

## Your Contributor Contract and Proof

Dear Contributor(s),

Thank you for publishing with us. Please find enclosed your contributor proof.

Please be sure to fill out the **current address details** on the relevant form and send us the corrections. We need this data so that you can download **your contribution as a PDF** from our homepage (see <https://www.degruyter.com/cms/pages/faq-for-authors-and-editors>) and so we can send you your **free copies** if you have made a corresponding agreement with us. Your data from this form will only be used for internal processes and will not be passed on.

In order for the contribution to appear, we also ask you to conclude the attached **contributor contract** by ticking the box and adding a date. Any special written agreements with us also apply.

Thank you for your cooperation!

De Gruyter

### Appendices

- Title page of the Contributor Contract
- Address form
- General Terms and Conditions for Contributor Contract
- Proof

# CONTRIBUTOR CONTRACT

Between

De Gruyter

and

Corresponding Contributor

Regarding

Chapter Title:

Chapter DOI:

Book Title:

Creative-Commons- License:

a Contributor Contract has been concluded. Details regarding the Contributor Contract are specified in the attached General Terms and Conditions for Contributor Contract.

## Address form

**Book title:**

**Chapter DOI:**

**Chapter title:**

We ask for your current address details for the following purposes:

- Your postal address for sending free copies (if agreed)
- Your email address to activate your personal download of your contribution as a PDF from <https://www.degruyter.com>

**Please note that free copies and your personal download can only be processed with complete data. Never mix institutional and personal addresses to ensure a correct delivery.**

### Contributor 1

Personal data		
<i>Corresponding data according to available information</i>		<i>To be changed</i>
Salutation* (Mr/Ms/other)		
Title		
Surname*		
First Name*		
E-Mail*		
Corresponding Author* (yes/no)		

Shipping Address		
<i>Corresponding address according to available information</i>		<i>To be changed</i>
Institution		
Department		
Number*		
Street*		
ZIP Code*		
City*		
State		
Country*		

**\*required**

Please check the data in the second column carefully and note any changes in the third column. Please do so, even if you have already transmitted this data to the publisher or the editor in some other way.

Your data from this form will only be used for internal processes and will not be passed on.

You may find more information about your personal download of your contribution from our homepage at <https://www.degruyter.com/cms/pages/faq-for-authors-and-editors>.

**Checked and confirmed:**  
**(In case of multiple authors by the corresponding author.)**

Address information and Contributor Contract

**Date** \_\_\_\_\_

(By inserting the check mark you confirm the conclusion of the Contributor Contract for your contribution. In case of technical problems with the check mark, you can agree to the contract by typing „Confirmed“ in the date field, e.g.: „Confirmed, 17.4.2020“.)

## GENERAL TERMS AND CONDITIONS FOR CONTRIBUTOR CONTRACT

These General Terms and Conditions are an integral part of your Contributor Contract. The individual details of your agreement with us can be found on the sheet titled *Contributor Contract*.

Our goal as a publisher is to be a competent partner to our contributors and to facilitate the quality, reach, reputation, and validity of their work. In order to do so, both parties must commit to a set of rules as follows:

### 1 Definitions

**You:** You as the Contributor of the Work. When there is more than one Contributor, the term “You” shall apply collectively and the provisions set out in these terms and conditions apply equally to all Contributors.

**We:** the Walter De Gruyter GmbH Publisher named in your *Contributor Contract*.

**Work:** the content to be published as printed and electronic edition.

**Contributor Contract:** the actual agreement, which is issued to you as a cover page to these terms and conditions.

### 2 Your Rights and Obligations

- 2.1 **Grant of Rights:** As a publisher, we take copyright very seriously. We must make sure that we have the right to use all parts of your Work. You warrant that you own the manuscript, and that you are free to assign the rights without restriction and have acquired the rights to any content as necessary. This applies to all parts, including any illustrations, indices, tables, textual excerpts, multimedia components, etc. Further, you warrant that you have not assigned any rights that would conflict with the rights granted to us in this contract. You guarantee that your work, including all parts, does not infringe on any rights such as copyrights, performing rights, trademarks, rights of privacy, or other third-party rights. You agree to reimburse us for any costs or liabilities resulting from a breach of these warranties.
- 2.2 **Publication Elsewhere:** In order to support the marketing strategy for your Work, you agree not to publish the Work (or a substantially equivalent work) or make it otherwise available to the public without first obtaining our written consent.
- 2.3 **Repository Policy:** You are free to self-archive up to 10% of the Work (with the exception of textbooks and databases) on your own website or in the repository of your university or institution. In addition, you may place a link to the product page of your Work on our website [www.degruyter.com](http://www.degruyter.com) in public repositories that allow a redirect. You can find a complete list in the Rights and Licenses section of our website.
- 2.4 **VG Wort:** You grant to us, for the duration of the contract, all usage rights that may be exercised at collecting societies such as VG Wort and VG Bild-Kunst according to their contractual stipulations. The granting of these rights serves the purpose of registration at the collection societies for mutual exercising of rights. The proceeds from the exercising of rights are distributed by the collecting societies according to §27 Abs. 2 VGG and according to the shares defined in their distribution plan, and are distributed directly to copyright holders and publishers. You agree that you must conclude an agreement directly with the collecting society in order to receive the (copyright-holder) share of the distribution.

### 3 Grant of Rights

- 3.1 **Rights of Use:** You assign to us, for the purpose of ensuring the optimal distribution and availability of your work the right:
  - a) To reproduce, distribute, and make available your Work in printed form including as print-on-demand;
  - b) To produce machine-readable forms of your Work (including digitization) and to store it electronically in all storage media, including in our own databases and those of third parties, such as Amazon or Google;
  - c) To make your Work available in part with “look inside” functionality, for example on Amazon or Google;
  - d) To reproduce and make available your Work in electronic form, particularly as eBook, database, and/or other forms of electronic media and within the scope of internet services or other online uses or in interactive multimedia production;

- e) To make your Work available in public or closed user groups at the location and time of their choice (for example, eBook use in libraries) as well as reproducing it on monitors or other scanners and to be printed by the user as many times as the user wishes, in whole or in part, including as prepublication or in excerpt;
  - f) To reproduce and distribute your Work on any and all data carriers, for example DVD, CD-Rom, flash drive.
- 3.2 **Ancillary Rights:** You also assign to us, for the purpose of optimally exercising the rights to your Work, the right:
    - a) To translate it into other languages and to use the translation;
    - b) To print it in whole or in part as a prepublication and/or as subsequent reprint, including in newspapers and periodicals (for example in reviews);
    - c) To publish it in whole or in part in our other publications or publications of another publisher, including in abridged form;
    - d) To produce or license as a paperback, or as a popular or special or reprint edition;
    - e) To reproduce and distribute it in a collected works edition and in compilations, even after 20 years have elapsed since the first publication of the Work;
    - f) To reproduce and distribute it by all other means, including photocopying, photomechanical reprinting, or as Braille embossing;
    - g) Of rendition, including rights to recitation, performances, and broadcast in radio or television media or internet;
    - h) To transfer it, in full or in part, to sound recordings, image or image-sound recordings as well as the right to their reproduction, distribution, and reproduction to the public;
    - i) To use it in collections for use in church, school, or instructional settings.
  - 3.3 **Extension of Rights:** Unless otherwise specified in the provisions for contributors in the authors section of our website you grant all usage rights and ancillary rights to us as exclusive rights without any restriction as to content or territory for the duration of the copyright. We may exercise these rights but are under no obligation to do so to the extent described here.
  - 3.4 **Unknown Types of Use:** You grant us the exclusive and permanent rights without any restriction as to content and territory for all forms of media of expression now known or that will be developed in the future. The granting of rights extends to the exercising of rights through us or through the granting of these rights to a third party.
  - 3.5 **Transferral to Third Parties:** You grant us the right to transfer all rights listed here to third parties and/or to license the Work to third parties. We require these rights in order to fulfil certain sales models such as online use through aggregators (platforms that curate content for specific usage by customers and give us a share of the proceeds). We naturally require that all licensees provide appropriate attribution to you, the copyright holder.

### 4 Open Access

In the case that we have mutually agreed to publish your Work as Open Access, the following conditions apply in addition:

- 4.1 You are free to publish your Work according to a Creative Commons license (<https://creativecommons.org>), as of a date agreed upon with us. You choose the appropriate license when discussing the contractual details with us (see *Contributor Contract*). You have the choice between:
  - a) CC-BY (Attribution)
  - b) CC-BY-NC-ND (Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives).
- 4.2 We will provide you with the final version of your Work as a PDF file. This is the version that is published Open Access.
- 4.3 We will publish your Work as a freely available eBook on our website under the license you have chosen and which is shown in the *Contributor Contract*.
- 4.4 According to the license stated in 6.1, you are of course free to put the eBook version of your Work on your own home-page, a university or institutional repository, or any website of your choice.

### 5 Manuscript / Content

- 5.1 **General:**
  - a) We and the editors are authorized to change your Work after prior discussion with you, or to ask you to make changes in order to maintain the consistency of the series, the volume, or the database.
  - b) In addition, to ensure quality of your Work before final acceptance, we are authorized to ask a third party to review the Work. Should revisions be necessary, you will be asked to perform these. Should you be unable

or unwilling to do so, we reserve the right to deny acceptance or publication of your Work.

- c) Our customers and readers are interested in the most precise information possible regarding your Work. Please inform us immediately as soon as you become aware that you will not be able to deliver by the date agreed upon in the *Contributor Contract* or that the manuscript deviates by more than 10% of the length agreed upon.
- d) If your Work contains an index, you are required to create an index according to our technical specifications. If the publication date is delayed by more than 6 weeks as a result of index preparation, we reserve the right to publish the Work without an index. In the electronic version of the Work, the full-text search replaces the need for a separate index.
- e) If you cannot adhere to the manuscript length or the submission deadlines agreed upon with you in your *Contributor Contract* (e. g. delayed delivery of the Work), we reserve the right to set a new deadline or to plan a different form of publication. If the second deadline also cannot be kept, we reserve the right to deny publication or to reduce your royalty.

5.2 Manuscript for Typesetting

- a) This option is for manuscripts that will be professionally typeset. You submit the manuscript to be typeset as an electronic file, usually in the format docx, tex, rtf, or indd. Formulas and tables should not be anchored in the manuscript as images. In addition, we require a PDF file or a definitive printout for comparison including reproducible copies of illustrations / high-resolution image files.
- b) After the manuscript has been prepared by our typesetter, we provide you with proofs for corrections. In most cases, you will receive proofs in electronic format as a PDF file or via a web-based online proofing system. We ask for your understanding that we generally provide one set of proofs for correction and a second set of proofs for your approval for printing (imprimatur).
- c) The first set of proofs is provided for you to check the manuscript conversion to typesetting. Please check these proofs carefully for any mistakes (e. g., word breaks) that may have occurred during the process. Kindly note that only minor content corrections can be done at this late stage. If the index entries were not already anchored in the manuscript, we will ask you to do this during the first correction stage.
- d) The second set of proofs is simply to check that any corrections marked in the first proof run have been carried out, and for you to provide your approval for printing (imprimatur), if need be under the condition that final corrections be carried out before the work is printed. We will check these final corrections internally in order to ensure punctual publication of your Work. We retain the right to decide when the manuscript is ready to print from a technical and typographical point of view.
- e) We ask for your cooperation in keeping the number of corrections at a reasonable and necessary level. Changes to the Work after the submission of the final manuscript are very costly. We cover the cost of corrections up to two per printed page, and reserve the right to charge you if changes made beyond that result in excessive costs and/or if these changes require additional print runs. This does not apply if corrections are required due to errors in the typesetting process or due to new academic findings or legal decisions.

5.3 Writing and Submitting via a Content Management System (CMS)

- a) Particularly in the case of encyclopedias, dictionaries and reference works, which are often published “ahead of print,” we may use a so-called Content Management System (CMS), which is individually configured for each Work.
- b) We provide the CMS to you, and we request that you use it to write and submit your Work. You will receive an invitation to the system and all relevant supporting guidelines and documentation.
- c) Reviews by the series or volume editors or in-house editors as well as manuscript revision and corrections are done directly in the CMS. Please follow the style and content guidelines to avoid unnecessary delays.
- d) At the relevant point in the process, you will be contacted to provide your approval for publication of the content (not the form). Please make only those corrections which are absolutely necessary at this time. Changes to content are no longer possible, as they can no longer be reviewed. If you do not respond to the call for approval by the given deadline, approval will be assumed.
- e) We support your work in the CMS with detailed instructions and guidelines, and are personally available if there are problems. Any decisions regarding bug fixes or other technical issues will be made solely by us.

**6 Publication Subsidy / Open Access Fee**

- 6.1 A publication subsidy may be required for some works to be paid plus VAT if not mutually agreed in the *Contributor Contract*.
- 6.2 If we have come to a mutual agreement to publish your Work as Open Access, an Open Access fee is generally required.
- 6.3 The payment of the publication subsidy or the Open Access Fee is generally due upon publication of the work. The publication subsidy or the Open Access fee is not subject to reimbursement.
- 6.4 We will be happy to support you in applying for any outside funding by providing any necessary calculations or paperwork, and will fulfil funder requirements.

**7 Free Copies**

If you provide us with your e-mail address you can download a PDF of your contribution from our website. The number of free print copies is agreed upon in the contract concluded with your editor. You may acquire further non-German copies of your own Work as well as all book titles from the publisher, including eBooks, at a discount of 30% off the retail price. You are also entitled to a discount of 20% off the retail price of individual subscriptions and single issues of journals. You may not sell free copies or copies purchased at a discount.

**8 Subsequent Editions, Revised Editions**

- 8.1 A number of factors are relevant when considering a subsequent or revised edition, for example, the economic feasibility of the work, as well as the topicality or the accuracy of the scientific findings.
- 8.2 Should you wish to publish a new edition of your Work, please inform us and we will review your suggestion in light of the criteria above.
- 8.3 Should we decide against publishing a new edition of your Work, we will contact you to discuss alternative options.
- 8.4 Should we decide to publish a new edition of your Work, we will communicate to your our decision and negotiate with you a publication plan. You agree to revise the Work according to the current state of the academic discussion and submit it to us for publication.
- 8.5 Should you not be willing or able to perform the revisions yourself, you may suggest a third party to us. We agree not to reject this suggestion without good reason. If you do not wish to make a suggestion, we are authorized to assign the revision to a third party.
- 8.6 In the case of revision by one or more third party/parties, we are entitled but not obligated to continue to use your name in the title of the Work.

**9 Remainders**

Because our warehouse capacities are limited, we regularly check if our printed stock can be reduced. Through digitisation and print-on-demand, we can keep the majority of our titles available and in print without keeping physical stock on hand. We reserve the right to pulp or sell any remaining stock at a reduced price.

**10 Legal Succession**

- 10.1 The legal situation must be defined in case of succession. Our obligations and duties according to the *Contributor Contract* will transfer for your heirs in full, with the exception of paragraph 11.
- 10.2 In the event of death before the first edition of the Work is completed, we are entitled to withdraw from this agreement with no claims from your heirs. We may take over the partial manuscript and have it completed by a third party, taking your personal rights into account.

**11 Termination**

- 11.1 We are entitled to terminate the *Contributor Contract* in writing with immediate effect if our cooperation on the Work cannot be completed as planned, e. g. if you are unwilling or unable to complete the Work. If we have made substantial investments at the time of termination, all rights assigned remain with us. We reserve the right to reclaim any payments already made to you.
- 11.2 You are also entitled to terminate the agreement in writing with immediate effect, e. g. if we are liquidated. In this case, all rights revert back to you.
- 11.3 In the case of termination, we retain the right to continue to distribute any copies of the Work that have already been produced. We may continue to make the electronic version of your Work available on our platform in order to fulfil obligations to customers who have purchased those versions.
- 11.4 If your Work is published as part of a series or as a contribution to a volume or database, we are entitled to terminate the *Contributor Contract* with immediate effect if the contract with the editor expires or is terminated, or if the

series or database has been terminated. In this case, we will do our utmost to publish your Work as a stand-alone volume or to include it in another series.

- 11.5 You agree to forgo your extraordinary termination option according to German law for the non-publication of a contribution in a periodical, e. g. year-book (§45 Para. 1 Verlagsgesetz).

## 12 Data Protection

We are committed to the responsible handling and processing of the personal data we collect from you. Details can be found in our data protection policy for authors and editors on our website (<https://www.degruyter.com/cms/pages/privacy-policy?lang=en>). A printed copy will be provided to you upon request.

## 13 General Provisions

- 13.1 Unless otherwise agreed upon, all provisions of this agreement are valid and binding for both your legal successors as well as our legal successors.

13.2 Revisions and amendments to the agreement must be made in writing. Oral agreements and declarations have not been made.

13.3 Should individual provisions of this agreement become invalid or unenforceable, this shall not affect the validity of the remaining provisions. You and we are bound to replace the invalid provision with a valid one that corresponds to the purpose and meaning of the invalid one. The same shall be applicable to any gaps in this agreement.

13.4 The laws of the Federal Republic of Germany apply to this agreement, particularly the German Civil Code, German Copyright Law, and German Publishing Law.

13.5 Place of fulfilment and jurisdiction is the location of our headquarters in Berlin, Germany, to the extent legally possible.

Version last revised: 07.06.2021

Carlos Alexandre Gonçalves

## 13 Morphology

**Abstract:** This chapter outlines the distinction between lexical and inflectional morphology in contemporary Brazilian Portuguese (henceforth BP) through a description of synchronic paradigms. BP shares many morphological features with other varieties, such as European Portuguese (EuP) and Portuguese spoken in Africa and Asia, but it also displays properties that set it apart from other members of the Lusophone world. In this chapter, we privilege the latter aspects, as well as discussing new syncretisms and morphological reductions in the contemporary spoken language in comparison to written language. In particular, emphasis is given to the boundaries between compounding and derivation. In mapping differences between these two processes, we describe several cases that could be interpreted as derivation or as compounding: prefixing, adverbs formation in *-mente* (*-ly*, in English) and diminutives, among others. In addition, we discuss some types of word-formation (henceforth WF) not addressed in the grammatical tradition, such as blending, clipping and other non-concatenative morphological processes, especially recent patterns of reduplication and acronyms used today in BP. While influential traditional studies, such as Câmara Jr. (1970), Basilio (1987) and Sandmann (1989), are discussed where appropriate, the description in this chapter is mainly based on recent works of BP morphology and intends to show the arena of current morphological discussions.

**Keywords:** inflection, derivation, composition, diminutives, word formation, composition-derivation-continuum, compounding

### 1 Introduction

In this chapter, we intend to describe some specificities of Brazilian Portuguese in relation to other varieties of Portuguese with regard to issues of synchronic morphology. We will focus on aspects of Brazilian Portuguese linked to inflection, word formation, the creation of diminutives etc., always intending to make flexible the borders between the main areas of morphology: inflection, derivation and compounding.

The description is structured as follows: Section 1 explores differences between inflection and derivation, and addresses the derivational properties of grammatical categories such as gender in nouns, and tense-mood-aspect in verbs. Section 2 turns to the formation of diminutives, one of the most controversial cases of categorization in BP morphology, after which the boundaries between compounding and derivation are described and the typological diversity of the BP WF system is addressed. The study then moves on to processes such as lexical blending, neoclassical compounding,

re-compounding, and the creation of new morphemes (splinters). Finally, the diversity of nonconcatenative processes of BP is discussed.

## 2 Inflection and derivation

Inflection and derivation can be understood as two branches of morphology. The first regards the part of morphology that is relevant to syntax; thus, inflection is concerned with syntactically-driven morphology. Conversely, derivation arises from the need to create new meanings, but it is also constrained by syntax in some way, and hence is more than merely that part of morphology used to create new lexical items.

Most work in this area has focused on the fact that the difference between inflection and derivation is a discrete one, highlighting formal criteria to make the distinction. Some of these formal criteria are listed in Table 1, based on Gonçalves (2005; 2011), who noted almost thirty differences between these processes. Despite various properties that undoubtedly characterize the two “morphologies”, clear-cut distinctions concerning inflection and derivation have not been found, which points towards the existence of a scale between them.<sup>1</sup>

**Table 1:** Summary of the differences between inflection and derivation

<b>Inflection</b>	<b>Derivation</b>
A. Obligatory	A. Optional
B. Conditioned by the syntax	B. Not conditioned by syntax
C. Highly structured	C. Idiosyncratic
D. Closed class	D. Open class
E. Meanings are manifested only morphologically	E. Meanings are manifested by means of various linguistic forms
F. There are fewer inflectional morphemes in a language than derivational ones	F. There are more derivational formatives in a language than inflectional ones
G. Does not change the stress of the source form	G. Often changes the stress of the source form

<sup>1</sup> In this table, properties such as those described in G, K and U, for example, could easily be questioned by someone who works with typology, using counterexamples of Russian, Japanese and Bantu. In Russian, the accent (criterion in G) changes very often along its flexion; speaker’s characteristics (age, sexual orientation, region and education) is widely represented in morphological and morphosyntactic paradigms in Japanese (K); in many Bantu languages, flexion occurs on the left edge and not on the right (M). These differences, therefore, should be viewed as general trends (not as a final verdict on the status of morphological units).

Table 1: (continued)

Inflection	Derivation
H. Does not express the speaker's perspective about something or someone	H. Can express the speaker's perspective about something or someone
I. Produces various forms of the same word	I. Creates new lexical units
J. Word class does not change	J. Sometimes changes word class
K. Does not identify the speaker by age, sexual orientation, region or education	K. Sometimes identifies the speaker by age, sexual orientation, region or education
L. An inflectional rule cannot be reapplied	L. A derivational rule can be reapplied
M. Expression at word periphery	M. Expression close to the base
N. Presents constant meanings	N. Presents variable meanings
O. Usually no gaps in the paradigm, being fully productive in a word class	O. Usually has a gap in the paradigm. Some derivational processes can be highly productive, but many are restricted to a part of the vocabulary
P. Fusion cases are more common in meanings linked to inflection	P. Fusion cases are less common in meanings linked to derivation
Q. Never changes the reference because its meanings are less relevant to the meaning of the base	Q. Is more relevant to the meaning of the base and always changes the reference
R. The absence of inflectional marks (suffixes in BP) produces incomplete words	R. The absence of derivational affixes often produces complete words (roots or themes)
S. Grammatical meanings can co-occur in the same morph; therefore, cumulative expression is possible in inflection	S. Always non-cumulative
T. Is less sensitive to lexicalization phenomena	T. The loss of compositionality is common (more sensitive to lexicalization)
U. The head is on the left (pattern nucleus-modifier)	U. The head is on the right (pattern modifier-nucleus)

It is usually claimed that inflection is used to create grammatical forms of the same word (I), without changing its word class (J), while derivation necessarily generates new lexical units (I), changing the reference, that is, pointing to a new designatum (Q). However, Table 1 raises the following questions:

- (a) When does a new word arise and in what conditions is the same word only modified grammatically? What makes us believe that, for instance, *perseguir* ‘to pursue’ and *perseguido* ‘pursued’<sup>2</sup> are different words, and that *perseguida* ‘pursued, fem.’ is only a gender inflection of *perseguido* ‘pursued, masc.’?
- (b) What criterion (or criteria) can be used to differentiate a new word from the same word modified for gender, number or degree? For instance, are *janela* ‘window’, *janelinha* ‘little window’ and *janelão* ‘big window’ new words or variations of the same word?

The distinction between what is or is not a new lexical item is not always clear in practice. In BP, for example, *perseguida* ‘pursued, fem.’ acquires an independent meaning and can refer pejoratively to the female genitals. The nominal forms of verbs (gerund, participle past and infinitive) do not have a stable categorization. The affixes responsible for the categorization of these forms create units with unstable behavior in its word class. The following examples show the instability of participle forms:

1. O homem foi *roubado*. (verb)  
‘The man was robbed’
- A bolsa *roubada* foi encontrada. (adjective)  
‘The stolen bag was found’
- Ele está numa *roubada*. (noun)  
‘He is in a fix’

Some evidence for this instability is that there is no unanimous agreement as to what is to be treated as a new word or as a form of the same word. Sandmann (1989, 31) shows that the classification of a word as a standalone unit or a formal variation of a word is sometimes difficult even for lexicographers. In this regard, Basilio (1987, 12) raises the question: ‘should we consider *perdido* ‘lost’ as a verbal form of *perder* ‘to lose’ or as another word?’<sup>3</sup> Sandmann (1989, 31) notes in this sense some contradictions in the most influential of Portuguese dictionaries, the *Aurélio*:

‘The *Aurélio* records the following past participles as distinct from the verb entries: *folgado* (‘rascal’), *apaixonado* (‘in love’), *cansado* (‘tired’), *lido* (‘read’). Immediately after the entry in brackets for the verbs *folgar* (‘to hang out’), *apaixonar* (‘to fall in love’), *cansar* (‘to tire’) and *ler* (‘to read’), it sorts the corresponding past participles as adjectives. *Aurélio* does not cite as adjectives *come-*

<sup>2</sup> As in English, the past participle may be used as a verbal form or as an adjective. Even if the word is used in the verbal form, it will vary in gender, marked by *-o* or *-a* (as occurs in the passive voice).

<sup>3</sup> Original: Poderíamos considerar perdido como forma verbal de ‘perder’ ou como outra palavra?

*çado* ('started') and *chateado* ('upset'), for example, which is particularly puzzling in the case of *chateado*, certainly used far more as an adjective than as a past participle.<sup>4</sup>

Gonçalves (2005) shows that in BP there are always counterexamples in terms of the criteria used to argue for a discrete opposition between inflection and derivation. Those who propose a dichotomy between the two "morphologies" give different weight to each criterion. If all the criteria are analyzed with one measure and the data are effectively observed, one can imagine a cline between inflection and derivation. Altakhaineh (2014) observes that to argue for the split morphology, researchers generally use intuition as their basis—which, according to him, is not an argument—and they "close their eyes" to counterexamples. In what follows some of the questions raised by Altakhaineh (2014) will be shown through BP data.

As examples of failures in the criteria used to distinguish inflection from derivation, Altakhaineh (2014) points to syntactic relevance (differences in A and B). As in inflection, the agreement leading to the use of derivational affixes, such as those listed in Table 2, is evidence of their syntactic relevance: word-class switching, in derivational processes, must also be regarded as essential to syntax. Moreover, the author questions syntactic relevance in categories like mood, tense and aspect, which are in no way imposed by syntax.

**Table 2:** Short list of suffixes that change word class in BP

Verb → Noun	Verb → Adjective	Noun → Adjective	Noun, Adj. → Verb	Adjective → Adverb	Adjective → Noun
-ção; -ada	-vel; -nte	-ense; -ar	-izar; -escer	-mente	-ice; -idade
<i>inibição</i> 'inhibition'	<i>gerenciável</i> 'manageable'	<i>canadense</i> 'Canadian'	<i>agilizar</i> 'streamline'	<i>felizmente</i> 'fortunately'	<i>esquisitice</i> 'oddity'
<i>esticada</i> 'stretch'	<i>estafante</i> 'gruelling'	<i>hospitalar</i> 'hospital'	<i>florescer</i> 'flourish'	<i>certamente</i> 'certainly'	<i>felicidade</i> 'happiness'

<sup>4</sup> The following gloss, from the Aurélio Dictionary (Ferreira, 1987), illustrates Sandmann's comments: *folgado* ('cheeky', in relation to the verb *folgar*) appears in a separate gloss of the verb *folgar* 'to hang out', but its meanings do not relate to the meaning of the verb. Moreover, it is substantive in the most common meaning (3). 'Folgado: *adjetivo* 1. livre de tarefas, de deveres; descansado. 'depois que defendeu a tese, está bem mais folgado' 2. largo, amplo. 'o sapato ficou folgado'. 3. Esperto. É muito folgado. Quer se dar bem em tudo'. ('Cheeky: adjective 1. free of duties; rested. After he defended the thesis, it is much more rested 2. wide; comfortable. 'the shoe is comfortable' 3. Abused; scoundrel. He is very roguish; always fools people').

As for the obligatory nature of the expression in inflection (A), Bybee (1985) demonstrates that morphological zeros express grammatical meaning through the absence of formal expression. If the mark is  $\emptyset$ , it means there is no compulsory expression in inflectional morphology.

Bybee (1985) provides cross-linguistic evidence that disturbances in morph-morpheme mapping are not entirely arbitrary. For her, form-meaning mapping problems in morphology, such as  $\emptyset$  morph, involve basic (or cognitively simpler) grammatical categories, and such categories often fail to present formal expression in natural languages. The absence of phonetic expression, she argues, is psychologically motivated since zeros determine non-marked categories or grammatical meaning from which others can be explained.

In Portuguese, singular form, masculine gender, present indicative tense and third person singular are grammatical meanings which are not expressed phonetically. Thus, only unmarked grammatical meanings are represented by zeros in BP: the  $\emptyset$  morph is, in all these cases, the most general member of their grammatical categories<sup>5</sup>. For example, in 2, a masculine form (*aluno* ‘student, masc.’) can be used with reference either to a man or a woman; in 3, the inflected verb (*começa* ‘begin’) does not necessarily express the present tense. Note that an adverb can be used to indicate tense:

2. *Aluno é difícil de entender.*  
‘A student is hard to understand’—man or woman
3. *Começa hoje o festival.*  
‘The festival starts today’  
*Começa amanhã o festival.*  
‘The festival starts tomorrow’  
*Começa o festival.*  
‘Festival starts’ (in a newspaper report)

Spencer (1998) notes that, when one addresses the paradigmatic organization of inflection (unlimited applicability), cases of defectiveness are forgotten (difference in C). Defectiveness is often justified in terms of the same reason that determines the incompleteness of derivation: semantic incompatibility. For example, verbs that express a natural phenomenon have no meaning compatible with morphological markers

---

<sup>5</sup> As Bybee herself points out, the association of zero-morph with an unmarked element does not have definitive power, because there are languages, such as Russian, that the use of  $\emptyset$  in inanimate feminine and neutral words represents the plural genitive. However, the use of zero to express the unmarked member of the pair is much more usual.

which require a subject (*\*chovemos* ‘we rain’; *\*nublei* ‘I clouded’).<sup>6</sup> Thus, number/person affixes present constraints on this applicability and, therefore, distance themselves from the possibility of becoming established as inflectional by the criterion of generality (O).

Bybee (1985) raise questions regarding the distinction between inflection and derivation as to aspects of meaning. Aronoff/Fudeman (2005), among others, argue that, in inflection, there is no expression of a new concept: inflected forms indicate the same concept as the base (Q). Instead, in derivation, words are formed to designate new concepts. Thus, according to the criterion of compositionality (T), in inflected forms the meaning is always transparent because the content of the word shape is indicated by the sum of its parts, while derivative forms may have non-compositional interpretations.

In BP, numerous cases exist of non-compositional meaning in inflection, both in nouns (inflected forms in gender and number), and in verbs (forms varying in tense-mood-aspect and number-person).<sup>7</sup>

Concerning the feminine morphological marker, the unstressed final vowel *-a* ([ɐ]), as in *professor+a* ‘teacher+fem’, there are in BP various semantically lexicalized morphological structures in which this vowel does not express the notion of female. The word *peru+a* ‘turkey+fem’, for example, does not necessarily mean ‘female turkey’, and can mean ‘a type of vehicle’ ‘van’ or ‘tart’ ‘an overdressed woman’. Designations for women in colloquial speech community reveal strong use of semantic lexicalization; thus *coelh+a* ‘rabbit+fem’ means ‘teenager who has several children’. The recent formation *preparad+a* ‘prepared+fem’ illustrates how women can be described negatively in the context of night clubs, in that it refers to a ‘woman who goes to a club with no underwear, ready to engage in sexual relations’. In 4, other feminine forms appear lexicalized:

4.	<i>brux+a</i>	‘witch+fem’ = ‘moth’
	<i>porc+a</i>	‘pig+fem’ = ‘nut for a bolt’
	<i>caminhoneir+a</i>	‘truck driver+fem’ = ‘lesbian’

Lexicalization also exists involving the plural (PL) mark, a fricative /s/, although to a lesser extent:

<sup>6</sup> In order to standardize the symbols used in this chapter with those employed in the diachronic morphology chapter, we use the symbol \* to indicate ungrammaticality and reserve \* for reconstructed historical data.

<sup>7</sup> In Portuguese, the verbal markers are always cumulative (criterion in S): proximity to the root indicates simultaneously mood/tense/aspect, and distance from it expresses, at the same time, number/person.

5. *costa+s*                    ‘coast+PL’ = ‘back’  
*copa+s*                        ‘pantry+PL’ = ‘in cards, the suit of hearts’  
*féria+s*                        ‘income+PL’ = ‘holiday’

Vivas (2015) notes that in verbs there are numerous cases of modified forms in tense-mood-aspect (TMA) and/or number-person (NP)<sup>8</sup> that can act on other morphosyntactic categories also undergoing changes in meaning. In the following data, there are cases of inflected forms, which, besides being verbs, can also be categorized in other word classes:<sup>9</sup>

6. Interjections: *tomara, dera, soubera, quisera, pudera* (case 1)  
 (These forms reveal the speaker’s desire for something to happen in different ways)  
 Interjections: *demorou, formou, partiu, valeu* (case 2)  
 (These forms reveal the speaker’s contentment about something said by someone)  
 Adjectives: *cheguei, choquei, caguei* (case 3)  
 (These forms reveal the negative impression of the speaker about something or someone)  
 Discourse markers: *sabe, entende, olha* (case 4)  
 (These forms refer to the interaction between speaker and listener)

Words modified in the MTA and NP can serve to indicate the speaker’s viewpoint, contrary to the expectations in H and K. When this happens, the syntactic category of the word changes. The first two cases (interjections) involve forms with a marking of TMA that have fallen into disuse (*-ra*, inflectional affix indicating the pluperfect indicative is no longer used in spoken language) or that are inflected with an affix of number-person which does not occur in all conjugations (*-u*, the third-person singular formative appears exclusively in the simple past indicative).<sup>10</sup>

**8** The template of Portuguese verbs includes the constituents *theme* and *inflection*, with the former comprising the root and a thematic vowel (/a/ in the first conjugation; /e/ in the second, and /i/ in the third), and the latter comprising the formal variation in the cumulative dimensions of mood-tense-aspect (MTA) and number-person (NP), in this sequence:

Theme		Inflection	
Root	Thematic Vowel	MTA	NP

**9** Since these words are slang, it is difficult to assign a precise meaning to them in that their uses are pragmatic. For now, we prefer to indicate a generic meaning for each group.

**10** BP has three different kinds of tenses to express the notion of past, with morphological marking. These tenses indicate the following aspects: perfective (a), imperfective (b) and pluperfective (c).  
 (a) *Quando Jane telefonou, John estava dormindo.* ‘When Jane telephoned, John was asleep.’

In the third case, evaluative adjectives are formed through verbs modified in the first-person singular of the present indicative. Also, in this case, a less general formative appears in the verbal conjugation: the morph *-i*, first-person singular particle, only occurs, in indicative mood, in the present tense and in the future present. The first case interests us here, in that there is allomorphy, given that the thematic vowel /a/, the first conjugation affix, becomes [e] before [i].

In the latter case, verbal forms are equivalent to discourse markers and, as they are inflected in the third person singular, present indicative tense, are formally devoid of NP and TMA markers (both the present tense and the third person singular are  $\emptyset$  in the verbal paradigm). A summary of the morphological behavior of re-categorized verbs in BP is provided in Table 3:

**Table 3:** Summary of the behavior of re-categorized verbs

	TMA	NP
Case 1	<i>-ra</i>	$\emptyset$
Case 2	$\emptyset$	<i>-u</i>
Case 3	$\emptyset$	<i>-i</i>
Case 4	$\emptyset$	$\emptyset$

The existence of  $\emptyset$ s, the use of markers that have fallen into disuse and those that are not general in verbal paradigm, tend to create forms with a greater predisposition to function in another class (interjections such as *tomara* ‘I hope so!’, and *valeu* ‘cool!’, or adjectives, like *cheguei* ‘extravagant’ and thus to acquire a non-verbal meaning, such as a non-verbal kind of behavior. In other words, it seems that these aspects—the use of a marked form, its disuse, or its absence—give words a less verbal appearance, which are more likely to acquire other uses and meanings in spoken language.

Bybee (2010) distinguishes compositionality from analyzability. Even considering these correlated and gradually distinct parameters, she demonstrates the need to make a differentiation here as a means of better understanding how the linguistic constructions vary. Analyzability is related to the existence of segmentation of a word into smaller units provided by phonetic form and meaning. Compositionality, in turn, consists of identifying more than one meaning in the word. This multiple content is not re-

(b) *Sempre que Jane telefonava, John estava dormindo.* ‘Whenever Jane telephoned, John was asleep.’

(c) *João já saíra, quando Jane telefonou.* ‘John had already left, when Jane telephoned.’

BP has also two kinds of future tenses, with morphological markers. Simple future expresses certainty, assurance (d); conditional future expresses an action unlikely to occur (e).

(d) *Eu irei à festa amanhã.* ‘I will go to the party tomorrow.’

(e) *Eu iria à festa amanhã, se pudesse.* ‘I would go to the party tomorrow, if I could.’

lated to phonetic sequences and cannot be divided into discrete parts of form and meaning. Idioms and compounds are often analyzable even when not compositional –for example, *baba-ovo* ‘brown noser’, a compound, can be analyzed as formed by the words *babar* ‘slaver’ and *ovo* ‘scrotum’, although its interpretation is holistic.<sup>11</sup>

With examples of supplementary forms in verbal inflection, we can say that the opposite is also true: there is compositionality, but not analyzability. In *foi* ‘went’, we know that it indicates ‘past’ and ‘third-person’ even though this form is not divided into smaller portions of form and meaning. The analyzability relates to the existence of segmentation with particular meaning in the word; the compositionality, in turn, consists of identifying more than one meaning within the word.

When verbal forms express a positive view of a situation, as in the examples below, extracted from Vivas (2015), they fail to convey the meanings of past indicative tense and third-person singular. In other words, there is a loss of compositionality and analyzability. In 7, B agrees with A and welcomes the idea of leaving tomorrow.

7. A—*Vamos sair amanhã?* ‘Let’s go out tomorrow?’  
B—*Fechou!* ‘Sure!’

The same is true in *roupa cheguei* ‘garb’; ‘I arrived’ = ‘very flashy clothes’, in which the meanings of first-person singular and perfect indicative tense, in *cheguei*, are neither analyzable nor compositional. The function of *cheguei* here is to show the speaker’s derogatory impression of the clothes. This pattern is productive only in spoken language and serves to demonstrate a negative impression of something or someone. Another example, *verde choquei* ‘green’; ‘I shocked’ = ‘very intense green’, indicates the speaker’s opinion that the color tone is extravagant.

Bybee (2010) demonstrated the role of frequency in the loss of compositionality and analyzability. According to her, semantic and pragmatic changes that reduce compositionality are aided by frequency or repetition, but the origin of these changes is in the contexts where the complex unit is used. Repetition, in certain contexts, with certain forms of association with their meanings, is what would trigger semantic and pragmatic change. If a sequence of morphs or words is increasingly used, it will be stronger as a unit. Thus, there is a reduction in association with the component parts. The loss of association with these component parts causes an increase in the autonomy of the sequence. It is no coincidence that these are lexicalization patterns in verbal inflection characterized by a change in the thematic vowel of the first conjugation,

---

<sup>11</sup> Bybee does not “oppose” the two notions, but treats them as “closely related” (Bybee 2010, 44). I agree with the reviewer of this study as to the analyzability of idioms and compounds, but it is questionable to talk about compositionality in the case of suppletion. Bybee (2010, 45) defines compositionality as “the degree of predictability of the meaning of the whole from the meaning of the component parts”. This dichotomy, however, already appears in accounts by cognitive linguists such as Langacker (1987).

the most productive one. This leads us to think of a constructional block, *-ou* (allomorphic thematic vowel + third-person singular mark) and *-ei* (allomorphic thematic vowel + first-person singular mark), the most typical in spoken language. The sequence is integrated in such a way that it went on to form a unit, i.e., a chunk.

Interjections and adjectives in 6 reveal the pragmatic impact of the speaker that emits a value judgment about the utterance. Interjections, such as *formou* ‘sure!’ and *arrasou* ‘wonderful!’, evaluate an event positively while the adjectives *cheguei* and *choquei* indicate negative judgment on the part of the speaker. Thus, the idea that the inflection is completely transparent (criterion in N) and immune to changes of meaning (I) or expressive effects (H) and the creation of lexicalization patterns (T) is not true, at least for BP.

For the aforementioned reasons, the criteria listed in Table 1 do not behave consistently and accurately. Therefore, the mapping of those aspects that differentiate inflection from derivation should be seen as an attempt to diagnose affixes and not as a verdict on their morphological status. BP data show that the difference between the two morphologies, if in fact it exists, is a matter of degree only. In other words, inflection and derivation do not involve a discrete opposition, but a gradient one, and they can be interpreted as morphological processes whose boundaries are not always clear. In Cognitive Linguistics (Langacker 1987), the hypothesis that there is no rigid separation between lexicon and grammar reinforces the scalar nature from inflection (grammar) to derivation (lexicon). The idea discussed here is compatible with the notion of prototypes, originally developed by Rosch (1978), since there are more central and more peripheral members in each of these processes. These two “morphologies” can be interpreted as prototypical poles on a scale, and for this reason there are several morphological elements that do not fit well on either side.<sup>12</sup> In the following section, a difficult case to categorize in BP is discussed: *X-(z)inho* diminutives.

### 3 A problematic case of categorization: diminutives

Evaluative affixation is one of the most productive domains in BP word formation (WF). Since it is a resource used primarily in spoken language, it is studied only at quite a superficial level in schools. In this section, we describe the most interesting case of evaluative suffixation: the creating of diminutive forms, especially those ending in *-inho/-zinho*.

The status of *-inho* and *-zinho* is very controversial in the literature. The proposals of categorization here go from inflection to compounding, through to derivation. For example, Pereira (1908) considers the formation of diminutives to be an inflectional

---

<sup>12</sup> Other approaches to inflection and derivation in BP can be found, among others, in the following descriptions: Rocha (1994), Rosa (2000) and Colnaghi (2006).

process due to a historical issue related to classification in Latin. Moreover, Câmara Jr. (1970) interprets these forms as derivational. He seeks to prove their derivational status of degree based on only two criteria listed in Table 1: (B) Not conditioned by the syntax, and (C) Idiosyncratic. In fact, for these two reasons, these formatives are categorized as derivational units.

Other authors, such as Lee (1997), do not consider *-inho* and *-zinho* to be allomorphs of the same morpheme, and interpret *-inho* as an affix (unit of derivation) and *-zinho* as a word (unit of compounding). Some authors adopt a non-discrete categorization approach. Thus, Gonçalves (2005) considers that the elements described herein are on the border between inflection and derivation, whereas Andrade (2013) analyses them as border units between derivation and compounding. Finally, authors such as Villalva (2000) consider that such elements are actually independent units of grammar, requiring an analysis distinct from that of traditional WF processes.

This chapter will not discuss the status of diminutive forms; rather, we intend to show the morphological features that make this process so special in BP, and we will also therefore discuss the question of why they have such divergent interpretations.

There are three prominent responses to these issues. The first concerns the wide range of meanings that these elements offer. The second, that they present unique phonological properties that no other Portuguese suffix presents. The final response refers to the fact that these elements are not lexical heads like others suffixes (see criterion U, Table 1): they are neither syntactic heads (do not change the word class), morphological heads (do not assign gender), nor semantic heads (are not core meaning). Thus, as already noted above, these elements encourage different interpretations because they have characteristics that make them unique in comparison to most prototypical elements of each category with which we try to link them. Let us look at these properties.

The diminutive markers (henceforth DIM) change the base to which they are adjoined according to a range of semantic features related to different value judgments, so that their true meaning depends on pragmatic circumstances. DIM have more central meanings, which may extend to less central meanings, and also, because of this, they end up being compatible with so many different word classes.

According to Silva (2006), at the semantic centre of DIM are two dimensions to be assigned to *-(z)inho*. The first concerns the most referential meanings, which are those considered to be decreasing (diminishes) and reinforcing ones (explainers). The second dimensions concern the metaphorical and metonymic extensions that these diminutives can create:

**Table 4:** Central meanings of diminutives

Central meanings		Metaphorical and metonymic extension		
diminishes	explainers	size (space) to time	time to intensity	intensity to quantity
decreases the size of the <i>designatum</i>	reinforces the size of the <i>designatum</i>	of very short duration	low intensity; weak	small amount of; little
<i>pezinho</i>	<i>migalhinha</i>	<i>visitinha</i>	<i>chuvinha</i>	<i>bocadinho</i>
'little foot'	'small crumb'	'brief visit'	'light rain'	'very small bit'

From these most central meanings, specializations emerge from the DIM. These are divided into different levels of lexicalization depending on the speaker's beliefs and attitudes.

In sum, if the basic use indicates the scant or negligible weight of something, the pragmatic uses reveal the speaker's perspective, i.e., the speaker gives their explicit opinion about something or someone. The word *lembrancinha* 'low-value gift', for example, shows the speaker's posture, revealing that this gift serves solely as a means of not forgetting a commemorative event. Furthermore, Brazilian culture specifically values modesty as a face-saving strategy: negative politeness, in Brown/Levinson's terms (1983).

So, on the discursive level, DIMs are characterized also by professional uses. Often employed in advertising or product sales, these diminutives illustrate the reader/listener's beliefs in the quality of the product so that s/he can then proceed to purchase it, as shown in the example *Esse é o relóginho que vem junto com essa Melissinha* 'this watch comes with the sandal'. In this case, DIM smooth the referents watch+DIM *relógio* and shoes (designated by the brand 'Melissa+DIM' metonymically). Other examples of pragmatic and discursive uses of DIM are listed in Table 5:

**Table 5:** Pragmatics of diminutives

Affective uses	Hedonic uses	Positive evaluations	Negative evaluations	Intensive uses
affective and compassionate	what we like	positive impression	negative impression	Increase or maximum
<i>mãezinha</i>	<i>vinhozinho</i>	<i>corpinho</i>	<i>timinho</i>	<i>cheiinho</i>
'dear mother'	'good wine'	'sculptural body'	'bad team'	'full to the brim'

DIM take on other semantic values, these always linked to the central idea 'small', or simply having an independent function or designating something that goes beyond its basic meaning. However, it almost always involves formations with the status of inde-

pendent lexical items purchased individually, assigning new entities in a diminutive relation to the word base. Parallel to formations in which the relationship between the derivative and the base is of a reduced size ‘small type of’, as in 8a, others are in a different ratio, but usually also related to the idea of ‘small’: similarity relations or imitation (8b), contiguity (8c) and type (8d):

- |    |                |  |
|----|----------------|--|
| 8. | a. tesourinha  | ‘small scissors’; ‘scissors used to cut nails’ |
|    | b. camisinha   | ‘small T-shirt’; ‘condom’                      |
|    | c. bandeirinha | ‘small flag’; ‘linesman’                       |
|    | d. barzinho    | ‘small bar’; ‘pub’                             |

Because of the large semantic variability here, DIM applies almost without restriction: these suffixes can adjoin to all kinds of bases, either adjectival (9a), nominal (9b), adverbial (9c), or even to interjections (9d), numerals (9e) and pronouns (9f). Henceforth, EVAL indicates a speaker’s evaluation with the use of DIM:

- |    |              |                    |
|----|--------------|--------------------|
| 9. | a. fininho   | ‘fine+EVAL’        |
|    | b. livrinho  | ‘book+EVAL’        |
|    | c. cedinho   | ‘early+EVAL’       |
|    | d. adeusinho | ‘goodbye+EVAL’     |
|    | e. cenzinho  | ‘one hundred+EVAL’ |
|    | f. euzinho   | ‘I+EVAL’           |

In what follows we analyze the phonological and morphological characteristics of DIM that make them so unique compared to other suffixes. In BP, *-inho* and *-zinho* present the following distribution: vowel-initial suffix (*-inho*) is adjoined to roots (*vida* → *vidinha* ‘life’, ‘life+EVAL’); [z]-initial suffix (*-zinho*) is adjoined to words (*sol* → *solzinho* ‘sun’, ‘sun+EVAL’). The variation of these two competing forms is dialect-specific and is also prone to depend on the speaker’s preference, although some grammatical constraints also apply.

The most obvious constraint is the impossibility of adjoining *-inho* to athematic bases (roots that do not end in an unstressed vowel ([e, I, u]), like *sofá* ‘sofa’, *colar* ‘necklace’ and *pão* ‘bread’). Athematic words only allow *-zinho* suffixation, displaying in the suffix the unmarked thematic vowel (-o [u], for the masculine, and -a [e] for the feminine). In these cases, there is agreement with the gender as to the base (masculine, in 10a, and feminine, in 10b). Bisol (2000) generalizes this property of DIM, arguing that the conditions to avoid onsetless syllables govern the choice between these two forms. Thus, she analyses /z/ as an epenthetic consonant.

10. a.  $\text{caju}_{\text{masc}} + \text{zinh} + \text{o}_{\text{masc}}$  unmarked vowel ‘cashew+EVAL’  
 b.  $\text{orfã}_{\text{fem}} + \text{zinh} + \text{a}_{\text{masc}}$  unmarked vowel ‘orphan+EVAL’

The two forms of DIM preserve the phonetic and phonological features of the base. First, they block the mid-vowel neutralization<sup>13</sup> for preserving lower-mid vowels ([ɛ, ɔ]), as we seen in 11c and 11f. With other suffixes, this rule always applies (11a, 11b, 11d, 11e). Note that lower-mid vowels of the base alternate with their corresponding upper-mid vowels when they move to a pre-stress syllable (in phonetic transcriptions, we use the pronunciation of the city of Rio de Janeiro):

11. a.  $\text{vela}$  [‘vɛ.lɐ] ‘candle’ →  $\text{velório}$  [vɛ.ˈlɔ.rjɔ] ‘funeral’  
 b.  $\text{vela}$  [‘vɛ.lɐ] ‘candle’ →  $\text{velar}$  [vɛ.ˈlah] ‘to wake’  
 c.  $\text{vela}$  [‘vɛ.lɐ] ‘candle’ →  $\text{velhinha}$  [vɛ.ˈli.jɐ] ‘candle+EVAL’  
 d.  $\text{porta}$  [‘pɔx.tɐ] ‘door’ →  $\text{porteiro}$  [pɔx.ˈtɛ.rɔ] ‘porter’  
 e.  $\text{porta}$  [‘pɔx.tɐ] ‘door’ →  $\text{portaria}$  [pɔx.ˈta.ri.ɐ] ‘lobby’  
 f.  $\text{porta}$  [‘pɔx.tɐ] ‘door’ →  $\text{portinha}$  [pɔx.ˈtĩ.jɐ] ‘door+EVAL’

DIM also preserves the phonetic nasality of stressed vowel (12a) while other related morphologically forms that also promotes stress change never do so (12b, 12c).

12. a.  $\text{trama}$  [‘trɛ.mɐ] ‘plot’ →  $\text{traminha}$  [trɛ.ˈmĩ.jɐ] ‘trama+EVAL’  
 b.  $\text{trama}$  [‘trɛ.mɐ] ‘plot’ →  $\text{tramado}$  [traˈma.do] ‘plotted’  
 c.  $\text{trama}$  [‘trɛ.mɐ] ‘plot’ →  $\text{tramarei}$  [trama.ˈrej] ‘I will machinate’

Like Bisol (2010), we also consider *-inho* and *-zinho* variants in complementary distribution. The presence of /z/, an epenthetic segment that appears in other WF processes, as we see in 13, serves to satisfy structural requirements.

13. **Augmentatives** (*-ão ~ -zão*):  $\text{cachorrão}$  ‘big dog’,  $\text{tratorzão}$  ‘big tractor’  
**Locatives** (*-al ~ -zal*):  $\text{mangueiral}$  ‘mango plantation’,  $\text{cafezal}$  ‘coffee plantation’  
**Collectives** (*-ada ~ -zada*):  $\text{boiada}$  ‘a herd of cattle’,  $\text{gurizada}$  ‘group of youngsters’  
**Tree names** (*-eiro ~ -zeiro*):  $\text{coqueiro}$  ‘coconut tree’,  $\text{ingazeiro}$  ‘inga tree’

<sup>13</sup> In BP, there is contrast between the mid-vowels ([ɛ, ɛ], [o, ɔ]) only in stressed syllables:  $\text{boto}$  [‘bo.tu] ‘Amazon dolphin’, and  $\text{boto}$  [‘bɔ.tu] ‘I put’;  $\text{pelo}$  [‘pe.lu] ‘fell’, and  $\text{pelo}$  [‘pe.lu] ‘I scratch’. In pre-stressed syllables, the contrast is lost and the most common pronunciation, in the southern dialects, is the upper-mid vowels, [e, o]:  $\text{pretende}$  [preˈtẽdʒi] ‘He intends’;  $\text{procura}$  [pro.ˈku.re] ‘He searches’.

In the scope of WF, BP tends to prevent the creation of hiatus and to undo it when it might occur.<sup>14</sup> Also, DIM tend to avoid the formation of hiatus, favoring (i) the deletion of the thematic vowel—*feir+a* → *feirinha* ‘market +EVAL’—or (ii) the insertion of /z/ when the base has no thematic vowel, as in *irmã* → *irmãzinha* ‘sister +EVAL’.

To ensure greater fidelity to the base, DIM do not allow resyllabification, as in other derivational processes (*papel* [pa.'pɛɹ] → *papelaria* [pa.pe.la.'ri.ɐ] ‘stationary store’), i.e. DIM preserve the structural position of the segments of the base to which they are adjoined, so that the segment in the coda in the base remains in this position in the complex word, as in *papel* [pa.'pɛɹ] → *papelzinho* [pa.pɛɹ.'zi.jɿ] ‘paper+EVAL’.

Thematic words can present the epenthetic consonant /z/ when they end in *-inh*, which is phonetically identical to the suffix. Such is the case with *vinho* ‘wine’, whose diminutive always presents /z/: *vinhozinho* ‘wine+EVAL’.

Also in relation to the principles that govern linguistic structures, DIM avoid redundant information in the grammatical gender, so that *-inho* is privileged when the thematic vowel carries information about the gender, which is deleted, as in *garot+o* → *garotinho* ‘boy+EVAL’, while *-zinho* is favored when there is disparity between the thematic vowel and the gender (14a) or when there is lack of gender information (14b):

14. a. masculines end in *-a*: **o** *aroma* → **o** *aromazinho* ‘aroma+EVAL’ feminines end in *-o*: **a** *tribo* → **a** *tribozinha* ‘tribe+EVAL’  
 b. genderless names: **o/a** *pianista* ‘pianist’ → **o** *pianistazinho* ‘pianist-masc+EVAL’, **a** *pianistazinha* ‘pianistfem+EVAL’

Differently from other Portuguese suffixes, plural formations in DIM do not correspond with a singular source form, but with a plural inflectional form:

15. *pão* ‘bread’ → *pães* ‘breads’; *pãozinho* ‘bread+EVAL’ → \**pãozinhos* (the suitable form is *pãezinhos*)  
*papel* ‘paper’ → *papéis* ‘papers’; *papelzinho* ‘paper+EVAL’ → \**papelzinhos* (the correct form is *papezinhos*)

In BP, *X-zinho* is subject to the stress retraction rule applying to phonological phrases. As noted in 16a, the stress clash in 16a causes the first stressed vowel to lose the stress in favor of the immediately preceding syllable (16b). When the final syllable is stressed, in trisyllabic words for example, the secondary stress varies between the first and second syllables (16c):

<sup>14</sup> For example, *bambu* ‘bamboo’ + locative suffix *-al* would create the form \**bambual*, with a hiatus between the base and the suffix. This malformed structure is repaired by the epenthetic consonant, generating *bambuzal* ‘canebrake’.

- |     |    |               |   |
|-----|----|---------------|---|
| 16. | a. | <i>café</i>   | * <i>cafezinho</i>                      |
|     | b. | <i>café</i>   | <i>cafezinho</i>                        |
|     |    | ‘coffee’      | ‘coffee+EVAL’                           |
|     | c. | <b>animal</b> | <b>animalzinho</b> ~ <b>animalzinho</b> |
|     |    | ‘animal’      | ‘animal+EVAL’                           |

It can be concluded, therefore, that DIM in BP indeed represent a special case, with features not found in any other morphological process, justifying their special treatment in this chapter. Preference for *-zinho* may be explained by the fact that this form warrants better recognition of the base to which it is associated because it creates its own phonological domain, changing neither the segmental nor the prosodic properties of the base.<sup>15</sup>

## 4 Derivation and compounding

Compounding is generally understood as a process that combines words or roots to create a morphologically complex unit, whereas derivation requires the presence of an affix, a recurrent bound form. Kastovsky (2009) argues that derivation and compounding, although different, are not always easily distinguishable, because their boundaries are flexible on both sides. Such a claim is based on the existence of non-nuclear entities which can be classified as marginal roots or marginal affixes, in that they exhibit properties of both roots and affixes. In some approaches, such elements were considered to be a different class, between roots and affixes. Such particles have been called affixoids (Marchand 1969). Ten Hacken (2000, 355) notes that the increase in the production of new forms and the reduction of semantic specificity make affixoids resemble affixes; on the other hand, their link to a word makes them resemble roots, as we see below (19), in which *foto* ‘photo’ compresses the meaning of *fotografia* ‘photography’ and updates this meaning in the new formations:

- |     |                    |                             |
|-----|--------------------|-----------------------------|
| 17. | <i>fototeca</i>    | ‘collection of photographs’ |
|     | <i>fotoestúdio</i> | ‘photo studio’              |

For our present purposes, the postulation of affixoids highlights the vagueness and malleability of the boundaries between compounding and derivation. In other words,

---

<sup>15</sup> The reader interested in more details on diminutives in BP is referred, besides the works already mentioned, to the following: Skorge (1957), a historical approach to diminutive affixes; Moreno (1997), a study of *-inho/-zinho* distribution within the lexical phonology model; Freitas/Barbosa (2013), a variationist investigation of the topic. In the next section, we discuss the differences between compounding and derivation and describe the diversity of WF processes of BP.

affixoids are a valid descriptive entity to segregate the two processes, whether these are of a separate class or not. Such elements indeed stand midway between affixes and words.

Let us now examine two of the main criteria used to distinguish compounding from derivation: (a) the units of a morphologically complex word, and (b) the position where these units occur within the word. It is tacitly understood that compounding involves elements which can appear either on the left or the right of a base. In contrast, affixes are bound forms which conform to rigid positional constraints: for example, prefixes precede the bases, while suffixes categorically succeed them.

The criterion of position confers the status of roots to the units involved in the so-called “neoclassical compounds”, since in these morphological constructions there are elements that appear either on the left edge of a complex word or on its right. This is the case with the examples in 18, in which the same morphological unit (in italics) starts the word or precedes the suffix *-ia*, located thus to the right:

18. *fonética*/telefonía      ‘phonetics/telephony’  
       *democrata*/epidemia    ‘democrat/epidemic’

Martinet (1979) described as “confixes” those elements without a pre-determined position in word structure. The criterion ‘positional mobility’, therefore, would lead us to categorize such constituents as roots, since true affixes never change their places. The position, however, is not a criterion which can be considered wholly reliable. Authors like Jordan/Manoliu (1980, 446) use historical arguments to show that the existence of forms with a suffix appearing in the root position is evidence that there was a change in the morphological status of such elements. This was the path taken, for example, by *-metro*, now a productive suffix, although acting as root in words like *métrico* ‘metric’ and *metragem* ‘meterage’.

The noun indicator unit of measurement, *metro* ‘meter’, came to designate, in complex words, a measuring instrument, accounting for more than 300 new formations today. The vowel /o/ became an integral part of the rightmost element and nowadays it is impossible to assert that *-ômetro* creates technical names of scientific areas, because their formations are quite informal and typical of spoken language. The examples in 19 do not even remotely resemble the old and opaque technicalities (neoclassical compounds) of the 19<sup>th</sup> century (20), also because the base becomes a word rather than a root:

19. *beijômetro*                    ‘bad breath detector’  
       *roncômetro*                    ‘device that measures a person’s snoring during sleep’  
       *bafômetro*                     ‘machine that checks if someone has drunk alcohol’
20. *dinamômetro*                ‘dynamometer’  
       *ebuliômetro*                 ‘ebullimeter’

Bauer (2005) considers the morphological change to be the main empirical basis of his claims here. For him, the boundaries between compounding and derivation are blurred, as many prefixes and suffixes came from roots or words that tended to appear, respectively, on the left or on the right in a morphological construction. Like Kastovsky (2009), we believe that these morphological operations are the prototypical poles of a scale, and thus that some cases are clearly analyzable as compounds or derivatives, and others that are more diffuse, as neoclassical compounds and morphological processes that make use of non morphemic units (the so-called splinters):

To implement a proposal that relates the differences between compounding and derivation, it is necessary to deal with a predetermined set of attributes that applies to emblematic cases (the prototypical ones). In Table 6, we group the main features of the prototypical compounds and prototypical derivatives in BP. Obviously, such differences must be considered as general trends of both processes and not as a form of absolute truth regarding the morphological status of formatives:

**Table 6:** Main differences between compounding and derivation

	Compounding	Derivation
Units	I Words or Roots	Affixes
	II Free forms or Bound forms which correspond to content words	Bound forms that do not correspond to content words
Structural properties	III Units with not necessarily fixed position in word structure	Units defined by a predetermined position in a complex word (left or right)
	IV Roots combine with others morphological types	Suffixes combine almost exclusively with roots
	V Lexical head is on the left, predominantly	Lexical head is on the right
	VI Possibility of coordination between the constituents	There is no possibility of coordination between the constituents
	VII To convey more specific ideas, there is a larger distribution of linguistic units, thus characterizing an open inventory	To convey general ideas, there is a fixed allocation and linguistic units which are not very large, thus characterizing a closed inventory
	VIII Possibility of inflection between constituents	The inflection is always peripheral
Phonological properties	IX Expression in more than one prosodic word	Expression in a unique prosodic word
	X Isomorphism between morphological and phonological word	Absence of isomorphism between these two categories

Table 6: (continued)

	Compounding	Derivation
	XI Maintenance of segmental and prosodic properties of the bases	Setting the base for applying rules whose domain is the prosodic word
Semantic properties	XII The units express a lexical meaning	The units update more general semantic content, capable of combining with a larger number of linguistic forms
	XIII Interpretation often holistic	Interpretation often compositional
	XIV Can be endocentric or exocentric	Massively endocentric
	XV Less stable because the meanings of the elements usually undergo metaphorical or metonymic extensions	More stable, presenting predetermined syntactic and semantic functions, defining the possible uses and meanings of derived words
Productivity	XVI Builds closed sets of non-recurrent words ( <i>ad hoc</i> )	Builds more complete sets of words (more regular)
	XVII Presents many manufactured forms	Creates series of words

Except for the criterion (III), all the others may be called into question, leading us to conclude that these criteria really apply to more prototypical elements of the two WF processes here. For example, the difference in (IX) presupposes an isomorphism between the morphological word (MWd) and the prosodic word (PrWd). The prognosis is compatible with most derivative processes, as shown in the following representations, in which brackets indicate PrWds and keys, MWds:

21. MWd $\cong$ PrWd  
 {[des<sub>Af</sub> leal<sub>Rad</sub>] PrWd} MWd ‘not loyal’  
 {[leal<sub>Rad</sub> dade<sub>Af</sub>] PrWd} MWd ‘loyalty’

Criterion (9), however, fails in the analysis of prefixes such as *pré-* ‘pre-’ and *pós-* ‘post-’, which, undoubtedly, appear in an independent PrWd (22a). Suffixes cited by Booij (2005) as no-cohering, such as *-mente* and *-zinho*, also project PrWds themselves (22b), which avoid the rule of neutralization which applies to pre-stressed mid-vowels (cf. section 2):

- MWd $\neq$ PrWd  
 22. a. {[prɛ<sub>Af</sub>] PrWd [pag<sub>Rad</sub> o] PrWd} MWd ‘prepaid’  
 {[pɔs<sub>Af</sub>] PrWd [pag<sub>Rad</sub> o] PrWd} MWd ‘paid after’

- b.  $\{[b\mathcal{E}l]_{\text{Rad } a} \}_{\text{PrWd}} [mente]_{\text{Af}} \}_{\text{PrWd}} \}_{\text{MWd}}$  ‘beautifully’ (\**b[e]lamente*)  
 $\{[d\text{ɔ}lar]_{\text{Rad}} \}_{\text{PrWd}} [zinho]_{\text{Af}} \}_{\text{PrWd}} \}_{\text{MWd}}$  ‘dolar+EVAL’ (\**d[o]larzinho*)

The statements in (XII) and (XVII) are not entirely true, according to which affixes necessarily update more general meanings and produce words in series. As shown by Bybee (1985), the relevance of morphological units determines how much the WF scheme in which these elements are instantiated will or will not be applicable on a large scale: the more general the formative meaning is, the more applicable the scheme of which it is a part will be.

Criterion (VI) is also questionable, since it does not apply uniformly to all items classified as affixes in BP. It is impossible, in fact, to delete constituents in coordination in the follow examples (Gonçalves/Andrade 2012):

- |     |                             |   |                          |
|-----|-----------------------------|---|--------------------------|
| 23. | des-leal and/or des-honesto | ≠ | des-leal and/or honesto  |
|     | ‘unfair and/or dishonest’   |   | ‘unfair and/or honest’   |
|     | sabor-oso and/or vali-oso   | ≠ | sabor and/or valioso     |
|     | ‘tasty and/or valuable’     |   | ‘flavor and/or valuable’ |

However, there are other complex words, prefixed or suffixed, that allow deletion without restriction of directionality, as in 24. In these data, the deleted elements perform syntactic and semantic functions that are identical to the one that remains, which is the condition necessary to coordination reduction:

- |     |                                      |                              |
|-----|--------------------------------------|------------------------------|
| 24. | pré-admissão and/or pós-admissão →   | pré and/or pós-admissão      |
|     | ‘preadmission and/or post-admission’ | ‘pre- and/or post-admission’ |
|     | cordialmente and/or amavelmente →    | cordial and/or amavelmente   |
|     | ‘cordially and/or kindly’            | ‘cordial and/or kindly’      |

None of the properties listed in Table 6 are exclusive to the units under review, or, at least, characterize all the members of these two classes. Neoclassical elements are bound forms and do not behave like words by adding inflection or thematic elements, as other bound roots (*cant+ar* ‘sing’; *vid+a* ‘life’ do, which explains why the following sentence sounds so strange<sup>16</sup>:

25. *Antropos são em geral mais peludos que ginos.*  
 ‘Anthropos are generally hairier than gynes’

<sup>16</sup> We are using the invented examples in Portuguese and therefore we do not consider the corresponding Old Greek plurals

In fact, formatives like *bio-*, *biblio-* and *-teca*, among many others, do not perfectly fit within a root class. As affixes, they are characterized by severe positional constraints, appearing on a specific edge of the word. This is the case with *tele-*, systematically found on the left edge, and *-cida*, which categorically appears on the right:

- |     |                                    |                    |               |
|-----|------------------------------------|--------------------|---------------|
| 26. | <i>tele-novela</i> ‘TV soap opera’ | <i>inseti-cida</i> | ‘insecticide’ |
|     | <i>tele-pizza</i> ‘pizza by phone’ | <i>rati-cida</i>   | ‘raticide’    |

Are elements such as *tele-* and *-cida* roots or affixes? The answer to this intriguing question certainly depends on the criterion in focus. Considering the most basic affix properties, i.e., parameters (II) and (III), *tele-* and *-cida* should be recognized, respectively, as a prefix and a suffix, because in addition to being bound forms, they occupy a fixed position in word structure. Conversely, *tele-* and *-cida* do not exhibit the same behavior with respect to the formation of prosodic domains, since only the first projects an independent PrWd (27). In both cases, the front mid-vowel pronunciation should be considered, because the lower-mid vowel ([ɛ]), in *verme* ‘worm’, becomes upper-mid vowel ([e]), in *vermicida* ‘vermicide’, but remain as such in (29a):

- |     |   |                            |
|-----|---|----------------------------|
| 27. | $\{[(t[\varepsilon]le)]_{PrWd}[(atendimento)]_{PrWd}\}_{MWd}$ | not                        |
|     | $\{[(t[e]le)][(atendimento)]_{PrWd}\}_{MWd}$                  | ‘remote call services’     |
|     | $\{[(v[e]rmi)(cida)]_{PrWd}\}_{MWd}$                          | not                        |
|     | $\{[(v[\varepsilon]rmi)]_{PrWd}(ci.da)]_{PrWd}\}_{MWd}$       | ‘product that kills worms’ |

Also, in observing criterion (VII) it can be said that the inventory of neoclassical elements is not open as with other roots, and that this once again makes them similar to affixes. It should be noted, finally, that many neoclassical elements have a semantic and syntactic default function, as anticipated by criterion (XV). Thus, we agree with Bauer (2005, 105) when he says that “the label ‘neoclassical compound’ is then shown to be exocentric, since it is not the case that a neoclassical compound is a compound (under normal readings of the word), but that is a terminological problem rather than a problem of substance”.

Therefore, if the uses and meanings of derived words correspond to the functions of affixes, we would have no hesitation in categorizing *-teca* as a suffix, since this formative creates series of words, always providing the same meaning: ‘collection’. As shown in 28, all *X-teca* constructions are interpreted compositionally, in accordance with the provisions in (XIII):

- |     |                     |                             |
|-----|---------------------|-----------------------------|
| 28. | <i>foto-teca</i>    | ‘photos collection’         |
|     | <i>esmalto-teca</i> | ‘nail polishes collection’  |
|     | <i>xeroco-teca</i>  | ‘collection of photocopies’ |

If we interpret the differences shown in Table 6 as typical of unquestionably derived or compound constructions, we would have in *peixe-boi* ‘manatee’ a prototypical example of compounding, and in *saleiro* ‘shaker’ a clear case of derivation. On the other hand, if we see such differences as attributes to help us in the categorization of WF processes, we would certainly be looking at border situations in examples such as *ele-tro-choque* ‘electric shock’, *tiotrocínio* ‘sponsored by the uncle’, and in this vein why not include *felizmente* ‘fortunately’ and *pãezinhos* ‘biscuits’? Such constructions have attributes that situate them closer to and further from the most exemplary members of these two WF processes.

Considering the existence of a scale between morphological operations, we can better understand the behavior of WF processes difficult to categorize in BP, such as: (a) the truncated combination (*portunhol* ‘mixture of Portuguese with Spanish’, (b) the sub-lexical replacement (*trêbado* ‘very drunk’, a word analogically created from *bêbado* ‘drunk’, with the changing of the /b/, which thus evokes the prefix meaning twice (*bi*), for /tr/, which refers to the prefix meaning three times, *tri*-), and (c) the process known in Brazil as re-compounding (*auto-escola* ‘driving school’. These processes are best addressed by the approach advocated here: in BP there are several WF processes that, by sharing compounding and derivation properties. Let us look now at the reasons for this, analyzing first the phenomena referred to as a lexical blend.

A nonconcatenative morphological process often associated with compounding is blending. Although there are two words as inputs for a third (as in compounding), blends differ from compounds because they involve the intersection of bases, instead of concatenation, as in *crentino* (*crente* ‘evangelical’ + *cretino* ‘nitwitted’ = ‘nitwitted evangelical’).

From a phonological perspective, blends are single PrWds. The output preserves the largest possible number of identical segments of the input, as in *apartamento* ‘small apartment’ (*aperto* ‘tight’ + *apartamento* ‘apartment’ = ‘tiny apartment’. Thus, the transition of the first source form to the second coincides with an identical segment or syllable, as in *sacolé* (< *saco* ‘bag’ + *picolé* ‘popsicle’ = a type of popsicle’, wherein the bold indicates share segments.

An interesting fact in blend formations is the ability of a non-morphemic piece to engage in new constructions and to acquire morphological status through use. In this case, a phonic sequence is reinterpreted as a morpheme and can become recurrent and create series of words. The formatives in Table 7 are usually combined with parts of words or whole words in BP, and are commonly found in spoken language:

**Table 7:** Main native splinters in use in contemporary BP

formative	example	trigger words	meaning of new formations
- <i>drasta</i>	<i>sogradrasta</i> ‘husband’s stepmother’	<i>madrasta</i> ‘stepmother’	‘family on loan’

Table 7: (continued)

formative	example	trigger words	meaning of new formations
<i>-nejo</i>	<i>pagonejo</i> 'country music mixed with <i>pagode</i> '	<i>sertanejo</i> 'born in the backwoods'	'country music with'
<i>-nese</i>	<i>ovonese</i> 'mayonnaise salad with hard- boiled eggs'	<i>maionese</i> 'mayonnaise'	'mayonnaise salad with'
<i>-tone</i>	<i>sorvetone</i> 'ice cream panettone'	<i>panetone</i> 'panettone'	'panettone with/of'
<i>-trocínio</i>	<i>tiotrocínio</i> 'sponsored by uncle'	<i>patrocínio</i> 'sponsorship'	'sponsored by'
<i>caipi-</i>	<i>caipifruta</i> 'fruit caipirinha'	<i>caipirinha</i> 'a Brazilian cocktail'	'caipirinha made with'
<i>choco-</i>	<i>chocotone</i> 'chocolate panettone'	<i>chocolate</i>	'chocolate'
<i>piri-</i>	<i>piricrente</i> 'overly-extravagant evangelical woman'	<i>pirigete</i> 'tart'	'someone is a tart'

The top five particles in Table 7 come from lexical blends. For example, *-nese* is not related to any morphological constituent in *maionese* 'mayonnaise'; it was isolated from the blend *macarronese* 'pasta' + 'mayonnaise' = 'mayonnaise salad with pasta', favoring the creation of words in series by replacing, on the left, the ingredient contained in abundance in the salad made with mayonnaise, that is, *camaronese* 'shrimp' + 'mayonnaise' = 'mayonnaise salad with shrimp'. The last four elements are recurring forms derived from clippings (morphological subtractions) which in these cases do not focus on morphemes. In fact, *piri-*, for instance, has no morphological status in the word that originated it, *pirigete* 'tart', whose morphological structure is *pirigu+ete* 'dangerous+fem', form already lexicalized with the elevation of the middle vowel in the base *perigo* 'danger'.

In the current literature, these particles are called splinters, and are elements occurring in a fixed position, in the same way that affixes do, but they do so because their meanings correspond to roots. Therefore, splinters form a separate class, situated somewhere between roots and affixes. Splinters resemble root or words, but also bear properties of affixes, such as their high lexical production, the fact that they are bound forms, in that they attach at the left edge (*caipi-*) or at the right edge (*-nejo*) in the morphological constructions where they are found. Consequently, they cannot be seen as the result of prototypical compounding. However, they consist of more than one PrWd and are linked to words, evoking the source forms from which they emer-

ged. This dispenses with the need to analyze them as the result of a derivation process. Therefore, a clear case is seen here for a derivation-compounding cline.

The emergence of a new productive WF schema may happen when speakers start to use a borrowed form, also a splinter, to create series of words. This is indeed what is happening in BP with the use of formatives such as *cyber-*, *-tube-*, and *e-*, which, combined with native bases, form hybridisms like *cyber-avó* ‘grandmother well-versed in digital technologies’. Gonçalves/Almeida (2012) note that the use of newly created morphological elements in English from processes such as clipping and abbreviation is becoming common, especially on the Web. For these authors, such a situation—which may seem banal at first glance, as loans in English are quite common in BP—has favored the proliferation of non-native elements in morphological structures. Indeed, since these formatives also adjoin vernacular bases, the neologisms create WF schemes that conform to BP morphological patterns. In the following table, some non-native splinters in use in contemporary BP are illustrated:

**Table 8:** Main non-native splinters in use in contemporary BP

English splinter	Source form	Meanings	Example
<i>cyber-</i>	<i>Cybernetics</i>	‘digital’	<i>ciber-conselho</i> ‘advice on computer’
<i>pit-</i>	<i>Pitbull</i>	‘aggressive’	<i>pit-babá</i> ‘aggressive nanny’
<i>-leaks</i>	<i>Wikileaks</i>	‘leak of information’	<i>bolso-leaks</i> ‘leak of information about Bolso(naro)’
<i>-pédia</i>	<i>Encyclopedia</i>	‘encyclopedia’	<i>desciclopédia</i> ‘digital encyclopedia of trivia’
<i>-tube</i>	<i>Youtube</i>	‘on the computer screen’	<i>samba-tube</i> ‘learning samba over the Internet’

Another process which, in our view, operates on the boundaries between compounding and derivation is called, in the Brazilian grammatical tradition, re-compounding, a morphological process which creates a compound from a shortening of another compound. In the new formations, however, the base, in a formal metonymy, refers to the meaning of the compound from which it has strayed, moving away from its etymological meaning.

As in English, there are also several formatives in BP that do not fit well within either the class of roots or affixes: these are the aforementioned “affixoids”, elements which structure re-compounds. We refer here to particles such as *bio-*, *petro-*, *eco-*, *homo-* and *tele-*, among innumerable others. Perceived as being isolated, they are typical of technical languages (a neoclassical element), and should be treated as formally learned, since they are not products of natural evolution; rather, they have been recovered from classical languages, especially over the last two centuries. However, new formations differ from older technical terms and can come into common use:

29. *tele-sexo* ‘sex by phone’  
*eco-turismo* ‘ecological tourism’  
*aero-Lula* ‘Lula’s plane’  
*homo-agressor* ‘aggressor of homosexual people’

Undoubtedly, the formations in 29 have morphological elements that actually look like affixes: they (a) are recurring, (b) have a high applicability, (c) are fixed at a specific edge in the word structure, and (d) can be described using identical WF schemes designed by affixes.

If we assume, along with Sandmann (1989), for example, that production in series characterizes derivation, but not necessarily compounding, re-compounding is far from what is expected in prototypical compounding. However, the constituents of a re-compounded word clearly appear in different PrWds, among other factors, by the opening of the mid-vowel in the first formative. In addition, the parity between the shortened form and the full form suggests a compounding process. Finally, a kind of syntactic structure can enhance non-fulfilment of a first base, when two complex words are placed in parallel, such as in 30:

- |     |                                |   |
|-----|--------------------------------|---|
| 30. | <i>tele e auto-atendimento</i> | ‘phone service and self-service’            |
|     | <i>foto e tele-jornalismo</i>  | ‘photojournalism and television journalism’ |

The behavior of re-compounds is similar to formations in *-mente* (*livre e continuamente* ‘freely and continuously’, which would lead us to claim, for this and other reasons, that *X-mente* constructions are not a prototypical case of derivation. It can be concluded that the boundary between compounding and derivation is diffuse, at least in BP. The idea of a scale is promising, since it accounts for the typological heterogeneity of the Portuguese WF system, which allows for words, roots (native and neoclassical), splinters (natives and non-natives), different kinds of affixes, and affixoids as morphological units in a wide variety of WF processes. A more systematic study of the diversity of WF processes in BP can be found, for example, Andrade (2013) and Gonçalves (2016). Rio-Torto (2013) brings a monumental study on WF in EuP.

## 5 Other nonconcatenative word-formation processes

BP has a wide variety of nonconcatenative WF processes. Apart from blends, as discussed above, there are shortening processes (clipping or truncation), reduplication patterns and formation of acronyms, including reverse acronyms. These phenomena differentiate BP from other Lusophone varieties (Villalva/Gonçalves, 2016). This section devotes some attention to these processes, typical of spoken language, citing the most common examples in each case.

Clipping is quite common in BP. It is a mechanism by which a word is shortened without its lexical meaning being affected, but with frequent stylistic or pragmatic nuances. It eliminates phonological material at the right periphery of the base. Clippings may (31a) or may not (31b, 31c) affect morphological constituents:

- |     |    |                                |               |
|-----|----|--------------------------------|---------------|
| 31. | a. | prolet+ário → <i>prolet</i> +a | ‘proletarian’ |
|     | b. | cervej+a → <i>cerv</i> +a      | ‘beer’        |
|     | c. | bijuteri+a → <i>biju</i>       | ‘jewelry’     |

The patterns exemplified above require morphological and prosodic information. In 31a, we find a word formed by a root base and the thematic index *-a*, a constituent unrelated to the gender of the base (the products are not previously specified to gender). In 32b, the base root is not fully present in the truncated form, but, as in 31a, the clippings are stressed on the penultimate syllable, always forming a trochee at the right edge of the shortened form. In these two groups, the affixation of the thematic index (*-a*) always occurs, but not in 31c. In this case, the two first syllables of the base are kept, which form an iambic foot. The first pattern of clipping—the most common one—can also affect compounds, as in *grã-fino* → *granfa* ‘stylish’ and *São Paulo* → *Sampa* ‘Brazilian city’.

Forms such as *agro-*, *eletro-* and *foto-*, which are neoclassical roots, often become words through clipping. As words, they can vary in number, as in *A casa tem duas hidros* ‘The house has two tubs’ and *Tenho dois amigos homos* ‘I have two homosexual friends’.

Reduplication is another BP nonconcatenative process. It is a mechanism of very limited productivity in EuP, but in BP new reduplicated forms are easy to find. For example, the addition of a word-final VCV template expresses intensification:

- |     |        |         |                             |
|-----|--------|---------|-----------------------------|
| 32. | chor+o | chororô | ‘crying/excessive crying’   |
|     | bol+o  | bololô  | ‘group of people/confusion’ |
|     | baf+o  | bafa'fâ | ‘breath/quarrelling’        |

In all the words that express intensity through the use of this strategy, the resulting vowels are always identical, and thus there is perfect harmony in the vowel melody. Examples such as those in 32 lead us to consider that the copying process makes use of the melodic elements of the root (not the word), since the thematic index of the input never emerges in the output. Thus, from *ch[o]ro* we get *chororô*, with an upper-mid vowel [o] as the nucleus of the three syllables in the morphological output. The same can be said of *b[a]fo*, in which the elimination of the thematic vowel produces three identical low vowels (*bafafâ*).

This pattern of reduplication appears in other cases, and always expresses intensity, as in *bafafâ* ‘excessive verbal confusion’ and *sururu* ‘clutter’, for which it not always easy to designate a base (*bafo* and *suruba*, respectively ‘whiff’ and ‘bacchanal’).



Of all the nonconcatenative WF processes, the most important, due to the role they have played in contemporary BP morphology, are blending and clipping, due to the creation of new morphemes (splinters), as we have seen. Other discussions of nonconcatenative WF processes in BP can be found in Araújo (2000), Gonçalves (2004), and Basilio (2005).

## 6 Conclusion

For the description of Brazilian morphology here, not only have we focused on the more specific uses, ones which are often poorly described in the traditional literature, but we have also been careful to characterize different borders in morphology, analyzing a wide variety of morphological processes, such as clipping, blending, compounding and acronyms. We have looked specifically at nonconcatenative processes, which are not recognized in European Portuguese, as well as pragmatic aspects (such as the pejorative DIM).

In conclusion, we suggest that the facts as described point to BP as now being a language with a greater tendency to synthesis than other Lusophone varieties.

## 7 References

- Altakhaineh, Abdel Rahman. (2014), *The Interaction Between Inflection and Derivation in English and MSA: An Insightful Glimpse Into the Boundaries*, Chisinau, Lambert Academic Publishing.
- Andrade, Katia Emmerick (2013), *Proposta de continuum composição-derivação para o português do Brasil*, Doctoral thesis, Rio de Janeiro, UFRJ.
- Araújo, Gabriel (2000), *Morfologia não-concatenativa: os portmanteaus*, Campinas, Cadernos de Estudos Lingüísticos 39/1, 35–45.
- Aronoff, Mark/Fudeman, Kristen (2005), *What is Morphology?*, Hoboken, New Jersey, Wiley-Blackwell.
- Basilio, Margarida (1987), *Teoria Lexical*, São Paulo, Ática.
- Basilio, Margarida (2005), *Fusão Vocacular como Processo de Formação de Palavras*, in: *Anais do IV Congresso Internacional da ABRALIN*, Rio de Janeiro, UFRJ, 39–45.
- Bauer, Laurie (2005), *The borderline between derivation and compounding*, in: Wolfgang Dressler et al. (edd.), *Morphology and its Demarcations*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, Benjamins, 97–108.
- Bisol, Leda (2010), *O diminutivo e suas demandas*, D.E.L.T.A. 26/1, 59–85.
- Booij, Geert (2005), *Compounding and derivation: evidence for Construction Morphology*, in: Wolfgang Dressler et al. (edd.), *Morphology and its Demarcations*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, Benjamins, 109–132.
- Brown, Penelope/Levinson, Stephen (1978), *Universals in language usage: Politeness phenomena*, In: Edward Goody (edd.). *Questions and politeness*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 56–324.
- Bybee, Joan (1985), *Morphology: a study of the relation between meaning and form*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Bybee, Joan (2010), *Language, usage and cognition*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

- Câmara Jr., Joaquim Mattoso (1970), *Estrutura da língua portuguesa*, Petrópolis, Vozes.
- Colnaghi, Carmen (2006), *Flexão e derivação: um labirinto gramatical*, Passo Fundo, UPF.
- Fandrych, Ingrid (2008), *Submorphemic Elements in the Formation of Acronyms, Blends and Clippings*, Lexis – E-Journal in English Lexicology 2, 208–236.
- Freitas, Myrian Azevedo/Barbosa, Maria Fernanda (2013), *A alternância do diminutivo “-inho/-zinho” no português brasileiro: um enfoque variacionista*, Alfa 57/2, 577–605.
- Gonçalves, Carlos Alexandre (2004), *Processos morfológicos não-concatenativos: formato prosódico e latitude funcional*, Alfa 48/2, 30–66.
- Gonçalves, Carlos Alexandre (2005), *Flexão e derivação em português*, Rio de Janeiro, UFRJ.
- Gonçalves, Carlos Alexandre (2011), *Iniciação aos estudos morfológicos*, São Paulo, Contexto, 2011.
- Gonçalves, Carlos Alexandre (2016), *Atuais tendências em formação de palavras*, São Paulo, Contexto.
- Gonçalves, Carlos Alexandre/Almeida, Maria Lucia Leitão de (2012), *Por uma cibermorfologia: abordagem morfossemântica dos xenoconstituintes em português*, in: Maria Mollica et al. (edd.), *Linguística e Ciência da Informação*, Curitiba, Appris, 105–127.
- Gonçalves, Carlos Alexandre/Andrade, Katia (2012), *El status de los componentes morfológicos y el continuum composición-derivación en portugués*, Lingüística 28/2, 119–145.
- Iordan, Iorgu/Manoliu, Maria (1980), *Manual de lingüística románica*, Madrid, Gredos.
- Kastovsky, Dieter (2009), *Astronaut, astrology, astrophysics: about combining forms, classical compounds and affixoids*, in: Roderick W. McConchie et al. (edd.), *Selected Proceedings of HEL-LEX 2*, Somerville, Cascadilla Proceedings Project, 1–13.
- Langacker, Ronald W. (1987), *Cognitive linguistics, Foundations of cognitive grammar*, vol. 1: *Theoretical prerequisites*, Stanford, Stanford University Press.
- Lee, Seung-Hwa (1997), *Sobre a formação de diminutivos no português do Brasil*, Belo Horizonte, UFMG.
- Levinson, Stephen (1983), *Pragmatics*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Marchand, Hans (1969), *The Categories and Types of Present-day English Word-formation*, München, Beck.
- Martinet, André (1979), *Grammaire fonctionnelle du français*, Paris, Didier.
- Moreno, Cláudio (1997), *Morfologia nominal do Português: um estudo de fonologia lexical*, Doctoral Thesis, Porto Alegre, PUCRS.
- Pereira, Eduardo Carlos (1908), *Gramática expositiva*, Rio de Janeiro, TPS.
- Rio-Torto, Graça Maria (2013), *Gramática derivacional do português*, Coimbra, Coimbra University Press.
- Rocha, Luis Carlos de Assis (1994), *Flexão e derivação*, Belo Horizonte, UFMG.
- Rosa, Maria Carlota (2000), *Introdução à Morfologia*, São Paulo, Contexto.
- Rosch, Eleanor (1978), *Principles of categorization*, in: Eleanor Rosch/Barbara Lloyd (edd.), *Cognition and categorization*, Hillsdale, Erlbaum, 7–36.
- Sandmann, Antônio José (1989), *Morfologia Lexical*, São Paulo, Contexto.
- Silva, Augusto Soares (2006), *O mundo dos sentidos*, Lisboa, Fundação Calouste Gulbenkian.
- Skorge, Silvia (1957), *Os sufixos diminutivos em português*, Boletim de Filologia, 16–17/3–4, 40–90.
- Spencer, Andrew (1998), *Introduction*, in: Andrew Spencer/Arnold Zwicky (edd.), *The Handbook of Morphology*, Oxford, Blackwell, 1–10.
- Ten Hacken, Pius (2000), *Derivation and Compounding*, in: Geert Booij et al. (edd.), *Morphologie—Morphology*, Berlin/New York, De Gruyter, 349–360.
- Villalva, Alina (2000), *Estruturas morfológicas: unidades e hierarquias nas palavras do português*, Lisboa, Fundação Calouste Gulbenkian.

Villalva, Alina/Gonçalves, Carlos Alexandre (2016), *The phonology and morphology of word formation*, In: Leo Wetzels/João Costa/Sergio Menuzzi (edd.), *The Handbook of Portuguese Linguistics*, Oxford, Wiley-Blackwell, 167–187.

Vivas, Vitor de Moura (2015), *Abordagem de padrões derivacionais nas marcas de modo-tempo-aspecto e número-pessoa*, Doctoral thesis, Rio de Janeiro, UFRJ/Faculdade de Letras.