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Organization of the talk

I. Southeastern Pomo
   • general stress pattern

II. Secondary stress in four contexts
   1. compounds
   2. directional prefixes
   3. reduplication
   4. possessed nouns

III. Prosodic structures
   • including comparison to Kashaya
SECTION I
SOUTHEASTERN POMO
Distribution of Pomoan languages
Language relationships

following Oswalt (1964)
Southeastern Pomo

- extremely endangered
  - one native speaker that I’m aware of
  - fluent second-language speaker teaching his children
  - others also beginning study of language
- published grammar (Moshinsky 1974)
  - relatively brief at 144 pages
  - generative framework
    - much attention to derivations rather than description
- no dictionary or lexicon
- field notes at Berkeley
  - available as scans at the California Language Archive
  - includes unpublished texts
Southeastern Pomo stress

- words are uniformly stressed on the first syllable
  - excluding a short epenthetic vowel optionally inserted to break up some word-initial consonant clusters
  - more later on word length and syllable weight
- initial stress imposed on loanwords
  - notable on those with a later stress in the source language
  - overwhelmingly from Spanish
- no iterative stresses are reported
  - but secondary stresses occur in complex structures
  - initial primary stress that is demoted
Some native vocabulary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>yú</td>
<td>‘snow’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xéla</td>
<td>‘friend’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xélataay</td>
<td>‘friends’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cáduwa</td>
<td>‘north’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cáduwalkit</td>
<td>‘he went north’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cáqlamat</td>
<td>‘it flew to the ground’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dáqalhoyqat</td>
<td>‘(one) gathers into pile’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hálǐqmattat</td>
<td>‘(two) discuss, plan’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>báć’iwc’imfo</td>
<td>‘killers’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Some borrowed vocabulary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tlingit</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Spanish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>sómlilu</td>
<td>‘hat’</td>
<td>(sombréro)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kúcala</td>
<td>‘spoon’</td>
<td>(cuchára)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ñísquina</td>
<td>‘corner’</td>
<td>(esquína)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pápel</td>
<td>‘paper’</td>
<td>(papél)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>káwon</td>
<td>‘box’</td>
<td>(cajón)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>híhol</td>
<td>‘bean’</td>
<td>(frijól)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mántikiya</td>
<td>‘butter’</td>
<td>(mantequílla)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pólminante</td>
<td>‘percussion cap’</td>
<td>(fulminántête)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Deletion of source vowel

\[
\begin{align*}
kálwasa & \quad \text{‘melon’} \quad \text{(calabása)} \\
ʔáwha & \quad \text{‘needle’} \quad \text{(agúja)} \\
kúcya \sim kúčya & \quad \text{‘knife’} \quad \text{(cuchíllo)}
\end{align*}
\]

- even the vowel that is stressed in the source language can be deleted once it enters the new stress system
- of course, these loans may have come through an intermediary language
- \(/c/ \rightarrow /č/ \) before \(/i/, /y/\) is a general rule of the language
Stress on epenthetic vowel

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
pílatu & \text{‘dish’} \\
kálawa & \text{‘nail’} \\
tíriku & \text{‘wheat’} \\
fédinu \sim férinu & \text{‘bridle’} \\
tárapi & \text{‘cloth’} \\
kúrus & \text{‘cross’}
\end{array}
\]

(pláto) 
(clávo) 
(trígo) 
(fréno) 
(trápo) 
(cruz)

- these originally epenthetic vowels are now underlying
  - unlike the variable epenthesis we’ll consider next
- also may have arisen in intermediary language
  - SE Pomo normally permits a variety of initial clusters
  - although these are interestingly all obstruent + liquid
Pretonic Vowel Epenthesis

• description from Moshinsky (1974: 21)
  • *This rule inserts a schwa between stem-initial consonants, preceding the stress vowel.*
  • *It is optional in its operation for the most part, although it is more frequent in the most difficult to articulate consonant clusters, such as two stops.*
  • *It is less frequent in connected discourse when the preceding word ends in a vowel, as well as almost never occurring when the cluster is preceded by a vowel in the same word.*

• varying transcriptions in fieldnotes
  • but the vowel, when present, is never stressed
Epenthesis in the published grammar

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Pronunciation</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ksúṭkit</td>
<td>[kəsúṭkit]</td>
<td>‘he poked the fire’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ũšónik</td>
<td>[ʔəšónik]</td>
<td>‘to guess’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mlíka</td>
<td>[məlíka]</td>
<td>‘you (pl) throw it out!’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ũxáṭkit</td>
<td>[ʔəxáṭkit]</td>
<td>‘scratch with fingers’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bláy</td>
<td>[buláy]</td>
<td>‘blood’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xwán</td>
<td>[xuwán]</td>
<td>‘dance house’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xyá</td>
<td>[xiyá]</td>
<td>‘head’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sdíqa</td>
<td>[sidíqa]</td>
<td>‘swallow it’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ũxéktat</td>
<td>[ʔexéktat]</td>
<td>‘(two) make, fix things’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Epenthesis in the field notes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Pronunciation</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mlút</td>
<td>[məlút]</td>
<td>‘to bake’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?wékti</td>
<td>[ʔəwékʰtɪ]</td>
<td>‘yesterday’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?šáb</td>
<td>[ʔəʃáb]</td>
<td>‘fingernail’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bṭéqal</td>
<td>[bʰṭéqal]</td>
<td>‘bear’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nɣúɣy</td>
<td>[nəɣúɣy]</td>
<td>‘pinole’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xbú</td>
<td>[xʰbú]</td>
<td>‘carrot’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xɬụ́</td>
<td>[xɬụ́]</td>
<td>‘lake clam’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>šʔó</td>
<td>[šoʔó]</td>
<td>‘acorn soup’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qsíl</td>
<td>[qasíl]</td>
<td>‘cold’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary of epenthesis

• inserted vowel between two word-initial consonants
  • changes in vowel quality dependent on adjacent consonants are optional

• appears to be variable and gradient
  • more technically, probably an EXCRESCENT vowel
  • phonetic transition rather than phonological insertion

• different from true epenthesis of a phonemic vowel
  • in loanwords and at suffix boundaries

• presence of this vowel is largely correlated with left edge of a word
  • useful diagnostic for prosodic structure, if not entirely reliable
SECTION II
SECONDARY STRESS
Secondary stress

• transcriptions of secondary stress occur in several types of complex structures
• compound nouns
  • native and borrowed vocabulary
• directional + verb
  • about eighteen prefixes
• reduplicated roots
  • verb aspect and number
  • noun derivation
• possessor + possessum
  • whether possessor is pronoun or full noun
PATTERN 1
COMPOUNDS
Compounds in the grammar

\[ \chi \circ \, kàleta \quad \text{‘train’ (fire wagon)} \]
\[ sc\’úqam \, \chi q\’òwi \quad \text{‘sucking doctor’} \]
\[ šbè \, bq\’òq’ \quad \text{‘coot, mudhen’} \]

• these examples are relatively few
• need to rely on field notes
Compounds in the field notes

xál yà  ‘arm bone’
ʔúy ʔxbè  ‘eyeball’ (eye rock)
ktín ʔbut  ‘funeral’ (corpse burial)
t’à nxà  ‘tule boat’
t’à nà·waš  ‘tule skirt’
ṭ’ó qàclulu  ‘collarbone, breastbone’
xmán šèmic  ‘shoes’ (footwear)
sápatu kìn  ‘shoestring’
Prosodic structure in compounds

- stress can occur on a light syllable before another stress
  - a degenerate (monomoraic) foot and stress clash
  - both of these are marked structures

- has to be forced by the morphosyntactic structure
  - specifically, each branch of compound is a Prosodic Word
    
    \[
    \begin{array}{c}
    \text{[ (xó) ] [ (kàle)ta ]} \\
    \text{‘train’} \\
    \text{* [ (xóka)leta ]} \\
    \text{* [ (xóka)(lèta) ]}
    \end{array}
    \]

- also needed to place the second “initial” stress
  
  \[
  \begin{array}{c}
  \text{[ (sápatu) ] [ (kìn) ]} \\
  \text{‘shoelace’} \\
  \text{* [ (sàpa)(tùki)n ]}
  \end{array}
  \]
PATTERN 2
DIRECTIONAL PREFIXES
Directional prefixes

• indicate direction or type of movement
  • some directionals are suffixes, no special stress properties
• a sample of the 18 prefixes
  \( \times o l- \) ‘hither, towards the speaker’
  \( m a t- \) ‘down to a surface, to the ground’
  \( m a l- \) ‘across water, from water onto land’
  \( c a l- \) ‘to home’
  \( m o- \) ‘cease motion’
• these are the only prefixes containing vowels
  • instrumental prefixes are each a single consonant
  • directionals might therefore be expected to behave specially
  • seem to originate as cliticized adverbials, e.g. \( c a-l \) ‘house-LOC’
### Prefixed directional verbs: óò

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mó-ktòkit</td>
<td>‘stood up’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>móy-dìt</td>
<td>‘stuck in the mud’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xqól-dìt</td>
<td>‘floated out from shore’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dúl-flìt</td>
<td>‘move residence across river’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tíl-cìya</td>
<td>‘carried it away’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dúy-cìya</td>
<td>‘walked through, carrying’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lìl-kət’ànc’it</td>
<td>‘chased them in’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>máṭ-nèmk’olit</td>
<td>‘wrestled to the ground’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xól-yhèmk’ut</td>
<td>‘they met each other’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Initial light syllables: όσ

mό-šnèt  ‘put belt on someone’

mό-net  ‘lean something against’

bάy-dòqat  ‘stick head through window’

bάy-aqat  ‘(one) goes outside’

yό-flit  ‘move downstream’

yό-bdàt  ‘(creek) runs downward’

yό-dat  ‘(road) runs downhill’

yό-ciya  ‘walk down carrying’
Stress clash and syllable weight

• stress clash is allowed with initial closed syllable
  \((móš)(nèt)\)
  • true whether the coda consonant is within the prefix
    \(báy-dòqat\)
  • or from a root-initial consonant cluster
    \(mó-š.nèt\)

• but not with an initial open syllable
  \((mónet)\) or \((móne)t\) \(*(mó)(nèt)\)
  \((báya)qat\) \(*(bá)(yàqa)t\)
  • status of word-final consonant is uncertain; might be
    extrasyllabic (or nonmoraic) contingent on footing
  • assume no iterative footing: no iterative stresses are recorded
Clash and subminimal feet

- “the worst of the worst” (Prince & Smolensky 1993)
  - two marked structures are not permitted together
  - degenerate foot in clash with another stress
- word-internal stress clash is prohibited
  - assuming that prefix is truly that, not a clitic
- but only with these directional prefixes
  - part of same Prosodic Word, unlike compounds?
- compounds are insensitive to this weight issue
  - degenerate clash in (χό)(kàle)ta, etc.
  - each element in compound is a separate PrWd
  - therefore a foot cannot span the two elements
Evidence for prosodic structure

• indirectly shows syllable weight in the language
  • even though simple stress placement does not make reference to weight
  • and otherwise there seems to be no minimal word size

• there must also be syllabification across the prefix–verb boundary, in both directions
  • supports idea that there is a single prosodic word
  • syllables and feet can span the prefix boundary

• clash pattern distinct from compound structure
  • despite basic similarity in primary+secondary stress
TYPE 3 REDUPLICATION
Reduplication: ṣ́...̀σ

hóš-hòš \textasciitilde{} ‘porcupine’
lód-lòdqat \textasciitilde{} ‘knock many over’

qéyki-qèykimkle \textasciitilde{} ‘they laugh (when they play)’
čəyá-čyàkin \textasciitilde{} ‘green, blue’
c’íla-c’ìla \textasciitilde{} ‘mink’
cílik-cìlik \textasciitilde{} ‘swallow’
lókoy-lòkoy \textasciitilde{} ‘pink flower pinole’
### Stressed light syllable: óò

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>lú-lù</td>
<td>‘flute’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wó-wò</td>
<td>‘grandfather’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lmé-lmè</td>
<td>‘pneumonia’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lá-làq</td>
<td>‘goose’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c’í-c’ìkob</td>
<td>‘berry’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>čyó-čyò̄xqat</td>
<td>‘rattled it’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bək’ó-bk’òlit</td>
<td>‘pecks all the time’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Unstressed light syllable: σσ

τ’ό-τ’ό-κ-in
  ‘white (INTS)’

šú-šu-l-it
  ‘poke around with stick (ITER)’

q’é-q’e-k-c’-it
  ‘(one) clears his throat (COMP)’

χόλ-o-lo-m-kle
  ‘used to come around (HAB)’

• compare stresses with closed syllables:

τ’άν-τ’άn-in
  ‘brown (INTS)’

myó-myò-k-it
  ‘breathe (ITER)’

bók-bòk-k-it
  ‘boil over (COMP)’

b-k’ó-b-k’ò-l-it
  ‘pecks all the time (HAB)’
Two types of reduplication

• lexicalized derivation of nouns
  • wówò ‘grandfather’, lúlù ‘flute’
  • seem to always occur reduplicated; may also be onomatopoeic
  • compound structure: two PrWds

• more productive derivation of verbs (and adjectives): habitual, iterative, etc.
  • šúšulit ‘poke around with stick’
  • structure similar to directional prefixes
  • more tightly integrated with the stem: one PrWd
Prosodic structure in reduplication

• lexicalized nouns
  • two PrWds means two feet, two stresses
    • [ (wó) ] [ (wò) ] ‘grandfather’
  • degenerate feet permitted just as in compounds
    • [ (χó) ] [ (kàle)ta ] ‘train’

• verb (and adjective) derivation
  • single PrWd, at least when needed for a proper foot
    • [ (šúšu)lit ] ‘poke around with stick’
    • *[ (šú) ] [ (šùli)t ]
  • degenerate feet prohibited as with other prefixes
    • [ (yóci)ya ] ‘walk down carrying’
A near minimal pair

• root without instrumental prefix
  šu-šu-l-it ‘poke around with a stick’
• light syllable, no secondary stress
  (šúšu)lit

• same root with instrumental prefix (k- “poking”)
  k-šu-k-šu-t ‘he poked around with a stick’
• heavy syllable, secondary stress
  k(šúk)(šùt)
Inconsistencies

• in the section on reduplication, the data all follow these generalizations about syllable weight
  
  \[
  q'\acute{e}q'\acute{e}kc'it
  \]
  “cleared his throat”

• but in a derivation early in the grammar, Moshinsky gives a different form
  
  \[
  q'\acute{e}q'\grave{e}kc'it
  \]

• is he overapplying his stress rule?

• I assume that syllable weight does play a role
  
  • even if there may be some optionality
PATTERN 4
POSSESSED NOUNS
Possessives

• both elements stressed even if light

wí dà  ‘my wife’
wí mdèqlay  ‘my older sisters’
wít xèla  ‘our friend’
títbaq xyà  ‘[your] head’
ʔúyitbaq cà  ‘his house’
háyut xìn  ‘the dog’s name’
bṭédit ḷàl  ‘the woman’s arm’
wímʔet xèla  ‘my father’s friend’
Interpreting the field notes

- secondary stress marks are not common
  - sometimes all marks are “primary” (acute accent)
  - sometimes only the first syllable is marked
- in some cases, field notes map to published transcriptions that show levels of stress
  - field notes <wí da> ‘my wife’ (*several occurrences*)
  - published <wí dà>
- there is also variation in the notes
  - both <wít xela> and <wít xèla> for ‘our friend’
  - first is described as typical of “fast” speech
- I assume that, in general, these reflect the primary + secondary patterns in the published grammar
Normalized possessives: \(<\sigma\sigma>\)

| \(<\text{wí }\text{ʔeba}>\) | \(\text{wí }\text{ʔba} \) | ‘my husband’ |
| \(<\text{tí }\text{kaleta}>\) | \(\text{tí }\text{kàleta} \) | ‘your car’ |
| \(<\text{yíwit }\text{xela}>\) | \(\text{yíwit }\text{xèla} \) | ‘his friend’ |
| \(<\text{ʔómdit }\text{xela}>\) | \(\text{ʔómdit }\text{xèla} \) | ‘her friend’ |
| \(<\text{wítbaq hayu}>\) | \(\text{wítbaq }\text{hàyu} \) | ‘our dog’ |
| \(<\text{wi hayu}>\) | \(\text{wí }\text{hàyu} \) | ‘my dog’ |
| \(<\text{tímʔeṭ hayu}>\) | \(\text{tímʔeṭ }\text{hàyu} \) | ‘your father’s dog’ |
Normalized possessives: <όό>

<ʔúyít dá>      ?úyit dá      ‘his wife’
<ʔómlit ʔəbá>   ?ómdit ʔbà      ‘her husband’
<ʔímekit mʔé>   ?ímekit mʔè      ‘father’s father’

<ʔómlayt mʔqón>   ?ómlayit mqòn      ‘their brother-in-law’

<ʔúyitbaq lámesa>  ?úyitbaq làmesa      ‘his table’
Deviations from the pattern

• occasional emphatic or contrastive stress?
  \textit{héqat}ʔe \textit{tì xín} \quad ‘what’s your name?’

• although the notes give a different version:
  \textless \textit{tí xín héqat}ʔe > \quad \textit{tí xìn héqat}ʔe

• compare also
  \textless \textit{wi lámesa} > \quad \textit{wi lámesa} ? \quad ‘my table’

• these are uncommon and probably reflect different emphasis or pragmatics
Normalized compounds

- as an aside: assume same interpretation for compounds
  
  - `<bsú ya>` | `bsú yà` | ‘backbone’
  - `<xlé bu>` | `xlé bu` | ‘tree limb’ *(finger)*
  - `<bláy kin>` | `bláy kìn` | ‘blood vein’ *(string)*
  - `<híntil b⁰xɛ>` | `híntil bxè` | ‘venison’ *(Indian meat)*
  - `<kóci bxé>` | `kóci bxè` | ‘pork’ *(pig meat)*
  - `<káway sápatu>` | `káway sàpatu` | ‘horse shoe’

- again, sometimes confirmed in published version
  
  - `<xó kaleta>` | `xó kàleta` | ‘train’
Possessives as clitics

• surprising that the possessive pronoun takes the main stress within the NP
• but it presumably cliticizes to the N, and we know that primary stress is on the first element
  • so it’s essential to define the domain correctly
    [ wí [ dà ] ] ‘my wife’
• even more surprising that a full noun possessor appears to take the same structure
  [ hátut [ xìn ] ] ‘the dog’s name’
Possessive nouns

• alternative is a compound structure
  
  \[
  [ [ \text{háyut} ] [ \text{xìn} ] ]
  \]
  ‘the dog’s name’
• this works as well, as long as the two parts group together in a single domain for primary stress
  
  • especially since complex possessive noun must have a lexical derivation that should give it PrWd status
  
  • same might be true for (complex) pronouns
• phonological phrase is a less likely domain
  
  • this stress grouping is an exception, not the rule
• arose historically by analogy with clitic pronouns?
  
  • these can be very short (\textit{wi}), as can be full nouns (\textit{da})
  
  • can also be quite long: \textit{memlayitbaq} ‘their (NEAR, ALIENABLE)’
SECTION III
PROSODIC STRUCTURES
Observations

- each PrWd begins with a stress
- complex structures have two stresses
  - first is primary, parallel to PrWd more generally
- but this is blocked for light initial syllables
  - in verb prefixes — directional or reduplicated
  - not in compounds or possessive phrases
- need to express the difference between verb prefixes and other types
  - must be difference in prosodic word structure
Prosodification

- compounds consist of two lexical roots
  - each one is required to have its own PrWd
- possessives are added phrasally
  - cliticize or compound to make a larger PrWd
- prefixes are not as tightly bound as suffixes
  - a difference found in many languages
- they are more clitic-like, so also can adjoin
  - but this preference is subordinate to a ban on a degenerate syllable in clash
Domain of stress

• “End Rule” assigns prominence to leftmost foot
  • encodes primary vs. secondary stress
  • but in what domain?
• must occur in domain larger than lexical word
  • since includes full-noun possessor + head noun
  • but not typically in other multi-word configurations, so unlikely to be some kind of prosodic phrase
• make use of nested Prosodic Word structure
  • already present in the proposed adjunction of prefixes
  • highest PrWd is the domain of the End Rule
  • additional category of Clitic Group would be similar
Recursive prosodic words

- prefix is adjoined to PrWd as a clitic (unless light)
  - yields a single larger PrWd domain (Selkirk 1995)
    - [ móš [ nèt ] ] ‘put belt on someone’
    - [ bək’ób [ k’òlit ] ] ‘pecks all the time’
- incorporated in single PrWd to avoid degenerate clash
  - [ mónet ] ‘lean s.t. against s.t.’
- compounds and noun reduplicants have two PrWds
  - not adjunction, but still within a single higher domain
    - [ [ xó ] [ kàleta ] ] ‘train’
    - [ [ wó ] [ wò ] ] ‘grandfather’
Recursive prosodic words

• similar structures can be used with possession
• perhaps depends on nature of possessive element
  • clitic if simplex
    [ wí [ dà ] ] ‘my wife’
  • compound if complex
    [[ háyut ][ xìn ]] ‘the dog’s name’
• clitic pronoun cannot be fully incorporated in PrWd
  • since not lexical, unlike verb prefixes
  • not relevant if all possessives are compounded
  • either approach will work
Comparison to Kashaya

• very different stress pattern
  • quantity-sensitive, iambic, initial syllable is extrametrical
• often encompasses more than one word
  • a bit like SE Pomo treatment of possessives
• two-syllable reduplicants are separate PrWds for the purposes of basic lexical foot construction
  • but always stressed phrasally as a group

  *lexical*:  tili - ti(lima·)ci
  *phrasal*:  ti(lití)(lima·)ci

  ‘roll in there!’
Kashaya prosodic words

- noun compounds are probably two PrWds
  - lexicalized noun reduplicants are a single PrWd
  - evidence on this point is not very strong

- possessive pronouns often stressed together with following noun
  
  (yaʔkʰe cáhno)
  ‘our language’

- but can also be excluded in favor of another grouping

  tiʔkʰe ( maʔa dút’atanʔba)
  ‘having prepared his food’
Kashaya phrasal syllabification

- occurs across words such as object + verb
  - more aggressive than in Southeastern Pomo
- but more limited kinds of consonant clusters
  - mostly laryngeal increments /hʔ/
  - a few other possibilities in enclitics

\[\text{ʔahqʰáʔqʾotiyihe} = [\text{ʔah qʰaʔ qʾo ti yi he}]\]

‘in order to drink water’

\[\text{maʔa}sʾíti hšiyiʔ = [\text{maʔa sʾi tih ši yiʔ}]\]

‘(he) said he was going to make food’
Conclusions

• Southeastern Pomo has initial stress in PrWd
  • but requires relatively subtle definition of category
• primary stress is on leftmost foot in domain
  • domain can be treated as highest PrWd
• differences in structure depending on word type
  • separate PrWd despite clashing stress on light syllable
    • compound and reduplicated nouns; possessives
  • incorporation into PrWd to avoid degenerate clash
    • directionals and reduplicated verbs
• some similarities to Kashaya
  • but little that would seem to be common inheritance