

Shulun, Hideki Maki, Lina Bao, Megumi Hasebe and Yuta Sakamoto

Gifu University, Gifu University, Qiannan Normal University for Nationalities, Shinshu University and Chukyo 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).

- (1) [doyoobi-ni tamago-ga/-no yasui] mise
Saturday-on egg-Nom/-Gen cheap store '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.

This paper investigates the mechanism of genitive subject licensing in sentences with clause displacement in Mongolian, and shows that Mongolian allows genitive subjects (i) when complement clauses move across their subjects by scrambling, and (ii) when complement clauses are placed at the right edge, and are separated from their subjects by a clause boundary. These findings suggest (i) that the two conditions on genitive subject licensing (D-licensing and adnominal form licensing) proposed in Maki et al. (2016) need to be slightly revised in such a way that c-commanding licensors should be relaxed to incorporate nominal elements and CPs in Mongolian, and (ii) that displacement to the right actually involves rightward movement to a c-commanding position.

The organization of this paper is as follows. Section 2 reviews the mechanism of genitive subject licensing in Mongolian reported in Maki et al. (2016) as background to subsequent sections. Section 3 provides genitive subject data with clause displacement. Section 4 discusses what the findings might suggest for the theory of (Mongolian) syntax. Finally, Section 5 concludes the paper.

2. Background

In Mongolian, genitive subjects are disallowed in simple sentences, as shown in (2), but both nominative and genitive subjects are allowed, when they appear in relative clauses, as shown in (3).

- (2) Öcügедүр Ulayan-ø/*-u nom-ø qudaldun-ab-čai.
yesterday Ulagan-Nom/-Gen book-Acc buy-take-Past.Con 'Ulagan bought a book yesterday.'
- (3) Öcügедүр Ulayan-ø/-u t qudaldun-abu-γsan/*-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 (4) and (5).

- (4) Bayatur-ø [öcügедүр Ulayan-ø t₁ qudaldun-abu-γsan/-ab-čai geγü] bodu-γsan 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.'
- (5) Bayatur-ø [öcügедүр Ulayan-u t₁ qudaldun-abu-γsan/*-ab-čai geγü] bodu-γsan
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 (5) and (6).

- (6) Bayatur-ø Ulayan-ø/*-u nom-ø qudaldun-abu-γsan/-ab-čai geγü 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 (7) and (8).

- (7) a. Öcügедүр Ulayan-ø/*-u iniye-jei.
yesterday Ulagan-Nom/-Gen laugh-Past.Con 'Ulagan laughed yesterday.'
- b. Batu-ø [öcügедүр Ulayan-ø/-u iniye-gsen učir]-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].'
- (8) a. Bayatur-ø [öcügедүр Ulayan-ø/*-u iniye-gsen geγü] kele-jei.
Bagatur-Nom yesterday Ulagan-Nom/-Gen laugh-Past.Adn that say-Past.Con
'Bagatur said [that Ulagan laughed yesterday].'
- b. Batu-ø [Bayatur-ø [öcügедүр Ulayan-ø/*-u iniye-gsen geγü] kele-gsen učir]-tu

Batu-Nom Bagatur-Nom yesterday Ulagan-Nom/-Gen laugh-Past.Adn that say-Past.Adn fact-at soçi-jai.

be.surprised-Past.Con ‘Batu was surprised at [the fact that Bagatur said [that Ulagan laughed yesterday]].’

(7a) is a simple sentence without a nominal head. (7b) contains an NP with a gapless prenominal sentential modifier. It is grammatical, irrespective of whether the subject is nominative or genitive. (8a) contains a complement clause. It is grammatical when the subject in the embedded clause is nominative, but ungrammatical when it is genitive. (8b) contains an NP with a gapless prenominal sentential modifier. In contrast to (7b), 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 licenser for genitive subjects, based on Rizzi’s (1990) idea about feature specifications on functional categories. With these claims, Maki et al. (2016) propose (9) 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.

(9) *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 (9), 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 (9) precisely predict the fact that genitive subjects are disallowed in a non-local relationship with the relative head in Japanese, as shown in (10) and (11), the Japanese counterparts of (4)/(5) and (8b) in Mongolian.

(10) 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.’

(11) 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 and 3.2 examine Mongolian data with clause displacement to the left and to the right, respectively.

3.1. Leftward Movement

First, (12) is grammatical with a nominative subject on the second highest clause, but ungrammatical with a genitive subject on the second highest clause.

- (12) Batu-ø **Ulayan-ø** [Bayatur-ø tere nom-i qudaldun-abu-γsan geγü] öçügedür kele-gsen
Batu-Nom Ulagan-Nom Bagatur-Nom that book-Acc buy-take-Past.Adn that yesterday say-Past.Adn
geγü boduju bayina.
that think be.Pres.Con ‘Batu thinks that Ulagan said yesterday that Bagatur bought the book.’
- (13)* Batu-ø **Ulayan-u** [Bayatur-ø tere nom-i qudaldun-abu-γsan geγü] öçügedür kele-gsen
Batu-Nom Ulagan-Gen Bagatur-Nom that book-Acc buy-take-Past.Adn that yesterday say-Past.Adn
geγü boduju bayina.
that think be.Pres.Con ‘Batu thinks that Ulagan said yesterday that Bagatur bought the book.’

However, moving the most deeply embedded clause across the higher subject at issue makes the sentence grammatical, as shown in (14).

(14) Batu-ø [Bayatur-ø tere nom-i qudaldun-abu-γsan geγü] **Ulayan-u** *t* öçügedür kele-gsen
Batu-Nom Bagatur-Nom that book-Acc buy-take-Past.Adn that Ulagan-Gen yesterday say-Past.Adn
geγü boduju bayina.
that think be.Pres.Con ‘Batu thinks that [that Bagatur bought the book] Ulagan said yesterday *t*.’

This saving effect is exactly parallel to that of NP scrambling, as shown in (15) and (16).

- (15)* Batu-ø [**Ulayan-u** öçügedür tere nom-i qudaldun-abu-γsan geγü] kele-jei.
Batu-Nom Ulagan-Gen yesterday that book-Acc buy-take-Past.Adn that say-Past.Con
‘Batu said that Ulagan bought the book yesterday.’
- (16) Batu-ø [tere nom-i **Ulayan-u** *t* öçügedür qudaldun-abu-γsan geγü] kele-jei.
Batu-Nom that book-Acc Ulagan-Gen yesterday buy-take-Past.Adn that say-Past.Con
‘Batu said that Ulagan bought the book yesterday.’

Moreover, (17), which is derived from (14), is also grammatical, just like (18), which is derived from (16), is also grammatical.

(17) [Bayatur-ø tere nom-i qudaldun-abu-γsan geγü] Batu-ø **Ulayan-u** *t* öçügedür kele-gsen
Bagatur-Nom that book-Acc buy-take-Past.Adn that Batu-Nom Ulagan-Gen yesterday say-Past.Adn

- gejü boduju bayina.
that think be.Pres.Con ‘[That Bagatur bought the book] Batu thinks that Ulagan said yesterday *t*.’
- (18) Tere nom-i Batu-ø [Ulayan-u *t* öčügedür qudaldun-abu-γsan gejü] kele-jei.
that book-Acc Batu-Nom Ulagan-Gen yesterday buy-take-Past.Adn that say-Past.Con
‘Batu said that Ulagan bought the book yesterday.’

Furthermore, wh-clause scrambling also shows this saving effect, as shown in (19)/(20) and (21)/(22).

- (19)* Batu-ø Ulayan-u [Baγatur-ø ali nom-i qudaldun-abu-γsan-i] öčügedür asayu-γsan
Batu-Nom Ulagan-Gen Bagatur-Nom which book-Acc buy-take-Past.Adn-Acc yesterday ask-Past.Adn
gejü boduju bayina.
that think be.Pres.Con ‘Batu thinks that Ulagan asked yesterday [which book Bagatur bought].’
- (20) Batu-ø [Baγatur-ø ali nom-i qudaldun-abu-γsan-i] Ulayan-u *t* öčügedür asayu-γsan
Batu-Nom Bagatur-Nom which book-Acc buy-take-Past.Adn-Acc Ulagan-Gen yesterday ask-Past.Adn
gejü boduju bayina.
that think be.Pres.Con ‘Batu thinks that [which book Bagatur bought] Ulagan asked yesterday *t*.’
- (21)* Batu-ø Ulayan-u [Baγatur-ø ali nom-i qudaldun-abu-γsan-i] yay
Batu-Nom Ulagan-Gen Bagatur-Nom which book-Acc buy-take-Past.Adn-Acc totally
marta-γsan gejü boduju bayina.
forget-Past.Adn that think be.Pres.Con
‘Batu thinks that Ulagan totally forgot [which book Bagatur bought].’
- (22) Batu-ø [Baγatur-ø ali nom-i qudaldun-abu-γsan-i] Ulayan-u *t* yay
Batu-Nom Bagatur-Nom which book-Acc buy-take-Past.Adn-Acc Ulagan-Gen totally
marta-γsan gejü boduju bayina.
forget-Past.Adn that think be.Pres.Con
‘Batu thinks that [which book Bagatur bought] Ulagan totally forgot *t*.’

3.2. Rightward Movement

Next, let us examine examples with complement clauses being placed at the right edge. First, let us consider (23) derived from (12), reproduced as (24).

- (23) Batu-ø Ulayan-ø *t* öčügedür kele-gsen gejü boduju bayina, [Baγatur-ø
Batu-Nom Ulagan-Nom yesterday say-Past.Adn that think be.Pres.Con Bagatur-Nom
tere nom-i qudaldun-abu-γsan gejü].
that book-Acc buy-take-Past.Adn that
‘Batu thinks that Ulagan said yesterday that Bagatur bought the book.’
- (24) Batu-ø Ulayan-ø [Baγatur-ø tere nom-i qudaldun-abu-γsan gejü] öčügedür kele-gsen
Batu-Nom Ulagan-Nom Bagatur-Nom that book-Acc buy-take-Past.Adn that yesterday say-Past.Adn
gejü boduju bayina.
that think be.Pres.Con ‘Batu thinks that Ulagan said yesterday that Bagatur bought the book.’ (= (12))

In (23), the most deeply embedded clause is put at the right edge of the sentence. This sentence is grammatical in Mongolian. Let us then examine (25), which is derived from (13), reproduced as (26).

- (25) Batu-ø Ulayan-u *t* öčügedür kele-gsen gejü boduju bayina, [Baγatur-ø
Batu-Nom Ulagan-Gen yesterday say-Past.Adn that think be.Pres.Con Bagatur-Nom
tere nom-i qudaldun-abu-γsan gejü].
that book-Acc buy-take-Past.Adn that ‘Batu thinks that Ulagan said yesterday that Bagatur bought the book.’
- (26)* Batu-ø Ulayan-u [Baγatur-ø tere nom-i qudaldun-abu-γsan gejü] öčügedür kele-gsen
Batu-Nom Ulagan-Gen Bagatur-Nom that book-Acc buy-take-Past.Adn that yesterday say-Past.Adn
gejü boduju bayina.
that think be.Pres.Con ‘Batu thinks that Ulagan said yesterday that Bagatur bought the book.’ (= (13))

Interestingly enough, (25) is perfect with the genitive subject in the second highest clause. This saving effect is exactly parallel to that of NP right dislocation, as shown in (27) and (28). (28) is derived from (15), reproduced as (29).

- (27) Batu-ø [Ulayan-ø *t* öčügedür qudaldun-abu-γsan gejü] kele-jei, tere nom-i.
Batu-Nom Ulagan-Nom yesterday buy-take-Past.Adn that say-Past.Con that book-Acc
‘Batu said that Ulagan bought the book yesterday.’
- (28) Batu-ø [Ulayan-u *t* öčügedür qudaldun-abu-γsan gejü] kele-jei, tere nom-i.
Batu-Nom Ulagan-Gen yesterday buy-take-Past.Adn that say-Past.Con that book-Acc
‘Batu said that Ulagan bought the book yesterday.’
- (29)* Batu-ø [Ulayan-u öčügedür tere nom-i qudaldun-abu-γsan gejü] kele-jei.
Batu-Nom Ulagan-Gen yesterday that book-Acc buy-take-Past.Adn that say-Past.Con
‘Batu said that Ulagan bought the book yesterday.’ (= (15))

Of course, the same saving effect is observed with rightward displacement of a wh-clause, as shown in (30), which is derived from (19), reproduced as (31).

- (30) Batu-ø Ulayan-u *t* öčügedür asayu-γsan gejü boduju bayina,

Batu-Nom Ulagan-Gen yesterday ask-Past.Adn that think be.Pres.Con
 [Bayatur-ø ali nom-i qudaldun-abu-γsan-i].

Bagatur-Nom which book-Acc buy-take-Past.Adn-Acc

‘Batu thinks that [which book Bagatur bought] Ulagan asked yesterday *t*.’

- (31)* Batu-ø **Ulayan-u** [Bayatur-ø ali nom-i qudaldun-abu-γsan-i] öcügödür asaγu-γsan
 Batu-Nom Ulagan-Gen Bagatur-Nom which book-Acc buy-take-Past.Adn-Acc yesterday ask-Past.Adn
 geγü boduju bayina.
 that think be.Pres.Con ‘Batu thinks that Ulagan asked yesterday [which book Bagatur bought].’ (= (19))

4. Discussion

Newly elicited data shown above indicate that Mongolian allows genitive subjects (i) when complement clauses move across their subjects by scrambling, and (ii) when complement clauses are placed at the right edge, and are separated from their subjects by a clause boundary. Let us consider what these findings might suggest for the theory of (Mongolian) syntax.

4.1. Leftward Movement

First, the fact that Mongolian allows genitive subjects when complement clauses move across their subjects by scrambling indicates that the two conditions on genitive subject licensing in Mongolian proposed by Maki et al. (2016), as shown in (9), reproduced as (32), need to be revised in such a way that c-commanding licensors should be relaxed to incorporate nominal elements and CPs in Mongolian, as shown in (33).

(32) *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. (= (9))

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

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

A note is in order with respect to the locality restriction in the definition of (32a) and (33a). Maki et al. (2011) originally propose that a relation is established between a relative head and its gap by binding (c-commanding), in such a way that the nominal feature in the nominal head percolates down to the gap, and that any head on the path from the relative head to the gap may host a nominal feature, and one such a head may locally license the genitive subject on the path. Maki et al. (2016) slightly revise this idea, and claim that only the relevant Comp on 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. Rizzi (1990: 382) proposes that functional categories such as Comp and Infl have feature specifications made out of a combination of two binary features [±C] and [±I], and Comp has the feature specifications [+C, -I]. However, Comp does not have any feature specification regarding [±N], so that it is not implausible to assume that it can host the feature [+N], as this will not cause a contradiction among the feature specifications on Comp.

If we assume Maki et al.’s (2016) idea, what licenses the genitive subject in (14), reproduced as (34), is the C-feature of the moved CP.

- (34) Batu-ø [Bayatur-ø tere nom-i qudaldun-abu-γsan geγü] **Ulayan-u** *t* öcügödür kele-gsen
 Batu-Nom Bagatur-Nom that book-Acc buy-take-Past.Adn that Ulagan-Gen yesterday say-Past.Adn
 geγü boduju bayina.
 that think be.Pres.Con ‘Batu thinks that [that Bagatur bought the book] Ulagan said yesterday *t*.’ (= (14))

As for (17), reproduced as (35), what actually licenses the genitive subject is the Comp of the intermediate embedded clause, which shares the C-feature of the fronted CP by Spec-Head agreement.

- (35) [Bayatur-ø tere nom-i qudaldun-abu-γsan geγü] Batu-ø **Ulayan-u** *t* öcügödür kele-gsen
 Bagatur-Nom that book-Acc buy-take-Past.Adn that Batu-Nom Ulagan-Gen yesterday say-Past.Adn
 geγü boduju bayina.
 that think be.Pres.Con ‘[That Bagatur bought the book] Batu thinks that Ulagan said yesterday *t*.’ (= (17))

4.2. Rightward Movement

Second, the fact that Mongolian allows genitive subjects (ii) when complement clauses are placed at the right edge, and are separated from their subjects by a clause boundary suggests that given (33a), the clause that has undergone right dislocation should be able to c-command the genitive subject at issue, which in turn indicates that right dislocation in Mongolian should involve rightward movement to a c-commanding position rather than leftward movement of the remnant elements of the clause by scrambling in Japanese proposed by Tanaka (2001).

Tanaka (2001) claims that sentences with Right Dislocation (RD, hereafter), as shown in (36b), consist of two sentences, as Kuno (1978) proposes.

- (36) a. John-ga LGB-o yonda yo. b. John-ga yonda yo, LGB-o.
 John-Nom LGB-Acc read Prt John-Nom read Prt LGB-Acc
 ‘John read LGB.’ ‘John read it, LGB.’

Tanaka (2001) argues that the ‘right-dislocated’ phrase is a constituent of the second sentence, as shown in (37a), that the right-dislocated phrase occupies the initial position of the second sentence as a result of scrambling, which left-adjoins a constituent to IP, as shown in (37b), and that the remnant of the second clause is elided, as shown in (37c).

- (37) a. John-ga *pro*_i yonda yo, [_{IP} John-ga LGB-o_i yonda yo]. scrambling ->
 John-Nom read Prt John-Nom LGB-Acc read Prt
 b. John-ga *pro*_i yonda yo, LGB-o_i [_{IP} John-ga *t*_i yonda yo]. deletion ->
 John-Nom read Prt LGB-Acc John-Nom read Prt
 c. John-ga *pro*_i yonda yo, LGB-o_i [_{IP} ~~John-ga *t*_i yonda yo~~].
 John-Nom read Prt LGB-Acc John-Nom read Prt

He argues for the scrambling analysis of RD in Japanese based on the new facts he found. He starts with Ross’ (1967) claim for what is called the Right Roof Constraint, whose descriptive generalization is shown in (38).

- (38) *The Right Roof Constraint*
 Rightward movement is upward bounded.

(38) is motivated by the contrast between (39a) and (39b).

- (39) a. John said [that a picture of Madonna was on sale] yesterday.
 b. * John said [that [a picture *t*_i] was on sale] yesterday [_{PP} of Madonna]_i.

While (39a) allows the interpretation in which the temporal adverb *yesterday* can modify the matrix clause, (39b) does not. The fact that (39b) cannot have such an interpretation is expected under (38), as the PP *of Madonna* in (39b) moves across one clause boundary.

Tanaka (2001) then points out that Japanese RD is not clause-bound, as shown in (40), but seems to be constrained by Ross’ (1967) Complex NP Constraint or Chomsky’s (1973) Subjacency Condition, as shown in (41).

- (40) a. John-ga [Mary-ga LGB-o yonda to] itta yo.
 John-Nom Mary-Nom LGB-Acc read that said Prt ‘John said that Mary read LGB.’
 b. John-ga [Mary-ga *pro*_i yonda to] itta yo, LGB-o_i.
 John-Nom Mary-Nom read that said Prt LGB-Acc ‘John said that Mary read it, LGB.’
 (41) a. John-ga [Mary-ga Bill-ni ageta hon-o] nusunda yo.
 John-Nom Mary-Nom Bill-Dat gave book-Acc stole Prt
 ‘John stole the book that Mary gave to Bill.’
 b. ?* John-ga [Mary-ga *pro*_i ageta hon-o] nusunda yo, Bill-ni.
 John-Nom Mary-Nom gave book-Acc stole Prt Bill-Dat
 ‘John stole the book that Mary gave to him, to Bill.’

All these facts are straightforwardly accounted for under Tanaka’s (2001) scrambling analysis of RD in Japanese.

However, if RD involves scrambling in Mongolian, the fact that (25), reproduced as (42), allows a genitive subject is not expected at all.

- (42) Batu-ø **Ulayan-u** *t* öcügödür kele-gsen geju boduju bayina, [_{Bayatur}-ø
 Batu-Nom Ulagan-Gen yesterday say-Past.Adn that think be.Pres.Con Bagatur-Nom
 tere nom-i qudaldun-abu-ysan geju].
 that book-Acc buy-take-Past.Adn that
 ‘Batu thinks that Ulagan said yesterday that Bagatur bought the book.’ (= (25))

This is because the right-dislocated CP in (42) belongs to the second clause in which the remnant part that follows the fronted CP ultimately undergoes deletion, thus is not placed in a position that can c-command the genitive subject. On the other hand, if the right-dislocated CP in (42) involves adjunction to the matrix clause, it can c-command the genitive subject at issue. Therefore, we claim that in Mongolian, unlike Japanese, RD involves rightward movement, and does not involve deletion of the remnant part of the second clause. In (42), what actually licenses the genitive subject at issue is the Comp of the most deeply embedded clause.

Note in passing that the patterns of RD in Mongolian are exactly identical to those in Japanese, as shown in (43)–

- (43) a. John-ø LGB-i ungsi-ysan siu.
 John-Nom LGB-Acc read-Past.Adn Prt ‘John read LGB.’
 b. John-ø *t*_i ungsi-ysan siu, LGB-i.
 John-Nom read-Past.Adn Prt LGB-Acc ‘John read LGB.’
 (44) a. John-ø [Mary-ø LGB-i ungsi-ysan geju] kele-gsen siu.
 John-Nom Mary-Nom LGB-Acc read-Past.Adn that say-Past.Adn Prt
 ‘John said that Mary read LGB.’
 b. John-ø [Mary-ø *t*_i ungsi-ysan geju] kele-gsen siu, LGB-i.
 John-Nom Mary-Nom read-Past.Adn that say-Past.Adn Prt LGB-Acc
 ‘John said that Mary read LGB.’
 (45) a. John-ø [Mary-ø Bill-dü ögü-gsen nom-i] qulyaila-gsan siu.
 John-Nom Mary-Nom Bill-Dat gave book-Acc steal-Past.Adn Prt
 ‘John stole the book that Mary gave to Bill.’

- b. ?* John-ø [Mary-ø t_i ögü-gsen nom-i] qulγaila-gsan siu, Bill-dü.
 John-Nom Mary-Nom gave book-Acc steal-Past.Adn Prt Bill-Dat
 ‘John stole the book that Mary gave to Bill.’

Therefore, the question remains as to what a genuine analysis of RD in Japanese and Mongolian looks like. At this point, as far as genitive subject licensing in Mongolian is concerned, RD in Mongolian should involve rightward movement, which provides a piece of counterevidence against Kayne’s (1994) hypothesis that there are no rightward movement processes in syntax. As Tanaka (2001) points out, Kural (1997) also provides another piece of counterevidence against Kayne’s (1994) hypothesis, based on the fact that post-verbal constituents in Turkish, an SOV language just like Japanese and Mongolian, must be derived through rightward movement.

5. Conclusion

This paper investigated the mechanism of genitive subject licensing in sentences with clause displacement in Mongolian, and showed that Mongolian allows genitive subjects (i) when complement clauses move across their subjects by scrambling, and (ii) when complement clauses are placed at the right edge, and are separated from their subjects by a clause boundary. We argued that these findings suggest (i) that the two conditions on genitive subject licensing (D-licensing and adnominal form licensing) proposed in Maki et al. (2016) need to be revised in such a way that c-commanding licensors should be relaxed to incorporate nominal elements and CPs in Mongolian, and (ii) that displacement to the right should involve rightward movement to a c-commanding position in Mongolian.

References

- Chomsky, Noam (1973) “Conditions on Transformations,” *A Festschrift for Morris Halle*, ed. by Stephen R. Anderson and Paul Kiparsky, 287–307, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, New York.
- Harada, Naomi (2002) *Licensing PF-Visible Formal Features: A Linear Algorithm and Case-Related Phenomena in PF*, Doctoral dissertation, University of California, Irvine.
- Harada, S.-I. (1971) “*Ga-No* Conversion and Ideolectal Variations in Japanese,” *Gengo Kenkyu* 60, 25–38.
- Hiraiwa, Ken (2001) “On Nominative-Genitive Conversion,” *MIT Working Papers in Linguistics 39: A Few from Building E39*, ed. by Elena Guerzoni and Ora Matushansky, 66–125, Cambridge, MA.
- Janhunen, Juha A. (2012) *Mongolian*, John Benjamins, Amsterdam.
- Kayne, Richard (1994) *Antisymmetry in Syntax*, MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.
- Kural, Murat (1997) “Postverbal Constituents in Turkish and the Linear Correspondence Axiom,” *Linguistic Inquiry* 28, 498–519.
- Kobayashi, Yukino (2013) *Japanese Case Alternations within Phase Theory*, Doctoral dissertation, Sophia University.
- Kuno, Susumu (1978) *Danwa-no Bunpoo* (Grammar of Discourse), Taishuukan, Tokyo.
- 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, Wurigumula Bao, Qing-Yu Wu, Asako Uchibori, Fumikazu Niinuma, Megumi Hasebe, and Juri Yoshimura (2011) “Deep Genitive in Modern Inner Mongolian,” *Proceedings of GLOW in ASIA VIII 2010 Universals and Variation*, ed. by Ming-Le Gao, 282–288, Beijing Language and Culture University Press, Beijing.
- Maki, Hideki, Lina Bao and Megumi Hasebe (2015) *Essays on Mongolian Syntax*, Kaitakusha, Tokyo.
- Maki, Hideki, Lina Bao, Qing-Yu Wu, Wurigumula Bao, Asako Uchibori, Fumikazu Niinuma and Kenichi Goto (2010) “The Nominative/Genitive Alternation in Modern Mongolian,” *MIT Working Papers in Linguistics 61: Proceedings of the 6th Workshop on Altaic Formal Linguistics (WAFL6)*, ed. by Hiroki Maezawa and Azusa Yokogoshi, 229–245, Cambridge, MA.
- Miyagawa, Shigeru (1993) “Case-Checking and Minimal Link Condition,” *MIT Working Papers in Linguistics 19: Papers on Case and Agreement II*, ed. by Colin Phillips, 213–254, Cambridge, MA.
- Miyagawa, Shigeru (2011) “Genitive Subjects in Altaic and Specification of Phase,” *Lingua* 121, 1265–1282.
- Miyagawa, Shigeru (2012) *Case, Argument Structure, and Word Order*, Routledge, New York.
- Miyagawa, Shigeru (2013) “Strong Uniformity and *Ga/No* Conversion,” *English Linguistics* 30, 1–24.
- Ochi, Masao (2001) “Move F and *Ga/No* Conversion in Japanese,” *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 10, 247–286.
- Rizzi, Luigi (1990) “Speculations on Verb Second,” *GLOW Essays for Henk van Riemsdijk*, ed. by Joan Mascaró and Marina Nespó, 375–386, Foris, Dordrecht.
- Ross, John Robert (1967) *Constraints on Variables in Syntax*, Doctoral dissertation, MIT.
- Tanaka, Hidekazu (2001) “Right-Dislocation as Scrambling,” *Journal of Linguistics* 37, 551–579.
- Watanabe, Akira (1996) “Nominative-Genitive Conversion and Agreement in Japanese: A Cross-Linguistic Perspective,” *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 5, 373–410.

* 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.