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Outline of talk

• Iambic stress pattern
  – within words and phrases
  – (CV:) foot causes rightward shift of accent
    • including when length is lost or moved
  – lexical triggers with no long vowels

• Analysis as alignment
  – require head foot to follow the triggering foot
  – disrupted by phrasal resyllabification
  – unified diacritic analysis of all cases, with account for opacity
Kashaya in California
Kashaya footing

• Iambs from left to right
  – iterative, as evidenced by iambic lengthening
      • for clarity, the head (accented) foot is highlighted
• First syllable is extrametrical by default
  – blocked if the root is monosyllabic and unprefixed
    • essentially, a root vowel must be footed
• Focus on pattern with syllable extrametricality
  – but will also show monosyllabic root examples
Stress within a word

• Second or third syllable
  – depending on weight of second syllable

  a. \textit{cuʔdan-tʰu-meʔ} \textit{‘don’t shoot! PL’} \\
     \textit{<cuʔ>(dán)(tʰumeʔ)}

  b. \textit{cuʔdan-ad-u} \textit{‘keep shooting’} \\
     \textit{<cuʔ>(daná:)du}

  c. \textit{cahci-hqa-w} \textit{‘place in seated position’} \\
     \textit{<cah>(cíh)(qaw)}

  d. \textit{cahci-meʔ} \textit{‘sit down! IN-LAW’} \\
     \textit{<cah>(ciméʔ)}
Phrasal groupings

• Stress is often assigned across two or more words
  – or to a word and following clitic(s)
• Distinct from lexical footing
  – for words beyond the first in the phrase
  – iambic lengthening depends on word-internal feet
• Assume basic stratal architecture
  – Word vs. Phrase
• Examples presented here show phrasal footing
  – this is the source of surface accent
  – even in one-word utterances
Stress within a phrase

• Second or third syllable, once again
  – might fall on first or second word (or clitic)

  a.  *bihše hčʰoyic’-ʔ*  ‘the deer died’
      <bih>(šéh)(cʰoyiʔ)
  b.  *bihše boʔo-ʔkʰe*  ‘will hunt deer’
      <bih>(šebó)(ʔoʔ)kʰe
  c.  *simá =ltow*  ‘during sleep’
      <si>(mál)(tow)
  d.  *simá miṭi-ad-u*  ‘lying asleep on the ground’
      <si>(mamí)(ṭi:)du
Accent shift

- If leftmost foot is (CV:), pitch accent will fall on the following foot instead
  - thus occurs on third or fourth syllable
  - depending on weight of third syllable
- Skipped (CV:) is a nonbranching foot
  - parallel to (CVC) that takes the accent
Accent shift within a word

- To third or fourth syllable
  a. *dase:-wa-em*  
     *<da>(se:)(wám)*  
     ‘I see (you’re) washing it’
  b. *dase:-weti*  
     *<da>(se:)(wetí)*  
     ‘although I washed it’
  c. *maṭ’a:-qac’-tʰuʔ*  
     *<ma>(ṭ’a:)(qáʔ)(tʰuʔ)*  
     ‘don’t let it hex you!’
  d. *maṭ’a:-wi-y-e: to*  
     *<ma>(ṭ’a:)(wiyé:)to*  
     ‘it hexed me’
Accent shift within a phrase

• Quite a common occurrence
  – provides frequent evidence for phrasal stress

a. ʔima:ta =ʔyow-a-em ‘former woman NOM’
   <ʔi>(ma:)(táʔ)(yowam)

b. ʔima:ta našoya ‘young woman’
   <ʔi>(ma:)(taná)(šoya)

c. qahwe: wahqa-qa =ʔ ‘must have swallowed gum’
   <qah>(we:)(wáh)(qaqaʔ)

d. qahwe: qac-id-u ‘ask for gum’
   <qah>(we:)(qací:)du
Accentual domain

• Foot is excluded from “end rule left” domain

\[
\text{ma (ṭ’āːː) (wijéːː) to}
\]

• Accent is shifted within footing domain

\[
\text{ma (ṭ’āːː) (wijéːː) to}
\]
Accentual domain

- Foot is excluded from “end rule left” domain

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{ma (ť’a:) (wiyé:)}
\end{array}
\]

- This representation is like the result of foot extrametricality
  - but we’ll create it by different means

- Better account of (CV:) not at the left edge
Syllable extrametricality

• Exclusion of a syllable from foot structure

\[ \text{bih} \quad \text{(še bó)} \quad (ʔoʔ) \quad k^h_e \]

• Caused by a constraint dominating PARSE-SYL

• “Some syllable precedes every foot” (Buckley 1997)
  – ALIGN(Foot, L; Syllable, R)

• “No word begins with a foot” (Buckley 2009)
  – *ALIGN(Word, L; Foot, L)
Foot extrametricality

• Accent shift as extrametricality of the foot (Buckley 1994 et seq.)
  
  \[
  \begin{array}{cccc}
  \langle F \rangle & \tilde{F} & F \\
  \langle \sigma \rangle & \sigma & \sigma & \sigma & \sigma \\
  \hat{\imath} & (\text{ma:}) & (\text{ta ná}) & (\text{šo ya})
  \end{array}
  \]

• Trickier to formalize by means of alignment
  – not just any foot, but (CV:) specifically
  – also at a higher level of structure
  – “Align the left edge of a line 2 constituent with the right edge of a CV: foot.” (Buckley 1997)
Foot extrametricality

• Foot extrametricality is problematic as a component of the theory
  – few examples exist, and perhaps should be abandoned as an option (McCarthy 2003)
  – limited evidence for cumulativity of extrametricality at different levels (Hayes 1995)
• Other options, such as *(CÚ:), do not require exclusion from the accent domain
• Opacity in Kashaya, where (CV:) is not present on the surface, leads to particular complications...
Opaque accent shift

• Long vowel regularly shortens in closed syllable
  – but still causes accent shift
  a. šula:m-iʔba ‘would get sick’
     <šu>(la:)(máʔ)ba
  b. šula:m-qa-em ‘the one who seems sick NOM’
     <šu>(lam)(qám)
  c. šula:m-wi-y-e: to ‘I got sick’
     <šu>(lam)(wiyé:)to

• Compare underlying short vowel: no accent shift
  d. duṭ’am-wi-y-e: to ‘more keep coming to me’
     <du>(ṭ’ám)(wiye:)to
Opacity

• Long vowel often surfaces in stems like /šulaːm/
  – good evidence for underlying length

• Analysis by ordering
  – apply foot extrametricality before shortening
    (Buckley 1994)

• Analysis by output constraints
  – stem paradigms are uniform in showing accent shift
    (Buckley 1999)

• Or faithfulness to prior footing
  – in a stratal OT model
Word-edge accent shift

• CVC ending a disyllable is normally stressed
  – extrametrical syllable plus nonbranching foot
  
a. \( yahmoʔ = yac^{h}ma \) ‘mountain lion NOM.PL’
  \(<yah>(móʔ)(yac^{h})ma\)

b. \( kilak^{h} = yacol \) ‘eagle OBJ’
  \(<ki>(lák^{h})(yacol)\)

• But some such words (\(\rangle\)) show accent shift
  
c. \( \hat{acac}^{\rangle} = yac^{h}ma \) ‘person NOM.PL’
  \(<\hat{a}>(caʔ)(yác^{h})ma\)

d. \( \hat{acac}^{\rangle} = yacoʔk^{h}e \) ‘person BEN’
  \(<\hat{a}>(caʔ)(yacóʔ)k^{h}e\)
Word-edge accent shift

• Additional examples
  a. $k'abat \rightarrow shihp^h_a$ ‘madrone leaf’
     $<k'a>(ba?)(\acute{s}i\acute{h})p^h_a$
  b. $k'abat \rightarrow q^h_ale$ ‘madrone tree’
     $<k'a>(ba?)(q^h_ale)$
  c. $calel \rightarrow hi\acute{b}aya$ ‘some random man’
     $<ca>(lel)(hi?)(baya)$
  d. $calel \rightarrow cic'i:d-e: ma$ ‘you’re doing it haphazardly’
     $<ca>(lel)(cic'i:)(de:)ma$

• Not really discussed in previous literature
Monosyllables

• This occurs also with some monosyllables
  – they lack extrametricality, so the pattern is shifted

  a.  \( k'is > mi?da \)  
      \( (k'is)(mí?)da \)  
      ‘every red one’

  b.  \( k'is > cic'i:d-i \)  
      \( (k'is)(cíc'í:)du \)  
      ‘keep turning red!’

  c.  \( hec' > =t^{h}in =?-e: mu \)  
      \( (hec')(t^{h}iné:)mu \)  
      ‘it’s not a nail’

  – compare underlying short vowel: no accent shift

  d.  \( meṭ =t^{h}in =?-e: mu \)  
      \( (mé?)(t^{h}ine:)mu \)  
      ‘it’s not time’
Accent shift and vowel length

• These words never have a surface long vowel
  – they are not verbs, so they lack the necessary alternations under suffixation

• But that is Oswalt’s treatment of them
  – /ʔacaːc/, /caleːl/, /k’iːs/, etc.
  – always undergo closed-syllable shortening

• Not opacity in the same way
  – underlying long vowel is fully abstract
  – also makes incorrect prediction...
Restricted distribution

• Prediction if abstract long vowels exist
  – should be possible word-interally
  – compare transparent /ʔima:ta/ ‘woman’
  – and opaque /šula:m-qam/ ‘the one who seems sick’

• But no such forms exist
  – such as */ʔima:nta/
  – surfacing as *<ʔi>(man)(taʔé:)mu

• Medial CVC in such words always takes the accent
  – as in <šah> (phén)ta ‘bluebird’
Post-accentuation

• Lexicalized accent shift occurs only finally
  – confirms connection to the word edge
• Analyze as post-accentuation
  – requirement that the accent follow a certain element
  – ultimately, property of a foot rather than a stem edge
• Two possible sources
  – foot that consists of a syllable with a long vowel
  – lexeme that bears an idiosyncratic property
• Compare to similar patterns in other languages
Post-accentuation in Japanese

• Prefix *ma-* ‘true’ can induce accent on next syllable
  a. *ma>* + *minami* ‘due south’
     ma-mínami
  b. *ma>* + *yonaká* ‘dead of night’
     ma-yónaka

• Also (more common) pre-accenting suffixes
  c. *yosida* + *<ke* ‘Yoshida family’
     yosidá-ke
  d. *nisímura* + *<ke* ‘Nishimura family’
     nisimurá-ke
Analyzing Japanese

• Poser (1984): invisibility
  – prefix or suffix is ignored when accenting edge syllable
  – similar to Foot Extrametricality for Kashaya

• Alderete (1999): local anti-faithfulness
  – transderivational (output-output):
    • affixed stem must differ from its prominence realization in other contexts
    • must happen on syllable adjacent to the triggering affix
  – cannot be applied to Kashaya
    • not “base-mutating” as in most of Alderete’s cases
Post-accentuation in Russian

• Some basic accent patterns in nouns
  1. always on the same stem vowel
  2. on an accented suffix, else the first syllable
  3. always on the first suffix vowel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>koróv-a</th>
<th>borod-á</th>
<th>gospož-á</th>
<th>nom.sg.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>koróv-ı</td>
<td>bórod-ı</td>
<td>gospož-ı</td>
<td>nom.pl.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘cow’</td>
<td>‘beard’</td>
<td>‘lady’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• Last class is post-accenting
  – location on suffix is a property of the stem
  – occurs on unaccented suffixes such as nom.pl.
Analyzing Russian

• Melvold (1989): shifting stress
  – lexically at end of stem, but moves rightward
  – compare moving accentual tone to next foot head

• Idsardi (1992): final left bracket: \[ xx ( \]
  – similar to fixed stem stress: \[ x ( x \] or \[ ( x x \]
  – equivalent to alignment in OT
    • at least for bracket at edge, rather than internally

• Alderete (1999): post-stem prominence
  – Align(\textsc{PROM}, L; \textsc{Stem}, R)
  – Kashaya requires alignment with head foot rather than with a prominence
Accent shift as alignment

• Responds to lexical marking on stems
  – since true of just a subset of stems
• Cannot just be “some foot”
  – that’s expected anyway in most cases, since heavy syllable would be final in an iambic foot
• Treat as Head Foot
  – accent is then assigned to this foot
• Call it POST-ACCENT
  – right edge > is aligned with left edge of head foot
  – similar effect to extrametricality, but different basis
Analysis with accent shift

- **Non-Initial**: Initial syllable extrametricality
- **Post-Accent**: Must refer to diacritic feature of stem

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>yahmoṭ =yacʰ ma</th>
<th>Non-Initial</th>
<th>Post-Accent</th>
<th>Align-L</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. (yáh) (moʔ) (yacʰ) ma</td>
<td>*!</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. yah (móʔ) (yacʰ) ma</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. yah (moʔ) (yácʰ) ma</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>**!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>?acac&gt; =yacʰ ma</th>
<th>Non-Initial</th>
<th>Post-Accent</th>
<th>Align-L</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. ?a (cáʔ) &gt; (yacʰ) ma</td>
<td>*!</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. ?a (caʔ) &gt; (yácʰ) ma</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Analysis as (CV:) alignment

- Constraint (CV:) (HD)
  - Foot (CV:) is right-aligned with head (accented) foot
  - direct reference to the triggering property of length
- Not the same as extrametricality
  - no reference to the left edge

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>?ima:ta našoya</th>
<th>NON-INITIAL</th>
<th>(CV:) (HD)</th>
<th>ALIGN-L</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. ?i (má:) (tana) (šoya)</td>
<td></td>
<td>*!</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. ?i (ma:) (taná) (šoya)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. ?i (ma:) (tana) (šoyá)</td>
<td></td>
<td>*!</td>
<td>****</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Diacritic alignment of (CV:)

- Alternatively, same diacritic is inserted for (CV:) feet
  - does not make direct reference to vowel length
  - details otherwise remain quite similar
- Perhaps all alignment is with foot, not stem
  - even for the lexically specific items (more below)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>?ima:ta našoya</th>
<th>Non-Initial</th>
<th>Post-Accent</th>
<th>Align-L</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. ?i (má:) &gt; (tana) (šoya)</td>
<td></td>
<td>*!</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. ?i (ma:) &gt; (taná) (šoya)</td>
<td></td>
<td>**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. ?i (ma:) &gt; (tana) (šoyá)</td>
<td></td>
<td>*!</td>
<td>****</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Opaque alignment of (CVC)

- Underlying length in /CV:C/ eventually lost
  - could assign diacritic in Word level, with length still present
  - persists to Phrase level where lexical diacritic is also needed
- These outputs have shortening but retain diacritic
  - opacity is situated in the diacritic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word: šu(la:m) &gt; (qam)</th>
<th>NON-INITIAL</th>
<th>POST-ACCENT</th>
<th>ALIGN-L</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. šu (lám) &gt; (qam)</td>
<td></td>
<td>!</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. šu (lam) &gt; (qám)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
“Foot Flipping” to (CVCV:)

• Leftmost foot (CV:) plus CV surfaces as (CVCV:)
  (Buckley 1994)

  a.  šula:m-iʔba  ‘would get sick’
      <šu>(la:)(máʔ)ba
  – with opaque accent shift

  b.  šula:m-adad-pʰi  ‘after getting sicker’
      <šu>(lama:)(dán’)pʰi

  c.  šula:m-uced-u  ‘keep getting sick’
      <šu>(lama:)(ducé:)du
  – compare underlying short vowel: no accent shift

  d.  hoṭʰam-ad-uced-u  ‘keep getting warm’
      <ho>(ṭʰamá:)(duce:)du
Opaque alignment of (CVCV:)

- Diacritic could operate for this foot as well
- Best overall analysis is less clear (see Buckley 2017)
  - might be Output-Output effect (Buckley 1999)
    - i.e., via shared stem /šulaːm/
  - or assigned to (CV:) foot and persists with addition of CV

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word: šu(la:ma) &gt; (duce:) du</th>
<th>NON-INITIAL</th>
<th>POST-ACCENT</th>
<th>ALIGN-L</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. šu (lamá:) &gt; (duce:) du</td>
<td>*!</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. šu (lama:) &gt; (ducé:) du</td>
<td></td>
<td>***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Glottal-initial clitics

• Glottal stop at the beginning of an enclitic
  – surfaces as glottalization of a preceding stop/affricate
  – disappears after a sonorant
  – e.g., copular /ʔe:/, nominative /ʔemu/

• In either case, that consonant surfaces as an onset
  a.  siʔbal =ʔe: mito  ‘you are far away’
      <si?>(balé:)mito
  b.  yahmoṭ =ʔemu  ‘the mountain lion NOM’
      <yah>(moṭ’é)mu
Loss of accent shift

• In the same context, shifting words lose this special property
  – due to syllabification across the boundary
  a. ʔacac> =ʔemu  ‘the man NOM’
      <ʔa>(cac’é)mu
      *<ʔa>(cac’)(emú)
      *<ʔa>(ca)(c’emú)
  – pattern just like regular words
  b. yahmoṭ =ʔemu  ‘the mountain lion NOM’
      <yah>(moṭ’é)mu
More examples

• Regular accent due to resyllabification

  a. \( ?a\text{cac}^> =?i\text{-yow-a-l} \) ‘the former man OBJ’
     <\( ?a \rangle (\text{cac’í)yowal
     *<\( ?a \rangle (\text{cac’})(\text{iyó})\text{wal
     *<\( ?a \rangle (\text{ca})(\text{c’iyó})\text{wal

  b. \( ma\text{ṭʰey}^> =\text{ʔemu} \) ‘the doe NOM’
     <\( ma \rangle (\text{ṭʰeyé})\text{mu
     *<\( ma \rangle (\text{ṭʰey})(\text{emú})
     *<\( ma \rangle (\text{ṭʰe})(\text{yemú})
Effect of resyllabification

• Lexemes like ?aca? require post-accentuation
  – but this effect is mediated by prosody
  – akin to crisp edges (Ito & Mester 1999)

• Undominated ONSET leads to a prosodic conflict
  – maṭʰey> in ma.tʰe.y|e.mu
  – Foot alignment is impossible, renders it inert
    • not to mention effect of glottal fusion

• Same insight seems unavailable in other approaches
  – whether extrametricality or tone shift
Analysis with resyllabification

- \*C? : Forces fusion with preceding consonant
- \*[\sigma R’ : Loss of glottalization in onset for all sonorants
- Open question whether diacritic is actually present for (c)–(e)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>maṭʰey ≥ʔemu</th>
<th>Onset</th>
<th>*C?</th>
<th>*[\sigma R’</th>
<th>Post-Accent</th>
<th>Align-L</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. ma (ṭʰey) &gt; (ʔemú)</td>
<td>*!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. ma (ṭʰey’) &gt; (emú)</td>
<td>*!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. ma (ṭʰe) (y’&gt;emú)</td>
<td>*!</td>
<td></td>
<td>*?</td>
<td></td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. ma (ṭʰe y&gt;é) mu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*?</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. ma (ṭʰe) (y&gt;e mú)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*?</td>
<td></td>
<td>**!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• Forces fusion with preceding consonant
• Loss of glottalization in onset for all sonorants
• Open question whether diacritic is actually present for (c)–(e)
Underlying long vowel

• This also happens with a true long vowel
  – in verbs that show surface length elsewhere

  a. \( \text{šula:m-ʔ =ʔi-yow-a-l} \) ‘formerly sick OBJ’
     \(<\text{šu}>\text{(lamí)}\text{(yowal)}\)
     *\(<\text{šu}>\text{(lam)}\text{(iyó)}\text{wal}\)

  b. \( \text{da-t’e:l-ʔ =ʔi-do: mu} \) ‘they say he smeared it’
     \(<\text{da}>\text{(t’elí)}\text{(do:)mu}\)
     *\(<\text{da}>\text{(t’el)}\text{(idó:)mu}\)

  c. \( \text{mace:-w =ʔi-qan} \) ‘apparently protected’
     \(<\text{ma}>\text{(cewí)}\text{(qan)}\)
     *\(<\text{ma}>\text{(cew)}\text{(iqán)}\)
Loss of length

• It is quite noteworthy that the underlying long vowel fails to surface even in this open syllable
  \[\text{šula:m-ʔ =ʔi-yow-a-l} \quad \text{‘formerly sick OBJ’}\]
  <šu>(lamí)(yowal)
  *<šu>(la:)(miyó)wal
  – If (CV:) persists long enough to cause accent shift here, why is the length absent?

• But this makes sense under the diacritic analysis
  – does not rely on continued presence of (CV:)
  – assumes it is generally lost before Phrase level
Dubiousness of length as trigger

• Where long vowel can’t surface, accent shifts
  – but where it could surface, it disappears and accent doesn’t shift (b, d)

a. šula:m-ʔ banema:duʔ ‘arrived and fell down sick’
   <šu>(lam’)(bané)(ma:)(duʔ)

b. šula:m-ʔ =ʔi-yow-a-l ‘formerly sick OBJ’
   <šu>(la.mí)(yowal)

c. da-t’e:l-ʔ tubic-ic’-ʔ ‘start to smear’
   <da>(t’el’)(tubí)(yiʔ)

d. da-t’e:l-ʔ =ʔi-do: mu ‘they say he smeared it’
   <da>(t’e.lí)(do:)mu
Unified treatment

• At first glance, we find disjunct loci of accent shift
  – the right edge of certain stems
  – the right edge of (CV:) feet

• There is also considerable opacity
  – (CVC) from closed-syllable shortening
  – (CVCV:) that results from underlying CV: + CV

• But in every case, it is the right edge of a foot
  – requires accent on following foot
  – maybe it’s really about the foot in all cases
Focus on feet

- The transparent situation with (CV:) feet is already fairly unusual cross-linguistically
  - perhaps not surprising it requires an ad-hoc solution
  - diacritic on foot, triggering alignment constraint
    - with another foot, of course, so at the same prosodic level
- Remaining cases can all take the same approach
  - addresses the opacity problem
    - depends on diacritic, not on (prior) vowel length
  - effect at right stem boundary is also at a foot boundary
    - since CVC must end an iambic foot
    - lexical diacritic actually associates with this foot
Subtleties of edges

• Post-accentuation only if foot maintains its integrity
  – material can be added, but not moved out
• Maintained if external material is incorporated
  a. $q^h os'a: =\tilde{?}-yow-a-m$ ‘formerly in winter NOM’  
     $<q^h o>(s'a?)(yowám)$
• Fails if internal C is syllabified outside the foot
  b. $šula:m-?=i-yow-a-m$ ‘formerly sick NOM’  
     $<šu>(lamí)owam$
     $*<šu>la(miyó)wam$
• Disruption of syllable structure (from Word to Phrase level)
  – may depend on change in bimoraic syllable structure
  – foot is recreated (à la Hayes 1989) and loses diacritic
Diacritics and morphemes

• Lexical exceptionality often associated with morphemes, rather than phonological objects (Pater 2007, Gouskova 2012)
  – many long vowels in Kashaya arise from elision across morphemes, and behave the same way
  – but the (CV:) diacritic is predictable anyway, not specified underlyingly

• The only underlying diacritic is indeed linked to particular morphemes, such as /ʔacaʔ/
  – but I suggest it is transferred to the right-aligned foot
Diacritics and feet

- Lexically indexed constraints sometimes linked to phonological elements (Round 2017)
  - not necessary (or perhaps possible) in Kashaya, since the foot structure itself is regular, not in UR
  - but shares the notion that the diacritic is affiliated (ultimately) with a phonological category
  - here, the foot rather than the more typical segment

- Question remains about the mechanism that assigns this diacritic
  - need similar cases for comparison
Summary

• Advantages of alignment approach
  – avoids abstract underlying vowel length
    • accounts for lack of word-internal abstract length
  – deals with diverse and opaque triggers
    • unifies divergent sources of shifted accent
  – accounts for loss of accent shift under resyllabification

• Important question
  – how does this kind of prosodic diacritic fit into a larger theoretical picture
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