

**О МОДЕЛИРОВАНИИ ИНФОРМАЦИОННОЙ СТРУКТУРЫ
НА ОСНОВЕ СОБЫТИЙНЫХ НОМИНАЛИЗАЦИЙ
В РУССКОМ ЯЗЫКЕ**

А. М. Перельцвайг
независимый исследователь

В этой статье выдвигаются аргументы в пользу анти-картографического подхода к моделированию информационной структуры в русском языке на основе событийных номинализаций.

Ключевые слова: информационная структура, картография, номинализации, русский язык.

**MODELING TOPIC / FOCUS:
EVIDENCE FROM RUSSIAN EVENTIVE NOMINALIZATIONS**

Asya Pereltsvaig
Independent Scholar

This paper argues in favor of the anti-cartographic approach to modeling information structure, in particular the representation of topic and focus in Russian based on eventive nominalizations.

Keywords: information structure, cartography, nominalizations, Russian.

1. Introduction

It is well-known that languages differ as to how much word order might vary depending on the information structure: for example, in English verb-initial orders, VSO and VOS, are not allowed while in Russian they are both allowed under certain discourse circumstances. What parameters account for these differences across languages and what is the nature of these parameters? In syntactic literature, two approaches to this issue have emerged: the cartographic approach, which treats topic and focus as syntactic phenomena [Rizzi 1997], and the anti-cartographic approach, which treats topic and focus as post-syntactic [Neeleman, Van de Koot 2008]. Thus, according to the cartographic approach, “languages differ in the type of movements that they admit or in the extent to which they overtly realize each head and specifier” [Cinque, Rizzi 2008: 46]. In contrast, for the anti-cartographic approach, the variation in topic / focus is in the “mapping rules that associate syntactic representations with representations in information structure” [Neeleman, Van de Koot 2008: 269]. In this paper, I examine the three “pillars” (i.e. basic tenets) of the cartographic approach and pose challenges for all three pillars based on eventive nominalizations in Russian.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows: in section 2, I outline the three pillars of the cartographic approach. In section 3, I provide some basic information about eventive nominalizations in Russian and their analysis assumed in this paper. In section 4, I investigate how the two orders of arguments in such nominalizations are to be derived syntactically and examine how topic and focus work in these constructions. Section 5 concludes the paper and opens avenues for future research.

2. The three pillars of the cartographic approach

The first one to analyze topic and focus systematically within the cartographic approach was Luigi Rizzi [Rizzi 1997]. He proposed that the CP should be split into several functional projections, including two TopPs and a FocP sandwiched between them. TopPs are to host topical(ized) elements while the FocP is the location of the focused element. Underscoring this analysis is the first pillar on which the cartographic approach in general rests: the **One Feature One Head (OFOH) principle**: “Each morphosyntactic feature corresponds to an independent syntactic head with a specific slot in the functional hierarchy” [Cinque, Rizzi 2008: 45]. According to this principle, if topic and focus are to be considered

as morphosyntactic features, carried by elements interpreted as topics or foci, there must be at least one TopP and one FocP. As we shall see later, several other TopPs and FocPs, other than those postulated by Rizzi in the split CP, have been proposed in subsequent research.

The second pillar on which the cartographic approach rests is the notion of **antisymmetry** [Kayne 1994]. According to the antisymmetry, there is only one layout for any functional projection, with a specifier preceding the head and the complement following the head. Notably, antisymmetry allows for only a single specifier and no adjunction. Thus, antisymmetry provides functional projections that can be stacked one on top of another, creating right-branching structures of increasing complexity.

Because the antisymmetry reduces the word order possibilities that can be derived by Merge (for instance, VO but not OV can be derived by Merge), any analysis within the antisymmetry framework must rely more heavily on movement, and in many cases one must resolve to remnant movement, which is sometimes preceded by evacuation of elements that should not move with the remnant. For example, the final position of focused subjects (in VS order) can be derived within this framework by first moving the subject out of VP, *v*P or even TP and then moving the remnant VP, *v*P or TP to the left of the subject. In many cases, such evacuation-plus-remnant movement mimics the effects of rightward movement, without there being rightward movement, which is ruled out by the antisymmetry.

The third pillar of the cartographic approach is the notion of **triggered movement**: if each functional head is endowed with a specific morphosyntactic feature, it attracts phrases with a matching feature to its specifier. It is therefore unexpected that the movement of a certain phrase X would have interpretive effects on another phrase Y not directly involved in the movement operation; see [Van Craenenbroeck 2009] for a detailed discussion.

In what follows, we shall see that all three pillars of the cartographic approach are challenged by data and data-driven analyses of topic and focus in eventive nominalizations in Russian. But first, some background about eventive nominalizations is in order.

3. Eventive nominalizations in Russian

Eventive nominalizations in Russian, as in (1a-b), received much attention in the syntactic literature. However, the possibility of flipping the order of the arguments in such nominalizations (but not in result nominals, as in (1c-d)) has been merely acknowledged but not explained.

- (1) a. *kollekcionirovanie* *redkix monet* *millionerom Pupkinym*
 collecting [rare coins].GEN [millionaire Pupkin].INSTR
 ‘millionaire Pupkin’s collecting of rare coins’ {a = b}
- b. *kollekcionirovanie* *millionerom Pupkinym* *redkix monet*
 collecting [millionaire Pupkin].INSTR [rare coins].GEN
- c. *kollekcija* *redkix monet* *millionera Pupkina*
 collection [rare coins].GEN [millionaire Pupkin].GEN
 ‘millionaire Pupkin’s collection of rare coins’ {c = d}
- d. **kollekcija* *millionera Pupkina* *redkix monet*
 collection [millionaire Pupkin].GEN [rare coins].GEN

For example, [Babby 1997] points out that if one of the arguments in an eventive nominalization is pronominal, it appears first (this is true regardless of whether the pronominal argument is the S/external argument or the O/internal argument):

- (2) a. *kollekcionirovanie* *imi* *marok*
 collecting they.INSTR stamps.GEN
 ‘collecting of stamps by them’
- b. *kollekcionirovanie* *ix* *det’mi*
 collecting they.GEN children.INSTR
 ‘collecting of them by children’

What remains unexplained so far is how the two argument orders (SO and OS) are derived syntactically, what positions the two arguments occupy in each order, and which order serves to encode which information structure(s). The goal of this paper is to address these issues.

As in previous analyses of eventive nominalizations in Russian (especially [Lyutikova 2014; Pereltsvaig, Lyutikova, Gerasimova 2018; Pereltsvaig 2018, to appear], I assume that such nominalizations are produced by embedding a verbal structure under nominal functional projections. In particular, the verbal portion of the structure is assumed, following [Pazel’skaya, Tatevosov 2003, Tatevosov 2008], to include *vP*, the projection where the external argument (S) is merged, and *AspP*, the projection hosting the secondary imperfective *-yva*. As shown by Pazel’skaya and Tatevosov, aspectual morphology which is structurally higher than *-yva* cannot be included in eventive nominalizations. The nominal portion of the structure includes not only the DP, but also a much

lower functional projection nP , which hosts the nominalizing morphology [Pereltsvaig, Lyutikova, Gerasimova 2018; Pereltsvaig 2018, to appear], as well as the functional projections in between, such as NumP. The derived noun does not raise all the way to D° (as in [Abney 1987]) but appears as low as n° . Because (as we shall see below), the S and O arguments cannot appear to the left of the derived noun, they must appear in positions located within the verbal portion of the structure, regardless of their surface order.

According to [Pereltsvaig to appear], the two argument orders are derivationally related, and the SO order is basic. The latter conclusion is reached based on the Scope Freezing Generalization [Antonyuk 2015], which states that when two scopal elements are present, the Merge order is scopally ambiguous, whereas movement of one of the scopal elements results in scope freezing. In eventive nominalizations, the SO order, as in (3a), is scopally ambiguous, whereas the OS order, as in (3b), is not. It is thus concluded that the SO order is the Merge order of arguments. This conclusion is entirely unsurprising because in clauses the external argument (S) is also merged higher than the internal argument (O).

- (3) a. *otkryvanie kakim-to gostem každoj dveri*
 opening [some guest].INSTR [every door].GEN
 ‘opening by some guest of every door’: $\exists A, \forall E$
- b. *otkryvanie kakoj-to dveri každyj gostem*
 opening [some door].GEN [every guest].INSTR
 ‘opening by some guest of every door’: $\exists A, *A\exists$

This conclusion is further supported by the fact that nominalizations where the two arguments appear in the same morphological case are interpreted as having the SO order, similar to the claim in [Jakobson 1936/1984] regarding simple clauses such as *Mat’ ljubit doč* literally ‘Mother loves daughter’. In Jakobson’s example, the morphological form of both the subject and the object does not distinguish nominative and accusative; since we cannot tell which is the subject and which is the object, theoretically one could expect such sentences to be interpreted alternatively as either SVO or OVS, yet Jakobson claimed — and [Sekerina 1997] confirmed this experimentally — that such sentences are interpreted only as the Merge order, SVO.

With eventive nominalizations, the internal argument (O) may be lexically case-marked as instrumental or genitive, and the external argument (S) may have the same morphological case [Pereltsvaig, Lyutikova, Gerasimova 2018].

It turns out that when a case configuration obtains where both arguments are marked with the same morphological case, the nominalization is interpreted as SO and not as OS.

- (4) a. *kasanie snarjada bëder*
 touching crossbar.GEN hips.GEN
 ‘touching of the crossbar at the hips’ [Google hit]
 NOT: ‘touching of the hips at the crossbar’
- b. *upravlenie kuxarkoj gosudarstvom*
 managing cook.INSTR state.INSTR
 ‘managing of the state by a cook’ [Google hit]
 NOT: ‘managing of the cook by the state’

4. Deriving the two argument orders and topic / focus

If the SO order of arguments in eventive nominalizations is the basic / Merge order, the next question is how is the OS order derived. There are in principle two ways to derive it: by moving the S to the right of O, or by moving the O to the left of S. Let’s consider these possibilities in turn.

The first way to derive the OS order is to move the S rightward. If we assume the antisymmetry framework (in line with the cartographic approach, as explained above), the movement of S to the right can be mimicked, without allowing for rightward movement, by remnant movement. Specifically, the S must be first evacuated out of the ν P, to a position immediately above the n P (recall that the derived noun, which appears before both arguments regardless of their mutual order, occurs in n°). Then, a remnant movement of n P, which now contains only the derived noun and the O (in that order) moves to a position to the left of the S. The relevant landing sites, within the cartographic approach, would be the Spec-FocP for the S and the Spec-TopP for the remnant n P. (In keeping with Rizzi’s proposal, the TopP is projected above the FocP.)

Note, however, that this derivation of the OS order predicts that the S is always nominalization-final and other elements such as adjunct PPs, which move up with the rest of the remnant, cannot follow the S. Yet, this prediction is not borne out: adjunct PPs (in bold in examples below) can actually follow the S. Both orders in (5) are possible, and for some speakers the order in (5a) is preferred over (5b). Yet, (5a) is exactly the order that the cartographic approach relying on remnant movement would predict to be ungrammatical.

(The only way to achieve the order in (5a) within the cartographic / antisymmetry approach is to evacuate the adjunct PP to a position outside of the *nP*, then evacuate the S to a position even higher than the landing site of the PP, then move the remnant, now containing only the derived noun *raskladyvanie* ‘putting’ and the O *veščej* ‘of things’, to a position above the landing site of the S. However, while one can motivate the evacuation of the S by the need to move it to Spec-FocP, there no motivation for evacuating two different elements out of the remnant.)

- (5) a. *raskladyvanie* *veščej* *uborščicej* ***po mestam***
 putting things.GEN cleaner.INSTR in places
 ‘putting things in their places by the cleaner’
- b. ? *raskladyvanie* *veščej* ***po mestam*** *uborščicej*
 putting things.GEN in places cleaner.INSTR
 ‘putting things in their places by the cleaner’

We thus must conclude that the OS order is derived not by moving S to the right of O (or the equivalent evacuation-plus-remnant-movement), but by moving the O to the left of S, akin to the “left-shift” in [Samek-Lodovici 2015]. [Pereltsvaig to appear] assumes this analysis and shows that the relevant movement of O is an instance of A'- rather than A-movement. The evidence in support of it being A'-movement come from data concerning Binding and Weak Cross Over. For example, in the OS order, the O cannot bind the S, as shown in (6a), while in the SO order the S can bind the O, as shown in (6b). Thus, the fronting of the object does not feed into binding relations; hence, it is not A-movement.

- (6) a. **podderživanie* *partnerov* *drug drugom*
 supporting partners.GEN [each other].INSTR
 intended: ‘the partners’ supporting each other’
- b. *podderživanie* *partnerami* *drug druga*
 supporting partners.INSTR [each other].GEN
 ‘supporting of each other by the partners’

The next question is where the A'-movement of the O lands. In principle, there are three possible landing sites: (i) Spec-AspP, (ii) an adjoined position, or (iii) a Spec-TopP or Spec-FocP. Within the cartographic approach, each of these options is problematic in its own way. Placing the moved O into Spec-AspP,

for example, violates the first pillar of the cartographic approach — the OFOH principle: since the AspP is the projection hosting an aspectual morpheme, it cannot, by the OFOH principle, accommodate anything other than an element with the corresponding aspectual feature. Adjunction, likewise, is ruled out by the cartographic approach, particularly by its second pillar, the antisymmetry. So could the landing site of O be in the TopP or FocP?

To answer this question, we need to consider how topic and focus work in eventive nominalizations. In order to avoid terminological confusion, I assume the definitions of topic and focus, as well as of contrastiveness, as given in the state-of-the-art article by [Féry, Ishihara 2016]. To start with the new information focus, whether the focused element is the S or the O, it appears following the non-focused argument (as pointed out above, a non-focused PP adjunct can follow the focused argument). To illustrate, consider the examples in (7): the example in (7a) is from a text about Roman history; here, the S ‘by the Romans’ is backgrounded and the O ‘of Carthage’ is the new information focus, and hence the order is SO. In contrast, the example in (7b) is from a text about Jewish history. Here, the O ‘of Jerusalem’ is backgrounded and the S ‘by Vespasian’ is the new information focus; hence the order is OS.

- (7) a. *razrušenie rimljanami Karfagena*
 destruction Romans.INSTR Carthage.GEN
 ‘destruction of Carthage by the Romans’
- b. *razrušenie Ierusalima Vespasianom*
 destruction Jerusalem.GEN Vespasian.INSTR
 ‘destruction of Jerusalem by Vespasian’

Contrastive focus works differently in that it must be intonationally emphasized; yet it is similar to the new information focus in that its preferred position is nominalization-final, contrary to the generalization in [Neeleman et al. 2009: 36] that “contrastive foci typically occupy positions further to the left” in Russian. Crucially, the contrastively focused element cannot precede the derived noun; this applies regardless of whether the contrastively focused element is the S or the O:

- (8) *Opiši-ka*
 describe-please
- a. **IERUSALIMA razrušenie rimljanami (a ne Karfagena)*
 Jerusalem.GEN destruction Romans.INSTR and not Carthage.GEN
 intended: ‘destruction of JERUSALEM by the Romans (and not of Carthage)’

- b. **RIMLJANAMI razrušenie Ierusalima (a ne vavilonjanami)*
 Romans.INSTR destruction Jerusalem.GEN and not Babylonians.INSTR
 intended: ‘destruction of Jerusalem by the ROMANS
 (and not by the Babylonians)’

It is possible to place the contrastively focused element, again whether it is the S or the O, in the medial position, between the derived noun and the non-focused argument; however, to some speakers this order is degraded:

(9) *Opiši-ka*

describe-please

- a. ? *razrušenie IERUSALIMA rimljanami (a ne Karfagena)*
 destruction Jerusalem.GEN Romans.INSTR and not Carthage.GEN
 ‘destruction of JERUSALEM by the Romans (and not of Carthage)’
- b. ? *razrušenie RIMLJANAMI Ierusalima (a ne vavilonjanami)*
 destruction Romans.INSTR Jerusalem.GEN and not Babylonians.INSTR
 ‘destruction of Jerusalem by the ROMANS
 (and not by the Babylonians)’

Thus, the preferred placement for the contrastively focused argument, be it the S or the O, is nominalization-final:

(10) *Opiši-ka*

describe-please

- a. *razrušenie rimljanami IERUSALIMA (a ne Karfagena)*
 destruction Romans.INSTR Jerusalem.GEN and not Carthage.GEN
 ‘destruction of JERUSALEM by the Romans (and not of Carthage)’
- b. *razrušenie Ierusalima RIMLJANAMI (a ne vavilonjanami)*
 destruction Jerusalem.GEN Romans.INSTR and not Babylonians.INSTR
 ‘destruction of Jerusalem by the ROMANS
 (and not by the Babylonians)’

This is further confirmed by naturally-occurring examples such as the following, where the contrasted elements are boldfaced. As can be seen in these examples, the contrastively focused S ‘by the Germans’ appears after the O ‘of Lvov’.

- (11) a. *sperva prisoeдинenie k SSSR, a potom*
 first inclusion into USSR and then

zaxvat L'vova nemcami
 capture Lvov.GEN Germans.INSTR

‘first the inclusion into the USSR and then the capture of Lvov by the Germans’ [<https://vesti-ukr.com/kultura/240899-126-litrov-dlja-prodigy-i-tjzhelye-zvezdy-ua>]

- b. *zaxvat L'vova nemcami,*
 capture Lvov.GEN Germans.INSTR

vsled za kotorymi banderovcy
 after which Bandera.followers

‘the capture of Lvov by the Germans after which (came) followers of Bandera’ [<http://www.km.ru/forum/world/2014/07/10/protivostoyanie-na-ukraine-2013-14/744572-konstantin-sivkov-strelkov-demonstriruet->]

Furthermore, contrastive topics precede contrastive foci, in eventive nominalizations as in clauses. This applies regardless of whether contrastive topics are the S or the O:

- (12) *Da razve možno sravnivat'*
 PRT whether possible to.compare

a. *razrušenie Stalingrada nemcami i Berlina sojuznikami*
 destruction Stalingrad.GEN Germans.INSTR and Berlin.GEN allies.INSTR
 ‘destruction of Stalingrad by the Germans and of Berlin by the allies’

b. *razrušenie nemcami Stalingrada i sojuznikami Berlina*
 destruction Germans.INSTR Stalingrad.GEN and allies.INSTR Berlin.GEN
 ‘destruction by the Germans of Stalingrad and by the allies of Berlin’

Importantly, the relative placement of topics and (new information or contrastive) foci is blind to their syntactic function as the S or the O. The overall generalization is that new information foci and contrastive foci appear in the nominalization-final position (with a marginal possibility for contrastive foci to appear medially for some speakers and a possibility of post-focus placement of PP adjuncts); moreover, contrastive topics precede contrastive foci.

In order to capture these facts within the cartographic approach, that is by placing relevant elements in TopP or FocP, we need a new set of dedicated TopP and FocP projections, located below *nP*, which (as you would recall) hosts the derived noun. Recall that [Rizzi 1997] postulated that TopP and FocP projections are located in the split CP. Shortly thereafter [Belletti 2004] added another set of TopP and FocP projections at the left periphery of *vP*. Similar TopP and FocP projections have also been proposed in various locations throughout the DP. For example, [Giusti 1996, 2006] proposed topic / focus-related projections at the left periphery of the DP, while [Bastos-Gee 2011] proposed another set of such projections at the left periphery of *nP*. Yet, TopP / FocP projections postulated by [Giusti 1996, 2006] in the split DP are too high for the present purposes: as shown by [Pereltsvaig 2018], all nominalization-specific (morpho-)syntax occurs at or below *nP*. Even the TopP/FocP projections postulated by [Bastos-Gee 2011] are too high to capture the word order alternations within the Russian eventive nominalizations because these projections are located **above** the *nP*, while the arguments (regardless of their topic / focus status) do not cross *n°* (i.e. the position of the derived noun). In order to capture these facts by using TopP and FocP projections, we would need to postulate a third set of such projections within the DP, below *nP*. Yet, this proliferation of dedicated topic and focus projections detracts from the original elegance of Rizzi's proposal [Rizzi 1997].

An alternative in keeping with the cartographic approach would be to rely on the dedicated TopP and FocP projections located at the left periphery of the *vP*, as proposed by [Belletti 2004]. In terms of the functional architecture, these projections would be in the right place: just below *nP*. However, it is not clear whether the existence of such projections is supported by the Italian data that Belletti examined in the first place. In particular, she showed that postverbal subjects in VOS constructions in Italian (e.g. *Ha comprato il giornale Maria* literally 'has bought the newspaper Mary') express new information focus and appear low in the structure. She then concluded that these subjects are in a low FocP projection; moreover, she also claimed that the high FocP (in split CP) and the low FocP (at the *vP* periphery) are different in that the low FocP is restricted to information Focus, whereas the high FocP can express contrastive Focus. However, there are good reasons to believe that there is no such structurally low FocP projection and that postverbal subjects (expressing new information focus) in Italian stay *in situ* [Brunetti 2004, section 5.5.2; Samek-Lodovici 2015, section 3.3.].

Short of compelling evidence in favour of such low nominal TopP and FocP projections, postulating them all over the place solely to account for word order facts violates the OFOH principle, the first pillar of the cartographic approach. Note also that the facts uncovered in this paper also challenge the third pillar of the cartographic approach, namely the idea that all movement is triggered. Here, I showed that the backgrounded O moves to the left of S in order to allow for the latter to become the new information focus. In other words, the movement of O has an interpretative effect on S, contrary to the tenets of the cartographic approach. Moreover, the optionality of contrastive focus triggering movement is also a problem for the triggered movement principle.

5. Conclusions and avenues for further research

In this paper, I compared two approaches to modeling topic / focus: the cartographic approach, pioneered by [Rizzi 1997], and the anti-cartographic approach, developed by [Neeleman, Van de Koot 2008, *inter alia*]. I showed that the three pillars of the cartographic approach, namely the OFOH principle, the antisymmetry and the notion of triggered movement, are all challenged by the facts concerning the realization of topic and focus in eventive nominalizations in Russian. In particular, I argued that the OS order of arguments in eventive nominalizations is derived by moving the O to the left of the S, so that the S can function as the new information focus (or contrastive focus). Such movement violates the notion of triggered movement because the element moving is not the element that acquires an interpretative effect from the movement. Furthermore, moving the O into the Spec-AspP violates the first pillar of the cartographic approach, the OFOH principle, which requires each functional projection to be dedicated to one and only one morphosyntactic feature (in this instance, Aspect). Likewise, moving the O into an adjoined position is contrary to the antisymmetry, yet another pillar of the cartographic approach. Finally, in order to handle the topic / focus in eventive nominalizations, a special set of TopP and FocP projections is needed low in the structure, below the *nP*, which hosts the derived noun.

All in all, I reaffirm the conclusion of [Samek-Lodovici 2010: 817] about the “fine-grained parallelism between [...] clauses and DPs with respect to focus” and claim that this parallelism cannot be captured within the cartographic framework, along the lines of [Rizzi 1997]. Instead, an anti-cartographic analysis of topic / focus is to be developed for Russian eventive nominalizations,

along the lines of proposals that treat Information Structure as a separate linguistic interface [Vallduví 1992; Zubizarreta 1998; Samek-Lodovici 2006, 2010, 2015; Neeleman, Van de Koot 2008; Neeleman et al. 2009; *inter alia*], and specifically for Russian [Bailyn 2012; Titov 2012]. Here, only an outline of such an analysis is offered and many issues remain open for future research.

Once we abandon the cartographic approach and its three pillars, an analysis can be recast as follows. First, focus — whether new information and contrastive — occurs rightmost in a clause or nominalization (alternatively: rightmost in a *vP*). If the focused element is not merged in the rightmost position, there occurs a “raising of lower unfocused constituents to the left of focus, as this aligns focus and the associated stress with the clause right edge” [Samek-Lodovici 2016: 207], or as [Jasinskaja 2016: 724] puts it, “word order optimization so as to realize the nuclear accent in sentence-final position”.

In eventive nominalizations, this “word order optimization” applies primarily to non-focused arguments rather than adjuncts, which can stay in the post-focus position. In this respect, nominalizations differ from clauses, where not only adjuncts but also arguments can occur to the right of the focused element, analyzed by [Samek-Lodovici 2006, 2010, 2015] as right-dislocated. (For analogous Italian data, see [Samek-Lodovici 2016: 206].)

(13) Context:

<i>A</i>	<i>čto,</i>	<i>nikto</i>	<i>ne</i>	<i>zakazal</i>	<i>krasnogo</i>	<i>vina?</i>
and	what,	nobody	not	ordered	red	wine?

<i>Net,</i>	<i>ne</i>	<i>VYPIL</i>	<i>nikto</i>	<i>krasnogo</i>	<i>vina.</i>
no	not	DRANK	nobody	red	wine

‘No, nobody DRANK red wine.’

Going back to eventive nominalizations, rather than be right-dislocated, the *O* moves by *A'*-movement to a position immediately to the right of the *n*^o. In other words, it never leaves the verbal portion of the nominalization. Having set aside the second pillar of the cartographic approach, we are free to assume that the *O* moves to an adjoined position.

In addition to licensing focus in the rightmost position, mapping rules, encoding which features or their combinations result in which intonational contours, need to be postulated to account for the prosodic effects of the Information Structure, along the lines of [Neeleman, Van de Koot 2008; Neeleman et al. 2009]. A detailed investigation of the prosody in eventive nominalizations is left for future research.

Abbreviations

GEN – genitive case, INSTR – instrumental case, PRT – particle.

References

- Abney 1987 — Abney S.P. The English noun phrase and its sentential aspect. Ph.D. thesis, MIT, 1987.
- Antonyuk 2015 — Antonyuk S. Quantifier scope and scope freezing in Russian. Ph.D. thesis, SUNY Stony Brook, 2015.
- Babby 1997 — Babby L. Nominalization in Russian. Proceedings of FASL 4. Ann Arbor, MI: Michigan Slavic Publications, 1997. P. 54–83.
- Bailyn 2012 — Bailyn J. The syntax of Russian. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012.
- Bastos-Gee 2011 — Bastos-Gee A.C. Information structure within the traditional nominal phrase: The case of Brazilian Portuguese. Ph.D. thesis. University of Connecticut, 2011.
- Belletti 2004 — Belletti A. Aspects of the low IP area. Rizzi L. (ed.). The structure of CP and IP. The Cartography of Syntactic Structures, Volume 2. Oxford: OUP, 2004. P. 16–51.
- Brunetti 2004 — Brunetti L. A Unification of focus. Padova: Unipress, 2004.
- Cinque, Rizzi 2008 — Cinque G., Rizzi L. The cartography of syntactic structures. Studies in Linguistics. 2008. Volume 2. P. 42–58.
- Féry, Ishihara 2016 — Féry C., Ishihara S. Introduction. Féry C., Ishihara S. (eds.). The Oxford handbook of information structure. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016. P. 1–15.
- Giusti 1996 — Giusti G. Is there a FocusP and a TopicP in the Noun Phrase structure? University of Venice Working Papers in Linguistics, 1996. Volume 6, issue 2. P. 105–128.
- Giusti 2006 — Giusti G. Parallels in clausal and nominal periphery. Frascarelli M. (ed.). Phases of interpretation. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 2006. P. 163–184.
- Jakobson 1936/1984 — Jakobson R. Beitrag zur Allgemeinen Kasuslehre. Gesamtbedeutungen der Russischen Kasus. Waugh L., Halle M. (eds.). Russian and Slavic grammar. Studies by Roman Jakobson. Berlin: Mouton, 1936/1984. P. 59–103.
- Jasinskaja 2016 — Jasinskaja K. Information structure in Slavic. Féry C., Ishihara S. (eds.). The Oxford handbook of information structure. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016. P. 709–734.
- Kayne 1994 — Kayne, R. The anti-symmetry of syntax. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 1994.
- Lyutikova 2014 — Лютикова Е. Русский генитивный посессор и формальные модели именной группы. Лютикова Е., Циммерлинг А., Коношенко М. (ред.) Типология морфосинтаксических параметров 2014 [Lyutikova E. Russian genitive possessor and formal models of NP. Lyutikova E., Zimmerling A., Konoshenko M. (eds.). Tipologija morfosintaksičeskix parametrov 2014]. Moscow: MGGU, 2014. P. 121–145.
- Neeleman, Van de Koot 2008 — Neeleman A., Van de Koot H. The nature of discourse templates. Journal of Comparative Germanic Linguistics, 2008. Volume 11. P. 137–189.
- Neeleman et al. 2009 — Neeleman A., Titov E., Van de Koot H., Vermeulen R. A syntactic typology of topic, focus and contrast. Van Craenenbroeck J. (ed.). Alternatives to Cartography. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2009. P. 15–51.
- Pazel'skaya, Tatevosov 2003 — Pazel'skaya A., Tatevosov S. Nominalization in Russian: eventuality types and aspectual properties. Paper presented at FDSL-5, Leipzig, 2003.
- Pereltsvaig 2018 — Pereltsvaig A. Eventive nominalizations in Russian and the DP/NP debate. Linguistic Inquiry, 2018. Vol. 49, No. 4. P. 876–885.

- Pereltsvaig to appear — Pereltsvaig A. Word order and the structure of eventive nominalizations in Russian. *Proceedings of FASL 27*. Ann Arbor, MI: Michigan Slavic Publications, to appear.
- Pereltsvaig, Lyutikova, Gerasimova 2018 — Pereltsvaig A., Lyutikova E., Gerasimova A. Case marking in Russian eventive nominalizations: Inherent vs. dependent case theory. *Russian Linguistics*, 2018. Vol. 42, No. 2. P. 221–236.
- Rizzi 1997 — Rizzi L. The Fine Structure of the left periphery. Haegeman L. (ed.). *Elements of grammar*. Dordrecht: Kluwer, 1997. P. 281–337.
- Samek-Lodovici 2006 — Samek-Lodovici V. When right dislocation meets the left-periphery. A unified analysis of Italian non-final focus. *Lingua*. 2006. Volume 116. P. 836–873.
- Samek-Lodovici 2010 — Samek-Lodovici V. Final and non-final focus in Italian DPs. *Lingua*. 2010. Vol. 120. P. 802–818.
- Samek-Lodovici 2015 — Samek-Lodovici V. The interaction of focus, givenness, and prosody. A study of Italian clause structure. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 2015.
- Samek-Lodovici 2016 — Samek-Lodovici V. Constraint conflict and information structure. Féry C., Ishihara S. (eds.). *The Oxford handbook of information structure*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016. P. 203–224.
- Sekerina 1997 — Sekerina I. Scrambling and configurationality: Evidence from Russian syntactic processing. *Proceedings of FASL 4*. Ann Arbor, MI: Michigan Slavic Publications, 1997. P. 435–463.
- Tatevosov 2008 — Татевосов С. Номинализация и проблема непрямого доступа. Динамические модели: Слово. Предложение. Текст. [Tatevosov S. Nominalization and the problem of indirect access. Dinamičeskie modeli: Slovo. Predloženiye. Tekst.]. Moscow, 2008. P. 750–773.
- Titov 2012 — Titov E. (2012) Information structure of argument order alternations. Ph.D. thesis. UCL, 2012.
- Vallduví 1992 — Vallduví E. *The informational component*. New York: Garland, 1992.
- Van Craenenbroeck 2009 — Van Craenenbroeck J. Alternatives to cartography: An introduction. Van Craenenbroeck J. (ed.). *Alternatives to Cartography*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2009. P. 1–14.
- Zubizarreta 1998 — Zubizarreta M.L. *Prosody, focus and word order*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1998.

Статья поступила в редакцию 09.11.2018

The article was received on 09.11.2018

Ася Михайловна Перельцвайг

Ph.D.; независимый исследователь

Asya M. Pereltsvaig

Ph.D.; independent scholar

asya_pereltsvaig@yahoo.com