Adjunct Positions of Nominal Adverbials in Russian

0. Introduction

In this paper, I analyze bare Accusative and Instrumental adverbials considering both as adjuncts. I propose a theory of syntactically free adverbial adjunction, by which I mean that there is no syntactic projection which is inherently marked as the adjunction site for adverbials in general. The restrictions are semantic. In the case of bare nominal adverbials semantic 'constituents' largely correspond to syntactic constituents, i.e. syntactically, adverbials are restricted to the target which contains the semantic information they modify. I assume that temporal Accusative adverbials adjoin to the aspectual phrase (AspP). This accounts for Accusative case since Asp has been shown to contain structural case features. Accusative adverbials modify aspectual-temporal properties of the clause by delimiting, quantifying or localizing the event time. Temporal Instrumental adverbials (viz. duratives) also adjoin to AspP, but they do not delimit the event. The difference between Accusative adverbials and temporal Instrumental adverbials consists in the fact that the former are bounded expressions, whereas the latter are unbounded, i.e. an interpretable feature of the adjunct determines the possibility of agreement of the adverbial with structural case features. Non-temporal Instrumental adverbials, on the other hand, adjoin to projections of the lexical verb. I take the Instrumental case of nominal adverbials in Russian to be the default case for predicative [+N] elements which is licensed by a phonologically empty category. In the case of Accusative adverbials, this category functions as a case transmitter allowing for agreement of uninterpretable features.

1. Aspect and Internal Arguments

To justify the assumption that AspP checks structural case features, it is necessary to clarify the relation between Aspect and internal arguments. In Russian, Aspect and Tense as morphosyntactic categories bear semantically relevant (interpretable) features, which control the temporal categorization of events. Thus, the temporally structured event is composed of the syntactic constituents which constitute the proposition (VP/VP), and the verbal functional heads Asp and T, which c-command the former, cf. (1) and (2).

\[
\begin{align*}
(1) & \left[ TP T \left[ AspP Asp \left[ VP/VP \ldots V/V \ldots \right] \right] \right] \\
(2) & \left[ v_{\text{max}} DP_{\text{Subj}} [v' v \left[ VP V DP_{\text{Obj}} \right] \right] \right]
\end{align*}
\]

In Russian, verbs bear a feature [+pf] for (im)perfectivity which determines aspectual interpretation. The feature [+pf] produces a bounded interpretation of the event which implies a change of a situation $s_1$ to a resulting situation $s_2$ (cf. (3a)), i.e. there is an interpretable boundary between $s_1$ and $s_2$ (which does not imply that $s_2$ necessarily holds at speech time, for details cf. Szucsich 1999, 2000). On the other hand, the feature [–pf] yields an unbounded interpretation of the event which does not imply a change of a situation to a resulting situation (cf. (3b)), though this change may be pragmatically predictable (cf. Szucsich 1999, 2000).

* This paper is a reconsidered version of my presentation at FDSL-3 in Leipzig 1999. I would especially like to thank John F. Bailyn, Tanmoy Bhattacharya, Uwe Junghanns, and László Molnárff, as well as the audience of the FDSL conference for discussion and comments on earlier versions of this paper. Of course, all remaining errors are my own.
In languages without a morphological aspectual system, temporal structuring of the event has to be marked differently. For these languages it has been stated that the interpretation of DPs influences the interpretation of events in cases where the internal argument is a so-called incremental theme (cf. Krifka 1989, 1998, Filip 1995), i.e. there is a correlation between the interpretation of nominal and verbal entities with transitive and unaccusative verbs. An incremental theme is an argument which is affected by the event gradually, i.e. each part of the object or each part of its spatial state intrinsically corresponds to a part of the event which in turn corresponds to a part of the course of the event. In (4) an incomplete listing of the relevant verb class in English and Russian is provided (cf. also Filip 1995).

(4) (a) build (a house), destroy (a city), write (a book), read (an article), eat (an apple), sing (a song), melt (lead); enter, arrive, vaporize, etc.
(b) 

(5) (a) Peter trank in einer Stunde / ??eine Stunde (lang) das Bier.
Peter drank in an hour / one hour (long) the beer
'Peter drank the beer in one hour / ??for an hour.'
(b) Peter trank *in einer Stunde / eine Stunde (lang) (das ganze Leben) Bier.
Peter drank in one hour / one hour (long) (the whole life) beer
'Peter drank beer *in an hour / for an hour (his whole life long).'

(6) (a) Mari kirjoitti kirjeet yhdessä tunnissa / *yhden tunnin.
Mari wrote lettersACC in one hourNESS / one hourACC
'Mari wrote the letters in an hour / *for an hour.'
(b) Mari kirjoitti kirjeitä *yhdessä tunnissa / yhden tunnin.
Mari wrote lettersPART in one hourNESS / one hourACC
'Mari was writing letters *in an hour / for an hour.'
Bounded nouns are individuated. The individuals denoted by bounded nouns are quantized and have interpretable boundaries. Unbounded DPs have cumulative referents without interpretable boundaries. They have the property that the sum of two objects which fall under one expression (e.g. two objects denoted by the DP voda 'water') falls under exactly the same expression as its parts (again voda). Bounded nouns lack this property (cf. Krifka 1989, 1998, Szucsich 1999). Examples (5) and (6) show that in aspectless languages the [+B] feature of incremental themes influences the aspectual interpretation of the verbal predicate.

In Russian, DPs are determinerless and internal arguments are morphologically marked with Accusative or Nominative case (optionally with Genitive). But verbs are obligatorily marked for Aspect. Russian exhibits a mirror image of aspectless languages, i.e. the aspectual interpretation of verbal predicates influences the interpretation of nominal entities, cf. (7).

(7) (a) Maša napisala pis’ma za čas / *celyj čas.
Maša wrotePF lettersACC in hour / whole hour
'Maša wrote the letters in an hour / *for an hour.'

(b) Maša pisala pis’ma *za čas / celyj čas.
Maša wroteMP lettersACC in hour / whole hour
'Maša was writing letters *in an hour / for an hour.'

In Slavic languages, the aspectual feature restricts the interpretation of nominal arguments in its domain. In (7a) the event is interpreted as bounded, whereas in (7b) the event is interpreted as unbounded. This is again shown by collocational restrictions concerning durative and time-span adverbials. The internal arguments are also interpreted as bounded (7a) and as unbounded (7b). Thus, the boundary of a perfective event (change of situation s₁ to situation s₂) corresponds to the boundary of an individual or an individuated set of individuals. Russian (8) and Finnish (9) examples illustrate consequences of homomorphy between verbal and nominal boundedness vs. unboundedness with respect to logical implications ((8c,d) and (9c,d)). A typically bounded noun like ulica 'street' may be interpreted as unbounded in the case that the object denoted by the DP is not totally affected by the event denoted by the verb.

(8) (a) Pëtr perešël ulicu. On vošël v dom.
Pëtr crossedPF street He enteredPF in house
'Pëtr crossed the street. He entered a / the house.'

(b) Pëtr perexodil ulicu. Mašina naexala na nego.
Pëtr crossedIMP street Car hitPF on him
'Pëtr crossed the street. A car hit him.'

(c) Pëtr perešël ulicu.
'He reached the other side.'

(d) Pëtr perexodil ulicu.
'He reached the other side.'

(9) (a) Matti ylitti kadun. Hän meni erääseen taloon.
Matti crossed streetACC He entered certain houseILLAT
'Matti crossed the street. He entered a house.'

(b) Matti ylitti katua. Hän jää auton alle.
Matti crossed streetPART He got carGEN under
'Matti crossed the street. A car hit him.'

(c) Matti ylitti kadun.
'He reached the other side.'

(d) Matti ylitti katua.
'He reached the other side.'
As a consequence, I assume that \([\pm pf]\) features and \([\pm B]\) features are equivalent. This assumption accounts for the referential 'transmission' between nominal and verbal entities. Keeping functional projections to a minimum, this analysis leads to the assumption that the syntactic head Asp checks features of the direct object; among others structural case (Accusative in Russian; Accusative and Partitive in Finnish) and the Boundedness feature of the internal argument if it is an incremental theme. Aspectual features as well as structural case features are part of the formal feature-bundle of Asp, cf. (10).

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{AspP} \\
\text{(DP}_{DO}\text{)} \\
\text{Asp'} \\
\text{VP} \\
\text{V} \\
\text{...}
\end{array}
\]

In (10), the direct object (DP\(_{DO}\)) overtly or covertly checks its case features at Asp.

2. Accusative Adverbials as Bounded Modifiers

Similar to internal arguments in aspectless languages, some Accusative adverbials may affect aspectual properties of events. This also holds for Russian, though these adverbials do not change the aspectual feature of the verb itself. The relevant adverbials are so-called 'duratives' which denote temporal and locational measures (time periods and spatial distances). Unbounded events which are modified by distance measure adverbials (11b), may be additionally modified by time-span adverbials (11c), cf. the contrast to (11a) – (11c) being marginal but acceptable to most informants.

\[(11) \quad \begin{array}{l}
\text{(a) } *\text{Pëtr } \text{begal } \text{za odnu minutu.} \\
\text{Pëtr ran IMP in one minute} \\
*\text{Pëtr ran in one minute.}'
\end{array}
\]

\[(11) \quad \begin{array}{l}
\text{(b) } \text{Pëtr } \text{begal } \text{pjatsot metrov.} \\
\text{Pëtr ran IMP fivehundredACC metersGEN} \\
\text{Pëtr ran fivehundred meters.'}
\end{array}
\]

\[(11) \quad \begin{array}{l}
\text{(c) } \text{Pëtr } \text{begal } \text{pjatsot metrov za odnu minutu.} \\
\text{Pëtr ran IMP fivehundredACC metersGEN in one minute} \\
\text{Pëtr ran fivehundred meters in one minute.'}
\end{array}
\]

Duratives are themselves aspectually sensitive. They occur only with unbounded events (marked \([–pf]\) in Russian) which they delimit (cf. Pereltsvaig 2000). Despite all the parallels, unbounded (imperfective) events modified by a delimiting adverbial differ from bounded events denoted by perfective verbs. With perfectivity, a resulting situation arises through the event denoted by the verb, and the resulting situation is itself part of the denotation of the verb. With imperfection and event delimiting duratives, there is nothing said about a resulting situation. Only the boundaries of the time interval of the event time are specified (for details cf. Krifka 1989, 1998, Wechsler & Lee 1996, Pereltsvaig 2000, Szucsich 1999, 2000). The contrast in (12) follows from these properties. In (12a) the implication is invalid, whereas in (12b) it is valid. Thus, it makes sense to distinguish \textit{limitation} and \textit{boundedness}. 
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Pëtr vsju noč' rabotal. —→ Pëtr uže ne rabotaet.
'Pëtr was working for the whole night.'
(Pëtr isn't working any more.
(with respect to an aspectual evaluation time)

Pëtr pročital ètot roman. —→ Pëtr uže ne čitaet ètot roman.
Pëtr read that novel
'Pëtr read that novel.'
Pëtr isn't reading that novel any more.
(with respect to an aspectual evaluation time)

Accusative "frequency" adverbials (13) are also aspectually sensitive (cf. also Schoorlemmer 1995, 1997, who calls them "imperfectivity triggers").

(13) (a) Ona každyj god pokazyvala / *pokazala ego vračam.
She every year showed him physicians
'Every year she had him examined by physicians.'

(b) My každyj god ezdili / *poexali na kurort.
We every year went to spa
'We went to the spa every year.'

However, not all Accusative adverbials are restricted to unbounded events. Multiplicatives and temporal positional adverbials (for some Russian speakers the latter are colloquial) may modify both bounded and unbounded events, cf. (14) and (15), though (14b) is marginal and denotes three repetitions of an unbounded event (three 'occasions', cf. Mourelatos 1978).

(14) (a) Tri raza udarili v kolokol, i zanaves podnjalsja.
Three times struck in bell and curtain rose
'Three times they rang the bell, and the curtain rose.'
(TolBu)

(b) Tri raza rugalsja.
Three times swore
'I have sworn (cursed) three times.'
(RazR, 05001)

(15) (a) Ona dežurila prošlyj god.
She duty-made last year
'Last year, she was on duty.'
(RazR, 02301)

(b) Tat'jana Sergeevna prošlyj god poxoronila muža.
Tat'jana Sergeevna buried her husband
'Last year, Tat'jana Sergeevna buried her husband.'
(TüUp, XSS00201)

Nevertheless all Accusative adverbials (i.e. duratives, frequency adverbials, multiplicatives, and temporal positional adverbials) are closely related to temporal information which is encoded in Asp, viz. the time interval E (for details cf. Szucsich 1999, 2000). They temporally delimit / "quantize" or localize the event denoted by the verbal predicate, although they do not override aspectual features of the verb. Accusative adverbials do not modify the event itself but the temporal anchoring of the event which is represented in functional categories (Ernst 1998 counts them among the so-called 'Functional adverbials').

The common property of Accusative adverbials is that they are all bounded terms. Accusative duratives are countable and multiplicatives themself are numerative constructions, i.e. the nominal head raz 'time' in (14) is also countable (whereas unbounded nominal terms with cumulative interpretation are not countable, cf. (16), except when interpreted sortally). Frequentatives always occur with the distributive universal quantifier každ- 'each' which modifies only bounded (count) nouns. It is incompatible with unbounded (mass) nouns. On the other hand, the universal quantifier v#s- 'all' has a cumulative reading, hence it is the only

(16) (a) *tri zolota
three gold_{GEN:SG}
(b) *pjat' vin
five wine_{GEN:PL}

(17) (a) vsë zoloto (mira)
all gold (world_{GEN})
'all the gold (of the world)'
(b) *každoe zoloto (mira)
each gold (world_{GEN})
*’each gold (of the world)'

Taking these data into account, I propose that Accusative adverbials base-adjoin to AspP, which enables them to occur in a syntactically local relation to the Asp-head with the features [±pf] (or [±B]) and the feature for structural case, cf. (18) (cf. also Chomsky 1995: 177). In (18) the fundamental relations sister and contain apply: AdvP_{ACC} is the sister of the segment Asp_{2} (in case the object moves overtly) which contains Asp'; alternatively, AdvP_{ACC} is the direct sister of Asp' (in case the object moves covertly). Asp' is a projection of the feature bundle Asp which also bears structural case features. Thereby the local syntactic relation between AdvP_{ACC} and the feature [Case] of Asp is established.

(18) AspP_{1}
    \[+B]\n    AdvP_{ACC} (AspP)_{2}
    (Spec) Asp'
    Asp ... VP
    [Case] …

The positive Boundedness feature of Accusative adverbials modifies the syntactic target constituent. This modificational relation triggers default-agreement of the adverbial’s case features with the target constituent AspP, i.e. the case features of bare nominal adverbials are licensed 'from outside'. Agreement is possible due to the above-mentioned local relation to Asp and the presence of a positively marked feature of the adjunct (cf. section 3.1). Consequently, case features of Accusative adverbials are structural.

2 This account is supported by the fact that Accusative adverbials exhibit Genitive of negation under sentential negation in combination with constituent negation, cf. (i) (for details cf. Borovikoff 1997).

(i) Ivan ne rabotal i čas / časa.
Ivan NEG worked even hour\text{ACC/GEN}
'Ivan didn't work even for an hour.'
Moreover, a temporal Accusative adverbial checking the case feature of Asp would cause the derivation to crash. Either the case feature of the internal argument would remain unchecked, assuming that checked case features of functional categories are deleted (in the case of transitive verbs), or the inactive structural case feature of Asp would allow for checking (in the case of intransitive verbs). Both options are not desirable: the former for obvious reasons (the only solution would be to declare case features or features in general as undeletable); the latter, because nothing would prevent the subject of intransitive verbs from checking its structural case features at Asp, too. Therefore I propose licensing mechanisms for uninterpretable morphological features beside checking, viz. via agreement in a local relation (for details cf. Szucsich 2000).

3. Instrumental Adverbials

3.1 Durative (Temporal) Instrumentals

By contrast, Instrumental adverbials which denote a temporal or locational measure do not delimit the temporal structure of events. These adverbials are not bounded, and their negative Boundedness feature does not affect the aspectual properties of the event, although Instrumental duratives also modify temporal information (i.e. specify an unbounded time interval for which a positive truth value for the event is stated). This (negative) property can be seen in (19) in contrast to (11c).

(19) (a)  Pëtr *begal kilometrami.
       Pëtr ranIMP kilometerINST:PL
       'Pëtr ran for kilometers.'

(b)  *Pëtr *begal kilometrami za odin čas.
       Pëtr ranIMP kilometerINST:PL in one hour
       '*Pëtr ran for kilometers in one hour.'

Furthermore, Instrumental duratives are restricted to plural DPs, cf. the contrast in (20). That is, they denote unbounded, pluralic, i.e. cumulative objects, like determinerless mass nouns and plural DPs in languages like German and English. This analysis is corroborated by the fact that Instrumental duratives never occur in numerative constructions, cf. (21).

(20) (a)  Pëtr časamī sidel molča.
       Pëtr hourINST:PL sat being-silent
       'Pëtr has been sitting (there) for hours without saying a word.'

(b)  *Pëtr časom sidel molča.
       Pëtr hourINST:SG sat being-silent
       '*Pëtr has been sitting (there) for hour without saying a word.'

(21)  *Pëtr dvumja časami sidel molča.
       Pëtr two hourINST:PL sat being-silent
       '*Pëtr has been sitting (there) for two hours and hours without saying a word.'

Due to the fact that Instrumental duratives modify the time course of the event, I assume that they adjoin to AspP, i.e. the adjunction site is the same as for Accusative adverbials. In Russian, different case marking with temporal nominal adverbials corresponds to different feature values concerning referential properties of the respective adverbials: bounded – Accusative vs. unbounded – Instrumental.
Thus, in Russian, a [–B] feature does not support default-agreement with the Asp category. In other languages, the local relation to Asp is sufficient for agreement. E.g. in Czech, the local relation to Asp always licenses default-agreement, i.e. unbounded duratives also appear with Accusative case (22), whereas Serbo-Croatian patterns with Russian (23).

(22)  
\[ \text{Petr celé měsíce hledal onu knihu.} \]
\[ \text{Petr whole month\text{ACC:PL} looked-for\text{IMP} that book} \]
\['Petr was looking for that book for months.'\]

(23)  
\[ \text{Petar je mjesecima tražio onu knjigu.} \]
\[ \text{Petar is month\text{INSTR:PL} looked-for\text{IMP} that book} \]
\['Petar was looking for that book for months.'\]

These data support the assumption that the target for adjunction of bounded and unbounded temporal adverbials is indeed the same. The relevance of features of the adjunct concerning case-agreement with the target constituent is parametrized.

3.2 Non-Temporal Instrumentals

Instrumental adverbials as a whole are not restricted to a specific adjunct position. They also diverge to a great degree with respect to the semantic role they bear, cf. (24).

(24) (a)  
\[ \text{Ivan vyl volkom.} \]
\[ \text{Ivan howled wolf\text{INST}} \]
\['Ivan howled like a wolf.'\]

(b)  
\[ \text{Ivan rezal xleb nožom.} \]
\[ \text{Ivan cut bread knife\text{INST}} \]
\['He cut the bread with a knife.'\]

(c)  
\[ \text{On kivnul golovoj.} \]
\[ \text{he nodded head\text{INST}} \]
\['He nodded his head.'\]

(d)  
\[ \text{Ivan plakal gor'kimi slezami.} \]
\[ \text{Ivan cried bitter tears\text{INST}} \]
\['Ivan cried bitterly.'\]

Non-temporal Instrumental adverbials modify mostly the event itself, that is, the so-called referential or event argument of the verb (cf. Davidson 1980). By this they enrich the event structure with "argument-like" participants or specify the event like "real" manner adverbials. Those Instrumental adverbials which clearly modify the referential argument of the verb like those in (24), adjoin to a target within the domain of the lexical verbal projections (VP/\(v\)P). They introduce an additional predicate, which is not selected by the verb. Most of them are comparable to PP-adverbials as in (25).

(25) (a)  
\[ \text{Ivan našël mnogo gribov [PP v lesu].} \]
\[ \text{Ivan found much mushrooms in wood\text{PREP}} \]
\['Ivan found a lot of mushrooms in the wood.'\]

(b)  
\[ \text{Student izvlëk urok [PP iz ošibki].} \]
\[ \text{Student pulled-out lesson from mistake\text{GEN}} \]
\['The student learned a lesson from the mistake.'\]
It is impossible to account for the case marking facts in Russian by positing different adjunction sites for Accusative and Instrumental adverbials. This would ignore the apparent case alternation with duratives in Russian (in contrast to the general Accusative marking of duratives in Czech). I therefore assume an empty category with the DP-adverbial as its complement (cf. (27)). This category (c-commanding the 'bare' DP-adverbial) adjoins to lexical or functional projections of the verb instantiating the predicative relation between Instrumental adverbials and the target constituents of the adjunction. Instrumental case is analyzed as a default-case for predicative [+N]-elements. This approach allows for a unified analysis of Instrumentals, in cases of both 'primary' predication with the copula verb (26a) and so-called 'secondary' predication as in (26c). Instrumental adverbials are a special kind of secondary predicate in the sense that they do not have an external argument which is coindexed with an argument of the verb as in (26c) (in the case of an adjunct small clause) or which is raised to the matrix sentence as in (26b) (in the case of an argument small clause exhibiting ECM).

(26) (a) \textit{Ivan byl učitelem.}  
\textit{Ivan was teacher\textsubscript{INST}}  
'Ivan was a teacher.'

(b) \textit{Ivan sčitaet Petra ti glupym.}  
\textit{Ivan considers Pëtr\textsubscript{INST} stupid\textsubscript{INST}}  
'Ivan considers Pëtr stupid.'

(c) \textit{Ivan\textsubscript{i} vstretil svoego druga\textsubscript{j} PRO\textsubscript{i/j} p'janym.}  
\textit{Ivan\textsubscript{i} met his friend\textsubscript{j} PRO\textsubscript{i/j} drunk\textsubscript{INST}}  
'Ivan met his friend drunk.'

The internal structure of Instrumental "AdvPs" in (27a) makes it possible to analyze the Instrumental case as a default-case for predicative DPs.

(27) (a) $[[P(r)P \ P(r) \ [DP\text{INST}] ] ]$ = AdvP

(b) $[[P(r)P \ P(r) \ [DP\text{ACC}] ] ]$

This analysis has to be carried over to temporal adverbials adjoining to AspP. To account for the parametrization of case marking (cf. (22) and (23)), we have to assume the same internal structure for Accusative adverbials (cf. (27b)) by analyzing the corresponding empty category c-commanding the DP:ACC as a case 'transmitter' which under parametrized conditions allows for agreement with structural case features of the syntactic target (AspP). That is, in cases of agreement, P(r) does not license the case marking of its complement by itself, but allows for licensing 'from outside' transmitting case features of the syntactic target. In Russian and cross-linguistically, transmission of case features by P(r)s is a relatively widespread phenomenon.

In Russian, copula-verbs as instances of P(r) also allow for agreement even when lexically filled, cf. (28a). The null-copula even forces agreement (28b) (there is no space to discuss the Nominative (agreement) vs. Instrumental variation with 'primary' (copula) predication in Russian; cf. Bailyn 1995, Geist 1999 among others for different accounts for this variation).

---

3 These facts also contradict a purely configurational account for 'case assignment' à la Franks (1995), cf. Szucsich (2000) for a critical discussion.

4 The label of the empty category does not matter – it is important that it instantiates the predicative relation. Bailyn (1995) – following Bowers (1993) – labels it Predicational Phrase (PrP), Fehrmann (1995) analyzes it simply as a PP. Therefore, I put the "r" in (27) in parentheses.
The same is true for secondary predication. Secondary predicates under certain conditions also agree with coindexed DPs, cf. (29) in contrast to (26c). Again, there is no space to discuss details (for discussion of conditions on agreement cf. Bailyn 1995, Franks 1995, Szucsich 2000 among others). Thus, in Slavic languages in various predicative constructions the Instrumental case may alter with the 'Agreement-case' (the latter is possible under additional conditions).

Furthermore, the structure in (27) is also in line with Fehrmann's analysis of adverbials (cf. Fehrmann 1995) where she claims that all adverbials / adverbs have a PP structure.

4. Conclusion

First, I tried to show that the position of adverbials is determined by semanto-syntactic restrictions, i.e. that their position is the domain of the syntactic element they modify. There is no need to assume extra functional projections for adverbials, cf. Cinque (1999).

Second, I tried to show that adverbial case in Russian can be accounted for by assuming standard values for case. These values can be licensed by default-agreement or by predicational relations. Consequently, there is no need to assume special mechanisms of case assignment beside structural and lexical case. For temporal bare nominal adverbials there seem to be two options of case marking in Slavic languages: (i) agreement with the Asp category (which is found in many non-Slavic languages, too), or (ii) the assignment of predicative case (Instrumental). For non-temporal bare nominal adverbials which adjoin to VP/vP, there is no source for case-agreement (no target which hosts structural case features and no PRO which is coindexed with a DP of the matrix sentence). Hence, the predicative case (Instrumental) is obligatory. For temporal adverbials adjoining to AspP the possibility for agreement may depend on features of the adjunct (as in Russian and Serbo-Croatian). The case patterns for Russian adverbials are (abstractly) represented in (30) (AdvPs having an internal structure as in (27); potential specifiers of the functional categories are omitted).
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