1 INTRODUCTION

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>base verb</th>
<th>EDN in</th>
<th>EDN in</th>
<th>EDN in</th>
<th>EDN in</th>
<th>EDN in</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>adjoin</td>
<td>the</td>
<td>same</td>
<td>verbal</td>
<td>base.</td>
<td>Examples</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fábregas</td>
<td>Rodrigues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

2 AFFIX SELECTION: THE ALL OR NOTHING HYPOTHESIS

Fábregas (2010) has proposed that, in Spanish, the selection of the different nominalising suffixes depends on the semantic features of the internal argument of the base verb. According to Fábregas, verbs of change of state with the object original, will adjoin the suffix -da,-do, but not with the suffix -mento. Contrarily, verbs of change of state with an undergiver choose the suffix -mento and not -da/-do.

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

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

3 AFFIX SELECTION: OUR PROPOSAL

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

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

4 SEMANTIC COINDEXATION

The coindexation mechanism functions as follows: Remember that -da has as semantic features [+sudden event; +point of arrival]. If there is a verb whose event structure is similar to those of 'do', -da will coindexe with the feature of this verb, forming a deverbal noun whose meaning will be 'sudden event focused on point of arrival'. The suffix, besides having the same semantic feature(s), highlights the feature of the verb it coindexes with. Regarding the suffix -mento, this one has as semantic feature [+process]. This suffix has the subfeatures [+durative], being minimally compatible with the feature [point of arrival]. Subsequently, the semantic feature [+durative] of the suffix -mento will coindexe with the feature [+durative] of the base.

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

5 AFFIX RIVALS?

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>affix</th>
<th>deverbal noun</th>
<th>durative</th>
<th>point of arrival</th>
<th>ticle</th>
<th>process</th>
<th>point of arrival</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-da</td>
<td>deverbal noun</td>
<td>durative</td>
<td>point of arrival</td>
<td>ticle</td>
<td>process</td>
<td>point of arrival</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-mento</td>
<td>deverbal noun</td>
<td>durative</td>
<td>point of arrival</td>
<td>ticle</td>
<td>process</td>
<td>point of arrival</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Vamos proceder ao tosquiauimento do rebanho. We will proceed to the shearing of the flock.
(2) *Vamos proceder à tosquiauimento do rebanho. We will not proceed to the shearing of the flock.
(3) Vamos dar uma tosquiauao ao rebanho. We will give a shearing to the flock.
(4) *Vamos dar um tosquiauao ao rebanho. We will not give a shearing to the flock.

6 CONCLUSIONS

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