



BRILL

Language contact, borrowing and code switching

A case study of Australian Greek

Angeliki Alvanoudi*

James Cook University and Aristotle University of Thessaloniki

Angeliki.Alvanoudi@jcu.edu.au

Abstract

The present study is an in-depth investigation of the Greek language spoken by immigrants in Far North Queensland, Australia. The study focuses on contact-induced changes in the language, such as borrowing of lexemes and discourse patterns, and on code switching. The data analyzed derive from participant observation and some 23 hours of audio and video-recorded conversations with first- and second-generation Greek immigrants that were collected during fieldwork in 2013 in Far North Queensland. The study contributes to the investigation of the structure and use of Greek in the diaspora by integrating perspectives from contact linguistics and interactional approaches to code switching.

Keywords

language contact – borrowing – loanwords – calques – code mixing – code switching

* The research reported here was undertaken at James Cook University, Australia, during a two-year postdoctoral fellowship under the mentoring of Alexandra Y. Aikhenvald. Earlier versions of the paper were presented in the Weekly Seminar Series at the Language and Culture Research Centre, James Cook University (2014–2015). I would like to thank participants in these events for their valuable feedback. I am immensely grateful to Alexandra Y. Aikhenvald and R.M.W. Dixon for their constructive comments and suggestions, and to three *JGL* referees for their insightful and stimulating commentaries. Many thanks to Brigitta Flick for proofreading the text.

1 Introduction

The present study aims to describe and analyze language contact-induced change and code switching in an Australian Greek community in Far North Queensland, Australia. Although language contact has been extensively investigated by linguists (e.g. Aikhenvald 2002; Clyne 2003; Haugen 1953; Matras 2009; Silva-Corvalán 1994; Thomason 2001; Thomason and Kaufman 1988; Tsitsipis 1998; Weinreich [1953] 2011; Winford 2003, among others), to date there are very few in-depth studies of Greek varieties spoken away from Greece or Cyprus: Seaman (1972) on Greek spoken in the US, Tamis (1986) on Greek spoken in Victoria, Australia, and also Dawkins (1916) on Greek dialects spoken in Asia Minor. Partial studies include Tsokalidou (1994) on code switching and gender among second-generation Greeks in Australia, Maniakas (1991) on Greek in Canada, Gardner-Chloros (1992) and Fotiou (2010) on Cypriot Greek in the UK. The present article aims to fill this gap in the literature by reporting the findings of an inductive-focused investigation of the structure and use of Greek spoken in Cairns, Far North Queensland, Australia. More specifically, the study explores the linguistic results of Greek-Australian English contact, with particular attention given to borrowing and code switching phenomena.

1.1 *Language contact and change: theoretical preliminaries*

According to Thomason's (2001, 62) broad definition, language contact-induced change is understood as follows: "any linguistic change that would have been less likely to occur outside a particular contact situation is due at least in part to language contact". Contact-induced changes may be system-altering or system-preserving (Aikhenvald 2006, 19–20), depending on whether they involve restructuring of the grammatical system or borrowing of a term into an existing system. Three types of contact situations can be identified: language maintenance, language shift, and language creation (Winford 2003). Language maintenance lies at the heart of this study. This type of contact situation occurs when a dominant group is in contact with a linguistic minority, due to immigration, trade, or military invasion. The minority group preserves its native language with contact-induced changes from generation to generation. These changes involve borrowing of forms, constructions or patterns from the language of the dominant group, which carries more power and prestige.

There is no general consensus on the definition of borrowing¹ (cf. Winford 2010, 170–172). According to Thomason and Kaufman (1988, 37), borrowing is

1 In the literature, borrowing is also referred as transfer or transference (Clyne 2003), and copying (Johanson 2002).

“the incorporation of foreign features into a group’s native language by speakers of that language”. The language from which features are borrowed is known as the donor or source language, and the language into which these features are borrowed is known as the recipient or borrowing language. Following Trask (2000, 44), Aikhenvald (2006) defines borrowing as the transfer of features of any kind from one language to another as the result of contact. This broad definition of borrowing is adopted in the present study. Linguistic material transferred from a source language into a recipient language may include anything from lexemes, pronouns, affixes, nominal categories, verbal categories, and syntactic features, to phonemes, habits of pronunciation, intonation patterns, and ways of framing discourse (Aikhenvald 2006, 15–18).

Lexical borrowing involves the transfer of lexical material from the source language into the recipient language. Lexical borrowings are divided into loanwords and loanshifts (Winford 2003, 45, cf. Haugen 1953). Loanwords are lexical items in which all or part of the morphemic composition of the loan derives from the source language. Loanshifts are lexical items whose morphemic composition is entirely native and whose meaning derives at least in part from the source language.

The basic mechanism through which forms and constructions travel from the source language into the recipient language is code switching (cf. Heath 1989; Gardner-Chloros 2008, 60; Thomason 2001, 132–133). While borrowing constitutes a completed contact-induced change, switching from one language to another constitutes a “contact-induced speech behavior” (Haspelmath 2009, 40) that occurs extensively in the talk of bilinguals. In broad terms, code switching is defined as “the alternate use by bilinguals of two or more languages in the same conversation” (Milroy and Muysken 1995, 7), between turns of different speakers, between turn constructional units within a single turn, or within the same turn constructional unit. Code switching covers a wide range of patterns that have been identified by Auer (1995, 124–125), as in the following:

- (i) discourse-related or conversational code switching which is associated with the organization of conversation, and marks, indexes, or highlights aspects of conversational structure, such as turn taking, sequencing of activities, preference organization, repair, topic shift, tying, etc.;
- (ii) preference-related code switching which is related to speakers’ competences and preferences in the two languages;
- (iii) turn-internal switches that do not allow the identification of the language of interaction, and
- (iv) momentary intra-clausal switches or insertions that do not change the language of the interaction and do not carry any locally defined meanings.

This fourth type of switching is also known as transfer or code mixing (Auer 1999, 310).

Three patterns of code switching are found in Australian Greek talk-in-interaction: code mixing, participant-related code switching, and conversational code switching. The present study focuses on the first two patterns (see Alvanoudi 2016 for the conversational functions of code switching in Australian Greek talk-in-interaction).

1.2 *Greek in diaspora: previous studies*

Despite the large number of Greeks living in diaspora, there have been very few in-depth studies up to date with respect to Greek language in contact with other languages. The pioneering studies conducted by Seaman (1972) on Modern Greek spoken in Chicago, USA, and Tamis (1986) on Modern Greek spoken in Victoria, Australia, constitute the background of this study. Both studies report maintenance of Greek in diaspora, with minor contact-induced changes, mostly at the level of lexicon.

More specifically, Seaman (1972) and Tamis (1986) found that speakers insert lexical items from English into Greek, and tend to assign neuter gender to inserted English nouns. Both scholars report lexical borrowings, such as loan-shifts or calques that combine Greek morphemes in imitation of the English pattern (e.g. *yráps to káto* 'write.2SG.IMP it down', Seaman 1972, 169–170), and loanwords that combine an English stem and a Greek affix and are phonologically and morpho-syntactically integrated in Greek (e.g. *káro* 'car(N).NOM.SG', *xotéli* 'hotel(N).NOM.SG', *bósis* 'male boss(M).NOM.SG', *sórtis* 'short.M.NOM.SG', Tamis 1986, 133–135, 138). Greeks in the US and in Australia use verb constructions that consist of the Greek verb *káno* 'do.1SG.PRS' and *jínome* 'become.1SG.PRS', and English lexical items (e.g. *na jínune defrost* 'SBJV become.3PL defrost', *káno delivery work* 'do.1SG.PRS delivery work', Seaman 1972, 166–168). Compound verb constructions are also reported for Greek-Canadian English contact (Maniakas 1991) and Cypriot Greek-British English contact (Fotiou 2010; Gardner-Chloros 1992).

The paper is organized as follows: § 2 presents and discusses language demography in Cairns and the research methodology; § 3 examines borrowing in Greek with attention given to loanwords (§ 3.1) and their grammatical treatment (§ 3.2), calques (§ 3.3), and diffusion of discourse patterns (§ 3.4). In § 4, I analyze code mixing (§ 4.1) and participant-related switching (§ 4.2) in Australian Greek talk-in-interaction. My findings are summarized and presented in § 5, where I briefly discuss the factors that facilitate language maintenance in Cairns.

2 Establishing the context of the study

2.1 *The Greek-speaking community in Cairns*

Australia is a country of linguistic and cultural diversity (Clyne and Kipp 1999, 1). Clyne (2003, 9) describes this diversity as “an open-ended tension between English monolingualism, as a symbol of a British tradition, English monolingualism as a marker of Australia’s independent national identity, and multilingualism as a reflection of a social and demographic reality and of an ideology of an independent multicultural and outreaching Australian nation”. Greek is one of the many languages spoken in Australia by immigrant populations, and the Greek diaspora is one of the largest in the region. In 1996, Greek was the second most widely used community language spoken in Australia (269,770 speakers) and Melbourne, after Italian (Clyne 2003, 23).

This study targets Greek speakers who live in Cairns, a tropical remote city of Far North Queensland. The first Greeks arrived in Far North Queensland in the late 1890s. They were mostly unskilled or unemployed persons from the Greek islands who worked in the sugar cane industry and on tobacco plantations (see Tamis 2005 for the history of Greeks in Australia). The Greek community in Cairns consists of the children of these first Greeks, and also the Greeks who arrived in Australia after WWII and the Greek civil war, in the 1960s, 1970s, and early 1980s. Most of them come from the Greek islands (Rhodos, Kythera, Ithaca, Kasos, Kastelorizo), and some from Macedonia (northern Greece). The Greek community in Cairns is very small; the exact number is unknown. During fieldwork I met about 50 people.

Three groups of speakers were identified.

- (i) First-generation Greeks who were born and raised in Greece and arrived in Australia after their adolescence. They are late bilinguals, i.e. they have become bilinguals later than childhood (Li Wei 2000, 5).
- (ii) Second-generation Greeks who were born in Australia to first-generation Greeks, or born in Greece and arrived in Australia in their preschool years. They are dominant bilinguals, i.e. they have greater proficiency in one of their languages and use it significantly more than the other language, and/or early bilinguals, i.e. they have acquired the two languages early in childhood (Li Wei 2000, 5).
- (iii) Third-generation Greeks who were born in Australia to second-generation Greeks. Most of them hardly speak any Greek at all.

Data were collected from first-generation Greeks ($n=30$), 50 to 90 years old, and second-generation Greeks ($n=15$), 40 to 80 years old.

The contact situation in Cairns is language maintenance for first and second-generation Greeks, and language shift for third-generation Greeks. First-generation Greeks form a linguistic minority that became bilingual in the dominant host group, i.e. the English-speaking community, and preserved their native language with minor language contact-induced changes, such as borrowing of lexemes and ways of framing discourse. There are no indications of structural convergence between Greek and English. Greek is spoken at home, in social networks, and at church. Code switching is very common in Australian Greek talk-in-interaction.

2.2 *Research methodology*

From May 2013 to September 2013, I conducted linguistic ‘immersion’ fieldwork (Dixon 2007) in Cairns. I became a member of the community where the language was spoken, and immersed myself in daily life, and in daily language use. I participated in the religious and cultural activities at the St John Parish of Cairns, and I spent time with my informants in private and public social activities. During fieldwork, I employed basic ethnographic methods (see Eckert 2000 and Saviile-Troike 2003 for detailed descriptions of ethnographic methods in linguistics). I established relations of friendship and intellectual partnership with my informants. Data collection was based on audio and a few video recordings of informal face-to-face conversations, and participant observation.

More specifically, I observed who spoke which language and where, how well speakers spoke the languages, and how they utilized each language (see Johnstone 2000, 80–102 for participant observation techniques). Self-reports about when and how speakers use Greek or English, and about language attitudes were also taken into consideration. I used content checking techniques, when I was not sure about the meaning or use of specific loanwords or phrases. Field notes were documented. The aim of fieldwork is to get “real life language data” (Abbi 2001, 1), and conversation is the ideal place to find them. I recorded conversations with 11 first-generation and 9 second-generation Greek immigrants, after I got their consent. I collected about 23 hours of audio-recorded conversations (2 hours were also video-recorded): approximately 16 hours with first-generation Greeks and 7 hours with second-generation Greeks (the corpus contains more than 100,000 words). Conversations took place in arranged meetings, in cultural activities at the St John Parish of Cairns, or during dinners and lunches at the informants’ houses, where I was a guest. Informants were invited to share their life stories, or talk about the history of the Greek community in Cairns, but there were no restrictions regarding the topics of conversation. I would often start the conversation by requesting basic biographical information, such as age, year of arrival in Australia, education and occupation.

The structure and use of Greek spoken by immigrants was analyzed following an inductively based method of grammatical analysis in line with Dixon (2010), Aikhenvald (2014), and Aikhenvald and Dixon (2009). According to Dixon (2010, 2), “grammatical structures and rules are worked out inductively, on the basis of the textual corpus, from utterances observed as the community goes about its daily business, and from example sentences gathered during the construction of a lexicon”. The inductive analysis of data collected through recorded conversations and participant observation allowed for the generalizations presented in this study (more in § 3).

Code switching patterns were analyzed following Auer’s (1984; 1995) conversation analytic approach to code switching in interaction. Opposite to sociolinguistic and ethnographic approaches to code switching (e.g. Blom and Gumperz 1972; Gal 1979; Myers-Scotton 1993; Rampton 1995) that seek to discover correlations between code switching, fixed meanings, and speakers’ social and psychological motivations, interactional or conversation analytic approaches to code switching (e.g. Auer 1984, 1998; Li Wei 1994, 1998, 2005; Li Wei and Milroy 1995) define code switching as a locally meaningful linguistic activity/behavior. These studies examine the meaning of individual instances of code switching in conversation, by analyzing where and why code switching occurs, and exploring the procedures through which speakers produce their own behavior and understand and deal with the behavior of others (more in § 4).

3 Borrowing

Contact-induced change in Greek spoken in Cairns is system preserving, and mainly involves borrowing of lexical items.

3.1 *Loanwords*

Establishing contact-induced change in Greek is easy when it comes to loanwords, as these lexical items “betray their origin directly” (Thomason 2001, 91). The loanwords found are loanblends, which combine native and imported morphemes. These derivational blends comprise an imported English stem plus a native Greek affix, and are adapted in terms of the phonology and morphology of Standard Modern Greek (henceforth SMG). The type of derivational blend found in the data is illustrated with example (1).²

2 Examples in Greek have been transliterated according to broad transcriptions based on the International Phonetic Alphabet (IPA).

- (1) *to* *flór-i*
 DEF.N.NOM.SG floor(N)-NOM.SG
 ‘the floor’

SMG

- to* *pátoma*
 DEF.N.NOM.SG floor(N)-NOM.SG

The loanblend combines the English stem *floor* and the Greek affix *-i*, which is inflected for neuter gender, nominative case and singular number. Overall, 31 loanblends were found in the data. All items except one are nouns. This finding aligns with previous studies (e.g. Matras 2007; Moravcsik 1978; Myers-Scotton 2002, 240; Poplack et al. 1988) which report that nouns are among the most frequently borrowed elements in language contact situations.

Twelve of the loanblends are assigned to the same gender as the equivalent term in SMG, illustrated with (1)–(12).

- (2) a. *to* *flát-i*
 DEF.N.NOM.SG flat(N)-NOM.SG
 ‘the flat’

SMG

- to* *ðiamérisma*
 DEF.N.NOM.SG flat(N)-NOM.SG

- b. *to* *flatác-i*
 DEF.N.NOM.SG flat(N)-NOM.DIM.SG
 ‘the little flat’

SMG

- to* *ðiamerizmatáci*
 DEF.N.NOM.SG flat(N)-NOM.DIM.SG

- (3) *to* *kár-o*
 DEF.N.NOM.SG car(N)-NOM.SG
 ‘the car’

SMG

- to* *aftocínito*
 DEF.N.NOM.SG car(N)-NOM.SG

- (4) *to* *karpét-o*
 DEF.N.NOM.SG carpet(N)-NOM.SG
 ‘the carpet’
- SMG
to *xalí*
 DEF.N.NOM.SG carpet(N)-NOM.SG
- (5) *to* *kontrát-o*
 DEF.N.NOM.SG contract(N)-NOM.SG
 ‘the contract’
- SMG
to *simvóleo*
 DEF.N.NOM.SG contract(N)-NOM.SG
- (6) *to* *ticét-o*
 DEF.N.NOM.SG ticket(N)-NOM.SG
 ‘the ticket’
- SMG
to *isitírio*
 DEF.N.NOM.SG ticket(N)-NOM.SG
- (7) *to* *xotél-i*
 DEF.N.NOM.SG hotel(N)-NOM.SG
 ‘the hotel’
- SMG
to *ksenoðoçío*
 DEF.N.NOM.SG hotel(N)-NOM.SG
- (8) *to* *bás-i*
 DEF.N.NOM.SG bus(N)-NOM.SG
 ‘the bus’
- SMG
to *leoforío*
 DEF.N.NOM.SG bus(N)-NOM.SG

- (9) *ta spitáka*
 DEF.N.NOM.PL hospital(N)-NOM.PL
 ‘the hospital’

SMG

- to nosokomío*
 DEF.N.NOM.SG hospital(N)-NOM.SG

- (10) *i gríl-a*
 DEF.F.NOM.SG grill(F)-NOM.SG
 ‘the grill’

SMG

- i psistarjá / sxára*
 DEF.F.NOM.SG grill(F)-NOM.SG

- (11) *i blancét-a*
 DEF.F.NOM.SG blanket(F)-NOM.SG
 ‘the blanket’

SMG

- i kuvérta*
 DEF.F.NOM.SG blanket(F)-NOM.SG

- (12) *i marcét-a*
 DEF.F.NOM.SG market(F)-NOM.SG
 ‘the market’

SMG

- i ayorá*
 DEF.F.NOM.SG market(F)-NOM.SG

Ten of the loanblends are assigned to a different gender than the equivalent term in SMG. These are illustrated with (13)–(22).

- (13) *i fríz-a*
 DEF.F.NOM.SG fridge/freezer(F)-NOM.SG
 ‘the fridge’

SMG

to *psíjío*
 DEF.N.NOM.SG fridge(N)-NOM.SG

- (14) *i* *bascét-a*
 DEF.F.NOM.SG basket(F)-NOM.SG
 ‘the basket’

SMG

to *kaláði*
 DEF.N.NOM.SG basket(N)-NOM.SG

- (15) *i* *abúl-a*
 DEF.F.NOM.SG ambulance(F)-NOM.SG
 ‘the ambulance’

SMG

to *asðenofóro*
 DEF.N.NOM.SG ambulance(N)-NOM.SG

- (16) *to* *stéc-i*
 DEF.N.NOM.SG steak(N)-NOM.SG
 ‘the steak’

SMG

i *brizóla*
 DEF.F.NOM.SG steak(F)-NOM.SG

- (17) *to* *resít-i*
 DEF.N.NOM.SG receipt(N)-NOM.SG
 ‘the receipt’

SMG

i *apóðiksi*
 DEF.F.NOM.SG receipt(F)-NOM.SG

- (18) *to* *jár-i*
 DEF.N.NOM.SG yard(N)-NOM.SG
 ‘the yard’

SMG
i avlí
 DEF.F.NOM.SG yard(F)-NOM.SG

- (19) *ta bília*
 DEF.N.NOM.PL bill(N)-NOM.PL
 ‘the bills’

SMG
i loyarjaszmi
 DEF.M.NOM.PL bill(M)-NOM.PL

- (20) *to tséc-i*
 DEF.N.NOM.SG check(N)-NOM.SG
 ‘the check’

SMG
i epítají
 DEF.F.NOM.SG check(F)-NOM.SG

- (21) *to taksás-i*
 DEF.N.NOM.SG tax(N)-NOM.SG
 ‘the tax’

SMG
o fóros
 DEF.M.NOM.SG tax(M)-NOM.SG

- (22) *i mánjes*
 DEF.F.NOM.PL mango(F)-NOM.PL
 ‘the mangos’

SMG
ta mángo
 DEF.N.NOM.PL mango

In (23)–(25), it is indeterminate whether the loanword is assigned to the same gender or to a different gender than the equivalent term in SMG.

- (23) *to* *trác-i*
 DEF.N.NOM.SG truck(N)-NOM.SG
 ‘the truck’

SMG

to *fortiyó* *i* *dalíka*
 DEF.N.NOM.SG truck(N)-NOM.SG DEF.F.NOM.SG truck(F)-NOM.SG

- (24) *i* *yuéntz-a*
 DEF.F.NOM.SG wage(F)-NOM.SG
 ‘the wage’

SMG

o *misθós* *i* *amiví / plíromí*
 DEF.M.NOM.SG wage(M)-NOM.SG DEF.F.NOM.SG wage(F)-NOM.SG

- (25) *to* *bóks-i*
 DEF.N.NOM.SG box(N)-NOM.SG
 ‘the box’

SMG

to *kutí* *i* *kúta*
 DEF.N.NOM.SG box(N)-NOM.SG DEF.F.NOM.SG box(F)-NOM.SG

Double gender assignment is found in (26)–(27).

- (26) a. *to* *búc-i*
 DEF.N.NOM.SG book(N)-NOM.SG
 ‘the book’

- b. *to* *búk-o*
 DEF.N.NOM.SG book(N)-NOM.SG
 ‘the book’

SMG

to *vívlío*
 DEF.N.NOM.SG book(N)-NOM.SG

(27) a. *to* *rúf-i*
 DEF.N.NOM.SG roof(N)-NOM.SG
 ‘the roof’

b. *o* *rúf-is*
 DEF.M.NOM.SG roof(M)-NOM.SG
 ‘the roof’

SMG
to *taváni*
 DEF.N.NOM.SG roof(N)-NOM.SG

i *orofí*
 DEF.F.NOM.SG roof(F)-NOM.SG

Loanwords denoting male humans are grammatically masculine (28), (30), and loanwords denoting female humans are grammatically feminine (29).

(28) *o* *bós-is*
 DEF.M.NOM.SG boss(M)-NOM.SG
 ‘the male boss’

(29) *i* *bós-ena*
 DEF.F.NOM.SG boss(F)-NOM.SG
 ‘the female boss’

(30) *o* *púft-as*
 DEF.M.NOM.SG poofter(M)-NOM.SG
 ‘the poofter’

There is also one adjective borrowed from English that combines the English stem *flash*, the Greek derivational suffix *-ik-* and the suffix *-o*, which is marked for gender, case and number. In (31), the suffix *-o* is inflected for neuter gender, accusative case and singular number.

(31) *íce* *flásiko* *aftocínito*
 have.3SG.PST flashy.N.ACC.SG car(N)-ACC.SG
 ‘He had a flashy car.’

Similar loanwords are also reported by Seaman (1972, 182–185) and Tamis (1986, 132–137) for the Greek spoken in the US and in Australia respectively. These loanwords adapt the imported stem to Greek phonology. For example, the English stem in the words *fláti*, *flóri*, *káro*, *búko*, *xotéli*, *bási*, and *bóksi* is adapted in terms of Greek pronunciation. Phonological adaption is also accomplished via omission of final consonant (*yard* > *yári*) and nasalization (*wage* > *yuéntza*).

Overall, these loanwords are phonologically and morpho-syntactically integrated in the Greek language system, and are used interchangeably with the equivalent SMG terms. In some cases, speakers are aware of the status of these loanwords as borrowed items. For example, certain speakers reported that using these terms in conversations in Greece caused confusion and misunderstanding with other Greek speakers.

3.2 Grammatical treatment of loanwords

Although Greek and English are genetically related, they are not structurally similar. Greek is highly inflectional, while English is not. Greek nouns are inflected for gender, case and number. English loanwords in Greek are also assigned to a specific gender, and inflect for number and case. This section focuses on gender assignment to loanwords.

In SMG, the grammatical gender system is divided into three inflectional paradigms or declensions, which correspond to masculine, feminine, and neuter (Triantafyllidis [1941] 2005), illustrated with (32).

(32) Masculine

o *ðrómos*
 DEF.M.NOM.SG road(M).NOM.SG
 ‘the road’

Feminine

i *elpíða*
 DEF.F.NOM.SG hope(F).NOM.SG
 ‘the hope’

Neuter

to *vivlío*
 DEF.N.NOM.SG book(N).NOM.SG
 ‘the book’

All nouns, adjectives, articles, passive participles, and certain pronouns and numerals inflect for masculine, feminine and neuter gender. Gender assignment in nouns denoting humans is sex-based. In general, nouns denoting male humans are grammatically masculine, and nouns denoting female humans are grammatically feminine. Gender assignment in nouns denoting inanimate objects is semantically arbitrary; yet, a few exceptions are found (e.g. nouns denoting countries, islands and cities tend to be grammatically feminine, Anastasiadi-Symeonidi and Chila-Markopoulou 2003, 27). Moreover, in Greek, nouns are assigned to specific genders according to morphological principles (detailed accounts of gender assignment principles can be found in Triantafyllidis [1941] 2005, 225–253; Holton, Mackridge and Philippaki-Warburton 1997, 48–72).³

The gender of a loanword is determined either by gender assignment rules in the recipient language, or gender assignment rules in the source language. For instance, Haugen (1953) found that most English borrowings in Norwegian become masculine, but they become feminine or neuter if they are associated with a feminine or neuter morpheme in Norwegian. If they denote a female referent, they become grammatically feminine. The sex of the referent also determines gender assignment to English loanwords in Puerto Rican Spanish in New York City, and to English loanwords in Montreal French (Poplack et al. 1982; Poplack et al. 1988). Gender assignment rules of the source language seem to be dominant in French loanwords in Brussels. Treffers-Daller (1994) showed that words that are masculine or feminine in French remain masculine or feminine when borrowed in Dutch. Stolz (2009) reports similar findings for Italo-Romance loans in Maltese.

Loanwords in Modern Greek and in Greek dialects are assigned to gender according to semantic and morpho-phonological gender assignment rules in Greek. For example, Ralli et al. (2015) found that Romance and Turkish loanwords in Heptanesian and Pontic Modern Greek dialects become feminine if they have female reference, and masculine if they have male reference, whereas loans denoting non-humans tend to become neuter. Moreover, Ralli et al. (2015) showed that the endings that match the Greek ones are reanalyzed as pieces of Greek inflection or as stem-final segments, and through them the integrated nouns are allocated to specific inflectional paradigms. In Modern Greek, referent's sex is an important factor in assigning gender to loanwords (Anastasiadi-

3 For different proposals for the classification of SMG nouns into inflectional classes see Alexiadou and Müller (2004), Anastasiadi-Symeonidi and Chila-Markopoulou (2003), Klairis and Babiniotis (1996) and Ralli (2002).

Symeonidi 1994; Christofidou 2003). Very often, loanwords denoting inanimate objects become neuter (Anastasiadi-Symeonidi and Chila-Markopoulou 2003, 36).

In Greek-Australian English contact in Cairns, English loanwords are assigned gender according to semantic and morphological gender assignment principles in Greek (cf. Anastasiadi-Symeonidi 1994; Christofidou 2003; Ralli et al. 2015). For example, loanwords denoting male humans are grammatically masculine (e.g. *o bósis* ‘the male boss’), and loanwords denoting female humans are grammatically feminine (e.g. *i bósena* ‘the female boss’). The endings of loanwords that match the Greek endings are reanalyzed as pieces of Greek inflection and through them loanwords are allocated to specific declensions. For example, loanwords ending in *-a* are feminine, and loanwords ending in *-o* and *-i* are neuter. Nineteen out of the 27 loanwords referring to the inanimate world are assigned the neuter gender.⁴ As we will see in § 4.1.2, neuter is also the dominant gender in single word switches.

3.3 Loanshifts

The other type of lexical borrowing found in the data is loanshifts. These are pure loan translations or calques, i.e. complex lexical units, either single words or fixed phrasal expressions, which combine native morphemes in imitation of the foreign pattern. Overall, 22 calques were found in the data, marked with bold face in (33)–(41).

(33) *γράφο* *káto* *ta* *onómata*
 write.1SG.PRS **down** DEF.N.ACC.PL name(N).ACC.PL
 ‘I write the names down.’

(34) *aftós éspase*
 he **break.3SG.PST**
 ‘(He) went broke.’

(35) *pçáse* *to* *plío*
 catch.2SG.IMP DEF.N.ACC.SG boat(N).ACC.SG
 ‘Catch the boat.’

4 It is not clear whether in gender assignment to loanwords inflection class dominates or is dominated by gender. See Ralli et al. (2015) for further discussion.

- (36) *vreméni* *epočí*
wet.F.NOM.SG season(F).NOM.SG
 ‘wet season’
- (37) *prin na éxune peđjá*
 before **SBJV have.3PL** kid(N).ACC.PL
 ‘before they had kids’
- (38) *ða se spróxno*
FUT you.ACC.SG push.1SG.IPFV
 ‘I will push/urge you.’
- (39) *đino lift*
give.1SG.PRS
 ‘I give a lift.’
- (40) *me rotúsane na káno éna dish*
me ask.3PL.IMPER SBJV make.1SG one.N.ACC
 ‘They asked me to make a dish.’
- (41) *kánume kalá me ti mitéra tu*
do.1PL.PRS well with DEF.F.ACC.SG mother(F).ACC.SG his
 ‘We are doing okay with his mum.’

These lexical units copy syntactic and semantic patterns found in English and consist of “an item-by-item translation of the (complex) source unit” (Haspelmath 2009, 39). The calques found in Greek are probably due to frequency, and do not seem to be associated with salient cultural practices or perceived ‘gaps’ in the Greek language (cf. Aikhenvald 2006, 25). Similar calques are also reported by Seaman (1972, 169–170) for the Greek spoken in the US and by Tamis (1986, 172–178) for the Greek spoken in Australia.

3.4 *Diffusion of discourse patterns*

Diffusion of discourse patterns, such as formulaic greetings or other routinized phrases, has been reported in a number of language contact situations (e.g. Ameka 2006, 138–139; Epps 2006, 285). Indications of diffusion of discourse patterns are also found in Greek-Australian English contact in Cairns, illustrated with (42)–(43).

When a first-generation female Greek called me on my phone and did not reach me, she left the following voice mail.

- (42) *ja su anjeliki. eyó íme tu Peter*
 hello you Angeliki(F).VOC.SG I COP.1SG.PRS DEF.M.GEN.SG
i jajá.
 DEF.F.NOM.SG grandmother(F).NOM.SG
 ‘Hello Angeliki. It’s me, Peter’s grandmother.’

The usual formulation in SMG would have been *íme i jajá tu Peter* [COP.1SG.PRS DEF.F.NOM.SG grandmother(F).NOM.SG DEF.M.GEN.SG Peter], whereby the copula verb marks first person singular, the first person singular pronoun (*eyó*) is omitted, and the head is followed by the possessive in the noun phrase. Although the formulation *eyó íme tu Peter i jajá* is grammatically correct in SMG, it is not the default practice for delivering the specific action. Greek is a pro-drop language, i.e. pronouns may be omitted since person is marked in the verb form. When speakers use subject pronouns, they may indicate that something more than referring is being done (cf. Pavlidou 2012). In (42), no extra interactional task is accomplished besides self-reference. Moreover, although SMG allows for both [NP + NP_{GEN}] and [NP_{GEN} + NP] orders, the second order can be used as a pragmatic strategy to lend focus to the referent introduced by the NP_{GEN}. Such a strategy sounds untypical for (42), whereby identification and recognition of the caller is expected via a recognitional referring expression in initial position that picks out the caller, rather than a third party related to the caller.

Another instance of diffusion is reported by another first-generation female Greek. Once she visited a clothes shop in Greece, and asked the employee for a specific size (43).

- (43) *parakaló tha borúsate na mu dósete*
 please.1SG.PRS FUT can.2PL.PFV SBJV me give.2PL.PFV
to número dóddeka?
 DEF.N.ACC.SG number(N).ACC.SG twelve
 ‘Could you please give me number twelve?’

The employee asked her if she was a foreigner, because her request sounded unusual. It was too indirect and polite for Greek standards. The usual formulation in Greek would have been more direct, for instance via the present indicative interrogative *mu dínete to número dóddeka?* ‘Can you give me number twelve?’ that expresses immediacy. As Sifianou (1992) has shown, the politeness system in British English is more negative-face oriented, whereas the system in Greek is more positive-face oriented. This cross-cultural difference is reflected in the ways in which the negative-face threatening speech act

(Brown and Levinson 1987) of requesting is formulated in the two languages. In Greek, requests are more straightforward, whereas in English requests are more indirect. (43) indicates a similar cross-cultural difference between Greek and Australian English. The female speaker deploys a more elaborate utterance to deliver the request, imitating the English practice, and departs from the more direct formulation, which is expected in Greek. This is why her request is 'noticed' by the Greek employee.

3.5 *Interim summary*

Overall, the contact-induced changes found in the Greek spoken in Cairns, Australia, are system-preserving, and involve lexical borrowings, that consist of loanwords and loanshifts. There are also indications of diffusion of discourse patterns. These borrowings from English are due to intense contact with the English-speaking host community and cultural pressure associated with the prestige of the dominant group (cf. Myers-Scotton 2006, 216–217; Winford 2003, 33–34). Lexical borrowings are found in the speech of both first and second-generation Greeks, and across different ages.

English forms make their way into Greek via code switching. Code switching patterns in Australian Greek talk-in-interaction is the topic of the next section.

4 Code switching in Australian Greek talk-in-interaction

Three patterns of code switching are found in Australian Greek talk-in-interaction: conversational code switching, participant-related code switching, and code mixing (cf. § 1.1). In the next sections, I examine code mixing and participant-related switching.

4.1 *Mixing Greek with English*

Mixing Greek with English produces utterances with hybrid structures in which most of the lexicon and morpho-syntax comes from Greek, i.e. the matrix language, and single words or phrases are inserted from English, i.e. the embedded language (cf. Myers-Scotton 1993). Unlike loanwords (cf. § 3.1), single-word switches do not display phonological and morphological adaptation, and are not tokens of established or completed language change. Some of the switches may reflect gradual processes of integration into the Greek language, and thus constitute "regular" switches (Haspelmath 2009, 41).

In code mixing, Greek sets the grammatical frame for mixed constituents: it provides the morpheme order and system morphemes. Content morphemes are incorporated from English into the Greek frame. In code mixed utterances,

the number of Greek morphemes usually exceeds that of English morphemes. English content morphemes that appear in code mixed utterances are congruent with their Greek counterparts: they are similar in semantics, categorical status, syntactic and morphological properties, and discourse/pragmatic function. Single or multi-unit insertions consist of adjectives, nouns, noun phrases, verb phrases, adverbs, complement or main clauses, and pragmatic particles. Over 1000 occurrences of momentary insertions of English words and phrases were found in the corpus.

4.1.1 Adjectives

English adjectives are usually inserted in copula constructions as copula complements, as is shown in (44)–(48) (switches are marked with bold face).

(44) *épine* *ce* *ítane* ***violent.***
 drink.3SG.IMPER and COP.3SG.PST
 ‘He was drinking and he was violent.’

(45) *aftó* *íne* ***global.***
 this.N.NOM.SG COP.3SG.PRS
 ‘This is global.’

(46) *íne* *pço* ***easy*** *ja* *aftús.*
 COP.3SG.PRS more for them
 ‘It’s easier for them.’

(47) *íne* ***busy*** *i* *jitojá.*
 COP.3SG.PRS DEF.F.NOM.SG neighbourhood(F).NOM.SG
 ‘The neighbourhood is busy.’

(48) *óla* ***plastic*** *íne.*
 all.N.NOM COP.3PL.PRS
 ‘They are all plastic.’

English adjectives are also inserted as modifiers in noun phrases, as is shown in (49)–(50).

(49) *ton* ***pink*** *solomó*
 DEF.M.ACC.SG salmon(M).ACC.SG
 ‘the pink salmon’

- (50) *ðen ékana hard ðuclés.*
 NEG do.1SG.PST job(F).ACC.PL
 ‘I didn’t do hard jobs.’

4.1.2 Nouns

Insertions often involve English nouns and noun phrases, illustrated with (51)–(54), and (55)–(59) respectively.

- (51) *íxane heaters pu zesténane*
 have.3PL.PST CONJ heat.3PL.IMPER
 ‘They had heaters that heated’

- (52) *ðen ipírçe competition.*
 NEG COP.3SG.IMPER
 ‘There was no competition.’

- (53) *ja holiday íne nice.*
 for COP.3SG.PRS
 ‘It’s nice for a holiday.’

- (54) *íne san house.*
 COP.3SG.PRS like
 ‘It’s like a house.’

- (55) *ítan beautiful people.*
 COP.3PL.PST
 ‘They were beautiful people.’

- (56) *íne long story na su po.*
 COP.3SG.PRS SBJV you.GEN.SG tell.1SG.PFV
 ‘It’s a long story to tell you.’

- (57) *káname right job*
 do.1PL.PST
 ‘We did the right job.’

- (58) *ta meyalónune se fresh water.*
 them grow.up.3PL.PRS in
 ‘They grow them in fresh water.’

- (59) *íce* *good life.*
 have.3SG.PST
 'He had a good life.'

In general, neuter gender is assigned to the English nouns inserted, as is shown in (60)–(70).

- (60) *ótan ðulévis ja to community*
 when work.2SG.PRS for DEF.N.ACC.SG
 'When you work for the community'

- (61) *se pço department*
 in which.N.ACC.SG
 'In which department'

- (62) *íxa to passport*
 have.1SG.PST DEF.N.ACC.SG
 'I had the passport'

- (63) *sto Brazil*
 in DEF.N.ACC.SG
 'in Brazil'

- (64) *sto Cook Island*
 in DEF.N.ACC.SG
 'in Cook Island'

- (65) *ímastan kaló committee.*
 COP.1PL.PST good.N.NOM.SG
 'We were a good committee.'

- (66) *to past íne past, to pérases*
 DEF.N.NOM.SG COP.3SG.PRS it pass.2SG.PST
 'The past is the past, you've been through it.'

- (67) *píso apó ta counter*
 behind from DEF.N.ACC.PL
 'behind the counters'

- (68) *ðen trójete to bloody fish.*
 NEG eat.PASS.3SG.PRS DEF.N.NOM.SG
 ‘You cannot eat the bloody fish.’
- (69) *sto spare time ðulévi*
 in DEF.N.ACC.SG work.3SG.PRS
 ‘In her spare time she works.’
- (70) *ótan cítaksa to tiléfono íçe*
 when look.1SG.PST DEF.N.ACC.SG telephone(N).ACC.SG have.3SG.PST
tría missed calls.
 three.N.ACC
 ‘When I checked my phone, I had three missed calls.’

Yet, English nouns denoting countries and states (71–72), cities (73), or days (74) may also be assigned to feminine gender.

- (71) *ti New Zealand*
 DEF.F.ACC.SG
 ‘New Zealand’
- (72) *tin Tasmania*
 DEF.F.ACC.SG Tasmania
 ‘Tasmania’
- (73) *ti Melbourne*
 DEF.F.ACC.SG Melbourne
 ‘Melbourne’
- (74) *aftín tin Thursday*
 this.F.ACC.SG DEF.F.ACC.SG Thursday
 ‘this Thursday’

The assignment of feminine gender to nouns denoting days may be due to the fact that in Greek, 6 out of the 7 days of the week are grammatically feminine. The assignment of feminine gender to nouns denoting countries may be motivated by the tendency for Greek nouns denoting countries to be grammatically feminine (cf. Anastasiadi-Symeonidi and Chila-Markopoulou 2003, 27), and the tendency for English nouns denoting countries to be personified as female (cf. Mathiot 1979).

nouns, noun phrases, adjectives, and participles. These constructions are known in the literature as Bilingual Compound Verbs (cf. Edwards and Gardner-Chloros 2007; Muysken 2000), Light Verb Strategy (cf. Wohlgemuth 2009), or *do*-construction (cf. Myers-Scotton 2002). In this study, I employ the term Bilingual Compound Verbs (henceforth BCVs). BCVs consist of an embedded language verb (or other lexical item), and a matrix language ‘helping’ verb meaning ‘do/make’ or ‘be/become’ (Muysken 2000, 184–185). The embedded language lexical item carries the semantic information of the complex predicate, while the matrix language auxiliary-like verb bears the inflection and all grammatical functions of the predicate.

BCVs are common across various language contact situations, such as English-Spanish (Pfaff 1976; Silva-Corvalán 1994), Panjabi-English (Romaine 1986), Malay-Dutch (Muysken 2000), German-Hungarian (Moravcsik 1975), Greek-American English (Seaman 1972), Greek-Australian English (Tamis 1986), Greek-Canadian English (Maniakas 1991), and Cypriot Greek-British English (Fotiou 2010; Gardner-Chloros 1992). In Myers-Scotton’s (2002, 35) words, the construction “knows no typological or geographic limits” and occurs across agglutinating, fusional, and inflectional languages.

In the BCVs in the Greek variety of Cairns, the verbs *káno* and *jínome* are combined with English verbs or other lexical items (verbs are more common), and create complex predicates, illustrated below:

- (i) Greek verb *káno* + English verbs or verb phrases: *káno enjoy* (‘I enjoy’), *káno use* (‘I use’), *káno advise* (‘I advise’), *káno retire* (‘I retire’), *káno travel* (‘I travel’), *káno think* (‘I think’), *káno attract* (‘I attract’), *káno read* (‘I read’), *káno move* (‘I move’), *káno press* (‘I press’), *káni explode* (‘it explodes’), *káno look after* (‘I look after’), *káno attract people from other cities* (‘I attract people from other cities’), *káno design clothes* (‘I design clothes’), *káno invent something* (‘I invent something’);
- (ii) Greek verb *káno* + English nouns and noun phrases: *káno exams* (‘I give exams’), *káno feeling* (‘I feel’), *káno good time* (‘I enjoy/have a good time’), *káno vacuum cleaner* (‘I use the vacuum cleaner’), *káno high school* (‘I go to high school’); and
- (iii) Greek verb *káno* or *jínome* + English adjectives and participles: *jínome shocked* (‘I am shocked’), *káno stuck* (‘I am stuck’).

The native light verbs carry all grammatical information of the predicate, and the semantic information is associated with the foreign inserted items. The English items transfer their thematic properties to the Greek light verbs, and carry the meaning of the complex predicate. Inserted verbs can be transitive or intransitive, and are treated as nominal within these constructions.

- (85) 1 (.)
 2 Marilena => **Well**, ítan ci ecíni kaθijités ce o John ítan kaθijitís,
 ‘Well, they were also teachers and John was a
 teacher.’

(86) comes from a story telling about Kostantina’s arrival in Australia, and the first years of her residence in the country. After a parenthetical sequence that closes in line 3, Kostantina uses *and then* to continue the telling of the events (line 5). She employs *and then/and* (line 5, 6, 11) to express time continuity and establish succession between the events narrated (cf. Schiffrin 1987, 128).

- (86) 1 Kostantina >Ikosi oxtó xronón ímun pu írtha eðó.<
 ‘I was twenty eight years old when I arrived here.’
 2 (0.6)
 3 Researcher °Mikrúla.
 ‘Very young.’
 4 (0.7)
 5 Kostantina => **And then** sa írthame eðó:, **and then** e >épçasa ðulá,
 ‘And then when we came here, and then eh I found
 a job,’
 6 => ta pedjá píyan< sxolío katefθían, (0.7) **and then**
 épçasa
 ‘kids went to school straight away, (0.7) and then I
 started’
 7 ðulá sto rápsimo,
 ‘working as a seamstress,’
 8 (.)
 9 Axá,
 ‘Aha,’
 10 (0.9)
 ((4 lines omitted))
 11 Kostantina => **and** káname leftá;
 ‘and we earned money.’

In (87), *but* marks contrast between the preceding and the upcoming unit (cf. Schiffrin 1987, 152).

- (87) 1 Minas => i: anipsçá mu íçe teliósi: jeolóγos, **but** ðen borúse
 na vri <típota>

'My niece studied geology, but she couldn't find anything'

In (88) and (89), speakers employ *so* and *because* to convey meanings of result and cause respectively.

(88) 1 Kostantina Miláo misí óra, pliróno ðío ðolária,
 'I speak for half an hour, I pay two dollars,'
 2 => °so (.) tus telefonó.
 'so, (.) I call them.'

(89) 1 Petroula jaftó ðen epíya stin ekkisía.
 'That's why I didn't go to the church.'
 2 (0.9)
 3 Petroula => Ti:n cirjací. **becau::se** (1.2) °e::° ímuna kurazméni.
 'On Sunday. Because (1.2) eh I was tired.'

So is also used as a marker of transition (cf. Schiffrin 1987, 217) in (90). In line 2, Minas returns to the activity that was interrupted in the preceding lines: he continues presenting photos of Greeks in Cairns. He starts his turn with the particle *so* to mark transition to the activity.

(90) 1 (1.7)
 2 Minas So. (.) ótan ðis aftín saftín ti fotoyrafía, (0.9) aftí i i:
 jinéka
 'So. (.) when you see this in this photo, (0.9) this woman'

4.1.6 Adverbs, prepositional phrases and clauses

Speakers insert adverbs from English to modify clauses (91–93) or adjectives (94).

(91) *tu éðose yráma officially.*
 him give.3SG.PST letter(N).ACC.SG
 'He gave him a letter officially.'

(92) *Probably ðen tin íðes.*
 NEG her see.2SG.PST
 'You probably didn't see her.'

- (93) *óti information na kséri kápços,*
 whatever SBJV know.3SG.PRS someone.M.NOM.SG
straightway ða pári tiléfono.
 FUT take.3SG.PFV telephone(N).ACC.SG
 ‘If someone knows something, he will call straightway.’
- (94) *alá íne really strong.*
 but COP.3SG.PRS
 ‘But she is really strong.’

Insertions also include English prepositional phrases (95)–(96) or clauses (97)–(98).

- (95) *ótan íse under pressure*
 when COP.2SG.PRS
 ‘When you are under pressure’
- (96) *to neró íne like a lake ecí.*
 DEF.N.NOM.SG water(N).NOM.SG COP.3SG.PRS there
 ‘Water is like a lake there.’
- (97) **It must have been the day before or something like this**
pu tu íxa milísi ce ítane
 CONJ him have.1SG.PST speak.PFV and COP.3SG.PST
nevriazménos mazí mu.
 angry.M.NOM.SG with me
 ‘It must have been the day before or something like this that I had spoken to him and he was angry with me.’
- (98) *ótan ton iða teleftéa forá,*
 when him see.1SG.PST last time
he was very excited to see me.
 ‘The last time I saw him, he was very excited to see me.’

Greek immigrants often describe the code-mixed utterances examined above as ‘Greek Australian’. This type of code mixing is not socially and interactionally motivated, and should be understood as a “discourse mode”, in Poplack’s (1980, 614) words, that belongs to the repertoire of the speech community. As Poplack (1980, 614) argues, it is the choice or not of this mode “which is of significance to participants rather than the choice of switch points”. Code mixing is a pattern

agrees with the completion, by repeating the researcher's prior saying [*>Na tus provlé]psis me típota.<* 'You cannot] predict them in any way', line 9).

- (100) 1 Takis Ne. =i skorpçí ine polí ðinatí xaraktíres.
'Yes. =Scorpios have very strong characters.'
- 2 Researcher Polí ðína[tí, .h ce ka]tastréfode, aftokatastrofici
ine líyo,
'Very strong, .h and they destroy themselves, they
are a bit self-destructive,'
- 3 Takis [Ce polí:]
'And very'
- 4 Researcher alá metá::=
'but afterwards'=
- 5 Takis => =polí::: (0.6) pos to léne. (1.3) **unpredictable.**
= 'very (0.6) how do they call it? (1.3)
unpredictable.'
- 6 (0.6)
- 7 Takis E:: >ðe borís< (0.7)
'Eh you cannot (0.7)'
- 8 Researcher Na tus provlépsis [me °típota.]
'[You cannot] predict them in any way.'
- 9 Takis [*>Na tus provlé]psis me típota.<*
'[You cannot] predict them in any way.'

Example (101) comes from a story telling about Kostantina's son. In line 1, Kostantina has trouble retrieving a word (*ine-pos na su po*. 'he is- how should I explain this to you.'). In line 3, she inserts the English adjective *friendly*, and initiates a word-search sequence, whereby she requests the correct Greek word and gives an account for her incompetence (*pos to léne [sta: I] don't know::, sta eliniká?* 'how do we say this in I don't know, in Greek?'). The researcher provides the word *filikós* ('friendly') in line 5. In line 6, Kostantina accepts the researcher's answer by repeating the Greek word and employing the positive response token *yes*. In the next turn constructional unit, the speaker delivers a self-assessment (*>ksexásame< ta eliniká*. 'we forgot Greek.') that marks her incompetence in retrieving the Greek word as worthy of on-topic talk. She refers to herself as part of a collectivity via first person plural. This collectivity includes Greeks living in Australia and introduces the speaker's Greek-Australian identity as a feature that is interactionally relevant. After completing her turn, Kostantina starts laughing, and invites the recipient to laugh (Jefferson 1979). The recipient accepts that invitation by placing the laugh just

after onset of speaker's laughter (line 7). Shared laughter establishes affiliation between speaker and recipient, and indexes the recipient's shared alignment about the identity indexed (cf. Liebscher and Dailey-O'Cain 2013).

- (101) 1 Kostantina Pan ayorázun ce tróne, kséris íne- pos na su po.
'They go buy things and eat, you know he is- how
should I explain this to you.'
- 2 (.)
- 3 Kostantina **Friendly.** pos to léne [sta: I] don't know::, sta
eliniká?
'Friendly. how do we say this in I don't know, in
Greek?'
- 4 Researcher [Ne ne ne.]
'Yes yes yes.'
- 5 Researcher => **Filikós.**
'Friendly.'
- 6 Kostantina => **Filikós.** °yes.° >ksexásame< ta eliniká. ((*she*
laughs[.....]...))
'Friendly. yes. we forgot Greek.'
- 7 Researcher [((*she laughs*))]
- 8 Kostantina yeah.
- 9 (1.2)
- 10 Researcher Cinonikó pedí. cinonikós ánthropos.
'[He is a] sociable kid. [He is a] sociable man.'

The participant-related switches examined above display a number of vocal features that indicate that the speaker cannot immediately locate the appropriate word in Greek. These features are sound stretches (*íçe:-, polí:::*), cut offs (*íçe:-, íne-*), pauses, and wh-questions (*pos to léne, pos na su po*). Goodwin (1983) considers these features to be typical of word searches in interaction. The insertions of English items, which are related to the lexical retrieval problems in Greek, trigger incidental word-search sequences, which are embedded in the ongoing talk. After the speaker inserts the English item and displays his/her incompetence in finding the word in question, s/he initiates the incidental sequence by requesting the correct word. This request may be formulated via a wh-question. The request is the first pair part initiating the word-search sequence and projects the relevance of an answer as a second pair part. The addressee delivers the answer that consists of the correct Greek word the requester is looking for. The requester accepts the answer by repeating the correct word.

In participant-related switches, speakers orient to the ‘other language’ character of the inserted item, and treat the insertion as ‘inappropriate’ verbal activity (Auer 1984, 60). These switches reveal speakers’ incompetence in Greek, and preference for monolingual talk with the researcher, and may also bring speaker’s Australian Greek identity to focused attention in interaction.⁶

5 What can we conclude?

To sum up, the present study shows that language contact-induced changes in the Greek variety of Cairns, Australia, are minor and system-preserving. These changes involve borrowing of lexical items and discourse patterns. Code mixing is also extensive in Australian Greek talk-in-interaction. Usually, switches from Greek to English carry no local meaning. Yet, sometimes, they are related to speakers’ competences in the two languages used.

Overall, the findings reported in this study align with and complement the findings reported by previous studies about Greek-English contact in the US, Australia, Canada, and the UK (cf. Fotiou 2010; Gardner-Chloros 1992; Maniakas 1991; Seaman 1972; Tamis 1986). Moreover, the present study provides evidence for the borrowing of discourse patterns and analyzes code mixing and participant related switching in naturally occurring conversations with Greek immigrants. It contributes to the understanding of contact-induced change in Greek spoken in diaspora, and the patterns of code switching in bilingual conversation (cf. Auer 1984; 1998).

5.1 *Factors facilitating language maintenance*

The main factors facilitating the maintenance of Greek in Cairns concern the “social ecology” (Winford 2003, 26) of the contact situation examined. More specifically, the maintenance of Greek is due to language attitudes and the kinds of contact established within the Greek community, and between the Greek community and the dominant English-speaking community.

Clyne and Kipp (1999, 42) argue that “postwar Greek immigrants and their children had an unusually successful history of language maintenance”, which is due to “the interrelation of religion, language and a sense of ‘belonging’ as cultural core values”. This insightful description fits well with the contact

6 The study of the relation between code switching and identity goes beyond the scope of the present article. See Hall and Nilep (2015) for an overview of research on code switching and identity.

situation in Cairns. The Greek language has a core cultural value for the continuation of Greeks as a group in Cairns. Language is seen as cultural capital that defines group membership, and contributes to preserving Greek cultural heritage and ethnic identity. Moreover, the Greek language has maintained its economic or marketplace value, given that Greeks often worked together with other Greeks.

First-generation Greeks in Cairns have maintained a borderline between an “externally open” and an “internally tightly knit and closed” community (Aikhenvald 2006, 38). They married within their ethnic group, and socialized at the ethnically homogeneous Parish. Most of them maintained closed bonds with relatives and friends in Greece. Greek immigrants often criticize mixed marriages between Greeks and non-Greeks as threatening the maintenance of ethnic identity. Interestingly, there is a coinage that refers to the process of becoming less Greek and similar to foreigners: *ksenévo* ‘become like a foreigner’ (root word *ksénos* ‘foreigner’ + verb ending *-évo* ‘1SG.PRS’). Once a first-generation female informant made the following derogatory comment about other Greeks who got married with non-Greeks and have cut their bonds from the Greek community: *padréftikan me ksénus ce éxune ksenépsi*. ‘They got married to foreigners and they have become like foreigners.’ Sometimes, it was the nature of work in advanced capitalist Australia that did not allow lots of interaction with other non-Greeks, as a first-generation male informant explained to me: *Polí élines ðen máðane eglézika, jatí eksartáte pu ðulévis*. *‘Ama tse kápu pu ðulévis píso, ðen vlépis kanénan óli méra, ðen milás me kanénane, kséxasé to.’* ‘Many Greeks did not learn how to speak English, because it depends on where you work. If you work at the back, you don’t see anyone all day, and you don’t speak with anyone, forget about it.’

For the reasons discussed above, the Greek community in Cairns has been resistant to extensive contact-induced innovations. When the first and second generation of Greeks passes away, language shift is the next stage to follow, given that third-generation Greeks in Cairns have very limited or no grammatical and communicative competence in Greek.

References

- Abbi, Anvita. 2001. *A Manual of Linguistic Fieldwork and Structures of Indian Languages*. Munich: Lincom Europa.

7 The phrase *kséxasé to* [forget.2SG.PFV it] ‘forget about it’ is a calque from English.

- Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. 2002. *Language Contact in Amazonia*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. 2006. Grammars in contact: A cross-linguistic perspective. In *Grammars in Contact: A Cross-Linguistic Typology*, ed. by Alexandra Y. Aikhenvald and R.M.W. Dixon, 1–66. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. 2014. *The Art of Grammar: A Practical Guide*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. and R.M.W. Dixon. 2009. Speaking Greek in diaspora: Language contact and language change. *Hellenic Studies* 17:55–76.
- Alexiadou, Artemis and Gereon Müller. 2004. Class features as probes. Ms., Universität Stuttgart & IDS Mannheim.
- Alvanoudi, Angeliki. 2016. Συνομιλιακή εναλλαγή γλωσσών σε μια ελληνική κοινότητα της Αυστραλίας [Conversational code switching in an Australian Greek community]. In *Ελληνική Γλώσσα και Προφορική Επικοινωνία* [The Greek Language and Spoken Interaction], ed. by Theodossia-Soula Pavlidou, 61–77. Thessaloniki: Institute of Modern Greek Studies.
- Ameka, Felix. K. 2006. Grammars in contact in the Volta Basin (West Africa): On contact-induced grammatical change in Lipke. In *Grammars in Contact: A Cross-Linguistic Typology*, ed. by A.Y. Aikhenvald and R.M.W. Dixon, 114–142. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Anastasiadi-Symeonidi, Anna. 1994. *Νεολογικός δανεισμός: Άμεσα δάνεια από τη γαλλική και την αγγλοαμερικανική. Μορφολογική Ανάλυση* [Neological Borrowing in Modern Greek: Direct Loans from French and English. Morpho-Phonological Analysis]. Thessaloniki: Aristotle University of Thessaloniki.
- Anastasiadi-Symeonidi, Anna and Despoina Cheila-Markopoulou. 2003. Συγχρονικές και διαχρονικές τάσεις στο γένος της ελληνικής: Μια θεωρητική πρόταση [Synchronic and diachronic tendencies in gender in Greek: A theoretical proposal]. In *Γένος* [Gender], ed. by Anna Anastasiadi-Symeonidi, Angela Ralli and Despoina Cheila-Markopoulou, 13–56. Athens: Patakis.
- Auer, Peter. 1984. *Bilingual Conversation*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Auer, Peter. 1995. The pragmatics of code-switching: A sequential approach. In *One Speaker, Two Languages: Cross-Disciplinary Perspectives on Code-Switching*, ed. by Lesley Milroy and Pieter Muysken, 115–135. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Auer, Peter. (ed.) 1998. *Code-switching in Conversation: Language, Interaction, and Identity*. London: Routledge.
- Auer, Peter. 1999. From codeswitching via language mixing to fused lects: Toward a dynamic typology of bilingual speech. *International Journal of Bilingualism* 3(4). 309–332.
- Blom, Jan-Petter P. and John J. Gumperz. 1972. Social meaning in linguistic structure: Code-switching in Norway. In *Directions in Sociolinguistics: The Ethnography of Com-*

- munication*, ed. by John J. Gumperz and Dell Hymes, 407–434. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.
- Brown, Penelope and Stephen C. Levinson. 1987. *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Christofidou, Anastasia. 2003. Γένος και κλίση στην ελληνική (Μια φυσική προσέγγιση) [Gender and inflection in Greek (A natural approach)]. In *Γένος* [Gender], ed. by Anna Anastasiadi-Symeonidi, Angela Ralli and Despoina Cheila-Markopoulou, 100–131. Athens: Patakis.
- Clyne, Michael. 2003. *Dynamics of Language Contact: English and Immigrant Languages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Clyne, Michael and Sandra Kipp. 1999. *Pluricentric Languages in an Immigrant Context: Spanish, Arabic and Chinese*. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Dawkins, Richard McGillivray. 1916. *Modern Greek in Asia Minor: A Study of the Dialects of Silli, Cappadocia and Phárasa with Grammar, Texts, Translations and Glossary*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dixon, R.M.W. 2007. Field linguistics: A minor manual. *STUF—Sprachtypologie und Universalienforschung* 60(1).12–31.
- Dixon, R.M.W. 2010. *Basic Linguistic Theory. Vol. 1. Methodology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Eckert, Penelope. 2000. *Linguistic Variation as Social Practice: The Linguistic Construction of Identity in Belten High*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Edwards, Malcolm and Penelope Gardner-Chloros. 2007. Compound verbs in code-switching: Bilinguals making do? *International Journal of Bilingualism* 11(1).73–91.
- Epps, Patience. 2006. The Vaupés melting pot: Tucanoan influence on Hup. In *Grammars in Contact: A Cross-Linguistic Typology*, ed. by A.Y. Aikhenvald and R.M.W. Dixon, 267–289. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Fotiou, Constantina. 2010. Code-choice between English and Cypriot Greek Bilingual Compound Verbs *κάμνω* erase (I do erase) instead of *διαγράφω* (I erase)*. In *Cam-Ling 2010: Proceedings of the Sixth Cambridge Postgraduate Conference in Language Research*, 70–81. Cambridge: Cambridge Institute of Language Research.
- Gal, Susan. 1979. *Language Shift: Social Determinants of Linguistic Change in Bilingual Austria*. New York: Academic Press.
- Gardner-Chloros, Penelope. 1992. The sociolinguistics of the Greek-Cypriot community in London. *Plurilinguismes* 4.112–135.
- Gardner-Chloros, P. 2008. Bilingual speech data: Criteria for classification. In *The Blackwell Guide to Research Methods in Bilingualism and Multilingualism*, ed. by Li Wei and Melissa G. Moyer, 53–72. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- Goodwin, Marjorie Harness. 1983. Searching for a word as an interactive activity. In *Semiotics*, ed. by John N. Deely and Margot D. Lenhart, 129–138. New York, Plenum.
- Hall, Kira and Chad Nilep. 2015. Code switching, identity and globalization. In *The*

- Handbook of Discourse Analysis* (2nd edition), ed. by Deborah Tannen, Heidi E. Hamilton and Deborah Schiffrin, 597–619. John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Haspelmath, Martin. 2009. Lexical borrowing: Concepts and issues. In *Loanwords in the World's Languages: A Comparative Handbook*, ed. by Martin Haspelmath and Uri Tadmor, 35–54. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Haugen, Einar. 1953. *The Norwegian Language in America: A Study in Bilingual Behavior*. Bloomington: Indiana UP.
- Heath, Jeffrey. 1989. *From Code-Switching to Borrowing: A Case Study of Moroccan Arabic*. London: Kegan Paul International.
- Heritage, John. 1984. A change of state token and aspects of its sequential placement. In *Structures of Social Action*, ed. by J. Maxwell Atkinson and John Heritage, 299–345. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Heritage, John. 2015. Well-prefaced turns in English conversation: A conversation analytic perspective. *Journal of Pragmatics* 88.88–104.
- Holton, David, Peter Mackridge and Irene Philippaki-Warbuton. 1997. *Greek: A Comprehensive Grammar of the Modern Language*. London: Routledge.
- Jefferson, Gail. 1979. A technique for inviting laughter and its subsequent acceptance/declination. In *Everyday Language: Studies in Ethnomethodology*, ed. by George Psathas, 79–96. New York, NY: Irvington Publishers.
- Johanson, Lars. 2002. *Structural Factors in Turkic Language Contacts*. London: Curzon.
- Johnstone, Barbara. 2000. *Qualitative Methods in Sociolinguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Klairs, Christos and Giorgos Babiniotis. 1996. *Γραμματική της Νέας Ελληνικής: Δομολειτουργική-Επικοινωνιακή*, τόμ. 1: *Το Όνομα* [Grammar of Modern Greek: Structural-functional and Communicative, vol. 1, The Noun]. Athens: Ellinika Grammata.
- Li Wei. 1994. *Three Generations Two Languages One Family: Language Choice and Language Shift in a Chinese Community in Britain*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Li Wei. 1998. The 'why' and 'how' questions in the analysis of conversational code-switching. In *Code-Switching in Conversation: Language, Interaction and Identity*, ed. by Peter Auer, 156–176. London: Routledge.
- Li Wei. 2000. Dimensions of bilingualism. In *The Bilingual Reader*, ed. by Li Wei, 2–21. London/New York: Routledge.
- Li Wei. 2005. 'How can you tell?' Toward a common sense explanation of conversational code switching. *Journal of Pragmatics* 37(3).375–389.
- Li Wei and Lesley Milroy. 1995. Conversational code-switching in a Chinese community in Britain: A sequential analysis. *Journal of Pragmatics* 23(3).281–299.
- Liebscher, Grit and Jennifer Dailey-O'Cain. 2013. Constructing identities through laughter. In *Studies of Laughter in Interaction*, ed. by Phillip Glenn and Liz Holt, 234–257. New York: Continuum Press/Bloomsbury Publishing.

- Maniakas, Theodoros. 1991. KANO + inf: The case of Greek auxiliary verb in a language contact situation. *Journal of Applied Linguistics* 7.114–131.
- Mathiot, Madeleine. 1979. Sex roles as revealed through referential gender in American English. In *Ethnolinguistics: Boas, Sapir and Whorf Revisited*, ed. by Madeleine Mathiot, 1–47. The Hague/Paris/New York: Mouton Publishers.
- Matras, Yaron. 2007. The borrowability of structural categories. In *Grammatical Borrowing in Cross-Linguistic Perspective*, ed. by Yaron Matras and Jeanette Sakel, 31–74. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Matras, Yaron. 2009. *Language Contact*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Milroy, Lesley and Pieter Muysken. 1995. Introduction: Code-switching and bilingualism research. In *One Speaker, Two Languages: Cross-Disciplinary Perspectives on Code-Switching*, ed. by Lesley Milroy and Pieter Muysken, 1–14. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Moravcsik, Edith A. 1975. Verb Borrowing. *Wiener Linguistische Gazette* 8: 3–31.
- Moravcsik, Edith A. 1978. Language contact. In *Universals of Human Language, Volume 1, Method and Theory*, ed. by Joseph H. Greenberg, Charles A. Ferguson and Edith A. Moravcsik, 93–122. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Muysken, Pieter. 2000. *Bilingual Speech*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Myers-Scotton, Carol. 1993. *Dueling Languages: Grammatical Structure in Code-Switching*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Myers-Scotton, Carol. 2002. *Contact Linguistics: Bilingual Encounters and Grammatical Outcomes*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Myers-Scotton, Carol. 2006. *Multiple Voices: An Introduction to Bilingualism*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Pavlidou, Theodossia-Soula. 2012. Collective aspects of subjectivity: The subject pronoun 'emeis' (we) in Modern Greek. In *Subjectivity in Language and in Discourse*, ed. by Nicole Baumgarten, Inke Du Bois and Juliane House, 33–65. Leiden: Brill.
- Pfaff, Carol. 1976. Functional and structural constraints on syntactic variation in code switching. *Papers from the Parasession on Diachronic Syntax*, 248–259. Chicago: CLS.
- Poplack, Shana. 1980. Sometimes I'll start a sentence in Spanish *y termino en Español*: Toward a typology of code-switching. *Linguistics* 18.581–618.
- Poplack, Shana, Alicia Pousada and David Sankoff. 1982. Competing influences on gender assignment: variable process, stable outcome. *Lingua* 57(1).1–28.
- Poplack, Shana, David Sankoff and Christopher Miller. 1988. The social correlates and linguistic processes of lexical borrowing and assimilation. *Linguistics* 26.47–104.
- Ralli, Angela. 2002. The role of morphology in gender determination: Evidence from Modern Greek. *Linguistics* 40(3).519–551.
- Ralli, Angela, Marianna Gkiouleka and Vasiliki Makri. 2015. Gender and inflection class in loan noun integration. *SKASE Journal of Theoretical Linguistics* 12(3).422–455.

- Rampton, Ben. 1995. *Crossing: Language and Ethnicity among Adolescents*. London: Longman.
- Romaine, Suzanne. 1986. The syntax and semantics of the code-mixed compound verb in Panjabi/English bilingual discourse. In *Language and Linguistics: The Interdependence of Theory, Data and Application*, ed. by Deborah Tannen and James E. Alatis, 35–49. Washington D.C.: Georgetown University Press.
- Saville-Troike, Muriel. 2003. *The Ethnography of Communication: An Introduction*. Oxford, Blackwell.
- Schegloff, Emanuel A. 2007. *Sequence Organization in Interaction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schiffrin, Deborah. 1987. *Discourse Markers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Seaman, P.D. 1972. *Modern Greek and American English in Contact*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Sifianou, Maria. 1992. *Politeness Phenomena in England and Greece: A Cross-Cultural Perspective*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Silva-Corvalán, Carmen. 1994. *Language Contact and Change: Spanish in Los Angeles*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Stolz, Christel. 2009. Loan word gender in Maltese, with a special focus on gender copy. In *Introducing Maltese Linguistics: Proceedings of the First International Conference on Maltese Linguistics*, ed. by Bernard Comrie, Ray Fabri, Elizabeth Hume, Manwel Mifsud, Thomas Stolz and Martine Vanhove, 321–353. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Tamis, Anastasios. 1986. *The State of Modern Greek as spoken in Victoria*. PhD dissertation, University of Melbourne.
- Tamis, Anastasios. 2005. *The Greeks in Australia*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Thomason, Sarah. 2001. *Language Contact: An Introduction*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Thomason, Sarah and Terrence Kaufman. 1988. *Language Contact, Creolization and Genetic Linguistics*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Trask, R.L. 2000. *The Dictionary of Historical and Comparative Linguistics*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Treffers-Daller, Jeanine. 1994. *Mixing Two Languages: French-Dutch Contact in a Comparative Perspective*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Triantafyllidis, Manolis. [1941] 2005. *Νεοελληνική Γραμματική (της Δημοτικής)* [Modern Greek Grammar (of the Demotic)]. Reprint with corrections of the 1941 edition. Thessaloniki: Institute of Modern Greek Studies.
- Tsitsipis, Lukas D. 1998. *A Linguistic Anthropology of Praxis and Language Shift: Arvanitika (Albanian) and Greek in Contact*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Tsokolidou, Roula. 1994. *Cracking the Code—An Insight into Code-Switching and Gender among Second-Generation Greek-Australians*. PhD dissertation, Monash University.
- Weinreich, Uriel. [1953] 2011. *Languages in Contact: French, German and Romansch in*

Twentieth-Century Switzerland. With an Introduction and Notes by Ronald I. Kim and William Labov. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Winford, Don. 2003. *An Introduction to Contact Linguistics.* Oxford: Blackwell.

Winford, Don. 2010. Contact and borrowing. In *The Handbook of Language Contact*, ed. by Raymond Hickey, 170–187. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.

Wohlgemuth, Jan. 2009. *A Typology of Verbal Borrowings.* Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Notes

The following abbreviations are used in the examples: 1, 2, 3: first, second, third person; ACC: accusative; CONJ: conjunction; COP: copula; DEF: definite; DIM: diminutive; F: feminine; FUT: future; GEN: genitive; IMP: imperative; IMPER: imperfect; IPFV: imperfective; M: masculine; NEG: negation; N: neuter; NOM: nominative; PASS: passive; PFV: perfective; PL: plural; PRS: present; PST: past; SBJV: subjunctive; SG: singular; VOC: vocative.

I follow the transcription conventions used in the *Corpus of Spoken Greek of the Institute of Modern Greek Studies*.

I *Temporal and sequential relationships*

[left brackets: point of overlap onset between two or more utterances (or segments of them)

] right brackets: point of overlap end between two or more utterances (or segments of them)

= The symbol is used either in pairs or on its own.

A pair of *equals signs* is used to indicate the following:

1. If the lines connected by the equals signs contain utterances (or segments of them) by different speakers, then the signs denote 'latching' (that is, the absence of discernible silence between the utterances).
2. The single *equals sign* is used to indicate latching between two parts of the same speaker's talk, where one might otherwise expect a micro-pause, as, for instance, after a turn constructional unit with a falling intonation contour.

(0.8) Numbers in parentheses indicate silence, represented in tenths of a second. Silences may be marked either within the utterance or between utterances.

(.) micro-pause (less than 0.5 second)

II *Symbols and combinations of symbols for representing various aspects of speech delivery*

- punctuation marks** indication of intonation, more specifically,
- the *period* indicates falling/final intonation,
 - ? the *question mark* indicates rising intonation,
 - ,
 - :
- Colons are used to indicate the prolongation or stretching of the sound just preceding them. The more colons, the longer the stretching.
- word** Underlining is used to indicate some form of emphasis, either by increased loudness or higher pitch.
- The degree sign is used to indicate the onset of talk that is markedly quiet or soft. When the end of such talk does not coincide with the end of a line, then the symbol is used again to mark its end.
 - A hyphen after a word or part of a word indicates a cut-off or interruption.
 - _: Combinations of underlining and colons are used to indicate intonation contours. If the letter(s) preceding a colon is underlined, then there is prolongation of the sound preceding it and, at the same time, a falling intonation contour.
 - ↓ The down arrow indicates sharp intonation fall.
 - >word< The combination of 'more than' and 'less than' symbols indicates that the talk between them is compressed or rushed.
 - <word> The combination of 'less than' and 'more than' symbols indicates that the talk between them is markedly slowed or drawn out.
 - .h If the aspiration is an inhalation, then it is indicated with a period before the letter *h*.

III *Other markings*

- ((*laughs*)) Double parentheses and italics are used to mark meta-linguistic, para-linguistic and non-conversational descriptions of events by the transcriber.