The aim of this paper is to show how paradigms may function in derivational morphology and how they may give rise to productive processes of word formation. This will be done by discussing a few types of examples from English, Dutch and French, that are normally considered as marginal.

Traditionally paradigms are considered to be an inherent part of inflectional morphology. Within inflectional paradigms there appears only one major instance of language change: Ausgleich or paradigmatic levelling. However, in derivational morphology paradigms and language change may go hand in hand, especially when it comes to recent processes of word formation which so far were seen as quite uncommon, extra grammatical (Doleschal & Thornton 2000) and even irregular, such as clipping on –o in English, French, Dutch and some other languages or lib fixing (Zwicky 2010).

A few examples may show how the processes work. First trochaic clipping on –o.

\[
\begin{array}{lll}
(1) & \text{French} & \text{(2) English} & \text{(3) Dutch} \\
& \text{aristo} < \text{artistocrate} & \text{psycho} < \text{psychopath} & \text{aso} < \text{asociaal} \\
& \text{ado} < \text{adolescent} & \text{dipso} < \text{dipsomaniac} & \text{Indo} < \text{Indonesisch} \\
& \text{Sarko} < \text{Sarkozy} & \text{nympho} < \text{nymphomaniac} & \text{provo} < \text{provocateur} \\
\end{array}
\]

According to Zabrocki (1980) speakers of these languages recognised a common part in these paradigms, the so called *confusivum*, which is here –o. This common segment may be used after other clipped forms not ending themselves in –o.

\[
\begin{array}{lll}
(4) & \text{proll}+\text{o} < \text{proletarien} & \text{(5) journ}+\text{o} < \text{journalist} & \text{(6) frust}+\text{o} < \text{gefrustreerd} \\
& \text{metall}+\text{o} < \text{metallurgist} & \text{garb}+\text{o} < \text{garbage man} & \text{real}+\text{o} < \text{realist} \\
\end{array}
\]

A following step in this productive pattern is ‘suffixing –o after non clipped forms’, whereby the suffix –o means ‘a person who is X’:

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
(7) & \text{follo} < \text{foux/folle} \text{ ‘mad’} \\
(8) & \text{dumbo} < \text{dumb} \\
(9) & \text{lullo} < \text{lul} \text{ ‘penis’} \\
\end{array}
\]

Via *lib fixing*, or *secretion* as this phenomenon is called by Jespersen (1922:384), an element of a non complex form is ‘liberated’. At the moment the lib fix becomes part of a new paradigm it may become a productive derivational segment, most often a suffix-like segment. Warren (1990) and others call such a segment a *combining form*. An example from English will show how this process works.

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
(10) & \text{entertainment} \\
\end{array}
\]

In this non complex form speakers recognize a part *enter*, which for instance appears also as a confusivum in the verb *enter*, since *entertainment* and *enter* are part of a list, or paradigm of forms starting with *enter*.

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
(11) & \text{enter} \\
& \text{entertainment} \\
\end{array}
\]
enterprise
Since the words of this list share a common part or confusivum enter, speakers may think that entertainment and enterprise are complex forms, which means that –tainment and -prise also must have a certain morphological status. So –tainment could start a career as a libfix and became productive in a new paradigm such as
(12) docutainment
edutainment
musitainment
relitainment
militainment
Lib fixing not necessarily has to start with a list of forms with a common confusivum. Reanalysis of opaque forms as if they were complex forms or a syntagma, as Marchand (1969: 2) would call this process, also is a source for new libfixes. However, a lib fix only becomes productive when it can be used in a derivational paradigm. See for instance the opaque French form panorama, borrowed from Greek, which has been reanalysed as consisting of two parts pan and -(o)rama
(13) panorama
(13a) diorama
cyclorama
etc.
Another source for new libfixes comes from reanalysing successful blends as example (14) shows
(14) daycation from day + vacation
staycation
graycation
praycation
(14a) girlcation
mancation.
It will be clear that the difference between example (12) in which a common confusivum is supposed to be the basis of the change and example (14) where reanalysis of a productive blend pattern is considered to be the starting point of the new process, is not self-evident.

Conclusion
However, what both examples, trochaic clipping and lib fixing, show is that paradigmatic language change leads to new derivational processes.
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