PROSODIC WORD AND MORPHOLOGICAL DERIVATION IN BRAZILIAN PORTUGUESE

Luiz Carlos Schwindt
UFRGS, Brazil; NYU visiting scholar
schwindt@ufrgs.br

In this paper, I discuss the prosodic status of words formed by morphological derivation in Brazilian Portuguese (BP), in a descriptive approach.

In BP, according to Schwindt (2000), Bisol (2004), and others, morphological (MW) and prosodic words (PW) are not perfectly isomorphic, as shown in (1).

(1) **PWd extension in BP**

a.	equal to a MW :	casa]$_{PW,MW}$	*home*	isolated word
b.	smaller than a MW:	prɛ]$_{PW}$ escola]$_{PW}$]$_{MW}$	*pre-school*	prefixed word
		cafɛ]$_{PW}$ zinho]$_{PW}$]$_{MW}$	*small coffee*	suffixed word
		cachorro]$_{PW}$ quente]$_{PW}$]$_{MW}$	*hotdog*	compound
c.	larger than a MW:	me]$_{MW}$ espere]$_{MW}$]$_{PW}$	*wait for me*	clitic

This analysis is limited to (1b), particularly the cases of prefixation and suffixation. The general hypothesis is that the construction of MW is parallel to the construction of PW and that alignment constraints (cf. McCarthy and Prince, 1993) are responsible for well-formedness of these structures.

From a more specific standpoint, considering three types of prosodic formation (based on Booij, 1996) – composition, adjunction, incorporation –, I argue that prefixes are subject to all three, while suffixes are restricted to prosodic composition and incorporation, but not to adjunction, as represented in (2) and (3).

(2) **Prosodization of prefixes in BP**

a. Compositional prefixes	b. Adjoined prefixes	c. Incorporated prefixes
$[[\sigma(\sigma)]_{PW} [\sigma...]_{PW}]_{PW}$	$[\sigma + [\sigma...]_{PW}]_{PW}$	$[\sigma + \sigma...]_{PW}$
pré-escola *pre-school*	desescrito *erased*	descrito *described*
antedatado *backdated*	ilegal *illegal*	enlatado *canned*

(3) **Prosodization of suffixes in BP**

a. Compositional suffixes	b. Adjoined suffixes	c. Incorporated suffixes
$[[\sigma...]_{PW}[\sigma\sigma)]_{PW}]_{PW}$	$[\sigma... + \sigma(\sigma)]_{PW}$	$*[[\sigma...]_{PW} +\sigma]_{PW}$
brɛvemente *briefly*	brevidade *brevity*	

To discuss this classification, departing from the analysis of Peperkamp (1997), Schwindt (2000) and Vigário (2001), I examine phonological processes that occur within words in contrast to processes that occur at word boundaries. The main processes investigated are intervocalic voicing (IV), neutralization of pretonic vowel (PN), and nasal resyllabification (NR).

In (4) is shown a sample of these data, considering prefixes obligatorily adjoined to their bases and suffixes obligatorily incorporated.

(4) **Adjoined prefixes and incorporated suffixes in BP**

IV	a+social *asocial*		gas+oso *gaseous*	
	a[s]ocial	*a[z]ocial	ga[z]oso	*ga[s]oso
PN	pré+escolar *pre-school*		médico+ina *medicine*	
	pr['ɛ]-esc['ɔ]la	*pr[e]- esc['ɔ]la	m[e]dicina	*m['ɛ]dic['i]na
NR	pan+islamismo *pan-islamism*		tom+al *tonal*	
	pa[ŋ]-islamismo	*pa[n]islamismo	to[n]al	*to[ɲ]al

The complete analysis shows that prefixes are subject to processes internal to the PW, processes involving right and left limits of PWs, and processes involving only the left edge of PW. Unlike, suffixes are subject only to processes internal to PW and processes involving the right and left limits of PW, confirming the hypothesis that they do not undergo prosodic adjunction. From a morphological point of view, this suggests that the BP has derivational morphology based on the root and the word – unlike, for instance, what has been suggested by Bermúdez-Otero (2007) for Spanish.

Structures of prosodic incorporation, which reach prefixes and suffixes, do not affect, in principle, any conditions of prosodic hierarchy, expressed in the Strict Layer Hypothesis (cf. Nespor and Vogel, 1986). In this kind of prosodization, constraints concerning stress and well-formedness of syllables are involved. Moreover, structures of adjunction – that only involve prefixes in our proposal – are subject to violation of exhaustivity and non-recursivity (cf. Selkirk 1996), since syllables may be shared by two different PWs (e.g [i [nes.ti.má.vel]$_{PW}$]$_{PW}$ *invaluable*) and subordinate to each other. Structures of composition also violate non-recursivity, since PWs are configured as sister-nodes in a structure headed by another PW (e.g [[cafɛ́]$_{PW}$[zinho]$_{PW}$]$_{PW}$ *small coffe*).

This paper seeks to show that pairing between the units at issue is promoted by conflict between generalized alignment constraints and phonological constraints, yielding the three types of prosodic constituency discussed.

REFERENCES

BERMÚDEZ-OTERO, R. (2007) Morphological structure and phonological domains in Spanish denominal derivation. In: Fernando Martínez-Gil & Sonia Colina (Eds.) *Optimality-theoretic studies in Spanish phonology*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, p. 278-311.

BISOL, L. (2004) Mattoso Câmara Jr. e a palavra prosódica. *DELTA*, v. 20 n. especial, São Paulo: EDUC, PUCSP, p. 59-70.

BOOIJ, G. (1996) Cliticization as a prosodic integration: the case of Dutch. *The Linguistic Review* 13:219-242.

McCARTHY, J. and PRINCE, A. Generalized Alignment. In: Geert Booij and Jaap van Marle, (eds), *Yearbook of Morphology,* Dordrecht: Kluwer, 1993. [ROA-7]

NESPOR, M. and VOGEL, I. (1986) *Prosodic phonology*. Dordrecht-Holland: Foris Publications.

PEPERKAMP, S. (1997) *Prosodic words*. HIL dissertation 34. The Hague: Holland Academic Graphics.

SCHWINDT, L. C. (2000) *O prefixo no Português Brasileiro*: análise morfofonológica. Doctoral Thesis. Porto Alegre, Pontifícia Universidade Católica do Rio Grande do Sul.

SELKIRK, E. (1996) The prosodic structure of function words. In: James L. Morgan and Katherine Demuth (eds.) *Signal to syntax: bootstrapping from speech to grammar in early acquisition*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. p. 187-213.

VIGÁRIO, M. (2001) *The prosodic word in European Portuguese*. Doctoral Thesis. Lisboa, Faculdade de Letras.