

Response to Reviewer 2 Comments

1. Summary

Thank you very much for taking the time to review this manuscript. Please find the detailed responses below and the corresponding revisions/corrections highlighted in red color in the re-submitted file.

2. Questions for General Evaluation

Are the conclusions thoroughly supported by the results presented in the article or referenced in secondary literature?

Reviewer's Evaluation

Can be improved

Response and Revisions

See my point-to-point response to Comment 1

3. Point-by-point response to Comments and Suggestions for Authors

Comments 1: [1] ll 390-392: "When speakers insert English discourse markers in Australian Greek, they seem to draw on prosodic resources, which are locally meaningful and subjected to intra-speaker variation." While the first conclusion has been made clear throughout the text, the latter, namely, that these resources "are subject to intra-speaker variation", as far as I see, is not properly discussed in the paper.

Response 1: Thank you for pointing this out. I have removed the phrase "are subject to intra-speaker variation".

Comments 2: [2] ll. 30-37: "The Greek community in Cairns consists of three generations: [...] This study focuses on first-generation Greeks (50-90 years old) [...]" I am not sure if the three-way classification takes into consideration only those who migrated after WWII or those who settled in Australia at the end of the 19th c. as well.

Response 2: In line with the reviewer's comment, I have added footnote ii "Second-generation Greeks in Cairns are the offspring of the Greeks who settled in Australia in the early 20th century and after World War II."

Comments 3: [3] ll. 59-60: "Discourse markers (also known as 'pragmatic markers' or 'pragmatic particles') are small, uninflected words or phrases that are devoid of syntax [...]" Please notice that a growing body of work, mostly couched within the framework of Chomskyan-generative framework, discusses that discourse, hence discourse markers, can be syntacticized. See Haegeman and Hill (2013) and references therein for earlier work.

Reference

Haegeman, Liliane and Virginia Hill. 2013. Syntacticization of discourse. In *Syntax and its*

limits, ed. By Raffaella Folli. Oxford: OUP.

Response 3: Thank you for pointing this out. I have replaced the phrase “devoid of syntax” with “relatively syntactically independent from their environment”.

Comments 4: [4] l. 73: Furthermore,

Response 4: I have deleted the item.

Comments 5: [5] ll. 151-155: Is there a principled reason why these three participants were chosen among the 11 first-generation speakers?

Response 5: To address the reviewer’s question I have added endnote v in section 1.1 “The data analyzed are indicative of the patterns found in the speech of first-generation Greeks in Cairns.”

Comments 6: [6] section 2.2.: are the recordings stored in wav format?

Response 6: Yes. In section 2.2, 2nd paragraph, I have included the information: “I analyzed audio files (stored in WAV format)”

Comments 7: [7] ll. 339-341: ‘[...] the code switch found in the second iteration is not interactionally motivated, as it does not serve to highlight the referents’ twin relationship, but rather displays the speaker’s preference for Greek as the appropriate language of interaction.” Does this then mean that the speaker has evaluated using the word ‘twins’ is not well taken by the address and thus felt the urge to ‘correct’ herself? (Sorry, I am just trying to understand what must have possibly motivated the switch)

Response 7: There is no indication available in the transcript that the addressee treats the English term negatively. The code switch is motivated by Petroula’s preference for Greek monolingual talk in this speech event.

Comments 8: Just one more question, is the agreement marker on the Greek word (dhidima) OK in this context from a monolingual’s perspective?

Response 8: Yes.

4. Response to Comments on the Quality of English Language

Point 1: The quality of English of the manuscript seems quite fine to me; however, given that I am not a native speaker of English, I cannot state my opinion firmly. I would still kindly ask As to reread their manuscript carefully for typos and grammar mistakes.

Response 1: Done.