CHAPTER 4

JESPERSEN THEORY OF MORPHOLOGY
4.1. Foundations: Morphology (1942) and Philosophy of Grammar (1924) are Jespersen's two most important works which contain his major views on morphology from a theoretician's viewpoint. Jespersen rightly concerns himself in these works with two distinct perspectives: the speaker's and the listener's, on the basis of two distinct elements: the form and the meaning. In the first perspective "We take a form as given and then inquire into its meaning or function; (this Jespersen represents in terms of a movement from the outer to the inner (0 → 1) and in the second we invert the process and take the meaning or function and ask how it is expressed in form". Although this looks rather complex, the system could be called a 'Complementary morphology' as Jespersen himself says that the two parts supplement each other ( 0 → 1 + 1 → 0 ) and give a complete description of the morphological and syntactic facts of language.

Jespersen becomes as formal as a present-day linguist in the characterization of the features of morphology although Jespersen is often blamed for his preoccupation with meaning and for not paying attention to the formal aspects of language. Morphology, accordingly for Jespersen, is that part of grammar

1. Jespersen. 1924:4C.
in which the descriptive linguist focusses his attention on the formal units of the language as individual entities conveying some definite meaning and proceeds further to the meaning units of the forms. What is immediately accessible to the listener are the expressed formal units whose inner content meanings are conceived initially by the speaker only.

4.2. **Morphology - Syntax Relation**:

It is after having received the formal units that the listener comes to have access to the semantic content of the language he listens to. As far as the speaker is concerned, the semantic content is initially conceived. As a device of the formal expression the speaker undertakes a process of selection of forms from among the possible range of units available to him for the purpose of expression. Psycho-linguistically this selection of forms is an important linguistic process. It is this selection which ultimately decides the form of the sentence which the speaker utters at a given time. Hence, to Jespersen, syntax is the description of the syntactic specifications of the meaning units as they are given expression to making use of a set of formal units. Jespersen, therefore, conceives of a two-level organization in this process (i) at the level of the semantic units and (ii) at the level of the formal units. In Jespersen's own words, Syntax proper considers the speaker who "starts from certain ideas which he tries to communicate; to him the meaning is a given thing, and he has to find out
how to express it: he moves from within to without".  

A formal representation of the morphology-Syntax relation would amount to the following:

(Speaker $\rightarrow$ Semantic organization $\rightarrow$ Formal organi. $\rightarrow$ Listener)

encodes starting meaning

Grammar

decodes starting from forms

4.3. Form - Meaning Complementarity:

Jespersen conceives of the elements of form and meaning in so complementary and unified a manner that he does not see syntax and morphology, and syntax and semantics as separate layers of language. It is an important aspect of Jespersen's conception of language. According to Jespersen it is the linguist's task "to keep the two things (form and meaning) in mind, for sound and signification, form and function are inseparable in the life of language, and it has been detriment to linguistic science that it has ignored one side while speaking of the other, and so lost sight of the constant interplay of sound and sense."  

Jespersen quite characteristically believed in the unity, mutual directions,

---

the relevance to each other and the constant interplay of form and meaning in the complex structure of language.

As a linguist Jespersen finds perfect harmony in expressing the same fact in the morphological and syntactic manner. He takes the instance of the plural morpheme -s or the past tense suffix -ed. When it is said that -s in 'cats' turns the singular noun into a plural or that -ed in 'walked' turns the verb in the present into a past, one is dealing with syntactic facts. Jespersen calls these syntactic definitions. But the same will be a treatment of morphology when 'walked' or 'cats' are regarded as certain formal units corresponding to certain units of meaning attached to them, and attempt is made to describe the structure of the form or sequence of forms 'walked' and 'cats' without in any way placing in the total context of the sentence or the phrase. He views morphology as a treatment of such units in isolation as they are structured and conjoined to their meanings.

4.4. Notion of Morphoseme:

Jespersen introduces the term morphoseme as part of a much later description of morphology in his Analytic Syntax (1969:95). In this work Jespersen exerts himself to provide a rigorous and formal description of the syntactic facts about language. In the latter half of the book he traces the most prominent morphological definitions of his day including the definition of morphology provided by Bloomfield before he proceeds to state his own views. Jespersen recognizes Bloomfield's definition of a morpheme as "the smallest
meaningful unit" and the statement that the total stock of morphemes in a language constitutes its lexicon. Quite poignantly Jespersen brings out the magnitude of differences present in the opinions of his contemporary linguists.

Jespersen coins a new word 'morphoseme' to designate the specifications which are characteristic to forms such as (i) 'drank' or (ii) '-s, -z, and -iz.' According to some he found that 'drank' is one indivisible morpheme while according to others 'drank' is a unit which contains a replaced vowel 'a' which is a distinct morpheme. Again it is doubtful whether -s, -z, -iz are different morphemes or they constitute aspects of the same morpheme. Jespersen coins the new term 'morphoseme' to get rid of all these differences and he bases this on the triple criteria of form, function and meaning. Jespersen hoped to smoothen the extremely complex morphological ordering with the introduction of this term. According to him, morphoseme stands at the centre of form, and function, and represented the 'function' of a unit. He found it convenient to explain the intersection of form and meaning in the word morphoseme.

4.5. The Triple Distinction of Form, Meaning and Function:

The solid foundation of Jespersen's entire concept of syntax, morphology, phonology and semantics is the basic distinction he makes between the structural aspects of language: form, function and meaning. These are the three bases on which Jespersen's linguistic classifications are built.
As we examine the history of linguistics we find a constant preoccupation of almost every grammarian with two aspects of language: the form and the meaning. The whole notion came to be based on the Aristotelian distinctions between 'substance' and 'accidence', 'form and matter' and 'substance and form'. The roots of this distinction lie with the Greek philosophers in their attempt to discover the necessary connection between the meaning of a word and its form. What was most misleading in the later trend as it got rooted in tradition on the basis of a good beginning, was the convention of associating the word-form and the meaning by means of a one-to-one correspondence. Words came to be regarded as mere moulds expressing a set of universal categories of concepts.

Later grammarians distinguished between the two ways of looking at language: the 'formal side' and the 'logical side'. They called the connection between form and meaning 'imperfect' as different grammatical functions are often connected with the same form as in 'tree-s' and 'grow-s', and the same meaning expressed by a variety of forms as in the plural forms: 'boys, children and men.' They classified the regular parts of speech on the basis of these distinctions as 'formal categories' and 'logical categories.' In fact we find no trace of any significant insight into the phrase-structure or sentence-structure, apart from the classification and description of word-categories on the basis of the distinction mentioned above.

Jespersen handles the same form-meaning distinctions with a fresh point of view and greater insight. Jespersen's starting point is the contrasting functions of the speaker and the listener as seen above: "Any linguistic phenomenon may be regarded either from without or from within, either from outward form or from the inner meaning. In the first case we take the sound (a word or some part of a linguistic expression) and then inquire into the meaning attached to it; in the second case we start from the signification and ask ourselves what formal expression it has found in the particular language we are dealing with."\(^5\) Jespersen can well be interpreted as saying that no structural description of a language is possible exclusively on the basis of any of the three aspects: form, function and meaning.

Jespersen's Morphology is chiefly an attempt to give expression to the triple distinction which is fundamental to Jespersen's theory of morphology. The work too begins with the same viewpoint of the outer and the inner, of the listener and the speaker. As Harold Hungerford points out Jespersen with greater precision and in detail Henry Sweet's distinction between the contrasting views of the speaker and the listener. The speaker begins with the inner notional categories and the listener begins with the formal categories: the former selects the formal units for the expression and the latter translates these into their conceptual content for

---

the understanding of the language spoken. The entire work: Morphology uses the formal identity and distinctions of morphemes and introduces function and meaning as complementary elements.

4.6. The Syntactic Role of Function:

Jespersen identified function as a special linguistic category with the 'syntactic value' of a particular form or group of forms. The notion of function has a central place in Jespersen's linguistic system. It is a term used by Jespersen to mean a number of things both in morphology and in Syntax. Each linguistic form possesses a syntactic value or function. Function for Jespersen may be viewed as some specific syntactic value, occurring midway between the form and the meaning. The function links the world of sounds with the inner ideas. In a two-directional linguistic movement, for Jespersen, the function is positioned at the centre. The movement can be represented as follows:

Speaker: Meaning → Function → Form
Hearer: ................ Form ← Function ← Meaning

Jespersen takes each functional class and examines its relation, on the one hand to the form, and on the other to the meaning. The notion of function characterizes Jespersen's approach to the parts of speech. Function, standing at the cross-roads between form and meaning designate the actual signification of categories such as number, case.

and tense which cannot purely be attached to the forms or meanings of individual words. By viewing the parts of speech from such a perspective is a departure from the traditional approach to the nature of the parts of speech. The three-fold divisions of the parts of speech on the basis of form, function and meaning greatly reduced the importance of the parts of speech. In Jespersen we find a serious attempt to reduce the importance of meaning-oriented and notional definitions in the treatment of linguistic categories such as the parts of speech.

4.7. **Morphological Processes:**

Jespersen's theory of morphology is founded on what we know as morphological processes. A close look into Jespersen's morphological system shows that it has a thoroughly functional orientation inspite of the stress he puts on a structural description. The functional orientation enables Jespersen to view the whole range of linguistic phenomena as an evolving, developing and changing system. Jespersen's system of morphology is, therefore, a functional system. This springs from his understanding of the essential dynamism of language. By emphasising the fundamental 'morphological processes' Jespersen discovers this essential dynamism at the very outset. Language is a formal system and has an inherent abstractness by virtue of its nature and relation to the cognitive structure of man. This basic dynamism exerts its creativity on this abstract linguistic system and renders it a 'living' and creative process.
Morphological processes designate the operational or functional aspect of what has so far been stated terms of merely static, structural description and such a description is characterised by replacement morphs. In regard to the process of compounding Jespersen writes, "with regard to compounds we find two opposite tendencies. One is to strengthen the feeling of their composit nature 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 character." Example for the former is 'family gathering' and for the latter is channel, tunnel etc.. Such functional description of English morphology is quite characteristic of Jespersen as a contemporary of Sweet, Poutsma and others.

4.8. **Historical Perspective:**

Jespersen's outlook on language is thoroughly pervaded by a historical perspective. Writing almost during the same period, Bloomfield and the Bloomfeldians considered a descriptive (synchronic) approach to linguistics more adequate theoretically and methodologically than a historical (diachronic) approach. It was against that trend of the day that Jespersen still stressed the role of a historical perspective in language analysis. It is one of the distinguishing qualities of his outlook: he attempted a synchronization of

of the synchronic and diachronic approach to the study of language. For most historical linguists before him descriptive data were a purely instrumental thing and were subservient to the historical analysis. But for Jespersen the two approaches were of equal significance and importance: one complementary to the other, and the two together constituting a single, unified method of linguistic study.

The principal reason for Jespersen's concern for historical study was that he found language change a continuous and imposing factor. Every aspect of Jespersen's morphology as we find it in *Morphology* is dealt with wherever possible from its historical background. A structural description which of itself does not reveal any thing significant receives a touch of efficacy as the relevant historical background is traced. Jespersen presents the description of the inflections, the derivations, of compounds and the base-forms of verbs and nouns as employed in present-day English, with a tracing of the historical development of these forms with a view to enlarging the scope of the description of the particular form within the class in which it is placed.

4.9. **Explanatory Basis:**

Jespersen's theory of morphology has an explanatory basis as contrasted to theories which have an operational basis. An 'operational theory' springs from a well-defined and operationally acquired range of data. The linguist performs various 'operations' and observations on the data and as a
result gradually develops his description of the language without considerably from the scope and limits of the data. The linguist seldom resorts to introspection of his own experiences as the speaker of a language. The theory will in short reflect the patterns and regularities actually revealed by the data only. Theories which do not employ such operational restriction are known as 'explanatory theories'.

Jespersen's theory of morphology as it is traced at present is explanatory rather than operational by nature. There is hardly any room for and the kind of procedural restrictions of an operational theory. The mechanical operations of an operational theory are not part of his work. Jespersen's procedures in the theory of morphology are restricted to and developed from his own acquaintance and experiences of a number of languages. He drew upon introspection of these experiences and his scholarly knowledge of these languages as a learned man and embarked on these for his understanding of the language. As a linguist Jespersen looked for the patterns and regularities of the morphology of the English language as the language was present in his cognitive structure. It is over and above this that Jespersen leans on written records for additional material for illustrative purposes. This gives rise to a few contradictions in Jespersen's procedural methods as employed in developing his theory.

4.10. **Levels and Distinctions:**

There are significant departures in Jespersen as far as the levels and distinctions in his theory are concerned. We find a very deliberate attempt on the part of Jespersen to depart from the traditional distinctions and levels recognized as constituting the morphology of language. When Jespersen says that morphology is the listener's viewpoint he means a number of things. The structural units of a sentence having meaning are the words and the divisible constituents of words still retaining some unit of meaning are called morphemes. Any one listening to an utterance of speech has at the outset an experience of an auditory perception of a sequence of morphemes organized within the utterance.

With an adequate understanding of the structure of a sentence and of the structure of a word and a morpheme, Jespersen could conveniently draw proper levels and distinctions in his theory of morphology. The classification of the aspects of morphology in his *Morphology* is the proof of Jespersen's departure in drawing morphemic levels and distinctions as different from those of other grammarians of his period. *Morphology* is conceived of as a combination of two levels: (i) Inflectional Morphology and (ii) Word-Formation. The term 'accidence' Jespersen leaves out from his terminology. He further conceives Word-Formation as consisting of (i) Derivational affixation, and (ii) compounding. Jespersen's constant reference to the structure of language as exemplified
in English and as he spoke and heard it enables him to conceive of the whole structure of the English morphology in particular and that of the morphology of language as such from a new perspective.

4.11. **Intersecting Morpho-Syntactic System:**

Jespersen's system of linguistics can be called an intersecting morpho-syntactic system. In him we find an intersection of morphology and syntax. This is an important aspect of Jespersen's morphology that there is present a level where morphology and syntax intersect with each other; and the same grammatical facts are viewed and studied from the two different perspectives with terminology and elements intersecting. The traditional inflectional categories of tense, number, case etc., from the background against which Jespersen studies the morphemes from the more modern and exclusively morphological categories of suffix, prefix, compounding etc.. The -s ending in the triple forms in the spoken language is stated with its phonological structure and distributions under morphology; but the aspects of singular, plural, tense, case etc., form the background against which the description is attempted so that wherever an exclusive description of the forms is not possible, these categories brought to the forefront.

There are several advantages of such intersecting morpho-syntactic statements. Whatever is naturally together are explained together just as the plurality of the -es form cannot be isolated from the form itself. Jespersen's awareness
of the morpho-syntactic intersection in language is such that the early sections of both Morphology and philosophy contain numerous references to this fact. Jespersen's significant insight is that the structure and distribution of morphemes are governed in several instances by syntactic rules and drawing any demarcation between the two becomes impossible and unrealistic.

4.12. **Productive Nature of Morphology:**

The morphology of language is characterised by its highly productive nature. A linguistic community employs its language for all functional purposes related to the community's varied experiences. In the course of this process the language undergoes manifold changes from time to time. There occurs large-scale borrowing of all sorts as two languages come into contact. These may be in terms of full lexical items or of formatives that enable change of functions in the lexical items which are already part of the language. The productive nature of morphology is a central aspect of Jespersen's theory. Jespersen examines the productive nature of affixes and compounds and makes a distinction between 'productive' and 'unproductive' prefixes, suffixes and compounds.\(^\text{10}\) Jespersen's criteria for productiveness is the capacity or potency of formatives such as '-ation' or '-ing' to produce ever new new combinations.

There are numerous formatives such as -ation, -ness, -ity, and especially -ing which are capable of being cojoined

\(^{10}\) Jespersen. 1924 : 21
to any new word that the language receives. The formatives -s, -ed and -ing are regarded as the most productive ones in English capable of getting into the structure of any new word. In almost every chapter of *Morphology* Jespersen focuses attention on the productive or unproductive nature of the forms he is dealing with. The productive nature of morphology springs from and is rooted in the total dynamism of language of which as I have already mentioned Jespersen is conscious throughout. The productive nature of morphology is a basic reason for all the development language as a rule undergoes.

4.13. Formulas and Free-expressions:

Jespersen makes a distinction between formulas and free-expressions. Formulas are expressions which due to excessive use in the linguistic community have become stereotyped forms meaning nothing special and having, no definite semantic content except the 'functional value' within a social context.\(^{11}\) These express meanings of a practical nature. Jespersen cites examples such as 'Long Live the King', 'good morning', 'How are you?' and so on. Free expressions are the normal sentences of the language which are creatively and productively constructed according to the situation for which they are meant. Such expressions constitute the usual bulk of sentences made in the language. These are sentences following varied grammatical patterns and forms.

\(^{11}\) Jespersen. 1924: 21.
Formulas are closed systems; they do not permit any change in the structure. While 'good morning' is an accepted formulaic expression, 'good noon' is not accepted as having a similar functional meaning. Idiomatic expressions and verbal phrases have the formulaic characteristic in the sense a change in the possible combinations is not permitted. Jespersen considers productive affixes as having the characteristic of free expressions while the originally Roman-type (having origin in Latin) affixes and combinations carried over to modern English have the formulaic characteristic. In forms such as 'analyse, benefit, contrary, benevolent, content etc.' the constituent elements have got so much merged that a distinction between con + trary or con + tent is not possible. The 'con' in such forms have to be distinguished from words such as 'con + firm' $\Rightarrow$ confirm or un + lucky $\Rightarrow$ unlucky.

4.14. **Notion of Morphological Sequence:**

The notion of morphological sequence is important in our understanding of Jespersen's theory. A sentence of a language is the realization of a well-organized sequence of morpheme units. Both at the speaker's end and at the listener's end what is actualised as language is the sequence of morpheme units. This sequence forms the operational basis of an utterance. The speaker utters and the listener receives in fact only the sequence of a set of morphemic units organized in a linear fashion whose pattern of organization is a factor that is abstract and inherent to the sequence.
Jespersen's description of morphology is considerably influenced by his identification of morpheme units as part of the sequence of morphemes which constitutes an utterance. The classification of morpheme groups, morphemic alternants, and the statement of the structural features which govern their form as sequences of phonemes are based on the intuitive knowledge of the language as a speaker. In spite of the stress Jespersen lays on the interaction and interdependence of 'form, function and meaning', he makes sure that the "arrangement in the volume (Morphology of Modern English Grammar) is strictly according to forms : what are identical in form are treated together." Without separating it according to the traditional scheme of word-classes. The sentence as a realization of a set of linearly organized morpheme sequence whose constituent morpheme units have a positional value, is an insight that is characteristic of Jespersen as a contemporary of other scholarly grammarians of his period.

4.15. Paraligmatic Model:

Jespersen's analytic operations on the one hand confirmed the traditional paradigmatic model of describing the inflectional classes within morphology, but on the other some-thing greater than what tradition could offer is achieved. Jespersen's contributions to the study of morpho-syntactic intersection has already been dealt with. Jespersen bases his study of morpho-syntactic relations on two fundamental

aspects: (i) the 'paradigmatic relations' which unite the different forms of the same functional class and are different only in terms of the inflectional suffixes which indicate the functions proper to a particular form within the paradigm. Forms of the verb 'walk' has the paradigmatic set having the members of 'walk, walking, walks, and walked.' The noun 'boy' has the paradigmatic set having the members of "boy, boys, boy's and boys'". These correspond to the conjugations and declensions of Latin where we find that every noun has an elaborate, case-oriented declensional and every verb an elaborate tense-person-number-mood-oriented conjugational system. The second (ii) aspect of the morpho-syntactic relations is the 'syntagmatic relations' which defined and ordered the members of the paradigm in a sentence. The paradigmatic model of grammatical description is the central contribution of traditional grammar but the whole thing came to be refined in the hands of Jespersen, and the role of the paradigms as 'directions' to the syntax of a sentence is better defined by Jespersen. Jespersen based his study of morphology, again, on the paradigm and shed a new light on the approach.

4.16. Morphological Environment:

It is important to note how the aspect of morphological environment partly governs Jespersen's description of morphology and it is central to Jespersen's notion of 'sound alternations' treated today under 'morphophonemics.' Under morphophonemics we are concerned about certain phonological processes within morpheme boundaries which affect the shape
of the morphemes in question and thereby enable these morphemes to adapt themselves to a given environment. Jespersen's treatment of the aspect of sound alternations is central to his theory, but the aspect of how the morphological environment affects the shape of a morpheme receives a very sketchy treatment.

In his treatment of the third person singular suffix -es Jespersen is keenly aware of how the morphological environment plays an important role in altering the shape of some constituent element or other. The root which enters into the combination for instance is 'say'; and the suffix is -es in its triple forms of -iz, z, and s. The environment of the final phoneme 'ei' is given in this instance as 'z'. The occurrence of the suffix 'z' which he describes as the morphological environment affects the shape of the preceding phoneme i.e., the final phoneme of the root-form 'say' and transforms 'ei' into a shortened unit 'e' which when combined with 'z' yields the form 'sez' rather than 'seiz'. A similar environmental change is found in 'does'. In all these the morphological environment affects and changes the preceding unit.

4.17. Treatment of Stress in Morphology:

The treatment of Stress in morphology is most characteristic in Jespersen's theory. Jespersen regards stress as

an aspect of morphology (he does not use the term stress-morpheme or anything similar to this) and gives the features of stress a central place in his treatment of morphology. All aspects of sound alternations are treated by Jespersen in relation to alternations of stress. According to Jespersen, stress is an analogous phenomenon; children learn the accentuation as well as the sounds of each individual word. The whole of the pronunciation of a word is a 'formular unit' presented to the native speaker as a tautum. The best instance of the role of stress in morphology is the set of verbs and nouns whose semantic content alters as the stress alternation takes place. Jespersen dedicates a whole section for the treatment of these identical forms (1942:196). In pairs such as 'object (N) - ob'ject (V), 'convert (N) - con'vert (V) and 'compound (N) - com'pound (V) there takes place a stress alternation which results in the alternation of a vowel which results in the formation of the second word. The stress is called a functional unit in morphology because of its dynamic nature of movement within an utterance and because of its characteristic movement in different derivatives of the same root, belonging to different form-classes as found in 'form — for'mality and formalization. Most sound alternations in the inflectional, derivational, and compounding process result from the alternations which occur in the stress pattern. Jespersen's attention on the aspect of stress shows the emphasis that he laid on the spoken language in the analysis of language.

4.18. **Distributional Characteristics**:

Distributional characteristics of morphemes constitute part of Jespersen's theory in several ways. In the analysis of language are primarily concerned with two things: (i) the discovery of the relevant units of utterance and (ii) the manner of the distribution of these units in the utterance. Although Jespersen does not base his theory on any empirical data of a scientific kind, his analysis of language conspicuously shows that his analytic methods correspond closely to those of present-day linguistics. Jespersen employs several criteria for identifying the morpheme units of the introspective material that lay before him as a speaker of the language. Jespersen's philosophy of language and the Essentials of English Grammar reveal a constant preoccupation on his part to focus attention on a set of criteria for identifying the units of a sentence apart from the manner in which analysis was carried out by earlier grammarians.

Instead of taking for granted the set of form-classes, morpheme groups and their organization in an apriori manner Jespersen attempts to examine concrete examples of language utterances in terms of given sentences and locate the morpheme units as occurring within the context of their sequences. Jespersen's insistence on 'forms which go together' has its resonance on the 'immediate constituents' of a sentence although the directions both take are different. Where grammarians traditionally employed 'the logical
criteria' for identifying grammatical units, Jespersen deviated from his predecessors by employing what we may call 'the distributional criteria' for the identification and description of the units of an utterance in language.

4.19. **Morphological Change**:

Jespersen's historical perspective in morphological analysis is rooted in the reality of *morphological change* as a linguistic phenomenon. Language is in a state of dynamic development adapting itself constantly to the requirements of the linguistic community. The changes resulting from this cannot be felt at a given time; only the cumulative effect of these changes may be studied at any given period. The morphology of English by the ends of the old English and middle English periods and during the modern English as well as in present-day English marks most significant changes as they have affected (i) the formation of stems, single or compound, (ii) the formation of all aspects of inflections, (iii) derivational prefixes, (iv) derivational suffixes and (v) compounds.

In course of the morphological change of language, it is noted by Jespersen that some formations and formatives remain exceptionally alive, sensitive to new forms, and productive while others remain unproductive. Formatives such as the '-en in oxen, au-ai differences in mouse and mice, -lock in wedlock, -th in width, and the whole set of irregular plural forms, past tense forms and participle forms exemplify the tendency of language to receive new forms and formatives
in the course of its progress in line with the advancement of the linguistic community. The instances cited above are the remnants of large sets of regular morphological formations which were highly productive during the earlier periods of language. Jespersen's *Morphology and the Growth and Structure of Language* are a testimony to the large-scale morphological changes English language has undergone.

4.20. **The Notion of a Word:**

It is worthwhile to see what Jespersen's notion of a word is and the role it plays in determining his theory of morphology. The 'word' is seen by Jespersen as the central unit of language which has evaded attempts to define it in any adequate manner possible. The word is a sequence of sound elements combined into one or more syllabic units. Jespersen, resorting to the standpoints of his times depends on the spoken word for an understanding of the structure of the word and views the word as a combination of syllabic units. He attempts to set a limit to the definition of the word in terms of (i) its syllabic ordering, (ii) the spacing at the terminals, (iii) as the minimal unit of a sentence, (iv) in terms of the functional values of the word as the unit capable of carrying a grammatical function, (v) its independent occurrence, and (vi) its potency to convey a unit of meaning. The possibility to delimit the definition of the word in terms of any one of the above criteria of (i) form, (ii) function, and (iii) meaning are found to be limited. The word is seen as a grammatical unit, entering
into the syntactic structure of a sentence. It is seen as a root, a free-stem or a compound stem, a complex base and above all as a unit which can independently occur in its triple dimensions of form, function and meaning. The word is regarded as the centre of the native speaker's intuition of speech. Speech is imparted and received in terms of the words which enter into the sequential organization of the utterance which is spoken or heard.

4.21. Free-forms and Bound-forms:

Jespersen made a distinction between free-forms and bound-forms in morphology and centred this distinction on the notion of the root-form of a word. The notion of the 'word' is a complex one and it can be defined in terms of such specifications as the root, the stem, free-forms, bound-forms and so on. Jespersen made a distinction among these and organized the content of the book: Morphology on the basis of these definitions. He distinctly grouped together for treatment all kinds of bound forms in Part I, Part III and Part IV. The rest of the book treats only free forms in the English language. The root of a word consists of the last indivisible unit of the word which can have an independent occurrence, as in the form 'indivisibility' we have 'divide' as the root and the rest of the formatives carrying one grammatical function or other by being conjoined to the root.
All root-forms according to Jespersen, are free forms and a bound form will never occur as a root in the formation of a word. All forms such as nouns, verbs or any one category of the parts of speech, if such forms are not further divisible into smaller morphemes, are free forms and roots. Jespersen treats all the free forms under sections meant for lexical morphology and compounds. Compounds are constituted only by free forms and no bound form constitutes the stem of a compound. Inflections, derivational prefixes and suffixes are treated under the sections meant for bound forms. Behind the arrangement of the material in Morphology these notions are clearly at work.

4.22. The Notion of the Word-Stem:

Jespersen has an adequate notion of the word-stem on whose basis he viewed the structure of inflectional suffixes, derivations and compounds. The root is differentiated from the notion of the stem in the sense that while the root is the last indivisible and unified morpheme still retaining a meaning and capable of independent occurrence, the stem on the other hand takes one or more formatives as part of its structure and as such enters into combination with further formatives. While the root is simple by structure, the stem is complex having a root and one or more formatives.

The form 'divide' is a root which is functionally a verb in the context of the parts of speech. The root is extended further by the addition of a bound form '-ble' into 'divisible' and the final units of the root undergo some
change due to the new environment. The form 'divisible' becomes what we call a stem when it stands in need of entering into combination with another bound form 'in-' and is further enlarged into yet another word 'indivisible'. In relation to the notion of stem Jespersen finds that derivational suffixes and inflectional suffixes have a fixed pattern of formation to derive a new word or to denote a different grammatical function. Inflections are thus found to be the most external elements to be affixed to the stem and therefore inflectional suffixes are called external formations; derivations fall closer to the stem and are called internal formations: 'form-ation-s'; (1) the root (stem), (2) derivational suffix, and (3) inflectional suffix.

4.23. Word-formation:

Word-formation as a component of the theory of morphology is basic to Jespersen's work on morphology. Morphology as a level of language intermediary to phonology and syntax, is conceived by Jespersen as composed of two aspects: (i) Word-formation and (ii) inflections. Morphology is the study of the formal units of language having some semantic content. While lexicography is concerned about the nature and meanings of the lexical units of language, morphology in a parallel line takes care of linguistically analysing the constituent elements that enter into the structure of the lexical items especially as they occur in sentences. The word as a basic unit of grammatical function devoid of the formatives which denote grammatical functions is the concern of
lexicography while morphology studies the lexical items as they concretely occur in sentences in their varied forms.

For the above reasons Jespersen conceives morphology in terms of the two constituents: Word-formation and Inflections. 'Word-formation' is a term used to designate two constituent aspects as they are traditionally understood: (i) derivations and (ii) compounding. The term as such is employed to denote the ways in which a language produces words of all categories for functional purposes. It is meant to describe the formation of different words from the same basic root, as in the derivation of 'formal' from 'form' by getting -al affixed to the root. New words are formed either by means of derivations or through compounding in which two or more roots are conjoined to form one functional unit such as 'blackbird' or 'goldsmith'. Word-formation is a central aspect of morphology.

4.24. Aspects of Inflection:

Although the concept of word-formation is central to Jespersen's morphology, what receives the major attention are the aspects of inflection. While word-formation deals with the aspects of deriving new words from the same root by derivation or compounding, inflections are strictly suffixes in the case of regular formations or replacive morphemes in the case of irregular formations which do not alter the word from one grammatical class to another (Noun — Verb) but effect changes within the same paradigm. Inflections are
thus closely bound with paradigmatic classes. Jespersen deals with the two aspects of morphology just as they are naturally tied up. Each paradigmatic class, whether it is of a noun, verb, adjective or adverb, has a number of constituent members which differ among themselves in terms of their different inflectional suffixes which are end-formations in regular cases.

Inflectional suffixes are grouped together under different functional classes: (i) the plural formations, (ii) the genitive formations, (iii) the third person singular formation, (iv) the gerund formation, (v) the present participle formation, (vi) the past tense (preterit) formation, (vi) the participle suffix and (vii) adjectival suffixes. A classification of this kind enables the linguist to study the forms not only from an analytic but also from a synthetic point of view. As Jespersen says, "to find out what particular class a given word belongs to, it is generally of little avail to look at one isolated form." In spite of such a classification, the inflectional system of English still evades a thoroughly objective description.

4.25. Compound forms:

Jespersen attempts a thoroughly comprehensive description of the compound forms in English. Provisionally Jespersen defines a compound as 'a combination of two or more words so as to function as one word, as a unit.' It is

apparently a working definition because of the presence of the term 'word' in it. In the case of the compound 'ice-cream' both 'ice' and 'cream' can represent a unit of meaning in an independent manner. Compounding as a morphological process is distinguished from inflections and derivations principally based on the criteria of 'independent occurrence' of the form entering into the combination in the three aspects of morphology. Both inflectional suffixes (-s, -t, -ing) and derivational affixes (pre-, -ation) do not have any form of independent occurrence in the utterances of language.

It is only when we come to compounding that we find that two independent root-forms are conjoined to form one unit as in 'blackboard' or 'outlaw' and in either cases the units 'black, bird, out and law' are capable of independent occurrence. The roots of a compound are easily recognizable because the constituent forms retain their identity. Jespersen recognizes that in a morphological treatment of compounds a definition based on meaning seems insufficient. He looks for formal external criterion for the accounting of the structure of compounds, but fails in locating any such criterion. He thus fall back on semantics for the explanation of the structure of compounds and speaks of the 'unity of meaning'.

4.26. **The Plural Suffix**

The notion of plurality is expressed in English by means of a set of regular formatives called the plural suffix. The notions of singularity and plurality and the corresponding grammatical functions go with noun morphemes. Like any other element of morphology the plural suffix as an inflectional suffix occurs in a well-defined environment. The plural suffix as a regular formative and the irregular occurrences of the plural morpheme come under the scope of the description of 'minimum meaningful forms.' Plurality as Jespersen sees it is both a semantic content and a functional unit of grammar, and it is realized in actual utterances in terms of three different sub-units.

If plurality is expressed by the unit '-s', its realization occurs in line with the environment and accordingly each occurrence is conditioned by that particular environment. Jespersen finds the occurrence of the plural suffix in terms of the following conditions:

1. **-iz** : occurs after sibilant sounds as in 'horses, houses.'
2. **-z** : occurs after voiced non-sibilant phonemes as in 'eggs'
3. **-s** : occurs after voiceless non-sibilant sounds as in 'pots.'

---

   1924 : 18, 197;
   1962 : 18, 364.
The three alternant occurrences of the plural suffix set themselves aside from all other morphemes of the language. It is one of the most productive suffixes of English.

4.27. **Irregular Plural Forms:**

The notion of plurality is expressed in English not only by means of a regular suffix but it is also expressed through a set of forms which Jespersen calls the irregular plural forms. An attempt is made to recognize in the syntax of any language only such categories as found in the formal expression of that language: 'form' here meaning 'form-words' and 'word-position.' About the form 'sheep (one sheep; many sheep) Jespersen asks whether it should be called only singular since only the singular form 'sheep' is employed for expression. 'Sheep' in 'many sheep', according to him is plural because many lambs' and cases similar to this in English language recognizes a plural in its nouns.

Jespersen applies the recognized criteria of 'proportionality.' When he finds that the ending -en serves to form a plural in 'oxen' in line with what happens in 'sheep'. Modification in the kernel of a word as in 'mouse-mice', voicing of the final consonant as in 'calf-calvs', suffixation of -en as in 'oxen, children' and specific replacement of vowels as in 'man-men' etc., constitute the regularities which Jespersen discovered among the irregular

19. Jespersen. 1924 : 50
20. Jespersen. 1924 : 51
The three alternant occurrences of the plural suffix set themselves aside from all other morphemes of the language. It is one of the most productive suffixes of English.

4.27. **Irregular Plural Forms**

The notion of plurality is expressed in English not only by means of a regular suffix but it is also expressed through a set of forms which Jespersen calls the *irregular plural forms*. An attempt is made to recognize in the syntax of any language only such categories as found in the formal expression of that language: 'form' here meaning 'form-words' and 'word-position.'19 About the form 'sheep' (one sheep: many sheep) Jespersen asks whether it should be called only singular since only the singular form 'sheep' is employed for expression. 'Sheep' in 'many sheep', according to him is plural because many lambs' and cases similar to this in English language recognizes a plural in its nouns.

Jespersen applies the recognized criteria of 'proportionality.'20 When he finds that the ending -en serves to form a plural in 'oxen' in line with what happens in 'sheep'. Modification in the kernel of a word as in 'mouse-mice', voicing of the final consonant as in 'calf-calfes', suffixation of -en as in 'oxen, children' and specific replacement of vowels as in 'man-men' etc., constitute the regularities which Jespersen discovered among the irregular

19. Jespersen, 1924 : 50
20. Jespersen, 1924 : 51
occurrences of the plural formation in English. The irregular plural formations are something set and stereotyped and for Jespersen such formations are formulaic and unproductive in modern English while the regular formative -s is so highly productive that any new noun occurring in the language will conveniently receive the regular plural formative into its structure.

4.28. **Third Singular Morpheme:**

The third singular morpheme is an aspect of morphology which is in all ways formally identical with the plural suffix in its varied occurrence but has a function and meaning different from the plural suffix. In English we have the verbal base as such functioning at various levels: (i) as an infinitive as in 'I want to live', (ii) as an imperative as in 'Do it', (iii) as a finite present as in 'I do it every day', (iv) and as an explicit wish as in 'live long' etc.

The same verbal base occurs in other varied functions with a number of suffixes which, again, we call inflectional suffixes.

The third person singular in the present indicative of all verbs except what Jespersen calls 'the small verbs' has the same set of three variants of -s ending as it occurs with the plural noun. Jespersen illustrates the occurrence of the -s suffix as the third person singular using the following:

\[
\begin{align*}
  \text{-(i) } & \text{ occurs after sibilant phonemes as in } \text{'kisses, pushes etc.'} \\
  \text{-(ii) } & \text{ occurs after non-sibilant voiced phonemes as in 'loves or moves.'} \\
  \text{-(iii) } & \text{ occurs after voiceless non-sibilant sounds as in 'likes or cuts'.}
\end{align*}
\]

The value of the alternant occurring after a verb depends, thus on the phonemic environment which received the suffix and determines its phonetic shape. The third singular suffix -s is one of the few morpheme units which permits practically no exception or irregularity in its occurrence with English verbs.

4.29. **Genitive Suffix:**

The pattern of the genitive suffix is characteristically treated by Jespersen as part of his theory of morphology. Jespersen explains the genitive case in English as having a unique and single function that marks this suffix functionally different from all other morphemes.\(^{23}\) The use of the genitive in English is greatly restricted except in cases as the following:- (1) possessive genitive, as in 'my son's wife; (2) subjective genitive, as in 'the boy's application, (3) objective genitive, as in 'the boy's release, (4) the genitive of origin, as in 'the girl's story', (5) descriptive genitive, as in 'a women's college', (6) partitive genitive, as in 'ten day's leave', and (7) appositive genitive, as in 'the city of York.'

Jespersen summarises all these distinctions under two heads: (i) 'subjective genitive' and (ii) 'objective genitive.'\(^{24}\) Essentially what is expressed by the genitive is a 'nexus', a connection between the two elements that occur in expressing the genitive. This nexus has semantic specifications of a

---

large variety of types as listed above. The formal shape and the distribution of the genitive suffix are exactly identical to that of the plural suffix in its regular occurrence. Jespersen conceives the singular -'s and the plural -s' suffixes as the two distinct aspects of the same suffix with distributional differences: one affixed to the singular noun form and the other to the plural noun. The same environments as those of the plural suffix is true of the genitive suffix in its varied occurrence.

4.30. **Regular Preterit Suffix:**

The treatment of the regular preterit suffix is a central aspect of Jespersen's morphology. Jespersen makes use of the term 'preterit suffix' for the past time morpheme which has two categories of occurrences: (i) the regular formations and (ii) the irregular formations. Just as in the case of the form -s which shares different grammatical functions, the form '-ed' shares the functions both of the past time morpheme and of the participle morpheme. Writing about verbs and their past forms Jespersen says, 'A classification on historical lines is hardly advisable.... the best way of systematizing Modern English verbs seems to be the division into two main classes: regular and irregular, the latter falling into several subclasses.'

All new verbs entering into modern English are capable of taking the regular preterit suffix: -ed in its varied

occurrences as in 'ended, called and kissed'. The suffix
-ed combines with the base forms under three distinct phono­
logical environments and function as alternants of the same
suffix:

- \( -id \) : occurs after alveolar sounds as in 'wanted, needed.'
- \( -ed \) : occurs after voiced consonants and vowels
  as in 'called, cried.'
- \( -t \) : occurs after voiceless consonants as in
  'locked, hopped, kissed.'

Each of the above environment takes a different positional
variant depending on the nature of the word-final phoneme
after which the formative -ed is suffixed, but the semantic
content remains identical in all the three forms.

4.31. Irregular Preterit Forms:

Jespersen's attention is focussed considerably on
aspects of irregular preterit forms. Describing the struc­
ture and distribution of the irregular occurrences of the
preterit morpheme has all the while been a stumbling block
to linguists. There are several categories of the preterit
formation: ate, took, put, burnt, bent, could, went and so on
makes it almost impossible to give a structural accounting
of the regularity of such forms. Jespersen classified all
the irregular preterit forms into eleven sub-classes. It
can be seen that all classifications attempted later are
reorganizations or repetition of the grouping undertaken by
Jespersen. The following are the characteristics on whose
basis the classification is done:
The form remains unchanged as in 'rid, put, spread and bet', (2) The kernel remains unchanged but 't' is added as in 'burnt, learnt, dwelt and split', (3) 't' is added to the form with a change of the vowel in the root as in 'delt, felt, meant, kept and wept'. (4) 't' is added in the place of 'V' effecting a vowel change as in 'left, bereft and lost'. (5) 't' is added and 'd' disappears as in 'bent, blent, rent and spent'. (6) 'd' is added with vowel change as in 'said, fled, told.' (7) Only vowel change as in 'swum, and began'. In this manner Jespersen makes an attempt to group together sets of irregular forms on the basis of some formal criteria such as vowel or consonant change, addition or deletion of consonants or vowels. All the same the classification of preterit irregular forms exhibit large-scale overlaps which spring from the very nature of these forms.

4.32. Post Participle Suffixes:

Jespersen's treatment of the post participle regular and irregular forms is rather elaborate and comprehensive in the context of his theory. The structure and distribution of the regular participle suffix -ed is identical in all aspects with those of the regular past time suffix. Jespersen does not dedicate a separate section for the different alternations of the regular past participle suffix as it is identical in treatment with the -ed of the past time suffix. Restating the regular participle suffix we find the following:-
-id: occurs after alveolar sounds as in 'wanted and needed.'

-ed

-d: occurs after non-alveolar voiced consonants, and vowels: called, cried.

-t: occurs after non-alveolar voiceless consonants as in 'locked and kissed.'

Even the irregular participle is identical in form in several instances as in the following: (1) the kernel remains unchanged as in 'rid, put and bet', (2) the kernel remains unchanged but 't' is added with a vowel change as in 'delt, felt, and meant'.

The irregular occurrences of the participle are identical in form with the preterit except in the following cases:

(1) the vowel in the kernel of the preterit form changes further as in 'swum, run, begun, clung and sung.'

(2) -en or (-n) is added to the infinitive form with a further change in the preterit as in 'given, eaten, chosen, gone, torn and worn.' Jespersen's attention is focussed more on these unique participle forms which end in -en (-n). There is considerable overlap in the treatment as Jespersen attempts a description of aspects whose forms are identical.

4.33. **Gerund -Ing Suffix:**

The description of morphology includes the structure and distribution of the gerund -ing suffix as a unique and highly productive element in English morphology. Most morphemes which are dealt with in the theory of morphology have occurrences both regular and irregular. Again due to variations in the
phonological environments these morphemes have different positional variations as in the case of -s occurring as -s, -z, and -iz. But the gerund suffix is a unique example of a morpheme which is affixed to any English word-stem without positional variations depending on the specific environment. There is no significant phonological or morphological environment which is capable of causing a change in the form of -ing. The same form occurs as both gerund and present participle suffix. These are the two identical functions of the same form -ing.

According to Jespersen, "the most interesting case in point is the English form is -ing where we witness a long historical development by which what was a pure substantive formed only from some particular verbs comes to be formed from any verb and acquires more and more of the characteristic of the finite verb. It can take an object in the accusative (on seeing him) and an adverb (he proposed our immediately drinking a bottle together), it develops a perfect (happy in having found a friend) and a passive (for fear of being killed). 26

-ing has thus become one of the most productive morphemes in modern English capable of being affixed to any new verb form that is coined or received into the language.

4.34. Aspect of Affixation:

One of the most elaborately treated aspects of Jespersen's morphology is affixation. A major portion of the

book: Morphology is set apart for the treatment of affixation from all its varied aspects. Affixation is the process of adding formatives in the word-initial, word-final or mid-word positions. Jespersen divided affixes into 'inflectional affixes' and 'derivational affixes.' All inflections occur in the word-final position and they are therefore 'suffixes' as found in 'boy-s, walk-ing, move-d, kep-t' and so on. All inflectional affixes are suffixes. Derivational affixes on the other hand occur both in word-initial and word-final positions. Formatives occurring in word-initial position are called 'prefixes' and those affixed to word-final position are called 'suffixes.'

Derivational affixes are conjoined to the root-form of the word as in 'in-form-al → informal.' The root 'form' becomes a stem as '-al' is affixed to it. The prefix 'in-' is affixed to the stem 'formal.' Derivative affixes occur closest to the root; inflections are affixed on the derivational affixes if there are any, as in 'formative-s'. Jespersen calls the derivations inner formations and the inflections outer formations so far as their relative occurrence is concerned. Jespersen surveys the whole range of inflectional suffixes in chapters 2 to 5 of Morphology. Derivational formatives, the prefixes are surveyed in chapters 26, 27 and 28. It is an attempt to survey not only the structural (formative) features of the English prefixes and suffixes but also to enquire into the historical development
of these formatives up to the modern English period.

4.35. **Replacement Morphemes:**

Replacement is an aspect of morphology which has assumed a central place in Jespersen's theory of morphology. We speak of 'additive morphemes' and 'replacive morphemes', the former Jespersen treats under 'affixation' and the latter under 'replacement'. Replacement is a very common feature in English language. Jespersen does not set apart a separate section for dealing with the process of replacement but the process recurs throughout his description of morphology. Sections like 'noun distinguished from verbs by vowel', 'difference in stress', 'change of consonant without any addition of formative', etc., are a common feature in *Morphology*. In all these Jespersen deals with the occurrence of replacement.

The pattern of replacement occurs both in inflection and derivation. Replacement occurs in (1) the irregular plural formations such as 'man-men, mouse-mice', in (2) irregular preterit formations such as 'begin-began and bite-bit', in (3) irregular participle formations such as 'ran-run, began-begun, and sang-sung', and in (4) the derivation of a verb from a noun such as found in 'bond-bind, life-live, proof-prove and belief-believe'. Replacement is

---

regarded as a morphological process in which a change occurs in a vowel or vowels, consonant or consonants or both. The process of replacement brings out a change in the form and subsequent alternation in meaning. Replacement pattern, stress shift in forms, and sound alternations of all sorts are aspects of the same morphological process which results in a new form, function and meaning.

4.36. Reduplicative Formations:

Jespersen sets aside a section for the discussion of reduplicative formations which is an important aspect of his theory of morphology. Jespersen discusses the occurrence of reduplication as a phenomenon of kernel repetition. Repetition of the same syllable or syllables, according to Jespersen, comes as a natural way of emphasizing aspects of an utterance. The phenomenon of reduplication is found in all languages in one form or other. In English reduplicative formation ranges from the repetition of a full word to a syllable: come, come! or well, well! etc., are a common feature with English. In morphology the pattern of reduplicative formation consists of the repetition of 'the kernel (base) of the verb' as found in 'chit-chatting, clink-clanking or chip-chopping.' These are clear-cut reduplicative formations in English.

Reduplication according to Jespersen is therefore kernel repetition of some kind either fully or in part. The combination of the base-form and the affix containing the part of the base function as a single unit as in 'chit-chatting'.

In the present example the combination of identical units functions as a verb. Reduplication is traced back to the infantile tendency to repeat long strings of identical syllables. The reduplicative formations are classified under three groups: (i) the base repeated without change often with an extension one of the forms, (ii) the kernel repeated with vowel change, and (iii) the kernel repeated with consonant change. Reduplication occurs also in the same word as found in 'ringing, singing, bringing or murmur, titillate and tintinnabulation'. Reduplication is an important aspect of Jespersen's morphology.

4.37. Case Formatives:

Jespersen deals with the case formatives in English as a controversial phenomenon in the theory of morphology. For the discussion of the case formatives Jespersen takes the following sentences for comparison:

1. Petrus filio Pauli librum dat.
2. Peter gives Paul's son a book.

The Latin sentence above has the noun in four different cases: Petrus — nominative, filio — dative, Pauli — genitive, and librum — accusative. The study of the two above poses certain controversial questions with regard to the nature of the morphemes which figure in the English sentence. Jespersen

32. Jespersen. 1942: 174,
disputes the position of some grammarians who easily transpose
the Latin case system into English in a one-to-one correspon-
dence. It has been a serious question as to how far the Latin
case formatives are found and realized ipso facto in English.
Latin has five basic case forms: Nominative, genitive, dative,
accusative, and ablative, as found respectively in 'terr-a,
terrae, terrae, terr-am and terr-a (the singular case forms
of the word terra: land). Regarding the 'accusative case'
Jespersen is of the view that it is impossible to distinguish
between the two even functionally in English.34 'We may safely
assert that there is no separate dative and no separate accu-
sative in English.' The only formally marked case in English
is the singular and plural of the genitive case: 's and s'.
The case forms as formally marked formatives are a rule in
Latin which is an exception in English; English has as a rule
more functional distinctions than formally marked case forma-
tives to denote various case-functions. Jespersen exposes
these aspects with considerable authority.

4.38. **Homophonic Formations:**

Jespersen's treatment morphology includes homophonic
formations as an important area in the theory of morphology
which for a variety of reasons contributes significantly to
the understanding of the nature of morphemes. For Jespersen,
homophonic forms are units with 'formal identity' but belongs

---

to different form-classes or grammatical groups. Forms such as 'Spring (N) - Spring (V), bank (N) - bank (N), date (N) - date (V)' etc., possess different areas of meaning and belong to different grammatical categories. Jespersen is of the view that 'the development of such identical forms must be reckoned one of the chief merits of the language, for, this noiseless machinery facilitates the acquirement and use of the language enormously and outweighs many times the extremely few instances in practical life in which ambiguities can arise.' Such formally identical words play a great role in the advancement of modern English.

Jespersen employs the term 'grammatical homonymy' to mean the same aspect of morphology in a more inclusive manner, when it comes to the homonymous nature of particular words such as 'round' to share the functions of several grammatical classes. 'Semantic distinctiveness' in such forms is a matter of gradation in the sense that there occurs in such forms a gradation of distinctiveness of meaning from close similarity as in 'run on the road' and 'run a factory' to little similarity in meaning as in 'date as a fruit' and 'to date with somebody'. Jespersen regards homonymy and the presence of homophonous formations a credit to modern English.

4.39. Formal Identity of Noun-Verb:

Jespersen's discussion of formally identical noun-verb morphemes is significant in the context of his theory of morphology. Jespersen's notion of 'grammatical homonymy' is concerned about those forms which have formal identity and semantic distinctiveness as well as different class-distribution. He is concerned in a special way with those forms which are identical in their functions as nouns and verbs. Forms such as 'run - run, fish : fish and drive - drive' are described as 'conversion' in Jespersen's theory of morphology denoting a process of change from one form class to another maintaining formal identity. Jespersen treats such identical forms under two classes: (i) verbs from substantives and (ii) substantives from verbs. This is based on historical reasons. Modern English enjoys a peculiar freedom in converting verbs into nouns either by adding or not by adding suffixes to the base: 'Did you enjoy your bathe?' or 'What a delightful smoke!' Another characteristic group belonging to the same homophonous class of noun-verb morphemes is the set of forms which differ only in stress as found in pairs such as: 'object (N) - ob'ject (V), 'convert (N) - Con'vert (V), 'Contract (N) - Con'tract (V) and so on. Extensive use of all these formations is made in modern English. Formation of nouns from verbs and vice-versa without suffixing any formative like -fy or -ive has

become a characteristic feature of modern English and Jespersen regards this as a significant aspect of the description of the morphology of language, and a linguistic tendency which should be considered as most advanced.  

4.40. **Personal Pronouns in English:**

Finally, Jespersen includes an accounting of personal pronouns in English as part of his treatment of the morphology of language. The structure and distribution of personal pronouns were found to have a morphological value which helps our understanding of the nature of morphology. Pronouns in English constitute, perhaps, the most heterogenous class with numerous and often formally unrelated subclasses and members. The pronouns are amenable to be classified into paradigms and each pronoun can be described in terms of the four different paradigmatic forms as under:

```
I  me  my  mine
We us  our ours
You you your yours
he him his  his
she her  her  hers
it  it  its  its
they them  their theirs
who whom  whose  whose
```

While Latin has a highly inflected system of pronouns, the entire lot of pronouns in English put together comes only to the list shown above. Jespersen finds, again that the 'formal identity' between many pairs of pronouns as we find above is a great advantage to and an efficacy of the morphological system of English. While formal identity and functional distinctiveness is an exception in the case of pronouns in Latin such a thing as formal identify and semantic and functional distinctiveness of such identical pronouns is a rule in English. English carries out using a limited set of pronouns the large variety of grammatical functions which requires Latin to employ a heavily inflected system of pronouns.