

Foreword

How to designate snow falling in the autumn, using just one adjective and one noun? It is easy enough for anyone who has a good grasp of English derivational morphology. There is a suffix *-al* that forms adjectives of related meaning from many nouns: *ancestral* (from *ancestor*), *behavioural* (from *behaviour*), *central* (from *centre*), and so on. Not all nouns are allowed to take that suffix, but *autumn* is. So just put the suffix on *autumn* to form the adjective you need, and you can form the phrase *autumnal snowfall*.

Now try to do the same thing with *spring*. It seems that you can't: *spring* is not on the (rather idiosyncratic) list of bases that take *-al*, so **springal* is not a word. So for unexpected snow in April or May, some other syntactic strategy must be used.

Other syntactic strategies are available, of course: it is always possible to use a noun as an attributive modifier, so snow falling in the spring could be referred to as a spring snowfall. But that doesn't mean that *spring* is an adjective, any more than *California* is an adjective in *California girls*. The tradition of defining 'adjective' as 'word that modifies a noun' is a mistaken tradition for exactly that reason.

Standard form-based morphology leaves the matter there: *autumn* has an adjectival *-al* derivative, while *spring*, *summer*, and *winter* do not. That is all there is to it. But this entirely ignores the existence of the word *vernal*, which appears to have the *-al* suffix and, in semantic terms, to serve exactly as **springal* would if it existed. Is there no way to look at English that would represent the *spring* : *vernal* pair as related, just as the pair *autumn* : *autumnal* are related?

In fact there is, though it appears to have been sidelined for some time: the European tradition of meaning-based morphology. Under an approach of this kind, paradigms are recognised on the basis of semantic relations, and stem suppletion is a possibility in derivational paradigms just as it is, quite uncontroversially, in inflectional paradigms (every morphologist treats *went* as the preterite form in the inflectional paradigm of *go*).

In this monograph Dr Tetsuya Koshiishi treats the special sub-class of adjectives known as the **collateral adjectives**. They are exemplified by *feline* (of or pertaining to cats or a cat), *paternal* (of or pertaining to fathers or a father), *vernal* (of or pertaining to spring), and so on. Semantically, they are the adjectival counterparts of nouns; they form a subclass of the larger class of **relational** or **associative** adjectives, but unlike *autumnal* they don't have a synchronic formal relation to the nouns of which they are counterparts.

Dr Koshiishi draws on the rich literature of the European tradition of semantically grounded derivational morphology. He regards nouns and their associated relational adjectives as forming paradigms in which pairs like *cat* : *feline* and *father* : *paternal* are suppletive while pairs like *sister* : *sisterly* and *brother* : *brotherly* show a formal relationship as well as the semantic one.

This wide-ranging study is comparable in terms of scope, approach, and ambition to that of Judith Levi's famous 1978 study *The Syntax and Semantics of Complex Nominals*. It explores in great depth the consequences of a meaning-based approach to the chosen specific part of the derivational morphology of English. Dr Koshiishi shows that the meaning-based approach has real benefits not only in the theoretical analysis of collateral adjectives but also in their lexicographical treatment, and in the description of the sociolinguistics of their use.

The scholarship exhibited throughout this meticulously researched study is genuinely impressive. The book is well-rounded and detailed. It is audacious in its adoption of a neglected theoretical approach; it is wide-ranging in its perspective; its empirical analysis is thorough and well-informed. Its coverage of the relevant literature is also quite remarkable.

We believe this book will prove to be an important and lasting contribution to the study of English adjectives and to derivational morphology more broadly. It should provoke thought among researchers concerning whether they should be limiting their thinking to the standard form-based models of derivational morphology. Even if they continue to do so, they will have a lot to learn from Tetsuya Koshiishi's work.

Heinz J Giegerich
Geoffrey K Pullum
University of Edinburgh