American Spanish dialects: Chile, Río de la Plata, Paraguay

Carlos Muñoz Pérez
Universidad Austral de Chile
cmunozperez@filo.uba.ar

Andrés Saab
IIF-SADAF-CONICET & Universidad de Buenos Aires
andres.saab@uba.ar

Second Draft, August 2022

Abstract

This chapter describes the main linguistic features of three South American dialects: Chilean Spanish, Rioplatense Spanish and Paraguayan Spanish. Assuming Kayne's conjecture that all relevant linguistic variation, in particular syntactic variation, can be reduced to microparameters, i.e., to a subset of properties present in a subset of functional items, we dismiss the distinction between Spanish and its dialects, and adopt the equation: *dialect* = *language*. Then, we introduce some historical and geographical background to set the ulterior description, which is essentially an overview of the main lexical, phonological/phonetic, morphological and syntactic particularities of the three dialects/languages. Yet, the description is intentionally not balanced, since we particularly focus on certain syntactic features of these dialects that illustrate what Kayne's conjecture is about. So the chapter is offered, first, as a basic overview of the dialects under consideration and, second, as a gateway, or perhaps just an invitation, for further inquiry into dialectal variation from a microparametric perspective.

1 Introduction: Some terminological remarks

In this chapter, we present a general overview of three South-American Spanish dialects, classified under the somewhat arbitrary rubrics of *Chilean Spanish*, *Rioplatense Spanish* and *Paraguayan Spanish*. Before entering into particular descriptions, we would like to clarify the basic notions of *language* and *dialect* we will use through the chapter.

We take for granted that the very notion of *language* is ambiguous and that it is good practice to disambiguate the relevant uses/meanings of the term as far as possible. On the one hand, the term, as we understand it here, denotes a type of internal knowledge that each human acquires during the first years of life on the basis of two main factors, namely (i) genetic endowment and (ii) external stimuli. Following the terminological distinction Chomsky made many years ago and in several works (but see in particular Chomsky

1986), we use the term *I-language* to refer to this notion of internal language as an specific type of knowledge. But the term *language*, both in everyday use and within an important scientific tradition, may also refer to a body of concrete utterances registered in writing and oral texts. If those utterances can be reduced to a coherent linguistic analysis describing their phonetics, phonology, morphology and syntax, then the object described by such analysis can also bear the rubric of *language*. Indeed, this is basically the notion of language that the structuralist tradition maintained for decades at least in the United States.[1] In this sense, also following Chomsky's distinction, we say that this latter object is an *E-language*, where E stands for *external*. The relation between I-language and E-language can be characterized as the relation between a set (E-language) and a certain mechanism that generates such set (I-language). Of course, this must be taken as a rough approximation, since it is well-known that the set of utterances that we linguists use as object of analysis is not always a perfect reflex of the cognitive mechanism generating usable sentences. In other words, there are external factors introducing "noise" to the E-language. Therefore, the theorist must deduce from different available sources which particular pieces of E-language can actually be generated by a particular I-language (i.e., by the particular theory under construction).

The situation of any language theorist is essentially not different from the situation a child faces when confronted with the chaotic universe of linguistic data. Imagine a child who was born in the Buenos Aires Province in the 40's. The child's father is an Italian immigrant, who speaks some North Italian dialect, whereas her mother is a Galician immigrant, who speaks Spanish and Galician.[2] Both mother and father want her child to acquire Spanish, the national language, since Argentina is officially a monolingual country and speaking the official language will be required by schooling. In addition, the immigrant languages, all of them, are strongly stigmatized in the community. In her first years, the child is exposed then to a body of Spanish, North Italian and Galician fragments. The "Spanish" she hears does not come from a uniform corpus, since her mother speaks a variety of Peninsular Spanish, but many of her neighbors and other relatives speak what we call here Rioplatense Spanish, which, by the way, is the variety she is going to fix through schooling. All this informational mass does not count as a consistent set generated by any particular I-language. However, in a relatively short period of time, she will produce utterances entirely determined by her own I-language. This situation is replicated in myriads of Buenos Aires neighborhoods, where at least half of the immigrants came from different parts of Italy in that period of time. Any particular I-language acquired by those children is a pure individual language, but given that the external factors conditioning the process of language acquisition is quite similar for each of these children, their I-languages will have many common properties regarding their phonetic, phonology, morphology and syntax. Parallel scenarios could be replicated in different areas of Chile and Paraguay, with very distinct sociolinguistic factors influencing the development of specific I-languages.

1. The European structuralist tradition is extremely more complex, but even for the radical Saussurean, the notion of *linguistic analysis* and *linguistic level* is essentially the same.

2. As noted by Gugenberger (2011), there is a remarkable difference concerning the influences Italian dialects and Italian, on the one hand, and Galician, on the other hand, had in the formation of Rioplatense Spanish. While Italian and Italian dialects had an enormous impact in the syntax, morphology and intonation of the resulting language, the Galician influence was almost null, except for some lexical impact in the *lunfardo* (although, see Sinner (2015) for a different position). According to Gugenberger, this is due to the conspiracy of many factors such as the diglosic situation of Galician immigrants and the extreme stigmatization of their language.

A good description of a language would amount to describing the type of knowledge that children acquire in their first years of life. On this perspective, the described object is not a social or collective object, but just individual knowledge. However, given the nature and the aims of the present chapter, we will not offer a detailed description of any particular I-language; instead, we will offer a description for certain fragments of E-languages, which are the potential input for any child raised in different areas of Chile, Río de la Plata or Paraguay.

What we have just said with respect to the notion of *language* forces the following question.

(1) Is there any interesting relation between the notions of *language* and *dialect*?

It would be convenient to avoid any potential confusion regarding these terms from the very beginning. As is well-known, there are biased social representations, stimulated by social institutions, concerning this distinction. According to them, *dialects* are in a sense "deviations" of institutional norms. We explicitly deny any interesting scientific connection between language and dialect in this normative sense.

A more substantive thesis is that there are different ways in which languages vary. More specifically, variation could be determined by internal properties of the language faculty, on the one hand, and by specific properties of particular lexical items in each language, on the other. On this view, parameters internal to the language faculty would fix different language types (e.g., agglutinative vs. inflectional), whereas particular language types would give rise to different dialects caused by particular properties of lexical items, mainly inflectional. This approach offers a scientifically interesting distinction between *language* and *dialect*, and between *language typology* and *dialectology*. For instance, the term *Spanish* could be taken to refer to a certain space of variation resulting from parameter setting, while distinct *Spanish dialects* would result from minimal differences in the lexical specification of functional items within the Spanish space of variation. Thus, what is called *Rioplatense Spanish* would be a Spanish variant whose particular features are determined within the lexicon of the language (e.g., the clitic system).

This sketch of a theory of language variation essentially corresponds to the position taken in Baker (2008), which is a reaction to the microparametric approach defended by Kayne (2005). According to the latter, all linguistic variation can be reduced to properties of particular functional items. Kayne (2005:10) stated this conjecture as follows.

(2) Every parameter is a microparameter

Under this conjecture, there are no qualitative differences between the notions of *language* and *dialect*, or between *typology* and *dialectology*. These distinctions reduce to a matter of degree, i.e., accumulation of tiny differences. An important corollary of this view is that dialectology can be conceived as an ideal laboratory for linguistic experimentation, where minimal mutations among languages/dialects can be properly isolated. This is the approach we adopt here. In particular, we are committed to the thesis that *language* = *dialect*.

In the next two sections, we give some relevant historical and geographical background to the three dialects under consideration (sections 2 and 3). Then we will characterize them regarding their lexicon (section 4), phonetics and phonology (section 5), morphology (section 6), and syntax (section 7). As the reader might guess, it is impossible to provide

any detailed introduction to the many aspects we are going to discuss, so we organize the chapter selecting those features that are unique or particularly remarkable for each dialect. Our modest hope is that the chapter serves as an invitation to conduct more in-depth research of these dialects.

2 The interaction of historical and sociolinguistic aspects

At the time the Spanish arrived in Chilean territory in the 16th Century, it was occupied by a variety of indigenous communities. Among these, two are relevant to discuss the current situation of Chilean Spanish: the Inca, speakers of Quechua, who inhabited roughly the northern half of Chile, and the Mapuche, speakers of Mapudungun, who occupied the southern half. The role of Mapudungun in shaping the Spanish variety spoken in Chile constitutes a traditional topic in Hispanic linguistics. Lenz (1940a,b) famously resorted to the theory of Mapudungun substratum to account for the phonetic peculiarities of this variety. However, Alonso (1953:332–398) extensively refuted Lenz's theory by showing that the same phonetic realizations could be found in Spain and other American regions; see Cassano (1977) for a summary of these arguments. Much in line with Alonso's considerations, today's consensus is that the influence of Mapudungun on Chilean Spanish is mostly restricted to the lexical and prosodic levels (e.g., Oroz 1966:190, Rogers 2016).

The definitive foundation of Buenos Aires took place under Juan de Garay's expedition in 1580. The expedition counted with sixty-six participants, only ten of which came directly from Spain. According to Fontanella de Weinberg (1987), the rest were *mestizos* coming from Asunción (Paraguay). The vast majority of speakers that arrived in Buenos Aires in that period of time were then essentially bilingual speakers of Spanish and Guarani, in particular, women. Yet, during the 17th and 18th Centuries, the arrival of new inhabitants from Spain imposed the use of varieties of Peninsular Spanish over the use of the Guarani language. This situation remained stable until the second half of the 18th Century, when Buenos Aires stops being a marginal area for the interest of the Spanish crown. The Viceroyalty of the Río de la Plata was definitively established in 1776.

Yet, the actual profile of what we nowadays call *Rioplatense Spanish* is mainly due to the foundation of the nation-state around 1880, where the immigration policies changed the cultural and linguistic scene dramatically, a fact particularly stressed in Di Tullio (2010a). According to her sources, around the Centennial era (1910), one in three inhabitants was a foreigner. And the increase in population between 1869 (2 million people) and 1914 (almost 8 million people) caused a definitive change in the language of the region. Of all four million immigrants in 1914, two million were Italian immigrants both from north and south of Italy. These Italian speakers had an immense influence in the Spanish spoken in the region.[3]

Finally, let us briefly consider the historical and sociolinguistic context of Paraguayan Spanish. After the arrival of the Spanish conquistadors, Paraguay underwent a process of racial mixture (or *mestizaje*) between European men and native women, which resulted

3. But take into consideration that according to Fontanella de Weinberg (1987:94), many phonological and phonetic properties of the dialect already began to consolidate in the 18th Century (e.g., *seseo*, *yeísmo*, and /-s/ aspiration and deletion; see section 5)

in a Spanish–Guarani diglossic community. The bilingual scenario was further enhanced by a number of socio-historical factors, e.g., relative isolation from both Perú and Río de la Plata during the colonial period, use of both Spanish and Guarani in Jesuit *reductions*, nationalistic policies during José Gaspar Rodríguez de Francia's dictatorship (1814–1840); see Granda (1994:256–287) for a detailed consideration of these factors.

Today, Paraguayan bilingualism is relatively stable (Rubin 1968, Choi 2005), with both Guarani and Spanish being official national languages. According to the national census of 2002, 59.2% of the total population preferred to speak Guarani at home, while in 35.7% of homes Spanish was the predominant language; the census of 2012 depicts a similar scenario: in 34% of homes only Guarani is spoken, while in 46.3% both Guarani and Spanish are employed. Due to this situation, most of the salient characteristics of Paraguayan Spanish have been attributed to its close contact with Guarani. The question remains, however, on whether these traits (i) can be considered true properties of Paraguayan Spanish due to structural convergence, or (ii) are merely instances of interference from having Guarani as a first language, i.e., *imperfect learning* in Bakker et al.'s (2008) sense. As pointed out by Gynan (2011:362) and Klee and Lynch (2009:164), discerning this seems impossible at the moment since there is a lack of sociolinguistic studies discussing whether these properties are common among native monolingual Paraguayan Spanish speakers.

3 The interaction of linguistic and geographic aspects

Some preliminary remarks on the use of *Chile*, *Paraguay* and *Río de la Plata*, as they occur modifying the term *Spanish*, are in order .

First, Spanish in Chile can be divided in subareas. Wagner (2006) recognizes four dialectal zones within Chile: Northern (from regions I to IV), Central (from regions V to VII, including the Metropolitan region), South (regions VIII and IX) and South-Austral (from regions X to XII); Oroz (1966:46) presents a similar segmentation. Wagner's division is based on lexical preferences, and does not correlate with strong morphosyntactic variation (Lipski 1994, Rabanales 2000), although there seem to be some intonational differences. In this chapter, we use *Chile Spanish* as a convenient shorthand for the commonalities between the (sub)dialects in these subareas, which also includes areas of the Cuyo region in Argentina (Mendoza, San Juan and the North of Neuquén in Vidal de Battini's classification) although in a more dimmed way (see below).

Second, Río de la Plata Spanish should not be equated with the term *Argentinian Spanish*. The Argentinian territory is too vast and dialectologically consists of at least five or six different subareas, many of which are shared with its bordering countries (Chile, Paraguay, Bolivia, and Uruguay). Vidal de Battini (1964) recognized at least the following five:[4]

- *Litoral or Rioplatense region* (our focus in this chapter),
- Guaranitic region (Corrientes, Misiones, the east of Formosa and Chaco, the extreme zone of the northeast of Santa Fe and less clearly a zone of Entre Ríos),

4. Bear in mind that the connection between geographical region and linguistic region is vague: one cannot be subsumed under the other.

- Northwest region (Jujuy, Salta, Tucumán, Santiago del Estero, Catamarca, La Rioja, the north of San Juan and San Luis, and the northwest of Córdoba),
- Cuyo region (Mendoza, San Juan and the north of Neuquén), and
- Central region (mainly, Córdoba and San Luis)

Here, and for obvious space restrictions, we will only cover fragments of the Rioplatense region, which as noted by Vidal de Battini includes the Buenos Aires province, the city of Buenos Aires, the provinces of Santa Fe, Entre Ríos, La Pampa, colonized zones of la Patagonia by modern population coming from Buenos Aires, and, finally, important zones of Uruguay. In Vidal de Battini's words:

> It is the most extensive and most European linguistic region of the Republic. Its core is the populous and cosmopolitan Buenos Aires, a powerful center of culture, whose radiance dominates the entire territory.
>
> (Vidal de Battini 1964:76, our translation)

On occasions there is the misleading tendency to equate Rioplatense Spanish with Argentinian Spanish. As claimed by Di Tullio and Kaluweit (2011:12), Rioplatense Spanish does not correspond to any political unit, and cannot be identified with any socio-political division, e.g., *nation-state* or similar notions. While this is the general case when discussing geolectal variation, the clarification becomes particularly relevant for the Argentinian case: despite of the attempts to reach linguistic uniformity in the territory at the end of the 19th Century and, in particular, during the first half of 20th Century, Argentina exhibits a rich and extremely complex linguistic diversity. In part because of those attempts, the diversity in the territory has been masked and remains understudied.

Finally, we use the term *Paraguay Spanish* as basically referring to a phenomenon of close language contact between Spanish and Guarani. Under this definition, the speech of certain areas of the northeast of Argentina (e.g., the provinces of Corrientes and Misiones) can be considered part of the dialect. In other words, all this area would be partially covered by Vidal de Battini's Guaranitic region.

4 Lexicon

In general, Spanish dialects from the Southern Cone are rich in lexical borrowings from Quechua, e.g., *cancha* 'sports field', *choclo* 'corn', *papa* 'potato', *poroto* 'bean'. The influence of Quechua in these varieties is not homogeneous, however, as many Quechuan words are not common to all varieties. Thus, for instance, the word *callampa* 'mushroom' is found in Chilean Spanish, but not in the Rioplatense or Paraguayan dialects; Rioplatense Spanish has the word *changa* 'informal job', and Paraguayan Spanish employs the derived form *changador* 'eventual worker', but both terms are rather unknown in Chile; both Chilean and Rioplatense use the word *palta* for 'avocado', but Paraguayan Spanish employs the Nahuatl term *aguacate*. While these and other differences seem to be due to historical reasons, most of the lexical specificities in each of these dialects can be traced to different substrata.

Chilean Spanish has many lexical entries that are autochthonous to the variety, e.g., *ampolleta* 'light bulb', *caleta* 'a lot', *once* 'afternoon snack', *queque* 'cake', *resfalín* 'slide'. As

for borrowings, the Mapudungun lexical influence is very characteristic to the dialect, especially in the south of Chile (Rabanales 2000). Chilean Spanish words with Mapudungun origin include *charquicán* 'stew', *guata* 'belly', *pichintún* 'a little bit' and *pololeo* 'romantic relationship'; see Sánchez Cabezas (2010) for a list of Mapudungun terms in Chilean Spanish and beyond. As mentioned, a number of lexical borrowings from Quechua are also attested, e.g., *callampa* 'mushroom', *chupalla* 'hat', *combo* 'punch', *guagua* 'baby'.[5] In recent years, many lexical borrowings from the Rioplatense dialect have become common in Chilean Spanish (Salamanca 2010, San Martín Núñez 2011), e.g., *laburo* 'job', *versear* 'to lie', *tano* 'Italian', *gambetear* 'to dodge'. For an extensive list of lexical entries in this variety, see the *Diccionario de uso del español de Chile* (Academia Chilena de la Lengua 2001) and the *Nuevo Diccionario Ejemplificado de Chilenismos* (Morales Pettorino 2006); Lenz (1979) provides etymologies for a great number of borrowings in the dialect.

As for Rioplatense Spanish, the more remarkable feature of its lexicon is the so called *lunfardo*, a dynamic repertoire of slang words in constant change through years and generations even today. The richness of *lunfardo* is a product of a complex dialogue between the nascent Argentine literature at the beginning of the 20$^{\text{th}}$ Century and the process of consolidation of the Rioplatense variety. The contribution of the Italian immigrants and their dialects was fundamental as well, e.g., through lexical items like *laburo* 'job', *birra* 'beer', *bochar* 'to fail someone', *trola* 'prostitute', *gamba* 'leg', *nona* 'grandmother', *napia* 'nose', etc. To a lesser extent, Rioplatense *lunfardo* was also influenced by other languages and styles, such as French, Portuguese, Spanish *caló* (a Peninsular slang), Guarani and Quechua (Conde 2019). Moreover, the so-called *vesre* speech provided *lunfardo* with a mechanism of lexical creation. *Vesre* is a process of syllabic inversion that takes a neutral word from the Rioplatense lexicon and returns a word with identical denotation but distinct expressive meaning. For example, the neutral *café* 'coffee' becomes *feca*, *mujer* 'woman' becomes *jermu*, and so on; see Bohrn (2015) for discussion. Some *vesre* words have become so conventionalized in the dialect that their *vesre* origins are extremely opaque, e.g., Rioplatense speakers might be surprised to learn that the word *ortiba* is the *vesre* version of *batidor* 'snitch'.

Paraguayan Spanish exhibits a number of Americanisms that are also attested in other dialects, especially in Rioplatense, e.g., *bombacha* 'panties', *corpiño* 'bra', *malla* 'bathing suit', *pollera* 'skirt', *tambo* 'milking yard'; these also include words with Quechuan origin, e.g., *chacra* 'cultivated land', *chala* 'cob leaves', *changador* 'eventual worker', *vincha* 'hair ribbon'. Most of the lexical items that are exclusive to the Paraguayan variety come from Guarani, e.g., *berujú* 'horsefly', *carapé* 'bananas', *kuña* 'woman', *marigüí* 'sandfly', *najatí* 'dragon-fly', *payé* 'curse', *pora* 'ghost', *tapití* 'wild rabbit', *tavy* 'dumb', *teyú* 'iguana'. See Lezcano and Lezcano Claude (1988), Pane (2005, 2014), Navarro Carrasco (2020) and references therein for more examples and discussion.

5 Phonetics and Phonology

Our discussion of the sounds of these three varieties starts by their segmental properties. As a common feature, the three dialects display *seseo*, i.e., they dispense with the voiceless dental fricative /θ/ that allows to distinguish the graphemes *c* and *z* from the letter *s*

5. Some of these words might have entered the dialect through Mapudungun contact, as this language also exhibits borrowings from Quechua (Moulian et al. 2015).

in some Peninsular varieties. Thus, words like *casa* 'house' and *caza* 'hunt' are both pronounced [ˈka.sa].

A list with six salient phonetic characteristics of Chilean Spanish is presented in (3); from these, only the last property is exhibited in all sociolinguistic levels. For a more comprehensive discussion of the phonological system of the dialect, see Oroz (1966); for a sociolinguistic analysis of the distribution of different realizations, see Sadowsky (2015).

(3) a. Aspiration or deletion of /s/ in coda position,
b. instances of gemination by means of total assimilation,
c. assibilation of /ɾ/ within the consonant cluster /tɾ/,
d. deletion of intervocalic /d/,
e. loss of occlusion in /t͡ʃ/, and
f. *yeismo*.

First in the list (3a), Chilean Spanish speakers may realize /s/ in coda position either as [s], [h] or [∅] (Magaña and Valdivieso 1991, Tassara 1991, Cepeda 1995, Ortiz Lira and Mena Flores 2015). For example, the nominal phrase *los niños* 'the kids' might be realized as [loh.ˈni.ɲo]. The use of each of these variants is associated with a number of heterogeneous factors, e.g., phonetic context, education, register. The second item (3b) refers to the process through which /r/, /s/ and /b/ in syllable-final position undergo total assimilation to the following sonorant consonant, resulting in gemination (Palacios 1918:165, Rabanales 2000); for instance, the proper noun *Carlos* might be pronounced as [ˈkal.lo], the noun *isla* 'island' as [ˈil.la], or *submarino* 'submarine' as [sum.ma.ˈri.no]. Third (3c), the dialect exhibits the assibilated realization of /ɾ/ when it appears in the consonant cluster /tɾ/ (Lenz 1940a, Figueroa Candia and Soto-Barba 2010, Soto-Barba 2011), a feature that is also attested in Paraguayan Spanish (Granda 1982a); thus, for instance, *otro* 'other' can be realized as [ˈo.t̪̊o]. Fourth (3d), the phoneme /d/ can be realized as [∅] in intervocalic positions, especially in words finishing in *–ado*, *–edo* and *–ido* (Wigdorsky 1978, Rabanales 2000, Pérez 2007); for instance *cansado* 'tired' might be pronounced [kan.ˈsao] in spontaneous speech. Fifth (3e), Chilean Spanish speakers may pronounce /t͡ʃ/ as the fricative [ʃ] (Wigdorsky 1978, Haska 2016), e.g., the word *chileno* 'Chilean' may be realized as [ʃi.ˈle.no]. This is a stigmatized variant; its avoidance leads to instances of hypercorrection with foreign words, e.g., *sushi* pronounced as [su.t͡ʃi]. This is in line with Sadowsky's (2015) observation that /t͡ʃ/ exhibits a number of alternative realizations with different sociolinguistic distributions. Finally (3f), Chilean Spanish is a *yeista* dialect, i.e. it neutralizes the phonemic opposition between [ʎ] and [ʝ], and realizes the graphemes *ll* and *y* as the same phoneme: /ʝ/ (Oroz 1966:114, Wagner and Rosas 2003). Thus, the fricative sound in *ya* 'now' is the same sound that can be found in *pollo* 'chicken', i.e., [ˈpo.ʝo], but not [ˈpo.ʎo].

Rioplatense Spanish has a narrower array of defining characteristics at the segmental level. Its most salient properties are listed in (4); at least the first two items in the list are common to other Argentinian varieties. Succinct presentations of the phonological features of Argentinian Spanish can be found in Colantoni and Hualde (2013) and Coloma (2018).

(4) a. Aspiration of /s/ in preconsonantal coda positions,
b. diphthongization of mid vowels,

c. lose of /ɲ/ as a separate phoneme, and
d. assibilated *yeísmo*.

As pointed in (4a), the Rioplatense dialect tends to aspirate /s/ in coda position when followed by a consonant (Terrell 1978, Donni de Mirande 1984), e.g., the word *asco* 'disgust' is generally pronounced as [ˈah.co], and the sentence *es lo mismo* 'it is the same' as [ˈeh.lo.ˈmih.mo]. Deletion of /s/ is also attested, although it tends to occur in word-final positions. Second (4b), Rioplatense Spanish displays patterns of diphthongization of mid vowels (Luis and García Jurado 1983), e.g., *línea* 'line' pronounced as [ˈli.nja], or *almohada* 'pillow' as [al.ˈmwa.da]. Third, the item in (4b) refers to the incipient collapse of the phonological contrast between the nasal palatal sound /ɲ/ and the sequence /nj/, formed by the nasal alveolar /n/ and the palatal glide [j] (Colantoni and Hualde 2013, Bongiovanni 2015). In short, this means that the orthographic sequences *ña*, *ñe*, *ño*, and *ñu* do not contrast to *nia*, *nie*, *nio*, and *niu* in pronunciation. Thus, the words *huraño* 'aloof' and *uranio* 'uranium' may receive the same realization, i.e., [u.ˈra.njo]. Fourth and last (4d), perhaps the most characteristic feature of Rioplatense Spanish is its particular form of *yeísmo*: unlike Chilean Spanish and other *yeísta* dialects, the graphemes *ll* and *y* are pronounced as assibilated postalveolar fricatives (Zamora Vicente 1949, Guitarte 1955, and many others after). While both voiced [ʒ] and voiceless [ʃ] variants are currently attested, there is a historical trend towards devoicing; see Rohena-Madrazo (2013) and references therein for discussion. Thus, for example, *pollo* 'chicken' is typically pronounced as [ˈpo.ʃo] by younger speakers, and never as [ˈpo.jo] or [ˈpo.ʎo].

As for Paraguayan Spanish, Granda (1982a) offers a comprehensive description of the pronunciation of the dialect. The list in (5) is mainly based on his observations. All but the last of these properties have been attributed in the literature to contact with Guarani. This has been the standard line of analysis for these phenomena since, at least, Malmberg (1947); see Cassano (1977) for critical discussion on this position.

(5) a. Glottal stops,
b. nasalization of vowels,
c. prenasalization of word-initial voiced stops,
d. broader diffusion of [v] than in other Spanish varieties, and
e. *lleísmo*.

As stated in (5a), Paraguayan Spanish exhibits glottal stops (Krivoshein de Canese and Corvalán 1987:23, Trawick and Michnowicz 2019, Gynan and López Almada 2020), which are rare in other Spanish dialects but are part of the Guarani phonological system. The insertion of these elements occurs mostly before vowel-initial words, but it has also been attested word-internally as a strategy of hiatus resolution. For instance, a string like *esto hace* 'this makes' might be realized as [ˈʔes.to.ˈʔa.se], or the sentence *me caí* 'I fell' as [me.ka.ˈʔi]. Another feature of the dialect is the nasalization of vowels (Granda 1982a, Kallfell 2009); while this process is also attested in other Spanish varieties, it is much more pervasive in Paraguayan Spanish. Granda observes that the effect is stronger in male speakers from lower social strata. This trait is also arguably due to the influence of Guarani, in which half of its twelve vowels are nasal. Moving on to the next point, (5c) states the observation that word-initial voice stops tend to be prenasalized in Paraguayan Spanish (Krivoshein de Canese and Corvalán 1987:24, Granda 1982a). The process is

particularly productive with /b/, which becomes [mβ]. As (5d) indicates, Paraguayan Spanish seems to make more use of the labiodental fricative [v] than other Spanish varieties (Granda 1982a:155, Krivoshein de Canese and Corvalán 1987:24); this is particularly striking in comparison to Chilean Spanish, which practically does not employ this variant (Oroz 1966:95). Note, however, that [β] is still more predominant than [v] in Paraguayan Spanish (Kallfell 2009). Finally, Paraguayan Spanish displays *lleísmo*, i.e., the phonemic opposition between /ʝ/ and /ʎ/ (Granda 1982a:171, Gabriel et al. 2020); this trait is quite characteristic of the dialect, as it has been abandoned in General Spanish.

Two other features that have been attributed to Paraguayan Spanish are the presence of the Guarani vowel [ɨ] (Krivoshein de Canese and Corvalán 1987:25, Pruñonosa 2000) and epenthesis (Granda 1982a, Pruñonosa 2000). However, the productivity of these phenomena seems to be restricted to a few specific examples in the literature, e.g., [ˈpɨɾ.ta] instead of *puerta* 'door', [ku.ɾu.ˈse.ta] for *cruceta* 'crosspiece'. Gynan (2011) points out that none of these traits are attested in field data.

As for prosody, an overarching generalization encompassing the three dialects is that language contact shaped in some degree their intonational properties. Considering first Chilean Spanish, its intonation has been relatively understudied. Most research is based on data from the cities of Santiago or Valdivia, which is troubling since authors like Oroz (1966:189) and Rabanales (2000) observe that there is considerable intonational variation throughout the country. In principle, the patterns reported so far in the literature tend to coincide with traditional descriptions of Spanish (e.g., Cepeda 2001, Román et al. 2008). Prenuclear accents in broad focus statements are realized as in most Spanish dialects: they consistently exhibit late alignments, although the peak is not as delayed as in Peninsular Spanish (Ortiz et al. 2010). As a peculiarity, Román et al. (2008) registered a tendency for double-peaked prenuclear accents in declarative sentences. Nuclear configurations in broad focus statements are also relatively common for Spanish, as they tend to display smooth falling contours with a peak on the syllable with nuclear accent (Cepeda 1998, Cid et al. 2000, Ortiz et al. 2010). However, Muñoz-Builes et al. (2017) and Ruíz Mella et al. (2019) observe that speakers from the south of Chile display *uptalk*, i.e., a rising intonation contour at the end of a declarative utterance. Ruíz Mella et al. suggest that this feature could be due to Mapudungun influence, as this language exhibits similar rising patterns.

Rogers (2013, 2016) offers convincing evidence for Mapudungun substratum in Chilean intonation. Rogers (2013) notes that Chilean Spanish displays a pattern that he describes as an *intonational plateau*. It consists of two parts: an optional low-tone portion, i.e., a "valley", and a high-tone portion, i.e., the "plateau" itself. All the material in each of these portions is realized at the same tonal level. That is, all words within the valley are pronounced at a steady low level, and all words within the plateau are pronounced at a steady high level. The length of the plateaus may vary significantly, and can go from a couple syllables to several words. Such intonation pattern has not been documented for other Spanish varieties. However, Rogers (2016) concludes that similar intonational plateaus are attested in Mapudungun. Thus, the substratum argument in this case is straightforward.

More research on both Chilean Spanish and Mapudungun is necessary to further explore the intonational substratum hypothesis. In particular, the fragmentary nature of the studies on Chilean Spanish intonation seems to still conceal many idiosyncrasies of the dialect.

For a description of general aspects of intonation in this variety, see Ortiz et al. (2010).

Rioplatense Spanish has a very distinctive intonation. A first feature that consistently distinguishes it from other Spanish dialects is that it displays early peak alignments, i.e., the pitch peak tends to be located within the stressed syllable (Toledo 2000, Colantoni and Gurlekian 2004). The way in which Rioplatense finishes its declarative focus-final utterances is also distinctive. It typically displays a "long fall", a steep falling contour within the syllable carrying the nuclear accent (Kaisse 2001, Colantoni and Gurlekian 2004). Since similar properties are attested in Italo-Romance varieties, Colantoni and Gurlekian (2004) argue that these traits are due to the influence of Italian immigration in Argentina. They propose that these patterns are the result of a double-sourced convergence process: via direct contact with Italian dialects, and via indirect contact through *lunfardo*.

On a similar note, Gabriel et al. (2011) observe that prosodic phrasing in Rioplatense Spanish exhibits a behaviour that mixes aspects of Peninsular Spanish and Italian. SVO sentences in Rioplatense tend to form (S)(VO) groupings, as in Peninsular Spanish, but Rioplatense also produces a higher rate of (SVO) groupings, which are very frequent in Italian. Furthermore, prosodic boundaries in Rioplatense tend to be either *continuation rises* or *sustained pitches*, as it happens in Italian, while Peninsular Spanish relies mostly on continuation rises.

A further characteristic of Rioplatense Spanish is the possibility of accenting clitics in enclitic positions, e.g., (6). As discussed by Colantoni and Cuervo (2013), this accentuation is non-emphatic, and seems to be the option by default for many speakers. These authors also suggest that this phenomenon could be due to Italian influence, as many Southern Italian dialects also display it.[6]

(6) agarren-LÓ, da-me-LÓ, disculpando-LÁ
grab.3PL-it give.2SG-me-it forgiving-it
'grab it!, give it to me!, forgiving her.'

In sum, the prosodic properties of Rioplatense resonate with traditional observations by Vidal de Battini (1964) on the "Italianness" of Rioplatense's intonation. For further discussion of the intonational properties of the variety, see Gabriel et al. (2010) and Colantoni (2014).

As for Paraguayan Spanish, there are practically no descriptions of its intonation other than vague observations about its resemblance to Guarani, e.g., Malmberg's (1973:442) remark that "Paraguayan intonation is not Hispanic at all. It is completely indigenous (Guarani)". Vidal de Battini (1964) describes the intonation in the Argentinian province of Corrientes as "Guaranitic"; she reports that tonic syllables in nuclear position are shorter than in Rioplatense, and also that the falling contour seems to be much less pronounced. Colantoni (2011) partially corroborates these observations, as her data suggest

6. This trait could also be related to instances of *mesoclisis* within the dialect, as the one exemplified in (i): adding *–n* to the right of the clitic would make the syllable heavy and, therefore, would facilitate accenting it. See Arregi and Nevins (2018:679) for relevant discussion.

(i) Siente –n –SÉ –N!
sit.IMP -PL -CL.REFL –PL
'Sit down!'

that nuclear accents in the Corrientes dialect are rising accents, coinciding with what has been reported for Guarani.

6 Morphology

Perhaps the most salient morphological feature of these dialects is *voseo*, i.e., the replacement of *vos* for *tú* as a second person singular pronoun (i.e., *pronominal voseo*) and a change in the corresponding verbal inflection (i.e., *verbal voseo*). There are, however, important differences that lead to distinguish between Rioplatense/Paraguayan *voseo* and Chilean *voseo*. To begin with, *voseo* is generalized in Rioplatense and Paraguayan Spanish, while it is substandard in Chilean Spanish; in the latter, the use of *vos* alternates with *tú*, and is reserved to informal interchanges or employed with deferential purposes. Second, the morphological exponents for verbal inflection are different. For instance, second and third conjugations are syncretic in Chilean Spanish, but not in the Rioplatense and Paraguayan dialects. Table 1 contains examples in present tense; see Morales Pettorino (1998) for comparison and discussion of the whole paradigm.

	ser 'to be'	*amar* 'to love'	*comer* 'to eat'	*vivir* 'to live'
R&P	*sos*	*amás*	*comés*	*vivís*
Chilean	*soi/erih/erei*	*amai*	*comíh*	*vivíh*

Table 1: Comparison of Rioplatense/Paraguayan (RP&P) and Chilean verbal *voseo* in present (indicative) tense

Third, Chilean Spanish allows to combine the pronoun *tú* and verbal *voseo* in the same sentence, e.g., *¡tú no vivíh aquí!* 'you don't live here'; equivalent uses are unattested in the speech of Buenos Aires and Asunción. Fourth, verbal *voseo* does not surface in the same tenses. For instance, imperative in Rioplatense and Paraguayan Spanish exhibits *voseo*, e.g., *cantá* 'sing!', but not in Chilean Spanish, e.g., *canta*; conversely, Chilean displays *voseo* in past imperfect tense, e.g., *cantábai* 'you sang', but Rioplatense and Paraguayan do not, e.g., *cantabas*. Finally, table 1 shows that the verb *ser* 'to be' in present tense can be realized with either of its two allomorphic roots in Chilean Spanish. Morales Pettorino (1998) suggests that this alternation arises as an ambiguity avoidance mechanism. For instance, he observes that a sentence like *¡Puta que soi weón!* is phonetically ambiguous between 'I'm an idiot!' and 'You are an idiot!'; use of *erei* as in *¡Puta que erei weón!* solves the issue; this, however, does not account for the alternation between the forms *erih* and *erei* that share the same morph. González Vergara (2002) studies the sociolinguistic distribution of *erih* and *soi* and concludes that the former tends to be employed by younger speakers.

This succinct presentation of *voseo* leaves many substantial issues unmentioned. For instance, we did not discuss the particularities of the *voseo* system in Uruguay; we refer the reader to Bertolotti (2011), who discusses in detail the complex use of the triad *usted-tú-vos*. Other *voseo* variants can be found in the Argentinian territory; see Di Tullio (2010b) and Estomba (2012) for relevant discussion.

Needless to say, it is impossible to do justice to the richness of both inflectional and derivative morphology in the three dialects. We will discuss two additional patterns to,

at least, provide a flavour of the phenomena found in these varieties. These are attested in Rioplatense and Paraguayan Spanish, respectively.

Rioplatense Spanish displays many particular derivative and appreciative morphological processes. Consider the case of the prefix *re–*, studied in detail by Kornfeld and Kuguel (2013). At first sight, this prefix looks like a standard degree intensifier that combines with adjectives. Patterns such as (7) are attested in several Spanish dialects.

(7) *re* lindo, *re* alta, *re* inteligente
RE cute RE tall RE intelligent
'very cute, very tall, very intelligent'

However, Kornfeld and Kuguel show that *re–* in Rioplatense can be combined with any lexical category, with many functional elements and even with full sentences. The examples in (8a) show *re–* attaching to verbs; in (8b), *re–* attaches to sentences.

(8) a. *re* estudiamos, *re* trabajamos, *re* jugamos
RE studied.1PL RE worked.1PL RE played.1PL
'We studied a lot/for many hours, we worked a lot/for many hours, we played a lot/during many hours'

b. *re* que estudié, *re* que trabajamos, *re* que jugamos
RE that studied.1SG RE that worked.1PL RE that played.1PL
'I studied for sure, we worked for sure, we played for sure'

As the glosses show, the level of attachment of the prefix produces predictable changes in meaning. The examples also demonstrate that *re–* can attach to phrasal categories, sentences being a prominent case. This leads Kornfeld and Kuguel to analyze *re-* as a phrasal prefix. Evidence supporting this characterization comes from the fact that *re–* can remain stranded and function as a fragment answer.

(9) A: ¿Venís a mi casa?– B: Re (voy a tu casa).
come.2SG to my house RE go.1SG to your house
'A: Are you coming to my place?– B: Yes, for sure (I am coming to your place).'

Paraguayan Spanish regularly displays a number of morphological borrowings from Guarani; these elements exhibit the same form and meaning as in their original language. They correspond to a wide variety of functional elements, ranging from interrogative markers to diminutives; see Granda (1980a,b), Avellana (2013) and Estigarribia (2017) for discussion. The sentences in (10) illustrate the use of the requestative marker *na*, the emphatic marker *ko*, and interrogative marker *piko*.

(10) a. Quedáte-*na* un poco más conmigo.
stay.2SG-REQUEST a few more with.me
'Stay a little more with me, please.'
(Krivoshein de Canese and Corvalán 1987:52)

b. Así-*ko* é la vida, ña Eudosia.
so-EMPH is.3SG the life miss Eudosia
'So that's life, Miss Eudosia.' (Granda 1980a:60)

c. ¿Cómo-*picó* se llama?
how-Q SE call.3SG
'How is she/he called?' (Krivoshein de Canese and Corvalán 1987:71)

Estigarribia (2017) argues that these phenomena do not actually illustrate morphological borrowings, but should rather be analyzed as instances of code-switching. According to him, most of these uses can be explained as *backflagging* (Muysken 2013), i.e., insertion of L1 discourse markers in L2 speech.

7 Syntax

As already discussed, the language spoken by the Spanish arrived in the 16th Century evolved in America under the influence of different indigenous languages, massive waves of European immigration and other factors. As seen in section 4 and, to a lesser extent, in section 6, the lexicon of the three varieties under discussion is a testimony of this complex development. While the incorporation of contentful lexical items had no relevant impact on the syntax of these varieties, there are reasons to believe that their functional lexicons have been subject to significant changes. Consider once again Kayne's (2005:10) conjecture.

(11) Every parameter is a microparameter

There are two important theses contained in the conjecture. First, as already noted in the introduction, it collapses the distinction between languages and dialects, and consequently, between language typology and dialectology. Second, it states that all syntactic variation is reduced to properties of functional items. Which ones? Research within the microparametric framework has shown that determiners, clitics and pronominal systems in general (overt and null), polarity items, tense, mood, complementizer systems, and so on tend to be the locus of microparametric variation.

This section, perhaps the most substantial in content throughout the chapter, takes a look at some fragments of syntactic variation. The objective is to give the reader a flavor of which functional elements play a role in determining the syntactic peculiarities of Chilean, Rioplatense and Paraguayan Spanish.

7.1 Chile

7.1.1 Stylistic *LE*

Chilean Spanish exhibits a phenomenon that Muñoz Pérez (2020) calls *stylistic LE*; see Kany (1945:139), Oroz (1966:174), Campos (1999:1571) and Silva-Corvalán (2005) for previous mentions of the construction. Stylistic *LE* occurs in contexts combining inchoative *SE* and a "dative of interest". Take the sentence in (12a), which is standard among Spanish dialects; as can be seen, the construction involves a clitic cluster of the form $SE{+}CL_{dat}$. Chilean Spanish speakers from the central regions of the country may employ this sequence of clitics, but can optionally replace it for the ones exemplified in (12b) and (12c), i.e., $SE{+}CL_{dat}$ can be alternatively expressed as $CL_{dat}{+}LE$ or as $SE{+}CL_{dat}{+}LE$.

These three realizations are completely synonymous; the third-person dative form *LE* has no referential value whatsoever in these constructions.[7]

(12) a. Se me cerró la puerta.
SE DAT.1SG closed.3SG the door
'The door closed on/for/to me.'

b. Me le cerró la puerta.
DAT.1SG DAT.3SG closed.3SG the door

c. Se me le cerró la puerta.
SE DAT.1SG DAT.3SG closed.3SG the door

The same alternation occurs in two other related contexts: (i) with verbs that acquire an inchoative interpretation with *SE* but do not introduce a cause, e.g., *caer* 'to fall', *morir* 'to die'; and (ii) with psychological verbs formed with *SE* that select a dative experiencer, e.g., *olvidarse* 'to forget', *ocurrirse* 'to realize'.

(13) a. Se me cayeron las llaves.
SE DAT.1SG fell.3PL the keys
'The keys fell on/for/to me.'

b. Me le cayeron las llaves.
DAT.1SG DAT.3SG fell.3PL the keys

c. Se me le cayeron las llaves.
SE DAT.1SG DAT.3SG fell.3PL the keys

(14) a. Se me olvidó eso.
SE DAT.1SG forgot.3SG that
'I forgot that.'

b. Me le olvidó eso.
DAT.1SG DAT.3SG forgot.3SG that

c. Se me le olvidó eso.
SE DAT.1SG DAT.3SG forgot.3SG that

While all the examples presented so far involve 1SG dative clitics, the pattern is also attested with 2SG datives, e.g., (15). Any other specification of person and number blocks the alternation, e.g., (16).

(15) a. Se te cerró la puerta.
SE DAT.2SG closed.3SG the door
'The door closed on/for/to you.'

b. Te le cerró la puerta.
DAT.2SG DAT.3SG closed.3SG the door

c. Se te le cerró la puerta.
SE DAT.2SG DAT.3SG closed.3SG the door

(16) a. Se nos cerró la puerta.
SE DAT.1PL closed.3SG the door

7. All examples throughout subsections 7.1.1 and 7.1.2 are taken from Muñoz Pérez (2020).

'The door closed on/for/to us.'

b. * Nos le cerró la puerta.
DAT.1PL DAT.3SG closed.3SG the door

c. * Se nos le cerró la puerta.
SE DAT.1PL DAT.3SG closed.3SG the door

At the moment, there is no complete analysis for this construction; a rather schematic proposal can be found in Muñoz Pérez (2020).

7.1.2 Clitic reduplication

Chilean Spanish displays *clitic reduplication*, i.e., a construction in which two instances of the same clitic (or clitic cluster) appear (Kany 1945:127, Oroz 1966:378, Mann 2012, Muñoz Pérez 2020). As the examples in (17) show, a first group of clitics is attached proclitically to a (matrix) tensed verbal form, while a second group is attached enclitically to the non-finite verb that selects it.

(17) a. *Te* voy a ver-*te* mañana.
ACC.2SG will.1SG to see-ACC.2SG tomorrow
'I will see you tomorrow.'

b. *Te* *la* voy a dar-*te*-*la* al tiro.
DAT.2SG ACC.3SG.FEM will.1SG to give-DAT.2SG-ACC.3SG.FEM to.the shot
'I will give it to you immediately.'

The reduplication pattern is optional and semantically vacuous. That is, a sentence like (17a) is completely synonymous with both alternatives in (18), in which the clitic appears only in its enclitic or proclitic position.

(18) a. Voy a ver-*te* mañana.
will.1SG to see-ACC.2SG tomorrow
'I will see you tomorrow.'

b. *Te* voy a ver mañana.
ACC.2SG will.1SG to see tomorrow
'I will see you tomorrow.'

Since the pair in (18) illustrates a case of *clitic climbing*, it seems natural to advance an analytical link between both phenomena, e.g., a sentence exhibiting clitic reduplication involves pronunciation of a clitic in both its base and raised positions. In fact, authors like Nunes (2004), Mann (2012), Masullo (2019) and Villa-García (2019) have suggested that clitic reduplication is a variant of clitic climbing in more or less this sense.[8] A straightforward argument supporting this claim can be drawn based on the syntactic distribution of both phenomena: just as clitic climbing, clitic reduplication can be found with temporal periphrases, e.g., (17), aspectual predicates, e.g., (19a), causative constructions, e.g., (19b), subject control verbs, e.g., (19c), object control verbs, e.g., (19d), and modal verbs, e.g., (19e).[9]

8. Nunes (2004) actually discusses a pattern attested in Argentinian Spanish that differs slightly from the Chilean construction.

9. This list does not pretend to be exhaustive.

(19) a. *Te* voy a empezar a molestar-*te*.
ACC.2SG will.1SG to begin to bother-ACC.2SG
'I will start to bother you'.

b. Me *las* hizo comprar-*las*.
DAT.1SG ACC.3PL.FEM made.3SG buy-ACC.3PL.FEM
'She/he made me buy them.'

c. *Te* quiero puro ver-*te*.
ACC.2SG want.1SG just see-ACC.2SG
'I just want to see you.'

d. Me *lo* prohibieron contár-se-*lo*
DAT.1SG ACC.3SG forbade.3PL tell-DAT.3SG-ACC.3SG
'They forbade me to tell it to him.'

e. *Se* puede romper-*se*.
SE can.3SG break-SE
'It might break.'

However, this argument is not fully conclusive as there are contexts blocking clitic climbing that do license clitic reduplication.

(20) a. ¡*Lo* hay que puro hacer-*lo*!
ACC.3SG is.3SG that just do-ACC.3SG
'It needs to be done.'

b. * ¡*Lo* hay que hacer!
ACC.3SG is.3SG that do

(21) a. *Lo* odio hacer-*lo*.
ACC.3SG hate.1SG do-ACC.3SG
'I hate to do it.'

b. * *Lo* odio hacer.
ACC.3SG hate.1SG do

In principle, clitic reduplication can be taken to be a phenomenon pertaining either to the domain of syntactic movement, i.e., the reduplicated clitics are links in a single movement chain (Nunes 2004, Villa-García 2019), or to the domain of agreement relations, i.e., (at least) one of the reduplicated clitics is an agreement marker (Mann 2012). Data discussed by Muñoz Pérez (2020) suggests that the latter alternative is correct. Muñoz Pérez observes that there is a linear asymmetry regarding which of the predicates in a coordinate structure displays the reduplication pattern: if the reduplicated clitic appears within the first coordinate, the structure is grammatical, e.g., (22a); however, if the reduplication pattern recruits a clitic within the second coordinate, the result is unacceptable, e.g. (22b).

(22) a. Mi hermana *lo* quiere probar-*lo* y comprar la weá.
my sister ACC.3SG wants.3SG try-ACC.3SG and buy the thingy
'My sister wants to try it and buy the damned thing.'

b. * Mi hermana *lo/la* quiere probar la weá y
my sister ACC.3SG.MASC/FEM wants.3SG try the thingy and
comprar-*lo*.
buy-ACC.3SG.MASC
'My sister wants to try the damned thing and buy it.'

This pair is unexpected if clitic reduplication involves movement, but finds a rather straightforward explanation under the hypothesis that (22) reflects an instance of *closest conjunt agreement* (Nevins and Weisser 2019).

Whatever analysis is advanced for the construction, the proposal needs to be able to capture the fact that the stylistic *LE* phenomenon can feed clitic reduplication.

(23) No *te* *le* vaya a olvidár-*te*-*le*.
not ACC.2SG DAT.3SG go.SUBJ.2SG to forget-ACC.2SG-DAT.3SG
'Don't forget about it.'

7.1.3 Definite determiner with anthroponyms and demonstrative pronouns

While normatively marked, the co-occurrence of definite determiners with anthroponymic proper nouns is a recurrent phenomenon in several Spanish dialects (Kany 1945, García Gallarín 1983).

(24) No creo que *la* *Marcela* se enoje con *el* *Jorge*.
not believe.1SG that the Marcela SE get.angry.SUBJ.3SG with the Jorge
'I don't think Marcela will be mad with Jorge.'

This construction is particularly productive in Chilean Spanish, especially with feminine proper nouns (De Mello 1992). Moreover, while other varieties marginally exhibit the construction as part of "vulgar" speech, e.g., this is the case in Rioplantese Spanish (Vidal de Battini 1964), the use of definite articles together with anthroponymic proper nouns may be considered a general norm in Chilean Spanish (Oroz 1966:371), and it is commonly attested in the speech of educated speakers.

There are reasons to believe that this property might be related to other syntactic phenomena in Chilean Spanish. For instance, in this dialect it is also possible to combine a definite determiner with a demonstrative pronoun to vaguely refer to animate or inanimate entities, e.g., (25).

(25) a. *La* *esta* me dijo un garabato.
the this DAT.1SG told.3SG a swear.word
'The female individual that you know about told me a swear word.'
b. Me olvidé *el* *este* en el auto.
DAT.1SG forgot.1SG the this in the car
'I forgot the thing that you know about in the car.'

Further research is necessary to determine whether there is a single parameter of variation ruling the distribution of the patterns in (24) and (25).

7.2 Río de la Plata

7.2.1 Clitic doubling

One of the most prominent features of the Rioplatense Spanish syntax is the doubling of full nominal phrases (Barrenechea and Orecchia 1979, Suñer 1988, Jaeggli 1986, Zdrojewski 2008, Di Tullio and Zdrojewski 2006, Di Tullio et al. 2019). Kany (1969) already noted examples like the following.

(26) a. Santos (*la*) miró *a Rosa*.
Santos CL.3FEM.SG.ACC look-at:PST.3SG ACC Rosa
'Santos looked at Rosa.'

b. La vieja (*lo*) tomó *al llorón* de la
DET old-woman CL.3MASC.SG.ACC take:PST.3SG ACC-DET weeper of DET
mano.
hand
'The old woman took the weeper one by the hand.' (Kany 1969:148)

These are typical examples of clitic doubling of definite and animate direct objects. Part of the debate is the actual extension of the phenomenon. Suñer (1988) argued that the crucial restriction is the definiteness and specificity of direct objects. Thus, in addition to definite direct objects, indefinite direct objects can also be clitic-doubled, if they bear specific interpretation.

(27) Diariamente, *la* escuchaba *a una mujer que*
daily CL.3.F.SG.ACC listen:PST.3SG ACC DET.indef woman that
cantaba tangos.
sing:PST.3SG tangos
'Daily, she listened a woman that use to sing tangos.' (Suñer 1988:396)

Rioplatense Spanish speakers seem to have very clear and consistent judgements with respect to clitic doubling with different types of animate and definite DOs, but not with respect to sentences like (27) (see Zdrojewski 2008 for a discussion of Suñer's 1988 observation). Notwithstanding this, it is not hard to find examples of accusative clitic doubling with specific indefinite objects in several internet corpora. Consider some examples with the indefinite determiner *un* 'a', but bear in mind that the accusative clitic can double other kinds of indefinites (such as numerals and other types of indefinite quantifiers).

(28) a. Así lo confirmó el comisario Sergio Soria,
in-this-way CL.3.SG.ACC comfirm:PST.3SG DET commissioner Sergio Soria
que dos personas encapuchadas el sábado en horas de la mañana
that two persons hooded.F.PL DET Saturday in hours of DET morning
la asaltaron *a una mujer*...
CL.3.F.SG.ACC assault:PST.3PL ACC DET.INDF woman
'In this way, the commissioner, Sergio Soria, confirmed that on Saturday morning, two hooded persons assaulted a woman...'
(http://www.acontecercalchaqui.com.ar/tag/novedades/page/5/)

b. Sobre el final, el defensor de Juveniles, Esteban Barría,
over DET end DET defender of Juveniles Esteban Barria
recibió la doble amonestación y cuando iba al
recieve:PST.3SG DET double admonishment and when go:PST.3SG to.DET
vestuario *lo* escupió *a un rival.*
locker-room CL.3.M.SG.ACC spit:PST.3SG ACC DET.INDF rival
'Over the end of the match, the defender of Juveniles, Esteban Barria, received the double admonishment and when he was going to the locker room he spitted a rival.' (https://laquime.wordpress.com/2012/04/page/6/)

c. *la* fajaron *a una piba de 12* en el colegio.
CL.3.F.SG.ACC swathe:PST.3PL ACC DET.INDF girl of 12 in DET school
'They hit a twelve years old girl in the school.'
(http://www.taringa.net/posts/noticias/18166855/La-fajaron-a-una-piba-de-12-en-el-colegio.html)

Other side of the debate is whether accusative doubling requires differential marking on doubled objects. Osvaldo Jaeggli, attributing the observation to Richard Kayne, famously proposed that clitic doubling does require differential object marking: "an object NP may be doubled by a clitic only if the NP is preceded by a preposition" Jaeggli (1982:20).

However, Suñer (1988), based on data taken from the corpus *El habla culta de la ciudad de Buenos Aires*, claimed that there is no correlation between differential object marking and clitic doubling:

(29) Yo *lo* voy a comprar *el diario* justo antes de
I CL.3MASC.SG.ACC go:PRS.1SG to buy:INF DET newspaper just before of
subir.
come-up:INF
'I am going to buy the newspaper just before coming up.'

(Suñer 1988:178)

Yet, in a more recent study, Di Tullio et al. (2019) have shown that examples like (29) cannot be assimilated to true clitic doubling, but to some type of right dislocation construction.

Regarding dative clitic doubling, there is a remarkable process of grammaticalization across most Spanish dialects. However, in Rioplatense Spanish, this process is extended in such a way that clitic doubling of indirect objects is almost mandatory in every context. For instance, some varieties do not require dative clitic doubling with indefinite pronouns or proper names. But in Río de la Plata Spanish, there is a strong tendency for having obligatory dative doubling in exactly those kinds of contexts. Compare, in this respect, the following examples.

(30) a. Eso no interesa a nadie.
that not interest:PST.3SG DAT anybody
'That doesn't interest anybody.' [?*Rioplatense Spanish]

b. Eso no *le* interesa *a nadie.*
that not CL.3.SG.DAT interest:PST.3SG DAT anybody
'That doesn't interest anybody'

c. No daba dinero a nadie.
not give:PST.3SG money DAT anybody
'She didn't give money to anybody.' [?*Rioplatense Spanish]

d. No *le* daba dinero *a nadie.*
not CL.3SG.DAT give:PST.3SG money DAT anybody
'She didn't give money to anybody.'

(31) a. Eso no interesa a Juana.
that not interest:PST.3SG DAT Juana
'That doesn't interest Juana' [?*Rioplatense Spanish]

b. Eso no *le* interesa *a Juana.*
that not CL.3.SG.DAT interest:PST.3SG DAT Juana
'That doesn't interest Juana'

c. No daba dinero a Juana.
not give:PST.3SG money DAT Juana
'She didn't give money to Juana.' [?*Rioplatense Spanish]

d. No *le* daba dinero *a Juana.*
not CL.3SG.DAT give:PST.3SG money DAT Juana
'She didn't give money to Juana.'

The *Nueva Gramática de la Real Academia Española* (NGRAE 2009) observes that bare nominal groups are commonly constructed without doubling (32a) (Ordóñez 1998, Fernandez-Soriano 1989). Note, however, that this observation does not apply to Rioplatense Spanish in (32b), example in which doubling is strongly preferred.

(32) a. (**Les*) legó su fortuna *a organizaciones de*
CL.3.PL.DAT bequeath:PST.3SG POSS fortune DAT organizations of
caridad.
charity
'She/he bequeathed her/his fortune to charity organizations.'

b. Juan (*les*) dio las entradas *a niños carenciados.*
Juan CL.3.PL.DAT give:PST.3SG DET tickets DAT kids poor
'Juan gave the tickets to poor kids.'

	Pronouns	HumanNPron DPs	Indef. DPs	NPron DPs	Bare Nouns	Generics
DO	Yes	Yes	± (it depends on the specific reading)	No	No	No
IO	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Table 2: Distribution of Indirect Object clitic doubling in contrast with Direct Object Clitic Doubling

In sum, the doubling of indirect objects has a wider extension than the doubling of direct objects in most, if not all, Spanish dialects, but in particular in Rioplatense Spanish.

7.2.2 Verbal doubling

While clitic doubling is part of the Rioplatense norm, there are other types doubling constructions, arguably involving some functional category related to focus/emphasis, strongly stigmatized in the community. This is the case of verbal doublings of the following type (examples from Kany 1969, 315-316):

(33) a. ¿Son muchas las yeguas? – No, señora. *Son* ocho nomás, *son*
are much the mares no, madame. are eight only, are
'Are there many mares? - No, madame. They are only eight.'
(Güiraldes, Don Segundo Sombra, pg. 46)

b. *Tené* pasensia, *tené*...
have patience have
'Be patient!'

c. *soy* un desgraciado, *soy*
am a unfortunate am
'I am unfortunate.' (Last-Reason, pg. 13)

d. *Tengo* sentimientos, *tengo*
have.1SG feelings have.1SG
'I have feelings!' (Sánchez, La gringa, IV, 5)
(Kany 1969:315-316)

Kany already remarked the curiosity and stigmatized nature of the phenomenon and said the following regarding the previous examples:

> Another curious phenomenon typical of uneducated people in certain regions [Argentine and Uruguay, Authors] is the repetition of the verb at the end of a sentence or phrase
>
> (Kany 1969:315-316, our translation)

Yet, Saab (2008) has shown that, beyond its philological curiosity, the phenomenon is attested in other Romance languages, like European Portuguese and Italian, and beyond Romance, as well. More importantly, this type of verbal duplication provides robust evidence for the thesis that certain repetitions result not from the mere act of repeating a word or a phrase, but from a independently motivated syntactic process involving two "copies" of the same constituent (Chomsky 1995, Nunes 2004). Evidence supporting that verbal doubling of the Rioplatense type is entirely resolved within the domain of the sentence comes from the following pattern. As is well-known, Rioplatense Spanish, as most Spanish dialects, does not license definite object drop (Campos 1986):[10]

(34) A: ¿Compraste el libro? B: Sí, *(*lo*) compré.
bought.2SG the book- yes (CL.MASC.3SG) bought.1SG
'A: Did you buy the book?- B: Yes, I bought it.'

Verbal doubling behaves exactly in the opposite way; pronominalization by clitic insertion gives rise to strong ungrammatically.

10. Important exceptions are Quito Spanish (Suñer and Yépez 1988) and other Andean dialects and, as we will see in subsection 7.3.4, Paraguay Spanish.

(35) ¡Compró el libro, (*lo*) compró!
bought.3SG the book, (CL.MASC.3SG.ACC) bought.3SG
'She bought the book!'

Given that the Rioplatense does not have definite object drop, the most reasonable assumption is that this pattern involves a unique sentence in which a verbal copy is created. See the referred work for more arguments in favor of this analysis.

7.2.3 Emphatic negative doubling

Rioplatense Spanish is also extremely productive in the use of a third type of doubling construction, which Di Tullio (2008) has called *emphatic negative doubling*.

(36) A: ¡Vení acá!- B: ¡*No* voy *nada*!.
come here not come.1SG nothing
'A: Come here!- B: I do not go!'

As argued in detail by Di Tullio, the distribution of this emphatic *nada* 'nothing' can be distinguished from the distribution of the quantifier *nada* on the basis of their respective intra-clausal behaviors. That is, whereas quantificational *nada* 'nothing' has the standard distribution of any other argument, emphatic *nada* has a non-argumental distribution. Consider, for instance, the case in (36), in which emphatic *nada* occurs in a non-argumental position (i.e., the verb *ir* 'to go' is intransitive), a position prohibited for quantificational *nada* and any other true verbal argument. In the same vein, emphatic *nada*, but not argumental *nada*, can occur with transitive predicates that have their complement position already filled by a true argument.

(37) A: ¡Comprá eso!- B: ¡*No* lo compro *nada*!.
buy that not CL.MASC.1SG.ACC buy.1SG nothing
'A: Buy that!- B: I do not buy it!'

Another important difference pointed out by Di Tullio is that emphatic *nada* has a more rigid distribution than its argumental counterpart. As is well-known, negative quantifiers can occur in preverbal or postverbal position depending on the presence or absence of sentential negation, e.g., (38). However, emphatic *nada* cannot participate in this alternation, e.g., (39).

(38) a. *No* compró *nada*.
not bought.3SG nothing
'She did not buy anything.'

b. *NADA* compró.
nothing bought.3SG
'She did not buy ANYTHING!'

(39) A: ¡Comprá eso!- B: *¡*NADA* lo compro!
buy that NOTHING CL.MASC.1SG.ACC buy.1SG
'A: Buy that!- B: I do not buy it!'

We refer the reader to Di Tullio (2008) for a more detailed description of this phenomenon.

7.3 Paraguay

7.3.1 Duplicated negation

Paraguayan Spanish displays a pattern in which two negative elements appear in preverbal position. As the examples in (40) show, these elements are (i) a negative polarity item, e.g., *nada* 'nothing', *nadie* 'nobody', *nunca* 'never', and (ii) the negative marker *no* 'not'. In contrast, negative polarity items must always be in postverbal position if they co-appears with *no* 'not' in General Spanish, as we saw in the previous section.

(40) a. Nadie no vino.
nobody not came.3SG
'Nobody came.' (Granda 1994:276)

b. Nunca no comí esa comida.
never not ate.1SG that food.
'I never ate that food.' (Granda 1994:334)

As pointed out by Granda (1994:333–334), this seems to be a case of linguistic convergence between Spanish and Guarani. On one hand, he observes that the patterns observed in (40) were common in Spanish during the 16th century. On the other, there is an analogous configuration in Guarani.

(41) Avave ndoúi kuehe.
nobody not.came yesterday
'Nobody came yesterday.' (Granda 1994:334)

Cuervo and Mazzaro (2013) observe this construction in the speech of Corrientes (north-eastern Argentina). According to them, the sentences in (40) do not differ significantly from their non-duplicative counterparts; the relevant factor is whether the negative head *no* 'not' receives pronunciation or not. Thus, they take that the General Spanish sentence *nadie vino* 'nobody came' is simply a variant of (40a) in which the negative head remains silent.

7.3.2 Multiple determiners

A similar point can be drawn from the possibility of hosting two determiners within the same nominal phrase in Paraguayan Spanish. Consider the examples in (42). In these sentences, a prenominal possessive pronoun co-appears together with a determiner that precedes it. As can be seen, these elements may be of different type, e.g., demonstrative pronouns, indefinite articles, indefinite pronouns.

(42) a. Ese mi amigo ya no vive aquí.
that my friend already not lives.3SG here
'That friend of mine doesn't live here anymore.' (Granda 1996:76)

b. Un mi hijo vive en Aregua.
a my son lives in Aregua.3SG here
'My son lives in Aregua.' (Granda 1996:78)

c. Que te ayude alguno tu compañero.
that ACC.2SG help.3SG some your colleague

'That some colleague of yours helps you.'
(Krivoshein de Canese and Corvalán 1987:40)

Granda (1996) once again argues that this is a case of linguistic convergence. His argument is analogous to the one discussed above: patterns like those in (42) are attested in the Spanish of the 16th century, while Guarani also has a similar syntactic configuration.

(43) Petei che ryvy oiko Areguápe.
one my young.brother lives in.Aregua
'My younger brother lives in Aregua.'
(Krivoshein de Canese and Corvalán 1987:40)

7.3.3 *Leísmo*

Paraguayan Spanish exhibits *leísmo*, a phenomenon in which a would-be accusative clitic surfaces with dative morphology. According to Granda (1982b), two main characteristics of Paraguayan *leísmo* are its generality and formal invariability. The former refers to the fact that the dative form appears with any type of direct object, no matter its features are [±HUMAN], [±ANIMATE], [±MASCULINE] or [±SINGULAR]; this trait distinguishes Paraguayan Spanish from other *leísta* dialects.[11] The latter property captures the observation that the singular dative form *le* is the only form available for both direct and indirect objects with any specification of φ-features.

(44) a. Yo *le* vi *al* *niño.*
I DAT.3SG saw.1SG DOM.THE child.MASC
'I saw the child.'

b. Yo *le* vi *a* *la* *niña.*
I DAT.3SG saw.1SG DOM the child.FEM
'I saw the child.'

c. Yo *le* vi *a* *los* *niños.*
I DAT.3SG saw.1SG DOM the childrenMASC
'I saw the children.'

d. Yo *le* vi *a* *las* *niñas.*
I DAT.3SG saw.1SG DOM the children.FEM
'I saw the children.'

(45) a. Y tiene todo su torre iluminada pero cuando yo *le* vi
and has.3SG all its tower illuminated but when I DAT.3SG saw1SG
parece que no é tan alta como vo eperá
seems.3SG that not is so tall as you expect.2SG
'And it has its tower illuminated but when I saw it, it seems that it is not as tall as you would expect.'

11. Palacios (2000) points out that some of her informants prefer the accusative form with direct objects combining the features [+HUMAN], [-MASCULINE] and [-SINGULAR]; the fact that these judgements come from university students suggests a sociolectal tendency. This trend is confirmed by Symeonidis (2013), who found that high class speakers are responsible for the few cases in which the accusative forms are used.

b. Un billete medio viejo ya, pero no etaba roto, Masiado bien
A bill half old already, but not was broken too.much well
me acuerdo que saqué y *le* puse ahí.
DAT.1SG remember that took and DAT.3SG put there
'A rather old bill, but it wasn't broken. Too well I remember that I took it and put it there.'

7.3.4 Definite object drop

As observed by Krivoshein de Canese and Corvalán (1987), Granda (1996), Choi (2000) and others, Paraguayan Spanish speakers usually drop accusative clitics when referring to inanimate objects, e.g., (46B). This sentence is unacceptable in most Spanish dialects.

(46) A: ¿Viste mi anillo?
B: No, no vi.

Krivoshein de Canese and Corvalán (1987:39) conjecture that this feature of Paraguayan Spanish is also due to the influence of Guarani, since personal pronouns in this language can only be used to refer to [+ANIMATE] entities. Granda (1996) and Choi (2000) support this claim, but the latter author also notices that the presence of the pattern in other dialects suggests that there are language-internal factors leading to the simplification of the pronominal system.

As seen, Paraguayan Spanish displays both *leísmo* and definite object drop. These features have also been attested together in Quiteño Spanish by Suñer and Yépez (1988); they suggest that Quiteño displays both of them as a consequence of morphological impoverishment. The data from Paraguayan Spanish supports a potential correlation between these phenomena.

8 Conclusions

As announced in the introduction, this chapter had two main goals. On the one hand, it presented a succinct description of three South-American dialects with the aim of offering a first approximation to students and researchers interested in their linguistic particularities. Even if, given the nature of the chapter, the topics were presented as a general overview for each subtopic, we have also offered an important body of literature to which the reader is referred for more detailed descriptions and analyses. Second, we decided to develop with a bit more of detail some issues concerning their syntactic variation, this time with the aim of making visible what Kayne's conjecture (and more generally, the microparametric approach) is about. The hope is to encourage new researchers working on this and other perspectives to further inquiry into the fascinating realm of the Spanish *languages* spoken in South-America, in which there is still much to be done.

References

Academia Chilena de la Lengua. 2001. *Diccionario de uso del español de Chile. Una muestra lexicográfica*. Santiago: Direcciónn de Bibliotecas, Archivos y Museos.

Alonso, Amado. 1953. *Estudios lingüísticos: Temas hispanoamericanos*. Madrid: Gredos.

Arregi, Karlos, and Andrew Nevins. 2018. Beware occam's syntactic razor: Morphotactic analysis and Spanish mesoclisis. *Linguistic Inquiry* 49:625–683.

Avellana, Alicia. 2013. El español en contacto con el guaraní: valores aspectuales en el dominio nominal y clausal. *Revista Española de Lingüística* 43:5–36.

Baker, Mark C. 2008. The macroparameter in a microparametric world. In *The limits of syntactic variation*, ed. Theresa Biberauer, 351–373. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Bakker, Dik, Jorge Gómez Rendón, and Ewald Hekking. 2008. Spanish meets Guaraní, Otomí and Quichua: a multilingual confrontation. In *Aspects of language contact*, ed. Thomas Stolz, Dik Bakker, and Rosa Salas Palomo, 165–238. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Barrenechea, Ana Marìa, and Teresa Orecchia. 1979. La duplicación de objetos directos e indirectos en el español hablado en Buenos Aires. In *Estudios lingüísticos y dialectológicos. temas hispánicos*, ed. Ana María Barrenechea, Mabel Manacorda de Rosetti, María Luisa Freyre, Elena Jiménez, Teresa Orecchia, and Clara Wolf, 73–101. Buenos Aires: Hachette.

Bertolotti, Virginia. 2011. La peculiaridad del sistema alocutivo singular en Uruguay. In *El español rioplatense. Lengua, literatura, expresiones culturales*, ed. Ángela Di Tullio and Rolf Kailuweit, 23–47. Madrid: Iberoamericana.

Bohrn, Andrea. 2015. Inversión silábica y realización de género y número: el caso del vesre rioplatense. *Rasal* 29–48.

Bongiovanni, Silvina Carla. 2015. Neutralización del contraste entre / ɲ/ y /nj/ en el español de Buenos Aires: un estudio de percepción. *Signo y Seña* 27:11–46.

Campos, Héctor. 1986. Indefinite object drop. *Linguistic Inquiry* 17:354–359.

Campos, Héctor. 1999. Transitividad e intransitividad. In *Gramática descriptiva de la lengua española. Volumen 2: Las construcciones sintácticas fundamentales. Relaciones temporales, aspectuales y modales*, ed. Ignacio Bosque and Violeta Demonte, 1520–1574. Madrid: Espasa Calpe.

Krivoshein de Canese, Natalia, and Graziella Corvalán. 1987. *El español de Paraguay en contacto con el guaraní*. Asunción: Centro Paraguayo de Estudios Sociológicos.

Cassano, Paul Vincent. 1977. Substratum hypotheses concerning American Spanish. *Word* 28:239–274.

Cepeda, Gladys. 1995. Retention and deletion of word-final /s/ in Valdivian Spanish (Chile). *Hispanic Linguistics* 6:329–354.

Cepeda, Gladys. 1998. El movimiento tonal de cadencia. Ejemplos del español de Valdivia. *RLA: Revista de lingüística teórica y aplicada* 36:37–52.

Cepeda, Gladys. 2001. Estudio descriptivo del español de Valdivia, Chile. *Estudios Filológicos* 36:81–97.

Choi, Jinny K. 2000. Direct object drop: The genetic cause of a syntactic feature in Paraguayan Spanish. *Hispania* 83:531–543.

Choi, Jinny K. 2005. Bilingualism in Paraguay: Forty years after rubin's study. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 26:233–248.

Chomsky, Noam. 1986. *Knowledge of language. Its nature, origin and use*. New York: Praeger.

Chomsky, Noam. 1995. *The minimalist program*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Cid, Miriam, Héctor Ortiz, Mario Poblete, Hernán Pons, and José Luis Samaniego. 2000. Hacia una descripción prosódica del español culto de Santiago de Chile: resultados de una investigación. *Onomázein* 5:95–106.

Colantoni, Laura. 2011. Broad focus declaratives in Argentine Spanish contact and non-contact varieties. In *Intonational phrasing in Romance and Germanic*, ed. Christoph Gabriel and Conxita Lleó, 183–212. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Colantoni, Laura. 2014. La variación prosódica en el español de la Argentina. *Boletín de la Academia Argentina de Letras* 79:151–172.

Colantoni, Laura, and María Cristina Cuervo. 2013. Clíticos acentuados. In *Perspectivas teóricas y experimentales sobre el español de la Argentina*, ed. Laura Colantoni and Celeste Rodríguez Louro, 143–157. Frankfurt am Main: Vervuert Verlagsgesellschaft.

Colantoni, Laura, and Jorge Gurlekian. 2004. Convergence and intonation: historical evidence from Buenos Aires Spanish. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition* 7:107–119.

Colantoni, Laura, and José Ignacio Hualde. 2013. Introducción: variación fonológica en el español de la Argentina. In *Perspectivas teóricas y experimentales sobre el español de la Argentina*, ed. Laura Colantoni and Celeste Rodríguez Louro, 21–36. Frankfurt am Main: Vervuert Verlagsgesellschaft.

Coloma, Germán. 2018. Argentine Spanish. *Journal of the International Phonetic Association* 48:243–250.

Conde, Oscar. 2019. *Diccionario etimológico de lunfardo (3ra edición)*. Buenos Aires: Taurus.

Cuervo, María Cristina, and Natalia Mazzaro. 2013. Duplicación de la negación en el español de corrientes. In *Perspectivas teóricas y experimentales sobre el español de la argentina*, ed. Laura Colantoni and Celeste Rodríguez Louro, 159–176. Frankfurt am Main: Vervuert Verlagsgesellschaft.

De Mello, George. 1992. El artículo definido con nombre propio de persona en el español hablado culto contemporáneo. *Studia Neophilologica* 64:221–234.

Di Tullio, Ángela. 2008. Palabras negativas en contextos enfáticos: *nada*, *ningún*. Paper presented at the XI Congreso de la Sociedad Argentina de Lingüística (SAL). Facultad de Humanidades y Ciencias, Universidad Nacional del Litoral, Santa Fe, Argentina.

Di Tullio, Ángela. 2010a. *Políticas lingüística e inmigración. El caso argentino (1ra reimpresión)*. Buenos Aires: Eudeba.

Di Tullio, Ángela. 2010b. El voseo argentino en tiempos del Bicentenario. *Rasal* 1-2:47–71.

Di Tullio, Ángela, and Rolf Kailuweit. 2011. Introducción. In *El español rioplatense. Lengua, literatura, expresiones culturales*, ed. Ángela Di Tullio and Rolf Kailuweit, 11–19. Madrid: Iberoamericana.

Di Tullio, Ángela, Andrés Saab, and Pablo Zdrojewski. 2019. Clitic doubling in a doubling world. the case of argentinean spanish reconsidered. In *The syntactic variation of spanish dialects*, ed. Ángel Gallego, 213–242. Oxford: Oxfprd University Press.

Di Tullio, Ángela, and Pablo Zdrojewski. 2006. Notas sobre el doblado de clíticos en el español rioplatense: asimetrías entre objetos humanos y no humanos. *Filología* XXXVII:13–44.

Donni de Mirande, Nélida E. 1984. Un cambio lingüístico en Rosario. A propósito de las realizaciones de /S/. *Cuadernos de Literatura. Revista de Estudios Lingüísticos y Literarios* 3:117–142.

Estigarribia, Bruno. 2017. Guarani morphology in Paraguayan Spanish. Insights from code-mixing typology. *Hispania* 100:47–64.

Estomba, Diego. 2012. El voseo americano: vicisitudes sintácticas y pragmáticas. Paper presented at the XIII Congreso de la Sociedad Argentina de Lingüística (SAL). Potrero de los Funes, San Luis.

Fernandez-Soriano, Olga. 1989. Rección y ligamiento en español. Aspectos del parámetro nulo. Doctoral Dissertation, Universidad Autónoma de Madrid, Madrid, España.

Figueroa Candia, Mauricio A., and Jaime Soto-Barba. 2010. Los alófonos del grupo consonántico /tɾ/ en el castellano de Chile. *Onomázein* 22:11–42.

Gabriel, Christoph, Ingo Feldhausen, and Andrea Pešková. 2011. Prosodic phrasing in Porteño Spanish. In *Intonational phrasing in Romance and Germanic*, ed. Christoph Gabriel and Conxita Lleó, 153–182. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Gabriel, Christoph, Ingo Feldhausen, Andrea Pešková, Laura Colantoni, Su-Ar Lee, Valeria Arana, and Leopoldo Labastía. 2010. Argentinian Spanish intonation. In *Transcription of intonation of the Spanish language*, ed. Pilar Prieto and Paolo Roseano, 285–317. München: LINCOM Publishers.

Gabriel, Christoph, Andrea Pešková, and Tim Ewald. 2020. How much like Guarani does Paraguayan Spanish sound? The pronunciation of ¡y¿ and ¡ll¿. In *Contact, variation and change in Romance and beyond. Studies in honor of Trudel Meisenburg*, ed. Christoph Gabriel, Andrea Pešková, and Maria Selig, 39–56. Berlin: Erich Schmidt Verlag.

García Gallarín, Consuelo. 1983. El artículo ante nombre propio de persona. Doctoral Dissertation, Universidad Complutense de Madrid, Madrid.

González Vergara, Carlos. 2002. La variación "erí"/"soi" en el voseo verbal de Santiago de Chile. Un estudio exploratorio. *Onomázein* 7:213–230.

Granda, Germán. 1982a. Observaciones sobre la fonética del español en el Paraguay. *Anuario de Letras* 20:145–194.

Granda, Germán. 1982b. Origen y formación del leísmo en el español del Paraguay. Ensayo de un método. *Revista de Filología Española* 62:259–283.

Granda, Germán. 1994. *Español de América, español de África y hablas criollas hispánicas. Cambios, contactos y contextos*. Madrid: Editorial Gredos.

Granda, Germán. 1996. Interferencia y convergencia sintácticas e isogramatismo amplio en el español paraguayo. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 117:63–80.

Granda, Germán de. 1980a. Préstamos morfológicos del guaraní en el español del Paraguay (I). *Revue de Linguistique Romane* 44:57–68.

Granda, Germán de. 1980b. Préstamos morfológicos del guaraní en el español del Paraguay (II). *Revue de Linguistique Romane* 44:247–265.

Gugenberger, Eva. 2011. ¿Existe un "cocoliche gallego"? La inmigración gallega y sus implicancias lingüísticas. In *El español rioplatense. Lengua, literatura, expresiones culturales*, ed. Àngela Di Tullio and Rolf Kailuweit, 123–135. Madrid: Iberoamericana.

Guitarte, Guillermo L. 1955. El ensordecimiento del žeísmo porteño. *Revista de Filología Española* 39:261–283.

Gynan, Shaw N. 2011. Spanish in contact with Guaraní. In *The handbook of hispanic sociolinguistics*, ed. Manuel Díaz-Campos, 353–373. Hoboken: Wiley-Blackwell.

Gynan, Shaw Nicholas, and Ernesto Luís López Almada. 2020. Chapter 9. the glottal stop in Guaraní and Paraguayan Spanish. In *Spanish phonetics and phonology in contact*, ed. Rajiv Rao, 227–262. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Haska, Christina. 2016. La percepción fonético-fonológica del fonema /t͡ʃ/ del español de Chile: un estudio sociofonético experimental. *Estudios Filológicos* 57:65–78.

Jaeggli, Osvaldo. 1982. *Topics in Romance syntax*. Dordrecht: Foris.

Jaeggli, Osvaldo A. 1986. Three issues in the theory of clitics: Case, doubled nps, and extraction. In *Syntax and semantics 19. the syntax of pronominal clitics*, ed. Hagit Borer, volume 19, 15–42. Florida: Academic Press.

Kaisse, Ellen M. 2001. The long fall: An intonational melody of Argentinian Spanish. In *Features and interfaces in Romance: Essays in honor of Heles Contreras*, ed. Julia Herschensohn, Enrique Mallén, and Karen Zagona, 147–160. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Kallfell, Guido. 2009. Fonética y fonolog'ia del español paraguayo. Efectos concomitantes del cntacto con el guaraní. *UniverSOS: Revista de Lenguas Indígenas y Universos Culturales* 6:81–104.

Kany, Charles E. 1945. *American-Spanish syntax*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Kany, Charles E. 1969. *Sintaxis hispanoamericana*. Madrid: Gredos.

Kayne, Richard. 2005. Some notes on comparative syntax, with special reference to English and French. In *The Oxford Handbook of Comparative Syntax*, ed. Guglielmo Cinque and Richard Kayne, 3–69. New York: Oxford University Press.

Klee, Carol A., and Andrew Lynch. 2009. *El español en contacto con otras lenguas*. Washington: Georgetown University Press.

Kornfeld, Laura, and Inés Kuguel. 2013. Un afijo re loco. In *El español de la argentina. Estudios gramaticales*, ed. Àngela Di Tullio, 15–35. Buenos Aires: Eudeba.

Lenz, Rodolfo. 1940a. Estudios chilenos (fonética del castellano de Chile). In *El español en Chile. Trabajos de Rodolfo Lenz, Andrés Bello y Rodolfo Oroz*, ed. Amado Alonso and Raimundo Lida, 86–208. Buenos Aires: Instituto de Filología (UBA).

Lenz, Rodolfo. 1940b. Para el conocimiento del español de América. In *El español en Chile. Trabajos de Rodolfo Lenz, Andrés Bello y Rodolfo Oroz*, ed. Amado Alonso and Raimundo Lida, 210–258. Buenos Aires: Instituto de Filología (UBA).

Lenz, Rodolfo. 1979. *Diccionario etimológico de voces chilenas derivadas de lenguas indígenas americanas*. Santiago: Universidad de Chile.

Lezcano, Luis A., and Julio Lezcano Claude. 1988. Glosario de Paraguayismos. *Estudios Paraguayos* 16:129–169.

Lipski, John M. 1994. *Latin American Spanish*. London: Longman.

Luis, Carlos Rafael, and María Amalia García Jurado. 1983. Desplazamientos fonéticos de vocales españolas. *Letras de Hoje* 18:98–109.

Magaña, Juanita, and Humberto Valdivieso. 1991. Variación fonética de "s" en el habla espontánea. *RLA: Revista de lingüística teórica y aplicada* 29:97–114.

Malmberg, Bertil. 1947. *Notas sobre la fonética del español en el Paraguay (Yearbook of the New Society of Letters at Lund)*. Lund: C. W. K. Gleerup.

Malmberg, Bertil. 1973. La lengua española en la historia y en la actualidad. In *Linguistique générale et romane. Etudes en allemand, anglais, espagnol et français*, ed. Bertil Malmberg, 433–444. The Hague: De Gruyter Mouton.

Mann, Daniel. 2012. Chilean clitic reduplication: Implications for morphology and syntax. *Working Papers in TESOL & Applied Linguistics* 12:17–37.

Masullo, Pascual José. 2019. Merge, restructuring, and clitic climbing in Spanish. In *Exploring interfaces*, ed. Mónica Cabrera and José Camacho, 211–231. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Morales Pettorino, Félix. 1998. Panorama del voseo chileno y rioplatense. *Boletín de Filología* 37:835–848.

Morales Pettorino, Félix. 2006. *Nuevo diccionario ejemplificado de chilenismos y de otros usos diferenciales del español de Chile (NDECh)*. Valparaíso: Puntángeles.

Moulian, Rodrigo, María Catrileo, and Pablo Landeo. 2015. Afines quechua en el vocabulario mapuche de Luis de valdivia. *RLA. Revista de lingüística teórica y aplicada* 53:73–96.

Muñoz-Builes, Diana, Dania Ramos, Domingo Román, Camilo Quezada, Héctor Ortíz-Lira, Magaly Ruiz, and José Joaquín Atria. 2017. El habla ascendente de Chiloé: primera aproximación. *Onomázein. Revista de lingüística, filología y traducción* 1–15.

Muñoz Pérez, Carlos. 2020. Dos fenómenos de clíticos en el español de Santiago de Chile. *Cuadernos de la ALFAL* 12:411–429.

Muysken, Pieter. 2013. Language contact outcomes as the result of bilingual optimization strategies. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition* 16:709–730.

Navarro Carrasco, Ana Isabel. 2020. Americanismos en Paraguay. *Revista Española de Lingüística* 50:119–140.

Nevins, Andrew, and Philipp Weisser. 2019. Closest conjunct agreement. *Annual Review of Linguistics* 5:219–241.

Nunes, Jairo. 2004. *Linearization of chains and sideward movement*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

Ordóñez, Francisco. 1998. Post-verbal asymmetries in Spanish. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 16:313–345.

Oroz, Rodolfo. 1966. *La lengua castellana en Chile*. Santiago: Universidad de Chile.

Ortiz, Héctor, Marcela Fuentes, and Lluïsa Astruc. 2010. Chilean Spanish intonation. In *Transcription of intonation of the Spanish language*, ed. Pilar Prieto and Paolo Roseano, 255–283. LINCOM Publishers.

Ortiz Lira, Héctor, and Leonardo Mena Flores. 2015. Alofonía del fonema fricativo alvéolo-dental /s/ en posición codal preconsonántica en el habla de profesionales de Santiago. *Boletín de Filología* 50:123–148.

Palacios, Azucena. 2000. El sistema pronominal del español paraguayo: un caso de contacto de lenguas. In *Teoría y práctica del contacto: el español de América en el candelero*, ed. Julio Calvo Pérez, 123–143. Frankfurt am Main: Vervuert.

Palacios, Nicolás. 1918. *Raza chilena. Libro escrito por un chileno y para los chilenos*. Santiago: Editorial Chilena.

Pane, Leni. 2005. *Los paraguayismos. El español en el habla cotidiana de los paraguayos*. Asunción: Arandura.

Pane, Leni. 2014. *Los paraguayismos II. El español en el habla cotidiana de los paraguayos*. Asunción: Criterio.

Pérez, Hernán Emilio. 2007. Estudio de la variación estilística de la serie /b-d-g/ en posición intervocálica en el habla de los noticieros de la televisión chilena. *Estudios de fonética experimental* 16:228–259.

Pruñonosa, Manuel. 2000. Algunos rasgos fónicos de interferencia del guaraní en el español del Paraguay. In *Teoría y práctica del contacto: el español de América en el candelero*, ed. Julio Calvo Pérez, 113–122. Frankfurt am Main: Vervuert.

Rabanales, Ambrosio. 2000. El español de Chile: presente y futuro. *Onomázein* 5:135–141.

Real Academia Española. 2009. *Nueva gramática de la lengua española*. Madrid: Espasa.

Rogers, Brandon M. A. 2013. The extent of tonal events: intonational hat patterns in Chilean Spanish. *Estudios de Fonética Experimental* 22:171–192.

Rogers, Brandon M. A. 2016. When theory and reality collide: Exploring Chilean Spanish intonational plateaus. Doctoral Dissertation, The University of Minnesota, Minneapolis.

Rohena-Madrazo, Marcos. 2013. Variación y cambio de sonoridad de la fricativa postalveolar del español de Buenos Aires. In *Perspectivas teóricas y experimentales sobre el español de la Argentina*, ed. Laura Colantoni and Celeste Rodríguez Louro, 37–58. Frankfurt am Main: Vervuert Verlagsgesellschaft.

Román, Domingo, Valeria Cofré, and Claudia Rosas. 2008. Rasgos prosódicos de oraciones sin expansión, del español de Santiago de Chile en habla femenina. *Language Design* 10 (Special Issue 2):137–146.

Rubin, Joan. 1968. *National bilingualism in Paraguay*. The Hague: Moulton.

Ruíz Mella, Magaly, Olga Ulloa Sepúlveda, and Antonio Chihuaicura Chihuaicura. 2019. Acento y entonación en enunciados declarativos del español de chile y mapudungun: primer acercamiento a la prosodia de ambas lenguas en contacto. *ALPHA: Revista de Artes, Letras y Filosofía* 2:261–274.

Saab, Andrés. 2008. Hacia una teoría de la identidad parcial en la elipsis. Doctoral Dissertation, Universidad de Buenos Aires, Buenos Aires.

Sadowsky, Scott. 2015. Variación sociofonética de las consonantes del castellano chileno. *Sociolinguistic Studies* 9:71–92.

Salamanca, Gastón. 2010. Apuntes sociolingüísticos sobre la presencia de argentinismos en el léxico del español de Chile. *Atenea (Concepción)* 502:125–149.

San Martín Núñez, Abelardo. 2011. Voces de origen lunfardo en el registro festivo del diario chileno La Cuarta. *Onomázein* 23:105–147.

Sánchez Cabezas, Gilberto. 2010. Los mapuchismos en el DRAE. *Boletín de Filología* XLV:149–256.

Silva-Corvalán, Carmen. 2005. La construcción *(se) me le* en el español de Santiago de Chile. In *Filología y lingüística. Estudios ofrecidos a Antonio Quilis. Volumen I*, 1175–1182. Madrid: CSIC.

Sinner, Carsten. 2015. O galego como lingua de contacto co castelán riopratense: unha relación esquecida. *Estudos de Lingüística Galega* 8:187–204.

Soto-Barba, Jaime. 2011. Variación consonántica en el habla urbana y rural de la provincia de Ñuble. *RLA: Revista de Lingüística Teórica y Aplicada* 49:111–127.

Suñer, Margarita, and Maria Yépez. 1988. Null definite objects in Quiteño. *Linguistic Inquiry* 19:511–519.

Suñer, Margarita. 1988. The role of agreement in clitic-doubled constructions. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 6:391–434.

Suñer, Margarita, and María Yépez. 1988. Null definite objects in Quiteño. *Linguistic Inquiry* 19:511–519.

Symeonidis, Haralambos. 2013. Análisis sociolingüístico del leísmo en el español paraguayo. *Revista Internacional d'Humanitats* XVI:55–68.

Tassara, Gilda. 1991. Variación lingüística: /s/ implosiva en el habla semiformal culta de valparaíso. *Revista Signos* 24:131–139.

Terrell, Tracy D. 1978. La aspiración y elisión de /s/ en el español porteño. *Anuario de Letras* 16:41–66.

Toledo, Guillermo. 2000. H en el español de Buenos Aires. *Langues et Linguistique* 26:107–127.

Trawick, Sonya, and Jim Michnowicz. 2019. Glottal insertion before vowel-initial words in the Spanish of Asunción, Paraguay. In *Current approaches to spanish in multilingual populations*, ed. Gregory L. Thompson and Scott M. Alvord, 147–171. Wilmington, DE: Vernon Press.

Vidal de Battini, Berta Elena. 1964. *El español de la Argentina*. Buenos Aires: Consejo Nacional de Educación.

Villa-García, Julio. 2019. Clitic climbing (or lack thereof) and the copy theory of movement. *Glossa: a journal of general linguistics* 4.

Wagner, Claudio. 2006. Las zonas dialectales de Chile. *RLA: Revista de lingüística teórica y aplicada* 44:13–30.

Wagner, Claudio, and Claudia Rosas. 2003. Geografía de la "ll" en chile. *Estudios Filológicos* 38:188–200.

Fontanella de Weinberg, María Beatriz. 1987. *El español bonaerense. Cuatro siglos de evolución lingüística (1580-1980)*. Buenos Aires: Hachette.

Wigdorsky, Leopoldo. 1978. Realización de algunos fonemas consonánticos en el castellano de Santiago. Informe preliminar. *RLA. Revista de lingüística teórica y aplicada* 16:53–60.

Zamora Vicente, Alonso. 1949. Rehilamiento porteño. *Filología* 1:5–22.

Zdrojewski, Pablo. 2008. ¿Por quién doblan los clíticos? Restricciones morfosintácticas sobre la duplicación pronominal en el español rioplatense. Master's thesis, Universidad Nacional del Comahue, General Roca.