1. **Issues Involved**

Is there a (syntactically or semantically required) mediator between the subject and the non-verbal predicate?

Is it required cross-linguistically?

Some examples of “overt predicators” in Slavic and their analysis:

- *as*: a complementizer
- *for*: a preposition
- *in*: another preposition

Conclusion: *To a person with a hammer everything looks like a nail*. Occam’s razor can come in useful.

2. **The Syntactic Theory of Mediated Predication**

Bowers 1993, 2001: APs, NPs and PPs do not denote predicates, but rather must be converted into predicates. The semantic function of Pred is therefore to create a predicate that could be combined with the subject.

(1) \[ \text{VP} \]

\[ \text{V}^0 \quad \text{PredP} = \text{small clause (SC)} \]

\[ \text{consider} \quad \text{NP} \quad \text{Pred'} \]

\[ \text{Marie} \quad \text{Pred'} \quad \text{AP} \]

\[ \text{ø proud of her work} \]

Evidence:

- The constituent containing the predicate and not containing the subject of a small clause can be moved by wh-movement. This constituent (known as an X’-level) is supposed to be unmovable for theory-internal reasons (Svenonius 1994).
- The predicate of a small clause may receive a special predicative case (accusative in Arabic, dative in Hungarian, instrumental in Russian…). A functional head is assumed to be necessary to assign that case (Bailyn 2001, 2002, Bailyn and Citko 1999, Bailyn and Rubin 1991, etc.).
- Coordination of small clause predicates of apparently different lexical categories is possible, which suggests that they should belong to the same category — hence a functional head should be present in the small clause (Bowers 1993, 2001).

2.1. **Support: overt predicators**

In some languages a functional element appears between the subject and (some categories of) the predicate (Bowers 1993, 2001):

(2) \[ \text{a. Mae Siôn *}(yn) \text{ ddedwydd. Welsh (Rouveret 1996:128)} \]

\[ \text{is Siôn PRT happy} \]

\[ \text{Siôn is happy.} \]
b. Y mae Siôn yn feddyg.
PRT is Siôn PRT doctor
Siôn is a doctor.

(3) a. Tha Calum ‘na thidsear. Scottish Gaelic (Adger and Ramchand 2003)
be-PRES Calum PRT=in-3MSG teacher
Calum is a teacher.

b. Chunnaic mi Calum agus [e ‘na thidsear].
see-PAST I Calum and [him PRT=in-3MSG teacher]
I saw Calum while he was a teacher.

(4) a. Èmèrí *(yé) mòsèmòsè. Edo (Baker 2003)
be-PRES Mary PRT beautiful.A
Mary is beautiful.

b. Úyi *(rè) òkhaèmwèn.
Uyi PRT chief.N
Uyi is a chief.

3-lion PRT 3-ASSOC 3-fierce
The lion is fierce.

b. M-kango *(ndì) m-lenje.
3-lion PRT 1-hunter
The lion is a hunter.

Non-verbal predication must be mediated by a functional head Pred⁰. The small clause is a projection of this head (PredP).

NB: Both Bowers 1993, 2001 and den Dikken 2006 take the extreme position, though for different reasons: every kind of predication must be mediated by a functional head. We will not address this complication here.

2.2. Question: Universal existence of overt predicators

Bowers 1993: in small clause complements like (6) as is, in fact, the lexicalization of the Pred operator (see also Emonds 1985 and Aarts 1992):

(6) a. She regards this hypothesis as silly. English
b. They take him for a fool.


(7) a. My sčitaem ego svoim. Russian (Bailyn 2001)
we consider him-ACC self.POSS-INSTR

b. My sčitaem ego kak svoego.
we consider him-ACC AS self.POSS-ACC

c. My sčitaem ego za svoego.
we consider him-ACC FOR self.POSS-ACC

We consider him as one of us.

Our proposal: what looks like the preposition za ‘for’ and the complementizer kao/kak ‘as’ are, in fact, a preposition and a complementizer. What you see is what you get.
2.3. The definition of a small clause

There are two major classes of hypotheses associated with the notion of a “small clause”:

(i) Semantic: small clauses are minimal units of non-verbal predication semantically corresponding to a proposition (or a state of affairs, as in Svenonius 1994; Wilder 1992, etc.)

(ii) Syntactic: small clauses are constituents formed by the combination of two (non-verbal) maximal projections mediated or not by a special (functional) head Pred⁰. No special semantics is associated with a small clause (e.g., Bennis, Corver and den Dikken 1998: a small clause is assumed to be projected inside an NP)

Against the purely syntactic definition of a small clause: its only prediction is that a small clause should be able to move as a constituent, which it does not do, either in English or in Slavic, presumably for independent reasons.

This is why we adhere to a more restricted hypothesis where a small clause corresponds to a proposition and contains a subject (type e or ⟨e, ⟨e, t⟩⟩) and a predicate (type ⟨e, t⟩, setting aside intensionality).

NB: For many authors the notion of a small clause also includes verbal predicates, as in ‘I heard Callas sing’. In Slavic linguistics such is usually not the case, possibly because such constructions are not grammatical in Slavic

3. What is ‘for’ for?

Now-standard assumption: a small clause is involved:

(8) a. VP ECM, for is Pred⁰

b. VP ECM, for is f⁰

NB: Not all entertained structural options are exemplified

More traditional assumption (ours, too): for-PP is an adjunct:
Another possibility: the *for*-PP is a second argument of the verb (not to be discussed).

Assuming a small clause structure makes the following predictions:

- **Status of NP₁:** if the NP₁-*for*-NP₂ string is a small clause, NP₁ is its subject. If we are dealing with a single predicate, then the NP₁ is an object of the verb.

- **The status of *for***: under the analysis in (8a, b) za ‘for’ is either a Pred⁰ or some sort of C⁰. Under the single predicate analysis in (8c), it is a regular preposition. We expect prepositions to combine with NPs and to assign case.

- **Status of NP₂:** under the small clause analysis (8a) the complement of za ‘for’ is a semantic predicate (type (e, t))

- **Propositionality:** under a small clause analysis (8a, b) the main verb combines with a semantic proposition: (i) verbs that combine with *for* should also take other canonical realizations of propositions, i.e., more regular small clauses and CPs; (ii) conversely, verbs that normally take small clauses (verbs of change of state or intensional verbs) should combine with *for*.

Claims:
- za ‘for’ behaves like a preposition
- The NP₁-*for*-NP₂ string does not behave as a small clause.

### 3.1. Anaphor binding

In Slavic languages the subject orientation of reflexives is absolute, i.e., only the local subject can serve as a binder for a reflexive:

(9) a. Tristram, tvrdi [da [je Lorens, video sebe_i/*j]].  
Tristram claims that is Laurence saw self

b. Tristram, je Lorensu pokazao sebe_i/*j u ogledalu.  
Tristram showed Laurence himself in the mirror

Only a local subject can bind the reflexive.

Like the subjects of *that*-clauses in (9a) and (10a) and unlike the indirect object in (9b), the small clause subject in (10b) is a legitimate binder for the reflexive in the predicate in Serbo-Croat:

(10) a. Tristram, smatra da je Lorens, ljut na sebe_i/*j.  
Tristram considers that is Laurence angry on self

b. Tristram, smatra Lorensa ljutim na sebe_i/*j.  
Tristram considers Laurence angry on self
c. Tristram, čini Lorensa, nezadovoljnim sobom, Tristram makes Laurence dissatisfied self-

Tristram, makes Laurence dissatisfied with himself.

The same facts obtain for the possessive reflexive svoj.

NB: Russian does not permit small clause subjects to bind reflexives, so we restrict ourselves to Serbo-Croat.

(11) a. Tristram, je greškom zamenio Lorensa, za sebe. Serbo-Croat

Tristram AUX mistake- INSTR took Laurence- ACC for self

(11) b. Tristram, je greškom zamenio Lorensa, za svog neprijatelja. Serbo-Croat

Tristram AUX mistake- INSTR took Laurence- ACC for self’s enemy

The inability of Laurence to bind the reflexive in either (11a) or (11b) clearly indicates that in (11) Laurence is an object of the matrix verb rather than a subject of a small clause.

3.2. The status of za ‘for’

Regular small clauses can have predicates of any lexical category:

(12) a. Jane considers her friends [AP smart]/[PP in love]/[NP idiots].

b. My sčitaem ego [AP umnym]/ [PP vne sebja]/ [NP idiotom]. Russian

We consider him smart/ beside himself with anger/an idiot.

Putative for-small clauses can only have an NP predicate:

(13) a. Oleg prinjal ego za vrača/ *francuzskogo. Russian

Oleg took him for a doctor.

b. Proglasili su ga za izdajnika/ ??/* za krivog. Serbo-Croat

He was announced a traitor.

In other words, za ‘for’ behaves like a preposition.

NB: Some apparent exceptions in Bailyn 2001 actually involve NP-ellipsis, i.e., an omitted noun.

NB: In Dutch and French for can appear with APs (though not PPs) with the same set of verbs (cf. Starke 1995). However, the construction still behaves mysteriously.

In addition, za ‘for’ assigns accusative case just like it does in its normal use as a preposition:

(14) a. Prvi poljubac se uzima za godišnjicu. Serbo-Croat

The first kiss is counted as the anniversary date.

b. On možet sojti za advokata. Russian

He can pass for a lawyer.

Once again za ‘for’ behaves like a preposition.

3.3. The semantic status of the NP1-for-NP2 sequence

If (8a) is correct, the NP1-for-NP2 sequence must have the semantic type of a proposition:
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(8) a. VP ECM, for is Pred^0

```
(8) b. VP
    NP
  \    /
  \   /
  they\  /
     \ /
      \v
       V'   PredP
      /     = a proposition
     take   Pred'
    NP_1  NP_2
   /       \\
  him \     /  for
      Pred^0  an idiot
```

However, such sequences appear exactly with those verbs (take, pass, mistake, count, etc.) that are incompatible with regular small clauses:

(15) a. *We took [him smart/an idiot/in love].
    b. *He can pass [t_1 smart/an idiot/in love].

Conversely, verbs that normally take small clauses (intensional verbs or verbs of change of state) systematically do not appear with for-PPs:

(16) a. Jane made/considered him (*for) an idiot.
    b. He seems/became (*for) an idiot.

Possible hypothesis: it is precisely za ‘for’ that enables verbs like take and pass to take small clause complements and stops it from combining with intensional and change-of-state verbs that normally take small clause complements ⇒ (8b), cf. Starke 1995

(8) b. VP ECM, for is f^0

```
(8) b. VP
    NP
  \    /
  \   /
  they\  /
     \ /
      \v
       V'   F^0
      /     = a proposition
     take   PredP
    NP_1  NP_2
   /       \\
  him \     /  for
      Pred^0  an idiot
```

If (8b) is correct, NP_2 must be a predicate.

3.4. The semantic status of NP_2

Regular small clauses consist of a subject and what is recognizable as a semantic predicate:

(17) a. I consider [John very stupid/*each student].
    b. I expect [that sailor off my ship/drink/*every visitor (by midnight)].
    c. We feared [John killed by the enemy/dead/*some poor corpse].

Whatever the semantic function of the putative Pred^0, it can’t combine with a quantified NP and return a predicate.

The putative Pred^0 za ‘for’ can combine with a proper name, a pronoun or a quantified NP:

(18) a. Tristram je u mraku greškom zamenio Lorensaj za sebe i. SC
    Tristram is in dark mistake-INSTR took Laurence-ACC for self
    Tristram took Laurence for himself by accident in the dark.
b. Uzima me za nekog idiota.
   take-3SG me for some idiot
   *He takes me for some stupid idiot.*

(19) Podopytnyj poočerëđno prinimal Lenu za každuju devočku. Russian
   experimental.subject one.by.one took Lena for every girl
   *The experimental subject look Lena for each of the girls, one by one.*

Assuming some semantic uniformity of small clauses, za ‘for’ cannot be either Pred$^0$ or F$^0$ in an extended small clause.

3.5. Make it simple

What if the for-PP is an adjunct (an adverbial modifier)?

One of the standard meanings of za ‘for’ in Russian is ‘in exchange for, instead of, in place of’ (just like in English):

(20) a. My nemalo zaplatili za ètu privilegiju. Russian
   we not.little paid for this privilege
   *We paid a lot for this privilege.*

b. Ja zdes’ za direktora.
   I here for director
   *I’m the director’s stand-in here.*

c. Kto èto za vas sdelaet?
   who this for you do-PRF-PRES-3SG
   *Who will do it for you?*

d. Imam ludaka za muža.
   have-1SG fool for husband
   *I have an idiot for a husband.*

In other words, in take-for constructions the intake becomes figurative (perceptual rather than physical) as a result of adverbial modification.

Adjuncts can be obligatory:

(21) a. He worded the letter *(carefully).

b. We took the matter *(seriously).

c. They treated him *(shamefully).

The perceptual meaning becomes more directly linked to the prepositional adjunct with verbs mistake and pass.

3.6. What for?

In the Russian equivalent of wasß für constructions, za ‘for’ does not assign case, even though it still requires an NP complement:

(22) a. Čto za knigu ty kupila?
   what for book-ACC you-NOM bought
   *What kind of book did you buy?*

b. Čto èto za kniga?
   what this for book-NOM
   *What kind of book is this?*

This construction (clearly different from those above) is absent from South Slavic.
3.7. Summary

The hypothesis that za ‘for’ introduces a small clause has nothing to recommend it and much to disprove it.

The alternative hypothesis, (8c), has numerous advantages:

- natural transition from the ordinary meanings of the verbs take, pass and count:
  just add a manner adverbial (cf. seriously, lightly, for granted; some adjuncts are
  obligatory, so no problem there)
- no modification of the argument structure or thematic grid is required
- za ‘for’ remains a preposition
- impossibility with proposition-taking verbs follows automatically

WYSIWYG. QED.

4. What’s in ‘in’?

Bailyn 2002: Another candidate for an overt predicator: in is the head of a small clause in the unusual construction in (23):

(23) a. On rešil vybrat’sja v prezidenty. Russian
   he decided elect-INF-REFL in presidents-ACC=NOM
   He decided to get elected as president.

   b. On sobralsja v soldaty.
      he collected-REFL in soldiers-ACC=NOM
      He decided to become a soldier.

Bailyn 2002: v ‘in’ here is extremely unusual in that it takes a nominative, obligatorily plural NP complement. This is an instance of case-absorption by Pred0.

Melčuk 1985:461-482, Franks and Pereltsvaig 2004: the case on the NP is accusative and it is realized as nominative (rather than the genitive that usually appears with animates) because the plural NP (denoting here the entire class or profession) is treated as inanimate.

Melčuk 1985: mass nouns denoting the entire profession are possible with exactly the same set of verbs and the same meaning. With a first declension noun the case is clearly accusative:

(24) On pošel/xočet v aviaciju. Russian
   he went/wants in aviation-ACC
   He went/wants (to go) into aviation.

The same facts hold for Serbo-Croat:

(25) a. Otišao je u penziju/penzionere. Serbo-Croat
   left AUX in retirement-ACC.SG/pensioner-ACC.PL
   S/he retired/He become a pensioner.

   b. Želi u avijaciju/avijatičare.
      wants in aviation-ACC.SG/airline.pilot-ACC.PL
      S/he wants (to go) into aviation/to become an airline pilot.

Melčuk 1985 observes that this construction involves a change-of-state meaning (become X).

NB: This is why the complement of the preposition appears in the accusative (directional) case. When it is made stative, the case becomes instrumental
There are parallel construction of persistence in state and discontinuation of the state, which behave as locatives:

(26) a. On služil v soldatax.
    he served in soldiers.LOC
    *He served as a soldier.*

b. Ego vygnali iz lëtčikov.
    him chased from pilots-GEN
    *He was kicked out of aviation.*

Conclusion: v ‘in’ is a regular preposition introducing a directional complement of a motion verb.

WYSIWYG. QED.

5. WHAT DOES ‘AS’ FUNCTION AS?

In Russian and Serbo-Croat what otherwise looks like a complementizer or an adverbial wh-operator can appear followed by nothing more than an NP (just like in English):

(27) a. Ja čuvstvuju sebja kak inostranec.
    I feel-PRES-1SG SELF-ACC as foreigner
    *I feel like a foreigner.*

b. Osećam se kao pijana.
    feel-1SG REFL AS drunk-NOM
    *I feel drunk.*

In Slavic languages the NP following as (NP₂) shows the same morphological case as the NP that it semantically combines with (NP₁).

This looks like case-agreement in small clauses (cf. Latin, Greek, Icelandic, etc.)


5.1. Dissimilarities

What follows as need not look like a predicate.

5.1.1. Oblique and prepositional as-XPs

There is no direct case restriction on the complement of kao/kak ‘as’:

(28) a. Ona govorit so mnoj kak rebenok.
    she speak-PRES-3SG with me AS child-NOM
    *She speaks with me as a child does/as if she were a child.*

b. Ona govorit so mnoj kak s kakim-nibud’ rebenkom.
    she speak-PRES-3SG with me AS with some. FC child-INSTR
    *She speaks with me as she does with a child/as if I were a child.*

c. Ona izbegaet menja kak prokažennogo.
    she avoid-PRES-3SG me-ACC AS leper-ACC
    *She avoids me as she does with a child/as if I were a leper.*

d. On ej vse prinosit kak princesse.
    he-NOM her-DAT everything bring-PRES-3SG AS princess-DAT
    *He brings her everything as if she were a princess.*
(29) a. Zaobilazi me kao propalicu.  Serbo-Croat
    He avoids me as if I were a bum.
    avoid-PRES-3SG me-ACC AS bum-ACC

b. Ona govori sa mnom kao sa detetom.  She speaks with me as with a child.
    she speak-PRES-3SG with me AS with child-INSTR

b. On joj sve donosi kao princezi.  She brings her everything as if she were a princess.
    he her-DAT everything bring-PRES-3SG AS princess-DAT

Regular small clauses only appear associated with subject and direct object positions.

5.1.2.  Quantification

The NP following kak/kao ‘as’ can be quantified. Pejorative connotation surfaces as a result:

    feel-PRES-1SG SELF-ACC as foreigner

b. Ja čuvstvuji sebja kak kakoj-nibud’ inostranec.  I feel like some stupid foreigner.
    feel-PRES-1SG SELF-ACC as some foreigner

Predicates cannot be quantified (except in certain specific cases, cf. Partee 1986).

5.1.3.  Referential NP

The NP following kak/kao ‘as’ (NP₁) can be a proper name or a deictic demonstrative:

    feel-PRES-1SG REFL.CL as Smurfette/Luke

b. Osečam se kao ova/onu budala.  I feel like this/that fool
    feel-PRES-1SG REFL.CL as this/that fool

Predicates are not referential.

5.1.4.  Non-constituents

What follows kak/kao ‘as’ may not even form a constituent:

(32) a. Ona govorit so mnoj kak odin rebenok s drugim.  She speaks with me like one child with another.
    she speak-PRES-3SG with me AS one child-NOM with other-INSTR

b. Razgovara sa mnom kao psihiijatar sa pacijentom SC  She speaks with me like a psychiatrist with a patient
    speak-PRES-3SG with me AS psychiatrist-INSTR with patient-INSTR

Regular small clauses cannot contain NPs of semantic types other than (e, t):

(33) a. *My sčitaem ego Ljukom.  We consider him Luke-INSTR
    we consider him Luke-INSTR
Against overt predications in Slavic

b. *On kažetsja odnim mal’čikom.
   he seems one-INSTR boy-INSTR
Whatever it is that as does, it can combine with a variety of semantic and syntactic elements. Such freedom is not expected of Pred$^0$.

5.2. Clausal instances of as

The Russian kak ‘as, how’ seems to allow all the options that the English as does in its usage. The Serbo-Croat kao ‘as’ is somewhat more restricted (due to the presence of an alternative wh-item kako ‘how’), though it also appears in equatives:

(34) a. Kak ty sebja čuvstvueš’?
   how you self-ACC feel-PRES-2SG
   How do you feel?

b. Kak ona s toboj govorit?
   how she with you speak-PRES-3SG
   How does she talk to you?

(35) a. Èta gora takaja že vysokaja kak i ta.
   this-F.SG mountain such JUST tall how AND that-F.SG
   This mountain is as high as that one.

b. Ego ostavili zdes’ kak načalnika.
   him-ACC leave-PAST-PL here AS supervisor
   He was left here as a supervisor.

(36) Beo je kao sneg.
   white-3SGMASC is-PRES-3SG AS snow
   He is as white as snow.

Both in Russian and in Serbo-Croat kao/kak ‘as’ can introduce clausal complements:

(37) a. Ja postuplju s vami kak postupajut s malen’kimi det’mi.
   I treat-PRF with you as treat-IMPF-3PL with small children
   I will treat you as they do small children.

b. Osečam se kao da sam pijana.
   feel-1SG REFL AS COMP BE.PRES.1SG drunk-NOM
   I feel as if I were drunk.

NPs introduced by kak/kao ‘as’ are interpreted as manner adjuncts, but can also acquire an idiomatic interpretation:

(38) a. Radi kao singerica.
   works-3SG AS Singer-NOM
   He works like a Singer sawing machine/He works dilligently.

b. On rabotaet zdes’ kak lošad’.
   he work-PRES-3SG here AS horse
   He works here like a horse/He works a lot here.

Both in Russian and in Serbo-Croat kao/kak ‘as’ can introduce manner appositives:

(39) a. On vedët sebja na redkost’ naglo, kak inoj belyj v Afrike.
   he behaves SELF on rarity impudently AS other white in Africa
   He is behaving incredibly impudently, like some white people do in Africa.
b. Ona govori sa mnom polako kao sa detetom. Serbo-Croat
she speak-PRES-3SG with me slowly AS with child-INSTR
She speaks with me slowly as with a child/as if I were a child.

Thus kao/kak ‘as’ looks like a wh-operator of manner here, which correlates with the more general interpretation of kak ‘as’ as a non-entity wh-operator.

5.3. Proposal

The simplest and most evident way of dealing with NPs preceded by kak/kao ‘as’ is via CP-ellipsis: the relevant NP is moved to the (right?) periphery of the clause and the rest of the clause is deleted:

(40) a. Ja čuvstvuju sebja kak čuvstvue sebja inostanje. Russian
I feel-PRES-1SG SELF-ACC as feel-PRES-3SG SELF-ACC foreigner
I feel like a foreigner (does).

b. Zaobilaze me kao što zaobilaze propalicu. Serbo-Croat
avoid-PRES-3PL me-ACC AS COMP avoid-PRES-3PL bum-ACC
They avoid me like (one avois) a bum.

We are glossing over the possibility of an alternative (subjunctive?) source for nominative NPs remnants, since a sentence like (41b) cannot be a source for other types of remnants.

(41) a. Osećam se kao što se oseća gubitnik. Serbo-Croat
feel-1SG REFL AS COMP feel-PRES-3SG loser-NOM
I feel as a loser feels.

b. Osećam se kao da sam gubitnik. Serbo-Croat
feel-1SG REFL AS COMP BE.PRES.1SG loser-NOM
I feel as if I am a loser.

Such treatment immediately derives the case-matching effect.

Similar phenomena: gapping and comparative ellipsis.

(42) a. Ja ljublju jablki, a mama – gruši. Russian
I like apples and Mom pears
I like apples, and Mom does pears.

b. Lena kupila takuju že doroguju knigu, kak i Vera. Lena bought such-F.SG JUST expensive book how AND Vera
Lena bought as expensive a book as Vera did.

There is only one kao/kak ‘as’ and it always introduces propositional complements, which are interpreted as $\lambda$-abstracts of different sorts (depending on the size of the complement).

Advantages:
- Lack of restriction on the case and interpretation of the NP₂ is explained
- Discontinuous remnants explained
- Choice of lexeme explained
- Required ellipsis independently attested
- Unification over different-sized as-remnants

Disadvantage: we now have to work out the detailed semantics for as.

General hypothesis: as always indicates $\lambda$-abstraction over non-entities

NB: Matushansky 2010: as in comparison clauses (in equatives or with as) also correlates with $\lambda$-abstraction over properties.

What non-entity are we concerned with?
5.4. Small clause complements of *kak/kao* ‘as’

There exist examples where the NP following *kak/kao* ‘as’ does seem to be a predicate and alternates with instrumentals with the same meaning:

(43) a. Ivan rabotaet zdes’ kak враč.
   Ivan work-PRES-3SG here AS doctor

b. Ivan rabotaet zdes’ враčom.
   Ivan work-PRES-3SG here doctor-INSTR

*Ivan works here as a doctor (in the capacity of a doctor).*

(44) a. Ego ostavili zdes’ kak наčалника.
   him-ACC leave-PAST-PL here AS supervisor

b. Ego ostavili zdes’ наčалником.
   him-ACC leave-PAST-PL here supervisor-INSTR

*He was left here as a supervisor (in the capacity of a supervisor).*

This is about predicates of capacity (see Roy 2001, 2006, de Swart, Winter and Zwarts 2005 among many others). It is the only instrumental in Russian that can appear with the present tense null copula:

(45) On zdes’ враčom.
   he here doctor-INSTR

*He is here in the capacity of a doctor.*

As noted by de Swart et al. 2005, 2007, bare NP predicates can appear with overt qualifiers:

(46) a. Jan en Sofie zijn leraar *van beroep*.
   Jan and Sofie are teacher of profession

   *Jan and Sofie are teachers by profession.*

b. Jan is Belg *van nationaliteit*/* christen van religie*.
   Jan is Belgian of nationality/* Christian of religion

   *Jan is of Belgian nationality/of the Christian faith.*

Hypothesis: The fact that the relevant qualifiers are adverbial further supports our view that \( \lambda \) always quantifies over non-entities: here, \( \lambda \)-abstraction over such capacity qualification.

The adjunct in (43a) could then have the meaning in (47a), with the whole sentence meaning approximated in (47b):

(47) a. \( \lambda x \ [x \text{ is a capacity of } y \text{ and } x \text{ is a doctor}] \)

b. \( \exists x \ [x \text{ is a capacity of } Ivan \text{ and } Ivan \text{ is a doctor in the capacity } x \text{ and } Ivan works here in the capacity } x \]

In other words the *kak/kao* ‘as’ adjunct involves the movement of a null operator over a PRO subject (controlled by the matrix argument that it shares the Case with):
Assuming the exact syntactic position of the qualifier inside the small clause is unclear, but note that it cannot appear inside an argument NP.

Semantically this is very similar to the locatives in (49) ((49a) is from von Stechow 2001 who attributes it to David Lewis, p.c.):

(49) a. Look at this pipe. It’s square in the ground but it is round in the first floor.
   b. He is wide in the shoulders.

Capacities are thus treated as subparts of the individual in question.

NB: This is a simplification, since “capacities” (a.k.a. roles) can be treated as separate individuals and even be named (Matushansky, work in progress). This aspect, however, is not relevant for our purposes here.

Hypothesis: the main predication functions as the capacity qualifier for the as-XP, and the as-XP supplies the role for the relevant argument.

The entire as-XP still functions as an adjunct to the main clause. Can it be a complement or an NP-modifier?

5.5. Remaining issues

As with for-PPs, as-XPs can be obligatory and/or alternate with instrumentals:

(50) a. Pokazao se kao dobar istraživač.  Serbo-Croat
    showed-PART-SG REF.CL AS good-NOM researcher-NOM
   b. Pokazao se dob rim istraživačem.
    showed-PART-SG REF.CL good-INSTR researcher-INSTR
He proved himself to be a good researcher.

(51) a. Ja čuvstvaju sebj a kak inostranec.  Russian
   I feel-PRES-1SG SELF-ACC AS foreigner
   b. Ja čuvstvaju sebj a inostrancem.
    I feel-PRES-1SG SELF-ACC foreigner-INSTR
I feel like a foreigner.

The obligatory character is again unsurprising, given that some manner adjuncts (especially with verbs like feel) can be obligatory.

Alternation with instrumental is also expected – but only with the verbs that can take clausal complements as well.

These observations can account also for cases where XPs introduced by kak/kao ‘as’ seem to appear in the complement position:

(52) a. Znam/poznajem ga kao poštenog čoveka.  Serbo-Croat
    know-PRES-1SG him-ACC AS honest-ACC man-ACC
I know him as an honest man.
   b. Ja znaju ego kak porjadočnogo čeloveka.  Russian
    I know-PRES-1SG him-ACC AS decent-ACC man-ACC
I know him as a decent man.
   c. Vidim te kao šefa instituta.  Serbo-Croat
    see-PRES-1SG you-ACC AS head-ACC institute-GEN
I see you as a head of the institute/I expect you to become...

Contrary to the first impression, the phonological sequence “him as NP” does not form a small clause constituent here; the as-XP is still an adjunct.

- Our semantics does not allow an as-XP to function as a (primary) predicate.
The verb *know* is not factive in this use and can be neither negated nor modified; the verb *see* resists passivization.

Case is still not restricted to direct cases, but PPs seem to be impossible (as expected, if the *as*-XP corresponds to a small clause):

(53) a. Ja vam éto kak vraču govorju. Russian
1SG-NOM 2PL-DAT this-ACC AS doctor-DAT say-PRES-1SG
*I’m telling this to you as a doctor (in your capacity of a doctor).*

b. Ja s vami kak s vračom govorju.
1SG-NOM with 2PL-INSTR AS with doctor-INSTR say-PRES-1SG
*I’m talking to you as with a doctor (as I would with a doctor).*

Intuition: (52a,b) are cases of coercion – the predicate in the *as*-XP does not properly express a capacity, nor does the verb – a way of being. (52c) is a natural extension of the meaning of the verb *see*.

Alternation with instrumental is as with *for*-PPs: only with the verbs that can take clausal complements as well.

5.6. Summary

*As*-XPs always correspond to a clausal adjunct, either finite or non-finite, with movement of a null operator over non-entities.

With finite clauses the remnant introduced by *as* corresponds to an argument or an adjunct – these can be detected by the fact that the remnant may be referential or quantified.

With small clauses nothing is deleted; *as* quantifies over the qualifier (*by profession*) property of the NP predicate.

6. Conclusion

Slavic languages provide no evidence whatsoever for treating the Slavic equivalents of *as, for* and *in(to)* as small clause heads (Pred0):

- *as* is better treated as a wh-operator over non-entities
- *for* can’t be treated as either Pred0 or a functional head introducing a small clause
- *in* actually alternates with other locative prepositions

NPs in none of these constructions show neither syntactic behavior nor semantic properties expected under the small clause analysis.

There are no “overt predicators” in Slavic.
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