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This paper presents an analysis of some aspects of SEP verb morphology different in a number of respects from the analysis made by Noshinsky (Noshinsky 1974; hereafter cited as N followed by the number of the relevant section or subsection). I will not cover all aspects of the structure of verbs but will use as a focal reference point the "directionals" (a list of these is given in N 4, 4) and will comment on other aspects of structure as necessary for this exposition.

I rely for my examples primarily on my own field notes, collected in 1940, but will also cite forms not in my notes but cited by Noshinsky. For the sake of clarity I will use a not completely phonemic transcription. Specifically, I will indicate accent—at least, the primary stress in a word—and will employ the schwa (ə). I will argue that some components of the verb are morphophonemically accented while others are not, and that the surface phonetic shape, as well as the phonemic shape, of the word depends on the sequence of accented and unaccented morphophonemes. My transcriptions can easily be phonemized by simply removing the schwa and the accent mark.

Parenthetically, a rather scholastic point can be made about the relation of schwa to the phonemic system. It is a phonetic vowel and evidently allophonic. It seems absurd, however, to categorize it as an allophone of a zero or of a non-existent phoneme. The other possible solution is to refer it to the preceding consonant, its allophonic role being syllabicity of consonants which occur in certain positions relative to other consonants. The typical cases would be single consonants immediately preceding a morphophonemically accented syllable (e.g., the causative-instrumental prefixes of verbs, whether word-initial or medial after a closed syllable) and the second members of phonemic triconsonantal clusters (which is tantamount to saying that there are no phonetically doubly closed syllables or syllables beginning with a consonant cluster).

The usual consonantal allophone in the indicated positions is ʃ, as will appear in examples cited hereafter. In the case of /l/ and /m/, however, the allophone is syllabicized ʃ when followed by a homorganic consonant. I continue to represent this by schwa, as in

1edə = ʃədə 'mountain lion', mefə = ʃəfə 'people' and others. In the case of voiceless spirants followed by voiceless homorganic consonant, there is no schwa in normally rapid speech:

stʃ 'bed', stʃat 'one licks', stʃat 'one dwells', stʃays, stʃaɿi 'headnet', xkf 'hawk sp.', xəɿ 'world', and others

In careful speech, however, as when instructing a linguist, speakers utter the spirant as a syllable, sometimes adding schwa.
(These cases are covered by Koshinsky’s Phonological Rules 2 and 3 under section 3.3. Rule 4 in the same section covers variants in the phonetic actualization of schwa under stated circumstances, particularly when a /ə/ or /ə/ follows. The present formulation eliminates the need for a statement in terms of vowel epenthesis and restates the facts on the phonetic/phonemic level rather than the morphophonemic level.)

The full structure of an SEP verb can be extremely complex. The only truly compulsory elements are a stem (containing a root only or a prefix+root) and a tense-mode indicator. In the more complex forms the order of occurrence can be, for example, proclitic+stem+directional+aspect+reflexive+plural+tense-mode+enclitic, all components following the stem being suffixes except the last. (See § 4.1 for a more elaborate statement of Suffix Ordering Constraint. I prefer the term proclitic, for morphophonemic reasons given below, to Koshinsky’s “Directional prefix”, for which see § 4.4. I omit here other morphemes, like -qa ‘permissive’ and -muku- ‘reciprocal’, whose position relative to other morphemes is beyond the scope of this paper.)

With regard to morphophonemic shapes the hypothesis proposed here is:

Two kinds of morpheme are monoconsonantal. These are certain final suffixes: -t ‘positive imperfective’ and -s ‘negative imperfective’, and all stem-prefixes, whose shape is always C-.

M 4.3 attributes the shape C- to a pre-SEP deletion of “an unstressed vowel which preceded the stressed root vowel.” This is fair enough diachronically speaking, but it still provides no synchronic ground for a possible shape CV- for these prefixes. Koshinsky then proposes that stems whose present shape is CCV or CCVC be considered single morphemes “except in cases where a prefix is clearly identifiable” semantically. I would prefer to regard such stems ex hypothesi as composed of prefix+root on the ground that the initial C- functions phonologically exactly as do those initials that can be easily segmented by minimal contrast or by some semantic feature.

All other morphemes (with an exception noted below) are composed of open syllables, some of whose morphophonemically unstressed vowels are deleted in accordance with rules to be formulated as this analysis proceeds. This approach differs entirely from that of Koshinsky, who posits a large number of monoconsonantal suffixes and accounts for intervening vowels as the result of post-tonic epenthesis. (M 4.1 provides a list of verbal suffixes. M 3.3.10 cites pre-SEP phonological processes by which “many CV suffixes were reduced to the shape C-” and formulates a vowel epenthesis rule by which vowels are reinserted in certain positions in a right-to-left direction.)

Mono syllabic roots all have the shape C-, with morphophonemically stressed vowel which is never deleted. Disyllabic roots all have the shape CVC, the first vowel being morphophonemically stressed and non-deletable, the second vowel being morphophonemically unstressed and regularly reduced or deleted in context. That is, when immediately followed by a word-final suffix, the vowel is retained, though often altered in quality; when followed by a non-final suffix, reduced to schwa or deleted.
As for the quality of the unstressed (second) vowel in CV,C,V₁ roots, there are three possible hypotheses: that it is the same as the stressed vowel; that it is determined by the phonetic character of C₁; that it is determined by the phonetic context of C₁, preceding it and the consonant of the suffix following it. All three hypotheses are tenable and perhaps operate concurrently. An advantage of the first hypothesis is that it provides a consistent explanation of certain reduplicated forms which otherwise have to be accounted for by special rules of a more or less ad hoc nature.

Koshinsky 42.4 cites numerous examples of reduplicated verb forms with a variety of structures. The possibilities are (with a verb suffix sometimes included in the repeated form):

1. CV stem, repeated:
   Stem ʂù > ʂúmat 'l punches a hole through', ʂùmat 'l punches many holes'
   Stem te > xa teátmat 'l is full of water', xa teátmat 'many are full of water'

2. Prefix-CV stem, repeated:
   Stem k-tó > kétót '(house) stands', kétót 'many (houses) stand'; also, kétót '(man) stands', kétót 'one stands around'
   Stem ?-né > ñú?émat 'l takes l round object around', ñú?émat 'l stands around around'; also, mó?énekkit 'l picks up l round object', mó?énabki?énekkit 'l picks up l after another'

3. CV,C,V₁ stem, repeated:
   Stem láka > láka?kit 'l shakes head from side to side'
   Stem súcu > súčkit 'l is frightened', súčkit 'many are frightened'

4. Prefix-CVC,V₁ stem, repeated:
   Stem ?-sáta > ?sátkit 'l feels (w. hand), gropes', ?sátkit 'l keeps feeling around'
   Stem k-sósso > késósit 'something goes wrong', késósososlit 'something is always going wrong'

In all cases the accented vowel of the repeated root retains its quality but loses, or is reduced in, stress. (Koshinsky records secondary accents, but I am inclined to omit them in favor of a general rule that loudness declines progressively from the first stressed vowel through the word regardless of morphemic makeup. In the same way I do not record vowel length, but do record a few instances of phonetic long /a/ as phonemic /aa/, where loudness declines through the length of the vowel. These instances require a modification of the concept of the
word as a sequence of morphophonemic CV syllables or a special hypothesis that in these cases an intervening semivowel, or possibly a glottal stop, has been lost.

There is, however, another type of reduplication of the root only, which occurs under special conditions:

(1) in unprefixed CVC₁V₁ roots where C₁ is /ŋ/;

(2) in prefixed CVC₁V roots where C₁ is /y/ or /ŋ/ and when only the root, not the whole stem (prefix+root), is reduplicated. Noshinsky sets up a special rule (3.3.9) of semivowel metathesis when C₁ is /ŋ/ but does not specifically deal with the cases when C₁ is /k/. Both varieties yield to analysis on the assumption that the quality of V₁ is the same as ẞ, with the further condition that V₁ is weakened to the quality /i/ in the unreduplicated form when immediately preceding, for example, the final suffix -t. Thus,

seqőyit 'he slices it' < s-qóyo-t by weakening of V₁,
seqőyqeyot 'he slices many' < s-qóyoqoyo-t

by a rule of reduction of post-stress vowels in a left-to-right (i.e., temporal) sequence, affecting especially the first and second post-tonic syllables. There are restrictions: e.g., since final consonant clusters are not permitted, the ultima will always contain a vowel; since no more than two immediately post-stress vowels are reduced, a vowel of the penult is often protected, as in Noshinsky's example (3.3.9)

seqőyqeyomat < s-qóyoqoyo-ma-t 'they were sawing logs.'

Comparable examples are:
"okáyit 'uproot (a bunch of grass), (wind) blows (house) away' < ñ-káya-t, ñ-skáykeyat 'one uproots many, many uproot, (wind) blows (houses) away'
< ñ-káyakaya-t

feñůykit 'one forgets' < f-ťúyu-ki-t, feñůyqeyut 'one forgets many things' < f-ťúyuqutuyu-t,
cf. feñůyqeyit 'many forget'

Noshinsky's (4.2.4) example
"előyololit ~ előlyolit 'she skins an animal every day'
probably yields to the same analysis. I have no record of a form ñelőyit but suggest ẞ-loydoyo- ſi-t as the source of ẞelőyololit by vowel reduction and reduction of /y/ before durative -li, as well as of ẞelőlyololit by reduction of the /y/ (in this case C₁ of the root) before the /i/ of the reduplicated root. (4.3.16 cites ẞloydit 'snake sheds its skin', which he analyzes as ẞylu-1u-1l+6-t/, but an analysis ẞ-loydoyo- ſi-t appears at least equally tenable.

In cases where C₁ is /k/ the reduplication formula involves total reduction of the first C₁V₁ plus reduction of the first vowel of the repeated root: i.e., CVC₁V₁ > CVCC₁V₁. Noshinsky notes (3.3.17 Ejective Reduction) that /k/ is reduced to /ʔ/ when immediately preceding
/k/. What is suggested here is that the same reduction goes further in the context of reduplication. There are several examples.

First, of unprefix ed root-stems:

súkít 'it is burning' < súku-t, súskut 'they are burning' < süséku-t < süsusuku-t

dúkít 'one drills beads' < dúku-t, dúskut 'one drills repeatedly' < düséku-t < dúkuduku-t

Second, of prefix-root stems:

?úy kebá?kit 'it goes into his eye' < k-báka-ki-t,
?úy kebá?kat 'things go into their eyes' < kebá?beka-t < k-bákabaka-t

genákit 'one sleeps' < q-nák-a-t, genánkat 'many sleep' < qená?nkat < q-nákánaka-t

Similarly xó tákit 'fire dies out', xó tátkat 'fires die out'; and xó xétáka 'put out the fire!', xó xétátkala 'put out the fire'.

The case of fáda kit 'one dresses a deer', fádádát 'one dresses several deer' seems more complicated, depending on one's identification of the segment /fá/. The simplest solution is to take it as fá 'entails, faeces' procliticized to the root-stem dáka (not, as М 4,3,9 does, as a variant of causative-instrumental f- 'with the end of a long object').

Iohninsky identifies 26 directionals (4,4,1-26), of which 16 occur preceding and 6 following the verb stem. The former 16 he refers to as prefixes, a term which I replace with "proclitics". Following is a list of these 16 in English alphabetical order, each preceded by the number assigned in М 4,4.

21. báy 'to outside an enclosed area'
17. cál 'to home'
16. dül 'to across water'
20. dúy 'through an area'
19. kúh 'out of an enclosed space'
18. líf 'into an enclosed space'
10. má 'down to the ground' (of doubtful status)
15. màl 'across water to land'
11. màt 'down to the ground'
25. mó 'come to rest'
13. mòy 'up from the ground'
12. tíl 'thither'
1. xól 'hither'
22. xqól 'outward, to the outside'
14. xúy 'up to a high position' (? should be xúy ?)
9. yón 'downstream, downhill'
4. yól 'to away from something'
24. yúy 'back to'

Of these 16 Iohninsky cites two, mà and mò, as open syllables, two, kúh and yón, as ending in h, and the remaining 14 as closed syllables;
but see below for a form indicating that mô, kûh and yôn should all have the same shape.

There are few questions to be raised about the 16 proclitics. They always occur initial in the word and always bear the main stress. Their main effect is to reduce the stress of the verb root (whether to a secondary stress or completely is virtually a matter of choice), but they never reduce the morphophonemically accented root vowel to schwa. Thus such forms as:

dûycacamat ‘one flies around’ < dûycáca-ma-t
bâyêgando ‘she crawled out, they say’ < bûy+bé-që-t+dô

The same effect is observed in forms of similar structure where there is no directional meaning:

 tôshámkut ‘they embrace e.o.’ < tô ‘breast’ +ê-ná-muku-t ‘tie to e.o.

meyótlomat ‘one grieves’ < myô ‘breath’ + tô-lô-ma-t
‘one turns around’
or even in compounds and phrasal sequences. If one classifies these as proclitics, there remains only one morpheme which can qualify as a prefix to verbs, the nominalizer 'ô-', as in toqàtal ‘a lie, liar’ < bêkáttal ‘one lies’ (for this and the few other examples see # 4.12.285. There is a bare possibility, however, that the same 'ô-' is to be found in òawa ‘something, a thing’.)

A further question is, whether the list of proclitics can be considered closed. I have recorded

'ônilot ‘one goes west, to back of house’, kenôlo ‘go up slope!’ , xhâlot ‘I go up into boat’
I have also recorded móhot ‘one climbs, goes up (hill)’
as well as kûmalot ‘one comes this way’ and an occasional variant kûmalhot; also málohôt and xôhôt as occasional variants of málot and xôlot.

The problem raised by these forms is not so much the shape of the proclitics as the morphemic shape of the root 'one goes'. In word-initial position the root is /ô/. Koshinsky analyzes it as /ô/ following any proclitic and assigns the /h/ of yônhot and kûnhot to yôn- and kûnt- (which would otherwise be open-syllable proclitics) with a rule of deletion of /h/ when the following stem begins with a consonant. There is also a unique variant /ô/ which occurs only in báyaqat ‘one goes outside’ < báyâ-qa-t (h 4,4.21 and 4,11,10). I can find no justification given for the analysis kûh-o and yôn-o other than a simple statement of a phonological rule (h 3,3,21). By own preference is to analyze the morpheme as /ô/ when word-initial, /ô/ when following a proclitic, with a rule of deletion of /h/ when following a consonant, with a unique change of vowel quality (ô > ُ) in the form báyaqat, while assigning morphophonemic shapes /kû/ and /yôn/, as well as /ô/, to the proclitics.
I see no need to postulate in a synchronic analysis a common underlying shape for /wá/ and /hó/. One can suggest, however, that the forms point to a common pre-SEP ancestor with the single shape /hwá/, whence word-initial /wá/ by elimination of initial consonant clusters and non-initial /hó/ by conversion of /wá/ into a vowel.

The directional suffixes raise more questions than the proclitics. Koshinsky lists -m 'towards or onto a surface', for which in accordance with the approach I have indicated I would prefer -ma. Similarly for -q 'away (out from here)' I would prefer -qa. I also add to Koshinsky's list -yí 'out from there (towards here)', which is recorded only with root wá and, curiously, pluralizes the root:

kéqol wáyílit 'the bees come out'

A dual form wáytat is also recorded. Both -ma and -qa behave as expected, having their vowels deleted when followed by another suffix, as in the dual:

cáqtat 'round object falls', cáqtat '2 rd obj fall'
kétómat '(man) stands', kétómat '2 stand'
or when followed by -qa 'permissive':
wáqt 'one goes out, away', wáxqa 'let him go away',
< wáqa-

with spirantization of /q/ before /q/. The vowel of -qa is retained after a CVC, root when V, is deleted and another suffix follows, putting directional -qa in the protected ultima or penult positions:

?eyéqlit 'many go along' < ?-yéqa-li-t, ?eyéqat 'many go away from' < ?-yéqa-qa-t

and with added -qa 'permissive'

?eyóqqa 'let them go away from' < ?-yéqa-qa-qa

Koshinsky cites -qla 'downward', -qlo-w-ql 'upwards; up off the ground'. The first of these is never found except followed by -ma, which Koshinsky analyzes as -m- 'onto a surface'. This doubling up of suffixes of the same category seems awkward, and since the association is so close I would prefer to set up a single morpheme -qalama 'down onto'. One would be more confident of the analysis if there were a contrasting morpheme with the meaning 'down from', but of this there is no recorded example in SEP. Koshinsky's -qlo-w-ql, however, can be demonstrated to be two separate morphemes, whose forms I take to be -qoloqo 'up onto' and -qaliki 'up from' respectively. Koshinsky's analysis of the -kí in -qaliki as 'semelfactive' and the final -qo in -qoloqo as 'causative' are difficult to accept.

Examples of -qalama and -qaliki are numerous but of -qoloqo are relatively few:

With root wá, wáqlamat 'one comes down', wáqlikit 'one goes up'

With stem ?-yéqa, ?eyóqqlamat 'many come down', ?eyóqqlikit 'many go up'
and in a text example:

\[\text{d}et\text{f}\ q\text{o} \ y\text{m}ay \ n\text{q}lam\text{d}it (< n\text{q}-\text{qalam}\text{-}\text{t}) 'he shoved the elderberries down into his (own) stomach'}\]

Of occurrences of -qoloq I have recorded, with root bō 'one crawls'
bōqloqot 'one crawls uphill', bōqloqtat '2 crawl uphill'
as well as mehāqloqot 'many crawl uphill'. In text I have recorded, for example,

with root cā, cāqloqot 'one flew up onto'
with stem y-nē, yehāqloqot '2 go up onto', yehēqloqdit '2 will go up onto'

The vowel of the first syllable of these three trisyllabic suffixes cannot be documented by citation of a recorded form. Because directional suffixes occur in the first position after the stem, the first syllable of these three is always in a position to have its vowel deleted. Only if one occurred after a CVC, stem with another affix preceding the directional would the proper environment for the retention of the first vowel be realized. Despite the absence of direct evidence, however, I am inclined to adopt the morphophonemic shapes as indicated.

The morpheme -b-, which Woehsinsky defines as 'intensive change in motional state' (k 4.4.26) is subject to a similar doubt. In all his examples -b- is constantly associated with a following -k, which is rather dubiously identified as 'momentaneous' (or 'semelfactive'?). For reasons similar to those cited for -qalama and others, I would be inclined to postulate a single morpheme -biki with the meaning 'sudden change of direction', either from motion to rest or from rest to motion. I have one text example which possibly confirms the vowel of the first syllable:

\[\text{xelē} \ x\text{qā} \ y\text{owwa} \ xq\text{obykit} 'they lay down in the shade of the tree'}\]

but the form xqobykit is difficult to analyze. Further, I have a few cases in which the second syllable is replaced in pluralization:

dōbkit 'one puts one’s hand down', dōbkitat '2 etc.',
dōmat 'many etc.'
similarly from stem xkō 'to hear'
xkōbkt 'listen!', xkōbktta '2 listen!', xkōbma 'many listen!'

I see no way at present to resolve the problems these forms present.

I have similar doubts about Woehsinsky's separation of n- 'figure separation' and -ēx- 'to away from a point': first, because the two are almost invariably associated; second, because other affixes occur separating the combination n-ēx from a preceding stem. Some examples are:

tīl?ēshēn̄īt '1 chases 1 away' and bāy'ēshēqan̄īt '1 chases 1 out'

the latter involving occurrence of directional -qa 'out from here' between the stem and -n-ē; also,
tilkefančit '1 chases many away, or many chase 1 away'
with dual tilkefančittat and plural imperative
(1 tilkefanmača
in which a pluralizer -ma- interrupts the combination -(n)-či, as well as
kočalnci 'chase them!', plural kočalinmača
in which an apparent -li 'durative' intervenes between the stem and
-či, and again the pluralizer -ma- separates -(n)- from -či. Here again
I see no way to resolve the problems, but it is clear that these suf-
fixes do not behave in the same way as other directionals. (The seg-
ment /n/ either violates the rule that suffixes have the shape CV or it
contains a vowel of indeterminable quality, since there are no test
forms recorded by which the quality could be fixed.)

Finally there is -mulu 'around' (ibshinsky's -mlu- 'circulative'),
which I construct as CVCV in shape although I have no citable examples
of any surface shape other than -mulu whence -mlo by lowering of high
vowels before -li 'durative'. Doubtless fortuitously, the suffix is
recorded only after CV roots:

camlut 'one flies around', čelamlolit 'one keeps
turning around', němlut 'I turns over a flat
object' whence dual němluttat
although there are such stems as
-yěga 'many go' and -déll '1 carries around
object in hand'

which could conceivably provide the environment in which -mul, -mulu,
-muli could be produced. It is noticeable also that the second vowel
does not weaken to /i/ before final -t. Some of these characteristics
are found also in -muklu 'reciprocal', which, however, does take the
shapes -mku, -muk, -muki under appropriate conditions:

stem -q-f1 'marry (catch?)' > ñekimkut 'they are
married', ñekimkutta 'marry e.o.!' vs.
stem m-yólo > meyólmukit '1 mixes s.t. with s.t. else',
meyólmuktat '2 mix, or 1 mixes many things

It is possible that these two affixes share some special morphophonemic
rules.

A revised list of directional suffixes would, then, read as
follows:
- ma 'to, on or onto a point or surface'
- qa 'out from here (away from speaker)'
- yi 'out from there (toward speaker)'
- biki 'sudden change of direction', so constructed
  in spite of the suppression of segment /k1/ in
  pluralization
- mulu 'around'
- qalama 'down onto'
- qaliki 'up from'
- qololoq 'up onto'
The foregoing list does not include -n\^{2}i which, whether it is analyzed as two morphemes -n-\(\delta\)i or one discontinuous morpheme, differs from the others on the list in its position of occurrence as well as in its interruptibility. It is clearly a directional of some kind. Further study of SEP and/or comparative analysis might throw some useful light on its origins.

Earlier in this paper I stated that I would formulate rules for vowel deletion and retention. Although I cannot cover the whole structure, a few simple rules can be stated, taking components in the order of their occurrence.

1. Proclitics always contain a morphophonemic accented syllable. This accent becomes the primary accent of the word, weakening subsequent morphophonemic accents.

2. Causative-instrumental prefixes have the shape C and are never accented but always syllabic.

3. Stems consist either of a root or prefix-root. Roots have the shapes CV or CC\(\delta\)V, \* when there is no proclitic, the root accent is the is the primary accent of the word. The accented vowel is never deleted or changed in quality except for high vowels /\(\breve{u}\), \(\breve{i}\)/ being lowered to /\(\delta\), \(\breve{e}\)/ before -\(\breve{\lambda}\) 'durative'.

4. In reduplication the accent of the repeated root/stem component is deleted/reduced, but the accented vowel of the root retains its quality and is not deleted. In reduplication of CC\(\delta\)V, roots V\text{\_}1 is deleted from the first component.

4.1. A special rule obtains for CC\(\delta\)1V\text{\_}1, roots when C\text{\_}1 is \(/y/\) or \(/\breve{y}/\)

4.11. When C\text{\_}1 is \(/y/\), V\text{\_}1 of the first component and \(\delta\) of the second component are deleted, but V\text{\_}1 of the second component is retained; \(\text{i.e.}, CC\breve{y}V\text{\_}1 + C\breve{y}V\text{\_}1 \rightarrow C\breve{y}yV\text{\_}1\).

4.12. When C\text{\_}1 is \(/\breve{y}/\), C\text{\_}1V\text{\_}1 of the first component and \(\delta\) of the second are deleted; \(\text{i.e.}, C\breve{y}\breve{y}V\text{\_}1 + C\breve{y}\breve{y}V\text{\_}1 \rightarrow C\breve{y}\breve{y}V\text{\_}1\).

5. Suffixes contain no accented vowel. They have the shapes CV, CVCV and CVCVCV.

5.1. Following a root of shape CV, the first vowel of a suffix and every alternate vowel of that or subsequent suffixes is deleted, with a result tending toward a succession of closed syllables.

5.2. The ultima, however, must always contain a vowel, whether it is open or closed.

5.21. When the antepenult is a closed syllable and the penult is an open syllable, the penult remains open, \(\text{i.e.}\), the vowel of the penult is protected against deletion.

6. Enclitics are not covered by the rules given just above and are outside the scope of this paper.
Southeastern Pomo, it is generally agreed, is in many respects the most divergent member of the Pomo family. This is correct at least if surface shapes are compared. Under morphophonemic analysis, however, the divergence appears less than it is on the surface, both as to morpheme shapes and as to phonological processes.

A point particularly illustrated by the foregoing analysis has to do with prosodic marking of the root. Most of the Pomo languages have some method of marking the root by a prosodic feature, either a stress or a pitch accent, omitting for the sake of argument cases of accent shifting brought about by various morphophonemic processes in certain of the languages. Although I have reservations about some features of McLendon’s reconstructions of Proto-Pomo (McLendon 1973), I fully agree that reconstruction of prosodic root-marking is necessary. Further, prosodic marking of the root is general in the Yuman languages and is possibly an old Hokan feature.

Southern Pomo does not mark the root by a prosodic feature. It has no phonemic accent but follows a rule by which primary stress in a breath group falls on the penult with secondary stress on every second syllable preceding the penult. The root is therefore often unstressed but is marked partly by its position in the word, partly by a system of increments on its initial consonant, which at the same time protects the root vowel against deletion.

Southeastern Pomo also has no phonemic accent but follows a mechanical rule by which stress falls on the first vowel of the word. Schwa being neither a phoneme nor an allophone of a vowel, it is never stressed. In most cases, then, phonetic (but not phonemic) stress falls on the root vowel. The exception is the case when the stem is preceded by a proclitic, which then bears the stress. The construction of morphophonemic accent of the root vowel is necessary not so much to account for phonetic stress on the root as to account for the non-deletability of the root vowel.

The foregoing analysis, then, contributes something to the justification for reconstructing prosodic root-marking in Proto-Pomo and illustrates one of the ways in which the various daughter languages have preserved root-marking.
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