1. INTRODUCTION

Small clause: a minimal unit of non-verbal predication:

(1) a. VP
   \[\text{Warwick}\ V' \]  
   make \ SUBJ \ him \ PRED \ king
   b. S
   \[\text{Warwick}\ V' \]  
   seems \ SUBJ \ Warwick \ PRED \ clever

Small clauses may appear in a variety of environments (Williams 1983):

(2) a. John is sad.  
    b. John ate the meat raw.  
    c. John ate the meat nude.  
    d. John made Bill mad.  
    e. John seems mad.


(3) a. [With John sick], we’ll never get the job done on time.  
    b. [Me mad]?! Ridiculous!  
    c. They hammered [the metal flat].


(4) a. The people elected [SC Nixon ("the") president].  
    b. Carroll named [SC his heroine Alice].

Summary: a non-verbal constituent consisting of a subject (type e or ⟨e, t⟩) and a predicate (type ⟨e, t⟩) with a propositional meaning may appear in a variety of environments, retaining certain syntactic properties in common.

2. PREDICATE CASE: THE BIG PICTURE

At least the following patterns of Case-marking on non-verbal predicates are observed:

Default or undetectable case (putative lack of case):

(5) hommish-níi barána gáárii.  
    Harar Oromo (Owens 1985 via Comrie 1997)
    harvest-NOM this.year good.CIT
    The harvest is good this year.

NB: The citation case in Harar Oromo is also used for direct objects; nominative case is morphologically marked

Case-agreement (the predicate is marked with the same case as the subject):

(6) a. Ciceronem clarum habent.  
    Latin: Case-agreement
    Cicero-ACC famous-ACC consider/hold
    They consider Cicero famous.
b. Cicero clarus habetur.
   Cicero-NOM famous-NOM consider/hold-PASS
   Cicero is considered famous.

Dedicated predicative case(s):

(7) a. Ja сčitaju ee lingvistkoj.  
   I consider her-ACC linguist-INSTR
   I consider her a linguist.

b. Ona vernulas’ krasavicej.  
   She came back beauty-INSTR
   She came back a beauty.

(8) a. Toini on sairaa-na.  
   Toini-NOM be.3SG ill-ESS
   Toini is ill.

b. Toini tul-i sairaa-ksi.  
   Toini-NOM become-PAST.3SG ill-TRS
   Toini became ill.

A combination of the above (Georgian):

(9) a. sasmelma nino geniosi gaxada  
   drink-erg Nina(abs) genius(abs) turn-aor
   The drink made Nina a genius.

b. nino tvlida meris mtvral-ad/genios-ad  
   Nino(nom) count-imp Mary-acc drunk-adv/genius-adv
   Nina considered Mary drunk/a genius.

c. meri mtvrali/masc’avlebeli iq’o  
   Mary(nom) drunk(nom)/teacher(nom) BE-pst-3sg
   Mary was drunk/a professor.

d. merim ševeba saxli c’itl-ad  
   Mary-erg paint-aor house(abs) red-adv
   Mary painted the house red.

Given case-agreement in the most basic environment, what happens in more complex ones?

3.  **Hungarian**

NB: The Hungarian data, unless specified otherwise, are courtesy of Veronika Hegedüs, Gabi Tóth, Greta Dalmi and Balácz Surányi @}-`---.

3.1.  **Predicate case options**

In primary predication the predicate is marked **nominative**:

(10) a. János orvos (lejt).  
   Janos-NOM doctor-NOM was/became
   John is (was/became) a doctor.

b. A fiúk aranyosak voltak.  
   the boy-PL nice-PL were
   The boys were nice.
A plural subject triggers agreement on the nominative predicate:

(11) A lány-ok-0 nem voltak / maradtak sokáig boldog-ok-0.  
    the girl-PL-NOM not were / stayed for long happy-PL-NOM  
    The girls were not / did not remain happy for long.

**Intensional verbs**, like *seem* and *consider*, assign *dative* to both AP and NP predicates:

(12) Péter zseni-nak /okos-nak tart-ja Mari-t.  
    Peter genius-dat/smart-dat consider-3sg.def Mar-acc  
    Peter considers Mary a genius/smart.

**Depictive APs** appear with *essive; depictive NPs*, with *dative*:

    Janos- NOM drunk-ESS drove the car-3SG  
    John drove his car drunk.

   b. János hideg-en ette a hús-t.  
    Janos- NOM cold-ess ate the meat-acc  
    John ate the meat cold. *(He ate the meat when it was cold.)*

(14) konyhá-nak használ  
    kitchen-dat use-inf  
    to use as a kitchen

The **AP predicate** in the **resultative** construction is marked sublative, though **NP predicates** are assigned *dative*:

(15) a. János apry-ra vágta a gombá-t.  
    John small-subl cut the mushroom-acc  
    John cut the mushroom into small pieces.

   b. János pirosra festette az ajtót.  
    Janos- NOM red-SBL painted the wall-ACC  
    John painted the wall red.

(16) a. Az anyja tanárnak tanítatja Pétert.  
    the mother-his teacher DAT learn-make Peter ACC  
    His mother makes Peter learn to become a teacher.

   b. A lány- om-at Mari-nak nevezt-em el  
    the daughter 1 SG ACC Mary DAT named 1SG PREVERB  
    I named my daughter Mary.

The verbs *make* and *become* assign *translative*:

(17) A diszvacasorán ‘SOK VENDÉGj val-t-0 [nevetséges-sé tj].  
    the banquet-SPR many guest become-PAST-3SG ridiculous-trs  
    MANY guests became ridiculous at the banquet.

(18) János hiressé tette Marit.  
    John-NOM famous-TRS made Mary-ACC  
    John made Mary famous.

(19) a. Mari orvossá vált.  
    Mary doctor-trs became  
    Mary became a doctor.

   b. Mari békává változott.  
    Mary frog-trs changed-into  
    Mary changed into a frog.
Case decomposition (December 6, 2010)

Question: how are all these cases assigned? While for depictives it would have been possible to postulate a case-assigning functional head (as), such an analysis seems very far-fetched for intensional verbs.

NB I will not address the issue of number agreement for nominative (but no other) predicates.

Since dative is the most generic goal case, some sort of impoverishment appears to happen with NP predicates.

3.2. Analysis

Hungarian surface predicate case is determined by the complexity of the environment and the lexical category of the predicate:

(20) Hungarian predicate cases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>functional heads</th>
<th>AP case</th>
<th>case meaning elsewhere</th>
<th>NP case</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>be, remain</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>nominative</td>
<td>nominative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attitude verbs</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>dative</td>
<td>goal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>make, become</td>
<td>BECOME, v</td>
<td>translative</td>
<td>transition to a goal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>resultative</td>
<td>v, BECOME, v</td>
<td>sublative</td>
<td>movement to the surface of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>depictive</td>
<td>as?</td>
<td>essive</td>
<td>circumstantial</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Morphologically, sublative is more marked than translative (e.g., it doesn't exist in Finnish), translative is more marked than dative (duh!), and dative is more marked than nominative.

**AP predicates:**
- sublative (change of state plus location): in resultatives (verb denoting change-of-state plus something else)
- translative (change of state): verbs denoting pure change of state

**NP predicates:**
- translative (change of state): verbs denoting pure change of state
- dative: elsewhere in non-primary predication

Summary: change-of-state results in sublative > translative > dative > nominative on APs: a
- change of state + manner (resultative): sublative
- change of state - manner (become, make): translative
- manner, no change of state: dative
- no manner, no change of state: nominative

There does not seem to be any sort of subset relation between essive and translative.

Nominative seems to occur in environments of least complexity (no relevant features). It is not clear whether it corresponds to no Case at all or to Case agreement.

3.3. Special cases

With some nomination verbs NP predicates may appear in dative or translative case:

(21) a. Megválaszt-ott-ák elnök-nek
    pfx-elect-past-3pl president-dat
    He was elected president.

b. Elnök-ké választ-ott-ák.
    president-transl elect-past-3pl
    He was elected president.
With a prefix only dative is possible (Gabi Tóth, PC):

(22) Az emberek megválasztottak *elnökké/elnöknek Pétert.
The people-nom pref-elected president-trs/dat Peter-acc
*The people elected Peter president.

This variation could be due to incomplete impoverishment.

Translative and sublative can appear on resultative NPs, but predication cannot be claimed to exist there in its pure form (A is a B):

(23) János kemény tésztá-vá gyúrta az alkotanyagok-at.
John stiff dough-trans moulded the ingredients-acc
*John moulded the ingredients into stiff dough.

(24) János halálra verte Pétert.
János death-SBL beat-PST-3SG Péter-ACC
János beat Péter to death.

Lack of reduction to dative here suggests that not all surface translative are created equal; a null preposition or something similar is required.

A similar (perhaps identical) phenomenon can be observed in pseudo-resultatives, marked illative in Finnish (Levinson 2010).

4. **ESTONIAN**

NB: The Estonian data in this section, unless specified otherwise, are courtesy of Anne Tamm @-}-`---.

4.1. **Secondary predication**

**Essive** appears on *depictives* (examples from Lutkat and Hasselblatt 1993:192 via Schultze-Berndt and Himmelmann 2004):

boy-ESS play-PAST-1SG football-PART
*As a boy I played soccer.*

c. Ta läks koju rõõmsa-na.
(s)he go-PAST-3SG house-ILL happy-ESS
S/he went home happy.

Estonian also has nominal depictives not attested in English (but present in Russian):

(26) a. NN töötab meie saadiku-na London-is.
work-PRES-3SG our ambassador-ESS London-INESS
*NN works as our ambassador in London.*

b. Anna prišla na objekt vodoprovodčikom.
plumber-INSTR
Anna came on site as a plumber.

**Translative** case appears on predicates in the complement of change of state verbs:

(27) a. Peeter saab vana-ks.
Peter becomes old-TRS.SG
*Peter is getting old.*

c. NN määrati meie saadiku-ks London-is.
appoint-PASS our ambassador-TRS London-INESS
NN was appointed as our ambassador in London.
**Attitude** verbs assign **translative** if ECM, nominative if raising:

Mary considers John.ptv good-trs decathlete-trs/intelligent-trs
Mary considers John a good decathlete/intelligent.

b. Raskus näib ületamatu.
difficulty seems unsurmountable-nom
The difficulty seems unsurmountable.

Summary: three different cases are assigned in Estonian secondary predication, with essive the odd man out

### 4.2. Primary predication

Stassen 2001 (somewhat misleadingly): the copula allows three cases on nominal predicates:

(29) a. NN on meie saadik London-is. Estonian, Lehiste 1972:216
NN be-PRES our ambassador-NOM London-INESS
*NN is our ambassador in London.*

b. NN on meie saadiku-na London-is.
NN be-PRES our ambassador-ESS London-INESS
*NN is our ambassador in London.*

c. NN on meie saadiku-ks London-is.
NN be-PRES our ambassador-TRS London-INESS
*NN is our ambassador in London.*

For adjectival predicates only two options are possible:

(30) a. Ta oli noor. Estonian, Stassen 2001
(s)he was young-NOM
S/he was young.

b. Ta oli seal noore-na.
(s)he was there young-ESS
S/he was there (when) young.

The essive case in (29b) and (30b) is that of a depictive.

Without another predicate (the primary one), essive is ungrammatical:

NN be-PRES our ambassador-ESS

(s)he was young-ESS

An essive depictive can appear with the nominative and translative primary predication, but not with another essive:

(32) a. NN oli meie saadiku-na päris hea tegija.
NN be-PAST our ambassador-ESS quite good-NOM activist-NOM
*NN was quite active (while/as) our ambassador.*

b. *NN oli ülõpilase-na iluduse-na.
NN be-PAST student-ESS beauty-ESS
*NN was a beauty as a student.*
c. NN oli ülõpilase- na kultuurisaadiku-ks.
   NN be-PAST student-ESS cultural ambassador-TRS
   NN was a cultural ambassador as a student.

With the copula translative can only appear on nominal predicates denoting professions; other NPs are coerced into a role interpretation:

(33) a. ?NN on meie isa-ks.
   NN be-PAST our father-TRS
   NN plays the role of our father.

b. ?NN on hispaanlase-ks/ mulati-ks.
   NN be-PAST Spaniard-TRS/ mulatto-TRS
   NN plays the role of a Spaniard/mulatto.

Thus in primary predication translative indicates the presence of an additional, transient component, with those nouns that trigger article omission in Romance and Germanic

(34) Estonian predicate cases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>functional heads</th>
<th>AP case</th>
<th>NP case</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>be, seem</td>
<td>v-def</td>
<td>nominative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attitude verbs</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>translative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>make, become</td>
<td>BECOME, v</td>
<td>translative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>resultative</td>
<td>V, BECOME, v</td>
<td>translative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>depictive</td>
<td>as?</td>
<td>essive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary: in Estonian essive is assigned to depictives, nominative is assigned to the predicate in non-change-of-state raising sentences and **translative is the marked default** (nominative plus one feature that does not correspond to "essive").

5. FINNISH

NB: The Finnish data in this section, unless specified otherwise, are courtesy of Liina Pylkkänen @}---.

5.1. Secondary predication and the rule of change of state

Stassen 2001, Fong 2003: Finnish has semantically determined Case-marking on predicates: in resultatives and with change-of-state verbs (including naming verbs) translative case is used instead of the default predicative Case (essive).

**Essive** on NP and AP predicates is used in depictives and with attitude verbs:

(35) a. Alice palas-i kotikaupunki- in-sa presidentti- nä. depictive
   Alice return-PAST hometown-ILL-3SG.POSS president-ESS
   *Alice returned to her hometown (as) president.*

b. Me pidä-mme Sue-ta presidentti- nä. attitude verb
   we consider/hold-PRES-1PL Sue-PART president-ESS
   *We consider her president.*

**Translative** on NP and AP predicates appears with verbs of change of state:

   old man became blind-TRS.SG
   *The old man went blind.*
b. Me maalas-i-mme seinä-n keltaise-ksi. resultative construction
we paint-PST-1PL wall-ACC yellow-TRS
We painted a/the wall yellow.

c. Me kutsu-mme William Gatesi-a Billi-ksi. naming verb
we call-1PL William Gates-PART Billy-TRS
We call William Gates Billy.

d. Me valits-i-mme Sue-n presidenti-ksi. nomination verb
we elect-PST-1PL Sue-ACC president-TRS
We elected Sue president.

It is clear that in the structure of a change-of-state verb an aspectual component (BECOME) must be present.

Hypothesis: The element with the change-of-state meaning is responsible for translative case assignment.

Important: translative case reflects a meaning that is not located on the predicate itself.

5.2. Primary predication

NP and AP predicates behave differently.

AP predicates can be nominative or essive. The latter implies that the property denoted by the predicate is “contingent” (Stassen 2001, Fong 2003):

(37) a. Tytto on pieni. Finnish, Fromm and Sadeniemi 1956:116
   girl- NOM is small-NOM-SG
   The girl is small.

b. Toini on sairaa-na. Fong 2003
   Toini- NOM be-3 SG ill-ESS
   Toini is ill.

c. Toini oli sairaa-na kolme viikko-a. Fong 2003
   Toini- NOM be-PAST-3SG ill-ESS three week-PART
   Toini was ill for three weeks.

NP predicates can be marked essive, but only if they denote professions or particular stages in life (Stassen 2001):

   friend-my is vicar-NOM
   My friend is a vicar.

b. Han oli siella opettaja-na. Stassen 2001 from Lehtinen 1963:373
   (s)he was there teacher-ESS
   S/he was a teacher there, s/he worked there as a teacher.

A locative can be omitted, but only in the presence of a temporal modifier:

c. Han oli opettaja-na *(!kolme viikko-a). Finnish
   (s)he was teacher-ESS three week-PART
   S/he was a teacher for three weeks.

Votic has the same two options in primary predication (Stassen 2001):

   3SG is old woman-NOM
   She is an old woman.
be-PAST-1SG soldier-ESS Tallinn-LOC
I was a soldier in Tallinn.

Summary: in Finnish, translative marks change of state, nominative is used with the copula and essive is the marked default.

6. CONCLUSION

The complex Case system of Finno-Ugric languages provides evidence for both the featural complexity of syntactic case and the role of impoverishment in its surface realization.

6.1. Some illustrations

Small clause Case-agreement:

(40) a. T′
    T
    vP
    v′
    [NOM]
    Alice
    v′
    [ACC]
    V
    PredP
    DP
    consider
    Mary
    a genius

b. T′
    T
    vP
    v′
    [NOM]
    V′
    V
    PredP
    DP
    seem
    Mary
    a genius

NB: It's a standard assumption that raising and passive v0 does not assign Case

Estonian: nonverbal predicates in the complement of seem and consider receive nominative and translative respectively.

The more complex case corresponds to the more complex structure

6.2. Multiple case-marking

Further evidence that Case can be assigned to constituents larger than xNPs: Case-marking in Kayardild (Merchant 2006, based on Evans 2005) and Lardil (Richards 2007):

(41) Ngada mungurru, [ maku-ntha yalawu-jarra-ntha yakuri-naa-ntha Kayardild
I know woman-C.OBL catch-PAST-C.OBL fish-M.ABL-C.OBL
thabuju-karra-nguni-naa-ntha mijil-nguni-naa-nth].
brother-GEN-INS-M.ABL-C.OBL net-INS-M.ABL-C.OBL
I know that the woman caught the fish with brother’s net.

(42) Ngada kangka niween were-thuru-Ø wangalk-uru-Ø. Lardil
I tell him.ACC throw-FUT-ACC boomerang-FUT-ACC
I told him to throw the boomerang.

This looks like concord, except it isn’t in an xNP. Since verbs are also Case-marked, it seems the simplest hypothesis to assume that Case here is assigned to the entire CP and percolates
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