**Selectivity in L3 transfer: effects of typological and linguistic similarity in the L3
Turkish of Uzbek-Russian bilinguals**

A sentence such as (1) is scopally ambiguous: It has a surface (see (1a)) and an inverse scope
((1b)) interpretation:

(1) Jack didn't find two guys.
  a. It is not the case that Jack found two guys. (e.g. Donald found one guy, three
   guys, no guys, etc.)
  b. There are two guys that Jack didn't find.

L1 acquisition research has found, with truth-value judgments (TVJs), that English-speaking
children consistently interpret these sentences on their surface scope reading, though adults
prefer inverse scope readings (e.g. Musolino 1998; Musolino, Crain & Thornton 2000; Lidz
& Musolino 2002). Given the Semantic Subset Principle (Crain, Ni & Conway 1994), one
interpretation of these facts has been that (1a) is children's initial hypothesis, and that they
add (1b) on the basis of positive evidence (though see Gualmini 2003, 2004). Given also that
there are languages like Turkish, which allows only (1a) (see (2)), it has been argued that
there is a binary parameter of UG which distinguishes superset languages like English from
subset languages like Turkish (Ozcelik 2011):

(2) Jack iki kişi bul-ma-dı.
 Jack two person find-NEG-PAST
 "Jack didn't find two guys."

  ✓ a. It is not the case that Jack found two guys. (e.g. Donald found one guy, three
    guys, no guys, etc.)
  * b. There are two guys that Jack didn't find.

   We focus on this issue, for the first time, from the perspective of L3 acquisition. We
investigate L3 acquisition of Turkish by Uzbek-Russian bilinguals. Uzbek, a Turkic language
that is typologically and structurally similar to Turkish and is mutually understandable with it,
is surprisingly like English with respect to this parameter. As with English, it has both surface
and inverse scope interpretations of sentences with quantification and negation (see (3)):

(3) Jack ikki kishi-ni top-ma-di.
 Jack two person-Acc find-NEG-PAST
 "Jack didn't find two guys."

  ✓ a. It is not the case that Jack found two guys.
  ✓ b. There are two guys that Jack didn't find.

On the other hand, Russian, which is typologically more like English than Turkish, behaves
like Turkish with respect to this parameter, as it does not, arguably, allow quantifier raising
(see e.g. Ionin 2001):

(4) Jack ne našel   dvux mal'čikov.
    Jack not found two   boys
   "Jack didn't find two guys."

    ✓ a. It is not the case that Jack found two guys.
    * b. There are two guys that Jack didn't find.

In other words, the learning scenario here is ideal in that it allows us to disentangle the effects of typological vs. structural similarity in leading to syntactic transfer. If, as maintained by the Cumulative Enhancement Model (CEM) (Flynn et al. 2004), transfer is either facilitative or remains neutral, the similarity between Russian and Turkish with respect to the structure investigated here, i.e. quantificational scope, should have a scaffolding effect on the acquisition of the relevant structure in Turkish by Uzbek-Russian bilinguals; knowledge of Russian should, in other words, enhance subsequent acquisition of Turkish while knowledge of Uzbek remains neutral in this regard. To put it another way, under the CEM, transfer is not expected to obtain in the Uzbek to Turkish direction. If, on the other hand, typology is the deterministic factor, as proposed by the Typological Primacy Model (TPM) (Rothman 2011), linguistic properties of the closest (psycho)typological language, i.e. Uzbek in this case, will constitute the initial state, rather than Russian, even though Russian provides the best/most ideal source for transfer here. In other words, non-facilitative transfer, under the TPM, is possible, based on perceived typological proximity.

        To pursue these issues, we conducted an experiment, testing adult Uzbek-Russian bilingual learners of Turkish, of different proficiency levels, on the same structures, and using the same task. The task involves TVJs of sentences like (2). (2) is presented following a story where *Jack* plays hide-and-seek with four of his friends, and, in the end, finds two of the four guys. In such a context, (2) would be true on its inverse scope interpretation (if available, as with (1b)) whereas it is false on its surface scope interpretation. Given the Maxim of Charity (Grice 1975), one would choose the interpretation that makes the sentence true (i.e. inverse scope) if both interpretations are accessible, and would, therefore, accept (2). If, on the other hand, the (2b) interpretation is not available, as with the target language Turkish, one would reject (2), since the only interpretation that is available is the one that makes the sentence false. Preliminary results, based on 7 Uzbek-Russian bilingual learners of Turkish, show that these learners accept such sentences, indicating that they have the additional inverse scope interpretation that is not available in Turkish or Russian, but is available in Uzbek, a response pattern similar to Uzbek (and English) native speakers.

        In conclusion, even though one of the previously acquired languages (i.e. Russian) provides the features needed for immediate successful L3 acquisition, as this language is also the system that is perceived as less typologically similar to the target language (Turkish), transfer is not activated, contra the CEM. Rather, as is predicted by the TPM, transfer is activated on the basis of (perceived) typological similarity, even though this leads to a less optimal result, as the source language (Uzbek) and the L3 (Turkish) behave rather differently with respect to the parameter tested here, despite the general similarity between the two languages, which are both members of the Turkic language family and are mutually understandable.