CHAPTER 2

PROCEDURES & PARAMETRES
2.1. The Methodology of the Present Investigation:

2.1.0. Introduction: The present investigation is characterized by a number of basic features pertaining to the nature of the kind of research undertaken. The methodology employed in a particular investigation is determined by the nature of the research undertaken. It all depends to what extent the discipline in which the investigation is carried out can be closer or away from most concrete experiments of an objectively scientific and empirical type. First of all we may make a distinction between empirical and non-empirical type of research and I must include the present investigation under the non-empirical type. The present enquiry is non-empirical as contrasted to a strictly empirical type of research both of which are possible and relevant in a discipline such as linguistics. By an empirical research we mean an investigation into a problem of a practical or theoretical kind or a combination of both by means of a procedure which is strictly under empirical control in terms of observation, measurement and analysis. An empirical investigation is strictly scientific in the sense that (i) it is based on a fully controlled quantum of data, (ii) measurable in quantitative terms, and (iii) the conclusions and findings are strictly within the limits of data gathered by means of empirical tools such as observation.
or testing.

2.1.1. Nature of the Enquiry: The present investigation cannot be qualified as an empirical study in the strict sense of the term and I must group it under a non-empirical, linear study of strictly theoretical kind. By this I mean that the investigation is not founded on a fully controlled quantum of data. It is neither based on the data gathered from a group of speakers of a language, nor it is based on the data gathered by means of a tool such as a questionnaire or interviews. The study has all the same the necessary data which consists of the components of the theory of morphology as expounded by Otto Jespersen.

As a linear, theoretical study, the present research is not measurable in any quantitative terms. It means that the investigation does not involve the use or employment of mathematical or statistical tools or norms. At no phase of the investigation has there been the use of any mathematical or statistical tool and as such the content of the enquiry is strictly non-mathematical and non-statistical. The findings and conclusions of the present study has therefore been presented in terms of a set of well-organized theoretical components which are not susceptible to statistical measurement under the present scope.

2.1.2. Present Study as non-experimental: The present enquiry is a non-experimental type of research. It is indeed a corollary of the fact it is non-empirical. If non-empirical
we have meant that the study involves no empirical elements of the kind described above, I may say, that by being non-experimental the investigation excludes all possibilities of any experiment ... of an empirical kind as a method of gathering the necessary data. As an experimental study it is possible for a linguist to work on the language acquisition processes and levels of an 'experimental group' and 'a controlled group'. The findings and conclusions, then will directly be related to the data 'gathered from the relative performance of the two groups. But the present study entertains no scope for experiments of any kind.

The present investigation retains a level of **rigorousness** and precision which is absolutely necessary for any research. It does not indeed call for the kind of precision and rigorousness which are required of or are characterized by a strictly empirical study which involves the use of quantitative measurement. It is rigorous and precise only as much as any such linear, non-empirical, theoretical study can guarantee. It is to enable the enquiry to be as precise and controlled as possible that we have employed the parameters which will be discussed in detail later. The study possesses as much rigorousness and precision, therefore as the use of the set of parameters has provided. It seems to me, as the investigator, necessary to be very clear on this point to maintain the lucidity of the study.
2.1.3. Objectivity & Validity: The objectivity and validity of the present study can cause some concern. No one doubts the objectivity and validity of an empirical or experimental type of study because of the quantitative measurement employed in the research. Problems arise when it is a question of such theoretical research as the present one whose objectivity and validity cannot be substantiated in terms of statistical measures. The notion of objectivity in the present context calls for an exactness of specifications avoiding the deviations of ambiguities, elements of subjective prejudices and preferences and lack of specification in the presentation of the components of the theory under consideration. The notion of validity demands of the present study an exact relation between what is aimed at and what has been obtained as a result of the investigation. Again, the investigator has done all at his disposal to render the work as objective and valid as possible.

Another aspect of concern over the validity of the methodology employed in the present investigation is that of generalization. Generalization as a major and determining factor in research is at once related to what we know as the sample and the population of an investigation. Practically no enquiry of a serious kind can be undertaken reaching the entire population for which the enquiry is finally meant. The population of an empirical-experimental study can consist of anything ranging from human beings to
molecules of water. The population is the totality of the members of a group or a class to which the conclusions and findings will be extended and applied. Such a population being immensely more vast than the investigator can reach and bring under his control for the study, he is required to find a 'representative group' which we call the sample. The sample represents the population for all practical functions within the scope of the enquiry. The findings and conclusions based on the sample must be capable of being extended and generalized over to the whole population.

The present enquiry is neither devoid of the virtue of generalization nor of the sample and the population because it is non-empirical. It has both the sample and the population and does possess the quality of generalization though it is a theoretical investigation. But the members of the group are neither human beings, nor molecules of water; they are the individual and distinctly definable components of Jespersen's theory of morphology. As in the case of any research, it is not within the scope of the present investigation to include each and every theoretical statement Jespersen included as part of his work and which put together make the whole of what we can call 'Jespersen's theory of Morphology'.

2.1.4. Tools of the study: The present investigation has employed the parameters as the tools. An empirical study employs several types of instruments or tools as a means of
gathering the data required for the study. The linguist can interview his informants, observe their language behaviour, or get a set of questions answered by means of a questionnaire. Here the tools of interview, observation, questionnaire or a set of tests are employed by the linguist as an investigator which will yield the data required for his study. As a non-empirical enquiry, the present study retains no scope for the use of any of the above instruments. Instead the present study in an endeavour to render the enquiry as objective and valid as possible has made use of a set of norms, criteria or what we have called the parameters which function as the tools of an objective type for the investigation. Thus the role of the parameters is most central to the present study.

Thus the investigation can be most suitably labelled as a linear, non-empirical, theoretical study of Jespersen's theory of morphology with a view to obtaining an objective estimate of its relevance to present-day linguistics. All the same it has all the characteristics of what we call a scientific research: a definite set of aims and objectives, a definite outline of the methodology and the procedures, a definable tool for analysis and comparative study, an implicit sample and population, and the most intrinsic characteristic of generalization applicable within the entire range of Jespersen's theory of morphology.
2. The Parameters of the Investigation:

2.2.0. Introduction: The parameters constitute the yardsticks of the investigations by means of which a 'measurement' necessary for the enquiry is carried out. The parameters as presented in the form of an inventory in Chapter 5 serve several functional purposes. These guide the central procedure in the research. We have chosen the set of parameters as an inventory and classified them all into two groups: (i) the general Parameters, and (ii) the particular Parameters. The distinction is made on the basis of their nature in terms of the function they are expected to carry out in the research. Some of the general parameters are related to concepts such as (1) simplicity, (2) generality, (3) objectivity, (4) comprehensiveness and so on. These are regarded as general because their application to the theory of morphology is possible not in terms of any one aspect of the theory in particular but to the theory as a whole. The application of the parameter of, say, simplicity is intended to reveal how far Jespersen's theory of morphology retains the basic characteristic of simplicity. I have further split the aspect of one parameter into several of its subcomponents for the sake achieving most concrete and specific application.

2.2.1. Role of Theoretical Statements: There is a parallel process followed for the estimate of the material. I have already mentioned the elements of the 'sample and the population'. The present population consists of the entire
range of theoretical statements included by Jespersen as part of his theory of morphology. It is as in any research understanding impossible to reach out and include each and every one of those statements in the present estimate. We have therefore the necessary quantum of statements based on the various aspects of his theory of morphology just as we have chosen the inventory of parameters from the various aspects of the theory of morphology in an objective manner and accepted by present-day linguists. The parallilism and the contrast is held between these two sets of components of two theories of morphology: (1) presented by Otto Jespersen, and (2) accepted by the present-day linguistics.

2.2.2. Norms and Sample: The critical appraisal is based on the contrast and comparison, the similarity and dissimilarity between the two sets: the set of norms or criteria, and the set of what we have called the sample. Both are brought down to a number of their details and specifications for the sake of objectivity, specificity and clarity of the enquiry. The work is not without problems which will be taken up for discussion at the end of the present chapter. The representative set of components selected for the sample material are supposed to cover all aspects of Jespersen's theory of morphology and as such the findings and conclusions of the investigation will necessarily be applicable to the entire work on morphology which Jespersen undertook and presented in 'Morphology' and other books. These are the functional purposes of the parameters in the investigation.
2.2.3. Sources of the Parameters: A few words need to be said about the sources of the parameters and the mode of their selection. The primary source of the parameters is the investigator's own acquaintance with the present-day theory of morphology as expounded by eminent authors in linguistics. The investigator's own acquaintance is stressed here because of the overall lack of consent and identity among authors insofar as what should a theory of morphology consist of. I have taken a certain extent of liberty in this regard in choosing the parameters. The second source as is understood is the quantum of theories of morphology presented by eminent authors in linguistics belonging to all familiar and well-known schools of linguistic thought. Constant reference is made to such authors as the inventory of parameters was being worked out. The last important source and one on which I have laid much stress is a set of a few experts in the field including my guide whom I could personally contact. The set of parameters were referred to them and their corrections and advice sought. The three mentioned above constitute the overall source from which the parameters of the investigation are drawn.

2.2.4. Structure of the Parameters: The presentation and the structuring of the parameters are characteristic. Twenty parameters of the general type and twenty of the specific type are chosen for the purpose of evaluation. The forty parameters are presented as an inventory in Ch. 5. And every 'unit of estimate' in Chapters 6 and 7 begins with a restatement of the parameter followed by a detailed presentation of the aspects
of the similarities and the aspects of that particular component of Jespersen's theory. All the forty units are dealt with making use of the same scheme. A few things need to be mentioned regarding the structuring of one particular parameter. The parameter is stated in the beginning. This statement of the parameter is followed by a very short description of the parameter and some illustration of the parameter is added wherever I have found such a thing possible within such a limited scope of the inventory. This scheme is resorted to for the presentation of each component included in the inventory as a unit. For the sake of convenience of treatment I have made sure that each unit has the same extent of material included under the statement, description and illustration.

2.2.5. Organisation of the Parameters: Another important aspect of the parameters is their sequence and organization. I faced a number of problems while trying to follow some sequence and organize the components in a logical order. As the components of a theory of morphology, I thought it best that they be organized in their logical order. The problem was what constitutes such a logical order. I tried out various measures and finally arrived at a sequence of organization as found in Ch. 5. The simpler components of the theory have been given precedents over more complex ones. The more general ones are placed before the more specific parameters. The more abstract parameters are placed before the more concrete ones. Again an attempt is made to put the more comprehensive parameters before the less comprehensive ones, comprehensive in terms of the depth of specifications of content included under one single
component. All the same the criteria mentioned above are not strictly followed in all the cases because more than all these the parametres as the components of a theory of language, I thought, must follow a sequence and organization in terms of primarily the intrinsic relation between one component of the theory and another wherever such a relation of content could be maintained.

Yet another aspect of the parametres is their quantum and range as components of a theory of morphology. It was impossible to set an objective limit to the quantum and range of the parametres as norms of the evaluation. It could be twenty, forty or fifty as well, and the range could be from A to G or H or I as well since an exhaustive quantum of numbers and an exhaustive range of components from A to Z are impossible within any discipline as far as a theory is concerned. Any theory, scientific, philosophical, psychological or political, is a changing, evolving and growing thing and as such nothing can have the claim of being exhaustive and ultimate. The number of parametres and the range which it covers are decided in consultation with those who were in a position to help me in this regard.

2.2.6. Functions of the Parametres: It has been pointed out that the parametres are expected to function as a kind of yard sticks for the measurement and evaluation of Jespersen's theory of morphology. The application of the parametres to Jespersen's material is a very sensitive thing as it is not
possible to achieve an objective quantification of the material by means of any mathematical or statistical means within the scope of the present work. It has therefore to be stressed that the parameters in the inventory function as specified directions to a unified theory of morphology with the aspects of such a theory regarded as definable components within the limits of the theory. These directions are applied to Jespersen's theory in a kind of parallelism of detailed specifications as described in the early part of the present chapter.

3. The Terminology and Its Specifications:

2.3.0: Introduction: It is important in an investigation of the present kind to examine and clarify the major and most recurring technical terms used in order to convey the central ideas pertaining to the investigation. This section is included here not as a ritual but with a view to avoiding any misleading notion that may be thought of as part of the meanings of the terms used and to render the work as much lucidity as possible. The first thing is to examine the very title of the present investigation which reads as follows:

'A Critical Appraisal of the Theory and Procedures of Morphology in Otto Jespersen's System of Linguistics.'

The present enquiry the essential nature of which is explained in detail in Ch. 1, constitutes a critical appraisal of some material. The term 'appraisal' indicates in depth the procedure which the investigator follows. It is an 'evaluation'
with a view to bringing out the merits and drawbacks of the material under consideration. As mentioned earlier the evaluation does not involve any quantitative measurement, but it is a critical evaluation of a theoretical kind. The appraisal is expected to yield a quantum of critical material within some well-defined, controlled and organized limits. The term appraisal indicates also a well-defined procedure and use of tools by means of which the critical evaluation can be carried out.

2.3.1. **Meaning of theory:** The present investigation consists of a critical appraisal of a theory cum procedure of some aspect of a discipline. The content matter of the investigation is a theory expounded by an eminent scholar. The term 'theory' is understood in present-day linguistic context in a number of ways. Presenting all aspects of the term theory in all their perspectives is beyond the scope of the present section. It can mean 'the essential linguistic system of components and patterns developed in the cognitive realm of the speak of a language.' It can also mean 'expounding and explicating this linguistic system with a view to presenting a unified system of knowledge about the structure and (or) functioning of the linguistic system.' A theory in the latter sense is a 'unified system of ideas' or what we may call 'some systematic organization of concepts.'

2.3.2. 'Theory' in Jespersen: It is in the latter sense that the term 'theory' is used in the present treatise. Jespersen's work on the morphology of language is conceived as a unified
system of knowledge or a systematic organisation of concepts about the structure of language and in particular of the morphology of language. The extent of unification attained by Jespersen in the explication of his theory of morphology is a matter for discussion later. We have used the terms 'theory and procedure' together. 'Procedure' in the present context is conceived as any systematic methodology which Jespersen as a linguist must have employed in developing, giving shape to and organizing his theory. Although the theory and the procedures which the theory expounds as part of the system (i) or which function as a means to developing the theory (ii), can be conceived as distinct having separate components, the two go hand in hand and inseparable. The theory and procedures of morphology, in the present investigation, are conceived as one unified and inseparable whole and they are therefore dealt with as parts of one and the same content matter of the investigation. I do not make efforts to see Jespersen's procedural components as a separate system and treat these components separately.

Coming back to the notion of theory it may be stressed that the term and the notion of theory cannot be compounded and delimited in terms of the scope which may be included. A theory can have just one specification or it may have a hundred or a thousand specifications. In the present context we conceive a theory as a sequence of 'specifications' which we label throughout the treatise as components. These components are well-definable and are amenable to description
within the bounds of the theory. Every one of the parameters employed in the investigation is conceived as a component of theory of morphology.

2.3.3. **Specifications of the Unit:** The components are presented in terms of their (i) statement, (2) description and (iii) illustration. But we get into the process of estimate and evaluation a presentation of the whole parameter cum the critical evaluation is labelled as a unit of the appraisal. Every unit in turn consists of a set number of specifications which together will constitute an aspect of the appraisal of Jespersen's theory of morphology. The specifications of the unit include both the merits and drawbacks, and similarities and departures.

The present investigation is into the theory and procedures of Morphology. In other words, it is an appraisal of that aspect of linguistics which we call 'morphology' as developed by Jespersen. At this juncture a word about the scope of the term 'morphology' will seem appropriate.

2.3.4. **Structural System:** Language is conceived as a system which is developed in the cognitive structure of the native speaker. Language is also a form of behaviour and as such the linguistic system constitutes the content of linguistic behaviour. The structural linguist conceives language as a structured system. This structured system assumes a level of objectivity and as such can be theoretically conceived as distinct from the cognitive structure which is the functional base of language.
2.3.5. **Lexical System**: The system of language is thought of as structured of several levels. These levels include (1) the sound system, (2) the **lexical system**, (3) the syntactic system, and (4) the semantic system. It is possible and often necessary to conceive a few other intermediary levels in the description of language. The lexical system consists of the entire lexicon a language employs at a given time for generating the sentences of the particular language. When the lexical system is looked at as a product of combination of the sound units of the language giving shape to **meaningful units** we have what we know as the morphology of language.

2.3.6. **Morphology**: Morphology is (i) that aspect of language where the sounds of a language enter into mutual combinations to form **meaningful units** producing the lexical items of the language, and (ii) it is the **formal study** of the structure and function of these meaningful units of language. It need to be stressed, therefore that 'morphology' as made use of in the present investigation means both (i) an aspect of human language and (ii) the systematic **study** of that aspect.

Again the content of morphology are the **morphemes** whose nature will be defined and discussed in the main text of the treatise. The morphemes constitute the content of the morphology of language as well as the content of the linguistics study of morphology. We do not drag in for the time being the controversy whether or not 'morphology' is a distinct level of language. Morphology is conceived in the
present investigation for the sake of lucidity of treatment as part of the larger area which we know as Grammar under which are included the two areas of morphology and syntax.

The discussion above is expected to highlight the specificities of the sense in which the major terms in aspects of morphology which will figure in the main text of the paper and the technical terms used in those areas will be defined and explained as they occur in the text. Again, the chapters that follow will discuss in detail Jespersen's notion of morphology and the manner in which he used the terms related to morphology.

4. Validation of Parameters:

2.4.0. Introduction: The forty parameters employed as tools for the study are central to the overall procedure in the particular research. These parameters are linguistic principles in the form of descriptive statements. These are given a particular function in the study right from the beginning. These parameters are conceived of as a set of broad-based but concrete criteria with their own inherent logical truth validity. The parameters are chosen with care keeping an eye on the truth validity of the linguistic principles and components which they stand for.

2.4.1. Twin aspects of the study: As stated above the twin aims of the research are: 1. a critical appraisal of the morphological components of Jespersen's theory of language
and 2. a reconstruction of a comprehensive theory of morphology based on this appraisal of Jespersen's work. Hence the contribution to the theory of language that the present investigation makes is two-fold: 1. a body of knowledge that reveals Jespersen's contribution to morphology, and 2. a theory of morphology reconstructed from Jespersen's works. These twin aims of the study are in fact two sides of the coin intertwined and overlapping. It is developing a component of the theory of morphology that I have uppermost in mind.

2.4.2. Truth Value of Parameters: The parameters chosen are linguistic principles presented as descriptive statements and accepted by theoreticians as truths fundamental to the nature of language as such and English language in particular. In fact many of these could be evolved as universals in the theory of language. These principles and statements are drawn from linguistic documents of a primary nature and from basic writings in linguistics that have been accepted as authoritative. Since the present study is basically a critical appraisal of Jespersen's theory of morphology such a study needs to be founded on and evaluated with respect to the truth value of a set of principles and statements in linguistics that are theoretical components or components in the theory of language. These in turn function as the criteria or parameters, as the term is employed, for establishing the truth validity of the components of Jespersen's theory of morphology.
2.4.3. **Components of the theory:** The forty parameters, of which twenty are of general nature and the rest are of specific nature, constitute the basic components or constituents of the theory of morphology as envisaged in the basic writings in linguistics. In order to obtain a very concrete critical appraisal a parallelism is established by drawing a similar number of forty components of Jespersen's theory of morphology from his comprehensive writings. In other words for this purpose Jespersen's theory of morphology is reduced and brought down to forty components of a theory of morphology. This is the way I thought I could achieve the aims of the present research with greater objectivity.

2.4.4. **First Phase of Validation:** In the meantime an important question had to be answered. This pertains to the validation of the forty parameters I had chosen for the purpose. The question is what constitutes the basis for the validity of the parameters in question. As the basic tool for the evaluation and appraisal of Jespersen's theory of morphology the parameters have a fundamental function to perform. Hence the validity of these parameters had to be ascertained. Two distinct tools were employed to measure the validity of the forty parameters. The first consisted in a very systematic reference to the basic writings in linguistics. A set of fifteen fundamental, original writings in the form of books and contributions are selected from which to make the systematic reference.
2.4.5. **Oppinionnaire:** The second tool consisted of an oppinionnaire with which I personally met ten well-known professors of linguistics. It was a twin approach to the validation of the parametres which were supposed to form the basis of the study. The list of the basic books to which references were made and from which materials are drawn for the finalisation of the parametres is given as part of the bibliography. The following constituted the procedure of this systematic reference for the validation of the parametres. As the investigator I started the entire work on my own acquaintance with and understanding of the general theory of morphology. This basic knowledge of the theory of morphology was broadened further by means of a series of discussion session I undertook with a number of teachers of linguistics I could meet from time to time, and with colleagues and friends who were interested in the area. This knowledge was further strengthened and completed by the specialised reading that I undertook as my study went on. It was from this theory structure I had developed that I ventured to give shape to the parametres.

2.4.6. **Second Phase of Validation:** Once the parametres were drawn and finalised i.e., about fifty of them, the first phase of the validation of these was over. The second phase was to refer back these parametres more systematically to a set of authentic and basic works even though these works formed part of my general reading and reference. Each parametre was for this purpose taken in isolation studied and understood in
greater depth with respect to the connotation and extension of its meaning and attempts were made to arrive at a most precise statement of the particular parametre. The criteria for this reference were two: 1. a direct and parallel statement of the parametre with more or less identical semantic and syntactic connotation; and 2. an indirect but parallel statement of the parametre with semantically and syntactically approximate connotation.

Keeping the two criteria above in mind the parametres were referred back in the books. It was indeed painstaking to make a judgement in this regard as the correspondence (semantic/syntactic) was not always black and white. The second phase of the validation process was completed when the parametres were stated, restated, evaluated and re-evaluated based on the closeness or departure of the viewpoints of the authors in the most particular cases. At this stage five parametres had to be dropped and another five adopted due to the author-coverage the parametres were expected to have.

2.4.7. Third Phase of Validation: The third phase of the validation of the parametres began with the formulation of the oppinionnaire for the purpose. The format of the oppinionnaire is not included in the appendix as it would amount to a repetition of the parametres in the thesis. The parametres that were finalised after the reference phase of the validation procedure were then stated in the oppinionnaire for the
professors to look through. A checklist was provided alongside to mark the evaluation. The checklist consisted of the following criteria:

1. Most Acceptable
2. Acceptable
3. Acceptable with revision

The parameters were referred to these professors one by one and their opinion was recorded using the checklist criteria above. I was thus able to receive a number of suggestions, further drop a few more parameters, re-word quite a few of the more parameters and finally arrive at the forty parameters that are chosen and presented in the thesis.

2.4.8. Conclusion: The entire process of validation thus consisted of the three phases stated above: (1) the first phase drawing and finalisation of the parameters, (2) the second phase reference back to source books, and (3) the opinionnaire through which the parameters were referred to teachers of linguistics for their consent in regard to their validity for the specific purpose for which they are prepared.

The forty parameters thus drawn and validated constitute the basic components of a theory of morphology as acceptable to theoreticians from various schools of linguistics. This again constitutes the framework of such a theory within which morphology is to be understood by a student of linguistics. Jespersen's contribution to the various aspects of a
the theory of morphology is appraised, estimated and evaluated on the basis and against the background of the theory of morphology as enunciated in the set of parameters.

5. **Problems and Limitations of the Procedure:**

2.5.0. **Introduction:** As a non-experimental investigation the present study retains no scope for the kind of objectivity, exactness and precision which the use of quantitative measures makes possible in an experimental study. This has already been discussed. As a non-empirical research whatever further scope for the use of explicit data and the subsequent quantitative measures there can be, is not present. Apart from having no experiments, the present investigation has not made use of explicit tools for data-gathering such as tests, questionnaires or interviews. The fact that the present one is a non-empirical, non-experimental, linear, theoretical study needs to be re-emphasised.

2.5.1. **Norms and the sample:** It is an enquiry into a theory of morphology as expounded by Jespersen. I have found it a herculean task to develop a set of norms as objective and valid as they can be and present them in a way enumerated in the beginning of the present chapter. Again there involved what I have called a 'parallelism' as I came to develop the procedure. This parallelism is between the norms (the parameters) and the sample representing the entire theory of morphology by Jespersen. It was equally a challenging task
to derive a sample of all the aspects of Jespersen's theory which could be contrastively studied against the normative specifications of the parameters. I am very well aware that the whole success of the present investigation depends fundamentally on the quality, objectivity and validity of these two sets: the parameters and the sample components of Jespersen's theory.

2.5.2. Relevance: Again, it must be acknowledged that presentday linguistics has naturally come a long way ahead of what Jespersen or his contemporaries could think of. The present attempt is not to rationalize and justify all aspects of Jespersen's work on morphology, but to find out against the background of present-day thinking on morphology what elements in his work on morphology can be considered useful, relevant and in line with present-day thinking. The scope of the present work need to be viewed from this humble perspective.

2.5.3. Directions: Lastly, the present enquiry does not constitute an inventory of the drawbacks, negligences and limitations of Jespersen's theory of morphology. That will indeed be a fruitless and irrelevant exercise for an investigator in linguistics. Only mention is made of a few outstanding limitations of Jespersen's theory as part of every unit of the estimate that is undertaken in the main
text of the treatise. The focus is certainly on the **positive contributions** by Jespersen to the theory of morphology. It does not mean that the investigation has focussed attention on a wholesale rationalization of whatever Jespersen wrote as part of his theory of morphology. It is an attempt to reinstate Jespersen's theory of morphology in the mainstream of present-day thinking in linguistics by highlighting a few valuable contributions which cannot be neglected, perhaps, in a crowd of limitations.