Abstract
This study is an investigation of a conventionalized ironic marker in spontaneous Cypriot-Greek conversations. Specifically it examines the lexical item siga, which translates variously as “like hell”, “yeah right”, “big deal”. For the analysis of siga, this study will rely on the insights offered by recent work on the interface of grammar and interaction (cf. Ochs, Schegloff and Thomson 1996) in order to analyze the interactional role of siga in the positions where it occurs, by taking into consideration its sequential placement and its position in the turn. Another issue that will be discussed throughout this study is that although there are various translations of siga, its investigation with respect to the positions in which it occurs in a turn reveals that the interactional role of siga is much more complex than a dictionary definition of its meaning suggests. This study will suggest that investigations of irony in context can provide useful insights into the study of verbal communication in general.
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1. Introduction
This study discusses the interactional role of one form of ironic response, that is, the conventionalized ironic marker siga.

Greek dictionaries (e.g. Babinotis 1998: 1608; Manolis Triandafyllides Foundation 1998: 1208; Dorbarakis 1994: 653; Georgopapadakos 1984: 854; Tegopoulos-Fitrakis 1990: 688) make reference to a literal meaning of siga. Thus, for literal siga Greek dictionaries give the interpretations “noiselessly”, “quietly”, “calmly”, and “slowly”. Greek-to-English dictionaries (e.g., Stavropoulos 1988: 789) also translate siga as slowly, quietly, gently. Siga is the adverb of siganos, translated as gentle, soft, quiet (id.). The conventional meaning of siga has no apparent relation to its literal meaning. The repeated usage of siga in ironic contexts accounts for its formulaic

---

1 Cyprus is an independent island republic in the Eastern Mediterranean. Data from the 2001 census of population showed that on 1st October 2001 the total population of the Cyprus Republic was 689,565 composed of 89.7% Greek Cypriots, 0.2% Armenian, 0.5% Maronites, 0.04% Cypriots of European origin called “Latins” and 0.05% Turkish Cypriots; 0.1% did not declare their ethnic religious group (Census of Population 2001); the remainder being foreigners from Europe and Asia. The Greek speech community in Cyprus is defined as diglossic. Diglossia in Cyprus refers to the simultaneous use of the dialect (Cypriot Greek dialect, CD) and the demotic Greek (Modern Greek, MG) (cf. Pavlou 1997: 617; Moschonas 2002).

2 My translations in English of the Greek interpretations of siga (aθορία, isιγα, irema, arγα, αγαλια etc.) found in the dictionaries.
character. The translations given in the Greek-English dictionary of Stavropoulos (1988: 789) for the ironic siga and siga min are “like hell” and “who cares!” respectively.  

In addition to the above, Babiniotis (1998: 1661) refers to the ironic phrase siya to prayma! which he claims is used for situations that have no interest or importance (id.). The word prayma means “thing”, “matter”, “deal”, so the phrase siya to prayma seems to be the closest equivalent to “big deal”.

Thus, although some Greek dictionaries refer to the ironic meaning of siga as part of some formulaic expressions, in others the ironic meaning of siga is not mentioned at all. Cypriot dictionaries (e.g. Yiangoillis 1994; Yiangoillis 1997; Hadjiioannou 1996; Papangelou 2001) only include the words that are either pronounced differently or do not exist in Standard Modern Greek. Siga exists and is pronounced in the same way in Standard Greek and Cypriot. As a result, it is not included in Cypriot Greek dictionaries.

The analysis is concerned with the actions performed with siga in the interactional and sequential environment of its use by taking into consideration what Schegloff (1995a: 196) recognizes as the “position” and “composition” of a turn. These refer to the sequential placement of siga in conversation and its position in the turn, as well as its relation to other elements of the turn. Hence, the analysis of siga aims at contributing to studies that analyze the relationship between grammar and interaction (cf. Ochs, Schegloff and Thomson 1996).

The first part of this study identifies the address forms that usually accompany its use in the data and presents previous research on these address forms. The second part discusses the data and methodology. The third and largest part of the paper is concerned with the investigation of the role of siga in interaction. Throughout the paper the translation of siga in context is also discussed.

Before proceeding to the examination of the role siga in interaction, some mention should be made with reference to the particle re and the address forms that usually accompany siga.

2. Sigā, siga+re, siga+address form

In my data, siga may be “freestanding” (cf. Heritage 1984b), but is often followed by address forms. Thus, siga is usually followed by:

1. the particle re,
2. the particle re + addressee’s first name,
3. the particle re + second person singular pronoun esi (“you”),
4. an address term + first person singular possessive pronoun, e.g. korimu (“my girl”).

Previous studies (cf. Tannen and Kakavá (1992), Georgakopoulou (2001)) have shown that re, which is often followed by addressee’s name or by a kinship term is linked with

---

3 Mi(n) is a negative marker that has the meaning of “don’t”, “not” (Stavropoulos 1988: 550).
4 According to Schegloff (1995a: 187), discourse units perform actions and if we want to clarify how the actions people do with talk “are” obviously what they “are”, we have to analytically show how they are constructed to be obviously that, and how they are recognizable as obviously that, both by recipients and by academic analysts.
the expression of disagreement and that the functions of *re* are related to its position in the turn. As will be shown, in my data the particle *re* is a recurrent marker that occurs after *siga*, but sometimes it is also followed by *address forms*.

3. Data and methodology

The study of *siga* as ironic response investigated in this work is based on recordings of informal, spontaneous, face-to-face conversations among close friends or relatives. These are exclusively conducted in Cypriot Greek. The conversations transcribed for the present study are part of a collection of recordings that took place between December 1998 and April 2003. They comprise transcriptions of 35 hours of tape-recorded natural interactions produced by young native Cypriot Greek speakers during a variety of gatherings or occasions, e.g. dinner, gathering for coffee in friends’ houses etc. The extracts included in this article comprise transcriptions of approximately 3 hours. The recordings consist of same sex conversations among women and cross sex conversations.  

The transcription symbols used in this study are based on the transcription conventions developed by Jefferson for the analysis of conversational turns in English conversation (see Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson 1974) and are adopted in the form presented by Ochs, Schegloff and Thompson (1996) and Clift (1999). The relevant transcription symbols for this study are cited in appendix I.

The phonetic inventory used for reading transcription is presented in appendix II and it combines the phonetic alphabet which is based on the International Phonetic Association [IPA] which is adjusted to the Greek language by Nespor (1999: 45) and on the phonetic inventory of Cypriot Greek presented and described by Newton (1972a: 22). The phonetic symbols used from other works cited which are based on the roman alphabet have been adjusted to the phonetic inventory of this study.

4. Grammar and interaction

The focus of this paper is on the turn and its component turn constructional units (TCUs) in order to analyze the meaning of *siga* in interaction and to recognize that utterances within turns are “contextually understood by reference to their placement and participation within sequences of actions” (Heritage and Atkinson 1984: 5). When sequences and the turns within them are the focus “the analytical salience of certain interactional considerations becomes apparent” (Clift 2001: 248). In addition, Schegloff, Ochs and Thompson demonstrate that a significant aspect of linguistic structures is “their moment-by-moment, evolving interactional production” (1996: 39).

In this context it should be noted that the shift of focus from sentences and lexical items, traditionally conceived, to the turn as “the habitat in which turn constructional units - henceforth TCUs - are housed” (Schegloff 1996: 56) and this reframing deepens our understanding of the placement of such particles as *siga*.

---

5 In the extracts presented and analyzed, 16 different interactants have participated. Speakers range in age from 20 to 30. They are all residents of Nicosia and are either University students at graduate or postgraduate level or are qualified with bachelor or master’s degrees and are working.
Before I begin the analysis of *siga* in interaction, some reference to the standard translations of *siga* is in order.

### 4.1. *Siga*: Turns-at-talk

There are several candidate translations for *siga* e.g. “big deal”, “yeah right”, “sure”, “for sure”, “like hell!” etc. But the adoption of one such translation would confuse, if not mislead the analysis. For example, “big deal” could possibly translate some of the instances of *siga*, but not all; the translations do not specify the contexts in which the particle can be deployed.

Along with the above, the basic reason that any attempt to translate *siga* in context is faced with such unresolved difficulties is that the proposed possible English translations (e.g. “big deal”, “yeah right”, “sure”, “for sure”, “like hell!”), consist of elements that occur in a specific sequential position, that is, turn initially, whereas *siga* is not restricted to one position. This is in accordance with Clift’s claim that “the position of a lexical item within a turn and the position of that turn within its wider sequence is criterial to what any item is understood to be doing” (2003: 180).

Investigation of *siga* within the positions in which it occurs in a turn reveals it to be much more complex with respect to the actions that it performs than would initially be thought with respect to its meaning as given by dictionary definitions. Bearing in mind Clift’s claim that participants in interaction “use linguistic items to do things rather than for what they mean” (2003: 182), *siga* will be left un-translated here in order to uncover what is used to do in interaction. Detailed explanations on the candidate translations of *siga* will be given with examples in the subsections that follow along with the investigation of the interactional role of *siga* as it occurs in the data at hand.

In my data the main uses of *siga* are the following:

- *siga*, *siga re* and *siga* + address form:
  - freestanding
  - non-first TCU

In focusing on the turn in interaction, the analysis in the following sections will be concerned with the possible placements of the above realisations of *siga* within turn-constructional units (TCUs) within turns. Turn constructional units are sentential, clausal, phrasal and lexical units, which can constitute complete turns (Sacks et al. 1974: 702). On their potential completion, transition to another speaker turns out to be relevant (id.).

These are indicated in the following extracts showing *siga* in different possible positions in the data. The turns in which *siga* occurs are marked with arrows.

(1)
(M=Melina; T=Thalis. M is trying on her new clothes (blouse and trousers) given to her as a gift by T. She first tried on the trousers.)

1. M itan na valo tʃe tim bluːzaː: mu alla eʃo llio meik ap tʃe foume oti
2. enna ti lleroː:so.
3. (.)
4. T→ siya:: re.
5. M kala.

Translation
1. M I was going to try on my blou::se too but I’m afraid it’s going to get dirty:: from my make up.
2. ()
3. (.)
4. T→ siga:: re.
5. M okay.

(2)
(M = Melina; T = Thalis. A few minutes ago a friend was in the flat.)
1. M "ndrepume jati to flatt en ano pu kato::º
2. T→ ela re, siya:: re, jati to diòkon dus en kalitteri katastasi?
3. (.)
4. M oi re si:: e polla χαἈa ema::s.

Translation
1. M "I’m embarrassed because the flat is a me::ssº
2. T→ come on re, siga:: re, do you think theirs is better? 6
3. (.)
4. M no re you:: ou::rs is really awful. 7

(3)
(C = Christina; N = Nicolas. C opened the coke and it was spilt on N’s gemstones.)
1. N en ejine tipote::.
2. C ejine kokakoleπο::o s o tιχos ma::s.
3. N en ejine tipote::; enna steγnosi re, menj gamnis etsi:: (.). en ejine tipote (.). siya to πρAma.
4. (1.5)
5. (1.5)
6. C i petres?

Translation
1. N nothing happene::d.
2. C our wa::ll became coca-coalai::sh.
3. N nothi::ng happened it will dry re, don’t behave like tha::t (.)
4. → nothing happene::d (.). siya to πρAma. 8
5. (1.5)
6. C the stones?

In extracts (1)-(3) siga and siga followed by re compose complete turn constructional units (TCUs) occurring in a different position in the turn. In 1: 4 siga re is “free-standing”. The term “free-standing” proposed by Heritage (1984b: 302) is used to refer to a particle or a single word - in this case siga - which composes a turn on its own. In 2: 2 siga occurs as a non-first TCU in a multi-unit turn and is followed by another TCU. In 3: 4 siga to prama occurs as the final TCU in a multi-component turn. As will be

6 “theirs” refers to the flat which belongs to the friend who visited them and his flatmate.
7 re+second person personal pronoun (esi: “you”) serves as an address form.
8 For the phrase siya to prayma! see section 1.
shown in section 5.1, siga is often used as a shortened form of the conventionalized ironic expression siga to prama.

An early observation about the turns in which siga occurs is that they come as responses to prior claims, assessments, or requests.

In the following sections, I examine the use of freestanding siga/siga re/siga+address form, siga/siga re/siga+address form in non-first TCU position.

4.2. Freestanding siga, siga re and siga + address form

In this section I will examine the use of siga, siga re and siga + address form as a response to prior claims, informing, evaluations and assessments. I use the term assessment in a broad way as used by Pomerantz (1984: 63), who assesses that an initial assessment proffered by a speaker accomplishes actions such as praise, complaint, compliment, insult, self-deprecation. The next relevant action accomplished by the recipient is agreement or disagreement with the prior assessment (id.).

4.2.1. Siga, Siga re: Freestanding Challenge

In the following extracts siga/siga re is used to challenge in an ironic conventionalized way what is said in the prior speaker’s turn. What is challenged with siga/siga re is usually the factuality/truth/accuracy of what is said in the prior speaker’s turn by showing skepticism. This use of siga/siga re is shown with the arrowed turns in the following extracts:

(4)
(Same with number (1), page 5)

1. M itan na valo tʃe tim bluːzaː mu alla eɣ o llio meik ap tʃe foume oti
2. enna ti llɛrɔː so.
3. (.)
4. T→ siɣaː re.
5. M kala.

Translation

1. M I was going to try on my blouːse too but I’m afraid it’s going to
t2. get dirtyː from my make up.
3. (.)
4. T→ sigaː re.
5. M okay.

(5)

In Stavropoulos’ Greek-English learner’s dictionary, ironic siga is translated as “like hell” (1988: 789). This translation of siga could be loosely applied for the use of freestanding siga. In addition to this, translations like “yeah right” and “sure” could also be applied to the use of freestanding siga/siga re/siga+address form with the only difference that siga (+re/+address from) does not express the overt ironic agreement expressed by the English translations. For these reasons, siga will be left untranslated.
(T = Thalis; M = Melina. T is typing an essay as part of his job. M is preparing the coverpage. After finishing it M goes to the kitchen where T is sitting.)

1. T tora eteλoses me to eksofillo::?
2. M ne re::.
3. T £ise polla se- σχολastici pandos£.
4. M→ siya:: re::.
5. T £inda siya re£?
6. M e ennen dipote.
7. T δεkapende ores enan eksofillo::?

Translation
1. T have you been working on the coverpage until now?
2. M yes re::.
3. T £well you’re definitely overworking£.
4. M→ siga:: re::.
5. T £what siga re£?
6. M well it’s nothing.
7. T fifteen hours for a coverpage?

In the examples above what is said in the prior speaker’s turn is challenged in the next turn with the deployment of siga re. Thus, in 4: 1 M proffers an assessment through the expression of some reluctance about trying on the blouse “I was going to try on my blouse too”. The grounds for this reluctance “but I’m afraid it’s going to get dirty from my make up” (4: 1-2) are challenged/rejected with the use of “siga:: re” (4: 4). The lengthening of the last syllable of “siga::” is emphatic and so marks it prosodically as ironic and challenging of the previous one. The irony serves to dismiss and ridicule the grounds for the reluctance. The recipient responds with “okay” (4: 5) and goes on to try the blouse claiming that way acceptance of T’s stance (Schegloff 1995b: 113).

In 5: 3 T’s expression of concern and compliment to M is challenged/dismissed through the operation of “siga:: re::” (5: 4). The lengthening in both “siga::” and “re::” frames the response as ironic and again makes the rejection hearably very challenging. T (5: 5) rebuts the challenge through the use of a counter-challenge expressed by questioning her use of siga with a “next-turn repair-initiator”: “£what siga re£?” (cf. Schegloff 1995b). His response is an indicator that he interpreted “siga:: re::” as ironic challenge.

4.2.2. Siga + address form: Freestanding

Challenge

Although siga in the data is commonly followed by re, it is also, though less often, followed by address forms. With reference to the data, the use of an address form may consist of the particle re + addressee’s first name or of an address term + first person singular possessive pronoun.

It can be argued that in the following extracts in a similar vein with the use of siga re, siga + address form is also used to challenge what is said in the prior speaker’s turn by ironically criticising and rejecting it. This is illustrated with the arrowed turns:
Maria Christodoulidou

(G = Giolanta; S = Stella; M = Marina. G, S and M are sisters. Their father is also present at the conversation. A few minutes before he announced that their cousin might give birth prematurely. Nina is their mother’s friend who is also pregnant.)

2. G jati::?
3. S >ipen i Nina oti varcete na perimeni tʃ’ epiöi an en cessarici enna
tis ta kamun<.
4. ()
5. M→ sигра:: kori mu.
6. S etsi mu pen KORI MU:: ((forcefully)).
7. (3.5)
8. M ma i Nina enomisen en o θeos.
9. S praymati(h).
10. S еtsi mu pen KORI MU:: ((forcefully)).

Translation
1. S does she have a problem? 10 Nina too will give birth prematurely.
2. G why::?
3. S >Nina said that she doesn’t want to wait and if she gives birth
with the cesarean method, she will be able to do it earlier<.
4. ()
5. M→ sигра:: my girl.
6. S that’s what she told me MY GIRL ((forcefully)).
7. (3.5)
8. M well Nina thought she’s god.
9. S indee(h)d.
10. S ((undistinguishable))

(A = Anita; T = Timos. Anita (1) is holding a bag of pitta bread.)

1. A еʃi oχto::.
2. T еfaa ta eksi::;
3. ()
4. T oi re ta eksi, ta tria.
5. A еfaa tʃe mɲan ego::, emina::n tesseris
e e δíces su.
6. ()
7. A→ sигра:: re Timo!
8. ((undistinguishable))

Translation
1. A ((each bag)) contains e::ight.
2. T I ate si::x,
3. ()
4. T not re six, three.
5. A I:: also ate one, there are four left.
6. T well the ones left are for you.
7. ()

10 This first TCU is a question about a previous announcement that her cousin will give birth prematurely.
8. A→ siga:: re Timo!
9. ((undistinguishable))

In 6: 3, 4 S makes an announcement which is constructed as an informing act elicited with G’s question (6: 2). M (6: 6) ironically challenges the accuracy of the news announcement “siga:: my girl”. This turn is interpreted as ironic based on its sequential placement and its design. Thus, the lengthening of the last syllable of “siga::” and the address form “my girl” overturn the expectation built so far with the announcement (6: 2) and shift the footing in this way, and frame the turn as ironic challenge. 11 Given that generally announcements prefer acceptances (Pomerantz 1984), this challenge, which claims disbelief, is dispreferred, produced after a slight delay. S (6: 7) defends herself by offering an account about the accuracy of the announcement. The defence shows that S perceived 6: 6 as ironic challenge. Here, siga occurs upon the reporting of the words of a third non-present party. S’s defence (6: 7) serves also as a detachment from the stance expressed by the non-present party. G’s response (6: 9) serves as a clarification that the prior emphatic challenge (6: 6) was not directed at S but was deployed to challenge the words of the non-present party. Thus, S by claiming detachment from the reported words and M by making a restatement of her earlier challenge express alignment with each other in talking about a non-present party.

In 7: 8 the deployment of “siga::” followed by the address form “re Timo!” is used to reject a prior offer (7: 6). In sum, the conversation (7: 1-5) concerns how much of the shared bread each ate. The basis on which the offer – to Anita of the left bread (7: 6) – is made is that Timos, the offerer, ate more than her. Hence, with this offer Timos is doing being attentive. The deployment of siga re Timo (7: 8) challenges the syllogism that invoked Timo’s offer. Therefore, the ironic nuance attributed to the challenge performed with siga is not based on the fact that it challenges an offer but, that it challenges the syllogism behind that offer. The use of the address form “re Timo!” after “siga::” like the use of forms of address in such turn-final positions generally, emphasizes the action performed with siga, that is, the ironic challenge.

**Summary:** Sigasiga re/siga + address form: Freestanding

To sum up, siga/siga re/siga + address form does the work of directly challenging what is said in the prior speaker’s turn by expressing scepticism or disapproval. Sigasiga re/siga + address form is hearable as a strong marker that uses irony to overturn the prior proffered stance.

In the extracts of this section there is evidence that siga/siga re/siga + address form is treated by recipients as a conventional ironic marker as shown by their responses to it. Hence, recipients usually display an understanding of the work being done with siga as ironic challenge and they respond to what is “meant by the ironic act”, producing a frame switch back to ordinary discourse (cf. Kotthoff 2003: 1394).

The use of siga and siga followed by an address form is not as common as the use of siga followed by re but, when siga is followed by an address form, it is hearable as being more ‘conscious’ of the act being performed and thus more challenging than siga and siga re. On the other hand, re mitigates (cf. Georgakopoulou 2001: 1886) the use of siga.

---

11 Goffman (1974)
5. Non-first-TCU: Siga, siga re, siga + address form

In this section I will examine the use of siga/siga re/siga + address form in non-first-TCU position when it occurs in multi-component turns, by taking into consideration that “(t)he grammar of a TCU may be related to its position in its turn – as a single TCU or one of several and if one of several in various positions.” (Schegloff 1996: 60). The main interest here is to see how these TCUs, one of which is siga/siga re/ siga+address form “may be constructed so as to fit together and complement one another as parts” of the construction of the turn or how they “fail to do so” (Schegloff 1996: 60) and what their interactional role is in each case.

First, in section 5.1 I will examine the use of siga when produced as part of the turn. Then, in section 5.2 I will examine the use of siga as “topically disparate”, that is, distinct to the prior TCUs of the turn (cf. Schegloff 1996: 72).

5.1. Siga, siga re: Non-first TCU
Making the disagreement/challenge overt

In this section I will show how siga and siga re are used to reinforce or make overt the disagreement with the prior speaker’s turn expressed with the TCU that precedes them in the turn. Specifically, siga/siga re occurs as a non-first TCU in turns that serve as second assessments, as responses to other-initiated repairs and as counterpositional assessments or claims.12

5.1.1. Second assessment: Challenge/rejection

According to Pomerantz “(s)second assessments are assessments produced by recipients of prior assessments in which the referents in the second are the same as those in the prior” (1984: 59). In the following two extracts, the speaker makes an assessment and the recipient proffers a second assessment which is in disagreement with the prior one. The disagreement is proffered through a multi-component turn. Sigasiga re is used as a non-first TCU in order to reinforce the disagreement/challenge/rejection by making an ironic evaluation of what is said in the prior turn. Siga/siga re is followed by another TCU which also expands on the disagreement. The extracts that follow serve to illustrate this point:

(8)
(Same with (2) on pages 5)

1. M “ndrepume jati to flat en ano pu kato::º
2. T→ ela re, sîγa:: re, jati to δîkon dus en kalitteri katastasi?
3. (.)

12 As mentioned in section 4.2 of this chapter, the translation of siga as “big deal” is the closest equivalent for some cases of the use of siga. Some examples where “big deal” can translate siga are shown with the conversational extracts in this section. However, “big deal” usually occurs turn initially, but siga in the examples of this section is used in non-first TCU position within a multi-component turn.
4. M oi re si:: en polla χαλα ema::s.
5. T e:: ndaksi
6. M e:: (-) em banda etsi.

Translation
1. M "I’m embarrassed because the flat is a me::ssº
2. T→ come on re, siga:: re, do you think theirs is better?
3. (.)
4. M no re you ou::rs is really awful.
5. T we::ll it’s okay.
6. M we::ll (--) it’s always like that.

(M = Melina; T = Thalis. M is trying to lose weight.)
1. M e:: na fao patate::s?
2. T θelis na fais to::?
3. (.)
4. T pos to leme?
5. M ti?
6. T to::=
7. M =lazaɲa?
8. T ta lazaɲa su::?
9. (1.5)
10. T me sa[latua?
11. M [tora na ðume poso pai to malli.
12. T me salatua?
13. (4)
14. T ela more::.
15. M ne:: re::, ela more.
16. T→ ela more, siγa:: posa pai?
17. M e?
18. T to malli?
19. M to malli to ena paccettui en eksakofes saranda. its tu mats.
20. T ttu matʃ eksakofes saranta? na fais ena fai tis prokopis?

Translation
1. M shall I eat potatoe::s?
2. T do you want to eat the::?
3. (.)
4. T what is it called?
5. M what?
6. T the::=
7. M =lasagna?
8. T you::r lasagna?
9. (1.5)
10. T with sa[lad?
11. M [it depends on the calories.
12. T with salad?
13. (4)
14. T come on more:::
15. M yea::h re::, come on more.
16. T→ come on more, siga::: how many is it?
17. M what?
18. T calories?
19. M six hundred and forty per serving, it’s tu mats. 13
20. T is six hundred forty too much? for a good meal?

The disagreeing turns in 8: 2 and 9: 16 have identical structure and lexical construction: come on re/more+siga/siga re+question. 14 In 8: 1 M’s complaint/self-deprecation is responded to in the first TCU with disagreement “come on re” (8: 2). In 9: 15, M counter-challenges T’s (9: 14) earlier challenge and he (9: 16) rebuts the challenge. Thus, in the first TCU of 9: 16 he repeats his earlier challenge “come on more” (9: 14).

In both these extracts the first TCU of 8: 2 and 9: 16 is prefatory and not conclusory as it projects more to come (Schegloff 1996). “Come on”, which is produced before *siga* is hearable as an alignment marker, basically an attempt by the teller to bring the addressee with his side, in order to accept his viewpoint which is expressed with the following TCUs. *Siga* that follows is specifying what would be unclear with the use of the minimal “come on re”/“come on more”. Thus, the meaning of the first TCU (“come on re”/“come on more”) is specified with *siga*. This way it could be argued that *siga* looks back to what precedes it in the turn in order to expand on it and reinforce the challenge. Hence, in 8: 2 the disagreement is strengthened with the use of “siga:: re”. The lengthening of the last syllable of “siga::” marks it as very challenging. In 9: 16, “siga::” reinforces the challenge by underestimating the importance of what she claimed in 9: 11. This is achieved by shifting out of the disagreement expressed with “come on more”, to do something stronger, that is, an ironic evaluation through the use of the formulaic ironic marker *siga*. The question that follows *siga*, composing the final TCU (8: 2; 9: 16), expands on the disagreement, offering an argument against the prior teller’s assessment. Therefore with the first TCU the teller introduces disagreement, with the second TCU he expands on the disagreement by diminishing the importance of the prior teller’s claim, and with the final TCU he offers an argument to support his disagreement.

In sum, *siga/siga re* occurs in non-first TCU position in turns that are in disagreement with prior assessments which serve as claims, complaints etc. That is, after a first assessment the recipient responds with a multi-component turn. The first TCU of that turn expresses disagreement with the assessment. This is followed by a second TCU composed of *siga/siga re* which reinforces the disagreement by doing insistence and at the same time ironically evaluates the prior assessment. *Siga/siga re* is followed by another TCU which expands on the disagreement. It seems that *siga/siga re* is the most emphatic component of the disagreement/challenge expressed with multi-component turns. Compared with the other preliminary components of the turn, *siga* diminishes the importance of the prior teller’s assessment.

13 “tu muts”: Greek pronunciation of “too much”.
14 Etymologically, *re* comes from *more* (Babiniotis 1998: 1550). Already in classical times, the vocative case of the adjective *moros*, the form *möré* and *mörē*, was used to address someone reprovingly or pejoratively (id.). *Morē* in the beginning must have had the meaning “stupid, silly” (Babiniotis 1998: 1550; Andriotis 1983: 226).
5.1.2. Misalignment with disagreement-implicated other-initiated repair

In the following extracts siga occurs in non-first TCU position in a multi-component turn that expresses misalignment with the “disagreement-implicated other initiated repair” expressed in the prior turn (Schegloff 1995b: 146-147). This use of siga re is shown with the arrowed turns in the following extracts:

(10)
(A = Anita; T = Timos. Anita and Timos are Cypriots. Olivia is Greek. She calls English pounds “lirja” (neuter, plural) instead of “lires” (feminine, plural) as Cypriots call them.)

1. A nevriazo pu lali i Olivia, ta lirja, to pira ekato lirja,
2. to pira::s,
3. T jati re? en o tropos pu milun.
4. A lirja?
5. T→ ne re, siγa::s.
6. A ma en dʒi’ itan ekaton, afu ton iða ton pprinter tis sto =
7. T =tuti en Elliniða. pe mu::;

Translation
1. A it gets on my nerves when Olivia says, lirja, I bought it one
2. hundred lirja, I bought i::t,
3. T why re? it’s the way they talk.
4. A lirja?
5. T→ yes re, siga::.
6. A but it wasn’t a hundred pounds, I saw her printer in=
7. T =she is Greek. tell me::;

(11)
(M = Melina; T = Thalis; M has recently moved in a university flat. One of the flatmates is in the kitchen with friends. T wants some juice from the kitchen. M offers to bring some juice for him.)

1. M daksi:: dinome k’ efíγa.
2. T jati na diði::s?
3. M ja na pao na su fero.
4. T (ja na ðís ti::n?)
5. M e endaksi e:: enna pao san do::?
6. T→ ne re::, siγa:: re::, aman enna diðis endaksi men pais.
7. M endaksi re Θαli mu en dʒe:: nna:: paðo:: tipote:: epiði enna valo
8. ena pandeloni.

Translation
1. M okay:: I’ll change my clothes and I’ll go.
2. T why should you change::?
3. M to go and bring ((some juice)) for you.
4. T (to see who::?)
5. M well okay we::ll I’m I supposed to go dressed like th::?
6. T→ yes re::; siga:: re::; if you are going to change it’s okay don’t go.
7. M it’s okay re my Thali nothing wi::ll happe::n to me just because I’ll
8. put on some trouse::rs.

In extracts 10: 4 and 11: 5 the teller proffers a “disagreement-implicated other initiated repair” which prefers a alignment with the teller as a response, but the recipient responds with “yes” (yes re + siga) insisting on his earlier response and expressing misalignment. Thus, in 10: 1, 2 Anita proffers a criticism of a third person inviting that way agreement as a response (cf. Pomerantz 1984). Timos (10: 3) expresses disagreement with the criticism by questioning this assessment and offering a defensive account for the criticized person. Anita (10: 4) makes another attempt to elicit an agreeing response by means of a “disagreement-implicated other-initiated repair” inviting a “backing down” (Schegloff 1995b: 150). Timos’s response (10: 5) takes the form of disagreement/misalignment with the premise of the question yes re + siga. With this response he insists on his prior defence. Sigas expands and insists on the stance expressed with yes re, that is, the disagreement by ironically downplaying the importance of the point on which the criticism is based. The ironic underestimation is achieved with the use of siga through which the speaker shifts out of the activity of disagreeing to make an ironic evaluation.

In (11) M and T are negotiating as to whether M should change clothes in order to go to the kitchen or not. T (11: 4) challenges M’s claim that she needs to change clothes through the use of “other-initiated repair” (Schegloff, Sacks and Jefferson 1977). M (11: 5) reciprocates the challenge through another initiated repair which treats the prior turn as problematic. T’s (11: 6) answer takes the form of disagreement with the premise of the question, that is, yes re+siga re+assessment. Thus, T (11: 6) responds literally “yes re::”, that is, that she should not change clothes. Sigas re is used to reinforce the disagreement by underestimating the importance of her claim. The assessment that follows siga re expands on the disagreement. The addressee (11: 7, 8) responds with another disagreement. In both these cases siga expands and reinforces the meaning of the minimal yes re by doing insistence.

In this section siga is used in a turn that occurs after other-initiated repair which is disagreement-implicated (Schegloff 1995b). The turn in which siga occurs has the form of disagreement with the premise of the question + siga. Sigas is used to reinforce the meaning of the prior TCU, that is, the disagreement with the premise of the question by making an ironic evaluation. Sigas may be followed by another disagreeing assessment.

5.1.3. Counter-positional assessment or claim

Another context in which siga as final TCU may occur is in sequences where a first assessment/claim is responded to with a counter-assessment/claim expressed through a multi-component turn. In this environment, siga is produced as an expansion to the counter-positional assessment in final TCU position. Two simple cases - in which what is proposed/asserted in the prior turn is responded with a counter-positional assertion - are shown with extracts 12 and 13.

(12)
(C = Christina; N = Nicolas. Christina’s friends asked Christina and Nicolas to go out with them and Christina agreed.)

1. C ti enna tus pume telika enna pame?
2. N e enna pamen afu i::pes tus pco prin, (2) oti
3. enna pame.
5. N → ennan dropi tora. Enna ta kopsumen tfin din oran,
6. → siya::.
7. C enna ta kopsume?
8. N e nne (. ) misi lira? (2) i diafora? (2) siya na men vurumen
dora::.

Translation
1. C what are we going to tell them, are we going?
2. N well, since you’ve already told them that we’re going, (2) we’re going,
3. yeah, but we didn’t get tickets.
4. N → it’s embarrassing. We’re going to get tickets in the
5. → entrance, siga::.
6. C we are?
7. N → well yes (.) for half pound? (2) more? (2) as if we were going to
8. → rush to it now::.
9. (13)

(Expanded version of (3) on page 5).

1. C na pari:: nevríAző::: Nikolino mu. afu en eőiçnen oti enna pai
toso:::. se tundin χoran i koca kola afrizi pco po(h)LLA(h)
2. ha ha ha.
3. 4
4. N en ejine tipote:::
5. C ejine kokakolető::: o tǐços ma:::s.
6. N → en ejine tipote:::, enna steỳnosi re, mej gamnis etsi::: (.) en ejine
7. → tipote (. ) siya to prAma.
8. (1.5)
9. C i petres?
10. N e siya:: eskupisa tes en endaksi.

Translation
1. C da::sh It makes me ma::::d my Nikolino ((dim)). I didn’t notice
2. this was going to happen. In this country coke is more
3.spa(h)RKLI(h)ng ha ha ha.
4. (4)
5. N it’s nothing. 15

15 The literal translation of extract 13 shows how the assessment in lines 7-8 is counter-positional to the assessment of line 6:
5. N it didn’t happen ((anything))
6. C it happened ((that)) the wall ((became)) cocacolaish
7. N → it didn’t happen ((anything)) it will dry re, don’t do like tha::::::::t (. ) it
8. → didn’t happen ((anything)) (. ) sige the dEal.
6. C our wa::ll is cokacolai::sh.
7. N → it’s nothi::ng, it will dry re, don’t do like tha::t () it’s nothi::ng ()
8. → siga to prAma.
9. (1.5)
10. C what about the stones?
11. N well big de::al I cleaned them, they are fine.

In (12) and (13) the speaker makes an assessment or claim which is contradicted in the next turn by the recipient. Thus, in 12: 4 C makes a claim which is directly countered by the recipient (12: 5-6) who proffers a counterclaim. That is, the form of the verb used in the first assessment (12: 4) is converted in the next turn (12: 5) from negative “we didn’t get tickets” to affirmative “we’re going to get tickets”. The final TCU of 12: 5-6, that is, “siga::” reinforces the disagreement expressed with the preceding counter-assertion. The shift from the counterclaim “we’re going to get tickets” to the conventionalized challenge expressed with “siga::” (12: 6) effected with lengthening frames it as ironic challenge. C (12: 7) responds with disagreement by means of “other initiated repair” (Schegloff et al. 1977) expressed with a question.

In 13: 6 C makes an assessment which serves as a complaint. N’s response (13: 7-8) contradicts the prior assessment. Thus, in N’s rejection (13: 7-8) of the complaint, the same verb (ejine: “become/happen”) is transformed from affirmative ejine (lit: “became/happened”) to negative en ejine (lit: “it didn’t become/happen”). The following TCUs are expansions and repetitions of the counter-assertion. The use of the strong ironic formula siga to prAma - framed as such by the stress in intonation - in final position reinforces the disagreement by doing insistence. Its placement in final position seems to be related to its use to close the sequence.

Siga/siga re is used as the final TCU in turns where the first TCU is counter-positional to what is stated in the prior turn. Siga/siga re is used to reinforce the disagreement/be dismissive by expressing an ironic underestimation for the prior teller’s claims. In the above extracts the assessment in which siga/siga re occurs, comes after the expression of resistance by the speaker of the prior turn to what is uttered in the prior to it turn.16

Summary: Siga, siga re: Non-first TCU
Making the disagreement/challenge overt

In this section siga/siga re was shown to occur in turns that are in disagreement with what is said in the prior speaker’s turn in order to reinforce what precedes it in the turn. First, siga/siga re occurs in non-first TCU position in turns that consist of second assessments that are in disagreement with prior assessments which serve as claims, complaints, challenges etc. in order to reinforce the disagreement expressed in the first TCU. Siga/siga re is followed by another TCU which expands on the disagreement and does insistence. Compared with the other TCUs in the turn, siga/siga re performs the strongest challenge. Second, siga/siga re is used in turns that occur after other-initiated repairs, which are disagreement-implicated (cf. Schegloff 1995b). The turns in which siga/siga re occurs have the form of disagreement with the premise of the question +

16 The closest translation of siga in the examples of this section is “big deal” although this is a first TCU and siga is not
siga/siga re. Siga/siga re is used to reinforce the meaning of the prior TCU, that is, the disagreement with the premise of the question by making an ironic evaluation. Siga/siga re may be followed by another disagreeing assessment. Third, siga/siga re is used as the final TCU in turns where the first TCU is counter-positional to what is stated in the first pair part. Again, siga/siga re is used to reinforce the disagreement expressed with the counterpositional assessment/claim.

The comparison of the use siga with the use of siga re shows what was already noted about their use in section 4.2, i.e. that re serves as an affiliative marker which mitigates the challenge undertaken by siga.

5.2. Siga, siga + address form: Final TCU
Topically disperate-Challenge

The use of siga/siga+address form in the following extracts is rather different to what it has been seen to be doing in the previous sections. Here, siga/siga+address form is hearable as “topically disparate” (Schegloff 1996: 72) from the prior TCUs. This means that it initiates another response to the prior turn which is not complementing the one given by the prior TCU. 17

The use of siga/siga+address form is shown in the arrowed turns in the following extracts:

(14)
(C = Christina; N = Nicolas. C is narrating the story of her colleague who had an unexpected pregnancy. This was a big surprise for both her and her husband.)

1. C lali tu, je mu ekama to me allo::? en din epistefcen o andras
2. tis (1.5) aspume.hh ifne,
3. N [tse pian tse tfakkaran to?
5. N ne tse pian tse tfakkaran to oti:: en pu tfi::non?
6. C → e o::i en e-- sija re Nikola::.
7. N hu hu hu
8. C endaksi en to pistefken o athropos, epistepsen tin meta...

Translation
1. C she says to him, did I do it with someone else::?: her husband
2. couldn’t believe her (1.5) for instance .hh itf’ s
3. N [and did they check it?
4. C she was pregnant indeed.
5. N yes and did they go to check that it was his?
6. C→ well no::: they didn’t g-- siga re Nicola::: 18
7. N hu hu hu
8. C okay the man couldn’t believe it, he believed later…

17 A possible loose translation for the occurrence of siga in the following extracts could be “for sure”. The reason that siga is left untranslated is that contrary to “for sure”, siga does not express ironic agreement so overtly.
18 “g--” is hearably about to be “go”.
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(15)
(T = Thalis; M = Melina. T is typing an essay as a part of his part time job. M is preparing the essay’s coverage.)

1. T men tis kamnis polla kalo ton titlo jati fenete terastia i διαφορά
2. pu tin ipo(h)li(h)pi(h)n e(h)rya(h)si(h)a(h) ha ha ha
3. ha [ha ha ha ha ha ha ha ha ha ha
4. M→ [ama::n ti i::pen! siya re si::.
5. T ti(h)?
6. M siya::.
7. T e ne::, en öizni ((the rest of the essay)) atomo pu na kamni etsi(h)::
8. ekso(h)fillo(h).

Translation
1. T don’t overdo it with the coverpage because it will be much
2. better than the re(h)st of the e(h)ssa(h)y(h) ha ha ha ha
3. [ha ha ha ha ha ha ha ha ha ha
4. M→ [my go::d wha::t he sai::d! siga re you::.
5. T wha(h)t?
6. M siga::.
7. T well yes, it ((the rest of the essay)) doesn’t show a person that can
8. do su(h)ch a co(h)ve(h)r.

Extract 14 is a typical example of the self-repair undertaken by siga after a cut off. According to Schegloff et al. (1977: 361), with repair the speaker addresses “recurring problems in speaking, hearing, understanding”. Hence, after the narration of a story, N (14: 3) addresses C with a question responded to in 14: 4 by C with an informing. In 14: 5 N initiates a repair in the form of a question that expands on his prior question (14: 3). The additional increment to the question that is emphatically pronounced (“it was his?”) marks C’s prior response as misunderstanding and initiates a repair of the answer. C (14: 6) initiates a response to the form of the turn by giving the requested information “well no:: they didn’t g~”, but she cuts off abandoning the first emphatic answer and initiates a repair through another answer “siga re Nicola::” which serves as an ironic challenge of what has been asked. This way the speaker replaces the initiated serious response with an ironic challenge of what is stated or implicated with the first pair part. The use of the address form (re+addressee’s first name) makes the challenge hearably more emphatic. With the cut off the speaker shifts the footing from responding to evaluating hearably a rebuke/chiding. N’s laugh (14: 7) shows that the question was not serious.

In 15: 1-3, T’s joking request produced with laughter is delivered as a compliment towards M and self-deprecation of himself. M (15: 4) rejects the compliment and self-deprecation of the statement with an expression of surprise “my go::d wha::t he sai::d!”. This TCU is complete grammatically, syntactically, prosodically and pragmatically. The second TCU, that is “siga re you::” expresses disagreement with the use of siga followed by an address form. The initiation of another response expressed with the conventionalized siga frames the evaluation proffered as ironic. Hence, it is hearable as evaluation of the prior turn, not a continuation of the prior TCU.

Summary: Sigas, Sigas + address form: Final TCU
“Topically disparate”- Challenge
Siga/siga + address form is used as a topically disparate TCU in turns where the prior TCU is grammatically, syntactically, prosodically and pragmatically complete (Schegloff 1996). Siga initiates another response to the prior speaker’s turn which is distinct from the response given in the first TCU. In fact, with the deployment of siga the prior response is abandoned in order to proffer an ironic challenge of the prior speaker’s turn performed with siga. For this reason, this use of siga is linked to its freestanding use.

In addition to this, another observation that could be made is that the use of re + addressee’s first name, and re + second person singular pronoun esi (“you”) following siga in some of the extracts of this section, seems to have a particular importance in that it makes it hearable as more challenging than simple siga because it is more conscious and hearable as designed to be addressed to the recipient. Hence, in the extracts here the use of the address form stresses the challenge expressed with siga as ironic evaluation and disagreement with the addressee. 19

6. Conclusion

This paper was concerned with the examination of the interactional role of siga which is usually followed by the particle re or other address forms. The aim was to analyze the actions accomplished with siga in relation to its sequential and interactional position.

As was shown siga/siga re/siga + address form may occur as a freestanding TCU or as a non-first TCU within a multi-component turn.

It can be concluded that siga/siga re/siga + address form when it occurs freestandingly, is directly challenging by showing disapproval or scepticism of what is said in the prior speaker’s turn. When siga is followed by an address form it is hearable as more ‘conscious’ of the act being performed and thus more challenging than siga re. On the other hand, re, when it follows siga, seems to make its use hearably more affiliative.

In addition to its freestanding use, siga/siga re/siga + address form can be used as a non-first TCU, within multi-component turns, either in order to expand on the TCU that precedes it in the turn or to initiate another response to the prior speaker’s turn. Hence, siga/siga re as a non-first TCU occurs in multi-component turns that are in disagreement with what is said in the prior speaker’s turn in order to reinforce the disagreement expressed in the first TCU of the turn, or make the disagreement overt in

---

19 In this context there is a significant observation to be made with relation to the translation of siga revealed through the analysis of the use of siga in the extracts in this section. That is, at the beginning of this subsection (5.2) I suggested that in the cases here siga could be freely translated as “for sure” but, because siga does not express such an overt ironic agreement, it was left un-translated. However, for the extracts presented in subsection 5.1 the most suitable translation is “big deal”. As an expansion of that discussion, it should be noted that the diversity of translations for the two cases of siga used as non-first TCUs shows how differently siga is used in the extracts presented in this section (5.2) in comparison with the extracts presented in section 5.1. This can also be shown by the fact that the translation of siga as “big deal” in the extracts of this subsection (5.2) would be completely inappropriate, in the same way that translation of siga as “for sure” in the extracts of section 5.1 would give a different meaning from the one conveyed. This shows how the translation of siga profits by the insights of conversation analysis because the analysis of the data shows that in extracts (8)-(13) siga is used to do insistence and reinforce the disagreement, whereas in (14)-(15) it is used to express another response, disparate from the one given with the first TCU. This proves that Conversation Analysis (CA) can be used to assist the translation of difficult cases like the ones presented in this chapter.
the cases that it is expressed with a minimal ambiguous TCU. Added to this use, siga/siga+address form can also be used as a “topically disparate” TCU (cf. Schegloff 1996) in turns where the prior TCU is grammatically, syntactically, prosodically, and pragmatically complete. Siga initiates a second response to the prior speaker’s turn which is distinct from the response given with the first TCU. Hence, this use of siga is similar to the freestanding use of siga.

Added to the above, it should be noted that, in the data, siga is overwhelmingly followed by re which seems to be marking siga as addressed to the prior speaker, but also adds an affiliative flavour to siga. In the cases that it is followed by an address form, it sounds more challenging, because the address form marks the challenge as designed to be directed at the addressee. Therefore, re and address forms are commonly used after siga in order to stress the directionality of the speech act performed with siga.

Evidence for this claim is given with analysis of extract 6 where the use of the address form “my girl” after siga (6: 6) results in confusion as to what siga is challenging. Briefly, the challenge proffered by M (6: 6) “siga:: my girl” to the prior teller’s announcement (6: 5) gets heard by the teller as challenging the accuracy of the announcement. This is indicated by the defensive account she proffers in 9: 7. M’s (6: 9) clarification shows that the challenge was not directed at the accuracy of the announcement, but at the reported stance of the non-present party. The misunderstanding as to whom the challenge is addressed (prior teller or non-present party) is the outcome of the use of the address form “my girl”, which makes it hearable as addressed to the prior teller.

The discussion of the actions performed by siga in the positions where it occurs is summarized in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Siga</th>
<th>TCU-POSITION</th>
<th>ACTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Siga, siga re,</td>
<td>Freestanding</td>
<td>Challenge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>siga+address form</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siga, siga re</td>
<td>Non-first</td>
<td>Making the disagreement overt:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Challenge/rejection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Misalignment with disagreement-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>implicated other-initiated repair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Counter-positional assessment or claim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siga, siga+</td>
<td>Final</td>
<td>Topically disparate-challenge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>address form</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Finally, another issue that has emerged in this chapter is the translation of siga in English. As was noted earlier in the chapter, there are some unresolved difficulties
involved in the translation of *siga*. Hence, although I suggest at least four possible translations of *siga*, namely “yeah right”, “like hell”, “big deal” and “for sure” to cover some instances of *siga*, I adopt none of them, basically because these English alternatives occur turn initially. *Siga*, however, can occur in initial as well as non-initial position in the turn. And although the translation of *siga*, at least at the beginning of this research was a major issue, this inability to translate *siga* in interaction shows how many different actions can be performed by a single lexical item which cannot be captured in a single translation or with a dictionary definition. Therefore, the analysis of *siga* confirms Clift’s claim, quoted at the beginning of the chapter, that participants in interaction “use linguistic items to do things rather than for what they mean” (2003: 182).
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APPENDICES

Appendix I

Transcription System

[ Separate left square brackets, one above the other on two successive lines with utterances by different speakers,
[ indicates a point of overlap onset, whether at the start of an utterance or later.
[[ Double separate left square brackets, distinguish pairs of overlapped utterances.
[= Equal signs ordinarily come in pairs – one at the end of a line and another at the start of a next line. If the two lines connected by the equal signs are by the same speaker, then there was a single, continuous utterance with no break or pause, which was broken up in order to accommodate the placement of overlapping talk. If the lines connected by two equal signs are by different speakers, then the second followed the first with no discernible silence between them.

(2) Numbers in parenthesis indicate silence.
(·) A dot in parentheses indicates a micropause.
. The period indicates a falling or final, intonation contour, not necessarily the end of a sentence.
? A question mark indicates rising intonation, not necessarily a question.
, A comma indicates continuing intonation, not necessarily a clause boundary.
:: Colons are used to indicate the prolongation or stretching of the sound just preceding them. The more colons the longer the stretching.
- A hyphen after a word or part of a word indicates a cut-off or self-interruption, often done with a glottal or dental stop.
word Underlining is used to indicate stress or emphasis.
Capital letters indicate louder than the rest talk.  
Two degree signs indicate that the talk between them is markedly softer than the talk around it.

The up arrow indicate a segment starting on sharper rise.
The combination of “more than” and “less than” symbols indicates that the talk between them is compressed or rushed.
The dot followed by “h’s” indicates inbreath
The letter “h” in parentheses inside the boundaries of a word indicates laughter.

Double parentheses are used to mark transcriber’s descriptions of events, e.g. ((telephone rings)), ((sniff)) etc.
When all or a part of an utterance is in parentheses, this indicates uncertainty on the transcriber’s part, but represents a likely possibility.
Word or Words enclosed by pound sterling signs indicate the word is articulated through a hearably smiling voice.
Empty parentheses indicate that something is being said, but no hearing can be achieved.
An arrow marks significant turns.

APPENDIX II

Phonetic Alphabet

/p/ a voiceless bilabial plosive, as in capable
/b/ a voiced bilabial plosive, as in boy
/t/ a voiceless dental plosive, as in fatal
/d/ a voiced alveolar plosive, as in dinner
/ʃ/ a voiceless postalveolar affricate, as in chair
/c/ a voiceless palatal plosive, as in Greek fice (=seaweeds)
/k/ a voiceless velar plosive, as in close
/g/ a voiced velar plosive, as in dog
/ʒ/ a voiced palatal plosive, as in gate
/f/ a voiceless labiodental fricative, as in feel
/θ/ a voiceless dental fricative, as in think
/ç/ a voiceless palatal fricative, as in history
/z/ a voiceless alveolar fricative, as in song
/ʃ/ an apico-dental voiceless rill fricative, as in shape
/ʃ/ a voiceless uvular fricative, as in hope
/v/ a voiced labiodental fricative, as in vote
/ʃ/ a voiced dental fricative, as in they
/ʒ/ a voiced alveolar fricative, as in zoo
/ʒ/ a voiced postalveolar fricative, as in prestige
/dʒ/ a voiced postalveolar affricate, as in *gesture
/γ/ a voiced velar fricative, as in *woman
/m/ a bilabial nasal, as in *mint
/n/ an alveolar nasal, as in *note
/ɲ/ a palatal nasal, as in Greek *kυɲeme (=I am shaking)
/ŋ/ a velar nasal, as in *hang
/r/ an alveolar trill, as in *red
/l/ an alveolar lateral approximant, as in *long
/ʎ/ palatal lateral approximant, as in Greek *eʎes (=olives)
/j/ an apico-post-alveolar voiced semivowel, as in *young
/i/ a high front tense vowel accompanied by lip spreading, as in *sit
/e/ a mid front lax vowel accompanied by moderate lip spreading, as in *pet
/a/ a low central lax vowel accompanied by neutral lip position, as in *father
/o/ a mid back lax vowel accompanied by moderate lip rounding, as in *law
/u/ a high back tense vowel accompanied by lip rounding, as in *full