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0. Proposal.
A central debate in the study of phrase structure concerns the nature of functional projections which dominate lexical ones. At one extreme is the stronger position, advocated by Cinque (1999, 2002), that languages employ a universal set of functional categories and that their number and relative order is the same across languages, regardless of properties of the lexical head. At the other extreme is the weaker position (adopted by Grimshaw 1994, Bošković 1997, among others) that only independently motivated phrase structure is projected, where there is considerable disagreement about what constitutes “motivated”. While the literature is overwhelmingly concerned with resolving this issue with respect to clausal structure (i.e., the extended projection of the verb), in this paper we focus on nominal structure and argue for the weaker position, namely, that not all the potential functional categories of the extended projection of the noun are realized in all structures. This does not imply that we reject evidence for positing a DP in languages like Serbian/Croatian (Progovac 1998), Polish (Rappaport 1998), or Russian (Padućeva 1985); since these arguments for DP are construction specific, they are perfectly consistent with our contention that DP is projected where it is semantically motivated but not where it is not.

According to our proposal, it is precisely the features of the lexical head that determine the functional projections which must dominate it. One minimalist approach is to have checking from functional categories (whether through head movement, feature movement, or Agree) driven by the features of the lexical head, so that the raison d’être of the particular functional categories in the
extended projection is simply to satisfy requirements imposed by the formal properties of the lexical head. This perspective, it seems to us, fits squarely within the spirit of minimalism. We take as an instantiation of this the idea, espoused by Bošković (1997), that the Numeration consists of lexical but not functional categories. Under this sort of account, the lexical items in the Numeration will typically bear grammatical features that correspond to features of functional categories and that need to be checked. The Lexicon is thus accessed in the course of the derivation, and appropriate functional heads are selected to merge into the structure and subsequently check formal features on the corresponding lexical elements. We adopt this general scheme, but reject feature checking *per se* and recast it in terms of evaluation of under- or unspecified features, as in the system developed in Franks (1995) and elsewhere. So far as case is concerned, this means that a noun will be drawn from the Lexicon with alpha values for its case features, which must be fixed in the course of the derivation. The need to fix the open feature values on lexical heads, which is partly an accident of a language’s morphology, in fact determines exactly how far an extended projection of any given lexical head extends. This is an empirical matter. The evidence seems to us compelling that argument VPs exist of various sizes, ranging all the way from “small” Small Clauses through full CPs, as roughly catalogued in (1); cf. Wumbrand (2001).

\[(1) \begin{align*}
  a. \text{The movie made } [\text{VP John cry}]. \\
  b. \text{We expected } [\text{TP Mary to leave}]. \\
  c. \text{Everyone thinks } [\text{AgrP the dance should be held outdoors}]. \\
  d. \text{I cannot understand } [\text{CP why they brought their dog}].
  \end{align*}\]

Likewise in the analysis of Russian, the need for clauses of various sizes has been argued. Babby and Franks (1998), for example, argue that subject control infinitives are bare VPs, whereas object control are full sentences.¹ This difference in structure is revealed

¹ These structures are adjusted from their (29 and (30) (p. 498) to fit our assumptions.
through different case forms of the semipredicative *sam* or *samomu:* in (2a) the null case PRO is nominative by virtue of control by *on* ‘he’, whereas in (2b) it is dative under Spec-head agreement with infinitival T°.²

(2) a. On [VP xočet [VP PRONOM vse sdelat’ sam ]].
   he wants all to-do himself. NOM
   ‘He wants to do everything himself.’

   b. Oni [VP zastavili ego [TP PRODAT T° [VP vse sdelat’
   they forced him all to-do
   himself.DAT
   ‘They forced him to do everything himself.’

In this paper, we apply similar reasoning and criteria within the nominal domain. As far as we know, the issue of the extent of the extended projection of N in Russian has not really been investigated. In what follows, we examine a number of constructions in Russian and argue that only motivated functional categories are projected above NP.

2. Case on DPs and NPs.
As a point of departure, it seems to us that the necessity for morphological case, not only in Russian in particular, but in grammar in general, needs to be divorced from considerations of thematic roles or argumenthood. Factors such as these presumably motivate the existence of case as a nominal category, but they are both too broad and too narrow. In Russian, for example, case goes far beyond NP-marking. Nominals are paradigmatic, some form must be chosen, so all nouns (and adjectives that modify them, including numerals when oblique) simply have to be in some case, it is a matter of form. On the other hand, clauses that are arguments

² Alternatively, PRO in (2b) could remain in [Spec, VP] and have its null case valued by T° through Agree. Note that Babby and Franks reject the VP-internal subject hypothesis, so that their (29) – corresponding to our (2a) – lacks PRO entirely.
are not necessarily in case positions, although when they do find
themselves in positions where an oblique case is called for, this
must somehow be instantiated. Compare (3a), where dumat’
‘think’ assigns no case, to (3b), where the preposition o ‘about’
requires locative:

(3) a. Ja dumaju, čto nel’zja tak vesti sebja na ulice.
    I think that not-possible so behave oneself on street
    ‘I don’t think one should behave like this on the street.’

   b. Ja dumaju o *(tom), čto nel’zja tak vesti
    I think about that.LOC that not-possible so behave
    sebja na ulice.
    oneself on street

That is, the CP headed by čto ‘that’ in (3a) has no case. The same
CP in (3b) similarly cannot bear locative, but here it must be
embedded in a DP that realizes this case.

If we turn to languages such as Japanese or Korean, where case
markers attach to nominals and there is one such marker per
nominal, the relationship between grammatical role and
morphology is more transparent.3 And in these languages predicate
nominals are not case-marked, as shown in (4):

(4) a. John-ga gakusei desu. (Japanese)
    John-NOM student COP

   b. John-i haksayng-ita. (Korean)
    John-NOM student COP
    both: ‘John is a student.’

Similarly, so-called “light” verbs in these languages, which do not
assign thematic roles, also do not assign case to their
“incorporated” object nominals, as in (5):

3 We put aside the concatenation of oblique case markers plus topic marker wa (e.g.
dewa or niwa).
In Russian, on the other hand, nouns can only be morphologically instantiated in fully inflected forms.\(^4\) It is precisely for this reason that it is not so easy to differentiate a bare NP from a nominal that projects all the way up to a DP, in that both are equally inflected for case. We can thus contrast (4) with Russian (6), where case is simply a morphological fact of life. Indeed, there are, as is well-known, two distinct options (at least, with an overt form of *byt’ ‘be’) – nominative or instrumental:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{(6) a. } & \text{ Ivan byl } [\text{DP:NOM student }]. \\
\text{b. } & \text{ Ivan byl } [\text{NP:INSTR studentom }].
\end{align*}
\]

Our essential claim about Russian is indicated in the labels in (6): as argued extensively in Pereltsvaig (2001), the predicate nominative marks a DP, whereas the predicate instrumental marks an NP. We return to Russian predicative nominals in section 3.3 below. But before that, we turn to two genitive constructions.

3. **Empirical support.**
In this section, we offer some diagnostics for distinguishing different degrees of nominal projection.

First, allowing only motivated projection of functional categories provides us with a principled account of the two classes of genitive-of-quantification (henceforth, GEN-Q) in Russian. The original analysis goes back to Pesetsky (1982); updating his account to incorporate X-bar syntax and functional categories,

\(^4\) We disregard the special truncated vocative form of certain nouns (e.g., *Maš, Van’, mam*).
Franks (1995) proposed that the subject of (7) was a DP, whereas the subject of (8) was a bare QP.

(7) a. V ètom restorane obedali [DP desjat’ čelovek].
    in this restaurant ate-lunch.PL ten people.GEN-Q
    in this restaurant ate-lunch.

b. V ètom restorane obedalo [QP desjat’ čelovek].
    in this restaurant ate-lunch.NEUT ten people.GEN-Q

Only the subject in (7a) is referential, hence has an individuated reading, has φ-features relevant to agreement and participates in processes such as control (8a) and binding (8b), which are indicated using coindexing:

(8) a. [DP pjat’ ženščin], staralis’/*staralos’ [PRO, kupit’ ètu five women.GEN-Q tried.PL/*NEUT to-buy this knigu],
    book.ACC
    in mirror

b. [DP pjat’ ženščin], smotreli/*smotrelo na sebja, five women.GEN-Q looked.PL/*NEUT at themselves
    in mirror

Since these are referential relations, they require that the numeral phrase be a DP, which is why only the plural is acceptable on the verb. Pereltsvaig (2001), following Longobardi (1994), formalizes this idea by demonstrating that “referentiality (and therefore, the possibility of argumenthood) is to be associated with D° and not N°”. Thus, bare QPs cannot in principle be referential. Whenever forced to be referential, they must project up to a DP, in order that the relevant features be expressed.

What is the structural difference between the DP in (7a) and the QP in (7b)? In order to reflect the fact that the nominal is assigned genitive case regardless of whether it is ultimately an QP or a DP, Franks (1995) proposes the contrast in (9):
Crucially, NPs in Russian must be able to bear case, and that case can be assigned directly to an NP, thus internally to a DP. This implies, as in Babby (1987), that NP and its containing DP can be in different morphological cases. Franks (1995) goes on to argue, partly on the basis of the possibility in (10), that the numeral actually appears in [Spec, QP] and that QP has an empty head.

(10) po \{QP pjati \ Q° \{NP rublej \} \}  
DISTR five.DAT rubles.GEN-Q  
‘five rubles each’

We can thus posit a more articulated QP structure as in (11), where NumP is the locus of the actual numeral (cf. also Bailyn, this volume). This is Babby’s “heterogeneous” pattern.

(11)  
\[ \begin{array}{c}  
\text{QP} \\
\text{NumP} \\
pjat’ \\
\text{Q} \\
\emptyset \\
\text{NP}_{\text{GEN-Q}} \\
\text{ženščin} 
\end{array} \]  

A major question that remains is how to incorporate into the analysis oblique, agreeing numerals – i.e. Babby’s “homogeneous” pattern, as in (12):

(12) [PP o [DP pjati (krasivyx) ženščinax ]]  
about five.LOC beautiful.LOC women.LOC
Franks, following Neidle (1988), assimilates these to ordinary adjectives, adopting an Abney-style structure where AP dominates NP. This is however not necessary, given that, assuming (11), the numeral itself is \textit{not} a functional head, but rather a specifier of one. We will show shortly that it is not even desirable, since there is evidence that numerals are introduced above NP, unlike ordinary adjectives but like demonstratives. Adjective phrases merge directly with (some projection of) N. Numerals, on the other hand, merge as specifiers of QP. This will be necessary because the data reveal numeral phrases always to be larger than NPs.

Our formalization of this involves assimilating case government/assignment and agreement/percolation to the same minimalist mechanism, recasting the approach in a bottom-up framework and adapting Chomsky’s “Probe and Agree” system. For the sake of explicitness, we adopt the case feature system in Franks (2002), given in (13):

\begin{align*}
\text{accusative} & = [-\text{obl}, -\text{marg}, -\text{indef}, -\text{quant}] \\
\text{nominative} & = [-\text{obl}, -\text{marg}, +\text{indef}, -\text{quant}] \\
\text{genitive} & = [+\text{obl}, -\text{marg}, -\text{indef}, +\text{quant}] \\
\text{dative} & = [+\text{obl}, +\text{marg}, -\text{indef}, -\text{quant}] \\
\text{locative} & = [+\text{obl}, +\text{marg}, -\text{indef}, +\text{quant}] \\
\text{instrumental} & = [+\text{obl}, +\text{marg}, +\text{indef}, -\text{quant}]
\end{align*}

Franks argues that GEN-Q is a special [–oblique] genitive, essentially a pure quantificational case. Now, recall that lexical items are selected for the Numeration with open (or variable) feature values for syntagmatic properties such as case. The case features on a Goal XP with open case features are subsequently specified (“valued”) under Agree by a head Y° merged with a XP (or a ZP dominating XP) that bears valued case features. Percolation can then be treated as a kind of multiple Agree. In (11), the Q° values GEN-Q case on its complement NP and itself projects. [Spec, QP] is then occupied by some kind of quantitative operator.
The difficult technical question is then how the homogenous pattern in (12) obtains in oblique case contexts. Our approach to this takes advantage of Chomsky’s notion of “phases”. These are akin to the cycles of earlier transformational periods, but dictate periodic discharging of information to the interpretative PF and LF components rather than iterative rule application. Much attention has been paid to the phase nature of the clause, and in particular the idea that CP, but not the lower clausal IP projection, is a phase.

It is desirable, we contend, also to treat the maximal extended projection in the nominal system as a phase, but not lower units. Specifically, at the end of each phase the syntax interfaces with the morphology, which means the unvalued features must at that point be valued. Here is where the difference between plus feature values (which we take to be marked) and minus ones comes into play. Crucially, we assume that \( \alpha \) oblique is specified as \([-\text{oblique}] \) (that is, its unmarked value) only at the end of the phase, when the structure is being shunted off to the morphology. Since GEN-Q is a \([-\text{oblique}] \) case, it is only valued at the end of the phase.\(^5\) Thus, any oblique case in the same phase will appear to override it. That is why numerals in oblique contexts agree and the GEN-Q of the null Q° is essentially ignored. In this way, the kinds of frequently observed interactions between direct and oblique cases can be made to follow automatically from our system.

3.2. The Genitive-of-Negation construction.
Let us extend this reasoning to the genitive-of-negation (henceforth, GEN-NEG) construction: Russian GEN-NEG applies only to non-referential direct objects; cf. (14), from Gundel (1974).

\(^5\) Franks (1995) exploits the GB distinction between D-structure for inherent case and S-structure for structural case to obtain the homogeneous-heterogeneous dichotomy. In earlier minimalism this may have been reworked in terms of strong vs. weak features. In this paper, we distinguish between features which immediately probe once merged into the tree (marked) and those that wait until the end of the phase and are filled in by default (unmarked).
There is a vast literature on the GEN-NEG in Russian, but one thing is generally agreed upon: the accusative in (14a) presupposes existence, whereas the genitive in (14b) does not. We thus take the accusative to be an ordinary full DP and the genitive not to project all the way up to DP. It is, presumably, a bare NP, hence it is not referential. Of course, the issue of exactly why it is marked genitive remains. One could either imagine an Agree mechanism with Neg probing down the tree, or one could follow Bailyn (this volume) in taking advantage of a structure as in (11), but with a null operator that needs to be licensed and identified through Neg. Here, we opt for the former approach for a number of reasons based on the observation that, to the extent morphological differences can be detected, GEN-NEG patterns with the regular oblique genitive rather than with GEN-Q. Moreover, the numeral itself can be included in the scope of the negation, as in (15):

(15) On ne čital i [QP četryrex knig].
    he NEG read even four GEN books GEN
    ‘He did not read even four books.’

Clearly, the entire QP is being marked genitive, as an oblique case, which immediately fixes the values of all the case features therein, bypassing any conceivable effect of the null quantifier.

This is not to say there are no QPs that lack phonetic exponence, either within Q° or [Spec, QP]. For example, Franks (1995) adopts such an analysis for partitives and large-quantity expressions. The crucial point here is that, unlike in (15), a QP is selected for, with the value of the null operator in [Spec, QP]
syntactically licensed and identified. This selectivity can most clearly be demonstrated by verbs whose semantics causes them to take QP rather than NP complements, as in (16):

(16) Ivan nakupil [QP Ø [NP knig ]].
   Ivan na-bought books.GEN
   ‘Ivan bought a lot of books.’

When compared with (17), we see that what is selected in (16) is actually not the genitive case, but rather a QP.

(17) Ivan nakupil [QP mnogo /* mnogix [NP knig ]]
    Ivan na-bought many / *many.GEN books.GEN
    ‘Ivan bought a lot of books.’

To summarize so far, nominals in Russian do not need to be fully projected as DPs. Examples of nominals that we hypothesize not to have the DP-layer include: non-agreeing (Babby’s “heterogeneous”) QPs; genitive-of-negation NPs; QPs selected by verbs with quantificational semantics. These analyses require NPs and QPs to be able to be assigned case directly and, following the insights of Babby (1987), allow for different morphological cases on different projections within the nominal system.

3.3. Predicative nominals in Russian.
Our claim is that, in addition to the bare QPs discussed above, non-referential NPs occur in other contexts as well. In what follows, we demonstrate that they play a considerably more prominent role in Russian grammar than previously imagined. Let us now turn to predicative nominals in Russian, which, as is well known, can be either nominative or instrumental. We follow Pereltvaig (2001), who treats predicate instrumental (18a) as a bare NP, as opposed to the predicate nominative DP in (18b).

6 In the present tense, only the nominative is possible. We do not discuss this issue here.
Before we discuss the association of cases with syntactic structures, a word or two on our assumptions about the two structures instantiated in (18) is in order. As argued in Pereltsvaig (2001), ‘byt’ ‘be’ in (18a) is a light verb, introduced in v, that governs the instrumental and selects a (non-referential) NP. Since, as argued in Franks (1995) inter alia, ‘byt’ is formally (if not semantically) perfective, its conjugated form results in future rather than present tense meaning. In (18b), on the other hand, we have an equative structure in which ‘byt’ is inserted directly into T° to bear tense and agreement features. The subject DP, here Oleg, raises from a small clause where it actually had merged with the DP durak ‘fool’.

Why do we associate the predicate instrumental with a bare NP and the predicate nominative with a DP rather than the other way around? It turns out that if a predicative nominal includes material normally associated with the D-layer, then it has to be marked with the nominative case and cannot be instrumental. For instance, as shown in (19) from Pereltsvaig (2001), only the DP is allowed in a context which requires referentiality:

(19) a. Ivanuška -dučok byl [DP tot brat, Ivanushka-fool was that.brother.kotoryj vsegda popadal v bedu]. which.always got into trouble ‘Ivanushka the Fool was that brother who always got into trouble.’
Presence of the demonstrative element *tot* ‘that’ forces the projection of a DP; since the resulting phrase can only be nominative, we conclude that the predicate instrumental, as in (19b), is limited to bare NPs. Pereltsvaig shows that a similar situation arises for numerals, as can be seen by considering the contrast in (20):

(20) a. Oleg i Ivan byli [DP dva xorošix rabotnika].
    Oleg and Ivan were two good.GEN workers.GEN
    ‘Oleg and Ivan were two good workers.’

b. Oleg i Ivan byli [NP (*dvumja) xorošimi rabotnikami].
    Oleg and Ivan were two.INSTR good.INSTR workers.INSTR
    intended: ‘Oleg and Ivan were two good workers.’

Since the predicate instrumental is only licensed on bare NPs, it is incompatible with *dvumja* ‘two.INSTR’ in (20b). The status of this example is particularly telling. The fact that an instrumental adjective is perfectly acceptable, whereas the instrumental numeral is not, shows that when *dvumja* is present the phrase must be larger than an NP. Since the light verb *byt’ selects an instrumental NP as its complement, (20b) with *dvumja* is impossible.

Furthermore, as shown in (21), negative polarity items, which are non-referential, must be instrumental and not nominative.

(21) On ne byl nič’im drugom. / * ničej drug.
    he NEG was [nobody’s friend].INSTR / * NOM
    ‘He wasn’t anybody’s friend.’
The flip side of this observation is that pronouns, which are often assumed to be D°s, normally appear in the nominative case:

(22) Èto byl on / * im.
       this was he.NOM / *INSTR
       ‘It was him.’

There have been noted in the literature, however, certain examples where pronouns appear in the post-copular position in the instrumental case. Two such examples, suggested for a Dr. Jekyll-Mr. Hyde situation and cited by Nichols (1981:206), are given in (23). In this example the pronoun does not have its characteristic referential interpretation.

(23) Kogda ja byl im, to ja soveršal užasnye
       when I was he.INSTR then I committed terrible
       prestuplenija.
       crimes
       ‘When I was him, I committed terrible crimes.’

Because of this, we argue that pronouns in Russian are not merged in D°, contra the standard analysis. Instead, we propose to merge them in N°. In the exceptional cases when the pronoun has a non-referential interpretation and appears in the instrumental case, as in (23), it by hypothesis cannot by a D°, since no DP is projected. The possible N° status of pronouns is further corroborated by examples such as those in (24), where they can be modified by adjectives and preceded by determiners:

(24) a. Silnaja ja smogu èto preodolet’.
       strong I.NOM will-manage this overcome
       ‘A strong me will manage to overcome this.’

       I love [that you].ACC which I know
       ‘I love the you that I know.’
In the typical referential cases, however, the pronoun raises from N° to D°, when there is a DP above it. This is why, for example, we find the relative orders in (25):

(25) a. [ego, samogo t]  b. [samogo direktora]
    him.ACC self.ACC          self.ACC director.ACC
    ‘himself’                 ‘the director himself’

To recap so far, we have argued that nominative predicatives are DPs and instrumental predicatives are NPs. One of our basic points was that nominative but not instrumental predicatives presuppose the existence of an individual. This is further supported by the coordination test for an equative reading, given in (26) from Holmberg (1993:130):

(26) a. Peter is a teacher, and Lisa is a teacher, too.
    b. ?? Peter is the teacher, and Lisa is the teacher, too.

Adapting this test to Russian, a similar contrast emerges for copular sentences. Since instrumental predicatives do not refer, they cannot give rise to an equative reading. This is demonstrated by the minimal pair in (27):

(27) a. Piter byl doktorom, i Andrej tože byl doktorom.
      Peter was doctor.INSTR and Andrew too was doctor.INSTR
      ‘Peter was a doctor, and Andrew was a doctor too.’
    b. ?? Piter byl doktor, i Andrej tože byl doktor.
      Peter was doctor.NOM and Andrew too was doctor.NOM
      intended: ‘Peter was the doctor and Andrew was the
doctor too.’

---

7 See Progovac (1998) for detailed discussion with respect to Serbian/Croatian.
3.4. Approximative Inversion.
Further support for our claim that nominals in Russian need not project all the way up to DP can be seen in the behavior of the curious “approximative inversion” construction, typologically peculiar to East Slavic. Franks (1995:165-174) argues at length that this only occurs in bare QPs, never in DPs. It is thus impossible in forced referential contexts such as (8) above. Now consider the fact that either the heterogeneous or the homogenous pattern is allowed in (28):

(28) a. Ja videl \([QP \text{ četyre soldata }].\)
    I saw four soldiers.GEN
b. Ja videl \([DP \text{ četyrex soldat }].\)
    I saw four.GEN soldiers.GEN

We interpret this, as is indicated in the examples, in terms of the dichotomy between QP and DP. Franks also observes that only Babby’s heterogeneous pattern is allowed in (29):

(29) a. Ja videl soldata \(\text{četyre} \).
    I saw soldiers.GEN four
    ‘I saw about four soldiers.’
b. * Ja videl soldat \(\text{četyrex} \).
    I saw soldiers.GEN four.GEN
    ‘intended: same as (29a)’

This follows directly from the posited difference, since only the heterogeneous pattern is consistent with the absence of DP necessitated by the approximative non-referential interpretation. Further corroboration for this account can be seen in the fact that verbs which select QPs always tolerate approximative inversion:

(30) Ivan nakupil \([QP \text{ knig sorok}].\)
    Ivan na-bought books.GEN forty
    ‘Ivan bought about 40 books.’
3.5. Animacy.
Finally, we tie animacy, as reflected in how accusative is realized, into referentiality, hence presence of a DP. We assume, following e.g. Fraser and Corbett (1995), that in the morphology there is a rule which invokes either the nominative or genitive form when the accusative is called for (and when there is no distinct accusative entry). In other words, this is not an instance of syncretism (contra Franks 1995), but rather obeys something like (31):

(31) Accusative prediction rule:
   a. Accusative + inanimate $\Rightarrow$ nominative
   b. Accusative + animate $\Rightarrow$ genitive

Let us return in this light to the difference between (28a) and (28b). The latter, we maintain, is a DP. It has an individuated reading, meaning that a total of four separate soldiers were perceived, as opposed to (28a), which is a QP and therefore favors a group reading. This clearly correlates with the application of the accusative prediction rule, in that the QP functions as inanimate, the DP as animate. Concomitantly, (29) shows that approximative inversion is only possible when the accusative is mapped into nominative rather than genitive.

Consider also (32), in which the non-referential, metaphorical use of dve ženy ‘two wives’ as a temporal phrase causes the accusative to be mapped into nominative rather than genitive.

(32) Ëto slučilos’ dve ženy/ *dvux
    that happened two wives.ACC=NOM/ two.GEN
    žen tomu nazad
    wives.ACC=GEN ago

This follows from the assumption that Russian adjuncts are not DPs, since there is no referential feature of NP that would require
merger of D° in order to be valued. The expression is thus treated as inanimate and mapped, by (31a) into the nominative.

A similar account can conceivably explain (33) as an instance of necessarily non-referential hence inanimate accusative.

(33) On pošel v soldaty/ *soldat.
he went into soldiers.ACC=NOM/ soldiers.*ACC=GEN
‘He became a soldier.’

This is sometimes regarded as an idiomatic construction, an exceptional use of the nominative. It would however be a unique instance of nominative selected by a preposition. Moreover, as shown by the list of collocations in (34) and (35), this a quite a productive expression:8


(35) pojti v gosti ‘go visiting’; postupit’ na službu v kamerdinery ‘get employment as a valet’; podat’sja v povara ‘become a cook’; godit’sja v njan’ki ‘be suited for a nanny’; kandidat v prezidenty ‘presidential candidate’

4. Conclusion.
In this paper, we have argued for a system in which NP (like VP) can be dominated by a range of functional projections, encompassing at least QP and DP. The level of projection

---

8 According to Zolotova (1988:170-172), this construction expresses “a characteristic of an individual according to his belonging to a category, a group of people, usually a socially meaningful one” (translation – A.P.).
ultimately depends on the kinds of functional categories required in order to value the features of the nominal selected from the Numeration. We hope to have shown that this kind of approach to the nominal domain opens up interesting new avenues of analysis of some familiar (and not so familiar) problems in Russian morphosyntax.
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