Bailyn (2002) argues that certain elements in Russian syntax, such as *kak* and *za*, are overt manifestations of the category PRED, based on Bowers 1993 and Bailyn & Rubin 1991, as in the (b) sentences in (1) and (2):

(1) a. On vygljadit Ø durakom / *durak
    he-NOM looks fool-INSTR / * fool -NOM
    ‘He looks (like) a fool.’

b. On vygljadit *kak* durak / *durakom*
    he-NOM looks PRED fool-NOM / *fool-INSTR
    ‘He looks like a fool.’

(2) a. My sèitaem ego Ø svoim / *svoego
    we consider him-ACC self's-INST / *self's-ACC
    ‘We consider him (as) one of us.’

b. My sčitaem ego *za* svoego / *svoim*
    we consider him-ACC PRED self's-ACC / * self's-INST
    ‘We consider him (as) one of us.’

Arguments in favor of the Overt Predicator analysis of such instances of *kak* and *za* involve rejecting alternative analyses whereby these elements head the categories PP or CP, and, crucially, the salient case facts whereby constructions that otherwise involve the Russian predicate Instrumental case (as in the (a) sentences above) suddenly are impossible with the Instrumental, and involve ‘sameness of case’. Recently, Marelj & Matushansky (2010) have argued against this analysis and in favor of an analysis involving *za* as the head of PP and *kak* as the head of CP followed by ellipsis of most of the CP internal structure. In this paper I consider M&M’s objections to the Overt Predicator analysis of *za* and *kak* for Slavic and show that they are inadequate, and that the original analysis is more appropriate for the Slavic constructions under discussion.