

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. $[_{CP} \text{that John likes } [_n \text{ picture}]]$ (\Rightarrow n-raising to the relative ‘head’ position)
- b’. $[_{nP} [_n \text{ picture}]][_{CP} \text{that John likes } t_n]$
(t_n : n’s original position; n projects in the derived position;
 \Rightarrow checking of n’s probe and structure-building features)
- b’’. $[_{nP} \text{the } [_n \text{ picture of himself}]][_{CP} \text{that John likes } t_n]$
(\Rightarrow semantic reconstruction of n’ to n’s original position & ‘reprojection’ yielding the ultimate ‘pragmatic/semantic’ *topic/comment* structure)
- b’’’. $[_{nP} [_{nP} \text{the } [_n \text{ picture of himself}]]][_{CP} \text{that John likes } [_{nP} \text{ picture of himself}]]]$
(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 picture]][_{CP} John painted t_n in art class]] (after n-raising due to [topic]-feature)
 b'. [_{nP} the [_n' which [_n' picture of himself]][_{CP} John painted t_n 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} I know [_n author] personally] (n with a [topic] and some other features)
 b'. [_{nP} the [_n' author of [_{nP} which [_n book]]][_{CP} I know t_{author} personally]]

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

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

You can still modify the fields that get created but you'll need to refer to the source code, and be aware that if the changes you make are against private bits of API then they may be subject to change. Third party packages. The following third party packages are also available. To which Main Modification does this representation relate? Referring to the modified CA1b wording. B2. Do you consider that the Local Plan as changed by the Main Modification(s): (please tick as appropriate).Â This representation is made on the grounds that even with the Main Modifications as proposed in the consultation document, the Draft New Reading Borough Local Plan is unsound. The reasons for this are set out below. Policy CA2: caversham park " deemed to be unsound. Stack Overflow for Teams is a private, secure spot for you and your coworkers to find and share information. Learn more. Fast volume representation, modification and polygonisation. Ask Question.Â It works very well and is incredibly fast, but since it is a surface algorithm, it is not easy to robustly change topology. So I want to go back to the drawingboard and implement a proper volumetric system. My first idea was some kind of octtree representation for the volume and marching cubes to polygonise it.