

Prefixes in the history of Portuguese: a semantic and cognitive approach

Maria José Carvalho

Universidade de Coimbra, CELGA-ILTEC (Portugal)
mariac@fl.uc.pt

Recibido o 17/06/2015. Aceptado o 28/09/2015

Abstract

Based on a medieval corpus, the article analyzes the evolution and the historic behavior of the prefixes *a(d)-*, *re-*, *en-*, *des-* and *es-* in certain lexical items, aiming to assess the semantic and cognitive motivations of the derivational change, as well as its direction. A contrast is made between the morpho-semantic variation of these prefixes in medieval Portuguese and in modern European Portuguese (including dialectal varieties), emphasizing questions of productivity, redundancy, recategorization, polysemy, and semantic specialization. We conclude that the motivations for derivational changes, normally semantic and cognitive, are extremely important, and require the inclusion of a diachronic perspective and of diatopic variation in any systematic study on Portuguese derivational morphology.

Keywords

Derivation and cognition, diachronic derivational morphology, polysemy and derivation, prefixes

Summary

1. Introduction. 2. Analysis of the corpus. 2.1. A-/AD-: Directionality of the change, standardization, polysemy and semantic specialization. 2.2. Prefix *en-*. 2.3. Prefix *re-*. 2.4. Prefix *des-*. 2.5. Prefix *es-*. 3. Conclusions. 3.1. Cognitive mechanisms in the evolutionary dynamics of the analyzed prefixes. 3.2 Theoretical implications and future research perspectives.

Os prefixos na historia do portugués: unha aproximación semántica e cognitiva

Resumo

A partir dun corpus medieval, o artigo analiza a evolución e o comportamento histórico dos prefixos *a(d)-*, *re-*, *en-*, *des-* e *es-* en determinadas unidades léxicas, co obxectivo de avaliar a importancia das motivacións semánticas e cognitivas no cambio derivativo, así como de determinar a dirección deste. Establécese unha comparación entre a variación morfosemántica deses prefixos no galego-portugués medieval e no portugués europeo contemporáneo (incluíndo variedades dialectais), incidindo en cuestións de produtividade, redundancia, recategorización, polisemia e especialización semántica. Conclúese que as motivacións para os cambios derivativos, xeralmente semánticas e cognitivas, son extremadamente importantes e requiren a inclusión tanto dunha perspectiva diacrónica como da variación diatópica en calquera estudo sistemático da morfoloxía derivativa do portugués.

Palabras chave

Derivación e cognición, morfoloxía derivativa diacrónica, polisemia e derivación, prefixos

Sumario

1. Introducción. 2. Análise do corpus. 2.1. A-/AD-: Direccionalidade do cambio, estandarización, polisemia e especialización semántica. 2.2. Prefixo *en-*. 2.3. Prefixo *re-*. 2.4. Prefixo *des-*. 2.5. Prefixo *es-*. 3. Conclusións. 3.1. Mecanismos cognitivos na dinámica evolutiva dos prefixos analizados. 3.2 Implicacións teóricas e perspectivas de investigación futuras.

1. INTRODUCTION

Based on the study of a medieval corpus (Carvalho 2006: 33-287), and employing, as far as possible, a usage-based model of current Portuguese (including dialectal variation), we shall describe the behavior and the historical development of the Portuguese prefixes A-/AD-, RE-, EN-, DES- and ES- in some lexical items, in order to evaluate the semantic and cognitive motivations of the change over time, as well as its direction¹. We shall contrast the morpho-semantic variation of these prefixes in medieval Portuguese and the semantic specializations that they have acquired in modern European Portuguese. The corpus on which the research is based consists of 153 original notarial documents, transcribed by us, from the holdings of the Cistercian monastery of Santa Maria of Alcobaça, an important center of Portuguese culture in medieval times. It includes a collection of documents from between 1289 and 1565², which form part of the collection *Mosteiro de Alcobaça, 1ª e 2ª incorporações* (IAN/TT), produced not only in the monastery but also in the outlying areas under its jurisdiction, known as *coutos*. We have also consulted the digitalized corpus of medieval Portuguese *Corpus Informatizado do Português Medieval* (CIPM), whenever it was necessary to compare and control the data. We are well aware that any corpus is merely a philological tool – only as a research method can it replace the language itself – but it is the only way that we can study the language in the early stages of its development.

According to Rio-Torto *et al.*:

Na linguagem dos falantes não instruídos do PE continua a usar-se um a- protético em verbos como (a) baixar, (a)costumar, (a)juntar, (a)levantar, (a)mandar, (a)mostrar, (a)semear, (a)sentar, sendo que nestes casos a presença de a- não assegura contraste semântico, como em aguardar x guardar. Também não é linear que se trate de um prefixo, neste caso esvaziado de conteúdo semântico, ainda que por reanálise da preposição latina que está na sua origem (Rio-Torto et al. 2013: 277, emphasis added).

[In the language of uneducated speakers of European Portuguese, a prothetic a- is still used in verbs such as (a)baixar, (a)costumar, (a)juntar, (a)levantar, (a)mandar, (a)mostrar, (a)semear, (a)sentar; in these cases the presence of a- does not indicate a semantic contrast, as in aguardar x guardar. It is also not obviously a prefix, here emptied of semantic content, even though by reanalysis of the Latin preposition from which it originated].

In fact, in contemporary European Portuguese there is a huge number of verbs formed by means of the addition of the prothetic derivational affix *a-/ad-*, and of verbs now lacking this affix, either because they have lost it at some point in the history of the language, or because it was never definitively implemented in the language. Among the former are *aproveitar* 'to make use of', 'to take advantage of', *administrar* 'to administer', and *arrecadar* 'to collect duties or taxes', while the latter include *costumar* 'to usually do', *nomear* 'to nominate', *romper* 'to break', etc. Social or diastatic variation can also be found – in some lexical items the prefix is only added in popular speech: **alevantar* 'to raise', **assentar* 'to seat', **adevertir* (= *divertir* 'to have fun'), **alimpar* 'to clean', the un-prefixive variant being the standard form. Furthermore, in some cases we find semantic specialization: *aguardar* 'to wait' and *guardar* 'to keep', *amostrar* 'to give away free samples' and *mostrar* 'to show', *sentar* 'to seat' and *assentar* 'to record, arrange, fix', *chegar* 'to arrive' and *achegar* 'to approach, bring near', *parecer* 'to seem' and *aparecer* 'to appear', *perceber* 'to realize, understand' and *aperceber(-se)* 'to become aware of, notice', for example.

As Alexandra Soares Rodrigues has noted, there is a need to "apontar as principais fontes de formas que, maioritariamente, se vêem integradas em quadros descritivos que infirmam, porque a ignoram, a realidade histórica" (Rodrigues 2001: 97). ["indicate the main sources of the forms which are usually found within descriptive frameworks which invalidate, because they ignore, historical reality"]. If, with Eugenio Coseriu, we adopt the concept of language as "dynamic synchrony", the phenomenon mentioned in our opening quotation is highly important for derivational morphology. In fact, the addition of *a-* (as a prefix or not) happens too often in Por-

¹ The present article is a revised version of part of the author's unpublished doctoral thesis (Carvalho 2006: 539-547).

² See Carvalho (2006: 33-287). In our collection, documents are identified by year, place of production and number.

tuguese to be considered simply as part of “the language of uneducated speakers of European Portuguese”³. Anyone aware of the talk of children playing ball games in the school playground will soon hear how often they use the verb **amandar* ‘to throw’; we have also heard pre-school children of highly educated parents using verbal adjectives such as **aderretida* ‘liquefied’. So it is only an excessively purist vision of the language, produced by an idealized speaker, that could neglect the creative force of the prefix *a-*, which of course is not unique to Portuguese:

Geographically, A-prothesis is widely represented across Romance. It has operated in varieties of northern Ibero-Romance, in various types of southern Gallo-Romance, in Sardinian, in southern Italo-Romance albeit under special circumstances and patchily in central and northern varieties, and in certain varieties of Rheto-Romance and Balkan Romance (Sampson 2010: 37).

We shall not deal here with the problematic question of whether this *a-* is a prefix or a simple phonetic-syntactic addition (prothesis), derived from its inherent initial position⁴. It is possible that, beginning as a preposition, it later spread by analogy to many verbs and to all other classes of words, as we shall see. For *a-/ad-* (coming from the Latin preposition *AD-*), for example, it will be seen that it was often the semantic contrast required by the need for polysemic disambiguation (particularly in technical language) which gave rise to many pairs of words (not only *guardar* ‘to keep’ and *aguardar* ‘to wait’) in which the *a-* is lost (or added) in one of the variants, by restriction or semantic specialization.

The prefix *des-* in current Portuguese is usually associated with the idea of negation, of contrary action. According to Rio-Torto (2013: 358), “associado a bases verbais, tem valor reversativo (cf. *desabotoar*, *desativar*, *desconvocar*) e/ou extrativo (cf. *desflorestar*) e/ou negativo (cf. *desobedecer* ‘não obedecer’). [“appended to verbal stems, it has the value of reversal (cf. *desabotoar*, *desativar*, *desconvocar* and/or extraction (cf. *desflorestar*) or negation (cf. *desobedecer* ‘disobey’)]. In fact, at the dialectal and popular level vestiges of the prefix survive, demonstrating a neutral value without any meaning supplementary to the base word, as seen for example in “*desfazer a barba*” ‘to shave’, very common in the northern region of the country, and “*descavar videiras*” ‘to clear earth around vines’, surviving in Portuguese dialects in the regions of Beira Alta and Beira Litoral. Equally productive was the prefix *es-*, sometimes alternating with *des-*, expressing movement, as in *escavar* ‘to make holes in soil, excavate, dig out’ ~ *descavar*. This leads us to believe that in this, as in other lexical items [such as *espedaçar* ‘to break up (soil)’, *escambar* ‘to exchange properties’], *des-* was less prestigious in archaic Portuguese than *es-*, in contrast to what we find in contemporary European Portuguese. In many cases, in fact, the meaning of ‘removal’ was given in medieval Portuguese by *es-*: it is only in modern Portuguese that it has been replaced by *des-*, as in *escampado* (arc.) ‘open field’. The prefixes *es-* and *des-* can also be synonymous, as in *espedaçar* and *despedaçar*, both appearing in the dictionary (‘transform into X- base word’), or *desfolhar* and *esfolhar* ‘to remove leaves’, both with the meaning of ‘depriving’. Another situation is where *des-*, added to the base, acts as an intensifier, resulting in a word that, unlike the base word, is stigmatized according to the norms, being indicative of the speaker’s lack of education: “*destrócar dinheiro*” ‘to exchange money’, for example.

Due to the nature of the materials analysed and of the data we have obtained, this present analysis of derivational processes is based in a semantic and cognitive perspective; our intention, however, is that the terminology we use should be generally understood within the research community in general. We have tried above all to observe real evidence, and to emphasize its importance for the history of Portuguese. In this way we are contributing to the study of ‘the archaeology of derivational morphology’, too often neglected in derivational theory, which itself can play a part in a well-founded understanding and acceptance of lexical creativity, and hence in lexicography.

³ According to Rio-Torto, “Dos prefixos formadores de verbos denominais e deadjetivais em português, *a-* é o prefixo com maior representatividade (≈ 52%). Ocorre maioritariamente com a forma *a-* (...) mas em alguns casos manifesta ainda a sua antiga forma latina *ad-*” [“Of the prefixes forming denominative and deadjectival verbs in Portuguese, *a-* is the most common (≈ 52%). It occurs mainly in the form *a-* (...), but in some cases still shows its ancient Latin form *ad-*”] (Rio-Torto et al. 2013: 285.)

⁴ For a clear approach to the problem, see López Viñas (2014: 60).

2. ANALYSIS OF THE CORPUS

As mentioned by Rio-Torto *et al.*:

Acresce que estes [verbos prefixados] apresentam, muitas vezes, valores semântico-aspetuais, especializações referenciais ou realizações argumentais que os distinguem dos não prefixados (cf. *forrar/aforrar, guardar/aguardar, listar/alistar, planar/aplanar, segurar/assegurar, testar/atestar*) ou dos prefixados com operadores diferentes (cf. *enterrar/aterar, enfarinhar/esfarinhar*). Nada impede, pois, que num mesmo paradigma de formação de palavras possam atuar diversas operações morfológicas concorrenciais, *encarregando-se a língua de institucionalizar aquela(s) que é/são necessária(s)* e semântica e/ou referencialmente distinta(s) (Rio-Torto *et al.* 2013: 277, emphasis added).

[We must add that these [prefixed verbs] often have semantic-aspectual values, referential specializations or argumentative realizations which distinguish them from unprefixed verbs (cf. *forrar/aforrar, guardar/aguardar, listar/alistar, planar/aplanar, segurar/assegurar, testar/atestar*) or from prefixed verbs with different operators (cf. *enterrar/aterar, enfarinhar/esfarinhar*). There is therefore nothing to stop diverse morphological operations acting concurrently in the same paradigm of formation, *with the language institutionalizing what it needs* and what is semantically and/or referentially distinct]

Throughout the medieval period, and even today, prothetic *a-* is a constant and lively feature⁵, especially in popular language. We see it particularly in verbal forms, but it seems to have been common from the mid-15th century, so that it spread by analogy to nouns (*apaul* ‘marsh’, *alagar* ‘olive oil press, wine press’, etc.) and to other grammatical classes. A question we may ask is this: why did some forms come to lose the prefix *a-* at a certain point in their development, while others (re)gained it⁶? Why were some forms rejected by the norm while others were included in it? It is to such questions, on the motivations and direction of morpho-semantic change in these prefixes, that this article aims to respond.

2.1. A-/AD-: Direction of the change, standardization, polysemy and semantic specialization

In the 13th century we find the forms *achegado* ‘closely related’ (1291 Alc 2) and *alimphar* ‘to clean’ (1291 Alc 3, 2 v.), the latter being now used only in popular speech and highly stigmatized, while the former deverbal adjective is part of Portuguese lexis (‘near’, ‘related’ or ‘relative’). Throughout the collection we also find many examples of the relational adjective *afouchinhado* ‘scythe-shaped’, which can be paraphrased as ‘evoking or having the properties of’, always with the prefix *a-*. Although *fouchinhado* is found in the 13th century (Machado 1995: see under ‘afouchinhado’), the adjective *afouchinhado* (‘describing a chicken with long tail feathers shaped like a scythe’) is found throughout the collection, from the late 14th century and through the 15th century: *afouchinhados* (1375 MA 48), *afouchinhados* (1416 MA 78), *afouchinhad[os]* (1479 MA 124) and *affouchinhad[os]* (1489 MA 130).

⁵ This phenomenon is also found in 14th-century Galician texts (Barbosa 1958: III, 48, see under “anēbrar”, “asentar”, “amostrar”).

⁶ The timing of this phenomenon seems to present a challenge to those concerned with the formation of prefixed and circumfixed verbs, since the need to take the chronology back to ‘Vulgar Latin’ requires a rethinking of some of the epistemological bases of derivational morphology, especially analytical perspectives and methodologies, and even of the terminology of this branch of morphology. In fact, we must suppose that this type of addition would have already existed in colloquial Late Latin. A study of the formation of verbs by prefixation and circumfixation, from a perspective which linked the synchronic and the diachronic, would help to clarify this chronology. *Ad*, as a prefix used with a verb, was widely used in Vulgar Latin: Grandgent (1991²: 36-37) mentions the examples *ADCAP(I)TARE, ADGENUCULARI, ADPRETIARE, ADPROPIARE, ADUNARE. According to Sampson, in its initial phase this kind of prothesis seems to have occurred in words beginning with R-: “The origins of the development appear to be bound up with the use of a strongly trilled realization /r/ for the rhotic R- in word-initial position within some but not all varieties of Late Latin and early Romance. However, in certain Romance varieties A- prothesis has subsequently come to operate in other structurally related contexts as well” (Sampson 2010: 37). The examples in our corpus are not confined to these contexts, although Sampson gives convincing examples of the earliest centers of the innovation, in northern Spain: *Aramirus rex* (‘King Ramiro’), in a manuscript of 976 from La Rioja; *aretundo* ‘round’ (manuscript of 1055, also from La Rioja), *arroturas* ‘breaks’ (1137, Oña, northern Castille). For Aragonese, he cites *arripera* ‘stream’ (1042), *arretundo* (11th century), *Arramon* ‘Ramón’ (1119), while for Navarrese he gives some place names: *Arriezu*, ‘Riezu’ (1054), *Arrieçu* (1055), *Arriezo* (1060) and *Arieçu* (1060), in texts from the monastery of Irache (Sampson 2010: 155).

The denominal adjective *acostumado* 'accustomed' (now accepted as the norm) usually appears with the *a-*, although inflected forms of the verb lack the prefix. They represent 89%, throughout the corpus, and always appear in documents produced in the monastery: *acoftumado* (1522 MA 144; 1528 MA 148), *acoftumadoj* (1391 MA 59), *acuftumado* (1459 MA 112; 1460 MA 113; 1527 MA 147; 1529 MA 149), *acuftumados* (1502 MA 138). Only one form, found in a document from Pederneira, lacks the prefix: *cuftumadas* (1526 Ped 146). This occurrence, though isolated, may perhaps be a sign that the prefix *a-* was a form which had some prestige in the formation of verbal adjectives.

Throughout the 14th century we find many occurrences of 'prefixal' *a-*, all of them still characteristic of current popular language (**achantar* 'to plant', **amergulhar* 'to immerse', **arrefazer*, 'to re-do', **arromper* 'to break, to cultivate land', **amostrar* 'to show'): **achãtedes* 'plantedes' (1324 Alc 18), **amergulhardes* (1362 MA 44; 1375 MA 48; 1397 MA 63), **amergulharedes* (1397 MA 63), **amergulhedes* (1356 MA 41; 1362 MA 44), **amjrgolhedes* (1383 Alj 53), **amojtrã* (1355 Cel 40), **amojtrou* (1383 Alj 53), **arôpades* (1375 MA 48), **arôperdes* (1375 MA 48), **arrefaçades* (1399 MA 66), **arrompades* (1345 MA 33), **arromper* (1345 MA 33), **arronpades* (1324 Alc 18; 1383 Alj 53), **arrôpades* (1321 Alc 17), **arrôper* (1321 Alc 17, 2 v.; 1375 MA 48), **arrôperdes* (1321 Alc 17, 3 v.; 1324 Alc 18), **arrôperô* (1304 Alc 10).

It is curious, however, to notice that in some lexical items the prefix *a-* only appears regularly in our collection from the end of the 14th century. In our corpus, the chronology of the present form *aproveitar* (from PROFĒCTU-)⁷ is as follows:

Chronology	Forms	%
Up to 1382	<i>aprofeitar</i>	6,6
1383-1450	<i>apro(f)feitar /aproueitar</i> (graphic and flexional variants)	47
1451-1565	<i>aproueitar/aproveitar</i> (graphic and flexional variants)	96

Table 1. Chronology of the form *aproveitar* (and variants), in percentages, in the corpus being studied

The form with *a-*, which must have already existed in Latin, came to be part of the educated norm, so that from the 1380s the direction of change was irreversible.

In the 15th century, while some forms were maintained, others came into being, but never achieved the necessary social acceptance to spread throughout the community: **abaixandojfe*, [from *abaixar* 'to lower' (1403 MA 69)], **amergulhardes* (1403 MA 69; 1408 MA 71), **amergulhedes* (1408 MA 71), **afemêtedes* [from *afemêtar* 'to sow' (1405 MA 70)].

From the second quarter of the 15th century a new change seems to have become consolidated: *prazer* > *aprazer* 'to please'. The medieval forms of the Perfect system of the verb *aprazer* (with the root *prou-* or *proug-*) only began to show the prefix *a-* from the second quarter of this century⁸, reaching 68%, in a chronological range between 1437 and 1528. We find the following: *ap[ro]juer* (1462 Mai 114; 1467 Mai 117, 3 v.), *ap[ro]juejfe* (1467 Mai 117), *aprouger* (1469 Cel 118; 1505 MA 138), *aprougue* (1469 Cel 118), *aprouguer* (1442 MA 98), *aprouguejfe* (1455 MA 108), *aprouuer* (1477 MA 121; 1478 MA 122; 1479 MA 124; 1528 MA 147), *aprouuera* (1437 Ped 94), *aprouuejfe* (1437 Ped 94) and *aprouvejfe* (1519 MA 142). Document 1479 MA 124 also has the variants *prouuer* and *aprouuer*.

⁷ Until 1383, only one document (from 1350) has the form *aprofeitar* 'to make use of' (1350 AM 36, 2 v.), which is found along with two other forms without *a*: *profetara* and *profetara*. From 1383 the two begin to appear frequently as variants. Examples are *aprofetedes* ~ *profetado* (1383 Alj 53) and *profetaredes* and *aproueite* (1399 MA 66). The Spanish form *aprovechar* is already found in a document from 1200, according to J. Corominas, who mentions that *provechar* was the lesser-used medieval variant (13th – 15th centuries) (Corominas 1989-1992: see under *aprovechar*).

⁸ In the 14th century the forms are the following: *prougue* (1300 Alj 8 and 1391 MA 59, 5 v.) and *prouguer* (1300 Alj 8; 1307 Alp 13), while in the 15th century we find these, showing no addition: *prouue* (1438 Ped 95), *prouguejfe* (1456 MA 109), *prouue* (1462 Alj 115), *prouuer* (1478 MA 123; 1479 MA 124; 1482 MA 125; 1484 MA 127; 1485 MA 128). We know, however, that the phenomenon of addition in this lexical unit was already known in the 13th century: *aprouguesse* (1260, document from Chancelaria de D. Afonso III), *aprazer* (*Cantiga de escárnio e de maldizer*: CEM 272) and from the early 14th century, *aplaga* (1310, Lugo). Cf. CIPM.

Concerning the forms of the Present system with the root *praz-*, the first occurrences with a prefix are a little later, in a document from 1467, and there they compete with the old form *prazia*: *prazia* ~ *aprazia* (4 v.) (1467 Mai 117)⁹. The lateness of the addition in forms with the root *praz-*, in contrast to what we find in those with the root *prouu-/proug-*, may be due to the presence in the former of a vowel with the same quality, in contrast to the latter, which only have raised vowels. It should be noted that, both in the root *prouu-* or *praz-*, the first innovations appear in documents written in the *coutos*, suggesting that this type of innovation in verbs was popular or regional in character. In the 16th century, all examples of these verbal forms have the prefix *a-*.

From 1450 onwards, there were many forms with this prefix which never became part of the educated norm, but which are still heard in popular contexts, from speakers of all ages: **aleuã-tem* [from *aleuãtar* 'to raise' (1479 MA 124)], **amergulhem* (1479 MA 124), **amjrgulhar* (1450 Alv 104), **amore*¹⁰ (1479 MA 124), **amofrey* (1491 Alj 133), **anome*¹¹ (1489 MA 130, 2 v.), **anomeadas* (1490 MA 131), **anomee* (1489 MA 130), **arenũciado* 'renounced' (1489 MA 130), **arrenũcio* (1484 MA 127), **arronpades* (1453 MA 107), **arronpam* (1479 MA 124). Some verbal adjectives also acquired the prefix: **aleuãtadas* (1453 MA 107), **amergulhada* (1489 MA 130), **afeelada* 'saddled' (1472 TC 120), **afelada* (1452 MA 106; 1453 MA 107), and some deverbal nouns: **arrenũciaçom* 'renunciation' (1495 MA 134).

One of the most interesting aspects of the addition of this prefix concerns a lexical product which, from 1450 onwards, acquired it unidirectionally. These are the flexional variants of *arre-cadar*: *rrecadar* (1345 MA 33) and *rrecadarã* (1448 Ped 102) in our corpus are replaced after the 1450s by *arrecadarom* (1459 MA 111) and *arrecadar* (1515 SM 141), thus being institutionalized in Portuguese¹². In fact the verb *recadar* in medieval Portuguese was highly polysemic, going from 'converse' (in *Crónica de D. João I*: "que esse dia chegara por *rrecadar* com elle"), to 'keep', 'keep secret' ("Mas o demo enartar-a/foi, por que empreñar-s'/ouve dun de Bolonna,/ome que de *recadar*/avia e de guardar/seu feit' e sa besonna", CSM 007), 'take', 'tolerate, suffer' ('suffer a blow', "*recadar* uma punhada", in a *Cantiga de escarnho e de maldizer*, slanderous song of mockery, CEM 267), to 'send a message', 'call, fetch' ("Como Santa Maria tirou um escolar de prigion en Touro porque lle fezera hũa cantiga eno carcer jazendo": "mas pero fugiu a Touro, foron pos el / e entom disseron aa jostiça que o fosse *recadar*", CSM 291, where *recadar* has, beyond the sense of 'send a message', the meaning of 'fetch, collect, free'). Curiously, *recadar* could also have the meaning (which it maintains in relation to 'message', but in a completely opposite sense) of 'catch' 'detain', 'send to detention', 'send notice of capture'. It is this meaning which is found in CSM 255 ("Como Santa Maria guareceu a moller que fezera matar seu genro polo mal prez que ll' apõyan com el, que non ardeu no fogo en que a meteron"): "Per que soub' a verdade do preito / e fez *recadar* de mui mal talan / os que fezeran aquele feito" (CIPM).

It is natural, however, that in the legal language used in contracts relating to leases, the need for semantic transparency would create the prefix *a-*, imparting a positive telic sense ('collecting dues and rents'), quite similar to current Portuguese. The polysemy mentioned above will be confirmed if we look at the *Crónica Geral de Espanha*, for example, where both meanings coexist:

⁹ Curiously, in the same text we find the deverbal noun *prazimêto* 'pleasure', although the first occurrence with prefix *a-* in this lexical item dates from 1459: *aprazimento* (1459 MA 111). However, this form is rare in the corpus, making up only 13% of all occurrences of this noun.

¹⁰ On the meaning of this lexical unit, see Piel (1980-1986: 44-47), who mentions the semantics of "amo(o)rar", and sees it as a case which Gilliéron would not have hesitated to classify as "détresse sémantique". This is because "un verbe *amorar* pouvait ainsi signifier aussi bien 'amoindrir' qu' 'agrandir'" (p. 47). It is certainly in this second acceptance that it is used throughout this corpus, where the prefixed variant is only 8% of the total.

¹¹ The inflected forms of *anomear* 'to nominate' shows idiolectal traces from the notary named 'Joham Affonfio'.

¹² In Galician, the accepted verbal form was the unprefixed one (Gal. *recadar*). Hence, the cognitive dimension being explored in the present article is unquestionably allied to dialectal factors, as Geeraerts has recently shown (Geeraerts / Kristiansen 2012). In other cases we find the opposite – for example *rodear-se* (Port.)/*arrodear-se* (Gal) 'to surround'. In the case of nouns, we can also see these dialectal differences: *mostra* (Gal.)/*amostra* (Port.) 'sample'; *arraiano* (Gal.)/*raiano* (Port.) 'from the border'. In fact, as Mariño Paz mentions: "A independencia e o baixo nivel de comunicación política e cultural entre as dúas áreas acabou conformando dous idiomas distintos a partir do que primitivamente nom eran máis ca diferencias dialectais entre a variedade do norte e a variedade do sur" (Mariño Paz 1999: 129). ["Independence, and the low level of political and cultural communication between the two areas, resulted in the creation of two distinct languages from what were originally nothing more than dialectal differences between the northern and southern varieties"].

recadar with the sense of ‘transmit a message’ (“E, pera *recadar* est[o], mãdou alla por embaxadores o bispo de Burgos [que avya nome] dom Mouriz e dom Pedro, abbade de Ryo Seco e dom Pedro, prior da hordem do Espital”), and *arrecadar*, meaning ‘collect dues, rents’ and thus ‘receive’ (“E mando, aos que ham d’*arrecadar* por mÿ as rendas e dereitos, que vos nõ façam agravamêto nõ vos tomê mais do dizimo, segundo manda a vossa ley”) (CIPM).

The prefix *a-* is also seen later in another lexical item, although the dental has been assimilated into the subsequent consonant: *amjniftrar* ‘to administer’ (1459 MA 111) and *amaniftrarem* (1505 MA 138). In one case, as indicating ‘agent’, the configuration of the original Latin preposition is maintained: *admjniftrador* ‘administrator’ (1482 MA 125); these three forms together make up only 33% of all occurrences in the corpus of forms based on the signifier /miniʃtr-/¹³.

Mention must also be made of the archaic deadjectival verb *aquentar* ‘to heat’, consisting of the transference of a property (which defines the predicative base), which can be expressed by the paraphrase “transform into/make PRED”, that is, denoting a change of state with a final direction. The circumfix (Rio-Torto 1998: 122)¹⁴ in archaic Portuguese is *a-...-a-* (*aquentar*): *aquentedes* (1383 Alj 53) and *aquêtaua* (1467 Mai 117). According to José Joaquim Nunes, this verbal item belongs to the group of those formed with the suffix *-ntar*, which became popular; “though its vitality is now almost or entirely extinct” (Nunes 1989: 382)¹⁵.

From the mid-15th century the phenomenon had such creative power that it spread by analogy to nouns and adverbs: **abaftante* ‘sufficient’ (1452 MA 106; 1459 MA 111), **abaftãte* (1455 MA 108), **alagar* ‘olive oil press; wine press’ (1453 MA 107), **apaul* ‘marsh’ (1502 MA 137, 5 v.), **Apaul* (1502 MA 137), **apauil* (1502 MA 137), **arremataçam* ‘auction’ (1528 MA 147), **arremataçam* (1495 MA 134), **ajfajego*¹⁶ ‘peace’ (1490 MA 131), **ajfeg[ũ]do* ‘according to’ (1489 MA 130), **atão* ‘such/so’ (1541 Sal 152). In the 16th century this prefixal change was still very much alive: **arõpã* (1502 MA 137), **arrenũciando* (1527 MA 146 and 1528 MA 147), **arrenũciando* (1522 MA 144), **arrezoarã* [from *arrezoar* ‘to discuss’ (1565 Alc 153)], **arrõpã* (1500 MA 136), and was seen also in past participles: **arroto* ‘broken’ (1505 MA 138), **ajelada* ‘saddled’ (1526 Ped 145), **ajellada* (1536 SC 150), **ajêtado* ‘seated’ (1515 SM 141), **ajelada* (1536 SC 150).

The data presented seem to indicate a general tendency: the prefix *a-/ad-*, as a particle of reinforcement or support in many cases already existent in Latin, is less frequent in words where (i) the following syllable begins with a dental, alveolar or palatal consonant, or (ii) the following syllable contains the vowel *a*. On the other hand, it seems to us that more important than the question of combinatory phonetics is the question of semantics. According to Rui Abel Pereira:

este prefixo comporta funções sêmicas ADLATIVAS de “aproximação” em relação a um limite ou a um ponto de destino. O conteúdo adlativo que caracteriza o prefixo *a(d)-* não implica necessariamente a ideia de deslocamento espacial, pois pode concretizar-se na de simples direcção da acção até um ponto terminal, correspondendo este, por exemplo, a uma propriedade ou conjunto de propriedades. Assim se explica que este prefixo se possa usar para exprimir tanto uma mudança de lugar [...] como uma mudança de estado [...]. Muitos verbos iniciados por este prefixo descendem já do latim, coexistindo com um conjunto vasto de produtos formados sobre um adjectivo ou um substantivo portugueses, que podem significar a mudança de estado ou a aquisição de uma propriedade por um objecto [...], a aproximação dum lugar [...], a transformação de um objecto num outro [...], a afectação de qualquer coisa com um objecto [...]. (Pereira 2000: 51-52).

[this prefix performs ADLATIVE semic functions, indicating ‘approximation’ in relation to a limit or destination. The adlative content characteristic of the prefix *a(d)-* does not necessarily imply an idea of spatial move-

¹³ The following are the occurrences without prefix: *mjniftrador* (1414 Alv 76), *miniʃtrador* (1478 MA 122 and 1478 MA 123), *meniftrador* (1479 MA 124), *maniftrare* (1505 MA 138) and *mjniftrar* (1536 SC 150).

¹⁴ According to Rio-Torto, “reflexão recente tem defendido que os verbos cuja base se encontra rodeada por estruturas do tipo *a-...-a-* (...), são produtos formados por prefixação”. (Rio-Torto 1998: 122). [“recent reflection has suggested that verbs with bases surrounded with structures of the type *a-...-a-* (...) are products formed by prefixation”]. She adds, however, “trata-se, contudo, de hipóteses a merecerem aturada reflexão” [“these are hypotheses which deserve further reflection”].

¹⁵ In the “Dicionário de Alcobaça” (14th cent.) there appears *aquecer* rather than *aquentar* (Carter 1952-1953: see under “aquecer”).

¹⁶ This is the dominant variant in the *Crónica de Castela* (Barbosa 1958: III, 26).

ment, since it can be seen in a simple direction of the action to an end point, which may be, for example, a property or a set of properties. This explains why the prefix can be used to express not only a change of place [...] but also a change of state [...]. Many verbs beginning with this prefix came from Latin, coexisting with a vast set of products formed from a Portuguese adjective or noun, which can signify a change of state or the acquisition of a property by an object [...], approximation to a place [...], transformation of one object into another [...], the transference of something with an object [...].

In fact, *aproveitar* derives from PROFICĒRE, ‘prosper’, ‘be useful’; in the specific case of the present documents, ‘take advantage of’, ‘make use of’. The form *arrecadar* came from Vulgar Latin RECAPĪTARE (probably a modification of Latin RECEPTARE, later RECAPTARE, due to the influence of CAPITALIS ‘goods’), the original meaning of which (‘receive’, ‘regain’) easily transformed into ‘collect taxes’. The form *aprazer* (< PLĀCĒRE) meant ‘please’, ‘satisfy’, and *administrar* ‘administer’, which existed in Latin¹⁷ (< ADMĪNĪSTRARE, de MINISTER), usually meant ‘serve (at table), help, supply’ – only later did it acquire its present meaning, (‘direct’, ‘govern’). Thus the need for the prefix seems to have accompanied the semantic alterations of the base word, and the effect of its addition was to reinforce the idea of a move in the direction of satisfaction, of the well-being or happiness of the individual.

An interesting phenomenon is seen in the pair *penhorar/apenhorar*. The form *penhorar* ‘legally seize the goods of the debtor as a security for a debt’ (< PĪGNŌRĀRE) is a technical term in juridical jargon which does not favor the subject, since the action expressed by the verb carries a negative idea (taking the goods of someone who does not fulfil what was established in the clauses of the contract, possibly through non-payment). Curiously, the prefixed form *apenhorar* also exists in contemporary Portuguese with the same meaning, but with a change in perspective or viewpoint (‘give as a pledge, as a guarantee’), that is, from the position (although unfavorable) of the subject. Both forms existed in medieval Portuguese, according to the data in our corpus, but everything leads us to believe that in the earliest phase of the language (13th century), the form meaning ‘give as a guarantee’ was the unprefixated, base form, the same which indicated the act of legal seizure. Thus:

PĪGNŌRĀRE > **enpenhorar*; *apenhorar* / *penhorar* (arc.) > *apenhorar* / *penhorar* (mod.)

The examples we have are few: *penhorar* (1291 Alc 2) and *penhoredef* (1291 Alc 3), found in the following contexts:

“nō <uos> feia a uos cōuenhauel o dicto cafal a uēder nē doar nē enprazar nē *penhorar* a nēhū crerigo nē a caualeyro nē a efcudeyro nē a relegiofo nē a outra pefoa qual quer” (1291 Alc 2)

“nē uēdadef os ditof cafaef nē doedef nē *penhoredef* nē enprazedef a nēhūu clerigo nē a caualeyro nē a efcudeyro nē a religiofo nē a nēhū” (1291 Alc 3)

Probably to avoid this ambiguity, notaries began to use the prefix *a-* when dealing with the party subject to obligations:

“e el nō léer podrofo de as uēder nē enprazar nē *apenhorar* nē en nēhūa maneyra alhear” (1304 Alc 9)

This need was perceived very early, but there were probably some hesitations, as shown in the intermediate form *enpenhorar* (1297 Alc 5)¹⁸:

“e nō uos feya outorgado deffe herdamēto uender nē dōar nē *enpenhorar* a clerigo ou a caualeyro ou a efcudeyro” (1297 Alc 5)

¹⁷ The form *administrar* is found in medieval Latin (Niermeyer 1976: see under “administrar”).

¹⁸ In document 20 of *Um formulário monástico português medieval: o manuscrito alcobacense 47 da BNL*, edited by Saul António Gomes, we find *inpignorar*, which must be the basis of the formation. This prefixed variant is seen from the 12th century, and must have been the one most used in the earliest stages of the language. Cf. Lorenzo 1977, see under “enpenorar”.

The forms without prefix *a-* (meaning ‘confiscate, seize goods’) are in the majority (probably emphasizing a discursive structure which stressed the power of those taking the property), being found throughout most of the 14th century: *penhorar* (1332 Alc 24; 1345 MA 33, 2 v.; 1356 MA 41; 1359 MA 42; 1362 MA 43; 1362 MA 44; 1363 MA 45; 1372 MA 47; 1379 Alc 51; 1386 MA 56), *penhoremos* (1375 MA 48), *penhoraria* (1444 Alv 100). We also find the past participle *penhorado* (1442 MA 98 and 1444 Alv 100). The type of clause where they are found is as follows:

“nos deuemos filhar pera nos as dictas uias e cafa e *penhorar* e cõtrêger uos polos dictos noifos dereitos e polas perdas e danos e cuftas que nas dictas coufas per uoifã rrazõ rreçebermos” (1332 Alc 24).

Taking into account the type of text and the nature of the documents, with innumerable legal clauses which became more complex from the 1380s onwards, the pair *apenhorar* ~ *penhorar* began to emerge from 1388 (1388 MA 58; 1397 MA 63; 1397 MA 64; 1399 MA 66; 1408 MA 71; 1419 MA 79; 1423 MA 83 and 1450 Alv 104), while after 1450 only forms without the prefix are found: *penhorar* (1452 MA 106, 2 v.; 1453 MA 107; 1465 MA 116; 1467 Mai 117).

In other cases, semantic specialization happened slightly later, with loss of the prefix:

**aguardar* ~ *guardar* (arc.) > *guardar* (arc.) > *aguardar* ~ *guardar* (mod.)

In these lexical units, the forms with and without the prefix *a-* survive together for some time, the prefixed forms later dying out. An example is the form *aguardar* ‘observe’, ‘fulfil’: in our corpus, there seem to be two phases: up to 1425 the form *guardar* (e.g. “*guardando* e cõprindo uos fõbredictos e todos uoifos fõceffores todalas fõbredictas claufulas e cõdições”, 1386 MA 56) occupies approximately 65%; after that date the rate rises to 95%, with the last form with *a* dating from 1429: *aguardando* (e.g. “*cõprindo* uos e *aguardando* as dictas” [cláusulas], 1429 MA 88). It should be noted that in two documents from 1459, written by different notaries, the form *ef-guardando* appears, probably as a reaction to the loss of the supporting particle, thus apparently showing awareness of a recently completed process of change:

(1) “os fõbre dictos dyfõeram que, veendo e *efguardando* elles fõruço de Deus, proll e honrra do dicto moifteiro” (1459 MA 110)

(2) “os fõbre ditos difõerom que *efguardando* elles fõruço de Deus, proll e honrra do dito moeifteiro” (1459 MA 111)

In contemporary Portuguese, *aguardar* coexists with *guardar*, despite well-known semantic restrictions (‘to wait’ and ‘to keep’ respectively). The base *guardar* derives, through Vulgar Latin, from the Germanic *WARDŌN, of which it keeps the meaning. Today, the meaning of *aguardar* is ‘wait’, which was already known in the 13th century, for example in the *Cantigas de Santa Maria*: “Aquest’ é o que tant’ ei buscado/ A creer devemos que todo pecado / Pero se aquest’ é fol, pela ventura, / *aguarda-lo-ei* tõe la noit’ escura / ca se el non é ben louco de natura / algur irá long’ albergar apartado” (CIPM).

Thus *guardar* and *aguardar* probably shared the semic trace ‘fulfil, respect, during the required time’. It was probably through the need for specialization and semantic restriction that *aguardar*, when it appeared in juridical language, lost the prefix – that is, to distinguish it from *aguardar* meaning ‘wait’.

There were other cases where semantic specialization seems to have started by being grammatical (categorical) in nature:

**parecer* ~ *aparecer* (arc.) > *aparecer/comparecer* ~ *parecer* (mod.)

Throughout the corpus, all occurrences of the inflected forms of *aparecer* ‘to present oneself before someone, normally the judge’) (< *APPARĒSCĒRE), common in all the romances of Gaul and

Hispania¹⁹, appear systematically without prosthesis: *parecer* (< PARĒSCĒRE, an inchoative derivative of PARĒRE, ‘appear’, ‘seem’):

pareça (1428 Alj 86), *pareceo* (1422 MA 81; 1487 PP 129), *pareceo* (1383 Alj 53; 1396 Ped 62; 1412 Ped 74; 1415 Ped 77; 1421 Evo 80; 1442 SM 97; 1444 Alv 100; 1452 MA 106; 1491 Alj 133; 1496 SM 135; 1521 SM 141; 1521 Ped 143; 1526 Ped 145; 1536 SC 150; 1565 Alc 153), *pareçera* (1414 Alv 76), *pareçeram* (1421 Evo 80), *parecerê* (1565 Alc 153), *parecerô* (1434 SC 91), *pareçerô* (1436 Alf 93); *pareçerom* (1402 Ped 68; 1448 Alj 103; 1456 MA 109), *pareçeje* (1451 MA 105), *pareçeu* (1451 MA 105, 3 v.; 1460 MA 113, 3 v.), *pareçom* (1440 MA 96).

In this case too, medieval juridical technoelect opted for the unprefixated form, possibly to distinguish the meanings of *parecer* (‘appear before the judge’, ‘attend’) from *aparecer* which, apart from meaning ‘appear in the light of day’, ‘make visible’ (very frequent from the 13th century onwards, especially in religious and moralistic texts), also appeared very early with the same meaning, as we see in the *Foro Real*, treatise of Laws, probably dating from 1280:

“Poys que o alcaide poser prazo aas partes q(ue) *aparecã* ant’el rey ou ante aquel que á de iuigar o alçamento” (CIPM).

In the same *Foro Real*, the other variant is also found, with the agent/subject having the trace [-animate]:

“porende estabelecem(os) q(ue) se os fruytos ficã e *parecê* ena h(er)dad(e) aa sazõ da morte, q(ue) se partã p(er) meo o viuõ e os erdeyros do morto” (CIPM).

On the other hand, the medieval forms of *aparecer* only have *a* in the infinitive, the occurrence appearing in a document by the same notary who, curiously, nine years before had opted for the variant without *a*: “o dicto frey Lopo me diê *que* o termo a *que* o dicto Afomjo Lourenço auya de *pareçer* era pañado e mujto mais” (1451 MA 105). After this, only document 1460 MA 113 has this form of the infinitive, which has addition of *a*- in all occurrences:

- (1) “e me moñrou hũu eftormêto de *dya de apareçer que* parecyã feer factõ e alijnado per Pero Fernãdez”.
- (2) “e o procurador <do moeñeiro> uos pidyu o dicto *dya d’apareçer*”
- (3) “o procurador do moeñeiro me diê *que* o termo a *que* a dicta apelaçõ perante mjm auya d’*apareçer* era pañado e mujto mais”
- (4) “e viũto o dicto eftormêto e como o termo a *que* a dicta apelaçom ouuera de *apareçer* era pañado e mujto mais”
- (5) “E viũto o dicto eftormêto de *dya d’apareçer*”

It is possible that the appearance of *a*- may have been encouraged by previously existing forms such as *dya*, *auya* and *ouuera*, all ending in *a*, and so it is natural that prothetic *a* can be explained by syntactic phonetics. Anyway, the same notary uses the same construction, without prefix, in 1451 (“*auya de parecer*”), so it seems that from the second half of the 15th century there begins a stage of semantic and grammatical awareness in the use of this prefix²⁰. In fact, *aparecer* only appears in this document to refer to a special type of instrument, namely that stipulating the date of appearance before the judge: “o eftormêto de *dya d’apareçer*”. It is curious how unprefixated flexional variants are always used to refer to the event – the process – while the prefixed variant is used for the concept, the juridical document which was motivating this process, where the date of appearance was stipulated. It seems to us, therefore, that use of

¹⁹ The verb form APPARESCERE existed in Vulgar Latin (Grandgent 1991⁵: 40).

²⁰ This metalinguistic awareness is highly important, and relevant for many of the questions posed by Geeraerts and Kristiansen on the processing and representation of linguistic variation: “Are there any cultural models of language diversity: what models of lectal variation, standardization, and language change do people work with? To what extent do attitudinal and perceptual factors have an influence on language change? How do language users acquire lectal competence, how is it stored mentally, and how does it work in language production?” (Geeraerts / Kristiansen 2012: 8).

the forms *parecer* and *aparecer* was semantically and pragmatically motivated in the juridical discourse we are analyzing here.

In contemporary Portuguese, neither *parecer* nor *aparecer* exist with this meaning, having been replaced by *comparecer* 'to appear in court', which must have been of more recent creation. In fact, the first two verbs are too ambiguous and polysemic to survive in functional language.

To sum up, we hope to have thrown a little more light on the phenomenon of the addition of *a-* (prothetic or prefixal), thus completing the study by Rodney Sampson, according to whom:

Unfortunately, due to the general lack of research by Romanists into the etiology of this category of prosthesis, the relative significance of the individual factors that have been considered remains uncertain. It is to be hoped that *future investigation will help to clarify this question and also perhaps reveal further relevant contributory factors* (Sampson 2010: 180, emphasis added).

On the other hand, all the cases of polysemy we have presented lead us to agree with Augusto Soares da Silva: "Se os significados e consequentemente a polissemia são inerentemente flexíveis, então a mutabilidade é uma componente de qualquer estágio sincrónico de língua e daí a integração natural das perspetivas sincrónica e diacrónica" (Silva 2003: 166, emphasis added). ["If meanings and hence polysemy are inherently flexible, then mutability is a component of any synchronic period of language, and synchronic and diachronic perspectives are thus naturally integrated."].

Rather different, in terms of the rhythm and the directionality of change, are the phenomena seen in *vogado* and *frontar*, the former a technico-scientific (juridical) term associated with litigation for non-compliance or prevarication on the part of one of the parties involved in a contract, the latter a term which now has negative semantic content, in both juridical and common use:

ADUOCĀTU- > **vogado* (arc.) > *advogado* (mod.)

The prefix *ad-* in the professional name *advogado* (ADUOCATU-, participle of ADVOCĀRE, 'summon, in the quality of advocate or defence counsel', a derivative of VOCARE, 'call; that is, 'he who is called to be with, to help or defend, someone') is not found in the period covered by this study, when the forms *uogado/ vogado(s)* occur throughout: "Gonçalo Perez *vogado*" (1326 MA 19), "Martin Anes *vogado*" (1326 MA 19), "Martjn Loureço *vogado*" (1353 SC 39), etc. As in *administrar*, what we have here is an erudite term, with the prefix joining the base *vogado* probably from the end of the 15th century. In fact it is only in 1504 that we find the infinitive *advogar* and the noun *avogado*, in the *Catecismo*: "e ho *avogado* por nom *avogar* ou mal *advogar*, nom se deve restituyr a quem ho deu" (CIPM).

In this product, the adlative semic function has been lost during the medieval period, probably because the base itself already had a telic dimension, the idea of 'direction of the action to an end point'. The erudite reintroduction, which in principle would remain unidirectionally in the norm, may also have been due to a need for conceptual rigor in juridical language, characteristic of the 16th century: 'to summon *ad hoc*', for a specific cause (to defend someone), as opposed to other types of call.

afrontar ~ *frontar* (arc.) > *frontar* (arc.) > *afrontar* (mod.)

The same happened with the variants of *afrontar* (from FRONTE, perhaps related to the base *AFFRÖNTĀRE)²¹, 'require, ask repeatedly, testify', which only appears in the first half of the 14th century, although in variation within the same text with the unprefixal forms *afrôta* ~ *frôtarā* (1328 Alv 20); *affrôtou*, *afrontou* ~ *frôttau* (1336 Alj 26) and *affrôttau* ~ *ffrôtou* (1338 Alv 28). In the

²¹ Lorenzo 1977, see under "afrontar".

corpus as a whole, the prefixed forms do not exceed 25% of occurrences, having disappeared after 1350²². The form (*a*)*frontar* is often inserted in the expressions “dizer e *frontar*”, “*frontar* e requerer”, “*frontar* aos ditos juizes”, “dar um testemunho da *afronta*”, etc. The verb (*a*)*frontar* had other meanings too, such as ‘denounce’ and ‘accuse’.

The early loss of prefix *a-* in juridical Portuguese must, in principle, have been due to the need for a distinction from the homonymous form *afrontar* ‘pressurize’ ‘molest’ ‘trouble’, already found in the 13th century in troubadour poetry (Lorenzo 1977: see under “*afrontar*”). In Castillian, *afrontar* is found from the 9th to the 15th centuries, after which the modern form *afrentar* begins to appear (Lorenzo 1977, see under *afrentar*). It is highly probable that the loss of the prefix in juridical language is due to the need to distinguish between *frontar* (‘request’) and *afrontar* (‘contest’, ‘denounce’, ‘accuse’, and, by semantic extension, ‘insult’, ‘molest’, in common language. In this case the prefix *ad-* carries an idea of negativity, unlike the base word, which would have been more neutral. In this case, too, juridical language opted for the unprefixed variant throughout the medieval period. Currently the prefix forms part of juridical vocabulary in which only *afronta* (‘confrontation’, ‘injury’, ‘affront’, ‘provocation’) appears. It is in this sense that it is found in the following passage from the *Crónica do Conde D. Pedro de Meneses*:

“omde os cr(ist)ãos foram tam *afrontados*, que os dous que heram d’acordo de se darê aos ymigos lhe lamçarão as capas, as quaes os mouros fezeram em tamtos pedaços, que nõ avia no mumdo allfayate que as podesse ajumtar” (CIPM).

2.2. Prefix *en-*

The historically representative form of ALIENARE is *alhear* (1291 Alc 3; 1324 Alc 18; 1453 MA 107), also found in the variant *enhear* (1403 MA 69). The most common form in our corpus, however, is *enalhear*, the result of a historical process which already in Latin had added a prefix to the base (< INALIENARE, ‘alienate’, ‘transfer possession’)²³. Here, the suffix was decidedly refined, despite its very frequent use, and quite early on it passed into Romance languages, where it lost its negative sense. In Spanish, for example, it was only seen up to the 15th century (Brea 1976: 337). The following are the examples in our corpus:

éalhear (1345 MA 33; 1362 MA 43; 1362 MA 44; 1375 MA 48; 1386 MA 56; 1397 MA 63; 1397 MA 64; 1399 MA 66; 1408 MA 71; 1423 MA 83; 1478 MA 123; 1479 MA 124; 1485 MA 128; 1502 MA 137), *emalhear* (1405 MA 70; 1416 MA 78; 1419 MA 79; 1450 Alv 104; 1460 MA 112; 1465 MA 116; 1505 MA 138), *emalhea[r]* (1410 MA 73; 1452 MA 106), *enalhear* (1321 Alc 17; 1337 Alc 27; 1356 MA 41; 1388 MA 58; 1409 MA 72; 1413 MA 75).

Considering the negative structures in which these verbal forms appear, the prefix *en-* adds no meaning to the base word, only serving as a (redundant) reinforcing particle. The same occurs in the archaic *êpeiorar* ‘worsen’: *êpeiorado* (1350 AM 36), where the affixal operator *en-* represents only 3.4% of occurrences of this deverbal product, coexisting with *peiorajem* in the same document. Once again, it is the deverbal adjectives that are most receptive to the prefix.

According to Rio-Torto *et al.*, “o prefixo *en-* junta-se a bases nominais (cerca de 91%); as bases adjetivais representam 9 %, e são quase exclusivamente iniciadas por consoante. As exceções são em número muito reduzido (*enamorar*, *enouricar*)” (Rio-Torto *et al.* 2013: 287). [“the prefix *en-* is joined to noun bases (approximately 91%); adjectival bases represent 9%, and almost all of them begin with a consonant. There are very few exceptions (*enamorar*, *enouricar*)”] (Rio-Torto *et al.* 2013: 287). We do not know the situation for medieval Portuguese, since no systematic study of this prefix in the available corpora has yet been made.

²² The form *fronta* exists currently in Cape Verde Creole with the meaning of ‘misfortune’, so it must have had considerable semantic breadth in the 16th century.

²³ Gaffiot 1934: see under INALIENATUS, -A, -UM. According to Ramón Lorenzo, the form derives from EN and ALLEAR (< ALIENARE). Lorenzo 1977: see under “enalleado”.

2.3. Prefix *re-*

Normally, the effect of this prefix is to intensify, repeat or reiterate. The examples of verbs in our corpus are:

refaçades [from *refazer*, 're-do' (1413 MA 75)], *refez[er]d[e]s* (1413 MA 75), *rrefazêdo* (1422 MA 82), *rrefaçad[e]s* (1423 MA 83), *rrefarees* (1452 MA 106), *rrefaçades* (1452 MA 106), *rrepayraredes* (1453 MA 107), *rreconhoçã* (1456 MA 109), *rrefaçades* (1465 MA 116), *rrefaçadeo* (1469 Cel 118), *rrepayredeo* (1478 MA 122), *rrefaçades* (1356 MA 41, 2 v.; 1453 MA 107), *rrefaçades* (1362 MA 43; 1386 MA 56; 1388 MA 58), *rrefaçades* (1363 MA 45; 1429 MA 88), *rrepairaredes* [from *repairar*, arc. 'repair' (1465 MA 116)], *rrepairredes* (1383 Alj 53) and *rrepaired[e]s* (1397 MA 64).

The deverbal noun *rrefazymêtos* 'repairs' is also found (1422 MA 82).

However, there is one case which does not fit into this type of semantic format. In fact, the adjective *nouo* often appears as a noun through a process of elision²⁴, which opens the way to a change of category and hence to a phenomenon of conversion or reanalysis. It was probably to avoid homonymic ambiguities that there arose the product with prefix *re-*: *renouos* (1337 Alc 27), *rrenouos* (1379 Alc 51, 2 v.), in the sense of 'early Spring vegetables', 'agricultural produce, generally horticultural', 'first vegetables'. In fact, *nouos* can appear qualifying "fruytos":

"froytos *nouos*" (1304 Alc 10), "froytos *nouos*" (1321 Alc 17), "ffructos *nouos*" (1324 Alc 18, 2 v.),

or as the second element of a coordinate noun structure:

"froytos e *nouos*" (1304 Alc 10), "froytos e *nouos*" (1346 Tur 35), "ffruytos e *nouos*" (1372 MA 47), "froytos e *nouos*" (1383 Alj 53), "froytos e *nouos*" (1472 TC 120).

This ambiguity of category is seen in document 1304 Alc 10, which, besides having "froytos *nouos*", also has "froytos e *nouos*". We should note that document 1379 Alc 51 shows the form *rrenouos* either as the second element of a coordinate structure ("frutos e *renouos*") or isolated ("todolos *rrenouos*"). The prefix *re-* is included, therefore, in the final product through a process of lexicalization, having lost its original meaning of intensity, deriving from that of repetition, as seen in *recurvo*, 'very curved', *resseco*, 'very dry', *revelho*, 'very old' (Rio-Torto et al. 2013: 356). Naturally, as with grammaticalization, one of the questions on lexicalization which could be investigated would be "a diferença essencial (se é que existe) entre itens lexicais e itens gramaticais" (Silva 1996: 134) ["the essential difference (if it in fact exists) between lexical and grammatical items". This case points to the need to relate grammaticalization with lexicalization, an aspect highlighted by Juan C. Morena Cabrera:

a strong tendency exists for grammaticalization processes to feed lexicalization processes, and that there is a close interaction between both procedures. This interaction is crucial for having a better understanding of the evolutionary dynamics of lexical and grammatical elements (Moreno Cabrera 1998: 223).

2.4. Prefix *des-*

The prefix *des-* probably comes from the Latin prefix *DIS-*, although there is also the possibility that it originated in the agglutination of *DE* + *EX*. It is now the most common prefix, and the most creative in the formation of words implying deprivation ('separation', 'withdrawal'). In our corpus, it joins with various bases to indicate the notion of 'contrary action', 'negation', 'opposition' or 'privation', which are contained in terms with the same semantic content as in current Portuguese, especially with previously parasyntetic bases, originating from nouns or adjectives/participles: *de[con]tentament[os]* 'discontents' (1490 MA 131), *de[corjm]en[en]to* 'lack of care'

²⁴ Seen in the Latin expression "de omnibus fructibus et de omnibus *bonis* que Deus dederit", where *bonos* seems to have the same meaning as *novos* (Gomes 1999: 168).

(1495 MA 134), *dejag*[*u*]jado ‘disagreement’ (1351 Alv 37), *deja*pojado ‘debilitated’ (1336 Alj 26, 2 v.), *de*fatado ‘untied’, ‘exempt’ (1455 MA 108), *de*jóbrjado ‘exempt’ (1455 MA 108), *de*ffemcaredado [*ff*iuas comcyemcyas]²⁵ [from *de*ffemcaredar ‘to clear (their consciences)’ (1536 SC 150)] or in prefixed words based on verbs: *de*fenparard[e]s [from *de*fenparar ‘to abandon’ (1405 MA 70)], *de*fenparardes (1386 MA 56; 1388 MA 58; 1397 MA 63), *de*jēp[ar]ardes (1337 Alc 27).

The fact is that this prefix does not always have a stable semantic value that changes the meaning of the base in a regular way. Some examples prove that, in medieval (14th – 15th centuries) as in current Portuguese, this prefix brings no contrary meaning to the base, which (in our corpus) is affected by the trace [- human]: *de*fperefcā ‘to perish, to fade’ (1304 Alc 9), *de*fperefcam (1304 Alc 9) and *de*fperecejem (1422 MA 81). This prefix, when added to the base in question, however, is not very productive: the examples cited above form only 17% of the total. In current Portuguese we see the same phenomenon with *falecer* and *desfalecer*, although with restrictions of meaning: *desfalecer* now means ‘lose consciousness, faint’, which is neither the opposite nor a synonym of *falecer* (‘die’).

Neither does *de*ff-, in the non-parasynthetic product *de*ffcauar (1450 Alv 104), signify negation, not least because it appears next to *cauar* ‘dig’ in the same coordinate structure: “*de*ffcauar e podar e empaar e amjrgulhar e *cauar* e arrendar”. In this context, the prefix *de*- in *de*ffcauar must mean the same as *es*-, whose meaning we shall examine later; this is a case of analogical hyper-correction, caused by the association of *de*- with the act of removal (of the earth around the stalk) and hence of ‘contrary movement’ or ‘privation’. It is curious to note that the only occurrence of *de*- added to *cauar* is found in this document, which enriches a substantial set of linguistic specificities from documents produced by notaries of the outlying *couto* of Alvorninha. It should be noted that the form *descavar* is still used in certain rural areas of Portugal (“*descavar* videiras” ‘clear earth around vines’ is a very common expression in Beira Alta and Beira Litoral, for example).

Another very interesting lexical item is *de*ffazer, the context of which does not allow us to link *de*- to a contrary action (‘undo’), since the SN selected by the base cannot semantically possess the trace [+ constructed object]:

“e vem oje em dia *de*ffazer o dito *pexe* por parte do dito moiteiro e que ao dito moiteiro fe leuaua ho azeite [from the fish (whale)] e per feus officias fie ffaz todo sem nenhũa cõmdjçam de pefoa algũa, e o dito juiz afy dife fer todo verdade” (1515 SM 141).

It is interesting to notice that the prefix *de*- does not always have a sense of reversal, as in contemporary European Portuguese²⁶. In fact, in this context, the meaning of *de*ffazer could be similar to the base without the prefix, if we understand it in the sense of ‘arrange’, ‘prepare’ (‘gut fish’). The prefix here is not negative, with a dynamic root, but static.

A very curious example mentioned by José Pedro Machado is *de*leixar, which does not seem to be from Latin DELAXARE, since the intermediate forms *de*aixar and *dee*ixar are lacking, and whose meaning does not seem to diverge from that of *de*ixar ‘abandon, leave, allow, let...’. It is seen in the following passage from a text in medieval Latin (1188-1230): “Nvlhis homo qui obie-rit et non *delaxare* nullo auer ad suos filios... et si dilexarent auer quia illos hereditand respondant et si non *delaxarent* unde lo quitem, dent lo qui habuit de herentia”, *Leges*, p. 838. In Portuguese texts, from the 13th century there is: “...ingano no coração nom teer, paz falsa non dar, caridade non *de*leixar, non jurar...”, in the *Inéd. Alc.*, I, p. 259. The verb continued in use in the 15th century, as seen in the *Livro da ensinança de bem cavalgar*: “E nom porem em tal guisa que se *de*leixe na sella...”, cap. I, p. 66²⁷.

If we remember that speakers of some northern dialectal varieties only know the expression “*des*fazer a barba” ‘to shave’, it seems tempting to see some productivity in the prefix *de*-

²⁵ “tynham *de*ffemcaredado ffuvas comcyemcyas”. The -em- can be considered an interfix (*de*s + em + Vb), non-existent in current Portuguese in this lexical product.

²⁶ Considerations of this type, which can give us important dialectal information, are not mentioned by Rio-Torto *et al.* (2013: 358).

²⁷ All the examples presented here were collected in Machado 1995: see under *de*ixar.

throughout the history of Portuguese, as a form of reinforcement or intensity²⁸. The distinction between *trocar* and *destrocar* (pop.), with the latter taking a countable argument (a banknote, for example), seems to support this hypothesis.

Thus, considering the examples we have just analyzed, it seems possible that the prefix *des-* merits a deeper diachronic analysis, which would consider the semantics of the base as well as its argument structure. In our view, the main interest in the analysis of this prefix seems to lie in the contrasts or similarities with archaic and modern Portuguese, since an analysis in terms of morphological/ semantic interface will allow us to generalize on the nature, motivations, mechanisms and directionality of change in Portuguese word-formation.

2.5. Prefix *es-*

Having been lost as a preposition in Latin, *ex-* survived as a prefix in the signifier /*es-*/. From *cauar*, *efcauar* 'excavate' was formed by prefixation, giving another meaning to this lexical unit, not to be confined to the semantic value of separation (in this case, of 'extraction') (Rio-Torto 2013: 368). We shall analyze the following examples:

- (1) "outroffli podedes e empéedes *cauedes* e *efcauedes*" (1356 MA 41)
- (2) "empeedes *cauedes fcauades*" (1362 MA 44)
- (3) "tapedes podedes empeedes *cauedes fcauades*" (1362 MA 44)
- (4) "*fcauedes* podedes épéedes fégedes *cauedes*" (1375 MA 48)
- (5) "*fcauardes* amergulhardes tapardes podardes épáardes legardes *caua[r]des*" (1375 MA 48)
- (6) "poded[e]s e épedes e *caued[e]s* e mjrgulhedes e (...) e *efcaued[e]s*" (1377 Alv 50)
- (7) "*caued[e]s* e mjrgulhedes e *efcaued[e]s* e rrendedes" (1380 Alv 52)
- (8) "e *cauedes* e amjrgolhedes (...) *efcauedes* ante da poda" (1383 Alj 53)
- (9) "lauredes e arrotedes e *efcauedes* oljua" (1383 Alj 53)
- (10) "adubedes e *caued[e]s* e arrendedes e *fcaued[e]s* e enpaedes" (1408 MA 71)
- (11) "*efcauem* e êpeem e quauê" (1479 MA 124)

The contexts show us that the SN selected by *efcauar* is considered individually and is therefore countable (as in *podar* 'to prune' and *empar* 'to stake'), while that of *cauar* is seen as a unit or an indivisible continuum, with elements that are not viewed individually (and is therefore uncountable). Thus *efcauar* would mean 'make a hole beside a tree, plant or bush' and *cauar* would apply to earth in general. Syntactically, this semantic difference is seen at the level of the argument structure of the verb: *cauar* is normally an intransitive verb, while *efcauar* (though it can be used intransitively)²⁹, can be transitive, taking two arguments.

In current Portuguese, *escavar* still exists with the same meaning in rural areas, while in urban settings it is associated with archeological activities: its meaning therefore carries an important sociocognitive dimension. In the two cases, however, the verb has a common semantic trace, namely the teleological dimension it describes – that is, in both situations the action described (always needing an Agent) leads to a pre-determined end.

It is curious to see that in the same document which has *deffcauar*, we also find *effcâpados* 'open fields' (1450 Alv 104) and *efcâpados* (1450 Alv 104), whose prefix (signifying "privation" in archaic Portuguese) is *des-* in contemporary Portuguese, rather than *es-*. According to Rui Abel Pereira: "Desde os tempos latinos *es-* compete com *des-* no sentido de 'separação', 'extracção'. Os falantes confundem os dois prefixos a cada passo por causa da sua semelhança fónica (...)"

²⁸ In fact in 1124 the same lexical product appears, taking an internal argument considered as countable: "Ferreiro que for morador *desfaza* v mallios pro illo anno"; *Leges*, p. 364 (Machado 1995: see under "malho"). The meaning of "malho" is 'martelo' ('hammer'). In the *Crónica de Castela*, however, the form *desfarey* appears, precisely with the meaning of the base [Barbosa 1958: vol. III, see under "desfazer": "Eu quero fazer hũu engano, por razão de aver algo pera este tempo pera que dé aos que forê comigo; e, se Deus mi der consello, eu'llo *desfarey* muyto agiãna" (87-9)].

²⁹ In rural areas of the Douro, *escavar* is used for the operation carried out immediately after the grape harvest, in which ditches are dug beside each vine in order to fertilize them (e.g. with leaves and bark from the stems).

(Pereira 2000: 54). [“Since Latin times *es-* has competed with *des-* in the sense of ‘separation’, ‘extraction’. Speakers often confuse the two prefixes because of their phonetic similarity (...)”].

In other lexical products (denominal verbs) current Portuguese, like Galician and Catalan (Neira 1976: 317), accepts *es-* or *des-*, although in the corpus the signifier *des-* has never been found. This is the verb of change of state which can be paraphrased as “transform /change (one-self) into base noun”, the base of which is *pedaço* ‘piece’, in which one of the segments of the afixal operator is *es-* (graphically, *es-* only began to appear from 1450, since until then it was represented by *f-*)³⁰. Modern Portuguese, probably by a semantic-cognitive process in which *des-* was associated with negation (or change for the worse), has the (more current) allomorphic variant *despedaçar* ‘to break’. We shall analyze the examples from the corpus:

espedaçar (1519 MA 142), *epdaçar* (1495 MA 134; 1502 MA 137; 1507 MA 139), *epdaçar* (1356 MA 41; 1419 MA 79; 1452 MA 106; 1453 MA 107; 1482 MA 125; 1489 MA 130), *epdaçarê* (1522 MA 144), *effpedaçar* (1450 Alv 104), *fpdaçar* (1465 MA 116) e *fpdaçar* (1345 MA 33; 1362 MA 44; 1375 MA 48; 1386 MA 56; 1388 MA 58; 1397 MA 63; 1397 MA 64; 1399 MA 66; 1403 MA 69; 1405 MA 70; 1408 MA 71; 1409 MA 72; 1410 MA 73; 1413 MA 75; 1423 MA 83).

In this context, however, *espedaçar* is still in current use as a synonym or stylistic variant of *despedaçar*. According to Rio-Torto, “entre os prefixos que formam verbos denominais e deadjectivais, *es-* é o que tem menor representatividade (cerca de 10% do total dos verbos prefixados)” (Rio-Torto 2013: 288) [“among prefixes forming denominal and deadjectival verbs, *es-* is the least represented (about 10% of the total of prefixed verbs)”. The dictionary by António Morais e Silva (1992) refers to these products as synonyms, although *es-* seems to have been used in early phases of the language, at least up to the 16th century. In fact, from a sociocognitive viewpoint, speakers give to the prefix *es-* (perhaps because it had lost phonic material) an older, popular or dialectal character, while /*des-*/ appears modern and educated. Some research in perceptual dialectology would be needed to map the sociocognitive awareness and the limits of this variation. In this case, too, *es-* has no semantic value of separation (‘to the outside of’); *espedaçar* is not equivalent to ‘take away’ pieces, but rather to ‘make into pieces’.

Another verbal product which began to appear frequently in documents from the end of the 15th century was *escambar* ‘exchange’ (referring to properties), where *es-* lacks any meaning. *Cambiar* no longer exists in Portuguese, which uses *trocar* in this context. The following are the examples found:

escābar (1519 MA 142), *efcaimbar* (1528 MA 147), *efcambada* (1482 MA 125), *efcambado* (1482 MA 125), *efcayba[r]* (1495 MA 134), *efcaybaar* (1500 MA 136), *efcaybar* (1485 MA 128; 1489 MA 130; 1502 MA 137; 1502 MA 137; 1507 MA 131), *efquambairê* (1522 MA 144), *fcaibar* (1484 MA 126).

Curiously, in other cases the prefix *es-* is also a particle of support and intensification, without any semantic value, and is thus different from *des-*: *efguarneçuda[r]* ‘provided’ (1291 Alc 3): “*efguarneçuda[r]* do céelo”, as in *efmontem* (1479 MA 124): “e os dic-tos oliuaaes *efmontem* e amorem”; in the last case, *esmontar* means ‘clear (land)’, in the sense of creating a ‘monte’ (‘farm, farmhouse’).

Finally, when the prefix *a-* in *aguardar* began to be abandoned, *es-* was a solution that was also soon rejected³¹: *efgua[r]*dando (1459 MA 110) and *efguardando* (1459 MA 111).

3. CONCLUSIONS

The addition of the prefix *a-* seems to have been accepted throughout medieval Portuguese in forms of relational adjectives expressing qualities (‘which evoke, which have x properties of Nb’) or in past participles (with a finished aspect). We find the forms *afouchinhado* ‘scythe-shaped’ (from

³⁰ According to Ramón Lorenzo, *Crónica Troyana* has *despedaçar* (Lorenzo 1977: s.u. ‘*espedaçar*’).

³¹ *Esguardar* has the same meaning as *aguardar*: ‘to wait’. According to Joan Corominas, the early form *esguardar* ‘observe’ was taken from Catalan (Corominas 1989-1992, see under ‘guardar’). António Geraldo da Cunha also mentions the old French form *esgarder* ‘look’, ‘watch’. Cf. Cunha 1998: see under ‘guardar’.

foucinha) and *acostumado* 'accustomed' (verbal forms of *coftumar* do not have this addition), which conform to a word-formation pattern which still operates now, in *avermelhado* 'reddened' and *aconselhado* 'advised' respectively. It is important here to note that in the area of language acquisition, we have only ever heard the deverbal adjective *aderretida* 'liquefied' from a five-year-old child, which, together with the data we have presented, leads us to suppose that the focus of spread of this prefix must have been related forms. In fact, the cognitive mechanisms which operate in the acquisition of language are very similar to those that operate in language change, as long as the necessary linguistic conditions are found.

In certain bases, from the end of the 14th century only, the prefix *a-* begins to be seen, and from then on becomes part of the educated norm, as it still is. An example is the verbal form *aproveitar* and its variants, in which the direction of change (*profeitar/proveitar* > *aproveitar*) was irreversible.

From the end of the second quarter of the 15th century the medieval forms of the Perfect system of the verb *aprazer* 'to please' (with root *prouu-* or *proug-*) begin to show the prefix, these variants being in the majority. The forms of the Present system, with root *praz-*, however, only begin to appear in the third quarter of the century. This time difference may be due to the greater inertia seen in forms with a root containing the vowel *a* (*praz-*). After 1450, too, the lexical product *arrecadar* 'to collect duties or taxes' (and variants) was institutionalized in the language. We believe that it was the highly polysemic character of *recadar*, the meaning of which can go from 'free' to the opposite, 'capture', 'detain' (as well as 'converse', 'tolerate', 'suffer', 'call', 'send for', 'send a message') which led to this semantic restriction. It is also later that *a-* is seen in *ministrar*: *amjnjjtrar* 'administer' appears in 1459. In medieval Portuguese, therefore, the verbal bases to which the prefix *a/ad-* was added (*aproveitar*, *aprazer*, *arrecadar* and *administrar*), and which thus became established from the end of the 14th and during the 15th centuries, becoming part of the current educated norm, carry positive semantic content, viewed from the interest of the subject as the point of reference. These changes seem to have coincided historically with the birth of a new social order, with the end of feudalism and the rise of a nascent middle class (1385 onwards) which valued material wealth, prosperity and progress³². These are verbs which contain a telic dimension of personal and psychological well-being. From a cognitive perspective, we may say that these are verbs with 'positive content'.

An interesting pair is *penhorar* 'legally seize the goods of the debtor'/'*apenhorar* 'give as a guarantee', found in contemporary Portuguese and practically fixed from the early 14th century. In fact the need for the prefix seemed obvious in juridical language, probably due to the semantic-pragmatic need of those in power to distinguish between points of view. In the 13th century, notaries tended to use the form *penhorar* for both senses, and in a transitional phase they used *apenhorar* to designate the action of the subject. *Aguardar* too, which shared with *guardar* the semic trace 'fulfil, respect, during the required time', lost the prefix from the second quarter of the 15th century, that is, to distinguish it from *aguardar* in the sense of 'wait'. It is interesting to note that in *aparecer* the addition of *a-* seems to be semantically and pragmatically motivated: throughout the corpus we find that the inflected variants without prefixes designate the event, the action, the prefixed variant being used for the concept, the juridical document which was motivating this process, which stipulated the date of appearance: the "instrumento de *dia de aparecer*". Since the forms of the infinitive are few, it is interesting to note that the same notary who in 1451 used the structure "*auya de parecer*", twice (1451 MA 105), opted nine years later for the form *aparecer*, in the same structures. To make the concept of *aparecer* clearer, juridical language opted for *comparecer* 'to appear in court'.

³² The variant with *a-* is therefore possibly connected with the movements of population caused by the crisis of the Portuguese interregnum, from 1383-1385, like many phenomena which we have already examined, some of which became established in the norm while others were more ephemeral. We can mention, for example, on the phonetic level, the spread of the phonological neutralization *b/v*, which happened at exactly the same time, but which never became part of the norm (Carvalho 2006: 417-420), and the diphthongization of *i* (*vuinho*), which is now typical of some subdialects in Madeira and the Azores (Carvalho 2006: 322-323).

In the medieval form *vogado*, the reintroduction of the prefix is due to the need for conceptual rigor, allied to a different view of Man, so to label it as a 'cultured', classical form, as often happens, is inadequate. In other cases the prefix was lost because of a need for restriction or semantic specialization. This was what happened with *frontar* (from *FRONTE*). The early loss (from 1350) of the prefix *a-* (carrier of a negative idea, in contrast with the base, which would have been more neutral) in juridical language would have happened in principle because of the need for a distinction from the homonymous *afrontar* 'pressurize' 'molest', 'trouble', also found in the 13th century. It must have been reintroduced later in juridical language, where today we find the noun *afronta* 'confrontation', 'injury', 'affront', 'provocation'.

The prefix *en-*, in the forms of our corpus, adds no meaning to the base word, serving merely as a (redundant) reinforcing particle: *ēalhear/enalhear/emalhear* 'alienar os bens' ('to confiscate') and *ēpeiorar* 'piorar' ('to worsen') are the only occurrences in our corpus. In the former, this type of form survives until the 16th century. The form *ēpeiorado* coexists with *peiorajem* in a document from 1350, which once again leads us to suppose that the prefix *en-*, like *a-* (cf. *afouchado*, *acoftumado*) began by being stable in verbal and deadverbial adjectives, perhaps because they carried the notion of quality/state or of finish/conclusion.

The prefix *re-* came to be part of a final product through a process of lexicalization, having lost its original grammatical significance of intensity, derived from iteration: we find the expression "frutos e *rrenouos*", in a document from 1379, where *rrenouos* means 'first vegetables'. To make a thorough survey of the number of items produced by lexicalization processes of this type would be one of the challenges for derivational morphology.

Finally, although in many cases (particularly in examples of parasynthesis) the prefix *des-* is associated with the value of 'contrary action, deprivation, or negation', in fact analysis of our corpus, linked to sociodialectal examples from current European Portuguese, has revealed the interesting evolutionary dynamics of the prefixes *des-* and *es-*, which cannot be neglected in a synchronic description. In contrast with contemporary European Portuguese, the prefix *es-* seems to have been more productive in the archaic period than now: *escavar* appears in the same contexts as *cauar* 'to dig', connected or not by a conjunctive particle, though the forms are not synonymous (at least in contemporary Portuguese). The prefix *es-* carried implications of purpose and spatial restriction. On the other hand, in some of the more remote of the monastery's lands, we find the prefix *des-* joined to *cavar*, a form which is still current, at least in some dialectal and/or diastatic varieties. It was also the prefix *es-* which was added to the bases *pedaço* and *montar* to form the (circumfix and prefixed) verbs *espedaçar* and *efmontar*, respectively. The former exists in free variation with *despedaçar*, but curiously, *desmontar* 'take down' is now the antonym of *efmontar* 'montar' ('to set up', 'to clear land to create a farm'). On the other hand, medieval Portuguese had the verb *escambiar* (and variants) 'exchange properties' and not *descambiar*, but, curiously, the verbal product *destrocar* 'exchange money' is often heard in contemporary European Portuguese, even from middle-class speakers, when talking about exchanging notes for coins of the same value. *Es-* was also a solution when in the 15th century *a-* began to disappear from *aguardar* in a move towards semantic specialization. It is the denominal adjectival form *efcampado* which is dominant in our corpus, but now only *descampado* 'open field' exists; on the other hand, *es-* also existed in certain deverbal adjectives merely as a reinforcing particle (*efguarneçada*, for example), and later disappeared. Investigating the reasons why the same word-formation rules are not found in this type of pairs is a task for derivational morphology; it proves once again that semantic transformation of paraphrasable meanings linked to prefixes (as with suffixes) in fact requires "clear assumptions of historical semantics", as Viaro already pointed out (2010: 180).

3.1. Cognitive mechanisms in the evolutionary dynamics of the analyzed prefixes

Despite indications that the prefix *a/ad-* had begun to be consolidated in past participles and relational adjectives from a very early date, generally it seems to have been highly productive

in verbal forms semantically based on movement of a subject (or done by a subject) towards a point in space, or in an action with an end in view (telicity): *achantar* 'to plant', *amergulhar* 'to immerse', *abaixar* 'to lower', *ajementar* 'to sow', *alevantar* 'to raise', *asselar* 'to saddle', *arromper* 'to break/to cultivate land', *alimpar* 'to clean', *arrefazer* 'to re-do'; in a change of state (*aquestar*, 'to heat'), or in performative verbs: *anomear* 'to nominate' and *arrender* 'to renounce'. The tension between social sanction and the judgment of the speakers (crucial in the change) differed in degree, and the prefix remains alive even today, especially in verbs indicating spatial movement (with a point of departure or arrival), in the speech of lower socio-economic groups (**alevantar* 'to raise', **abaixar* 'to lower', **assentar-se* 'to seat', etc. This is therefore a social or diastatic type of variation.

Concerning questions of space, we should mention that in contemporary European Portuguese we find the pair *chegar* 'arrive' / *achegar* 'get near' (to a point of reference, which may be a person, animal or object)³³. Some dictionaries give both variants for the latter meaning (*chegar* ~ *achegar*; *chegado* ~ *achegado*); others however give *achegar* but not the past participle form (**achegado*), seeing it only as a noun (*achegado*, n. 'relative'). In our corpus, the adjective *achegado* 'close (of relatives)³⁴ is documented in the 13th century, but we consider that in current use participle forms of this type are in fact stigmatized. We believe that prefixation in this process of semantic specialization is still in progress, and therefore there may be some optional variation; however, a perceptual study would be needed to assess the judgments and attitudes of speakers to the phenomenon. This instability shows that prefixes are not only carriers of diverse shades of meaning, but that they also operate at the level of categorical selection, so that the phenomenon of lexicalization³⁵ cannot be dissociated from grammatical categorization. This is what we see with the pair *costumar* 'usually do' / *acostumar* 'become accustomed to', which now only accept the prefixed participle *acostumado*, a tendency which was seen in early texts, although with a few unprefixed exceptions. In this case the prefix is obligatory in order to give the sense of 'conclusion' to the base word, being incompatible with an iterative aspect.

Throughout our analysis we have mentioned the process of addition of the prefix *a(d)-* to reinforce the idea of "a move in the direction of satisfaction, of the well-being or happiness of the individual". There were in fact some bases (with more abstract and less physical or concrete semantic content) which acquired the prefix unidirectionally from a certain point in time, with normative sanctions constraining speakers' creative liberty. In fact there is no kind of variation in these products in contemporary European Portuguese. Such is the case with the following: the lexical product *aproveitar* 'to make use of', which first showed the prefix systematically from the 1380s onwards; prefixed products formed from the root *prougue-/prouue-* (Perfect of the verb *aprazer*), practically established by the mid-15th century (with degrees of progression dependent on phonemic combinations with the root); the lexical items *arrecaadar* and *administrar*, the latter slightly later. In the case of *recadar*, the function of the prefix *a-/ad-* was also related to the need to avoid the polysemic ambiguities around the base word, and in *administrar*, the prefix *ad-* probably conferred another meaning, which eventually included more positive content and evaluation of the subject.

The opposite occurred with the forms *afrentar* and *afronta*, possibly with more negative semantic content. In fact these forms lost the prefix *a-* very early in notarial texts, only possibly reappearing after the Middle Ages. In contemporary European Portuguese we have the form *afronta* 'confronting witnesses' in legal language, and standard variety has *afronta* and *afrentar*. The form *fronta* still survives in Cape Verdian dialect with the meaning of 'misfortune'.

³³ According to Langacker, the viewer (V) is the conceptualizer, "who can be identified primarily with the speaker, secondarily with the addressee, and derivatively with some other individual whose perspective they adopt or otherwise take into account" (1990: 318).

³⁴ This phenomenon of semantic extension may be compared to what happens with some prepositions in English, as mentioned by Langacker: "one sense describing spatial motion, objectively construed; and a second sense in which (...) spatial motion is replaced by subjective motion" (1990: 329).

³⁵ We tend to believe that generally this is a process of lexicalization, to the extent that the prefixes, possibly with autonomous grammatical significance in Latin, over time lost this autonomy and were included in the meaning of the final product.

In other cases, the appearance of the prefix is due to the need to restrict meanings, given the enormous polysemy surrounding the base word. Examples are *penhorar* ~ *apenhorar*, *guardar* ~ *aguardar* and *parecer* ~ *aparecer*. The first pair (*penhorar* ~ *apenhorar*), elements of which are technical legal terms, was the first to be affected, although in the 13th century the non-prefixed form (*penhorar*) was used for both meanings, from the point of view either of the individual ('give as a guarantee') or of the judicial power ('take the goods of the debtor'). In some cases (*guardar* ~ *aguardar*), our corpus only shows us that from a certain time the prefix disappeared. We do not know, however, whether this loss happened because *aguardar* already existed, or whether, on the contrary, addition of the prefix came after the medieval period. We know that the form *aguardar* was already found in *Cantigas de Santa Maria*, with the same meaning as today. With *parecer* and *aparecer*, the prefix *a-*, in legal language, was an operator of semantic-categorical restriction, since it was only used (at least at a certain period) to designate the date and type of document, with the process/event ('appear before the magistrate') always indicated by *parecer*. In contemporary European Portuguese, the pair *parecer* ~ *aparecer* evolved precisely in the opposite direction, since it is *aparecer* that, in standard variety, gives the idea of process/movement (in the direction of a subject), while *parecer* is a stative verb. Finally, the telic meaning transmitted by the prefix *ad-* in the medieval form *vogado* must have reappeared only in the 16th century, with the rebirth of Roman law and the search for conceptual rigor and concision (*advogar* 'defend someone's point of view').

As for the prefix *es-*, it can exist without any particular function, serving only to reinforce or intensify the base word, creating with it a relationship of synonymy [*esmontar* = 'montar' ('to set up)]; *esguarnecer* = 'guarnecer' ('garnish, provide'); *escambhar* = 'cambiar (exchange properties, arc.). This prefix may also have had the meaning of 'transform into X- base word', eventually competing with the (phonically stronger) prefix *des-* after the medieval period, as in *espedaçar* ~ *despedaçar*, a variation acceptable within the norm of contemporary European Portuguese. Also post-medieval was the replacement of *es-* by *des-*, maintaining the same function ('deprivation'): *escampado* > *descampado*. In these two cases, the relationship of synonymy was maintained, though only in the sense of 'deprivation' was the prefix substituted.

In some cases the prefix *des-* also served merely to strengthen the base word, as in *desperecer* (= *perecer*), but this prefixed form eventually died out. Curiously, in current European Portuguese it appears affixed to the base *falecer*, indicating a particular type of deprivation ('deprivation of physical senses'), thus creating an interesting case of semantic specialization: *falecer* 'to die' ~ *desfalecer* 'faint, lose consciousness'. In *deleixar*, documented in other sources, the prefix *de-* (*des-*) brought no meaning to the base in the earliest phases of Romance, but the current form *desleixar* ('neglect') must have been formed in early Portuguese, with *des-* added to the base *leixar* (arc.; now *deixar* 'leave, abandon, let, allow...') through a need for semantic specialization in relation to a highly polysemic base. In fact, the pair *deixar* ~ *desleixar* still exists, the derived product being a marked form, from an evaluative standpoint. In other words, the prefix *des-* transmits the idea of 'abandonment and psychological distancing from what should not be neglected from a social and moral point of view'. In other cases, as with the pair *cavar* ~ *descavar* the prefix *des-*, maintaining the telic meaning present in the base word, spatially circumscribes the action. This morphological formation, which also comes from semantic specialization, has syntactic consequences in current Portuguese: "*descavar* [videiras]". We tend to accept that this variant is more geographical and dialectal than social, although the geographical distribution of vine-growing (usually linked to those with less formal education) might condition the distribution.

This prefix could be attached to other highly polysemic bases, such as *fazer*, here not signifying 'contrary action' (as is the case today), but strengthening the base word, in bases semantically incompatible with the argumental structure where they are found. This is the case of the construction *desfazer o peixe* 'prepare, removing the oil', as presented in the analysis of the corpus. In the pairs *fazer a barba* ~ *desfazer a barba* 'shave' and *trocar dinheiro* ~ *destronar dinheiro* 'exchange money', too, which are not documented but exist in current Portuguese, the prefix intensifies the meaning of the base, giving origin to a relationship of synonymy, only perturbed by being now considered marked forms (the former dialectally and the latter socially).

3.2. Theoretical implications and future research perspectives

The processes involved in the semantic evolution of the prefixes *a-/ad-* (and in some cases *des-*, as in *desleixar*) are thus related with the notion of ‘perspective’, seen by Langacker (1990: 315) from a synchronic perspective and developed diachronically by Traugott (1995: 31–54). In conceptual terms, Langacker relates perspective with factors such as “orientation” and “vantage point” (1990: 315) or “egocentric viewing arrangement”. He admits: “I am probably not the first to observe that people are sometimes concerned with themselves and the relationships they bear to other entities”. (1990: 317). This is a phenomenon which he calls “subjectification”, a very common type of semantic change which often figures in the process of “grammaticization”, although he refuses to distinguish between lexis and grammar, preferring the idea of a continuum between these two (arbitrarily divisible) components of language (Langacker; 1990: 324).

Langacker identifies “subjectification” with “semantic attenuation” (1990: 324), concentrating only on examples of grammaticization in which grammatical elements develop from lexical items through increased subjectivity. But in fact the products with prefix *a(d)-* presented in section 2.1, far from losing any semantic information, have rather enriched it (concretizing and specifying the content), only occasionally showing reduction of the phonological status of their prefixes, which may have had some kind of grammatical autonomy in Latin (e.g. *avocado*, *aministrar*, *arc*). Thus, the prefixed examples we have presented show processes of lexicalization, supporting Traugott’s view that subjectification can be seen both in grammatical and lexical change (Traugott 1995: 32). For Traugott, subjectification “refers to a pragmatic-semantic process whereby meanings become increasingly based in the speaker’s subjective belief, state/attitude, towards what the speaker is talking about” (Traugott 1995: 31). In fact the possibilities of intersection between subjectification and grammaticalization apply equally to lexical change, although in grammaticalization the interaction between morphosyntactic and pragmatico-semantic factors lead to more complex paths. Also on the level of lexical change, the old and new forms and meanings may coexist for a long period, the speaker being able to opt for the ambiguous or polysemic form, or for one which already shows semantic specialization (arc. Port.: *guardar/aguardar*; *recadar/arrecadar*); in other cases, the nature of the variation may be dialectal (as in the constructions “*fazer a barba*” and “*desfazer a barba*”) or else sociolinguistic (*trocar* and *destrocar*); sometimes the norm even allows stylistic alternatives (*espedaçar* ~ *despedaçar*, for example). In the literature on grammaticalization, this phenomenon has been called “layering” (Hopper / Traugott 1993: 114), a concept that can equally apply to the processes of lexicalization that we have studied.

The examples of polysemy and semantic specialization analyzed here show that the motivations for lexicalization are intimately related with “the attempt on the speaker’s part to increase the informativeness to the interlocutor of what is being said, i.e. a cognitive-communicative motivation” (Traugott 1995: 49). The concept of subjectification therefore helps to throw light on the structural organization (not only cognitive but also communicational) of the grammatical and lexical material of language.

Prefixes have been acknowledged as symbolic units (Langacker 1990: 17), simultaneously grammatical and lexical, diachronically highly volatile, even competing between each other in meaning. It is therefore only historically that their function in the structure of contemporary European Portuguese can be understood, within an epistemological framework that brings together the social, the cognitive and the pragmatic. In fact, present variation results from a long and complex diachronic process³⁶, often neglected in descriptive synchronic grammars.

Finally, our study aims to show that an analysis of the prefixes from a strictly morphosyntactic (functional systemic) point of view is highly reductive. We have seen that technical languages, stressing neutrality and transparency, or simply attempting to make communication clearer and

³⁶ Metalinguistic awareness of change is occasionally found in texts: this seems to have arisen in the 1450s. If a notary in 1453 used the form *de(a)foram[ê]t[os]* with the meaning of ‘aforamentos’ [‘contracts related to leases’] (“E esto flob as obrigacoos e *de(a)foramê[os]* deita outra parte ecriptos e clarados” 1453 MA 107) and two others, in two other documents from 1459, showed a preference for the form *efguardando* rather than *aguardando* (‘waiting’), this shows that they were aware of the change in the prefixal structure of the lexical items. In the first case, it is interesting to see that the notary removed the particle *de* in *declaradas* and placed it wrongly in *aforamentos*.

less ambiguous, were not immune to the expressivity of the presence or absence of prefixes. It would be interesting to widen this type of analysis to a significant set of lexical items, in diverse corpora; for only a study of historical semantics allied to cognition (which would include polysemy, ambiguity, synonymy, antonymy and other types of relationships in the lexicon), as well as to sociolinguistics, would be able to clarify the path of the prefixes in these products and explain their vitality in Portuguese, in both normative and diastatic or dialectal varieties. Rodney Sampson reached much the same conclusion when referring to the inadequacies of Optimality Theory: “OT historical accounts typically contain just *ex post facto* statements of such modification, which is not of course an explanation of change. A further theoretical problem that has been identified is posed when accounting for change which involves *the lexical restructuring of underlying forms*” (Sampson 2010: 35, emphasis added). And it is with the same optimistic wish as Sampson that we end this small contribution to the derivational morphology of Portuguese:

Romance with its wealth of surviving philological materials reaching back over many centuries provides an unrivalled testing ground for exploring the complex interplay that has occurred between sociolinguistic and structural factors in particular cases of phonological evolution. How this interplay comes to operate in guiding current and future patterns of prosthetic usage *will be intriguing for later linguists to observe* (Sampson 2010: 237, emphasis added).

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We would like to thank the two anonymous reviewers for their comments and suggestions.

REFERENCES

- Barbosa, Jorge Manuel de Morais Gomes (1958): *Cronica de Castela (ms. 8817 da Biblioteca Nacional de Madrid). Elementos para o estudo linguístico. Texto (Fernando I – Afonso VI)*. Volume I (*Introdução e elementos para o estudo linguístico*). Vol II (*Texto*). Vol. III (*Glossário*). Dissertação de licenciatura em Filologia Românica. Universidade de Lisboa: Faculdade de Letras (unpublished).
- Brea, Mercedes (1976): “Prefijos formadores de antónimos negativos en español medieval”, *Verba. Anuario Galego de Filoloxía* 3, 319-341. <http://dSPACE.usc.es/handle/10347/3096>.
- Carter, Henry Hare (1952-1953): *A Fourteenth-Century Latin-Old Portuguese Verb-Dictionary*. Reprinted from *Romance Philology*, vol. 6, nº 2 & 3, November 52-february 53, U.S.A., 71-103 (= Publicação do *Dicionário de Alcobaça* – cota 286 de Alcobaça, nos Reservados da Biblioteca Nacional de Lisboa).
- Carvalho, Maria José S. Pereira de (2006): *Documentação medieval do mosteiro de Santa Maria de Alcobaça (sécs. XIII-XVI). Edição e estudo linguístico*. Faculdade de Letras da Universidade de Coimbra. Unpublished doctoral thesis.
- Corominas, Joan (1989-1992): *Diccionario crítico etimológico castellano e hispánico*. Con la colaboración de José A. Pascual, 6 vols. Madrid: Gredos.
- Corpus Informatizado do Português Medieval (CIPM)*. Centro de Linguística da Universidade Nova de Lisboa. <http://www.clunl.edu.pt/pt/?det=260§ion=Recursos&title=Dicionario-de-Verbos-do-Portugues-Medieval-DVPM&id=4>.
- Cunha, Antônio Geraldo da (1998): *Dicionário etimológico Nova Fronteira da Língua Portuguesa*. 10ª impressão. Rio de Janeiro: Editora Nova Fronteira.
- Gaffiot, Félix (1934): *Dictionnaire illustré Latin-Français*. Paris: Librairie Hachette.
- Geeraerts, Dirk / Gitte Kristiansen (2012): “Cognitive Linguistics and Language Variation”. Draft version, August 2012, 13 p. To be published in Jeannette Littlemore / John Taylor, *Companion to Cognitive Linguistics (Continuum)*. On-line: http://www.ling.arts.kuleuven.be/qlvl/prints/iclc_cogsoc.pdf [Retrieved April 23, 2015].
- Gomes, Saul António (1999): *Um formulário monástico português medieval: o manuscrito alcobacense 47 da BNL*. Separata da Revista *Hvmanitas* 51, 141-184.
- Grandgent, C. H. (1991): *Introducción al latín vulgar*. Traducción y anotación por Francisco de B. Moll. 5ª edición. Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas.

- Hopper, Paul J. / Elizabeth Closs Traugott (1993): *Grammaticalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Langacker, Ronald W. (1990): *Concept, Image, and Symbol. The Cognitive Basis of Grammar*. Berlin / New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- López Viñas, Xoán (2014): "Aproximación á prefixación no galego literario medieval", *Madrygal. Revista de Estudios Gallegos* 17, 55-65. <http://revistas.ucm.es/index.php/MADR/article/view/45738/42984>.
- Lorenzo, Ramón (1975-1977): *La traducción gallega de la Crónica General y de la Crónica de Castilla*. Edición crítica anotada, con introducción, índice onomástico y glosario, 2 vols. Orense: Instituto de Estudios Orensanos "Padre Feijoo".
- Machado, José Pedro (1995): *Dicionário etimológico da língua portuguesa. Com a mais antiga documentação escrita e conhecida de muitos dos vocábulos estudados*, 5 volumes. 7ª edição. Lisboa: Livros Horizonte.
- Mariño Paz, Ramón (1999): *Historia da lingua galega*. Santiago de Compostela: Sotelo Blanco.
- Moreno Cabrera, Juan C. (1998): "On the Relationship Between Grammaticalization and Lexicalization", in Anna Giacalone Ramat / Paul J. Hopper (eds.), *The Limits of Grammaticalization*. Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 211-227. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1075/tsl.37.10mor>.
- Neira, Jesus (1976): "El prefijo /des/ en la lengua galego-portuguesa", *Verba. Anuario Galego de Filoloxía* 3, 309-318. <http://dspace.usc.es/handle/10347/3091>
- Niermeyer, Jan Frederik (1976): *Mediæ Latinitatis Lexicon Minus. Lexique Latin médiéval-français/anglais. A Medieval Latin-French/English Dictionary*. Leiden: E. J. Brill.
- Nunes, José Joaquim (1989): *Compêndio de gramática histórica portuguesa (Fonética e Morfologia)*. 9ª edição. Lisboa: Clássica Editora.
- Pereira, Rui Abel Rodrigues (2000): *Formação de verbos em português: a prefixação com A(D)-, EN-, e ES-*. Dissertação de Mestrado em Linguística Portuguesa. Faculdade de Letras: Universidade de Coimbra.
- Piel, Joseph (1980-1986): "Um difícil verbo medieval português: 'amo(o)rar'". *Revista Portuguesa de Filologia* 18, 41-47.
- Rio-Torto, Graça et al. (2013): *Gramática derivacional do Português*. Coimbra: Imprensa da Universidade de Coimbra.
- Rio-Torto, Graça Maria (1998): *Morfologia Derivacional. Teoria e Aplicação ao Português*. Porto: Porto Editora.
- Rodrigues, Alexandra Filipa Soares (2001): *A construção de postverbiais em Português*. Porto: Grano Editores.
- Sampson, Rodney (2010): *Vowel Prosthesis in Romance. A Diachronic Study*. Oxford University Press. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199541157.001.0001>.
- Silva, António de Moraes (1992): *Novo dicionário compacto da língua portuguesa*. Edição compacta do texto fundamental do *Grande Dicionário da Língua Portuguesa*. Segundo a 10ª Edição Revista, muito aumentada e atualizada conforme as regras do acordo ortográfico Luso-Brasileiro de 10 de Agosto de 1945, por Augusto Moreno, Cardoso Júnior e José Pedro Machado, alivida de Etimologia, formas verbais e abonações constituindo o maior repertório de vocábulos da língua falada e escrita em Portugal e no Brasil, 5 volumes. Editorial Confluência.
- Silva, Augusto Soares da (1996): "Dos conceitos lexicais aos conceitos gramaticais. Aspectos da gramaticalização". *Diacrítica* 11, 113-138.
- Silva, Augusto Soares da (2003): "O que é que a polissemia nos mostra acerca do significado e da cognição?" In: Augusto Soares da Silva (org.), *Linguagem e Cognição: a Perspectiva da Linguística Cognitiva*. Braga: Associação Portuguesa de Linguística e Universidade Católica Portuguesa, 147-171.
- Traugott, Elizabeth Closs (1995): "Subjectification in grammaticalisation", in Dieter Stein / Susan Wright (eds.), *Subjectivity and subjectivisation. Linguistic perspectives*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 31-54. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/cbo9780511554469.003>.
- Viaro, Mário Eduardo (2010): "Sobre a inclusão do elemento diacrónico na teoria morfológica: uma abordagem epistemológica", *Estudos de Linguística Galega* 2, 173-190. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3309/1989-578X-10-8>.