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0. Introduction and Outline

Important semantic properties of English denominal verbs have been discussed by Hale and Keyser (1993); French denominal verbs have been treated by Di Sciullo (1993) in a similar fashion.¹ For Hale and Keyser’s theory, parasythetic denominal verbs, which are characterized by a verbalizing suffix and a prefix are unexpected. Their proposal does not suggest a satisfactory treatment of the unexpected prefix. Labelle’s (1992) study on French denominal verbs, both parasythetic and nonparasythetic denominal verbs, and Di Sciullo’s (1990) treatment of Italian parasythetic verbs cannot be related to Hale and Keyser’s proposals.

In this study, I want to show that Pustejovsky’s (1995) proposals on the semantic “telic qualia” structure of nouns permits us to solve one important problem for Hale and Keyser’s analysis and to characterize the relation between parasythetic and nonparasythetic denominal verbs. The data have been drawn from Spanish; they can be found in other Romance languages as well.

An intriguing property of a parasythetic denominal verb is the lack of "intermediate" forms. For example, the Spanish noun botella ‘bottle’ is related to the parasythetic verb embotellar ‘to bottle’. It is composed of the prefix em- (an orthographic and phonetic variant of en-, used before /b/ or /p/), the nominal stem botell- and the infinitival ending -ar, which is one of the 50 verb endings that Spanish verbs can take. There are no "intermediate" forms: the noun *embotella and the verb *botellar are inexistent.

A second intriguing property of Spanish parasythetic verbs is that there are two parasythetic prefixes: en- and a-. Intuitively, there seems to be a meaning difference between parasythetic verbs with the prefix en- and those with the prefix a-. Still, the meaning of the prefix is difficult to pin down.

A third intriguing property is that, in a number of cases, the parasythetic prefix is not found in denominal verbs although their meaning is comparable to that of a parasythetic denominal verb. For instance, the noun horca ‘gallows’ is related to the parasythetic denominal verb ahorcar ‘to hang’, and the noun guillotina ‘guillotine’ is related to the nonparasythetic denominal verb guillotinar ‘to guillotine’. From a conceptual of view, these two verbs are related and can be interpreted as: “to execute by means of the gallows / guillotine”.

¹ I would like to thank F. Melka, E.-P. Kester and an anonymous reviewer for helpful comments.
Parasynthetic denominal verbs have been interpreted as denominal verbs which happen to possess a prefix. They tend to be considered as historical residues, remnants of once meaningful prefixation processes. This cannot be true, since verbs such as *encajetillar* ‘to pack’ and *emboquillar* ‘to provide with a filter tip’ denote industrial processes related to cigarettes, which suggests that they have been formed recently, in this or the last century.

The hypothesis that will be put forward in this paper is that the parasynthetic prefixes are meaningful, that is, that they contribute compositionally to the meaning of the verb. They will be interpreted as "focalizers" which combine with a specific aspect of the meaning of the noun with which they are combined. The "focalizer" *en-* is combined with nouns having a static "telic quale", and the "focalizer" *a-* is combined with nouns having an active "telic quale". The concept of "telic quale" as part of the semantic structure of nouns is due to Pustejovsky (1995). Focalization of the event type (state or activity) implied by the "telic quale" can only be successful if the noun has been "verbalized". I will show that nouns without any prefix can "verbalize" in the same way, by focusing the "telic quale" without any "focalizer" being present.

In the first section, it will be shown that the Spanish parasynthetic prefix *en-* combines with nouns which have a basically static "telic quale" and that the parasynthetic prefix *a-* combines with nouns which have a basically active "telic quale". It will be discussed what kinds of static "telic qualia" are found, and what kinds of active "telic qualia". Some apparent exceptions will be discussed.

In the second section, it will be argued that *en-* and *a-* are "focalizers", whose meaning is to highlight the static or the active event implied by the "telic quale" of the noun. The same denominal verbal meanings can be obtained without any focalizer being present, which is why the prefix is not necessary. Nonparasynthetic denominal verbs are characterized by the same semantic process of foregrounding the event type which is part of the "telic quale". In fact, foregrounding of the "telic quale" will be argued to be verbalization. As will be shown, this approach can be combined with Hale and Keyser's (1993) analysis of the lexico-conceptual structure of English denominal verbs.

In the third section, I will show that the event implied by the "telic qualia structure" of nouns is highlighted without affecting the event structure of the verb.

1. On two types of parasynthetic verbs

At first sight, parasynthetic verbs such as *embotellar* ‘to bottle’ invite the hypothesis that the prefix *en-* is similar to the locative preposition *en*, as shown in (1a,b):

(1)  
a. embotellar el vino (‘to bottle the wine’)  
b. meter el vino en botellas (‘to put the wine in bottles’)
This makes sense for (1a,b) since the location is verbalized in (1a), and the locatum, the entity whose location is described, keeps on being the direct object of this verb. The hypothesis, however, is simply wrong in cases such as the example given in (2a,b):

(2) a ensillar el caballo ('to saddle the horse')
    b meter una silla en el caballo ('to put a saddle on the horse')

In (2a), the locatum has been verbalized and the location is its direct object. The use of the locative preposition *en* with the locatum does not make sense. This is why *en-* will be analyzed as a prefix, not related synchronically with the homophonous preposition.

Note that *en-* is found in verbs in which the *state* of the object denoted by the direct object is defined, as a result of the activity denoted by the parasynthetic denominal verb. Thus, the wine, in (1a), will be in a *state* of a bottle containing it and the horse, in (2a), will be in a *state* of a saddle covering it.

In Pustejovsky (1995), the semantic structure of nouns is suggested to contain four Aristotelian "Qualia" in a "Qualia Structure, which specifies four essential aspects of a word's meaning (or *qualia")." (Pustejovsky 1995: 76). The Qualia or aspects of a word's meaning are defined as in (3):

(3) *Qualia Structure* (Pustejovsky (1995:76))
    .CONSTITUTIVE; the relation between an object and its constituent parts;
    .FORMAL: that which distinguishes it within a larger domain;
    .TELIC: its purpose and function;
    .AGENTIVE: factors involved in its origin or "bringing it about".

The Telic Qualia structure of nouns such as *bottle* and *saddle* can be conceived as shown in (4a,b):

(4) *Telic Qualia of Nouns combining with EN-* (first version)
    a bottle: has the function to hold liquids
    b saddle: has the function to cover the back of a horse

A more formal version will define a relationship of a specific kind, the "containing kind" holding between the bottle, the container, and the liquid, the "containee", and the "covering kind" holding between the saddle, the "coverer", and the horse, the "coveree". This formal version is given in (5a,b):
(5) **Telic Qualia of Nouns combining with EN- (formal version)**

a bottle=x: R=CONTAIN (e, x, y)
b saddle=x: R=COVER (e, x, y)

In both cases, e is the event argument.

What the two kinds of R, R=CONTAIN and R=COVER have in common is that they are stative verbs; they share the event type **state**.

The number of container nouns found in parasynthetic denominal verbs is quite large; the same goes for the number of nouns denoting "coverers". Some containers are: *cajón* 'drawer', *baúl* 'trunk'; by extension, some spaces can be interpreted as containers: *cárcel* 'prison', *cámara* '(storage) room', *bodega* 'wine cellar', etc. The same goes for "coverers": *papel* 'wall paper', *baldosa* 'tile', *petate* 'mat', which can be extended as well: *cuaderno* 'book binding', *boquilla* 'filter tip (of a cigarette)', etc.

Parasynthetic verbs with the prefix *a-* denote activities in *acariciar* 'to caress' and *acuchillar* 'to stab (with a knife)', derived from the nouns *caricia* 'caress' and *cuchillo* 'knife'. The "telic qualia" of these nouns can be defined as: "touch someone" and "cut or stab someone"; more generally, they can be conceived as: "affect someone with a caress / knife". The most typical instances of parasynthetic verbs with the prefix *a-* involve actions such as hitting, killing, and touching.

Some instances are: *afusilar* 'to shoot (with a rifle)', *apalear* 'to hit (with a stick)', *agarrotar* 'to execute with the garrotte', derived from the nouns *fusil* 'rifle', *palo* 'stick', *garrote* 'garrotte'. The formal version of the "telic qualia" of these nouns is given in (6):

(6) **Telic Qualia of Nouns combining with A- (formal version)**

a fusil 'rifle' = x: R=KILL (e, z, y, with x)
b palo 'stick' = x: R=HIT (e, z, y, with x)
c garrote 'garrote' = x: R=KILL (e, z, y, with x)

In these cases, e is an event argument, and z is the agent.

---

2 In Moliner (1966), more than 60 verbs of this type can be found. The nouns on which they are based denote containers like 'basket', 'barrel', 'trunk', 'bag' and spaces such as 'pool', 'cellar', 'bullpen', 'prison'.

3 In Moliner (1966), more than 80 verbs of this type can be found. The nouns on which they are based denote 'oil', 'ochre', 'sand', 'mud', 'stone', 'pebble', 'tar', etc. A number of nouns denote "adornments", such as 'headstall', 'feather', 'tapestry'.

4 This type is difficult to analyze. About 50 verbs of Moliner (1966) have the conceptual properties mentioned in the text. Not all verbs with this prefix can be analyzed the same way; the nouns from which they derive may have other "telic qualia". Still, the prefix *a* highlights activities in most of the clear cases.
What the nouns with these "telic qualia" have in common is that the event type is an activity; usually, there is an agent performing this activity with the object denoted by the noun. Many parasynthetic verbs with the prefix a- can be interpreted this way.

However, some parasynthetic verbs with the prefix a- have different properties. A typical example is acartonarse 'to get like cardboard', derived from cartón 'cardboard'. In this case, the following, different derivation can be suggested. There is a sizable number of parasynthetic denominal adjectives with the prefix a- and with the suffix -ado, like atigrado 'striped, marked like a tiger', which is derived from tigre 'tiger'. The suffix -ado is homophonous with the Past Participle form of verbs with the infinitival ending -ar, which are the regular, common and productive verbs of Spanish. There is no verb *atigrarse. In general, these adjectives have the meaning "like x", x being the nominal base. In a case like acartonarse 'to get like cardboard', a plausible suggestion is that it is derived from the parasynthetic adjective acartonado 'like cardboard', by reanalyzing it as a Past Participle form of a regular verb. A non-existing word as *atigrarse is felt as a possible neologism with the meaning "to become (striped) like a tigre".

A problem is constituted by the existence of two parasynthetic verbs derived from the same noun, one with the prefix en- and the other one with the prefix a-. Consider, for example, Peninsular Spanish embetunar 'to black (shoes)' and Latin American abetunar 'to polish', derived from betún 'shoe polish'. The Peninsular Spanish verb would seem to highlight the resulting state of shoes being covered with shoe polish, whereas the Latin American variant highlights the act of polishing, that is, of making contact with the shoes with shoe polish. Although this analysis might seem to be somewhat contrived, other examples suggest that it is on the right track. One such example is constituted by encarcelar 'to imprison, to jail' and aprisionar 'to imprison'. The noun cárcel 'prison' denotes the "container" holding the prisoner, which is compatible with the prefix en-, and not with a-. The noun prisión 'prison; imprisonment', on the other hand, does not only denote the "container", but also the act of imprisoning people, a meaning which is not found with cárcel 'jail'. Thus, aprisionar 'to imprison' can be interpreted as highlighting the act of putting someone in jail.

To resume, the analysis of the data suggests that the parasynthetic prefix en- is used with nouns having a telic quale of the state type, and that the parasynthetic prefix a- is used with nouns having a telic quale of the activity type.

Note that exceptions of various types are possible to these generalizations. I have suggested that some parasynthetic verbs with the prefix a- are derived from parasynthetic adjectives formed by adding the prefix a- and the suffix -ado to a noun stem and having the meaning "like x", x being the noun stem.

Another kind of exception is constituted by metaphors. One might wonder how enamorar 'to win the love of' and enamorarse 'to fall in love' can be analyzed. Should the noun amor 'love' be taken to be a container, like a prison (there
is a famous medieval book with the title Cárceel de amor ('Prison of love'), or should love be conceived as a "covering substance", wrapping up people? Although the telic quale is difficult to define, it is evident that love tends to be considered as a state. The exact analysis of the "telic quale" of amor 'love' and similar nouns having metaphorical meaning will not be discussed in this paper.

Finally, note that lexical items can have "idiomatic" meanings; they will be exceptions to any kind of semantic, compositional rule.

The discussion in the following sections will be limited to the clear cases.

2. Focalizers and how to verbalize a noun

The parasynthetic prefixes en- and a- as "focalizers" are operators requiring a "focalized" element. As is suggested by the analysis of the data in the first section, the parasynthetic "focalizers" have the curious property of selecting specific event types.

Another curious property of these "focalizers" is that they cannot be used to derive nouns from nouns:

(7) Focalizers prefixed to Nouns

botella ('bottle') > *embotella
silla ('saddle') > *ensilla

Two reasons can be imagined why these parasynthetic nouns are out, and why they sound as impossible words.

The first reason that we can think of is that the focalizer might be taken to be an adjunction-like or specifier-like element trying to access a part of the meaning of the noun which it too "hidden" to be seen. The theory of qualia structure, however, makes this a dubious move since "qualia structure" is accessible to adjectives as good, as shown by Pustejovsky (1995:ch.6).

The second reason that can be thought of is that focalizing the state of the "telic quale" would produce a clash: focusing the event type would transform this "telic quale" into the head of the word. This implies that the event is the head of the lexical item. Nouns heading NPs obtain referential properties, denoting objects, which clashes with the event implied by its "telic quale" being the head. Verbs are headed by event structure, permitting headedness of the event implied by the "telic quale". The incorporated noun from which the denominal verbs are derived can no longer obtain the usual referential properties of the noun; it cannot denote specific objects.

Thus, focalization of the event-type of the telic quale and verbalization are related. Focalizing the event-type of the telic quale implies, in fact, verbalization.

The parasynthetic verb, just as any other verb, has an event structure, composed of the subevents $e_1$ and $e_2$. The subevent $e_1$, according to proposals made by
Grimshaw (1990) and Pustejovsky (1995) denote the activity or process, and the subevent $e_2$ denotes the resulting state. Given the two parasynthetic prefixes that we find in Spanish parasynthetic verbs, this suggests that $en$- is associated with the second subevent $e_2$ and that $a$- is related to the first subevent $e_1$. However, differently from the aspectual prefixes that we find in Russian, the Spanish parasynthetic prefixes are found with each and every verb form, whatever its aspectual value. Therefore, these prefixes cannot be claimed to bind one of the subevents that the denominal verb implies. The verbal event structure, however, is needed to "cover" the event defined by the "telic quale" of the noun, which has been promoted to its head.

Let us take a look at nonparasynthetic denominal verbs, such as English to bottle and to saddle. According to Hale and Keyser (1993), their lexico-conceptual structure is comparable with a semantically related syntactic structure, in the way shown in (8) and (9):

(8) **Lexico-conceptual structure of "to bottle"**

```
to bottle = (to) PUT IN bottle(s), where PUT and IN are phonetically zero
[cf. the syntactic construction: to put in bottles]
```

(9) **Lexico-conceptual structure of "to saddle"**

```
to saddle = (to) PROVIDE WITH saddle(s), where PROVIDE and WITH are phonetically zero
[cf. the syntactic construction: to provide with saddle(s)]
```

Hale and Keyser argue that the lexico-conceptual structure is basically similar to the syntactic structure, as to relations such as "head-complement" and "specifier-head". The zeroing of the highest head, the verb and the preposition forces the complement of the preposition to raise to the position of the preposition and to that of the verb, where it ends up being verbalized, that is, by combining with inflectional elements.

Now consider the "Qualia structure" that the nominal bases of denominal verbs have. Hale and Keyser's proposal can be combined with Pustejovsky's suggestion on "qualia structure".

To facilitate the comparison, I will revise the "telic qualia" structure described in (5) by giving the passive equivalent of the active, stative structure given in (5). The alternate telic qualia structure is given in (10):

(10) **Stative telic qualia structure of nouns (alternate formal version)**

```
a bottle=x: R=BE_CONTAINED_IN (e, y, x), e=stative
b saddle=x: R=BE_COVERED_WITH (e, y, x), e=stative
```

Hale and Keyser's (1993) proposal can now be reinterpreted in a more natural way. The tree structure they propose for the lexico-conceptual structures of to bottle and to saddle is given in (11):
The lexically filled N is dominated by nonlexical heads P, V, V which must be filled by raising bottle / saddle to the highest V-position.

A difficult point in this analysis is that the empty preposition corresponds to lexical *in* if N=bottle and that it corresponds to lexical *with* if N=saddle. Hale and Keyser (1993) do not try to solve the puzzling question why two unrelated prepositions can correspond to the same zero position, obtaining different interpretations. In Labelle (1992), the simple observation is made that some denominal verbs like *to bottle* are verbalized locations, and can be considered as "standard constructions" producing "standard verbs", whereas other denominal verbs such as *to saddle* are verbalized locatums, and can be called "crossed constructions", producing "crossed verbs". The suggestion that she gives as to why the location is verbalized in one case, and the locatum in another case is that this is due to pragmatic reasons. Hale and Keyser's analysis and Pustejovsky's "Qualia structure" proposal suggest that the reasons are semantic, and must be formulated as part of lexical semantics.

If we take into account the "telic qualia" given in (10), the solution to this problem can be given. The first step is that bottle and saddle are not interpreted as complements of empty prepositions, but that they are assumed to be complements of V, as in (12):

(12)  
\[
\begin{array}{c}
V' \\
V \\
\text{NP} \\
\text{the wine} \\
\text{the horse} \\
\text{bottle (N(P))} \\
\text{saddle (N(P))}
\end{array}
\]

\begin{align*}
\text{bottle} &= \text{BE\_CONTAINED\_IN (e,y,x)} \\
\text{saddle} &= \text{BE\_COVERED\_BY (e,y,x)}
\end{align*}
Verbalization will consist in lifting the "telic quale" out of the semantic structure of the noun; in other words, the telic quale structure is raised. This lifting or raising operations implies that the telic quale is transformed into a head.

Pure semantic features, however, cannot move on their own; the phonetic form they are part of must accompany them, as argued in Chomsky (1995). For example, the constituent which house in: which house do you like? has a WH-feature, which is part of which. The WH-feature must move, and the lexical item which it is part of must follow it, dragging along the noun so that the NP-constituent is moved. The moved words are copied, under Chomsky's assumptions. The original constituent is deleted at Phonetic Form, but it can be interpreted in this (now invisible) position, at Logical Form.

A comparable proposal can be made for the verbalization of bottle in to bottle the wine and of saddle in to saddle the horse. The telic quale is raised to V-position; the phonetic form must be copied to make the semantic feature visible, and is deleted in its original position. Raising the telic quale to V provides us with the desired interpretations, in their first step towards a full interpretation. This first step gives: "the wine is_contained_in (the) bottle" and "the horse is_covered_by (the) saddle".

Thus, our claim is that the raising of the telic quale produces the desired interpretation of the verbalized noun, and the desired interpretation with respect to the preposition.

Evidence for this claim is provided by the existence of "shadow arguments", as they are called in Pustejovsky (1995:ch.5.2), who presents the following example, which had also been discussed in Jackendoff (1990:ch.8.3):

(13) Mary buttered her toast with margarine / *with butter

The "shadow argument" with butter, but not the "subtype" with margarine, is implied by the lexical structure of the denominal verb to butter.

Deletion of the "shadow argument" is only possible, and if possible, necessary, if the shadow argument is recoverable by the lexical structure of the denominal verb. Note that recoverability implies that the original nominal part of the denominal verb must be visible.

"Subtyping specification" makes full deletion of the subtyped shadow argument irrecoverable, and hence impossible. The contrast between recoverable and irrecoverable "shadow arguments" is semantic in (13) and syntactic in (14):

(14) a Mary bottleneck the wine *in bottles / in beautiful bottles
    b Mary saddled the horse *with a saddle / with a beautiful saddle

The contrast that we find in (13) and (14) suggests that the lexical structure of the denominal verb is visible in syntax. A similar phenomenon can be found in cognate object constructions: *to die a death / to die a painful death.
Now consider the parasynthetic denominal verbs with the prefix *a-. This prefix has been analyzed as a "focalizer" of an activity event in the "telic quale" of the noun. Their qualia structure, as given in (6), can be reformulated as in (15):

(15) Active qualia structure of nouns (alternate formal version)
   a fusil 'rifle'=x: R=BE_KILLED_WITH (e,y,x), e=activity
   b palo 'stick'=x: R=BE_HIT_WITH (e,y,x), e=activity
   c garrote 'garrotte'=x: R=BE_KILLED_WITH (e,y,x), e=activity

In these cases, e is a "process", or activity. With this "telic qualia" structure, the same things can be said as with respect to parasynthetic verbs with *en-. Also in English, this kind of activity denominal verbs exists, such as to stone and to knife, which correspond to Spanish apedrear (derived from piedra 'stone') and acuchillar (derived from cuchillo 'knife').

In conclusion, the telic qualia structure of the nouns can profitably be interpreted as the head of the denominal verb, both with parasynthetic denominal verbs and with nonparasynthetic or "pure" denominal verbs.

3. On the structure of parasynthetic denominal verbs

Scalise (1986:ch.VII,2) argues that the parasynthetic prefix attaches to the verb which may be a denominal (or deadjectival) verb. His proposal goes counter to the fact that denominal verbs are special, as I have tried to show. In his proposal, the prefix cannot "see" that the verb is denominal. Alcoba Rubio (1987) argues that the parasynthetic prefix is added to the nominal base, and that this complex is verbalized. He does not account for the fact that the intermediate parasynthetic noun must be verbalized.

In this paper, the parasynthetic prefixes *en- and *a- have also been analyzed as prefixes of nouns which are verbalized. Consider the first step in the morphological derivation of parasynthetic denominal verbs, as given in (16):

(16) [prefix, [ noun <telic quale: R (e, ...)> ]]

The prefix is a "focalizer", which is like an operator in that it must have a suitable element in its domain. As has been argued, the element that the focalizer is looking for is the event type of the telic quale, with which it associates. This operator-variable-like association forces it to follow the movements of the telic quale, in order to keep it in its domain.

If (16) is the initial structure of nouns which are verbalized, the lexico-conceptual structure given in (12) for denominal verbs can be maintained for Spanish parasynthetic denominal verbs, as is shown in (17):
Raising the telic quale, and its phonetic host, to V, forces the prefix to raise as well in order to keep the associated element in its domain.

Although the Spanish parasynthetic prefixes *en-* en-*a-* select different event types, state and active events, they do not interpret the event. Being "focalizers", they highlight and call attention to the event type of the telic quale. As said, foregrounding of the event under verbalization is done also without any "focalizer" being present.

This implies that the use of parasynthetic prefixes is not necessary to obtain the intended meaning. In principle, it follows that the speaker can use *embotellar* or *botellar* to express the meaning "to bottle" and *ensillar* or *sillar* to express the meaning of "to saddle". However, the first form, with prefix, is used and the second form, without the prefix, is not used.

I want to suggest that the choice was free when the denominal verbs were created. However, as has been observed by Aronoff (1976:ch.3), lexicalization of one form blocks other possible forms. In this case, this means that the transmission of the lexical items *embotellar* 'to bottle' and *ensillar* 'to saddle' has blocked other possible forms (see Melka and Schrote (1997)).

The parasynthetic prefix in Spanish has no effects on the interpretation of the event structure in syntax. The fact that there are two prefixes, "focalizers" associated with a state and an active event suggests some link with the two subevents, usually interpreted as activity or process and as result or state that are part of the event structure. Still, no effect on the interpretation of the event structure can be noted, which implies that they are not to be interpreted as aspectual prefixes.

Note that our analysis of the two Spanish prefixes, which have been argued to select two different event types, defined by the telic quale of the noun, leads to a surprising conclusion. The conclusion is that even if the two event types selected by the two prefixes are semantically related to the two subevents that have been argued to define the event structure of the verb, this is a coincidence. The coincidence might have historical roots, of course.
If the analysis is on the right track, languages having one parasynthetic prefix should be possible. English might be a case: it has a sizable class of verbs with the prefix \textit{en-}; other prefixes such as \textit{a-} are found in "idiomatic" lexical items.

4. Conclusion

In this paper, the two parasynthetic prefixes that we find in Spanish parasynthetic denominal verbs have been discussed.

In the first section, a case has been made for the claim that the two prefixes are meaningful, and the relevant meanings have been sketched.

In the second section, the reason why the meaningful prefix is not necessary for denominal verb formation has been discussed. The prefixes have been interpreted as focalizers, each one focalizing a specific event type as defined by the "telic quale" of the noun. They have been argued to be "focalizers": operators which require a specific event type to be associated with, and which highlight the event type. In general, verbalization of the noun can be interpreted as the conversion of the "telic quale" of the noun into its head. The parasynthetic prefix is not necessary for verbalization of the noun.

In the third section, the status of the parasynthetic prefixes has been discussed.
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