Anti-pied-piping refers to where the morphosyntax targets a proper subpart of the logical focus for operations such as focus particle placement and movement.

\[ \text{YP}_F \]

\[ \ldots \text{XP} \]

\[ [\text{F}] \]

\[ \ldots \text{XP} \]

\[ [\text{F}] \]

\[ \ldots \text{YP}_F \]

Compare to pied-piping, where the morphosyntax targets a constituent properly containing the logical focus.

Focus particles in Miyara Yaeyaman (Ryukyuan; SOV) are systematically ambiguous in their choice of associating logical focus (Davis 2013: 33):


(2) Q: What did she eat? / Q: What did she do? (object focus) (VP focus) Kunu midunpi=to=i [izi=ba]=du fai. this woman=tor fish=acc=du ate ‘This woman ate fish.’

… and similarly in various other languages.

Generalization: The logical focus — as determined by the interpretation of the focus particle — is the focus-particle-marked constituent or the next propositional node up (TP, vP). The latter are instances of anti-pied-piping.

Focus movement in Kikuyu (and other lang.’s) leads to similar ambiguities (Schwarz 2007: 12):

(3) a. Ne- [mae] Abdul a-nyu-ir-e ___.
   roc 6.book Abdul 1s-drink-ASP-FV
   ‘Abdul drank water.’ (object or VP focus)

Anti-pied-piping focus particle placement can then feed scrambling in Japanese (Kotani 2008: 46):

(4) After winning a gold medal, that athlete has been on TV and is dating an actress...
   Uta=saekare-wa [VP dasi] -ta. song=even he-tor release -prr ‘He [that gold-medalist] even released a song.’

In many languages, anti-pied-piping displays a positional preference — the leftmost constituent within the logical focus is chosen:

(1’) * S O=du VP  Intended: ‘Hayashi-san hit Jiro.’

   roc 5.book A. 1S-read-ASP-APPL 1.child
   ‘Abdul read the child a book.’ (Schwarz 2004: 95)

This suggests that anti-pied-piping can refer to post-syntactic properties, like “edgemost.”

This closely resembles well-known restrictions on pied-piping!

(6) a. [Whose picture] did you paint __?
   b. [A picture of whom] did you paint __?

Here, the logical focus (wh) prefers to be leftmost within the pied-piped constituent.

A theory of (anti-)pied-piping

A bipartite syntax for constituent focus particles:

1. **Operator (op):** Semantically contentful. Joins to a position of propositional type and takes scope there. Possibly unpronounced.

2. **Focus particle (prr):** Reflects the presence of or, but not itself semantically contentful. Must take logical focus and prr in its scope.

During cyclic Spell-Out by phase (Chomsky 2001 a.o.), prr is Late Adjoined in the scope of op.

- prr on logical focus = no mismatch
- prr on focus-containing constituent = pied-piping
- prr on constituent within focus = anti-pied-piping

Prr placement during Spell-Out can refer to PF information such as “edgemostness.”

Since prr is present in the narrow syntax, further operations may target the phrase which prr has adjoined to (like Cable’s Q), explaining (3–6).
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Extended handout with further data: