

akup

ARBEITEN DES KÖLNER UNIVERSALIEN - PROJEKTS

Nr. 46

Christian Lehmann (ed.)

Twenty-four questions on linguistic
typology and a collection of answers

June 1982

© by the authors

Editor of the Series:
Prof. Dr. Hansjakob Seiler
UNITYP
Institut für Sprachwissenschaft
Universität
D-5000 Köln 41

CONTENTS

Preface	5
Questionnaire	7
Reactions to the questionnaire:	11
Robert Austerlitz	11
Johannes Bechert	13
László Dezső	15
Claude Hagège	16
Klaus Heger	21
Gustav Ineichen	28
Gilbert Lazard	29
Werner Lehfeldt	30
Christian Lehmann	32
Winfred P. Lehmann	42
Edith A. Moravcsik	43
Paolo Ramat	48
Karl Horst Schmidt	55
Bibliographic references	56

.....

P R E F A C E

At the end of last year, I designed an inquiry about the present state of linguistic typology in the form of a questionnaire. It was an attempt to cover the whole field by formulating the questions which seemed most relevant to it. This questionnaire is reproduced, without modifications, following this preface. In the first days of this year, it was sent to 33 linguists who I know are working in the field. The purpose was to form, on the basis of responses received, a picture of convergences and divergences among trends of present-day linguistic typology. The idea was also to get an objective basis for my report on "The present state of linguistic typology", to be delivered at the XIII. International Congress of Linguistics at Tokyo, 1982.

The echo to this enterprise was somewhat less than overwhelming, as far as the number of responses is concerned. Most of the addressees did not answer at all; some excused themselves. Those who did answer at least some of the questions had no objections to their answers being published in some such form as the present one. One of the contributors (a friend of mine) may not have meant his answers quite seriously; I nevertheless publish them here, being sure that he will defend them if necessary. I thank him, as well as all the others, for their cooperation.

I had to do some minor editing because some of the answers were not cast in the framework of the questionnaire but couched in the form of a letter. Since partial answers, especially bibliographic indications, had been encouraged (rather than no answer at all), I see no reason why they should be suppressed in this publication.

On receiving the answers, I was struck by the diversity of approaches and viewpoints represented in the field. The only question whose answers showed some significant convergence was no.4: at present no one appears to seriously believe in the possibility of a finite number of holistic language types. However, exactly this is the crucial point. If the an-

swer to this question could be positive or at least more optimistic, typologists would share a basis on which it would be possible to formulate a common ultimate goal for typological activities. Failing this, much that is going on within comparative linguistics, including universals research, figures under the catch-word 'typology', but is quite heterogeneous as to objective, theory, method and empirical scope. A superficial look at the history of the field shows that this has not always been so. Traditional European typology was the search for holistic language types. In the United States, this has really never been tried seriously. With the advent of universalistics, mainly through Greenberg 1963, American linguists began to use the term 'linguistic typology' as essentially synonymous with 'linguistic universals research'. They were led to this by Greenberg 1963 itself, which, under the heading 'universals of grammar', obviously establishes word order types. Greenberg, in his turn, was largely relying on R. Jakobson, who also does not make a clear-cut distinction between universalistics and typology. Since traditional European typology is by now fairly extinct, this terminology (or conception?) easily made its way into European linguistics, as evidenced by various of the present contributions.

It is my hope that this collection of statements will make clear to the reader what a variety of opinions can be held on issues which he might have thought to be straightforward, and that it will provoke some clarifying discussion. The reader is invited to answer the questions for himself or to send me his answers if he so chooses; I would certainly be grateful for it.

Cologne, 24.6.82

Christian Lehmann

Q U E S T I O N N A I R E

Cross-references between questions are meant to insure that your answers are mutually consistent. All questions except 5, 19 in part, and 20ff, are intended as theoretical questions; i.e. they ask not so much what is currently happening in linguistic typology, but which provisions linguistic theory should make, on the basis of available evidence.

1. What is a language universal?
2. What are the tasks and methods of linguistic typology?
3. What is the difference between linguistic typology and and universals research? (→ 1,11a)
4. A holistic language type comprises all linguistic levels from semantics to phonology. Is there (the possibility of) a finite set of holistic language types?
5. If 4 = yes: What empirical evidence is there for a finite number of holistic types?
6. If 4 = no: Is there (the possibility of) a finite set of morphosyntactic (grammatical) types?
7. If 4 = no and 6 = yes: How are semantics and phonology connected with such morphosyntactic types? (→ 12, 13)
- 8.-10. If 4 or 6 = yes:
 8. As to the substance, the constitutive element of a language type:
 - (a) Does the type center around a specific set of grammatical features which are basic to language structure (and to typology)?
 - (b) If a = yes: Which are these, and how is their special status justified? (→ 19)
 - (c) If a = no: What is the unifying factor / principle of the language type?
 9. What is the formal structure of a language type? Please comment on the notions of implication, clustering, equilibrium and hierarchical layering of properties.
 - 10.(a) Are language types disjunct or do they overlap?

10. (b) What is the relation between a language and a language type? Does every language belong to just one type, or to several types?
- (c) If types are disjunct: Please argue with W. von Humboldt ("Über die Verschiedenheiten des menschlichen Sprachbaues", §33) : "einer ... solchen Klassifikation, wo auch die gar nicht stammverwandten Sprachen nach allgemeinen Ähnlichkeiten ihres Baus zusammengestellt würden [i.e. a typological classification], widerstrebt, wenn man den Begriff genau nimmt und fordert, daß die zusammengestellten wirklich als Gattungen in allen wahrhaft charakteristischen Merkmalen einander ähnlich und von andern verschieden sein sollen, wie tiefer erörterte Natur der Sprache selbst. Die einzelnen Sprachen sind nicht als Gattungen, sondern als Individuen verschieden ... Das Individuum, als solches genommen, füllt aber allemal eine Klasse für sich."
- (d) If types are not disjunct: What is the difference between a language type and any empirically confirmable combination of properties?
11. If 4 and 6 = no:
- (a) How is linguistic typology distinct from general comparative (or universal) grammar? (→ 3)
- (b) How can we avoid typologizing on just any feature? How can the preferential status of certain grammatical properties in present-day typology be justified?
12. (a) Is there (the possibility of) a finite number of phonological types? (→ 7)
- (b) If a = yes: What are the criteria?
- (c) If a = no: Should phonological typology (as distinct from general comparative phonology) be pursued?
13. Can there be a semantic typology (distinct from syntactic and morphological typology)? What would it deal with? (→ 7)
14. Is there, within morphosyntactic typology, a genuine difference between form-oriented and content-oriented typology (as G. Klimov claims)?

15. (a) Is there any need for quantitative typology?
 (b) If a = yes: What must it contribute?
 (c) If a = no: → 10 a/d
16. (a) Can the typological perspective shed any light on language change? I.e. is there a necessity for a diachronic typology as distinct from general diachronic linguistics?
 (b) What is the use of typology in historical reconstruction?
17. What is the tertium comparationis for types (no matter whether in whole-system (holistic) or part-system typologies)? Is there any such thing as an *étalon* language (B. Uspensky)?
18. What are the explanatory principles for the limits of linguistic diversity and for typological clustering? How are they related to language universals?
19. Please comment on the actual merits and possible prospects of the following typologies currently promoted (→ 8b, 11b):
- fundamental relations (ergative, accusative, active (etc.?));
 - basic order (SOV, VSO etc.);
 - role and reference (subject-prominent, topic-prominent etc.);
 - morphological typology:
 - degree of fusion, degree of synthesis;
 - concentric vs. excentric construction (i.e., roughly, personal affixes vs. case affixes, T. Milewski);
 - other.
20. In which regards are the present questions biased; which significant aspects / problems of present-day linguistic typology have been overlooked?
21. Please indicate up to five of your recent publications which are most directly relevant to linguistic typology.
22. Please indicate up to five recent publications by other

researchers which have significantly advanced linguistic typology.

23. What are you currently working on within linguistic typology (topics(s), paper(s) in preparation)?
24. Which typological theme(s) do you plan to work on when your present work is finished?
25. Personal bibliography
26. Alien bibliography

REACTIONS TO THE QUESTIONNAIRE

ROBERT AUSTERLITZ

(New York)

1. Exploited deepest structure
2. Catalogue instances of 1.
3. Token vs. type.
4. Yes, theoretically; no, practically.
5. Substance is presumably finite.
8. (a) Yes.
(b) They vary from language to language.
9. Implication and clustering are relevant; equilibrium and hierarchical layering of properties are the same as implication.
10. (a) They overlap.
(b) It belongs to several types.
(c) The last two sentences of the quotation are inconsistent.
(d) None.
12. (a) Yes.
(b) Reasonable parameters.
13. Concepts.
14. Probably yes.
15. (a) Yes.
(b) Statistical confirmation of hypotheses.
16. It could help to set up pan-chronic laws (Jespersen).
17. ?
18. They lose power when they impede communication.
19. Fundamental relations: **yes**. Basic order: exhausted by now?
Role and reference: **yes**. Morphological typology: always useful.

20. None(?).

21. Austerlitz 1980.

22. See Australian Journal of Linguistics.

23. Areal semantic typology (→ 13).

JOHANNES BECHERT

(Bremen)

3. Es scheint mir schwierig zu sein, Sprachtypologie und Universalienforschung zu unterscheiden. Die interessanteren (Greenberg-)Universalien beispielsweise handeln nicht von universellen Eigenschaften der natürlichen Sprachen, sondern von universellen Implikationen/Äquivalenzen/statistischen Korrelationen zwischen nicht-universellen Spracheigenschaften. Nicht-universelle Spracheigenschaften wiederum gehören zum Gegenstandsbereich der Sprachtypologie.
- 16.(a) Gelegentlich werden Sprachtypologie, Areallinguistik und historisch-vergleichende Sprachwissenschaft in Parallele gebracht. Ein gemeinsames Merkmal der Sprachtypologie und der Areallinguistik scheint mir darin zu bestehen, daß sie - gemessen an dem Entfaltungsgrad der historisch-vergleichenden Sprachwissenschaft - eine Kümmerexistenz führen. Vielleicht kann man sie am besten verstehen als zwei Kollektionen von Gesichtspunkten historischer Sprachforschung, die in der sogenannten historisch-vergleichenden Sprachwissenschaft vernachlässigt werden. Wenn die historisch-vergleichend arbeitenden Kollegen sich entschließen könnten, ihren theoretisch-methodologischen Horizont zu erweitern, würden sich Sprachtypologie und Areallinguistik als separate Disziplinen erübrigen, und es käme eine historische Sprachforschung zustande, die zum erstenmal diesen Namen wirklich verdienen würde. Die Aufnahme areallinguistischer Gesichtspunkte in das Programm der historisch-vergleichenden Sprachforschung könnte zu einer angemessenen Berücksichtigung der Rolle des Sprachkontaktes in der Sprachgeschichte führen, wäre also in erster Linie eine immanente Vervollständigung des - gegenwärtig sehr lückenhaften - Begriffs von Geschichte in der historisch-vergleichenden Sprachwissenschaft. Die Aufnahme sprachtypologischer Gesichtspunkte würde die Sprachgeschichtsforschung mit der theoretischen

Linguistik in Verbindung bringen. Sie könnte dazu führen, daß man in den Ergebnissen der historisch - vergleichenden Sprachwissenschaft die theoretische Bedeutung entdeckt.

Sprachtypologie in ihrem gegenwärtigen Zustand ist eine Erinnerung daran, daß die Spaltung der Sprachwissenschaft in eine historische und eine theoretische Disziplin (letztere mit vielen Unterdisziplinen) überbrückt werden könnte. Im Kontext jeder einzelnen der beiden Teildisziplinen ist sie sperrig; darin besteht zur Zeit wohl ihr Hauptverdienst.

21. Da ich nicht genau weiß, was Sprachtypologie ist, fällt es mir auch schwer, einschlägige Arbeiten von mir oder anderen zu nennen. In die Rubrik 'Typologie' könnte man vielleicht einordnen:

Bechert 1976, 1977a, 1977b, 1979.

22. Zu den Greenberg-Universalien über Wortstellung möchte ich hinweisen auf:

Hawkins 1979, 1980.

23. Zur Zeit arbeite ich über areallinguistische Probleme.

LÁSZLÓ DEZSŐ

(Debrecen)

On the state of the art in typology

I am looking at typology from the point of view of its integration and possible application in the description and comparison of languages. Typology is a more or less autonomous branch of linguistics; here, I am going to concentrate on its specific features. My approach can be characterized as "functional", "structural" and "operational" from the point of view of methodology. My views are in constant change: the role of function is growing. This results from the impact of the accumulation of substantive generalizations. According to them the universal functions of languages, like communicative organization, determination and actualizations, are expressed by formal means relevant to the analysis according to types. I think that the development of the functional aspect and the existence of an enormous empirical base of morphosyntax will give new impetus to the study of the structural, especially paradigmatic component in a unified framework connecting universal and typological aspects. At present, we are far from this because the fundamental questions of typology are formulated and answered in different ways, and behind this there are differences in general or specific theories, in the empirical base and the substantive foundations underlying the views of typologists working according to their research programs often unconnected with those of others. The discussion will show how great the differences are and will call our attention to aspects and views emerging from the research of others.

21. Dezső 1974, 1978, 1979, 1980, 1981.

23. Dezső, László 1982, Typološka karakteristika hrvatsko-srpske gramatike u sporedivanju sa mađarskom/ A typological characterization of Croato-Serbian grammar contrasted with Hungarian. Budapest.

id. 1983, Tipologičeskaja karakteristika rusškoj grammatiki v sravnenii s vengerskom/ A typological characterization of Russian grammar contrasted with Hungarian. Budapest.

CLAUDE HAGEÈGE

(Paris)

The state of the art in language typology

1. A language universal is, in fact, a general tendency, not a defining (hence universal) feature. The range of application of this tendency is numerically evaluated on a sample of as many and as diverse languages as possible, and those which do not have it, provided they do not exceed 25%, are submitted to an inquiry in order to determine the (generally external) causes of this absence.
2. I view linguistic typology as the step which comes, logically as well as chronologically, after the search for language universals. If a general tendency is illustrated by less than 75% of the examined sample, then the observed types of deviations will be viewed as corresponding to types of languages in the domain they belong in (phonology, morphosyntax or semantics and their numerous sub-chapters).
3. See 2.
4. No. A language belongs to type X as far as its phonology is concerned and to type Y as far as its syntax is concerned. However, it is not to be ruled out that at the end of the establishing of language types one might have to propose abstract (non-existing in reality) language types in relation to which existing languages could be characterized.
6. Yes.
7. I do not see any necessary connection between morphosyntactic types and phonology, and I do not think that languages provide us with such a thing. As for the connection of semantics to these types, it depends on how you define it. I, for one, do not think this connection can be seen in strict synchrony, but only in diachrony (see 13).
- 10.(c) Leaving away questions 8 and 9 since I do not believe in holistic language types as attested objects, I refer to

my answer to question 4.

- (c) To the extent I understand it, I would not be against Humboldt's view, although I find it too strict. It is true that if we consider a language in its totality, no single other language will share all its features, and that as an individuum, the total class of features is unique to it, to say nothing of the way they are structurally related (hence the hostility of classical European and, even more, American, structuralism to this branch of the search for universals which is called language typology (see answer to question 2)). However, linguists should not aim at establishing holistic language types, to which Humboldt's criticism rightly applies. What language typology in fact seeks are sets of features within autonomous linguistic levels, not a complete language construct.

11. I refer to 2 for 11a, and to

- (b) I reply this: the only justification of the preferential status of certain grammatical properties in contemporary typology is quite practical: Western linguists are naturally led to be surprised by, and accordingly give more attention to, features they are not familiar with in their native languages. It is precisely the task of the search for universals as the preliminary step to language typology (see answer to question 2) to decide which of the favoured features will be retained as typologically relevant.

12. (c) If "phonological" means (traditional English sense) "belonging to historical phonetics", then there are general tendencies in the evolution of sound systems (paradigmatics) and of sound associations (syntagmatics). If it means the same as "phonemics", then it is an important field for typology: many features of consonant, vowel, accent and tone nature and function can serve to establish types: not holistic types (selbstverständlich), not even "phonological types", but types in relation to a definite property within phonemics (see chapter 1 of

Hagège 1982 and Hagège et Haudricourt 1978).

13. The type of semantic typology which I think deserves to be studied does not belong to synchrony. It is very important to establish, on the basis of a broad inquiry in what is known of the history of various languages, the general laws of the evolution which freezes semantic (i.e. obligatory) features. This represents the contribution of language typology to the solution of an important (and very fashionable) problem: the relationship of syntax and semantics. Such a relationship is a dynamic, not a static one.
14. The reason why I do not think so is that the very notion of morphosyntax corresponds to a field precisely defined as the one which studies the relationship between form (morpho-) and a more or less frozen (dynamically static!) type of content (i.e. -syntax).
15. Definitely yes. The proportion of languages with a definite feature as opposed to those with another, related, feature and to those lacking this feature, etc. constitutes a fundamental information on the way human languages function, i.e. on what we want to know better when we do typological research.
16. (a) and (b) The typological perspective can and must shed light on language change. However, the "i.e." in this question seems inadequate, since typological perspective means the contribution that our knowledge of the most widespread types of language (from the phonological, syntactic, etc. viewpoints) brings to the establishment of what direction of change are the likeliest ones in little documented cases, whereas diachronic typology is (see answer to question 13 as far as syntax/semantics is concerned) the study of the general laws of the evolution of linguistic systems. I do not know what the scope of "general diachronic linguistics" is. Who does it and who distinguishes it from diachronic typology?
17. See 4.
18. The universal translatability; beneath it, the common de-

fining features of human beings, both physically and socioculturally. These, and probably others, in implication relationships with them, are the justification for the inquiry on language universals.

19. - Fundamental relations: rich prospect, provided one gives up the TG-biased idea that most so-called ergative languages except Dyirbal are only superficially ergative(!). Language typology precisely deals with "surface", if anything.
- Basic order: cannot teach us interesting facts as long as one keeps to formulas which mix up categories (V) and functions (S, O); are manipulated without any serious attempt at defining what a subject, an object, a verb are for every new language; do not allow one to decide what word order is more basic when the language presents various word orders according to aspect (e.g. Lendu, Zaire), topic (e.g. Chinese, Finnish), autonomy of clause (subordination) (e.g. Kru languages, West-Africa). Furthermore, correlations between types of orders are not sufficient. An attempt must be made at a historical explanation: for instance, a language with both prepositions and postpositions, such as Chinese, has prepositions "because" they come from verbal predicates, which have long been before their complement (S P O), and it has postpositions "because" they come from determined nouns, which have long followed their determining noun. As for how one and the same language can have the two contradictory orders S-P-O and determining Noun - determined Noun, this must be explained by external causes (see, on all that, Hagège 1975).
 - Role and reference: not clear to me (see Hagège 1978).
 - Morphological typology: in fact the most explored field, from the Schlegels (1808-1818) to Milewski. Not without reason, since it is by their morphology that languages differ most. This field has already been studied enough for linguists to rather tackle other fields.
 - Other: panchronic phonology (see Hagège and Haudricourt 1978), semantic typology of minimal utterances (see Hagège 1980 and 1981).

20. See 19.
21. Hagège 1975, 1978, 1981, 1982, Hagège et Haudricourt 1978.
22. Greenberg 1963, Li (ed.) 1976, Ramat (ed.) 1976, Seiler(ed.) 1978, Tesnière 1959. The last mentioned has been largely ignored, but utilized, no matter whether they cite it or not, by the others.
23. The organization of linguistic utterances. See:
Hagège, Claude 1980, "Three viewpoints on the organization of linguistic utterances", The 6th LACUS Forum, Columbia:68-77.
24. Semantic typology: its relationship with syntactic typology; paradigmatic organization of lexicons across languages; types of contributions of context to meaning across languages.

KLAUS HEGER

(Heidelberg)

1. Den Terminus Universale vermeide ich tunlichst, denn die viel zitierten, dankenswerterweise durch "language universals" ersetzten "linguistischen Universalien" sind
 - a) entweder sprachwissenschaftliche Universalien, die ihrerseits
 - aa) Disziplin-bezogene Universalien, d.h. für jede Subdisziplin der Sprachwissenschaft als verbindlich anzusehende Prinzipien der Theoriebildung (= Erarbeitung des einer jeweiligen speziellen Fragestellung angemessenen theoretischen Instrumentariums), über die - abgesehen von allgemein-wissenschaftstheoretischen Prinzipien - mit Aussicht auf allgemeine Zustimmung zu sprechen angesichts der divergierenden Ansichten über Sprachwissenschaft kaum möglich sein dürfte,
 - ab) und/oder Objekt-bezogene Universalien, d.h. innerhalb einer gegebenen Subdisziplin der Sprachwissenschaft als auf jede beliebige Einzelsprache und/oder auf "Sprache" (in einem wie auch immer zu verstehenden absoluten Singular) anwendbare und als verbindlich anerkannte Prinzipien der Theoriebildung, die jeder Sprachwissenschaftler - im Extremfall als einziger Repräsentant einer ausschließlich durch ihn im Moment gerade repräsentierten Subdisziplin - zumindest implizit als selbstverständlich gegeben unterstellt, sein können,
 - b) oder sprachliche Universalien, die ihrerseits
 - ba) entweder einzelnsprachliche Universalien, d.h. in jeder möglichen Einzelsprache anzutreffende Entitäten und als solche
 - baa) entweder definitorische Universalien, d.h. durch die zugrundegelegte Definition notwendige Universalien von dem gleichen trivialen Aussagewert wie die Feststellung, daß alle Vierecke vier Ecken haben,

- bab) oder statistische Universalien, d.h. durch entsprechende Extrapolationen als in jeder möglichen Einzelsprache als mit hoher Wahrscheinlichkeit (aber eben nicht notwendigerweise) zu erwarten erwiesene Entitäten, also gerade keine Universalien,
- bb) oder außereinzelsprachliche Universalien, d.h. zur Abbildung von Eigenschaften jeder möglichen Einzelsprache geeignete nicht-außersprachliche Entitäten (cf. Heger 1981a § 2.3.),
sein können;
- daß ich trotz bb) beim Reden über meine "noematischen Kategorien" den Terminus Universale weitestgehend vermeide, erfolgt angesichts der Gefahr von Verwechslungen mit den Fällen aa), ab), baa) und bab).
2. Den Terminus Typologie gebrauche ich selten, da ich mir zu viele verschiedene Dinge unter ihm vorstellen kann; zu unterscheiden ist mindestens zwischen
- a) Typologie als unmittelbarer Zielsetzung, die den Zweck verfolgen kann,
- aa) entweder die Verbreitung eines gegebenen Merkmals zu eruieren
- ab) oder mittels der durch aa) eruierten Verbreitung eines Merkmals zur Klassifizierung
- aba) von Einzelsprachen
- abb) und/oder von wie auch immer abgegrenzten Teilbereichen von Einzelsprachen zu gelangen,
- b) und Typologie als Zwischenschritt auf dem Weg zu mittelbaren Zielen wie beispielsweise
- ba) denjenigen der auf aa) aufbauenden Bestimmung von "Sprachbünden" (z.B. Balkanphilologie)
- bb) oder denjenigen der auf aba) aufbauenden und die weiteren Zwischenschritte der komparativen und der diachronischen Rekonstruktion (cf. noch unten zu Frage 16) einschließenden Bestimmung genetischer Sprachbeziehungen (cf. Heger 1981a § 3.1.)

- bc) oder denjenigen der auf abb) aufbauenden Bestimmung verschiedener Teilbereiche innerhalb einer gegebenen Einzelsprache (cf. in Heger 1982 die Illustration der Schemata 8, 10, 13, und 15 mit deutschen Beispielen).
3. Wenn "universals reseach" im Sinne von 1.bb) und "linguistic typology" im Sinne einer der in 2. eröffneten Möglichkeiten verstanden wird, dann - unter Bezugnahme auf die übrigen in 1. genannten Möglichkeiten: nur dann - läßt sich ihr Verhältnis als dasjenige von noematischer Systematik und onomasiologischer Abbildung bestimmen (cf. Heger 1981b).
 4. Das in Heger 1982 als Typologisierungskriterium benutzte Merkmal verschiedener Bezeichnungstypen für Aktantenfunktionen zeigt, daß es lediglich einer hinreichenden Spezifizierung derartiger Merkmale bedarf, um den Übergang zwischen den ad Frage Nr. 2 unterschiedenen Fällen aba) und abb) als Kontinuum zu erweisen; ich kann Frage Nr. 4 daher nur mit einem uneingeschränkten "nein" beantworten.
 6. Da ich lediglich - in Anlehnung an Martinets double articulation - zwischen Distingemen als Gegenstandsbereich von (je nach materieller Substanz) Phonologie, Graphematik und Taktematik einerseits und Signemen als Gegenstandsbereich der Semantik andererseits, nicht jedoch zwischen "Morphosyntax" und "Semantik" (¿=Lexikologie?) oder gar zwischen "Syntax", "Semantik" und "Pragmatik" (cf. Heger 1976, § 1.4.1) zu unterscheiden vermag, ist diese Frage für mich nur für den Gesamtbereich dessen, was ich Semantik nenne, beantwortbar; aus den gleichen Gründen wie ad Frage Nr.4 lautet meine Antwort "nein".
 10. Entfällt (trotzdem zu
 - (c): auch ohne mich unbedingt in jeder Hinsicht in eine spezifische Humboldt-Tradition stellen zu wollen, finde ich dieses Zitat überaus sympathisch.
 - 11.(a) Wenn "general comparative (or universal) grammar" zu verstehen ist als
 - a) "universals research", dann cf. ad Frage Nr.3,

- b) komparative Sprachwissenschaft (in einem gemäß Heger 1981b §§ 0.1. und 1. zu extrapolierenden Sinn, dann schließt sie definitionsgemäß eine L-komparative Sprachwissenschaft, damit eine L-komparative Semantik und damit sowohl eine noematische Systematik (= "universals research" gemäß ad Frage Nr.3) als auch eine onomasiologische Abbildung (= "linguistic typology" gemäß ad Frage Nr.3) als Subdisziplinen in sich ein,
- c) irgendetwas anderes, dann wäre dieses andere erst zu definieren.
- 11.(b) Da ich mir gemäß ad Frage Nr.2 überaus vielfältige primäre und sekundäre Aufgabenstellungen der Typologie vorstellen kann, und da der Nutzen eines Merkmals als Typologisierungskriterium von der jeweiligen Aufgabenstellung abhängt, kann ich mir kein Merkmal vorstellen, dessen Ausschluß aus grundsätzlich jeder Betrachtung a priori gerechtfertigt werden könnte.
- 12.(a) Angesichts der relativen Überschaubarkeit von Phonemsystemen kann ich hier im Gegensatz zu Frage Nr.6 nicht mit der gleichen Sicherheit antworten, halte aber auch hier bis zum Nachweis des Gegenteils ein "nein" für angemessener.
- (c) Warum nicht? (Zumindest, um den "Nachweis des Gegenteils" gemäß ad Frage Nr.12a zu führen).
13. Gemäß ad Frage Nr.6 müßte ich hier wiederholen, daß ich nicht weiß, was der Unterschied zwischen "semantisch" und "syntaktisch/morphologisch" ist; sollte damit gemeint sein, was ich als lexematisch und grammematisch einander gegenüberstelle, dann lautet meine Antwort selbstverständlich "ja" - allein schon deswegen, weil ein und derselben noematischen Kategorie einmal eine lexematische und ein anderes Mal eine grammematische Bezeichnung entsprechen kann; aus eben diesem Grunde aber wäre es auch abwegig, die Gegenstandsbereiche von "lexematischer" und "grammematischer" Typologie voneinander trennen zu wollen.
14. Wenn "form : content" zu verstehen ist als
- a) "form : substance" (Hjelmslev), dann "nein";

- b) "expression : content" (Hjelmslev) = "signifiant : signifié (Saussure), dann würde ich die weitere Übersetzung in "Distingem : Signem" (cf. Heger 1976 § 2.3.1.1.) vorschlagen, auf ihrer Grundlage Frage Nr. 14 mit "ja" beantworten und - wie zumindest implizit schon ad Fragen Nr. 6 und 12 - entsprechend zwischen einer semantischen und einer Distingem-bezogenen (phonologischen, graphematischen, taktematischen etc.) Typologie unterscheiden.
15. (a) Analog zu Frage Nr.11b kann ich mir hier durchaus Aufgabenstellungen der Typologie vorstellen, die eine affirmative Antwort rechtfertigen.
- (b) Die Beantwortung dieser Frage hängt von der jeweiligen Aufgabenstellung ab.
16. (a) Gemäß dem ad Frage Nr.2 unter bb) Gesagten lautet meine Antwort zumindest für denjenigen Fall "ja", in dem die Typologie Zwischenschritt auf dem Weg zu einer diachronischen Rekonstruktion ist.
- (b) Da ich vorziehe, zwischen diachronischer (Bezugsetzung der komparativ rekonstruierten Sprachsysteme auf die Dimension Zeit) und historischer (zusätzliche Bezugsetzung auf die historischen Benutzer komparativ rekonstruierter und diachronisch geordneter Sprachsysteme) Rekonstruktion zu unterscheiden, unterscheide ich auch **zwischen**
- a) der von mir gemäß ad Fragen 2 (sub bb)) und 16a zu bejahenden Möglichkeit eines Nutzens der Typologie für die diachronische Rekonstruktion, und
- b) der von mir zu verneinenden Möglichkeit eines (zusätzlichen) Nutzens der Typologie für die historische Rekonstruktion.
17. Gemäß der ad Frage Nr.14 b) getroffenen Unterscheidung im Fall
- a) einer Distingem-bezogenen Typologie: z.B. Systeme phonetisch definierter potentieller Phonem-Oppositionen,
- b) einer semantischen Typologie: noematische Teilsysteme (cf. Heger 1981b).

18. Eine Beantwortung dieser Frage in ihrer generischen Form würde mir einen jedenfalls für mich nicht mehr einlösba-
ren Anspruch zu implizieren scheinen; als Beispiel für ei-
ne Beantwortung in bestimmten Einzelfällen ließe sich die
oft beobachtete Affinität von Kausal-Funktion und Themazi-
tät zitieren, die ich bis zum Nachweis des Gegenteils als
charakteristisches Merkmal primär weder bestimmter Einzel-
sprachen noch bestimmter Konstruktionstypen, sondern einer
bestimmten - nämlich narrativen - Textsorte einstuft.
19. a) Im speziellen Sinn einer Bezugnahme auf die Fragen 8b
und 11b (cf. dort) entfällt eine Beantwortung dieser
Frage.
b) Generell dürfte gelten, daß es eine unumgänglich not-
wendige Voraussetzung jeder Typologisierung ist, daß
die von ihr als Kriterien benutzten Merkmale hinrei-
chend wohl definiert sind; diese Voraussetzung scheint
mir beispielsweise
ba) im Fall der Aktantenfunktionen (cf. Heger 1982) oder
in dem der Verbindung personal-deiktischer und quan-
titativer Kategorien (cf. Heger 1980) gegeben zu sein.
bb) überall dort hingegen zu fehlen, wo mit dem Terminus
"Subjekt" operiert wird.
20. Eine grundsätzlich interessante und hinsichtlich zu erwar-
tender Antworten amüsante zusätzliche Frage hätte der Ein-
ordnung der Ansichten über Sprachtypologie in allgemeinere
wissenschaftstheoretische und/oder philosophische (aller-
dings nicht in dem leicht als trivialisierend mißzuversteh-
enden Sinn von englisch 'philosophy') Zusammenhänge gelten
und zu letzteren als 'multiple choice' Namen wie Hegel,
Marx, Bergson und Wittgenstein (alle vier nicht ohne bos-
hafte Hintergedanken und mit der potentiellen Antwort, daß
ich ohnedies nicht verstehe, wieso nach Kant noch so etwas
hat geschrieben werden können) anbieten können...
21. Heger 1976, 1980, 1981a, 1981b, 1982.
22. Eine Antwort auf diese Frage an eine UNITYP-Adresse zu rich-
ten, hieße, Eulen nach Athen tragen!

23. Zusätzlich zu ad Frage Nr.21 sind im Druck:

Heger, Klaus, "Nominativ - Subjekt - Thema". Festschrift H. Stimm. Tübingen.

id. "'Il la lui a donnée, à Jean, son père, sa moto'- neue Überlegungen zu einem alten Beispiel". Festschrift J. Hubschmid. Bern.

24. Die Beantwortung dieser Frage unterbleibt mangels hinreichender prophetischer Fähigkeiten.

GUSTAV INEICHEN

(Göttingen)

21. Ineichen 1979, 1981, 1982a, 1982b.

GILBERT LAZARD

(Paris)

La typologie, comme la recherche des universaux, a pour but de contribuer à la connaissance fondamentale du langage en décelant dans les langues entre des faits apparemment hétérogènes des liaisons résultant de la nature même de l'activité linguistique.

Les groupements typologiques de langues (types) peuvent s'appuyer ou prétendre s'appuyer sur de vastes ensembles de faits intéressant la totalité de la structure linguistique (typologie "totale") ou sur des ensembles plus restraints (typologie "partielle") ou sur des faits isolés (typologie "élémentaire").

L'expérience montre qu'on ne trouve pas de "solidarités" entre les faits linguistiques, mais dans le meilleur des cas un plus ou moins haut degré de corrélation. D'autre part les typologies globales (ex.: langues isolantes/agglutinantes/flexionnelles/polysynthétiques, ou: accusatives/ergatives/"actives") sont peu convaincantes parce que fondées sur d'excessives simplifications. Plus fécondes sont les typologies partielles, surtout si elles considèrent les types comme des choix faits dans des cadres démontrés universaux (ex.: projet de Cologne). Les typologies élémentaires sont elles-mêmes inaptes à servir les buts de la méthode, mais, aidées par l'intuition et la chance, elles peuvent être le point de départ de découvertes de corrélations.

WERNER LEHFELDT

(Konstanz)

2. Die Frage nach den Aufgaben der Sprachtypologie möchte ich unter Hinweis auf Altmann/Lehfeldt 1973:15 beantworten, wo zwei Aufgaben genannt werden, nämlich a) die Sprachklassifikation, d.h. der Aufbau eines Ordnungssystems für die natürlichen Sprachen aufgrund ihrer globalen Ähnlichkeit, und b) die Aufdeckung des Konstruktionsmechanismus der Sprachen, d.h. der Aufbau eines Beziehungssystems, eines "Netzes", an dem man nicht allein die offensichtlichen, kategorischen, sondern auch die latenten Mechanismen der Sprache ablesen kann. An dieser Bestimmung halte ich für mich nach wie vor fest.

Was die Beschäftigung mit konkreten sprachtypologischen Untersuchungen betrifft, die als Versuch gewertet werden können (oder wollen!), die beiden genannten Aufgaben zu erfüllen, so kann ich für mich eine "phonologische" und eine "morphologische" Phase unterscheiden. Alles, was Herrn Altmann und mir an Methoden zum Vergleich phonologischer Systeme eingefallen ist, findet sich in Altmann/Lehfeldt 1980 zusammengefaßt und in systematischem Zusammenhang dargestellt.

21. Lehfeldt 1977, 1979, 1980.

23. Über die "morphologische" Phase, die noch andauert, ist folgendes zu sagen: Ich beschäftige mich mit der Erarbeitung von analytischen und deskriptiven Methoden, die es ermöglichen, morphologische Teilsysteme von Sprachen ganzheitlich-numerisch unter verschiedenen Gesichtspunkten zu charakterisieren und somit vergleichbar zu machen. Diese Beschäftigung ist der oben genannten Aufgabe a) zuzurechnen. Einige Mitarbeiter von mir und ich arbeiten ferner seit längerem daran, die erwähnten Methoden auf den Vergleich der slavischen Sprachen anzuwenden. Die Untersuchungen, die zu diesem Thema bereits veröffentlicht worden sind, finden Sie in der beiliegenden Bibliographie aufgeführt. Im Moment werden Vorbereitungen getroffen, die noch fehlenden

slavischen Sprachen in den ersten vollständigen Teilvergleich einzubeziehen. Selbstverständlich bin ich daran interessiert, die Brauchbarkeit und Tragfähigkeit meines Ansatzes auch außerhalb des Bereiches der Slavia zu prüfen bzw. überprüft zu sehen. Der erste und nach meiner Meinung sehr interessante Anlauf in dieser Richtung ist von dem Kollegen Peter Raster (1980) unternommen worden.

CHRISTIAN LEHMANN

(Cologne)

1. A language universal is something any human being does when engaged in language activity; it is an invariant of language activity (cf. Lehmann, Ch. 1981:85). As such, it provides the common denominator for a range of law-governed variation of structural properties within a certain 'dimension' (H. Seiler) or 'functional domain' (T. Givón). Any statement that expresses a connection between structural properties present within one language system (e.g. the implicative 'universals' of Greenberg 1963) is not a universal but a typological law.
2. The primary task of linguistic typology is the conceptualization of linguistic diversity within a minimum number of linguistic types. A linguistic type is instantiated by a set of law-governed relationships ('clusterings') among a set of structural properties, and it is constituted by the abstract organizational principles which account for these connections. Therefore typology must discover what it is that holds a language system together, by looking for correlations among properties which vary on certain parameters. A secondary task, or application, of typology is the classification of languages on a structural basis (see, however, 10c).

The principal method of linguistic typology is inductive: the comparison of as many languages as possible with respect to two or more structural parameters. By gradually enlarging the scope of the analysis, more and more subsystems are related to each other, until one arrives at a comprehensive language typology. The deductive method will not lead to specific empirical results, but provide the general framework for typological theory.

3. Linguistic typology and universalistics are the two principal subdisciplines of general comparative linguistics. Typology establishes linguistic types as defined in 8 and 9; universalistics establishes language universals as defined in 1. They are complementary and presuppose each other.

4. I agree with E. Moravcsik that if the type is required to be predictive, the answer is 'no'. If the type allows for a certain amount of variation considered irrelevant to its essence, there is a remote chance that each language may be related to one of a finite number of sufficiently abstract holistic types. If this did not turn out to be so in the long run, the dictum according to which every language is a "système où tout se tient" would be false. (cf. P. Ramat on this point).

5. There is presently no such evidence. On the contrary, we have come to know a fair number of cases where a connection between structural features which one might have considered well-motivated turned out not to be adhered to by a minority of languages (for instance, 'If a language has prenominal relative clauses, its basic order is SOV' is falsified by Chinese). I regret having to agree with G. Lazard that linguistic experience shows absence of solidarity in a great many cases which one would have thought to be good candidates. However, this may be a fault of our method, of our looking for correlations of the wrong sort, or in the wrong places. Such failures therefore cannot prove that a language is not an integrated system. Moreover, precisely those connections which transcend the global morphosyntactic type, namely those between phonology, morphosyntax and semantics, have been too little investigated to justify resignation.

6. The answer will be more positive than that to 4 and 5 if it can be shown that phonology, morphosyntax and semantics are largely independent, typologically disconnected parts of the language system, as C. Hagege thinks. Since the subject matter of morphosyntax is more homogeneous than that of grammar (which comprises the three components mentioned), a positive answer to 6 appears more plausible than one to 4. Cf. also 9.

8. (a) There is no set of grammatical features which is basic to language structure and, therefore, to typology. In particular, none of the features mentioned in question 19 have been shown to be central to the language type (or the morphosyntactic type). The present unsatisfac-

tory state of linguistic typology results, to a large extent, from the wide-spread acceptance of a positive answer to 8a. For there is obviously no unanimity about what the central features are, and consequently there is a wealth of concurrent typologies which are equally invalid as global morphosyntactic typologies.

- (c) The unifying factor of the language type is a coherent set of principles organizing linguistic structure on the most abstract level (cf. Seiler 1979). Recent work by E. Coseriu (e.g. 1980, § 4.3.) has turned up some principles (though he would not consider them abstract) which point in the right direction. These principles account for independent choices of specific procedures from several universal functional dimensions. They allow for a certain (hopefully law-governed) variation, so that it is unnecessary to commit oneself to the unattractive idea of an inconsistent language (as one which does not possess some of the traits which define its type). Furthermore, the principles are dynamic; they show the transitions between neighboring types.

9. Implication and hierarchical layering go together, and clustering and equilibrium go together. Implicative relationships and hierarchies have been shown to exist mainly within certain narrowly defined morphological and syntactic paradigms (e.g. markedness relations among morphological subcategories, or implicative relationships within main constituent order). This is a level of grammatical detail hardly constitutive of language types. The more comprehensive the subsystems are among which connections are sought, the less strict these connections will be. On the most general level, which concerns the connections between the three components of grammar, we only find clustering ('mutual preferences') and equilibrium. This is also largely true of the major subsystems of morphosyntax. If there were a hierarchical relationship between the grammar (morphology, word order etc.) of the verb-actant relations and the grammar of, say, possessive constructions, the positing

of typologically basic properties in the sense of 8a would be justified. Unfortunately, such logically clear-cut, exceptionless correlations do not prevail on the more general levels. Therefore, clustering and equilibrium are more important than implication and hierarchy for a language typology which aims at comprehensive types.

10. (a/b) A language type comprises a large number of subsystems; there is less than 100% correlation among the variations within each of these; and types differ from each other only gradually, admitting of transitions between each other. This situation can be accounted for in two alternative ways. On the one hand, language types may be disjunct; then a language may belong to one type with respect to one subsystem and to a neighboring type with respect to another subsystem (this is essentially V. Skalička's conception). Alternatively, if each of the types embodies the whole range of variation found in the languages representing it, then language types overlap. These alternatives might be mere notational variants. However, with the first alternative, language types are more abstract? (cf. Skalička's term 'construct'). If every language may choose and combine properties from available types without restriction, the concept of the type loses its explanatory power and becomes superfluous. Therefore, the solution in which language types overlap seems to be the sounder one.
- (c) Neither of the above alternatives permits a classification of languages into disjunct sets. Humboldt argues against the attempt to do just this, and in my opinion he is completely right. This does not, of course, preclude the possibility of relating languages to types and to derive a (non-disjunct) classification from typology for practical purposes, as Humboldt admits in the further course of his argument.
- (d) If language types are constituted by structural properties, then this is the most vexing question of all; for obviously, if any empirically confirmable combination

is in the R?

of properties may constitute a type, typology as a search for types becomes superfluous. The problem can be avoided only if types are constituted by abstract construction principles, so that different combinations of structural properties may instantiate the same type.

- 11.(a) (Although my answers to 4 and 6 are not negative,) I suggest the following use of the terms involved here: The two principal subdisciplines of general comparative linguistics are linguistic typology and universals research. A general (comparative) grammar is not a linguistic activity, but a product of general comparative linguistics, namely a systematic representation of all the grammatical features to be found in the languages of the world (roughly as envisaged in Gabelentz 1901: 479-482). A thing that could rightly be called 'universal grammar' does not exist (cf. Lehmann, Ch. 1981:74).
- (b) The possibility of typologizing on just any feature is theoretically excluded by a positive answer to 4 or 6. Apart from this, there remains the methodological problem and the practical impossibility of knowing in advance which features will reward typological research. It is to be feared that the relevance of a feature to a particular language system is not only determined by its belonging to a certain functional domain or universal dimension, as has been assumed exclusively by present-day typologists, but also by the make-up of that particular system. What is central to one language (e.g. assorting nouns into classes, or referring to speech participants), need not be central to another one (cf. R. Austerlitz on 8b). There is, thus, no justification for the preferential status of certain grammatical properties in present-day typology. On the contrary, the practice of basing typology on a few selected features inevitably leads to reductionism.
- 12.(a) It is impossible to give a satisfactory answer to this question in the absence of empirical analyses. The following speculations might be relevant: On the one hand,

since the subject-matter of phonology is much more limited and coherent than those of either morphosyntax and semantics, phonological systems are more tightly integrated than either morphosyntactic or semantic systems, and consequently typology should be much easier here than elsewhere. On the other hand, here, if anywhere, the subject-matter is non-discrete, continuous, to an extent that one may wonder whether there are any peaks in the continuum that leads, say, from the Kabardian to the Kuy pole (assuming vocalic differentiation to be a relevant parameter); i.e. one does not see types emerging from the continuum.

- (b) The criteria would certainly have to be structural, i.e. not substance-based. Only if we use such structural criteria as the canonical syllable-type or the distribution of boundary signals can we hope to connect phonological with morphosyntactic typology.
- { (c) Phonology has often stimulated other linguistic fields with fruitful analogies. Typology has so far not profited from the otherwise leading role of phonology. Phonology is a field where the comparison of whole systems is humanly possible. Therefore, even if the qualms of 12a should turn out to be justified in the end, it would be methodologically promising to try phonological typology.)

zu
abstract

13. Similarly as in phonological typology, the interesting question here is certainly not whether or where a language uses a certain feature. What is typologically relevant is how a language structures its semantics. The systematicization of a whole lexicon has so far proved elusive, probably for objective reasons. However, the semant syntax is definitely structured; and there is a continuous transition from the lexicon to semant syntax by grammaticalization (cf. C. Hagege on this point). The semantics of a language is most clearly structured in semant syntax, structures becoming more and more blurred the further one penetrates into the lexicon. It would therefore appear to be methodologically sound to seek semantic structures in a language by starting

from semantotax. One may find, e.g., that the structure of the subsystem of verbs of possession in the lexicon of a language is typologically relevant since such verbs belong to the dimension of possession (Seiler 1981) and are systematically related to more grammaticalized means of expressing possession.

[14. Such a dichotomy can, in fact, be used to characterize certain trends of linguistic typology. Traditional morphological typology, for instance, is exclusively form-oriented, whereas Klimov's own typology is, indeed, content-oriented, and likewise is Capell's (1965) typology of concept-dominance. However, both approaches are equally wrong. The proprium of language is neither content nor expression (form), but the association of the two. It is in the association of content and expression that languages differ most, and here should be, accordingly, the center of linguistic typology. To give an example: neither the presence of verbal suffixes in a language nor the presence of a tense category are per se typologically relevant; it is rather the expression of tense by verbal suffixes that counts.] *weglassen*

15. (a) Since differences between languages and between types are gradual, the only way to deal adequately with the objective situation is quantitative typology. Non-quantitative typology is only an approximation.
- (b) At a preliminary stage of typological analysis (which will probably never be superseded by an advanced one), quantification is necessary to render claims about (less than 100%) typological correlations precise and falsifiable. Once we have reached a degree of precision in the analysis which allows us to speak of laws instead of tendencies, quantification will no longer be needed for this purpose. However, it will always be needed to describe linguistic phenomena exactly, to make explicit the scales on which they are ordered, and to make them cross-linguistically comparable.

[16. (a) Diachronic typology is, of course, a subdiscipline of general diachronic linguistics. Most of what has posed

as diachronic typology in recent times is, in fact, general diachronic linguistics outside typology, since it does not presuppose the concept of a type, but deals merely with diachronic laws. The concept of a linguistic type is fruitful if it can be shown that languages tend to submit to a limited number of types, i.e. that the free space between types is rarely or never used. Should this be so, it would imply that for a language to fully instantiate a certain type means to be in a diachronically relatively stable situation. Languages then would tend to change from one type to the next, hurrying through empty space.[?] If this is not so, we have diachronic laws, but no diachronic typology.]

(b) Its use is much more limited than is often assumed. On the basis of tendencies, one can infer virtually nothing, still less for reconstructed languages. Inferences are possible on the basis of hard-and-fast implications. But due to peculiarities of modus ponens and of linguistic implicative laws having to do with markedness, they allow us to learn only about what the reconstructed language cannot have had (see Lehmann, Ch. 1980:155f). Within these limits, typology may be useful in reconstruction.

17. There is certainly no such thing as an étalon language. As Uspensky himself says, this metalanguage resembles, in its structure, one of the language types; and any metalanguage necessarily would. Thereby, one language type gains a special status as against the others, which is methodologically inadequate. The same objection applies when linguistic structures are compared as to the degree to which they come near to a certain logical structure (E. Keenan).

The tertium comparationis for types, just as for languages in cross-linguistic comparison, are universal language functions. Each of them is fulfilled by an array of structures ordered on a scale, and each type, just as each language, makes its selection from these scales.^{may be described in its behaviour in regard to the scale} Thus the scales provide at once the genus proximum and the differentia specifica in the determination of differences among linguistic types (cf. Seiler 1979:364f). "

18. The limits of linguistic diversity in each of the functional domains/dimensions are embodied in the universals. Universals may be explained, in their turn, by general laws of language (forming part of language theory), [in conjunction with laws from other sciences such as physics, psychology, sociology etc.]. The principles explaining typological clustering have to do with general requirements of economy, efficiency, coherence and the like posed to semiotic systems. In particular, the principle of complementarity is valid for structures of a language which fulfill similar functions, and the principle of parallelism for structures fulfilling concomitant functions.
19. All of the typologies mentioned are partial; they typologize only certain aspects or subsystems of the language system. As partial typologies, all of them are useful, although some are particularly restricted. Basic order typology, for instance, does not typologize the syntax of the major constituents, but only their relative ordering. It must be combined with the typology of fundamental relations (see Bossong 1980 for an attempt to do this) and that of the concentric vs. excentric construction in order to approximate completeness in its domain.
- * *Konkurrenz?*
Any claims of these typologies to holism, 'basicness' (and such claims have been raised for most of them), are noxious, because they lead to reductionism. In each of them, most features of a language system remain unaccounted for. What we need is not many alternative typologies but one comprehensive typology.
21. Lehmann, Ch. 1979(R), 1979(T), 1980, 1982(N), 1982(R).
22. Klimov 1977, Lehmann, W. (ed.) 1978, Coseriu 1980, Comrie 1981, Mallinson/Blake 1981.
23. Articles in press are: "Ergative (and active) traits in Latin", in Glossologia; "Universal and typological aspects of agreement", in Hansjakob Seiler & Franz Josef Stachowiak (eds.), Apprehension II. Tübingen : Narr; Thoughts on grammaticalization. A programmatic sketch. Vol.I. Köln : Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität (akup, 43). I am

currently revising Lehmann 1979(R) for publication and preparing reports on "The present state of linguistic typology" and "The role of grammaticalization in language typology".

24. Next will be vol.II of Thoughts on grammaticalization.

Grammatikalisierung

Vollständigkeit des Sprachtyps / Sprachtyp u. Features
 keine "schleier Übergänge" zwischen Sprachtypen
 Veränderung des Sprachtyps
 Equilibrium und Grammatikalisierung
 Gewichtung der Sprachmerkmale
 alternative Typologien

"idealer" Typ

"Proto-Typ"

"numerischer Typ"

WINFRED P. LEHMANN

(Austin)

23. My recent publications may have been more general than those you would like to list for your purpose. Lehmann, Winfred P. 1981, Linguistische Theorien der Moderne. Bern/Frankfurt : P. Lang, has a chapter on typology. I have also concerned myself recently with the conditional in Indo - European, also specific dialects.

24. I still have in mind doing something on deixis. Though my chief energy for some time now will be devoted to Gothic etymology. Brill has commissioned me to do the 4th edition of Feist.

EDITH A. MORAVCSIK

(Wisconsin-Milwaukee)

Some answers to the questions regarding language
typology raised by Christian Lehmann

1. As is the case with any label, one could define the use of the term "language universal" in any way one would like to. It would seem to be wise, however, to determine the meaning of this term in such a way that a) it refers to a significant class of entities; b) the definition stays reasonably close to the literal meaning of the term as well as to its traditional use.

The following appears to be a definition that fulfils these desiderata: "A language universal is a characteristic that is present in all members of some non-arbitrarily delimited class of human languages." The class of human languages may be the class of all human languages or it may be a properly included subclass thereof. What is meant by the proviso that the class should be non-arbitrarily delimited is simply that it should not be defined by reference to proper names (such as "in English and in Swahili" or "in Indo-European languages"). Examples of language universals are an a-like vowel which is present in all human languages; or prepositions which are present in all languages that show basic VSO order.

Since we never have access to all members of a non-arbitrarily defined class of human languages, it follows that language universals are always hypothesized to be such.

Alternatively, the term "language universal" has been - and can legitimately be - used to refer to a statement asserting universality for a particular language characteristic, rather than to the characteristic itself.

2. Languages are both similar to and different from each other. The goal of language typology is to discover in just what ways languages are similar and in what ways they are different. More specifically, the purpose is to formulate predic-

tive/explanatory principles about language similarities and differences. Typical contributions to the achievement of this goal are so-called unrestricted universal statements which hypothesize that some characteristic is present in all human languages; and so-called restricted, or implicational, statements which hypothesize that some characteristic is present in all human languages that belong into a (non-arbitrarily defined) subclass of the entire set of human languages. It follows from general meta-scientific criteria that the more richly predictive an implication statement is, the better it is. In other words, in language typology we strive to hit upon language characteristics the presence of which is predictive of more than one additional feature - the more the better. In addition to establishing unrestricted and restricted universals, language typology should also aim at explaining these universals.

3. I can see none.
4. Possibility - yes; likelihood - no.
6. If the question means: can we - or is there a possibility that we will ever be able to - predict every morphosyntactic characteristic of every language on the basis of the presence of some other characteristic(s), the answer is that we cannot and that it is unlikely that we ever will be able to do so.

(I will now go ahead and answer 7-10 even though these questions are asked only of people who answered "yes" to 6. I do not understand why the answerability of 7-10 is made dependent on an affirmative answer to 6. 7-10 ask about the concept of language type - a notion that one may subscribe to even though one may not believe in the probability of there being a finite set of comprehensive morphosyntactic types as mentioned in 6).

7. I know of no well-documented principles that have been proposed to date concerning the relation of these areas.
8. Strictly speaking, a language type may be defined by a

single characteristic; such as in saying: "Some languages have infixes". A language type of a more fruitful kind is, however, defined by the lawful cooccurrence of at least two characteristics. The single one indispensable ingredient of a type in this second sense is a characteristic (or a conjunction of characteristics) whose presence in human languages universally implies the presence of some other characteristic(s). The special status of these predictive characteristics is justified precisely through their predictive power.

9. Taking "type" in the second sense mentioned above in 8, there is always a cluster of characteristics involved - one that includes at least two characteristics. For each characteristic in the cluster, there must be a universal principle which predicts its occurrence in a language on the basis of some other characteristic(s) also in the cluster. These implicational relations between characteristics may be unidirectional or mutual.
10. (a) They overlap in some cases.
 (b) Every language seems to belong to several types.
 (d) Nothing that I can see.
11. (a) I cannot see anything that universal grammarians might want to do and that is distinct from what language typologists (taken in the sense of 2 above) have to do.
 (b) The preferential status of a feature in typology can be justified if it is either predictable from other features or is predictive of others. Typologizing on just one feature - i.e., noting that a characteristic is present in some languages but not in others - is a step in the working process of establishing useful, multi-feature typologies. If the initially observed feature is either predicted or predictive, it will figure in a useful type; if it is neither, it should be discarded.
12. If the question means: can we - or is there a possibility that we will ever be able to - predict every phonetic/phonological characteristic of every language on the basis of

the presence of some other characteristic(s), the answer is that we cannot and that it is unlikely that we will ever be able to do so. - As to distinctness of phonological typology and general (comparative) phonology: I do not see what this difference would consist in.

13. Yes - it deals with similarities and differences among languages in relation to the meanings of morphemes, words, and larger syntactic units.
14. Based solely on Klimov's unpublished paper "Some prospects for content-oriented typological studies", I do not understand the nature of this distinction.
15. I do not know enough about these to be able to say anything.
16. Diachronic typology is I think an indispensable part of general diachronic linguistics. Language typology makes crucial contributions to the concerns of diachronic linguistics in two ways. On the one hand, typological statements that pertain to single language states tell us what are possible prior or future directions from which a given language stage cannot have developed and into which a given language stage cannot develop, regardless of the specific characteristics of the given language stage. Second, to the extent that language typology also typologizes over time-wise related sets of language stages, rather than just over single stages - i.e., provided that it also typologizes over diachronic processes - such typological statements further delimit the set of possible prior and subsequent stages for any given language stage by making reference to some specific characteristics of that stage.

To exemplify the former kind of contribution language typology makes to diachronic linguistics: given that language typology tells us that an a-like sound is present in all human languages, it follows that English could neither have developed from a language without such a vowel nor can it develop into one. To exemplify the second kind: if language typology tells us that an ü can become an i in the

course of time but an i cannot become an ü, it follows that English, which has an i but no ü, could have developed from a language that had an ü but cannot develop into one which has ü-s replacing all English i-s.

17. I am not familiar with the Uspensky notion and in general I am unclear about the question as a whole.
18. Explanations of language universals may come from human psychology and physiology as they relate to communication through language. Such non-linguistic principles are superordinate to language universals in that the latter are derivable from them.
19. The merits of a given typology consist in demonstrated universal implicational principles proposed in the typology that relate language characteristics with each other. Whereas I am not aware of such principles in the areas of morphology and subject/topic-prominence, some such principles appear to exist in the areas of constituent order and grammatical relations. To this extent, these two latter areas seem to be fruitful areas for typologizing.
20. Apart from occasional obscurities, I found the questions individually interesting and jointly constituting a good coverage of the most significant relevant issues.
21. Moravcsik 1978, 1979, 1980.
22. Sanders 1977, Schachter 1976, Comrie 1978, Hopper/Thompson 1980.
23. I have just finished a paper on Hungarian direct objects which presents a typological assessment of these constructions in Hungarian. At present, I am planning a typological discussion of the Hungarian pronominal system, a typological discussion of verb-object agreement in Hungarian, and a paper on iconicity from a typological point of view. Next will be a comprehensive college-level textbook on language typology and universals.
24. The answer was included in 23.

PAOLO RAMAT

(Pavia)

Answers to Christian Lehmann's Questionnaire

1. There are three types of universals:
 - a) Definitional properties which belong to human language as human language (e.g. language is a system of articulated sounds; a kind of analytic a priori judgment);
 - b) psycholinguistically conditioned shapes of human language, i.e. constraints of (bio-)psychological nature, as e.g. the accessibility hierarchy or the serialization strategies;
 - c) the operational decisions of the linguist (methodological universals).
2. To uncover the underlying Ground-Plans governing the (implicational) combinations of the combination possibilities of linguistic elements. This means in other words to explain the non-accidental organization of the 'innere Sprachform' of different language types.
3. Principally they are two basically different perspectives: linguistic typology looks for differences (i.e. for features and traits which are type specific), whereas universals research looks for properties which must be common to all languages (NB: language universals \neq generalizations!). Practically both trends are and must be complementary to each other.
4. I do not know. On empirical grounds I would be inclined to answer negatively, though from a theoretical point of view the answer ought to be affirmative, since language is a système où tout se tient....
5. 4 being "no" on empirical grounds, the answer is "no". What we have observed up to now in typological research are clusterings of features (Greenberg) and preferred connections (Skalička), but never all-encompassing principles.
6. In principle: yes, although typologically relevant traits

can combine in very different ways. It is not so important to establish how many morphosyntactic types can exist theoretically; it is, on the contrary, highly relevant to capture the really existing types.

7. See 12, 13.
8. (a) I think that clusters of features are hierarchically disposed and that there is a core of such clusters with more or less far-reaching effects. Thus, for instance, the verb (or rather the verbal function) seems to be central in basic sentences (see the research on lateralization), and hence basic word order of simple affirmative sentences dominates a series of concomitant phenomena: in language there is the tendency to apply consistent strategies (of word order, determination, fundamental relations, etc.), although many factors (as, e.g., historical accidents) may alter the consistency of such strategies.
 - (c) Languages show functions related to the communication problems they have to solve (Seiler). Functions are the unifying factor cross-linguistically and cross-typologically, but they are not the unifying factor of a given type.
9. See 8. Implications in typology are not logical implications of a nomologic-deductive paradigm. They are rather of probabilistic nature in the sense of Greenberg's universals. And also the hierarchical layering of properties (see 8), which relies upon (bio-)psychological constraints, may be 'altered' by some sociologically or historically determined accident.
10. (a) A type is, according to my definition (Ramat 1978a:142) the underlying constitutive principle ordering the co-occurrence of features which are hierarchically disposed. Therefore it may be that features of Type A overlap features of Type B (say, ergative traits in the active type), but types as 'Konstrukte' (Skalička) will not overlap. Languages, on the contrary, do really show overlappings of different 'pure types'.

Therefore

- (b) a quantitative typology is by no means unnecessary as a tool for language classification.
11. (a) The procedure of linguistic typology is basically inductive, starting from the empirical observation of as many facts as possible (although, of course, having in mind a general hypothesis of how languages can be shaped); universal grammar (I do not understand what is meant by 'general comparative grammar') is rather based on a deductive procedure (although in its turn it has to have reference to the empirical facts of language(s)).
- (b) A main point is that typology cannot be equated with taxonomy of languages. There is a great difference between a type of language and a class of languages (cf. Ramat 1978a:142; 1980:329f.; Coseriu 1980:158f.). A class is a set of entities grouped according to a mono- or polythetic criterion. A type is a constituting principle (see 10a) where the features are not all on the same level. In the clusters of features there are traits which show far-reaching effects, more than others: and these are typologically more relevant (see 8a).
12. (a) Since the constraints on the phonic apparatus of the human being are stronger than those at the level of the morphosyntactically possible combinations and of the lexical realizations (first articulation level of Martinet), one would be inclined to give a positive answer, although we are by now very far from any data-based possible conclusion; and
- (b) I am not aware of any reasonable convincing criterion for finding out consistent phonological types.
 - (c) The basis for phonological typology should be given by the context-free natural phonology with the correlated concept(s) of naturalness/unmarkedness (and natural phonological change): cf. Wurzel 1980:107. Anyway, I do not believe that morphosyntactic, typologically relevant changes originate (only) at the phonological level.

13. Syntactic and morphological typologies are compulsorily based on semantics, since syntax and morphology are formal means to express semantic contents. This is true, e.g., of the relations 'Actants/Predicate' which can be represented with recourse to predicate logic (cf. also Dik's Functional Grammar). But I do not (at least presently) see how a semantic, i.e. principally language-independent typology could be built up. What linguistic typology is interested in is, after all, how semantic contents are linguistically expressed, which means: how meanings are morphosyntactically vehiculated (where by morphosyntax we must comprise word-formation, too). Of course, there remains an unsolved question: is it possible to find out typological criteria for the unmotivated ('etikettierende') lexemes, for 'signes arbitraires'?
14. I do not think so; see 13.
15. Yes; see 10b.
- 16.(a) The typological approach may reveal deeply underlying ties between facts that apparently do not have anything in common (think of the new synthetic future forms of the Romance languages, the rise of adverbials like douce-ment, dolce-mente, the new demonstratives from eccu ille, ecce iste etc.: they all go back to the tendency to develop a syntagmatic stress in place of the classical word stress; a tendency which was active already in Pre-classical Latin: cf. máge-vòlo > malo).
- (b) On the other hand, the typological approach being of inductive nature, it can never predict (in the strongest sense of the word: logically deduce) that linguistic development will take this and not that way; why for instance we do not have cantatum habeo > *cantatò as we do have cantare habeo > canterò. Typology can provide very important cues for probable ('natural', unmarked) changes but it cannot give us any certainty that those probable changes will really happen. It is more apt to furnish a posteriori explanations than a priori previsions. (And, as far as I know, there is

no satisfactory theory of language change!). Cf. also Egerod 1980:133f.

17. Typology is based on comparison as well as historical and genealogical linguistics are, to which it is also historically linked. The *tertium comparationis* for historical comparison of, say, French and Spanish is Latin; in most cases, however, such a *tertium comparationis* is not known: PIE, ProtoGmc, ProtoIndoIran. are unknown entities recovered not as real languages but as language models from the comparison of the extant languages of the family. A linguistic model is the sum of the informations gathered from the cognate languages: it is, so to say, their formal representation. The same holds true of a linguistic type: it is a linguistic model, which as such enables us to typologically compare language A with language B.

In this sense we can admit the usefulness of Uspenskij's *jazyk étalon*, although it seems difficult to agree with him in assuming that the structure of an amorphous language appears as the structure of a metalanguage with respect to a corresponding language of any type, incorporating, agglutinative or inflectional, since an amorphous language can, in turn, be described in terms of an incorporating or agglutinative or inflectional language: the type as model is not valid cross-typologically, but only for the languages of that type. A cross-typologically valid model will rather be of a formal, logical, and mathematical form, in which all linguistic relations of any type whatsoever can be represented (see Ramat 1970 on Uspenskij).

18. Universally valid psychological constraints (see 1) limit linguistic diversity. Analogical processes will, e.g., tend towards unmarked forms (see 12c), not only at the phonological level (for examples see Mayerthaler 1979; and cf. Dressler 1980:83ff.). Thus the tendency to place the topic in first position, or, at any rate, before its comment will lead us to conclude that with more than chance probability S will precede O in an unmarked ('natural') word order type. Actually, very few languages are known that

have a basic OS order. This is not a language universal as illustrated in 1.a), but a universally valid psychological constraint, as demonstrated also by studies on first language acquisition and on aphasic disturbances. Historical accidents of a sociological nature (see also 8a and 9) may account for the constraints not being respected in a particular language.

19. None of the listed typological approaches can be considered to be better than the other ones. They are all partial typologies referring also to different language levels. E.g.: role-and-reference typology deals with pragmatic functions such as Theme/Rheme, Topic/Comment, Focus, whereas basic order typology deals with syntactic functions such as Subject and Object. There are, of course, contact points between them, but the levels of analysis are different. They must all be regarded as parts of a (not yet existing) integrated typology. It seems, however, that some partial typologies, as fundamental-relations typology and basic-order typology, are more central than others since they deal with phenomena that show more far-reaching effects (more complex clusters of facts) than others (see 11b).
20. Perhaps more attention should have been paid to the concept of 'markedness/naturalness' to which I have referred in many answers.
21. Ramat 1978b, 1979, 1980, 1981a, 1981b.
22. Dik 1980, Thrane et al. (eds.) 1980, Comrie 1981, Mallinson/Blake 1981, Lingua e Stile 15/3, 1980
23. Several problems of historical developments in different IE language families typologically revisited (e.g. the rise of periphrastic verbal paradigms in Romance and Germanic languages; the development of impersonal constructions of the mihi videtur-type; the evolution of the double negation: ne...pas, etc.).
24. I feel that dynamic typology, i.e. the study of historical changes from the typological point of view (Greenberg 1974: 64ff.), deserves much more attention than it has received

up to now. Most typologists are concerned with languages that do not have historical documents of their past, so that typological studies are more synchronically than diachronically oriented. I think I will go on studying the typological evolutions of well attested linguistic traditions, also when the present research program sponsored by the Italian Consiglio Nazionale delle Ricerche (see 23) will be over.

KARL HORST SCHMIDT

(Bonn)

21. Schmidt 1979, 1980a, 1980b, 1980c, 1980d.
22. Jakobson 1958, Greenberg 1963, Melikišvili 1976, Klimov 1977, Altmann/Lehfeldt 1973.
23. Im Druck befindlich:
- Schmidt, Karl Horst, "Typusrelevanter Sprachwandel flektierend zu agglutinierend und seine Korrelationen". Études Finno-Ougriennes 15, Festschrift Erdödi.
- id. Versuch einer geschichtlichen Typologie des Deutschen. Sprachgeschichte. Ein Handbuch zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache und ihrer Erforschung.
- id. "Caucasian Typology as an Aid to the Reconstruction of Proto-Indo-European". Conference on the Non-Slavic Languages of the USSR II.
- id. "Perfekt, Haben und Übergang von Ergativ- zu Nominativ-Konstruktionen im Armenischen und Südkaukasischen". Bedi Kartlisa.
- id. "Miscellanea Svanica". Çeliçdeuli.
- id. "Indogermanisch als Diasystem". Festschrift P. Hartmann.
24. Pre-IE Typology; Typology of the Caucasian Languages.

BIBLIOGRAPHIC REFERENCES

- Altmann, Gabriel/Lehfeldt, Werner 1973, Allgemeine Sprachtypologie. Prinzipien und Meßverfahren. München : Fink (UTB, 250)
- Altmann, Gabriel/Lehfeldt, Werner 1980, Einführung in die quantitative Phonologie. Bochum : N. Brockmeyer (Quantitative Linguistics, 7)
- Austerlitz, Robert 1980, "Typology and universals on a Eurasian east-west continuum". Brettschneider, Gunter/Lehmann, Christian (eds.), Wege zur Universalienforschung. Sprachwissenschaftliche Beiträge zum 60. Geburtstag von Hansjakob Seiler. Tübingen : Narr, 235-244
- Bechert, Johannes 1976, "Bemerkungen zu Greenbergs 'Basic Order Typology'". Papiere zur Linguistik 10:49-66
- Bechert, Johannes 1977a, "Zur funktionalen Erklärung des Ergativsystems". Papiere zur Linguistik 12:57-86
- Bechert, Johannes 1977b, "Das Nominativ-Ergativ-Kontinuum und die pragmatische Fundierung grammatischer Kategorien". Trier : L.A.U.T., Series A, No. 47. (10 Seiten).
- Bechert, Johannes 1979, "Ergativity and the Constitution of Grammatical Relations". Frans Plank (ed.), Ergativity. Towards a Theory of Grammatical Relations. London / New York : Academic Press
- Bossong, Georg 1980, "Variabilité positionnelle et universaux pragmatiques". BSL 75:39-67
- Brettschneider, Gunter/Lehmann, Christian (eds.) 1980, Wege zur Universalienforschung. Sprachwissenschaftliche Beiträge zum 60. Geburtstag von Hansjakob Seiler. Tübingen : Narr
- Capell, A. 1965, "A typology of concept domination". Lingua 15:451-462
- Comrie, Bernard 1978, "Ergativity". Winfred P. Lehmann (ed.), Syntactic typology. Austin : University of Texas Press. 329-394
- Comrie, Bernard 1981, Language universals and linguistic typology. Oxford : Blackwell
- Coseriu, Eugenio 1980, "Introduction: Der Sinn der Sprachtypologie". TCLC 20:157-170
- Dezső, László 1974, "Topics in syntactic typology". Linguistica generalia I. Prague : Charles University; 191-210
- Dezső, László 1978, "A typological interpretation of frequentals". H. Seiler (ed.), Language Universals. Papers from the Conference held at Gummersbach/Cologne, Germany, Oct. 3-8, 1976. Tübingen : Narr (TBL, 111); 157-163.
- Dezső, László 1979, "Questions of system and structure in language from the viewpoint of typology". Linguistica Silesiana 3:41-54

- Dezso, László 1980, "Grammatical typology and protolanguages".
Ramat, P. et al. (eds.), Linguistic Reconstruction and
Indo-European Syntax. Amsterdam : J. Benjamins, 17-26
- Dezso, László 1981, Studies in syntactic typology and con-
trastive grammar. Budapest / The Hague : Akadémiai Kiadó/
Mouton
- Dik, S. 1980, Studies in Functional Grammar. London etc. : Aca-
demic Press
- Dressler, Wolfgang U. 1980, "Introduction". TCLC 20:75-91
- Egerod, Søren 1980, "Introduction". TCLC 20:115-139
- Gabelentz, Georg von der 1901, Die Sprachwissenschaft. Leip-
zig : Tauchnitz (2. ed.)
- Greenberg, Joseph H. (ed.) 1963, Universals of Language.
Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press
- Greenberg, Joseph H. 1974, Language typology: A historical
and analytic overview. The Hague / Paris : Mouton (JLSMin,
184)
- Hagège, Claude 1975, Le problème linguistique des prépositions
et la solution chinoise (avec un essai de typologie à tra-
vers plusieurs groupes de langues). (Société Linguistique
de Paris), Paris : Peters
- Hagège, Claude 1978, "Du thème au thème en passant par le su-
jet. Pour une théorie cyclique". La Linguistique 14,1:3-38
- Hagège, Claude 1981, "Towards a semantic typology of minimal
linguistic utterances". The 7th LACUS Forum. Columbia :
Hornbeam, 63-72
- Hagège, Claude 1982, La structure des langues. Paris : PUF
- Hagège, Claude/Haudricourt, André 1978, La phonologie pan-
chronique. Paris : PUF
- Hawkins, John A. 1979, "Implicational universals as predictors
of word order change". Language 55:618-648
- Hawkins, John A. 1980, "On implicational and distributional
universals of word order". Journal of Linguistics 16:193-
235
- Heger, Klaus 1976, Monem, Wort, Satz und Text. Tübingen
- Heger, Klaus 1980, "Sprachvergleich und Semantik - Das Bei-
spiel der grammatischen Kategorien 'Person' und 'Numerus'".
Sitzungsberichte der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissen-
schaften, philosophisch-historische Klasse, Abh. 10
- Heger, Klaus 1981a, "Außersprachlichkeit - Außereinzelsprach-
lichkeit - Übereinzelsprachlichkeit". Festschrift Coseriu
II:67-76
- Heger, Klaus 1981b, "Zum Verhältnis von Semantik und Noematik".
Diskussionsvorlage zur Tagung des Deutschen Romanisten-
Verbandes Regensburg
- Heger, Klaus 1982, "Akkusativische, ergativische und aktivi-
sche Bezeichnung von Aktantenfunktionen". Vortrag Hanno-
ver

- Hopper, F. J./Thompson, Sandra A. 1980, "Transitivity in grammar and discourse". Language 56, 2:251-299
- Ineichen, Gustav 1979, Allgemeine Sprachtypologie. Darmstadt : Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft
- Ineichen, Gustav 1980, "Zur Beurteilung der lateinischen habeo-Periphrasen". Brettschneider, Gunter/Lehmann, Christian (eds.), Wege zur Universalienforschung. Sprachwissenschaftliche Beiträge zum 60. Geburtstag von Hansjakob Seiler. Tübingen : Narr, 218-22
- Ineichen, Gustav 1982a, "Lateinische Futurperiphrasen und die romanische Klassifikation". Festschrift H. Stimm, to app.
- Ineichen, Gustav 1982b, "Cambiamento linguistico e classificazione romanza". Vortrag für die Società di Linguistica Italiana, Florenz
- Jakobson, R. 1958, "Typological Studies and their Contribution to Historical Comparative Linguistics". Proceedings Eighth Int. Congr. of Linguistics 1957. Oslo. Rprt. Selected Writings II. The Hague / Paris 1971; 523ff.
- Klimov, G.A. 1977, Tipologija jazykov aktivnogo stroja. Moskva : Nauka
- Lehfeldt, Werner 1977, "Eine Methode zum synchronen Vergleich der Formenbildung in den slavischen Sprachen". Girke, W./Jachnow, H. (ed.), Slavische Linguistik 1976. München; 109-128.
- Lehfeldt, Werner 1979, "Bemerkungen zu Bondarkos 'Theorie der morphologischen Kategorien'". Die Welt der Slaven 24:249-267.
- Lehfeldt, Werner 1980, "Perspektiven der 'vergleichenden Grammatik' der slavischen Sprachen". Konstanzer Universitätsreden 94. Konstanz
- Lehmann, Christian 1979, Der Relativsatz. Typologie seiner Strukturen, Theorie seiner Funktionen, Kompendium seiner Grammatik. Köln : Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität (akup, 36)
- Lehmann, Christian 1979, "Zur Typologie des Lateinischen". Glotta 57:237-253
- Lehmann, Christian 1980, "Der indogermanische *kwi-/kwo-Relativsatz im typologischen Vergleich". Paolo Ramat et al. (eds.), Linguistic reconstruction and Indo-European syntax. Amsterdam : Benjamins; 155-170
- Lehmann, Christian 1981, "On some current views of the language universal". akup 40:67-91. Rev. version in LeSt 17/2, 1982:91-111
- Lehmann, Christian 1982, "Nominalisierung - Typisierung von Propositionen". Hansjakob Seiler & Christian Lehmann (eds.) (eds.), Apprehension I. Tübingen : Narr; 64-82
- Lehmann, Christian 1982, "Rektion und syntaktische Relationen". akup 45. Rev. version to app. in FoLLing 16, 1982.

- Lehmann, Winfred P. (ed.) 1978, Syntactic typology. Hassocks : Harvester Press
- Li, Ch. (ed.) 1976, Subject and topic. New York : Academic Press
- Mallinson, Graham/Blake, Barry J. 1981, Language typology. Amsterdam etc.: North Holland
- Mayerthaler, Willi 1979, Morphologische Natürlichkeit. Wiesbaden : Athenaion
- Melikišvili, I. G. 1976, Otnošenie markirovannosti v fonologii. Tbilisi
- Moravcsik, Edith A. 1978, "On the distribution of ergative and accusative patterns". Lingua 45:233-279
- Moravcsik, Edith A. 1979, "Typology in linguistics". Acta Linguistica Hungarica 29:315-338
- Moravcsik, Edith A. 1980, "Some crosslinguistic generalizations about motivated symbolism". Brettschneider, Gunter/Lehmann, Christian (eds.), Wege zur Universalienforschung. Sprachwissenschaftliche Beiträge zum 60. Geburtstag von Hansjakob Seiler. Tübingen : Narr; 23-28
- Ramat, Paolo 1970, "Tipologia strutturale". LeSt 5:315-325
- Ramat, Paolo (ed.) 1976, La tipologia linguistica. Bologna : Il Mulino
- Ramat, Paolo 1978a, "Problemi della tipologia linguistica". Incontri Linguistici 4:127-157
- Ramat, Paolo 1978b, "Infinite Universalien vs. finite Typologie?". H. Seiler (ed.), Language Universals. Papers from the Conference held at Gummersbach/Cologne, Germany, Oct. 3-8, 1976. Tübingen : Narr; 141-47
- Ramat, Paolo 1979, "La typologie des langues". Modèles Linguistiques 1:35-62
- Ramat, Paolo 1980, "Introduzione" and "Il concetto di 'tipo' in linguistica". In "La nozione di 'tipo' e le sue articolazioni nelle scienze del linguaggio". L&St 15:311-35
- Ramat, Paolo 1981a, Einführung in das Germanische. Tübingen : Niemeyer
- Ramat, Paolo 1981b, "Vers une crise du formalisme? Théorie de la grammaire et données empiriques". Modèles Linguistiques 3:1-14
- Raster, Peter 1980, "Paradigmatische Strukturen von Verbal-systemen indogermanischer Sprachen". Kwartalnik Neofilologiczny 27:259-286
- Sanders, Gerald A. 1977, "A functional typology of elliptical coordinations". Fred Eckman (ed.), Current themes in linguistics: bilingualism, experimental linguistics, and language typologies. New York : Hemisphere; 241-270
- Schachter, Paul 1976, "The subject in Philippine languages: topic, actor, actor-topic, or none of the above". Charles Li (ed.), Subject and topic. New York : Academic Press; 491-518

- Schmidt, Karl H. 1979, "Die vorgeschichtlichen Grundlagen der Kategorie 'Perfekt' im Indogermanischen und Südkaukasischen". Arnol'du Stepanoviču Čikobava (Sbornik, posvjaščenj 80-letiju so dnja roždenija), Tbilisi; 76-83
- Schmidt, Karl H. 1980a, "Typologie und Sprachwandel". H. Lüdtke (ed.), Kommunikationstheoretische Grundlagen des Sprachwandels. Berlin / New York; 20-36
- Schmidt, Karl H. 1980b, "Ergativkonstruktion und Aspekt". V čest na akademik Vladimir Georgiev. Ezikovedski proučvanija po slučaj sedemdeset godini ot roždenieto mu. BAN, Sofija; 163-171
- Schmidt, Karl H. 1980c, "Zur Typologie des Vorindogermanischen". P. Ramat (ed.), Linguistic reconstruction and Indo-European Syntax. Proceedings of the Colloquium of the Indogermanische Gesellschaft, Pavia 1979. Amsterdam; 91-112
- Schmidt, Karl H. 1980d, "Casus indefinitus bei Eigennamen". Bedi Kartlisa 38, 233-238
- Seiler, Hansjakob (ed.), 1978, Language Universals. Papers from the Conference held at Gummersbach/Cologne, Germany, Oct. 3-8, 1976. Tübingen : Narr (TBL, 111)
- Seiler, Hansjakob 1979, "Language universals research, language typology and individual grammar". Acta Linguistica Hungarica 29:353-366
- Seiler, Hansjakob 1981, POSSESSION as an operational dimension of language. Köln : Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität (akup, 42)
- Tesnière, L. 1959, Eléments de syntaxe structurale. Paris : Klincksieck
- Thrane, T. et al. (eds.) 1980, "Typology and Genetics of Language". TCLC 20. Proceedings of the Rask-Hjelmslev Symposium held at the University of Copenhagen ...
- Wurzel, Wolfgang Ulrich 1980, "Some remarks on the relations between naturalness and typology". TCLC 20:103-113

In der Reihe akup erscheinen die Arbeiten des Kölner Universalienprojekts (DFG-Projekt, Leitung Prof. Dr. Hansjakob Seiler). Die Nummern 1-15 sind erschienen als Linguistic Workshop I-III (LW I, LW II, LW III), München: Fink 1973-75.

1. Seiler, H. 1973, "Das Universalienkonzept", LW I, 6-19.
2. Lehmann, C. 1973, "Wortstellung in Fragesätzen", LW I, 20-53.
3. Ibañez, R. 1973, "Programmatische Skizze: Intonation und Frage", LW I, 54-61.
4. Brettschneider, G. 1973, "'Sexus' im Baskischen: Die sprachliche Umsetzung einer kognitiven Kategorie", LW I, 62-72.
5. Stephany, U. 1973, "Zur Rolle der Wiederholung in der sprachlichen Kommunikation zwischen Kind und Erwachsenen", LW I, 73-98.
6. Seiler, H. 1974, "The Principle of Concomitance: Instrumental, Comitative and Collective (With special reference to German)", LW II, 2-55.
7. Seiler, H. 1974, "The Principle of Concomitance in Uto-Aztecan", LW II, 56-68.
8. Lehmann, C. 1974, "Prinzipien für 'Universal 14'", LW II, 69-97.
9. Lehmann, C. 1974, "Isomorphismus im sprachlichen Zeichen", LW II, 98-123.
10. Seiler, H. 1975, "Die Prinzipien der deskriptiven und der etikettierenden Benennung", LW III, 2-57.
11. van den Boom, H. 1975, "Zum Verhältnis von Logik und Grammatik am Beispiel des neuinterpretierten λ -Operators", LW III, 58-92.
12. Untermann, J. 1975, "Etymologie und Wortgeschichte", LW III, 93-116.
13. Lehmann, C. 1975, "Strategien für Relativsätze", LW III, 117-156.
14. Ultan, R. 1975, "Infixes and their origins" LW III, 157-205.

15. Stephany, U. 1975. "Linguistic and extralinguistic factors in the interpretation of children's early utterances", LW III: 206-233.
16. Ultan, R. 1975. "Descriptivity grading of Finnish body-part terms"
17. Lehmann, C. 1975. "Determination, Bezugsnomen und Pronomen im Relativsatz"
18. Seiler, H. 1975. "Language Universals and Interlinguistic Variation"
19. Holenstein, E. 1975. "Semiotische Philosophie?"
20. Seiler, H. 1976. "Introductory Notes to a Grammar of Cahuilla" (To appear in Linguistic Studies offered to Joseph Greenberg on the occasion of his 60th birthday)
21. Ultan, R. 1976. "Descriptivity in the Domain of Body-Part Terms"
22. Boom, H. van den. 1976. "Bedeutungsexplikation und materiale Implikation"
23. Seiler, H. 1977(a). "The Cologne Project on Language Universals: Questions, Objectives, and Prospects"
Seiler, H. 1977(b). "Determination: A Functional Dimension for Interlanguage Comparison" (final version of Seiler, H. 1976 "Determination ...", published as akup 23, 1976).
(To appear in: Papers from the Gummersbach Conference on Language Universals. The Hague: Mouton)
24. Moshinsky, J. 1976. "Measuring Nominal Descriptivity"
25. Seiler, H. (ed.) 1976. "Materials for the DFG International Research Conference on Language Universals"
26. Walter, H. 1976. "Das Problem der Deskriptivität am Beispiel deutscher Verbalderivation"
27. Seiler, H. 1977. "Two Systems of Cahuilla Kinship Expressions: Labeling and Descriptive" (To appear in the Festschrift for Madison S. Beeler)
28. Holenstein, E. 1977. "Motive der Universalienforschung"
29. Virkkunen, P. 1977. "Zum Ausdruck der notivischen Bestimmtheit im Finnischen. Mit einer Schlußbemerkung zum typologischen Vergleich des Französischen und des Finnischen von Wolfgang Raible".

30. Kölver, Ulrike. 1977. "Nominalization and Lexicalization in Modern Newari".
31. van den Boom, Holger. 1978. "Paradigmenwechsel als Notationswechsel: Saussure - Chomsky".
32. Holenstein, Elmar. 1978. "Von der Hintergebarkeit der Sprache (und der Erlanger Schule)".
33. Ramat, Paolo. 1978. "Y a-t-il une typologie profonde? (quelques considérations théoriques (et pratiques))".
34. Kölver, Ulrike. 1979. "Syntaktische Untersuchung von Numeralklassifikatoren im Zentralthai".
35. Holenstein, Elmar. 1979. "Zur Begrifflichkeit der Universalienforschung in Linguistik und Anthropologie".
36. Lehmann, Christian. 1979. "Der Relativsatz. Typologie seiner Strukturen - Theorie seiner Funktionen - Kompendium seiner Grammatik".
37. Serzisko, Fritz. 1980. "Sprachen mit Zahlklassifikatoren: Analyse und Vergleich".
38. Barron, Roger. 1980. "Das Phänomen klassifikatorischer Verben in nordamerikanischen Indianersprachen: Ein typologischer Versuch".
39. Seiler, Hansjakob. 1980. "Two Types of Cahuilla Kinship Expressions: Inherent and Establishing".
40. Stachowiak, Franz. 1981. "Zum funktional-operationalen Ansatz in der sprachlichen Universalienforschung aus psycholinguistischer Sicht."
- Lehmann, Christian. 1981. "On some current views of the language universal".
- Serzisko, Fritz. 1981. "Gender, noun class and numeral classification: a scale of classificatory techniques".
41. Clasen, Bernd. 1981. "Inhärenz und Etablierung".
42. Seiler, Hansjakob. 1981. "POSSESSION as an Operational Dimension of Language".
43. (Wird später ausgeliefert)
44. Mosel, Ulrike. 1982. "Possessive constructions in Tolai".
45. Lehmann, Christian. 1982. "Rektion und syntaktische Relationen".