INTRODUCTION

The papers in this volume originated in a workshop on morphology that I organized at the Linguistic Society of America Summer Institute that was held at the University of Arizona in Tucson during the summer of 1989. Except for the paper by Jack Hoeksema, all papers were presented and discussed at the workshop.

LSA Summer Institute workshops are usually highly formal affairs, with papers solicited in advance on a closely circumscribed topic within a particular theoretical framework. By contrast, this workshop just grew. At the Arizona institute, there were more that the usual number of morphologists, and it seemed to me, after a few days at the institute, that it would be useful to have a forum where we could meet as a group on a regular basis and discuss current research. I sent round a notice, announcing the workshop and asking for volunteers. To my great pleasure, within a few days we had a full schedule and to my even greater pleasure, all the weekly workshop sessions were very well attended and all the presentations were very well received. When it was over and everyone was getting ready to go home, it struck me that a way should be found to preserve this moment, not simply for reasons of nostalgia, but also because the presentations, despite the lack of an explicit organizing framework, did seem in retrospect to fit together very well indeed. Let me now try to demonstrate this last point.

All the papers in this volume are formulated within the generative tradition. The study of morphology within a generative framework, although it is conventionally rooted in Chomsky's 1970 article "Remarks on Nominalizations," did not really begin until some time later.[1] The first works, such as Remarks and Halle's Prolegomenon, were more in the way of exhortations: There are interesting things going on here in morphology; let's have a look! Only after a few years had passed did research began to appear that dealt directly and unapologetically with morphological phenomena from a generative perspective, and it is only very recently that the generative study of

morphology has become a normal part of the field, so that departments adver-
tise positions in morphology and there are regular sessions on morphology at
scholarly meetings.

Generative morphology has come of age and this volume is a kind of
celebration of this ritual passage. All the papers in the volume assume without
question that the field of generative morphology exists and needs no special
defense. Furthermore, they all assume, implicitly for the most part, that
morphology should be dealt with on its own terms, that it is different from
phonology and syntax (what we fashionably call autonomous), although it
must inevitably interact with the rest of language. They thus differ as a group
from much recent revisionist work done within the generative paradigm,
which seeks to subsume morphology under other components, as it was in
earlier periods of the generative enterprise.

The skeptic might counter that morphology never needed any defense in
the first place, because it had a legitimate place in linguistics long before
generative theory was ever dreamed of. Yes, this point is well taken, and the
fact that morphology has again assumed its rightful place in the core after
decades of exile is testimony to its power. Nonetheless, it is important to
understand that the study of morphology within the generative framework,
broadly defined, has distinct properties that set it apart from other mor-
phological enterprises.

First, the generative tradition is a theoretical one, so that most work,
although it is grounded in fact, is directed toward theoretical ends. The
purpose of the generative enterprise is to explain rather than to describe,
although description must inevitably accompany (some would say precede)
explanation. In this, generative linguistics only follows a long tradition in
mainstream American linguistics that stretches in an unbroken line back to
Boas, although certain polemicists of the fifties liked to believe that their
"descriptive linguistics" lay above theoretical concerns. Each one of the
articles in this volume is thus centered around a point of morphological theory.
That is not to say that the volume is theoretically unified. In fact, several
distinct general linguistic theories are represented here: Autolexical theory
(Chelliah), Categorial Grammar (Hoeksema; Raffelsiefen), Functional Gram-
mar (Haspelmath), and Government and Binding (Drijkoningen). The remain-
ing three articles (Aronoff, Kari, de Reuse) are compatible with a number of
general frameworks, and none of the articles is so deeply imbedded within a
single theory as to be inaccessible to the average well-educated linguist.
Altogether, though, this is a collection of theoretical works, each one de-
signed to further the development of morphological (and hence general lin-
guistic) theory.

Second, the best of the generative tradition has always followed the
maxim that a language is a system where everything holds together. A gram-
mar may consist of autonomous parts, but they all interact. This is especially

true of morphology, which lies at the center of language, so that it is impossible to treat morphology without treating some other aspect of language at the same time. Indeed, perhaps the most difficult task in morphological research is to figure out what aspect of a particular phenomenon is morphological, as opposed to phonological or syntactic or semantic. There are (surprisingly to the novice) no purely morphological phenomena, despite the existence of purely morphological concepts. Thus, all the articles in this volume deal directly or indirectly with the interaction of morphology with other theoretical modules.

Finally, the generative tradition has always emphasized the diverse unity of human language. In this volume, although each article is devoted to either a single language or a small number of related languages, we find many very different kinds of languages, from Sino-Tibetan Manipuri (Chelliah), through Eskimo Central Siberian Yupik (de Reuse) and Athabaskan Ahtna (Kari) to Latin (Aronoff) and modern European languages, and finally to English (although no paper is devotedly solely to that most widely discussed language). Nonetheless, each of the authors assumes that all these sometimes dramatically different systems are a manifestation of a single unified human language faculty, so that the goal of linguistic theory is to reconcile the two, to create a theory that will permit just the diversity that we find.

I hope that the reader will enjoy reading these articles as much as I have enjoyed working on them. For most, they will not have the Proustian effect that they will have on those of us who were there. They will not conjure up the intensity, both intellectual and meteorological, of those summer afternoons in Tucson. Nonetheless, I hope that they will, like the desert sun, generate as much light as they do heat.

MARK ARONOFF