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the decade-long ‘invasion’ of SG in education, the media, etc. It is therefore envisaged that de-dialectization is a long way from taking place in Cyprus. In fact, the contemporary vital presence of varying registers of CG in the media (Georgiou, 2010; Tsiplakou & HadjiIoann-nou, 2010) and on the internet (Sophocleous & Themistocleous, forthcoming; Themistocleous, 2009, forthcoming), as well as the availability of a dictionary\textsuperscript{17} and a grammatical description of the CG koiné following linguistic criteria,\textsuperscript{18} together with the on-going national language curriculum reform, may be operative in reversing language shift and arresting potential de-dialectization.\textsuperscript{19}

5.2 Cypriot Arabic: a moribund variety

At 900 speakers (COE, 2011) CMA is by-and-large moribund; attrition and pidginization have been operative for generations (Roth, 2004) and speakers over the age of 30 are probably the terminal speakers of this language. Morbidity has been expedited with the relocation to the south of the CMA-speaking population, who mostly lived in the village of Kormakiti in the north of Cyprus pre-1974. Since 2002, Cypriot Arabic is one of the UNESCO-designated severely endangered languages (UNESCO, 2009). The community has expressed a wish for standardization and language maintenance (see Kermia Ztite, 2006), with which the MOEC has complied by putting together a committee of linguists to work on the standardization and revival of Cypriot Arabic since 2008, following a recommendation of the Council of Europe (COE, 2006). The Committee has produced an action plan for the codification and revitalization of CMA, which involves:

(a) a general description and a pre-assessment of the current state of CMA;
(b) an action plan for the revitalization of CMA;
(c) a proposal for the adoption of an alphabetical codification of CMA.

Whether these measures will help arrest morbidity unfortunately remains doubtful.

6. Language policy and language planning in the northern part of Cyprus
(contribution by Matthias Kappler)

6.1 Preamble

The following sections describe the language policy and planning situation in the northern part of Cyprus; issues discussed in the previous chapters on the Republic of Cyprus (particularly concerning Turkish in the Republic of Cyprus) are not addressed. After the intervention (‘invasion’ according to Greek sources and ‘peace movement’ according to Turkish sources) of the Turkish army in the summer of 1974, and the declaration of the independence of the (officially largely unrecognized) Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus in 1983, the northern part of Cyprus is de facto outside the jurisdiction of the Republic of Cyprus, but has been included in this review because it forms an historical and cultural part of Cyprus as a whole. Given that the political situation has resulted in the use of differing and often conflicting terminologies in the two parts of Cyprus to describe the area under Turkish Cypriot administration, we will use the terms ‘northern part of Cyprus’, or the ‘north of Cyprus’, which are widely used by Cypriot and international Non-Government Organizations (NGOs) and other organizations, avoiding any use of signs (e.g. the use of quotation marks or modifiers such as ‘pseudo-’ or ‘so-called’) which have ideological connotations. In the following pages, words such as government, university or ministry are used without quotation marks when referring to institutions in the northern part of Cyprus (in
contrast to established practice in Greek Cypriot official language policy; cf. Floros, 2009, 2011a) for reasons of simplifying text flow. This does not imply any particular ideological or political positioning of the author.

6.2 Language profile

6.2.1 Official language

The only official language in the northern part of Cyprus is Turkish. The officially used variety is ST, i.e. the variety used in the Republic of Turkey (see Section 2.1). ST is also the sole language of literacy (on local varieties, see Section 6.2.3).

6.2.2 Major minority languages

The constitutional document in effect in the northern part of Cyprus does not acknowledge minority languages. A number of local and immigrant languages and varieties are unofficially ‘tolerated’, but do not appear in public life.

CMA, which, as mentioned in Section 2.2, is identified as one of the endangered languages of the world, is spoken in Kormakitis/Koruçam (see map in Figure 1), the only historically Maronite village that still has a CMA-speaking population. Though most Maronites who lived in the Kormakitis area prior to 1974 moved to urban centers of the south, approximately 130 individuals ‘have chosen to remain under Turkish administration’ (Karyolemou, 2010, p. 3). Since the opening of the borders in 2003, many Maronites who currently reside in the southern part of Cyprus visit Kormakitis regularly, and, having reclaimed their real estate property, have had their houses restored for use as second or vacation homes. Recently, 27 Maronites who had moved to the area under the control of the Republic of Cyprus post-1974 have been granted permission to move back to Kormakitis and reclaim their status as residents of the village (Kormakitis.net, 2011). Because of increased traveling of individuals living in the southern part of the island to the Kormakitis area, during the last few years Greek street signs, alongside the official Turkish ones, have been installed in Kormakitis, but no public signs in CMA have been put up in the village. In an attempt to revitalize CMA (see Section 5.2) and to solidify a connection between Maronite youth and Kormakitis, annual language immersion camps for children aged 7–16 have been held in the village since 2008 (Bielenberg & Constantinou, 2010).

CG and Armenian are almost completely out of use since 1974, when most Greek and Armenian speakers fled to the south of Cyprus. CG is still spoken in the village of Rizokarpaso/Dipkarpaz and surrounding areas, where a limited number of Greek Cypriots (520 in 1994 according to Brey, 1998; 343 in 2011 according to the Press and Information office of the Republic of Cyprus; PIO, 2011) have remained after 1974. The immigrant population that moved into Rizokarpaso as the local Greek Cypriots departed is often bilingual (in Kurdish or Anatolian varieties of Turkish and CG). CG is also still the dominant language for a small number of Turkish Cypriots in the Lurucina region and in Kaleburnu (Karpaz); the older generation is almost exclusively Greek-speaking, whereas the younger people are balanced bilinguals (Johanson & Demir, 2006; Ioannidou, 2009c; Kappler, 2010).

Another important, yet usually neglected, local minority language is Kurbetcha/Gurbetcha, the language of the Cypriot Muslim Roma, or Gurbet (an Arabic term that reached Romani through Turkish). Many of the Cypriot Muslim Roma have migrated south after 2003, but there is still a small number of Roma living in the Morfou/Güzelyurt and Famagusta/Mağusa districts; their precise number is unknown due to the mobility of the
Kurbetcha/Gurbetcha seems to be a kind of creole with mainly Romani lexicon and CT grammar (Pehlivan, 2009, p. 150), but the language is still completely unexplored (see Section 2.2).

The most important immigrant languages are Kurdish and Arabic; the latter is a Syrian variety from the Antiocheia/Hatay region of Turkey; the exact number of speakers of either of these languages is unknown. Other languages (i.e. other Arabic varieties, French, Spanish, Persian, Turkic languages of the Caucasus and Central Asia and of Iran, African languages and Urdu) are mostly spoken by such temporary migrants as workers or students. In addition, the use of Russian and Rumanian is consistently increasing because of the increasing presence of residents and workers from Eastern Europe, especially in the Keryneia/Girne area.

English is still widely used in interethnic communication and in tourism. Native speakers of English residing permanently in the northern part of Cyprus may be found in the Keryneia/Girne and Lapithos/Lapta areas; some villages (e.g. Karmi/Karaman) are almost exclusively English-speaking. A smaller German-speaking community resides permanently in these areas (see figures in Section 6.2.4). As a result of the massive emigration of Turkish Cypriots to English-speaking countries after 1974 (primarily to the UK), there is a small number of Turkish–English bilingual speakers, who have either returned to Cyprus, come from linguistically mixed backgrounds, or are merely occasional tourists.

6.2.3 Dialects and language variation

In terms of phonology, and partly of morphology, CT varieties belong to the Central Anatolian Turkish dialect group, but differ from it in many respects, primarily in syntax and in the lexicon. Similar to the situation in the south regarding SMG and CG, CT and ST stand in a diglossic relationship (see Ferguson, 1959 and note 4). CT is the L, naturally acquired variety and ST is the H, superposed variety used in literacy and formal communication (see also Section 2.3).

CT ‘is generally described as an extension of Anatolian Turkish’ (Johanson & Demir, 2006, p. 2). However, its (socio)linguistic profile appears to be significantly different from that of other Anatolian varieties, which have experienced substantial ‘homogenizing’ influences by prestige dialects, and are converging toward ST. The distinct (socio)linguistic status of CT can be attributed to the fact that prior to 1974 the dialect had evolved in a context of relative geographical isolation from other varieties of Turkish and in ‘intensive interaction’ with CG and English (Johanson & Demir, 2006, p. 3). CT has several sub-varieties (Demir, 2002; Duman, 1991; Kappler, 2008), which are undergoing levelling and koinéization (Menteşoğlu, 2009; Pehlivan, 2003; Theocharous, 2009). This process appears to have been accelerated after 1974 as:

- groups of speakers of various geographical sub-varieties became inter-mixed after moving to the northern part of the island,
- ‘intensive linguistic contacts with both ST and Anatolian dialects’ took place as a result of significant influx of immigrants from Turkey (Johanson & Demir, 2006, p. 2); and
- ST was adopted ‘as the official language of education, bureaucracy, and the mass media’ (Menteşoğlu, 2009, p. 76).

According to Johanson and Demir (2006), unlike the situation in Turkey, where dialects are typically stigmatized, in the northern part of Cyprus the emerging CT koiné carries quite some prestige as it is ‘spoken, alongside ST, at various levels of public communication’ (p. 3),
including television discussions, parliament debates, television series, public political speeches, etc. Still, CT is generally absent from the daily press (with the exception of satirical periodicals) and news broadcasting (cf. Section 6.3.2). Although, as a rule, CT is used in oral communication, dialect interference has been documented in written language, e.g. in official records, minutes and school essays (Pehlivan, 2000; Pehlivan & Adalıer, 2010; Vancı-Osam, 2006). The relatively high prestige of CT is indicated by the fact that children of immigrants from Turkey usually adopt CT dialect features when speaking to Cypriots, or, if their language acquisition process has been completed on the island, their oral production displays dominant CT features (Johanson & Demir, 2006).

On the other hand, the influence of ST through the mass media, the influx of immigrants from Turkey and the re-immigration of Turkish Cypriots from Turkey (most of whom return to Cyprus after attending university in Turkey) have played a significant part in the levelling of CT in recent years.

Turkish-speaking immigrants from Turkey and other countries (e.g. Bulgaria) brought with them a large number of dialect varieties from central, southern, eastern and northern Anatolia, as well as from the Balkans. Although recent numbers are not available (see Section 6.5), it is assumed that immigrants from Turkey form the majority of the population in the northern part of Cyprus. Immigrants tend to use their dialects within their own speech communities, and may switch to ST when speaking to people from other regions. Moreover, as was pointed out above, they use CT features when addressing Cypriots. Given the overwhelming influence of immigrants in the society, Turkish Cypriots use their dialect more and more in order to differentiate themselves from non-Cypriots as a means of creating/defending identity (European Commission, 2004). Specific epithets are used to denote pejoratively immigrant or even standard speech (e.g. the verb karasakallasmak ‘to speak like a karasakalli’, from karasakalli ‘black-bearded’ for ‘Anatolian [peasant]’), and new slang forms (such as turist ‘tourist’, Amerikalı ‘American’, kasıyyakali ‘from the opposite side’, mavro (Gr.) ‘black’, apaçi ‘Apache’) which serve to mark social and linguistic dissociation from Turkish immigrants, have recently been coined.

6.2.4 Speakers/the population issue

Up until 1974, the population and distribution of linguistic varieties in the area currently under Turkish Cypriot administration paralleled the state of affairs in the rest of Cyprus:

- Up until 1963, there were villages inhabited by Greek Cypriots or by Turkish Cypriots, but also villages inhabited by members of both communities. As a rule, Greek Cypriots spoke Cypriot and SG, and, depending on the sociolinguistic and geographical context, Turkish Cypriots spoke either Cypriot and ST, or only CG, or they were bilingual in (Cypriot) Turkish and (Cypriot) Greek.
- During the turbulent time of intercommunal conflict between 1963 and 1970, the distribution of the population in Cyprus changed as Turkish Cypriots retreated to territorial enclaves across the island. According to Kliot and Mansfeld (1994), ‘from 1962 to 1964 most of the Turkish Cypriots moved or were forced to move to larger villages and towns and some 42 Turkish-controlled enclaves were formed, each containing both local populations and the displaced persons from neighbouring villages’ (p. 329).

The war in 1974 brought about significant population shifts and led to a radical differentiation of the distribution of the population in the northern and southern parts of Cyprus,
as Greek Cypriots were forced to leave the northern part of Cyprus and Turkish Cypriots from all over Cyprus moved to the areas under Turkish Cypriot control.

A population census conducted in 1960 by the Republic of Cyprus counted 104,320 Turkish Cypriots, constituting 18.2% of the population of Cyprus (European Commission, 2004). However, various sources report that a significant portion of this population and their descendants do not currently reside in the northern part of Cyprus (Faiz, 2008): beginning from the time of the intercommunal skirmishes of the 1960s, peaking in 1974, and continuing well into the 1980s, significant numbers of Turkish Cypriots emigrated, primarily to Great Britain and Australia, for economic and political reasons (Hatay, 2007; Issa, 2006; Robins & Aksoy, 2001). According to the European Commission (2004) ‘at least 36,000 Turkish Cypriots emigrated in the period 1975–1995, with the consequence that within the occupied area the native Turkish Cypriots have been outnumbered by settlers’ (n. p.). However, in her analysis of the 2006 census conducted in the northern part of Cyprus, Hatay (2007) suggests that claims of massive post-1974 immigration of Turkish Cypriots (some reports allege up to 57,000 outbound immigrants) are exaggerated and misleading, and refutes claims that the ‘native’ Turkish Cypriot population is dwindling.

Another significant section of the current population of the northern part of Cyprus comprises persons who immigrated to Cyprus from Turkey after 1974. Between 1975 and 1981, Turkey encouraged its own citizens to settle in northern Cyprus’ (International Crisis Group, 2010, p. 2). Turkey and the Turkish Cypriot administration maintain that this was in order to encourage economic development and render the northern part of Cyprus self-sufficient, but the Greek Cypriot side asserts that the policy was aimed at altering the demographic character of the area and at raising the proportion of the Turkish community to the total population of Cyprus (European Commission, 2004; Hatay, 2007). This facilitated migration policy resulted in a significant influx of Turkish immigrants ‘from various regions of Anatolia, mostly from the southern coastal regions such as Mersin, Adana, and Antalya’ (Johanson & Demir, 2006, p. 3). Hatay (2007) reports that ‘immigrants who were part of this policy received empty Greek Cypriot properties and citizenship in the Turkish Cypriot state almost upon arrival’ (pp. 2–3), but notes that the allocation of property was discontinued after 1982 and that citizenship criteria were made more stringent in 1993.

The passage of time (and the birth of children to immigrant families), the absence of comprehensive immigration records (particularly in the first few years after the war), the immigrants’ acquisition of citizenship in the self-proclaimed state of the north and intermarriage between immigrants and ‘native’ Turkish Cypriots render determining the exact numbers of Turkish immigrants impossible. According to the International Crisis Group (2010), ‘perhaps half the estimated 300,000 residents of the Turkish Cypriot north were either born in Turkey or are children of such settlers’ (p. 2).

The current demographic makeup of the northern part of Cyprus is unclear, as there is significant variation among the demographic information reported in various sources. The most recent census in the north of Cyprus was conducted in 2006. The census included items related to citizenship as well as items related to respondents’ and their parents’ place of birth. However, it did not include questions about language. This was a de facto census but ‘information necessary for determining the de jure population was also compiled’ (Hatay, 2007, p. 26). Table 4 shows the population census results according to citizenship (source: TRNC State Planning Organization/KKTC Devlet Planlama Örgütü; SPO, 2006):

However, similarly to past censuses and officially reported numbers whose trustworthiness was challenged by various scholars and political stakeholders, the credibility of this census has been seriously questioned. Hatay (2007) acknowledges that some under-counting (particularly of immigrants) did occur, but notes that ‘the exact number of uncounted
persons is not known’ (p. 27). Others, such as Muharrem Faiz, the Director of the Cyprus Social and Economic Research Centre (Kıbrıs Toplumsal ve Ekonomik Araştırmalar Merkezi, KADEM), which did poll research for Eurobarometer, offers considerably more damning critiques: ‘30% of the population of the northern part of Cyprus was not included in the 2006 census’ and ‘the de facto population and the de jure population definition were not clear’ (Kanatlı, 2010, p. 3; cf. Faiz, 2008).

According to the census, 49.5% of the de facto population of the northern part of Cyprus in 2006 consisted of individuals who the Turkish Cypriot administration did not consider as citizens. Though this number also included college students as well as other persons who were in Cyprus for short-term stay, presumably the majority consisted of immigrants. In some areas, such as Keryneia/Girne or the inner (old) city of Nicosia/Lefkoşa (northern part), the distribution is even more in favor of the immigrant population. Thus, according to the 2006 census, 65% of the population in inner Nicosia are citizens of Turkey, 15% have dual nationality and 25% are TRNC citizens (Yeni Kıbrıs Partisi (YKP), 2008).

Interesting information may also be gauged from a recent survey by the Turkish Cypriot Teachers’ Trade Union (KTÖS, 2008) regarding the composition of school classes. According to this survey, both parents of 34% of primary school students are citizens of the Republic of Cyprus (which means that they must have been born in Cyprus); one of the parents of 9% of the students is a citizen of the Republic of Cyprus, both parents of 19% of the students have double (TRNC-Turkish) citizenship (which means that they have a Turkish background and were granted the TRNC citizenship at a later stage), and the parents of 37% of the students are citizens of the Republic of Turkey. In other words, the survey results show that more than half of the students have a non-Cypriot background. In some cities the balance shifts even more toward the non-Cypriot side (e.g. in Kyreneia/Girne 54.5% have only Turkish citizenship and 10.1% have dual citizenship, i.e. TRNC-Turkish citizenship).

The population issue is particularly relevant for the linguistic profile of the north of Cyprus. However, the general oscillation of demographic data and the contradictory statements of government and opposition forces reflect the unreliability of population data as

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4. 2006 Population census results according to citizenship.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>De facto</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. TRNC&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. TRNC and other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) TRNC – Turkey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) TRNC – UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) TRNC – Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Turkey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Bulgaria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Iran</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) Moldova</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e) Pakistan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(f) Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>The term TRNC is used to reflect the data as reported by the census agency and not as a political statement on the status of the area under Turkish Cypriot administration.
well as the lack of official sources on the numbers of speakers of the various languages and dialects of the area. Therefore, it is fair to say that the actual number of speakers of the varieties mentioned in Section 6.2.3 (CT, Turkish dialects, local minority languages, immigrant languages) is not known.

The 2006 census, as others before it, did not deploy language as a criterion; therefore, the only language-related information that can be drawn from it are inferences stemming from the figures for citizenship. However, these figures provide rather poor information about the actual speakers of CT or of other Turkish varieties since:

1. the statistics about citizenship do not fully reflect the varieties used by the population;
2. no statistics are available about the regions of origin of the immigrants from Turkey; such statistics would be important in order to establish the numbers of speakers of the various Anatolian dialects; furthermore, a reported recent increase in immigration from Turkey and the subsequent granting of TRNC citizenships has changed the population profile of the area and contributes to the lack of reliable data about the demographic situation in the northern part of Cyprus.

6.3 Language spread

6.3.1 Education

6.3.1.1 Education system, foreign languages and attitudes toward dialects in education. As in the Republic of Cyprus, education in the northern part of Cyprus is compulsory until the age of 15. Basic compulsory education includes 5 years of primary school (ilkokul) and 3 years of secondary school (ortaokul). High-school education (lise) lasts 3–4 years, depending on the type of school (MEC, 2005). Alternatively, there are state and private secondary colleges (kolej) which provide six-year instructional programs, their diploma being equivalent to a lise diploma (Yaratan, 1998, p. 613). Access to colleges (e.g. the prestigious Türk Maarif Koleji) formerly required an entrance examination, but that requirement was waived in 2009.

The school curriculum of 1999 was reformed following an initiative of the left-wing government in 2004, when the Ministry of Education and Culture introduced a new education system. The main differences between the two curricula lie in their differential foci – on ‘mainland Turkey’ in the former curriculum versus the inclusion of local Cypriot culture in the curricula after 2004/2005 (see Section 6.3.3).

The language of instruction is ST in all schools, while in colleges the medium of instruction is English. CT was not acknowledged in the curriculum before 2004. New curricular guidelines regarding CT are in deference to recommendations by Turkish Cypriot researchers that ‘particular attention has to be paid to the differences between the standard and the dialect’ and that ‘the implementation of bidialectal programs could be useful for the North Cyprus educational context’ (Pehlivan, in Schroeder & Strohmeier, 2006, p. 295; see also Pehlivan & Adalier, 2010, p. 394). According to the curriculum of the period between 2004 and 2009, the teacher is expected to place ‘emphasis on the active use of the Turkish language and [must] continuously make efforts to develop the Cypriot Turkish culture’ (MEC, 2005, p. 8). The curriculum also includes a newly-established Turkish Cypriot Literature course (school year 2004/2005); one of the objectives of this course was to ‘contribute to the students’ ability to perceive the differences between CT and Turkish spoken in
Turkey’ (Pehlivan, 2007, p. 39). Research by Pehlivan and Menteşoğlu (forthcoming) on the attitudes of primary school teachers to dialects shows that most teachers claim that they always use ST in the classroom, that they ‘correct’ students if dialect is spoken, and that they think that education programs should not take into account the students’ linguistic diversity. Crucially, as is evidenced by the figures in Section 6.2.4 showing the origins of the student population, a large variety of different dialects and languages (i.e. CT, several Anatolian dialects, Balkan dialects, other languages) is present in the classrooms of the northern part of Cyprus today. In an interview with representatives of the Teachers’ Trade Union (conducted by the author in December 2010), informants (primary school teachers) reported that many teachers use CT in the classroom.

English is taught in incremental steps:

- first to second grades: ‘familiarization education’ (farkındalık eğitimi) with use of audio-visual material (especially songs)
- third grade: 3 hours weekly
- fourth to fifth grades: 5 hours weekly
- sixth grade onwards (secondary education): 6 hours weekly

According to informants from the Teachers’ Trade Union (interviewed by the author in December 2010), primary school education in English (grades 1–5) is problematic since the teachers have no TEFL training. In 2005, the Ministry of Education and Culture introduced a reform within the framework of the new education system according to which students who reach a satisfactory level in Turkish language study by the end of the sixth grade may opt into English-medium courses in subjects (called akademik dersler ‘academic courses’) such as Mathematics, History, Science and Geography. This can result in a ‘horizontal’ transition to both Turkish and English programs, depending on the abilities of each individual student (MEC, 2005, pp. 16–17).

From the sixth grade onwards, pupils may choose either French or German as an elective course. According to the new curriculum (2005), it was planned to include ‘Greek [Modern Greek], the language of the neighboring society, in the programs as an optional subject from the 6th grade after pilot implementation in some schools whenever possible’ (MEC, 2005, p. 16).

Greek courses are also offered optionally in some universities, e.g. at the Cyprus International University (Nicosia), which opened some of its courses to extramural students. Since 2003 the KTÖS (the Teachers’ Trade Union) has been offering Greek language courses, which are open to everyone; instructors usually come from the southern part of the island. Private institutes also offer Greek courses, while some Turkish Cypriots go to the southern part of Cyprus in order to take Greek courses, e.g. the courses of the School of Greek Language at the University of Cyprus. In a survey among Turkish Cypriot education students at the Near East University, Pehlivan and Atamtürk (2006) found that attitudes toward Greek language learning were generally positive, yet participants were undecided as far as the Greek Cypriot community and culture were concerned (as opposed to the rather negative attitude of Greek Cypriots toward Turkish; see Osam & Ağazade, 2004).

The northern part of Cyprus hosts five universities: two in Nicosia (Near East University, Cyprus International University), one in Famagusta (Eastern Mediterranean University), one in Keryneia (Girne American University) and one in Lefke (European University); moreover, it hosts branches of several Turkish universities. Three of the five universities are private, while the Eastern Mediterranean University and the European
University are state-trust institutions. Students come from Cyprus, Turkey and other countries. To accommodate students who do not know Turkish, the universities offer courses to help students develop the requisite Turkish-language skills (e.g. the one-semester compulsory course TUR 101 at the Cyprus International University, which offers two hours of Turkish per week). The major language of instruction in all universities is English, except in the departments of Turkish Language and Literature and the Schools of Education, Law and (partly) Communication.

Informal education includes practical vocational schools, centers of vocational courses for women in towns and villages, a number of private tutoring schools (dersane) and after-school private tutoring sessions (Yaratan, 1998, p. 622).

6.3.1.2 Objectives and assessment. The new objectives of the 2005 education system include the following two statements on language:

The child

- acquires communication skills in a second language apart from English in accordance with the ‘European Language Portfolio’;
- develops the attitude that Greek (Modern Greek) is ‘the language of the neighboring society’ (MEC, 2005, p. 12).

The planned objectives were intended to be implemented in the school years 2005–2008 for the second foreign language, whereas the introduction of optional courses in Modern Greek had not been allocated a time frame (MEC, 2005, p. 49). According to representatives of the Teachers’ Trade Union (interview with the author, December 2010) the objectives have been implemented in the period 2005–2008; however, the additional foreign language courses are currently (2010) offered only at the elective level. Greek courses are offered in some schools in urban areas, but still only as electives.

Many science textbooks used in both primary and secondary education are still imported from Turkey. Textbooks produced in Cyprus include:

- the Turkish language and Cyprus geography textbooks (Ülkemizi tanıyorum ‘I get to know my country’);
- the textbooks for social sciences;
- the new history books and
- Turkish Cypriot Literature books.

The texts of the last two textbook categories have been designed to represent the Cypriot situation as it was in 2004 under the left-wing government of Mehmet Ali Talat (cf. 6.3.3).

It can be expected that the curricula and objectives are going to change in the near future because of recent political changes (a right-wing government since April 2009, a right-wing president since April 2010).27

6.3.1.3 History of language policies in the Turkish Cypriot Education System. During the Ottoman period (1571–1878), education was primarily offered by religious institutions; the two major religious communities (Muslims and Orthodox Christians) had separate education systems and structures, and there were no inter-group relations in the domain of education (Ozerk, 2001, p. 256). Primary education was offered in the sibyan mektebi (school for young children, primary school), and it involved writing and Kur’an
classes, whereas secondary education was provided by the medrese (theological school), and, in later times, by the rüşdiye (Ottoman junior high school), where Turkish (Ottoman), Arabic and Persian grammar were taught. The idadiye, the secondary schools established at the end of the Ottoman period and the beginning of the British rule, added English to their programs (Behçet, 1969; Pehlivan, forthcoming); in the rüşdiye curricula English was not introduced until 1896 and French was offered as an elective (Özerk, 2001, p. 257). In the same year, Greek was introduced as an academic subject in the rüşdiyes, whereas in 1902 the Turkish Cypriot School Board ‘decided to hire bilingual (Turkish-Greek) teachers at the primary schools in areas where Greek was in use as lingua franca’ (Özerk, 2001, p. 257). Arabic and Persian were also retained as electives until the 1920s, when these subjects were abolished due to the influence of the Kemalist language reforms. As explained in Section 4.1, the British retained and encouraged the practice of having two separate school systems for Turkish and Greek Cypriot students, which resulted in each of the two systems orienting itself toward the cultural and ethnic centers of Turkey and Greece, respectively. Similar to the situation in Greek Cypriot education discussed in Section 4.2.2, Turkish Cypriot education after the 1930s was strongly oriented toward Turkey; textbooks and teachers came from Turkey, and Greek courses were abolished. However, English gained importance due to its role as the official language of Cyprus as a British colony and was introduced in the schools as the language of administration. Teachers with insufficient knowledge of English often had to quit service (Pehlivan, forthcoming; Weir, 1952). On the history of education between 1960 and 1974 see Section 6.3.1.1.

6.3.2 The languages of the media

The earliest Turkish newspaper in Cyprus of which copies have survived is the weekly Zaman, which started publishing in December 1891 (Azgın, 1998, p. 642). Like other newspapers of that time, it was oriented against the Greek press and against British colonial rule, which were both felt to be a menace to the small community of Turkish Cypriots. Thus, one of the objectives of Zaman was ‘to make sure that the Turkish language survives on the island of Cyprus’ (Azgın, 1998, p. 642). Also under the British ‘Newspaper, Books and Printing Press Law’, which replaced the Ottoman Press Law (Matbuat Nizamnamesi) as late as 1930, the newspapers were mostly in Turkish and most took a strong position against enosis (union with Greece) and Greek expansionism. After 1960, the newly-founded paper Cumhuriyet ‘Republic’ tried to encourage harmonious relations between the Turkish and the Greek communities (Azgın, 1998, p. 652); however, only one Turkish newspaper (Halkın Sesi) survived until the post-1974 period. In 1976 (the year of the first elections in the ‘Turkish Federative State of Cyprus’), a number of new newspapers were launched as instruments of the political parties involved in the elections.

At present (November 2010), there are 12 daily Turkish-language newspapers published in the northern part of Cyprus; most of them have strong affiliations with the various political parties, while a few of them are independent. All the newspapers use exclusively ST; the only one hosting weekly columns in CT on specific days and on specific topics (mostly in satirical and humorous articles, but also as a means of indexing its dissociation from Turkey-centered policies) is the opposition paper Afrika. In a few cases, the various dialects of the immigrants (or rather, written representations of the perception an average Cypriot has of these dialects) are also used for satirical purposes.
In addition to the Turkish press, there is a bi-weekly English newspaper, *Cyprus Today*, and a weekly trilingual (Turkish, Greek, English) one, *Cyprus Dialogue*, founded by the journalist Reşat Akar in 2004 after the opening of the borders.

*Bayrak Radyo Televizyon Kurumu* (‘Flag Radio Television Organization’, BRT), the state television and radio organization, has two TV channels and seven radio stations. One of the missions of BRT, according to the new television draft law (2010), is to take measures to secure that broadcasting is made in an easily understandable language using Turkish without violating its peculiarities and rules, and to contribute to the development and enrichment of the language of education and science.

(Yayınların kolayca anlaşılabilecek bir dille yapılması sağlayıcı önlemleri almak, bunu yaparken Türkçe’nin özellikleri ve kuralları bozulmadan kullanılmasına, çağdaş eğitim ve bilim dili halinde gelişmesine ve zenginleşmesine katkı koymak [Section 2.4.3. of “Bayrak Radyo Televizyon Kurumu Yasa Tasarısı”; KKTC-CM, 2010]).

This means that the only variety used in BRT programs is ST (for details on language policy practices in the media see Section 6.4.2). Apart from Turkish, news is broadcast daily in Greek and English; weekly news is also available in Arabic, French, German and Russian.

Apart from BRT, there are seven private TV channels; some make moderate use of CT in a koinéized form, mostly in talk shows or debates. Additionally, the radio station *Radyo Mayıs*, which belongs to the Teachers’ Trade Union, broadcasts a program in three languages (Turkish, Greek and English) for 1.5 hours per week in cooperation with the bi-communal Association for Historical Debate and Research (AHDR); the program focuses mostly on history topics.

### 6.3.3 Local literature

As early as the Ottoman period, Turkish-language non-oral literature in Cyprus was written only in Standard (Ottoman) Turkish; the use of dialect was confined to folk literature (Kappler, 2009). This is an important difference between Turkish- and Greek-language literary production on the island. Only very few Turkish Cypriot authors sporadically use CT in their work, and no one writes exclusively in dialect, as some Greek Cypriot authors do. On the other hand, folk literature (for the greater part poetry) is usually composed in CT; most of these texts are published, often with many transcription errors and using standardized morphology. Literature is an important symbol of Cypriot identity, especially for the generation writing after 1974 (Yaşın, 1990; Yashin, 1997). Consequently, financial support for it depends on the political landscape. Between 2004 and 2009, during the time in power of a left-leaning administration, local literature flourished both in terms of publications and in terms of publicity in the media. After 2009, mostly NGOs (e.g. the Nicosia-based European and Mediterranean Art Association) support local literature through literary contests and publications.

As far as education is concerned, the new curriculum introduced in 2004/2005 by the – at the time left-wing – Ministry of Education (see Section 6.3.1) included a general orientation toward European and Cypriot values. While the goal of the 1999 curriculum had been ‘to bring up citizens … for their motherland Turkey, and the Turkish people and their very own country’, in 2005 ideals such as ‘the acquisition of Cypriot national identity and cultural values’ were foregrounded (Pehlivan, 2007, p. 38) and Turkey was considered a ‘neighboring country’; similarly, the southern part of Cyprus was termed the ‘neighboring
society’. The ways in which this development has recently been halted and reversed will be discussed in Sections 6.4 and 6.5. The innovations proposed by the previous government also involved a new ‘Turkish Cypriot Literature’ course with a textbook produced in Cyprus; the course, which was designed for grades 9–11, was first taught in the school year 2004–2005. According to Pehlivan (2007), the course was well received by both teachers and students, although there was some disagreement regarding content, ideology and instruction. In spite of the political changes in 2009, this course is still part of the curriculum.

Concerning literature in other, essentially unrecognized, languages (e.g. such minority languages as CMA, Kurbetcha/Gurbetcha or immigrant languages) there has been no official or unofficial support whatsoever.

6.3.4 Immigrant languages

As was reported in Section 6.2.2, the main immigrant languages other than Turkish varieties are Kurdish and Arabic. The speakers of these languages are typically bilingual and use Turkish in their everyday interactions with speakers of Turkish and with Cypriots, the only exception being the village of Rizokarpasos/Dipkarpaz, where Greek seems to be the lingua franca between immigrants and (Greek) Cypriots. There are no Turkish courses, either state-run or private, to improve competence in Turkish, especially in the written language, among immigrants. However, in certain colleges of secondary education such as Bayraktar Türk Maarif Koleji and some private colleges, immigrant children are pulled out during Turkish/Language Arts to attend special Turkish language classes. Fluency in Turkish is not an entrance requirement at universities, as the language of instruction in most departments is English. Nonetheless, compulsory Turkish courses are offered in some universities for first-year non-Turkish-speaking students (see Section 6.3.1.1).

As shown in Table 4, the 2006 census indicated that 4% of the de facto population of the north part of Cyprus did not hold TRNC or Turkish citizenship. In general, tourist residents and persons who come to the northern part of Cyprus for business purposes have very limited knowledge of Turkish; they speak mainly English and Russian and they tend to use English when communicating with Cypriots. English and Russian have had some impact on public life, as they can be seen in advertisement billboards and signs.

6.4 Language planning and policy

6.4.1 The historical dimension

The Turkish language reform (Dil Devrimi) of the 1930s in the context of the Kemalist westernization and democratization process had essentially two objectives:

(1) the alphabet reform, which involved a change from the Arabic-Ottoman script to the Latin alphabet and

(2) corpus planning, which involved effecting ‘changes in the form of the language itself (e.g. the words, the grammar, the orthography)’ (Haig, 2003, p. 121); significantly, corpus planning was coupled with the campaigns for the purification of the Turkish language and the ‘purging’ of Arabic and Persian lexical elements (Lewis, 1999).
The Turkish language reform exerted an immense influence on the sociocultural structure of Turkey. The alphabet reform was officially introduced in 1928, while the language purification reforms began in 1932 with the foundation of the Türk Dili Tetkik Cemiyeti (Society for the Study of the Turkish Language), later called Türk Dil Kurumu (TDK), since both tetkik and cemiyet are Arabic words. The reforms continued until the 1970s, and, in certain circles, they are still ongoing; the TDK, the regular publisher of the periodical Türk Dili, is still the official institution for language and corpus planning in Turkey. Although the reform could not be implemented exactly as it had been initially conceived by the reformers and by Mustafa Kemal Atatürk himself, the Turkish language changed drastically, and many of the committee’s suggestions on lexicon and terminology have been widely accepted (Brendemoen, 1990; Heyd, 1954; Lewis, 1999).

Both aspects of the reform were very soon implemented in Cyprus. In 1930, two years after the Turkish alphabet reform, a printing machine with the Latin alphabet was sent to the editor of the Cypriot newspaper Söz as ‘a present by the Turkish government on the personal orders of Kemal Atatürk’ (Azgın, 1998, p. 646). Söz, which had been founded in 1920, was thus the first Turkish Cypriot newspaper to publish in Latin characters as early as 1931; other papers followed suit years later (Azgın, 1998, p. 646). Kızilyürek and Gautier-Kızilyürek (2004) report that ‘the language [sic; i.e. alphabet] reform did not reach the majority of Turkish Cypriots until the period following the Second World War’ because of the interruption in the publication of newspapers after 1936 (p. 44). The authors attribute this interruption to the fact that many Cypriots could not read newspapers in the new script. However, it seems that the slower spread of the new alphabet in Cyprus was rather the result of the prohibitive new British Press Law and the lack of paper during war years (Azgın, 1998) rather than of less effective educational activities regarding the new alphabet compared with the efforts in Turkey. Apart from facilitating the introduction of the new alphabet, the newspapers played a key role in the spread of language purification. At present the vocabulary used by Cypriots in formal oral communication and in writing does not differ essentially, as far as the effects of the language reform are concerned, from the standard variety spoken and written in Turkey. Also, imported Turkish textbooks and other school material, together with the presence of teachers from Turkey, have been instrumental in the implementation of the reform on the island.

During British rule, Turkish Cypriots were generally bilingual (Turkish L1–Greek L2), whereas bilingualism in Greek and Turkish among Greek Cypriots was only sporadic (Kappler, 2010; Karyolemou, 2003). In the 1950s, Greek and Turkish nationalism and the pressure of nationalist underground organizations such as ΕΟΚΑ (Εθνική Οργάνωσης Κυπρίων Αγωνιστών ‘National Organization of Cypriot Fighters’) and TMT (Türk Mukavemet Teşkilati ‘Turkish Resistance Organization’) respectively, led to diminished contact between the two communities and reinforced resistance against the language of the ‘other’, which from that point on became the ‘language of the enemy’. In the case of Turkish, the infamous Vatandaş Türkçe Konuş! (‘Citizen, speak Turkish!’) campaign, which started in 1958, imposed the use of Turkish and the avoidance of Greek, and introduced a monetary fine for every Greek word spoken (Kızilyürek & Gautier-Kızilyürek, 2004, p. 46). Other outcomes of linguistic nationalism in the late 1950s were the beginnings of initiatives to change Greek names of towns and villages to Turkish (Özerk, 2001, p. 258) and the educational mobilization of the Turkish Cypriot Youth Organization, who sometimes brutally imposed Turkish language courses on (Muslim) speakers of Greek or on those whose Turkish was considered insufficient (Kızilyürek & Gautier-Kızilyürek, 2004, p. 46). After 1960, ‘asymmetrical bilingualism’ shifted to ‘zero bilingualism’ among Greeks and
restricted bilingualism, confined to the older generation, among Turks (Karyolemou, 2001a, p. 27; Özerk, 2001, p. 259; Yağcıoğlu, 2003).

6.4.2 The current situation

In the northern part of Cyprus, there is currently no official language-planning institution comparable to the Society for Turkish Language (TDK) in Turkey. Restrictive language policies do, however, surface in the state media. Immediately after the government changed in April 2009, a number of instructions were informally (orally) communicated to the journalists of BRT (the state television and radio broadcasting company) regarding preferred linguistic choices. A precise pattern of verbal forms has been developed in order to differentiate political statements of the Turkish versus the Greek side (interview with television journalist, Nicosia 25.10.2010):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Utterances of the Turkish side</th>
<th>Utterances of the Greek side</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>say (söyle-)</td>
<td>claim (iddia et-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stress (vurgula-)</td>
<td>defend (savun-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>underline (altını çiz-)</td>
<td>express (ifade et-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>add (kaydet-)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>criticize (eleştür-)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The only verb permitted for statements from both sides is the neutral de- (‘say’).

An additional symptom of the tangled links between geopolitical ideology and language policies is the guideline that journalists working in state television must not use the word ada (island) when referring to the northern part of Cyprus (e.g. Cumhurbaşkanı yurda/KKTC’ye döndü ‘the President came back to the country/to the TRNC’ (instead of... adaya döndü ‘... came back to the island’), and they are obliged to use Anavatan (‘Motherland’) when referring to Turkey.

To sum up, although there are no official language-planning agencies in the northern part of Cyprus, it seems that a trend toward ‘turciﬁcation’ has emerged in the last two years. Moreover, the sole language of literacy and the only language used in the courts is ST.

6.5 Language maintenance and prospects

The diglossic situation between Cypriot (L) and ST (H) is arguably affected by a complex levelling process with the concomitant emergence of a koinéized variety and the maintenance of several varieties on the basilectal end of the dialect continuum. Levelling occurs in all aspects of grammar (phonology, morphology, syntax); code-switching and mixing between ST and CT in informal communicative situations may also be seen as an aspect of the shift in the diglossic relationship between ST and CT (Theocharous, 2009). Nevertheless, CT still retains its relatively high status due to its connection to a Turkish Cypriot identity and attitudes of dissociation from the immigrant population. In spite of the significant influx of immigrants from Turkey and the consequent trend for native Turkish Cypriots to become a minority in the northern part of Cyprus, it is not expected that CT will become moribund in the near future, since the current complex sociopolitical situation seems to reinforce CT as an identity symbol:

- Because of the demographic shifts currently under way, Turkish immigrants are increasingly felt as an overwhelming menacing majority, compelling Turkish
Cypriots to buttress aspects of Cypriotness (including CT) as a means of asserting (and preserving) their separate identity.

- Prior to 1974 and in the years that followed the partition of Cyprus, a narrative of Turkish nationalism, according to which Turkish Cypriots were simply ‘Turks who happened to live in Cyprus’, was formally espoused as a framework for guiding ‘public education and cultural policy’ (Kızilyürek & Gautier-Kızilyürek, 2004, p. 48) and efforts to increase ‘the “Turkishness” of north Cyprus’ (Arbuckle, 2008, p. iii) were systematically undertaken. However, as Kızilyürek and Gautier-Kızilyürek (2004) report, after the establishment of substantive contact between Turkish Cypriots and mainland Turks (e.g. the Turkish army stationed in Cyprus, Turkish immigrants, close political ties with Turkey), the cultural differences became apparent and in response ‘many Turkish Cypriots are highlighting the intimate “Cypriot” cultural aspects as vital factors in reasserting their Turkish Cypriot ethnic identity’ (Arbuckle, 2008, p. iii), in a trend that ‘can be considered as a political act of resistance’ (Kızilyürek & Gautier-Kızilyürek, 2004, p. 45).

- In deciding on how to cast their vote in the 2004 Referendum, which, had it been approved, would have led to the reunification of Cyprus, Turkish Cypriots had to decide between adherence to the dogma of sameness with mainland Turks or to a Cyprocentric identity. The endorsement of the referendum by 64.9% of voters in the northern part of Cyprus suggests a preference for the latter.

As discussed in 6.2.2, in the northern part of Cyprus CG is spoken by a small group of Greek Cypriots who live in Rizokarpasos, some older Turkish Cypriot bilingual speakers and the small Greek-speaking Muslim community in Lurucina. It is also used as a lingua franca in parts of the Karpaz region. Despite having a very small number of speakers, CG can be expected to resist moribundity in the northern part of Cyprus for reasons related to the speakers’ determination to assert their Greek Cypriot identity. Another factor potentially aiding the preservation of CG in the northern part of Cyprus is its increased usefulness after the relaxing of travel restrictions between the northern and southern part of Cyprus. The other local languages (CMA and Kurbetcha/Gurbetcha) are likely to have a different fate; CMA has already been officially defined as moribund (see Section 5.2), and Kurbetcha/Gurbetcha, despite being an emerging creole, has a diminishing number of speakers due to continued emigration to the southern part of Cyprus, mainly for economic and family reasons.

7. Conclusions

In this monograph an attempt has been made to provide a comprehensive account of language policies and language planning in Cyprus. Language policies and planning are usually extremely complex issues, depending, as they do, on a host of political, social and cultural factors.

The Cyprus Constitution (1960) provides for a dual-language approach to language matters in assigning official language status to Greek and Turkish, in deference to Cyprus’ two main linguistic communities. Though this provision in isolation seems to point to a bilingual society, the Constitution document as a whole established structures and procedures pertaining to a society where mutual bilingualism was not required or even promoted: citizens could conduct official business in the state language of their choice, vote only for representatives of their own community and attend independent, community-based educational systems. These constitutional provisions in many ways reflect and
solidify a centuries old status quo, based on which each community managed its own linguistic (and other) affairs.

Since the de facto geopolitical separation of Cyprus’ two main communities, first in the 1960s and, even more decisively, in 1974, language policies and language planning in the Republic and in the northern part of Cyprus have remained ultimately separate from one another. Despite the separation, however, the trajectory and the ideological underpinnings of activities directly or indirectly influencing language matters exhibit notable parallels, such as the levelling of subvarieties, koineization and a partial restructuring of the functions of the naturally acquired varieties of each community and the superposed standard languages; the essential absence of official language-planning agencies; a dynamic tension between cypriotizing and outward-looking trends; finally, the wielding of language policy as a tool for connecting with, or, more frequently, for dissociating from, other communities.

As discussed in Section 2, the naturally-acquired varieties are CG for Greek Cypriots and CT for Turkish Cypriots. Though many dialects in both the Greek- and the Turkish-speaking worlds have become moribund or have significantly converged with the respective standard languages, it appears that both CG and CT are thriving; this may well be because of their status as koine varieties at the expense of local sub-varieties, which have been subject to levelling. Both koinês seem to be slowly acquiring the status of prestige varieties, possibly a combination of overt prestige vis-à-vis stigmatized basilectal sub-varieties and of covert prestige vis-à-vis the externally superposed standard languages (or, in the case of CT, overt prestige vis-à-vis the dialects of Turkish immigrants). Whether these processes of koineization will eventually lead to diglossia resolution in both communities is still unclear; it is certainly not to be expected that diglossia resolution will take place as a result of any kind of political decision given the absence of concrete language policies and, crucially, of identifiable and stable language policy agents in both communities.

The Cyprus Constitution does not include provisions for state language planning and language policy agencies, and since neither of the two main communities has formed such community-based bodies, the absence of official language policy-makers and of language-planning organizations is a common feature of the two major communities of the island. This absence is due to a host of factors, principal among them being the long tradition of implicitly relegating language issues to the education systems, which were kept separate and were community-based throughout the prolonged period of colonial rule, concomitantly with a relatively non-interventionist colonial policy toward language use on the island (with the brief exception of the quasi-centralizing and de-ethnicizing Education Laws of the 1930s). The two community-based education systems have consistently drawn upon the education systems of their respectively acknowledged ‘motherlands’, Greece and Turkey, for pedagogical models, for ideological orientation, and for policies regarding language use on the island. This lacuna has resulted in a strong orientation toward the respective standard languages as vehicles of both literacy and national identity, to the detriment of the status of the local varieties of Greek and Turkish spoken on the island, at least as far as their written status and their visibility in education and literacy practices are concerned. The perpetuation of this situation is largely due to the events of 1974 and the still unresolved ‘Cyprus issue’.

That both communities still remain by and large ‘outward-looking’ in terms of their language policies may well explain the absence of official language policy-making entities on the island (or, indeed, the fact that the creation of such entities is not envisaged) and the relegation of issues of (overt or covert) language planning, as they arise on occasion (e.g. with respect to language(s) and varieties of literacy learning, dialect standardization, the languages of the media, the languages of the law, the languages of the state universities,
etc.) to entities and individuals as varied as (officials of) the Ministry of Education, the Institute of Education, school inspectors, the members of occasional and *ad hoc* committees of experts, academics at large, the Press and Information Office, journalists, Members of Parliament and, on occasion, the courts of law and individual citizens.

A significant parallel tension characterizing debates about language both in the area controlled by the Republic of Cyprus and in the area under Turkish Cypriot administration is the conflict between ‘cypriotizing’ trends and ‘outward-looking’ trends toward the communities’ perceived national centers (hellenizing trends in the south and turcification trends in the north). On a surface level, this means that cypriotization trends involve the endorsement of a Cypriot identity as the principal one and a rather positive disposition toward the Cypriot dialects, whereas ‘outward-looking’ trends in each community involve the endorsement of a primarily Greek or Turkish identity and the promotion and protection of the standard languages from potential erosion. The conflict between these two trends has fuelled several language-related debates, including the polemic regarding the standardization of toponyms in the Republic of Cyprus (see Section 4.2.1) and, in the north, the tension between the dogma of sameness with mainland Turks and the desire to assert a unique Cypriot identity, which is often expressed through the wielding of CT as a marker of ‘Cypriotness’ and as a tool for distinguishing Turkish Cypriots from Turkish immigrants (see Sections 6.4 and 6.5). However, as indicated by such cases as the protracted debate over the language(s) of instruction at the University of Cyprus, and the abandonment of English in the civil service in the Republic of Cyprus, the actors, processes, and outcomes of the tension between ‘cypriotizing’ and ‘outward-looking’ trends can be quite varied, and conflicting ideologies may generate identical policies (Karyolemou, 2002, 2010; Karoulla-Vrikkii, 2009).

It will be interesting to see whether such recent developments as the influx of immigrants in both communities, the linguistic implications of globalization, the new curricular reforms, financial developments and, crucially, any new developments toward the resolution of the ‘Cyprus issue’, will result in a set of overtly stated and consistent language policies and language-planning measures, whether these will be Cyprus-centered or outward-looking and what agents (other than government and education) will be involved in the instantiation of such policies and aspects of language planning on the island.

**Notes**

1. After the ceasefire in 1974 and up until 2003, crossing the buffer zone established between the area under the control of the Republic of Cyprus and the northern part of the island was uncommon. Crossing over to the northern part of the island was highly restricted; it was allowed only through special permission from the Turkish Cypriot administration. Public crossings have only become possible since April 23, 2003, when, in a surprise move, the Turkish Cypriot administration announced a relaxing of the restrictions over cross-travel. ‘This meant that people were able to cross in both directions without the requirement for any special permission, as was the case before, simply by showing their passports or identity cards’ (Sahin, 2011, p. 586).

2. The Cyprus Constitution (Articles 2 and 3) recognizes two communities (Greek and Turkish) and three minority religious groups: the Maronites, who belong to the Eastern Catholic Church; the Armenian Cypriots; and the Latins, who are Roman Catholics of European or Levantine descent (Dietzel & Makrides, 2009; Government Web Portal, 2006; Hadjilyra, 2009; PIO, 2010a, 2010b, 2010c)). The identification of the three minorities as religious groups rather than as national minorities/communities by the constitution was significant as it meant that upon the formation of the Republic they were ‘compelled to choose to belong to one of the two main and constitutionally equal communities’ (Varnava, 2010, p. 207). All three minority religious groups opted through the Referendum of 1960 to join the Cypriot Greek community politically.
3. ‘Diglossia is a relatively stable language situation in which, in addition to the primary dialects of the language (which may include a standard or regional standards), there is a very divergent, highly codified (often grammatically more complex) superposed variety, the vehicle of a large and respected body of written literature, either of an earlier period or in another speech community, which is learned largely by formal education and is used for most written and formal spoken purposes but is not used by any section of the community for ordinary conversation’ (Ferguson, 1959, p. 336). Ferguson terms the superposed variety ‘High’ (H) to denote its higher prestige, and the set of naturally acquired, low-prestige varieties is termed ‘Low’ (L).

4. All quotations from documents originally in Greek or in Turkish are rendered into English by the authors.

5. According to EUROSTAT 2006, 10.1% of 15-year-olds in the Republic of Cyprus attended private schools.

6. The programs of study in a number of private schools fully mirror or partially parallel the curricula and course schedules of public schools.

7. Gerogiou (2010) shows very convincingly that, despite the current preponderance of CG in sitcoms, its continued relative invisibility in other types of programs points to its construction as ‘non-serious’, i.e. as unsuitable for types of communication other than the ‘light’/comedic one of the sitcom. This is the dominant view expressed by media producers/channel directors; facets of the current mediascape, however, provide a more subtle and intriguing picture. Tsiplakou and Ioannidou (2010, September) discuss the use of hyperdialectal forms coupled with code-switching and code-mixing between CG, SMG and English in the recent sitcom Αγία Φουκία (‘The Fuchsia Goat’, Ant1 Cyprus, 2009–2010) and argue that extreme dialect stylization together with aberrant filmic techniques make for a postmodern, deconstructive take on constructions of language and identity in Cyprus.

8. The excellent translation/adaptation into the Cypriot Greek koiné of Asterix in the Olympic Games by linguist Loukia Taxitari (2007) merits special mention here. The author uses a consistent, linguistically informed orthographic system which is very close to that of the ‘Syntychies’ (Συντυχίες) [sindi fes] Project (see note 17) and the one in Tsiplakou, Coutsougera and Pavlou (forthcoming).

9. In other colonies, such as India and Hong Kong, Christian proselytism and tensions between Orientalism and Anglocentrism were key forces in determining language and education policies; see, e.g. Carnoy (1974), Phillipson (1992), Sweeting and Vickers (2005), Whitehead (1988, 1995, 2005a, 2005b).

10. See Evans (2002) for an analysis of the impact of parsimony concerns on colonial education and language policy.

11. Such neologisms can, surprisingly, also be found in the translations of EU documents produced in Cyprus, despite the fact that translators have ample recourse to translations from Greece. Floros (2011b) suggests that this is a ‘cypriotizing’ practice, an instance of covert language policy, on par with similar practices in media and law translation (cf. Floros 2009, 2011a).

12. Court cases demanding the exclusive or privileged use of Greek on passports and driving licences are discussed in detail in Karoulla-Vrikki (2010). A citizen of the Republic of Cyprus, Ms. Thekla Kittou, sued the Republic in 1984 and again in 1988 and 1994 demanding that she be issued (a) a drivers’ license in Greek and (b) a passport in Greek or in Greek with English as a secondary language, in deference to her linguistic and national rights as a Greek. In 1985, to avoid taking the first case to trial, the Republic’s lawyer submitted to the court ‘a drivers’ license in Greek, specially printed for the plaintiff’ (p. 265). The passport suits were rejected in 1994 on the grounds that (a) passports do not fall under the constitutionally derived obligation of the Republic to communicate with Greek-speaking citizens in Greek, as they are ‘not addressed to Greeks’ and are intended for use outside the Republic (p. 267), (b) no law of the Republic made explicit provisions regarding the language or format elements of passports and (c) the use of English did not infringe upon Ms. Kittou’s legal rights. Despite the rejection of the passport suit by the Supreme Court of the Republic, just days after the judgment, the Cabinet of Ministers decided that identity information on passports, drivers’ licenses and identification cards would be rendered in Greek for Cypriot Greeks and in Turkish for Cypriot Turks, followed by transcriptions in the Latin alphabet. Karoulla-Vrikki speculates that, given Ms. Kittou’s stated intent to pursue the matter further through the European Court, this decision may have been precipitated by a desire to avoid potentially
negative implications for Cyprus’ then pending application for ascension into the European Union.

13. It is interesting that other comic distortions of Greek Cypriot toponyms (e.g. the name of the village of /ape’ja/, whose unfortunate standardized rendering is ΑΠΛΙΣΙΑ, which coincides orthographically with the word /ə’pesia/ ‘horrible’ in SMG) were not at the center of the controversy. As Karyolemou (2010) aptly notes, the debate was centered around the distortion of what are deemed salient phonetic variants in folk-linguistic perceptions of CG.

14. Beginning from the academic year 2011–2012 Greece discontinued the gratis dispatchment of textbooks to the Cypriot public schools as part of the austerity measures enacted in response to the economic crisis. The Republic of Cyprus was set to purchase the textbooks from Greece at a discounted rate (Hasapopulos, 2011; MOEC, 2011b).


16. It should be noted that very little is known to date about emerging immigrant ethnolects and their properties.

17. The University of Cyprus ‘Syntychies’ (Συντυσίες [sindi’fes] Project (2006–2010) (Armostis, Christodoulou, Katsoyannou, & Themistocleous, 2011) deserves special mention in this regard, as it is the first attempt to implement theoretical principles of lexicography together with a linguistically informed proposal for orthographic standardization. The project, whose output is a dynamic electronic web-based dictionary of CG, including a speech synthesizer (http://lexcy.library.ucy.ac.cy/), addresses theoretical problems and discrepancies in traditional Cypriot Greek lexicography (Hadjioannou, 1996; Papagellou, 2001; Yangoullis, 2005) such as (a) the exclusion of CG vocabulary that overlaps with SMG; (b) the erroneous treatment of false friends, i.e. homophonous words which have different meanings in Cypriot and Standard Greek; (c) the fact that criteria for the selection of lemmas are biased in favor of basilectal/less frequent dialect words; (Katsoyannou, 2010; Pavlou, 2010); (d) the absence of a non-standardized orthography (which may result in many allographs, especially of CG speech sounds such as the postalveolar fricative and affricate, which are unavailable in SMG). The problems with lemma selection and description have been resolved, and an orthographic system has been proposed which is largely in accordance with the linguistically oriented one in Tsiplakou et al. (forthcoming); for example, the inverted brevis (caron) diacritic (‘) is used for postalveolar fricatives/affricates. The Cypriot Greek keyboard (developed by linguist Charalambos Themistocleous) can be found at http://www.charalambosthimistocleous.com/downloads.aspx.

18. The two available older grammars of Cypriot Greek (Hadjioannou 1999; Newton 1972b) each have their own particularities, Newton’s is seminal, theoretically informed work based on extensive fieldwork carried out in the 1960s; however, it does not reflect the current state of Cypriot Greek, and, crucially, it only focuses on phonology and (aspects of) morphology. Although valuable in terms of data, Hadjioannou (1999) is a classic example of traditional philological work which is not informed by contemporary linguistic principles, often following the author’s own ad hoc principles of grammatical classification and describing geographical variants from presumably different regions, without any systematic indication of the variant’s geographical distribution; syntax is naturally excluded. In contrast, the forthcoming Grammar of Cypriot Greek by Tsiplakou et al. focuses on the panceyprian koiné and on register/stylistic variation within the koiné, leaving aside geographical variation due to the absence of systematic linguistic research; the phonology, morphology and syntax of the Cypriot Greek koiné are examined systematically following linguistic principles of grammatical description and bringing in insights from phonological, morphological and syntactic theories where appropriate.

19. The strong public interest in the dialect and its maintenance is indicated by the vast and ever-expanding number of webpages in Cypriot Greek, including the facebook groups Κυπριακές Λέξεις [Cypriot Words] (http://www.facebook.com/groups/cypruswords/), I speak CYPRIOT and I’m proud of it (http://www.facebook.com/group.php?gid=7013787203) (cf. the equivalent TC facebook group Kibris Türkçesi (Cypriot Turkish Language) (http://www.facebook.com/groups/GIBRIZ/), which boasts mixed Greek and Turkish Cypriot membership, and the recent Cypriot Greek lexicon Γονικυπριακή [Wikicypriot] (http://www.wikipriaka.com/cy). Andreas
Andreou, one of the officers of the *I speak CYPRIOT and I’m proud of it* facebook group and the creator of Γουικυπριακά [WikiCypriot], has gone as far as to compile the 185-page long Σύγγρονη Γραμματείας ή της Τζ. Υπαίτιας ή Τρόμοι της Ανάγκης –*A Contemporary Grammar of the Greek-Cypriot Idiom* [sic] (2009), which is heavily based on Hadjioannou (1999). Although the grammar does not follow any recognizable linguistic principles and actively promotes as ‘genuine’ Cypriot Greek a rather inaccurate mélange of basilectal sub-varieties and registers, including obsolete forms, it is indicative of the new-found interest in the dialect among its younger speakers, the expression of which is facilitated by computer-mediated communication.

20. ‘Resmi dil Türkçe’dir.’ Constitution (Anayasa) of the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus (TRNC), 15.11.1983, art. 2 (2). Article 9 of the Constitution includes the aforementioned article under those which ‘cannot be changed and cannot be recommended to be changed’ (‘[…] değiştirilemez ve değiştirilmemesi önerilemez’).

21. The 1960 population census, ‘the only census covering the whole population in the Republic of Cyprus […] counted 573,566 inhabitants, of which 442,138 were Greek Cypriots (77.1%), 104,320 Turkish Cypriots (18.2%) and 27,108 others (4.7%), mainly Armenians, Maronites, Latins and British’ (European Commission, 2004, n. p.)

22. The Republic of Cyprus treats all individuals who arrived in the northern part of Cyprus after 1974 as well as their descendants as illegal settlers.

23. Ilican (2011) reports that population estimates ‘range from 500,000 in Cyprus to 500,00 around the world’ (p. 95) and notes that Turkish nationals ‘are thought to constitute up to 50%’ of the population of the north (p. 97).

24. According to Hatay (2007), the 2006 census was designed as a single-day *de facto* census, aiming to count every single person in the north part of Cyprus, except members of the Turkish military.

25. During the recent visit (6.10.2010) to Cyprus of the Deputy Prime Minister of the Republic of Turkey, Cemil Çiçek, the Turkish Cypriot Prime Minister İrsen Küçük could not reply to the question how large the population in the northern part of Cyprus was. Çiçek questioned the reliability of the official numbers (which oscillate between 250,000 and 300,000) and recommended a ‘serious state reform’ (Kanatlı, 2010, p. 1). The discussion was commented on in detail, especially by the opposition press (see, e.g., *Kibris*, 07.10.2010).

26. For this reason, the sources used in this chapter, with the exception of SPO (2006), are mostly unpublished papers and surveys by agents whose political orientation is opposition-friendly.

27. After the most recent political changes history textbooks were modified (in August 2010) to focus on more Turkey-oriented content and (Islamic) religion has been (re)-introduced as a compulsory course in grades 4 and 5 (before 2009 religion courses were elective). The effects of these changes on language policy need to be investigated.

28. The interview was conducted by the author. The informant also stated that the term *Kibris Türkü* (‘Cypriot Turk’), used until then in official as well as in informal oral communication, had been substituted by the term *Kibris Türkü* (‘Turk of Cyprus’) in BRT news broadcasting.
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