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 [subt i president/the head of the association]. NP predicate

b. This proposition is/seems [subt i preposterous/out of the question. AP/PP predicate

c. [CP That Jessie should fight] was considered [CP t i obvious]. CP subject/ECM verb

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

(2) SC

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 is 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 to have died already.

b. I considered this book to be instructive.

c. I suspected this man to have fathered the child.

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

(6) a. Luke to 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 to be off my ship (by midnight)].

c. We feared [ John to have been killed by the enemy].

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

(9) 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 myself very stupid.

b. * I expect that sailor sincerely off my ship by midnight.

c. * We feared John 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 repeatedly [PRO to turn down the music].

b. Barbara told us herself [PRO to leave and never to come back].

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

(13) a. The tree to the table is dead.

b. Jack to Jane to the Rosetta Stone is Linda’s son.

The standard assumption is that *be* is merely a host for tense and agreement morphemes with no semantics whatsoever. Its inchoative counterpart is *become*, whose transitive counterpart is *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.
    Ciceronem-ACC famous-ACC consider/hold
    They consider Cicero famous.
    b. Ciceronem clarus habetur.
    Ciceronem-famous-ACC considered-3SG
    Cicero is considered famous.

(17) a. Ciceronem consulen facit.
    Ciceronem-ACC consul-ACC makes-3SG
    S/he makes Cicero consul.
    b. Ciceronem fitt consul.
    Ciceronem-CONSULTER consul-3SG
    Cicero is made consul.

(18) a. Hún er kennari/*kennara.
    hún-ACC teacher-ACC
    He is a teacher.
    b. Ég taldi hana/*hun vera kennara/*kennari.
    ég-ACC believe teacher-ACC/NOM
    I believe her to be a teacher.

(19) a. theoro to Yani ilithio.
    theoro-1SG to/Yani-idiot-masc-ACC
    I consider Yani an idiot.
    b. o Yani theorite ilithios.
    o Yani-ACC consider/3SG idiot-ACC
    Yani is considered an idiot.

(20) a. diorisa to Yani diefhindi.
    diorisa-1SG to/Yani-appoint-3SG
    I appointed Yani (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 sail or off the ship (by midnight).
    b. * I expect [that sailor very stupid].
    c. * I expect [that sailor killed by the enemy].

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

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 predicates

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

   Siôn is 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).

Bowers 1993: in small clause complements like (28) as is, in fact, the lexicalization of the Pred operator (see also Emonds 1985 and Aarts 1998):

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


(29) a. My sčitaem ego svojim. Russian (Bailyn 2001)
   we consider him-ACC self.POSS-INS

b. My sčitaem ego kak svojeg. Russian (Bailyn 2001)
   we consider him-ACC AS self.POSS-ACC

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.

3.2. 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).

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. Ja čuvstvuju sebjja kak inostrance. Russian
   I feel-PRES-1SG SELF-ACC as foreigner
   I feel like a foreigner.

b. Osečam se kao pijana. Serbo-Croat
   feel-1SG REFLEX 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).


4.1. Dissimilarities

NP₂ 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’:
(31) a. Ona govorit so mnoj kak rebenok. Russian
   She speaks with me as a child.

b. Ona govorit so mnoj kak s kakim-nibud' rebenkom.
   She speaks with me as with some child.

c. Ona izbegat' menja kak prokažennogo.
   She avoids me as if I were a leper.

d. Ona vse prinosit kak princesse.
   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 xNP following kak/kao 'as' can be quantified. Pejorative connotation surfaces as a result:

(32) a. Ja čuvstvuju sebja kak inostranec. Russian
   I feel like a foreigner.

b. Ja čuvstvuju sebja kak kakoj-nibud' inostranec.
   I feel like some 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. Osečam se kao Smurfete/Luka. Serbo-Croat
   I feel like Smurfette/Luke.

b. Osečam se kao ova/ona budala. Serbo-Croat
   I feel like this/that fool.

xNPs introduced by kak/kao 'as' are interpreted as manner adjuncts, but can also acquire an idiomatic interpretation:

(34) a. Ona govorit so mnoj kak odin rebenok s drugim. Russian
   She speaks with me like one child with another

b. Osa govorit sa mnom kao dete, sa detetom. SC
   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.

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 sebju čuvstvuешь?
   How do you feel?

b. Kak ona s tobjo govorit?
   How does she talk to you?

(37) a. Èta gora takaja že vysokaja kak i ta.
   This mountain is as high as that one.

b. Ego ostavlili zdes' kak na alnika.
   He was left here as a supervisor.

(38) Beo je kao sneg.
   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 will treat you as they do small children.

b. Osečam se kao da sam pijana.
   I feel as if I were drunk.

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

(40) a. Radi kao singerica.
   He works like a Singer sawing machine/He works diligently.

b. On rabotaet zdes' kak lošad'.
   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 vedet' sebja na redkost' naglo, kak inoj belyj v Afrike.
   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 xNPs preceded by kak/kao ‘as’ is via CP-ellipsis: the relevant xNP is moved to the (right?) periphery of the clause and the rest of the clause is deleted:

(42) a. Ja čuvstvaju sebja kak čuvstvujem sebja inostranec. 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
They avoid-PRES-3PL me-ACC AS 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. I like apples, and Mom does pears.
Ja ljublju jablki, a mama – gruši. Russian
I like apples, and Mom pears.

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

4.4. Small clause complements of kak/kao ‘as’

There exist examples where the xNP 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
He works here as a doctor (in the capacity of a 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’ načalnika. Russian
him-ACC stand-PAST-PL here AS supervisor
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) a. 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)

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. I know him as an honest man.
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. I see you as head of a/the institute/I expect you to become head of the institute.
Vidim te kao šefa instituta. Serbo-Croat
see-PRES-1SG you-ACC AS head-ACC instituta-INSTR
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 Pred$^3$
b. Tristram, je Lorensu, pokazao sebe\_i\_j u ogledalu.
Tristram, is Laurence\_DAT showed self\_i\_j in mirror
Tristram, showed Laurence, himself\_i\_j 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 Lorens, ljut na sebe\_i\_j.
Tristram considers that is Laurence\_NOM angry on self
Tristram believes that Laurence, is angry at himself\_i\_j.

b. Tristram: smatra Lorensa, ljutim na sebe\_i\_j.
Tristram considers Laurence\_ACC angry on self
Tristram considers Laurence, good/kind at himself\_i\_j.

c. Tristram, čini Lorensa, nezadovoljnim sobom\_i\_j.
Tristram makes Laurence\_ACC dissatisfied self\_INSTR
Tristram makes Laurence, dissatisfied with himself\_i\_j.

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 Lorensa i za sebe *i/j.
Tristram AUX mistake- INSTR took Laurence- ACC for self
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 NP\_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 Pred\_0 or some sort of C\_0. Under the single predicate analysis in (49a), it is a regular proposition. 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) 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 NP\_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]].
Tristram claims that is Laurence saw self
Tristram, claims that Laurence, saw himself\_i\_j.

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:
The first kiss is counted as the anniversary date.

He can pass for a lawyer.

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:

\[(49)\]

\[\text{VP} \quad \text{ECM, for is \textit{Pred}₀} \]

\[\text{they} \quad \text{take} \quad \text{NP₁} \quad \text{PredP} \quad \text{= a proposition} \]

\[\text{him} \quad \text{Pred}₀ \quad \text{NP₂} \quad \text{for an idiot} \]

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 [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 \(\text{for}\) 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 \(\Rightarrow\) (49b), cf. Starke 1995

\[(49)\]

\[\text{VP} \quad \text{ECM, for is \textit{F₀}} \]

\[\text{they} \quad \text{take} \quad \text{NP₁} \quad \text{F₀} \quad \text{PredP} \quad = \text{a proposition} \]

\[\text{for} \quad \text{NP₂} \quad \text{an idiot} \]

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:
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. Russian
    he decided to get elected as president.

b. On pošel v soldaty.  
    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 Pred0.

Mel’čuk 1985:461-482, Franks and Pereltsvaig 2004: the case on the NP is accusative because the plural NP (denoting here the entire class or profession) is treated as inanimate.

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 aviacion. Russian
    he goes/wants in aviation-ACC
    He went/wants (to go) into aviation.

The same facts hold for Serbo-Croat:

(65) a. Otišao je u penziju/pensionere. Serbo-Croat
    he retired/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 χ*).

There are parallel constructions of persistence in state and discontinuation of the state, which behave as locatives:

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

b. Ego vygnali iz letelikov.  
    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.

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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