Table of Contents

List of Figures

List of Tables

Conventions

This note documents the conventions I have adopted regarding linguistic data, terminology, and presentation of data throughout this thesis.

It is well known that the world's languages realize widely different sets of morphosyntactic categories (Whaley 1997: 58; Haspelmath 2007). Moreover, even when these categories bear the same name, they may differ drastically in their behavior (Dixon 2010: 9). It is the subject of much debate whether these language-specific categories can be mapped onto each other or compared in any useful way (Croft 1995; Song 2001: 10–15; Croft 2003: 13–19; Haspelmath 2010a,b; Newmeyer 2010; Stassen 2011; Hieber 2013: 308–310; Croft 2014; Plank 2016; Song 2018: 44–58). Recognizing these difficulties, I have made no attempt to standardize the linguistic terminology used in examples from different languages. I have, however, standardized the abbreviations used to refer to those terms. For example, even though one researcher may abbreviate Subject as SUBJ and another researcher abbreviate it as SUB, I nonetheless gloss all Subject morphemes as SUBJ. See the List of Abbreviations (p. xii) for a complete list of glossing abbreviations.

I have not attempted to standardize the transcription systems and orthographies used in examples. All examples are given as transcribed in their original source. The reader should consult those original sources for further details regarding orthography.

The source of each example is always provided after the example itself.

In all interlinear glossed examples, I follow the formatting conventions (but not necessarily the recommended abbreviations) of the Leipzig Glossing Rules (Bickel, Comrie & Haspel-

math 2015).

It is increasingly common in typological studies to write language-particular terms and categories with an initial capital letter, and to write terms that refer to language-general or semantic/functional concepts (e.g. the crosslinguistic notion of subject) in lowercase (Comrie 1976: 10; Bybee 1985: 47 (fn. 3), 141; Croft 2000: 66; Haspelmath 2010a: 674; Croft 2014: 535). For example, the English Participle suffix *-ing* is, obviously, specific to English, and does not exist in any other language; therefore it capitalized and written as *Participle*. If, however, a writer is discussing the category of participles generally and crosslinguistically, not specific to any particular languages, the term is written in lowercase as *participle*. I follow these same capitalization conventions in this thesis.

The first mention of a language within each chapter is followed by its genealogical affiliation (following the format `family > phylum`) and the location where it is spoken. For example, Central Alaskan Yup'ik would appear as "Central Alaskan Yup'ik (Eskimo-Aleut > Eskimo; Alaska)". Language information is taken from the Glottolog database (Hammarström, Forkel & Haspelmath 2019). Language names are given in English following Haspelmath (2017). A complete list of languages mentioned in this thesis, along with their ISO 639-3 codes and Glottolog codes, is in the List of Languages.

Within quotations, *italics* indicates emphasis in the original, while **boldface** indicates my emphasis.

After each graphical representation of data, I have included the file path within the accompanying GitHub repository for this thesis to the script which will generate that figure.

Chapter 1

Introduction

This chapter motivates the need for research on lexical flexibility by situating it within broader concerns regarding linguistic categories more generally, and categories in human cognition. The specific problem that this study seeks to address is our lack of understanding regarding what lexical flexibility looks like, and how it varies across languages. This thesis contributes to answering these questions via a quantitative corpus-based study of lexical flexibility in English (Indo-European) and Nuuchahnulth (Wakashan). It is the first study to examine lexical flexibility using natural discourse from corpus data. This chapter provides an overview of the thesis, including the specific research questions addressed, the data and methods used, a concise summary of the results, and a preview of the conclusions.

Word classes such as noun, verb, and adjective were once thought to be universal, easily identifiable, and easily understood. Today they are one of the most controversial and least understood aspects of language. While language scientists generally agree that word classes exist, there is much disagreement as to whether they are categories of individual languages, categories of language generally, categories of human cognition, categories of language science, or some combination of these possibilities (CITE: Mithun 2017: 166; Haspelmath 2018; Hieber forthcoming: 1). Lexical categorization—how languages separate words into categories—is of central importance to theories of language because it is tightly interconnected with linguistic categorization more generally, which in turn informs (and is informed by) our understanding of cognition. Categorization is a fundamental feature of human cognition (CITE: Taylor

2003: xi), and lexical categorization is perhaps the most foundational issue in linguistic theory (CITE: Croft 1991: 36; Vapnarsky & Veneziano 2017: 1).

References

Sources of Literature

The references listed in this section are literature on the topic of this thesis that have been cited in the text.

Bickel, Balthasar, Bernard Comrie & Martin Haspelmath. 2015. *The Leipzig Glossing Rules: Conventions for interlinear morpheme-by-morpheme glosses*. Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology. Leipzig: Department of Linguistics. https://www.eva.mpg.de/lingua/resources/glossing-rules.php.

Bybee, Joan L. 1985. *Morphology: A study of the relation between meaning and form* (Typological Studies in Language 9). Amsterdam: John Benjamins. DOI:10.1075/tsl.9.

Comrie, Bernard. 1976. *Aspect: An introduction to the study of verbal aspect and related problems* (Cambridge Textbooks in Linguistics). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Croft, William. 1995. Modern syntactic typology. In Masayoshi Shibatani & Theodora Bynon (eds.), *Approaches to language typology*, 85–144. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Croft, William. 2000. Parts of speech as typological universals and language particular categories. In Petra M. Vogel & Bernard Comrie (eds.), *Approaches to the typology of word classes* (Empirical Approaches to Language Typology 23), 65–102. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Croft, William. 2003. *Typology and universals*. 2nd edn. (Cambridge Textbooks in Linguistics). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. DOI:10.1017/CBO9780511840579.

Croft, William. 2014. Comparing categories and constructions crosslinguistically (again): The diversity of ditransitives. *Linguistic Typology* 18(3). 533–551. DOI:10.1515/lingty-2014-0021.

Dixon, R. M. W. 2010. *Basic Linguistic Theory*. Vol. 1: *Methodology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hammarström, Harald, Robert Forkel & Martin Haspelmath. 2019. *Glottolog 4.0*. Max Planck Institute for the Science of Human History. https://glottolog.org.

Haspelmath, Martin. 2007. Pre-established categories don't exist: Consequences for language description and typology. *Linguistic Typology* 11(1). 119–132. DOI:10.1515/LINGTY.2007.011.

Haspelmath, Martin. 2010a. Comparative concepts and descriptive categories in crosslinguistic studies. *Language* 86(3). 663–687. DOI:10.1353/lan.2010.0021.

Haspelmath, Martin. 2010b. The interplay between comparative concepts and descriptive categories (Reply to Newmeyer). *Language* 86(3). 696–699. DOI:10.1353/lan.2010.0021.

Haspelmath, Martin. 2017. Some principles for language names. *Language Documentation & Conservation* 11. 81–93. DOI:10125/24725.

Hieber, Daniel W. 2013. On linguistics, linguists, and our times: A linguist's personal narrative reviewed. *Linguistic Typology* 17(2). 291–321. DOI:10.1515/lity-2013-0013.

Newmeyer, Frederick J. 2010. On comparative concepts and descriptive categories: A reply to Haspelmath. *Language* 86(3). 688–695. DOI:10.1353/lan.2010.0000.

Plank, Frans (ed.). 2016. *Linguistic Typology* 20(2): *Of categories: Language-particular – comparative – universal.*

Song, Jae Jung. 2001. *Linguistic typology: Morphology and syntax* (Longman Linguistics Library). London: Routledge.

Song, Jae Jung. 2018. *Linguistic typology* (Oxford Textbooks in Linguistics). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Stassen, Leon. 2011. The problem of cross-linguistic identification. In Jae Jung Song (ed.), *The Oxford handbook of linguistic typology* (Oxford Handbooks in Linguistics), 90–99. Oxford: Oxford University Press. DOI:10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199281251.013.0006.

Whaley, Lindsay J. 1997. *Introduction to typology: The unity and diversity of language.* Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

Language Index

Todo list