

Modification as Reprojection

Norio Suzuki *Kobe Shinwa Women's University*

The goals of this paper are twofold: (i) To make an attempt to reanalyze restrictive relative constructions in terms of a *Münchhausen feature* (Fanselow 2004) & the concept of “reprojection” (as applied in Hornstein and Uriagereka 2002); & (ii) To propose a new way of looking at the Strict Cycle Condition (SCC) on narrow-syntactic (NS) derivation by accommodating restrictive relatives with a complex head while keeping at the same time to the strict mode of head movement, according to which only the (non-complex) head (i.e., X^0 ; namely, n or N for the purposes here) raises to become the “head” of the relative construction. Take a look at the following restrictive relative construction:

- (1) a. the picture of himself that John likes
(with the underlined elements referring to the same individual)
- b. [_{CP} that John likes [_n picture]] (⇒ n-raising to the relative ‘head’ position)
- b’. [_{NP} [_n picture]][_{CP} that John likes t_n]]
(t_n : n’s original position; n projects in the derived position;
⇒ checking of n’s probe and structure-building features)
- b’’. [_{NP} the [_n picture of himself]][_{CP} that John likes t_n]]
(⇒ semantic reconstruction of n’ to n’s original position & ‘reprojection’ yielding the ultimate ‘pragmatic/semantic’ *topic/comment* structure)
- b’’’. [_{NP} [_{NP} the [_n picture of himself]][_{CP} that John likes [_{NP} picture of himself]]]
(checking of n’s [topic]-feature is implemented via the ‘reprojected’ structure (1b’’’))

I assume the nP/NP approach to nominal phrases instead of the DP approach (Georgi and Müller 2010, Chomsky 2007 for the former approach). I also follow Bhatt (2002) in assuming that “... the constituent that raises out of the CP is an NP and not a DP.” As for the reason for n-raising in (1b’), I tentatively take the trigger to be a [topic]-feature, which I assume to have been assigned to n from the “pragmatics” module at the time of strong v phasal TRANSFER via the “invasive” approach to the FLN-interfaces connection in the sense of López (2003). And I follow the general “reprojection” framework of Georgi and Müller 2010 in postulating (part of) the lexical organization consisting of probe features (for ‘Agree’) and structure-building/subcategorization features (for ‘Merge’), along with their checking mechanism crucially involving a Münchhausen feature (Fanselow 2004), which is a probe feature co-occurring with its corresponding subcategorization feature (Georgi and Müller 2010). Then as for the SCC as it applies to (1b’, b’’), I follow its version indicated in Georgi and Müller (2010: 13): *SCC*: “Only the head of the present root can have features that trigger operations.” In

(1b') n (*picture*) is the head of the root and hence, it is free to implement its various checking operations to yield (1b''). And as for the “topic/comment” structure in (1b''), the structure-building part of n's [topic]-feature is checked via the presence of the CP comment in a sisterhood/mutual c-command relation with the nP topic involving it, and, as a matter of fact, the probe part (i.e., a Münchhausen feature of some sort) of n's [topic]-feature has already been checked in (1b'), where it can c-command CP for the purposes of Agree.

Given the framework and assumptions above, let us see some recalcitrant examples to see how they work in their analysis:

- (2) a. The picture of himself (that) John painted in art class is impressive.
 b. *?The picture of himself which John painted in art class is impressive.

(from Aoun and Li 2003: 111, (46a, c))

- (3) a. (The derivation for the subject in (2a) roughly proceeds successfully as in (1).)
 b. $[_{nP} [_n \text{ picture}] [_{CP} \text{ John painted } t_n \text{ in art class}]]$ (after n-raising due to [topic]-feature)
 b'. $[_{nP} \text{ the } [_n' \text{ which } [_n' \text{ picture of himself}]] [_{CP} \text{ John painted } t_n \text{ in art class}]]$

(after checking of n's probe and subcategorization features; both *the* & *which* are Ds)

Presumably, (2b) is almost ungrammatical for roughly whatever reason ruling out such cases as: **my the book*, **that your sister*, **the book which that I read*. Then examine the derivation of the following:

- (4) a. the book the author of which I know personally (from Kayne 1994: 91, (31))
 b. $[_{CP} \text{ I know } [_n \text{ author}] \text{ personally}]$ (n with a [topic] and some other features)
 b'. $[_{nP} \text{ the } [_n' \text{ author of } [_{nP} \text{ which } [_n \text{ book}]]] [_{CP} \text{ I know } t_{\text{author}} \text{ personally}]]$

(checking of *author*'s probe & subcategorization features; *book* has checked one of its two D-associated features to check)

- b''. $[_{nP} \text{ the } [_n' \text{ book}]] [_{nP} \text{ the } [_n' \text{ author of which } t_{\text{book}}] [_{CP} \text{ I know } t_{\text{author}} \text{ personally}]]]$

(checking of *book*'s other D-associated features)

In (4) the two Ds, *which* and *the*, associated with *book* may be accommodated because they belong in two different projections with a distinctive head. Notice that (4) is pragmatically/semantically a double structure with *the author of which* & CP as topic & comment, and *the book* & nP (with *author* as head) as topic & comment. [800 words]

References: Aoun & Li. 2003. *Essays on representational and derivational nature of grammar.*/ Bhatt, R. 2002.

The raising analysis of relative clauses. *Natural Language Semantics* 10./ Chomsky, N. 2007. Approaching UG from

below./ Fanselow, G. 2004. Münchhausen-style head movement and the analysis of verb second. In *Linguistics in*

Potsdam 22./ Georgi, D. and G. Müller. 2010. Noun-phrase structure by reprojection. *Syntax* 13./ Hornstein &

Uriagereka. 2002. Reprojections. In *Derivation and explanation in the MP.*/ Kayne 1994. *The antisymmetry of*

syntax./ López, L. 2003. Steps for a well-adjusted dislocation. *Studia Linguistica* 57: 193-231.