CHAPTER 6

A CRITICAL APPRAISAL OF THE THEORY - 1
A sound theory of morphology or an acceptable component of a theory of morphology has the characteristic of simplicity. By this we mean that a theory which offers a simplex but relatively adequate description of the forms of language is regarded as more acceptable than another which renders things inherently complicated. By the component of a theory is meant an element which goes into the integral whole of what we may call a theory as against another which describes aspects of the same area, say for instance as in our particular case, the morphology of language. Simplicity of description aims at presenting an accounting of a component without greater complexity than the component itself would naturally involve.

Appraisal: In the light of the parameter stated above it is possible to view Jespersen's theory of morphology as a whole and the components in particular from a new perspective. It needs to be confessed that we have come a long way from Jespersen in our understanding of the structural and procedural features of morphemes. Against this background it becomes all the more significant that we are in a position to look back on Jespersen and attach some significance on his theoretical contributions as there are numerous components
which still shine out amidst the present-day theoretical confusions. Insofar as theoretical simplicity is concerned Jespersen's work on morphology can be judged on the basis of the following points:

6.1.1. Jespersen's work on morphology manifests a simplicity of approach. This simplicity of approach comes mainly from the background against which he wrote. We find Jespersen at the climax of traditional works on language and grammar. The simplicity of the traditional approach to problems of grammar had a positive effect on his theory although it was one of Jespersen's aims to present a rigorous theory of language wherever possible using the medium of symbols. This fact is amply clear from his attempts in his 'Analytic Syntax.'

6.1.2. Jespersen's treatment of the problems of morphology is quite in consonance with and closer in several ways to the commonsense experience of the ordinary speaker of the language. This aspect of his theory provides it an additional dimension of simplicity and integrity. By this we mean that the theory as presented in his Morphology and other works on grammar and language in general appeals to the commonsense of the speaker of the language.

6.1.3. The language which Jespersen used as the medium of expression may be called non-technical in several ways, and thus has a dimension of simplicity compared to most later works on the theory of language. Jespersen's works on morphology yield themselves to lucid reading because of the absence
of compactness of theoretical jargons which have amply been introduced by later thinkers in Linguistics. It is not advocated that a non-technical presentation must be a pre-condition for any lucid theory-making, but the simplicity of any theory in part reveals itself in the absence of material and the type of accountings which are far too apart from what an ordinary speaker of the language feel about the language.

6.1.4. Jespersen's classifications of the material in morphology retain a simplicity of its own because he did not drastically depart from the traditional modes of classification of morphology. Again contrast is drawn between the aspects of Jespersen's theory and of those of the structuralists and the generativists which often leave the student of language more puzzled about the inherent nature of human language.

6.1.5. Jespersen's historical perspectives though very often leave the reader confused, and make his work more compact with much material from history, all the same provide his theory with a sense of logical coherence and logical integrity and a greater rationale for what he was trying to put forward as part of his theory on morphology. It may be added that his historical approach despite the compactness leave his theory simpler in terms of its logical coherence than it would have otherwise been.

6.1.6. The fact that Jespersen's theory on language has stood the test of times, and even as part of present-day linguistics we find some consistent interest in what he said about language. This in particular has got a lot to do with his simplicity of
approach which leaves a greater sense of understanding the nature of language.

6.1.7. **Drawbacks:** It is a fact that Jespersen's works are **overburdened** with illustrative material. He leans far too much on material from written records and literature inspite of the fact that Jespersen puts great stress on spoken language. The overtones of his **historical perspective** often leave a negative impact on the reader. Jespersen's classical understanding of morphology drove him to burden his **classification** especially his treatment of compounds and the section on derivative prefixes and suffixes.

6.2.0. **Unit 2: Parametre:**

A sound theory of morphology has the characteristic of **Generality** in the sense that the theory or the theoretical component is capable of accounting for the features of a whole range of forms rather than any one particular form. The theoretical component is not just able to explain the specific features that go uniquely with a single form, in the present context, but takes care of the explanation of an entire class of which the particular form is just a member. An accounting which takes care of the features of, say for instance, the plural **suffix includes** as part of its coverage or 'population' all forms which function as the plural suffix or all forms which constitute at least a sub-group of the members which express the function of the plural suffix.
Appraisal: Jespersen's works on language clearly show that he was aware of the principle of generality. He was convinced of the fact that language is an interrelated hierarchy of patterns produced by man, which woven together enable the speaker of a language to have a mode of thinking, feeling and behaving. The very fact we are able to speak of a 'human language' shows that there are some phenomena higher and more universal than any one particular language spoken by a community; something higher and general than a dialect used by a section of a community; and something higher and more general than the language used by one particular member of a community. The linguist by observing and studying the patterns and regularities present in the language of a given number of individual people is in a position to generalize a finding to and extend a finding on a 'population' of a much larger dimension. Just as the linguist is capable of generalizing the linguistic specificities of one, two or three informants, he in the same manner retains the logical integrity to generalize the structural and functional features of one, two or three forms to all the members belonging to the same class. In Jespersen we find the following characteristics as far as generalization is concerned:

6.2.1. Jespersen's theoretical components reveal the type of generality required of a sound theory of morphology, and of language as a whole. There are hardly any instances where his speculations on the morphological aspects of language as given in his material on morphology, which are so particularised that they do not represent a class.
6.2.2. Jespersen finds a class of morphemes even to fix a form such as 'oxen' and the consequent suffix from that '-en'. Stressing the formal aspect of -n (-en) Jespersen groups together in *Morphology* (1945) Ch. XX five aspects of the morpheme as it occurs in five different syntactic environments: (a) plural of a noun as in 'oxen', (b) primary of a pronoun as in 'none', (c) adjectives as in 'woollen', (d) participle as in 'taken' and (e) verbs from adjectives as in 'sharpen'.¹ Jespersen further goes on to disclose some curious historical points of agreement which unify these seemingly disparate phonetic, morphological and syntactic uses. We have here one instance what generality means for Jespersen, perhaps carried too far for the sake of his desire too reach total comprehensiveness.

6.2.3. Jespersen's attempt to an all-inclusive treatment of the manifold aspects of morphology in his book 'Morphology' indicates his concern for generality and coverage of components. He reveals a meticulous concern for the details but this concern led him too far in the listing of illustrative material. The whole thing has an orientation to the universals of the morphology of language.

6.2.4. Another aspect of Jespersen's concern for generality and the type of generality the components of his theory manifests consists in the representative units of morphology taken up for treatment in every section. The very organization of

¹ Jespersen 1942: 337.
**Morphology** is unique in terms of the representative morphological units which become central to the treatment that he follows.

6.2.5. In spite of the burdened classification that we find in *Morphology*, there is more generality of morphological components treated than found in many later linguists belonging to the structuralist or generative schools. The correctness of his classification and the closeness his treatment has with the most undisputed aspects of morphology, again, contribute to the dimension of generality in his theory.

6.2.6. Jespersen makes use of ample illustration to ensure that his coverage is wider than most theories on morphology of his time. But often his desire to have a wider coverage ended in presenting a complete list of items forming part of the content of his theory instead of giving only examples which were representative of groups of morphemes. Another significant aspect of Jespersen's theory is his concern for human language in general with English forming only the starting point.

6.2.7. **Drawbacks:** For the sake of generality long listing of items is resorted to. Except in the case of the aspects of inflectional morphology we find limited range of structural description although he often stresses his concern for the formal aspect of language.
6.3.0. Unit 3: Parametre:

The aspects of a theory of morphology is expected to have as much objectivity and clarity as possible to the nature of the treatment the theory receives. By objectivity is meant that conflicting accountings do not go into the description of any class of forms, and no two form-classes of diverse characteristics are included in any one description. Objectivity calls for a level of clarity, distinctiveness and specificity. A clear and specific statement on an aspect of morphology does not confuse between two issues of diverse nature and enable the reader to have clarity of mind in understanding A as A and B as B. All the same there may be cases where two diverse aspects may share some elements in common and the two descriptions may have some degree of overlaps. In such cases illustrations help point the distinction between components A and B.

6.3.1. Appraisal: Jespersen right in the beginning of Morphology makes it clear that 'the arrangement in the volume is strictly according to forms: what is identical in form is treated together'. Jespersen's concern for putting together morphemes of identical forms in the same section gives rise to considerable amount of unnaturality and clumsiness and artificiality to his theory of morphology as a reader of Morphology easily discovers. This will be included under the 'drawbacks.' All the same it is important to note that

same concern has significantly contributed to the objectivity of Jespersen's theory. Jespersen rightly did all that is possible even today: grouping together apparently disparate morpheme units under some common class to avoid under-generalization and the formation of too many form-classes.

6.3.2. Jespersen ensured as part of his treatment of morphology that intermittent statements of clarity be given which has the purpose of giving the reader a sense of direction which he is taking. Such statements about the roles of 'form, function and meaning' as shown above are part of every section that he dealt with. Talking about compounds he says 'As already mentioned, the number of possible logical relations between the two elements is endless. The following grouping, therefore, does not pretend to any degree of exhaustiveness, but is meant merely to illustrate the manifoldness of the relations.' Indications of this kind provide a sense of direction to the author in formulating as well as for the reader in understanding the theory in a lucid manner.

6.3.3. By attempting to avoid greater level of abstractness and by resorting to formulations which put the matter closer to the native speaker's experience Jespersen succeeded to some extent in maintaining a level of objectivity. The book 'Morphology' is the clear proof of Jespersen's close acquaintance with English language in general and English

word-analysis in particular. This close intimacy with the language helped him formulate and describe his material with greater objectivity than what the work of his period deserved.

6.3.4. The precision and clarity with which Jespersen formulated the manifold aspects of morphology indicate the level of objectivity that goes with the theory. Except the apparent mixing of items which need not be put together, under the same form we find things are fairly objective with him. There is no confusion between the aspects and elements of inflectional morphology and derivational morphology that he chose for treatment. Inflections are dealt with in Chapters I to V, and in XVI of *Morphology*. The rest of the chapters are divided between the treatment of compounds derivational affixes and various aspects of lexical morphology. Proper distinction is drawn between the two aspects of word-formation: compounding and derivational affixation. Again two sections are completely dedicated for the separate treatment of prefixes and suffixes. The prefixes and the suffixes are grouped together under the criterion of formal unity. While such a thing was good for the treatment of prefixes because of the identity we often find between noun as well as verb prefixes, the same criteria does not work well with the suffixes as the suffixes can be neatly divided on the basis of their grammatical functions. This is a major drawback we find in his treatment of suffixes.

6.3.5. Jespersen's close acquaintance with the detailed aspects of English morphology and syntax is clear from the almost complete lack of ambiguity we find in his treatment of
the various components of his theory of morphology. This is in consonance with what we have seen as the simplicity of his theory of morphology. Behind every expression, every statement and every illustrative example there is reflected a meticulous and intense care to put forward things in a crystal clear manner.

6.3.6. Drawbacks: Some mention has already been made of an important drawback in the treatment of suffixes under one and the same formal criterion. Despite the levels of objectivity mentioned above there are sections in Morphology like that of '-er endings' which are of not any relevance and are mere grouping of items which do not go together.

6.4.0. Unit 4: Parametre:

An adequate theory of morphology represents in a formal way the native speaker's intuition of the characteristic of that part of the language which is described. The linguist undertaking the description may or may not be a native speaker in the strict sense of the term. The formal linguistic description which is attempted must be in consonance with the native speaker's intuitive understanding of the specific aspect which comes under description. A theoretical component which holds the view that the form 'sheep' (pl) contains a zero plural suffix compared to forms such as 'boys' which carries with it the plural suffix, does not make sense as the theoretical component turns out to be a mere technical jargon. The forms 'sheep' (sing) and 'sheep' (pl) are merely two synonymous forms one of which is used as the plural. Anything
beyond this is attempted for the sake of mere theoretical congruency.

6.4.1. **Appraisal:** The theoretical basis of Jespersen's entire work on language is found in his *Philosophy of Grammar* (1924) and *Language* (1922). These two books reflect Jespersen's thinking on language and the directions it takes. It is in these two works, in the same way, that we find Jespersen's thinking on language almost identifies with that of a native speaker of English though for him English constituted not the native language but a second language. We may say that *Language* contains Jespersen's 'psycholinguistic thinking' and *Philosophy* contains his 'logistic thinking' on human language. *Morphology* being his second last work to be published can be said to be the corollary of the two works: *Language* and *Philosophy*. Language is seen in 'Morphology' as a living, dynamic process and Jespersen attempts to bring out the elements and atoms which go into the making of language. Jespersen's notions of language as hierarchical are based, again, on his conception of language. The conceptions of *language* as an atomic and hierarchical structure are closer to the native speaker's intuition of the structure of language.

6.4.2. Jespersen gave expression to his linguistic intuitions in working out the theory of morphology as a speaker of the language. In fact it was this intuition and further introspection on the manifold structure of the language that led him to give expression to his theory of morphology as a climatic work of his life.
6.4.3. What Jespersen undertook was not a piece-meal type of treatment of the manifold aspects of morphology. A very comprehensive work as his was the first attempt in the history of linguistics. Even Bloomfield's 'Language' (1933) which came much before that had altogether a different approach to the problems of morphology. Such a comprehensive understanding of the language is the result of his great intuition of the language and problems of morphology as a linguist and as a speaker of the language.

6.4.4. Again what we find in his works is his deep analytic mind. Just as Jespersen was capable of seeing English language as one whole in spite of the complex componential distinctions it revealed, he was also capable of perceiving each and every component of morphology with the intuition of a linguist fully aided by a thorough familiarity and mastery of the language as a speaker. Jespersen's analytic mind is the principle behind his analytic approach to the problems of morphology, which encompassed every minute detail of inflections, compounding, suffixes or prefixes.

6.4.5. As in the case of many who came after him Jespersen's attempt was not to employ English merely as an illustrative basis for a discussion of a few piece-meal problems related to language, but Jespersen, on the contrary, undertook a morphological analysis and description of the entire English language as he found it and presented the morphological components found in every nook and corner of the language with
a view to providing a comprehensive theory of the English morphosyntax. All the same based on this he elaborated his observations on the morphology of human language in general.

6.4.6. As a result of the personal intuition of Jespersen, he sees language as a process and the components of morphology as the result of this dynamic process which cannot, as he feels, escape the mind of the linguist. His intuition of language as a process is directly related to the historicity of language which forms the background of his work. Again, unlike a linguist who makes use of a few piece-meal instances from actual language for the development of a theory, Jespersen keeps an encompassing view of the entire range of the language as an evolving and developing thing. But he goes on describing the aspects and components of this process in the right spirit of a structural linguist.

6.4.7. **Drawbacks:** It a fact introspection and personal intuition of the language as a speaker is the keynote of Jespersen's morphology. All the same Jespersen leans too much on elements from history and traces back components to a very tedious length, and on written records. These two things conflict with the spirit of intuition which characterises his theory.

6.5.0. **Unit 5: Paratemporal:**

An adequate theory of morphology reveals optimum comprehensiveness of formal, functional and semantic elements which come under the scope of the description. If by generality we meant coverage of the all the members of a particular
class, by comprehensiveness we mean the connotative depth of the description in such a way as to include all the formal elements, functional aspects and semantic specificities which naturally go with that particular aspect of the language the theory is meant to describe. The more there are going to be exceptions of formal, functional and semantic elements to the theoretical component and leaves out specifications as exceptions, the less adequate the theory is. The most adequate theory is that theory which has the greatest comprehensiveness of descriptive elements.

6.5.1. Appraisal: First of all Jespersen looks for formal comprehensiveness by aiming at an all-inclusive treatment of morphology. His 'Morphology' is the living example for this. One finds throughout the book a painstaking effort to achieve an extent of depth in terms of the formal, functional and semantic elements of the unit of morphology under consideration in any one section. He seemed to have been aware of connotative depth which a description ought to achieve. It is fairly easy for a theoretician to deal with just one aspect or element of a grammatical notion and include a few instances of the same and at the same time not touch aspects which may crop up as exceptions or as elusive to the whole concept which he is treating. At all levels we find Jespersen struggling to examine a grammatical concept to its very depth and to treat those elements which are essential to a proper understanding of that grammatical concept.
6.5.2. This concern for comprehensiveness has led to what we may call 'over-classification.' The plural morpheme, for instance, receives a very comprehensive treatment in his hands. An examination of the component of plural morpheme in Jespersen's theory of morphology we find that there is hardly any aspect of the plural morpheme which he has not dealt with. An attempt is made to include every possible example of some specific significance as part of his theory of the plural morpheme in English. This has certainly led to including the same item under more than one class of items. Jespersen's concern for the formal, functional and semantic criteria for grammatical description has also led similarly to a confusion between the three and a constant switchover from one to another. All the same the care he has taken to deal with the unit in all depth cannot escape the notice of a student who reads him well.

6.5.3. Every morpheme is dealt with in terms of all possible formal differences. The plural morpheme t, d, id is looked at as a formal set under which are classified a set of functional groups which may otherwise receive separate treatments. Again Jespersen is not satisfied with the treatment of the regular plural morphemes t, d and id, instead he goes on to include irregular instances such as -en (n) as found in oxen or children. Here we find Jespersen's concern for formal comprehensiveness at its peak. This is true when Jespersen treats other aspects of morphology as the verb derivations and noun derivations as well as all aspects of verb inflections.
6.5.4. Jespersen deals with every morpheme from viewpoint of all possible functional differences. The same morpheme unit -ed for instance falls under two different functions: as past tense morpheme and as past participle morpheme. Jespersen is compelled to deal with two formally different units under one head because of their functional oneness and a single formal unit such as -ed under two different heads because of the different functions the form has in two different grammatical contexts. The present concern is that Jespersen attempts to achieve the most possible formal and functional comprehensiveness of treatment by taking care of all the formal and functional units of the component of the theory that he is dealing with.

6.5.5. Every aspect of Jespersen's theory of morphology finds the fullest semantic comprehensiveness. Jespersen's attempt to deal with all possible semantic specifications of a morphological component is visible as we read through especially the 'Morphology.' This is most visible in his treatment of the inflections and derivations. The semantic specifications of the prefixes and suffixes are dealt with in most comprehensive depths even tracing the historical bases wherever such a thing was found suitable. In all this the concern is for a theoretical comprehensiveness from the formal, functional and semantic perspectives.

6.5.6. Drawbacks: The concern for depth of the treatment and comprehensiveness of aspects has made him go back to history in such a way as to blur his theory of morphology. He has brought in areas which are not significant to modern linguistic such as meanings of forms which are no longer relevant in the
context of a theory of morphology.

6.6.0. Unit 6: Parametre:

An acceptable component of a theory of morphology has the formal, functional and semantic adequacy. Formal adequacy requires that the formal units used in the description have a high degree of consistency and that the units are self-explanatory. Functional adequacy requires that the forms or the set of forms that the theory describes have a constant function to represent. The forms have a set of functions to perform. These functions need adequately to be represented in the theory. Semantic adequacy requires that the set of forms that the theory describes should represent a set of definite semantic specifications. The formal changes explained should be capable of accounting for the corresponding changes insofar as the semantic specifications are concerned.

6.6.1. Theoretical adequacy in Jespersen can be spotted at different levels. The notion of adequacy cannot be applied to Jespersen's theory in so rigorous a manner as understood by transformational generativists beginning with Chomsky. All the same the notion of adequacy as understood above is applicable to Jespersen's treatment of morphology. The first level in this connection is that of the clarity in aims and purposes. It should be understood that lucidity of treatment, and clarity of aims and purposes are a feature so characteristic of Jespersen. Every unit of Jespersen's morphology as developed in Morphology and other works has the presence of
that transparence which only a master mind can provide. However inadequate and overlapping the classifications often are, at every step we find the clarity of purpose and the theoretical direction forming an essential part of Jespersen's treatment.

6.6.2. Again, there is the necessary adequacy in terms of the organization of material, and the depth of treatment. The discussion we have covered under 'comprehensiveness' equally holds good here in relation to the theoretical adequacy. Jespersen clearly reveals a sense of logic which is not contradictory to the organization required at the linguistic level. There is the theoretical adequacy of procedures as these are knit together with the organization of material. Jespersen makes use of data wherever necessary to render his description of language a close touch of empiricism. Illustration of theoretical standpoints is a characteristic feature in Jespersen. Every component of his theory is aptly illustrated with examples either from written records such as literature or from ordinary usage.

6.6.3. Jespersen employs a judicious use of introspection which is an asset to his theoretical adequacy. There is a constant reference back to his own language competence as a speaker of the language. We do not find an exclusive dependence on observation and analysis of data as in a full-fledged operational theory. The use of introspection runs through and through Jespersen's theoretical development.
We may say that Jespersen's method of treatment is introspection combined with observation.

6.6.4. Jespersen makes an attempt to organize cursive description of the various aspects of his theory of morphology hand in hand with inventories of language items for purposes of illustration. Often it happens that such inventories predominate over theoretical description. Because of this lots of insights stand blurred on several occasions. On the one hand the sequential description contributes to explanatory adequacy while on the other the inventories of items cause confusion due to over-classification.

6.6.5. Another aspect of adequacy is the organization of the formal elements in terms of their adequacy place in the theory. An attempt to achieve this kind of an adequacy in formal organization is found in all the major works of Jespersen including the Philosophy, the Language, Morphology and Efficiency. It has happened that such an effort has also resulted in putting together forms with different functions and meanings under the same head. Yet the pains Jespersen has taken to have an adequate formal organization have borne results. Various aspects of such an organization are discussed in the prefaces of his works.

6.6.6. Explanatory adequacy is also contributed by the absence of ambiguity as a whole except in rare instances. It is a characteristic feature of Jespersen, and true especially of his theory of morphology that there are rare instances of
explanatory ambiguity arising out of the inadequacy of description. All the same there are also drawbacks in this regard. Descriptive elements are often clouded with illustrations and are scattered. Occasionally there is a lack of coherency in description which blocks the comprehensiveness of that component of the theory. Again, introspection in this regard is not articulated adequately. There is a conflict arising out of the observation of speech and writing. He is prone to stress speech while providing illustrations from written records.

6.7.0. Unit 7: Parameters:

The components of any theory call for an adequate rationale which makes the description more significant because of the explanatory adequacy the description achieves. This rationale in several cases can be obtained from the historical background which goes with the historical i.e., the vertical development of a form under consideration. In most cases an attempt to provide a purely structural description to the features of the form such as, say, 'oxen' or 'borne' renders fruitless as the description turns out to be a tautology. A theory which thus attempts to establish a link between the form under study and a set of precedent forms often assumes greater objectivity and validity, and the rationale provided from the historical development of the form often renders the theory sound and acceptable.
6.7.1. **Analysis:** It is a matter of great significance that in Jespersen we find a synchronization of descriptive and historical methods. Jespersen's consistent training in historical linguistics and his persistent interest in the historicity of human language in general and of English language in particular have contributed to this synchronization between descriptive and historical methods. For Jespersen the principal element which provided significance to linguistic description at any level is its historical perspective apart from all the pertinent insights the structure of a form might yield. Jespersen wrote at a period when descriptive (structural) linguistics was gaining foot-hold over historical (comparative) linguistics. Therefore it was the need of the day that he made full use of the structural descriptive technique in his analysis of language.

6.7.2. For this reason we find him stressing the structural description of the form of the language at all levels. Yet for Jespersen historicity was the centre of language development and of linguistic description. The diachronic background as employed by Jespersen especially in his description of morphology provided greater significance i.e., rationale to the form under consideration. The structural description was for him just a tautology and a laying bare of aspects which are already apparent in the very structure of the form. Tracing the development of the form in time provided, for him, what the linguist and the student are essentially looking for i.e., a significant and adequate explanation of the
structural features of the form under consideration.

6.7.3. Jespersen is able to provide greater substantiality to his theory by means of his appeal to the historicity of the forms. By substantiality we mean a fundamental solidity and thoroughness without which the description of a set of forms would seem superficial. It is true that several of the structural descriptions without such a substantiality cannot provide the description the necessary rationale required by it. This fundamental substantiality also enables a theory to be of permanent value as Jespersen's works have proved to be.

6.7.4. Jespersen's appeal to the historical background of the forms he is describing provides the necessary objectivity that the description call for. Objectivity of description is desirable especially when the theoretician is faced with the possibility of rendering his description ambiguous and without proper direction. The historical perspective that is provided with every phase of the theory enables Jespersen to demarcate one phase from another in a proper manner.

6.7.5. The application of historicity to the structural description have enabled Jespersen to achieve greater comprehensiveness of description, a point which has already been looked into in detail. The organization of the material within Jespersen's theory of morphology has revealed greater logical sequence and theoretical adequacy as well as componental compresiveness because each component of his theory of
morphology is supported by the historical perspective of structural changes. Jespersen stands justified in the use of historical perspective because of several reasons. First of all morphology is an area in which the historical development gets embodied and imprinted most conspicuously. The lexicon of the language and the formatives which go into the making of larger formations bear the traces of historical development than any other aspect of a language. Secondly, sound alternations can be fruitfully explained only by resorting to their historical change. In these instances structural descriptions often tend to be merely tautological. Jespersen has been able to show the relations of apparently different forms by means of historical description.

6.7.6. There are a few drawbacks in this regard. Jespersen's historical approach links him at once with and establishes him within traditional grammar. In many places he uses historical explanation instead of more revealing structural description. There are too detailed listing of historical forms. The historical background often clouds his theoretical standpoints. There is too much of a dependence on written material because of this approach.

6.8.0 : Unit 8 : Parameters:

A sound theory of morphology acceptable in the context of modern linguistics has an operational basis and as such is built on a set of sound data of a particular language. The data may be drawn from two sources: i.e., first, from the natural utterances of a group of native informants or from
the population to whom theoretical conclusions will be extended, and (or) secondly from the language stock of the linguist himself. The language of the linguist will be explicitly stated for operational purposes. By this it is not assumed that the findings and conclusions of the linguist cannot cross the bounds of the data on which the investigation is based. It is assumed that the linguist has all the right to cross the constraints of the data and use the data only as an operational basis and starting point for the development of the theory.

6.8.1. Analysis: It can be well said that Jespersen's theory of morphology satisfies two requirements: on the one hand the theory is explanatory and has the qualities of an explanatory theory, and on the other it satisfies the essential requirements of an operational theory. The two aspects are realized in two different ways. Jespersen's is an explanatory theory with an operational basis. As an explanatory theory Jespersen makes use of introspection the details of which we shall examine in the following section. The use of introspection as a method of theory building has been most adequately used by Jespersen. We do not find that Jespersen is bound fast by any set of empirical data and the analysis of the data alone functioning as the sole criteria of the theoretical development under consideration.

6.8.2. The explanatory development of the theory is based on an operational foundation. In fact we find in Jespersen a synchronization of two different trends. His attempt to build
a theory of morphology is rooted in the traditional mode of thinking. As a result introspection and intuition by the linguist is heavily depended upon. It is this method of theory making that Chomsky and the generativists recommends as valid for linguistics. The synchronization has occurred because of the structuralist influence on Jespersen in the 30's and the 40's. As a result we find Jespersen taking pains to lay an operational foundation of some kind for his theory of language.

6.8.3. The operational basis is formed from the data he gathers in the form of sentences and material from common speech. This data are not rigorously organized and analyzed as we find in the structuralist grammarians, the phonologists and morphologists. Jespersen's material is on the one hand a more starting point and on the other it has an illustrative function. Therefore the organization and the use of the material cross a certain bounds, and the constraints the material puts on his theory is limited.

6.8.4. Because of the characteristic mentioned above we call Jespersen's an explanatory theory with an operational basis. The freedom which Jespersen takes in having his explanatory flights from this operational basis enables him to reach and state linguistic conclusions which are not strictly within the range of the data with which he starts his analysis and description. This freedom from the operational constraints is visible throughout Jespersen's works. The synchronization he has achieved in this regard does not involve serious limitations.
6.8.5. A characteristic feature of Jespersen's theory in this regard is the attempt to survey the whole range of language. There is hardly any structural or generative description which aims at or achieves a rather comprehensive description of the phonological, morphological or syntactic features of language as modelled on English. An attempt to survey and describe the entire range of the morphology of English language is very characteristic of Jespersen. This achievement to extend his description to all aspects of the English morphology is perhaps the result of the synchronization between the explanatory and operational bases of his theory. Apart from these features, Jespersen treats classes of forms rather than particular forms as found in most modern linguists. This has a distinct advantage of achieving a better coverage of language which cannot be the case when purely individual forms are treated in stray manner to illustrate the component of a theory under consideration.

6.8.6. An attempt to treat all individual forms within a morphological class as mentioned above has had its own drawback. Much of Jespersen's precious energy is wasted on forms and their distinctions which are of no interest to a linguist or student of language dealing with various components of a theory of language. The attempt to start from an operational basis or to have a whole range of illustrative material has made him include, again, lists of material which do not fit the whole texture of the component of the theory he is out to describe. Such inventories, as mentioned earlier, have blurred the explanatory features of the theory. This has resulted also
in partial treatment of more crucial aspects of the theory,

6.9.0. Unit 9: Parametre:

It is assumed that a theoretical component acceptable in the context of present-day linguistics is characterized by the linguist's introspection and intuition as a native speaker of the language. It is possible for the linguist on the basis of his linguistic competence to focus attention within his own competence and make advancement in the understanding of the aspect of the language which he is concerned with while at the same time his theory on the operational aspects we have discussed earlier. It is expected that there involves no contradiction between the linguist's introspective findings as a student of language and the intuition of the native speaker as a layman. The closer the correspondence between the two the more objective, we must assume, that the theory ought to be.

6.9.1. Analysis: 'The Philosophy of Language' bears the greatest testimony of Jespersen's use of introspection. He employs introspection not as a native speaker of the language but as one who has attained the competence of the language in par with a native speaker. The theory of morphology as outlined in the work: Morphology as well as in other works such the Philosophy has been subjected to Jespersen's introspective analysis and description because morphology is an area which Jespersen undertook to describe most comprehensively and penetratingly. Jespersen's intuition of the morphological structure of English language as one who is conversant with and thoroughly educated in the structural aspects of the
language is coupled with the systematic introspection he was capable of exercising within himself to provide or rather obtain insights into the morphological structure of the language.

6.9.2. The use of the method systematic introspection has enabled Jespersen to have access to the much deeper aspects of the morphology of language. He was a linguist trained in the traditional ways of linguistic analysis. At the same time he was well-versed in the structuralist trends which came to have foothold during the decades. Jespersen was well aware of the structuralist constraints on the meaning part of language. Despite these limitations and contradictions he had to face, he gets closer and closer to the semantic layer of language with a view to providing greater insights into the structure of morphology. Jespersen obtains insights into the deep structure of language including the semantic specifications of the components of morphology which he was out to describe.

6.9.3. The use of introspection also is the technique through which Jespersen reaches certain universal aspects of language. Introspection recognizes the role of the mind in terms of its own exercise and at once relates the mind to the intricate structure of language. Free and unprejudiced access to the mind enables the linguist to have equal access to the semantic layer of language. In the theory of morphology Jespersen exploits the potentials of the meaning component of morphemes in discovering the structural specifications without making these meanings the sole criteria of his classifications and structural
descriptions. These are several instances in his *Philosophy, Essentials* and *Morphology* where Jespersen aims not at the immediate structural features of a particular component but those characteristics of the components of morphology such as the formatives which have a clear resonance of the universals of language.

6.9.4. Introspection is an area in Jespersen where we find a constant move to discover the universal components of language in general and morphology in particular to achieve maximum significance to his description of language. Seldom does Jespersen stop at the structural features of a given component but he uses the structural features of the particular component as a means to achieve significance as a universal feature wherever such a thing is possible. The explanatory approach employed by Jespersen as seen earlier has enabled Jespersen to discover the universals of language with greater ease and logical coherence.

6.9.5. The use of introspection has enabled Jespersen to combine the structural and behavioural aspects of language. We may be prone to call Jespersen's approach to morphology psycholinguistic because of the stress he puts on language as behaviour as against language as a structural system. The process oriented description of morphology stems, thus from Jespersen's introspective understanding of language which he successfully synchronizes with his structural description.

6.9.6. Yet we find a level of confusion as a result of the combination of the behavioural and structural features of
language. This has often compelled Jespersen to bring in features of language which are too plain within the intuitive understanding of the speaker. The concept of 'morphology' for instance is an area where he wished to achieve this synchronization of the two aspects but failed to introduce anything new.

6.10.0. **Unit 10: Parametre:**

The linguist is expected to draw proper distinctions between the **morphological aspect** of a theory of language and the phonological, syntactic and semantic aspects wherever and to whatever extent such a distinction is possible within the scope of a theory of language. The **morphology** part of the theory of language is concerned about the internal and the terminal structure of individual forms which carry some semantic specification. This aspect of a theory of language is contrasted with that part of the theory which deals with the structure and characteristics of individual sounds i.e., phonetics and phonology, and that part of the theory which describes the ordering of word-forms in sentences i.e., syntax, and further with that part of a theory which describes the regularities existing at the level of meanings i.e., semantics.

6.10.1. **Analysis:** Jespersen makes distinctions which are logical and exclusive. This is an important aspect of his theory in the sense that the proper and adequate distinctions drawn in a theory alone make the theory intelligible on the one hand and coherent on the other. Wherever the author fails to achieve this feature of description and classification, the theory becomes unintelligible and incoherent because of overlaps
and nonspecific distinctions between the components. Another feature in this connection is that the distinctions that he makes within the theory of morphology and between morphology and other components of the general theory of language are adequately and intimately related to the linguistic intuitions of a native speaker. This is what basically renders Jespersen's theory all the transparence and lucidity that it possesses. There is a close parallelism between the morphological distinctions he makes and the intuitive experiences of the native speaker.

6.10.2. Jespersen's formal distinctions are essentially related to the grouping of the formatives which constitute the major part of his morphology. These are certainly apparent and occasionally actual clashes between the formal, functional and semantic distinctions which can be possibly made within a theory of morphology. But Jespersen has indeed attempted to reduce such clashes to the minimum in *Morphology*. It is clear that his eyes are set on distinctions between morphological elements on the basis of their forms. We call this formal criteria as contrasted to functional and semantic criteria. The distinctions within the theory of morphology based on formal criteria have enabled Jespersen's theory to have longer and lasting impact on and relevance in modern linguistics. This has much to do with the tendency to move over to more and more rigorous formalism which we come across in his *Analytic Syntax*. The formal criterion is considerably strong and well-established in his theory of morphology as worked out in *Morphology*. 
6.10.3. The theory of morphology makes use of distinctions between elements which are functional by nature. Jespersen's constant powerful preoccupation with the syntactic categories of language have had great influence on his theory of morphology. The functional distinctions which are most proper within the area of syntax have cropped up as part of the theory of morphology. But such distinctions are employed in morphology merely to bring home the formal distinctions which he considered fundamental to his theory of morphology. The functional distinctions are, thus subservient to the distinctions that he draws based on formal criteria.

6.10.4. One occasionally comes across in Morphology distinctions of semantic nature which Jespersen was compelled to employ because of the failure of other distinctions to take care of the description. Jespersen's description of the compound-forms as a component of his theory of morphology is an important instance of the use of semantic criteria for morphological distinctions. The fundamental role of the formal criteria is stressed over and again when Jespersen is compelled to employ functional as well as semantic criteria for morphological distinctions as part of his theory of morphology. Again, Jespersen aims at comprehensive distinctions so that the basic coherence and soundness of his theory is maintained. There is a keen attempt throughout to draw distinctions which would clearly and adequately set aside aspects of morphology from other components of a syntactic or semantic nature.
6.10.5. There are inadequacies in regard to the componental distinctions he draws within the theory of morphology. As an instance we find that Jespersen draws very inadequate distinction between the segmentals and suprasegmental features of morphology. It is a fact that Jespersen depends on a greater quantum of examples from spoken language and written records than on the theoretical content of his work. The conflict between the three criteria, formal, functional and semantic, is often apparent as he struggles to achieve coherence of description and comprehensiveness of treatment.

6.11.0. Unit 11: Parameter:

An adequate theory of morphology explicates the characteristic feature of what we call the morpho-syntactic functions. These are thought of as a set of transitional features of morphology overlapping into the domain of syntax. This part of the theory of morphology attempts to maintain the intimate structural relations that we find existing between two forms and yet essentially and strictly part of the structure of the particular word or words under consideration. The 'number specification' of a verb in English, e.g., the contrast between 'is, am, are', belongs to the specific structure of the verb as such, but is essentially governed by the morpho-syntactic relation between the noun or pronoun which occur as the antecedent.

6.11.1. Analysis: It is quite characteristic of Jespersen that he maintains the basic morpho-syntactic of the traditional grammar as one of the bases of his theory of morphology. But
there is an essential difference in Jespersen's use of the morpho-syntactic principle. In the traditional approach to grammar this feature is case and category oriented in the sense that traditional grammar focuses attention on the 'syntactic categories' of English and the chief preoccupation is to describe and find relation among these categories of grammar. But in Jespersen there is an essential departure from this trend. In his grammar as explicated in his 'Philosophy' and in the five volumes of his Modern English Grammar Jespersen to a great extent follows this traditional scheme but with great difference that the entire work manifests a level of linguistic insights and descriptive adequacy. In Morphology Jespersen's linguistic orientation is found at its best and we find his attention focussed on the morphological components rather than syntactic categories.

6.11.2. Unlike in the traditional grammar of his predecessors Jespersen has a new morpho-syntactic approach which makes him, again, a modern linguist. He discovers the role and significance of those areas of grammar where syntax and morphology overlaps. There are numerous areas in English grammar and, as visualizes, in the grammar of all languages, where the structure of a form possesses certain syntactic features as part of the formal features. All 'flectional languages' like Latin these syntactic features such as the case and number categories constitute part of the inflectional system as the declensions of nouns and conjugations of verbs. Apart from these most conspicuous and outstanding syntactic features
morphological units as the smallest elements to carry sense do retain features which are syntactic by nature. One conspicuous example is the verb inflections which are strictly conditioned by the syntactic features inherent in and governed by other forms in an utterance.

6.11.3. Throughout *Morphology* we find Jespersen trying to pin-point and sharpen the description of the morpho-syntactic features. The formal relation which one individual form has on another is the focus of Jespersen's attention especially when he deals with the verb inflections and more concretely the plural suffixes. With all the burden of the traditional approaches weighing heavily on his training and ways of thinking we find Jespersen straining hard to keep away from the treatment of the traditional syntactic categories in the treatment of strictly morphological components.

6.11.4. Again, Jespersen endeavours to achieve a synchronization of the morpho-syntactic approach and structural description. The morpho-syntactic approach as he found it is process-oriental. The morpho-syntactic approach and the morphological processes are intrinsically correlated. Therefore it requires definite orientation to achieve a strictly structural description of the components of morphology as demanded by the structuralist norms of his day and the morpho-syntactic approach which he thought was essential to an objective and fruitful description of the morphology of language.
6.11.5. In fact, the morpho-syntactic approach resorted to by Jespersen offered him a much wider scope for his treatment of morphology. Jespersen could by means of this approach cover areas of morphology which the structuralists or the traditionalists could not do because of the preoccupation of the former with strictly structural descriptions within the limits of particular forms and of the latter with the syntactic categories on the one hand and what they called 'accidents' on the other. Jespersen saw the morpho-syntactic features as syntactic signals as we find in the example 'the boy's picture' in which 's establishes syntactic relations with the noun 'picture'.

6.11.6. Inspite of Jespersen's insights into the morpho-syntactic features of language we find his theory giving place for the traditional categories and occasionally learning on to the semantic criteria in his description of forms. Again wherever he uses the morpho-syntactic approach the treatment is not as comprehensive as it could have been.

6.12.0. Unit 12: Parametre:

A theory of morphology deals with the regularities present in the forms which represent the smallest units of meaning. But the theory of morphology is equally concerned about the regularities which relate the formal units with their corresponding semantic units. This correspondence between forms and meanings and the regularities which the linguist is in a position to observe and describe are what ultimately makes a theory of morphology valid within a theory.
of language. The theoretician should be able to bring out, for instance, the regularities which exist between the varied aspects of the semantic unit of the 'past tense' and the corresponding morphology which in a varied way give expression to the 'past tense'. The linguist meets with several explanatory constraints while attempting to describe such regularities between forms and meanings.

6.12.1. **Analysis**: There are two features which are fundamental to Jespersen's theory of morphology which have made him as modern as any other linguist in the present century. On the one hand Jespersen aims not at a prescriptive accounting of the grammar of the English as the early traditionalists did. Instead Jespersen aims at a discovery and description of what the contemporary linguists of both structural and transformational schools call 'the regularities that are fundamental' to any component of the language. The attempt by any linguist insofar as any component of language is concerned is what we may call a 'discovery procedure.' This discovery procedure in the form a linguistic analysis and description is expected to yield the fundamental and surface regularities of the component of the language under consideration.

6.12.2. That is what Jespersen does precisely. In an attempt to 'discover and describe' the deep-set and surface regularities of the morphological component of language. The first thing Jespersen does is to discover and describe a set of the general and deep-set regularities of the morphology of the English language we find this in the *Philosophy* where the basic
components of Jespersen's theory of morphology are enunciated. The early sections of *Morphology* includes in a more up-to-date and revised manner the same general regularities of the English language.

6.12.3. Secondly, Jespersen attempts to discover and describe the specific regularities of the morphology of the English language. The work *Morphology* is precisely this. This work is an embodiment of Jespersen's attempt to discover and describe in detail the regularities in the form-function-meaning relations within the morphology of English language. The 'operational' basis and the 'explanatory' nature of Jespersen's theory of morphology are the procedural dimensions of this attempt to discover and describe the regularities in a most scientific manner.

6.12.4. Again, it is not only the general and specific morphological regularities that we find Jespersen attempting to discover, but going a most significant step ahead he attempts to discover and describe the morphological regularities which underlie human language in the form of certain universals of morphology. Although apparently Jespersen's concern is with the English language, his eyes are on the ultimate universal aspects and elements of human language as such.

6.12.5. While traditional grammar is an attempt to pronounce those 'norms' of the language which constitute the rules for its use, and an attempt to superimpose those categories which the grammarians thought should be befitting to the structure
of the particular language they were treating, we find that Jespersen constantly employs the traditional categories of both syntax and morphology to discover and describe the regularities which he finds as essentially part of the syntactic and morphological structure of the language.

6.12.6. Jespersen undertakes a discovery of the formal, functional and semantic regularities and the relations which are inherent in the morphological component of language. This follows, on his part, an attempt to formalize these regularities to render it a level of rigorousness as we find in his Analytic Syntax on a large-scale and in Morphology in a much smaller scale. It was not possible for Jespersen within the format in which he developed his theory of morphology to employ formalization in morphology as he did in his Analytic Syntax.

6.12.7. Inspite of Jespersen's adherence to strictly particularized description, we find a repetition, in several places, of the classical norms as applicable to the morphology of English. On several occasions it is found that a detailed formulation of the underlying regularities is not undertaken because of Jespersen's interest in a much greater coverage of the morphological components of language than required. Again, illustration over-rides the description of the regularities.

6.13.0. Unit 13 : Parametre:

A sound theory of morphology maintains the necessary componental sequence between the morphological elements which are accounted for as part of the theory. A sequence of this kind takes care of the natural link between one aspect of
morpology and another. By establishing a sequence of this kind the linguist is trying to bring out the deep correspondence between the theory as a scientific, objective description and language which is a complex of manifold components. In this componential sequence a description of the most elementary morpheme units logically precedes the description of more complex ones. An accounting of 'inflectional morphology' comes before that of 'lexical morphology.' In language too the inflectional morphemes constitute the most outer and simplex formations.

6.13.1. Analysis: There is an attempt in Jespersen to reshuffle the traditional sequence of the components of a theory of morphology, Jespersen recognizes the need for a reorganization of the topics of morphology at the preface to his work: Morphology. We find considerable awareness and enthusiasm on the part of Jespersen to arrive at a sequence of the components of the theory of morphology in a way most acceptable to his contemporary linguists and better than the arrangement employed by the earlier grammarians. The ordering of the components, he felt, should in some way reflect the priority of the components as they occur within the actual language.

6.13.2. Jespersen's treatment of the components of morphology and the sequence he employed reveal a characteristic affinity to the intuitive understanding of the components of language. The lack of a number of prejudices and constraints which the structuralists entertained enabled Jespersen to employ a
sequence which would be most acceptable to the speaker of the language. The native speaker's intuition so far as his understanding of the structure of the morphology of his language is concerned, is sensed and felt by Jespersen both as a scientific observer of the language and as a speaker of the native speaker's calibre. Jespersen's acquaintance with the structure of English was so authentic and authoritative that an understanding of the native speaker's intuition in this regard was quite natural for him.

6.13.3. Jespersen's stress of the formal features in the theory of morphology has helped a successful sequential arrangement of the elements of morphology. Although there is no apparent marks of his endeavour to work out a comprehensive explanatory theory of morphology as we understand it in the post-transformational generative era, the sequence of the components of morphology as he employs it in his theory reveals an effort on Jespersen's part to achieve such a comprehensive description not only of the morphology of English but also an objective and universal theory of morphology. The stress of the formal elements as against the functional and the semantic elements has in many ways influenced and determined the sequence of the components of the theory.

6.13.4. We may regard each chapter of Morphology as the major components of Jespersen's theory of morphology. There is a constant preoccupation to keep these chapters as logically related to each other and sequential within the general outline. Jespersen begins with the inflections of the verb and the noun category, moves on to the description of all aspects
of the root forms, and finally arrives at the derivational forms, the prefixes and the suffixes. The sections of each chapter of Morphology serves as elements within the major components of Jespersen's theory of morphology. Finally the particular and detailed aspects which Jespersen deals with serve as the content matter of the components of Jespersen's theory of morphology.

6.13.5. Jespersen could have knit together in a much more cursive and descriptive manner the components and the subcomponents of morphology in order to produce a comprehensive theory of morphology. But we find that the objective is not to work out a theory of morphology as we understand it but to achieve a comprehensive and a sequentially presented description of the components of language without leaving out even the most insignificant exception. Because of this we find that there is an undue stress on the illustrative part of the theory which clouds and disturbs Jespersen's theory of morphology. Often one gets the feeling that Jespersen is more concerned with the particular forms of the English language than with the theoretical coherence within which these forms must be accounted for. Jespersen's concern to have a complete coverage of the particular forms of the language with all the exceptions and deviations affects the integrity of the theory of morphology.

6.14.0. Unit 14: Parameatre:

A theory of morphology accounts, in some way as part of its description, for the fundamental creativity of language. The theory explains the inherent linguistic potency to derive
ever new forms from the old keeping in line with and responding to the needs of the times, just as linguistic creativity enables the speaker of a language to produce potentially an infinite number of sentences on the basis of a limited set of lexical items and linguistic patterns and constructions. Linguistic creativity is the fundamental principle behind language change. Language is a changing and evolving thing and the highly productive nature of language should be accounted for. A morpheme such as the plural suffix -s or the affix -tion has proved itself to be exceptionally productive as part of modern English.

6.14.1. Analysis: It is significant to note that creativity is a notion central to Jespersen's theory of morphology. The notion that human language is creative, productive process resulting from the cognitive faculty of man is very much the foundation of Jespersen's theory of language as explicated in Jespersen's Language, Philosophy and Essentials. In an era when behaviourism in psychology, pragmatism in philosophy and structuralism in linguistics were the norms of the day Jespersen could hardly give expression to his fundamental notions of creativity. Jespersen would have indeed come out with a fuller expression of his notion of creativity had he belonged to the post-Chomskyan period when linguistic creativity is recognized as most fundamental to the understanding of linguistic process as relating to and emanating essentially from the rationality of man.

6.14.2. Jespersen considers language a 'progressive' thing and as such it possesses a dynamism inherent to the source which it springs from. This source and this dynamism is the creativity
of language. Of course the notion of creativity is not an exclusive feature of Jespersen's work. But of all his predecessors and contemporaries such as Henry Sweet, Poutsma and Kruisinga Jespersen is the most articulate about the creative nature of language. Jespersen gives expression to this feature in ways which are most conspicuous even in his theory of morphology. Jespersen's essential approach to the components of morphology is coloured by this characteristic of language although he does not explicitly attack the behaviourist viewpoints.

6.14.3. Jespersen's notion of linguistic creativity is given expression to primarily in his ideas on 'linguistic productivity'. Jespersen makes a significant distinction between productive and unproductive aspects of language. He finds that this notion is most relevant to the morphology of language. Jespersen's ever pervading distinction between productive forms and expressions in English and unproductive and expressions which he calls 'formulas and formulaic expressions' is most significant in understanding his theory of morphology as a whole. Linguistic productivity and the resulting novel forms and novel and varied expressions are essentially rooted in linguistic creativity. Just as creativity is at the very base of human linguistic behaviour in the transformational-generative grammar Jespersen's theory of morphology is rooted on the fundamental notion of creativity with the difference that Jespersen has not been in a position to integrate creativity to his theory of morphology in so explicit a manner as he could have.
6.14.4. Another notion in which Jespersen's linguistic creativity is given expression to is his much discussed 'linguistic Progress' in relation to morphology. It is one of the fundamental articles of Jespersen's linguistic faith that languages undergo not a process of deterioration in the long run, but every language in normal circumstances undergo a process of continuous progress. The progress of a language is expressed most in the evolving and changing forms of a changing and evolving community. Therefore what Jespersen finds in the natural language is a parallel evolution of features of communal experience and features of language. The move from the flectional type of morphological structure to an analytical type as featured by a modern language like English is looked at by Jespersen as an instance of linguistic progress. Jespersen's book: Progress in Language (1894) contains his ideas on language as a progressively evolving thing.

6.14.5. Jespersen attempts to give expression to a large variety of aspects of linguistic creativity. His notion of linguistic creativity has a vertical (historical) dimension and a horizontal (spatial) dimension. These two aspects take care of the creative evolutions both in language as a product of the evolving and changing history of man as well as a product of the great spatial i.e., geographic variations and evolutions. As in the case of several other components of his theory of morphology Jespersen did not succeed in working out or rather explicating a coherent theory of linguistic creativity which would enhance his theory of morphology more than what it has done.
6.15.0. **Unit 15: Parametre:**

The linguist is aware of the fact that language possesses an inherent tendency for **condification of linguistic expressions**. An acceptable theory of morphology attempts to account for this characteristic of human language to turn a very productive and dynamic expression into a highly codified **formulaic expression**. In this process of codification of expressions many an expression goes obsolete but others remains in active use in the form of a solidly set expression which is susceptible to no change. Expressions like 'How do you do?' or idiomatic uses such as 'to put up with (to bear with)' or isolated forms such as 'oxen' have become so formulaic that it is not possible to point out in any way the rationale for the combination of the formatives or elements in the word or expression.

6.15.1. **Analysis:** Jespersen looks upon the technique of codification and stratification of linguistic expressions as a device to achieve semantic stability. Every language reveals numerous instances of expressions which were once upon a time in the history of language dynamic, productive and active expressions and were employed to convey semantic units in the most usual manner as per the norms of the language. Productive formatives in English such as -tion, a productive from such as 'walk', a verb phrase such as 'put it in', a phrasal expression such as 'put on---- ', and an idiomatic expression such as 'put up with' are all different and phased steps of a linguistic process which Jespersen calls 'formalization' as an essential linguistic process.
6.15.2. Jespersen attempts in his Philosophy and Morphology to give expression to this fundamental notion by means of which every language achieves what we may call an 'economy' of semantic representation. Formulization of linguistic expressions and formatives into formulaic expressions like 'oxen' or 'went' or 'run' enables language to economize the fundamental linguistic energy and closely knit together the formal and semantic units of the expression in a permanent manner without permitting the same form or formative to enter into similar combinations in the language. This economization by means of formulization is a significant aspect of Jespersen's theory of morphology.

6.15.3. Something quite characteristic of the formulaic expressions as Jespersen sees it is the manner of retaining older forms and employing such forms for expressing new semantic contents. English language is full of instances for this particular linguistic technique. Several words have remained formally the same right from the Anglo-Saxon period as we find in several of the Scandinavian forms in English. Either the earlier meaning is retained while fresh connotations are added to the use of the word as we find in words like 'father' which originally meant the biological parent, now has come to have several other religious and sociological connotations. The same is true of the word 'brother'. But among such words of an earlier origin there are words whose forms only are retained while the form assumes new meaning. The word 'heaven' or several words from Christianity retain
this characteristic. Such forms have become partly formulas in the above sense.

6.15.4. Jespersen analyzes all aspect of the nature of formulaic expressions to discover how human language exploits this technique. Jespersen's Morphology contains details of formulaic expressions scattered in several chapters as he deals with the different types of formulaic expressions as related to different components of morphology. The essential function of 'formulization' is driven home in all these chapters by means of illustrations and lists of items. The focus is, again on the formulaic units such as -en (n) or -ock in 'hillock' which are either inflections or derivations coming under the scope of morphology.

6.15.5. Another means for which language employs the technique of formulization as Jespersen sees it is to achieve social harmony by rendering forms and expressions with tremendous ease to transfer quick socio-cultural connotations. Most of those formulas which belong to the category of social etiquette should be regarded as achieving this end.

6.15.6. A most conspicuous drawback in Jespersen's formulation and description of the component seen above is the lack of consistency. Jespersen attempts to segregate two different sets: (a) productive affixes and (b) formulaic units like 'oxen' or 'inner' whose formatives are not regarded as affixes. But the same he at other times groups under affixes thus clouding the classification of description of the component of his theory of morphology.
Morphological processes have come to be accepted as an integral part of morphology and a sound theory of morphology in present-day linguistics accounts for the manifold morphological processes in the formation of the word-forms in language. The formation of a word-form such as 'information' is accounted for in terms of a number of morphological processes such as 'prefixation' or 'suffixation'. The conjoining of an affix morpheme to a stem is regarded as a morphological process and is labelled as 'prefixation.' The accounting of the formation of morphological units has been given by structuralist linguists in terms of a 'structural description' as against the process-oriented description of traditional grammarians. We have come to a stage in the post transformationalist era when this process-oriented description is thought of as more adequate than a structural description of a morphological unit.

6.16.1. Analysis: What we find as a result of the analysis of Jespersen's morphological system is its functional orientation which enables Jespersen to view the whole range of language as an evolving, developing, changing i.e., a functional system. In other words we may speak of the dynamic aspect of morphological processes as inherent to Jespersen notion of morphology. By essentially clinging to the morphological processes Jespersen discovers this dynamism of language at the very outset. As language itself is a sort of an 'abstraction', this
this dynamism of language exerts its creativity in and through the actual 'living' and evolving units called the meaningful forms or morphemic units.

6.16.2. Jespersen studies language experience from the speaker's and the listener's viewpoints. This consequently corresponds to competence and performance. Morphology for Jespersen is the listener's viewpoint which subsumes the forms as the starting point of the language experience. While giving due stress to form and meaning Jespersen finds function at the cross-roads between the two. An essential dynamism of human language is made explicit as we view the multiple functional values inherent in the meeting-point between the speaker and the listener.

6.16.3. Unlike historical linguistics which attempts to classify things in the past history of a language and thereby record the changing features of the language, Jespersen employs 'descriptive techniques' to describe the language which is 'dynamic and in motion', not to record the development but the pulses of the living language in terms of their structural and process features. Morphological processes designate the operational or functional aspect what has otherwise been simply and statically stated as 'replacement morphemes.' In regard to the process of compounding Jespersen writes of it as consisting of two opposit tendencies: One is to strengthen the feeling of the composit nature of the elements involved by making each element more and more independent. The second
tendency is to strengthen the unity of a compound which is thereby made into a fixed unit with obliteration of its composite nature. Example for the former is 'family gathering' and the latter is 'channel or gunnel'. The whole thing involves a functional description of morphology.

6.16.4. In line with the requirements of the contemporary structuralist norms Jespersen does not employ terms such as 'affixation', prefixation and suffixation*. Instead he employs terms such as affix, prefix and suffix to designate the structural features of a formative being present in the initial position or the final position. But the theoretical context in which these structural elements are employed are procedural, functional and process-oriented to do 'justice' to the essential dynamism which we have already discussed.

6.16.5. The historical perspective which Jespersen employs in his theory of morphology and the productive characteristics of language which Jespersen stresses so much are essentially related to Jespersen's notions of morphological processes. Morphological processes are the embodiment of Jespersen's historical perspective and the productive characteristics in the sense that morphological processes are the principal device through which the two are given expression to.

6.16.6. In spite of the rather articulate manner in which Jespersen propounds this component of his theory of morphology, there is no attempt, again, to integrate the whole notion into
the structure of his theory as to make it comprehensive. Instead one has to abstract the notion of morphological process from his general theory as he views it in relation to other components of his theory of morphology.

6.17.0 Unit 17: Parametre:

The paradigmatic properties of words constitute an area which an adequate theory of morphology takes care of as part of its description. Nouns, verbs and partly adjectives have paradigmatic properties as morphemes and these properties enable a particular noun or verb to function specifically according to their number and case properties. While 'syntagmatic properties' define the relationships of words as they combine to form sentences, paradigmatic properties define words as they assume different forms to suit a specific syntactic function. Paradigmatic differences occur within the structure of a word as in the sets: 'walk, walks, walked, walking' or 'boy, boys, boy's and boys' or 'fine, finer and finest'.

6.17.1. Analysis: English grammar is traditionally described in terms of parts of speech: noun, pronouns, adjectives, verbs, adverbs, prepositions, conjunctions and interjections. The fact is that these properties overlap to such an extent that any definitions of the same would result in conflicts or overlap, and the validity of the definitions becomes questionable. But the only way achieve a simplification of structural description was to class together words which play essentially identical roles in the structure of language.
In our consideration of Jespersen's attempt to classify morphemes we found how Jespersen tried to group morphemes chiefly on the basis of forms and functions with reference to meaning. Jespersen as part of this attempt tries to systematize a small set of related forms attached to each word called the 'paradigms.' These paradigms are the basis for the description of inflectional morphemes as they find themselves associated to their stems.

6.17.2. Jespersen groups together the paradigmatic forms under four heads based on the nature of the stems on which the formatives are affixed:

1. Noun paradigms as found in 'boy, boys, man, men'.
2. Pronoun paradigms as in 'I, me, my, mine'.
3. Verb paradigms as in 'ride, rides, rode, ridden, riding'.
4. Adjective paradigms as in 'fine, finer, finest'.

These four groups of paradigmatic classes are very significant in the understanding of Jespersen's theory of morphology. These paradigmatic classes are distinguished in present-day linguistics from 'syntagmatic classes.' The book 'Morphology' is organized partly on the basis of the role the paradigms play in the formation of related morphemes.

6.17.3. Paradigms as seen above are members of the same group of morphemes in which there exists an intrinsic relation that arises from the functional (syntactic) change expressed in a set of formatives attached to them. In other words paradigms are functional groups as far as Jespersen understand them and the intrinsic relation that exists between the forms is not the same and is more inherent than the relation found, say,
6.17.4. Jespersen's understanding of paradigms is related to the notion of language progress as well as the formulization of language. Paradigms represent that dimension of morphology which has the greatest dynamism since the inflections come under the paradigmatic classes. Language progress as a process is a continuous and historical thing. Therefore the notion of paradigms is related to the historicity of morphology. Language progress in its creative dimension is embodied in the paradigmatic classes. The paradigms are the sets of forms whose outermost formations constitute the central components of a theory of morphology. Thus the notion of paradigms provide a dynamic criteria for the grouping of the central components of morphology.

6.17.5. The basic understanding of the paradigmatic classes has been derived from the study of the Latin paradigms. In Latin the cogugational derivations for verbs and the declensional derivations for nouns represent the paradigms of Latin. Jespersen attempts to avoid a close reference to the Latin origin of the notion of paradigms in order to avoid any transfer of the fundamental Latin category to English. An attempt is made to deal with the English paradigms in an independent manner so that he is not accused for the error of transposing the Latin category on English.

6.17.6. Jespersen's fundamental notion of paradigms is explicated in his Philosophy of Grammar, but behind every chapter of Morphology the paradigmatic property of English is
taken for granted. All the same Morphology could have been better organized on the basis of the paradigmatic property of English Language had he been able to work out a more systematic exposition on the paradigms as part of his theory of morphology.

6.18.0. Unit 18: Parametre:

There are several environmental features which condition the occurrence of the noun and verb morphemes or rather all lexical morphemes as they order themselves in a sentence or enter into any type of a combination. An adequate theory of morphology accounts for the conditions which restrict the occurrence of morpheme units in sentences and bring out the phonological and morphological features which go into such conditions. Such environmental features are governed by the word-final and word-initial phonemes and their distinctive features. This turns out to be a major area of treatment in a theory of morphology. The combination of 'house' which has /s/ as the word-final phoneme with the plural suffix -s results in the alternation of /s/ into /z/. The environmental features may be phonemic, morpho-phonemic, or morpho-syntactic by nature.

6.18.1. Analysis: The role of environmental features is a structuralist concept and Jespersen discovers the importance of the concept. An understanding of linguistic elements being influenced and conditioned by occurrences before or after these elements had been part of even the traditional understanding of morphology. The occurrence of items in which one can be predicted by the presence of the other or others
was recognized by earlier linguists and grammarians. But with the structuralist linguists this notion became a systematic component of linguistic description. Throughout Morphology we find an awareness of the importance and the role of environmental features, elements which determine the phonological shape of morphemes.

6.18.2. Innumerable illustrations of the conditioning influence of environmental features are available in Jespersen's works, especially Morphology. The simplest and the most easily accessible instances are the plural morpheme, -iz, -z, and -s and the past tense morpheme -id, -d and -t. Each of the three allomorphs are said to be conditioned since each occurs when certain clearly defined conditions occur. In these cases (the noun suffix and the verb suffix) the conditioning factors are the phonetic nature of the preceding phonemes: [z] occurs only after voiced non-sibilants, [iz] occurs only after sibilants such as [z, s, and ʃ] and [s] occurs after voiceless non-sibilants.6

6.18.3. Jespersen recognizes that the elements and changes mentioned above cannot be described except in relation to the conditioning environment in which these elements occur. Thus it is the linguist's task to define the context in which a particular form assumes a particular shape. In cases that are isolated the conditioning environment does not assume so much importance as in features that continue recurring in

language. Jespersen finds that morphemes such as 'man : men or child : children' are perhaps context-free, isolated instances which are not defined in terms of the environments. These morphemes occur in any environment conditioned only by their syntactic features and not by morphological elements.

6.18.4. The irregular noun morphemes as examined by Jespersen provide fine illustration, again, for the process of conditioning by environmental features. While morphemic alternations between /mauz/ and /mais/ or /wuman/ and/wimin/ are not conditioned in the present-day English, most instances of plural alternants, regular past tense alternants, as well as irregular plural forms provide us illustrations of conditioning environments and subsequent phonemic transformations and deletion. Jespersen deals with these aspects in their details and enhances his theory of morphology.

6.18.5. As Jespersen⁷ notes it a spirant became voiceless at the end of a word, while in the interior the voiced sound was retained. Always Jespersen goes back tracing the historical development of the particular form in order to justify the process of change effected in the form as we find in 'wife - wives, calf - calves, mouth - mouths, wolf - wolves, thief - thieves.' In all the above instances the process of conjointing the sibilant sound [s] with the voiceless fricatives yields voiced fricatives respectively at the end of the base and the [s] alternant of the plural morpheme becomes realized. Here the conditioning environments are the alternants of the plural morph, and the phonetic change occurs in the

6.18.6. Jespersen's notion of the environmental features, thus, correspond closely to those of the structuralists and Jespersen undertakes a rather comprehensive treatment of these aspects in his *Morphology*. All the same the term is not made use of and the focus is always not on the component as a part of his theory rather than the illustrative instances of the actual language. Consequently the aspect suffers as a component of his theory of morphology.

6.19.0. **Unit 19: Parameter:**

A theory of morphology accounts for the significant area of the *morphophonemic aspect of stress*. Language is characterized by what we know as morphophonemic alternations. A theory of morphology attempts to describe the several regularities which are inherent in such alternation. Stress as a suprasegmental feature controls morphophonemic alternations considerably. Stress becomes important in morphology and takes the central place in morpho-phonemic treatment because of the potency of stress alternations to effect meaning changes. There are numerous words in English which have the stress on the primary syllable as a noun and the stress is shifted to the second syllable when the word is employed as a verb. Examples are: 'export-"export or convict - con'vict.'
6.19.1. **Analysis:** Jespersen is constantly aware of the role stress plays in the structure of language and we find constant references to the pattern of stress in English morphology. With regard to those alternations within the periphery of a morpheme, stress features have a big role to play. Under morpho-phonemics we are concerned with certain phonological processes within the morpheme boundaries in question, and thereby enable themselves adapt to the features of the environment. In otherwords by morphophonemcs we mean, in a restricted and narrow sense, the phonological alternations that take place as a result of morphemes entering Jespersen's morphology includes aspects of morphophonemcs without using the term itself which has assumed new connotations later.

6.19.2. It is in relation to stress features that Jespersen marks sound changes in modern English. Although Jespersen, again does not speak of 'stress morphemes', stress is marked as having full status as morphemes. Throughout *Morphology* a predominent concentration on the aspect of sound alternations resulting from stress is visible. From stress features Jespersen moves into various other features of morphophonemcs as part of his theory of morphology.

6.19.3. According to Jespersen stress is an analogous phenomenon; children learn the accentuation as well as the sound of each word.⁸ Jespersen considers the whole of the pronunciation of a word a formula or unit presented to the native speaker as one tautum. In Jespersen (1924) we find

---

⁸ Jespersen. 1924 : 23.
a full treatment of the sound alternations which resulted in a set of sounds we employ in several familiar words in modern English. Homophonous forms in English which alter between verbs and nouns on the basis of the change in stress would perhaps furnish the best examples for the function of stress in morphophonemics.

6.19.4. Aspects of morphophonemics in relation to sound alternations is central to Jespersen's theory. The notion of functional stress as related to sound alternations as part of a structural description is a significant aspect of Jespersen's theory. A number of words with the so-called Latin - type prefixes show what we may call the functional stress alternation. It is called functional because the stress is not fixed on the word as it alternates between the form - classes, as the word change from one form-class to another. When the word is used in one part of speech (form - class category) it is stressed on one syllable, and when it is used in another the stress alters. A description of this aspect of sound alternations as illustrated by say for instance a form like 'form, formal, formality, formalize and formalization' is central to Jespersen's theory.

6.19.5. Nowhere does NJesper sen mention things similar to the structuralist description of the various aspects of stress morpheme and of morphophonemics. Eventhough these formal aspects of a theory of morphophonemics are not present in his work, a reading of his material on stress features and on
sound alternations distinctly shows how conscious Jespersen was of the manner and significance of sound alternations as a result of alternations in stress or as a result of the coming together of morphemes with contrastive features as it happens in the manifold occurrences of Sandhi.

6.19.6. It may be noted that Jespersen's material on stress alternations and morphophonemics has got lost or mixed up with his preoccupation with the historical perspectives. But Jespersen sees sound alternations as an integral aspect of a sound description of the morphology of language. For Jespersen sound alternations as a synchronic factor and as a diachronic factor are of equal importance in the totality of the description of the morphology of language. For him the morphological processes and sound alternations are the sides of the same coin both being central to the structural and functional aspects of the morphology of language.