In conclusion, this reference work on English morphology is an indispensable tool for all serious morphologists. Whatever topic one works on, one should first read what findings the authors of this book have to offer on that topic.

References

Booij, Geert 1986. Form and meaning in morphology: the case of Dutch 'agent' nouns. *Linguistics* 24: 503–518.
Marchand, Hans 1969. *The categories and types of present-day English word formation*. 2nd edn. München: Beck.

Author's address: (Geert Booij)
            Leiden University Center of Linguistics
            Postbus 9515
            2300 RA Leiden
            The Netherlands
            E-mail: g.e.booij@hum.leidenuniv.nl

The problem of parts of speech, their definition and identification in particular languages and cross-linguistically, their theoretical status and (non-)universality, has for a long time been on the agenda of linguistic debates. The volume currently under review is an important contribution to the theoretically and typologically informed discussion of parts of speech, since it addresses one of the important and yet not sufficiently understood issues: That of the so-called flexible word classes, that is, lexical items which in individual languages can assume functions attributable to distinct parts of speech in the more familiar Standard Average European languages.

Though parts of speech are often called 'SYNTACTIC categories' (cf. the title of Croft 1991, where an influential functional-typological approach to parts of speech has been developed), their relevance for morphology and word structure is clear and needs no special justification. The same is true of the issue of flexible word classes or lexemes. Indeed, the latter are often defined as such words which can occur in distinct syntactic environments (for example, as heads of noun phrases, as predicates, and as modifiers) without additional MORPHOLOGICAL markers, therefore linguists working with flexible word classes are bound to ask morphological questions (for example, what kinds of morphology count as those additional morphological markers which preclude the analysis of particular lexemes as flexible?), and also to look for possible correlations between part of speech flexibility and certain kinds of morphology (for example, are

analytical languages, on the one hand, and polysynthetic languages, on the other, more prone to part of speech flexibility than languages with classic Indo–European-style morphology?). Finally, theorizing about morphology may also involve assumptions or claims regarding parts of speech, cf. for example, Distributed Morphology, whose proponents regard roots, that is, the morphological objects which in the most general sense determine the lexical meanings of words, as universally a-categorial or pre-categorial (Marantz 1997) and, therefore, assume the crucial role of (syntactically-mediated) morphology in deriving the surface word classes.

The volume under review has been largely inspired by the pioneering work of Kees Hengeveld (Hengeveld 1992), who has proposed a functional typology of RIGID and FLEXIBLE word classes, as well as by the more recent debate on the parts of speech flexibility in Mundari (cf. *Linguistic Typology*, Vol. 9/3, 2005, for example, Hengeveld & Rijkhoff 2005 vs. Evans & Osada 2005). The ten contributions to the volume are mostly couched in the broadly understood functional-typological approach to language and fall into those dealing with typological and theoretical issues (van Lier & Rijkhoff, Hengeveld, Don & van Lier, Bisang) and those discussing flexible parts of speech in particular languages (Gil, Peterson, Rau, Beck, McGregor, Nordhoff), though some of the latter contain important typological insights besides extended coverage of language-specific data (Gil, Beck). Most of the languages discussed in the individual contributions come from Eastern and South Eastern Asia (Kharia, Santali, Tagalog, Riau Indonesian, Sri Lanka Malay, Late Archaic Chinese, Khmer), but other parts of the world such as Australia (Gooniyandi) and the Americas (Lushootseed, Classical Nahuatl) are also represented. In the following I will focus on the issues raised in the individual contributions which are of special relevance for morphological research.

In the introductory chapter, 'Flexible word classes in linguistic typology and grammatical theory' (pp. 1–30), Eva van Lier and Jan Rijkhoff provide a useful and fairly detailed overview of the phenomenon of part of speech flexibility and typological and theoretical approaches to word classes in general. Special attention is paid (pp. 13–20) to the criteria of word class flexibility proposed by Evans & Osada (2005), namely (i) 'explicit semantic compositionality', such that '[. . .] any semantic differences between the uses of a putatively [flexible] lexeme in two syntactic positions [. . .] must be attributable to the function of that position' (Evans & Osada 2005: 367), which has been refuted in its strongest form and reinterpreted as coercion by Hengeveld & Rijkhoff (2005), (ii) 'bidirectional distribution equivalence', such that the members of the putative flexible word class must be equally acceptable in all the relevant syntactic positions, which is again a too strong requirement, considering that the frequency of occurrence of lexemes in certain syntactic positions necessarily depends on their meanings and, therefore '[. . .] infrequency of certain combinations of meaning and function may also lead to accidental gaps' (p. 17), especially in languages with no huge electronic corpora; and (iii) 'exhaustiveness', such that claims regarding flexibility of word classes be supported by data suggesting that whole parts of speech and not just isolated lexemes show flexibility, which is not easy to assess. Issues of special relevance for morphology include conversion or zero-marked recategorization, sometimes invoked in modelling part of speech flexibility, as opposed to the already

Table 1. Lexemes and functions according to Hengeveld.

	HEAD	MODIFIER
PREDICATE PHRASE	verb	manner adverb
REFERENTIAL PHRASE	noun	adjective

mentioned idea of '[. . .] uncategorized roots from which categorially differentiated lexemes are zero derived' (p. 22), or to the more 'radical' position advocated by Hengeveld and McGregor that flexible lexemes are monosemous and their ability to occur in different syntactic positions even with meaning shifts is not accompanied by any kind of derivation. Another important idea is Haig's (2003) 'principle of successively increasing categorization', whereby categorial distinctions '[. . .] increase and/or become more fine-grained' (p. 23) according to the 'concentric' complexity levels of roots, stems as inputs to derivation, outputs of derivation and inflectional morphology. Thus, not only lexemes but also grammatical markers can exhibit flexibility with respect to occurrence in different syntactic environments, and a combined typology of flexible vs. rigid lexemes and grammatical markers emerges (p. 25), further discussed in the chapter by Bisang. The last section of the chapter provides fairly detailed summaries of individual contributions.

In 'Parts-of-speech systems as a basic typological determinant' (pp. 31–55), Kees Hengeveld develops his own typology of flexible word classes and draws implications from it for other components of grammar, including morphology. Hengeveld's approach rests on the definition of major word classes in terms of the four universal functional slots shown in Table 1 (p. 32).

Word class systems are classified according to whether they have distinct classes of lexemes for each of the functions (such systems are called 'differentiated') or not, the latter falling into two types: those where '[. . .] a single class of lexemes is used in more than one function' (p. 33), that is, flexible systems, and those where lexeme classes are functionally specialized, but not all classes are represented by morphosyntactically underived lexemes (for example, some languages lack adjectives and have to resort to relativization of stative verbs for modification of referential phrases). The resulting typology of part of speech systems is shown in Table 2 (p. 36).

Hengeveld makes four sets of predictions from his approach to the typology of word classes: (1) 'Identifiability': The degree of rigidity with regard to the flexibility of a word class inversely correlates with the elaboration of morphosyntactic marking of the positions in which it occurs by means of word order or morphology; (2) 'Integrity': The formal independence of a flexible lexeme from the morphological material specific to a certain function correlates with flexibility; in particular, Hengeveld predicts that '[. . .] flexible lexemes may be expected not to show morphologically conditioned stem alternation' (p. 38) or fusion of lexical and inflectional material; (3) 'The phonological, morphological, and semantic unity of a lexical class increases its applicability in various syntactic slots' (p. 38), from which follows that flexible word classes should not exhibit gender and inflection classes and, notably, flexible verbs should not be categorized

Table 2. Parts-of-speech systems according to Hengeveld.

PoS-system		Head of predicate phrase	Head of referential phrase	Modifier in referential phrase	Modifier in predicate phrase
Flexible	1	contentive			
	2	verb	non-verb		
	3	verb	noun	modifier	
Differentiated	4	verb	noun	adjective	manner adverb
Rigid	5	verb	noun	adjective	
	6	verb	noun		
	7	verb			

according to transitivity; (4) 'Pervasiveness': The expectation that flexibility with respect to the rigidity of basic lexemes correlates with flexibility with respect to the rigidity of larger grammatical units, such as morphologically complex stems or wordforms or syntactic phrases. Hengeveld concludes that '[...] the more flexible a language is in its use of lexemes, the more rigid it is in its syntax and morphology', 'the more resistant it is to fusional morphology', 'the more it lacks intrinsic lexical features' such as inflectional classes, and 'the more it is flexible in its use of phrases and clauses' (p. 50). He also states that flexible languages are expected to be 'predicate-final or -initial', 'agglutinative or isolating', and to have '[...] lexemes that are not specified for transitivity, number' (p. 51) or inflection class. All these predictions are supported by various cross-linguistic studies based on balanced samples of languages summarized in the appendix (pp. 52–5).

In 'Derivation and categorization in flexible and differentiated languages' (pp. 56–88), Jan Don and Eva van Lier address the already mentioned issue of semantic compositionality: If the meanings of the putatively flexible lexeme are not fully predictable in its different syntactic uses, do the two meanings correspond to two distinct lexemes belonging to distinct word classes (Evans & Osada 2005), or do the two different meanings instantiate distinct ways of accommodation of a vague unitary lexical meaning by different syntactic frames (Hengeveld & Rijkhoff 2005)? Don and van Lier assume a Distributed Morphology-style approach and argue that both derivation and category assignment can occur at different levels of linguistic structure, namely lexicon vs. syntax. A compositional interpretation is mediated by syntactic derivation and involves category assignment, while a non-compositional interpretation occurs in the lexicon, and is coupled with category-assignment only in differentiated ('early categorizing') languages, in contrast to flexible ('late categorizing') languages, where categories are determined at the level of syntax only. The bulk of the chapter is devoted to the discussion of data from four individual languages: Kharia, Tagalog, Samoan, and Dutch. In Kharia, Tagalog and Samoan both semantically non-compositional lexical and fully compositional syntactic derivation, zero as well as overt, occurs, and only syntactic derivation may involve

Table 3. Gil's isolating-monocategorial-associational typology.

Type	Morphological structure	Syntactic categories	Compositional semantics	Language
1	Ø	Ø	Ø	Riau Indonesian
2	Ø	Ø	+	?
3	Ø	+	Ø	Ju‖'hoan (?)
4	Ø	+	+	Papiamentu (?)
5	+	Ø	Ø	?
6	+	Ø	+	Tagalog (?)
7	+	+	Ø	Meyah (?)
8	+	+	+	Hebrew

category-assignment. By contrast, in Dutch both idiosyncratic lexical and compositional syntactic derivation is category-assigning.

In 'Riau Indonesian: a language without nouns and verbs' (pp. 89–130) David Gil makes a strong methodological claim that linguists should not *a priori* believe that languages have distinct word classes and word class flexibility is exceptional, but rather start from the assumption of flexibility and justify word class distinctions in individual systems: '[...] syntactic categories should be assumed to be absent until positive evidence is found to the effect that such distinctions are in fact present' (p. 90). The bulk of the article, nevertheless, is devoted to the justification of the claim that Riau Indonesian does not have a distinction between nouns and verbs or between nominals and clauses, but only between the open class of what could be called 'content expressions' and a small closed class of function words. Words and phrases semantically denoting things and activities behave identically according to all possible diagnostics in Riau Indonesian: Both can stand alone as complete sentences, be coordinated, co-occur with various grammatical markers such as existentials, topic markers, adpositions, demonstratives, quantifiers, tense-aspect markers, relativizers, and negation. Gil also addresses the criteria of flexibility proposed by Evans & Osada (2005) (see above) and shows that Riau Indonesian fulfils the requirements of bidirectionality, compositionality, and exhaustiveness. The latter is proven by showing that any arbitrary combination of randomly selected content words yields a grammatically well-formed and semantically interpretable (albeit sometimes pragmatically strange) expression in Riau Indonesian. Gil concludes that Riau Indonesian is not just a flexible language in terms of Hengeveld, but a MONOCATEGORIAL language, which Gil considers to be the simplest and default case among the world's languages. In the concluding section of his article Gil addresses typological implications of monocategoriality, which, as he has proposed earlier (Gil 2005), correlates with isolating morphology and associational semantics, that is, with very few or no construction-specific rules of semantic interpretation. Since these three properties are logically independent of each other, eight potential language types are logically possible, though not all are instantiated by actual languages, as shown in Table 3 (p. 126).

Two chapters of the volume deal with Munda languages. John Peterson's 'Parts of speech in Kharia: a formal account' (pp. 131–68) presents an account of word class flexibility in Kharia in terms of a monostratal syntactic framework. In Kharia, like in Riau Indonesian, morphemes fall into two classes: Content morphemes (lexemes) and functional morphemes. However, and unlike Riau Indonesian, Kharia structurally distinguishes between two types of syntactic phrases, which Peterson calls 'case syntagmas' (referential phrases) and 'TAM/person syntagmas' (predicate phrases). Notably, the internal structure of the lexical elements of the two types of syntagma are shown to be identical and case syntagmas can occur as predicates and attach enclitic TAM/person markers, and *vice versa*, TAM/person syntagmas can be used referentially and combine with enclitic case markers. Still, co-occurrence restrictions may apply on grammatical morphemes, such as the ban on attaching TAM/person marking to case syntagmas marked with overt cases or postpositions other than the genitive. As to the formal analysis, into details of which I do not go for the reasons of space, its most important aspect is the strict division between lexical ('content') and functional heads, both of which can have complex internal structure. It is only at the level of functional heads that the syntactic categories are determined in Kharia, and this is much in line with Don and van Lier's analysis of flexible languages as showing 'late categorization'.

In 'Proper names, predicates, and the parts-of-speech system of Santali' (pp. 169–84) Felix Rau shows that, like any other thing-denoting lexemes, names can function as predicates in this Munda language. An interesting feature of this phenomenon is that, when names are used without a copula in predicational (rather than equative or specificational) sentences, they name persons or things and occur with an applicative suffix taking the entity being named as a direct object, as in example (1) (p. 182).

(1) Santali

    hɔpɔn-tɛtʼ-dɔ   *ənuə-a-e-a*

    son-3POSS-TOP   Anua-APPL-3SG.O-IND

    'The name of the son was Anua', lit. 'Her son was Anua-ed'

In 'Unidirectional flexibility and the noun–verb distinction in Lushootseed' (pp. 185–220), David Beck discusses the rather special situation in one of the languages of the Salishan family from Pacific Northwest, for which claims about the lack of nouns and verbs have been raised in the literature (see, for example, Kinkade 1983, Jelinek & Demers 1994, and a more up-to-date discussion in Davis & Matthewson 2009). Beck claims that Lushootseed word classes show unidirectional flexibility, whereby '[. . .] for a particular pair of lexical classes, X and Y, X can appear in the syntactic roles criterial for Y, but Y cannot appear in the roles criterial for X' (p. 186). This entails contextual neutralization, rather than a complete lack of parts of speech. In Lushootseed, like in other Salishan languages, different word classes are neutralized in the predicative position. Yet, in the argument position, event–denoting

lexemes show more complex morphosyntax than thing-denoting lexemes. In particular, Beck argues that, in order to occur in argument position, event-denoting lexemes (= verbs) must either be overtly nominalized or form headless relative clauses, which is evidenced by specific morphological marking of both verbs and their arguments. The article is concluded by a typological discussion: Beck addresses the distinction proposed by Evans & Osada (2005) between 'precategorial' languages with bidirectional noun-verb flexibility like Tongan and Samoan, and 'omnipredicative' languages with unidirectional flexibility whereby word classes showing distinct behaviour in the argument position are neutralized in the predicate slot. Beck argues that both these types of putatively flexible languages are probably non-existent since, in his view, semantically irregular correspondences between homophonous lexical items occurring in different syntactic slots attested in various languages claimed to be precategorial are better treated as '[. . .] extreme examples of a lexicon built on the cross-linguistically well-attested process of lexical conversion' (p. 217). Beck also objects against the Hengeveldian typology of parts of speech, arguing that '[. . .] the distributional evidence from both Salishan and Tongan seems to point [. . .] that languages with only two lexical classes distinguish between nouns and everything else' (p. 218), rather than between verbs and non-verbs, as is proposed by Hengeveld. This issue is also addressed by Bisang (see below).

William B. McGregor in 'Lexical categories in Gooniyandi, Kimberley, Western Australia' (pp. 221–46) discusses an admittedly rather atypical Australian language from the Bunuban family, addressing it from the perspective of 'Semiotic Grammar', a framework of his own invention (see, for example, McGregor 1997). While most Australian languages have rigid word classes definable on purely morphological grounds, Gooniyandi, according to McGregor, has very restricted bound inflectional morphology to begin with, and most functional morphemes which he regards as 'postpositions' can co-occur with many (if not any) kinds of lexical stems. Even so, McGregor postulates distinct word classes such as verbs, nominals, adverbs, adverbials (sic!), particles, etc. on the basis of '[. . .] the range of types of grammatical relations the lexemes may serve in units [constituents] of specified types' (p. 233). However, McGregor admits that, for example, verbs can surface in NPs and combine with case markers, so '[. . .] we are forced to adopt a non-finite-clause analysis to preserve the above characterization of verbs as a part of speech' (p. 236). This conjecture seems to be supported by some independent evidence (p. 236), although the latter appears to be rather scanty and possibly amenable to a different analysis. McGregor concludes by a brief discussion of the semantic vagueness of Gooniyandi verbs, which can occur in a wide range of constructions and are unspecified for valency. By contrast, verbs in the Pama-Nyungan languages are strictly categorized into transitive and intransitive.

I must confess that I found McGregor's article much less clear and convincing than the other chapters, and the reason for this is the framework he employs. This review does not give space to discuss the merits and shortcomings of 'Semiotic Grammar' (though I would contend that proliferation of 'theories of language' is to be avoided as *per* Occam's Razor at least), but I cannot help pointing out that the terminology employed in it does not seem illuminating for the simple reason that it is

unfamiliar to most readers, and some of the terms do not look adequately defined (for example, the following formulations on p. 213 sound cryptic to me: '[...] where one whole encompasses the other, indicating it is to be taken as a demonstration rather than description'; '[...] marking relations, whereby grammatical relations or categories are labelled'). Some details of the analysis of particular examples are also unclear, for example '[...] the particle manifestly fulfills an interpersonal role' regarding the negative marker in example (37) on p. 240.

In 'Jack of all trades: the Sri Lanka Malay flexible adjective' (pp. 247–74) Sebastian Nordhoff departs from the 'mainstream' topic of the volume, that is the distinction verb vs. noun, and discusses the flexible behaviour of adjectives in a variety of Malay which has experienced extensive language contact with such languages as Sinhala and Tamil. While both verbs and nouns are clearly differentiated in Sri Lanka Malay with regard to both syntactic positions they occur in and morphology they combine with, adjectives are compatible with both verbal and nominal morphosyntax, and are distinct from both nouns and verbs in that they take a special negation marker. An important contribution of this chapter is the discussion of the diachronic changes which have led to the atypical situation in Sri Lanka Malay. Nordhoff argues that Sri Lanka Malay has changed from the fully flexible part of speech system similar to that of Riau Indonesian to a rigid system under language contact with Tamil and Sinhala, which are rigid languages. The erstwhile flexible lexemes bifurcated into rigid nouns and verbs by specializing in the prototypical functions characteristic of lexemes denoting time-stable entities (things) and time-unstable entities (events):

> '[...] a certain semantic feature [...] evokes a certain semantic class, which in turn attracts a prototypical discourse function. Over time, the lexeme becomes ultimately connected with the discourse function, and use in non-prototypical functions has to be signalled' (p. 271).

The volume is closed by Walter Bisang's chapter 'Word class systems between flexibility and rigidity: an integrative approach' (pp. 275–303). Bisang starts from the typology of flexibility outlined in the introductory chapter and comprising both lexemes and grammatical markers, discussing four languages instantiating some of the logically possible types (p. 276):

> 1. $L_{FLEXIBLE}/G_{FLEXIBLE}$ [L_F/G_F]: Languages with underspecified or precategorial lexemes and with grammatical markers that can occur in clauses and noun phrases;
> 2. $L_{FLEXIBLE}/G_{RIGID}$ [L_F/G_R]: Languages with underspecified or precategorial lexemes and with grammatical markers that occur either in clauses or in noun phrases;
> 3. $L_{RIGID}/G_{FLEXIBLE}$ [L_R/G_F]: Languages with lexemes that are specified for certain syntactic slots and with grammatical markers that can occur in clauses and noun phrases;

4. L_{RIGID}/G_{RIGID} [L_R/G_R]: Languages with lexemes that are specified for certain syntactic slots and with grammatical markers that occur either in clauses or in noun phrases.

According to Bisang, Late Archaic Chinese, is a precategorial $L_{FLEXIBLE}$ language whose G parameter cannot be determined due to the lack of morphological markers. A rather special case is Khmer, where flexible morphology is coupled with a rigid lexicon: Morphemes can attach both to nouns and to verbs, but the output of derivation is always either a noun or a verb. It is unclear, however, whether Khmer affixes should indeed be treated as flexible markers with largely unpredictable outputs (for example, -*vmn*- 'nominalization', 'transitivization', 'specialization'), or rather as sets of homophonous affixes with better-defined functions and word-class rigidity. Finally, Classical Nahuatl and Tagalog are claimed to belong to the class $L_{RIGID}/$ G_{RIGID} languages, but instantiate two different subtypes. Classical Nahuatl is an omnipredicative language where all lexical stems are predicates and all referential phrases are headless relative clauses. Rather paradoxically, at least to my mind, Bisang argues that Classical Nahuatl nevertheless possesses distinct nouns and verbs, since event-denoting and object-denoting lexemes combine with different (though overlapping) sets of grammatical markers. By contrast, Tagalog is claimed to be patterned around nominal morphology, its voice or focus markers (called 'triggers' in the article) being analysed as a kind of nominalizations, and its basic syntax being comparable to that of equational constructions. Since Tagalog lexemes can be divided into those that take 'trigger' morphology and those that do not, Bisang concludes that '[. . .] Tagalog is a language with distinct morpholexical categories but no distinct terminal syntactic categories that are associated with the syntactic slots for nouns and verbs' (p. 302). Frankly speaking, the argumentation in this chapter does not seem to me to be fully clear and uncontroversial. Probably, Bisang should have been granted more space to lay out all the details and logical links of his undoubtedly interesting analysis. For example, I cannot help finding the following statement contradictory:

> 'While Nahuatl has only verbs and Tagalog has only nouns, its morphology clearly distinguishes between nouns and verbs and thus does not care about the linking rules that apply from the lexicon to the syntax' (p. 302).

The book ends with a general list of references (pp. 304–22) and indices of authors, languages and subjects (pp. 323–39). The volume is remarkably well edited with very few typos or other inaccuracies (though Hengeveld's paper could have been proofread better, thus 'verbs' in line 10 on p. 33 should be evidently replaced by 'non-verbs', 'not' is missing in line 7 on p. 39, and 'it' is missing in line 16 on p. 45). The internal coherence of the book also seems, at least impressionistically, higher than is common for an edited volume.

In general, I find the volume very interesting and thought-provoking, addressing both language-particular empirical data (sometimes analysed with great detail and sophistication) and typological variation, and making methodologically important

observations. The book clearly shows that morphology and word classes are tightly interconnected, with certain kinds of morphology, such as gender and inflection classes and lexically determined irregularities in general being incompatible with word class flexibility (see the correlations proposed by Hengeveld). The much debated division between inflection and derivation also has an impact on word classes, since these two kinds of morphology may play different roles in lexical categorization: Inflectional morphology may be categorizing even in flexible languages ('late categorization'), whereas derivational morphology in flexible languages may yield class-neutral outputs. This suggests that the ability to change word class, which has been often evoked as one of the criteria of differentiation between inflection and derivation, is hardly applicable to flexible languages.

Among the few shortcomings of the book, which is probably less of a shortcoming than a *desideratum* for future research, I would like to mention the clearly biased coverage of languages, most of which come from South and Southeast Asia. It remains unclear whether this particular area is for historical reasons especially densely populated by languages with flexible word classes, and since the volume includes some typological chapters (for example, Hengeveld's sample-based research), a discussion of the areal and genetic distribution of part of speech flexibility in the world's languages would have been very welcome.

To conclude, I find this book an excellent collection of articles on a pertinent topic in linguistic theory and typology, containing interesting data from a wide variety of languages as well as important cross-linguistic generalizations and insights into the relation between lexical categories, morphology and syntactic structure, as well as opening fascinating possibilities for future research.

Abbreviations

3–3rd person; APPL–applicative; IND–indicative; O–object; POSS–possessive; SG–singular; TAM–tense, aspect, mood; TOP–topic.

References

Croft, William C. 1991. *Syntactic categories and grammatical relations. The cognitive organization of information*. Chicago IL and London: The University of Chicago Press.

Davis, Henry & Lisa Matthewson 2009. Issues in Salish syntax and semantics. *Language and Linguistics Compass* 3(4): 1097–1166.

Evans, Nicholas & Toshiki Osada 2005. Mundari: The myth of a language without word classes. *Linguistic Typology* 9(3): 351–390.

Gil, David 2005. Isolating-monocategorial-associational language. In Henri Cohen & Claire Lefebvre (eds.), *Handbook of categorization in cognitive science*. Oxford: Elsevier. 347–379.

Haig, Geoffrey 2003. Word-class distinctions and morphological type: agglutinating and fusional languages reconsidered. Ms. available at https://uni-bamberg.academia.edu/GeoffreyHaig

Hengeveld, Kees 1992. Parts of speech. In Michael Fortescue, Peter Harder & Lars Kristoffersen (eds.), *Layered structure and reference in a functional perspective*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia PA: Benjamins. 29–55.

Hengeveld, Kees & Jan Rijkhoff 2005. Mundari as a flexible language. *Linguistic Typology* 9(3): 406–431.

Jelinek, Eloise & Richard A. Demers 1994. Predicates and pronominal arguments in Straits Salish. *Language* 70(4): 697–736.

Kinkade, M. Dale 1983. Salish evidence against the universality of 'noun' and 'verb'. *Lingua* 60: 25–40.

Marantz, Alec 1997. No escape from syntax: Don't try morphological analysis in the privacy of your own lexicon. *UPenn Working Papers in Linguistics* 4(2): 201–225.

McGregor, William 1997. *Semiotic grammar*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Author's address: (Peter Arkadiev)
Institute of Slavic Studies
Russian Academy of Sciences
Leninsky prospekt 32–A
119991 Moscow
Russia
E-mail: peterarkadiev@yandex.ru