Foreword

We are pleased to present this monograph as the first in the series *Linguistic Inquiry Monographs*. These monographs will present new and original research beyond the scope of the article. Because of their originality it is hoped that they will benefit our field by bringing to it perspectives that will stimulate further research and insight.

Samuel Jay Keyser

BLANK PAGE

Preface

What follows represents an attempt to integrate what I believe to be a reasonably well-motivated account of morphological structure into a general theory of generative grammar. The work deals mainly with questions of derivational morphology, though inflection is touched upon briefly in a few places; compounds, despite the title, will not be discussed.

Historically, morphology and generative grammar have been uneasy bedfellows, and I cannot presume that all of my readers will be equally conversant with both. On morphology, happily, there are several good introductory works. The relevant sections of Bloomfield (1933) are, to my mind, the best of these. Matthews (1974) is more detailed and also contains discussions of many of the more persistent problems. These problems have also received great attention in the structuralist literature on morphemic analysis. Bloch (1947), Hockett (1947), Nida (1948), and Harris (1948) form the classic core. Harris' views are presented in further detail in his *Methods* book (1951). As for generative grammar, I adopt the general perspective of Chomsky (1972a) and Chomsky and Halle (1968) (henceforth SPE).

A few words about personal peculiarities. In the tradition of SPE, I tend to use spelling where others might use transcription. I will only use transcription when I wish to emphasize phonological properties. In these cases I use square brackets ([ ]) not solely for phonetic transcription but, as in SPE, indiscriminately to represent any level of a phonological derivation. I depart from this practice only when quoting from other sources. I have avoided the term *lexeme* for personal reasons and use instead the term *word*. This means that I have no way of distinguishing an uninflected word (lexeme) from an inflected word (word). I am confident that the ambiguity will not cause much grief. I use the term *morpheme* in the American structuralist sense, which means that a morpheme must have phonological substance and cannot be simply a unit of meaning. Entities such as PLURAL and PAST, which have many phonological realizations and which were problematic within earlier frameworks, are considered to be syntactic markers and not morphemes.

We find comfort in precedent. It is convenient when introducing a notion which may not be uncontroversial to defend the introduction with an allusion to its commonness in older thought. This may reflect a deep ecclesiastian conviction. It is more conventionally considered to be a sign of modesty. Modesty, though, is a convenient cover for a less virtuous attitude: when something is not ours, we can easily disclaim ultimate responsibility for it. With this in mind, let me say that the basic view of the workings of morphology presented in this work is not new.