

Speaking Greek in Diaspora: language contact and language change

Alexandra Y. Aikhenvald and R. M. W. Dixon*

RÉSUMÉ

Cet article présente un projet de recherche socio - linguistique sur les langues en contact considérées comme mécanisme d'interaction culturelle et de communication inter-ethnique. L'étude concerne la langue grecque et les changements qu'elle subit comme langue minoritaire sous la pression de la langue dominante dans des environnements socio - culturels et géographiques différents, principalement en Australie et en Argentine. L'auteur fait une revue critique et une évaluation de la situation, de l'état de la structure et de l'usage du grec dans la diaspora au sein des environnements sociolinguistiques mentionnés plus haut; il fait aussi le suivi et l'évaluation des mécanismes de changement sous diverses conditions et sources d'influence. L'article fournit également le cadre théorique et une revue de la bibliographie existante sur les questions de transfert et de la linguistique contrastée.

ABSTRACT

This paper discusses a sociolinguistic project on language contact as a mechanism of cultural interaction and inter-ethnic communication. The focal points are the Greek language and the contact-induced changes in Greek, as a minority language under pressure from the dominant language in different socio-cultural and geographic environments, concentrating mainly on Australia and Argentina. This study critically overviews and assesses the structure and use of Greek in Diaspora in the aforementioned sociolinguistic environments, monitoring and evaluating the mechanisms of change under differential conditions and sources of influence. The paper also provides the theoretical perspective and a comprehensive book review on issues of transference and contrastive linguistics with emphasis on languages and dialects in contact. The article also identifies the effects of language contact in the areas of phonology, lexicon, morphology, syntax and pragmatic phenomena from a pluricentric perspective describing the methodological approaches and the mechanisms of analysis.

* James Cook University, Australia

1. Greek in Diaspora: what makes it special

The question of how languages influence each other is fundamental to our understanding of cultural interaction and inter-ethnic communication. Languages which are in contact – where a significant proportion of the speakers of one also have some competence in another – are likely gradually to become more like each other. This is known as convergence (see Aikhenvald 2006; Aikhenvald and Dixon 2001, and further references there). The most pervasive borrowing generally involves grammatical structures, and the organization of lexical and grammatical meanings. There can also be borrowing of lexical forms and – to a lesser degree – of grammatical forms. The extent of this varies from culture to culture, and is realised differently in different language situations. One of the most important issues is how what is essentially the same language can change in different ways in varied situations, under the influence of different neighbours and cultural milieu.

Investigating the outcomes and impact of language contact on minority languages in a variety of plurilingual situations in Diaspora provides a particularly fertile ground for unveiling the mechanisms of ‘externally’ and ‘internally’ motivated language change in progress. The Greek language, with its history of documentation of over 4000 years, and extensive spread in communities outside its traditional domain, is an obviously fruitful area for a study of how languages in contact evolve, survive and can be maintained.

There is an extensive body of research on language contact. And some truly outstanding results have been achieved in the area of contact-induced change in Greek - including the classic study by Dawkins (1916), plus Janse (2000), Joseph (2003), Trudgill (2004b), Tamis (1986, 1987, 1989) and also Seaman (1972), to name but a few. The geographical spread of Greek speakers is impressive: almost every country in the world has a Greek population, of varying sizes. We anticipate that the way they speak is affected by the major language of the place. But how? And does Greek spoken in Argentina differ from Greek spoken in Australia or South Africa? These questions are important for Greek linguists and also for any linguist interested in how languages in contact change. A comprehensive study of Greek in Diaspora is what linguists need, and need urgently.

Similarly to many immigrant languages, people living away from the language community start losing their language: the dominant language of the country becomes their main one. These varieties are sometimes called ‘Heritage languages’. Existing studies include Heritage Russian (Pereltsvaig

2008, and references there; Kagan and Dillon 2001), Heritage Italian, Heritage Norwegian (Haugen 1989), Heritage Swedish and Heritage Czech (see Bettoni 1991, Milani 1996, Hjelde 1996, Klintborg 1999, Henzl 1981). But there is little done on Heritage Greek. Our project aims at filling this gap.

2. Introducing the project

A major aim of this project is *an inductively based investigation of the structure and use of Greek in Diaspora*, with particular attention to the ways in which the language changes depending on the sociolinguistic environment it is in. We envisaged **two case studies** involving contrastive investigation of Greek in two areas: Australia, and South America. The expected results include two extensive systematic examinations of the impact of language contact on the two varieties of Greek, one in contact with English, and one with Spanish.

For general linguists interested in mechanisms of language change this implies a *systematic investigation of the mechanisms of change under differential conditions and sources of influence*. To put it simply: the results will enable us to understand which categories are more prone to borrowing or transfer in language contact, and which are more resistant. And we will be in a position to better understand the current situation of Greek as a Heritage language – that is, a minority language under pressure from the dominant language in the new country. This brings together various perspectives – including heritage languages in general, and specifically language endangerment and how to avoid losing a language. Why are languages the way they are? And what makes them different? Different contact patterns may provide a partial answer.

Languages reflect the sociolinguistic history of their speakers. A number of sociolinguistic parameters have an impact on the outcomes of language contact, interacting with preferences in contact-induced change in grammar and affecting typological diversity. Languages become similar following different pathways; and the net results of language contact are not the same. Intensive contact with a minority language tends to bring about the gradual convergence of languages, whereby the conceptual categories of one language are replicated in another. Borrowing a conceptual template rather than a morpheme brings about the enrichment of patterns in a target language (see Heine and Kuteva 2005, on the diffusion of conceptual patterns; cf. also the concept of metatypy in Ross 2001). Linguistic convergence does not always

result in the creation of identical grammars or in the straightforward projection of categories from one language into another (Aikhenvald 2006; Dixon 1997).

To understand how this happens, it is crucial to undertake an in-depth study of the differential impact of different substrata languages (both in forms and in conceptual patterns). Conceptual and methodological foundations for this have been laid in Aikhenvald (2002). Language contact studies and sociolinguistics owe their major advances to painstaking inductive based investigations of how one language is affected by another. Among these are Haugen's (1969) work on English-Norwegian interaction in America (1969), Silva-Corvalán's (1994) study of how English affected Spanish in Los Angeles and Clyne's (2003) work on bilingual interaction in the Australian context.

Studies in this direction have been attempted for a few pluricentric languages, such as Spanish spoken as majority, and as minority language in the four continents (Silva-Corvalán 1994, 1995; Clyne 2003, 2005); also see §3.4 below for a few paradigm examples. Partial studies of the development of dialects in different linguistic areas and sociolinguistic conditions have shed light onto the borrowability and stability of categories. A prime example is Albanian as spoken in Albania and the adjacent areas, which reflects the impact of Balkan areal features, and the Arvanitika Albanian, spoken in Greece, which does not reflect such impact (see Friedman 2003, 2006 and references therein; and Tsitsipis 1998). However, a systematic contrastive study of different contact situations affecting one language has never been undertaken. The project is highly significant in that it fills in this gap.

We cannot predict with full assurance which way a language will change. Nor can we postulate universal 'constraints' on language change. It appears to be true that 'as far as strictly linguistic possibilities go, any linguistic features can be transferred from any language to any other language' (Thomason and Kaufman 1988: 14; also see Weinreich 1953).

We can, however, determine which changes are more likely – and which are less likely – to occur under particular circumstances. The same applies to 'borrowability' of linguistic features (cf. Thomason 2000). The project will help us understand the nature of linguistic factors facilitating diffusion of forms, and of patterns (see Aikhenvald 2006, Heath 1978, Moravcsik 1978, and Matras 2000) with an inductive base in a particular situation of contact between genetically related languages.

Languages with a common origin – and we recall that Greek, English, and

Spanish and Portuguese are members of three distinct branches of the Indo-European family – ‘will pass through the same or strikingly similar phases’: this ‘parallelism in drift’ (Sapir 1921: 171-2) accounts for additional similarities between related languages, even for those ‘long disconnected’. That is, if languages are genetically related, we – as comparative linguists – expect them to develop similar structures, no matter whether they are in contact or not. And if genetically related languages are in contact, trying to prove that a shared feature is contact-induced, and not a ‘chance’ result of Sapir’s parallelism in drift, may be a challenging task. A prime example of this is Pennsylvania German in contact with English (see Burridge 2006); also see Trudgill (2004b) on the interaction of Greek dialects. In such cases we have to account for a complex interaction between the ‘internal’ and the ‘external’ in language change, and the ways in which one may reinforce or help reactivate the other. This is why a study of contact-induced changes in Greek is of particular significance.

What makes Greek special? Greek has one of the longest histories of documentation. Its role in European civilization and culture cannot be underestimated. Greek plays a significant historical role as a language in which important texts of Christian scripture and of Western civilization were written and transmitted through the ages. Greek also enjoys an international prestige as a source language for the creation of new lexemes and as the fifth official language of the European Union (Tamis 1993, 2001). In recent years, Greek has come under scrutiny as part of the ever-growing interest in Europe as a broad linguistic area (see Heine and Kuteva 2006 and references therein). And Greek is both pluricentric (in Clyne’s 2003 terms) and ‘multidiasporic’. It has the status of an official language in two countries – Greece where it is currently spoken by about 11 million people, and Cyprus with 800,000 speakers (Mackridge 1985; Joseph 2003). There are over 5.5 million in 92 further countries across five continents, with Australia being the locus of the second largest concentration of Greeks (after the USA), with an estimated number of speakers nearing 600,000. In terms of sheer numbers, Greek is the second most powerful community language in Melbourne and Adelaide (after Italian), and third in Sydney (after Arabic and Cantonese) (Clyne 2005: 6; Clyne and Kipp 1999: 10-11; Clyne 2003: 6-25). South America is among the largest areas of concentration of Greek in contact with a non-Germanic language (approx. 50,000) (Tamis 2006: 445ff). This adds to the significance of investigating the ensuing language contact situations, and comparing their outcomes.

A major problem in the world today is successful communication and mutual understanding. Given that language is the universal vehicle of communication, the ways it is used and the way it changes affect communication. The ethos of a people is rooted in the language they use, the structure of its vocabulary and grammar and its discourse techniques. What counts as charismatic rhetoric for one group may appear empty bombast to another and vice versa. Full understanding of the different dynamics of varied communities, and their origins, is a major task. And it is particularly important for heterogeneous communities – such as multilingual and multicultural Australia – and for linguistic and cultural interchange between minorities, and the mainstream society. This makes the task of investigating the dynamics and development of Greek as a major immigrant language in Australia **highly significant**, for achieving the goal of understanding the region and the world as one of the aspects of the National Priority ‘Safeguarding Australia’.

Further significance of documenting Greek as a community language in Australia comes from the fact that it is endangered: numerous authors note a high level of intergenerational discontinuity of Greek at least at tertiary studies level (Clyne 2003: 27, 44; Papademetre and Routolos 2001), although Tamis (2001 and 2009) diagnoses a strong language maintenance among 2nd and 3rd generation Greek Australian student. The issue of language maintenance and language survival can only be approached if one also addresses the linguistic impact of language obsolescence (in the spirit of Campbell and Muntzel 1989, Dixon 1991, Aikhenvald 2002: Chapter 11). Similar studies of ‘language depletion’ in a diasporic context compared to a full ‘version’ spoken in the original country have been attempted for a handful of languages – such as Spanish (Silva-Corvalán 1994), Russian (cf. Polinsky 1997), and even English (Trudgill 2002). Hardly anyone has analysed such phenomena in any Greek variety (the only brief study available is in Holmes et al. 2001).

Linguistic studies of Greek in contact go back a long way, the first major piece of work being the classic book by Dawkins (1916) – who provided a rather imaginative definition of the net result of how Turkish affected Cappadocian Greek: ‘the body has remained Greek, but the soul has become Turkish’ (p. 198). Despite the remarkably wide extent of Greek Diaspora, there have been very few in-depth studies of Greek varieties spoken away from Greece. The only book-length study is Seaman’s (1972) instructive, but partial, discussion of Modern Greek in America. Sound foundations for an in-depth investigation of Greek in Australia have been laid in the pioneering study by Tamis (1986). Partial studies include Vasilopoulos (1995) and

Tsokolidou (1994) (who analysed patterns of code-switching in second-generation Greek migrants in Australia); see further discussion and references in Tamis (1987, 1988, 1991, 1993, 2001 and 2006a-d and references there).

An in-depth investigation of all aspects of Modern Greek in Australia (covering phonetics, phonology, morphology, syntax, discourse-pragmatic devices and lexicon) is an urgent priority. Greek dialects and their survival in Australia is an additional issue which warrants further examination (see Tamis 1989, on Cypriot Greek in Australia; also see Trudgill 2003, for an up-to-date classification). There are hardly any in-depth studies of contact-induced changes in South American Greek (see Tamis 2005 and 2006). Filling these gaps will have practical implications for language maintenance, and at the same time advance our understanding of how and why languages change in the ways they do.

This study is very timely. Recent years have shown an up-surge of interest in various issues related to mechanisms and parameters at work in bilingual interaction; in particular, Muysken (2000), brief overviews in Thomason (2000), plus Winford (2003), Myers-Scotton (2002) and Clyne (2003). The urgency of undertaking the proposed task is corroborated by the needs of the communities, both Australian and South American, seeking support for language maintenance. The increasing importance of Greek in the European scene (see Heine and Kuteva 2006, for its linguistic standing) adds to the urgency of investigating Greek in Diaspora.

What was the benefit Australia would derive from the project? In other words, why would the Australian Research Council support it? In multicultural Australia, one generation thinks in terms of the immigrant language and next generation in terms of English. By identifying these differences one may be able to reconcile them and overcome cultural misunderstandings. This project will provide a significant contribution to our knowledge of Greek, a major community language in Australia, and enhance our understanding of the dynamics of this important ethnic group, and of multicultural and multilingual Australia. The social benefit of this proposal is that it will help enhance cross-cultural understanding both within Australia, and outside it, by building links and investigating similarities and differences between Greek-speaking communities in Diaspora.

In addition, the project will enhance language maintenance in Greek-speaking communities in Australia, via the documentation of the

existing varieties and showing that they have features in their own right – in other words, we may witness the emergence of new dialects and new forms of speech (in the spirit of Trudgill 2004a). The project should also have further application to the multicultural and multilingual immigrant situation in Australia, and thus contribute to overcoming potential miscommunications due to different language backgrounds. It will enhance the Australian intellectual ambience and fortify Australia's reputation as a 'knowledge nation', contributing to the preservation of cultural and linguistic diversity within Australia, and beyond.

3. Identifying the effects of language contact

Our objective is to evaluate linguistic convergence at various levels, in different language contact situations. For each contact situation, we need to systematically analyse the amount of shared features, including phonetic and phonological properties, grammatical categories of various word classes, inter- and intra-clausal syntax, clause types, marking of grammatical relations, compounding and derivations, and categories associated with important cultural practices. If languages are in constant contact, with a steady bi- or multi-lingualism, one expects them to share certain concepts and grammatical features and constructions. We envisage investigations along two following strands:

- I. Differential impact of a major language on the grammar(s) of the various minor languages it is in contact with, and in different contact situations (e.g. English, Spanish, Quechua, or Mandarin Chinese, as major languages). (An example, applied to Papua New Guinea languages, is in Lithgow 1989).
- II. Diffusion of a category, or types of categories, construction type(s) or grammatical technique within an established diffusion area or an established language contact situation.

3.1 Some background

The question of how languages influence each other is fundamental to our understanding of cultural interaction and inter-ethnic communication. Languages which are in contact – where a significant proportion of the speakers of one also have some competence in another – are likely gradually to become more like each other. This is known as convergence (see Aikhenvald 2006; Aikhenvald and Dixon 2001).

The most pervasive borrowing generally involves grammatical and phonological **structures**, and the organization of lexical and grammatical **meanings** (Aikhenvald 2002; Heine and Kuteva 2005).

There can also be borrowing of **lexical** forms and - to a lesser degree - of **grammatical** forms. The extent of this varies from culture to culture (see Aikhenvald 2002), and is realised differently in different language situations. One of the most important issues is **how** essentially the same language can change in different ways in varied situations, under the influence of different neighbours and in different cultural milieu.

Investigating the outcomes and impact of language contact on minority languages in a variety of plurilingual situations in Diaspora provides a particularly fertile ground for unveiling the mechanisms of 'externally' and 'internally' motivated language change in progress. The Greek language, with its history of documentation over 4000 years, and extensive spread in communities outside its traditional domain, is an obviously fruitful area for a study of how languages in contact evolve, survive and can be maintained.

3.2 Disentangling the effects of language contact

If one language is significantly different from its proven genetic relatives, language contact is the 'usual suspect'. Cantonese (Matthews 2006) has features not found in most Sinitic languages. Since some of these features are found in genetically unrelated Miao-Yao languages spoken in the same area, such features are likely to be due to contact-induced change. And if two languages are (or have been) in contact and share certain features, we immediately suspect that these features have been transferred from one to the other.

Our suspicion will be strengthened if the two languages are genetically unrelated, and the features they share are typical of the family to which only one of them belongs. Tibeto-Burman languages spoken in the 'Sino-sphere' tend to be more isolating, while those spoken in the 'Indo-sphere' tend to be more morphologically complex (Hashimoto 1986).

Similar principles apply to immigrant languages. If a language spoken by an immigrant minority differs from the language as spoken in the homeland, and the point of difference can be shown to be shared with the majority language rather than with any of the extant dialects, we suspect that they are due to contact-induced change. Prime examples come from Norwegian in America, Spanish in America, Pennsylvania German in Canada, and Greek (also see §3.4 below).

The intuition of the researcher if the homeland language is their native language plays a major role in the heuristic procedure of identifying 'foreign'-sounding material – a prime candidate for being contact-induced.

It is a serious error to judge the speech of any person as being a 'corrupt form' of some standard language system. Each speaker has their own language system, which is likely to be internally consistent and to have its own structures. These structures may vary in a principled way from the structures of the standard variety. What appears to be a mistake or infelicity may in fact be the result of influence from another language. An example of how speakers of some American Indian use evidential-like expressions found in their languages when speaking English is in Bunte and Kendall (1981: 5).

In such instances, intensive language contact results in discernible diffusion of patterns-phonetic, phonological, morphological, syntactic and especially pragmatic. This can, but does not have to be, accompanied by some diffusion of forms.

In most cases, contact-induced change affects only some aspects of the language. Take the Arabic of Nigeria. Its morphology, lexicon and phonology show that it is undoubtedly Semitic. Many of its syntactic structures and the semantics of numerous idioms are strikingly similar to the neighbouring Chadic languages. This does not make Nigerian Arabic 'unclassifiable'. Neither does it 'prove' that Nigerian Arabic is not a Semitic language anymore. It is simply the case that, as far as genetic classification goes, sharing forms and reconstructing forms is more important than sharing structures (see Owens 1996).

Along similar lines, Romanian remains recognizably Romance despite a Slavic 'layer' (Friedman 2006). Maltese remains Semitic, despite numerous forms and patterns of Italian descent (Tosco 1996; and see Borg 1994, on parallel development in Maltese, Cypriot Arabic and other Arabic dialects). In none of these cases has language contact affected the genetic affiliation of languages.

The impact of contact – or, in Swadesh (1951)'s words, 'diffusional cumulation' – is stronger and more central in some languages than in others. These languages are 'atypical' for their families. Modern Hebrew, Maltese and Nigerian Arabic have a clear non-Semitic 'feel' to them. As mentioned above, Dawkins (1916: 198) expressed the same idea of 'layering' in Cappadocian Greek in somewhat more imaginative terms – 'the body has remained Greek, but the soul has become Turkish'.

In order to be able to identify the effects of contact-induced change, the following information should be available:

- good description and good understanding of the grammar of the language under investigation as spoken in the putative ‘homeland’ of the given minority. This information should ideally include data on a particular dialect, or dialects, or a variety of a pluricentric language (such as Greek, as spoken, e.g. in Crete, or mainland Greece, or Cyprus);
- good description and good understanding of the grammar of the dominant language – such as English or Spanish. Once again, one needs to be aware of particular dialect features of the dominant language (e.g. Australian English or Latin American Spanish).

Further parameters to be taken into account include:

- whether the members of the community speaking a minority language affected by contact-induced change maintain contact with speakers of the homeland variety;
- if they do, whether they maintain contact with speakers of the same variety as the one they speak natively;
- sex, age, education level of speakers; their proficiency in Greek and in the dominant language (English or Spanish); if at all possible, use of language in different spheres of life and code-switching;
- speakers’ attitude to the language and its maintenance.

3.3 Methodology of data collection and analysis

The less intrusive the researcher, the better the result obtained. Questionnaires are useful for establishing basic biographical data. But linguistic information ought to be based on:

- (i) Spontaneous stories of varied genres, preferably from more than one speaker: folk tales, traditional stories (if possible), autobiographies, stories of other sorts; dialogues and discussions (such as community meetings) are a very useful source.
- (ii) Participant-observation: how the language is used on a day-to-day basis.

Also see Dixon (2007), for a comprehensive overview of fieldwork methodologies, data collection and data types.

3.4 Paradigm examples of investigating the impact of the dominant language (in most cases, English) on minority languages

As mentioned above, language contact studies and sociolinguistics owe their major advances to painstaking inductive-based investigations of how one language is affected by another. Among these are Haugen's (1969) work on English-Norwegian interaction in America (1969), Silva-Corvalán's (1994) study of how English affected Spanish in Los Angeles and Clyne's (2003) work on bilingual interaction in the Australian context. BurrIDGE (2006) is a startling example of how English has influenced Pennsylvania German, a fairly closely related language.

Studies in this direction have been attempted for a few pluricentric languages, such as Spanish spoken as majority and as minority language in the four continents (Silva-Corvalán 1994, 1995; Clyne 2003, 2005). (Further work on contact-induced changes in Spanish includes papers in Bjarkman and Hammond 1989; and Cotton and Sharp 1988). Studies on Albanian as spoken in Albania and the adjacent areas, which reflects the impact of Balkan areal features, and the Arvanitika Albanian, spoken in Greece, which does not reflect such impact include Friedman (2003, 2006) and references therein, Tsitsipis (1989, 1998) and Sasse (1992a,b) (where a special attention is accorded to concomitant processes of language obsolescence in Arvanitika). Studies of the impact of language contact on Greek include Dawkins (1916), Seaman (1972), Tamis (1985, 1986, 2003), and Janse's work (see References).

3.5 The impact of language contact on phonology: some examples

The first place to look in grammars for diffusional convergence is often in the phonetics and phonology, as first noted by Trubetzkoy (1931); also see Jakobson (1962) and Watkins (2001).

The change in many European languages from an alveolar to a uvular /r/ is presumably contact-induced (Trudgill 1974). A similar example is found in Dench (2001: §2.1): the lamino-dental stop /th/ in Martuthunira (Australian) has been lenited to *y* in some environments, making it phonetically more similar to nearby languages; this has occurred with no change to the phonological system of the language.

A variety of phonological changes are possible under language-contact. The simplest change is the addition of a phoneme (see Curnow 2001, for a further list of contact-induced phonological changes). Watkins (2001) discusses a variety of phonological changes which occurred in ancient Anatolia, such as

the convergence in the inventory and distribution of stops. Dimmendaal (2001: §3.1) discusses the areal spread of [+ATR] vowel-harmony systems in Niger-Congo languages. Dimmendaal (2001: §2.2) discusses a number of phonological changes in Baale, a Surmic (Nilo-Saharan) language, apparently under influence from Tirma-Chai (also Surmic), including an interesting phonotactic patterning, whereby word-final stops are lost in Baale, paralleling the phonotactics of Tirma-Chai. Similar phonotactic convergence is described by Aikhenvald (2001: §4.2.2), who notes for example that Resígaro has the same syllable structure as its neighbours, different from languages genetically related to it.

The area of phonology which appears particularly susceptible to change is suprasegmental features. Tone has been introduced into languages which previously did not have it: for example, Resígaro has acquired tonal contrasts (see Aikhenvald 2001: §4.2.2). Matisoff (2001) discusses tone as an areal feature in Southeast Asia.

Further contact-induced Phonological features include nasalization as a word-level prosody and tone systems in many languages of North-west Amazonia. Nurse and Hinnebusch (1993) demonstrate the loss of vowel length in some Northeast Coast Bantu languages in contact with Swahili. Diffusion of these features occurred independently of lexical loans.

New phonemes in Amuesha (Adelaar 2006) may have made their way into the language through reanalysis of lexical loans, as did the bilabial nasal in Basque (Trask 1998). Developing clitics and bound pronominal forms is an areally spread pattern within the Australian area (Dixon 2001, 2006). Diffusion affects segmental units (e.g. allophones, and phonemes), phonological processes, and the structure of a higher phonological unit, word.

One of most fascinating areas of contact is intonation. Tamis (1986: 262ff) points out certain elements of Australian-type intonations in Greek as spoken in Australia. This is perhaps one of the most fruitful areas of research.

4. Where to now?

The impact of language contact affects most areas of its grammar and discourse organization. Our aim is to undertake intensive inductive studies of diasporic Greek, contrasting a variety spoken in Australia, with Greek spoken in a South American country – Argentina, Uruguay or Brazil. We expect to analyse the effects of contact-induced change on morphology, syntax, and discourse structure, focussing on such salient categories as gender assignment,

agreement in gender, number and person, strategies of clause combining, and questions and commands. In her preliminary work on the Argentinian variety of Greek, Katerina Zombolou reports that speakers of local Greek employ the negator in questions which require confirmation, replicating the pattern found in Spanish, as in *Maria habla español, ¿no?* 'Mary speaks Spanish, right?' (lit. 'Maria speaks Spanish, no?') expecting the answer 'of course she does').

Each study, based on an extensive corpus of texts and participant-observation, will demonstrate which categories and forms are particularly prone to, and which are resistant to, language contact. To rephrase Dawkins' (1916: 198) metaphor, is it that the 'soul' of the Greek in Australia is now anglicized? And is the Greek spoken in Argentina hispanicised in its spirit? These are the fundamental questions to be answered.

And last but not least, inductive investigations of Greek spoken outside Greece and Cyprus should provide a foundation for recognising diasporic varieties of Greek as *ethnolects* (Tamis, 1986) or even dialects in their own right – shattering a popular attitude to non-standard ways of speaking as deficient, or inferior, rather than just different.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adelaar, Willem F. H. (2006), "The Quechua impact on Amuesha, an Arawak language of the Peruvian Amazon", pp. 290-312 of Aikhenvald and Dixon 2006 (eds).

Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. (2001), "Areal diffusion, genetic inheritance and problems of subgrouping: a North Arawak case study", pp. 167-94 of Aikhenvald and Dixon 2001 (eds).

—. (2002), *Language contact in Amazonia*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

—. (2006), "Grammars in contact: a cross-linguistic perspective", pp. 1-66 of Aikhenvald and Dixon 2006 (eds).

—. and R. M. W. Dixon. (2001), "Introduction", pp. 1-26 of Aikhenvald and Dixon 2001 (eds).

—. and R. M. W. Dixon (eds) (2001), *Areal diffusion and genetic inheritance: problems in comparative linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

—. and R. M. W. Dixon (eds) (2006), *Grammars in contact: a cross-linguistic*

typology, edited by A. Y. Aikhenvald and R. M. W. Dixon. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bettoni, C. (1991), "Language variety among Italians: Anglicisation, attrition and attitudes", pp. 263-9 of *Language in Australia*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bjarkman, Peter C. and Robert M. Hammond (eds) (1989), *American Spanish pronunciation. Theoretical and applied perspectives*. Washington: Georgetown University Press.

Borg, A. (1994), "Some evolutionary parallels and divergences in Cypriot Arabic and Maltese". *Mediterranean Language Review* 8: 41-67.

Bunte, P. A. and M. B. Kendall (1981), "When is an error not an error? Notes on language contact and the question of interference", *Anthropological Linguistics* 23: 1-7.

Burridge, K. (2006), "Language contact and convergence in Pennsylvania German", pp. 179-200 of Aikhenvald and Dixon 2006 (eds).

Campbell, L. and M. Muntzel (1989), "The structural consequences of language death", pp. 181-96 of Dorian (ed.).

Clyne, M. G. (2003), *Dynamics of language contact*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

— (2005), *Australia's language potential*. Sydney: UNSW Press.

— and S. Kipp (1999), *Pluricentric languages in an immigrant context. Spanish, Arabic and Chinese*. Berlin: Mouton.

Cotton, Greet and John M. Sharp (1988), *Spanish in the Americas*. Washington: Georgetown University Press.

Curnow, Timothy J. (2001), "What language features can be 'borrowed?', pp. 412-36 of Aikhenvald and Dixon 2001 (eds).

Dawkins, R. M. (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.

Dench, A. (2001), "Descent and diffusion: the complexity of the Pilbara situation", pp. 105-33 of Aikhenvald and Dixon 2001 (eds).

Dimmendaal, Gerrit J. (2001), "Areal diffusion versus genetic inheritance: an African perspective", pp. 358-392 of Aikhenvald and Dixon 2001 (eds).

Dixon, R. M. W. (1991), "A changing language situation: the decline of Dyirbal". *Language in Society* 20: 183-200.

—. (1997), *The rise and fall of languages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

—. (2001), "The Australian linguistic area", pp 64-104 of Aikhenvald and Dixon 2001 (eds).

—. (2006), "Grammatical diffusion in Australia: free and bound pronouns", pp. 67-93 of Aikhenvald and Dixon 2006 (eds).

—. (2007), "Field linguistics, a minor manual", *Linguistic fieldwork*, a special issue of *Language typology and universals* edited by Alexandra Y. Aikhenvald. 60: 12-31.

Dorian, Nancy (ed.) (1989), *Investigating obsolescence. Studies in language contraction and death*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Fishman, J. (1991), *Reversing language shift*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

—. (2001), *Can threatened languages be saved?* Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Friedman, V. (2003), "Evidentiality in the Balkans with special attention to Macedonian and Albanian", pp. 189-218 of *Studies in evidentiality*, edited by A. Y. Aikhenvald and R. M. W. Dixon. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

— (2006), "Balkanizing the Balkan sprachbund A Closer Look at Grammatical Permeability and Feature Distribution", pp. 202-19 of Aikhenvald and Dixon 2006 (eds).

Hashimoto, M. (1986), "The Altaicization of Northern Chinese", pp. 76-97 of *Contributions to Sino-Tibetan Studies*, edited by J. McCoy and T. Light. Leiden: E. J. Brill.

Haugen, E. (1950), "The analysis of linguistic borrowing". *Language* 26: 210-31.

—. (1969), *The Norwegian language in America. A study in bilingual behavior*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

—. (1989), "The rise and fall of an immigrant language: Norwegian in America", pp. 61-74 of Dorian (ed.).

Heath, Jeffrey (1978), *Linguistic diffusion in Arnhem Land*. Canberra: AIAS.

Heine, B. and T. Kuteva (2005), *Language contact and grammatical change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

- . (2006), *The changing languages of Europe*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Henzl, V. M. (1981), "Slavic languages in the new environment", pp. 293-321 of *Language in the USA*, edited by C. A. Ferguson and S. B. Heath. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hill, Jane H. (1985), "The grammar of consciousness and the consciousness of grammar". *American Ethnologist* 12: 725-37.
- . (1998), "Today there is no respect': nostalgia, 'respect' and oppositional discourse in Mexicano (Nahuatl) language ideology", pp. 68-86 of *Language ideologies: practice and theory*, edited by Bambi B. Schieffelin, Kathryn A. Woolard, and Paul V. Kroskrity eds. 1998. New York: Oxford University Press.
- . and K. C. Hill. (1986), *Speaking Mexicano. Dynamics of syncretic language in Central Mexico*. Tucson: The University of Arizona Press.
- Hjelde, A. (1996), "The gender of English nouns used in American Norwegian", pp. 297-312 of pp. 479-501 of *Language contact across the North Atlantic*, edited by P. S. Ureland and I. Clarkson. *Linguistische Arbeiten* 359, Tübingen.
- Holmes, J., M. Roberts, M. Verivaki and 'Anahina' Aipolo (2001), "Language maintenance and shift in three New Zealand speech communities", pp. 41-71 of *A Reader in Greek Sociolinguistics*, ed. by A. Georgakopoulou and M. Spanaki. Oxford: Peter Lang.
- Jakobson, R. O. (1962), "Über die phonologischen Sprachbünde", pp. 137-43 of his *Selected Writings. Vol. 1. Phonological Studies*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Janse, Mark (2000), "Convergence and Divergence in the Development of the Greek and Latin Clitic Pronouns", in: Rosanna Sornicola, Erich Poppe & Ariel Shisha - Halevy (eds), *Stability, Variation and Change of Word-Order Patterns over Time*, pp. 231-258. Amsterdam: Benjamins (*Current Issues in Linguistic Theory*, 213).
- Joseph, Brian D. (2003), "The Greek language", pp. 86-92 of volume 2 of *International Encyclopaedia of Linguistics*, second edition, edited by W. J. Frawley, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kagan, O. and K. Dillon (2001), "A new perspective on teaching Russian: Focus on the heritage learner". *The Slavic and East European Journal* 45: 507-18.

Klintborg, S. (1999), *The transience of American Swedish*. Lund: Lund University Press.

Lithgow, D. 1989. "Influence of English grammar on Dobu and Bunama", pp. 335-48 of *VICAL 1. Oceanic languages. Papers from the Fifth International Conference on Austronesian Linguistics*, edited by Ray Harlow & Robin Hooper. Auckland: Linguistic Society of New Zealand.

Matisoff, James A. (2001), "Genetic versus contact relationship: prosodic diffusibility in South-East Asian languages", pp. 291-327 of Aikhenvald and Dixon 2001 (eds).

Mackridge, P. (1985), *The Modern Greek language, A descriptive analysis of Standard Modern Greek*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Matras, Y. (2000), "How predictable is contact-induced change in grammar?" pp. 585-620 of *Time depth in historical linguistics*, Vol. 2, edited by C. Renfrew, A. McMahon and L. Trask. Cambridge: McDIAR.

Matthews, Stephen (2006), "Cantonese grammar in areal perspective", pp. 220-236 of Aikhenvald and Dixon 2006 (eds).

Milani, C. (1996), "Language contact among North-American people of Italian origin", pp. 479-501 of *Language contact across the North Atlantic*, edited by P. S. Ureland and I. Clarkson. *Linguistische Arbeiten* 359. Tübingen.

Moravcsik, E. (1978), "Language contact", pp. 93-123 of *Universals of human languages*, Vol. 1, edited by Joseph H. Greenberg, Charles A. Ferguson, and Edith A. Moravcsik. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Muysken, P. (2000), *Bilingual speech*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Myers-Scotton, C. (2002), *Contact linguistics. Bilingual encounters and grammatical outcomes*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Nurse, Derek (2000), *Inheritance, contact, and change in two East African languages*. Köln: Rudiger Köppe Verlag.

—. and Hinnebusch, T. J. (1993), *Swahili and Sabaki. A linguistic history*. University of California publications in linguistics 121.

Owens, J. (1996), "Grammatisierung, Semantisierung und Sprachkontakt: Arabisch im Tschad-See-Gebiet", pp. 79-85 of *Sprachkontakt und Grammatikalisierung*, edited by M. Haase and N. Nau. Special issue of *Sprachtypologie und Universalienforschung* 49.1.

- Papademetre, L. and S. Routolos (2001), "Social, political, educational, linguistic and cultural (dis-)incentives for language education in Australia". *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 22: 134-51.
- Pereltsvaig, Asya (2008), "Aspect in Russian as grammatical rather than lexical notion". *Russian Linguistics* 32: 27-42.
- Polinsky, M. (1997), "American Russian: Language loss meets language acquisition", pp. 370-407 of *Formal approaches to Slavic linguistics*, ed. Wayles Browne et al. Anna Arbor: Michigan Slavic Publications
- Ross, M. D. (2001), "Contact-induced change in Oceanic languages in northwest Melanesia", pp. 134-66 of Aikhenvald and Dixon 2001 (eds).
- Sapir, E. (1921), *Language*, New York: Harcourt, Brace & World.
- Sasse, Hans-Jürgen (1992a), "Theory of language death", pp. 31-57 of *Language death. Factual and theoretical explorations with special reference to East Africa*, ed. by Matthias Brenziger. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- . (1992b), "Language decay and contact-induced change: similarities and differences", pp. 58-79 of *Language death. Factual and theoretical explorations with special reference to East Africa*, ed. by Matthias Brenziger. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Seaman, P. D. (1972), *Modern Greek and American English in contact*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Silva-Corvalán, C. (1994), *Language contact and change, Spanish in Los Angeles*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- (1995), (ed.), *Spanish in four continents. Studies in language contact and bilingualism*. Washington: Georgetown UP.
- (1995), "The study of language contact: An overview of the issues", pp. 1-13 of Silva-Corvalan, ed.
- Swadesh, M. (1951), "Diffusional, cumulation and archaic residue as historical explanations", *Southwestern Journal of Anthropology* 7: 1-21.
- Tamis, A. M. (1985), "Factors Influencing the Language Loyalty of Greek Immigrants in Victoria", *Journal of Intercultural Studies*, V. 6: 15-48, Melbourne.
- . (1986), *The state of Modern Greek as spoken in Victoria*, PhD dissertation, University of Melbourne.

- . (1987), “The changing structure of Modern Greek: the formation of an Ethnolect”, *Glossologia*, V. 5-6: 123-138.
- . (1989), “The state of the Cypriot dialect in Australia”, *Dialectology* 1: 27-40.
- . (1991), “Modern Greek in Australia”, pp. 249-70 of *Language in Australia*, edited by Suzanne Romaine. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- . (1993), *Unlocking Australia's Language Potential, Volume 8, Modern Greek*, NLLIA, Canberra (introduction written by E. Gauntlett).
- . (2006a), *The Greeks in Latin America (Los Griegos in America Latina)*, Ellinika Grammata, Athens.
- . (2006b), “The Greek language Education in Australia” in *Etudes Helleniques-Hellenic Studies*, Volume 14, No 1, Winter 2006, Montreal, pp. 87-102.
- . (2006c), “Identity and the Hellenic Diaspora”, in *Festschrift in Honour of Prof. Ioannis Hassiotis*, pp. 303-345, University of Granada.
- . (2006d), “Macedonian Hellenic identities in the English speaking countries”, in I. K. Hassiotis and B. Gounaris (eds) *The Macedonian Identities*, 237-262, Museum for Macedonian Struggle, Thessaloniki.
- . (2008a), “The Greek Language in Australia”, in *Γνώσης Χάριν*, in *Festschrift in Honour of Prof. G. Babiniotis*, edited by A. Mozer, A. Bakakou-Orphanou, Ch. Charalambakis, D. Xeila-Markopoulou, pp. 310-325, *Ελληνικά Γράμματα*, Athens.
- Thomason, S.G. (2000), *Language contact: an introduction*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- . and T. Kaufman (1988), *Language contact, creolization and genetic linguistics*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Tosco, M. (1996), “Morfologia italiana in Maltese”, pp. 319-32 of *Semitica. Seria philologica Constantino Tsereteli dedicata*, edited by R. Contini, F. A. Pennacchietti and M. Tosco. Torino: Silvio Zamorani editore.
- Trask, R. L. (1998), “The typological position of Basque: then and now”. *Language Sciences* 20: 313-324.
- Trubetzkoy, N. S. (1931), “Phonologie und Sprachgeographie”. *TCLP* 4: 228-34.

- Trudgill, Peter. (1974), "Linguistic change and diffusion: description and explanation in socio-linguistic dialect geography". *Language in Society* 3: 215-246.
- . (2002), *Sociolinguistic Variation and Change*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- . (2003), *A Glossary of Sociolinguistics*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- . (2004a), "The impact of language contact and social structure on linguistic structure: Focus on the dialects of Modern Greek", pp. 435-51 of *Dialect Meets Typology: Dialect Grammar from a Cross-linguistic Perspective*, edited by B. Kortmann. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- . (2004b), *New Dialect Formation: The Inevitability of Colonial English*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Tsitsipis, Lukas D. (1989), "Skewed performance and full performance in language obsolescence: the case of an Albanian variety", pp. 117-38 of Dorian (ed.).
- . (1998), *A linguistic anthropology of praxis and language shift*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Tsokalidou, R. (1994), "Cracking the code — an insight into code-switching and gender among second-generation Greek-Australians". PhD thesis, Monash University.
- Vasilopoulos, L. (1995), "Modern Greek as spoken by the second generation in Melbourne". MA, La Trobe University.
- Watkins, Calvert (2001), "An Indo-European linguistic area and its characteristics: Ancient Anatolia. Areal diffusion as a challenge to the comparative method?", pp. 44-63 of Aikhenvald and Dixon 2001 (eds).
- Weinreich, U. (1953), *Languages in contact*. New York: Linguistic Circle of New York.
- Winford, D. (2003), *An introduction to contact linguistics*. Oxford: Blackwell.