Plural marking in German Turkish Code Switching

Kübra Atasoy-Özoğlu
University of Vienna, Austria

1.Overview In this talk I present data from Turkish German Code Switching: Plurals are marked twice, first using a German plural ending, then attaching the Turkish default plural. The analysis supports the analysis of German –s as default plural (Wiese 1999) while also showing that within the Code Switching context, the Turkish default plural checks for specificity, triggering the need for multiple plural marking.

2.Research area Code Switching Data as the basis of grammatical analyses opens up a new and emerging research area, that can account for phenomena by visualizing constructions that remain unseen in a monolingual environment. There has been work on DP-phases (van Gelderen/MacSwan 2008) and linearization (Gonzalez-Vilbazo/Lopez 2012) using CS data. The research results already indicate broader consequences on our understanding of multilingualism and the architecture of the Language Faculty, supporting in a broad sense the notion of UG and in a narrower one the constraint-free approach to Code Switching in the sense of MacSwan 1999. Code Switching research also opens up new perspectives on the cognitive model of language, in line with recent neurolinguistic findings suggesting that early bilinguals use similar brain areas with their respective L1s. (Frenck-Mestre et al. 2005) This leads us to believe that there must be only one syntactic path, with different lexical items entering the derivation. Timing phenomena in particular might easily be shown through Code Switching data, especially because some sequences might be uttered following one pattern, but not the other (Linearization).

3.Data Turkish uses the default -ler/lar as a plural marker, whereas German consists of four different lexical markers (0, e, er, en), three of which can also undergo Umlaut and one marker -s which has been analyzed as default (Marcus et al. 1995, Wiese 2009). In Turkish German Code Switching, Plurals can be marked either by using the singular root and adding only the default plural as in

(1)a. hareket- s b. Buch- lar
move. Pl_{GE}. ('moves') book. Pl_{TR}. ('books')

or by adding both the German and the Turkish plural markers to the German root resulting in structures like the following:

(2) Wohnung- en- ler- i gör-dü-m.
flat. Pl_{GE} Pl_{TR} specificity see.past.1.SG. ('I saw the flats')

However, combining both default markers leads to ungrammatical constructions as in

(3)a. *Park- s- lar- da oturduk.
park. Pl_{GE}. Pl_{TR} .LOC sit-past.3.PL ('We sat at the parks')

b. *hareket- ler- s
move. Tr.Pl Ge.Pl ('moves')

The Turkish-German Code Switching data exhibit multiple marking on plurals, while strictly prohibiting the use of two defaults, in this case the German –s and Turkish –lAr, in one utterance regardless of which L1 the root belongs to, illustrated in the following: *kitaplars ('books') *Pizzaslar ('pizzas') *pizzalars. Competition between two defaults leads to a crashed derivation, due to failure in selecting for a marked form, both plurals being underspecified. In the CS environment the plurals result in eight different possible forms in, one being ungrammatical:

$root_{GE}$	Pl_{GE}	Pl_{TR}	Multiply marked Plurals	CS result	meaning
Frau	-(e)n	-ler/-lar	(e)n + **lAr**	Frauenlar	*women*
Hund	-e	-ler	e + **lAr**	Hundeler	dogs
KÜh	-e + U	-ler	e + U + **lAr**	Küheler	cows

Kind	-er	-lar	er + **lAr**	Kinderlar	children
WÄld	-er + U	-lar	er + U + **lAr**	Wälderlar	forrests
Daumen	-∅	-ler	∅ + **lAr**	Daumenler	thumbs
MÜtter	-∅ + U	-lar	∅ + U + **lAr**	Mütterlar	mothers
Park	**-s**	-lar	***s** + **lAr**	*Parkslar	*Parks

Table 1. German Turkish Code Switching following the Pattern $root_{GE}$-Pl_{GE}-Pl_{TR}

Adding the Turkish default allows for seven grammatical constructions, the eighth being the disallowed combination of the two defaults.

At first glance, German plural seems already multiply marked, when Umlaut and -e, or -er endings are combined. However, it would make sense to analyse Umlaut as a phonological readjustment rule within the framework of Distributed Morphology. Interestingly enough, some German varieties already produce forms like 'Kinders' (*children*, marked both –er and –s) or 'Weibers' *(broads*).

The plural form in the bilingual environment can optionally be marked twice:

(4) BÜch- er- lar
Root. er- lAr
book. Pl_{GE} Pl_{TR} ('books')

The Turkish default standing between the German root and marked plural is ungrammatical: *Frau-ler-en (woman-Pl_{TR}-Pl_{GE}) I assume, that the German plurals other than default –s exhibit a higher Markedness. The data also shows that the root must be merged with a marked plural before a default can be applied, resulting in this pattern: M D,*D M, *D D, M M :

	a. M D	b. *D M
	BÜch-er-lar ('books')	*Frau-ler-en ('women')
	c. *D D	d. M M
	*Park-s-lar ('parks')	BÜch-er ('books')

When it comes to the difference between a i.e. Singular German root plus Turkish plural (NP bears plural meaning) ending *Buch-lar-ı [book-Pl_{TR}.-ACC]* and a German plural plus Turkish plural (also plural meaning) *BÜch-er-lar-ı [book-Pl_{GE}.-Pl_{TR}-ACC]* , prima facie, both utterances show no difference in plural.

They do, however, exhibit a difference in specificity. If combined with a determiner and ACC marking, an example like *?o Buchları (Det Sg_{GE} + Pl_{TR})* if not completely ungrammatical, is at least odd, triggering a need for specificity, whereas *o Bücherları (Det Pl_{GE} + Pl_{TR})* seems to be completely well-formed. This seems to be, because the Turkish plural checks for some kind of semantic specificity, which the German non-default plural endings seem to carry.

4.Implications Due to the overall lack of Code Switching data in comparison to monolingual corpora, the data I use stem from spontaneous utterances only. It is the first time that Turkish - German switches are being explored and analyzed within a generative framework, but seeing that this research has implications on not only the analyses of switches, but on the semantics and syntax of each L1, the notion of timing (Linearization) and the distinction between post-syntactic and pre-syntactic operations.

References: Frenck-Mestre, Cheryl, Jean Luc Anton, Muriel Roth, Jyotsna Vaid, und François Viallet. „Articulation in Early and Late Bilinguals' Two Languages: Evidence from Functional Magnetic Resonance Imaging". *Neuroreport* 16, Nr. 7 (12. Mai 2005): 761–65. Gelderen, Elly van, und Jeff MacSwan. „Interface Conditions and Code-Switching: Pronouns, Lexical DPs, and Checking Theory". *Lingua* 118, Nr. 6 (Juni 2008): 765–76. González-Vilbazo, Kay, und Luis López. „Little v and Parametric Variation". *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 30, Nr. 1 (Februar 2012): 33–77. MacSwan, Jeff. „A Minimalist Approach to Intrasentential Code Switching", 1999.Wiese, Richard. „The Grammar and Typology of Plural Noun Inflection in Varieties of German". *The Journal of Comparative Germanic Linguistics* 12, Nr. 2 (Juli 2009): 137–73.