

P-1 Subjects of stative predicates in prenominal sentential modifiers in Mongolian*

Yiliqi, Hideki Maki, Lina Bao and Megumi Hasebe

Gifu University, Gifu University, Qiannan Normal University for Nationalities and Shinshu University

1. Introduction: Harada (1971) originally discussed a nominative/genitive case marker alternation phenomenon in Japanese, called the *ga/no* conversion, as illustrated in (1)–(2).

- (1) [ike-ga/-no aru] niwa (2) [doyoobi-ni tamago-ga/-no yasui] mise
pond-Nom/-Gen be garden Saturday-on egg-Nom/-Gen cheap store
'the garden which has a pond' 'the store where eggs are cheap on Saturdays'

Since his seminal work, the phenomenon has been discussed by many linguists, such as Miyagawa (1993, 2011, 2012, 2013), Watanabe (1996), Hiraiwa (2001), Ochi (2001), Harada (2002) and Kobayashi (2013), among many others. Maki et al. (2015, 2016) investigate the distribution of genitive subjects in Mongolian, and reports that the distribution of genitive subjects in Japanese and Mongolian is more or less identical, although Mongolian allows genitive subjects in slightly broader contexts. In this paper, we will investigate the distribution of genitive subjects in Mongolian when they appear with existential verbs and adjectives, and point out that the distribution of genitive subjects in Mongolian is more restricted than that in Japanese when they appear with these predicates. This is illustrated in (3)–(4), which are Mongolian counterparts of the Japanese examples in (1)–(2).

- (3) [nayur-ø/*-un bai-qu] qasiya (4) [ɣaray-un jirɣuyan-du öndege-ø/*-yin kimta] qudalduya
pond-Nom/-Gen be-Pres.Adn garden Saturday-on egg-Nom/-Gen cheap store
'the garden which has a pond in its center' 'the store where eggs are cheap on Saturdays'

2. Background: In Mongolian, genitive subjects are disallowed in simple sentences, as shown in (5), but both nominative and genitive subjects are allowed, when they appear in relative clauses, as shown in (6).

- (5) Öcügedür Ulayan-ø/*-u nom-ø qudaldun-ab-čai.
yesterday Ulagan-Nom/-Gen book-Acc buy-take-Past.Con 'Ulagan bought a book yesterday.'
(6) Öcügedür Ulayan-ø/-u *t* qudaldun-abu-ɣsan/*-ab-čai nom-bol ene nom.
yesterday Ulagan-Nom/-Gen buy-take-Past.Adn/-take-Past.Con book-Top this book
'The book which Ulagan bought yesterday is this book.'

Maki et al. (2010) report that genitive subjects are also allowed in a non-local relationship with the relative head, as shown in (7)–(8).

- (7) Bayatur-ø [öcügedür Ulayan-ø *t*₁ qudaldun-abu-ɣsan/-ab-čai] geju bodu-ɣsan nom₁-bol
Bagatur-Nom yesterday Ulagan-Nom buy-take-Past.Adn/-take-Past.Con that think-Past.Adn book-Top
ene nom.
this book 'The book which Bagatur thought [that Ulagan bought *t* yesterday] is this book.'
(8) Bayatur-ø [öcügedür Ulayan-u *t*₁ qudaldun-abu-ɣsan/*-ab-čai] geju bodu-ɣsan
Bagatur-Nom yesterday Ulagan-Gen buy-take-Past.Adn/-take-Past.Con that think-Past.Adn
nom₁-bol ene nom.
book-Top this book 'The book which Bagatur thought [that Ulagan bought *t* yesterday] is this book.'

Note that genitive subjects in embedded clauses need a relative head, as shown by (8)–(9).

- (9) Bayatur-ø Ulayan-ø/*-u nom-ø qudaldun-abu-ɣsan/-ab-čai geju bodu-jai.
Bagatur-Nom Ulagan-Nom/-Gen book-Acc buy-take-Past.Adn/-take-Past.Con that think-Past.Con
'Bagatur thought [that Ulagan bought a book].'

Maki et al. (2011) further investigated examples with gapless prenominal sentential modifiers, as shown in (10)–(11).

- (10) a. Öcügedür Ulayan-ø/*-u iniye-jei.
yesterday Ulagan-Nom/-Gen laugh-Past.Con 'Ulagan laughed yesterday.'
b. Batu-ø [öcügedür Ulayan-ø/-u iniye-gsen uçir]-tu soči-jai.
Batu-Nom yesterday Ulagan-Nom/-Gen laugh-Past.Adn fact-at be.surprised-Past.Con
'Batu was surprised at [the fact that Ulagan laughed yesterday].'
(11) a. Bayatur-ø [öcügedür Ulayan-ø/*-u iniye-gsen geju] kele-jei. 'Bagatur said [that Ulagan
Bagatur-Nom yesterday Ulagan-Nom/-Gen laugh-Past.Adn that say-Past.Con laughed yesterday].'
b. Batu-ø [Bayatur-ø [öcügedür Ulayan-ø/*-u iniye-gsen geju] kele-gsen uçir]-tu
Batu-Nom Bagatur-Nom yesterday Ulagan-Nom/-Gen laugh-Past.Adn that say-Past.Adn fact-at
soči-jai.
be.surprised-Past.Con 'Batu was surprised at [the fact that Bagatur said [that Ulagan laughed yesterday]].'

(10a) is a simple sentence without a nominal head. (10b) contains an NP with a gapless prenominal sentential modifier. It is grammatical, irrespective of whether the subject is nominative or genitive. (11a) contains a complement clause. It is grammatical when the subject in the embedded clause is nominative, but ungrammatical when it is genitive. (11b) contains an NP with a gapless prenominal sentential modifier. In contrast to (10b), it is grammatical only when the subject in the embedded clause is nominative. In order to correctly predict the distribution of genitive subjects, Maki et al. (2011) claim that a relation is established between a relative head and its gap *t* by binding (c-commanding), in such a way that the nominal feature in the nominal head percolates down to *t*, and Maki et al. (2016) further claim that only the

relevant Comp in the binding path from the relative head to its gap may host the feature [+N] inherited from the relative head, and can function as a licensor for genitive subjects, based on Rizzi's (1990) idea about feature specifications on functional categories. With these claims, Maki et al. (2016) propose (12) based on two important approaches to genitive subject licensing in Japanese, namely, Miyagawa's (1993, 2011) D-licensing approach and Watanabe's (1996)/Hiraiwa's (2001) adnominal form-licensing approach.

(12) *Conditions on Genitive Subject Licensing in Mongolian*

- a. A genitive subject must be c-commanded by a nominal element in a local domain.
- b. A genitive subject must be in a local relationship with the adnominal form of a predicate.

Maki et al. (2016) claim that both Mongolian and Japanese obey the same conditions on genitive subject licensing in (12), and the differences between the two languages arise from the environments in which the adnominal form of a predicate may appear. Thus, the conditions in (12) precisely predict the fact that genitive subjects are disallowed in a non-local relationship with the relative head in Japanese, as shown in (13)–(14), the Japanese counterparts of (7)/(8) and (11b) in Mongolian.

- (13) Taroo-ga [kinoo Hanako-ga/*-no t_1 kat-ta to] omot-ta hon-wa kono hon desu.
Taro-Nom yesterday Hanako-Nom/-Gen buy-Past.Con that think-Past.Adn book-Top this book be
'The book which Taro thought [that Hanako bought t yesterday] is this book.'
- (14) Masao-wa [Taroo-ga [kinoo Hanako-ga/*-no warat-ta to] it-ta koto]-ni
Masao-Top Taro-Nom yesterday Hanako-Nom/-Gen laugh-Past.Con that say-Past.Adn fact-at
odoroi-ta.
be.surprised-Past.Con 'Masao was surprised at [the fact that Taro said [that Hanako laughed yesterday]].'

3. Data

3.1. Existential Verbs: First, let us consider simple sentences without relative clauses shown in (15)–(16). (15)–(16) contain two representative existential sentences that express existence and non-existence, respectively.

- (15) Ene ger-tu telvis-ø/*-un bai-na.
this house-in TV-Nom/-Gen be-Pres.Con 'There is a TV set in this house.'
- (16) Ene qota-du yaltu tergen-u örtege-ø/*-yin bai-qu ügei.
this city-in railroad-Gen station-Nom/-Gen be-Pres.Adn not 'There is not a railroad station in this city.'

Second, let us consider gapless relative clauses that contain examples (15)–(16), as shown in (17)–(18).

- (17) ene ger-tu telvis-ø/*-un bai-qu uçir
this house-in TV-Nom/-Gen be-Pres.Adn fact 'the fact that there is a TV set in this house'
- (18) ene qota-du yaltu tergen-u örtege-ø/*-yin bai-qu ügei uçir
this city-in railroad-Gen station-Nom/-Gen be-Pres.Adn not fact 'the fact that there is not a railroad station in this city'

Just like (15)–(16), (17)–(18) are grammatical with a nominative subject, but ungrammatical with a genitive subject, a surprising fact. **Third**, let us examine relative clauses with a gap for (15)–(16), as shown in (19)–(20).

- (19) t telvis-ø/*-un bai-qu ger (20) t yaltu tergen-u örtege-ø/*-yin bai-qu ügei qota
TV-Nom/-Gen be-Pres.Adn house railroad-Gen station-Nom/-Gen be-Pres.Adn not city
'the house which has a TV set' 'the city which does not have a railroad station'

Interestingly enough, (19)–(20) are ungrammatical with a genitive subject, in contrast to (6). Note here that Mongolian has possessive pronouns (PoPs). When a possessor-possessee relation holds between a relative head and a subject in the relative clause, a possessive pronoun is attached, as shown in (21)–(22).

- (21) t telvis-ni bai-qu ger (22) t yaltu tergen-u örtege-ni bai-qu ügei qota
TV-PoP3 be-Pres.Adn house railroad-Gen station-PoP3 be-Pres.Adn not city
'the house which has a TV set' 'the city which does not have a railroad station'

In (21), the relative head *ger* 'house' semantically possesses *telvis* 'TV.' Likewise, in (22), the relative head *qota* 'city' semantically possesses *yaltu tergen-u örtege* 'railroad station.' **Fourth**, let us then consider examples that contain (15)–(16) as embedded clauses, as shown in (23)–(24).

- (23) Batu-ø [ene ger-tu telvis-ø/*-un bai-na gejü] kele-jei. 'Batu said [that there was a TV set in this house].'
Batu-Nom this house-in TV-Nom/-Gen be-Pres.Con that say-Past.Con a TV set in this house.'
- (24) Batu-ø [ene qota-du yaltu tergen-u örtege-ø/*-yin bai-qu ügei gejü] kele-jei.
Batu-Nom this city-in railroad-Gen station-Nom/-Gen be-Pres.Adn not that say-Past.Con
'Batu said [that there was not a railroad station in this city].'

(23)–(24) are grammatical with a nominative subject, but ungrammatical with a genitive subject. **Fifth**, let us consider gapless relative clauses that contain (23)–(24), as shown in (25)–(26).

- (25) Batu-ø [ene ger-tu telvis-ø/*-un bai-qu gejü] kele-gsen uçir
Batu-Nom this house-in TV-Nom/-Gen be-Pres.Adn that say-Past.Adn fact
'the fact that Batu said [that there was a TV set in this house]'
- (26) Batu-ø [ene qota-du yaltu tergen-u örtege-ø/*-yin bai-qu ügeigejü] kele-gsen uçir
Batu-Nom this city-in railroad-Gen station-Nom/-Gen be-Pres.Adn not that say-Past.Adn fact
'the fact that Batu said [that there was not a railroad station in this city]'

Just like (23)–(24), (25)–(26) are grammatical with a nominative subject, but ungrammatical with a genitive subject. **Sixth**, and finally, let us examine relative clauses with a gap for (23)–(24), as shown in (27)–(28).

- (27) Batu- \emptyset [*t* telvis- \emptyset /*-un bai-qu ge \ddot{u}] kele-gsen ger ‘the house which Batu said
Batu-Nom TV-Nom/-Gen be-Pres.Adn that say-Past.Adn house [*t* had a TV set]’
(28) Batu- \emptyset [*t* yaltu tergen-u \ddot{r} tege- \emptyset /*-yin bai-qu \ddot{u} gei ge \ddot{u}] kele-gsen qota
Batu-Nom railroad-Gen station-Nom/-Gen be-Pres.Adn not that say-Past.Adn city
‘the city which Batu said [*t* had a railroad station]’

Interestingly enough, (27)–(28) are ungrammatical with a genitive subject, in contrast to the example in (8), but they improve when the embedded subjects are followed by a PoP3, as shown in (29)–(30).

- (29) Batu- \emptyset [*t* telvis-ni bai-qu ge \ddot{u}] kele-gsen ger
Batu-Nom TV-PoP3 be-Pres.Adn that say-Past.Adn house ‘the house which Batu said [*t* had a TV set]’
(30) Batu- \emptyset [*t* yaltu tergen-u \ddot{r} tege-ni bai-qu \ddot{u} gei ge \ddot{u}] kele-gsen qota
Batu-Nom railroad-Gen station-PoP3 be-Pres.Adn not that say-Past.Adn city
‘the city which Batu said [*t* had a railroad station]’

3.2. Adjectives: Next, let us examine examples with adjectives. **First**, let us consider simple sentences without relative clauses shown in (31)–(34).

- (31) Angqi-du Ulayan- \emptyset /*-u qamuy qur \mathring{c} a.
class-in Ulagan-Nom/-Gen best smart ‘Ulagan is the smartest in the class.’
(32) Angqi-du Ulayan- \emptyset /*-u qamuy qur \mathring{c} a bai-na.
class-in Ulagan-Nom/-Gen best smart be-Pres.Con ‘Ulagan is the smartest in the class.’
(33) Angqi-du Bayatur- \emptyset /*-un Ulayan-e \mathring{c} e beye- \emptyset /*-yin \ddot{o} ndür bai-na. ‘Bagatur is taller than
class-in Bagatur-Nom/-Gen Ulagan-than body-Nom/-Gen tall be-Pres.Con Ulagan in the class.’
(34) Angqi-du [Bayatur-un beye]- \emptyset /*-yin qamuy \ddot{o} ndür bai-na.
class-in Bagatur-Gen body-Nom/-Gen best tall be-Pres.Con ‘Bagatur is the tallest in the class.’

(31)–(32) have the identical meaning, but the latter has a copula that follows the adjective. (33) has multiple subjects, and these two are separated by a phrase *Ulayan-e \mathring{c} e* ‘Ulagan-than’ in order to guarantee that these two do not form a constituent. (34) has a subject with the form of NP’s N, namely, *Bayatur-un beye* ‘Bagatur-Gen body.’ The examples in (31)–(34) are grammatical with a nominative subject, but ungrammatical with a genitive subject. In the following, we call adjectives unaccompanied by the copula *bai* ‘be’ bare adjectives, and those accompanied by it non-bare adjectives. **Second**, let us consider gapless relative clauses that contain (31)–(34), as shown in (35)–(38).

- (35) angqi-du Ulayan- \emptyset /*-u qamuy qur \mathring{c} a u \mathring{c} ir
class-in Ulagan-Nom/-Gen best smart fact ‘the fact that Ulagan is the smartest in the class’
(36) angqi-du Ulayan- \emptyset /-u qamuy qur \mathring{c} a bai-qu u \mathring{c} ir
class-in Ulagan-Nom/-Gen best smart be-Pres.Adn fact ‘the fact that Ulagan is the smartest in the class’
(37) a. angqi-du Bayatur- \emptyset Ulayan-e \mathring{c} e beye- \emptyset \ddot{o} ndür bai-qu u \mathring{c} ir ‘the fact that Bagatur is taller
class-in Bagatur-Nom Ulagan-than body-Nom tall be-Pres.Adn fact than Ulagan in the class.’
b. angqi-du Bayatur-un Ulayan-e \mathring{c} e beye- \emptyset \ddot{o} ndür bai-qu u \mathring{c} ir
class-in Bagatur-Gen Ulagan-than body-Nom tall be-Pres.Adn fact
c. *angqi-du Bayatur- \emptyset Ulayan-e \mathring{c} e beye-yin \ddot{o} ndür bai-qu u \mathring{c} ir
class-in Bagatur-Nom Ulayan-than body-Gen tall be-Pres.Adn fact
d. *angqi-du Bayatur-un Ulayan-e \mathring{c} e beye-yin \ddot{o} ndür bai-qu u \mathring{c} ir
class-in Bagatur-Gen Ulagan-than body-Gen tall be-Pres.Adn fact
(38) angqi-du [Bayatur-un beye]- \emptyset /-yin qamuy \ddot{o} ndür bai-qu u \mathring{c} ir ‘the fact that Bagatur is the
class-in Bagatur-Gen body-Nom/-Gen best tall be-Pres.Adn fact tallest in the class’

There is a contrast between (35) and (36). Only (36) allows a genitive subject. In the four examples in (37), only (37b) is grammatical with a genitive subject. Finally, (38) is grammatical either with a nominative subject or a genitive subject. **Third**, let us examine relative clauses with a gap for the example in (33), as shown in (39).

- (39) angqi-du *t* Ulayan-e \mathring{c} e beye- \emptyset /*-yin \ddot{o} ndür bai-qu k \ddot{u} m \ddot{u} n ‘the person who is taller than
class-in Ulagan-than body-Nom/-Gen tall be-Pres.Adn person Ulagan in the class’

Interestingly enough, (39) disallows a genitive subject. Note here again that (39) is saved when the subject of the relative clause *beye* ‘body’ is accompanied by the third person possessive pronoun *ni* ‘PoP3,’ as shown in (40).

- (40) angqi-du *t* Ulayan-e \mathring{c} e beye-ni \ddot{o} ndür bai-qu k \ddot{u} m \ddot{u} n ‘the person who is taller than
class-in Ulagan-than body-PoP3 tall be-Pres.Adn person Ulagan in the class’

Fourth, let us consider examples that contain (31)–(34) as embedded clauses, as shown in (41)–(44).

- (41) Batu- \emptyset [angqi-du Ulayan- \emptyset /*-un qamuy qur \mathring{c} a ge \ddot{u}] kele-jei. ‘Batu said [that Ulagan was
Batu-Nom class-in Ulagan-Nom/-Gen best smart that say-Past.Con the smartest in the class].’
(42) Batu- \emptyset [angqi-du Ulayan- \emptyset /*-un qamuy qur \mathring{c} a bai-qu ge \ddot{u}] kele-jei.
Batu-Nom class-in Ulagan-Nom/-Gen best smart be-Pres.Adn that say-Past.Con
‘Batu said [that Ulagan was the smartest in the class].’
(43) Batu- \emptyset [angqi-du Bayatur- \emptyset /*-un Ulayan-e \mathring{c} e beye- \emptyset /*-yin \ddot{o} ndür bai-qu ge \ddot{u}]

Batu-Nom class-in Bagatur-Nom/-Gen Ulayan-than body-Nom/-Gen tall be-Pres.Adn that kele-jei.

say-Past.Con ‘Batu said [that Bagatur was taller than Ulagan in the class].’

- (44) Batu-ø [angqi-du Bayatur-un beye-ø/*-yin qamuy öndür geju] kele-jei.
 Batu-Nom class-in Bagatur-Gen body-Nom/-Gen best tall that say-Past.Con
 ‘Batu said [that Bagatur was the tallest in the class].’

(41)–(44) are all grammatical with a nominative subject, but ungrammatical with a genitive subject. **Fifth**, let us consider gapless relative clauses that contain (41)–(44), as shown in (45)–(48).

- (45) Batu-ø [angqi-du Ulayan-ø/*-un qamuy qurča geju] kele-gsen učir
 Batu-Nom class-in Ulagan-Nom/-Gen best smart that say-Past.Adn fact
 ‘the fact that Batu said [that Ulagan was the smartest in the class]’
- (46) Batu-ø [angqi-du Ulayan-ø/*-un qamuy qurča bai-qu geju] kele-gsen učir
 Batu-Nom class-in Ulagan-Nom/-Gen best smart be-Pres.Adn that say-Past.Adn fact
 ‘the fact that Batu said [that Ulagan was the smartest in the class]’
- (47) a. Batu-ø [angqi-du Bayatur-ø Ulayan-eče beye-ø öndür bai-qu geju] kele-jei.
 Batu-Nom class-in Bagatur-Nom Ulagan-than body-Nom tall be-Pres.Adn that say-Past.Con
 ‘the fact that Batu said [that Bagatur was the taller than Ulagan in the class].’
 b. *Batu-ø [angqi-du Bayatur-un Ulayan-eče beye-ø öndür bai-qu geju] kele-jei.
 Batu-Nom class-in Bagatur-Gen Ulagan-than body-Nom tall be-Pres.Adn that say-Past.Con
 c. *Batu-ø [angqi-du Bayatur-ø Ulayan-eče beye-yin öndür bai-qu geju] kele-jei.
 Batu-Nom class-in Bagatur-Nom Ulagan-than body-Gen tall be-Pres.Adn that say-Past.Con
 d. *Batu-ø [angqi-du Bayatur-un Ulayan-eče beye-yin öndür bai-qu geju] kele-jei.
 Batu-Nom class-in Bagatur-Gen Ulagan-than body-Gen tall be-Pres.Adn that say-Past.Con
- (48) Batu-ø [angqi-du Bayatur-un beye-ø/*-yin qamuy öndür geju] kele-gsen učir
 Batu-Nom class-in Bagatur-Gen body-Nom/-Gen best tall that say-Past.Adn fact
 ‘the fact that Batu said [that Bagatur was the tallest in the class]’

Just like (41)–(44), (45)–(48) are all grammatical with a nominative subject, but ungrammatical with a genitive subject. **Sixth**, and finally, let us examine relative clauses with a gap for (43), which contains an adjective that expresses the state of the body part of the subject, as shown in (49).

- (49) Batu-ø [angqi-du t Ulayan-eče beye-ø/*-yin öndür bai-qu geju] kele-gsen kümün
 Batu-Nom class-in Ulagan-than body-Nom/-Gen tall be-Pres.Adn that say-Past.Adn person
 ‘the person who Batu said was taller than Ulagan in the class’

Interestingly enough again, (49) is ungrammatical with a genitive subject, in contrast to (8). Remember that Mongolian has possessive pronouns (PoPs), which can save (49), as shown in (50).

- (50) Batu-ø [angqi-du t Ulayan-eče beye-ni öndür bai-qu geju] kele-gsen kümün
 Batu-Nom class-in Ulagan-than body-PoP3 tall be-Pres.Adn that say-Past.Adn person
 ‘the person who Batu said was taller than Ulagan in the class’

4. Discussion: Newly elicited data shown above indicate that Mongolian disallows genitive subjects in (i) relative clauses with an existential verb, whether or not they are gapless, (ii) relative clauses with a non-bare adjective that contain a gap and (iii) relative clauses with a bare adjective. Let us consider then what these findings might suggest for the theory of (Mongolian) syntax. **First**, the fact that Mongolian disallows genitive subjects in gapless relative clauses with bare adjectives, while it allows them with non-bare adjectives, indicates (i) that bare adjectives in Mongolian are in principle in the conclusive form, and do not possess the adnominal form, and (ii) that the two conditions on genitive subject licensing in Mongolian in (12) are both necessary. In (35), the adjective is bare, and is adjacent to the relative head *učir* ‘fact.’ If genitive subject licensing in Mongolian only relies on c-commanding nominal elements, (12a) should be sufficient. However, since (35) does not allow a genitive subject, it must be assumed that the bare adjective in (35) does not contribute to genitive subject licensing. Then, we are led to assume that the conjugational form of the predicate is also crucial for genitive subject licensing in Mongolian, and to conclude that the condition in (12b) is also necessary for genitive subject licensing in Mongolian. When the bare adjective is followed by a copula, as in (36), the complex predicate (made out of the bare adjective and the copula) is in the adnominal form, which then contributes to genitive subject licensing along with a nominal head in such an example. This provides a piece of evidence for Maki et al.’s (2016) claim for the two conditions in (12). Furthermore, the fact that “long distance” genitive licensing is not allowed in gapless relative clauses in Mongolian, as shown in (46), for example, also provides a piece of evidence for the locality condition in (12a), because in such an example, the genitive subject cannot be locally associated with the relative head, as there is no gap that corresponds to the relative head. The question arises here as to why the Japanese counterpart of (35) shown in (51) is possible with a genitive subject, given Maki et al.’s (2016) claim that both Mongolian and Japanese obey the same conditions on genitive subject licensing in (12), and the differences between the two languages arise from the environments in which the adnominal form of a predicate may appear.

- (51) kurasu-de Hanako-ga/-no ichiban kashikoi koto
 class-in Hanako-Nom/-Gen best smart fact ‘the fact that Hanako is the smartest in the class’

In (51), the predicate *kashikoi* ‘smart’ looks like a bare adjective, which we have seen cannot license genitive subjects in Mongolian. However, old Japanese examples show that the adjective in (51) is not actually bare, but is in a concealed adnominal form. In old Japanese, the adjective in (51) conjugates depending on the environments where it appears. Therefore, it appears in the conclusive form *-shi* ‘Pres.Con’ at the sentence-final position, as shown in (52), and in the adnominal form *-ki* ‘Pres.Adn’ in front of a nominal expression, as shown in (53).

- (52) ..., *kashiko-shi*. (53) *Kashiko-ki mono-wa*, ...
 smart-Pres.Con ‘...smart.’ smart-Pres.Adn person-Top
 (Makura-no Sooshi (105-03 Joo)) ‘The person who is smart (is...)’ (Makura-no Sooshi (081-11 Ge))

In the course of the history of the Japanese language, the voiceless palato-alveolar sibilant [ʃ] represented as *sh* in *-shi* ‘Pres.Con’ and the voiceless velar stop [k] represented as *k* in *-ki* ‘Pres.Adn’ disappeared, as (54)–(55) show, and they look identical at the present day Japanese. See Nishiyama (1999) for precise structures of adjectives in modern Japanese.

- (54) *Taroo-wa kashiko-i*. (55) *kashiko-i hito*
 Taroo-Top smart-Pres.Con ‘Taro is smart.’ smart-Pres.Adn person ‘the person who is smart’

However, the conclusive form/adnominal form distinction has been abstractly held. Given this, the fact that the genitive subject is allowed in (51) is precisely predicted, as it is locally c-commanded by the relative head, and is in a local relation with the adnominal form of the adjective. **Second**, the fact that Mongolian disallows genitive subjects in relative clauses with an existential verb, whether or not they are gapless, and in relative clauses with an adjective that have a gap suggests that independently of the conditions on genitive subject licensing in (12), there is a restriction on the position of a genitive subject in Mongolian, such as (56).

- (56) A genitive subject is only allowed in the Spec of T.

To see what this means, let us consider the basic word order of sentences with an existential verb. Janhunen (2012: 232), among others, states that “for reasons connected with the pragmatic structure of the clause (topicalization), the adverbial modifier (locative adverbial), when present, often occupies the initial position, while the subject is placed between it and the predicate.” Therefore, an example such as (15) will have a structure like (57).

- (57) Locative PP Subject Existential Verb

Kuno (1973) reports that the basic structure of an existential clause in Japanese is also as in (57). Therefore, it is not implausible to assume that the basic structure of an existential clause in Mongolian and Japanese is something like (57).

Let us further assume that the subject in the existential clause is placed within VP, not in the Spec of T, as it is not agentive at all, unlike the subject of a transitive verb, following Baker (1988) and Chomsky (1995). Baker (1988: 46) proposes the Uniformity of Theta-Assignment Hypothesis (UTAH), which states that the identical thematic relationships between predicates and their arguments are syntactically represented by identical structural relationships between those items at the level of D-structure. Since the subject of an existential sentence cannot be agentive, it must be generated in a lower position than the one filled by a true agentive subject, which should be *vP* SPEC (Chomsky (1995: 315–316)). Then, (57) will have a structure like (58).

- (58) [_{TP} Locative PP [_{VP} Subject Existential Verb]]

Then, the subject of the relative clause in the example in (17) *telvis* ‘TV’ is not in the Spec of T, but within VP. The position of the subject of the relative clause in (17) *telvis* ‘TV’ will remain the same, when the possessor of the subject is relativized, as shown in (19). Then, in (19), the subject is again not in the Spec of T, but within VP. The same will be true to the subject position of a clause with an adjective that expresses the state of the body part of the subject, such as (33). (33) contains two nominative phrases. Just like the subject in existential clauses, the lower subject in (33) is not agentive at all. Therefore, it is not implausible to assume that it is located within VP, not in the Spec of T. Then, just like the structure in (19), the position of the lower subject in (33) *beye* ‘body’ will remain the same, when the possessor of the lower subject *kūmūn* ‘man’ is relativized, as shown in (39). If the above argument is correct, the examples in (17), (19) and (39) indicate that a genitive subject is not allowed within VP in Mongolian.

The fact that the Transitivity Restriction does not hold in Mongolian also fits the generalization derived from (56). Examples such as (59) indicate that the Transitivity Restriction, which prohibits co-occurrence of an accusative DP with a genitive DP (Harada (1971), Miyagawa (1993, 2011), Ochi (2009) and Watanabe (1996), among others), does not apply to the distribution of genitive subjects in Mongolian, since genitive subjects may appear, whether or not they co-occur with accusative objects. Compare the Mongolian (59) with the Japanese (60).

- (59) [öçügedür Baγatur-ø/-un Ulaγan-i mayta-γsan] uçir ‘the fact that Bagatur praised
 yesterday Bagatur-Nom/-Gen Ulaγan-Acc praise-Past.Adn fact Ulaγan yesterday.’

- (60) [kinoo Taroo-ga/*-no Hanako-o home-ta] koto
 yesterday Taro-Nom/-Gen Hanako-Acc praise-Past fact ‘the fact that Taro praised Hanako yesterday’

In (60), the predicate in the relative clause is a transitive verb *homer* ‘to praise,’ and the subject and object are marked nominative *-ga* and accusative *-o*, respectively. However, in this configuration, a genitive subject is not allowed in Japanese. The effect of the Transitivity Restriction is, therefore, that the subject cannot be marked genitive as long as the object is marked accusative. In contrast, in the Mongolian (59), the subject is marked genitive, and the object is marked accusative, simultaneously, which indicates that the Transitivity Restriction does not apply to the distribution of genitive subjects in Mongolian. This in turn indicates that the genitive subject in (59) should be in the Spec of T, as shown in (61), where it is properly licensed.

(61) [TP NP-Gen [_{VP} [_{VP} NP-Acc V] _v]]N

Let us then consider whether the proposed condition in (56) can properly deal with the examples with a subject in the form of NP's N, such as (38). (38) allows a genitive subject for the adjective *öndür bai-qu* 'tall be-Pres.Adn.' However, as seen above, the same adjective does not allow a genitive subject in a relative clause with a gap, as shown in (39). In (39), the subject *beye* 'body' is considered to be within VP, as the Spec of T is occupied by the trace/resumptive pronoun of the relative head *kümün* 'person.' Therefore, a genitive subject is not allowed in (39). In (38), however, the subject is allowed to be in the genitive form *Bayatur-un beye* 'Bagatur-Gen body,' in spite of the fact that the head of the subject is *beye* 'body,' just as in (39). This fact, we claim, suggests that the genitive subject in (38), not in (39), may move to the Spec of T, as the position is not occupied by any other element in the sentence, so that the subject in that position can be genitive under the condition in (56). On the other hand, in (39), the Spec of T has been occupied by the trace/resumptive pronoun of the relative head, which blocks movement of the lower subject into this position. Therefore, (39) does not allow a genitive subject. The hypothesis that the Spec of T, when unoccupied by any element in the sentence, can be used by a genitive subject in Mongolian is also supported in taking into consideration examples that involve an unaccusative verb such as *kür* 'to arrive,' as shown in (62).

(62) [öcügedür Bayatur-ø/-un Tookyo-du kürü-gsen] čay 'the time when Bagatur arrived at Tokyo
yesterday Bagatur-Nom/-Gen Tokyo-at arrive-Past.Adn time yesterday'

The subject of an unaccusative verb is not agentive. Therefore, it must be generated in a lower position than the one filled by a true agentive subject, which should be *vP SPEC*, given Baker (1988 : 46) and Chomsky (1995: 315-316). However, if the genitive subject *Bayatur-un* 'Bagatur-Gen' remains within VP, (62) with a genitive subject would be incorrectly predicted to be ungrammatical. Therefore, at some point in the derivation, the genitive subject will be in the Spec of T. Now in (62), since the Spec of T is not occupied by any other element in the sentence, it should be available for the genitive subject. Note here that the Japanese counterparts of the Mongolian examples in (17), (19) and (39) are all grammatical with a genitive subject, as shown in (63)–(65).

(63) kono ie-ni terebi-ga/-no aru koto
this house-in TV-Nom/-Gen be-Pres.Adn fact 'the fact that there is a TV set in this house'

(64) *t* terebi-ga/-no aru ie
TV-Nom/-Gen be-Pres.Adn house 'the house which has a TV set'

(65) kurasu-de *t* Hanako-yori se-ga/-no taka-i hito 'the person who is the taller than
class-in Hanako-than body-Nom/-Gen tall-Pres.Adn person Hanako in the class'

Taking into consideration Kim's (2009) observation of the distribution of genitive subjects in Japanese, Miyagawa (2011: 1277) claims that a genitive subject may appear with a defective T, and the clause with a genitive subject is "aspectually limited to stative interpretations, where the stative may be the actual Aktionsart of the predicate or the result of an eventuality." Since in Japanese, a nominative subject, not a genitive subject, may co-occur with an accusative object in a relative clause, as shown in (60), and a nominative subject as well as a genitive subject may co-occur with a stative predicate, as shown in (65), the size of a relative clause in Japanese varies according to the nature of the subject, as summarized in (66).

(66) a. A relative clause with a nominative subject is a projection of a (non-)defective T.
b. A relative clause with a genitive subject is a projection of a defective T. (Japanese)

In contrast, since the Transitivity Restriction does not hold in Mongolian, and a nominative subject as well as a genitive subject may co-occur with a stative predicate, (66) should be something like (67) in Mongolian.

(67) A relative clause is a projection of a (non-)defective T. (Mongolian)

Accordingly, the restriction in (56) should be slightly revised, as shown in (68).

(68) A genitive subject is only allowed in the Spec of T, whether T is defective or not. (Mongolian)

5. Conclusion: This paper found that Mongolian disallows genitive subjects in (i) relative clauses with an existential verb, whether or not they are gapless, (ii) relative clauses with a non-bare adjective that contain a gap and (iii) relative clauses with a bare adjective, whether or not they are gapless. These findings suggest four things. **First**, the fact that sentences with a bare adjective disallow a genitive subject in Mongolian suggests that bare adjectives in Mongolian are in principle in the conclusive form. **Second**, bare adjective examples in Mongolian provide another piece of evidence for Maki et al.'s (2016) claim that the two conditions on genitive subject licensing in Mongolian in (12) are both necessary. **Third**, Japanese and Mongolian have a different size of a relative clause with a genitive subject. While a relative clause with a genitive subject in Japanese is a projection of a defective T, the one in Mongolian can be a projection of a non-defective T. **Fourth**, and finally, examples with existential verbs and adjectives examined in this paper suggest that Mongolian requires the third condition in (68).

Selected References: Janhunee, Juha A. (2012) *Mongolian*, John Benjamins, Amsterdam. Koten Soogoo Kenkyuujo (2017) <http://genji.co.jp/> Maki, Hideki, Lina Bao, Wurigumula Bao and Megumi Hasebe (2016) "Scrambling and Genitive Subjects in Mongolian," *English Linguistics* 33, 1–35. Maki, Hideki, Lina Bao and Megumi Hasebe (2015) *Essays on Mongolian Syntax*, Kaitakusha, Tokyo.

* We are indebted to Jessica Dunton and Michael Sevier for their helpful comments on an earlier version of this paper. All errors are our own. Research by the second author was supported in part by JSPS KAKENHI Grant Number 16K02623 to Gifu University.