

## 33.6 Précis

Costas Constantinou

*Linguistic indicators in the language of Cypriot pupils*  
(a PhD. thesis, University of Athens, 1997)

1. In this work I search the dialect of Cypriot Secondary Education pupils in accordance with the norm of standard demotic Greek (KNE) via written and oral data. Ninety-six informants filled out a questionnaire and were also recorded during an averagely ten-minute conversation they had with the observer. The data are statistically analyzed as far as five parameters are concerned (17.4.1), namely sex, Gymnasium or Lyceum, school performance, financial status of the family and place of residence. The whole project was undertaken in spring 1993.

2. According to the data (19.), dialect is equated to local idiomatic speech, to different accent, to correctness and language cleanliness too. Half of the informants claim that there is no problem in Cyprus if someone speaks only dialect. On the contrary, a sixty five per cent regards there are advantages to dialect speaking. Nevertheless, these are not of social backgrounds as they are ascribed to national reasons and localism. Dialect is not connected to cleverness. A dialect speaker is characterized as socialized and sincere, exactly as a non-dialect speaker, although the latest is of a lower percentage. It is clear therefore that social success is by no means connected in any way to dialect. On the other hand, dialect speakers are totally evaluated more positively.

3. With reference to written data (indicators, 20.) boys are in favor of the dialect nearly twice as much as girls. Lyceum behaves likewise (and more). Comparatively, pupils of lower economic status show a tendency to prefer dialect five times as much. Full marks pupils not only give the impression that they possess the dialect but they also want to show this too. No direct relation (especially in a positive way) can be drawn between dialect speaking and school success. With regard to geography, the relation «the more eastern the more dialectal» is often apparent.

4. In morphology (20.1.1, 20.3.1), on the part of the so-called bad pupils, there is a greater tendency for over-correction and compliance with the norm. However, the actual distribution of the indicators is restored in syntax, as pupils with low marks at school are often (comparatively) more dialectal. Besides, there are no high remarkable differences to observe between boys and girls, Gymnasium and Lyceum. Moreover, as far as non-verbal indicators are concerned, a preference to dialect is found more frequently among girls. Generally speaking, the following dialectal indicators still insist: *[en]* or *[`eni]*, *[la`lo]*, *[`ivra]* and *[`evro]*, *[`kamno]*, the *k-Aorist*, except for *[`ginomai]*, verbal formations with *[-sso]*, *[-`efko]* and *[-sko]* suffixes, except for *[`ginomai]*, and some allomorphs of the Imperative as well. Adverb endings in *[-os]* dominate *[a`mesos]*. There is a clear use of the future particle *[`enna]* and of the negation particles *[men]* and *[en]*. Furthermore, the adverb *[pol`la]* is preferred instead of *[po`li]*. On the contrary, the fight between question pronoun *[`indambu]* and *[ti]* is in the balance. The use of the article *[tis]* and *[tes]* is equally divided. A high percentage of correctness is observed in the declination of the so-called three-sex-and-two-endings adjectives like *[akri`vis]* and *[`pliris]*. Post-position of pronoun is much more common in written data *[ipen\_dus]*. The use of Aorist is very strong, although Perfect comes up often. There is also a well-performed use of Past Perfect to observe. A clear yielding is found in dialectal verbal endings *[-sin]*, in what I call “accusative genitive”, namely the use of masculine accusative in the place of possessive genitive *[i `kores tus vo`skus]*. A similar retreat is also to be seen in s-less Imperfect *[a`gapun]* as in verbal combinations with genitive too, mainly when these verbs have the meaning of “feel” or “know”. Rare are also the dialectal forms of the personal pronoun *[e`jo]*, *[e`su]*, *[e`men]*, *[e`sen]*.

5. Compared to norm, Cypriots have a difficulty with consonant articulations that are realized more front in the oral cavity and between vowels, as for example in *[ka`ta]*. Consequently, a part of the articulated speech is located more back (*vague and unstable articulations*, 21.). Evidently, and taking into consideration the normal eradication of consonant between vowels, the Cypriot dialect is characterized by a hiatus in its articulated (pronouncing) sequence.

6. One of the most typical features of the dialect is final *[n]* (22.). Its presence is very strong, although the informants have

shown a clear tendency to abandon it. Remarkable is on the other hand the not infrequent absence of the obligatory final [n] from the verbal endings [un], [an] not only before vowel but even before consonant [i`ipe tus].

7. Under title *intruder nasals and nasality of Cypriot speech* (23.) I discuss the appearance of a nasal, [n] in the overwhelming majority of cases, in environments where typically it is not to be expected, so it can be characterized as a completely arbitrary element. In certain cases it is attributed to a kind of conflict, due to the more or less similar sound image of the involved lexical units. I considered furthermore that besides the nasal intruders an additional source of nasality comes from other nasalized elements too. It mainly concerns vowels, which are realized with a nasal accent ("with the nose"). The output of this kind of nasality is, in most cases, [n] and secondly [m]. Nasalized are often present either at the end of verbal endings or at the end of the accusative. They are found near regularly expected nasal as well. Thus, the impression is given that they function supplementary to the deletion of [n].

8. As for the thematic vowel (24.) I have to observe the following: In the first conjugation of active voice in the present tense there are two options: [-u-] and [-o-], with that of [-u-] in the first person of Plural [i`grafumen] being more prevalent. Moreover it is observed that girls make a more extensive use of this feature in speaking, while on the contrary boys do exactly the opposite. As for the present tense of mediopassive an equally shared preference of the two (under specific conditions) is manifested in general. This means a spreading of dialectal [-u-] against the counter-type [-o-] of the norm, as in [e`yo si`konnume] instead of [e`yo si`konnome].

In the passive first class of the second conjugation of present and imperfect tense, between [-ie-], [-io-], [-iu-], a non-economical paradigm of declination (24.10.2) appears as the dialect offers theoretically a deviation from the norm in the three quarter of all types. More specifically, for the mediopassive first class of the second conjugation there is an evident incompatibility of the dialectal feature of augment with that of standard thematic vowel [-io-] of the norm. Dialectal features have a different effect on boys and girls. These features are combined among boys to a bigger extent. Boys, as far as this is concerned, show themselves more consistent. The interaction of dialectal features teaches that a normative decision about the use

of something can affect the future of other linguistic elements as well.

9. I named the very frequent and without any regularity appearing interconsonantal vowels as *not expected intensive geminates and aspirants* (MAA, 25.). As the case may be, a common feature (as for regularly expected geminates) is intensity with duration or aspiration. Generally, their frequently repeated appearances, not only in the same words but from different informants too, establish, for sure, a new tendency for duplication. The Cypriot dialect appears not to recede in this point. In the future, an extension and stability in their use may turn them to become grammatically expected elements.

10. Only half of our informants support verbal augment (26.). This is true also for the environment after pause or vowel, while after consonant, obviously for euphonic reasons, the percentage increases to about ten per cent. On the other hand, by no means infrequent are (during speaking) instances of cutting off the augment from the remaining body of the verb and in this way creating two-syllable forms accentuated on the penultimate syllable (paroxytona), like [*`praxan*].

11. Under the term *ellipticity* (27.) I characterize the very frequent economical tendency of the dialect not to have, in the linear flow of speech elements, which in the frame of norm are considered as at least imposed. With the criteria of a contextual grammar they are indeed semantically fully acceptable realizations but typically, within a narrow structural sense, and concerning standard language, the dialect doesn't function grammatically. For the matter in question, the corpus of such evidences shows unexpected deletions of elements smaller than one syllable and reaches up to verb or whole verbal complex.

12. Under *pleonasm* (28.) I mean the exact opposite tendency, as Cyprus dialect often provides the impression, compared to standard Greek, that "has something more". This sense of redundancy seems to mark more often the expression of movement or stop inside a space and on a place, like [*`mesa sto*] instead of simply [*sto*], [*`pano sto*] instead of simply [*sto*], and the expression of means or escort as well, like [*ma`zi me*] instead of simply [*me*]. In the same way, there is a double appearance of the article and the enclitically pronoun as well.

13. Under title *accentual and rhythmical differences between Cypriot dialect and Common Greek* (29.) it is shown that the setting of the verbal dialectal accent mark in the past tenses (and in combination with the different inflectional paradigm) is still strong. Generally, a greater resistance appears to stand up in the singular. In any case and in comparison to standard Greek there are statistically more unaccented syllabic periods in the Cypriot speech.

14. Finally, under *linguistic variety and conflicts between dialect and norm in the Cypriot speech* (30.) I mostly talk about the competition of the following elements: the verb-types [*en*], [*eni*] with that of [*ine*], the ending of third Person singular [*-sin*] with that of [*-un*] or [*-an*]. I also mean the different phonetic rules and realizations, the variation in the thematic vowel, the pre-position or post-position of the personal pronoun (as often happens in [*a`resi*], [*a`resci*] and [*leo*], [*la`lo*]), the final choice of a dialectal word, instead of its corresponding in the norm (KNE) or reverse, the preference between [*kano*], [*kamno*] or [*leo*] [*la`lo*], the dialectal or non-dialectal accentuation of the verb, in combination with the preferred type of thematic vowel. In most cases, effort for correction towards the direction of norm is obvious, while fewer are the evidences of the opposite.