

**Petr Stehlik. *The Issue of Delimitation in Some Word Formation Processes and Resources in Spanish*. Brno: Masarykova univerzita, Filozofická fakulta, 2016.**

This monograph focuses on word formation mechanisms that in traditional Spanish linguistics have been assigned to the field of lexical morphology (i.e. suffixation, prefixation, interfixation, parasynthesis and compounding). We aim to clarify the reasons for certain definitional and classification discrepancies in representative grammars and treatises on word formation, and on the basis of detailed analyses of the above-mentioned neological processes to map out the transitional areas between derivation and inflection, derivation and compounding, and compounding and phraseology. This is an issue that has not yet been tackled comprehensively in the Spanish specialized literature.

The book is divided into seven chapters. In the *Introduction*, we define our object of study and methodology, and we briefly review the bibliographic sources used.

The first thematic chapter (2. *Suffixal Derivation and its Delimitation with Respect to Inflection and Compounding*) is dedicated to derivative suffixation and its diffuse limits with inflection and compounding.

As for the first transitional area (suffixal derivation – inflection), it includes mainly the appreciative suffixation and some specific functions of the Spanish gender endings *-o*, *-a* (e.g. *general*, m. 'general' > *general*a, f. 'wife of general'; *manzana*, f. 'apple' > *manzana*o, m. 'apple tree'). Our conclusion is that the best example of a gradual transition between derivation and inflection is not the appreciative suffixation (its similarities with inflection being merely apparent), but the different uses of the gender vowels *-o*, *-a* (see examples above).

There exists also a transitional area between suffixation and compounding that comprises, apart from the large group of so-called affixoids, two suffixes of lexical origin: *-oide* and *-mente*. Since Spanish linguists are generally reluctant to recognize the suffixal nature of any lexical elements (in contrast with what can be observed in the field of prefixation), the inclusion of both these morphemes in the inventory of suffixes represents rather exceptional cases.

The following chapter (3. *Prefixal Derivation and its Delimitation with Respect to Compounding*) deals with the morphological process of prefixation, considered until recently as a type of compounding. Besides the prepositional prefixes *sin-*, *anti-* and *pro-*, whose functioning shows the porosity of the boundary between prefixes and prepositions, the most interesting group of prefixes are those modifying the meaning of the word in a similar manner as adjectives (*prefijos adjetivales*). After the establishing of this new class of prefixes (GDLE 1999, NGLE 2009), which was favored by the previous existence of some appropriate semantic categories (e.g. size: *maxi-*, *mini-*, *macro-*, *micro-*), other originally lexical elements with more or less general meaning were equally recognized as derivative affixes (e.g. *equi-*, *hetero-*, *homo-*, *iso-*). In our opinion, it is precisely the word formation with adjective prefixes that represents today the true transitional zone between prefixation and neoclassical composition, since all Greco-Latin morphemes originated from nouns (e.g. *bio-*, *dermo-*, *geo-*, *hidro-*) are classified by most contemporary Spanish linguists as compounding elements.

In the chapters 4 (*Infixation, Interfixation or Suffixation?*) and 5 (*Parasynthesis*), we examine two supposed lexicogenetic mechanisms that have several fundamental problems in common: they were never sufficiently defined and delimited, their precise distinction from the secondary derivation requires a diachronic approach to establish the chronology of the morphological processes involved and, above all, the serious questioning of these concepts is closely linked to the evolution of the theoretical framework of linguistics (especially in relation to the generativist perspective). Whereas the interfixation as a derivative process could not resist the recent return to the relatively traditional definition of morpheme as a minimal linguistic unit endowed with meaning, at least the parasynthetic derivation – unlike the parasynthetic compounding – has proven to be a viable concept up to this date, partially due to the gradual

abandonment of the Binary Branching Hypothesis, partially also thanks to the alternative interpretation of parasynthesis as the attachment of a single circumfix.

The last thematic chapter (6. *Standard Compounding, Neoclassical Compounding and the Status of Multi-Verbal Expressions*) is dedicated to the word formation process of compounding. After a concise description of the main characteristics of compound words and their classes, we proceed to analyze the problematics of neoclassical compounding. Most Spanish linguists refute the derivative functioning of the majority of Greco-Latin bound morphemes on the basis of three synchronic criteria (positional, combinatorial and semantic), but as we try to demonstrate, the key factor that decides whether a neoclassical element will be considered an affix or a lexical base is, in reality, the traditional etymological criterion, applied, moreover, differently according to the position of the morpheme in the word. This asymmetry has its explanation in a very similar semantic structure of prefixed words and neoclassical compounds (that is, modifier – modified base), which favors the interpretation of the first element as a prefix.

However, the most important issue in compounding concerns the delimitation of syntagmatic compounds with respect to nominal phraseologisms and free syntactic structures. At least since the 1950s, the same types of multi-verbal units are studied both in Spanish Phraseology and Morphology, thus establishing two mutually exclusive and parallel traditions. Unfortunately, none of the delimitation criteria proposed so far (e.g. the designative function of syntagmatic compounds versus the predicative function of phraseologisms; the semantic compositionality of compound words in contrast to the idiomaticity of phraseological units) makes it possible to differentiate clearly between syntagmatic compounds and other syntactic constructions, so that the contemporary Spanish linguists are facing a problem that simply has no solution.

To summarize the general conclusions of our study, it is evident that the serious difficulties to define, classify and delimit the main lexicogenetic mechanisms in Spanish result not only from the indisputable existence of certain gradual transitional areas, but also from a considerable margin of subjectivity in the application of some apparently objective criteria (e.g. the grade of idiomaticity, abstraction or other semantic property).

**Key words:** Spanish, word formation, processes, resources, delimitation, derivation, compounding, parasynthesis.