Hulst, Harry van der, Rob Goedemans & Ellen van Zanten (eds). 2010. *A survey of word accentual patterns in the languages of the world*. Berlin/New York: De Gruyter Mouton.

Reviewed by Larry M. Hyman
Department of Linguistics
1203 Dwinelle, MC 2650
University of California
Berkeley, CA 94720-2650
hyman@berkeley.edu

To appear in *Linguistic Typology*.

The goal of the volume under review is to present in survey fashion what is known about the accentual properties of the world's languages. For this purpose the editors have assembled a distinguished list of authors, including themselves, all deeply interested in accentual systems, several having broad areal expertise. The result is an invaluable handbook that phonologists, typologists, and arealists will want to often consult, if not own. The task of conceptualizing, let alone producing such a work is an enormous one, as researchers in this area face several obstacles which are appropriately evoked in various chapters. The first is to establish a reasonable amount of agreement on what kind of properties count as "accentual". Assuming that this issue has been resolved (it hasn't), a second obstacle concerns the available literature: Beyond the fact that many languages have not been described at all, descriptions which do exist often provide only scanty coverage of accentual phenomena—or even fail to mention whether a given language has stress-accent or not. Finally, where multiple descriptions exist, one often finds conflicting views on whether a given language has stress-accent or not, and if so, on how the stress system works. Unless otherwise noted, in what follows I will use the words *accent* and *accentual* as cover terms for the broad range of phenomena covered in this survey, which mostly concern stress-accent (SA), the more elusive concept of pitch-accent (PA), and occasionally other properties to be discussed below.

The editors begin with a short preface giving the background of the project, in particular that it was designed to complement Goedemans et al (1996) with a "focus on presenting data on StressTyp along with typological studies in the domain of word stress/accent" (*v*). StressTyp is a database currently consisting of 511 stress/accent systems which can be consulted and searched on the web: http://www.unileiden.net/stresstyp/. As enumerated in the preface (*vii*), each entry in StressTyp provides:

> " — The language name
> — A Stress Type Code
> — A genetic affiliation
> — A geographical area
> — A prose description of the primary stress location
> — Some examples in IPA with glosses
> — Some references which have been used."

The editors clarify that "no preconditions (theoretical or otherwise) were set, but the authors were encouraged to use the StressTyp data in their chapters" (v).

Following the preface, the volume is organized in two parts. Part I "Typological Surveys" (1-666) consists of 12 chapters. Chapters 1 (Harry van der Hulst, "Word accent: Terms, typologies, and theories") and 12 (Rob Goedemans, "A typology of stress") serve as bookends (accents?) to chapters 2-11, which go through the world's languages, as follows:

2. An overview of word stress in Australian Aboriginal languages (Rob Goedemans), 55-85.
3. Stress types in Austronesian languages (Ellen van Zanten, Ruben Stoel & Bert Remijsen), 87-111.
4. Word stress and pitch accent in Papuan languages (Ellen van Zanten and Philomena Dol), 113-154.
5. Accent in the native languages of North America (Keren Rice), 155-248.
6. The languages of Middle America (Harry van der Hulst, Keren Rice & Leo Wetzels), 249-311.
7. A survey of South American stress systems (Leo Wetzels & Sérgio Meira), 313-380.
8. Accent in African languages (Laura J. Downing), 381-427.
9. Word accent systems in the languages of Europe (Harry van der Hulst), 431-507.
10. Word accent systems in the languages of Asia (René Schiering & Harry van der Hulst), 509-613.
11. Word accent systems in the Middle East (Harry van der Hulst & Sam Hellmuth), 615-646.

As seen, with the exception of chapter 3, the chapters are organized by geography rather than language family. From these titles one immediately sees the lack of preconditions mentioned in the preface: not only do these chapters vary considerably in length from 24 pages (ch. 4) to 95 pages (ch. 10), this latter being way longer than it needed to be (see below), but one wonders why the chapters could not all have had parallel titles, perhaps sharing the "Word accent systems in..." title of chs. 9-11. The actual geographical cuts are sometimes justified (e.g. chs. 2, 4-9), but ch. 10 is unfortunate, uniting Chukotko-Kamchatkan and isolates from Eastern Siberia with the expansive "Altaic" grouping (Turkic, Mongolic, Tungusic, Korean and Japanese), Indo-Aryan, Dravidian and other languages of Southern Asia, as well as East and Southeast Asian languages (minus Austronesian): Chinese, Tibeto-Burman, Tai-Kadai, and Austro-Asiatic. Since the chapter is so long, it can take the reader a bit of work to find specific languages or groupings. Unfortunately, the index to Part I is not ideal, since it does not bold the page numbers for the main entries, e.g. one cannot immediately tell which one of the 22 different pages indexed under "Japanese" is the main one vs. the various individual mentions and references to Japanese throughout the volume. One wonders why there could not have been three chapters, roughly: Northern Asia, Southern Asia, and East and Southeast Asia.[1] Although the Middle East is extracted from Asia and receives separate treatment (ch. 11), most of the discussion concerns Arabic dialects (17 out of 27 text pages), which receive duplicate attention in the chapter on

---

[1] While the authors do a reasonable job based on the literature, here and elsewhere, I wondered if they could have involved an areal specialist for both South and East & Southeast Asia, since many of these languages do not unambiguously exploit word accent; perhaps one was sought, but did not materialize.

Africa (386-9). Be this as it may, most of these chapters provide detail concerning language classification either at the beginning or as the different sections proceed and, where possible, diachronic issues concerning reconstructed accentual systems and the changes that have produced the present-day daughter languages. Many chapters summarize the often quite diverse accentual properties of the subgroups they cover in table form or in recapitulative appendices, each ending with its own references, typically several pages long.

Part II "StressTyp Data" (667-845) presents the full set of StressTyp entries. These essentially follow the same order as in chapters 2-11, the major exception being the combination of Africa with the Middle East.[2] An appendix (847-9) then follows which explains the StressType codes. These include those for fixed stress, I, S, T, A, P, U, which indicate systems where stress is always on the initial, second, third, antepenultimate, penultimate or ultimate syllable, respectively, as well as codes for variable stress patterns which require lexical marking or depend on syllable weight, tone, or sonority. The following pair is representative of the care which went into the stress coding:

> **U/U** : "Place stress on the ultimate syllable if heavy (even if the penultimate syllable is also heavy), otherwise place stress on the penultimate syllable if it is heavy, if neither are heavy, place stress on the ultimate syllable.
>
> **U/P** : "Place stress on the ultimate syllable if heavy (even if the penultimate syllable is also heavy), otherwise place stress on the penultimate syllable if it is heavy, if neither are heavy, place stress on the penultimate syllable." (848)

The volume ends with a subject index (851-6), a language index to Part I (857-875), and a language index to Part II (876-882).

Since the goal of Part I is to address all of the world's languages, the bipartite structure of the volume necessarily incurs duplicate coverage of the languages which appear in Part II. Such duplication is most striking in chs. 6 and 9-11, which systematically (and, in my view, unnecessarily) repeat the full contents of the StressTyp entries (minus the references), thus with the same examples appearing in Parts I and II. Instead of following these up with subsections entitled "Additional information", a better strategy for the reader would have been to incorporate the relevant information from the the StressTyp database into the prose discussion, as in the other chapters.[3] In the end, all of the typological survey chapters expand beyond the respective StressTyp entries and provide much more information and syntheses of accentual tendencies in different subfamilies or subareas.

---

[2] This organization requires that the reader first look up the language in the index, or thumb through the areas, to find a language. In my view it would have been more reader-friendly for the StressTyp entries to be presented in alphabetic order, rather than by geography.

[3] A missed opportunity would have been to indicate in the text in Part I which languages appear in StressTyp, either in small caps, e.g. TONGAN, YUCHI, or with an asterisk: Tongan*, Yuchi*. Such a distinction is made (but not explicitly revealed) in the index to Part I, where languages not included in StressTyp appear italics, e.g. *Blackfoot, Tupari* vs. Georgian, Yana.

Since this is a very rich volume with too much information to summarize or evaluate in a comprehensive way, I will simply mention a subset of what struck me in chapters 2-11 and then turn to chapters 1 and 12 and general issues.

Goedeman's ch.2 on Australia presents a very coherent picture of the left-oriented stress patterns that characterize most of the continent. There is extensive discussion of right-oriented systems in Arnhem Land (64-81), with a nice map (66) showing how the predominant initial area is split in two by languages having penultimate stress. Goedemans suggests that "the penultimate stress pattern arose in one or more languages as the result of the development of prefixing in non-Pama-Nyungan languages and spread through Arnhem Land to produce the division into the intiial, penultimate and intermediate stress systems we find today" (81).

Van Zanten, Stoel & Remijsen's ch. 3 on Austronesian surveys languages whose stress is contrastive (e.g. in the Philippines), penultimate, or final (e.g. in mainland Austronesian), with a thoughtful section entitled "Word-based stress or phrasal intonation?" (99-102). Indicating that some researchers have analyzed Indonesian with or without stress, the authors cite experiments with "native speakers with different regional backgrounds" which produce different results (101): Those with a Javanese or Jakartan background were "indifferent" to the position of stress, vs. those with a Toba Batak background. They conclude that "Toba Batak Indonesians do have word stress, but Javanese and Jakartan Indonesians (and thus the majority of Indonesians) do not." (102) They go on to conclude that "the Indonesian language does not have word stress as a linguistic property" (102). Beyond regional differences between speakers, they caution users of StressTyp that "a language which has no word-based stress at all may be perceived as having fixed stress by a researcher who is accustomed to stress in his native language" (103). What they hear may instead be intonational, either phrasal stress or boundary tones.

Van Zanten and Dol's ch. 4 on Papuan languages is remarkably concise, given the estimate of 750 non-Austronesian, languages spoken in and around New Guinea. Whereas ch.3 does not discuss accent in the relatively few Austronesian languages which have tone, this is harder to ignore in Papuan, where the authors draw a distinction between word stress (stress-accent, SA), pitch-accent (PA), and tone (114-5). Basing themselves on 74 sample languages listed in the appendix, the authors find that 51 have SA, 8 tone, 12 SA + tone, 1 unclassified, and 2 with no word-prosodic features. Alternative interpretations are considered in several cases and indicated in the appendix (see below for discussion of Ekari). The chapter provides one of the most extensive typological and methodological discussions of word-prosodic typology, which I will take up at the end of this review.

Rice's ch.5 is provides one of the most comprehensive treatments in the volume, covering a huge diversity of Goddard's (1996) 62 language families and isolates in North America (Canada, the United States, Northern Mexico). Contrasting with many of the other chapters, Rice considers the role of morphology in great detail:

"A hallmark of many native languages of North America is morphological complexity, and I examine the role that morphology plays in accent systems of the languages, focusing on whether accent systems that have a morphological basis are more stable than those which are purely phonologically defined." (155-6)

Starting with Eskimo-Aleut and ending with Iroquoian, Rice follows Goddard's order in presenting the accentual properties of each of the 62 language groups. She presents a summary section concerned mostly with the areal distribution of accent and its realization. Although establishing that the different SA systems surveyed can be bounded or unbounded, quantity sensitive or not, with the primary accent being found on any of the common positions, she points out the following among several tendencies:

"Perhaps most obvious is that many native languages of North America determine the position of primary accent from the left. This left-orientation bias is the opposite of that found in the rest or [sic] the world, and is likely linked to the predominance of iambicity in the languages of North America (see Hayes 1995: 269, Goedemans 2001 p.c.)" (211).

Another is that the root or stem is a frequent "domain of accent" (220ff).

Van der Hulst, Rice & Wetzel's ch.6 provides a very useful survey of the language families of "Middle America": Oto-Manguean, Mixe-Zoquean, Totonacan, Tequistlatecan, Mayan, Misumalpan and isolates. Tone and/or laryngeal features are especially central to most of these groups. The authors distinguish a number of systems, which they outline as follows (251):

1. Tonal languages
   a. no accent
   b. accent present but not related to tone
   c. accent present and in a relationship with tone
      i. tone location dependent on accent ("tonal accent language")
      ii. accent location dependent on tone
2. Non-tonal languages
   a. no accent
      i. with stress
      ii. without stress
   b. accent
      i. with "stress" as cue ("stress-accent language")
      ii. with pitch as cue ("pitch-accent language")
      iii. with duration as cue ("duration-accent language")
      iv. with ....

The authors define "accent" and "stress" as follows:

"We will use the term 'accent' for a lexical mark (predictable or unpredictable) of syllables that are somehow 'special' and 'stress' for a metrical structure and its associated phonetic cues" (252).

Although they discuss and mention languages which exemplify the combinations they are mostly interested in, viz. (1) and (2b), an explicit encoding for each language in their survey would have helped the reader appreciate the full typology (e.g. type (2ai) seems elusive to me). After a discussion of these types the authors then provide a lengthy section surveying the languages by

family. Corresponding to Rice's observation concerning languages further north, the authors summarize that "There is ample evidence that in languages of the Oto-Manguean family the root is the locus of stress and, expectedly, it is also the position that shows the greatest number of phonological contrasts" (271). Of particular note is stem-initial accent in Proto-Otomanguean (Rensch 1976), most present-day Mixtecan, however stem-final accent is found in Trique) as well as in Zapotecan in general. A second observation is the frequent relevance of syllable weight: "In many languages of this area, stressed syllables are heavy on the surface. In some cases, stress is attracted to heavy syllables, while in other cases syllables lengthen in response to stress, with either vowels or consonants becoming long" (298).

Stating that typology of any feature "is premature" (313), Wetzels' and Meira's ch.7 presents what is known about accent (and tone) in South American languages. The chapter begins with a table quantifying, locating, and summarizing the stress properties of the following seven language families: Arawakan (Maipurean), Tupian, Cariban, Macro-Jê, Panoan, Chibchan, and Tukanoan (314). In a brief section on the typology of stress systems they suggest that stress cues may be hierarchized as follows, based on the nature of the lexical contrasts in the language (317):

a.	contrastive vowel length	:	pitch $>$ intensity $>$ duration
b.	contrastive tone	:	duration $>$ intensity $>$ pitch
c.	neither a nor b	:	pitch $>$ duration $>$ intensity

As seen, pitch is the expected primary cue to SA unless the language has contrastive tone. Although this is not to say that SA cannot affect tone (it can!), the assumption is that languages will tend to avoid cues that can obscure, ultimately merge phonemic contrasts on stressed syllables. After surveying the different language families and isolates, the authors conclude that "the great majority of the systems listed can be categorized as stress-accent systems, among which, in turn, the quantity-insensitive type is the most dominant." They end the chapter with a table summarizing their results, but caution that they have covered "only 90 languages out of a total of approximately 500" (359) and that many of these have not been sufficiently described.

Downing's ch.8 surveys the African continent, starting with a brief typological introduction, particularly as concerns whether "a particular pitch system is best described as tonal or accentual" (382). What is striking in this chapter is just how little interest so many African languages appear to have in marking word accent. This includes not only tonal sub-Saharan languages which are rarely described with accent, but similarly non-tonal Berber in North Africa and Southern Semitic in the Eastern Horn. Even where accent has been claimed, e.g. the common phenomenon of penultimate lengthening in Eastern and Southern Bantu, it is typically a phrasal phenomenon, sometimes a mark of declarative intonation (Hyman, in press). Still there are cases to suspect stem-initial accent, especially since stem-initial syllables often allow a greater array of consonant and vowel contrasts, as in Gokana and Ibibio (403) or different realizations of the same underlying segments, as in Basaa (409). The stem-affix distinction can also affect how tone rules apply, as Noonan (1992: 51) shows from Lango. As I have elsewhere remarked concerning African languages, "stress systems... rarely, if ever, achieve the complexity found in other (mostly non-tonal) languages" (Hyman 2003: 153). One exception not covered in the chapter is Heath's (2005) grammar of Tamashek which includes multiple

sections treating the extensive accentual properties of this language, much of it morphologically determined.

Van der Hulst's chapter 9 on Europe provides a good overview of "... the European area [which] contains all conceivable types of word accent" (496), including the Indo-European subgroups, Basque, South Karvelian, North Caucasian, Uralic and Etruscan. I was particularly struck by how many cases among related languages where some have initial stress, some penultimate, some both (one as primary, another as second, or one as word- and the other phrase-accent), a pattern which repeats in certain other parts of the world as well. This is a very clear chapter which goes over much of the same material that is treated in greater length in van der Hulst (1999).

I have already commented on van der Hulst & Schiering's ch.10 which treats the huge Asian land mass and van der Hulst & Hellmut's ch.11, which has a short section on isolate ancient languages (616-7) followed by a longer section on Egyptian and Semitic, most of it on Arabic.

As mentioned, the survey by geography and language family is preceded by Harry van der Hulst's chapter 1 on defining accent and followed by Rob Goedeman's chapter 12 on stress typology. These two chapters nicely identify the two different, but related concerns of the volume: determining what the different kinds of "accent" are vs. typologizing how languages assign accent, especially SA. Goedeman's chapter shows how the StressTyp database can be used to plot out and quantify the different parameters of SA: left- vs. right-edge marking, quantity-(in)sensitivity, rhythmic secondary stress, degenerate feet etc. He ends with some methodological considerations and comments on the limitations of the literature.

Van der Hulst's chapter 1 also covers various parameters of stress, but also the other goal of characterizing "accent" in languages which do not obviously have SA. The chapter goes through the various terminological practices and oft-confusing concepts associated with accent, stress, restricted tone and other aspects of word-prosodic systems. Concerning pitch-accent, van der Hulst points out that the term is used differently by some of the authors in this work (18), which points to how unsettled this area still is:[4]

> "Van Zanten and Dol [ch.4] reserve this term for systems in which 'one syllable is more prominent than the other syllables in the same word, a prominence that is achieved by pitch (p.120). Downing [ch.8], on the other hand, uses a definition that is broader than what we have proposed. She refers to *any* language that has some kind of interaction betweentone/pitch and accent as a pitch accent language."

It is usually assumed that word accent must be *culminative* ("at most one per word") and, in the case of SA, also *obligatory* ("at least one per word"). Thus, in the canonical case there will be one and only one accent per word, and all accentual manifestations will refer to that one accented position, something which Dresher & Lahiri (1991) refer to as "metrical coherence". At the

---

[4] I was puzzled by the following additional condition in Goedemans' chapter: "Pitch-accent languages are languages in which accent placement is rule based." (649n) This would seem to rule out the accents on Japanese nominals, which are not assigned by rule. Of course some consider Japanese to be a restricted tone system.

opposite extreme is the view that word accent can be culminative and/or obligatory, with perhaps more than one accent per word:

> "... if we push the use of accents to its limits (at the expense of using tones), this implies allowing unaccented words (violating obligatoriness) and multiple accents (violating culminativity). In this liberal view on accent, only languages that have more than a binary pitch contrast are necessarily tonal." (van der Hulst 2011: 13)

This "liberal view" naturally dovetails with Goedemans & van der Hulst's (2009: 238) "working hypothesis" that all languages have accent:

> "A comprehensive typology of accent manifestation remains to be developed, but given the broad area of cues and functions it is likely that many more languages may have word accent than just those in which accent is manifested as "pitch" or "stress". As a working hypothesis, we might assume that all languages have accent."

If any phenomenon which singles out one or more positions per word for special treatment is interpreted as "accent", more language will of course be judged to have accent. Many readers will consider this interpretation to be too loose for comfort, not only because the culminative and/or obligatory criteria have become optional, but also because there can be conflicts and indeterminacy between properties which in fact satisfy the criteria. Consider for example the case of Obokuitai, a Lakes Plain language of Papua (Indonesia), whose entry in StressTyp in Part II reads as follows:

> "Stress falls on the last high tone, or on the last syllable if there are no high tones." (732)

I have long been skeptical of such claims of stress based on tone, often asking researchers if anything else in the language depends such placement of stress, for example, if only a voiceless stop onset of a stressed syllable becomes aspirated. In fact, if we examine the original source (Jenison & Jenison 1991), there is reason to wonder if the language doesn't have initial stress. The following table presents the attested tone patterns, arranged by the number of syllables in the word:

	all H	*all L*	*H + L*	*L + H*	*HL (+ L)*	*HL + H*	*H + L + H*	*L + H + L*	*L + HL*
1 syllable:	H	L			HL				
2 syllables:	H-H	L-L	H-L	L-H	HL-L	HL-H			
3 syllables:	H-H-H	L-L-L	H-H-L	L-H-H	HL-L-L	HL-H-H	H-L-H	L-H-L	L-L-HL
			H-L-L	L-L-H					

What is particularly striking is the fact that there is only one culminative (but non-obligatory) HL falling tone per word.[5] Does this culminativity mean that the one HL syllable is accented? If so, in the case of HL-H and HL-H-H there would be a conflict with the above characterization of stress falling on the last H—or maybe there are two "accents" in such words? In fact, except for the last column, HL appears limited to the first syllable, suggesting that it may be a position of

---

[5] I have reinterpreted Jenison & Jenison's /1/, /2/ and /12/ tones as /H/, /L/ and /HL/, which they say are realized with the lower variants 12, 13, and 23, respectively, before pause.

prominence. Such cases of potential mismatches are not rare. How are we then to decide when a culminative property is an "accent"? How are we to decide even whether to trust a description (cf. de Lacy, in press)?

In this connection it is worth quoting the following from van Zanten & Dol's ch. 4 :

"It is, admittedly, sometimes quite hazardous to decide what kind of word-prosodic system a language has on the basis of its description by other researchers. Some languages may have syllable prominence even if it is not explictly mentioned. We therefore agree with Foley (1986: 64) that a detailed study into the suprasegmental systems of these and other Papuan languages is needed. Such a study should include careful experimental research involving native speaker's judgments on syllable prominence." (122)

While the first part of this quote is presumably uncontroversial, the authors appear to defer to native speaker judgments on whether something is an accent or not. As a case in point, the authors comment on Louwerse's (1978) description of Una, a Mek language of Indonesia (Papua), which has the following tone patterns:

1 syllable	:	H	L	
2 syllables	:	H-L	L-H	
3 syllables	:	H-L-L	L-H-L	L-L-H
4 syllables	:	H-L-L-L	L-H-L-L	L-L-H-L	L-L-L-H

As seen, except for monosyllabic words, there is one obligatory and culminative H per word. About this van Zanten & Dol write:

"Some Papuan linguists use the term 'pitch accent' without reference to prominence of the pitch-accented syllable.... Donohue [1997] sees pitch-accent systems primarily as tonal system, and not as prominence systems. It is, course, imaginable that the high-pitched syllable in Una is perceived as prominent by native speakers. If this is the case, Una is a pitch-accent language according to our definition as well." (p.121).

It is highly probable that if asked whether there is one syllable that stands out to them, Una speakers will identify the one with the H pitch. However, this does not necessarily indicate accenthood, rather it could simply be pitch prominence.[6] It would certainly be interesting to know which syllable, if any, Obokuitai speakers might identify as the most prominent in HL-H and HL-H-H words, given the apparent conflict mentioned above. Any such experimentation, however, would not be definitive; rather, it would simply provide more data to be interpreted along side the phonological distributions and alternations.

The problem of interpretation is particularly important in this context. Louwerse (1978: 72) provides the minimal pair /kɔ́/ 'chalk, kapur' vs. /kɔ/ 'magical lowland woman' as an illustration

---

[6] Both Obokuitai and Una are likely best analyzed with a privative /H/ feature. While a number of tone systems have been reported with privative /L/, I know of none in which a privative /L/ is obligatory or culminative. A different kind of case is Hakha Lai, a Tibeto-Burman language whose monosyllabic words are /HL/, /LH/ or /L/, thus each containing a (non-privative) L feature which could hardly be considered "accentual" (Hyman & VanBik 2004). As often remarked, it seems likely that high(er) pitch is more intrinsically salient than low(er) pitch. Thus /H/ is more likely to acquire obligatory or culminative prominence than /L/.

of an "accented" vs. "unaccented" contrast on monosyllabic words. He goes on to say that such words are pronounced HL and LH, respectively, before pause. Unless this is the effect of a final polar boundary tone, not unheard of, perhaps the latter noun also has an underlying /H/, which however floats, making the contrast /kɔ́/ vs. /kɔ´/. In this analysis /H/ is underlyingly obligatory (thus *more* accentual?), with the floating /H/ of monosyllables deleting *except* before pause.

The Una example shows that even if we know "the facts", the interpretations can vary, sometimes by simple personal taste on the part of the linguist. In other cases the facts are either unknown or not clearly presented. This is what characterizes the literature on Ekari (a.k.a. Ekagi, Kapauku or Mee), to which van Zanten & Dol devote three pages, remarking that among the three consulted sources, Drabbe (1952) uses the term "emphasis" instead of stress, Doble (1987) speaks in terms of two pitch-accents, and Steltenpool & van der Stap (n.d.) "states that Ekari has three lexical tones as well as (contrastive) stress" (134). Having had the opportunity to work with Niko Kobepa, a linguistics PhD student at the Australia National University and native speaker, we are now preparing a report on how this system actually works. The following minimal- and near-minimal pairs, arranged by syllable structure, show that the only possibilities are for a Mee (Ekari) word to have a pitch drop from H to L after its first or second mora (long vowels are written as double):

	H(L)		HH(L)	
CV	má	'body, trunk'		
CV:	dáà	'frog'	dáá	'forbidden'
CVV	bóù	'wind'	bóú	'to skin'
CVCV	dídì	'illness'	dídí	'mouse (sp.)'
CV:CV	díìbù	'gnat, mosquito'	díípì	'gnat, mosquito'
CVVCV	káìyà	'where'	káídò	'jewsharp'
CVCV:	kádèè	'brideprice'	kádéé	'grasshopper'
CV:CV:	píìpìì	'urine'	píípàà	'bird (sp.)'
CV:CVV	múùmàì	'to finish'	búúmàì	'to swim'
CVCVCV	ménòkà	'when'	kénékà	'sibling'
CV:CVCV	kúùtàkà	'strong, loud'	píípògà	'utopia'
CVCVVCV	kápàùkà	'Mee language'	mógóútà	'stone (upright)'
CVCVCV:	pútèwèè	'knife'	dókégàà	'waves'
CV:CVCV	máàgìyòò	'what'	tíítìwàà	'student'
CVCVVCV:	kónàìyòò	'beard'	wákóúyòò	'exit'
CVCVCVCV	nákàpìdù	'squash'	dígímìtà	'darkened'
CVCV:CVCV	kédèètìyà	'stomach'	yégéénàkà	'glorious

Since CV words such as *má* (cf. *bó* 'leg') have only one mora, there is no drop and no contrast between the two tonal patterns. Similarly, the second pattern has no drop when the word is bimoraic (*dáá, bóú, dídí*). The one complication is that when the first syllable is monomoraic and the second bimoraic, i.e. CVCV: or CVCVV, the second pattern does not show a fall between the two moras of the second syllable. Instead, the drop to L is on the third syllable, if there is one (*mógóútà, wákóúyòò, yégéénàk*à), otherwise there is no fall (*kádéé*); cf. *bádíí* 'clan name' (not **bádíì*). While we have found no evidence for stress, the question still arises as to whether this is an accentual or restricted tone system, i.e. the same question as has been applied so often to

Standard Japanese. It is not clear whether we should have two different assignments of /H/, two different assignments of /L/, a difference between /H/ vs. /HL/, or perhaps some more abstract accentual distinction or combination. A particularly attractive analysis evolving out of personal communications with Florian Lionnet and Tony Woodbury is to construct an iambic foot (CV, CVV, CVCV, CVCVV) on the left edge of the word within which there is a /H/ vs. /HL/ contrast. Words such as *kádéé* and *mógóútà* which begin with a CVCVV iamb would have a /H/ tone assigned to the two syllables of the foot. All moras which follow the left-edge iamb would be pronounced L.

What is striking about Mee is how simple the system is, and yet how much lack of clarity it has engendered among the different researchers. This is but one of many examples that could likewise be cited to show the conceptual challenges of some researchers involved in the analysis and typology of marginal tone systems. As I pointed out in the introduction, the editors and authors are thus to be congratulated for the extraordinary product that they have produced in this volume which I (and I assume many others) will continue to consult with great benefit and pleasure.

In reading the work the relatively few typos, omissions, and small errors I noted are as follows:

p. 35, line 1, re "Hyman (1977) counts more penultimate than initial cases": Hyman (1977) had more initial (114) than penultimate (77) stress systems.
p.41: Vergnaud & Halle is not in references. (Halle & Vergnaud 1987 is.)
p.101: citation of Heuven (line 6) vs. van Heuven (note 15).
p.130: Scott & Jenison not in references
p.156, line 2 of the abbreviations: P for 2nd syllable stress instead of S
p.211, up 9: "or" for "of".
p.251, note 2, line 2: Dol & van Zanten should be van Zanten & Dol.
p.289, up 4, typo: Nigeragua for Nicaragua.
p.297: Bibri is not in the index. (Cabecar is.)
p.331: Subsection numbering is off. There are three §3.1s : Arawkan (319), Tupian (326), Cariban (331); then §3.4 (Pano-Takanan) (333) without a §3.2 or §3.3.
p.402, typo in §6.5 paragraph: Cann should be Canu
p.444, note 13: "romance vocabulary" should be "Romance vocabulary".
p.452, middle of page, typo: Comrie and Crobett (1993) should be "Comrie and Corbett".
p.456, lines 1-3: awkward long parenthetical interrupting a sentence.
p.641, §4 should be §5.

References

de Lacy, Paul. Evaluating evidence for stress systems. To appear in Harry van der Hulst (ed.). *Studies on Word Accent*. Oxford University Press.
Doble, Marion. 1987. A description of some features of Ekari language structure. *Oceanic Linguistics* 26.55-113.
Donohue, Mark. 1997. Tone in New Guinea languages. *Linguistic Typology* 1.347-386.
Drabbe, P. 1952. *Spraakkunst van het Ekagi*. 's-Gravenhage: M. Nijhoff.

Dresher, Elan B. and Aditi Lahiri. 1991. The Germanic foot: Metrical coherence in Old English. *Linguistic Inquiry* 22.251-286.

Foley, William A. *The Papuan languages of New Guine*a. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Goddard, Ives. 1996. Introduction. In Ives Goddard (ed.), *Handbook of North American Indians, vol. 17. Languages*, 1-16. Washington: Smithsonian Institution.

Goedemans, Rob W.N., Harry G. van der Hulst & Ellis A.M. Visch. 1996. Stress Patterns of the world. Part 1: Background. HIL Publications II. Holland Academic Graphics. The Hague.

Goedemans, Rob and Harry van der Hulst. 2009. StressTyp: A Database for Word Accentual Patterns in the World's Languages. In Martin Everaert, Simon Musgrave and Alexis Dimitriadis (eds.), *The use of databases in cross-linguistics research.* New York/Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 235-282.

Hayes, Bruce. 1995. *Metrical stress theory. Principles and case studies*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Heath, Jeffrey. *A grammar of Tamashek (Tuareg of Mali)*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Hulst, Harry van der (ed.). 1999. *Word prosodic systems in the languages of Europe*. Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin & New York.

Hulst, Harry van der. 2011. Pitch accent systems. In Marc van Oostendorp, Colin J. Ewen, Elizabeth Hume, and Keren Rice (eds.), The Blackwell Companion to Phonology, vol. II, #42. Malden, MA & Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.

Hyman 2003 African languages and phonological theory. *GLOT International* vol. 7, no. 6, 153-163.

Hyman, Larry M. In press. Penultimate lengthening in Bantu. To appear in Balthasar Bickel, Lenore Grenoble, David A. Peterson & Alan Timberlake (eds), *What's where, why? Language typology and historical contingency: a Festschrift to honor Johanna Nichols*. Benjamins.

Hyman, Larry M. & Kenneth VanBik. 2004. Directional rule application and output problems in Hakha Lai tone." In *Phonetics and Phonology, Special Issue, Language and Linguistics* 5.821-861. Academia Sinica, Taipei.

Jenison, Scott, D. & Priscilla B. Jenison. 1991. Obokuitai phonology. Workpapers in Indonesian Languages & Culture 9.69-90.

Louwerse, Jan. 1978. A tentative phonology of Una. *Irian* 7(3).43-90.

Noonan, Michael. 1992. *A grammar of Lango*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Rensch, Calvin R. 1976. *Comparative Otomanguean phonology.* Language Sciences Monographs. Indiana University Publications. Bloomington: Indiana University.

Steltenpool, J. & P.A.M. van der Stap. n.d. *Leerboek van het Kapauku*. [n.p.]