

A discourse-analytic approach to the use of English in Cypriot Greek conversations

DIONYSIS GOUTSOS
University of Cyprus

The use of English in Cypriot Greek has been a highly contested issue, involving much speculation and prescription but, as yet, little analysis of actual data. This study is a preliminary exploration of the issue, focusing on extensive data from informal conversations between members of a Limassol family. The analysis suggests that instances of language alternation can be accounted for in terms of discourse analytic categories such as the distinction between local and global phenomena and the tri-partite scheme of ideational, interpersonal and sequential functions. The presence of English in Cypriot Greek conversations covers a wide range, from local borrowing to stereotypical sequential or more complex interpersonal and sequential phenomena, and cannot be effectively separated from the role that language alternation plays in specific textual and contextual settings. The discussion suggests that a discourse analytic approach is an indispensable means of studying language alternation phenomena.

Introduction¹

The alternate use of languages in conversation has been extensively studied in the tradition of code-switching research. This field, however, as Milroy and Muysken (1995: 12) point out, is "replete with a confusing range of terms descriptive of various aspects of the phenomenon". This is an outcome of both the theoretical perspective adopted in each study and the characteristics of the language alternation practices observed. The various competing approaches to code-switching can thus be distinguished with regard to type of language alternation and the focus of study.

In terms of the type of alternation phenomena, we can distinguish between *inclusive* and *separating* approaches, that is, approaches that tend to lump

together a variety of phenomena under the umbrella of code-switching vs. those that introduce distinctions in order to keep them separate. For instance, Haugen (1956), one of the earliest studies of code-switching, locates all bilingual phenomena along a continuum of code distinctiveness, ranging from instances maximally distinct from the surrounding discourse to instances identical to the recipient language. In this inclusive view, switching belongs to one end of the continuum, with integration or borrowing in the middle and interference at the other end. In the same vein, Lüdi (1987) makes use of the term *marques transcodiques* to cover all kinds of language contact phenomena, including borrowing, code-switching and interference in learner languages.

On the other hand, a common distinction is usually made between code-switching as "the language choice of a person who speaks two or more languages and has to choose which one to use" and code-mixing as "the phenomenon where pieces of one language are used while the speaker is basically using another language" (Fasold 1984: 180). In this separating approach, code-switching 'proper' should be kept apart from code-mixing, which usually includes borrowing. Most commonly, it is the criterion of monolingual or bilingual competence that specifies whether we are dealing with code-switching or borrowing. Furthermore, interference is seen as contingent and individual, whereas borrowing is collective and systematic (Romaine 1989: 131ff).

The extensive literature on the differences between code-switching and borrowing has contributed to the discussion in various ways.² Poplack, who distinguishes between community-level lexical borrowing and momentary or nonce borrowing (i.e. speech errors due to interference), recognizes that "one type of behavior may fade into another" (1988: 239). Gardner-Chloros (1991: 164) also criticizes the notion of nonce-loans by pointing out that all loans must start off as code-switches. The historical dimension of borrowing predicts that "gradually the words which are classed as switches will move over into the category of loans". Her stance is thus inclusive, tending to emphasize that code-switching merges into other interlingual or language contact phenomena such as borrowing, language interference and pidginisation. As she points out, "drawing clear lines between these phenomena is an ideological, rather than an objective linguistic, activity" (Gardner-Chloros 1995: 70).

The adoption of an inclusive or separating approach to language alternation is closely related to the focus or orientation of the study. For instance, Poplack's (1980) well-known categories of *tag-switching*, *intersentential-switching* and *intrasentential-switching* reflect an orientation towards syntactic phenomena, addressing the question of where language alternation *can* occur rather than *why* it occurs at a particular point. More recent approaches have shown that code-switching occurs beyond the clause or sentence boundary. For instance, Moyer (1998) points out that it may apply to an entire conversation, a limited number of turns, or may be restricted within a turn or turn-constructional unit, while Dabène and Moore (1995) extend the 'inter' vs. 'intra' distinction to cover inter-act and intra-act code-switching. As a result, earlier syntactic approaches that emphasized grammatical restrictions and possibilities have

been gradually complemented with views of code-switching as a sociolinguistic phenomenon, underlining the (social or personal) motivations of the participants. In this shift, Gumperz's (1982) notion of conversational code-switching has been paramount. According to Gumperz (1982: 61), participants are often unaware which code is being used at any time, since their main concern is with the communicative effect of what they are saying; thus,

rather than claiming that speakers use language in response to a fixed predetermined set of prescriptions, it seems more reasonable to assume that they build on their own and on their audience's abstract understanding of situational norms, to communicate metaphoric information about how they intend their words to be understood.

Code-switching is thus seen as a communicative option which is available to a bilingual member of a speech community in the same way that switching between styles or dialects is an option for the monolingual speaker. This emphasis on pragmatic dimensions assumes that the motivation for switching is stylistic and/or social and that code-switching is to be treated as a discourse phenomenon that cannot be handled satisfactorily in terms of the internal structure of sentences.

On the basis of these assumptions, Gumperz also introduces the distinction between situational (or transactional) and non-situational or metaphorical code-switching, according to whether language alternation can be accounted for by factors external to the participant's own motivations (e.g. topic, setting etc.) or by the presentation of self in relation to topic. The issue of external motivations has given rise to a host of sociolinguistically oriented models (summarized and reviewed in Myers-Scotton 1993). The pendulum has thus swung in the other direction, at the expense of the fundamental role of code-switching as a multi-functional discourse event.

Work within a conversational analysis framework has, instead, pointed out the sequential nature of language alternation as a conversational event (Milroy & Wei 1995: 148). The volume edited by Auer brings together studies that share a common emphasis on the conversational dimension of code-switching and underline the importance of its production "in the emerging conversational context which it both shapes and responds to" (1998: 1). Code-switching is thus viewed as a contextualization cue (in Gumperz's terms), i.e. an indication of how the participants both interpret and formulate the context of interaction. This is achieved by signalling what they are doing at a particular moment and by simultaneously invoking social meanings such as language attitudes, preferences, group identity, community values etc. (cf. Auer 1988; Wei 1998; Sebba & Wootton 1998).

The emphasis on conversational code-switching allows us to examine language alternation phenomena by referring to the place in the interactional event where languages alternate and to the functions of this alternation in the discourse as a whole. We can thus assess the significance of language alternation for the interaction itself rather than for its narrower (syntactic) or broader

(social) aspects. Nevertheless, this emphasis on the significance of language alternation for the achievement of discourse is usually submerged under different analytic preoccupations. As Bailey (2000: 166) notes, "conversational/discourse management functions of code-switching . . . are not always differentiated so clearly from more metaphorical, socio-political functions". Similarly, Gardner-Chloros, Charles and Cheshire (2000) point out that the speakers' ability to code-switch can be seen as one among a broad range of means also available to monolingual speakers for the achievement of varying effects in discourse.

In this article, I discuss the use of English in prototypical, everyday Cypriot Greek interaction, with a strict interest in the discourse role of language alternation phenomena. More specifically, the study focuses on the ways in which these Greek Cypriot speakers, who are members of a Limassol middle-class family, alternate between English and Greek when engaging in informal conversation. The questions addressed do not concern either grammatical constraints or 'larger', individual and social motivations but concentrate instead on the role of each phenomenon in discourse. In other words, for each instance of language alternation, what is asked is not *whether* this is allowed to occur, nor *why* it occurs (if, by *why*, we exclusively refer to psycholinguistic or sociolinguistic reasons), but *how* it is used in the construction of discourse.

For this reason, my approach starts from an inclusive point of view, in terms of the distinction made above, with the aim of outlining the full range of language alternation phenomena in the particular interactions. This approach is also most appropriate for the kind of data analyzed, which comes from a largely endolingual, unilingual situation (Lüdi 1987), the speech of a community which is dominant in its geographical context.³

The following section places the study within the background of research on the use of English in Cyprus, which has been restricted to the description of attitudes, beliefs etc. and has shunned discussion of evidence from actual use. I then provide the context of the data under analysis and illustrate the main categories used in the analysis as borne out by the data. It is pointed out that the majority of functions identified in code-switching research for language alternation can be interpreted in terms of categories of discourse functions as they appear in discourse analytic research in general. The insights of discourse analysis and sociolinguistics can thus be combined for a better understanding of the types of phenomena involved and their relative importance when two linguistic codes are employed in conversation.

English in Cyprus: the sociolinguistic context

The presence of English in Cypriot Greek is intimately related to the complex history of this southeast Mediterranean island. The transition of the former British colony to post-colonial independence in the 1960s has not been an uncomplicated affair but was largely the result of a bloody struggle by the island's predominantly Greek population. The events that followed independence⁴ have

practically substituted Greek for English as a language of administration and public life, while new sources of influence have also developed. Predominant among these have been tourism and the presence of a large international community on the island, including British diplomats and military personnel from the British sovereign bases. This multiple influence of English, related in its current form to the growing linguistic influence of the language, is further complicated by the interaction between Standard Modern Greek (SMG) and Cypriot Greek (CG) that results in a complex situation of diglossia. Although the current status of the standard and the local varieties is still far from settled, it seems that SMG predominates in public domains, exerting considerable pressure through its prestige on Cypriot Greek speakers and restricting CG to private domains, including everyday conversations between Greek Cypriots.

A further complication arises from the fact that, because of its socio-historical context, as Papapavlou and Pavlou put it, "language seems to have acquired a central and almost exclusive role in defining the identity of Greek Cypriots" (1998: 2; cf. Papadakis 1998). As a result, the use of English in CG has been a highly contested issue, related to political alignments, national fears and perceptions, as well as socio-economic factors. Most public discussions of the issue (e.g. Symposium 1993; Lectures 1997; Makridis 1998) not only manifest a continuously increasing preoccupation with the 'purity' of CG but also show an alarming tendency for polarization and demonization of the issues surrounding this notion. For instance, the introductory statement in a recent discussion finds that "English has turned from a means, a tool of practical interaction and communication of foreign language speakers into . . . a communication code of same-language speakers" (Symposium 1993: xi).⁵ It also laments that "we are standing on the edge of a cliff, at the jaws of visible, insidious cultural imperialism" (ibid.: xii).

In the same discussion, the intervention by the only linguist who participated in the discussion attempts to frame the issue in more general terms, linking it to the distance from the metropolitan centre and the "strength and cohesion of the common national language" (Babiniotis, in Symposium 1993: 5). Babiniotis locates the problem in the presence of foreignisms, which "increasingly deform Greek in Cyprus similarly to – but to a larger extent and more forcefully than – what happens in the area of Greece" and states that "this 'language blending' has reached an extreme and dangerous point" (ibid.: 9). However, Babiniotis is careful to distinguish between the normal process of language contact and the real danger which lies, according to him, in the "facile and uncritical recourse to English for even the simplest forms of communication" and "the extent of foreignisms in Cyprus . . . developing at a really worrying pace" (ibid.: 10–11).

The normative aspects of the public interest in the presence of English in CG touch upon practical issues of language planning. The most famous (or notorious) among these concern the official language of the recently founded University of Cyprus (Karyolemou 1994; and more recently, Mavros 1998) and

the ban on English signs (*Cyprus Weekly* 11/97). At the same time, attempts at a description of the issue have remained at an intuitive level. For instance, adopting a liberal stance, Ioannou (1991) and Karoulla-Vrikakis (1991) suggest that there is three-way code-switching by many speakers between Standard Modern Greek, Cypriot Greek and English. In the latter's opinion, English has taken the place of SMG. Also in her view, it is women who use this prestigious language more than men. The same situation is perceived by Stamatakis (1991: 61) as "an on-going linguistic confusion, where Greek, English and Turkish, and the very distinct Greek Cypriot dialect fight for a share of the formal and informal communicative encounters". However, these studies and other similar ones (summarized in Papapavlou & Pavlou 1998) are not based on actual data or extensive sociolinguistic research but rely instead on personal opinion and speculation.

Research by linguists, on the other hand, has focused exclusively on the issue of linguistic attitudes rather than language use. The most extensive of these are Papapavlou's (1994) classification of foreign loans in relation to language attitudes and Sciriha's (1996) study of attitudes in relation to the ubiquitous 'identity question'. Sciriha, for instance, rejects the view of other researchers that English is a threat to CG by stating that this

stems more from their concern regarding the trendy insertion of English words by some Cypriots who like peppering their conversations with words from the English lexicon, rather than from actual large scale use of large chunks of English words in conversation. (Sciriha 1996: 105)

However useful from a sociolinguistic point of view, these studies involve decontextualized data and offer limited help in finding out what people say rather than what they think and report about what they say. Milroy (1987: 187) sums up a well-known finding of sociolinguistic research when she points out that much self-reported behavior by bilinguals is contradicted by observation of actual behaviour. For instance, it is unclear what kind of knowledge of English is involved in Sciriha's finding that English is reported to be understood and spoken by 63.2% of the respondents. This would seem to reflect the aspirations – also manifest in the high desirability features for English (40% overall) – rather than the actual competence of the speakers.

It is clear that this kind of evidence has little, if any, import for the issue of English as used in Cypriot Greek.⁶ The low level of public and theoretical discussion is accompanied by an aversion, common to all approaches, to real language data as currently spoken by Cypriot Greeks. As a result, the discussion of the use of English in Cyprus seems to have involved extensive speculation, numerous declarations about language planning and statements of linguistic purism, as well as detailed descriptions of linguistic attitudes but, as yet, little analysis of language data.

The only source of information about the contact of English with CG comes from research on London's Cypriot Greek community in two studies,

Gardner-Chloros (1992) and Zarpetea (1995). They both find a predictable generation gap in the Greek spoken in this community, as well as an extensive range of language contact phenomena. The latter include loanwords for items associated with the British culture (e.g. *full-time course*), established 'Gringlish' terms (such as *tšécci* for 'cheque'), set expressions in English (such as *sorry*, *unfortunately*, *that's all*), discourse markers (e.g. *anyway*), and intense intra-phrase switching. A special use concerns the formation of new compound verbs such as *tsekáro* for 'check' and *kámno use* for 'use'. This type of mixing is very limited but, as noted, "some of these terms are also in common use in Cyprus, where the language is increasingly influenced not only by Standard Greek but also by English" (Gardner-Chloros 1992: 127). Finally, a gradual intergenerational shift towards the complete use of English is also reported to be taking place by both studies.

Whether related to justified fears in the face of growing English language imperialism or to outdated beliefs about language purity, the question of the use of English in CG cannot be addressed without the systematic collection and analysis of language data drawn from real social contexts. The present study constitutes a step in this direction by focusing on extensive recorded data of naturally occurring episodes of interaction of the most prototypical kind, namely conversations between intimates who are members of the same family. This orientation towards talk-in-interaction emphasizes "the quotidian experience of the participants in [the] social worlds and settings they inhabit, frequent and construct" (Schegloff, Ochs & Thompson 1996: 18). Thus our examination starts from one of the most basic contexts of language interaction as a first step towards a better understanding of the problem.

Data and method

The data used in this study was collected as part of a larger research project aiming at a systematic description of CG. Two kinds of material were drawn upon for this article. First, extensive data was taken from informal, spontaneous, face-to-face conversations between CG speakers who are members of a Limassol middle-class family. In total, 20 people participated in the conversations, 12 female and 8 male, with varied educational backgrounds (from primary school to university students), in the age range of 5–68 (most were in their twenties). Four hours of recorded conversations were selected for closer analysis. These correspond to seven different conversational events between intimates in a variety of time and place settings. This data was complemented by one hour of recorded telephone conversations involving members of the same family and either intimates (friends, relatives etc.) or not (e.g. directory inquiries). Recording of all data was surreptitious, but permission to use this material for research purposes was subsequently requested from the participants, where possible. (This excluded, in practice, telephone conversations). All conversations took place in March 1998, and the occasions mainly included lunch and

dinner time in the main participant's home. In the extracts discussed below, four interactants have participated more extensively than others:⁷

Dina (D) is 22 years old and is studying for a degree in English at the university. She was the main informant, and she was the person who collected the data for the research. She is the only speaker who considers herself fluent in English.

Yota (Y) is Dina's mother. She is 44 years old and is a housewife, married with two children.

Sophie (S) is Dina's aunt (her father's sister). She is 47 years old and works as a driving instructor. She is unmarried and lives on her own. She has also recently started taking English lessons.

Thekla (T) is Dina's grandmother (Yota's mother). She is 68 years old and has only had elementary school education. She is the only one who was an adult during the British colonial administration.

As noted above, the collection of data was made by the main informant (Dina), who used a tape recorder on loan from the researcher. As Sebba and Wootton (1998) point out, this method may imply that the collection itself is outside the control of the researcher, but it can yield usable and interesting data. The main informant is a CG speaker and is herself a member of the family studied. This is particularly important for the quality of the data, since "persons accepted as insiders are more likely to be able to participate in group activities and to have access to types of language different from those observable to outsiders" (Milroy 1987: 64). Milroy also observes that in her Belfast data, "sometimes the original participants would leave in the course of a long recording session" and thus "it was not always clear whether all participants were aware of being tape-recorded" (1987: 89). The same informal method of recording was followed here: as is made clear in the data, relatives, friends and neighbours drop in to the main informant's house to chat. Thus, the language used is casually embedded in specific activities rather than offered for observation and analysis. The insider's view is thus combined with the researcher's interests, avoiding the acute problem of selecting code-switching data, which comes from the fact that, as Milroy puts it, "mixed codes are particularly stigmatized, probably as a consequence of underlying ideologies of linguistic 'purity'" (1987: 186).

For this study, 3,000 words were transcribed and analyzed in detail for instances of language alternation between English and Greek. This means that, roughly, one-fifth of the recorded talk (amounting to a total of about 15,000 words) was of interest for our purposes – something which is in itself significant for the extent of the use of English in these conversations. To decide whether a particular point presented an instance of language alternation, an independent assessment of each case was made by four judges, two speakers of CG (including the main informant) and two speakers of SMG (including myself) (cf. Gardner-Chloros 1991).

Discourse-analytic categories of language alternation

As suggested in the discussion of code-switching above, studies of language alternation phenomena can be useful from the perspective of their role in the construction of discourse. For this reason, they can be analyzed in terms of discourse-analytic distinctions. In particular, as was borne out by our data, language alternation phenomena can be distinguished according to the *local* vs. *global* role they play in discourse, as well as according to the *ideational*, *interpersonal* and *sequential* functions they might have.

The distinction between *local* and *global*, which is widely used in discourse analytic approaches (e.g. Georgakopoulou & Goutsos 1998), concerns the difference between phenomena that play only a narrow, locally restricted role in the construction of discourse and those that have a wider significance for the discourse event in which they occur. The size of the constituents involved is related to the distinction for functional reasons: thus, for instance, language alternation involving words and phrases would normally be employed for local purposes, whereas longer switches would be expected to relate to global discourse functions. However, this correlation is not categorical, since, as we know from discourse analytic research, small elements such as discourse markers can have both local and global functions. This suggests that global functions within the larger discourse structure are almost always associated with local functions within an utterance, whereas the opposite is not necessarily true (Georgakopoulou & Goutsos 1997, 1998).⁸

Furthermore, language alternation phenomena can be usefully analyzed with reference to Halliday's tri-partite scheme of (meta)functions, as used in discourse analytic research (Georgakopoulou & Goutsos 1997). We can thus distinguish between: (a) *ideational functions*, when language alternation relates to propositional or topical aspects of discourse, (b) *interpersonal functions*, when language alternation relates to self- and other-presentation and the relationships between discourse participants, and (c) *sequential functions*, when language alternation relates to the sequential organization of discourse, i.e. the signalling of units and their sequence (Goutsos 1997). It must be noted that the term 'sequential' is used here in place of Halliday's 'textual' to refer to the global segmentational concerns of participants, which constitute only one part of the overall textual concerns in the construction of discourse (Georgakopoulou & Goutsos 1997). In this use it should not be confused with sequentiality in the tradition of conversation analytic research, which refers to the local, conversational management activities of speakers in the ongoing negotiation of discourse (Schegloff 1986; cf. Bailey 2000) – although, as pointed out above, global strategies depend on local activities for their implementation.⁹

A detailed illustration of the way in which the above discourse analytic categories apply to the description of language alternation phenomena can be seen in the following discussion of conversational data from Cypriot Greek interactions. In particular, it is shown that Greek-English alternation in this context comprises both local and global phenomena. The former include

internationalisms, non-assimilated and assimilated loanwords (either as proper names or not) and compound forms, while the latter include boundary markers with stereotypical sequential functions and longer instances with typically interpersonal or combined functions.

LOCAL LANGUAGE ALTERNATION PHENOMENA

Items that were judged to be one-word switches from English include proper names, non-assimilated and assimilated loanwords, and original compound forms. Firstly, proper names include internationalisms (Thomas 1991) like *Superman*, *Batman*, *Bic*, *Spice Girls*, *Xóliyt* (< Hollywood), *khófleks* (< corn flakes), *Maggie*, names for local colleges (*Anglia*, *Pitmans*) and non-assimilated or assimilated names for animals: *tsintser* (< Ginger), *pópi* (< Bobby), *blácis* (< Blacky), *tfípis* (< Chippy), *lácis* (< Lucky). Loanwords can be non-assimilated items, which, according to the judges, may also be used in SMG (*detól*, *aeroklín*, *neskafé*, *aerózól*, *grup*, *exprés*, *báscet*, *djúti fri*, *méikaps* (< makeup), *víteo*, *sidi*, *álpum*, *sánduits*, *párti*, *kafé*, *klap* (< club) *computer*, *diet cheese*, *sleeping bag*, *supermarket*, *curry*) or which do not occur in SMG (*interview*, *highway*, *seasonals*, *táspin* (< dustbin), *mópail*, *çam*, *čanpak* (< handbag)). For the last two items, SMG uses words of French origin (e.g. *zambón*, *sak-vuajáz*). Finally, assimilated loanwords can also be similar to SMG (*sinemá*, *baráki*, *rezérva*) or not (*tfécci* (< cheque)).

Most interestingly, the data includes three instances of new compound forms of the kind that were found to be in use in the Cypriot Greek community of London (see p. 200). These are formed with the delexicalized verb *kámno* and an English nominal form:¹⁰

1) C7: 083

S: *éθθa kámo shower*

'I will do shower'

D: *ma póte ekames?*

'but when did you do [it]?'

S: *ói epsés to proí ekama (.) éнна kámo tfe proí tfe níxta*

'no, yesterday morning I did [it], I will do [it] morning and evening'

2) D2: 620

Y: . . . *lálun tus pu na érti i jajá su enna kámni swimming*

'I was saying to them, when your grandma comes, she will do swimming'

3) C4: 045

T: *éplina ti fústa mu (.) me iyró tfe ístera epía tsesapúnisa tin tfe kaθárise*

'I washed my skirt with liquid and then went and soaped it and got clean'

S: *ói djóti ótan kámnis wash*

'no because when you do wash'

- D: *ne*
'yes'
S: *wash*
D: *ne*
'yes'
S: *in the washing machine* (.)

Extract (3) is the only case in the data where local material from English triggers a longer switch into English. Sophie has ventured a turn that she has difficulty completing. Dina offers only back-channeling rather than moving to joint completion, and so Sophie unsuccessfully repeats the switched item (*wash*) and then continues in English without achieving completion. However, this switch has a local function: it is not taken up (or commented upon) by the other speakers or continued by the same speaker and does not seem to play a role in the ideational, sequential or interpersonal organization of discourse.

In general, local phenomena of language alternation in the everyday interactions between family members under study seem to be restricted in both the number and range of functions. It should also be noted here that the presence of loanwords seems to be field-related: in the case of the data studied, most instances come from interactions involving a topic related to specific foreign or international items. Furthermore, compared to SMG, CG draws more on English resources for borrowing and creates 'mixed' compound forms with delexicalized verbs.

GLOBAL LANGUAGE ALTERNATION PHENOMENA

In the data studied, global language alternation phenomena relate mostly to sequential and interpersonal functions. Both categories present characteristic instances of conversational code-switching that rely on context for their interpretations. Ideational uses are not as prominent, but most instances concern multi-functional uses of language alternation.

Sequential functions

Switches to English signal sequential relations by functioning as boundary markers at openings and closings of interactional events, especially telephone conversations (cf. 'tag-switching'). This use is found with three elements: *aló*, *théncju* and *pái* (*pái*).

Telephone conversation openings start with the contact item *aló* or *alóu* (< hello), offered by the person receiving the call. In CG, this move is followed by other-identification by the caller, confirmation by the addressee and then the expected 'how-do-you-do' greeting moves (cf. Schegloff 1986), as can be seen in the following:

- 4) H1: 000
(ringing)
aló? 'hello?' summons
korú? 'girl?' contact
ne 'yes' other-identification
confirmation

- | | | |
|----------------------|----------------|-------------------------|
| <i>na bu kámnis?</i> | 'how are you?' | 'how-do-you-do' section |
| <i>kalá esí?</i> | 'fine, you?' | |
- 5) H6: 001
- | | | |
|----------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------------|
| <i>aló?</i> | 'hello?' | contact |
| <i>pjos milá?</i> | 'who's talking?' | other-identification |
| <i>PJO thélete?</i> | 'WHOM do you want?' | challenge |
| <i>fanió mu esí?</i> | 'is that you, my Fanio?' | new try at other-identification |
| <i>ne</i> | 'yes' | confirmation |
| <i>na bu kámnis?</i> | 'how are you?' | 'how-do-you-do' section |
| <i>kalá thía</i> | 'fine, Aunt' | |

The same pattern is also found between non-intimates:

- 6) H2: 001
- | | | |
|--------------------|----------------------|-------------------------|
| <i>aló?</i> | 'hello?' | contact |
| <i>círje sáva?</i> | 'Mr. Savvas?' | other-identification |
| <i>ne</i> | 'yes' | confirmation |
| <i>ti kámnete?</i> | 'how are you [pl.]?' | 'how-do-you-do' section |
| <i>kalá esís?</i> | 'fine, you [pl.]?' | |
| <i>kalá</i> (.) | 'fine' | |

The data indicates that *aló* is a free variant among a set of openers which occur in this position: the data includes *parakaló?* (H3), *málista?* (H4), *ne?* and *(e)mbros?* (H7), which also constitute typical openers in SMG telephone conversations. However, *aló* has a wider function as a contact marker, as can also be seen in its use in the middle of telephone conversations, when there is a change of speaker, or when miscommunication occurs between the speakers:

- 7) H2: 007
- | | |
|---------------------------|---------------------|
| <i>i tasúlla entzamé?</i> | 'is Tasulla there?' |
| <i>ne éna leptó</i> | 'yes, one moment' |
| <i>théncju</i> | 'thanks' |
| (7 seconds) | |
| → <i>aló?</i> | 'hello?' |
| <i>kóri?</i> | 'girl?' |
| <i>ne</i> | 'yes' |
| <i>na bu kámnis?</i> | 'how are you?' |
| <i>kalá esí?</i> | 'fine, you?' |

- 8) H3: 004
- | | |
|---|---------------------------------|
| (a) <i>o rákis entzamé?</i> | 'is Rakis there?' |
| (b) <i>ói en páno re</i> | 'no, he's upstairs' |
| (a) <i>ndáksi</i> (.) <i>ena piáso páno</i> | 'alright, I will call upstairs' |
| (b) <i>ndáksi</i> | 'alright' |

- (a) *aló?* 'hello?'
éla re? 'c'mon?'¹¹
 (b) *éla re* 'c'mon'
 (a) *ena (.) ena páis máppa?..* 'will you go to football?'
- 9) H4: 002
na paragjilo? 'can I order?'
ne akúo 'yes, I'm listening'
 (.) *mja píttá s- ((noise))* 'a pitta s-' ((noise))
ne 'yes'
 → *aló?* 'hello?'
ne ne 'yes yes'
mja píttá suvlácja? 'a pitta souvlaki'
mja píttá suvlácja ne 'a pitta souvlaki, yes'

In examples like the ones above, *aló* is found after a change of speaker, which may be preceded by a longer or shorter pause (extracts 7, 8) or after an unintelligible statement by a speaker which may result in misunderstanding (9). In both cases, it is clear that the item is deprived of any semantic content and merely acts as a channel-checking mechanism (cf. Scollon 1998).

A similar function is found for the two instances of *théncju* (< thank you) in the telephone conversations studied:

- 10) H2: 007
i tasúlla entzamé? 'is Tasulla there?'
ne éna leptó 'yes, one moment'
 → *théncju* 'thanks'
 (7 seconds)
- 11) H5: 032
pjástin sto állo ndáksi? 'call her at the other one, alright?'
 → *ne ndáksi marína (.) théncju (.)//* 'yes, alright, Marina, thanks //'
ena ti bjáso sto állo 'I will call her at the other one'
//océi 'ok'

In (10) and (11), *théncju* marks the ending (pre-closure) of the exchange by confirming that the caller has followed the addressee's instructions. In this function as a contact marker, *théncju* seems to be in contrast with its Greek counterpart, (*e*)*fcharistó*, which is reserved for the preferred response to a stereotypical wish, as in:

- 12) H8: 024
kaló páska '(have a) good Easter'
ndáksi thía (.) fcharistó 'alright Aunt, thanks'
áte (.) fcharistó tfe kalá 'ok, thanks and have a nice time'
na dextís ta pedjá su 'with your children'

- fcharistó thía* 'thanks Aunt'
ja 'bye'
ja, ja, ja 'bye, bye, bye'

Cases like (12), where the interlocutors thank each other for reciprocal wishes ('have a good Easter', 'have a nice time'), would seem to indicate a division of (discourse) labor between *théncju* and *fcharistó* similar to other cases in the literature (e.g. Maschler 1998). However, much more data is needed to confirm whether *fcharistó* has a genuine thanking role and *théncju* functions only as a channel-checking mechanism.¹²

Finally, *pái (pái)* (< bye) is used as an ending marker in both telephone conversations and face-to-face interactions in the data studied. Its use as a greeting typically follows the pre-closing section, which, as in SMG telephone conversations (see Pavlidou 1997), can be quite elaborate, as in the following examples:

- 13) G4: 063
kalá pjásme na mu pis ti éjine 'fine, call me to tell me what happened'
endáksi 'alright'
endáksi 'alright'
océi 'ok'
áte pái 'ok, bye'
pái 'bye'
- 14) H1: 032
ndáksi re 'alright'
océi 'ok'
ena ta ksanapúme 'talk to you later (see you later)'
pái 'bye'
pái 'bye'
pái 'bye'
- 15) H2: 025
e:: pénde éksi (.) se pénde déka leptá 'eh, 5–6, in 5–10 minutes'
kalá ndáksi //re 'fine alright'
//océi 'ok'
pái 'bye'
pái 'bye'

In the examples above, markers like *kalá* indicate the end of the purpose-of-call section and the beginning of pre-closing; (*e*)*ndáksi*, *éjine* and *océi* (a well-known internationalism) indicate agreement to close; and *áte* is a contact marker indicating the beginning of the closing/greeting section, where *pái pái* is located. The latter is in free variation with the SMG greeting *ja*, which is used either in combination with *pái pái* or on its own, as we can see in (16) (cf. also 12):¹³

16) H3: 044

- ena ndiθó tfe náрто potzi* (.) 'I'll put something on and come there,
endáksi? alright?'
endáksi 'alright'
áte
áte
ja 'bye'
pái pái re 'bye bye'
ja 'bye'

Finally, in one instance *pái pái* is also syntactically assimilated into Greek – it is combined with a personal pronoun, on the pattern of *ja*:

17) A7: 241

- áte ja sas* (.) *tfe kaló páska=* 'bye to you and (have a) nice Easter'
sto kaló na páte= 'have a nice time'
→ *áte re pedjá* (.) *pái pái sas* 'ok, guys, bye bye to you'
pái pái 'bye bye'

In all the examples above, *pái pái* signals the definitive closing of the conversation after the elaborate moves that preface the closure.

In conclusion, there seems to be systematic English–Greek alternation with regard to a small set of boundary markers occurring at the beginning and ending of sequential segments. These markers signal the opening (or re-opening), the pre-closure and the closure of conversational segments and thus have a primarily sequential function. The indication of conversational boundaries is one of the clearest motivations for code-switching in the literature (Maschler 1998). In the CG data, most of these items are found in free variation with their Greek counterparts (*aló?* and *parakaló?*, *pái pái* and *ja*, *θéncju* and *fxaristó*), an indication that language choice here does not carry any meaning for the participants. However, *aló?* seems to have also acquired a specialized function as a contact check in the middle of telephone conversations, and in this function it has no Greek counterpart (cf. Maschler 1998: 141). Similar tendencies are found for *θéncju*, which seems to be restricted to channel checking, leaving the signalling of 'thanks' to *fxaristó*.

As observed, frequent code alternation weakens the contextualization value of boundary markers or similar cues (Auer 1998: 20). This is true for the elements under examination, which seem to have developed an exclusively phatic role to conventionally indicate sequential relations. As such, they are expected to develop into fossilized, stereotypical uses with less emphasis on their global discourse function.

Interpersonal functions

Instances of more extended switches to English are related to interpersonal functions in our data. The interpersonal function is evident in instances

like (18), which involve the common case of representing another person's voice:

18) C4: 293

- S: *to lipón eγó kámno síðero tóra dína* (.) *allá eán íxa mja pondútes* (.)
tes
D: *srilankhézes*
S: *srilankhézes*
D: *ma áðe ómos pu en éxume?*
S: *i θía su en na siðérona* (θa siðéronan) *i srilankhézes*
D: *ói θía ma éne kríma* (.) *eγó lipúme tes*
S: *lipáse tes?*
D: *lipúme tes=*
S: *nda tñínes kámnun xará pu kámnun ðuljés*
D: *epiði kámnun xará pu ðuléfkun*
→ S: thank you ma- thank you madam
D: *énna pu thélis na su pun i kaiménes sti ftófa tus=*
→ S: *kóri mu me mu léis madam* (.) *lée me sófi* (.) *ói na me léis madam*

S: well I'm doing the ironing now, Dina, but if I had one of those, the
D: Sri Lankans
S: Sri Lankans
D: yes, but now that we don't have one?
S: your aunt would not iron (they would iron) the Sri Lankans
D: no, Aunt, it's a pity (.) I feel sorry for them
S: you feel sorry for them?
D: I feel sorry for them=
S: but they feel happy when they do the chores
D: they feel happy because they are working
→ S: 'thank you ma- thank you madam'
D: what would you expect them to say, the poor ones, in their poverty=
→ S: girl, don't call me 'madam' (.) call me Sophie (.) don't call me 'madam'

In the extract above, Dina challenges her aunt's wish to have a Sri Lankan maid by saying that she feels sorry for "them". To discount Dina's opposition, Sophie offers the suggestion that they feel happy when they are working for someone else and, to increase the force of the suggestion, she adds a direct quote of their 'actual' words in English. The switch to English functions here as a means of adding validity to Sophie's argumentation and counteracting Dina's arguments by reference to evidence (speech) that is constructed to be real. Sophie thus creatively reconstructs the voice of a hypothetical maid as supportive evidence for her argumentation.

In her subsequent turn, she moves on to recontextualize the previous switch by performatively recreating her own voice speaking back to the maid. This recontextualization aims at specifying the quote as a narrated event and thus

anchoring the switch to a supposedly real experience in the past. In this way, not only is the validity of the evidence enhanced but also the speaker's self-presentation is served: Sophie presents herself as rejecting her nomination as "madam" and asking to be called by her first name. By invoking a frame of equality in her interaction with the maid, she shows herself in a positive light and suggests an alignment with her interlocutor's sympathetic position towards the maids.

It is significant that the recreation of the "English" voice is accepted without any comment on the language choice from Sophie's interlocutor. Dina instead tries to contest Sophie's argumentation by offering an alternative explanation for the maid's thanking voice and insisting on the generic case rather than any individual example ('them to say . . . the poor ones . . . in their poverty'). The use of English thus constitutes an integral part of the argumentation stances of both interlocutors, indicating that it can successfully invoke a new frame for the talk through recreating a 'foreign' voice.

In the following instance, it is not the voice of a foreigner that is recreated but a different voice for the self which is claimed by the speaker:

19) B10: 342

T: *kátse na pjúme kafé*

S: *ma EM mboró em brolavéno*

T: *e:: akóma en éndeka pará déka*

→ S: I don't have time (.) I have lesson

D: *amá::n panajía mu (i θía mu) (.) ejínike egléza sto defterólepto panajía mou damésa da (.) //pái θía*

S: ((gets ready to go)) //pái pái

D: *íse ce i próti θía sta eglézika*

S: *ípa ta kalá?*

D: *ípes ta (.) íse ce i próti*

T: stay, we'll have a coffee

S: but I CAN'T, I don't have time

T: eh, it's only ten to eleven

→ S: "I don't have time (.) I have lesson"

D: gosh, Christ! (my aunt) (.) she became English in a second. Christ! (.) //bye Aunt

S: ((gets ready to go)) //bye bye

D: you're number one, Aunt, in English

S: did I say that ok? [=was that ok?]

D: you did (.) you're number one

Sophie, who has recently taken up English classes, again uses a switch to English as a move in her argumentation, i.e. her reason for not staying longer. In the first part of her turn, she thus reformulates her refusal to stay in English and then adds a further explanation in the same language. This move clearly

constitutes an attempt at reframing the speaker's self-presentation, and it is understood as such by her interlocutor, Dina, who shows her surprise at the unexpected switch to English. The latter keeps on commenting on this even after her aunt is ready to go and thus urges Sophie to reveal her worries about her performance in English. Language alternation functions in this case as a means of self-projection into a different persona, that of the language learner (cf. Franceschini 1998: 63) and, in this sense, is related to concerns of self-presentation and alignment.

A third characteristic case of switch to English revolves around the dog of the house, who in more than one instance is admonished in a foreign language:

20) C6: 048

((dog barking))

→ S: *láci (.) láci (.) be quiet =*

D: *a ha! 'najá mu θía pándos íse ce i próti (.) re peðí mu*

→ S: *e ti na kánume? (.) ((to the dog)) e quiet sjopí*

→ S: Lucky (.) Lucky (.) Be quiet =

D: *a ha! Christ, Aunt, you're number one (.) you are*

→ S: eh, what can we do [= oh, well!]? (.) ((to the dog)) eh quiet silence

21) C9: 101

D: (*éto*) *épianto o lácis túto to práma tféferé to mésa panajá mu*

→ S: *láci frónimos áli forá next time (.) na me::n férnis*

?: (.)

→ T: another time you good boy

D: (.)

S: *ti na kámo? mána mu ti na kámo?*

→ T: *na tu pis*, another time good boy

D: *mána mu re!*

S: (*póses*) *póses forés na tu to po (.)*

?: (.) (*ípes tu to pollés forés*)

D: *alá íðisi éntze pérni (.)*

D: (there it is) Lucky got it, this thing and brought it in, Christ

→ S: Lucky, behave, another time, next time (.) don't bring

?: (.)

→ T: another time you good boy

D: (.)

S: what can I do? well, what can I do?

→ T: tell him, 'another time good boy'

D: well, well!

S: (how many) how many times must I tell him (.)

?: (.) (you told him many times)

D: but he doesn't get it (.)

Both Sophie and Thekla switch into English in order to give a command to the dog. This use seems again to correspond to a change in the speaker's self-presentation from addressing their human interlocutors to addressing the dog. It is also important to note here that these commands are given in conjunction with their Greek counterparts ("quiet *sjopí*"; "*áli forá* next time"). In (21), Thekla reformulates Sophie's utterance into a more effective command, in her view, ("another time you good boy") and then repeats this for emphasis.

It is also noteworthy that, whereas in (19) the switch into English is commented upon by the interlocutor, in (20) the choice of language is left unnoticed and the focus is on the message, which is reported ('tell him') and elaborated upon ('how many times must I tell him'). Finally, it must be added that the last instance of a switch in (21) triggers an extended story about the origin of the name *lácis* for the dog:

22) C9: 110

D: (*íðisi*) *éntze pérni*S: *ðjóti o lácis ine láci bói,*T: *láci bói*S: *láci bói* (1) *an ðen ítan láci bói ítan na ton évri o kostandínos mólis ejeníðice mesta aposkúpiða na ton féri ðamé na xorázumen biberó=*

T: ()

S: *=me kufettúes tfe na to taízume na tes petássume tes kufettúes na tu válume y-*D: *na to jomónun yála pu ton KTINIATRON to yála málista*S: *pu ton ktiniatro, tfe na trói tfe na zísi tfe na jini ko-tsa-mu lácis (.) mána mu (to) láci*D: *ma jafió ton onómasan láci (.) jajá*

D: he doesn't get it

S: because *lácis* is a "lucky boy"

T: "lucky boy"

S: "lucky boy" (1) if he were not lucky, would Konstantinos find him, when he was born, in the garbage and bring him here for us to buy a milk-bottle=

T: ()

S: *=with pills and feed him and throw away the pills to give him m-*

D: to fill it up with milk and this milk from the VET!

S: from the vet, and he ate, and he lived and became a big and strong *lácis* (.) my sweet *lácis*D: that's why they called him *lácis* (.) grandma

In (22) Sophie draws the connection between the dog's name and the fact that he is lucky. She then uses this explanation as a preface to a story that accounts for the connection: if the dog were not lucky, he would not have been found and taken care of so that he finally survived. Dina accepts her aunt's argumentation

in summing up the point of the story ('that's why they called him *lácis*'). English is thus used in (22) as a semantic resource in the speaker's account. Her explanation rests on her ability to draw from another code: while she could have explained the name of the dog by referring to *Lácis*, which is a common affectionate name for men in Greek, she prefers to link it by 'false etymology' to English. The speaker's use of English in (22) is thus creative *par excellence* and relates to her performative and argumentative concerns.

The same creative function underlies the speakers' use of English in (23) and (24) below, where English is drawn upon as an intertextual resource:

23) C8: 033

D: *θία éθθα páme sti dóra? (.) ta fríðkja mas (.) (en) áðeta*→ S: *ta fríðkja mas en éfi (.) no money no honey (.) en na mas ta káni θéli riálja*

D: Aunt, are we not going to Dora? (.) our eyebrows (.) (are) a sight!

→ S: our eyebrows, there's no (.) no money no honey (.) to have it done, she asks for money

24) C11: 341

D: *ti vásana pu éçi i zoí (.) i zoí ine períterji*T: *ti vásana éçi i zoí*

→ Y: this is the life

→ T: Eurolife

((laughter))

D: *índa ne túto púpes jajá páli?*

T: (Eurolife)

D: *a, ípes Eurolife tin asfalisticí etería (.) mána mu moré i jajá mu. ðjafímise tin asfalisticí tis etería*T: *íne i asfálja mu*

D: life is full of trouble (.) life is funny

T: life is full of trouble

→ Y: this is the life

→ T: Eurolife

((laughter))

D: what's it you said grandma?

T: (Eurolife)

D: oh, you said 'Eurolife', the insurance company (.) well, grandma!. she advertized her insurance company

T: it's my insurance

In (23) Sophie uses a stereotypical phrase in English to support her answer to Dina and then reformulates her answer in Greek. Similarly, Yota in (24) uses

an utterance with gnomic force in English to contribute to comments by her interlocutors. Thekla's turn recontextualizes Yota's contribution by linking it to a slogan from an advertising campaign. This comment provides an ironic evaluation of her interlocutors' opinion, invoking a distancing in perspective. In both (23) and (24) the reporting of other voices is employed to creative ends that imply a reframing of the interlocutors' stance.

The interplay of interpersonal and sequential functions

As hinted at in the discussion above, interpersonal concerns are almost always related to sequential functions, such as the signalling of the shift between different speech acts or other structural elements of the interaction. Non-stereotypical global language alternation may thus have a combined interpersonal-sequential function. This is particularly evident in examples like the following, in which language alternation occurs at strategic points in the narration in relation to both the sequential and the interpersonal concerns of the speaker:

25) D2: 603:

D: *áte máma pému (.) ma na pu jínice teliká me tin gjiría andrúlla*

Y: *ítan anixtí i fundána pu plimírise to túto =*

((2 turns))

Y: *i jajá su ítan ekleisía*

D: *e::?*

Y: *ómos to neró ítan koméno (.) metá pu írte ómos to neró (.) e (.) árcepe tfétrefe tfe to spíti klistó tfe nemborúsame na búme mésa (.) epíe o kótfos na tin évri stin ekleisía éndin ívre e (.) e ímastun me tin énja óti eksifílise (.) tfékamna tfe ta morá tfe jelúsan tfe lálun tus pu na érti i jajá su ená kamni swimming*

→ D: *stin baralía!*

((further on))

Y: *pái i núнна su na mbi spíti anní tin pórtá na mbi potfí spíti tus (.) vrísci to spíti tus plimírisméno (.) jemátes i kámares (.) a: lalí i núнна su*

→ *évale tes tsiriljés what happened laló tis*

D: *áte máma, áte máma (.) máma íse*

→ Y: *mu léi swimming, pu ta kalá tóra léo tis*

D: *alíthkja ípes tis étsi pellárika?*

Y: *afú ítan jemáto kóri neró=*

((3 turns))

Y: *ma ntze kséráme óti i fundána ítan anixtí tfétrefe to neró (.) epía ekúnto i nastáfa potfí ekúnto eyó éfcene podá (.) éfefce mas epíe tfe ston iljakó evrafíkan ta xaljá the carpets everything everything everything*

→ D: *tfe ti éjine teliká?*

→ Y: *teliká I am swimming*

D: c'mon mum, tell me (.) what happened finally with Mrs. Andrulla

Y: the tap was open and that [the house] flooded=

((2 turns))

Y: your grandma was at church

D: eh?

Y: there was a water cut (.) but then, when the water came on again (.) eh (.) it started running and the house was locked and we couldn't get in (.) Kotsjos went to find her in church and he didn't find her eh (.) eh we kept worrying that it [the house] was flooded (.) and I made the kids laugh, I was saying to them when your grandma comes, she will do
→ *swimming'*

D: at the beach!

((further down))

Y: your grandma tries to get in, she opens the door to get in their house, next door (.) she finds their house flooded (.) the rooms were full (.)

→ 'ah:' says your grandma, she lets out a scream, 'what happened' I say to her

D: c'mon mum, mum (.) mum, you are

→ Y: she says 'swimming', 'for real, now', I say to her

D: did you really tell her this crazy thing?

Y: but, it was full of water, girl =

((3 turns))

Y: but we didn't know that the tap was open and the water kept running (.) I went, Nastasia tried to move it [the water] one way, I tried the other (.) it escaped and went towards the drawing room the carpets
→ were ruined with water 'the carpets everything everything everything'

D: and what happened finally?

→ Y: finally 'I am swimming'

Prompted by Dina, Yota tells a story about a leak that ended up flooding her mother's (Dina's grandmother's) house. The story mainly revolves around Yota's and grandmother's reactions to the flooding. The switches that occur in the story seem to be triggered by the first use of the compound form, consisting of the delexicalized verb *kámno* and *swimming*, which, interestingly enough, is found in quoted direct speech. The same switch into English is repeated in the direct speech used by Yota to report grandmother's reaction and, a third time, in summarizing the concluding event of the story.

More interesting is the switch to English found in the climax of the story: 'what happened I say to her'. Here language alternation is not simply used for the reporting of one's own words; it also marks one of the culminating events of the story, also indicated by the switch to narrative present in Greek ('I say to her'), a well-known marker of climax in Greek narratives (Georgakopoulou 1997). The answer to the question, which is also part of this climax, is again in direct speech in English. The indication of reporting, or rather reconstructing of voices, as seems to be the case in the story, is thus combined with the indication of the sequential organization of the narrative.

In contrast, the following switch marks the evaluative section of the story ("the carpets everything everything everything"). This switch repeats part of the previous utterance and continues with an emphatic repetition of *everything*, which functions to evaluate the story. The same evaluative function is carried over in the concluding event, which is marked by an intrasentential switch to English. In both these cases, interpersonal concerns in the use of English are thus combined with the need to clearly indicate the structure of the story by marking changes of footing that occur in story-telling (cf. Alfonzetti 1998: 195). As Gardner-Chloros et al. (2000: 1330) point out, "the speakers' ability to code-switch provides them with a further tool with which to structure their narratives".

Conclusions and further research

The analysis of extended data from conversations between members of a Cypriot Greek family has yielded a variety of patterns in the use of English in this context. As noted, English was present in roughly one-fifth of the total interactions in the recorded conversations, according to the judges. Although this is not significant in itself and detailed statistical analysis has not been carried out, this amount seems to indicate that the use of English in the everyday interactions of this middle-class family is not wide. Qualitatively speaking, language alternation phenomena in the casual talk between family members are both local and global and combine a variety of functions, related mainly to considerations of the sequential and the interpersonal organization of discourse in each occasion. Local phenomena include internationalisms, non-assimilated and assimilated loanwords (some proper names) and compound forms, while global phenomena include boundary markers with stereotypical sequential functions and larger stretches with typically interpersonal-sequential functions.

More specifically, instances of non-stereotypical language alternation in Cypriot Greek can have a global interpersonal function, which is related to some of the most common purposes of code-switching in the literature, including the shift to direct speech and the marking of quotations (Gumperz 1982). As we have seen, CG speakers also switch to English as a means of representing the voice of another person (extracts 18 and 25), a different aspect or persona of one's self (19, 20, 21), or a more general, intertextual reference (19 and 24). Switches are thus used as a primary device for indicating the change of footing and constitute a valuable conversational resource in the expression of the polyphony of discourse (cf. Lüdi & Py 1986; Alfonzetti 1998).

In this sense, recourse to English in CG conversations broadens the stylistic repertoire of the speakers in building up polyphonic discourses. It is also drawn upon as an integral part of the speaker's argumentative strategy or narrative building, to accommodate for the listener's reaction and indicate the speaker's alignment. In this sense, as analyzed above, it constitutes a contextualization cue that recontextualizes the interlocutors' contributions and the organization

of the discourse as a whole. For this reason, it can assume a markedly evaluative function, both in stories and conversational exchanges.

At the same time, the switch to English does not seem to have the capacity "to 'bring about' higher-level social meanings such as the speakers' language attitudes, preferences, and community norms and values", as Wei (1998: 173) indicates about code-switching in the community he studied (cf. Auer 1998: 8; Sebba & Wootton 1998). This explains why, for instance, the choice of English by a speaker is not commented upon (or challenged) by the other participants. In examples like (19) and (20), it is brought into focus only to emphasize the appreciation of the speaker's alignment by her interlocutors.¹⁴ In short, instances of English-Greek alternation in our data are embedded in particular conversational contexts and index micro-discourse concerns rather than macro-discourse or sociolinguistic aspects of e.g. identity, language preference, power relations etc.

Finally, it must be emphasized that interpersonal concerns are almost always related to the indication of sequential aspects, such as the signalling of the shift between different speech acts or the major structural elements of a story. On the other hand, ideational considerations (e.g. reiterating what has just been said) seem to be much less important.

With regard to the issue of the perceived threat of English, it must first be noted that the extent of language alternation phenomena seems to be restricted to a small proportion of conversational exchanges. However, there is clearly a need for more systematic, quantitative analysis of data using a much broader database to establish the extent to which English alternates with Greek in this environment.¹⁵ Most importantly, instances of global language alternation have a strategic function in the text. They constitute means of segmentation or argumentation moves related to self- and other-presentation, reveal the speakers' concerns with account and narration, and evoke varying frames of stance and alignment towards the interlocutors and the topic discussed.

From a theoretical point of view, it can also be argued that discourse analytic concepts such as the distinction between local and global phenomena and ideational/interpersonal/sequential functions is operative in our data and is most helpful in the analysis of conversational code-switching. The multiplicity of language alternation phenomena can thus be successfully accounted for in terms of discourse analytic categories. For instance, we could argue that ideational functions can be traced in cases where language alternation is used for reiterating what has been said, qualifying a message (Gumperz 1982), for commentaries, repetitions, expansions etc. of a story (Alfonzetti 1988) etc. Interpersonal concerns may underlie cases where language alternation is used to mark quotations and interjections, personalization or objectification (Gumperz 1982), to provide cues about the speaker's identity (Franceschini 1998: 63; cf. Auer's 1988 'participant-related' alternation) and, in general, for evoking a new 'frame' or 'footing' for the interaction to be shared by the participants (Auer 1998). Finally, sequential or segmentational functions may characterize cases where language alternation is used to specify the addressee (Gumperz 1982), for asides

and, more generally, to regulate the turn-taking mechanism and the ongoing interaction (Franceschini 1998; Maschler 1998; cf. Auer's 1988 'discourse-related' alternation).¹⁶

Our analysis has followed a micro-analytic perspective, restricting itself to providing an explanatory framework for individual cases of code-switching in a carefully selected context of interaction. This clearly leaves open the issue of the extent to which practices observed in a single family can be generalized to all the CG speakers in Cyprus. The answer to this can only come from a much larger investigation of the extended networks in which families such as the one presented in our study participate. For this reason, more systematic research is needed in a variety of genres, as well as in differentiated social and geographical contexts, in order to determine where the speakers in our study fit regarding general trends in broader Cypriot society. This would also allow us to specify the relationship of language alternation phenomena with the indexing of social and symbolic values, although our preliminary investigation has suggested that micro-constructive concerns may play a more important role in this context than macro-symbolic or identity functions (cf. Alfonzetti 1998).

A further issue concerns the extent of individual differences in the use of English in Cyprus. For example, in our data it seems that Sophie's switches are introduced to support her argumentative concerns, whereas Thekla's are related to an ironic or distancing stance. The speakers' degree of bilingualism is surely relevant here, although our study suggests that speakers who switch do not have to be fluent speakers of English or able to sustain an extended monolingual conversation in this language. It is surprising, for example, that older speakers like Thekla seem to switch more often than younger speakers like Dina. This is parallel to findings in the literature (e.g. Franceschini 1998: 57; Meeuwis & Blommaert 1998), indicating that code-switching is not a matter of absolute choice but has to be seen rather as a continuum of practices.

Finally, a further limitation of this study relates to its emphasis on what Hymes (1996: 72) calls the "salient, detachable features of language – words". As he points out, "the many and subtle ways in which languages can influence each other, through adaptation of grammatical categories, shifts in connotations, translation of phrasal patterns, and the like, are less apparent at the surface" (ibid.: 72–3). It is to be hoped that the further study of language alternation in a variety of Cypriot Greek contexts will also shift attention to the whole range of these phenomena.

Although it cannot be doubted that the question of the use of English in CG conversations is crucially dependent upon sociolinguistic considerations, the main implication of this study is that a full discussion must include an analysis of the role that English plays in specific textual and contextual settings. As Gardner-Chloros (1995: 86) puts it, the question is not how speakers keep their languages separate but "how they manipulate the overall sociolinguistic situation to create their own linguistic sub-groups and sub-codes". A discourse analytic approach to language alternation phenomena in particular contexts of interaction is an indispensable means of clarifying this question.

Notes

1. I would like to thank Dina and her family for allowing me to collect the data for this research as well as for their warm hospitality. Earlier versions of this paper were presented at a one-day ESSE Symposium, organized at the University of Cyprus in October 1999 and at the 14th International Symposium on the Description and/or Comparison of English and Greek, organized by Aristotle University in Thessaloniki in May 2000. I owe thanks to the participants of the Symposia for their most helpful comments, to Marilena Karyolemou and Alexandra Georgakopoulou for commenting on an earlier draft, and to the reviewers of InJAL for their most encouraging, even if diametrically opposite, feedback.
2. The best reviews are given in Poplack, Sankoff and Miller (1988), Romaine (1989) and Myers-Scotton (1993). See also Boeschoten (1998: 18) for an apt summary comparison of all related terms.
3. It should be noted here that, in contrast, most studies of CS are based on "the informal speech of those members of cohesive minority groups in modern urbanizing regions" (Gumperz 1982: 64).
4. To summarize the historical context, it should be noted that the fragile independence was not meant to last for long in the face of the growing nationalism of both the Greek majority and the considerable Turkish minority (18% of the population), especially since the 1960 Constitution recognized an important role for the "three guarantor powers", Greece, Turkey and Britain. The 1974 Turkish invasion led to the displacement of 200,000 Greek Cypriots from their homes and the violation of international law which accompanied the illegal occupation of 37% of the land. Despite this, the Republic of Cyprus has developed a prosperous economy and aims at European integration. A good synopsis of the "Cyprus problem" can be found in Papadakis (1998).
5. All translations from Greek sources are mine. Greek data are transcribed using a broad phonetic transliteration.
6. The absence of rigorous and/or more recent sociolinguistic or dialectological methods in the existing studies also seriously limits their usefulness.
7. Names have been changed to preserve anonymity.
8. The local vs. global distinction has interesting parallels in the code-switching literature, e.g. in Auer's (1988) approach, which distinguishes two categories: (a) *transfer*, when the phenomenon in question is connected to a particular conversational structure, whether word, sentence or a larger unit, and (b) *code-switching* (proper), when language alternation is connected to a particular point in conversation. Gardner-Chloros adopts a similar distinction in her study of the Alsatian community of Strasburg (1991) between *translinguistic markers*, involving set expressions or topic-related terminology, *style-shifting*, involving elements of the other language enriching a bilingual speaker's stylistic repertoire, and *switching* for longer switches (involving whole sentences or parts of sentences).
9. For a thorough discussion of this view of (global) sequentiality in expository discourse, see Goutsos (1997).
10. Transcription conventions follow Georgakopoulou & Goutsos (1997). In particular, inaudible stretches are included in single parentheses, editorial comments by the transcriber are given in double parentheses, pauses of less than one second are indicated by (.), animated tone is shown by capital letters and exclamation marks, and lengthening by colons.
11. Contact items like *éla*, *re*, *áte*, *ndáksi*, *océi* (< ok) etc. have no direct equivalents in English, so a roundabout or no translation is given where they are not the focus of discussion.
12. Informal evidence such as the speakers' intuitions would seem to support this hypothesis. The co-occurrence of *théncju* with other confirmatory signals such as

endáksi ('alright') also seems to indicate a weakening of its function as a politeness marker.

13. Calls between non-intimates can end without a greeting section:

H4: 043
se pósín óra? 'how long will it take?'
éna dékálepto (.) ti ónoma? 'ten minutes (.) what's the name?'
 X.M. 'H.M.'
ndáksi 'alright'
 ((hangs up))

14. It could be claimed that (18) is a possible exception to this, since the voice represented is that of a 'foreigner' and thus English is reserved for a 'they' code (Gumperz 1982). However, the main speaker's point is precisely her invitation to the foreigner to share her own code rather than an attempt to emphasize the 'we' in opposition to the 'they' code.
15. In addition, language alternation phenomena seem to be restricted within turns. Individual switches may trigger a longer phrase in English, but this is not extended beyond the current speaker's turn and is not taken up by the other participants, i.e. they do not trigger more extended talk in English (translinguistic markers, in Gardner-Chloros' (1991) terms). These are complemented by mostly phonologically and sometimes also morphologically assimilated loanwords which may or may not be found in SMG.
16. As pointed out in the literature, we also have to allow for cases in which there are subtle functions for code-switching or no functions at all, i.e. where language alternation does "not carry meaning *qua* language choice" (Auer 1998: 16) for the participants or is not treated as pertinent by them (Franceschini 1998: 60).

References

- Alfonzetti, G. (1998) The conversational dimension in code-switching between Italian and dialect in Sicily. In P. Auer, *Code-switching in conversation. Language, interaction and identity*. London/New York: Routledge. 180–213.
- Auer, P. (1988) A conversation analytic approach to code-switching and transfer. In M. Heller, *Code-switching. Anthropological and sociolinguistic perspectives*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. 187–213.
- (1998) Introduction: bilingual conversation revisited. In P. Auer, *Code-switching in conversation. Language, interaction and identity*. London/New York: Routledge. 1–24.
- Bailey, B. (2000) Social/interactional functions of code-switching among Dominican Americans. *Pragmatics* 10.2: 165–93.
- Boeschoten, H. (1998) Code-switching, code-mixing, and code alternation. In R. Jacobson, *Code-switching worldwide*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. 15–24.
- Cyprus Weekly* (14–20/11/97) Chamber opposes ban on English signs.
- Dabène, L. & D. Moore (1995) Bilingual speech of migrant people. In L. Milroy & P. Muysken, *One speaker, two languages. Cross-disciplinary perspectives on code-switching*. Cambridge University Press. 17–44.
- Fasold, R. (1984) *The sociolinguistics of society*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Franceschini, R. (1998) Code-switching and the notion of code in linguistics: Proposal for a dual focus model. In P. Auer, *Code-switching in conversation. Language, interaction and identity*. London/New York: Routledge. 51–72.
- Gardner-Chloros, P. (1991) *Language selection and switching in Strasbourg*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- (1992) The sociolinguistics of the Greek Cypriot community in London. *Plurilinguismes* 4: 112–36.
- (1995) Code-switching in community, regional and national repertoires: the myth of the discreteness of linguistic systems. In L. Milroy & P. Muysken, *One speaker, two languages. Cross-disciplinary perspectives on code-switching*. Cambridge University Press. 68–89.
- , R. Charles & J. Cheshire (2000) Parallel patterns? A comparison of monolingual speech and bilingual code-switching discourse. *Journal of Pragmatics* 32: 1305–41.
- Georgakopoulou, A. (1997) *Narrative performances. A study of Modern Greek storytelling*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- & D. Goutsos (1997) *Discourse analysis: an introduction*. Edinburgh University Press.
- & D. Goutsos (1998) Conjunctions versus discourse markers in Greek. The interaction of frequency, position and functions in context. *Linguistics* 36.5: 887–917.
- Goffman, E. (1979) Footing. *Semiotica* 25: 1–29.
- Goutsos, D. (1997) *Modeling discourse topic: sequential relations and strategies in expository text*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Gumperz, J. (1982) *Discourse strategies*. Cambridge University Press.
- Haugen, E. (1956) *Bilingualism in the Americas*. University of Alabama Press/American Dialect Society.
- Hymes, D. (1996) *Ethnography, linguistics, narrative inequality. Toward an understanding of voice*. London: Taylor & Francis.
- Ioannou, Y. (1991) Language, politics and identity: an analysis of the Cypriot dilemma. *The Cyprus Review* 3.1: 15–41.
- Karoulla-Vrikkis, D. (1991) The language of the Greek Cypriots today: a revelation of an identity crisis? *The Cyprus Review* 3.1: 42–58.
- Karyolemou, M. (1994) Linguistic attitudes and metalinguistic discourse: an investigation in the Cypriot press. In I. Philippaki-Warbuton, K. Nicolaidis & M. Sifianou, *Themes in Greek linguistics. Papers from the first international conference on Greek linguistics*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins. 253–9.
- Lectures (1997): Η διχόνοια, η ελληνική γλώσσα και η κυπριακή διάλεκτος [Ethnic strife, Greek language and the Cypriot dialect]. Lectures at People's University. Nicosia: Nicosia Municipality.
- Lüdi, G. (1987) Les marques transcodiques: regards nouveaux sur le bilinguisme. In G. Lüdi, *Devenir bilingue – parler bilingue. Actes du 2e colloque sur le bilinguisme, Université de Neuchâtel, 20–22 Septembre 1985*. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer. 1–19.

- & B. Py (1986) *Etre bilingue*. Berne: P. Lang.
- Makridis, A. (1998) Το γλωσσικό πρόβλημα στην Κύπρο [The language problem in Cyprus]. *Χαρavyή* 25-26-27/8/98.
- Maschler, Y. (1998) On the transition from code-switching to a mixed code. In P. Auer, *Code-switching in conversation. Language, interaction and identity*. London/New York: Routledge. 125–49.
- Mavros, P. (1998) The University's official languages. *The Cyprus Weekly*, 1–7 May.
- Meeuwis, M. & J. Blommaert (1998) A monolectal view of code-switching: layered code-switching among Zairians in Belgium. In P. Auer, *Code-switching in conversation. Language, interaction and identity*. London/New York: Routledge. 76–98.
- Milroy, L. (1987) *Observing and analysing natural language*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- & P. Muysken (1995) Introduction: code-switching and bilingualism research. In L. Milroy & P. Muysken, *One speaker, two languages. Cross-disciplinary perspectives on code-switching*. Cambridge University Press. 1–14.
- & L. Wei (1995) A social network approach to code-switching: the example of a bilingual community in Britain. In L. Milroy & P. Muysken, *One speaker, two languages. Cross-disciplinary perspectives on code-switching*. Cambridge University Press. 136–157.
- Moyer, M.G. (1998) Bilingual conversation strategies in Gibraltar. In P. Auer, *Code-switching in conversation. Language, interaction and identity*. London/New York: Routledge. 215–34.
- Myers-Scotton, C. (1993) *Social motivations for code-switching. Evidence from Africa*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Papadakis, Y. (1998) Greek Cypriot narratives of history and collective identity: nationalism as a contested process. *American Ethnologist* 25.2: 149–65.
- Papapavlou, A.N. (1994) *Language contact and lexical borrowing in the Greek Cypriot dialect. Sociolinguistic and cultural implications*. Athens: N.C. Grivas.
- & P. Pavlou (1998) A review of the sociolinguistic aspects of the Greek Cypriot dialect. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 19: 212–20.
- Pavlidou, T. (1997) The last five turns: preliminary remarks on closings in Greek and German. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 126: 145–62.
- Poplack, S. (1980) 'Sometimes I'll start a sentence in Spanish y termino en español': toward a typology of code-switching. *Linguistics* 18: 581–618.
- (1988) Contrasting patterns of code-switching in two communities. In M. Heller, *Code-switching. Anthropological and sociolinguistic perspectives*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. 215–44.
- , D. Sankoff & C. Miller (1988) The social correlates and linguistic processes of lexical borrowing and assimilation. *Linguistics* 26: 47–104.
- Romaine, S. (1989) *Bilingualism*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Schegloff, E.A. (1986) The routine as achievement. *Human Studies* 9: 111–51.
- , E. Ochs & S.A. Thompson (1996) Introduction. In E. Ochs, E.A. Schegloff & S.A. Thompson, *Interaction and grammar*. Cambridge University Press. 1–51.
- Sciriha, L. (1996) *A question of identity. Language use in Cyprus*. Nicosia: Intercollege Press.
- Scollon, R. (1998) *Mediated discourse as social interaction: a study of news discourse*. London: Longman.
- Sebba, M. & T. Wootton (1998) We, they and identity: sequential versus identity-related explanation in code-switching. In P. Auer, *Code-switching in conversation. Language, interaction and identity*. London/New York: Routledge. 262–86.
- Stamatakis, N. (1991) History and nationalism: the cultural reconstruction of the Modern Greek Cypriot identity. *The Cyprus Review* 3.1: 59–83.
- Symposium (1993): *Ελλάδος φθόγγον χέουσα. Η αλλοτρίωση της ελληνικής γλώσσας στην Κύπρο. Συμπόσιο για την ελληνική γλώσσα σήμερα στην Κύπρο* [Symposium for the Greek Language Today in Cyprus]. Nicosia: Study Centre of the Holy Monastery of Kykkos.
- Thomas, G. (1991) *Linguistic purism*. London: Longman.
- Wei, L. (1998) The 'why' and 'how' questions in the analysis of conversational code-switching. In P. Auer, *Code-switching in conversation. Language, interaction and identity*. London/New York: Routledge. 156–76.
- Zarpetea, P. (1995) Code-switching and lexical borrowing (loanwords) in the speech of three generations of Greek Cypriots in London (Harringey). *Studies in Greek linguistics. Proceedings of the 16th Annual Meeting of the Department of Linguistics*. Aristotle University: Thessaloniki. 576–87.

[Received 3/4/00; revised 24/11/00]

Dionysis Goutsos
 Department of Foreign Languages and Literatures
 University of Cyprus
 P.O. Box 20537
 1678 Nicosia
 Cyprus
 e-mail: dionysis@ucy.ac.cy