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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
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. cuʔdan-tʰu-meʔ  ‘don’t shoot! PL’
   <cuʔ> (dán) (tʰumeʔ)

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

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

d. cahci-meʔ  ‘sit down! IN-LAW’
   <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 hcʰoyic’-ʔ*  ‘the deer died’
   <bih>(šéh)(cʰoyiʔ)

b. *bihše boʔo-ʔkʰe*  ‘will hunt deer’
   <bih>(šebó)(ʔoʔ)kʰe

c. *simā =ltow*  ‘during sleep’
   <si>(mál)(tow)

d. *simā miṭi-ad-u*  ‘lying asleep on the ground’
   <si>(mamí)(ti:)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. \textit{dase}:-\textit{wa-em} \quad \text{‘I see (you’re) washing it’}
\quad \langle \text{da}\rangle (\text{se}:)(\text{wám})

b. \textit{dase}:-\textit{weti} \quad \text{‘although I washed it’}
\quad \langle \text{da}\rangle (\text{se}:)(\text{wetí})

c. \textit{maṭ’a}:-\textit{qac’-tʰuʔ} \quad \text{‘don’t let it hex you!’}
\quad \langle \text{ma}\rangle (\text{t’a:})(\text{qáʔ})(\text{tʰuʔ})

d. \textit{maṭ’a}:-\textit{wi-y-e: to} \quad \text{‘it hexed me’}
\quad \langle \text{ma}\rangle (\text{t’a:})(\text{wiyé:})to
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)(qaqa?)

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

• Foot is excluded from “end rule left” domain

[ ] ➔ [*] 
[ ]
[ ]

ma (ṭ’a:) (wiyé:) to

• Accent is shifted within footing domain

[ ] ➔ [*] 
[ ]
[ ]

ma (ṭ’a:) (wiyé:) to
Accentual domain

• Foot is excluded from “end rule left” domain

```
[    *    ]2  accent
[     ]1   feet
[    ]0   syllables
```

ma (ṭ’a:) (wiyé:) to

• 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

\[ \hat{F} \quad F \]
\[ <\sigma> \quad \sigma \quad \sigma \quad \sigma \quad \sigma \]

bih (še bó) (?o?) kʰe

• 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.)
  \[
  \begin{align*}
  &<F> \quad \hat{F} \quad F \\
  &<\sigma> \quad \sigma \quad \sigma \quad \sigma \quad \sigma \\
  &?i \quad (ma:) \quad (ta \ n\acute{a}) \quad (\breve{\text{s}}o \ ya)
  \end{align*}
  \]

• 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. duṯ’am-wi-y-e: to  ‘more keep coming to me’
     <du>(t’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. yahmoṭ = yacʰma  ‘mountain lion NOM.PL’
     <yah>(móʔ)(yacʰ)ma
  b. kilakʰ = yacol  ‘eagle OBJ’
     <ki>(lákʰ)(yacol)

- But some such words (>) show accent shift

  c. ?acac> = yacʰma  ‘person NOM.PL’
     <ʔa>(caʔ)(yácʰ)ma
  d. ?acac> = yacoʔkʰe  ‘person BEN’
     <ʔa>(caʔ)(yacóʔ)kʰe
Word-edge accent shift

• Additional examples
  a. $k'abaṭ > šihpʰa$ ‘madrone leaf’
     <$k'a>(baʔ)(šíh)pʰa
  b. $k'abaṭ > qʰale$ ‘madrone tree’
     <$k'a>(baʔ)(qʰalé)
  c. $calel > hiʔbaya$ ‘some random man’
     <$ca>(lel)(híʔ)(baya)
  d. $calel > cic’i:d-e: ma$ ‘you’re doing it haphazardly’
     <$ca>(lel)(cic’í:)(de:)ma

• Not really discussed in previous literature
Monosyllables

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

  a. \( k’is \) \( \overset{\text{\textasciitilde}}{mi?}da \) 'every red one'
     \( (k’is)(míʔ)da \)
  b. \( k’is \) \( \overset{\text{\textasciitilde}}{cic’i:d-i} \) 'keep turning red!'
     \( (k’is)(cic’í:)du \)
  c. \( hec’ \) \( =t^{h}in =ʔ-e: \mu \) 'it’s not a nail'
     \( (hec’)(t^{h}iné:)\mu \)
  – compare underlying short vowel: no accent shift
  d. \( meṭ \) \( =t^{h}in =ʔ-e: \mu \) 'it’s not time'
     \( (méʔ)(t^{h}ine:)\mu \)
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. $ma^> + minami$ → **ma-mínami** ‘due south’
  - b. $ma^> + yonaká$ → **ma-yónaka** ‘dead of night’

- **Also (more common) pre-accenting suffixes**
  - c. $yosida + 'ke$ → **yosidá-ke** ‘Yoshida family’
  - d. $nisímura + 'ke$ → **nisimurá-ke** ‘Nishimura family’
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-ɨ</td>
<td>bórod-ɨ</td>
<td>gospož-ɨ</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: $\text{x x (}$
  - similar to fixed stem stress: $\text{x ( x or ( x x}$
  - equivalent to alignment in OT
    - at least for bracket at edge, rather than internally

- Alderete (1999): post-stem prominence
  - Align($\text{PROM, L; Stem, R}$)
  - 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 = yacʰma</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; = yacʰma</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>
Analysis as (CV:) alignment

- Constraint (CV:) (H.D)
  - 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:) (H.D)</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>ḥima:ta našoya</th>
<th>NON-INITIAL</th>
<th>POST-ACCENT</th>
<th>ALIGN-L</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. ḥi (má:) &gt; (tana) (šoya)</td>
<td></td>
<td>*!</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. ḥi (ma:) &gt; (taná) (šoya)</td>
<td></td>
<td>**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. ḥi (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. šulaːm-iʔba  ‘would get sick’
     <šu>(la:)(máʔ)ba
     – with opaque accent shift
  
  b. šulaːm-adad-pʰi  ‘after getting sicker’
     <šu>(lama:)(dán’)pʰi
  
  c. šulaːm-ad-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 /šula:m/
  - 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’
      $<siʔ>(balé:)(mito)$
  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. \( ?acac^{>} = ?i\)-yow-a-l \quad \text{‘the former man OBJ’} \\
     <?a>(cac’í)yowal \\
     *<?a>(cac’)(iyó)wal \\
     *<?a>(ca)(c’iyó)wal

  b. \( maṭ'hey^{>} = ?emu \quad \text{‘the doe NOM’} \\
     <ma>(ṭ'heyé)mu \\
     *<ma>(ṭ'hey)(emú) \\
     *<ma>(ṭ'h)(yemú)
Effect of resyllabification

• Lexemes like ʔacaʔ 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\rangle 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
- **[σ R’** : Loss of glottalization in onset for all sonorants
- Open question whether diacritic is actually present for (c)–(e)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>maṭʰey &gt;ʔemu</th>
<th>Onset</th>
<th>C?</th>
<th>[σ 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

* [σ R’: 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. šulaːm-ʔ =ʔi-yow-a-l  ‘formerly sick OBJ’
     <šu>(lamí)(yowal)  
     *<šu>(lam)(iyó)wal

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

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

• It is quite noteworthy that the underlying long vowel fails to surface even in this open syllable

  šula:m-ʔ =ʔi-yow-a-l ‘formerly sick OBJ’
  <šu>(lamí)(yowal)
  *<šu>(lːaː)(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.  \(q^h_{o}s^a: =\tilde{?}-yow-a-m\)  ‘formerly in winter NOM’
     \(<q^h_o>(s^a?) (yowám)\)
• Fails if internal C is syllabified outside the foot
  b.  \(\text{šu}la:m-?=\tilde{i}-yow-a-m\)  ‘formerly sick NOM’
     \(<\text{šu}>(\text{lamí})\text{owam}\)
     \(*<\text{šu}>la(\text{miyó})\text{wam}\)
• 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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