**Alexandra Vydrina, HSE**

## Ex-situ morphological focus marker in complex sentences

Focalization can be viewed in two ways in the context of a complex sentence. First, the focus feature can target a subconstituent of a subordinate clause. Second, the whole CP can be the focus with respect to the complex sentence, as it is the case of the adverbial clause in (1b); see the discussion in Matić et al. (2014: 9ff). The focus is an instance of what is referred to in the literature as External Information structure, as opposed to internal Information structure.

(1) Complex sentence and focalization
a. I believe [that [it is a BOOK]$_F$ that Mary gave to Paul].
b. [It was only [after I arrived home]$_F$ that I saw them].

This paper deals with restrictions imposed on morphological focus marking in the contexts when focus involves subordinate clauses in complex sentences. The discussed data comes mainly from Kakabe (Western Mande, Guinea)[1]. In this language, prosody is not involved in the expression of focus which is instead marked y the focus particle *lè (dè* after nasals). This particle generally appears at the end of the focused constituent that is always in situ.

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| (2a) | [mùséè | **lè**]$_F$ | ka | sòbéè | tàbi[2] | | Sbj focus |
| | woman.ART | FP | PFV.TR | meat.ART | prepare | | |
| | THE WOMAN prepare the meat. | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| (2b) | mùséè | ká | [sòbéé | **lè**]$_F$ | tàbì | | Obj focus |
| | woman.ART | PFV.TR | meat.ART | **FP** | prepare | | |
| | The woman prepared THE MEAT. | | | | | | |

Yet, the position of the focus particle does not always correspond to the position of the semantically focused XP. When the focus is on a subconstituent of a subordinate clause, e.g. an adverbial clause as in (3), *lè* cannot appear at its right boundary as would be expected. Instead, the focus marker is found at the end of the matrix clause:

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| (3a) | [[ à tááta | lúúmɛ̀ | tɔ | **lé**] | [à | ní | [bàntárà]$_F$ | sàn]] |
| | 3SG go-PFV.I | market.ART | in | FP | 3SG | SBJV | manioc.ART | buy |
| | He went to the market to buy MANIOK (not rice). | | | | | | | |

(3b) *à tááta lúumɛ̀ tɔ à ní bàntárà **lè** sàn

The same happens when the focus is, pragmatically, on the whole adverbial clause: here, again, *lè* appears not at the end of the focused constituent, i.e. the dependent clause, but at the end of the matrix clause:

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| (4a) | káá | wò | bì | táá-lá | **lè** | [wò | nì | wó dɔ̀n]$_F$ |
| | or.Q | 2PL | be | go-GER | **FP** | 2PL | SBJV | 2PL dance |
| | [Do you go there TO STUDY] or do you go there IN ORDER TO DANCE | | | | | | | |

[1] Kakabe is an under-studied Mande language, S-aux-O-V-X word order, lexical tones (H vs. L), downdrift (automatic downstep).

[2] Abbreviations used in the examples: ART – referential article; BNF – benefactive; F – focus; FP – focus particle; GER – gerund; I – intransitive; OBL – oblique; PFV – perfective; PL – plural; POT – potential; PST – past; Q – question; SBJV – subjunctive; SG – singular; TR – transitive; SBJV – subjunctive.

(Litt. "SO THAT YOU DANCE")?

(4b) *káá wò bì táá-lá wò nì wó dɔ̀n **dè**

The analysis is based on the cartographic approach in which focus is represented as a syntactic projection in the left periphery (Rizzi 1997, 2004). I argue that, whereas the semantic focus feature F can appear on any constituent in the sentence structure, the morphological focus marker (the particle *lè* in the case of Kakabe) has to be licensed by the FocP projection.

Next, Following Haegeman (2003, 2006, 2010, 2012), dependent clauses can have either full or truncated CP, with no Focus projection present in the dependent clause in the latter case.

Full CP: CP> ForceP > TopP > FocP > TopP > IP
Truncated CP: CP> IP

I claim that, in Kakabe, truncated CPs form islands, so that constituents, such as IPs or DPs bearing the F feature cannot host the focus marker:

(5) Truncated CP form islands for the expression of F feature: XPs dominated by reduced CP cannot have in situ expression of F feature.

The effect of truncated CPs islands is manifest in the contrast that exists in Kakabe between adverbial and relativized clauses, on the one hand, and utterance complements, on the other hand. Whereas adverbial and relativized clauses have truncated CP and therefore do not allow *lè* to appear on their subconstituents (3), utterance complements, associated with full CP structure, and do not have such restriction; see the focus particle on DO within the utterance complement in (5).

(6) à ká-à fɔ́ [$_{CP}$Músà kà bàntárà **lè** sàn]
3SG PFV.TR-3SG say Musa PFV.TR manioc.ART FP buy
He said that Musa bought MANIOC.

Next, when a whole dependent CP is in focus, as in (4), the impossibility to place the focus particle at its right boundary is due to the place of adjunction of this CP to the main clause. I argue that such dependent CPs are base-generated within IP of the main clause (adjoined to IP or lower, depending on the type of clause), and then undergo A'-movement to CP, and more precisely, are adjoined above the Focus Projection. The base-generation under FocP accounts for the presence of the focus particle in the complex sentence (otherwise it would not be licensed at all). Next, the subsequent movement to the CP level allows to account for the 'dissociation' of the focus particle from the $XP_F$.

Not all clauses undergo such A'-movement to CP in Kakabe. And, in line with the above said, *lè* is not dissociated from the focused subordinate clause in this case. See the position of lè in the example with the focus on the embedded relativized clause:

(7) ànu kà [$_{DP}$kàyéè [$_{CP}$jàtáà kà mín mágbá] **lè**] dònì lábútánɛ̀ tɔ̀
3PL PFV.TR man.ART lion PFV.TR REL wound **FP** send hospital.ART in
They sent the man [that the lion wounded]$_F$, to the hospital (not the man that fell down).

Interestingly, expressive adverbials, ideophones as well as names in naming constructions, display in Kakabe the same incapacity to host the focus particle when focused semantically as the CP-adjoined subordinate clauses. Importantly, the prosodic properties of these constituents, namely, their association with downdrift break indicates as well that they end up being adjoined at the level of CP.

To conclude, the Kakabe data provides important evidence in favor of the Focus Projection located in the left periphery, even though the focused XP and the focus marker are always in situ. The pattern of distribution of the focus particle where it is dissociated from the constituent which is semantically in focus is explained as due to the movement to the higher CP position after the focus marker has been licensed by the focus Projection.


Aboh, Enoch Oladé. 2004. *The Morphosyntax of Complement-Head Sequences: Clause Structure and Word Order Patterns in Kwa*. Oxford Studies in Comparative Syntax. Oxford ; New York: Oxford University Press.

———. 2007. "Leftward Focus versus Rightward Focus: The Kwa-Bantu Conspiracy." In *SOAS Working Papers in Linguistics 15*: 81–104.

———. 2016. "Information Structure. A Cartographic Perspective." In *The Oxford Handbook of Information Structure*, edited by Caroline Féry and Shinichiro Ishihara, First edition, 147–64. Oxford Handbooks in Linguistics. Oxford, United Kingdom: Oxford University Press.

Haegeman, Liliane. 2003. "Conditional Clauses: External and Internal Syntax." *Mind and Language* 18 (4): 317–39.

———. 2006. "Conditionals, Factives and the Left Periphery." *Lingua* 116 (10): 1651–69.

———. 2010. "The Internal Syntax of Adverbial Clauses." *Lingua* 120 (3): 628–48.

———. 2012. *Adverbial Clauses, Main Clause Phenomena, and Composition of the Left Periphery*. Oxford Studies in Comparative Syntax. Oxford ; New York: Oxford University Press.

Matić, Dejan. 2014. "Questions and Syntactic Islands in Tundra Yukaghir." In *Information Structure and Reference Tracking in Complex Sentences*, edited by Rik van Gijn, Jeremy Hammond, Dejan Matić, Saskia van Putten, and Ana Vilacy Galucio, 105:127–62. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Matić, Dejan, Rik van Gijn, and Robert D. van Valin Jr. 2014. "Information Structure and Reference Tracking in Complex Sentences: An Overview." In *Information Structure and Reference Tracking in Complex Sentences*, edited by Rik van Gijn, Jeremy Hammond, Dejan Matić, Saskia van Putten, and Ana Vilacy Galucio, 1–42. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Matić, Dejan, and Irina Nikolaeva. 2014. "Focus Feature Percolation: Evidence from Tundra Nenets and Tundra Yukaghir." In *Proceedings of the 21st International Conference on Head-Driven Phrase Structure Grammar (HPSG 2014)*, edited by S. Müller, 299–317. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.

Rizzi, Luigi. 1997. "The Fine Structure of the Left Periphery." In *Elements of Grammar*, edited by Liliane Haegeman, 281–337. Dordrecht: Springer Netherlands.

———. 2004. "Locality and the Left Periphery." In *Structures and Beyond*, edited by Adriana Belletti and Certosa di Pontignano (Pontignano, Italy). Oxford Studies in Comparative Syntax. New York: Oxford University Press.

Selkirk, Elisabeth. 1986. *Phonology and Syntax: The Relation between Sound and Structure*. Current Studies in Linguistics Series 10. Cambridge, Ma: The MIT Press.

———. 1995. "Sentence Prosody: Intonation, Stress and Phrasing." In *The Handbook of Phonological Theory*, edited by John A. Glodsmith, 550–69. Oxford, UK: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.

Stechow, Arnim von, and Susanne Uhmann. 1986. “Some Remarks on Focus Projection.” In *Topic, Focus and Configurationality: Papers from the 6th Groningen Grammar Talks*, edited by Werner Abraham and Sjaak de Meij, 295–320. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.