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1 Introduction

In English, depictives have been analysed by Williams (1980) as a type of syntactic predication, determined by c-command relations, and so whether a depictive predicate is subject- or object-oriented is determined by its syntactic position.

In the previous literature on Mongolian, its depictives have been introduced rather randomly (Rachewiltz 1972; Brosig 2009). In this paper we will show that Mongolian has three types of constructions which look like depictives. All these constructions have a typical depictive interpretation as well as a depictive-like structure, at least on the surface. However, their syntax appears to be rather more complex than that of English depictives, and there is a lot of freedom of constituent order. The structures of the three constructions are schematically illustrated in (1).

(1) a. S O-acc X-INSTR{-ø/-REFL.POSS/3.POSS} V
b. S O-acc X-COP-INF-DAT{-ø/-REFL.POSS/3.POSS} V
c. S O-acc X{-ø/*-REFL.POSS/*3.POSS} V

In (1), the REFLECT.POSS marker agrees only with subject, so the depictive phrase with REFLECT.POSS has to link to subject. The 3.POSS marker agrees only with object, so the depictive phrase with 3.POSS has to link to object. As for the ones without referential marking, “X-INSTR-ø” of (1a) and “X-ø” of (1c) are potentially ambiguous between subject- and object-oriented depictives, while “X-be-INF-DAT-ø” of (1b) links to only object, due to a structural reason. All types of “depictives” are laid out in (2a-g), in unmarked constituent order, with the depictive phrases in bold.

*We would like to thank to Peter Sells for his valuable comments and suggestions. We are also grateful to Andrew Spencer with his comments on the earlier version of this paper. This research was supported by Nanzan University Pache Research Subsidy I-A-2 for the 2012 academic year. Remaining errors are entirely ours.
(2) **<Subject-oriented Depictives>**

a. *John Mary-g nüžgen-eer-ee* shalga-san. --(1a)
   ‘John examined Mary naked.’
   
b. *John Mary-g nüžgen bai-d-aa* shalga-san. --(1b)
   ‘John examined Mary naked.’

**<Object-oriented Depictives>**

c. *John Mary-g nüžgen-eer n’* shalga-san. --(1a)
   ‘John examined Mary naked.’
   
d. *John Mary-g nüžgen bai-h-ad n’* shalga-san. --(1b)
   ‘John examined Mary naked.’
   
e. *John Mary-g nüžgen bai-h-ad* shalga-san. --(1a)
   ‘John examined Mary naked.’

**<Ambiguous Types>**

f. *John Mary-g nüžgen-eer* shalga-san. --(1b)
   ‘John examined Mary naked.’
   
g. *John Mary-g nüžgen* shalga-san. --(1c)
   ‘John examined Mary naked.’

In this section, we will investigate the sentences in (2) as well as some other fake types such as manner adverbs in terms of syntactic and semantic properties, and conclude that the types of (1a,c) represent real depictives but (1b) does not.

2 **Syntactic and Semantic Properties of Mongolian Depictives**

We will present several different syntactic and semantic tests onto the sentences in (2) to determine the properties of Mongolian depictives. Firstly the depictive phrases in (1)/(2) are distinguished from manner adverbs. Then we will show several syntactic tests such as ‘do-so’ replacement tests to determine the syntactic positions of subject- and object-oriented depictive phrases. As the most important and interesting test, we will also exhibit the ‘overt notional subject’ test, which reveals that the types of (1a,c)/(2a,c,f,g) have the true secondary predication, but those of (1b)/(2b,d,e) take a TP adjunct form. The data and analysis for the (1b)/(2b,d,e) as an embedded TP clause will be supported with the double accusative structure, where the second
accusative case is the “differential subject marking”, showing that the depictive phrase can take its notional subject overtly inside its clause.

In Mongolian, adjectives and adverbs are morphologically identical. In addition, adverbs can also attach the instrumental case marker like adjectives; X-INSTR-Ø of (1a) and X-Ø of (2c) could simply be adverbal. Thus, the clear separation of depictives from the (manner) adverbs is necessary. The tests we will use here are the referential test and *adilhan* ‘similarly’ replacement. Since manner adverbs modify verbal elements rather than nominal elements, it is impossible to attach a nominal referential marker such as *n’*3.POSS*. Adilhan* ‘similarly’ is a manner adverb in Mongolian, which hence successfully replaces a manner adverb, maintaining its original adverb’s meaning. Examples are given in (3).

(3) [Canonical Manner Adverbs (possible to replace them with *adilhan* ‘similarly’)]

a. *John Mary-g höörhön-Ø/-öör*-öör-n’ shalga-san.*
   *John Mary-ACC beautiful(ly)-Ø/-INSTR/-INSTR-3.POSS examine-PST*
   ba *Bill ch gesen Mary-g adilhan shalga-san.*
   and Bill also *Mary-ACC similarly examine-PST*
   ‘John saw Mary with a beautiful manner, and Bill also saw Mary similarly (similarly = beautifully).’

b. *Ene mod navch-aa udaan-Ø/-aar/-aar-n’ unagaa-san*  
   *this tree leaf-REFL.POSS. slow(ly)-Ø/-INSTR/-INSTR-3.POSS drop-PST*
   ba *ter mod ch gesen navch-aa adilhan unagaa-san*  
   and that tree also *leaf-REFL.POSS similarly drop-PST*
   ‘This tree dropped the leaves slowly, and that tree also dropped leaves similarly (similarly = slowly).’

Depictive predicates are not manner adverbs, thus it is impossible to replace the depictive predicate phrases with *adilhan* ‘similarly’. The depictive phrases (in bold font) of (2) are now replaced with *adilhan* ‘similarly’, which all fail to keep their original meanings; in (4a-g), *adilhan* ‘similarly’ indicates how the subject *John* behaved to see *Bill*: e.g. the way *John* used his eyes, or secretly or bravely. The test suggests that the strategies in (1a,b,c) are not adverbal.

(4) [Adilhan ‘similarly’ Replacement (is not possible with depictive phrases)]

<Subject-oriented Depictives>

a. *#John Mary-g nūzgen-eer-ee shalga-san ba Bill*
   *John Mary-ACC naked-INSTR-REFL.POSS examine-PST and Bill*
   *ch gesen Mary-g adilhan shalga-san.*
   also *Mary-ACC similarly examine-PST*
   ‘John, examined Mary naked, and Bill also examined Mary similarly (≠ naked).’

b. *#John Mary-g nūzgen bai-h-d-aa shalga-san.*
   *John Mary-ACC naked be-INF-DAT-REFL.POSS examine-PST*
Next we start investigating the syntactic properties of the Mongolian depictive sentences. The first test is the teg- ‘do-so’ replacement test. Lakoff and Ross (1976) explained that the adjunct element adjoined to VP does not need to be replaced with do-so, but the elements which are inside VP have to be replaced by do-so together with the head verb. The data below shows that (5e) was judged as clearly ungrammatical, and thus the depictive phrase in (5e)/(2e) stays in a position lower than VP (branching from V’ or the complement of V), and all other object-oriented depictive phrases seem to be the adjunct of VP or an element of TP.
As to the subject-oriented types, we will here show further data with pseudo-clefting. (6) below indicates that the depictive phrases may/may not be inside VP; they may adjoin to VP or a higher position. This fact of the subject-oriented depictives is not specific to Mongolian. In fact, Koizumi (1994) first reported the same property with Japan subject-oriented depictives, and Shibagaki (2011) with Korean subject-oriented depictives.
Here, we will show some tests to determine the size of each depictive phrase/clause. In (7), a nominative-marked notional subject is added for each depictive phrase/clause. If the insertion of the NP:NOM is acceptable, the depictive element is not a secondary predication but a TP. However, if the insertion is impossible, then the depictive element is smaller than TP, namely a small clause (secondary predication). As can be seen below, (7a,c,f,g) are ungrammatical; they do not take the TP strategy. On the other hand, (7b,d,e) are grammatical; the depictive elements form an embedded TP clause, which will be further supported later on. Thus we can deduce that (7a,c,f,g)/(2a,c) represent true depictives forming a small clause adjunct, whereas (7b,d,e)/(2b) does not.

(7)  <Subject-oriented Depictives>

a. *John Mary-g [TP biye n’ nüzgen-eer-ee] shalga-san.
   John Mary-ACC body 3.POSS naked-INSTR-REFL.POSS examine-PST
   Int. ‘John_i examined Mary while his body was naked_i.’

b. John Mary-g [TP biye (n’) nüzgen bai-h-d-aa] shalga-san.
   John Mary-ACC body 3.POSS naked be-INFINITIVE-REFL-POSS examine-PST
   ‘John_i examined Mary while his body was naked_i.’
<Object-oriented Depictives>

c. *John Mary-g [\textsc{tp} biye n’ nüzgen-eer n’] shalga-san.
John Mary-ACC body 3.POSS naked-INSTR 3.POSS examine-PST
Int. ‘John examined Mary\textsubscript{j} while her body was naked\textsubscript{j}.’

d. John Mary-g [\textsc{tp} biye n’ nüzgen bai-h-ad n’] shalga-san.
John Mary-ACC body 3.POSS naked be-INF-DAT 3.POSS examine-PST
‘John examined Mary\textsubscript{j} while her body was naked\textsubscript{j}.’

e. John Mary-g [\textsc{tp} biye n’ nüzgen bai-h-ad] shalga-san.
John Mary-ACC body 3.POSS naked be-INF-DAT examine-PST
‘John examined Mary\textsubscript{j} while her body was naked\textsubscript{j}.’

<Ambiguous Types>

f. *John Mary-g [\textsc{tp} biye-ee/ n’ nüzgen-eer] shalga-san.
John Mary-ACC body-REFL.POSS/3.POSS naked-INSTR examine-PST
Int. ‘John\textsubscript{i} examined Mary\textsubscript{j} naked\textsubscript{i,j} while his/her body was naked.’

g. *John Mary-g [\textsc{tp} biye-ee/ n’ nüzgen] shalga-san.
John Mary-ACC body-REFL.POSS/3.POSS naked examine-PST
Int. ‘John\textsubscript{i} examined Mary\textsubscript{j} naked\textsubscript{i,j} while his/her body was naked.’

Those which allow the embedded subject can always take the accusative-marked embedded subject instead of the embedded nominative-marked subject. In Mongolian there is a Differential Subject Marking system (Guntsetseg 2010); the embedded subject can be nominative- or accusative-marked. Thus, the fact that the nominative case of the embedded subject NP can be converted to the accusative case proves that the additional NPs in (7b,d,e) are indeed the subjects.\footnote{In (8) these accusative-marked nouns are not the object of the matrix verb. This can be proved by the fact that “naked-be-INF-DAT{-REFL.POSS/3.POSS}” cannot scramble to the preceding position of “body{-REFL.POSS/-ACC}”.
\footnote{REFL.POSS contains the function of ACC, when the respective NP represents an embedded subject, as is the case of (8a).}}

(8)  
a. [for (7b)]\textsuperscript{2}
John Mary-g [\textsc{tp} biye(-ee) nüzgen bai-h-d-aa] shalga-san.
John Mary-ACC body-REFL.POSS naked be-INF-DAT-REFL.POSS examine-PST
‘John\textsubscript{i} examined Mary while his body was naked\textsubscript{i}.’

b. [for (7d)]
John Mary-g [\textsc{tp} biye(-iïg) n’ nüzgen bai-h-ad n’] shalga-san.
John Mary-ACC body-ACC 3.POSS naked be-INF-DAT 3.POSS examine-PST
‘John examined Mary\textsubscript{i} while her body was naked\textsubscript{i}.’

c. [for (7e)]
John Mary-g [\textsc{tp} biye(-iïg) n’ nüzgen bai-h-ad] shalga-san.
John Mary-ACC body-ACC 3.POSS naked be-INF-DAT examine-PST
‘John examined Mary\textsubscript{i} while her body was naked\textsubscript{i}.’
Since the depictive phrases of (1b)/(2b,d,e) are TP adjuncts, they can be more than one depictive phrase in a sentence, in principle. This is shown in (9); (9a) is the case of subject-oriented depictive from (2b), and (9b,c) are the cases of object-oriented depictives from (2d,e).

(9)  

a. [Two “X be-inf-dat-refl.poss” phrases in (2b)]

John ene mashin-iig [nas zaluu bai-h-d-aa] [turshлага]
John this car-ACC age young be-INF-DAT-REFL.Poss experience
nimgen bai-h-d-aa]
thin be-INF-DAT-REFL.Poss take-PST
‘John bought this car when he was young and when he had little experience.’

b. [Two “X be-INF-DAT-3.POSS” in (2d)]

John ene ohin-iig [nas (n’) zaluu bai-had n’]
John this girl-ACC age 3.POSS young be-INF-DAT 3.POSS
[turshлага (n’) nimgen bai-had n’] ajil-d av-san.
experience 3.POSS thin be-INF-DAT 3.POSS work-DAT take-PST
‘John appointed this girl when she was young and when she had little experience.’

c. [Two “X be-INF-DAT-0” in (2e)]

John ene ohin-iig [nas (n’) zaluu bai-had] [turshлага]
John this girl-ACC age 3.POSS young be-INF-DAT experience
(n’) nimgen bai-had] ajil-d take-san.
3.POSS thin be-INF-DAT work-DAT take-PST
‘John bought this car when she was young and when she has little experience.’

Theoretically speaking, the number of adjuncts should not be limited as long as they fit the semantic and pragmatic contexts of a sentence. We have observed the case of two depictive phrases in (9). This theoretical expectation is true to some extent. (10) exemplifies the case of both subject- and object-oriented depictive phrases in one sentence. (10a) is grammatical, where two subject-oriented depictive phrases are located between the subject and object, and one object-oriented-depictive phrase is located between the object and verb. (10b) is almost ungrammatical, where two subject-oriented and one object-oriented depictive phrases are located in one position; between object and verb. The theory of adjuncts/complements cannot predict the ungrammaticality of (10b), but the reason is simply because the sentence takes too much processing, from the psycholinguistic point of view.

(10)  

a. [Both Subject- and Object-oriented Depictive Phrases in a Sentence]

John [nas zaluu bai-h-d-aa] [turshлага nimgen
John age young be-INF-DAT-REFL.Poss experience thin
bai-h-d-aa] ene mashin-iig [motor n’
be-INF-DAT-REFL.Poss this car-ACC engine 3.POSS
huuch(i)n-aar / bai-h-ad n’] av-san.
old-INSTR / be-INF-DAT 3.POSS take-PST
‘John bought this car when he was young and had little experience, and the car’s engine was old.’

b. [All Subject- and Object-oriented Depictive Phrases after the Object]

\[\text{John ene mashin-iig [nas zaluu bai-h-d-aa]}\]
\[\text{John this car-ACC age young be-INF-DAT-REFL.POSS}\]
\[\text{[turslhaga nimgen bai-h-d-aa]}\]
\[\text{[motor n’ experience thin be-INF-DAT-REFL.POSS engine 3.POSS}\]
\[\text{huuch(i)n-aar / bai-h-ad n’] av-san.}\]
\[\text{old-INSTR / be-INF-DAT 3.POSS take-PST}\]
Int. ‘John bought this car when he was young and had little experience, and the car’s engine was old.’

Much like the case of bol- ‘become’ of the Mongolian resultatives (cf. Shibagaki and Guntsetseg 2011), bai- ‘be’ of depictives is also an auxiliary verb, which carries the aspect, namely stative. The presence of this auxiliary verb bai- ‘be’ implies that the depictive phrase of (1b) forms a TP, because aspect is always dependent on its local T-head. Importantly, the others such as (1a,c) cannot have the aspectual marker bai- ‘be/STATIVE’, which suggests that the depictive phrases in (1a,c) do not form a TP.

(11) [Inserting bai- ‘be’ in (2a,c)]

a. SUBJ NP-ACC Adj (*bai-)*INSTR-Ø-aa/n V
b. SUBJ NP-ACC Adj (*bai-*) V

The facts laid out in (11) can consistently be observed in the resultatives and depictives; the existence of aspect or a verbal element is associated with TP status in Mongolian, and the lack of aspect or a verbal element indicates the phrase is smaller than TP and represents a secondary predication connecting the predicate and a surface object (its notional subject). (1) is reanalysed in (12). We also assume that there is pro inside the depictive phrases.

(12) [Structures of Mongolian Depictives]

b. SUBJ NP-ACC [TP (NP:NOM) Adj be-INF-DAT-Ø/-REFL.POSS/3.POSS]* V
c. SUBJ NP-ACC [sc pro] Adj-Ø/-REFL.POSS/*3.POSS] V

Following the analysis we developed in this section, the syntactic representation of the Mongolian depictives can be illustrated as in (13). There are two subject-oriented depictives in this structure, but as mentioned earlier, there seem to be two possible positions in this language. In this paper, we cannot show what provides the positional differences among the object-oriented depictive phrases, due to the limit of the space. On this issue, there are several complicated affecting factors, including the presence of n’ “3.POSS’; there is no previous research on this word, however we regard that this word functions as a syntactic device which not only
determines the syntactic position but also works as a barrier which intervenes a c-commanding relation. This topic will be discussed with Mongolian double object construction in the future.

(13) not only reflects the properties of Mongolian depictives but also explains some other facts about the (2e) type. First, the depictive phrase “Adj be-INF-DAT” of (2e) cannot be scrambled unlike the other Mongolian depictive phrases. Compare (14e) with the others.

(a) John [nüzgen-bai-h-d-aa]i Mary-gt\(_i\) shalga-san. (=2a))
John naked be-INF-DAT-REFL.POSS Mary-ACC examine-PST
‘John\(_i\) examined Mary naked\(_i\).’

(b) John [nüzgen bai-h-d-aa]i Mary-gt\(_i\) shalga-san. (=2b))
John naked be-INF-DAT-REFL.POSS Mary-ACC examine-PST
‘John\(_i\) examined Mary naked\(_i\).’

(c) John [nüzgen-eer n’]\(_i\) Mary-gt\(_i\) shalga-san. (=2c))
John naked-INST 3.POSS Mary-ACC examine-PST
‘John examined Mary\(_i\) naked\(_i\).’

(d) John [nüzgen bai-h-ad n’]\(_i\) Mary-gt\(_i\) shalga-san. (=2d))
John naked be-INF-DAT 3.POSS Mary-ACC examine-PST
‘John examined Mary\(_i\) naked\(_i\).’
e. *John [nūzgen bai-h-ad]t Mary-gt shalga-san. (=2e))
   John naked be-INF-DAT Mary-ACC examine-PST
   ‘John examined Maryj naked,.’

<Ambiguous Types>

f. John nūzgen-eer Mary-gt shalga-san. (=2f))
   John naked-INSTR Mary-ACC examine-PST
   ‘Johni examined Maryj nakedj.’

g. John nūzgeni Mary-g ti shalga-san. (=2g)
   John naked Mary-ACC examine-PST
   ‘Johni examined Maryj nakedj.’

(14) suggests that the depictive phrase of (2e) cannot move to a position which precedes the object. The reason seems to be because the depictive phrase of (2e) is an element inside VP as illustrated in (14e), whereas all the other depictive phrases adjoin to VP or even higher than VP.

Second, although the depictive phrase “Adj be-INF-DAT” of (2e) does not have any referential markers such as -AA ‘REFL.POSS’ or n ‘3.POSS’, it only links to object, but never to subject unlike the cases of (2f,g); in (2f,g) there is no referential marker and the depictive phrases of (2f,g) can link to either subject or object. This fact can also be explained with the syntactic structure in (13). The depictive phrase of (2e) is the element inside VP unlike all the others, so the control of pro can take place only within VP.

As a final point, we raise one issue which slightly contradicts our account of this paper. The theory of adjuncts predicts that an adjunct can occur more than two times, unlike a complement. However, when there is no overt notional subject for each depictive phrase, Mongolian depictives, which we analysed as adjuncts, cannot occur more than two times in a sentence.3

(15)  <Subject-oriented Depictives>

a. *John Mary-g nūzgen-eer-e shalga-san.
   John Mary-ACC naked-INSTR-REFL.POSS drunk-INSTR-REFL.POSS examine-PST
   Int. ‘Johni examined Maryj drunkk.’

b. *John Mary-g nūzgen bai-h-d-aa shogtuu
   Johni Mary-ACC naked be-INF-DAT-REFL.POSS drunk
   bai-h-d-aa
   be-INF-DAT-REFL.POSS examine-PST
   Int. ‘Johni examined Maryj naked, drunkk.’

<Object-oriented Depictives>

c. *John Mary-g nūzgen-eer n′ shogtuu-gaar n′ shalga-san.
   John Mary-ACC naked-INSTR 3.POSS drunk-INSTR 3.POSS examine-PST
   Int. ‘John examined Maryj nakedj drunkj.’

---

3 Andrew Spencer commented on this issue that the point about only one (‘pure’) depictive being allowed per clause seems to be valid for English as well as Mongolian, and the depictive is different from a purely adjunct in that the depictive creates a kind of complex predicate, to see NP drunk, and hence the depictive functions more like a complement than an adjunct (while lacking most other adjunct properties).
d. *John Mary-g nø̝gén bai-h-ad n’ sogtuu bai-h-ad n’
   examine-PST
   Int. ‘John examined Mary_j naked_j drunk_j.’

e. *John Mary-g nø̝gén bai-h-ad sogtuu bai-h-ad shalga-san.
   John Mary-ACC naked be-INF-DAT drunk be-INF-DAT examine-PST
   Int. ‘John examined Mary_j naked_j drunk_j.’

The grammatical acceptability of the English translation “John saw Mary naked drunk” is also quite low, although English depictive predicates are believed to be adjuncts. Again like the case of resultatives, more research is needed in the theory of complements and adjuncts; these two categories may not be so clear-cut in some languages.

3 Summary

In this paper, we investigated the syntactic properties of Mongolian depictives, where we found that there are syntactically two types of depictives, such as TP and small clause types. Moreover, we determined the syntactic positions of each depictive phrase. In the process of investigating the properties of Mongolian depictives, we also analysed the relations between the clausal structures and case marking system. Comparison among Mongolian, Japanese and Korean depictives will be our future research project, in that we will discuss where the difference among the depictives of the three languages comes from.
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