LANGUAGE GAMES, ASPIRATION AND SYLLABIFICATION IN ARGENTINE SPANISH

Carlos Gelormini Lezama[1]

cgelormini@udesa.edu.ar

ABSTRACT: Traditional rule-based models have offered an accurate description of different aspects of syllabification in Spanish but have failed to provide a unified explanation of the various phenomena related to syllable structure and resyllabification across word and morpheme boundaries (Hualde, 1992). Several authors (e.g., Colina, 1995, 2002, 2011; Face, 1999; Wiltshire, 1999, 2006; Bradley, 2014) in the framework of Optimality Theory have attempted to provide a coherent account of Spanish syllabification and the related widely spread process of aspiration. In this paper, I study two language games and I re-examine previously reported data from Argentine Spanish to challenge the view that prefix and word boundaries share the same status.
KEYWORDS: Spanish; syllabification; phonological domain; aspiration; language games.

RESUMO: Modelos tradicionais baseados em regras têm oferecido uma descrição precisa de diferentes aspectos da silabação em espanhol, mas não conseguiram fornecer uma explicação unificada dos vários fenômenos relacionados à estrutura da sílaba e à ressilabificação através dos limites de palavras e morfemas (Hualde, 1992). Vários autores (Colina, 1995, 2002, 2011; Face, 1999; Wiltshire, 1999, 2006; Bradley, 2014), no contexto da Teoria da Otimidade, tentaram fornecer uma explicação coerente da silabificação espanhola e da aspiração. Neste artigo, eu estudo dois jogos de linguagem e reexamino dados anteriormente relatados de espanhol argentino para desafiar a visão de que prefixos e limites de palavras compartilham o mesmo *status*.
PALAVRAS-CHAVE: espanhol; silabificação; domínio fonológico; aspiração; jogos de linguagem.

1. INTRODUCTION

In this paper I summarize and review some of the most relevant accounts of Spanish syllabification in the framework of Optimality Theory (OT). I re-examine previously reported data from the Spanish spoken in Buenos Aires (BA) and Rio Negro (RN), two closely related dialects spoken in Argentina (Kaisse, 1999). I also study two language games, called *jeringozo* and *gaso:* the former spoken in many Hispanic countries (including Argentina) and the latter being used in the city of

---

[1] Universidad de San Andrés.

Rosario, Argentina. These data suggest that morpheme and word boundaries do not behave in the same way as regards resyllabification. OT models based on the fusion of these two kinds of boundaries fail to offer a satisfactory explanation for these data.

2. SOME BASIC FACTS ABOUT SYLLABIFICATION IN SPANISH

In Spanish, simple onsets are preferred over simple or complex codas. This Onset Maximization Principle determines that intervocalic consonants become the onset of the second syllable rather than the coda of the first vowel (Clements & Keyser, 1983; Blevins, 1995). Example: [mo.no], *[mon.o]. Only when a consonant cannot become the onset of a subsequent syllable - because there are none- will it form a coda. For example, in [en.ten.der] the [r] cannot become the onset of a non-existing subsequent syllable and, in this case, the consonant has to become a coda. However, [d] could become part of a complex coda of the syllable *[tend] as in English *attend*. It does not in Spanish, though. Following a sonority hierarchy, the most sonorous segment in a syllable, the vowel, constitutes its nucleus. The first, second and third [e] in [en.ten.der] will constitute the nuclei of their respective syllables. The boundary between these syllables has to be established. The first [n] counting from the rightmost edge cannot form part of the last syllable because it is more sonorous than [d]. However, [d] could, in principle, be part of either the last or penultimate syllable. But if it becomes part of a complex coda of the penultimate syllable, the last syllable would become VC instead of CVC and the penultimate syllable would become CVCC. Frequency of occurrence shows that Spanish prefers CVC over VC and CVC over CVCC. However, VC and CVCC do exist in Spanish as in the first syllable of the words *alcanzar* [al.kan.sar] and *construir* [kons.tru(.)ir], respectively. In [en.ten.der], the [d] prefers becoming the onset of the last syllable to making up a complex coda of the penultimate one. Again, onsets are preferred over codas, both word-internally and across word boundaries as in *el avion* [e.l|a.βion] *[el|.a.βion] . And it appears as if there is a conspiracy towards an optimal CV structure, the most frequent syllable in Spanish. It is also the case that complex onsets are preferred over simple codas. A word such as *agregar* /aɣregar/ is syllabified as [a.ɣre.ɣar] rather than *[aɣ.re.ɣar]. The first [ɣ] creates a complex onset instead of becoming the coda of its preceding syllable. We can see that both simple and complex onsets are preferred over codas. It has also been claimed that prefixes behave as words in the sense that their last

consonants become onsets rather than remain as codas of an admissible syllable (Face, 1999). Examples: *desentender* [de.sen.ten.der]; *[des.en.ten.der]; *desaparecer* [de.sa.pa.re.ser]; *[des.a.pa.re.ser]. To sum up, Spanish appears to display a very strong preference for its consonants to become onsets rather than codas, and this preference appears word internally, across morpheme and word boundaries.

However, the preference for complex onsets over codas does not apply in the following example: *snob loco* [eh.noβ.lo.ko], * [eh.no.βlo.ko]. It seems as if the preference for complex onsets over codas does not apply across word boundaries or across prefix boundaries as shown by Face (1999). The following data suggest that this is a generalized feature: *subrayar* [suβ.ra.ʃar] *[su.βra.ʃar]; [su.βa.kwa.ti.ko] *[suβ.a.kwa.ti.ko]. In [suβ.ra.ʃar], /b/ does not create a complex onset but remains as coda of the first syllable. In [su.βa.kwa.ti.ko] /b/ becomes a simple onset rather than a simple coda of the preceding syllable. Therefore, it is usually considered that:

- simple onsets are preferred over simple codas.
- simple onsets are preferred over complex codas.
- complex onsets are preferred over simple codas within a morpheme.
- complex onsets are preferred over complex codas within a morpheme.

But:

- simple codas are preferred over complex onsets across morphemes and words.

However, some examples cast some doubt on the cross-dialectal validity of the last rule:

(1) *sublingual* /sub/|liŋ.gwal/

In BA, this word is pronounced either [suβ|.liŋ.gwal] or [su.β|liŋ.gwal]. However, no alternation occurs across words *[klu.βlin.do] or *[klu.βra.ro] or *[in.ter.ne.tlin.da], etc. The rule which establishes that simple codas are preferred over complex onsets across morphemes, does not apply in this case. Both pronunciations are extended in Argentina.

(2) *sublevar* /sub|lebar/

This is a word whose pronunciation [su.βle.βar] never alternates with the unattested *[suβ.le.βar]. This counts as a counterexample to the same rule because there should be no reason for the /b/ to make a complex onset across a morpheme, -unless, of course, /sub/ is not a separate morpheme in the mental grammar of the

native speaker. If this is the case, then complex onsets are preferred over simple codas within morphemes, as expected.

(3) *subliminal* /sub|liminal/

This word aternates between [su.βli.mi.nal] and [suβ.li.mi.nal].

(4) *sublimar* /sub|limar/

This word is pronounced /su.βli.mar/ but never */suβ.limar/.

Data (1-4) might question the validity of considering morpheme boundaries as phonologically equivalent to word boundaries, unless, again, the last rule does not apply because /sub/ does not count as a separate morpheme for the native speaker in certain cases, in particular, (2) and (4) above.

3. CONSTRAINTS

In the framework of Optimality Theory (Prince & Smolensky, 1993; McCarthy & Prince 1993), Face (1999) proposes a particular arrangement of the following constraints, which follow from the rules summarized above:

ONSET: every syllable has an onset.

NO CODA: syllables do not have codas.

The following is the tableau for *cubre* ("cover") /ku.bɾe/:

(5)

candidates	ONSET	NO CODA
a.☞[ku.βɾe]		
b. [kuβ.ɾe]		*!

As we can see, both candidates satisfy ONSET and, therefore NO CODA becomes decisive. These two constraints can account for word internal syllabification but they cannot explain the fact that a phrase such as *club lindo* is never pronounced as */klu.βlin.do/ because it would select the wrong candidate:

(6)

candidates	ONSET	NO CODA
a.☞[klu.βlin.do]		*
b. [kluβ.lin.do]		**!

Hualde (1992) proposes that the COMPLEX ONSET RULE (COR) does not apply post lexically. Colina (1999) uses an ALIGN constraint to account for resyllabification.

ALIGN: every initial stem-edge should match to an initial syllable edge.

The following is the tableau for the phrase *club lindo.*

(7)

candidates	ONSET	ALIGN	NO CODA
a.☞[kluβ.lin.do]			**
b. [klu.βlin.do]		*!	*

The first candidate [kluβ.lin.do] crucially satisfies ALIGN and thus is selected as optimal. Face (1999) proposes a revision of the ALIGN constraint to account for the syllabification in *subliminal.* He shows that if we follow Colina's ALIGN constraint we would not get the expected result.

(8)

candidates	ONSET	ALIGN	NO CODA
a. [suβ|.li.mi.nal]			**!
b.☞ [su.β|li.mi.nal]			*

The ranking of ALIGN above NO CODA prohibits the formation of complex onsets both across word and morpheme boundaries, two environments that are equated by the notion of "phonological domain" (PD) defined as "a morphological grouping containing one or more morphemes, which is input to the phonology" (Face 1999: 4). The idea behind this notion is that the phonology can refer to a PD but not to particular morphemes within a PD. The claim is that prefixed words constitute two PDs unlike suffixed words which behave as only one indivisible input to phonology. This predicts that in suffixed words the phonology will not be able to refer to the two morphological units of the word and no rule should apply between these domains, since this boundary is invisible to phonology. In prefixed words, phonology will have

access to the morphological structure of the word (or phrase) by seeing the two corresponding PDs and may refer to each of these two units individually. Face (1999) proposes a revision of Colina's constraint:

ALIGN: Every initial edge of a phonological domain should match to an initial syllable edge.

This renders the following tableau.

(9)

candidates	ONSET	ALIGN	NO CODA
a. ☞ [suβ|.li.mi.nal]			**!
b. [su.β|li.mi.nal]		*!	*

As we can see, the candidate selected is [suβ.li.mi.nal] in the same way as [kluβ\|.lin.do] for the reason that both PDs (/sub/ and /liminal/) are subject to the ALIGN constraint. Since [su.βli.mi.nal] violates ALIGN once, [suβ.li.mi.nal] is chosen as the right candidate.

If we want to show Face's set of constraints in Argentine Spanish and account for [su.βli.mi.nal], we would like to suggest that NO CODA and ALIGN are ranked in a different order:

(10)

candidates	ONSET	NO CODA	ALIGN
a. [suβ|.li.mi.nal]		**!	
b.☞ [su.β|li.mi.nal]		*	*

This tableau produces the right candidate [su.βli.mi.nal]. Now, by means of the same tableau we would get [klu. βlin.do] as shown below:

(11)

candidates	ONSET	NO CODA	ALIGN
a. [kluβ|.lin.do]		**!	
b. ☞[klu.β|lin.do]		*	*

The wrong candidate is selected. No matter how we re-rank theses constraints we do not obtain the whole set of attested forms. As regards this example, it seems as

if Colina's approach can give a better account of the output forms [kluβ.lin.do] and [su.βli.mi.nal]. However, the problem remains that while [su.βli.mi.nal] alternates with [suβ.li.mi.nal], *[klu.βlin.do] does not exist in any dialect of Spanish.

According to Face's (1999) view a word such as *suboficial* /sub|ofisial/ should be syllabified in a straightforward way as [su.βo.fi.sial]. However, this form alternates with [suβ.o.fi.sial] and forms such as *subacuatico* /sub|akwatiko/ is pronounced both as [suβ.a.kwa.ti.ko] and [su.βa.kwa.ti.ko]. It could be certainly argued that in Argentine Spanish NO CODA and ALIGN are equally ranked, which would explain the constant alternations between the forms above. However this would predict an unattested alternation between [kluβ.lin.do] and *[klu.βlin.do]. The problem appears to lie in the central claim that prefix boundaries are subject to the same rules of syllabification as word boundaries.

Face (1999) gives two examples where no complex onsets are allowed across prefix boundaries: [að|.ri.sar] and [suβ|.ra.yar]. And he claims that "the data demonstrate that complex onsets are not formed across prefix boundaries either, even though the consonant cluster would produce an acceptable complex onset" (Face 1999: 2). However, the word *adrizar* is always pronounced [a.ðri.sar] in Argentine Spanish and there is no alternation with the purportedly optimal [að.ri.sar]. However, it could be argued that /ad/ may not count as a prefix for some native speakers and so it is not a phonological domain.

There are not many combinations of final /d/ and initial /r/ in Spanish across morphemes within a word. Final /d/ is very frequently elided in normal speech, so an expression like *ciudad roñosa* /siudad roɲosa/ becomes [sju. ða.ro.ɲo.sa] where the question of whether the /d/ forms a complex onset or stays as coda remains obscure. For a phrase such as *club lindo* the most common form is [klu.lin.do]. The offending coda disappears, which can be easily explained by positing a NO OBSTRUENTS in CODA constraint. Deletion and aspiration could both be explained this way as a group of phenomena that conspires against the occurrence of obstruents in coda.

However, it is clear that in careful speech *ciudad roñosa* is pronounced as [sju. ðað.ro.ɲo.sa] and not [sju.ða.ðro.ɲo.sa]. This coincides with the example of *club lindo*. But one would think that there is something more in this example. In order to combine /d/ and /r/ into members of the same cluster we would need to produce /r/ as a simple vibrant [ɾ] since the cluster /d/ followed by a multiple vibrant [r] does not

exist in Spanish. This would involve changing the pronunciation of the second word. Furthermore, the simple vibrant cannot occur initially in Spanish and it may be the case that by producing a cluster such as [dɾo], the effect is an alteration in the initial sound of the second word because we would be using a different phoneme - one which happens to be in contrastive distribution with the simple vibrant only in some contexts but which is intuitively regarded as a different sound.   It seems then that in the optimal candidate [siu. ðað.ro.ɲo.sa] there might be two phenomena conspiring: first, the avoidance of resyllabification across words in a context in which this process would favor a complex onset over a simple coda; second, the fact that resyllabification would alter the initial sound of the second word. As a consequence the purportedly optimal candidate [að.risar] does not prove the absence of resyllabification across morphemes but a much more basic process whereby syllabification cannot occur if this would imply a radical change in a phoneme.

Moreover, for a form such as [suβ.ra. ʃar], we cannot know whether it is true that [b] and [r] do not combine together because no complex onsets are formed across word boundaries, or for the simple reason that in order to produce such a cluster we would be forced to change the pronunciation of the word *rayar*. A simple vibrant would be used to produce an admissible cluster. Examples such as [siu. ðað.ro.ɲo.sa], [suβ.raʃar] and [að.risar] can be better explained in terms of a constraint that minimizes the allomorphy of content words. In line with this view, Shepherd (2003: 20) claims that:

> "resyllabification across word-internal PD boundaries is possible in many dialects. Perhaps the clearest evidence of this is the fact that Manuel Seco (1996) sees the need to prescriptively correct the frequent pronunciation of words such as *subrayar* ('to underline') and *subrogar* ('to subrogate') as [su.βra.ʃar] and [su.βro.ɣar] instead of [suβ.ra.ʃar] and [suβ.ro.ɣar] respectively."

We should note that the alternation between [suβ.ra.ʃar] and [su.βra.ʃar] at the level of morpheme boundary does not occur at word boundaries.

4. Language Games

Language games such as the ones I present in this section can be considered to be ludlings, defined as "the result of a transformation or series of transformations acting regularly on an ordinary language text, with the intent of altering the form but

not the content of the original messages, for purposes of concealment or comic effect" (Laycock 1972: 61). These language games are linguistic systems that are built upon a natural language. The relevance of language games as regards a discussion about syllable structure has been shown by Blevins (1995: 209-210) who states that:

> in a number of languages, native speakers have clear intuitions regarding the number of syllables in a word or utterance, and in some of these, generally clear intuitions as to where syllable breaks occur". It is this native speaker's awareness of syllable breaks which justifies the inclusion of this topic in the present discussion.

"Rosarigasino" or "gaso" is a language game practiced by speakers from Rosario, Argentina. This language game is called "rosarigasino" or "gaso". This ludling is generated by adding two syllables to each word. Immediately after the vowel of the stressed syllable, /gas/ is infixed, and then the vowel is repeated. The name of the language game itself is generated from the word "rosarino" which means "from Rosario". The following text in conventional spelling is taken from the *Rosarigasino* entry of Wikipedia:

> To**gaso**dos los se**gase**res huma**gasa**nos na**gasa**cen li**gasi**bres e igua**gasa**les en <u>dignida**gasa**d</u> y en dere**gase**chos. Esta**gasá**n dota**gasa**dos de <u>razo**gasó**n</u> y de conscie**gase**ncia, y de**gase**ben comporta**gasa**rse fraterna**gasa**lmente los u**gasu**nos con los o**gaso**tros.

> ("Todos los seres humanos nacen libres e iguales en dignidad y en derechos. Están dotados de razón y de conciencia y deben comportarse fraternalmente los unos con los otros").

It should be noted that the infixation occurs not after the stressed syllable, but after the stressed vowel. The coda is added as part of the second syllable. This is why we do not get *[diɣ.ni.dad.ɣasa] or *[ra.son.ga.so] but [diɣ.ni.da.ɣa.sad] and [ra.so.ɣa.son]. In the case of a phrase such as *club lindo*, this language game produces [klu.ɣa.suβ.li.ɣa.sin.do] and not *[klu.ɣa.su.βli.ɣa.sin.do]. And for *club acuatico* it produces [klu.ɣa.suβ.a.kwa.ɣa.sa.ti.ko] but not *[klu.ɣa.su.βa.kwa.ɣa.sa.ti.ko]. As we can see, the reason why *[klu.ɣa.su.βa.kwa.ɣa.sa.ti.ko] is wrong cannot be that it "creates a complex onset across word boundary", because it simply does not. It may well be the case that there is one and the same reason why *[klu.ɣa.su.βa.kwa.ɣa.sa.ti.ko] and *[klu.ɣa.su.βli.ɣa.sin.do] are less harmonic. And this same reason may apply to */klu.βlin.do/. Avoiding complex onsets does not account for these data because, as

Rosarigasino shows, simple onsets across words are sometimes also avoided. What is noteworthy about this example is that even in a language game which separates a coda from its syllable, word boundaries are clearly respected: in *[klu.ɣa.su.βa.kwa.ɣa.sa.ti.ko], [suβ] is not a prefix now. However, it does not syllabify as word internally but remains separate from the following word. The question remains of whether the form *[klu.ɣa.su.βli.ɣa.sin.do] is unattested because it would imply a violation of "no complex onsets across words" or because no resyllabification applies (whether it would create a complex or a *simple* onset as in *[klu.ɣa.su.βa.kwa.ɣa.sa.ti.ko]). It appears as if this Argentine ludling shows a marked sensitivity to word boundaries while it completely disregards the internal morphological structure.

The example of [a.ðri.sar] versus [að.ri-sar] left the question opened of whether in the first case (although unattested in BA) the reason why /dr/ does not form a cluster might be because /d/ + multiple vibrant is not an admissible cluster in any variety of Spanish, and not because the prefix "ad" constitutes a phonological domain. I will address this issue by referring to the cluster /dl/.

The /dl/ cluster does exist in Argentine Spanish, and it is perfectly admissible. Shepherd (2003:3), when analyzing syllable structures in Spanish, points out:

> in a perfect world it would be possible to classify all conceivable syllable configurations as either well or ill formed in a particular language. However, in reality it seems that such structures exist along a continuum ranging from clearly acceptable to clearly unacceptable and leaving a number of frustrating cases in between. Particularly interesting are non-occurring patterns whose absence, in some cases, may be attributable to historical coincidence rather than their inherent ill formedness.

So the question is whether the absence of /dl/ is an accidental or a systematic gap. The fact that there are very few words that have that cluster does not mean that it does not exist. In order to prove that /dl/ does not exist as a cluster, there should be no exceptions to the rule by which /d/ and /l/ are syllabified in different syllables. This is not what happens in Argentine Spanish. The word *adler* is a famous trademark in Argentina. There is no alternation here: the only attested pronunciation is [a-ðler] while truly unacceptable onsets such as /spr/ are systematically avoided in trademarks such as *sprite* which is always pronounced with an epenthetic vowel [es-prai(t)]. As I said there are very few examples of /dl/ in Spanish. But when they do occur, by no means does the native speaker choose to separate this cluster into

different syllables. The adjective *adleriano* and the corresponding proper name *Adler* are systematically pronounced [a.ðle.ria.no] and [a.ðler], respectively. In the most typical type of Argentine jerigonza a syllable formed by /p/ + previous vowel is inserted (Piñeros, 1998). In this game, we never get *[að.pa.le.rpe]/ but [a.pa.ðler.pe], which shows that /dl/ belongs to the same syllable. In another kind of Argentine jerigonza, which inserts /big/ + previous vowel, we never get *[ad.βi.ɣa.ler.βi.ɣe] but [a.βi.ɣa.dler.βi.ɣe].

The fact that /tl/ forms a cluster in Argentine Spanish is less controversial. In the two language games described above, we never get forms such as *[at.pa.lam.pa.ti.pi.ko] but [a.pa.tlam.pa.ti.pi.ko.po] for *atlántico*. In the same way we get: [a.βi.ɣa.tlan.βi.ɣa.ti.βi.ɣi.ko.βi.ɣo/ and not */at.βi.ɣa.lan.βi.ɣa.ti.βi.ɣi.ko.βi.ɣo/. However, it remains the fact that we never get phrases such as *[in.ter.ne.tlo.ka] but [in.ter.net.lo.ka]. Again, this shows the general preference for simple codas over complex onsets across word boundaries. There seems to be no exception to this. The exceptions always come from morpheme boundaries which appear to behave differently than word boundaries.

If /ad.risar/ is syllabified in some dialects as [að.risar] it may be the case that this syllabification is not due to a morpheme boundary but because of the fact that the cluster /d/ + multiple vibrant does not exist. This has to be contrasted with /dl/, a cluster which exists and disregards morpheme boundaries as can be seen in the alternation of the pronunciation of *adlatere* /ad|latere/ as either [a.ðla.te.re] or [að.la.te.re].

5. ASPIRATION AND PHONOLOGICAL DOMAINS

Aspiration is also presented as evidence of the similarity between the behavior of prefixes and words. The set of rankings proposed by Face (1999) renders the following tableau for *desecho*:

(12)

	candidates	ONSET	ALIGN	NO CODA
a.	[de.he. tʃo]		*	
b.	[de.se. tʃo]		*	

This tie is broken by UNIFORM EXPONENCE (UE).

UE-PD: minimize the differences in the realization of a phonological domain.

(13)

candidates	ONSET	UE-PD
a. ☞ [de.he.tʃo]		
b. [de.se.tʃo]		*!

Since *des* is forced to be realized as [deh] in aspirating dialects where the segment /s/ remains in coda position, this constraint would be violated if the same phonological domain were realized without aspiration in cases where the [h] has become an onset of the subsequent syllable. If *des* were pronounced [des] in *deshecho* the preffix *des* (the same phonological domain) would have two different realizations, which would violate UE-PD. This would then produce [me.heh)] or [me.hes] instead of [me.seh] or [me.ses] for *meses*. However, the /s/ in question (the first /s/) cannot be considered PD final since the whole argument is that prefixes create phonological domains whereas suffixes do not. The optimal candidate between [me.heh] and [me.seh] has to be decided on different grounds.

Colina (1997) uses a faithfulness constraint (Prince & Smolensky, 1993/2004) which requires phonetic realizations to match underlying forms. Unless this implies a violation of a higher ranked constraint, forms should not deviate from their underlying representation. This breaks the tie:

(14)

candidates	ONSET	UE-PD	FAITH
a. ☞ [me.seh]			
b. [me.heh]			*!

Intuitively one would think that aspiration in [me-heh] may be due to the fact that both /s/ are "at the end of some word". However, the singular form /mes/ -contained in the suffixed word /meses/ - does not constitute a domain that can be seen by phonology. Thus, aspiration occurring in [de.se.tʃo] and not in [me.seh]

cannot be explained unless we accommodate faitfulness constraints to fit our surface forms. In both accounts, it appears as if the claim ends up being that that the reason why one or other candidate is chosen depends on the always elusive underlying form. We must remember that in these aspirating dialects the singular form is systematically pronounced [meh] even when it becomes the onset of the following syllable, a fact that should be taken into account once we propose what the input form ought to be.

Kaisse's (1999) provides a rich description of the process of aspiration in Buenos Aires (BA) and Rio Negro (RN) Spanish. In BA /s/ is realized as [h] in coda before a consonant, whether this consonant starts a new syllable, a new morpheme, or a new word. As she points out: "if the segment after an /s/ is a vowel, the morphology is likewise irrelevant; the /s/ resyllabifies with the vowel and is not aspirated" (Kaisse 1999: 205). There are no [h]'s in onsets. RN provides a richer context for aspiration: apart from the BA aspiration (a) the RN dialect aspirates the /s/ word finally (b), and between vowels when the [h] is no longer part of the coda but has become the onset of the following syllable (c). Example (d) shows a context where neither BA nor RN aspirate the /s/.

	BA	RN
(a) /mismo/	[mih.mo]	[mih.mo]
(b) /dos/	[dos]	[doh]
(c) /dos amigos/	[do.sa.mi.gos]	[do.ha.mi.goh]
(d) /deseʃo/	[de.se.tʃo]	[de.se.tʃo]

Aspiration for BA disregards the difference between word boundaries or morpheme boundaries. Kaisse (1999: 203) explains the process of aspiration by means of a "sandwich application: resyllabification, aspiration, resyllabification". This implies that we apply three rules in the following order: (1) word-level resyllabification; (2) word-level aspiration; (3) phrasal resyllabification. For *dos amigos* we get: /doh.a.mi.goh/ and for *deshecho* we get /de.se.tʃo/, where aspiration does no longer apply. It applies in [do.ha.mi.goh] as constrained by outer word syllabification while it does not apply on [de.se.tʃo] because aspiration applies once the /s/ has become an onset. Kaisse (1999: 204) observes that "speakers of BA stigmatize all variation from their own pattern of aspiration and refer to Rio Negro speakers and dialect as [lohoxoh], a jocular reference to the way Patagonian speakers

pronounce the phrase "los ojos". Furthermore, she adds that:

> in my observation, Argentine aspiration, both RN and BA [...] is virtually obligatory. That is, any /s/ in the right morphological and syllabic position can be counted upon to aspirate. The only serious exception is the one I have already mentioned: Rio Negro speakers sometimes keep an /s/ unaspirated in environemnts where the prestige BA dialect would not keep it (205).

Wiltshire (1999) points out that equating prefix and word boundaries predicts that aspiration should occur both at word and prefix final position. She points out: "this is not the case in dialects such as those in RN, in which prefix-final aspiration occurs only pre-consonantly, while aspiration word-finally occurs regardless of the following segment" (Wiltshire 1999: 387). This is the reason why RN is a very interesting dialect because it shows that aspiration reacts in different ways to these two boundaries. This differentiated behavior is opaque in BA because aspiration responds to one and only rule which does not need (but does not disprove either) any morphological limitation. Wiltshire further argues that:

> prefixes could perhaps be given PD status only if prefix final aspiration occurs regardless of the following segment, although accounting for the different phonological outputs in different varieties by means of different PD analyses seems rather *ad hoc* (Wiltshire 1999: 387).

This author proposes a different approach, using the following ordered constraints:

*sC   No pre-consonantal alveolar fricatives

*h   No glottal fricatives

FAITH PL Output has the same place features as input

In addition, for RN, she proposes another constraint which ranks low for BA:

*S]pw   No [s] before the right-edge of a prosodic word (i.e. in word-final position).

In her analysis there is no longer need for PDs, since both BA and RN forms can be obtained without this notion. Wiltshire (1999: 376) finally claims: "I propose an analysis based on surface prosodic structure which is held to be the same in the different varieties of Spanish".

6. CONCLUSION

Aspiration appears to occur in some Spanish dialects beyond the question of whether internal prosodic boundaries are taken into account or not. The notion of phonological domain accurately accounts for the data of some dialects of Spanish. However, it seems as if showing internal prosodic boundaries for dialects like BA or RN is not fully motivated by the data. These differences are not solved by re-ranking constraints. Claiming that the prosodic structure is the same in every dialect of Spanish is theoretically elegant. However, if this were indeed the case, then there ought to be a set of constraints whose re-ranking would explain both generalized syllabification norms in Spanish, and dialectal variation as well. There seems to be at least some evidence that the different dialects of Spanish may not all share a uniform prosodic word structure.

REFERENCES

BLEVINS, J. "The Syllable in Phonological Theory." In John Goldsmith ed. *The Handbook of Phonological Theory*. Blackwell, Oxford. 206-244, 1995.

BRADLEY, Travis G.   Optimality Theory and Spanish Phonology. *Language and Linguistics Compass* 8(2), 2014.

CLEMENTS, G. N., & KEYSER, S. J. *CV phonology. A generative theory of the syllable* (Linguistic inquiry monographs 9). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1983.

COLINA, Sonia, An account of inter and intradialectal variation in Spanish /s/ aspiration in James Lee, Kimberley Geeslin and J. Clancy Clements, *Structure meaning and acquisition in Spanish: papers from the 4th Hispanic Linguistics Symposium*, 230-243. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Press, 2002

COLINA, Sonia. *A constraint-based analysis of syllabification in Spanish, Catalan, and Galician*. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 1995.

COLINA, Sonia. Spanish morphophonologoy. Studies in Hispanic and Lusophone Linguistics 4 (1). 173-191, 2011.

FACE, Timothy. "Reexamining Spanish 'Resyllabification". Paper presented at the 29th Linguistics Symposium on Romance Languages, Ann Arbor, Michigan, April 1999.

HARRIS, James. "Integrity of Prosodic Constituents and the Domain of Syllabification Rules in Spanish and Catalan". In: Kenneth Hale and Samuel Jay Keyser (eds.). *The View from Building 20*, 177-193. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1993.

HARRIS, James. *Syllable Structure and Stress in Spanish*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1983.

HUALDE, José Ignacio. "On Spanish Syllabification". In: Héctor Campos and Fernando Martínez-Gil (eds.). *Current Studies in Spanish Linguistics*, 475-493. Washington D.C.: Georgetown University Press, 1992.

KAISSE, Ellen. "Resyllabification Precedes All Segmental Rules: Evidence from Argentine Spanish". In: Marc Authier, Barbara Bullock, and Lisa Reed (eds.). *Formal Perspectives on Romance Linguistics,* 197-210. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 1999.

LAYCOCK, Don. Towards a typology of ludlings, or play languages. Linguistic Communication (Working Papers of the Linguistic Society of Australia. 6). 61-113, 1972.

MCCARTHY, John and PRINCE, Alan. Generalized alignment. Yearbook of Morphology, 79–153, 1993.

PIÑEROS, Carlos Eduardo. Prosodic Morphology in Spanish: Constraint Interaction in Word-Formation, 1998.

PRINCE, Alan & SMOLENSKY, Paul. *Optimality Theory. Constraint Interaction in Generative Grammar*. New Brunswick/Boulder, Rutgers University/University of Colorado, 1993, http://roa.rutgers.edu/files/537-0802/537-0802-PRINCE-0-0.PDF. Reprint: Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2004.

PRINCE, Alan & SMOLENSKY, Paul. Optimality Theory: Constraint interaction in generative grammar. Ms. Rutgers University and University of Colorado, Boulder, 1993. Reprint: Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2004.

Retrieved 26 February 2017.

ROSARIGASINO. In *Wikipedia, The Free Encyclopedia*. https://es.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Rosarigasino&oldid=90355488.

SECO, Manuel. Diccionario de dudas y dificultades de la lengua española, 9th ed.. Madrid: Espasa Calpe, 1986.

SHEPHERD, Michael Andrew. Constraint Interaction in Spanish Phonotactics: An Optimality Theory Analysis of Syllable-Level Phenomena in the Spanish Language, 2003.

WILTSHIRE, Caroline, Prefix boundaries in Spanish varieties: a non-derivational OT account, in *OT Advances in Phonology*, edited by Sonia Colina and Fernando Martinez-Gil. John Benjamins, pp. 358-377, 2006.

WILTSHIRE, Caroline. *Variation in Spanish Aspiration and Prosodic Boundary Constraints*. Paper presented at the 29th Linguistic Symposium on Romance Languages, University of Michigan, 1999.