

Structuring Itelmen Word Order

Jonathan David Bobaljik
Harvard University

Princeton

29 Sept 2023



Introduction

- (S)OV and (S)VO order are well-attested in Itelmen
- What conditions the alternation?
- Small text/corpus study

- Implications for Itelmen (morpho)syntax
- Implications for approaches to syntax of focus/new and given
- Consideration of (functional) alternatives



Itelmen [itl]

- Chukotko-Kamchatkan, Kamchatka peninsula, Russia
- 1990s ~ 80 speakers
- now handful of varying proficiency:
 - 1 completely fluid, native; others varying - revitalization
- all speakers bilingual, Russian-dominant since 1950s or earlier

Acknowledgments



T. N. Bragina



L. E. Pravdoshina



Susi Wurmbrand

Stats help: Kate Davidson,
Steven Worthington (Institute
for Quantitative Social Science,
Harvard)



Physical Sciences and Humanities
Research Council of Canada

Conseil de recherches en
sciences humaines du Canada

Canada



E. E. Silina



A. D. Ivashova

OV~VO:

- (1) sčas kma miŧ knin i? t'-il-aŧ-čen. OV
 NOW 1sg all 2SG.POSS water 1SG-drink-FUT-1>3SG
 'I will drink up all your water.' [AS (37)]
- (2) k'-il-?in=(n)in miŧ kəŧx^w-čax. VO
 PRT-drink-TRANS.PRT=3CL all lake-DIM
 'She drank up all the little lake.' [AS (38)]

- subject and object **cross-referenced on verb**
- no case marking on subj, obj
- arguments freely omitted

(1) sčas kma miɫ knin i? t'-il-aɫ-čen.
 NOW 1sg all 2SG.POSS water 1SG-drink-FUT-1>3SG

'I will drink up all your water.' [AS (37)]

(2) k'-il-ʔin=(n)in miɫ kəɫx^w-čax
 PRT-drink-TRANS.PRT=3CL all lake-DIM

'She drank up all the little lake.' [AS (38)]

Four Texts

Title	Stroyteller	Genre
1. Wingless Gosling	Tatiana N. Bragina	Myth/Tale
2. Old Man	Lyudmila E. Pravdoshina	Event
3. Kutkh and the Mice	Ekaterina E. Silina	Myth/Tale
4. Tilval	Agrafena D. Ivashova	Legend

- ~900 clauses (of which ~300 transitive)
- Sedanka-Tigil (Northern) dialect
- recorded 1994, transcr. & edited with speakers
- Speaker 1 *1906, Speakers 2-4 *1934-1942.

Methodology 1: Coding for IS

- O_{new} referent not previously mentioned in discourse
or explicitly contrastive ($n=6$) cf. *focus*
- O_{old} referent previously mentioned in discourse (=given)
1st and 2nd person always given
- dialogues within a story are new discourses
- Complications:
 - finer-grained: salience, accessibility, etc
 - part-whole: X's hand, door of house, etc.
 - common ground via world knowledge (chapel in village, etc)

Methodology 2: Coding for S,O,V

Three points of indeterminacy:

1. Coordination or separate clauses?
2. Perception verbs (NP as O or S)?
3. N-construction (“passive”/impersonal)

Indeterminacy 1: Counting clauses

(5) aŋaqa-čχ k-φti-knen k-ηrep-qzu-knen
 Angaqa-DIM PRT-remain-PRT PRT-sing-ASP-PRT

‘Angaqa remained and (he) sang’ [AS (25)]

a. [_{CP} Angaqa remained] & [_{CP} pro sang]

SV & V

b. [_{CP} Angaqa [_{VP} remained] & [_{VP} sang]]

SV & SV



Four Texts

INTRANSITIVE	V	SV	VS		Total
	304	236	36		576
					SubTotals
TRANSITIVE					
no S,O	V				
	58				58
1 NP	SV	VS	OV	VO	
	16	4	105	65	190
S>O	SOV	SVO	VSO		
	34	21	3		58
O>S	OSV	OVS	VOS		
	7	4	0		11
TOTAL TRANSITIVE					317

Table 1: Constituent Order (raw)

Indeterminacy 2: Perception (and similar) verbs:

- (6) k'-əʈčku-in=(n)in tsxal-astas k-k'oʈ-knen
 PRT-see-TRNS.PRT=3CL fox-AUGM PRT-come-PRT
 'He saw a fox coming.' [AS (28)]
- a. [saw fox;] [(it;) came] NP-complement
 b. [saw [fox come]] clausal-complement

- (True) clausal complements always post-verbal (in texts)

Strategy:

- raw count: include perception O (and passive)
- adjusted count: exclude perception O (and passive)

Raw counts (before refinements)

Table 2: All texts OV/VO \times old/new (raw)
(Fisher's Exact $p < .0001$)

	OV	VO	Total
O_{new}	93	31	124
O_{old}	57	58	115
Totals	150	89	239

Table 3: Text 1 (raw) (Fisher's Exact
 $p = 0.02533$)

	OV	VO	Total
O_{new}	12	5	17
O_{old}	3	9	12
Totals	15	14	29

First Result

- O_{new} mostly pre-verbal (3:1)
- O_{old} variation
 - for oldest speaker, O_{old} mostly post-verbal

Broadly consistent with (S)OV languages, opposite of (S)VO

- Turkish (OV) (Kural, 1997; Kornfilt, 2005; Şener, 2010):
 - preverbal focus, O_{old} scrambled (L or R)
 - postverbal constituents must be background (given, non-topic)
- Russian (VO) (Dyakonova, 2009; Bailyn, 2012; Titov, 2012):
 - Right Focus: new information focus occurs clause-finally (IK1)
 - O_{old} may but need not front (also contrastive focus)

Turkish: SOV, unmarked? intonation


- (7) I know that my wife asked Pelin, Pinar, and Can each to read a famous book by Orhan Pamuk titled “White Castle” in her class last week. I ask her today:

A: What happened with that reading assignment of yours from last week?

- (8) B:
- a. # Yalnızca Pelin **kitab-ı** oku-muş. SOV
only Pelin book-ACC read-PAST
 - b. **Kitab-ı** yalnızca Pelin oku-muş. OSV
book-ACC only Pelin read-PAST
 - c. Yalnızca Pelin oku-muş **kitab-ı**. SVO
only Pelin read-PAST book-ACC
- ‘Only Pelin read the book.’


(Şener (2010), see also Kural (1997); Kornfilt (2005))

(9) SOVx



Given_{Top} > New > Given_{Bkgd}

(10) SVO




Given > New

Itelmen VP is head-final (I)

Negation: NEG ... V-(k)aq ... AUX

- (11) qaʔm βeqaʔnʈ ʈəm-aq tʻ-iʈ-čen
 NEG bear kill-NEG 1SG.-AUX-1>3SG
 ‘I didn’t kill (a) bear.’ [S3:9]

- (12) a. * tʻ-iʈ-čen qaʔm ʈəm-aq
 1SG-AUX-1>3SG NEG kill-NEG
 b. * qaʔm tʻ-iʈ-čen ʈəm-aq
 NEG 1SG-AUX-1>3SG kill-NEG
 ‘I didn’t kill it.’ [S3:9]



see also Abramovitz (2019) on Koryak

Itelmen VP is head-final (II)

Predicate complements to *le-* ‘become’
(including predicate nominals (b)):


- (13) a. qat **laq-aq** k-le-qzu-knen.
 already cold-ADV PRT-become-ASP-PRT
 ‘Already it was becoming cold.’ [AS (5)]
- b. qat A.S. **li** **p-laχ** **qsas** k’-le-knen
 ALREADY A.S. very big-ADJ goose PRT-become-PRT
 ‘A.S. had already become a very big goose, ...’ [AS (94)]

Itelmen VP is head-final (III)

Complex predicates (light verbs):

- (14) a. **xaq** tʃi-ʔn k-**təl**-knen
 know 3PL-PL PRT-AUX-PRT
 ‘They recognized (lit: knew) him.’ [TN (63)]
- b. jurte-čχ **ənluʃi-ʃ** k’-**ite**-ʔin
 yurt-DIM enflame-INST PRT-AUX-PRT
 ‘(They) burned the little yurt.’ [KL (118)ʹ]
- c. noz-əʔn knank **napravit** t’-**iʃ**-če-ʔn
 dried.fish-PL 2SG.DAT prepare(<*Russ.*) 1SG-AUX-1>3-PL
 ‘I’ve prepared jukola (dried fish) for you.’ [KL:15]

FOFC (Final-over-final constraint) (Biberauer et al., 2014)



An indirect argument for high VO_{Old}

FOFC: In many V-final languages, CP complements follow V

Headedness parameters (hypothetical):

VP-AUX	head-final AuxP
DP-V	head-final VP
V-CP	but CP complement to right

Predicts [[V O_{CP}]_{VP} AUX]

False! Unattested. ∴ [V CP] order involves extraposition, not complement on right

An indirect argument for high VO_{Old}

Elicitation (with Susi Wurmbrand):

(15) βeqaʔnʲɬ ‘bear’:

<1> qaʔm <2> ɬəm-aq <3> tʰ-iɬ-čen <4>
 NEG kill-NEG 1SG.-AUX-1>3SG

‘I didn’t kill (the/a) bear.’ [S3:9-10]

<2> preferred

<1,4> acceptable

<3> very hesitantly acquiesced but in ‘repeating’ switched to <2>

An indirect argument for high VO_{Old}

Texts:

- one occurrence of [V O Aux] in recordings (Lt. Vb)
- but auxiliary omitted in edited version V O

Tentative conclusion: * V O Aux

Unexpected, if O in [VO] within VP

prima facie case that VO is (high) extrapolation of O.

- Itelmen is an OV language, OV is derived

NB: Although the reasoning comes from FOFC, the motivation for finite CP extrapolation in FOFC does not extend to these derivations.

First results:

- $O_{new}V$
- $O_{old}V \sim VO_{old}$ (why diff?)
- Itelmen patterns with OV languages (**extrapolation**)
- not (just) Russian influence (Ono, others)
- Itelmen uses VO more than in Turkish, why?

Table 4: All texts OV/VO × old/new (raw)

	OV	VO	Total
O_{new}	93	31	124
O_{old}	57	58	115
Totals	150	89	239

Table 5: Text 1 (raw)

	OV	VO	Total
O_{new}	12	5	17
O_{old}	3	9	12
Totals	15	14	29

Perception (and similar) verbs:

(16) k'-əʃčku-in=(n)in tsxal-astas k-k'oʃ-knen
 PRT-see-TRNS.PRT=3CL fox-AUGM PRT-come-PRT

'He saw a fox coming.' [AS (28)]

- a. [saw fox_i] [(it_i) came] NP-complement
 b. [saw [fox come]] clausal-complement

Meaning alone doesn't preclude RtO/ECM (Lohninger et al., 2022)

Perception (and similar) verbs:

(16) k'-əłčku-in=(n)in tsxal-astas k-k'oł-knen
 PRT-see-TRNS.PRT=3CL fox-AUGM PRT-come-PRT

'He saw a fox coming.' [AS (28)]

- a. [saw fox_i] [(it_i) came] NP-complement
 b. [saw [fox come]] clausal-complement

- All perception verb complements post-verbal, regardless of IS
- (All clausal complements are post-verbal)
- 3/5 VO_{new} in Text 1 (15/31 in aggregate) are perception complements

Perception (and similar) verbs:

- (17) k'-joβa-ʔa-ʔn-(n)in qsa-ʔn k'oʈ-kil-at
 PRT-encounter-TR.PRT-PL-3CL goose-PL come-NOM-PL
 'He encountered geese coming.' [AS (76)]
- (18) t'-əʈčku-at-aʈ-čen k'e-ze enu ʈ-qzu-in
 1SG-see-GO-FUT-3SG.OBJ who-PTCL DEM BE-ASP-3SG
 'I'll go see who was there.' [TN (101)]
- (19) da-vot muza-ʔn nt'-utu-z-in [βitβit txuŋe-s.]
 INTRJ 1PL-PL 1PL-unable-PRES-3.OBJ seal drag.out-INF
 'Well, see, we can't drag the seal out.' [KL (18)]

Restructuring, Order, Scope (Bobaljik & Wurmbrand, 2005)

LDA is (descriptively) optional

- (20) a. na əntxa-**βum**=nin [**kma** jeβna-s.]
 3SG forget.TR-1.OBJ=3CL 1SG meet-INF
 ‘He forgot to meet me.’ [S6:8]
- b. na netxa-**in** [**kma** jeβna-s.]
 3SG forget.INTR-3SG 1SG meet-INF
 ‘He forgot to meet me.’ [S6:9]

Restructuring, Order, Scope (Bobaljik & Wurmbrand, 2005)


But LDA → object scope over matrix verb:

(21) t'-əntxa-čə-ʔn [miʔ okno-ʔn sop-es.]
 1SG-forget.TR-3.OBJ-PL all window-PL close-INF
 'I forgot to close all the windows.' [S6:6-7]

∀ > forget no window closed

NOT: forget > ∀ some, not all windows closed

Restructuring, Order, Scope (Bobaljik & Wurmbrand, 2005)



- Object extraposition precedes (remnant) clausal extraposition
- Same derivation with AUX, possibly more complex under FOFC/LCA

N-construction: passive/impersonal

- (22) a. **Mit-enk** n-qzu-z-um
 Miti-LOC N-wait-PRES-1s.OBJ
 ‘Miti (is) waiting for me.’ [KL (17)']
- b. **tsxal-enk** miṭ i? n-γil-čen
 fox-LOC all water N-drink-3sg.OBJ
 ‘All the water was drunk by the fox.’ [AS (47)']

S: oblique (LOC/INSTR), fixed prefix *n-* [=3PL]

O: unmarked, triggers object agreement

Source of Ergativity and “Inverse” in Chuktokan? (Bobaljik, 2019)

Passive/Impersonal

(23) a. **kma** n-oms-qzu-βum

1SG N-leave-ASP-3>1SG

‘I was left behind.’ [AS (46)]

b. sinanɛβt-enk **kma** n-txunt-qzu-βum anql

Sinangewt-LOC 1SG N-raise-ASP-1SG.OBJ winter

‘I was raised by Sinangewt in the winter.’ [AS (85)]

n=7 (Text1), n≥26 (aggregate)

- O_{old} preverbal
- unlike post-verbal O_{old} , passive O **is topic**
- Agensausblendung (Agent-backgrounding) (Georg & Volodin, 1999, 197)

Passive/Impersonal

- (24) a qunʲiʲin kʲiŋle k-piki-knen ɲeja-ʔn-k
 and once night PRT-go-PRT mountain-PL-LOC
 i bolʲše na qaʔm k'e-nk əʧku-q k'-iʧ-ʔin.
 and more 3SG NEG who-LOC see-NEG PRT-AUX-PRT

‘And one night he went into the mountains and was never seen by anyone again.’ (TL (126))

Revised Tables (excl. perception, passive)

Table 6: Aggregated OV/VO \times old/new (fin) ($\chi^2=39.9008$, $p<.00001$)

	OV	VO	Total
O_{new}	91	16	107
O_{old}	44	55	99
Totals	135	71	206

Table 7: Text 1 (final) (Fisher's Exact $p=0.001905$)

	OV	VO	Total
O_{new}	10	2	12
O_{old}	1	9	10
Totals	11	11	22

Narrative Inversion

VO_{new} in Text 1:

- (25) a. k-zun^ɟ-qzu-kne-ʔn qsa-ʔn
 PRT-live-ASP-PRT-PL goose-PL
 ‘There lived some geese.’ [AS (1)]
- b. qsa-ʔn k'-ənsxt-ʔeʔn tʃi-ʔn p'e-ʔn
 goose-PL PRT-give.birth-TRNS.PRT.PL 3PL-PL child-PL
 ‘The geese gave birth to children.’ [AS (2)]

INTRANSITIVE	V	SV	VS	Total
	304	236	36	576



Narrative Inversion

(Once upon a time, Жил был)

- (26) it'e k-zun^j†-qu-knen li staroj tnaqol.
 when PRT-live-ASP-PRT very old old.man
 'Once there lived a very old man.' [TN (2)]
- (27) it-qat k-zun^j†-qu-kne-ʔn Kusx†nequ i Miti,
 when-already PRT-live-ASP-PRT-PL Kutkh and Miti
 'Once there lived Kutkh and Miti,' [KL (1)]
- (28) it-qata zin-k k-zun^j†-qzu-kne-ʔn č'amza-ʔl.
 when-already woods-LOC PRT-live-ASP-PRT-PL person-PL
 'Once in the woods there lived some people.' [TL]

Narrative Inversion

Bailyn (2012, 337)
(Russian)



VO_{new} in Text 1

- (60) *sinanɛβit sisi-ʔn-č nβen k-sk-aʔn*
 Sinangewt wing-PL-DIM LOC PRT-make-PRT.PL
 ‘Sinangewt made little wings then.’
- (61) *k-ʔən-tʃi-ʔin-(n)i'n qsas-čχ-ank i k-t'ə-nin-(n)in*
 PRT-CAUS-wear-TR.PRT-3CL.PL goose-DIM-DAT and PRT-take-3>3SG-3CL
əz-ank
 outside-DAT
 ‘She put the wings on him and took him outside.’
- (62) *k-χene-knen:*
 PRT-say-PRT
 ‘She said:’
- (63) “*q-taβoŋ-xe'n tinu'n sisi-ʔn-č*”
 2.IRR-try-2>3PL DEM.PL wing-PL-DIM
 “Try these wings.”

Refined results:

- syntax of perception complements - no movement?*
- topic \neq given
- $O_{new}V$ (robust!)
- backgrounded O tends to be postverbal
- OV + (optional) extraposition

*pace Bobaljik & Wurmbrand 2005

Itelmen patterns with OV

- Basic order: OV
- New information: pre-verbal

	OV	VO	Total
O_{new}	91	16	107
O_{old}	44	55	99
Totals	135	71	206

For O_{new} : convergence

For O_{old} : conflicting constraints:

$OV > VO$

optionality

cf. Bobaljik & Wurmbrand (2012)

A “Noisy Channel” Alternative?

Gibson et al. (2013):

- for $V_{transitive}$, if one NP is missing, and if no case marking, what is the role of the NP?
 - SOV base: NP V - ambiguous
 - SVO base: NP V - subject
V NP - object

claim In SOV languages, VO order gives redundant coding of O role for **animate NP**

(NB: Gibson et al. (2013) consider no language data, only gesture tasks)
See Kocab et al. (2018) for additional critical remarks.

A Noisy Channel?

Itelmen:

- No case marking S/O
- OV~VO
- usually only one overt NP:

V	58	
V,NP	190	(S: 20, O:170)
V,NP,NP	69	
<hr/>		
Total	317	(raw)

A Noisy Channel?

No: Small effect of animacy, but larger effect of old/new.

- Holding other predictor variables constant:
 - odds ratio $VO_{anim} : VO_{inan} = 2.1$ (95% CI [1.0, 4.3]).
 - odds ratio $VO_{old} : VO_{new} = 6.1$ (95% CI [3.1, 12.9]).
- binary logistic regression model (glmer in R)
glmer(ORDER ~ INFSTR + ANIMACY + (1|TEXT))

A different animacy factor?

Aside: Small effect of animacy independent of IS, but $O_{inan}V$ or VO_{anim} ?

(29) esx-ank-əŋ li plex-a?n txu?-i?n_{new} q-la-qzu-čx-e?n
 father-DAT-DAT very big-PL greeting-PL IMP-tell-ASP-II-PL
 ‘Give (tell) your father big greetings!’ [TN (110)]

(30) muza-?n mił esx-a?n-k-əŋ txu?-i?n_{old} nt’-la-ał-xŋ-e?n
 1PL-PL all father-PL-DT-DT greeting-PL 1PL-tell-FUT-II-PL
 ‘We will all give (tell) our fathers greetings!’ [TN (112)]

Non-referential O?

When these (n=22) are excluded, effect of animacy dips below significance:
 ($p=.0981$, OR 1.9 (95% CI [0.9, 4.1])).

Noisy Channel?

- Main driver of $OV \sim VO$ is IS, not animacy
- small effect of animacy, many potential sources
- single NP with transitive verb 8.5:1 NP = object
- since $S \rightleftharpoons$ topic, IS alone normally enough to resolve GF
- Noisy channel effect not a contender for explanation of alternation

Conclusions: OV~VO in Itelmen

- Itelmen is an OV language (basic order)
- OV/VO reflects Information Structure
 - O_{new} is almost always pre-verbal
 - O_{old} may (need not) extrapose
- perception complements are clausal, despite agreement
- preverbal focus is low, extraposed O is high (not Cartography)
- potential for correlation V-final/-initial with prosody
Jackendoff (1972); Schmerling (1976); Gussenhoven (1983); Selkirk (1984); Arregi (2016)

Common end to traditional narratives (Text 1)

- (31) ti'n-nu t-pentφi-s-čen
 DEM-PRTC 1SG-finish-PRES-1>3SG
 'Here I have finished it (the story).' (AS(95))

aside: Word Order Freezing?

Why does Itelmen use more R-movement than Turkish?

Speculation:

(Almost) no scrambling across the subject.

Only 1 (non-wh, non N-construction) example of OSV in texts:

(32) tnaqol tχi-ʔn k-tzəl-knen
 old.man 3PL-PL PRT-catch.up-PRT-PL

‘They caught up to the old man.’ [TN (63)]

(O here is topic of story, but not of sentence)

caveat: short L-scrambling not investigated

- Abramovitz, Rafael (2019) Word Order and Negation in Koryak, handout of a paper presented at MIT.
- Arregi, Karlos (2016) Focus projection theories. In *The Oxford Handbook of Information Structure*, Caroline Féry & Shinichiro Ishihara, eds., Oxford: Oxford University Press, 185–202.
- Bailyn, John Frederick (2012) *The Syntax of Russian*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Biberauer, Theresa, Anders Holmberg, & Ian Roberts (2014) A syntactic universal and its consequences. *Linguistic Inquiry* 45(2): 169–225.
- Bobaljik, Jonathan David (2019) The Chukotkan “inverse” from an Itelmen perspective. In *Лингвистика и другие важные вещи: Памяти Александра Павловича Володина [Linguistics and other important things]*, E. V. Golovko, A. M. Pevnov, M. Yu. Pupynina, A. A. Syuryun, & A. Yu. Urmanchieva, eds., Sankt-Peterburg: Institute of Linguistics, Russian Academy of Sciences, 415–435.
- Bobaljik, Jonathan David & Susi Wurmbrand (2005) The domain of agreement. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 23: 809–865.
- Bobaljik, Jonathan David & Susi Wurmbrand (2012) Word Order and Scope: Transparent interfaces and the 3/4 signature. *Linguistic Inquiry* 43(3): 371–421.
- Dyakonova, Maria (2009) *A phase-based approach to Russian free word order*. Ph.D. thesis, University of Amsterdam.

- Georg, Stefan & Aleksandr P. Volodin (1999) *Die itelmenische Sprache*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag.
- Gibson, Edward, Steven T. Piantadosi, Kimberly Brink, Leon Bergen, Eunice Lim, & Rebeccas Saxe (2013) A noisy-channel account of crosslinguistic word order variation. *Psychological Science* **24**(7): 1079–1088.
- Gussenhoven, Carlos (1983) Focus, Mode and the Nucleus. *Journal of Linguistics* **19**(2): 377–417.
- Jackendoff, Ray (1972) *Semantic Interpretation in Generative Grammar*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Jakobson, Roman (1936[1971]) Beitrag zur allgemeinen Kasuslehre. Gesamtbedeutungen der russischen Kasus. In *Selected Writings*, vol. 2, Roman Jakobson, ed., The Hague: Mouton, 23–71.
- King, Tracy Holloway (1995) *Configuring Topic and Focus in Russian*. Stanford: CSLI.
- Kocab, Annemarie, Hannah Lam, & Jesse Snedeker (2018) When Cars Hit Trucks and Girls Hug Boys: The Effect of Animacy on Word Order in Gestural Language Creation. *Cognitive Science* **42**: 918–938.
- Kornfilt, Jaklin (2005) Asymmetries between pre-verbal and post-verbal scrambling in Turkish. In *The free word order phenomenon : its syntactic sources and diversity*, Joachim Sabel & Mamoru Saito, eds., Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 163–181.

- Kural, Murat (1997) Postverbal constituents in Turkish and the Linear Correspondence Axiom. *Linguistic Inquiry* **28**: 498–519.
- Lohninger, Magdalena, Iva Kovač, & Susanne Wurmbrand (2022) From Prolepsis to Hyperraising. *Philosophies* 7(32).
- Schmerling, Susan F. (1976) *Aspects of English Sentence Stress*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Selkirk, Elisabeth (1984) *Phonology and Syntax*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Şener, Serkan (2010) *(Non-)Peripheral Matters in Turkish Syntax*. Ph.D. thesis, University of Connecticut, Storrs, CT.
- Titov, Elena (2012) *Information Structure of Argument Order Alternations*. Phd dissertation, University College London, London.