1.1. Established generalisations.

In this study, extrametricality is put forward and the hierarchy of stress markedness is precisely identified among verbal forms in the Thematic Vowel (TV) affix, keeping the stress rules parameters in a pancategorical sense, in order to avoid some incoherences which we shall refer to in the solution of J.W. Harris, the most solid and best directed proposal.

The hypothesis in connection with the morphological determination of the verbal stress in Spanish is in a state of crisis. What is mentioned in [4], page 84, that “Segmental phonological representation and morphological identification are jointly necessary and sufficient to determine placement of word stress for all verbforms” is nowadays considered to be a challenge which needs to be and can be overcome: [5], [7] and [8] point in this direction.

I. EXTRAMETRICALITY OF THE FINAL METRIC ELEMENT.

1.1. Established generalisations.

The generalisations in connection with the stress in Spanish words which I consider to be established are the following:

First. Spanish words, as far as the accent is concerned, are hierarchically divided into three classes: on the one hand, a wide selection of words with regular stress on the penultimate syllable, or type A (‘sabanas, extensas, balcones, a‘ules); on the other hand, a collection of words with irregular stressing, divided into two subsets: one consisting of words with the stress on the antepenultimate syllable, or Type B (‘bananas, ‘omicas, ‘rboles, ‘utiles), and the other of words with the stress on the last syllable, or Type C (‘ara‘ues, caf‘es, ‘ruces, ma‘ruces, domi‘nos, ban‘tues). The roots or affixes of type B are marked in the lexicon with a responsible diacritic feature that expresses the markedness of the stress in Type B words. The unmarked lexical entries will be of Type A/C.

Second. An morphological words, of whatever category, fall in with the so-called window of three syllables restriction (WTS) which makes the existence of words like ‘(X--) with the stress on one syllable further back than the third from the end impossible in Spanish.

Third. The Spanish stress is sensitive to quantity (Branching Condition of [4]). An stress of Type B is not possible if the penult syllable has a branching rhyme: *(X-VC), *(X-VG), *(X-GV). Nor is a Type B stress possible in words ending in a final rhyme GV, *(X-GV) *(continua, continua, continua). Under these circumstances the window for stress is reduced to the last two syllables.

Fourth. The domain of stress assignment is the morphological word. The rules or parameters for the assignment of the stress explore the whole word (theme and non-cyclic or inflectional affixes) and establish the stress in accordance with the foregoing conditions.

The hypothesis of the word as the domain of the stress rules presupposes that the parameters explore lexical forms in a derivative stratum in which the non-cyclic affix constituents (word markers and paradigmatic constituents: πG, , πN, πTMA and πFN are specified.

Fifth. The representation of the stress is placed within the framework of the theoretical model developed in [3].

1.2. Harris’s stress rules.

The stress rules in [7] to generate the stress grids of Spanish words are collected in (1) and illustrated (2) where, for simplicity’s sake, only line 0 of the stress grid is shown.

1. Stressable elements are syllable nuclei (rhyme heads).

2. The rightmost stressable element is extrametrical iff word-final or followed by an inflectional consonant.

3. Forms constituent(s) on line 0 and mark head(s) on line 1;

Parameter settings:

a. unbounded, right-headed

b. binary, left-headed, right-to-left

(c. special case).

4. Form constituent(s) on line 1 and mark head(s) on line 2;

Parameter settings:

a. unbounded, right-headed.

5. Conflate lines 1 and 2 (=remove asterisks in columns that have no line 2 asterisks).

2. EXTRAMETRICALITY OF THE FINAL METRICAL ELEMENTS.

2.1. Hierarchy of markedness in verb forms.

I suggest that it is the outermost cyclic affix of the verb forms, the various forms of TV which carry the diacritic of markedness. The morpheme TV (a, i, 1) of the Theme of the Preterite (cfr. [1] and [2]) will be of the type A: weak preterite, imperfect indicative, imperfect and future subjunctive, gerund and participle. The morpheme TV (A, E, E) of the Theme of the Present will be of type B: present indicative, present subjunctive and imperative. And the morpheme TV (a, 1, 1) of the Theme of the Future will be of Type C: future indicative and conditional.

I suggest furthermore, that extrametricality be understood in terms of (3):

Expression (3) (replaces (1.2))

A stressable element is extrametrical iff it matches an inflectional constituent.

The formulation of (3) does not have a higher theoretical cost than (1.2): “It is perfectly straightforward to distinguish between «inflectional» and «non-inflectional» morphemes in Spanish... the set of «inflectional» morphemes contains exactly class markers and the plural morphemes in non-verbs plus tensed moodpect and personnumber suffixes in verbs... the set of «inflectional» morphemes corresponds exactly to the noncyclic affixes in the Halle-Vergnaud theory of phonological organization” (cfr. [7]: 253).

If (1.2) is a panecatagorical formulation, so is (3); but (1.2) has to treat as exceptions words of Class C, which is not necessary with the formulation of (3): words which lack flectional constituents will have extrametrical affixes in [6]: 38, the analysis of aleman and huesped, lacking word marker or inflectional elements and therefore extrametrical elements.

Now, given the formulation of (3), if it explain the accent on forms such as contesta.BA. <moslis>, how can the stress of contesta.<BA(s/n)> be explained? In the same way as occurs in contesta.<ST> as against contesta.<STE>.
is postulated that the domain scanned by the stress rules (1.3-5) is the derivative theme (according to [8] p. 11, "The domain of Spanish stress is the lexical theme (according to [8] p. 11, "The stress rules (1.3-5) is the derivative word. Clearly, the TMA and PN verbal endings are included in the domain of the lexical word") and not the word, it would be possible to do without (3). But the arguments of (7) are strong enough. Syllabification must precede the stress for this to show its sensitivity to WTS and the syllabic quantity (cfr. [7] p. 28). The inflectional elements, when they increase the number of syllables in the word, affect the placing of the stress by virtue of the WTS restriction (re'gimes, aver'i'guamos, aver'i'güemos) and not the word, it would be possible to do without (3). But the arguments of (7) are strong enough. Syllabification must precede the stress for this to show its sensitivity to WTS and the syllabic quantity (cfr. [7] p. 28).

Thus, the analysis of the examples in (2) would now be that of (3) where the fonts of the Theme of the Future would be exceptional to (3) in which the element immediate to the Theme is not declared extrametrical.

Therefore, it is necessary to retain the morphological word as a sequence scanned by the stress rules and a principle of extrametricality (3) specific to Spanish, albeit of little theoretical value, because it is established in generic terms. The concept of extrametricality in [8], p. 21, "The 'desinence' is extrametrical", although apparently similar to (3) is very different, according to [8] itself, p. 12 which explains: "Desinences in nonverbal auxiliaries are excluded by extrametricality, while in verbs both clitics and inflectional endings simply fall outside the domain". Roca's stress rules do not scan the extrametrical elements. Extrametricality, as defined by Roca, is redundant with his domain proposal (cfr. [8] p. 11).

Therefore suggest that (3) be understood in the sense of [6], p. 38, "the class marker is within the domain of scansion of the stress rules, but extrametrical". The difference between the stress domain hypothesis and the extrametrical hypothesis may be subtle but it is crucial, as Harris himself observes because the arguments previously put forward make the first hypothesis untenable but do not affect the second. The rules scan all the metric elements of the word but only the non extrametrical elements count.

Thus, the analysis of the examples in (2) would now be that of (3) where the fonts of the Theme of the Future would be exceptional to (3) in which the element immediate to the Theme is not declared extrametrical.

b. Marked stress, Type B.

WTS: \( \rightarrow * \)

\[ \text{con.tes.t+A.} \#.c'\&s \]

\[ \text{con.tes.t+A.} \#.m'os \]

\[ \text{con.tes.t+A.} \#.is \]

\[ \text{con.tes.t+A.} \#.e \]

\[ \text{con.tes.t+A.} \#.mos \]

\[ \text{con.tes.t+A.} \#.e \]

\[ \text{WTS: } \rightarrow * \]

\[ \text{TV*: } \rightarrow * \]

\[ \text{con.tes.t+A.} \#.e\]

\[ \text{con.tes.t+A.} \#.is\]

\[ \text{con.tes.t+A.} \#.e\]

\[ \text{WTS: } \rightarrow * \]

\[ \text{TV*: } \rightarrow * \]

c. Special stress, Type C:

exception to (3)

\[ \text{con.tes.t+A.} \#.(mos/is) \]

\[ \text{con.tes.t+A.} \#.(a) \]

\[ \text{con.tes.t+A.} \#.(a) \]

\[ \text{WTS: } \rightarrow * \]

\[ \text{TV*: } \rightarrow * \]

2.2. Outstanding questions.

In this analysis the oxiton forms of the weak preterite (con'teso, con'testo: compren'di, compren'dió) remain outstanding where there has to be a special solution parallel to those concerning the strong preterites (an'duve, an'duvo; con'duje, con'dujo). The case of the infinitive may be more complicated, although not for the reasons put forward in [6] p. 50-51. The problem rests in establishing the TV affixes of the forms of the infinitive. By reason of the stress, it could be considered as the Theme of the Future. On the other hand, by virtue of the TV form, it should be considered as the Theme of the Future or as the Theme of the Present; but then, how would the stress be explained?

3. References