sup> A similar boom has taken place in the press. In 1985, ten magazines, six dailies and eleven biweekly and monthly newspapers circulated in Cyprus. In 2005, there were eight dailies and 36 other newspapers, three weekly magazines and 51 magazines of less frequent circulation. Of the 92 publications that have appeared since 1985, 36 started circulating after 2000. The number of publications in circulation in Cyprus today is even more staggering: six daily newspapers, approximately 55 newspapers published weekly, biweekly or monthly and nearly 90 magazines not including publications the language of which is not Greek.<sup>10</sup> Finally, advertising and other information leaflets, newspapers and similar publications virtually non-existent twenty years ago, are now widespread.

9 Source:

[http://www.cyprus.gov.cy/moi/pio/pio.nsf/mass\\_media\\_en/mass\\_media\\_en](http://www.cyprus.gov.cy/moi/pio/pio.nsf/mass_media_en/mass_media_en);  
Ministry of the Interior website, accessed December 15<sup>th</sup>, 2010.

10 Source:

[http://www.cyprus.gov.cy/moi/pio/pio.nsf/mass\\_media\\_en/mass\\_media\\_en](http://www.cyprus.gov.cy/moi/pio/pio.nsf/mass_media_en/mass_media_en);  
Ministry of the Interior website, accessed December 15<sup>th</sup>, 2010.

These new domains have understandably expanded the repertoire of styles and registers of Standard Greek used in Cyprus. First, the use of Standard Greek in administration requires control of a formal style and of specialized registers, which at least some Cypriot speakers may lack, either because of ineffective schooling in Standard Greek (see immediately below), or because they were educated in English-medium schools and later studied in English-medium colleges or abroad. The difficulties of the speakers are reflected in the results of Greek and English proficiency tests taken in the course of applying for government positions; on one such occasion at least, out of a total of 332 applicants who obtained passing grades to these tests only 13% got better grades in the Greek proficiency test, while the rest got better grades in the English proficiency test (source: *Simerini* newspaper, 13 February 2004). Similar difficulties with Standard Greek are reflected in the results of research undertaken by the University of Athens in collaboration with the Pedagogical Institute of Cyprus (source: *Simerini* newspaper, 18 October 2002). This research involved 12<sup>th</sup> grade Cypriot students in Greek-medium schools who took part in a battery of Greek proficiency tests. Although the Cypriot students fared better in some respects than their counterparts in Greece (e.g. they did better in reading comprehension), they had great difficulty with certain aspects of grammar, such as morphology in general and verb morphology in particular (only 42.4% answered more than half the morphology questions correctly; the percentage was down to 21.1% for verb morphology).

In addition to problems with the command of Standard Greek that many users may face, the expansion of the uses of Standard Greek in the media has created new stylistic needs. The popular press, advertising, television and radio require a semi-formal style, for which both Cypriot and Standard Greek may not be suitable. Cypriot could appear too informal and uneducated for many programs, and it is largely unacceptable in writing. Even the most informal styles of Standard Greek, on the other hand, would be too formal and unfriendly for oral use, and would clearly seem artificial and pretentious if used between Cypriots in a casual phone-in or chat show (see also Pavlou 2004).

Furthermore, these semi-formal uses of Standard Greek create practical needs of comprehension particularly when everyday situations – until recently the exclusive realm of Cypriot – must be covered. This need for a style that is recognizable as Standard Greek but is still intelligible to

the average Cypriot was explicitly mentioned as a concern by translators who prepare subtitles for foreign programs broadcast on Cypriot television (Korda-Savva 2001); many reported that they consciously used certain Cypriot lexical items – e.g., [pses] ‘yesterday evening’ for Standard Greek [xtes vraði]) – in their largely Standard Greek copy. The same strategy of inserting Cypriot lexical items into Standard Greek text is also evident in a variety of publications in which comprehension on the part of the public is of paramount importance; e.g., in a job announcement in the *Official Gazette of the Republic of Cyprus* the Cypriot term for ‘carpenter’, [pelekanos], was used instead of the Standard Greek [skiluryos]. Similarly a supermarket leaflet advertised [marmelaða xrisomilo] ‘apricot jam’, [kapires] ‘toast’ and [kaltses] ‘socks’, using the Cypriot terms for *apricot* and *toast* but the Standard Greek term for *socks* (Cypriot [klatses]), presumably because the Standard Greek words for *apricot* and *toast* ([verikoko] and [friyapes] respectively) are most likely unknown to the wider Cypriot public, while the Standard Greek and Cypriot forms for *socks* are similar, and thus using Standard Greek in this case would not cause comprehension problems.<sup>11</sup>

However, the opening of new domains to Standard Greek cannot account for all the divergent features presented here. There are two main reasons why this is so. First, this kind of divergence would be more naturally expected to arise from lack of contact between two speech communities. Such lack of contact characterized Greece and Cyprus in the earlier part of the 20<sup>th</sup> c. (Terkourafi 2003). Yet Cypriot documents from that period are written in impeccable Katharevusa, while my corpus suggests that fewer features of Cypriot Standard Greek appear in texts written by older journalists. These observations suggest that Cypriot Standard Greek is a relatively new phenomenon; most interestingly, it appears at a time of unprecedented contact between Greece and Cyprus, and greater familiarity of Cypriots with Standard Greek. This greater contact is partly due to the fact that Cypriots travel often to Greece for business, and tourism (as an indication, the number of daily flights between Greece and Cyprus increased from eight to sixteen between 1995 and 2001; see also Papadakis 2003, for similar remarks). But even those who do not travel to Greece have become more familiar with different styles of Standard

11 Obviously, the use of Cypriot lexical items may not always be an addressee-oriented strategy; on at least some occasions, authors may simply be unaware that they are using a Cypriot term instead of a Standard Greek one.

Greek through the media: most Greek magazines and newspapers circulate in Cyprus, while Greek programs, such as games, chat shows, sitcoms and soap operas are regularly broadcasted on television. In such cases of great contact, convergence is expected (Trudgill 1983; Milroy 2003; Kerswill 2003; on the effectiveness of linguistic contact through the media, rather than face-to-face interaction, see Foulkes & Docherty 1999). Indeed the influence of Standard Greek on Cypriot has been noted by Karyolemou & Pavlou (2001), who discuss the effects of Standard Greek on the structure and vocabulary of Cypriot, by Terkourafi (1997, 2001), who examines the emerging adoption of certain Standard Greek communicative strategies by Cypriot speakers, and by Tsiplakou (2009a, 2009b, 2009c) who examines the mixing of Standard Greek features in acrolectal Cypriot. Despite this influence of Standard Greek on Cypriot, however, the two varieties remain distinct in the mind of the speakers, as the results of Karyolemou & Pavlou (2001) suggest, while Standard Greek in Cyprus is now more divergent from Standard Greek in Greece than it was half a century ago.

At first glance, the divergence of Cypriot Standard Greek from the Standard Greek of Greece could be attributed to the need of speakers to index their Cypriot identity when speaking the standard (cf. Trudgill 1983, chap. 8). Indeed, research suggests that most speakers wish to distance themselves from Standard Greek (Karyolemou & Pavlou 2001), since, as mentioned earlier, the use of Standard Greek, particularly in oral discourse, is seen as pretentious (Karyolemou & Pavlou 2001; Papadakis 2003). However, this need cannot be the whole answer, because most of the features of Cypriot Standard Greek presented earlier (with the exception of some phonological features) are *not* recognized by Cypriot speakers as features of their own distinct code; rather, they are considered by them to be features of Standard Greek proper. This is indeed the most striking characteristic of Cypriot Standard Greek, namely the fact that its users are largely unaware that it exists.<sup>12</sup>

12 It appears that the usage of Standard Greek in Cyprus may have now begun to attract some attention. In 2002, the Ministry of Education and Culture in collaboration with the Cyprus Radio and Television Authority organized seminars on “The correct use of the Greek language in the electronic mass media,” while in 2004, the Ministry of Education and Culture started offering examinations that lead to certificates of “sufficient knowledge” of Greek for graduates of English-medium high schools (on the assumption that these may be requested by prospective employers).

This lack of awareness is manifested in multiple ways, throughout the speech community. First, it is reflected in the way speakers report their own language usage. In Tsiplakou (2003) many speakers report that they use both Cypriot and Standard Greek equally well, and some even go as far as to claim that they speak Standard Greek better than Cypriot. Similarly, in Papapavlou (2004: 97) at least some Cypriot speakers report that in their daily interactions they use either a Cypriot dialect that is “like Standard Greek, with the presence of Cypriot terms but with the conscious avoidance of Cypriot sounds” or a variety that is “like Standard Greek, without the presence of Cypriot terms and with the conscious avoidance of Cypriot sounds.”

These claims could well reflect what the speakers would like to think about their usage, rather than the reality (and by doing so they indirectly attest to their unfavourable opinion of Cypriot). However, at least two scholars (Karoulla-Vrikkis, pers.com.; Papadakis 2003) agree that although Cypriots are aware of their accent, other “fine differences in morphology, syntax and vocabulary [such as those] noted in Arvaniti (2001) [2002] are not evident to the Cypriot speakers of the Greek formal code” (Papadakis 2003: 540). My own experience at least is in line with these reports: Cypriot speakers are more often than not taken aback if a difference between Standard Greek and Cypriot Standard Greek is pointed out to them.

Another manifestation of the lack of awareness is the presence of a host of hypercorrected forms, first noted by Newton (1983). Such hypercorrections take many forms; e.g., they include novel but widely accepted forms of Cypriot Standard Greek, such as [spanaçi] ‘spinach’ a form that is used instead of the Standard Greek form [spanaci], and also innovations of individual speakers, such as <παγιδάκια> [pa.ji.'ða.ca] ‘lamb chops’ seen on a restaurant menu (Standard Greek <παϊδάκια> [pa.i.'ða.ca]), and <τσιπουράδικο> [tsiburaðiko] ‘place where tsipuro is drunk’ seen on a shop sign (Standard Greek <τσιπουράδικο> [tsipuraðiko]; tsipuro is a Greek alcoholic drink that does not exist in Cyprus except as a recent import from Greece). Such hypercorrections are clearly based on attempts to speak or write Standard Greek (cf. Trudgill 1983, chap. 8, on similar

It is unclear, however, whether these measures reflect an understanding of the differences between Cypriot Standard Greek and Standard Greek, or whether they are a response to more general concerns about language use and the role of English in Cyprus.

attempts by British singers to sound “American”): [spanaçi], e.g., is based on the fact that often, though not in this case, Cypriot [ʃ] – found in the Cypriot form for *spinach*, namely [spanaʃi], corresponds to Standard Greek [ç]; in [pa.ji.'ða.ca] the hypercorrection relates to the deletion, in Cypriot, of intervocalic voiced fricatives which are retained in Standard Greek (cf. Cypriot [laos] vs. Standard Greek [layos] ‘hare’). Finally, in <τσιπουράδικο>, the writer must have noticed that many words spelt with <π> in Cypriot are written with <μπ> in Standard Greek (see also sections 3.2 and 3.7 above). The use of hypercorrections clearly shows that the Cypriot speakers are neither nonchalant about their choices, nor do they try to index their Cypriot identity when using Standard Greek by choosing certain forms or constructions; rather, on certain occasions at least, they strive to use Standard Greek, and assume that they are doing so although they are actually adopting features that belong to the Cypriot variety of Standard Greek, not Standard Greek per se. This is, for instance, evident with forms such as [spanaçi] which Cypriot speakers always assume is the Standard Greek pronunciation.

This lack of recognition of the differences between Cypriot Standard Greek and Standard Greek on the part of the speakers is indirectly replicated in the absence of any discussion of this topic in the Cypriot press where issues of language attitudes and language use are often debated. An extended search of language-related newspaper articles of the past fifteen years yielded only one article (Christides 2003) that noted a feature of Cypriot Standard Greek, namely the use of the masculine forms of titles even when a woman holds the position (e.g., [i yenikos ðiefθindis] ‘the director general, MASC.’ instead of Standard Greek [i yenici diefθindria]). However, even in this case, the difference in practice between Greece and Cyprus was not pointed out.

This lack of awareness of the differences between Standard and Cypriot Standard Greek can be juxtaposed to similar linguistic situations around the globe which yield quite different results from those seen in Cyprus. For instance, one can contrast the Cypriot situation with that of Switzerland – a community with a similar diglossic status quo – where publications do exist that aim at pointing out mistakes Swiss speakers make when using *hoc Deutsch* (e.g., Sieber & Sitta 1991). Cases like that of Switzerland exhibit a more typical pattern in that the speakers show greater norm-awareness for the standard than for the dialects (van Marle 1997). This is also typically the case even when no national standard has

emerged, but different regional standards prevail, as is the case in Germany (Barbour 1987), Italy (Hall 1980), Canada and the USA (Edwards & Jacobsen 1987), where speakers are aware of the differences between the regional standards (even though, as Trudgill 1983 points out, their knowledge tends to be passive and not always accurate). A similar situation also obtains in even larger domains, such as Central and South America in which local state-related varieties co-exist with a supra-regional standard variety of Latin American Spanish that can be juxtaposed to Peninsular Spanish (Hidalgo 1990).

One reason behind the unusual lack of awareness in the Cypriot case could well be the *erasure* of the differences between Standard Greek and Cypriot, “the process in which ideology, in simplifying the sociolinguistic field, renders some [...] sociolinguistic phenomena invisible. Facts that are inconsistent with the ideological scheme either go unnoticed or get explained away” (Irvine & Gal 2000: 38). Irvine & Gal provide as an example a situation in which dialectal variation is ignored if the prevailing ideology prescribes that a language is homogeneous. Precisely this kind of erasure seems to operate on several levels in the Cypriot speech community (and partly in the Greek speech community too, as shown below). On the one hand, in some circumstances speakers admit that Greek and Cypriot are so different as to be (at least occasionally) unintelligible to speakers of the other variety (e.g., Korda-Savva 2001; Tsiplakou 2003; Papadakis 2003). On the other hand, however, the speakers also claim that Cypriot and Standard Greek are very similar, as when they report that “Greek, Cypriot, it’s the same thing” (Sivas 2003: 8). This ideologically prescribed notion of similarity is also manifested in comments of Cypriot speakers to the effect that Cypriot does not exist any more, and that all that remains of it is its pronunciation (Tsiplakou 2003), or as Makridis (c. 1999) puts it “its phonetic guise.”

The same attitude is manifested in the press: the large number of newspaper articles that address linguistic issues always refer to “Greek” and rarely even mention Cypriot, thereby downplaying the differences between the two and relegating Cypriot to just a regional accent. The official stance appears to be the same, as the questions of the 2001 census suggest: as mentioned, people were not asked to specify which variety of Greek they “speak best”. The same erasure (albeit in a more sophisticated form) is evident in the website of the School of Modern Greek that operates at the University of Cyprus. In this website it is mentioned that

the aim of the courses offered is “to teach the Greek language to non-native speakers;” no clarification is given as to which variety of Greek the students will be taught, the implicit assumption being that they will be taught Standard Greek.<sup>13</sup> In order to understand how unusual this assumption is – were we to accept the view that the linguistic situation in Cyprus is not diglossic – one could try to imagine that similar schools in the US or Australia would undertake to teach their students a variety of English other than the local standard, such as British English. In the case of the University of Cyprus School of Modern Greek, however, the local variety is not mentioned at all in the School’s website.<sup>14</sup> In some cases, speakers go to even greater lengths to avoid bringing up the differences between Greek and Cypriot; for example, the Greek film distributors mentioned in Papadakis (2000) decided not to distribute the Cypriot film in Greece because they were unwilling to provide subtitles for it, as subtitles in Greece are only used for foreign language films and broadcasting; thus using subtitles for a Cypriot film would imply that Cypriot is a foreign language to Greeks.

The fact that the differences between the two varieties are downplayed to such an extent is part of the linguistic ideology that Christidis (1999) calls *Greek mythologies*, that is the notion that Greek has remained practically unchanged since Homer, and shows minimal geographical differentiation (for such views, see also Alexiou 1982). The origin of this ideology is not hard to find: language is the most important element of ethnic identity in Greece and Cyprus (Frangoudaki 1997; Trudgill 2000; Sifianou 2003). Thus, any suggestion that Greeks and Cypriots might speak different languages is tantamount to saying they are ethnically distinct, a point that many do not wish to contemplate. The strength of this ideology is such that many Cypriots took exception to the fact that a 2004 report on educational reform in Cyprus used the term *nation-state* to refer to their country. This term incensed politicians, faculty of the Uni-

13 Source: <http://www.ucy.ac.cy/goto/mogr/en-US/Home.aspx>, accessed December 15<sup>th</sup>, 2010.

14 It should be noted that some mention was made to the local variety in earlier versions of the website; e.g., Arvaniti (2006b: 18) mentions that in the then text of the School’s website it was said that “all courses comprise study of the Cyprus dialect, which students will encounter in their day-to-day life” and that the aim of such study was “to identify difficulties foreign speakers *may* [emphasis added] encounter during their daily contact with the Cyprus society.”

versity of Cyprus, teachers, and members of the public alike, since it implied that Cyprus is a separate nation from Greece and therefore that Greeks and Cypriots are ethnically distinct (non-speakers of Greek should note that in Greek *nation* and *ethnic identity* are formed from the same root – they are [eθnos] and [eθnikotita] respectively – while *nationality* [iθajenia] is unrelated to both). The same ideology is inculcated, according to male consultants, to Cypriot young men when they do their army service: they are often told that Greece and Cyprus are different states ([krati]) but form one nation ([eθnos]). Cypriot and Cypriot Standard Greek lexically encode this distinction: the term [elinas] is used to denote all Greeks independently of where they live – that is all people who speak some form of Greek – while the term [elaðitis] is used to denote Greeks from Greece in particular. Thanks to these two terms, in Cypriot and Standard Cypriot Greek there is no contradiction in expressions such as [ta elinopula tis kipru] ‘the Greek children of Cyprus’ which abound in the press and other publications (particularly those of a conservative leaning) and refer to children from Cyprus, not children from Greece.

Now the idea that Greek and Cypriot are very similar, allows the speakers to view the relation between the two varieties as a simple case of ‘standard-with-dialects’ rather than as diglossic. In turn, seeing the situation as ‘standard-with-dialects’ means that there is no need to pay special attention to “fine details” (as Papadakis 2003, puts it), that is to differences in linguistic structure and the lexicon between Standard Greek in Cyprus and Standard Greek in Greece. Equally, there is no need to consider whether the teaching of Greek should be implemented differently in Cyprus than in Greece since, unlike their counterparts in Greece, the vast majority of the Cypriot students have to learn at school a variety that is related to their native tongue but quite different from it (on the cognitive difficulties such a situation may impose on learners, see Barbour 1987, and also Milroy 2002 and references therein; it should be noted that such results are now leading to discussions about possible changes in the language curriculum in Cyprus but this was not the case until recently). Indeed the articles in the Cypriot press and the reactions of many educationalists suggest that the differences discussed here are not given much, if any, attention (unlike, as mentioned, the situation that obtains in Switzerland). Thus, as a result of erasure the use of these new features becomes consolidated as nobody comments on them and nobody tries to address them. In this way they spread, together with the unshakeable be-

lief that they are features of Standard Greek, gradually leading to greater divergence between Standard Greek and the emerging variety, Cypriot Standard Greek.

## 5. CONCLUSION

I have shown that in Cyprus today a new form of Standard Greek – Cypriot Standard Greek – is being gradually created; this form is recognizably different from Standard Greek as spoken in Greece. The origin of this phenomenon can partly be attributed to practical needs and changing circumstances. As shown, however, such needs cannot fully explain the emergence of this new variety. Rather, Cypriot Standard Greek appears to be related also to the reluctance of the community to acknowledge the extent of the differences between Standard Greek and Cypriot, because of the implications that their recognition would carry: according to the dominant ideology, language is the main determiner of ethnicity; thus, admitting that Greek and Cypriot are very different from each other and that Cypriot Standard Greek is not the same as Standard Greek would be tantamount to saying that Greeks and Cypriots are ethnically distinct. This reluctance has gradually led to the emergence of Cypriot Standard Greek, without either the speakers or the commentators being aware that while debating the Cypriot language question Cypriot Standard Greek has been happening to them.

## REFERENCES

- ABD-EL-JAWAD, H. 1987. Cross-dialectal variation in Arabic: competing prestigious forms. *Language in Society* 16: 359–367.
- ALEXIOU, M. 1982. Diglossia in Greece. In: W. Haas (ed.), *Standard Languages: Spoken and Written*. Manchester: 156–192.
- ARVANITI, A. 1999. Greek voiced stops: prosody, syllabification, underlying representations or selection of the optimal? In: *Proceedings of the 3rd International Linguistics Conference for the Greek Language*. Athens: 383–390.
- . 2002. Διμορφία, διγλωσσία και η εμφάνιση της Κυπριακής Νεοελληνικής Κοινής [Dimorphy, diglossia and the emergence of Cypriot Standard Greek]. In: *Recherches en linguistique grecque*. Vol. I. Paris: 75–78.
- . 2006a. Erasure as a mean of maintaining diglossia in Cyprus. *San Diego Linguistic Papers* 2. Available online at [http://escholarship.org/uc/ucsdling\\_sdlp2](http://escholarship.org/uc/ucsdling_sdlp2)
- . 2006b. Linguistic practices in Cyprus and the emergence of Cypriot Standard Greek. *San Diego Linguistic Papers* 2. Available online at [http://escholarship.org/uc/ucsdling\\_sdlp2](http://escholarship.org/uc/ucsdling_sdlp2)

- ARVANITI, A. & JOSEPH, B. 2000. Variation in voiced stop prenasalisation in Greek. *Glossologia* 11–12: 131–166.
- BARBOUR, S. 1987. Dialects and the teaching of a standard language: Some West German work. *Language in Society* 16: 227–244.
- CATON, S. 1991. Diglossia in North Yemen: a case of competing linguistic communities. *Southwest Journal of Linguistics* 10: 143–159.
- CHRISTIDIS, A.-F. 1999. *Γλώσσα, Πολιτική, Πολιτισμός* [Language, Politics, Culture]. Athens.
- CHRISTIDIS, L.-2003. Η ορθή χρήση της ελληνικής γλώσσας [The correct usage of the Greek language]. *Simerini*, 20 March 2003.
- DAVY, J., IOANNOU, Y. & PANAYOTOU, A. 1996. French and English loans in Cypriot diglossia. In: *Chypre hier et aujourd'hui entre Orient et Occident*. (Travaux de la Maison de l'Orient méditerranéen. 25.) Lyon: 127–136.
- DEMIR, N. 2002. “Wollen” im Zyperntürkischen. *Mediterranean Language Review* 14: 9–20.
- EDWARDS, J. & JACOBSEN, M. 1987. Standard and regional standard speech: distinctions and similarities. *Language in Society* 16: 369–380.
- FERGUSON, C. 1959. Diglossia. *Word* 15: 325–340.
- FRANGOUDAKI, A. 1992. Diglossia and the present language situation in Greece: A sociological approach to the interpretation of diglossia and some hypotheses on today's linguistic reality. *Language in Society* 21: 365–381.
- . 1997. The metalinguistic prophecy on the decline of the Greek language: its social function as the expression of a crisis in Greek national identity. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 126: 63–82.
- . 2002. Greek societal bilingualism of more than a century. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 157: 101–107.
- FOULKES, P. & DOCHERTY, G. (eds.) 1999. *Urban Voices: Accent Studies in the British Isles*. London.
- GEORGIU-SCHARLIPP, K. & SCHARLIPP, W. E. 1998. The example of a Turkish Cypriot dialect. *Mediterranean Language Review* 10: 169–178.
- GOUTSOS, D. & KARYOLEMOU, M. 2004. Introduction. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 168: 1–17.
- HAERI, N. 1997. The social reproduction on symbolic capital: language, state, and class in Egypt. *Current Anthropology* 38: 795–816.
- . 2000. Form and ideology: Arabic Sociolinguistics and beyond. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 29: 61–87.
- HALL, R. A., JR. 1980. Language, dialect and ‘Regional Italian’. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 25: 95–106.
- HIDALGO, M. 1990. The emergence of Standard Spanish in the American continent: Implications for Latin American dialectology. *Language Problems and Language Planning* 14: 47–64.
- HOUSEHOLDER, F. W. 1964. Three dreams of Modern Greek phonology. In: P. Austerlitz (ed.), *Papers in memory of George C. Pappageotes*. Supplement to *Word* 20: 17–27.
- IOANNOU, Y. E. 1991. Language, politics and identity: An analysis of the Cypriot dilemma. *The Cyprus Review* 3: 15–41.

- IRVINE, J. T. & GAL, S. 2000. Language ideology and linguistic differentiation. In: P. V. Kroskrity (ed.), *Regimes of Language: Ideologies, Politics, and Identities*. Santa Fe, NM: 35–83.
- KAROULLA-VRIKKIS, D. 1991. The Language of the Greek Cypriots today: A revelation of an identity crisis? *The Cyprus Review* 3: 42–58.
- . 2010. Η ελληνική ως ζήτημα ταυτότητας και γλωσσικού σχεδιασμού στην Κύπρο: Άδειες οδήγησης, διαβατήρια και πινακίδες κυκλοφορίας οχημάτων [Greek as a question of identity and language planning in Cyprus: Driver's licenses, passports and number plates]. In: A. Voskos, D. Goutsos & A. Moser (eds.), *The Greek Language in Cyprus from Antiquity to the Present*. Athens: 262–282.
- KARYOLEMOU, M. 1994. Linguistic attitudes and metalinguistic discourse: An investigation in the Cypriot press. In: I. Philippaki-Warbuton, K. Nicolaidis & M. Sifianou (eds.), *Themes in Greek Linguistics*. Amsterdam: 253–259.
- . 2000. Le chypriote: dialecte ou idiome? In A.-F. Christidis (ed.), *Η ελληνική και οι διάλεκτοί της / La langue grecque et ses dialectes*. (Bilingual edition.) Athens: 43–48 [in Greek]; 111–115 [in French].
- . 2001. Γλωσσικός σχεδιασμός και γλωσσική πολιτική: Η περίπτωση της Κύπρου [Language planning and language policy: The case of Cyprus]. In: *Proceedings of the 4th International Conference on Greek Linguistics*. Thessaloniki: 391–398.
- . 2010. Γλωσσική πολιτική και γλωσσικός σχεδιασμός στην Κύπρο [Language policy and language planning in Cyprus]. In: A. Voskos, D. Goutsos & A. Moser (eds.), *The Greek Language in Cyprus from Antiquity to the Present*. Athens: 242–261.
- KARYOLEMOU, M. & PAVLOU, P. 2001. Language attitudes and assessment of salient variables in a bi-dialectal speech community. In: *Proceedings of the First International Conference on Language Variation in Europe*. Barcelona: 110–120.
- KERSWILL, P. 2003. Dialect leveling and geographical diffusion in British English. In: D. Britain & J. Cheshire (eds.), *Social Dialectology: In honour of Peter Trudgill*. Amsterdam-Philadelphia: 223–243.
- KIZILYÜREK, N. & GAUTIER-KIZILYÜREK, S. 2004. The politics of identity in the Turkish Cypriot community and the language question. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 168: 37–54.
- KOLITSIS, A. M. 1988. The present day Cypriot dialect. In: *The History of the Greek Language in Cyprus. Proceedings of an International Symposium Sponsored by the Pierides Foundation*. Larnaca, Cyprus: 215–222.
- KONTOSOPOULOS, N. 2001. *Διάλεκτοι και Ιδιώματα της Νέας Ελληνικής* [Dialects and idioms of Modern Greek]. Athens.
- KORDA-SAVVA, D. 2001. Τα ψιλά γράμματα στην οθόνη μας: υποτιτλισμένες εκπομπές και διαμόρφωση (:) της γλωσσικής πραγματικότητας [The small letters on our screens: subtitled shows and the forming (?) of a linguistic reality.] In: *Proceedings of the 4th International Conference on Greek Linguistics*. Thessaloniki: 705–712.
- KURTBOKE, P. 2004. A methodological option for building the mixed code lexicon in Cyprus. *Mediterranean Language Review* 15: 167–180.
- ΜΑΚΡΙΔΙΣ, Α. c. 1999. Η κυπριακή διάλεκτος και η διακωμώδησή της [The Cypriot dialect and its ridiculing]. *Fileleftheros*.

- MCENTEE-ATALIANIS, L. & POULOUKAS, S. 2001. Issues of identity and power in a Greek-Cypriot community. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 22: 19–38.
- MILROY, L. 2002. Introduction: Mobility, contact and language change – Working with contemporary communities. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 6: 3–15.
- . 2003. Social and linguistic dimensions of phonological change: Fitting the pieces of the puzzle together. In: D. Britain & J. Cheshire (eds.), *Social Dialectology: In honour of Peter Trudgill*. Amsterdam-Philadelphia: 155–171.
- MOSCHONAS, S. 1996. Η διγλωσσία στην Κύπρο. *Politis* 27: 42–44.
- . 2002. Κοινή γλώσσα και διάλεκτος: το ζήτημα της γλωσσικής διμορφίας στην Κύπρο [Koine and dialect: The question of linguistic dimorphia in Cyprus]. *Νέα Εστία* 151(1745): 898–928.
- NEWTON, B. 1972a. *The Generative Interpretation of Dialect: A Study of Modern Greek Phonology*. Cambridge.
- . 1972b. *Cypriot Greek: Its Phonology and Inflections*. The Hague.
- . 1983. Stylistic levels in Cypriot Greek. *Mediterranean Language Review* 1: 55–63.
- PANAYOTOU, A. 1999. Η νεοελληνική στη σύγχρονη Κύπρο. In: *Proceedings of a Conference on the Greek Language 1976–1996*. Athens: 283–289.
- PAPADAKIS, Y. 2000. On linguistic bea(u)tification and embarrassment: Linguistic boundaries in Cyprus. Ms. University of Cyprus.
- . 2003. Linguistic varieties and social practices in Cyprus. In: D. Gefou-Madianou (ed.), *Self and “Other”: Conceptualizations, identities and practices in Greece and Cyprus*. Athens: 535–564.
- PAPAPAVLOU, A. N. 1998. Attitudes toward the Greek Cypriot dialect: Sociocultural implications. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 134: 15–28.
- . 2004. Verbal fluency of bidialectal speakers of SMG and the role of language-in-education practices in Cyprus. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 168: 91–100.
- PAVLOU, P. 2004. Greek dialect use in the mass media in Cyprus. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 168: 101–118.
- SCIRIHA, L. 1995. The interplay of language and identity in Cyprus. *The Cyprus Review* 7: 7–34.
- SIEBER, P. & SITTA, H. 1991. *Mundart und Hochdeutsch im Unterricht*. Aarau-Frankfurt am Main.
- SIFIANOU, M. 2003. Language variation in Greece. In: D. Britain & J. Cheshire (eds.), *Social Dialectology: In honour of Peter Trudgill*. Amsterdam-Philadelphia: 263–273.
- SIVAS, E. 2003. Γλωσσικές ιδεολογίες και κοινωνιογλωσσική κατάσταση στη σημερινή κοινότητα της Κύπρου [Language ideologies and the sociolinguistic situation in today's Cypriot community]. In: *Proceedings of the 6th International Conference on Greek Linguistics*. Available online at <http://www.philology.uoc.gr/conferences/6thICGL/>
- TERKOURAFI, M. 1997. *The discourse functions of diminutives in the speech of Cypriot Greeks and Mainland Greeks*. Unpublished M.Phil. Dissertation, University of Cambridge, U.K.

- TERKOURAFI, M. 2001. The use of the plural in expressing politeness in Cypriot Greek conversations. In: *Proceedings of the 4th International Conference on Greek Linguistics*. Thessaloniki: 462–470.
- . 2003. The Cypriot Koine: A recent development? In: *Proceedings of the 6th International Conference on Greek Linguistics*. Available online at <http://www.philology.uoc.gr/conferences/6thICGL/>
- . 2004. Testing Brown and Levinson's theory in a corpus of spontaneous conversational data from Cypriot Greek. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 168: 199–134.
- . 2005. Understanding the present through the past: Processes of koineisation in Cyprus. *Diachronica* 22: 309–372.
- . 2010. Δομικοί και ιδεολογικοί παράγοντες στην κατασκευή της διαφορετικότητας της κυπριακής [Structural and ideological factors in the construction of Cypriot Greek difference]. In: A. Voskos, D. Goutsos & A. Moser (eds.), *The Greek Language in Cyprus from Antiquity to the Present*. Athens: 213–227.
- TRUDGILL, P. 1983. *On Dialect: Social and Geographical Perspectives*. Oxford.
- . 2000. Greece and European Turkey: From religious to linguistic identity. In: S. Barbour & C. Carmichael (eds.), *Language and Nationalism in Europe*. Oxford: 240–263.
- TSIPLAKOU, S. 2003. Στάσεις απέναντι στη γλώσσα και γλωσσική αλλαγή: μια αμφίδρομη σχέση [Attitudes towards language and language change: a two-way relationship?]. In: *Proceedings of the 6th International Conference on Greek Linguistics*. Available online at <http://www.philology.uoc.gr/conferences/6thICGL/>
- . 2009a. Code-switching and code-mixing between related varieties: establishing the blueprint. *The International Journal of Humanities* 6: 49–66.
- . 2009b. Code-switching and code-mixing in situations of language contact: The case of contemporary Cypriot Greek. *Studies in Greek Linguistics* 29: 400–412. (Reprinted in A. Voskos, D. Goutsos & A. Moser (eds.), *The Greek Language in Cyprus from Antiquity to the Present*. Athens: 228–241.)
- . 2009c. Language alternation, competing grammars and interlanguage: Another facet of the Cyprus problem. In: G. Giannakis, M. Baltazani, G. Xydopoulos & T. Tsangalidis (eds.), *Proceedings of the 8th International Conference on Greek Linguistics*. University of Ioannina: 1195–1209. Available online at [http://www.linguist-uoi.gr/cd\\_web/docs/greek/044\\_Tsiplakou.icgl8.pdf](http://www.linguist-uoi.gr/cd_web/docs/greek/044_Tsiplakou.icgl8.pdf)
- TSIPLAKOU, S., COUTSOUGERA, P. & PAVLOU, P. [Forthcoming.] *The Cypriot Greek Dialect*. LINCOM. EUROPA.
- TSIPLAKOU, S., PAPAPAVLOU, A., PAVLOU, P. & KATSOYANNOU, M. 2006. Levelling, koineization and their implications for bidialectism. In: F. Hinskens (ed.), *Language Variation – European Perspectives. Selected Papers from the 3rd International Conference on Language Variation in Europe (ICLaVE 3)*. Amsterdam-Philadelphia: 265–276.
- VAN MARLE, J. 1997. Dialect versus standard language: nature versus culture. In: J. Cheshire & D. Stein (eds.), *Taming the vernacular: From Dialect to Written Standard Language*. London: 13–34.

- ΥΙΑΓΟΥΛΛΙΣ, C. 1994. *Επίτομο ετυμολογικό και ερμηνευτικό λεξικό της κυπριακής διαλέκτου* [Abridged etymological and interpretive dictionary of the Cypriot dialect]. Nicosia.
- . 2002. *Θησαυρός της Κυπριακής Διαλέκτου. Ερμηνευτικός και ετυμολογικός. Από τον 13<sup>ο</sup> αι. μέχρι σήμερα* [Thesaurus of the Cypriot dialect. Interpretive and etymological. From the 13th c. to today]. Nicosia.
- . 2005. *Λεξικό Κυπριακής Φρασιολογίας* [Dictionary of Cypriot phrases]. Nicosia.