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CHAPTER 5

THE PARAMETERS OF THE INVESTIGATION

5.0. Introduction:

The following pages contain a presentation of the set of parameters which are made use of as the principal criteria for the estimate of Jespersen's morphology. As stated in detail in Ch. 2 what the investigator has in mind is not a quantitative and statistical evaluation of the material since such a thing is impossible within the scope of the present investigation. While choosing, ordering and defining the parameters I have kept in mind two criteria i.e., the generality of the parameters in terms of their applicability to more than one theoretical component found in Jespersen's theory, and the specificity of the parameters so far as their applicability to one specific and concrete theoretical component. On the basis of these two criteria the parameters of the investigation have been subdivided into two groups just for the convenience of treatment: (1) the general parameters and (2) the parameters of a specific nature. The estimate of the theoretical components too will follow the same course of treatment. Each parameter is presented in a systematic way so as to avoid the logical complexity and vagueness wherever possible. The parameters are (1) defined; (ii) the terms are explained in short; and (iii) illustration is provided wherever it is necessary and possible. I have made attempts
to crystalize the statement of the parameters so as to avoid unnecessary elaboration and complexity of explanation. The ultimate norm for the selection of the parameters consists of the investigator's acquaintance with the present-day theory of morphology as enunciated in the literature available on the subject.

A: Parameters of a General Nature

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

5.2. A sound theory of morphology has the characteristic of generality in the sense that the theory or the theoretical component is capable of accounting for the features of a whole range of forms rather than any one particular form. The theoretical component is not just able to explain the specific features that go uniquely with a single form, in the present context, but takes care of the explanation of an entire class
of which the particular form is just a member. An accounting which takes care of the features of, say for instance, the plural suffix includes as part of its coverage or 'population' all forms which function as the plural suffix or all forms which constitute at least a sub-group of the members which express the function of the plural suffix.

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

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

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

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

5.7. The components of any theory call for an adequate rationale which makes the description more significant because of the explanatory adequacy the description achieves. This rationale in several cases can be obtained from the historical background which goes with the historical i.e., vertical development of the form. In most cases an attempt to provide a purely structural description to the characteristics of the form such as, say 'oxen' or 'borne' renders fruitless as the description turns out to be a mere 'tautology'. A theory which thus attempts to establish a link between the form under study and a set of precedent forms often assumes greater objectivity and validity, and the rationale provided from the historical development of the form often renders the theory sound and acceptable.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

5.16. Morphological processes have come to be accepted as an integral aspect of morphology and a sound theory of morphology in present-day linguistics accounts for the manifold morphological processes in the formation of word-forms in language.
The formation of a word-form such as 'information' is accounted for in terms of a number of morphological processes such as 'prefixation' or 'suffocation'. The conjoining of a prefix morpheme to a stem is looked upon as a morphological process and is labelled 'prefixation'. The accounting of the formation of morphological units has been given by structuralist linguists in terms of a 'structural description' as against the 'process-oriented description' of traditional grammarians. We have come to a stage in the post-transformationalist era when this process-oriented description is thought of as more adequate than a structural description of a morphological unit.

5.17. The paradigmatic properties of words constitute an area which an adequate theory of morphology takes care of as part of its description. Nouns, Verbs, and partly adjectives have paradigmatic properties as morphemes and these properties enable a particular noun or verb to function specifically according to their number and case properties. While 'syntagmatic properties' define the relationships of words as they combine to form a sentence, paradigmatic properties define words as they assume different forms to suit a specific syntactic function. Paradigmatic differences occur within the structure of a word as in the sets: 'walk, walks, walked, walking' or 'boy, boy's boys' and boys,' or 'fine, finer, finest.'
5.18. There are several environmental features which condition the occurrence of the noun and verb morphemes or rather all lexical morphemes as they order themselves in a sentence or enter into any type of a combination. An adequate theory of morphology accounts for the conditions which restrict the occurrence of morpheme units in sentences and bring out the phonological and morphological features which go into such conditions. Such environmental features are governed by the word-final and word-initial phonemes and their distinctive features. This turns out to be a major area of treatment in a theory of morphology. The combination of 'house' with /Z/ as the word final phoneme, with the plural suffix -S results in the alternation of /Z/ into /S/. The environmental features may be phonemic, morphophonemic, or morpho-syntactic by nature.

5.19. A theory of morphology accounts for the significant area of the morpho-phonemic aspect of stress. Language is characterized by what we know as morpho-phonemic alternations. A theory of morphology attempts to describe the several regularities which are inherent in such alternations. Stress as a suprasegmental feature controls morpho-phonemic alternations considerably. Stress becomes important in morphology and takes the central place in morpho-phonemic treatment because of the potency of stress alternations to effect meaning changes. There are numerous words in English which have the stress on the primary syllable as a noun and the stress is shifted to the
second syllable when the word is employed as a verb. Examples are: 'export' - export or 'convict' - convict.

5.20. Language is by nature dynamic, a fact proved from its evolving and changing characteristic. An accounting of the morphology of language should take care of and describe what may be called linguistic dynamism. Language is a product of human creativity and as such it is the most specific form of human behaviour. Linguistic dynamism is a gift of human nature and it becomes apparent in a theory of language that language is not amenable to sheer repetition or duplication. It is the very characteristic of language to grow and expand by means of a process of 'give and take' of forms and expressions. Linguistic borrowing is a universal phenomenon. Language by thus developing keeps abreast to the changing needs of different ages.

B: Parameters of a Specific Nature

5.21. A theory of morphology defines a word in the most accepted sense as an assemblage of syllables and phonemes (or syllables and letters). A word-form is analyzable in terms of letters and phonemes. Thus the form 'tried' is that form of the word 'try' which we call past participle. The form 'tried' is said to belong to the paradigmatic set of the base form 'try'. The other members of the verb paradigm 'try' are: tries, tried and trying (present, past and gerund respectively). In the same manner the theory of
morphology defines the word-form 'trial' not as a member of the paradigmatic set of the verb 'try', but as a member of a noun paradigm derived from the verb 'try'. But the use of 'word' is applied in general to everyone of the forms described above.

5.22. In a sound theory of morphology a set of varying forms of different functional properties is said to be derived from one and the same base-form. This most basic form which is morphologically indivisible is called a root. Two or more such roots can go into the formation of a compound form. 'drop' is a morphologically minimal root and 'out' is yet another root-form which when combined together yield a compound 'drop-out'. We take the word 'root' only in the strictest sense of the term as defined above; the word is used in several other senses too and often identified with the word 'stem'. The form 'drop' is regarded as a free form because it is capable of entering into a sentence on its own as a verb or a noun; but the '-ing' of 'dropping' is called a bound form as '-ing' can occur only suffixed to another form.

5.23. The root is the simplest indivisible form devoid of initial or final affix elements. However, a theory of morphology accounts for the presence of the roots with affix elements when the root becomes amenable to form the base of a larger word-form. Such a word-form is called a stem in the strictest sense of the term. The root 'form' combined to the bound form '-ation' gives us the stem 'formation'. Here 'formation' becomes the base for another affixation 'mal' and we have 'malformation.'
The entire word-form 'malformation' again becomes a stem functioning as the base for the plural morpheme -s and we have the plural form 'malformations'. The notion of stem is, thus, an important element in a theory of morphology.

5.24. A sound theory of morphology is concerned with the study of word-forms divided into two major sub-fields: inflection and word-formation. The entire set of morphemes in a language can be grouped under what we have called free forms and bound forms while free forms constitute the area of lexical studies, bound forms contribute, on the one hand to the study of inflectional morphology, and on the other to the study of derivational morphology. Inflectional morphology is concerned with the regularities we find in forms such as the plural suffix -s, the genitive suffix -s, the past tense morpheme -ed etc. Derivations are concerned about formations such as: in-, un-, non-, or -tion, -ly, -ity etc. The study of word-formation shares derivational morphology on the one hand, and compound formations on the other.

5.25. A theory of morphology deals with inflection as a process of providing different paradigmatic properties to nouns and verbs in order to carry out different syntactic functions. Inflectional morphemes are those units or bound forms added at the final position to a noun or verb. These include only suffixes such as -s in 'walks' or -ed in 'walked' or -ing in 'walking' which elevate a verb or noun to different grammatical functions. Inflectional morphemes include the formation of (1) the Third Singular Suffix, (2) the Plural Suffix, (3) the
Genitive Suffix, (4) the Past Tense Suffix, and (5) the Participle Suffix. All these are end-formations affixed at the word-final position and can be grouped into noun inflectional suffixes and verb inflectional suffixes.

5.26. The process of word-formation includes two major aspects of morphology: the processes of compound-formation and of derivational morphology. Both these sub-areas of morphology are concerned with the formation of words either carrying a meaning different from those of the particular forms which structure a compound as in 'frame-work', or producing a word-form which will belong to a grammatical category different from that of the original form, as in 'inform' (V) and 'information' (N). The formation of compounds in a language is something that any linguist has always found to be a stumbling-block in the development of a theory of morphology. All the same compounding has become one of the most characteristic and productive processes in modern languages, especially English. Compounding has become a major source of new formations in modern languages.

5.27. A theory of morphology as part of its treatment of inflectional morphology deals with the structure and distribution of the Plural Morpheme. The plural Morpheme is indicated by the symbol -s which represents the three regular occurrences of the suffix and several irregular occurrences. Instances of the regular plural morpheme are found in formations such as: boys, pots, batches, eggs, benches etc. All regular occurrences are grouped together under three types: -iz, -z and -s.
Words such as batches, benches, buses and bushes have the occurrence of -iz; boys, girls, eggs, and balls have the occurrence of -z; and pots, pits, cuts, and cups have the occurrence of -s in them as described above.

5.28. The Third Singular Morpheme is an aspect of inflectional morphology with which a theory of morphology is concerned. The Third Singular Morpheme is also indicated by the symbol -S which represents, again the three regular occurrences of the morpheme -iz, -z, and -s. This morpheme is so universal in its occurrence with verbs that there is found no exception to it. The Third Singular Morpheme indicates the agreement of a verb in the present tense with a singular subject. A theory of morphology accounts for the structure and distribution of this morpheme as it occurs in the three varied environments. The theory describes the environmental restraints for the occurrence of either -iz, -z or -s in words such as 'pushes, moves, or walks' to express the concord of the verb in relation to the singular subject.

5.29. Inflectional morphology is also concerned about the Genitive Morpheme in its singular and plural senses i.e., as the suffix gets added to a singular or a plural noun. The Genitive Morpheme suffixed to the stem as in formations such as : boy's, boys', cup's, cups', Ramesh's, and Charles's expresses quite a number of shades of meaning related to 'possession' and 'experience'. Just as in the case of the Third Singular Morpheme, the Genitive Morpheme has a universal comprehensiveness and regularity wherever it occurs. There
are no irregular formations as in the case of the Plural Morpheme. The occurrence of the Genitive -S is governed by the same morphological conditions as those which govern the occurrence of the Plural or the Third Singular Morpheme.

5.30. The Past Tense Morpheme in the inflectional morphology is component of a theory of morphology which the linguist need carefully to account for. Just as in the case of the Plural Morpheme, the Past Tense Morpheme has manifold occurrences in a large variety of environments. It has both regular as well as irregular occurrences to indicate mainly what we may regard as the 'past time meaning'. The regular occurrence is indicated by means of the symbols: -t, -d and -id, all the three being alternants of the same Past Tense Suffix -ed. The morphologist is faced with a hazardous task when required to account for the irregular occurrence of the Morpheme. The irregular units are so inconsistent that hardly any regular pattern of formation can be specified in the theory. A sound theory of morphology makes attempts to present a systematic description of all this.

5.31. The Past Participle Morpheme in the inflectional morphology is a component of morphology which an acceptable theory of morphology need to describe in line with its structure and distribution and the processes of formation. The Participle Morpheme is represented by one and the same symbol -ed in its numerous occurrences as in the case of the Past Tense Morpheme. The regular occurrence of the Participle Morpheme takes place in its three alternants: -t, -d, and -id. The
regularities of these alternants in their combinations with words such as 'walked, moved and wanted' as past participle forms are strictly identical with those of the Past Tense Morpheme. But the Participle Morpheme becomes characteristic in its irregular occurrences. A theory of morphology is confronted with the problem of accounting for the occurrence and formation of forms such as 'run, beaten, and put'.

5.32. A theory of morphology must account for the Gerund Morpheme as part of the description of inflectional morphology. The gerund morpheme has an identical form in indicating the present participle meaning. The form -ing represents the Gerund Morpheme and its allied present participle meaning. A theory of morphology describes the consistency with which this form occurs and the highly productive nature of this morpheme in its possibility to combine with any new verb that comes up in the English language. The form -ing is one of the most consistently occurring morphemes of the language. The functional modalities of the gerund as a noun and of the present participle as an adjective constitute the semantic content of the morpheme -ing.

5.33. Affixation is an area in morphology which a sound theory of morphology includes as part of its treatment of morphological processes. A root as the last indivisible unit in a word is in a position to take an affix at the initial, medial or final position. The same can happen to a stem which is already a combination of a root + an affix. When a formative
(an affix) is added in front of a root or a stem we know of the process as one of Prefixation and the formative thus added in front is called a Prefix. Prefixes are not part of inflectional morphology as inflections are morphemes which occur only in word-final position. Prefixation is a component of the theory which deals with the derivation aspect of word-formation. Forms such as pre-, in- and un- go into the formation of a new word-form.

5.34. An acceptable theory of morphology includes as part of its treatment of morphological processes the area of Suffixation. When a formative is added at the word-final position and has the function of deriving a new word-form it constitutes part of derivational morphology, and the formative will be known as a Suffix. Derivational suffixes are distinguished from inflectional suffixes as we have formatives such as -tion, -ment, and -ity occurring under the former, and formatives such as -ed, -s and -ing coming under the latter. All the same a theory of morphology makes use of the term 'Suffixation' primarily to mean derivational suffixes. A treatment of suffixation has numerous problems but a theory of morphology attempts to draw out the regularities of the occurrence of suffixes.

5.35. A theory of morphology describes the complex pattern of replacement which the linguist observes as a phenomenon pervading almost all aspects of morphology. Replacement which is commonly described as vowel or consonantal modification within morpheme units is found in all areas of inflectional morphology. Occurrences such as 'man — men, foot — feet, sit — sat, keep — kept, leaf — leaves' indicate a process which is
described in present-day linguistics as replacement of segmental units. Replacement as a pattern is found principally in areas such as the formation of the irregular plural morpheme, irregular Past Tense morpheme and irregular Participle Morpheme. It is a process which the theoretician must account for in a theory of morphology.

5.36. A sound treatment of case formatives constitutes part of an acceptable theory of morphology as cases are indicated mostly by formal elements. This is true especially of a in language like Latin. While/English formal case representations are found to the minimum and more often cases are functional values that go with nouns. But wherever such forms or functional values are found, they follow some regularity of occurrence. The only case which claims to have a definite formal unit to express itself in English is the genitive case represented by the unit -'s or s' respectively singular and plural. All other cases which are central to a language such as Latin are often said to be present in English not formally, but in terms of their functional properties only. A theory of morphology need to include this feature as a component.

5.37. Language is characterised by the phenomenon of repetition for a variety of purposes. Repetition of elements occurs in morphology and this is known as Reduplication. Reduplication takes place in a variety of ways, as found in redupliative morphemes such as 'chit-chat, dilly-dally, humdrum, hallabullu, and sing-song.' The principal purpose of reduplication in language, it is believed, is to create a special
phonemic-semantic effect on the listener. Reduplication is a universal phenomenon and there seems to be hardly any language without reduplication happening in some way or other. The element reduplicated may not always be the whole word, it can be just one or two consonant sounds, or consonants and vowels together as in 'dilly-dally and humdrum'.

5.38. **Formal identity** of morphemic units, especially nouns and verbs is a characteristic feature of language. The noun and the verb retain identical forms both written and spoken i.e., orthographic and phonemic identity as in words such as 'export (N)- ex'port (V), 'convict (N) - con'vect (V) and 'object (N) - ob'ject (V). The formal identity of the phonemic aspects is partial due to the vowel changes caused by the stress shift. Stress shift and the consequent vowel alternation are features central to these groups of morphemes, as found in 'k2:invikt and kan'vikt. The vowel which changes in almost all cases is the /ɔ:/ — /ə/ or /ə/ — /ɔ:/ depending on the nature of the derivation. A sound theory of morphology gives a central place to this phenomenon in the treatment of the recurring features of morphemes.

5.39. A theory of morphology accounts for the structure and distribution of **Personal Pronouns**. Personal pronouns constitute a very characteristic group of lexical morphemes which possess a large variety of forms representing varied functions. Personal pronouns also constitute an area where case functions are most powerfully, and uniquely represented. Pronouns such as
'I, we, they and he' possess nominative case functions as against those such as 'me, us, him, and them' which in turn possess what we know as accusative or objective cases. A theory of morphology includes a comprehensive description of the pronominal forms since these forms constitute a group which is unique in several ways.

5.40. A theory of morphology includes in the description of the morphology of language a treatment of Homophonous Morphemes. Homophones form a significant area in lexical morphology and are found occurring as part of inflectional morphology too. Homophones such as 'put, put, put', 'beat-beat', 'walk-walked, 'sheep-sheep' and so on pervade all sections of inflectional morphology. Homophones such as 'spring (i) - spring (ii) - spring (iii), 'bark (i) - bark (ii)' and 'date (i) - date (ii) - date (iii)' constitute a significant group of lexical morphemes. A theory of morphology includes as part of its accounting the component of homophonous morphemes and describe the characteristic feature of forms of identical nature representing a variety of meanings often totally unrelated as in the case of the 'date' of the calendar and the 'date' palms which do not share any semantic specifications.

The chapter includes forty parameters which are derived from what the investigator has called 'a sound theory of morphology'. The aspects of a theory of morphology thus chosen may not have a universal appeal as one or the other item may not be in consonance with the theoretical standpoints
of any one school of thought. All the same I have taken liberty to include among the parameters those components which I felt essentially goes into the making of a theory of morphology. The final authority in the particular selection is my own acquaintance with the field of morphology as theories on the morphology of language have been found conflicting even on basic issues. Again, it may be seen that many more details and items can be added to the total statements; but I have chosen for the purpose of theoretical clarity and lucidity of treatment only those aspects which, I have felt, go as components into the making of a sound theory of morphology.