This paper explores small clauses which contain particles such as as and for. It is well known that verbs like regard and take take particles in their small clauses. Until Middle English, it clearly functioned as preposition since only a DP appeared after as. Then it became to bear the properties of a functional element, i.e. Pr[edication]. This paper examines the property of small clause particle as and discusses what the categorial status as has in present-day English. It will be shown that for in the take...for construction is not Pr, but preposition.*
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1. Introduction

The main purpose of this paper is to examine the two types of constructions exemplified in the italicized parts of (1) and (2), respectively.

(1) a. They regard Mary as smart.
   b. They regard him as a fool.

(2) a. They take Mary for a fool.
   b. I took him for a doctor.

They consist of NP, as/for, and XP, which is regarded as constituting a small clause, with the NP and XP as its subject and predicate. In what follows, I will refer to as and for which occur in small clauses as
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“small clause particles.” As we will see shortly, the small clause particle *as* first appeared in Middle English with its prepositional properties, but it established its functional properties during the eighteenth century. Especially focusing on what properties *as* in present-day English has, this paper discusses the syntactic status of *as* and *for* in examples like (1) and (2), which I will henceforth call the *regard...as* construction and the *take...for* construction, respectively. Although the surface strings of these two constructions apparently look similar, it is argued that their small clause complements have different structures, on the basis of the distribution of pleonastic elements and the categories of the predicate phrases which may follow *as* and *for*.

This paper is conducted within the framework of the Minimalist Program advocated by Chomsky (2000, 2001), and the organization is as follows. Section 2 deals with the categorial change of the small clause particle *as* in the history of English. Section 3 introduces some differences between the *regard...as* and *take...for* constructions. Section 4 argues that *for* in the *take...for* construction is a preposition while *as* in the *regard...as* construction is a functional category Pr(edication) in the sense of Bowers (1993). Section 5 is a conclusion.

2. As and the Categorial Change of Small Clauses in the History of English

This section discusses the distribution of the small clause particle *as* in the history of English in order to clarify the categorial change of small clauses. According to Visser’s (1963) observation, *as* did not appear in Old English small clauses. This fact would suggest that they involve no functional categories; in other words, they consist only of substantive categories.

In Middle English *as* began to appear within small clauses. However, it was not so productive until early Modern English. This fact would show that although *as* began to bear functional properties in Middle English, it had not established its functional status yet, so that its distribution was restricted in Middle and early Modern English. Tanaka (1998) examines the distribution of *as* in small clauses in the history of English. He examines the change of the categorial status of the elements following *as*, presenting the data below on the first occurrence of each category.

(3) a. 1607 Shakes. Cor. V. vi 144 Let him be regarded As the
most Noble Coarse, that euer Herald Did follow his Vrne

‘Let him be regarded as the most noble corse that ever herald did follow to his urn’

b. 1706 Reflex. Upon Ridicule 39 They are regarded as inconversable, rough hewn, rude and phantasitical

‘They are regarded as inconversable, rough hewn, rude and fantasitical’

(4) a. 1387–8 T. Usk Test. Love ii. v. (Skeat) I. 63 Fairnesse of fieldes, ne of habitacions, ... maie not bee rekened as riches, ...

‘Fairness of fields, none of habitations, ... but not be reckoned as riches, ...’

b. 1709 Hearne Collect. II. 294 Reasons..not reckon’d as sufficient for turning Mr. Littleton by his Degree

‘Reasons..not reckoned as sufficient for turning Mr. Littleton by his degree’

c. 1719 Waterland Vind. Christ’s Div. 25 As if the Ray were not to be reckon’d to the Sun, as included in it

‘As if the ray were not to be reckoned to the Sun, as included in it’ (Tanaka (1998: (35)-(36)))

Based on the above data, Tanaka argues as follows: in Middle and early Modern English, although as began to establish its functional status as a small clause particle, it still had prepositional properties since it could only take NP. Because of its prepositional properties, the distribution of as was restricted until early Modern English. During the eighteenth century AP and VP came to appear after as. By that time it lost its prepositional properties and was established as a functional category. If Tanaka’s arguments are on the right track, it would follow that in present-day English as does not have prepositional properties, but it is indeed a functional category.

3. The Nature of Predication in Small Clauses

3.1. The Status of Postverbal NPs

Having suggested that as in present-day English is a functional category, let us examine the properties of the regard...as and take...for con-
structions, beginning with the status of postverbal NPs. Many gram-
marians have analyzed the postverbal NPs in (1) and (2) as direct
objects (cf. Quirk et al. (1985) among others). This analysis, however,
is untenable. As Arimoto (1989) and Aarts (1992) observe, pleonastic
elements like impersonal it and expletive there, which are semantically
empty, can appear in the regard...as construction (but not in the
take...for construction; see below).

(5) a. I regarded there as being too many people present.
    (Aarts (1992:112))

    b. I regard there as being a lot of people.¹

(6) a. They regard it as impossible for him to win.

    b. I regard it as obvious that he will win the game.

These examples clearly show that the NPs which follow regard cannot
be analyzed as its direct objects, since pleonastic elements are not argu-
ments and hence cannot occur in argument positions. Another reason
comes from a consideration of the thematic structures of regard and
take. The following examples indicate that the postverbal NPs in (1)
and (2) have no thematic relationship with the matrix verbs.

(7) a. #They regard Mary.

    b. #They took Mary.

Rather, Mary is only associated with the small clause predicates, smart
in (1a) and a fool in (1b), respectively.² Furthermore, [NP as NP]
strings can occur as constituents in positions other than the complemen-
t position of verbs. As shown by the examples in (8) and (9), the rele-
vant strings can occur in the complement position of prepositions and
the subject position, respectively.

(8) a. I walked Safari with camels as pack animals.

    b. He made a case for homosexuals as equals.

(9) Ian as chairman is not a good idea. (Aarts (1992: 113))

¹ Some of my informants observe that the acceptability of this sentence is rather
low.
² It should be noted that the NPs following regard are not always associated with
the elements following them. Consider the examples below.

(i) a. I regarded her with honor.

    b. I regard him highly.

In (i), it is clear that there is no subject-predicate relationship between the postverbal
NPs and the elements following them. Therefore, these examples do not contain
small clauses, so I will put them aside for the purposes of this paper.
Therefore, it is plausible to conclude that the NPs which follow the matrix verbs in (1) and (2) are not direct objects, but subjects of their small clause complements.

3.2. Differences between the Regard...as and Take...for Constructions

It has often been pointed out in the literature that the small clause particles *as* and *for* exhibit syntactic behavior similar to prepositions which are homophonous with them. As illustrated in the following examples, preposition stranding is allowed in English, and small clause particles can also be stranded.³

(10) a. Who did you vote for?
   b. Who did you talk to?

(11) a. Who do you take me for?
   b. What do you regard him as?

Given this, it might be tempted to argue that *as/for* in the regard...as and take...for constructions are prepositions (see Arimoto (1989)). As we will see shortly, this is true of *for* in the take...for construction, but *as* in the regard...as construction is a functional category.

Some verbs optionally have small clause particles in their complements, as shown in (12).

(12) a. I consider her (as) the best friend.
   b. I imagined her (as) a doctor.

However, verbs like regard and take obligatorily require small clause particles.

³ It is well-known that in contrast to English, preposition stranding is impossible in French, Italian, and German.

(i) a. Who did you vote for? (English)
   b. *Qui as-tu voté pour? (French)
   c. *Chi hai votato per? (Italian)
   d. *Wen stimmst du für? (German) (Starke (1995: 243))

Small clause particles also show exactly the same pattern.

(ii) a. Who do you take me for?
    What do you consider him as? (English)
   b. *Qui me prends tu pour?
    *Qu’est-ce que tu me considères comme? (French)
   c. *Chi mi prendi per?
    *Cosa mi consideri come? (Italian)
   d. *Was hältst du mich für?
    *Was betrachtest du mich als? (German) (ibid.: 243)
(13)  a. I regard John *(as) my best friend.
    b. They took John *(for) a fool. (Rafel (2001: 493))
    c. They took John *(as) a fool.

Pesetsky (1995) argues for selection of terminal elements that is referred to as “l-selection.” He notes that “l-selection” involves arbitrary selection of lexical items, and features associated with this selection cannot be reduced to either s-selection or c-selection. Hence, it does not refer to syntactic categories, but makes reference to individual lexical items and specific features (e.g. [+/-finite]). Applying his analysis, I will assume that it is l-selection that is responsible for different selectional properties of verbs taking small clauses, including the facts that take selects small clauses with either as or for, regard selects small clauses with as, and consider/imagine select small clauses that optionally contain as.

Now let us consider the structures of the regard...as and take...for constructions. It might be argued that the two constructions have the same complement structure because of their surface similarity. Despite their similarity concerning postverbal NPs observed in the previous section, the following facts indicate that the small clauses in (1) and (2) have different structures. First evidence comes from a difference in the categories of elements following the small clause particles as and for. As illustrated in (14)–(16), NP, AP, and VP can follow as:

(14)  a. They regard Mary as a fool. (=1b))
    b. I regarded him as a doctor.

(15)  a. They regard Mary as smart. (=1a))
    b. I regarded him as foolish.

(16)  a. They regard the book as given to Mary.
    b. He regards his bag as stolen by that thief.

It is also possible for -ing forms to follow as.5

(17)  a. They regard him as being a riot.
    b. I regarded the bag as having been stolen by him.

On the other hand, while NP can follow for, AP and VP cannot, as

---

4 Grimshaw (1991) argues that lexical entries of predicates contain information on c-selection which specifies the syntactic categories of their complements and s-selection which specifies the semantic types of their complements. Her claim is that there is no correspondence between c-selection and s-selection.

5 I will return to the status of -ing forms in section 4.1.5.
illustrated in (18)–(20).6

(18) a. They take Mary for a fool. (=2a))
   b. I take him for a genius.
(19) a. *They take Mary for smart.
   b. *I take him for angry.
(20) a. *They took him for known to the police.
   b. *His bag was taken for stolen by that thief.

Furthermore, -ing forms cannot follow for, either.

(21) a. *They take Mary for being a fool.
   b. *I take there for being a lot of people.

As shown in (22), if take selects small clauses with as, AP, VP and -ing forms can follow as.

(22) a. They take Mary as smart.
   b. They take me as known to the public.
   c. They take him as being honest.

This difference between as and for would lead us to argue that as is a functional category that takes predicate phrases of any categories, while for is a substantive category as a preposition that takes only NP.

Second, the different distribution of pleonastic elements may also support the assumption that the regard...as and take...for constructions have different complement structures.

(23) a. I regarded there as being too many people present.
   b. I regard there as being a lot of people.

(24) a. They regard it as pleasure to raise funds for an enterprise.
   b. I regard it as foggy enough to cover our retreat.

(25) a. *I take there for being a lot of people.
   b. *We take there for too many cars around the park.

(26) a. *I took it for fun to play the game.
   b. *I take it for pleasure to pay the money.

As shown by these examples, expletive there and impersonal it can appear in the regard...as construction, but not in the take...for construc-

---

6 The only case in which other categories than NP can follow for is idiomatic expressions involving take...for granted, which I will put aside as exceptional.

(i) He takes it for granted that he is a popular man.
tion. This would suggest that only the *regard...as* construction involves a functional category, because pleonastic elements like expletive *there* and impersonal *it* are generally taken to be inserted to satisfy the EPP feature of some functional category (Chomsky (2000, 2001)).

4. The Structure of Small Clauses

4.1. The Structure of the *Regard...As* Construction

Given the discussion in the previous section, the *regard...as* and *take...for* constructions are analyzed as having different structures. This section examines the internal structure of the *regard...as* construction, especially focusing on the syntactic status of the small clause particle *as* within the framework of the Minimalist Program. A number of researchers have analyzed the structure of small clauses involving *as*. Let us start by reviewing some of these analyses.

4.1.1. PP Analysis

First, let us consider the possibility that *as* is a preposition heading a small clause (see Arimoto (1989)). Since it is homophonous with the preposition *as* and can be stranded like prepositions (see (11b)), it might at first seem plausible that *as* in the *regard...as* construction is a preposition. However, in his comments on the *regard...as* construction, Starke (1995) notes that “P selects AP, an otherwise unattested fact” (see (15)). The PP analysis would have to allow for that sort of exceptional selection, which is obviously an undesirable move.

4.1.2. CP Analysis

A second possibility is to analyze *as* as a complementizer (see Hanston (1989) and Starke (1995)). One of the advantages of the CP analysis might come from the fact that the subordinate conjunction *as* can introduce a full sentence like the complementizer *that*, as shown in (27).

(27) I did as I was told. (Rafel (2001: 477))

Under the CP analysis, the structure of the *regard...as* construction in (28) would be as in (29), where its subject moves from Spec-IP to Spec-CP.

(28) I regard them as being clowns.

(29) I regard [CP themi [C as [IP t; [I [VP [v being [NP clowns]]]]]]]

However, the CP analysis cannot account for the following passive
sentences:
(30) a. They were regarded as being clowns.
b. The policy was regarded as having no effect.

(Aarts (1992: 115))

As Aarts (1992) and Rafel (2001) argue, in order to derive the passive sentence in (30a), for example, the subject would have to move from the embedded Spec-IP to the matrix Spec-IP, as represented in (31).

(31) [e] were regarded [CP [Spec] [C as] [them being clowns]]

Since Spec-CP is not an argument position, this derivation involves improper movement, i.e. movement from an A-position to another A-position via an A-bar position. This will pose a serious problem with the CP analysis.

One might claim that Spec-CP is no longer defined as an A-bar position within the framework of Chomsky (2000, 2001). In fact, the specifier position of vP, which is assumed to be a phase, is treated as either an A- or A-bar position. It functions as an A position for the landing site of Object Shift and as an A-bar position for the intermediate landing site of wh-movement. So it might appear that the above argument based on Spec-CP as an A-bar position is not strong enough to reject the CP analysis.

In Chomsky (2000), the distinction between A- and A-bar positions depends on whether the relevant head has phi- or P(eripheral)-features, both of which are related to Agree. A-movement is implemented by Agree of phi-features, and A-bar-movement is implemented by Agree of P-features such as a wh-feature. Therefore, it is reasonable to assume that C, a kind of force indicator, bears only P-features, but not phi-features. If so, in passive sentences like (30), the subject cannot move through Spec-CP, which in turn induces a violation of the Phase Impenetrability Condition (Chomsky (2000, 2001)). This is because the subject in the embedded Spec-IP cannot be accessed from outside the embedded CP as a phase. Thus, the CP analysis should be rejected.

4.1.3. IP Analysis

Aarts (1992) regards as as an inflectional element and proposes the following structure of the small clause in (28), where its subject occupies Spec-IP.

(32) I regard [IP them [I as [VP [v being [NP clowns]]]]]

I will defer the examination of Aarts’ analysis until section 4.1.5, where
it is claimed that his analysis fails to explain some aspects of the *regard...as* construction, especially the distribution of expletive *there*.

4.1.4. PrP Analysis

This section introduces the PrP analysis of Bowers (1993). He argues that small clauses are PrPs headed by Pr(edication), a functional category that is responsible for establishing a subject-predicate relationship. He further claims that *as* in the *regard...as* construction is a phonological realization of Pr, and Pr is present even in small clauses where *as* does not appear. Under his analysis, the structure of the *regard...as* construction would be as in (33), where the subject of the small clause is base-generated in Spec-PrP.

(33) I regard [PrP Mary [Pr as [AP [A smart]]]]

I will basically follow the PrP analysis of Bowers (1993), with some modifications discussed in the next section.

4.1.5. Proposal

Although Bowers (1993) assumes that the subject of small clauses is base-generated in Spec-PrP, there is good reason to assume that it is base-generated within the predicate phrase of small clauses. An argument for this assumption comes from the distribution of floating quantifiers.

(34) a. The cat considers the kids as all hopeless cases.
   (Starke (1995: 242))
   b. They regard the men as all foolish.
   c. We regard the money as all stolen by the thief.

Sportiche (1988), among others, argues that a floating quantifier does not move rightward from the NP it is associated with, but when the NP moves from its base position, it leaves behind a floating quantifier there. If this is correct, it seems plausible that the subjects of the small clauses in (34) are base-generated in the specifier position of the predicate phrase and then move to Spec-PrP, as shown in (35).

(35) a. The cat considers [PrP the kidsi [Pr' as [NP all ti hopeless cases]]]
   b. They regard [PrP the meni [Pr' as [AP all ti foolish]]]
   c. We regard [PrP the moneyi [Pr' as [VP all ti stolen by the thief]]]

It is generally assumed that the EPP requirement is present in small clauses. This is shown by the obligatory insertion of impersonal *it* in
cases where small clauses do not have external arguments:

(36)  a. We consider it impossible that he will win the game.
      b. *We consider _ impossible that he will win the game.

(37)  a. They regard it as pleasure to raise funds for an enterprise. (=24a)
      b. *They regard _ as pleasure to raise funds for an enterprise.

Therefore, I will assume that in the regard...as construction it is also the EPP requirement of Pr that induces the movement of the small clause subject from its base position to Spec-PrP as represented in (35). There, it is assigned the value of accusative Case under agreement with the matrix v.

Now, consider the structure of the regard...as construction with an -ing form as the predicate phrase, in comparison with its structure in (35) with NP/AP/VP as the predicate phrase. Aarts (1992) argues that the regard...as construction has the same structure regardless of the kind of elements that follow as. The structure which he proposes for the sentences in (38) is presented in (39).

(38)  a. They regard him as a fool.
      b. They regard him as being a fool.

(39)   They regard [IP him [I as [VP [V BE/being] [NP a fool]]]]

He assumes that the category of -ing forms is a VP and as is an inflectional element. He also assumes that even when the predicate phrase of a small clause is not a VP, null BE exists which indicates the subject-predicate relationship within the small clause. His analysis, however, is untenable when we consider the sentences in (40).

(40)  a. I regard there as being a lot of people.
      b. *I regard there as a lot of people.

These sentences show that the regard...as construction with expletive there becomes ungrammatical if there is no overt verb after as. Aarts cannot explain the contrast between (40a, b): under his IP analysis, there could be merged in Spec-IP regardless of the phonetic content of V.

Importantly, what (40b) shows is that there cannot be merged in Spec-PrP to satisfy the EPP feature of Pr (which will be accounted for in the next section in terms of the hypothesis that PrP is a phase in the sense of Chomsky (2000, 2001)). On the other hand, it would follow from the grammaticality of (40a) that there can be raised to Spec-PrP, assuming that -ing forms are TPs whose specifier there can be merged
in. This will lead us to the following structure of (40a).

(41) I regard [\text{PrP there; [Pr as [TP ti [T being [NP a lot of people]]]}}]

In (41), TP inside the small clause is headed by a defective T which is unable to determine Case/agreement. \textit{There} is merged in Spec-TP and raised to Spec-PrP to satisfy the EPP feature of Pr. Then, the associate NP \textit{a lot of people} is assigned the value of accusative Case under agreement with the matrix v.

This analysis can be extended to the contrast between (42a, b).

(42) a. I consider there likely to be a man in the room.
   b. *I consider there a man in the room. (Lasnik (1992: 384))

In (42a), \textit{there} is merged in Spec-TP of the raising infinitive embedded under the small clause and raised to Spec-PrP to satisfy the EPP feature of Pr. On the other hand, the ungrammaticality of (42b) indicates that \textit{there} cannot appear in small clauses in the absence of TP whose specifier it can be merged in, which in turn implies that \textit{there} cannot be merged in Spec-PrP.\\(^7\\)

4.1.6. PrP as a Phase

In the structures proposed in (35) and (41), substantive projections are selected by the functional category Pr (assuming that T is a substantive category; Chomsky (2001)). In the framework of Chomsky (2001), phases are defined as the configuration of the form F-XP, where the XP

---

7 On might wonder whether -\textit{ing} forms inside small clauses are indeed TPs like infinitival clauses. Support for the TP status of -\textit{ing} forms would come from the following pair of sentences:

(i) a. I regard him as obnoxious.
   b. I regard him as being obnoxious.

There is no difference in meaning between the two sentences. It is important to note that (ib) does not denote action, unlike the following sentence involving \textit{being} as a participle.

(ii) He is being obnoxious.

Therefore, \textit{being} which follows \textit{as} in the regard...as construction is not a participle, but a gerund. Since there have been a number of arguments presented in the literature that gerunds involve TP (Reuland (1983), Kayne (1984), and Arimoto (1991)), I will keep to the assumption that -\textit{ing} forms inside small clauses are TPs whose specifier \textit{there} can be merged in.

8 Even under the DP hypothesis advocated by Abney (1987), it should be noted that nominal phrases following \textit{as} are substantive projections NP without D, because they are predicative and D as a locus of referentiality only exists if the relevant nominal phrases are referential (Chomsky (2000)).
is a substantive root projection and its category is determined by the functional category F that selects it. Therefore, it would be reasonable to assume that PrP is a phase like vP and CP.

It will be important to note some differences between PrP and the other phases vP and CP. As mentioned in section 4.1.2, the distinction between A- and A-bar positions depends on whether the relevant head has phi- or P-features in the framework of Chomsky (2000). Given this distinction, we can distinguish among PrP, vP, and CP in terms of the features of their heads. C may have a P-feature as a force indicator, but cannot have phi-features. Pr may have both phi- and P-features, and this property allows PrP to behave like vP. Therefore, the specifier positions of vP and PrP can function as A-bar positions for the intermediate landing site of wh-movement. However, Pr differs from v in that Pr is not phi-complete and hence it does not determine Case/agreement. Moreover, Pr obligatorily has the EPP feature unlike v.

As we saw in the previous section, expletive there cannot be merged in Spec-PrP (see (40) and (42)). This will follow from the assumption that PrP is a phase. According to Chomsky (2000), a phase head may be assigned an EPP feature when the phase has been completed, exhausting the lexical subarray from which it is derived. Given this, the EPP feature of a phase head must be satisfied by raising from within the phase. This is possible in (40a) and (42a), because TP is embedded under the small clause whose specifier there can be merged in. On the other hand, there cannot be merged in Spec-PrP in (40b) and (42b): it must be merged somewhere within PrP before the EPP feature is assigned to Pr, but this is impossible simply because there are no functional categories other than Pr within the small clause which provides a specifier which there can be merged in.

4.2. The Structure of the Take...For Construction

As we saw in section 3, the small clause particle for in the take...for construction is analyzed as a preposition since it lacks functional properties in that it can only be followed by NP and the small clause does not allow pleonastic elements. Then, the structure of the take...for construction consists only of substantive projections, as shown in (43).

(43) They take [PP Mary [P for [NP a fool]]]

In this structure, the small clause subject is base-generated in Spec-PP; it is not raised there from the specifier position of the predicate phrase. An argument for this assumption comes from the following fact.
(44) *They take the men for all fools.
Under the analysis of floating quantifiers proposed by Sportiche (1988),
it follows from the ungrammaticality of (44) that the small clause subject
does not originate inside the predicate phrase in the take...for construc-
tion, unlike the small clause subject in the regard...as construction (see (34)).

Thus, the take...for construction involves a small clause, namely a
subject-predicate relationship, without Pr or any functional categories.
In this respect, this construction may be exceptional, but the PP status
of its small clause is supported by a number of empirical facts present-
ed above. This poses a serious challenge for Svenonius' (1996) view
that all instances of predication involve the functional category Pr.9

4.3. The Describe...As Construction
Finally, this section discusses the describe...as construction as in (45).

(45) a. They describe Mary as smart.
b. They describe him as a fool.
At first glance, it might be expected that the describe...as construction
shares the same type of small clause as the regard...as construction.
This expectation might come from the fact that like the regard...as con-
struction, small clauses which describe takes consist of NP, as, and XP,
and the XP following as may be the categories of NP, AP, VP, and TP
(-ing form). In fact, Quirk et al. (1985) do not distinguish between the
regard...as and describe...as constructions. However, there are at least
two arguments that these two constructions have quite different comple-
ment structures.

First, Aarts (1992) argues that describe assigns a θ-role to the NP
that follows it, on the basis of the following examples.

(46) a. They describe Mary as smart.
b. They describe him.

9 As we saw in (24), impersonal it may appear in the regard...as construction in
the absence of -ing forms (=TP) following as. This will indicate that it is merged
in the specifier of the predicate phrase and then raised to Spec-PrP to satisfy the
EPP feature of Pr. The ungrammaticality of (26) would then show that it cannot
remain within substantive projections, but must be raised to the functional domain
for some reason(s) yet to be clarified. Also left open is the difference between it
and there in the positions of first merger: the former is merged within substantive
projections, while the latter is merged within functional projections, especially TP.
(47)  a. I described him as a fool.
    b. I described him.

The grammaticality of the (b) sentences in (46) and (47) shows that the
postverbal NP in the describe...as construction has a thematic relation
with the verb as its direct object.

The second argument comes from the distribution of expletive there
and impersonal it.

(48)  a. *I described there as being a fool.
    b. *I described there as being a lot of people.

(49)  a. *I described it as raining all day.  (Aarts (1992: 117))
    b. *They describe it as a honor to meet the president.

The ungrammaticality of these examples indicates that the postverbal
NP in the describe...as construction is an argument of the verb and
hence should not be treated as a small clause subject. Therefore, it
follows from these arguments that the structure of the describe...as con-
struction is different from that of the regard...as construction.

Here adopting Larson’s (1988) VP-shell, I will propose the following
structure for the describe...as construction.

(50)  [VP They [V e [VP Mary [V describe [Pp PRO [Pr as [AP
        smart]]]]]]]

In (50), the postverbal NP Mary is base-generated in Spec-VP and
describe moves from the lower V to the upper V. PRO, as, and smart
form a small clause and PRO is controlled by Mary. Thus, the
describe...as construction involves object control.\footnote{\ref{note10}}\footnote{\ref{note11}}

\footnote{\ref{note10} Chomsky and Lasnik (1993) argue convincingly that PRO has Case. For
detailed discussion, see Martin (2001).}

\footnote{\ref{note11} Other verbs that behave like describe are understand, appoint, choose, elect,
and so on.}

(i)  a. I didn’t understand them as individuals.
    b. He appointed me as his agent.
    c. We choose this problem as easier.
    d. He is elected as chairman.

\textit{Appoint} and \textit{elect} only allow NP to appear after \textit{as}. This fact will be due to the
property of these verbs that they denote an action which assigns some status to
someone, where the status is typically expressed by NP. In such cases, \textit{as} might be
analyzed as a preposition, but not as a Pr.

\footnote{\ref{note12} Appoint and elect only allow NP to appear after as. This fact will be due to the
property of these verbs that they denote an action which assigns some status to
someone, where the status is typically expressed by NP. In such cases, as might be
analyzed as a preposition, but not as a Pr.}
5. Conclusion

In Middle English as first appeared in small clauses with preposition-
al properties. During the eighteenth century as lost them and estab-
lished its functional status. Therefore, as in the regard...as construction
is a functional category in present-day English.

This paper proposed that the regard...as and take...for constructions
are analyzed as having different structures. The evidence for this pro-
posal comes from the distribution of pleonastic elements and the cate-
gories of elements following as and for. In the structures proposed
here, as in the regard...as construction is a functional category Pr, while
for in the take...for construction is a preposition.

This paper also examined the possibility that small clauses are phases.
Chomsky (2001) defines phases as configurations of the form F-XP,
which led us to claim that PrP is also to be treated as a phase. The
argument for this claim comes from the fact that expletive there cannot
be merged in Spec-PrP. On the other hand, if small clauses have TP
embedded under them, there can be merged in Spec-TP and then moves
to Spec-PrP to satisfy the EPP feature of Pr.
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