

Anti-Pied-Piping as focus within a focus: Views from morphosyntactic focus marking languages

Daniel Aremu (Bielefeld University)

Following Rizzi's (1997) proposal that Information Structural (IS) categories, such as focus, are directly encoded in the syntax through dedicated left-peripheral projections, subsequent work has challenged this tight syntax–IS mapping based on *Pars Pro Toto* (Anti-pied-piping, APP) focus movement patterns in languages such as German (cf. Fanselow 2003, Fanselow & Lenertová 2011, a.o.). Extending this debate to morphosyntactic focus-marking languages, this study investigates APP in Kasem (Mabia, Ghana) and advances three claims: (i) APP involves nested focus structures, where a focused constituent occurs within a larger focus domain; (ii) morphosyntactic focus-marking languages differ systematically from prosodic focus-marking languages in the behavior of APP; and (iii) morphological APP marking is constrained by a leftmost condition linked to the weak Phase Impenetrability Condition. The findings support the view that focus retains a narrow syntactic status in morphosyntactic focus-marking languages and suggest a scale of syntax–IS congruence, with prosodic languages such as German occupying the lower end and discourse-configurational languages such as Hungarian and Kasem occupying the higher end.