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1. Introduction

Language borrowing is a frequent topic in Spanish works dealing with prescriptive grammar (or “bon usage”). In addition to organizing the cases under study according to their grammatical or lexical type, these works usually include observations, more or less influenced by the author’s subjectivity, about the adequacy of the specific elements being borrowed (Gómez Torrego 1989).

On the other hand, in current theoretically-oriented research, violations against the normative usage, reflected in dialectal or social varieties of the standard language, are considered different “norms” and consequently regarded as instances of language variation (Demonte 2000, 2001). In this same vein, we contend that most cases of borrowing —considered by purists “counter-normative”— can be included under the generic notion of variation.

The borrowings that we study here are well rooted in the grammar of the language of adoption. They are not like blends or other morphological formations from playful language that are generated in the extragrammatical morphology by means of some altered versions of the general mechanisms operating in natural languages (Dressler 2000). Although the rules that apply in the lexical constructs under analysis are not the same as those governing native word formations, they are nevertheless expected or logical extensions of them. In short, we contend that the basic principles of grammar are not only responsible for the “normal” use of the language but also for its novel and often occasional use.

For the most part, we will be analyzing the compounds shown in (1a), with the structure N+VsufN. Secondarily, we will also refer to some derived nouns, such as the ones included in (1b), involving a new meaning of the prefix co-.

In our understanding, the incorporation in present-day Spanish of these two new word formation processes can be explained as the result of parametric variation and regularization, respectively, and therefore should not be considered errors or interferences of a superposed prestige language:

b. *copiloto* ‘co-pilot’ (back-up pilot), *coeditor* ‘co-editor’ (second editor),
*codirector* ‘co-director’ (second director)

2. Morphosyntactic variation: evidence from synthetic compounds

As is well known, the right-headed pattern of the compounds in (1a)
represents a specific morphosyntactic choice for compounding (grounded in the
two lineal order parameters of Universal Grammar). The fact that some Spanish
right-headed compounds, such as *drogadicto* in (2a) or *narcotraficante* in (2b),
are reported as direct calques from English (Pratt 1980; Val Álvaro 1999), could
lead us to think that the new compounds in (1a) are just another instance of
external borrowing.

(2) a. drogadicto < drug addict
   b. narcotraficante < drug dealer

Nevertheless, the existence of autochthonous formations, like the majority
of the lexical items that appear in our data (cf. section 7), as well as the fact that
we can explain the new compositional scheme’s productivity from the
perspective of the grammar, provide evidence for our assumption that the
(partial) adoption of the English pattern for deverbal compounds is internally
motivated. In fact, such an alternative is the one normatively used in the field of
Spanish learned vocabulary and terminology. Moreover, the Spanish compounds
in (1a) comply exactly with some very specific morphophonological requisites
that are at work in other native lexical formations. In that sense, we do assert
that right-headed compounds belong to the class of internally motivated
borrowings and are not a case of mere calque or loan translation.

In short, we intend to demonstrate in that respect that although the
influence of English in novel creations such as the ones selected in (1a) is not to
be minimized, the morphological process underlying it is, nevertheless, well
rooted in the grammar of the Spanish language.

Our case study has the interesting point that, being in principle a simple case
of lexical innovation, it embraces more complex and far-reaching aspects of the
language. Due to the fact that such nominal compounds display a predicative
structure, the case under study may in fact be considered a kind of structural
borrowing, that is, a borrowing that affects the grammatical system of the
borrowing language, not just its lexical inventory (Thomason and Kaufman
1988).

In the first part of our paper we will (1) offer a detailed description of the
novel Spanish compounds with the form N+Vsuf$_N$ from a morphological, a
semantic and a phonological point of view; (2) examine the various factors,
external as well as internal, that potentiate the productivity of this compositional
pattern, and (3) establish the morphological conditions to which Spanish
N+Vsuf$_N$ compounds must adjust.
Let us begin by describing the compounds in (1a) in more detail. As a first step, we must emphasize that we are dealing here with three different types of nominal compounds: (i) agent and instrumental nouns, like *ruídofabricante* and *euroconversor* in (3a), (ii) action nouns, like *publicocontratación* and *odorcontrol* in (3b), and (iii) adjectival participles (adjectives with participial morphology), like *gastoaddicto* and *radioaficionado* in (3c). All these nominal formations depart from the native compositional pattern. In the case of agent / instrumental nouns, the productive scheme is $V_{suf}N + N$ (‘limpiabotas’ ‘bootblack’ / ‘sacacorchos’ ‘corkscrew’). In the case of adjectival participles compounds, the language had some right-headed items inherited from Latin or directly copied from English, but no productive autochthonous formations were attested until recently. Finally, no compounds headed by an action noun existed prior to the adoption of the new pattern.


The compounds listed in (3) are known in the literature as “synthetic” (also called “verbal compounds”). They are characteristically formed by a deverbal noun, the head of the lexical construction, and by a subordinated noun that is interpreted, in general, as the internal argument of the underlying verb.

2.1. Morphological characterization

We assume that complex words have a constituent structure, as syntactic constructions do, in which we find head(predicate)-complement relations and head(modified)-modifying relations. Such relations, in fact, can be substantiated either in the syntax or in the lexicon; in this second alternative, languages may resort to the morphological devices available to them. Accordingly, in Spanish we find parallel formations like *contador de la luz* ‘electric meter’ (lit. ‘counter of electricity’) in (4a)—where the relation head-complement is realized through a syntactic procedure—and *cuentakilómetros* ‘speedometer’ (lit. ‘counts kilometers’) in (4b)—in which the same relation is lexically instantiated by means of the morphological procedure known as “composition”. The same holds true with respect to the modified-modifier relation as seen in (5a) and (5b), respectively:

(4) a. (synt.) *contador de la luz* ‘electric meter’
   b. (morph.) *cuentakilómetros* ‘speedometer’
(5) a. (synt.) agua (verdosa / salada) del mar ‘(greenish / salt) sea water’; 
boca (grande / municipal) [de / para] riego ‘(big / municipal) hydrant for irrigation’
  b. (morph.) aguamarina ‘aquamarine’ (lit. ‘water marine’); bocacalle ‘street intersection’ (lit. ‘mouth street’)

As an instance of the first type of relation, morphology produces the synthetic compounds we are analyzing. As previously mentioned, all of them display a predicative structure. In native Spanish formations, those with agent/instrumental semantics show the same order head+complement we find in sentential syntax, but differ in their form since in the lexical formation the deverbal noun is deprived of overt suffixation (Varela 1989): escurreplatos ‘dish rack’ (lit. ‘drains dishes’) vs. escurridor de platos ‘dishdrainer’ (lit. ‘drainer of dishes’) in (6a). On the contrary, English distinguishes the morphological construction by reversing the syntactic order (complement+head) while it preserves the form of the deverbal N —with suffixation— as it appears in syntax: truckdriver vs. driver of trucks in (6b):

(6) a. escurreplatos ‘dish rack’ vs. escurridor de platos ‘dishdrainer’
  b. truckdriver vs. driver of trucks

Within the generative tradition two basic analyses have been proposed for English synthetic compounds. In the first approach, the verb assigns a thematic role to its internal argument and the structure [N+V] \_V receives the nominalizing suffix. This derivation corresponds to the structure in (7a). According to the other usual analysis, the verb nominalizes first and then a noun is adjoined to it. According to the Inheritance Principle, this noun will bear an argumental or thematic relation with the head deverbal noun, as in (7b):

(7) a. [[taxidriv]er]
  b. [taxi[driver]]

The compounding model recently attested in Spanish follows the English pattern. As assumed by most linguists in the case of English synthetic compounds, we will suppose that the structure to be preferred for Spanish novel compounds is the one corresponding to the English examples in (7b), that is, (8a), (8b) and (8c), for agent/instrumental nouns, action nouns and AdjPs, respectively:

(8) a. [ruído[fabricante]] ‘noise maker’ / [euro[conversor]] ‘euroconverter’
  b. [publicidad[contratación]] ‘publicity contracting’
  c. [radio[aficionado]] ‘ham radio operator’
2.2. Semantic characterization

Native VO compounds give rise to agent or instrument nouns only. The deverbal head refers to the actor of an action and the subordinated noun delimits such an action. English-style compounds, with OV order, also include other semantic types: action nouns (*publicontratación* ‘publicity contracting’) and adjectives with passive morphology or AdjPs (*radioaficionado* ‘ham radio operator’, *teleadicto* ‘TV addict’), in addition to agentive and instrumental nouns (*euroconversor* ‘euroconverter’).

As far as the AdjP is concerned, the subordinated noun at the left of the construction is not the theme argument, but rather is an adjunct that is free in its semantic interpretation (*aerotransportado* ‘air borne’ (lit. ‘air transported’)).

Also, in the case of action nouns, the subordinated noun doesn’t necessarily have to be the internal predicate argument. In addition to producing nouns with the argument structure of the underlying verb, such deverbal constructions can also generate nouns without thematic or argumental structure, as is the case of result nouns. Thus, next to compounds of the type of *publicontratación* ‘publicity contracting’ in which the first constituent is the internal argument, we get others like *telepromoción* ‘promotion on TV’ where the clipped noun *tele(visión)* is an adjunct.

The new agent/instrumental compounds also depart from the native ones. Among those that follow the order V$_3$N, there is no place for deverbal nouns related to prepositional verbs. However, this restriction doesn’t hold when the reverse order is imposed, as the example in (9) shows:

(9) *dependedrogas* (lit. ‘depends drugs’) vs. *drogodependiente* ‘drug addict’ (lit. ‘drug dependent’)

(cf. *depende* *(de) drogas*)

2.3. Phonological characterization

Most of these compounds include as a first constituent a bisyllabic noun, either from Latin-Greek origin or derived from a clipped or truncated noun. A third possibility is a noun (usually bisyllabic) with the binding or concatenating vowel [o] characteristic of learned compounds. Examples of the three possibilities are provided in (10):


b. Bisyllabic nouns created through clipping or truncation: *auto* in autorreparación ‘car repairing’; *radio* in radioescucha ‘lit. radio listener’; *tele* in teleadicto ‘TV addict’.
c. Spanish nouns plus binding vowel -o:
   i. Word marker and concatenating vowel coincide: *vaso* in *vasodilatación* ‘vasodilation’; *vasco* in *vascohablante* ‘Basque speaker / Basque speaking’.
   ii. First constituent word marker dropped before binding -o: *droga* in *drogodependiente* ‘drug addict’ (lit. ‘drug dependent’).
   iii. Binding vowel -o added: *catalan-o* in *catalanohablante* ‘Catalan speaker / Catalan speaking’.

Although the bisyllabicity of the first constituent is prevailing, we have attested various trisyllabic and even tetrasyllabic formations. See the last example in (10c) above as well as the examples in (11):

   b. Tetrasyllabic first constituent: *castellanohablante* ‘Castilian speaker / Castilian speaking’, *insulinodependiente* ‘insulin-dependent’.

As is well known, the phonological restriction observed is also active with other native compounding patterns where the subordinated or determining element in first position must contain a maximum of two syllables. That is the case of N+A compounds of the *pelirrojo* ‘red-haired’ (lit. ‘hair red’) type. See (12):

(12) N+A compounds: *pelirrojo* ‘red-haired (lit. ‘hair red’); *cuellicorto* ‘short-necked’ (lit. ‘neck short’); *cabizbajo* ‘crestfallen’ (lit. ‘head low’); *narilargo* ‘long-nosed’ (lit. ‘nose long’) (no first element with three syllables is attested: *cabezabajo*; *naricilargo*).

Fábregas (2002) maintains that the bisyllabicity requirement in the case of the compounds in (12) must be referred to the minimal prosodic word of Spanish: a syllabic trochee. The bisyllabicity restriction is, according to this author, a way of indicating a dependency relation between a determined constituent (the head) and a determining constituent (the modifier). In that way, the determining element would present a predictable form associated to its semantic and morphosyntactic function.

We think that in the case of the N+V compounds we are studying, first element bisyllabicity (= prosodic identity) and -o ending are two formal marks that constitute a functional requisite for identifying head-argument relations.5
3. Three factors favoring the productivity of the new compounding pattern

3.1. N+N root compounds

Journalistic, publicity and advertising vocabulary also manifests the adoption of the English right-headed pattern in the case of simple N+N compounds or “root compounds”. We have included some examples in (13):


The constituent order inversion observed in the case of Spanish synthetic compounds (*euroconversor* ‘euroconverter’ vs. *lavaplatos* ‘dishwasher’ (lit. ‘washes dishes’)) must then be viewed as a more general process of adopting the English scheme in which the subordinated constituent precedes the head of the word.

As is well known, the English N+N constructions of (14a) correspond in Spanish either to a combination of N+ relational A or to a combination of N+PP, as in (14b):

(14) a. love poetry
    b. poesía amorosa / poesía de amor

The root compounds borrowed from English in (13) are an alternative to the Spanish constructions in (14b): N + relational A or N+P+N. Extreme examples of this tendency are *bolsilibro* with the meaning ‘libro de bolsillo’ (‘paperback’, lit. ‘pocket book’) and *publicesta* (‘publicity basket’), recently attested.

In fact, most of the compounds of (13) with the modifier preceding the modified element may be paraphrased by a combination of N + relational A (*fotorreportaje* ‘reportaje fotográfico’ ‘photo story’; *teleserie* ‘serie televisiva’ ‘TV soap opera’), or by means of two nouns linked by a preposition (*fotorreportaje* ‘reportaje de fotos’ ‘photo story’; *teleserie* ‘serie de televisión’ ‘TV soap opera’).

As a matter of fact, the relationship between this type of construction and synthetic compounds has been considered a universal parameter. Thus, some authors (cf. Crisma 1990, Zamparelli 1993) have observed that languages like English with the syntactic order N (modifier) + N (modified) (*love poetry*) show the order N+V(N) in nominal compounds (*canopener*). On the other hand, those languages —like Spanish— with the syntactic construction N+ relational A (*poesía amorosa*), show the order V+NN in morphological compounds (*abrelatas*). It should come as no surprise then that the variation in word order
observed with regard to synthetic compounds is manifested also in the case of root compounds.

3.2. Some vestiges of an archaic pattern

We believe that the type of borrowing under study is also favored by a second factor: the residual existence in the Spanish language of some words showing the Latin syntactic order (OV). Thus, in the case of agentive/instrumental compounds, old lexical items like the ones illustrated in (15a) could very well have impelled analogical formations in modern Spanish, revitalizing an obsolete morphological pattern. In that sense, the case of borrowing we are examining here would fit into those word formation processes of a paradigmatic character, a continuous source for neologisms according to many morphologists (see, recently, Booij 2002). Besides agent nominals, we have other deverbal formations that contain additional remainders of the Latin OV order. Among them, there are precisely some adjectival participles, as can be seen in (15b).

It is also worthwhile to consider some dialectal data in support of this point. As shown in (15c), some Spanish dialects have a tendency to add the agentive/instrumental suffix to old formations with the Latin word order—that is, showing the null marked deverbal N in second position. This is a way to mark unambiguously the semantics of such lexical formations.

(15) a. misacantano ‘ordained priest’ (lit. ‘mass singer’), cuentadante (lit. ‘count giver’), terrateniente ‘land owner’.
   b. manuscibir ‘to write by hand’ (lit. ‘to handwrite’) / manuscrito ‘handwritten’, maniatar ‘to tie somebody’s hands’ (lit. ‘to handtie’) / maniatado (lit. ‘handtied’), manufacturar ‘to manufacture’ (lit. ‘to handmake’) / manufacturado ‘manufactured’ (lit. ‘handmade’).
   c. manicuro ‘manicurist’ (lit. ‘manicure’) > Col., Méx. manicur-ista ‘manicurist’, radioescucha ‘listener’ (lit. ‘radiolisten’) > radioyente ‘listener’ (lit. ‘radiolistener’).

3.3. Greek and Latin composition

A third factor increasing the productivity of the N+V+sufN pattern appears in compounds of Greek and Latin origin. Very often, here, the constituents show the order: subordinated element + head. We refer both to Greek formations that have come into Spanish through Latin, and to modern formations from technological and scientific vocabularies. We illustrate both cases in (16):

(16) a. Words proceeding from Greek via Latin: hipódromo ‘racetrack’; piromancia ‘fire prophecy’.
   b. Words pertaining to technological and scientific vocabulary: hemopatía ‘disease of the blood’; pirógeno ‘agent producing fever’.
This type of formations share with our N+Vsuf\_N compounds the order of constituents as well as some formal characteristics already pointed out, that is the preference for a two-syllable first constituent and the tendency for this second element to have final [o] (in the case of Greek stems).

4. Deriving the new compounding parameter

To conclude the section on compounding, we would like to provide a tentative explanation to two intriguing questions: (1) Why does the native order V\_N+N furnish agentive/instrumental compounds only and not the other nominals (i.e., action nouns and AdjPs)? (2) What are the conditions that license ‘borrowed’ N+Vsuf\_N compounds in Spanish?

Let us begin with the first question. As is well known, there are two types of suffixes. The first set links or absorbs an argument of the predicate, while the second set simply projects the predicate arguments. Agentive/instrumental suffixes are of the first type; action nominal -ción and passive adjectival -do belong to the second type. Action nouns, considered “transpositions” (cf. Beard 1995) due precisely to their specific derivational process (a simple change of category without any functional or semantic change), are characterized by inheriting all the verb arguments. As for AdjPs, -do affixation has the general effect of adjectivizing the base form to which it applies. As assumed in Varela (forthcoming), when the passive -do suffix attaches to a verbal base, it triggers a lexical process very similar in nature to the one that produces event/result nominalizations. Like the nominal suffix -ción, adjectival -do doesn’t bear or absorb any argument of the predicate. It is a mere category-changing suffix that is “transparent” to argument structure.

Both deverbal constituents—the action noun and the passive adjectival—must satisfy their argument inheritance throughout the whole derivational process. This is what the condition on Argument Structure (AS) Transparency in (17) is meant to capture. Such a condition forces obligatory placement of action nouns (publicocontratación ‘publicity contracting’) and AdjPs (termosoldado ‘heat welded’) to the right-hand of the compound, a place where they can be syntactically visible. Notice that if AdjP compounds don’t incorporate the agent as their complement (cf. Eng. expert-tested or Span. narcogobierno ‘gobierno ejercido por los narcotraficantes’), they may project it outside the compound, as in (18a). The same holds true for action nominal compounds with respect to the internal or theme argument, as we see in (18b). In other words, the deverbal head of action and passive compounds is still syntactically active. Spanish agitative deverbal nouns, despite being zero-marked in vernacular compounds, are not subject to this condition, since their AS is fully legitimated in the internal syntax or lexical syntax. Therefore, they cannot project even non-argument adjuncts outside the lexical construct, as seen in (18c).
(17) **AS Transparency**: Transposition type derivations must be able to project inherited AS in the internal as well as in the external syntax

(18) a. termosoldado por especialistas ‘heat welded by specialists’
b. telepromoción de juguetes para niños ‘TV promotion of toys for children’
c. *lavaplatos con calor ‘dishwasher with heat’ (lit. ‘washes dishes with heat’), *aparcacoches para/de clientes ‘car park attendant for customers’ (lit. ‘parks cars for customers’)

The answer to the second question —that is, what are the conditions that permit ‘borrowed’ N+VsufN compounds in Spanish— relies on the hypothesis that the Spanish adoption of the English N+VsufN scheme relates closely to the overt manifestation of a suffix, be it the agent/instrumental, the action or the passive suffix. In order to explain why in some agentive compounds the subordinated constituent is attached to the left of the head constituent —contrary to the order expected in a VO language like Spanish—, we postulate the second condition in (19) which is language-specific:

(19) **Suffix Visibility**: In Spanish, all overt suffixation must be placed at the edge of the lexical construct

This intends to capture a specific morphosyntactic requirement of the suffix which concerns its “visibility”. That is, the suffix receiving phonological expression and bearing the word marker (Harris 1991) has to be visible and therefore must appear at the external edge of the complex lexical item. Specifically, this condition imposes the English pattern on Spanish agentive/instrumental nouns only when they have an overt suffix. In other words, morphophonological marking is what induces (morpho)syntactic change in the case of agentive/instrumental compounds, as seen in (20a). However, if the agent/instrumental noun does not carry an affix, then the order expected for this compound type is the native one: Vsufø+N, as attested in (20b):

(20) a. N+VsufN: euroconversor ‘euroconverter’ vs. *conversoreuros (lit. ‘convertereuros’); radioyente ‘radio listener’ vs. *oyenterradios (lit. ‘listenerradios’).

b. Vø+N: cubrecama ‘bedspread’ (lit. ‘covers bed’) vs. *camacubre (lit. ‘bedcover’); guardabosques ‘forest ranger’ (lit. ‘guards woods’) vs. *bosqueguarda (lit. ‘wood guards’).

The relevance of overt suffixation for AS projection manifests itself in other languages as well. Thus, Roeper (1988: 218) presents some data from English showing that compounds with a suffixed deverbal constituent (notably the -ing suffix) may project a by-phrase —a true argument of the underlying verb—, as in (21a). Moreover, this argument, although implicit, can exert control outside
the lexical construction, as shown in (21b). On the other hand, such a possibility is forbidden for compounds with non-affixed derivatives in head position (see (21c)).7

(21) a. Letter-sending by the government occurred frequently.
   b. body-punching to win
   c. *a bodypunch to win
   (apud Roeper 1988: 218)

Also, we would like to point out that in the few cases where $V_N+N$ Spanish native compounds are endowed with a suffix, this suffix, according to condition (19), must project over the whole (final) compound and be placed word finally. That is, we get compounds with external derivation such as the ones in (22):

(22) a. \([\text{[saca}[^{\text{mol}}]ero}\] ‘tooth-puller’ (lit. ‘pulls tooth + suffix’)
   b. \([\text{[pica}[^{\text{pedr}}]ero}\] ‘stonecutter’ (lit. ‘cuts stone + suffix’)

To conclude the section on synthetic compounds, we have tried to demonstrate that the recent appearance of the $N+V_N$ compounding pattern in peninsular Spanish is supported from inside the language. Therefore, it should not be considered a mere calque of English. We have postulated two structural conditions that rule native formations. One has a morphosyntactic character, the other a morphophonological one. Moreover, we have pointed out other internal factors that most probably contribute to the success of this new compounding pattern: the increasing presence of $N+N$ right-headed root compounds and the analogical pressure of learned compounds from Greek and Latin origin.

5. Analogical extensions: co- prefixed nouns

In the last section of our paper we would like to consider another type of purported borrowing having to do with semantic drift: co- prefixation. This morphological process can apply very productively to verbs and nouns and more restrictively to adjectives. The examples are in (23):

(23) a. codirigir V ‘co-direct’ (two or more people jointly managing x)
   b. coautor N ‘co-author’ (author together with at least another person)
   c. cooficial A ‘co-official’

With regard to verbs, co- prefixation applies to agentive transitive verbs in a productive way. More precisely, only accomplishment verbs whose object is involved in a creation process readily accept this prefix (Felíu 2001), as attested by the examples in (24) vs. the ones in (25):

(24) a. coeditar la novela (= at least two people publishing the novel together)
   b. codirigir la tesis (= at least two people supervising the thesis together)
(25) a. *coobservar el paisaje (= at least two people watching the landscape together)
    b. *coescuchar música (= at least two people listening to music together)

In the derived verbs of (24), as well as their correspondent action nominalizations, the prefix \( co- \) imposes a plural and symmetric interpretation to the agent or the doer of the action. This participative symmetric interpretation\(^8\) is also present in agentive nouns formed by means of the prefix \( co- \), as shown in (26):

(26) codirector ‘co-director’ (= director at the same level as, at least, another director)

As we will immediately see through some relevant examples, the prefix \( co- \) is undergoing a process of semantic extension in present-day Spanish. This involves the creation of a new word formation rule through which an apparent lexical irregularity spreads and becomes regular.

As already said, the prefix \( co- \) adjoined to nouns usually expresses a symmetric relationship, that is to say, a bidirectional horizontal relationship, as in the example in (27):

(27) coautor del libro ‘co-author of the book’ (i.e., at the same level as, at least, another author).

As is well known, English \( co- \) has this same meaning. However, together with this use, in English the prefix \( co- \) can also express a hierarchical relationship between an independent term and a dependent term, as the examples in (28) show:

(28) pilot / co-pilot (= second pilot); driver / co-driver (= second driver)

Through the calque of some English words, for example the noun \( copilot \) > \( copiloto \) (Pratt 1980), Spanish has incorporated a new semantic value for the prefix \( co- \), which, as it happens in English, can now express not just a symmetric relationship but also a hierarchical one. We have attested this new use of the prefix \( co- \) in several cases, a sample of which is shown in (29):
a. **coñeder**: “Cada país invitado tiene derecho a estar representado por un equipo de hasta cuatro (4) estudiantes, un profesor **líder** que encabeza la Delegación y un segundo profesor acompañante (**coñeder**).” (Reglamento de las Olimpiadas Iberoamericanas de Física, Universidad de Zaragoza, Internet).

b. **coedito**r: “Economía industrial y de servicios (EIS). Editor: Omar Licandro; coeditor: Vicente Salas (Universidad de Zaragoza)”. (Página web de FEDEA: Fundación de estudios de economía aplicada, Internet).


This semantic extension is taking place only in the case of agentive nouns, since these nouns refer to entities, among which a dependency relationship can be established.

We claim that the semantic extension experienced by **co-**, which has spread from one or two borrowed lexical items, becoming more and more regular, is to a certain extent an expected process in two senses. First of all, it is an expected process in a general sense, since the same morphological marker **co-** is being used to mark two subtypes of nouns belonging to the same natural class, that of relational nouns. As established by Eschenbach (1993: 3-4), natural languages show two types of relational nouns: those expressing symmetric, reversible or bidirectional relationships that can be described as “horizontal” (**hermano**, **esposo**, **amigo**), and those expressing asymmetric or non-reversible relationships (**padre**, **madre**, **hijo**) that can be described as “vertical”. Secondly, the semantic extension observed in the case of **co-** is also favoured from inside Spanish grammar. As described by Varela and Martín García (1999), there is a significant trend in Spanish prefixes with an original locative meaning (cf. **infra-**, **sub-** **super-** or **vice-**) to change to evaluative meanings, as the examples in (30) show. (As the glosses show, the same process applies in English to prefixes of Latin origin):

(30) **sub-** ‘under’ (**subrayar** ‘to underline’) > ‘less’ (**subestimar** ‘to underestimate’)

We think that the semantic drift displayed by **co-** is in this same line. In this case, the locative meaning implicit in the symmetric relationship between two entities (‘together with’, ‘next to’) has given rise to a kind of evaluative meaning having to do with the hierarchic relation between an independent entity and a dependent one.
6. Conclusion

In this paper we have studied two different types of borrowing: a case of structural borrowing, illustrated by Spanish N+VsufN compounds, and a case of semantic extension, illustrated by the prefix co- adjoined to agentive nouns and imposing a hierarchical meaning.

The common line between the two processes of borrowing is twofold: (1) The change in order of compounds and the semantic extension of co- have a similar initial motivation: “language contact” plus the social prestige of the English language. More specifically, in both processes some particular loans (drogadicto / copiloto) act as a trigger in the regularization of apparent morpholexical irregularities. (2) In both cases the regularization of the change is favored by an internal cause. More precisely, both phenomena show a change, internally induced, that is ultimately based on analogy. In the case of compounds, there were and there are OV compounds (as vestiges in general language, and as a rule in scientific and technical vocabulary). As for the prefix co-, there is a general tendency in prefixation to derive evaluative meanings from locative denotations, a kind of metonymic change. That is, both changes are paradigmatically enforced.

We would also like to mention a functional motivation that may underlie the spread of these novel formations. This is the possibility of lexicalizing a greater number of meanings by opening new morphological possibilities to Spanish.

The main difference between both processes is that the structural borrowing that is taking place in compounds has a morphophonological conditioning: the presence of a suffix as an overt phonological mark. On the other hand, the change of order is also shown in root compounds. Thus, we have evidence in that first case of what language historians call “the pressure for harmony” (Kroch 2001). As for co- prefixation to agentive nouns, we are faced mainly with a case of semantic extension without any morphophonological cause or consequence.

7. Data

7.1. Spanish N+VsufN compounds

aerodifusor (advertisement)
aerotransportado [Rainer]
alcoholdependiente [Rainer]
anglohablante, angloparlante [DRAE] [DEA]
aromaterapia, hipnoterapia, cromoterapia [LGT]
autolavado [CREA], autorrecambio, autorreparación, autoventa [DEA]
broncodilatador [LGT]
castellanohablante, castellanoparlante [DRAE] [DEA]
dermohidratante, dermoprotector [LGT]
digitopresión, digitopuntor, digitopuntura [Rainer]
drogadicción, drogadicto [DRAE] [DEA]; analogically: arrozadicto, bombadicto, caldoadicto [Rainer], gastoadicta [CREA], jergadicto, libroadicto, pipadicto, tabacadicto, teleadicto, tontadicto, trabajoadicto [Rainer]
drogodependencia, drogodependiente [DRAE] [DEA], farmacodependiente, gastodependencia, insulinodependiente [CREA]
electrooferta (advertisement)
euroconversor
fotocomposición [Rainer], fotoconductor [DRAE] [DEA], fotoconversión, fotodispersión, fotodispersor, fotoemisión, fotointerpretación, fotomultiplicador [CREA], fotoprotección [DVUA] [DEA], fotoprotector, fortorreceptor [DVUA] [DEA] [Rainer], fortorreconocimiento [Rainer], fotorrresistencia [DRAE], fotorrresistente [DEA], fotosensibilización [CREA], fotosensibilizador [DRAE] [DVUA], fotosensibilizante [DVUA] [DEA]

hemoderivado [Rainer]
hidromasaje [LGT]
hispanohablante, hispanoparlante [DRAE] [DEA]

liposucción [LGT]
narcoanálisis [Rainer], narcogobierno [LGT], narcoterapia [Rainer], narcotraficante, narcotráfico [DRAE] [DEA]

neurotransmisor [Rainer], neurotransmisión
odorcontrol [publicity]
psicoanálisis, psicoanalizar [Rainer]

publicesta, publicontratación (advertisement)
radioafición [DVUA] [Rainer], radioaficionado [DRAE] [DEA], radioamplificador [CREA], radiodifusión [Rainer], radioemisor [DVUA], radioemisora [Rainer], radioescucha [DRAE] [DEA], radioguiado [Rainer], radioprotección [CREA], radiorreceptor [Rainer], radiotransmisor, radioyente [DEA] [DRAE]

ruidofabricante [Rainer]

teleadicción [CREA], teleadicto [DRAE] [DVUA] [DEA], telespectador, [DRAE] [DEA], telespectador [Rainer], telespectador, televendedores, televenta [LGT], televendencia [DRAE], televidente [DRAE] [DEA]
termoacumulador [CREA], termoaíslantes [Rainer], termodifusión [DVUA], termodifusor, termoportador [CREA], termorreceptor [DEA], termorregulador [CREA], termorregulación [DRAE], termorregulador [DVUA] [DEA]

vascohablante, vascoparlante [DRAE] [DEA]
vasoconstricción [CREA], vasoconstrictor [DRAE], vasodilatación [DEA], vasodilatació [DRAE] [DEA], vasoproliferación, vasoprotector [CREA]
videoadicto [CREA], videoaficionado [LGT], videograbadora, videoproyector (advertisement)
7.2. Co- prefixed nouns with a hierarchical meaning

codefensor: La abogada asistió a “Dioni” en calidad de codefensora ya que, según dijo, “el abogado de Dionisio Rodríguez es Fernando Muñoz Perea, compañero de bufete, pero no ha podido venir” (El Mundo, 28-7-1990, apud. [DVUA]).


coeditor: “Economía industrial y de servicios (EIS). Editor: Omar Licandro; coeditor: Vicente Salas (Universidad de Zaragoza)”. (FEDEA: Fundación de estudios de economía aplicada, Internet).

colléter: “Cada país invitado tiene derecho a estar representado por un equipo de hasta cuatro (4) estudiantes, un profesor líder que encabeza la Delegación y un segundo profesor acompañante (colléter)”. (Reglamento de las Olimpiadas Iberoamericanas de Física, Universidad de Zaragoza, Internet).

coproductor: Luis había prometido a sus amigos españoles rodar esta película con ellos pero en el contrato puso una cláusula par a que yo fuese el coproductor. Cuando vine a Madrid y conocí el deseo del productor de contratar a la estrella francesa [...] (El Cultural, Spain).

7.3. Data references

[CREA]: Real Academia Española. Corpus de Referencia del Español Actual.
Notes

A preliminary version of this paper was presented at the II Congreso Internacional de la Asociación Coreana de Hispanistas, Universidad de Alcalá de Henares, June 2002. This research has been partially supported by the research project “La variación gramatical: variación micro y macroparamétrica en la morfología y la sintaxis. Teoría, descripción y aplicación” (BFF2000-1307-C03-02).

1. A word formation process can be considered “new” from a formal as well as from a semantic point of view. The reason for choosing these two word formation processes—apparently, unrelated—is precisely to show two different instances of borrowing: formal borrowing (N+V suf  N compounds) and semantic borrowing (the new hierarchical meaning of the co- prefixed Ns that derives from the participative meaning through a metonymic change).

2. This compounding pattern (modifier + head) is considered by Guerrero (1997), among others, as borrowed from English and strange to the Spanish language. The majority of the compounds under study are neologisms, like videoproyector ‘video-projector’ or gastodependencia ‘spending addiction’. A small number of them, however, are attested in Spanish for a considerable time, like drogadicto ‘drug addict’ or drogodependiente ‘drug addict’. It is also important to note that the constituents tele, auto or euro, appearing very frequently as the first element of these compounds, are not the learned stems we find for instance in teléfono ‘telephone’, autógrafo ‘autograph’ or radioactividad ‘radioactivity’, but the homophonous clipped nouns: tele[vision] ‘TV’, auto[móvil] ‘car’, and radio[receptor] ‘radio’, respectively (cf. section 2.3.).

3. Turkish also shows a non-suffixed deverbal noun in head position although, being a head-final language, the deverbal noun appears in the right-hand position, as expected: [kaset [çalar] V N N] = ‘record-player’ (lit. ‘record-play’).

4. In compounds we get active AdjPs (radioaficionado) as well as passive AdjPs (aerotransportado) (cf. Varela, forthcoming).

5. Beard (1998: 57) also assumes that English analogical forms, like workaholic or cheeseburger, differ from regular derivations in that they require “prosodic identity”, an extragrammatical principle.

6. Incidentally, we would like to point out that this positional requirement supports the representation in (i)—for those compounds with an action noun in head position—and discards the other possible structure in (ii). These two representations capture the two analyses commonly defended for English synthetic compounds, as said before (cf. (7a) and (7b)): 

   (i) [euro[conversión]]
   (ii) [[euroconver]sión]

7. Recently, Borer (2002: 22 and foll.) has also claimed, in relation to nominalization, that it is obligatory to count with a phonologically realized suffix in order to obtain an event nominal, i.e. a nominal with AS. In relation to Germanic languages, Aronoff and Fuhrhop (2002) have observed also that in suffix combinations “closing suffixes” are the ones carrying more syntactic information and less semantic information.

8. This participative symmetric meaning of prefix co- was the only one documented in Spanish until recently, as can be seen in the work of traditional authors like Alemany (1920) as well as in other more recent works (cf. García-Medall, 1994).
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