1 Introduction

This chapter is devoted to the word formation process referred to as “parasynthesis”, which involves an attachment of two affixes (a prefix and a suffix) for a categorial change to happen. After defining the concept and providing some prototypical examples that illustrate this word formation process (Section 2), I proceed to comment on some relevant empirical aspects and the main descriptive proposals of parasynthesis (Section 3). Next, a syntactic analysis is posited, which aims to solve the conundrum of an apparently simultaneous attachment of two affixes to form the parasynthetic word (Section 4). Finally, the chapter concludes with some brief remarks (Section 5).
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Este capítulo está dedicado al proceso de formación de palabras denominado “parasíntesis”, que implica una adjunción simultánea de dos afijos (un prefijo y un sufijo) para que ocurra un cambio de categoría. Después de definir el concepto y proporcionar algunos ejemplos prototípicos que ilustran este proceso de formación de palabras (sección 2), procedo a comentar algunos aspectos empíricos relevantes y las principales propuestas descriptivas de la parasíntesis (sección 3). A continuación, se propone un análisis sintáctico que tiene como objetivo resolver el problema planteado por la adjunción aparentemente simultánea de dos afijos para formar la palabra parasintética (sección 4). Finalmente, el capítulo concluye con algunas breves observaciones (sección 5).
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2 The notion of parasynthesis

Parasynthesis has often been defined as the word-formation process that requires the presence of two affixes (a prefix and a suffix) for a categorial change to be possible. A typical example
used in the literature to exemplify this phenomenon is a denominal verb like Sp. *em-barc-a(r) ‘to board, to embark’, which has been claimed to be formed by the simultaneous attachment of two affixes: the prefix *en- ‘in’ and the verbal suffix involved in the infinitive -a(r) (see Batiukova, this volume, for the notion of verbalisation). Neither the prefix *en- plus the nominal base *barc(a) ‘ship’ nor the nominal root plus the verbal suffix are possible forms: cf. *em-barc(a) and *barc-a(r), respectively.

Ancient Greek grammarians had already noted that *parasýnthesis was a derivation process (more rarely, a composition process) based on a compound, whose product was called the parasýntheton. The first author who is credited with introducing the concept of parasyntasis in the Romance philology was Darmesteter (1875). For example, according to Darmesteter (1875, 79–80), the Romance verb *em-barca(r) is a parasynthetic form, since *embarca is a compound formed by the preposition *en ‘in’ and a noun. However, most Romance morphologists in the twentieth century analysed the attachment of *en- as a prefixation process (hence as a derivation) rather than as a compounding process. So the definition was changed, since for many Romance morphologists, a compound is not involved any longer in the formation of parasyntactic verbs like Sp. *embarcar.1

Although most of the literature on parasyntasis has typically concentrated on prefixed denominal verbs like *embarcar ‘to board’ and on prefixed deadjectival verbs like *en-gord-a(r) ‘to fatten’, it is important to point out that there other types of parasyntactic forms: for example, parasyntactic adjectives like *afortun-ad(o) ‘fortunate’ or *desalm-ad(o) ‘heartless’. Intermediate forms like *afortuna, which involves the prefix a- and the nominal base *fortuna, or *fortunado, which is formed from the nominal root and the participle/adjectival morpheme, are not possible in Spanish. Something similar happens with the formation of *desalmado: cf. *desalma and *almando. Adjectives like *sub-mar-in(o) ‘submarine’ have also sometimes been included in the set of parasyntactic adjectives. However, this case is different from the previous examples, since the base *marino does exist. Despite this, from an interpretational point of view, some authors have claimed that the prefix sub- does not modify the existing base *marino but rather takes the root *mar ‘sea’ as its complement. *Submarino can be said to be included in the set of parasyntactic words due to the ill-formedness of *submar (see Serrano-Dolader 1999, 2012b for a complete taxonomy of different types of parasyntactic adjectives).

Finally, there are also parasyntactic compounds, which involve the merger of two lexical bases, giving a non-existing compound, with a derivational suffix or through a conversion process (Serrano-Dolader 2012a, 427; see Buenafuentes, this volume, for compounding in general). For example, *sal-piment-a(r) ‘to season’ is formed from *sal ‘salt’ and *pimienta ‘pepper’, but there is no nominal compound like *salpimenta nor a denominal verb like *pimentar. As pointed out by Serrano-Dolader (2012a, 2015), parasyntactic compounding is a very marginal word formation process in Romance languages (e.g., see Bisetto and Melloni 2008), at least compared to parasyntactic verbs, which are much more productive.

3 Empirical aspects and descriptive proposals of parasyntasis

Most descriptive accounts of parasyntactic verbs like Sp. *embarcar ‘to board’ or *engordar ‘to fatten’ have concentrated on how to account for the apparent simultaneous attachment of a prefix and a suffix involved in their formation (see Serrano-Dolader 1995, 2015, 2016; Iacobini 2004, for some reviews of the relevant literature). Three main descriptive proposals are often distinguished: cf. the ones in (1). The proposal in (1a) is the one claimed by Crocco-Gáleas and Iacobini (1992, 1993) and Iacobini (2004, 2010), which can, in fact, be traced back to Darmesteter (1875); (1b) is the one proposed by Corbin (1980, 1987); finally, (1c) is the one posited by Scalise (1986), i.a.
Iacobini (2004) points out that in parasynthetic words like Sp. *embarcar* ‘to board’ or *engordar* ‘to fatten’, there is no derivative suffix with phonological content (e.g. cf. the suffix -ec- in the deadjectival (*bello* ‘beautiful’) verb *embeleecer* ‘to embellish’), but a conversion process is involved. His claim is that the prefix and the verbal suffix behave like a single affix, that is, a circumfix. However, Serrano-Dolader (1995, 2015) criticises the circumfixation proposal because the prefix and the suffix of parasynthetic formations seem to be morphologically independent and fulfil different functions (e.g., according to him, only the suffix takes part in the transcategorisation process, that is, in the verbalisation process). The option in (1a) has also been said to be problematic, since Spanish does not appear to present other cases of circumfixes beyond the alleged ones involved in parasynthetic verbs, making this kind of derivation an *ad hoc* word formation process.

Furthermore, Fábregas (2013, 104) points out that the circumfixation proposal is problematic when dealing with parasynthetic adjectives like *afortunado* ‘fortunate’: according to him, an alleged circumfix [*a*...*ado*] would not allow us to analyse *afortunado* as a participial adjective. Moreover, he notes that the relationship that this prefixed word establishes with unprefixed words like *dentado* ‘toothed’, *barbado* ‘bearded’ or *jorobado* ‘hunchbacked’ and many other words that express the possession of what is denoted by the base would then be lost.

As for the representation in (1b), Corbin (1980, 1987) denies the existence of verbal parasynthesis, since she claims that the suffix is not derivational but inflectional, whereby her proposal is to analyse parasynthetic verbs with the form [pref. + X N/Adj + infinitive ending] as the result of simple prefixation: [pref. X N/Adj]. However, as pointed out by many morphologists, the main problem with this representation is her controversial proposal that the prefix can change the category of the base to which it is attached, which has been claimed to be impossible.

Finally, the representation in (1c) is the one posited by Scalise (1986, i.a.). According to him, parasynthetic words are formed in two stages: in the first (i.e., suffixation) stage, a possible but not necessarily attested or actual word is generated (e.g., °*gordar* ‘to fatten’), whereas in the second (i.e., prefixation) stage, the actual complex word is generated (e.g., *engordar* ‘to fatten’).

An important advantage of this proposal is that the computational property of binarism, that is, the binary branching hypothesis, is preserved, although it is done at the expense of assuming an unattested intermediate stage. Similarly, Alcoba (1987) assumes the non-existing intermediate stage hypothesis, but, for him, this stage is formed by the prefix and the base: [[[pref.] X [suf.]]. V]. Crucially, unlike Corbin, Alcoba does not assume her controversial claim that the prefix assigns the grammatical category to the base. Rather, his claim is that the verbaliser is the thematic vowel involved in parasynthetic forms.

As pointed out by Iacobini (2004, 2010) and Serrano-Dolader (2015), a problem with applying the representation in (1c) to parasynthetic verbs is that it does not distinguish among different types of these verbs. For example, according to Iacobini (2004, 2010), true parasynthetic verbs like *engordar* ‘to fatten’ must be distinguished from verbs like °*descafeinar* ‘to decaffeinate’: the former involves a non-meaningful prefix, whereas the latter involves a meaningful one. He also notes that the fact that an unprefixed verb like Sp. °*cafeinar* ‘to caffeinate’ does not exist is probably due to non-linguistic reasons (e.g., due to our encyclopaedic or world knowledge), whereas the reason for the absence of verbs like °*gordar* ‘to fatten’ is linguistic. According to Iacobini, only the former involve a circumfix, whereas the latter can be claimed to be formed through a double stage derivation [cf. (1c)].
Although there appears to be no consensus in the literature as to which descriptive representation in (1) is the correct one, many morphologists have ended up assuming the hypothesis that the verbalisation in parasynthetic verbs is due to a zero morpheme. For example, Reinheimer-Rîpeanu (1974) claims that zero derivation is involved in parasynthesis as well as in the formation of unprefixed denominal and dejectival verbs (see Serrano-Dolader 2015 for a recent review of different proposals for the zero morpheme in parasynthesis).

At this point, after having sketched out the three main descriptive accounts of parasynthesis, two important methodological considerations are worth taking into account: on the one hand, Serrano-Dolader’s (2015) relevant remark that the formal analysis of parasynthetic word formation must be complemented with semantic considerations. On the other, Rainer’s (2016, 517) insightful conclusion that “an in-depth study of the mechanisms operative in affix coalescence, or reanalysis more in general, might be a more fruitful way of tackling the whole problem of parasynthesis than the purely synchronic treatments that have prevailed to now” (see also Allen 1981; Batllori-Dillet 2015; Pujol-Payet 2014, i.a., for similar remarks).

As pointed out by Fábregas (2013, 105), if one assumes the previously mentioned two-stage formation of parasynthetic words, unprefixed verbs like °fortunar ‘to fortunate’ and unprefixed participial adjectives like °fortunado ‘fortunate’ are expected to be possible. These forms turn out to be unattested in Spanish “due to historic, idiosyncratic or accidental reasons”. Fábregas’s point is correct since, for example, the Italian counterpart of Sp. afortunado is unprefixed: cf. It. fortunato ‘fortunate’. It is moreover important to realise that the variation we find when comparing Spanish and Italian participial adjectives (cf. Sp. afortunado and It. fortunato ‘fortunate’) is related to the variation that can also be found when dealing with denominal locatum verbs: for example, cf. the Spanish prefixed verb ensillar with the Italian unprefixed verb sellare ‘to saddle’.

Here is when Serrano-Dolader’s (2015) previously mentioned remark becomes relevant: that is, the formal analysis of parasynthetic word formation must be complemented with semantic considerations. It should be noted that it is not accidental that the previously mentioned variation on (un)prefixed forms can sometimes be found in the area of locatum/possession meaning but never, or much less frequently, in the area of location meaning. It is the case that in Romance languages, parasynthetic denominal verbs of the locatum type can be prefixed or unprefixed, whereas parasynthetic denominal verbs of the location type are very often prefixed (see Di Sciullo 1997, 71, fn. 9). As we will see in the next section, this difference is not accidental but rather can be claimed to have a structural explanation (in contrast, what is indeed accidental is that some locatum verbs are prefixed, while others of the same type are not). For example, it is not accidental that the location verb to bottle is consistently prefixed in Romance languages: cf. Sp. embotellar/It. imbottigliare/Cat. embotellar/Fr. embouteiller, and so on. As noted previously, the location pattern in Romance languages is the prefixed one, whereby a possible verb like °botellar is not expected to have the location meaning. In fact, a nice prediction can be made in this case: if a verb like °botellar were created in Spanish, its meaning would be ‘to provide/cover a location/surface with bottles’ rather than ‘to put a locatum or figural object into bottles’. A similar reasoning holds for the non-existent but possible verb °fortunar: to the extent it can be used as a locative verb, its meaning could not be ‘to introduce someone into a fortune’ (the location interpretation) but rather ‘to provide someone with a fortune’ (the locatum/possessive interpretation).

A similar prediction holds for the unattested but possible participial adjective form °botellado. If attested, its meaning could not express the state of something put into bottles but rather the state of a surface/location covered with bottles. In this sense, note also that Fábregas’s (2013) previously mentioned examples of unprefixed stative participial adjectives like dentado ‘toothed’,
barbado ‘bearded’ or jorobado ‘hunchbacked’, which crucially have a locatum/possessive but not a location meaning, are expected.

We have just exemplified why the analysis of parasynthetic word formation must be complemented with semantic considerations. However, note that there are some important issues that still remain unanswered: for example, why are there some parasynthetic denominal verbs of the locatum type prefixed in some Romance languages (e.g., Sp. ensillar and Cat. ensellar ‘to saddle’) but unprefixied in others (e.g., cf. It. sellare and Fr. seller ‘to saddle’)? Why does this variation exist in those parasynthetic words that have a locatum meaning like ensillar ‘to saddle’ but not in the ones that have a location meaning like embotellar ‘to bottle’?

Serrano-Dolader (2015) points out that in Spanish there are triplets like embaldosar/baldosar/baldosa ‘to tile/to tile/tile’. As predicted by our previous reasoning, the verb baldosar can only have the locatum reading ‘to provide/cover some surface with tiles’. But why is the prefixed variant embaldosar also possible with the same locatum reading? Here is when Rainer’s (2016, 517) previously mentioned remarks become relevant: purely synchronic treatments of parasynthesis cannot account for these issues. Indeed, a diachronic perspective is needed to address them. Accordingly, what follows is a bit sketchy but necessary to understand the phenomenon of verbal parasynthesis in Romance languages.

As pointed out by Mateu (2019), an important empirical generalisation that can be drawn from Fruyt’s (2017a, 2017b) excellent descriptive works on parasynthetic verbs in Latin is that in this language, location verbs were typically prefixed, whereas locatum verbs could be prefixed or not. In Mateu (2019), I provided a theoretical syntactic account of Fruyt’s descriptive insights on Latin locative verbs and argued for the following claims: (i) “true” locatum verbs are unprefixied (e.g., marginare ‘to provide a location with (a) border(s)’) and (ii) prefixed locatum verbs (e.g., elinguare ‘to tear the tongue off’) can be derived either from a location structure, which is always prefixed, (i.e., ‘to cause the tongue to go out of X’; for example, see also the Ground object raising posited by Acedo-Matellán 2010, 146–47) or, alternatively, can be derived from a causative change of state structure, that is, ‘to cause X to become deprived of a tongue’, that is, elinguare can be analysed as a “deadjectival” verb formed from the attested adjective elinguis ‘deprived of a tongue’.

As for deadjectival verbs in Classical Latin, Haverling (2000, 2010) points out that they can be unprefixied or prefixed: for example, cf. mollire ‘to soften’ and emollire (ex- ‘out’ mollis ‘soft’) ‘to become completely soft’. As pointed out by her, in Classical Latin, a prefixed deadjectival verb was typically telic, whereas in Late Latin and in Romance, this is not the case. For example, a verb like incrassescere in Late Latin can have an atelic value (‘to grow fatter’), whereas in Classical Latin, this prefixed verb would be telic (‘to start to grow fatter’). As pointed out by Haverling (2010), the complex prefixal system of Classical Latin collapsed in Late Latin, whereby prefixed deadjectival verbs could be atelic in this period. Spanish and other Romance languages inherited this situation from Late Latin, where the prefix is no longer a marker of resultativity. Hence Sp. engordar can also express an atelic situation like the French unprefixied form grossir.

A similar situation is relevant when accounting for the prefix en- in Spanish parasynthetic verbs of the locatum type like embaldosar ‘to tile’, ensillar ‘to saddle’, enharinar ‘to flour’, engrasar ‘to grease’, and so on, where the prefix is not a resultative marker any longer. Cf. the following mixed patterns in French and in Italian, respectively: Fr. carreler ‘to tile’, seller ‘to saddle’ and gnaisser ‘to grease’ are unprefixied, whereas englarine ‘to flour’ is prefixied; It. piastrellare ‘to tile’ and sellare ‘to saddle’ are unprefixied, whereas infarinare ‘to flour’ and ingrassare ‘to grease’ are prefixied (but cf. the unprefixied forms It. oliare and Sp. aceitar ‘to oil’). Unlike in Classical Latin, where prefixation is quite relevant for lexical aspect (see Romagno 2003; Acedo-Matellán 2010, 2016, i.a.), in Romance languages, these morphological differences involved in denominal verbs of
the locatum type (i.e., whether these are prefixed or unprefixed forms) do not have consequences for their lexical aspectual interpretation.

As for denominal verbs of the location type, it seems reasonable to assume that it must not be a coincidence that these verbs are typically prefixed in Latin, as well as in Romance languages. According to Fruyt (2017a), these verbs can be claimed to “agglutinate” a prepositional phrase in Latin: *in humo* > *inhumare* ‘to inhume, to bury’; *ex humo* > *exhumare* ‘to exhume’; *e limine* > *eliminare* ‘to carry out of doors, to eliminate’ (cf. also Serbat 1989). Furthermore, this French latinist assumes that the original preposition involved in these PPs was finally reanalysed in Latin as a preverb; see also Lüdtke (2011) for a recent proposal that in Romance languages, location verbs like Sp. *embarcar* ‘to board, to embark’ also involve the incorporation of a prepositional phrase.

To conclude this section, it is worth recalling that there are some issues that still remain to be answered: why is the prefix typically obligatory in parasynthetic verbs of the location type, whereas this element is not so systematically required in verbs of the locatum type? How different is the morphological/syntactic structure of parasynthetic verbs of the location type and of the locatum type? Finally, what is the syntactic structure of parasynthetic adjectives like *afortunado* ‘fortunate’ or *submarino* ‘submarine’ and less productive parasynthetic compounds like *salpimentar* ‘to season’ or *machihembrar* ‘to dovetail’ (e.g., see Serrano-Dolader 2012a, 2012b)? In the next section, some of these issues are addressed from a theoretical perspective.

### 4 Toward a possible explanation of parasynthesis: a syntactic analysis

There is no consensus in the recent generative literature with regard to the role of prefixes in the syntactic/semantic structure of parasynthetic words in Romance languages. As for prefixed denominal and deadjectival verbs, some authors assume that the prefix is a path head (Di Sciullo 1997; Acedo-Matellán 2006; Gibert-Sotelo and Pujol-Payet 2015, i.a.), a place head (Acedo-Matellán and Mateu 2013), a resultative head (Martínez-Vera 2016, i.a.) or a causative head (Darteni 2017, i.a.). This variety of proposals is not surprising, since, as pointed out by Crocco-Galéas and Jacobini (1992, 1993) and Jacobini (2004, 2010), among others, the prefix in Latin verbs typically encodes a clearly specific (locative or aspectual) meaning, whereas the prefix in Romance parasynthetic verbs typically encodes a less clear, more bleached meaning, which, basically, is signalling a change of state. As we will see in the following, the idea that Spanish parasynthetic verbs with prefixes *en-*, *a-*, and *des-* semantically express a change of state is crucial in the proposals reviewed in this section (see Labelle 2000; Mateu 2002 for the proposal that in denominal parasynthetic verbs of the location and locatum types the incorporated noun/root semantically identifies the final state of the process).

Acedo-Matellán (2006) provides an insightful theoretical account of Crocco-Galéas and Jacobini’s (1993) descriptive proposal by claiming that in Latin, the semantically rich prefixes can take full arguments (NP/DP), whereas in Romance, the semantically bleached prefixes can only take roots as complements, where the root is, as noted previously, interpreted as a Ground expressing a final state. For instance, according to him, the semantic paraphrase of the Catalan example *el vent va esboirar el cel* ‘the wind out-fog-ed the sky’ is ‘the wind causes the event of the sky exiting the state of fog’, and its corresponding syntactic structure is the one depicted in (2), drawn from Acedo-Matellán (2006, 13) According to this author, the formation of parasynthetic verbs involves the steps shown in (2): first, conflation of the root √*boir* ‘fog’ into [R], that is, the eventive R(elational) verbal head, giving the unattested verbalised form (∗*boiar*), and then affixation of the prefix es- ‘out’ to the verb, giving the final attested form (*esboiar*). Following
Hale and Keyser (2002) and Mateu (2002), the prepositional head, which is occupied by the prefix *es* ‘out’ in (2), is a birelational element that relates a Figure (*el cel ‘the sky*) with a Ground (the state of √boir ‘fog’)

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{FP} \\
\text{el vent} \\
\text{F} \\
\text{R} \\
\text{el cel} \\
\text{es-} \\
\text{√boir}
\end{array}
\]

Acedo-Matellán’s (2006) theoretical claim that Romance prefixes take roots as complements is further exploited by Gibert-Sotelo (2018) in her analysis of *des* ‘from’ prefixed verbs. According to her, Spanish *des-* prefixed verbs with ablative, privative or reversative values (e.g., cf. the parasynthetic verbs *descarrilar* ‘to derail’ and *desconchar* ‘uncork’ and the non-parasynthetic verb *desatar* ‘untie’, respectively) share the same syntactic structure. In her terms (p. 170), “ablative, privative, and reversative verbs encode Source-oriented change of state events in which a Figure (the internal argument) departs from a given state (a state that is inferred from the meaning of the verb root)”. Gibert-Sotelo (2018) shows that a similar structure can be provided for the prefix *des-* ‘from’ in parasynthetic verbs like *descarrilar* ‘derail’ or *despiojar* ‘delouse’ and in parasynthetic adjectives like *desalmado* ‘heartless’ or *desvergonzado* ‘shameless’. In all these cases, the prefix *des-* lexicalises the very same structure (Source-Goal-Place) and takes a root as its complement (e.g., *carril* ‘rail’, *piojo* ‘louse’, *alma* ‘heart’, *vergüenza* ‘shame’, etc.).

However, things become trickier when the prefix of the parasynthetic word is provided with a less specific meaning. For example, which semantic components are the Sp. prefixes *en-* and *a-* supposed to lexicalise in parasynthetic verbs like *ensillar* ‘to saddle’, *amurallar* ‘to wall’, *acuchillar* ‘to knife’ or *engordar* ‘to fatten’ and in parasynthetic adjectives like *embobado* ‘besotted’ or *afortunado* ‘fortunate’? Even in the case of location verbs like *embotellar*, it is not clear what meaning the prefix *en-* ‘in’ can be associated with. As noted previously, some authors have claimed that the prefix *en-* can be related with the preposition of the PP ‘in bottle(s)’ (see Lüdtke 2011, i.a.). However, as pointed out by Iacobini (2010, 2–3), among others, this claim cannot be maintained synchronically, since in some languages like French, the prefix of location verbs like *enfourner* ‘to put in the oven’ does not correspond with the relevant locative preposition: cf. *mettre dans le four* ‘to put in the oven’.

As for the structure of locative denominal parasynthetic verbs of the *en-* . . . *-ar* and *a-* . . . *-ar* types, an important difference between location and locatum verbs is that the former are resultative verbs, whereas the latter are not (see Acedo-Matellán and Real-Puigdollers 2015 for some aspectual tests teasing apart both classes of denominal locative verbs). It can then be claimed that parasynthetic denominal verbs of the location type can be analysed as encoding not only the adpositional relation involved in a Figure-Ground configuration but also the upper Result head. In contrast, parasynthetic denominal verbs of the locatum type and deadjectival verbs can be analysed as involving only the Figure-Ground configuration (see Acedo-Matellán and Real-Puigdollers 2015 for some aspectual tests that classify these two classes of verbs into the same aspectual class). Some relevant syntactic analyses of parasynthetic verbs are given in (3), where
the root is generated in the most embedded position and is conflated into the upper v(eralbal) head. Furthermore, as pointed out by Acedo-Matellán (2006), a prefixation operation takes place, which is responsible for the prefix not to be left astray in its original site.7

(3) a. Analysis of Sp. prefixed denominal location verbs (e.g., Sp. enlatar las sardinas ‘to can the sardines’):

\[
\left[ \text {vP v} \left[ \text {ResultP las sardinasi} \left[ \text {Result' Res} \left[ \text {PP las sardinas} \left[ \text {vP en- √lata} \right] \right] \right] \right] \right] \]
\]

b. Analysis of Sp. (un)prefixed denominal locatum verbs (e.g., Sp. (en)baldosar el suelo ‘to tile the floor’):

\[
\left[ \text {vP v} \left[ \text {PP el suelo} \left[ \text {vP en- √baldosa} \right] \right] \right] \]
\]

c. Analysis of Sp. prefixed deadjectival verbs (e.g., Sp. engordar al cerdo ‘to fatten the pig’):

\[
\left[ \text {vP v} \left[ \text {PP el cerdo} \left[ \text {vP en- √gordo} \right] \right] \right] \]
\]

Moreover, as shown in (4), parasynthetic adjectives of the desalmado type or the afortunado type are formed by embedding a locatum/possessive structure into a stative adjectival/participial category instead of a verbal one: see (4a) and (4b). Parasynthetic adjectives of the submarino type (see (4c)) are, in turn, formed by embedding a location structure into a stative adjectival category [see Embick 2004 for the claim that stative adjectival participles do not involve the v(eralbal) category].8 As in the previous, the formation of parasynthetic adjectives involves the two following steps: first, conflation of the root into the upper adjectival head, giving the unattested participial form (°almado/°fortunado) or the attested adjective (marino), and then affixation of the prefix to the adjective, giving the final prefixed form (desalmado/afortunado/submarino).

(4) a. Desalmado type (the boy deprived of a heart):

\[
\left[ \text {AdjP -d(o) [PP el chico [vP des- √ALMA]]} \right] \]

b. Afortunado type (the boy provided with a fortune):

\[
\left[ \text {AdjP -d(o) [PP el chico [vP a- √FORTUNA]]} \right] \]

c. Submarino type (the journey which takes place under (the) sea):

\[
\left[ \text {AdjP -in(o) [PP el viaje [vP sub- √MAR]]} \right] \]

Finally, parasynthetic compounds like salpimentar ‘to season’ are formed by merging two different roots (sal ‘salt’ and pimienta ‘pepper’). The resulting compound is then embedded into a locatum structure selected by a verbal category, which is headed by a zero morpheme: \[ \text {vP v [PP la carne WITH [vSAL √PIMIENTA]]} \] (‘to provide the meat with the complex √ROOT’).

5 Concluding remarks

Among the three most important descriptive proposals on parasynthesis, it seems that Scalise’s (1986) representation in (1c) [pref. [XN/Adj suf.]V] is the most adequate one. According to him, parasynthetic words are formed in two stages: in the first (i.e., suffixation) stage, a possible but not necessarily attested or actual word is generated (e.g., °gordar ‘to fatten’), whereas in the second (i.e., prefixation) stage, the actual complex word is generated (e.g., Sp. engordar). Syntactically speaking (e.g., see Acedo-Matellán 2006), the formation of the parasynthetic verb has been claimed to involve the two following steps: first conflation of the root into the upper verbal
head, giving the unattested verbalised form (e.g., *gordar ‘to fatten’) and then affixation of the prefix to the complex root+verb, giving the final attested form (e.g., Sp. engordar).

Two important methodological considerations have also been taken into account in the present chapter on parasynthesis: on the one hand, Serrano-Dolader’s (2015) relevant remark that the formal analysis of parasynthetic word formation must be complemented with semantic considerations. For example, among locative verbs, a semantic distinction between location and locatum verbs appears to be relevant: the former involve a syntactically transparent Res(ultative) head, whereas the latter lack it. This syntacticosemantic difference has also been claimed to be related to their different morphological make-up: in Romance languages, location verbs are typically prefixed, whereas locatum verbs can be unprefix (Di Sciullo 1997). On the other, as pointed out by Rainer (2016), the adoption of a diachronic perspective has also been shown to be necessary to surmount some deficiencies of purely synchronic accounts of the formation of parasynthetic words.

Notes

1 It should be noted that the formation of parasynthetic verbs is not a process found only in Romance languages but also in other languages. So, for example, Rainer (2016, 517) points out that in German, a verb like verdeutschen ‘to translate into German’ (cf. Deutsch ‘German’) cannot be derived in two steps either: deutsch → *verdeutschen; deutsch → *deutschen → verdeutschen. Accordingly, this author concludes that what turns out to be special about Romance parasynthesis is its terminology (in Slavic linguistics, similar processes are called ‘prefixal-suffixal formations’).

2 See Batiukova, this volume, for the famous distinction among locative verbs: cf. locatum verbs like to saddle or to flour and location verbs like to bottle or to jail. See also the classical proposals put forward by Clark and Clark (1979), Hale and Keyser (1993, 2002) and Kiparsky (1997), among others.

3 Schroten (1997, 196) argues against the typical claim that the prefixes involved in parasynthetic denominal verbs are mere “historical residues” by noting that Spanish verbs like encajetillar ‘to pack’ and embollinar ‘to provide with a filter tip’ denote industrial processes related to cigarettes, which suggests that they have been formed in recent centuries (nineteenth or twentieth). Todaro (2017) has also shown that parasynthesis is a quite productive process of verb formation in contemporary Italian.

4 As pointed out by Gibert-Sotelo and Pujol-Payet (2015) and Martínez-Vera (2016), among others, a prefixed denominal verb like abotellar is not possible on the locative reading but rather on the property one: that is, ‘to cause X to have the shape of a bottle’. For relevant distinctions between en- and a-prefixation in parasynthetic verbs, see these works and Acedo-Matellán (2006), among others. For example, compare the locative readings of envinagar (both the location and the locatum interpretations are possible: ‘to put X in vinegar’ and ‘to provide X with vinegar’, respectively) and the property reading of avinar or avinar ‘to make sour as vinegar’. See Batiukova, this volume, for more discussion.

5 Acedo-Matellán and Mateu (2013) relate this change to a well-known typological shift from a satellite-framed pattern to a verb-framed one.

6 As pointed out by Acedo-Matellán (2006, 13), “some operations must take place in order to derive the overt shape of the predicate: a conflation process, represented through angled arrows, taking the phonological content of the root up to the [R] head, and a prefixation operation, represented through curved arrows, responsible for the prefix, a phonologically dependent sequence, not to be left astray in its original site.” See also Montalbetti (1996) and Martínez-Vera (2016) for independent reasons that point to the fact that the prefix attaches to an already verbalised base predicate. The [R] head in (2), which expresses a source/initiation relation in Mateu’s (2002) relational semantic framework, corresponds to the v head. Finally, the FP in (2) is currently understood as VoiceP, that is, the functional projection that introduces the external argument (e.g., see Acedo-Matellán 2016, 31, i.a.).

7 Following Hale and Keyser’s (2002, 16–17) ideas on bipartite phonological matrices, it can be claimed that the phonological matrix associated to the P head in (3) is bipartite: for example, in (3a), the empty one is eliminated through conflation of the root √lata ‘can’ in its path to the upper verb, whereas the
full one is expressed by the prefix en- ‘in’. This apparently stipulative complexity can be claimed to be needed if one wants to avoid the direct conflation depicted in the syntactic tree in (2), where the P head is surpassed by the root √boir ‘fog’ in its conflation route to the upper verbal head. See Hale and Keyser (2002) for more discussion on how the so-called “head-to-head movement” is to be understood in their syntactic theory of verb formation.

8 In (4), the Figure DP arguments el chico ‘the boy’ and el viaje ‘the journey’ are included in the syntactic structure. However, following standard analyses of so-called ‘externalisation’ in adjectival passives (e.g., see Bruening 2014), this argument should be external to the adjectival participial structure, its slot being then occupied by an operator coindexed with it. For the sake of clarity, I omit this further complexity here.
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