Pro-drop realization in heritage Greek, Russian and Turkish is modulated by typological differences.

Maria Martynova[1] Onur Özsoy[2,1], Vasiliki Rizou[1], Natalia Gagarina[1,2], Artemis Alexiadou[2,1] & Luka Szucsich[1]

[1]Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin, [2]Leibniz-Center General Linguistics (ZAS)
martynma@hu-berlin.de, oezsoy@leibniz-zas.de, rizouvas@hu-berlin.de, gagarina@leibniz-zas.de, artemis@leibniz-zas.de, szucsicl@hu-berlin.de

Greek, Russian and Turkish are different types of null subject languages. Greek is a strict pro-drop language. Russian is claimed to be either a partial or a non-pro-drop language with abundant subject ellipsis. Turkish is a topic pro-drop language where overt subjects are necessary in underspecified contexts. Despite the typological differences, these heritage-varieties show similarities in pro-drop realization. Previous studies found that overt pronominal subjects are more frequent in heritage-varieties (Dubinina & Polinsky, 2013; Haznedar, 2010; Tsimpli et al., 2004). Based on this, we derive the following research questions:

RQ1: Does Greek, Russian and Turkish heritage speakers' (HSs) expression of (pro)nominal reference align with monolingual speakers' productions?

RQ2: How do heritage Greek, Russian and Turkish diverge in their realization of (pro)nominal reference?

We predict changes in pro-drop realization in HS based on the Interface Hypothesis. To prove this, we conducted a study on the RUEG corpus (Wiese et al., 2021) containing manually annotated data of 548 speakers. For each language, we ran binomial generalized linear mixed-effects models with independent variables Country (Germany, USA, the homeland), Formality (formal vs. informal), and Mode (spoken vs. written), and random effects by participant. Our results indicate significant medium effects for Country, Formality and Mode which confirms our preregistered hypotheses. Due to typological differences, we found effects of pro-drop in HS of less strict languages, Turkish and Russian, unlike in Greek HS. Our study offers cross-linguistically comparable data that can be generalized on dynamic heritage communities in Germany and the USA. This unique study design provides evidence of heritage languages' pro-drop use with respect to the different communication settings.

References: • Dubinina, I., & Polinsky, M. (2013). Russian in the USA. In M. Moser (Ed.), Slavic Languages in Migration (pp. 1-29). University of Vienna Press. • Haznedar, B. (2010). Transfer at the syntax-pragmatics interface: Pronominal subjects in bilingual Turkish. Second Language Research 26 (3), 355–378. • Tsimpli, I., Sorace, A., Heycock, C., & Filiaci, F. (2004). First language attrition and syntactic subjects: A study of Greek and Italian near-native speakers of English. International Journal of Bilingualism 8(3), 257–277. • Wiese, H., et al. (2021). RUEG Corpus. https://zenodo.org/record/5808870