Review Article

Peter Arkadiev
Linguistic typology: The Oxford handbook

The Oxford handbook of linguistic typology (*OHLT*) is the second major and all-encompassing reference work on linguistic typology after the two-volume collection *Language typology and language universals* (Haspelmath et al. (eds.) 2001) and, dedicated entirely to morphosyntax, the three-volume *Language typology and syntactic description* (Shopen (ed.) 2007, see Koptjevskaja-Tamm & Liljegren 2013 for a comprehensive review). In comparison to its De Gruyter predecessor, still unsurpassed in scope and detail, *OHLT* is handier and reflects recent important achievements and developments in the field, such as the *World atlas of language structures* (Haspelmath et al. (eds.) 2005; Dryer & Haspelmath (eds.) 2013) and the AUTOTYP project by Balthasar Bickel and Johanna Nichols (http://www.autotyp.uzh.ch/), as well as the general shift of focus in typology of the last two decades from the quest for putative universals to genetically and geographically informed inquiries about the distribution of (particular aspects of) linguistic diversity and the recognition of the validity and importance of exceptions and rarities (see, e. g., Plank no date; Bickel 2007; Wohlgemuth & Cysouw (eds.) 2010).

　　OHLT presents a fairly comprehensive picture of the current state of linguistic typology, understood by the editor and the authors as the discipline studying linguistic diversity in all its aspects and appealing to functional, usage-based, and diachronic explanatory principles in accounting for observed distributions. Such a delimitation of the field, contrasting typology with crosslinguistic investigations in the generative and other formal frameworks, with *OHLT* itself containing a

Peter Arkadiev, Institut slavjanovedenija Rossijskoj akademii nauk (ISl RAN), Leninskij prospekt 32A, 119991 Moskva, Russia; Rossijskij gosudarstvennyj gumanitarnyj universitet; Moskovskij pedagogičeskij gosudarstvennyj universitet, E-mail: peterarkadiev@yandex.ru

chapter entitled "Typology and formal grammar" by Maria Polinsky, is not unobjectionable, but does at least faithfully represent the current parlance of linguists.

OHLT's coverage includes both well-known empirical domains such as phonology (if somewhat peripherally), syntax, morphology, etc. and important theoretical and methodological issues, such as language sampling, crosslinguistic identification, and explanatory principles, as well as, and importantly, the "interfaces" of typology with neighbouring disciplines such as historical and contact linguistics and acquisition studies. The volume consists of thirty chapters written both by renowned experts in the field (Paolo Ramat, Edith Moravcsik, Joan Bybee, Anna Siewierska, to name a few) and by representatives of the younger generation of typologists (e. g., Ferdinand de Haan and Patience Epps), and is divided into four large thematic sections. Below I will give an overview of these sections without discussing each individual chapter in detail, which would take too much space, but singling out those aspects of the contributions to *OHLT* which I consider especially important or deserving criticism.

Part I, "Foundations: History, theory, and method" (pp. 9–127), starts with two chapters recounting the history of typology: "The (early) history of linguistic typology" (pp. 9–24) by Paolo Ramat and "The pioneers of linguistic typology: From Gabelentz to Greenberg" (pp. 25–42) by Giorgio Graffi. Both authors concur that Georg von der Gabelentz was the founder of modern linguistic typology. Of particular value is the discussion of such less well-known authors as Heymann Steinthal and Henri Weil, though it should be mentioned that Ramat appears to ignore or downplay very interesting developments of crosslinguistic thinking in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, such as work by Tommaso Campanella or François de Mesgnien, clear precursors of Greenbergian implicational universals (see Plank 2001 for an extensive survey). Unfortunately, both chapters discuss only Western European authors, ignoring the fact that some of the important developments in linguistic typology in the twentieth century have occurred in the Russian linguistic tradition, e. g., the pioneering work by Ivan Meščaninov (1883–1967) on syntactic typology, including such issues as parts-of-speech and grammatical relations (Meščaninov 1945) and ergativity (Meščaninov 1967).

The original and thought-provoking chapter "Linguistic typology and the study of language" (pp. 43–68) by Michael Daniel outlines the major features of typological research, stating in particular that "[l]inguistic typology is interested in crosslinguistic similarities only inasmuch as they foreground limits to variation" (p. 45), which this reviewer finds a bit too strong, though the focus on diversity, possibly at the expense of similarities, is one of the features setting typology apart from generative grammar (the distinction between the two enterprises is discussed at length), whose bias is just the opposite. Other issues addressed in this chapter include the problem of crosslinguistic comparability, with a useful distinction

between "relational" (system-determined) and "referential" (extralinguistically determined) perspectives, both of which are argued to be indispensable for sound typological work, sources of data and language sampling, types and modes of crosslinguistic generalization, and language change. In my view, this chapter is one of the best in the whole volume and can be read as a concise and yet fairly comprehensive introduction to the outstanding problems of modern typology.

The remaining three chapters of Part I address various theoretical and methodological issues. "Explaining language universals" (pp. 69–89) by Edith A. Moravcsik is a clear overview of different explanatory principles (structural, historical, and functional) for language-particular facts and crosslinguistic generalizations based on several case studies. Notably, Moravcsik makes an important and often overlooked point that though many language-particular facts and universal properties can be explained functionally, "we cannot expect all grammatical phenomena to be equally determined by language function, even if they are universal" (p. 88). The concise chapter "The problem of cross-linguistic identification" (pp. 91–99) by Leon Stassen addresses one of the most fundamental problems of linguistic typology, proposing that "mixed formal–functional domain definitions constitute the best strategy for ensuring cross-linguistic comparability" (p. 99), cf. also Haspelmath (2010), who reaches largely similar conclusions. Importantly for those who advocate strictly functional (or "referential", in Daniel's terms) criteria, Stassen notes that "[e]xternal criteria alone usually define a domain that is too broad" and that "formal criteria [...] commonly serve the function of keeping the domain manageable" (p. 96). Finally, "Language sampling" (pp. 100–127) by Dik Bakker is a useful guide to existing sampling techniques, making a clear distinction between probability samples and variety samples, which are used for different purposes and concomitantly must be compiled by different methods.

Part II, "Theoretical dimensions of linguistic typology" (pp. 131–249), contains six chapters dealing with particular explanatory notions commonly invoked in typological studies. "Markedness: Iconicity, economy, and frequency" (pp. 131–147) by Joan Bybee provides a discussion of the "rise and fall" of markedness and related influential notions, which have gradually come to be considered with skepticism and supplanted by more down-to-earth and language-particular considerations such as frequency of use (cf. Haspelmath 2006). "Competing motivations" (pp. 148–165) by John Haiman is a highly original and even somewhat surprising contribution largely dealing with the often overlooked and usually downplayed aesthetic function of language reflected in structural patterns such as Cambodian alliterative "symmetrical compounding". On the basis of several examples, mostly from Cambodian, Haiman claims that "a drive to decorate can also be viewed as an external and hence 'functional' motivation" (p. 159) and that "there are [...] many cases where [...] semantic distinctions and clarity are lost for

the sake of a pattern that is 'tidy', but has no basis other than tidiness for existing" (pp. 159–160). Haiman concludes that many historical developments in grammar may actually be due to "a playful drive for reproduction, decoration, or symmetry" (cf. the notion of "extravagance" invoked by Haspelmath (2000) with respect to grammaticalization) not motivated by "a kind of 'bare bones' communicative utilitarianism" (p. 164). I find Haiman's contribution, even if potentially controversial and falling outside of the "encyclopedic" schemas, very important, since it demonstrates the limitations of both formalist and mainstream functionalist approaches, with the latter's assumption that language structure is to a great extent motivated by the communicative function of language (whose primacy is taken for granted as a dogma largely in the same way as the innateness of Universal Grammar is assumed by generativists), and opens a vast and largely unexplored field of inquiry into the domain of creative manipulation of language.

"Categories and prototypes" (pp. 166–189) by Johan van der Auwera & Volker Gast is a clear and informative overview of the typological approaches to categories, with a discussion of prototype-based approaches to word classes and transitivity as well as of semantic maps. Though some influential researchers (e. g., Haspelmath 2010, 2015) argue for traditional definitions of typological notions by means of necessary and sufficient criteria, I tend to agree with the authors of this chapter that "aspects of prototype theory [...] can be very useful in many domains of grammar and lexicon, and in linguistic conceptualization more generally" (p. 189) (cf. also Lander & Tyshkevich 2015). In "Implicational hierarchies" (pp. 190–205), Greville G. Corbett reviews implicational hierarchies, such as his own Agreement Hierarchy (Corbett 1979), Keenan & Comrie's (1977) Noun Phrase Accessibility Hierarchy, Silverstein's (1976) Animacy Hierarchy, and Berlin & Kay's (1969) hierarchy of basic colour terms, and their use for formulation of crosslinguistic and language-particular generalizations.

"Processing efficiency and complexity in typological patterns" (pp. 206–226) by John Hawkins is a concise and informative summary of the author's recent proposals about the Performance-Grammar Correspondence Hypothesis and the three functional principles relating performance and grammar: Minimize Domains, Minimize Forms, and Maximize Online Processing (Hawkins 2004, 2014). The chapter contains definitions of these principles and related notions as well as compelling illustrations from a variety of languages and typological samples. Hawkins's approach to functional explanation in typology is, in my view, clearly superior to most other proposals of this type, since it transcends the "common-sense" logic of the kind "grammars code best what speakers do most" (Du Bois 1985: 363) and proposes a highly articulated theory of the relation between well-defined processing principles and concrete patterns of both variation within languages and frequency distributions of grammaticalized structures across

languages, making explicit and falsifiable predictions subject to empirical testing – something which many other approaches, formal and functional alike, often fall short of. Finally, "Language universals and linguistic knowledge" (pp. 227–249) by Sonia Cristofaro again discusses the difference between typological and generative approaches, now from the perspective of the status of universals (be it structural generalizations of the Greenbergian kind or functional principles) with respect to grammatical representation and speakers' knowledge of language. Cristofaro's conclusions that "[c]ross-linguistic investigation reveals that there is no distributional evidence for the idea that there are universal components of grammatical representation" and that "there appears to no evidence for universals in the sense of Universal Grammar, that is, no formal template to which the grammars of all languages conform" (p. 248), though self-evident to many typologists such as Croft, Dryer, or Haspelmath, is not only premature from the point of view of more formally-oriented linguists, but, notably, seems to run counter the functionalist approach by Hawkins, which, at least to this reviewer's understanding, rests on the assumption that all languages share some basic syntactic structure, i. e., hierarchical constituency, and at least the distinction between predicates, arguments, and adjuncts, and between branching and non-branching categories, otherwise the hypotheses advocated by Hawkins could not be formulated and tested.

Part III, "Empirical dimensions of linguistic typology" (pp. 253–548), with twelve chapters is the longest in the volume and is largely dedicated to issues of morphosyntax (ten chapters). "Word order typology" (pp. 253–279) by Jae Jung Song is a comprehensive and detailed survey of the evolution of word order typology from Greenberg to Hawkins, including many empirical data and statistical generalizations, and can readily serve as an introductory reference work on the topic. The same can be said about Balthasar Bickel's "Grammatical relations typology" (pp. 399–444), the longest chapter in the whole book, presenting arguably the most comprehensive and balanced overview of the field to date, richly illustrated from diverse languages and advocating a construction-based view of grammatical relations which eschews the traditional holistic characterization of whole languages as "ergative" or "accusative". "Word classes" (pp. 280–302) by Walter Bisang gives a useful survey of recent approaches to the crosslinguistic identification and typology of parts-of-speech, with special emphasis on Croft's (1991, 2000) prototype theory of word classes and its limitations. Most importantly, Bisang argues for a robust distinction between lexical and syntactic levels in the identification of word classes and related categories, which need not correlate in all languages.

"Case marking typology" (pp. 303–321) by Beatrice Primus presents an overview of the typology of case and case marking, with emphasis on the author's favourite idea of case hierarchy (Primus 1999). Unfortunately, this chapter is not as comprehensive as the other contributions to the volume (especially in comparison

to Bickel's chapter on a related topic) and sometimes lacks accuracy. For instance, it is clearly wrong to say that the English noun phrases in the translation of the Basque ex. (2) on p. 304 "show the accusative pattern" in the same way as the Basque ones show the ergative one. Treating the Latin *ablativus absolutus*, a special means of marking non-finite dependent clauses akin to the "complementizer case" of Australian languages (Dench & Evans 1988) on a par with the vocative under the rubric of "isolated or dislocated phrases" (p. 306) is also hardly correct. The chapter lacks several crucial references, e. g., to Bakker & Siewierska (2009) on case and alternative marking strategies, König (2006, 2009) on marked nominatives, Bossong (1985, 1991) on differential object marking, Donohue & Wichmann (eds.) (2008) on semantic alignment, and Filimonova (2005) on peculiarities of case marking with pronouns. The statement on p. 319 that "[w]hat is apparently never found as a lexical default is a construction in which the recipient is coded like the agent" is contradicted at least by the Circassian languages from the North Caucasus, where this is precisely the case (see, e. g., Kumakhov & Vamling 2009: 100–105), cf. ex. (1) from West Circassian (Adyghe).

(1)   *č'ale*-**m**   *pŝaŝe*-**m**   *məʔeresə-r*   *r-jə-tə-ʁ*
       boy-ᴏʙʟ   girl-ᴏʙʟ   apple-ᴀʙꜱ   3ꜱɢ.ɪᴏ-3ꜱɢ.ᴀ-give-ᴘꜱᴛ
       'The boy gave an apple to the girl.' (own fieldwork)

"Person marking" (pp. 322–345) by the late Anna Siewierska is dedicated to the morphosyntax of person forms in the languages of the world, giving a useful and richly illustrated survey of the structure of the person category and of the patterns of its formal expression. Notably, Siewierska argues against the notion of "person agreement" as devoid of argumental and referential function for a more balanced conception allowing "[b]oth the independent and dependent person forms [to] be treated as the realizations of the same argument [...] with referential value" (pp. 333–334). Unfortunately, this chapter is not free of shortcomings. For example, the definition of weak independent person forms on p. 329 as "ᴜɴꜱᴛʀᴇꜱꜱᴇᴅ person markers which are ᴜɴᴀᴛᴛᴀᴄʜᴇᴅ either phonologically or morphologically to any other constituent" (emphasis mine) appears to me to be self-contradictory, since unstressed elements by definition must prosodically, i. e., phonologically, attach to some host. The Japanese example (12) on p. 331 contains errors in segmentation (*deki* 'can' and *nai* ɴᴇɢ constitute a morphologically bound word form and are not separate words) and glossing (*mo* is a focus, not an accusative marker). Listing Yaqui (Uto-Aztecan) as lacking dependent person forms is certainly wrong, since Yaqui has both second-position clitics for 1st and 2nd person subjects and proclitics/prefixes for 3rd person objects (Guerrero 2004: 13–14).

"Transitivity typology" (pp. 346–367) by Seppo Kittilä and "Voice typology" (pp. 368–398) by Leonid Kulikov treat issues related to transitivity. Their empirical basis overlaps to a considerable extent, since the bulk of Kittilä's contribution is devoted to transitivity alternations including voice, though the two chapters are clearly distinct in their approaches. While Kulikov adopts the well-articulated theory of diathesis change developed within the Leningrad/Saint Petersburg school of typology (for an overview in English and comprehensive references cf. Testelets 2001: 312–314), Kittilä discusses transitivity-related issues in framework-neutral terms of formal and semantic properties. Though clear and comprehensive, Kittilä's chapter contains some unfortunate gaps in the bibliography – e. g., Næss (2007) on the transitivity prototype, Malchukov (2006) on semantic parameters of transitivity, and Nedjalkov & Sil'nickij (1973) on causativization – and a number of inconsistencies – e. g., Section 3.2 starts with the statement that with changes in argument marking "[t]he number of the arguments in clauses remains constant" (p. 356) and ends with an observation that "the number of core arguments changes because of the illustrated alternations" (p. 357), which probably stems from the lack of a clear definition of "argument" and "core argument". Kulikov's decision to adopt a particular framework for a discussion of voice and transitivity alternations might appear objectionable to some, but is justified by the really comprehensive and excellently informed discussion generously illustrated by a wealth of examples, including such rare but certainly instructive cases as the causative-passive polysemy (p. 394) or the Georgian benefactive derivation adding an indirect object and thus distinct from applicative proper (p. 390–391). The statements on pp. 384 and 385 that reflexive and reciprocal derivations are "obligatorily marked in the verbal morphology" are obviously contradicted by English examples like *James washed* or *Jane and Lesley kissed*.

Ferdinand de Haan's chapter "Typology of tense, aspect, and modality systems" (pp. 445–464), in my view, does not really do justice to this domain, which is no less complex than that of grammatical relations and which could well have received a treatment comparable to the latter in scope and detail. Thus, evidentiality is excluded from the discussion, as is the very important areal aspect of TAM systems. Moreover, de Haan wrongly recounts Reichenbach's ternary system of temporal logic, saying that "[w]hen S[peech time] and R[eference time] are identical [...] we speak of absolute tense" (p. 446) and "[w]hen R is distinct from S, we speak of relative tense", while Reichenbach (1947 [2005]) clearly states that the absolute vs. relative tense distinction is based on the relation between R and E[vent time], not R and S; a reference to the influential neo-Reichenbachian approach to tense and aspect developed by Klein (1994) is lacking. The discussion of relative tense in de Haan's chapter is far too short (less than half a page!) and too simplistic (cf. Xrakovskij (ed.)

(2009) for a comprehensive typological survey of the phenomenon), and much the same can be said about resultatives. The chapter is somewhat skewed towards modality (though such important contributions to the field as van der Auwera & Plungian (1998), Narrog (2005), or Nuyts (2001, 2006) are either downplayed or not mentioned at all), which is understandable given the author's expertise, but is unfortunate in the view of the wealth of contemporary crosslinguistic knowledge on tense and aspect categories and systems. The following passage on p. 453 looks like an editorial error: "Some scholars, such as Joan Bybee [...], view modality as a diachronic notion. For instance, she has introduced the term agent-oriented modality as a replacement for deontic modality", and the same can be said with respect to the discussion of DeLancey's views about speech act participants' relation to split ergativity on pp. 462–463.

"Syntactic typology" (pp. 465–486) by Lindsay Whaley surveys recent typological work on relative clauses, noun phrase conjunction, and content questions, conspicuously ignoring the whole bulk of research devoted to these issues in the "formalist" literature (a hint to this line of research on p. 481 without any references is certainly not very helpful) and not even referring to Hawkins's processing explanation of the Accessibility Hierarchy effects in relative clause formation. "Morphological typology" (pp. 487–503) by Dunstan Brown is again far too short for such an important topic, given that morphology is the domain where languages show most complex and non-trivial variation. Nevertheless, the discussion of such phenomena from the realm of so-called "pure morphology" (cf. Aronoff 1994 and Cruschina et al. (eds.) 2013) as inflectional classes, syncretism, and stem alternations is surely instructive. A substantial part of the chapter is devoted to the author's favourite default inheritance model, which in my view is not an appropriate decision, since it remains largely unclear how this model actually enhances crosslinguistic comparison. With respect to morphological typology, Bickel & Nichols (2007) remains an unsurpassed survey of empirical phenomena, notably including an informed discussion of "pure morphology". Among important recent developments in morphological theory which are possibly highly relevant for typology the entropy-based analyses of morphological paradigms by Finkel & Stump (2007), Stump & Finkel (2013), and Ackerman et al. (2009) deserve to be mentioned.

"Semantic typology" (pp. 504–533) by Nicholas Evans is an excellent overview of the major achievements and developments in the crosslinguistic study of meaning. From a methodological perspective, Evans shows the importance of taking into account both etic (Daniel's reference-based) and emic (relation-based) characterizations of linguistic meaning in semantic typology. Issues discussed in the chapter include the description of the denotational range of

linguistic elements, the use of distinctive features and "semantic primitives" for semantic analysis and crosslinguistic comparison, various kinds of relations between meanings, problems of polysemy and heterosemy, semantic maps, covert categories such as eventuality types (here a reference to the most clearly typologically-oriented work by Tatevosov (2002) would be in order), and, notably, compositional approaches to meaning in formal semantics, discussed in relation to the crosslinguistic study of quantifiers (Bach et al. (eds.) 1995). This reviewer eagerly supports Evans's urge for a "much greater collaboration between typologists and formal semanticists than the field has seen so far" (p. 531).

"Typology of phonological systems" (pp. 534–548) by Ian Maddieson is the only chapter dedicated to phonology in the whole volume, and already because of this it could have been longer, covering more topics, e. g., phonological processes. Despite the (self-imposed?) limitations of space, Maddieson succeeds in presenting some of the basic issues in phonological typology, such as the study of prosodic systems, consonant and vowel inventories, vowel harmony, and larger phonological units such as syllables and phonological words. The treatment of Lithuanian as showing a distinction between raising and falling pitch on stressed syllables, based on Blevins (1993), which is itself based on outdated sources, is too simplistic and largely inadequate with respect to the contemporary standard language (see Dogil 1999 and Daugavet 2015: 169–173).

Part IV, "Typology in a wider context" (pp. 551–665), contains six chapters dealing with the relationships between typology and several other linguistic disciplines. Kenneth Shields in "Linguistic typology and historical linguistics" (pp. 551–567), drawing mainly on Indo-European, analyzes the significance of typological generalizations for comparative-historical reconstruction as well as the role of comparative-historical linguistics in the explanation of typological patterns. Though informative, this chapter appears to represent somewhat outdated views of both typology and historical linguistics. It ignores recent, if not uncontroversial developments such as the application of statistical phylogenetic methods to typological and lexical data for establishing or verifying genetic relationships, as in Dunn et al. (2007, 2008) (and its critical evaluation in Donohue et al. (2011, 2012)) or Holman et al. (2008, 2011). What would also have been welcome in such a chapter is a critical assessment of the current state of genealogical classification of languages (both low-level and high-level) and its potential implications for language sampling and evaluation of typological distributions. "Linguistic typology and language contact" (pp. 568–590) by Maria Koptjevskaja-Tamm is an informative and comprehensive overview of two major topics of concern for both contact linguistics and typology, i. e., contact-

induced change and areal linguistics, to the regrettable exclusion of pidgins, creoles, and mixed languages, which are almost completely ignored also elsewhere in the volume.

The inclusion into the volume of two chapters on language acquisition, i. e., "Linguistic typology and first language acquisition" (pp. 591–617) by the late Melissa Bowerman and "Linguistic typology and second language acquisition" (pp. 618–633) by Fred R. Eckman, is a welcome decision, for which readers, who, like this reviewer, are not knowledgeable in the field, should be really grateful to the editor (note that the two-volume Haspelmath et al. (eds.) (2001) lacks special chapters on language acquisition). Both chapters are very informative and present thought-provoking ideas and results, sometimes showing that first and second language acquisition display important differences with respect to independently established typological generalizations. For instance, while Bowerman concludes that "the NP accessibility hierarchy plays a very minor role in children's acquisition of relative clauses" (p. 614), Eckman presents experimental data showing that "L2 learners will necessarily generalize from more marked structures to less marked structures" (p. 632) in accordance with the Accessibility Hierarchy. Unfortunately, both chapters remain rather isolated from the bulk of the volume, neither referring to other chapters nor being cross-referenced elsewhere.

"Linguistic typology and language documentation" (pp. 634–649) by Patience Epps discusses the relations between typology and language documentation, which have been more and more mutually influencing and enriching each other during the last decades. This well written chapter raises several important issues, e. g., the role of rare and exceptional patterns in language description and typology, the need to refine the kinds of data represented in reference grammars and used by typologists, and the impact typologically informed awareness of linguistic diversity in particular domains may have on linguistic description. What this reviewer considers misplaced, however, is the emphasis on the so-called "basic linguistic theory" (Dixon 2010) as a "framework" for both typology and description (p. 645). Not willing to spend time on the discussion of this issue, I refer the reader to Saj (2011) and Hieber (2013: 297–304) for the problematic validity of Dixon's writings as a "theory", let alone as a "basic theory", and would like to emphasize that in my opinion, possibly not shared by many fellow typologists, both linguistic typology and language description are compatible with and should benefit from the insights and analytic methods of existing theoretical frameworks, provided that they are treated not as dogmatic matters of belief but rather as tools suitable for particular tasks (on this issue see, e. g., Bowern (2008: 10–12) and Nordlinger (2007)).

The last chapter of the volume, "Linguistic typology and formal grammar" (pp. 650–665) by Maria Polinsky, one of the few practitioners of both fields, not

only discusses the differences as well as similarities between them, but also makes suggestions on the possibilities of bridging the unfortunate gap separating the two important lines of linguistic research. One such proposal concerns the in-depth typological comparison of closely related languages; here it is worth noting that intragenetic typology has been pursued not only by comparative generative syntacticians working on Germanic, Romance, Slavic, or, later, Austronesian or Bantu, but also, from a functionalist standpoint, by Aleksandr Kibrik (cf., e. g., Kibrik 1987, 1991, 1998). Notably, Polinsky singles out work by John Hawkins as presenting the approach that "truly offers a synthesis of the best of both worlds", where "typology and theory construction can indeed coexist to good effect" (p. 664), with which this reviewer wholly agrees.

The volume contains a general references section (pp. 666–727) and comprehensive indices (pp. 729–754). Besides that, each chapter ends with a short list of works suggested for further reading on the relevant topic.

All in all, *OHLT* is an excellent reference work on linguistic typology successfully presenting a fairly comprehensive and varied survey of the history of the field, of its empirical, theoretical, and methodological aspects and problems, as well as of the place of typology in the broader landscape of contemporary linguistics. Being broad in scope and addressing quite diverse issues, the volume is nevertheless internally coherent to a large extent, which is certainly a credit to the editor. However, the other side of this internal coherence is the fact that sometimes several individual chapters revolve around the same subject, as, e. g., the NP Accessibility Hierarchy, while certain other no less important topics, as, e. g., the establishment of crosslinguistic gram types (Dahl 1985; Bybee & Dahl 1989), are barely touched. Though it is perfectly understandable that for many objective as well as subjective reasons *OHLT* could not include everything related to typology, certain topics have regrettably almost entirely fallen out of its scope. On the empirical side, these are discourse-related phenomena such as the encoding of information structure and referential devices (on the latter see Kibrik 2011), or strategies of clause-combining besides relative clauses. Crucially lacking are pidgins, creoles, and mixed languages on the one hand and sign languages on the other, both of which are of extreme importance for typology, as reflected in Velupillai (2012). On the theoretical side, with respect to the issue of crosslinguistic identification and definition of typological notions Corbett's "Canonical typology" (Corbett 2005; Brown et al. (eds.) 2013) should have been included. Among the "interfaces" of typology, what is surprisingly lacking is a discussion of the relation of typology to sociolinguistics, e. g., in the light of such important developments as the hypotheses about the connection between sociolinguistic variables and language complexity (e. g., Lupyan & Dale 2010, Trudgill 2011).

Last but not least, I find it regrettable that *OHLT*, with the exception of Kulikov's chapter on voice, tends to almost completely ignore important developments and achievements of the Russian schools of linguistic typology, including work published in English. For example, Aleksandr Kibrik, one of the founding members of ALT, recognized as one of the pioneers of functionalist typology and typologically oriented language documentation (see, e. g., Testelets 2001: 317–319; Nichols 2013), is mentioned in the volume only twice, and his seminal paper on grammatical relations (Kibrik 1997), let alone older works on the typology of ergativity (Kibrik 1979, 1985), is not referenced in the otherwise quite comprehensive chapter by Bickel. The same has to be said about Viktor Xrakovskij, the leader of the Saint-Petersburg school of typology and the author and editor of important works on the typology of imperative (Xrakovskij (ed.) 2001), verbal plurality (Xrakovskij (ed.) 1997), and clause combining (Xrakovskij (ed.) 2005, 2009, 2012), as well as other topics. This is possibly a reflection of the more general recent trend to neglect work published in languages other than English, hardly justifiable for linguists, especially those studying linguistic diversity, since such important figures in linguistic typology as the Swiss Hansjakob Seiler (who was academically based in Germany) or the French Gilbert Lazard and Denis Creissels have hardly made it onto the pages of *OHLT* either (cf. Song 2001, who has a separate chapter on "non-English" trends in typology).

The book is remarkably well edited with only a few lapses such as the lack of genetic affiliation of languages in Kittilä's chapter or language names' spelling differing from chapter to chapter (e. g., Yidiny in Siewierska's chapter on p. 332 vs. Yidiñ in Kittilä's chapter on p. 352). There are only a few typos, some of them in the examples: e. g., ex. (6) on p. 181 *íslenks* instead of *íslensk* and ex. (19a, b) on p. 376–377 *Jòn* instead of *Jón* (both in Icelandic), and on p. 538 Russian /úʒkij/ instead of /úzkij/; also *Caucuses* instead of *Caucasus* on p. 332, *Sahapatin* instead of *Sahaptin* on p. 342, *Barwise and Perry* instead of *Barwise and Cooper* on p. 531. In the figure on p. 553 the palatal and velar series of Proto-Indo-European stops are not distinguished by any diacritic, and on p. 559 (fn. 10) "head-adjunct" should rather be "adjunct-head" to correspond to "operator-operand".

To conclude, while not free from a certain disbalance and a number of shortcomings, some of them regrettable, *OHLT* is certainly a very good book that is able to serve as an up-to-date and comprehensive introduction to the empirical and theoretical aspects of linguistic typology, useful both for academics and for (advanced) students.

Abbreviations: 3 = 3rd person; A = agent; ABS = absolutive; IO = indirect object; NEG = negation; OBL = oblique; PST = past; SG = singular.

References

Ackerman, Farrell, James Blevins & Robert Malouf. 2009. Parts and wholes: Patterns of relatedness in complex morphological systems and why they matter. In James P. Blevins & Juliette Blevins (eds.), *Analogy in grammar: Form and acquisition*, 54–82. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Aronoff, Mark. 1994. *Morphology by itself: Stems and inflectional classes*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Bach, Emmon, Eloise Jelinek, Angelika Kratzer & Barbara H. Partee (eds.). 1995. *Quantification in natural languages*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Bakker, Dik & Anna Siewierska. 2009. Case and alternative strategies: Word order and agreement marking. In Malchukov & Spencer (eds.) 2009, 290–303.

Berlin, Brent & Paul Kay. 1969. *Basic color terms: Their universality and evolution*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Bickel, Balthasar. 2007. Typology in the 21st century: Major current developments. *Linguistic Typology* 11. 239–251.

Bickel, Balthasar & Johanna Nichols. 2007. Inflectional morphology. In Shopen (ed.). 2007, Vol. 3: *Grammatical categories and the lexicon*, 169–240.

Blevins, Juliette. 1993. A tonal analysis of Lithuanian nominal accent. *Language* 69. 237–273.

Bossong, Georg. 1985. *Empirische Universalienforschung: Differentielle Objektmarkierung in den neuiranischen Sprachen*. Tübingen: Narr.

Bossong, Georg. 1991. Differential object marking in Romance and beyond. In Douglas A. Kibbee & Dieter Wanner (eds.), *New analyses in Romance linguistics*, 143–170. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Bowern, Claire. 2008. *Linguistic fieldwork*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Brown, Dunstan, Marina Chumakina & Greville G. Corbett (eds.). 2013. *Canonical morphology and syntax*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bybee, Joan L. & Östen Dahl. 1989. The creation of tense and aspect systems in the languages of the world. *Studies in Language* 13. 51–103.

Corbett, Greville G. 1979. The agreement hierarchy. *Journal of Linguistics* 15. 203–224.

Corbett, Greville G. 2005. The canonical approach to typology. In Zygmunt Frajzyngier, Adam Hodges & David S. Rood (eds.), *Linguistic diversity and language theories*, 25–49. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

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

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

Cruschina, Silvio, Martin Maiden & John Charles Smith (eds.). 2013. *The boundaries of pure morphology: Diachronic and synchronic perspectives*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Dahl, Östen. 1985. *Tense and aspect systems*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Daugavet, Anna. 2015. The lengthening of the first component of Lithuanian diphthongs in an areal perspective. In Peter Arkadiev, Axel Holvoet & Björn Wiemer (eds.), *Contemporary approaches to Baltic linguistics*, 139–201. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.

Dench, Alan & Nicholas Evans. 1988. Multiple case-marking in Australian languages. *Australian Journal of Linguistics* 8. 1–47.

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

Dogil, Grzegorz. 1999. Baltic languages. In Harry van der Hulst (ed.), *Word prosodic systems in the languages of Europe*, 877–896. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Donohue, Mark, Tim Denham & Stephen Oppenheimer. 2012. New methodologies for historical linguistics? Calibrating a lexicon-based methodology for diffusion vs. subgrouping. *Diachronica* 29. 505–522.

Donohue, Mark, Simon Musgrave, Bronwen Whiting & Søren Wichmann. 2011. Typological feature analysis models linguistic geography. *Language* 87. 369–383.

Donohue, Mark & Søren Wichmann (eds.). 2008. *The typology of semantic alignment*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Dryer, Matthew S. & Martin Haspelmath (eds.). 2013. *The world atlas of language structures online*. Leipzig: Max-Planck-Institut für evolutionäre Anthropologie. http://wals.info

Du Bois, John W. 1985. Competing motivations. In John Haiman (ed.), *Iconicity in syntax*, 343–366. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Dunn, Michael, Robert Foley, Stephen C. Levinson, Ger Reesink & Angela Terrill. 2007. Statistical reasoning in the evaluation of typological diversity in Island Melanesia. *Oceanic Linguistics* 46. 388–403.

Dunn, Michael, Stephen C. Levinson, Eva Lindström, Ger Reesink & Angela Terrill. 2008. Structural phylogeny in historical linguistics: Methodological explorations applied in Island Melanesia. *Language* 84. 710–759.

Filimonova, Elena. 2005. The noun phrase hierarchy and relational marking: Problems and counterevidence. *Linguistic Typology* 9. 77–113.

Finkel, Raphael & Gregory Stump. 2007. Principal parts and morphological typology. *Morphology* 17. 39–75.

Guerrero, Lilian. 2004. *The syntax-semantic interface in Yaqui complex sentences: A Role and Reference Grammar analysis*. Buffalo: State University of New York at Buffalo doctoral dissertation.

Haspelmath, Martin. 2000. The relevance of extravagance: A reply to Bart Geurts. *Linguistics* 38. 789–798.

Haspelmath, Martin. 2006. Against markedness (and what to replace it with). *Journal of Linguistics* 42. 25–70.

Haspelmath, Martin. 2010. Comparative concepts and descriptive categories in cross-linguistic studies. *Language* 86. 663–687.

Haspelmath, Martin. 2015. Defining vs. diagnosing linguistic categories: A case study of clitic phenomena. In Joanna Błaszczak, Dorota Klimek-Jankowska & Krzysztof Migdalski (eds.), *How categorical are categories?* 273–304. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.

Haspelmath, Martin, Matthew Dryer, David Gil & Bernard Comrie (eds.). 2005. *The world atlas of language structures*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Haspelmath, Martin, Ekkehard König, Wulf Oesterreicher & Wolfgang Raible (eds.). 2001. *Language typology and language universals: An international handbook*. 2 vols. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Hawkins, John A. 2004. *Efficiency and complexity in grammars*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hawkins, John A. 2014. *Cross-linguistic variation and efficiency*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hieber, Daniel W. 2013. On linguistics, linguists, and our times: A linguist's personal narrative reviewed. *Linguistic Typology* 17. 291–321.

Holman, Eric W., Cecil H. Brown, Søren Wichmann, André Müller, Viveka Velupillai, Harald Hammarström, Sebastian Sauppe, Hagen Jung, Dik Bakker, Pamela Brown, Oleg Belyaev, Matthias Urban, Robert Mailhammer, Johann-Mattis List & Dmitry Egorov. 2011. Automated dating of the world's language families based on lexical similarity. *Current Anthropology* 52. 841–875.

Holman, Eric W., Søren Wichmann, Cecil H. Brown, Viveka Velupillai, André Müller & Dik Bakker. 2008. Explorations in automated language classification. *Folia Linguistica* 42. 331–354.

Keenan, Edward L. & Bernard Comrie. 1977. Noun phrase accessibility and Universal Grammar. *Linguistic Inquiry* 8. 63–99.

Kibrik, Aleksandr E. 1979. Canonical ergativity and Daghestan languages. In Frans Plank (ed.), *Ergativity: Towards a theory of grammatical relations*, 61–77. London: Academic Press.

Kibrik, Aleksandr E. 1985. Toward a typology of ergativity. In Johanna Nichols & Anthony Woodbury (eds.), *Grammar inside and outside the clause: Approaches to theory from the field*, 176–191. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kibrik, Aleksandr E. 1987. Constructions with clause actants in Daghestanian languages. In R. M. W. Dixon (ed.), *Studies in ergativity*, 133–178. Amsterdam: North-Holland.

Kibrik, Aleksandr E. 1991. Organising principles for nominal paradigms in Daghestanian languages: Comparative and typological observations. In Frans Plank (ed.), *Paradigms: The economy of inflection*, 255–274. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Kibrik, Aleksandr E. 1997. Beyond subject and object: Towards a comprehensive relational typology. *Linguistic Typology* 1. 279–346.

Kibrik, Aleksandr E. 1998. Does intragenetic typology make sense? In Winfried Boeder, Christoph Schroeder, Karl Heinz Wagner & Wolfgang Wildgen (eds.), *Sprache im Raum und Zeit: In memoriam Johannes Bechert*, Vol. 2: *Beiträge zur empirischen Sprachwissenschaft*, 61–68. Tübingen: Narr.

Kibrik, Andrej A. 2011. *Reference in discourse*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Klein, Wolfgang. 1994. *Time in language*. London: Routledge.

König, Christa. 2006. Marked nominative in Africa. *Studies in Language* 30. 705–782.

König, Christa. 2009. Marked nominative. In Malchukov & Spencer (eds.) 2009, 535–548.

Koptjevskaja-Tamm, Maria & Henrik Liljegren. 2013. Language typology and syntactic description: A review article. *Linguistic Typology* 17. 107–156.

Kumakhov, Mukhadin & Karina Vamling. 2009. *Circassian clause structure*. Malmö: Malmö högskola. http://hdl.handle.net/2043/9338

Lander, Yury A. & Natalia Tyshkevich. 2015. True, liminal and fake prototypes in syntactic typology. In Ekaterina A. Ljutikova, Anton V. Cimmerling & Maria B. Konošenko (eds.), *Tipologija morfosintaksičeskix parametrov*, Vol. 2, 185–199. Moskva: Moskovskij pedagogičeskij gosudarstvennyj universitet. http://mggu-sh.ru/sites/default/files/lander_tyshkevich.pdf

Lupyan, Gary & Rick Dale. 2010. Language structure is partly determined by social structure. *PlosONE* 5(1). http://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0008559

Malchukov, Andrej L. 2006. Transitivity parameters and transitivity alternations: Considering co-variation. In Leonid I. Kulikov, Andrej L. Malchukov & Helen de Hoop (eds.), *Case, valency and transitivity*, 329–357. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Meščaninov, Ivan Ivanovič. 1945. *Členy predloženija i časti reči*. [Grammatical relations and parts-of-speech.] Moskva: Izdatel'stvo Akademii Nauk SSSR.

Meščaninov, Ivan Ivanovič. 1967. *Èrgativnaja konstrukcija v jazykax različnyx tipov*. [Ergative constructions in languages of different types.] Leningrad: Nauka.

Narrog, Heiko. 2005. On defining modality again. *Language Sciences* 27. 165–192.

Næss, Åshild. 2007. *Prototypical transitivity*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Nedjalkov, Vladimir P. & Georgij G. Sil'nickij. 1973. The typology of morphological and lexical causatives. In Ferenc Kiefer (ed.), *Trends in Soviet theoretical linguistics*, 1–32. Dordrecht: Reidel.

Nichols, Johanna. 2013. O pioneer! Kibrik and the growth of linguistic knowledge. *Linguistic Typology* 17. 519–521.

Nordlinger, Rachel. 2007. It's not what you do, it's the way that you do it: The role of formal theory in language description. Handout for invited plenary presentation given at the Australian Linguistics Society Conference, Adelaide, September 2007. http://languages-linguistics.unimelb.edu.au/sites/languages-linguistics.unimelb.edu.au/files/nordlinger-its-not-what-you-do.pdf

Nuyts, Jan. 2001. *Epistemic modality, language, and conceptualization: A cognitive-pragmatic perspective*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Nuyts, Jan. 2006. Modality: Overview and linguistic issues. In William Frawley (ed.), *The expression of modality*, 1–26. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Plank, Frans (no date). Introductory notes. In *Das grammatische Raritätenkabinett*. Konstanz: Universität Konstanz. http://typo.uni-konstanz.de/rara/intro/index.php?pt=1 (accessed 30 January 2016).

Plank, Frans. 2001. Typology by the end of the 18th century. In Sylvain Auroux, E. F. K. Koerner, Hans-Josef Niederehe & Kees Versteegh (eds.), *History of the language sciences: An international handbook on the evolution of the study of language from the beginnings to the present*, Vol. 2, 1399–1414. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Primus, Beatrice. 1999. *Cases and thematic roles: Ergative, accusative and active*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.

Reichenbach, Hans. 1947. *Elements of symbolic logic*. New York: Macmillan. Section 51 "The tenses of verbs" reprinted in Inderjeet Mani, James Pustejovsky & Robert Gaizauskas (eds.), *The language of time: A reader*, 71–78. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.

Saj, Sergej S. 2011. Review of R. M. W. Dixon, *Basic linguistic theory*, Vols. 1–2. *Voprosy jazykoznanija* 2011(1). 121–130.

Shopen, Timothy (ed.). 2007. *Language typology and syntactic description*. 2nd edn. 3 vols. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Silverstein, Michael. 1976. Hierarchy of features and ergativity. In R. M. W. Dixon (ed.), *Grammatical categories in Australian languages*, 112–171. Canberra: Australian Institute of Aboriginal Studies.

Song, Jae Jung. 2001. *Linguistic typology: Morphology and syntax*. Harlow: Pearson.

Stump, Gregory & Raphael A. Finkel 2013. *Morphological typology: From word to paradigm*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tatevosov, Sergei G. 2002. The parameter of actionality. *Linguistic Typology* 6. 317–401.

Testelets, Yakov G. 2001. Russian works on linguistic typology in the 1960–1990s. In Haspelmath et al. (eds.) 2001, 306–323.

Trudgill, Peter. 2011. *Sociolinguistic typology: Social determinants of linguistic complexity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

van der Auwera, Johan & Vladimir A. Plungian. 1998. Modality's semantic map. *Linguistic Typology* 2. 79–124.

Velupillai, Viveka. 2012. *An introduction to linguistic typology*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Wohlgemuth, Jan & Michael Cysouw (eds.). 2010. *Rethinking universals: How rarities affect linguistic theories*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Xrakovskij, Viktor S. (ed.). 1997. *Typology of iterative constructions*. München: Lincom Europa.

Xrakovskij, Viktor S. (ed.). 2001. *Typology of imperative constructions*. München: Lincom Europa.

Xrakovskij, Viktor S. (ed.). 2005. *Typology of conditional constructions*. München: Lincom Europa.

Xrakovskij, Viktor S. (ed.). 2009. *Tipologija taksisnyx konstrukcij*. [Typology of taxis constructions.] Moskva: Znak.

Xrakovskij, Viktor S. (ed.). 2012. *Typology of concessive constructions*. München: Lincom Europa.