
Prosody as an anchor for a clitic: conditional clitic in Kazym Khanty

Aleksandra Belkind

Universität Leipzig

aleksandra.belkind@uni-leipzig.de

In this talk I present novel data about possible hosts for the conditional clitic *ki* in Kazym Khanty (Ob-Ugric, Uralic). There are both syntactic and information structural restrictions on hosts interacting in this language. I argue that these can be simplified to prosodic phrasing combined with prominence.

The conditional marker *ki* in Kazym Khanty (Ob-Ugric, Uralic) is an enclitic. As a sentential clitic, it is expected to be located at the clause edge (e.g. Klavans 1984). Indeed, its most common position is the one right-adjoined to a word before a (clause-final) finite verb (1). *Ki* can also be right-adjoined to a finite verb (i.e. be the last element in a clause), a subject, an object (1), a high/low adverbial, or some DP-modifiers. Illicit hosts are complements of PP and demonstratives.

Penultimate position corresponds to wide-focus reading of the clause. When *ki* is not penultimate, its host must be a contrastive topic/focus. Background topics can never host *ki* (unlike contrastive topics).

- (1) Puχ-εm χošəm ńań (ki) juχi (ki) λε-λ (ki)
son-POSS.ISG fish bread if PREV if eat-NPST if
‘If my son eats a fish pie...’

Syntax or information structure alone are unable to capture the distribution of *ki*. I suggest that prosody can not only describe this clitic pattern, but also explains both syntactic and information structural restrictions. I argue that *ki* is adjoined to the most prominent phonological phrase. This allows unification of syntactic and information-structural restrictions. (i) Prosodic prominence groups together new information (wide) focus, contrastive focus and contrastive topic, with exclusion of background topic both in Khanty and beyond (Féry & Ishihara 2010; Sahnai & Mihkla 2017). (ii) Prosodic phrasing captures syntactic restrictions as well: a host should form a separate ϕ , to which *ki* can adjoin. Complements of PP and demonstratives never form separate ϕ and are correctly predicted to be illicit hosts.

This analysis has two consequences: (i) prosodic prominence should be seen as a separate prosodic feature, and not only as a realization of different information-structural features; and (ii) previously stated locality restrictions on PF-movement (e.g. Embick & Noyer 1999) are falsified wrt. prosodically motivated movement.

References: • Embick D. & R. Noyer. (1999). Locality in post-syntactic operations. MIT WPL, 34. Féry C. & S. Ishihara. (2010). How focus and givenness shape prosody. In: Information structure from different perspectives. Klavans, J. (1985). The independence of syntax and phonology in cliticization. Language. Sahnai, H. & M. Mihkla. (2017). Intonation of contrastive topic in Estonian. Interspeech.