

# Semantic affix rivalry: the case of Portuguese nominalisers

Alexandra Soares Rodrigues afsr@ipb.pt

Escola Superior de Educação - Instituto Politécnico de Bragança

Centro de Estudos de Linguística Geral e Aplicada – Universidade de Coimbra

9th Mediterranean Morphology Meeting,  
Dubrovnik, 15-18 of September, 2013

## 1 INTRODUCTION

In Portuguese there are different suffixes that permit to construct event deverbal nouns (EDN). Those affixes may adjoin the same verbal base. Examples of this are presented in table 1.

base verb	EDN in -mento	EDN in -da	EDN in -ção	EDN in -dela	EDN in -dura
tosquiar ‘to shear’	tosquiamento	tosquiada	tosquiação	tosquiadel	tosquiadura
moer ‘to mill’	moimento	moída	moição	moidela	moedura

Albeit deriving event nouns, the meanings of the derivatives of these suffixes are slightly different. We intend to contribute to the understanding of the mechanisms that are involved in affix semantic rivalry, specifically to the knowledge of the semantic features of the verbal base that are sensitive to the semantics of each affix.

In a Lexicalist framework (e.g. Halle (1973) and Scalise (1983)), each base has idiosyncratic information on the affix(es) it may select. Other descriptions have challenged that traditional account, searching for systematic features that may relate classes of bases with certain affixes. Some of those descriptions are, for instance, Fábregas (2010) and Rodrigues (2008).

## 2 AFFIX SELECTION: THE ALL OR NOTHING HYPOTHESIS

Fábregas (2010) has proposed that, in Spanish, the selection of the different nominalising suffixes depends on the semantic features of the internal argument of the base verb. According to Fábregas, verbs of change of state with a rheme path object originate nominals with the suffix *-da/-do*, but not with the suffix *-miento*. Contrarily, verbs of change of state with an undergoer choose the suffix *-miento* and not *-da/-do*.

The analysis of Portuguese data does not corroborate Fábregas’ hypothesis. As Portuguese data evidence, affix selection is not sensitive to the distinction between rheme path objects and undergoers. In fact, both verbs may be bases of nouns with the suffixes *-da* and *-mento*, as exemplified in table 2.

verbs with undergoers	deverbal nouns with -da	deverbal nouns with -mento
pensar ‘to think’	pensada ‘event of thinking’	pensamento ‘event of thinking’
aquecer ‘to heat’	aquecida ‘event of heating’	aquecimento ‘event of heating’
esfriar ‘to cool’	esfriada ‘event of cooling’	esfriamento ‘event of cooling’
verbs with rheme path objects	deverbal nouns with -da	deverbal nouns with -mento
bronzear ‘to tan’	bronzada ‘event of tanning’	bronzamento ‘event of tanning’
envernizar ‘to varnish’	envernizada ‘event of varnishing’	envernizamento ‘event of varnishing’
descascar ‘to peel’	descascada ‘event of peeling’	descascamento ‘event of peeling’

What we would like to question are those perspectives that consider affix selection as a question of blockage that operates in an ‘all or nothing mode’, that is, if a verb has a certain feature, the verb blocks the adjunction of a certain affix and requires the adjunction of another one. The examples in tables 1 and 2 arouse doubts concerning the ‘all or nothing mode’ conception on the way suffix selection operates. It is intriguing that the same verb goes under the affixation of so many suffixes that operate in the same word formation rule. Should not affix rivalry provide for the blockage of synonyms?

## 3 AFFIX SELECTION: OUR PROPOSAL

Instead of considering an ‘all or nothing mode’, we propose the notion of compatibility between the semantic features of the suffix and those of the verb (Rodrigues 2008, 2009 2012; Rodrigues & Rio-Torto 2013).

We consider that the suffix contains semantic features. The verbal base also has semantic features related to the event and to the lexical semantic structure of the verb. The semantic feature will coindex with the semantic feature of the verb that is more compatible with its own feature. The conception of coindexation that we adopt is not the same that is presented in Lieber (2004). In Lieber (2004), coindexation operates with semantic and syntactic features. Our proposal eliminates syntactic features and focus on semantic ones.

Coindexation is a semantic operation required in word formation processes such as affixation and compounding (Rodrigues & Rio-Torto 2013). In the case of affixation, coindexation is responsible for the adjunction of suffixes to the base, on the level of semantic structures operating in those formations. Coindexation works with semantic compatibility between the affix and the base.

Semantic features of the affixes are observable in a non-direct way, in the derivative. We have to compare with each other event deverbal nouns from the same verb with different affixes, such as the ones presented in table 1, and to compare with each other deverbal nouns from different verbs with the same affix, as the ones presented in table 2.

These two ways of comparison had led to the following statements (Rodrigues 2008, Rodrigues & Rio-Torto 2013):

- da* has as semantic features [+sudden event; +point of arrival];
- mento* has as semantic feature [+process].

## 4 SEMANTIC COINDEXATION

The coindexation mechanism functions as follows:

Remember that *-da* has as semantic features [+sudden event; +point of arrival]. If there is a verb whose event structure has a point of arrival, then the semantic feature of *-da* will coindex with this feature of the base, forming a deverbal noun whose meaning will be ‘sudden event focused on the point of arrival’. The suffix, because of its own semantic feature(s), highlights the feature of the verb it coindexes with.

Regarding the suffix *-mento*, this one has as semantic feature [+process]. This feature contains the subfeatures [+durative], being minimally compatible with the feature [point of arrival]. Subsequently, the semantic feature [+process] of the suffix *-mento* will coindex with the feature [+durative] of the base.

This means that the base may contain both features [durative] and [point of arrival]. However, due to this mechanism of coindexation, which works in a semantic compatibility mode, the same verb may select both *-da* and *-mento*. The first affix will capture the point of the arrival of the event implied in the base and the second affix will capture the process implied in the base.

		features of the verb			features of the affix -mento	
verb	deverbal noun	durative	point of arrival	telic	process	point of arrival
tosquiar ‘to shear’	tosquiamento	E <sup>es</sup>	E	E <sup>es</sup>	S <sup>s</sup>	
		features of the verb			features of the affix -mento	
verb	deverbal noun	durative	point of arrival	telic	process	point of arrival
tosquiar ‘to shear’	tosquiada	E	E <sup>es</sup>	E <sup>es</sup>		S <sup>s</sup>

## 5 AFFIX RIVALS?

Due to the different semantic features involved in each formation, the suffixes in those situations are not acting as rivals. In fact, the derivatives, although both meaning ‘event’, have different semantic nuances. Indeed, *tosquiada* means a quick event, whilst *tosquiamento* means the course of the process in itself (examples 1-4):

- (1) *Vamos proceder ao tosquiamento do rebanho.*  
‘We will proceed to the shearing of the flock.’
- (2) \**Vamos proceder à tosquiada do rebanho.*  
\*\*We will proceed to the shearing of the flock.’
- (3) *Vamos dar uma tosquiada ao rebanho.*  
‘We will give a shearing to the flock.’
- (4) \**Vamos dar um tosquiamento ao rebanho.*  
\*\*We will give a shearing to the flock.’

## 6 CONCLUSIONS

Unless there are other orders of constraints, in terms of semantic operations in word formation, it is not possible to state that only a certain kind of verbs will select a certain affix, since many affixes occur with the same base. This is possible because affixes have semantic features. These semantic features are semantically compatible or not with each one of the aspect features of the verb. The semantic feature of the affix will coindex with the semantic feature of the verb that is most compatible with itself. Because of this there may be a verb with different event deverbal nouns. Each one has semantic nuances that result from the specific features used in coindexation. Those semantic differences are observable in utterances that contain aspect constructions.

## 7 REFERENCES

- Fábregas, A. (2010). A syntactic account of suffix rivalry in Spanish. In A. Alexiadou & M. Rathert. *The syntax of nominalisations across languages and frameworks*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 67-91.
- Halle, M. (1973). Prolegomena to a theory of word formation. *Linguistic Inquiry*, 4 (1): 3-17.
- Lieber, Rochelle (2004). *Morphology and lexical semantics*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Ramchand, Guillian (2008). *First phase syntax*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rodrigues, Alexandra (2008). *Formação de substantivos deverbiais em português*. München: Lincom.
- Rodrigues, Alexandra (2009). Nomes em *-dor, -douro, -deiro, -dora, -doura e -deira*: uma abordagem de acordo com o modelo de RFPs em interfaces. In: *Linguística: revista de Estudos Linguísticos da Universidade do Porto*, 4, pp. 133-152.
- Rodrigues, Alexandra. (2012). What affixes reveal about word formation? In: Bloch-Trojnar, Maria; Bloch-Rozmej, Anna (Eds.), *Modules and interfaces*. Lublin: Wydawnictwo. p. 255-270.
- Rodrigues, Alexandra & Graça Rio-Torto (November 2013), Semantic coindexation: evidence from Portuguese derivation and compounding. In: ten Hacken, Pius & Thomas, Claire (eds.), *The Semantics of Word Formation and Lexicalization*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Scalise, Sergio (1984). *Generative morphology*. Dordrecht: Foris Publications.