

Successive cyclicity in DPs: Evidence from Mongolian nominalized clauses¹

Athulya Aravind, MIT

June 13, 2019

1 Introduction

A well-established property of long-distance movement is that it is *successive cyclic*: phrasal movement of an XP from its base position to the one where it is pronounced takes place in a series of shorter steps. This punctuated nature of movement is often tied to phasehood. Phases are taken to be special in that they (i) may provide intermediate positions along the path of successive cyclic movement where moving XPs can stop off and (ii) force XPs to land in these positions by virtue of being opaque domains otherwise. By now, there is a growing body of evidence that long-distance movement stops off at the edge of each intervening CP (Henry, 1995; McCloskey, 2002; Torrego, 1984) and vP (Bruening, 2001; Rackowski and Richards, 2005; van Urk, 2015) (see Citko 2014 for an overview). However, there is debate as to whether DP, another purported phasal domain, hosts escape hatches and allows intermediate movement through its edge (Bach and Horn, 1976; Chomsky, 1973; Cinque, 1980; Gavruseva, 2000; Giorgi and Longobardi, 1991; Matushansky, 2005; Svenonius, 2004; Szabolcsi, 1994; Tellier, 1991). On the one hand, Complex Noun Phrase Constraint effects as in (1) may be taken to show that DPs lack an escape hatch.

- (1) a. Where_{*i*} did you hear [CP that Mary bought a house *t_i*] ?
b. *Where_{*i*} did you hear [DP a rumor that Mary bought a house *t_i*] ?

On the other hand, left-branch extraction facts crosslinguistically have been argued to show

¹All uncredited data are from original fieldwork with two informants, Urandari Byambadalai and Buyandelger Manduhai; I am grateful to them for sharing their language with me. In addition, U. Byambadalai reviewed the transliterations for accuracy and conformity to orthographic conventions. Thank you to three reviewers for detailed comments on versions of the paper. My thanks also to David Pesetsky, Norvin Richards and Coppe van Urk for helpful comments and feedback.

the opposite (Cinque, 1980; Gavruseva, 2000; Giorgi and Longobardi, 1991; Szabolcsi, 1984, 1994). For instance, Szabolcsi (1994) shows for Hungarian that only possessors that appear to the left of determiners when non-extracted can undergo movement from their containing DP. She and others (e.g. Gavruseva 2000) have tied this to the availability of an escape hatch position within DP. Similarly, in Romance, only those arguments that can be possessivized can move out of the DP, which has also been taken to show that XPs must pass through Spec, DP in order to move out of the phase (Cinque, 1980; Giorgi and Longobardi, 1991). However, such interpretation of these facts is not uncontroversial. Left-branch extraction data have been analyzed by others as showing instead the *absence* of a D-layer altogether (Bošković, 2005, 2014; Uriagereka, 1998). Thus, the question remains: does DP allow — and require — movement of phase-internal material through its edge?

In this paper, I present novel evidence from Mongolian (Mongolic) showing that movement happens successive cyclically from at least some DPs. Nominalizations in Mongolian require \bar{A} -movement out of them to stop off at [Spec, DP]. Supporting evidence comes from unexpected interactions between embedded subject case and movement. Subjects of these nominalized clauses can ordinarily receive nominative (NOM), genitive (GEN) or accusative (ACC) case. The subject of a nominalized clause receives accusative case if it occupies Spec, DP, but movement from within the clause disrupts this case possibility. Specifically, (i) ACC on the subject of a nominalized clause is impossible when a non-subject undergoes movement out of that DP, and (ii) ACC is impossible on the subject of any intermediate nominalized clause which is crossed by movement. I argue that the (un)availability of ACC-case marking is a reflex of successive-cyclicity in DPs: when ACC on a nominalized clause subject is blocked, it signals that the edge of that DP has been targeted for intermediate movement. More broadly, these results lead to the conclusion that [Spec, DP] serves as a landing site for intermediate movement in at least some DPs and suggest that phases of any category can, in principle, provide escape hatches for movement out of them.

2 Mongolian Nominalized Clauses and Subject Case

2.1 Nominalized clauses are nominals

Subordinate clauses in Mongolian are ordinarily headed by the complementizer *gež* (2). But in addition, a range of embedding predicates, including verbs of perception (*xarsax* ‘see’, *sonsax* ‘hear’), (certain) cognitive factives (*medex* ‘know’, *olč medex* ‘find out’) and verbs of saying (*xelsex* ‘tell’), take nominalized complements. Though an overt nominalizer is absent, the nominal nature of these clauses is illustrated by the fact that they are obligatorily case marked (3), can be complements of prepositions (4), and may appear in subject positions (5). CPs in this language do not show any of these properties.

- (2) Bi [Bat sugalaa-nd hož-son gež] med-ne/bod-dog
I [Bat lottery-DAT win-PAST C] know-DUR/think-HAB
‘I know/think that Bat won the lottery.’

(3) *Nominalized complements must bear case; CPs cannot.*

- a. Bi [Bat sugalaa-nd xož-son]*(-iig) med-ne
I [Bat lottery-DAT win-PAST]*(-ACC) know-DUR
‘I know Bat won the lottery.’ *ACC-marked nominalization*
- b. Bi [Dorž övč-tai bai-gaa]*(-d) harams-san
I [Dorj sick-COM be-IMPRF]*(-DAT) regret-PAST
‘I regretted that Dorj is sick.’ *DAT-marked nominalization*
- c. Bi [Bat sugalaa-nd xož-son gež](*-iig) med-ne
I [Bat lottery-DAT win-PAST C](*-ACC) know-DUR
‘I know that Bat won the lottery.’ *CP*

(4) *Nominalized complements can complement prepositions; CPs cannot.*

- a. Bid [Naraa büžigle-sen] tuxai jar’-san
We [Naraa dance-PAST] about talk-PAST
‘We talked about Naraa having danced.’ *nominalization*
- b. *Bid [Naraa büžigle-sen gež] tuxai jar’-san
We [Naraa dance-PAST C] about talk-PAST
‘We talked about that Naraa had danced.’ *CP*

- (5) *Nominalized complements can be subjects; CPs cannot*
- a. [Bat xöl-öö xögal-san]-n' mede-gd-sen
 [Bat.NOM leg-REFL break]-PAST]-3.POSS know-PASS-PAST
 'That Bat broke his leg is known.' *nominalization*
- b. *[Bat xöl-öö xögal-san gež](-n') mede-gd-sen
 [Bat.NOM leg-REFL break]-PAST C]-(3.POSS) know-PASS-PAST
 'That Bat broke his leg is known.' *CP*

2.2 Subject Case Alternations

Subjects of nominalized embedded clauses may be case-marked in one of three ways: with NOM (unmarked), GEN (-*iin/nii*) or ACC (-(*ii*)*g*).

- (6) Bi Bat/Bat-**iin**/Bat-**iig** sugalaa-nd xož-son-iig med-ne
 I Bat.NOM/Bat-GEN/Bat-ACC lottery-DAT win-PAST-ACC know-DUR
 'I know that Bat won the lottery.'

Though seemingly in free variation, when we look beyond the basic cases, we find syntactic environments where one or the other case morphology is blocked. I take these asymmetries to reflect differences in the syntactic position of the nominal in question, as schematized in Figure 1.² Evidence for such structural differences among differently case-marked subjects come from specificity effects, NPI licensing facts, and variability in case-possibilities depending on the syntactic position of the clause. I elaborate on these arguments below.




Figure 1: Assumed structure

²The assumed syntax is in the spirit of Abney (1987) and Borsley and Kornfilt (2000) in taking nominalizations to involve a verbal projection dominated by a nominal projection.

2.2.1 NOM vs. GEN/ACC

Case on subject nominals varies as a function of specificity. For instance, a non-specific indefinite subject of a nominalized clause can only bear NOM (7). Pronouns, on the other hand, show the opposite pattern in disallowing NOM (8).³

(7) *Only NOM is possible on non-specific indefinites*

Bi [xen negen/*negen-ii/*negen-iig Naraa-g zur-sn]-iig
 1.NOM who one.NOM/*one-GEN/*one-ACC Naraa-ACC draw-PAST-ACC
 med-ež bai-na
 know-CV be
 ‘I know that someone drew Naraa.’ (but I don’t know who.)

(8) *Pronouns cannot be NOM*

- a. Naraa [minii/namaig/*bi bužigle-x-iig] xar-san
 Naraa 1.GEN/1.ACC/*1.NOM dance-FUT-ACC see-PAST
 ‘Naraa saw me dance.’
- b. Naraa [činii/čamaig/*či bužigle-x-iig] xar-san
 Naraa 2.GEN/2.ACC/*2.NOM dance-FUT-ACC see-PAST
 ‘Naraa saw you dance.’
- c. Naraa [tüüniitüüniig/*ter bužigle-x-iig] xar-san
 Naraa 3.GEN/3.ACC/*3.NOM dance-FUT-ACC see-PAST
 ‘Naraa saw him dance.’

These patterns provide indirect evidence that GEN/ACC-marked subjects are structurally higher than NOM subjects. More specifically, a NOM subject remains in the vP-internal position where it is generated, whereas GEN/ACC subjects move out of this position (see Asarina 2011 and Gribanova 2017 for similar claims about Uyghur and Uzbek respec-

³There is an interesting contrast between pronouns and proper names, in that the latter may appear with NOM case. Differential Object Marking in Mongolian does not exhibit this contrast in specificity, and requires ACC on both proper names and pronouns (i).

- (i) a. Bat namaig/*bi xar-san
 Bat 1.ACC/*1.NOM see-PAST
 ‘Bat saw me.’
- b. Bat Naraa*(-g) xar-san
 Bat Naraa*(-ACC) see-PAST
 ‘Bat saw Naraa.’

tively). Following Diesing (1992), Diesing and Jelinek (1995) and much work since, the interpretational differences between specific and non-specific nominals can be treated as a consequence of their relative position with respect to an Existential Closure operator. The specificity effects discussed above follow if Existential Closure occurs immediately above vP (and below nP), such that vP -internal subjects remain in the scope of this operator. Any indefinite that receives an existential interpretation must be in the scope of Existential Closure. Moreover, since Existential Closure is taken to be unselective (Heim, 1982), any nominal that introduces a free variable and must not receive an existential interpretation, e.g. referring pronouns, must move out of its scope.

It is important to note that while specificity and case-marking are often linked, case-marking differences cannot be reduced entirely to the semantic property of specificity (*contra* e.g. Guntsetseg 2010, 2016). There are certain non-specific indefinites, namely those formed with the focus particle *-ch*, which can be non-nominative.⁴

- (9) Bi [neg-č xün/xün-ii/% xün-iig üx-sen]-iig tüünd
 1.NOM \exists -FOC person.NOM/person-GEN/person-ACC) die-PAST-ACC 3.DAT
 xel-ee-güi
 say-IMPRF-NEG
 ‘I didn’t say, for one or more persons who have died, that they died.’⁵

In the presence of clause-mate negation, these indefinites receive an NPI interpretation. Crucially, in such environments, the subject can only bear NOM (10).

- (10) *Only NOM is possible on NPIs licensed by same-clause negation*
 Bi [neg-č xün/*xün-ii/*xün-iig Naraa-d
 1.NOM \exists -FOC person.NOM/*person-GEN/*person-ACC Naraa-DAT
 tusl-aa-güi]-g čamd xel-sen
 help-IMPRF-NEG-ACC 2.DAT say-PAST
 ‘I told you that no one helped Naraa.’

⁴One reason for the differential behavior of these indefinites could be that their existential force is contributed by the particle *-č* and thus they do not need to be in the scope of \exists -closure.

⁵The diacritic % is used to indicate points of speaker variation.

This restriction follows from the posited positional asymmetry between NOM and GEN/ACC subjects. The syntactic position of the negative morpheme *-gui*, when it appears in nominalizations, is structurally higher than *vP*, but, crucially, lower than *nP*. This is a direct consequence of the selectional properties of the morpheme, which is restricted to the verbal/clausal domain and cannot compose with nominals in the first place. As a result, only a *vP*-internal indefinite — which is NOM-marked — would be in the right position to display NPI-hood.

2.2.2 GEN vs. ACC

GEN and ACC subjects pattern together in most environments, but the availability of ACC on a subject, crucially, is limited to nominalizations in complement position. When the nominalized embedded clause appears in subject position, ACC is unavailable (11).

- (11) [Bat/Bat-**iin**/*Bat-**iig** xöl-öö xögal-san]-n' mede-gd-sen
 Bat.NOM/GEN/*ACC leg-REFL break-PAST-3.POSS know-PASS-PAST
 'That Bat broke his leg is known.'

This suggests that the licensing of ACC on embedded subjects depends on the presence of some higher-clause element. An ACC-marked subject has not, however, overtly raised into the higher clause, as argued to at length in Klein et al. 2012; von Heusinger et al. 2011 and Guntsetseg 2016. For instance, subjects of adjunct nominalizations can bear ACC (12).

- (12) Tujaa [**Bat-(iig)** jav-sn]-ii daraa ir-sen
 Tujaa Bat-(ACC) go-PAST-GEN after come-PAST
 'Tujaa came after Bat went.' (Guntsetseg 2016, p. 159, ex. 363)

Moreover, an ACC-mark subject cannot be interrupted from the rest of the nominalized clause by matrix elements (13) or stranded when the nominalized clause containing it undergoes scrambling (14). Thus, what we have here is not classical Raising-to-Object.

- (13) a. Bi tsonx-oor [šaar-**iig** xagar-ax]-iig xar-san
 I window-ABL [balloon-ACC pop-FUT]-ACC see-PAST

‘I saw the balloon pop through the window’

- b. ***Bi šaar-iig**; tsonx-oor [t_i xagar-ax]-iig xar-san
I balloon-ACC window-ABL [pop-FUT]-ACC see-PAST
Intended: ‘I saw the balloon pop through the window’
- (14) a. **Bi [Bat-iig sugalaa-nd xož-son]-iig med-ne**
I [Bat-ACC lottery-DAT win-PAST]-ACC know-DUR
‘I know that Bat won the lottery.’
- b. **[Bat-iig sugalaa-nd xož-son]-iig bi med-ne**
[Bat-ACC lottery-DAT win-PAST]-ACC I know-DUR
- c. *[t_i sugalaa-nd xož-son]-iig bi **Bat-iig**; med-ne
[lottery-DAT win-PAST]-ACC I Bat-ACC know-DUR

The resulting picture, then, is one where ACC-marked subjects must stay within the clause, but also establish a dependency with some higher clause element that licenses ACC-case. Given the phasehood of DPs, the only position where material internal to them are visible for operations outside the phase is the edge, i.e. [Spec, DP]. Therefore, I propose that ACC-case can be licensed only on nominals that move to this peripheral position. Thus, whereas both GEN and ACC-marked DPs have vacated their v P-internal position, ACC-subjects, by virtue of being at the DP-edge, are structurally higher than GEN-subjects.

For the purposes of this paper, it is not important how subject case is licensed, as long as the DP in question is forced to be at the phase-edge to receive ACC. Two prominent families of theories of case — head-licensing approaches (Chomsky, 1981, 2000, 2001) and configurational approaches (Baker and Vinokurova, 2010; Bittner and Hale, 1996; Levin and Preminger, 2015; Marantz, 1991) — make the same predictions regarding this requirement. Consider first theories that attribute case assignment to dedicated functional heads. ACC-case on embedded subjects may be thought as being exceptionally licensed by a higher-clause v . On a configurational approach, ACC case is a manifestation of *dependent case*, assigned to a DP if it is c-commanded by another DP within some local domain. ACC on embedded subjects could arise because the nominal in question may be in the same

case-competition domain as the higher-clause subject (Baker, 2015; Baker and Vinokurova, 2010). Importantly, on either approach, subjects receiving ACC must be local to some higher, clause-external element, either the higher ν or the higher subject, a requirement that is met only by subjects at the phase-edge.⁶

To sum up, I have suggested that NOM-marked subjects of nominalized clauses remain within the ν P domain, whereas GEN and ACC subjects occupy higher, derived positions. Because ACC-licensing requires that the relevant nominal be accessible to elements outside of the DP-phase, I proposed that ACC-subjects raise to Spec, DP. In the following section, I will argue that the availability of ACC case is a diagnostic of successive cyclicity in these nominalized clauses. The logic of the argumentation is as follows. Suppose a nominalized clause that otherwise permits ACC-subjects loses its ability to host such DPs when movement has taken place. This would indicate that the moving XP lands in [Spec, DP] on its way to its final landing site, in turn making this ACC-position unavailable for subjects.

⁶There are both conceptual and empirical evidence that favors a configurational view of case. First, the fact that ACC often shows up twice — on a nominalized complement clause *and* its subject — is difficult to explain on a head-licensing view without further stipulations (e.g. case-spreading or multiple-agree). On the configurational view, this is unproblematic: the two relevant nominals, by virtue of being c-commanded by a higher nominal in the same case domain, meet the criteria for dependent ACC assignment. Second, as shown in (i), certain predicates like *get angry* cannot license Accusative case. However, as (ii) shows, when such a predicate takes a nominalized clause as its complement, the subject of that nominalization can nevertheless receive ACC case.

- (i) Naraa xüüxed-ed/*iig uurla-san
 Naraa child-DAT/*ACC become.angry-PAST
 ‘Naraa got angry at the child.’
- (ii) Naraa [xüüxed-iig/*et bagš-iig-aa xaz-san]-d uurla-san
 Naraa [child-ACC/*DAT teacher-ACC-REFL bite-PAST]-DAT become.angry-PAST
 ‘Naraa got angry because the child bit his teacher.’

On a head-licensing approach, the head that assigns objective case would be one that is as unable to assign ACC. But if this is so, the availability of ACC on the embedded subject is surprising, given the absence of a suitable ACC-licenser in the verbal domain of the higher clause in the first place.

3 Successive cyclicity in nominalized clauses

My evidence relies on contrastive topicalization involving the marker *bol*. (15) shows that *bol*-topicalization reconstructs for binding. Anaphors in Mongolian must be c-commanded by a local antecedent, as shown by the ungrammaticality of (15-a); topicalization does not disrupt otherwise grammatical binding relations, as shown in (15-b) vs. (15-c).

(15) *Reconstruction for Principle A*

- a. *[Bat-iig sugalaa-nd xož-son ge-deg]-t öör-öö itge-sen
Bat-ACC lottery-DAT win-PAST C-HAB-DAT self.NOM-REFL believe-PAST
'Himself believed that Bat won the lottery.'
- b. Bat [öör-iig-öö sugalaa-nd xož-son ge-deg]-t itge-sen
Bat self-ACC-REFL lottery-DAT win-PAST C-HAB-DAT believe-PAST
'Bat believed that he won the lottery.'
- c. [öör-iig-öö sugalaa-nd xož-son ge-deg]-t bol itge-sen
self-ACC-REFL lottery-DAT win-PAST C-HAB-DAT TOP believe-PAST
'As for (the news) that he won the lottery, Bat believed it.'

The examples that follow illustrate the \bar{A} -properties of topicalization, in particular island-sensitivity and the ability to take place long-distance. Relative clauses in Mongolian are introduced by a null relativizer, but word-order frequently makes clear that relativization has taken place (16). They are islands in this language, and as shown in (17), topicalization cannot take place out of them. Topicalization that violates the coordinate structure constraint is also banned (17-b). Finally, as shown in (17-c), topicalization can take place across a clause-boundary.

(16) *Relative clauses in Mongolian*

- a. Xün ene zaxia-g bič-sen
person this letter-ACC write-PAST
'A person wrote this letter.'
- b. ene zaxia-g bič-sen xün
this letter-ACC write-PAST hun
'The person who wrote this letter.'

(17) *Topicalization shows \bar{A} -properties*

- a. *Ene zaxia-g bol t bič-sen- \emptyset xün-iig bi xar-san
This letter-ACC TOP write-PAST-REL person-ACC I saw-PAST
Intended: ‘As for this letter, I saw the person who wrote it.’
- b. *Ene zaxia-g bol bi t bič-sen bögööd ter zaxia-g unš-san
This letter-ACC TOP I write-PAST and that letter-ACC read-PAST
Intended: ‘As for this letter, I wrote it and I read that letter.’
- c. ene zaxia-g bol Bat [Naraa t bič-sen gež] xel-sen
this letter-ACC TOP Bat Naraa write-PAST C say-PAST
‘As for this letter, Bat said that Naraa wrote it.’

3.1 Topicalization from nominalizations

Constituents inside nominalized embedded clauses can be extracted by topicalization, but this movement interacts with subject case, whether or not it is the subject itself that is topicalized. First, if an embedded subject of a nominalized clause is topicalized, it must bear ACC case. The baseline in (18) shows that the subject of the nominalized clause can be marked NOM, GEN or ACC.⁷ In (19), however, the embedded subject undergoes topicalization and only ACC is possible.⁸

- (18) Bi [Bat/[?]Bat-iin/[?]Bat-iig ene nom-iig unš-san]-iig olž-med-sen
I Bat.NOM/Bat-GEN/Bat-ACC this book read-PAST-ACC find.out-PAST
‘I found out that Bat read this book.’

⁷There is a slight dispreference for the marked cases in the baseline example, due to adjacency to a marked object (see discussion in Guntsetseg 2016).

⁸If ACC is independently unavailable on the subject, e.g. when the clause is in subject position, topicalization does not change the situation. When the nominalization itself is in subject position and ACC is impossible, the next highest case available, i.e. GEN, is what shows up on the extracted subject.

- (i) Bat-iin/*Bat bol xöl-öö xogal-san-n’ mede-gd-sen
Bat-GEN/*Bat.NOM TOP leg-REFL break-PAST-3.POSS know-PASS-PAST
‘As for Bat, it is known that he broke his leg.’

- (19) **Bat-iig_i/*Bat_i/*Bat-iin_i** bol bi [_{*t_i*} ene nom-iig unš-san]-iig
 Bat-ACC/Bat.NOM/*Bat-GEN TOP I this book-ACC read-PAST-ACC
 olž-med-sen
 find.out-PAST
 ‘As for Bat, I found out that he read this book.’

Second, if a non-subject is topicalized, the embedded subject cannot bear ACC; compare the ill-formed (a)-variants in (20) and (21), where the subject of the nominalization bears ACC, to the (b) and (c) variants, where the subject is unmarked and GEN-marked, respectively.

- (20) *Topicalization of direct object blocks ACC on subject*
 ene nom-iig_i bol bi [**Bat/Bat-iin/*Bat-iig** _{*t_i*} unš-san]-iig
 this book-ACC TOP I Bat.NOM/Bat-GEN/*Bat-ACC read-PAST-ACC
 olž-med-sen
 find.out-PAST
 ‘As for this book, I found out that Bat read it.’

- (21) *Topicalization of dative argument blocks ACC on subject*⁹
 Dorž-od bol egč [[%]Bat/[%]Bat-iin/***Bat-iig** _{*t_i*}
 Dorj-DAT TOP sister Bat.NOM/Bat-GEN/*Bat-ACC
 uurla-sn]-iig nadad xel-sen
 become.angry-PAST-ACC 1.DAT say-PAST
 ‘As for Dorj, sister told me that Bat became angry at him.’

Finally, and strikingly, extraction of a constituent from an embedded nominalized clause has ramifications for the case on the subjects of every intervening nominalized clause along the path of movement. Specifically, the subjects of these intervening clauses cannot bear ACC, even though movement did not originate from within them. The sentences in (22), for example, involve the topicalization of a deeply embedded object nominal, but the variants where *Bat* is marked ACC is unacceptable. Crucially, ACC on intermediate subjects is not blocked in (22-b), which is identical to (22-a) except that no movement has taken place. This asymmetry confirms that it is indeed topicalization from the lower clause that blocks

⁹The acceptability of extracting a dative argument seems to be subject to speaker variation. However, to the extent that a speaker finds it acceptable, there is still a contrast between an ACC-marked embedded subject versus the others.

accusative case of the intermediate nominalized clause.¹⁰

(22) *Topicalization blocks ACC on intervening subjects*

Context: My mother hosted a potluck. After the potluck, she wants to know what dish was brought by whom. I'm trying to help her figure it out using whatever information I have available. I tell her that as far as the dumplings are concerned, I know that Naraa brought them. But about the horsemilk, I only have third-hand information, specifically:

- a. airag-iig bol egč [DP ✓Bat /?Bat-**iin** /*Bat-**iig** [DP Dulmaa *t_i*
 horsemilk-ACC TOP sister Bat.NOM/Bat-GEN/*Bat-ACC Dulmaa
 avčir-ex]-iig xar-sn]-iig nadad xel-sen
 bring-FUT-ACC see-PAST-ACC 1.DAT say-PAST
 'As for horsemilk, sister told me that Bat saw Dulmaa bring it.'
- b. ✓egč [Bat-**iig** [Dulmaa airag-iig avčir-ex]-iig xar-sn]-iig
 sister Bat.ACC Dulmaa horsemilk-ACC bring-FUT-ACC see-PAST-ACC
 nadad xel-sen
 1.DAT say-PAST
 'Sister told me that Bat saw Dulmaa bring horsemilk.'¹¹

To capture this observed correlation between long-distance topicalization and subject case, I propose that in Mongolian nominalized clauses, there is a single edge position, Spec, DP, where any nominal that needs to be visible to phase-external operations must move. If there is a single edge position accessible to phase-external processes, and if this is also the

¹⁰Given the correlation between subject case and specificity discussed in §2.2.1 and given that specificity is known to affect movement, one potential worry might be that the effects above are *semantic*: perhaps it is the case that (i) only specific nominals can move and (ii) specific nominals block movement over them. The example below, however, shows neither is the case. In (i), a non-specific object DP (the indefinite *xegen ayaga* 'some cups' has undergone topicalization over a specific subject (a proper name), *Naraa*.

- (i) a. Naraa xeden ayaga ugaa-san
 Naraa some cups wash-PAST
 'Naraa washed some cups.'
- b. [xeden ayaga]_i bol Naraa *t_i* ugaa-san
 some cups TOP Naraa wash-PAST
 'As for some cups, Naraa washed them.'

¹¹The complexity, including the multiple center-embeddings, makes this a rather unwieldy and unnatural sentence, which native speakers do not use in their everyday speech. Most crucial for us, however, is that it is grammatical and contrasts with the ungrammatical counterpart in (22-a).

only position in which the subject of a nominalized clause receives accusative case, the correlations discussed above are predicted and explained.¹²

3.2 Further evidence: Binding

A number of authors have argued that the binding domain for Condition A should be stated in terms of phases (Hicks, 2009; Lee-Schoenfeld, 2008; Safir, 2014): an anaphor can be bound outside of its own phase only if it is located at the edge of that phase. If what I have argued thus far is on the right track, we expect that only XPs that occupy [Spec, DP], i.e. ACC-marked subjects, are able to be bound by an element outside of the nominalization. Moreover, if movement out of a nominalization must proceed through [Spec, DP], as argued in the previous subsection, it is also expected that such cross-phasal binding can never co-occur with topicalization. Below, I show that these predictions are borne out.¹³

To express possession on a DP whose possessor is an element within the same sentence, Mongolian utilizes the reflexive possessive suffix *-AA* (subject to vowel harmony) (23).

- (23) Naraa najz-(iig)-aa ur'-san
 Naraa friend.NOM-(ACC)-REFL invite-PAST
 'Naraa_i invited her_i friend.'

¹²One argument for uniqueness of the edge position in nominalizations comes from the unavailability of multiple topicalization from them, even though it is generally possible in the language. Consider the contrast between (a), in which two constituents have been topicalized from a simplex sentence, and (b), in which a minimally different clause appears as an embedded nominalization.

- (i) a. Bat_i bol Naraa-tai_k bol [_{*t_i t_k*} ix xereld-deg bai-san]
 Bat TOP Naraa-COM TOP big argue-HAB be-PAST
 'As for Bat and Naraa, he argued with her a lot.'
 b. *Bat-iig_i bol Naraa-tai_k bol [Dulmaa nadad [_{DP *t_i t_k*} ix xereld-deg bai-gaa]-g
 Bat-ACC TOP Naraa-COM TOP Dulmaa 1.DAT big argue-HAB be-IMPRF]-ACC
 xel-sen]
 say-PAST
 Intended: 'As for Bat and Naraa, Dulmaa told me he argued with her a lot.'

¹³GEN-marked subjects seem to be marginally acceptable in cross-phasal binding configurations, contra to what is predicted. One possibility is that such cases involve smaller structures, e.g. a *nP*, which do not constitute a phase. Exploring this hypothesis in more details takes us too far afield, so at present, I will focus on the ACC vs. NOM contrast and leave the puzzle of GEN-subjects for later work.

Cross-clausal binding of a reflexive possessive-marked nominal inside a nominalized clause is possible, but in such cases, NOM is not possible (24). Moreover, if the antecedent is the subject of a higher nominalization, it *must* be NOM-marked. Thus in (25), the subject of the intermediate embedded clause, which binds the reflexive possessor-marked subject of the most deeply embedded nominalization, cannot appear with GEN or ACC case.

- (24) Bat [naiz-iig-aa/*naiz-aa ene noxoi-g šalga-sn]-iig
 Bat friend-ACC-REFL/*friend.NOM-REFL this dog-ACC examine-PAST-ACC
 olž-med-sen
 find.out-PAST
 ‘Bat found out that his friend examined this dog.’
- (25) Bi [_{DP} Bat/*Bat-iin/Bat-iig [_{DP} naiz-iig-aa una-sn]-iig
 I.NOM Bat.NOM/*Bat-GEN/*Bat-ACC friend-ACC-REFL fall-PAST-ACC
 olž-med-sen]-iig son-son
 find.out-PAST-ACC hear-PAST
 ‘I heard that Bat_i found out that his_i friend fell.’

What these patterns show is that reflexive-possessive binding in Mongolian requires a highly local relation between the antecedent and the reflexive. In (25) for example, the only way for this relation to be successful is if the antecedent remains within the higher ν P phase, and the anaphor is at the edge of the lower phase, [Spec, DP].

Crucially, topicalization out of a nominalized clause makes binding of a possessed subject impossible. As we see in (26), irrespective of the case morphology on the subject, reflexive possessor-marking renders the construction ungrammatical. The way to rescue this structure is by the use of the non-anaphoric third person pro-form *-n*, as shown in (27).

- (26) *ene noxoi- g_k bol Bat [naiz(-iig)-aa t_k šalga-sn]-iig olč-med-sen
 this dog-ACC TOP Bat friend-(ACC)-REFL examine-PAST-ACC find.out-PAST
 Intended: ‘As for this dog, Bat_i found out that his_i friend examined it.’
- (27) ene noxoi- g_k bol Bat [naiz-n’ t_k šalga-sn]-iig olž-med-sen
 this dog-ACC TOP Bat friend.NOM-3POSS examine-PAST-ACC find.out-PAST
 ‘As for this dog, Bat_i found out that his_{i/j} friend examined it.’

These data thus corroborate the present account. Movement out of nominalizations always proceeds through [Spec, DP], disrupting any other process requiring the use of the edge.

4 Conclusions

In this paper, I presented novel evidence from Mongolian nominalizations that extraction out of DPs involves intermediate movement through every phase edge on the way to the landing site, making DPs no different from CPs or ν Ps with regard to successive cyclicity. More generally, these data point to a perspective on phases where there are no fundamental asymmetries across phasal categories with regard to the availability of a landing site for intermediate movement. Of course, even in Mongolian, extraction from other kinds of DPs tends to be harder than from CPs and ν Ps, a fact that calls for explanation. But it is beyond the scope of this paper to delimit the conditions under which extraction is possible. What I hope to have shown is that when movement out of a DP is possible, it happens in the same way as movement out of CPs and ν Ps — in a series of short steps. Having established that, the next step is to identify general architectural or language-specific properties that make movement out of DPs much more severely constrained than movement out of these other phases.

References

- Abney, S. (1987). *The English noun phrase in its sentential aspect*. PhD thesis, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
- Asarina, A. (2011). *Case in Uyghur and beyond*. PhD thesis, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
- Bach, E. and Horn, G. M. (1976). Remarks on “conditions on transformations”. *Linguistic Inquiry*, 7(2):265–299.
- Baker, M. (2015). *Case: Its principles and parameters*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom.

- Baker, M. C. and Vinokurova, N. (2010). Two modalities of case assignment: case in Sakha. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory*, 28(3):593–642.
- Bittner, M. and Hale, K. (1996). The structural determination of case and agreement. *Linguistic Inquiry*, 27(1):1–68.
- Borsley, R. D. and Kornfilt, J. (2000). Mixed extended projections. In Borsley, R. D., editor, *Syntax and Semantics 22: The nature and function of syntactic categories*. Academic Press, New York, New York.
- Bošković, Ž. (2005). On the locality of left branch extraction and the structure of NP. *Studia Linguistica*, 59(1):1–45.
- Bošković, Ž. (2014). From the complex np constraint to everything: On deep extractions ĒĒ across categories. ms.
- Bruening, B. (2001). *Syntax at the Edge: Cross-Clausal Phenomena and the Syntax of Passamaquoddy*. PhD thesis, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
- Chomsky, N. (1973). Conditions on transformations. In Anderson, S. and Kiparsky, P., editors, *A festschrift for Morris Halle*, pages 232–286. Holt, Rinehart and Winston, New York, New York.
- Chomsky, N. (1981). *Lectures on government and binding*. Foris Publications, Dordrecht, The Netherlands.
- Chomsky, N. (2000). Minimalist inquiries: The framework. In Martin, R., Michaels, D., and Uriagereka, J., editors, *Step by step: Essays on minimalist syntax in honor of Howard Lasnik*, pages 89–156. MIT Press.
- Chomsky, N. (2001). Derivation by phase. In Kenstowicz, M., editor, *Ken Hale: A Life in Linguistics*, pages 1–52. MIT Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts.
- Cinque, G. (1980). On extraction from NP in Italian. *Journal of Italian Linguistics*, 5:47–99.
- Citko, B. (2014). *Phase Theory: An Introduction*. Cambridge University Press.
- Diesing, M. (1992). *Indefinites*. MIT Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts.

- Diesing, M. and Jelinek, E. (1995). Distributing arguments. *Natural Language Semantics*, 3(2):123–176.
- Gavruseva, E. (2000). On the syntax of possessor extraction. *Lingua*, 110:743–772.
- Giorgi, A. and Longobardi, G. (1991). *The Syntax of Noun Phrases*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Gribanova, V. (2017). Case and agreement across Uzbek nonfinite clause types. Talk given at UC San Diego.
- Guntsetseg, D. (2010). The function of accusative case in mongolian. In Maezawa, H. and Yokohoshi, A., editors, *Proceedings of the 5th Workshop on Altaic Formal Linguistics*, pages 139–153.
- Guntsetseg, D. (2016). *Differential Case Marking in Mongolian*. Tunguso-Sibirica 39.
- Heim, I. (1982). *The Semantics of Definite and Indefinite Noun Phrases*. PhD thesis, University of Massachusetts, Amherst.
- Henry, A. (1995). *Belfast English and Standard English*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Hicks, G. (2009). Tough-constructions and their derivation. *Linguistic Inquiry*, 40(4):535–566.
- Klein, U., Guntsetseg, D., and von Heusinger, K. (2012). Case in conflict: embedded subjects in Mongolian. In Lamers, M. and de Swart, P., editors, *Case, Word Order and Prominence: Interacting Cues in Language Production and Comprehension*, volume 40 of *Studies in Theoretical Psycholinguistics*. Dordrecht.
- Lee-Schoenfeld, V. (2008). Binding, phases, and locality. *Syntax*, 11(3):281–298.
- Levin, T. and Preminger, O. (2015). Case in Sakha: Are two modalities really necessary? *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory*, 33:231–250.
- Marantz, A. (1991). Case and licensing. In Westphal, G., Ao, B., and Chae, H.-R., editors, *Eastern States Conference on Linguistics*, pages 234–253, Cornell University, Ithaca, NY. Cornell Linguistics Club.

- Matushansky, O. (2005). Going through a phase. In *Perspectives on phases*, volume 49, pages 157–181. MIT Working Papers in Linguistics, Cambridge, Massachusetts.
- McCloskey, J. (2002). Resumption, successive cyclicity, and the locality of operations. In Epstein, S. D. and Seely, T. D., editors, *Derivation and Explanation in the Minimalist Program*, pages 184–226. Blackwell Publishing, Malden, Massachusetts.
- Rackowski, A. and Richards, N. (2005). Phase edge and extraction: A Tagalog case study. *Linguistic Inquiry*, 36(4):565–599.
- Safir, K. (2014). One true anaphor. *Linguistic Inquiry*, 45:91–124.
- Svenonius, P. (2004). On the edge. In Adger, D., de Cat, C., and Tsoulas, G., editors, *Peripheries: Syntactic Edges and their Effects*, pages 259–287. Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht, The Netherlands.
- Szabolcsi, A. (1984). The possessor that ran away from home. *The Linguistic Review*, 2:89–102.
- Szabolcsi, A. (1994). The noun phrase. In Fukui, N., Rapoport, T., and Sagey, E., editors, *Syntax and Semantics 27: The syntactic structure of Hungarian*. Academic Press.
- Tellier, C. (1991). Licensing theory and french parasitic gaps. In *Studies in Natural Language and Linguistic Theory*, page 213. Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht.
- Torrego, E. (1984). On inversion in Spanish and some of its effects. *Linguistic Inquiry*, 15(1):103–129.
- Uriagereka, J. (1998). A note on rigidity. In Alexiadou, A. and Wilder, C., editors, *Possessors, predicates and movement in the determiner phrase*, pages 361–382. John Benjamins Publishing Company, Amsterdam.
- van Urk, C. (2015). *A uniform syntax for phrasal movement: A Dinka Bor case study*. PhD thesis, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
- von Heusinger, K., Klein, U., and Guntsetseg, D. (2011). The case of accusative embedded subjects in Mongolian. *Lingua*, 121(1):48–59.