1. **PLAN FOR THE TALK**

The minimal unit of non-verbal predication: a small clause.

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

Is it available 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. **HOW SMALL CAN A CLAUSE BE?**

Stowell 1981, 1983: not only verbs have subjects. Predication is possible in the absence of a verb:

(1) a. Alice became [SC t1 president/the head of the association]. NP predicate
    b. This proposition is/seems [SC t1 preposterous/out of the question. AP/PP predicate
    c. [CP That Jessie should fight] was considered [SC t1 obvious]. CP subject/ECM verb

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

(2) \[ \text{SC} \]

\[ \text{subject} \]

\[ \text{predicate} \]

\[ \text{NP/CP} \]

\[ \text{AP/PP/NP} \]

The internal structure of a small clause will be discussed later.

2.1. **Propositional complements with and without tense**

There are good reasons to think that in examples like (3) the matrix verb takes the bracketed constituent as its sole internal argument:

(3) a. I consider [John to be very stupid].
    b. I expect [that sailor to be off my ship (by midnight)].
    c. We feared [John to have been killed by the enemy].

Verbs that take such infinitivals frequently also appear with finite clauses which contain also tense and mood markers:

(4) a. I consider that [John is very stupid].
    b. I expect that [that sailor would be off my ship (by midnight)].
    c. We feared that [John had been killed by the enemy].

The subject of the infinitive is not an argument of the matrix verb: e.g., the matrix verb does not determine any properties of the subject, while the infinitival verb does:
(5)  
   a. I believed Updike/\textsuperscript{\textit{the Rosetta Stone}} to have died already.
   b. I considered this book/\textsuperscript{\textit{this tree}} to be instructive.
   c. I suspected this man/\textsuperscript{\textit{this woman/\textit{this table}}} to have fathered the child.

Similar patterns can be observed for such verbs as \textit{seem} and \textit{appear} (known as raising verbs) and for adjectival predicates like \textit{likely}:

(6)  
   a. Luke/\textsuperscript{\textit{the Rosetta Stone}} seems to have died/to be the father.
   b. The Rosetta Stone is not likely to be a fake.
   c. I considered the Rosetta Stone likely to be a fake.

For these case an additional argument exists: with finite clause complements they require an expletive subject, which has no referent and receives no thematic role from the predicate:

(7)  
   a. It seems that Luke has died.
   b. It is likely that the Rosetta Stone is a fake.

In order to maintain one lexical entry for intensional verbs, it seems reasonable to assume that they always take a propositional argument.

2.2. **Complement small clauses**

Raising predicates and ECM verbs can also appear with a complement that is smaller than an infinitive but has a very close meaning:

(8)  
   a. I consider [John very stupid].
   b. I expect [that sailor off my ship (by midnight)].
   c. We feared [John killed by the enemy].

(9)  
   a. This theory seems very promising.
   b. A new war appears imminent.

These examples also clearly establish a relation between the matrix subject and a proposition:

(10)  
   a. I consider [that John is very stupid].
   b. I expect [that that sailor is off my ship (by midnight)].
   c. We feared [that John had been killed by the enemy].

No matrix adverbial may intervene between the subject and the predicate of the small clause, which would have been inexplicable if they had both been arguments of the matrix verb:

(11)  
   a. *I consider John \textbf{myself} very stupid.
   b. *I expect that sailor \textbf{sincerely} off my ship by midnight.
   c. *We feared John \textbf{with great concern} killed by the enemy.

No such constraint exists for structures where the verb takes two internal arguments: an NP and an infinitive:

(12)  
   a. Janice reminded Jenny \textbf{repeatedly} [PRO to turn down the music].
   b. Barbara told us \textbf{herself} [PRO to leave and never to come back].

Once we begin on this train of thought, it becomes obvious that \textit{be} is a raising verb (Stowell 1978, Burzio 1981, Couquaux 1981, among others):

(13)  
   a. The tree/\textsuperscript{\textit{the table}} is dead.
   b. Jack/\textsuperscript{\textit{Jane/\textit{the Rosetta Stone}}} is Linda’s son.

The standard assumption is that \textit{be} is merely a host for tense and agreement morphemes with no semantics whatsoever. Its inchoative counterpart is \textit{become}, whose transitive counterpart is \textit{make}. As a result we obtain a unified look at non-verbal predication:
Syntactically a small clause is a unit of non-verbal predication. Semantically it corresponds to something akin to a proposition.

2.3. Further arguments for small clauses

Small clauses need not be complements of intensional verbs (cf. Moro 1995, Rothstein 2000):

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

Matushansky to appear: naming verbs frequently appear with SC complements.

Across many languages the predicate shows the same morphological case as the subject:

(16) a. Ciceronem clarum habent.  Latin
    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.

(17) a. Ciceronem consul-ACC make-3SG
    Cicero makes Cicero consul.

    b. Cicero fit consul.
    Cicero is made consul.

(18) a. Hún er kennari/*kennara.  Icelandic, Maling and Sprouse 1995
    he is teacher-NOM/ACC
    He is a teacher.

    b. Ég taldi hana/*hun vera kennara/*kennari.
    I believed her-ACC/ NOM to-be teacher-ACC/NOM
    I believe her to be a teacher.

(19) a. theoro to Yani ilithio.  Modern Greek
    consider-1SG the.ACC Yani-ACC idiot-masc-ACC
    I consider Yani an idiot.

    b. o Yanis theorite ilithios.
    the.NOM Yani-NOM consider-PASS.3SG idiot-NOM
    Yani is considered an idiot.

(20) a. diorisa to Yani diefthindi.
    appointed-1SG the.ACC Yani-ACC director-ACC
    I appointed Yani (the) director.
b. o Yanis dioristik diefthindis the.NOM Yanis-NOM appoint-PASS.3SG director-NOM
Yani was appointed (the) director.

Further arguments can be found in Kitagawa 1985, Chung and McCloskey 1987, Hornstein and Lightfoot 1987, Aarts 1992 and much other work.

3. THE INTERNAL STRUCTURE OF A SMALL CLAUSE

Stowell 1981, 1983: small clauses are maximal projections of the predicate:

Evidence from subcategorization: different verbs require different lexical categories:

(21) a. I expect [that sailor off the ship (by midnight).
b. *I expect [that sailor very stupid].
c. *I expect [that sailor killed by the enemy].

(22) \[\text{VP} \at \text{V}^0 \at \text{AP} \at \text{considers} \at \text{NP} \at \text{A'} \at \text{Marie} \at \text{A} \at \text{PP} \at \text{proud of her work}\]

Theory-internal objections:

- It is possible to have small clauses with predicates containing a possessive, which is generally assumed to occupy [Spec, NP] – a position that would be reserved for a subject in Stowell’s approach.
- 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).

The syntactic theory of mediated predication (Bowers 1993, 2001):

(23) \[\text{VP} \at \text{V}^0 \at \text{PredP} \at \text{small clause (SC)} \at \text{considers} \at \text{NP} \at \text{Pred'} \at \text{Marie} \at \text{Pred'} \at \text{AP} \at \text{Ø proud of her work}\]

Bowers’ proposal: 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.
3.1. **Support: overt predicators**

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

   is Siôn PRT happy
   Siôn is happy.

b. Y mae Siôn yn feddyg. PRT is Siôn PRT doctor
   Siôn is a doctor.

   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.

(26) a. Èmèrí *(yé) mòsèmòsè. Edo (Baker 2003)
   Mary PRT beautiful.A
   Mary is beautiful.

b. Úyì *(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.

3.2. **Question: Universal existence of overt predicators**

Bowers 1993: in small clause complements like (28) as is, in fact, the lexicalization of the Pred operator (see also Emonds 1985 and Aarts 1992):

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


(29) 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.  
\[
\text{we consider him-ACC FOR self.POSS-ACC} \\
\text{We consider him as one of us.}
\]

**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*.

### 3.3. 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 $\langle e, \langle e, t \rangle \rangle$) and a predicate (type $\langle e, t \rangle$, 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

### 4. 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):

(30) a.  
\[
\text{Ja čuvstvuju sebja kak inostranec. Russian} \\
\text{I feel-PRES-1SG SELF-ACC as foreigner} \\
\text{I feel like a foreigner.}
\]

b.  
\[
\text{Osečam se kao pijana. Serbo-Croat} \\
\text{feel-1SG REFL AS drunk-NOM} \\
\text{I feel drunk.}
\]

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. section 2.3)


#### 4.1. Dissimilarities

What follows *as* need not look like a predicate.

4.1.1. Oblique and prepositional *as*-XPs

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

\[
\text{My sčitaem ego za svoego.} \\
\text{we consider him-ACC FOR self.POSS-ACC} \\
\text{We consider him as one of us.}
\]
(31) a. Ona govorit so mnoj **kak rebenok**. Russian
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 if I were a leper.*

d. Ona 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.*

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

4.1.2. Quantification

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

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

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

Predicates cannot be quantified

4.1.3. Referential NP

The NP following *kak/kao* ‘as’ (NP₂) can be a proper name or a deictic demonstrative:

(33) a. Osećam se kao Štrumpfeta/Luka. Serbo-Croat
I feel-PRES-1SG REF.CL as Smurfette/Luke
*I feel like Smurfette/Luke.*

b. Osećam se kao ova/ona budala.
I feel-PRES-1SG REF.CL as this/that fool
*I feel like this/that fool.*

4.1.4. Non-constituents

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

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

b. Ona govirom sa mnom kao dete sa detetom. SC
she speak-PRES-3SG with me AS child-NOM with child-INSTR
*She speaks with me like one child with another*

Regular small clauses cannot contain NPs of semantic types other than ⟨e, t⟩:

we consider him Luke-INSTR
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 Pred0.

4.2. 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:

(36) a. Kak ty sebja čuvstvueš?  Russian
   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?

(37) 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.

(38) Beo je kao sneg.  Serbo-Croat
    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:

(39) a. Ja postuplju s vami kak postupajut s malen’kimi det’mi.  Rus
    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.  Serbo-Croat
    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:

(40) a. Radi kao singerica.  Serbo-Croat
    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.

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

(41) a. On vedët sebja na redkost’ naglo, kak inoj belyj v Afrike.  Rus
    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 speaks-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.

This correlates with the more general interpretation of kak ‘as’ as a wh-operator in Russian and as a degree operator in Serbo-Croat.

4.3. Proposal

The simplest and most evident way of dealing with NPs preceded by kao/kak ‘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:

(42) a. Ja čuvstvuju sebja kak čuvstvuet sebja inosranc. 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 pro avoid-PRES-3PL bum-ACC
   *They avoid me like (one avoids) a bum.

Such treatment immediately derives the case-matching effect.

Similar phenomena: gapping and comparative ellipsis.

(43) a. Ja ljublju jabloki, 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 λ-abstracts of different sorts (depending on the size of the complement).

Advantages:

- Lack of restriction on the case and interpretation of the NP 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.

4.4. 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:

(44) a. On rabotaet zdes’ kak vrač. Russian
   he work-PRES-3SG here AS doctor

b. On rabotaet zdes’ vračom.
   he work-PRES-3SG here doctor-INSTR
   *He works here as a doctor (in the capacity of a doctor).

(45) a. Ego postavili zdes’ kak načalnika. Russian
   him-ACC stand-PAST-PL here AS supervisor
b. Ego postavili zdes’ načalnikom.
   him-ACC stand-PAST-PL here supervisor-INSTR
   He was appointed here as a supervisor (in the capacity of a supervisor).

This is 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.

Case is still not restricted to direct cases:

(46) Ja vam èto kak vraču govorju. Russian
   1SG-NOM 2PL-DAT this-ACC AS doctor-DAT say-PRES-1SG
   I tell this to you as a doctor (in your capacity of a doctor).

Proposal: the kak/kao ‘as’ adjunct is syntactically similar to a reduced relative or a depictive:

(47) CP
   AdvP as C' C
   PROPred' Pred
   Pred0 NP
   AdvP as NP2
   as an idiot

Differences with the previous case:

- No PPs
- No non-constituent remnants
- No quantified or referential NPs available
- The interpretation is not adverbial
- They need not be VP-adjuncts

(48) a. Ja znaju ego kak porjadočnogo čeloveka. Russian
   I know-PRES-1SG him-ACC AS honest-ACC man-ACC
   I know him as an honest man.

b. Vidim te kao šefa instituta. Serbo-Croat
   see-PRES-1SG you-ACC AS head-ACC institute-GEN
   I see you as head of a/the institute/I expect you to become head of the institute.

Interpretation: the guise of the entity in question = all the ways in which one can be a doctor

5. WHAT IS ’FOR’ FOR?

Now-standard assumption: a small clause is involved:

(49) a. VP
   ECM, for is Pred0
   NP
     \[
     \begin{array}{c}
     \text{they} \\
     \text{take} \\
     \text{him} \sum
     \end{array}
   \]
   PredP
   Pred' NP1
   \[
   \begin{array}{c}
   \text{for} \\
   \text{an idiot}
   \end{array}
   \]
   NP2

b. \[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{for}\ 
\end{array}
\]
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b. VP ECM, for is t⁰

NP
they

V⁰

take

FP

NP₁
him

V′

PredP

for

NP₁
Pred⁰

NP₂
an idiot

NB: Not all entertained structural options are exemplified

More traditional assumption (ours, too): **for-PP is an adjunct:**

NP
they

V⁰

take

V′

PP

NP₁
for an idiot

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 (49a, b) *za* ‘for’ is either a Pred⁰ or some sort of C⁰. Under the single predicate analysis in (49c), it is a regular preposition. We expect prepositions to combine with NPs and to assign case.
- **Status of NP₂:** under the small clause analysis (49a) the complement of *za* ‘for’ is a semantic predicate (type ⟨e, t⟩)
- Intensionality: under the small clause analysis (49a, 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.

5.1. 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:

(50) a. Tristram, tvrdi [da [je Lorens, video sebe i/*j]]. Serbo-Croat
      Tristram claims that *is* Laurence saw *self*
      *Tristram, claims that Laurence; saw himselfᵢ/*j*. 
b. Tristrami je Lorense 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 (50a) and (51a) and unlike the indirect object in (50b), the small clause subject in (51b) is a legitimate binder for the reflexive in the predicate in Serbo-Croat:

(51) a. Tristram smatra da je Laurenci ljutja na sebe i/*j.  Serbo-Croat
Tristram considers that Laurence is angry at himself.

b. Tristram smatra Lorense ljutim na sebe i/*j.  
Tristram considers Laurence good/kind at himself.

c. Tristram čini Lorense nezadovoljnim sobom i/*j.  
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.

(52) a. Tristram je greškom zamenio Lorense za sebe i/*j.  Serbo-Croat
Tristram mistook Laurence for himself.

b. Tristram je greškom zamenio Lorense za svog neprijatelja.  
Tristram mistook Laurence for his enemy.

The inability of Laurence to bind the reflexive in either (52a) or (52b) clearly indicates that in (52) Laurence is an object of the matrix verb rather than a subject of a small clause.

5.2. The status of za ‘for’

Regular small clauses can have predicates of any lexical category:

(53) 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:

(54) 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:
(55) a. Prvi poljubac se uzima za godišnjicu. 
   Serbo-Croat
   first kiss SE take-3SG for anniversary date-ACC
   The first kiss is counted as the anniversary date.

b. On možet sojti za advokata. 
   Russian
   he-NOM can pass-INF for lawyer-ACC
   He can pass for a lawyer.

Once again za ‘for’ behaves like a preposition.

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

If (49a) is correct, the NP₁-for-NP₂ sequence must have the semantic type of a proposition:

(49) a. VP ECM, for is Pred⁰
   
   NP
   
   they V⁰ PredP = a proposition
   
   take NP₁ Pred⁰
   
   him Pred ⁰ NP₂ for an idiot

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

(56) a. *We took [him smart/an idiot/in love].
   b. *He can pass [t i 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:

(57) 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 ⇒ (49b), cf. Starke 1995

(49) b. VP ECM, for is F⁰
   
   NP
   
   they V⁰ FP = a proposition
   
   take NP₁ PredP
   
   him Pred⁰ NP₂ for an idiot

If (49b) is correct, NP₂ must be a predicate.

5.4. The semantic status of NP₂

Regular small clauses consist of a subject and what is recognizable as a semantic predicate:
(58) a. I consider [John very stupid/*each student].
   b. I expect [that sailor off my ship/drunk/*every visitor (by midnight)].
   c. We feared [John killed by the enemy/dead/*some poor corpse].

Whatever the semantic function of the putative Pred⁰, it can’t combine with a quantified NP and return a predicate.

The putative Pred⁰ za ‘for’ can combine with a proper name, a pronoun or a quantified NP:

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

(60) Podopytnyj poocerëdno prinimal Lenu za každuju devočku. Russian
   The experimental.subject one.by.one took Lena for each of the girls, one by one.

Assuming some semantic uniformity of small clauses, za ‘for’ cannot be either Pred⁰ or F⁰ in an extended small clause.

5.5. 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):

(61) 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:

(62) 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.
5.6. Summary

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

The alternative hypothesis, (49c), 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.

6. 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 (63):

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

b. On pošel v soldaty.
    he went in soldiers.ACC=NOM
    He became 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 Pred9.

Mel’čuk 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.

NB: Mel’čuk 1985 provides other cases in Russian where morphological and syntactic (or semantic) animacy do not coincide, claiming that in this construction animacy is removed.

Mel’čuk 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:

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

The same facts hold for Serbo-Croat:

(65) a. Otišao je u penziju/penzionere.
    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.

Mel’čuk 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:

(66) a. On služil v soldatex.
    he served in soldiers.LOC
    He served as a soldier.

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

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

WYSIWYG. QED.

7. CONCLUSION AND FURTHER QUESTIONS

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
- for can’t be treated as either Pred0 or a functional head introducing a small clause
- in actually alternates with other locative prepositions

There exist further syntactic diagnostics for the status of NP1 and NP2 in these constructions, also indicating that no small clause structure is involved.

There are no “overt predicators” in Slavic.

As for “covert predicators”, there is some evidence from predicate case assignment indicating the presence of a (functional) head between the subject and the predicate of a small clause in Slavic, but it is amenable to a different treatment.

There are also semantic reasons to question the desirability of Pred0, at least in Montagovian semantics.

An alternative analysis of for-constructions, also not involving a small clause, is that the verb becomes ditransitive (transitive, for pass). There are, however, good reasons not to adopt this structure. We have set them aside here because they are heavily syntactic.

Further questions:

- What is the status of “overt predicators” in languages where they routinely appear in small clauses?
  - Baker 2003: Pred0 is required in order to enable NPs and APs to project a syntactic subject
  - Adger and Ramchand 2003 for Scottish Gaelic: the preposition ‘na ‘in-3MSG’ creates events out of NPs
- Is it chance that cross-linguistically “overt predicators” are usually prepositions or complementizers?
- What is the status of for in French and in Dutch, where it can introduce APs?
- We have glossed over some curious details of the Slavic data here in order not to confuse the issue (more than necessary), but quite a few of them are interesting in themselves and deserve further investigation.
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