

## для обсуждения

ния типологических исследований вам  
важает их продуктивность?

вистической типологии? В чем состоя-

ология? Какой из ее разделов представ-  
ересным? В чем вы видите практиче-

осалии? На чем основано разграниче-  
типов?

»? Существуют ли «чистые» языковые  
ику русского, немецкого и английско-

ективными и агглютинативными язы-

и проекта «Немецкая грамматика на  
в», осуществляемого Институтом не-  
ме. Как вы сформулируете цель курса  
и немецкого, английского и русского

й аппарат для контрастивного сопос-  
. Обоснуйте свое мнение.

ветствия/несоответствия грамматиче-  
разных языках. Объясните их.

из того, что немецкий, русский и анг-  
ный порядок слов? Проинтерпрети-  
о-русско-английские соответствия:

en. (г) Nach Berlin fährt er nicht.  
В Берлин он не едет.  
He isn't going to Berlin.

en. (д) Fährt er nicht nach Berlin?  
Он не едет в Берлин?  
Isn't he going to Berlin?

n.

еского строя, роднящие и различаю-  
ий языки.

## Тексты для чтения и реферирования

### 1. Подходы к лингвистической типологии

#### Introduction

The schools of language typology represented in this volume are all current and active. What unites them is a common goal and a shared scholarly tradition. They have all developed theoretical frameworks within which to account for the particular aspect of cross-linguistic variation they have selected to study, and they all have their roots in a shared European tradition of scholarship.

According to Greenberg (1974: 13), the word "typology" gained wide currency in linguistics only after circa 1918, but the research activities that can be brought under the rubric of "language typology" have a long history. Although it is not easy to ascertain the first formulations of a research program of language typology, the underlying assumptions that run throughout the history of language typology can be gleaned from the older passages of the nineteenth-century writings. Friedrich von Schlegel (1772-1829) was among the first linguists to propose a typological framework on the basis of morphological characteristics. In *Über die Sprache und Weisheit der Indier* (1808: 45), he argues for a classification in terms of the linguistic devices which languages employ in relating concepts to each other; the corresponding categories of relational meaning he terms "additional determinants of meaning" (*Nebenbestimmungen der Bedeutung*):

Entweder werden die Nebenbestimmungen der Bedeutung durch innere Veränderung des Wurzellauts angezeigt, durch Flexion; oder aber jedesmal durch ein eignes hinzugefügtes Wort, was schon an und für sich Mehrheit, Vergangenheit, ein zukünftiges Sollen oder andere Verhältnisbegriffe der Art bedeutet; und diese beiden einfachsten Fälle bezeichnen auch die beiden Hauptgattungen aller Sprache. Alle übrigen Fälle sind bei näherer Ansicht nur Modifikationen und Nebenarten jener beiden Gattungen; daher dieser Gegensatz auch das ganze in Rücksicht auf die Mannigfaltigkeit der Wurzeln unermessliche und unbestimmbare Gebiet der Sprache umfasst und völlig erschöpft.

(The additional determinants of meaning are indicated either through internal modification of the root, that is to say by means of inflection or, conversely, in each instance by the addition of a separate word which in itself signifies plurality, past, future obligation or some other such relational concept; and these two simplest cases also represent the two main categories of language. All other cases prove, on closer inspection, to be mere modifications and variants of these two categories; this is why this opposition covers exhaustively the total domain of language which, as regards the variety of roots, is infinite and indeterminate.)

Though later typologists have elaborated on this simple morphological classification based on the distinction between *Sprachen durch Flexion* and *Sprachen durch Affixa* – notably by adding a third isolating (monosyllabic) type in which the word is invariant and unanalysable – (see below), Schlegel makes it clear that the business of language typology is, firstly, to classify exhaustively the languages of the world according to specific grammatical criteria.

August Schleicher (1821-1868) is better known as the founder of the *Stammbaumtheorie*, the genealogical tree model in historical and comparative grammar, than as a typologist, but he too made an important observation highly germane to contemporary typological practice, namely the possible connections between morphological characteristics and the manner in which grammatical relations are expressed. Schleicher (1848: 6-7) pointed out, perhaps following Wilhelm von Humboldt, upon whose work he relied heavily in typological subjects, that in the isolating languages, which do not have morphology, the grammatical relations of subject and object are expressed by word order, whereas in agglutinative languages they are expressed by affixes loosely attached to the root. In inflectional languages, on the other hand, grammatical relations are expressed fusionally with the unit expressing the root meaning. The significance of Schleicher's observation lies in his recognition that linguistic properties show correlative patterns such that the presence of one particular property often implies the presence (or absence) of some other properties.

Our references to Schlegel and Schleicher were made not because these grammarians were the first typologists – it is most likely that they were heavily influenced by their predecessors – but because their clear formulations of the relevant issues represent the two most prevailing concerns of typologists of the past and the present, namely (1) the typological classification of the world's languages and (2) the identification of correlative grammatical properties that define linguistic types. Various issues directly

addressed or surmounted in the typological groupings. In the following sections, the various client subissues that have

As mentioned in the previous section, the study of languages has been a central concern of such scholars as August Schlegel (1767-1835) and August Schleicher (1821-1868). The shift in focus towards linguistic typology is reflected in the work of such scholars as August Schlegel (1767-1835) and August Schleicher (1821-1868). The shift in focus towards linguistic typology is reflected in the work of such scholars as August Schlegel (1767-1835) and August Schleicher (1821-1868).

As explained in the previous section, the study of languages has been a central concern of such scholars as August Schlegel (1767-1835) and August Schleicher (1821-1868). The shift in focus towards linguistic typology is reflected in the work of such scholars as August Schlegel (1767-1835) and August Schleicher (1821-1868). The shift in focus towards linguistic typology is reflected in the work of such scholars as August Schlegel (1767-1835) and August Schleicher (1821-1868).

nants of meaning are indicated either through root, that is to say by means of inflection or, by the addition of a separate word which in itself obligation or some other such relational con- cases also represent the two main categories of ve, on closer inspection, to be mere modifica- o categories; this is why this opposition covers n of language which, as regards the variety of inate.)

ave elaborated on this simple morphologi- distinction between *Sprachen durch Fle- xa* – notably by adding a third isolating the word is invariant and unanalysable – clear that the business of language typologi- vely the languages of the world according a.

868) is better known as the founder of the logical tree model in historical and compara- ist, but he too made an important observa- orary typological practice, namely the pos- phological characteristics and the manner re expressed. Schleicher (1848: 6-7) pointed von Humboldt, upon whose work he relied hat in the isolating languages, which do not ical relations of subject and object are ex- n agglutinative languages they are expressed e root. In inflectional languages, on the oth- are expressed fusionally with the unit ex- gnificance of Schleicher's observation lies c properties show correlative patterns such ar property often implies the presence (or ies.

nd Schleicher were made not because these ologists – it is most likely that they were ecessors – but because their clear formu- represent the two most prevailing concerns e present, namely (1) the typological clas- ges and (2) the identification of correlative fine linguistic types. Various issues directly

addressed or surrounding the undertakings by the various typologists and typological groups are all concerned with these two fundamental problems. In the following exposition, we shall elaborate on a number of salient subissues that emanate from the two goals set forth above.

### Classification and Language Types

As mentioned above, Schlegel's bipartite classification of the world's languages has been modified and extended by the successive attempts of such scholars as August Wilhelm Schlegel (1767-1845), Wilhelm von Humboldt (1767-1835), August Schleicher (1821-1868), Edward Sapir (1884-1939), and Vladimir Skalička (1909-1991). Before we take up these developments in the classificatory aspect of language typology, perhaps brief mention should be made of a significant shift in philosophical orientation towards linguistic comparison that had taken place in the history of linguistics. The shift in question is of interest not only from a historical point of view but also from a contemporary methodological perspective in that the two current linguistic methods, namely generative grammar and typological studies, reflect the two philosophical traditions that provided the backdrop for eighteenth- and nineteenth-century linguistic studies.

As explained by Paolo Ramat in his contribution to this volume, in the Age of Reason the diversity of the languages of the world was considered a superficial phenomenon behind which lay hidden a universe of "eternal ideas" (or innate concepts) without which rational thought was deemed impossible. These underlying mental invariants were said to be imperfectly reflected in the lexicon and grammatical structure of the various languages and must therefore be made apparent through linguistic comparison. This comparison was, in view of the postulated priority of the universal concepts, deductive and "constructive" (Coseriu 1972: 214) in that the grammatical and semantic structure of different languages was interpreted in terms of the basic categories which were deemed logically necessary for rational thought. Language types would result from comparing linguistic to logical structure; for instance, cross-linguistic variation in the ordering of subject, verb, and object would be related to the order of logical predication, in which the agent precedes the action and the action is followed by the affected entity. Languages which reflect the logical order form one type, and those which do not, form another requiring an elaborate morphology to compensate for "inverting" the logical order.

For Ramat it was Wilhelm von Humboldt who represented the turning-point from this "philosophical" to a new properly linguistic perspective. Humboldt supported the rationalist position to the point that thought depends on concepts, but departed from it in claiming that concepts are language-specific. This is because individual languages are historical entities which differ from one another in both form and content and which continue to be developed by their speakers according to cultural needs. Each single language thus represents a unique segmentation of the external world and of the universe of human experience (see Ramat, this volume). Cognition is achieved in the individual speech act when the speaker uses the forms of his or her language creatively in context-related utterance. The relationship between form and meaning, in other words, is not only language-specific but also sufficiently elastic for new cognitive acts to be created and communicated. From this perspective, then, linguistic comparison does not give access to, nor is it based on, a universal logic. What is truly universal is the dependence of cognition on "articulated sound". That is to say, what all languages have in common is that they "achieve and represent cognition" (Seiler, this volume).

Given that each language is a sign system in its own right linking language-specific forms and language-specific meanings, what aspect of language is amenable to parametrization? In the passage quoted in the introduction to this chapter, Friedrich Schlegel argues that the inventories of lexical roots are large and incommensurate whereas variation in the grammatical mechanisms employed in relating lexical concepts to each other is severely constrained cross-linguistically. It is the formal expression of relational meaning, then, which forms the basis of the so-called classical (or morphological) typology. As elaborated by Sapir (1921: chs 5-6), relational meaning ranges from the most abstract to the most concrete, comprising the basic syntactic relations (subject and object), such morpho-syntactic categories as gender, case, and tense, and paradigmatic relations between related lexical concepts (compare *farm, farms, farmed, farming, farmer*).

Classical typologists have recognized three (potentially four) basic strategies or techniques in encoding relational meaning. An **inflectional** (or **flexional, fusional**) language encodes relational meaning by modifying the lexical base by "true" (that is to say, internal) inflection (as in English *sang*). This strategy was considered to achieve a truly symbolic integration of conceptual and relational meaning because it represents relational meaning as the modification of lexical units by means of "meaningless" elements devoid of lexical associations. In an **agglutinating** (or **agglutina-**

tive) language, categories are a *ler-im-de* (house) structures which in places, the p gin. An **isolating** meaning or else is used for enc *gei*, which deni ginally, an **incorporating** incorporating compressing t

The short catory scheme most language coding relation acter in the en and *may*, its *books*), and it formation (e. entirety cann question of to mine the bas commodates "degree of f "mildly aggl ploy one tec method in a be "agglutin

Clearly one culmin sical (or mo categorizat (1936), in v the assumpt aries. If an the more r countenar members

Im von Humboldt who represented the turn-  
 "epical" to a new properly linguistic perspec-  
 the rationalist position to the point that thought  
 departed from it in claiming that concepts are  
 because individual languages are historical en-  
 another in both form and content and which  
 by their speakers according to cultural needs.  
 represents a unique segmentation of the exter-  
 se of human experience (see Ramat, this vol-  
 d in the individual speech act when the speak-  
 er language creatively in context-related ut-  
 between form and meaning, in other words, is  
 but also sufficiently elastic for new cognitive  
 municated. From this perspective, then, lint-  
 t give access to, nor is it based on, a universal  
 al is the dependence of cognition on "articu-  
 y, what all languages have in common is that  
 t cognition" (Seiler, this volume).

ge is a sign system in its own right linking lan-  
 guage-specific meanings, what aspect of lan-  
 etrization? In the passage quoted in the intro-  
 edrich Schlegel argues that the inventories of  
 commensurate whereas variation in the gram-  
 ved in relating lexical concepts to each other is  
 nguistically. It is the formal expression of rela-  
 n forms the basis of the so-called classical (or  
 elaborated by Sapir (1921: chs 5-6), relational  
 ost abstract to the most concrete, comprising  
 (subject and object), such morpho-syntactic  
 nd tense, and paradigmatic relations between  
 npare *farm, farms, farmed, farming, farmer*).

ve recognized three (potentially four) basic  
 encoding relational meaning. An **inflectional**  
 age encodes relational meaning by modifying  
 at is to say, internal) inflection (as in English  
 nsidered to achieve a truly symbolic integra-  
 onal meaning because it represents relational  
 n of lexical units by means of "meaningless"  
 ssociations. In an **agglutinating** (or **agglutina-**

**tive**) language, on the other hand, the individual exponents of relational categories are attached one by one to the lexical base (as in Turkish *ev-ler-im-de* (house-PL.-ISG.POSS-LOC) "in my houses"), leading to word structures which are relatively complex but less integrated because, at least in places, the phonological shape of the affix may indicate its lexical origin. An **isolating** language does not give overt expression to relational meaning or else does so by employing to this end the same kind of unit as is used for encoding lexical concepts (as the Chinese dative goal marker *gei*, which derives from the full verb *gei* meaning "to give"). More marginally, an **incorporating** (or **polysynthetic**) language is characterized by incorporating constituents such as lexical objects into the verb, thereby compressing the content of a sentence into a single word.

The shortcomings of this classical morphological typology as a classifica-  
 tory scheme under the strict sense of classification are all too apparent, as  
 most languages possess forms exhibiting two or more "techniques" of en-  
 coding relational meaning. For example, English shows its isolating char-  
 acter in the encoding of modal meanings by independent words such as *will*  
 and *may*, its agglutinative character in the regular plural formation (e.g.  
*books*), and its inflectional character in the irregular plural and past tense  
 formation (e.g. *felt, sang*). Sapir (1921: ch. 6) asserts that languages in their  
 entirety cannot be neatly pigeonholed into a given class, the matter being a  
 question of tendency (p. 134). It is the prevailing characteristics that deter-  
 mine the basic type of a language. Reflecting this assumption, Sapir ac-  
 commodates the gradient characterizations of linguistic types along the  
 "degree of fusion" such as "weakly agglutinative", "symbolic tinge", and  
 "mildly agglutinative-fusional" (see below). Moreover, languages may em-  
 ploy one technique in one domain, e.g. derivational concepts, and another  
 method in another domain, e.g. relational concepts. Languages could then  
 be "agglutinative-isolating", "fusional-isolating", and so on.

Clearly then typological classification, as envisaged by Sapir, which is  
 one culmination – the other being Skalička's attempt (see below) – of clas-  
 sical (or morphological) typology, is inconsistent with the classical theories of  
 categorization and classification by, for example, Hemptle and Oppenheim  
 (1936), in which class membership is determined categorically, together with  
 the assumptions of the uniformity of members and of clear category bound-  
 aries. If anything, Sapir's classification is much closer to that envisaged by  
 the more recent prototype theory of categorization (e.g. Rosch 1977), which  
 countenances a gradation from central members (prototypes) to peripheral  
 members within a single category and fuzzy category boundaries.

Another innovation by Sapir was to separate from the parameters of technique the dimension of "synthesis", the morphological complexity permitted in words. This dimension, which encompasses the parameters "analytic", "synthetic", "polysynthetic", too, is gradient, and as with the degree of fusion, "mildly synthetic", "mildly polysynthetic", and other types of languages are recognized. The parameters along the dimension of synthesis combine with the parameters of technique such that languages can be isolating and analytic (e.g. Chinese), fusional and analytic (English), agglutinative and polysynthetic (Nootka), fusional and polysynthetic (Algonquin), and so on.

But, for Sapir, a more important classificatory scheme than those based on the "technical externals" was the conceptual classification based on the following two kinds of question: (1) whether a language "keep[s] the basic relational concepts ... free of an admixture of the concrete (Pure-relational languages) or not (Mixed-relational languages)", and (2) whether a language "keep[s] its radical concepts pure (Simple) or ... build[s] up its concrete ideas by an aggregation of inseparable elements (Complex)", (1921: 138). In the total classificatory scheme arrived at by Sapir, languages can be "Simple Pure-relational, Isolating, and Analytic" (e.g. Chinese), "Complex Pure-relational, Agglutinative, Synthetic" (e.g. Turkish), "Simple Mixed-relational, Fusional, Analytic (mildly fusional)" (e.g. French), "Complex Mixed-relational, Agglutinative (symbolic tinge), Polysynthetic" (e.g. Nootka), etc.

Sapir's morphological classification took two radical departures from the classical morphological typology. First, quantitative, as opposed to absolute, characterizations are recognized.\* Secondly, language types are defined in terms of combinations of properties, as opposed to single features. These two features of typological characterization, yielding quantitative characterizations (gradients, scales, continua) and polythetic characterizations (Ramat 1987: 12 ff.), are a hallmark of contemporary typology.

As is clear from the foregoing exposition, Sapir recognizes hierarchy in the importance of classificatory features, considering the conceptual classification to be the basis of fundamental types, which can be further subdivided according to the dimensions of technique and synthesis. The notion of hierarchy among the combinatory features defining types subsequently takes on a unique character, transforming itself into perhaps

\* See Greenberg (1954) for a rigorous quantitative approach to morphological typology.

the single most important practices, and there still remain some questions of classification.

First, concerning that language type, which may be called a "holistic, schematic cluster of properties" (Skalička 1987: 21 f.), the gradient characterizations are described as "weird" (Skalička 1935), perhaps an ideal reference never at all". In this language can be involved in its structure.

- Skalička characterizes (1) as having polythetic properties expressed by one word and semantic always specific ["king"-ACC-INDIC-ACT] plus the grammatical (athesis); (3) motion exists in *nigrum* [NEUTER]; (4) a relatively free (1987: 21 f.)

As noted above, individual language classification made to its structure. Shall (this volume) the structure of a language: adherence to alternation, or order

Sapir was to separate from the parameters of "synthesis", the morphological complexity dimension, which encompasses the parameters of "synthetic", too, is gradient, and as with the "mildly polysynthetic", and other types. The parameters along the dimension of "technique" (e.g. Chinese), fusional and analytic (English), fusional and polysynthetic (Nootka), fusional and polysyn-

the important classificatory scheme than those based on Sapir's was the conceptual classification based on Sapir's distinction: (1) whether a language "keep[s] the distinction of an admixture of the concrete (Purely relational languages)", and (2) whether a language "build[s] up the distinction of inseparable elements (Complex)", the classificatory scheme arrived at by Sapir, "Isolating, and Analytic" (e.g. English), "Isolating, Agglutinative, Synthetic" (e.g. Turkish), "Fusional, Analytic (mildly fusional)" (e.g. Latin), "Fusional, Agglutinative (symbolic tinge)", etc.

Sapir's classification took two radical departures from the traditional typology. First, quantitative, as opposed to abstract, is recognized.\* Secondly, language types are defined in terms of properties, as opposed to single features. Sapir's classification, yielding quantitative and qualitative (discrete, continua) and polythetic characterization, is a hallmark of contemporary typology.

In his exposition, Sapir recognizes hierarchical typological features, considering the conceptual distinction of fundamental types, which can be further distinguished in terms of dimensions of technique and synthesis. The Sapir's classification, transforming itself into perhaps

his quantitative approach to morphological typology

the single most important concept characterizing contemporary typological practices, and we shall dwell on it presently; but for the moment, there still remain several areas needing clarification with respect to the questions of classification and language types.

First, concerning the notion of "type", Sapir's approach makes it clear that language type is to be defined in terms of a combination of properties, which may be hierarchically ordered (see below). Type, in other words, is a "holistic, schematized structure" (Seiler 1990: 156) arising from a "cluster of properties" (Greenberg 1974) that exhibit "preferred connections" (Skalička 1966) among them. Whereas Sapir countenances direct gradient characterizations of actually occurring types in terms of such descriptions as "weakly agglutinative" and "mildly polysynthetic", Skalička (1935), perhaps following Humboldt's original idea, considers type to be an ideal reference point, "an extreme which is hardly ever realized (or never at all)". In this framework, then, actual languages are approximations to the ideal types, and the typological characterization of a given language can be made only in terms of the relative strength of the types involved in its structure.

Skalička characterizes the flecational type, for example, as follows:

- (1) as having polyfunctional endings (gender, number and case are expressed by one single ending);
- (2) no word appears without an ending, which contains both syntactic and semantic information (*reg-* never appears alone in Latin, but is always specified by an ending: *regibus* ["king"-DAT-PL], *reg-em* ["king"-ACC-SG] etc.; *-(a)verunt* in *amaverunt* ["love"-3PL-PERF-INDIC-ACT] expresses membership of the word in the verb class, plus the grammatical determination of time, mood, person and diathesis);
- (3) motion exists in word formation (*niger* ["black"-MASC], *nigra* [FEM], *nigrum* [NEUTER]);
- (4) a relatively free syntactic arrangement of words and so on. (Ramat 1987: 21 f.)

As noted above, in this Prague School typological framework, an individual language can be characterized in terms of the relative contribution made to its structure by the properties belonging to different types. Shall (this volume) suggests that the predominance of a particular type in the structure of a language may be interpreted in terms of linguistic economy: adherence to a single type (either grammar words, or affixes, or alternation, or order) as the means of encoding relational meaning would

appear less costly than an unprincipled deployment of several types side by side. That is to say, the ultimate point of reference is a functional perspective, which is an integral part of Prague School theory.

Defining language types in terms of a set of properties also constitutes the characterizations of the members of different typological classes. Indeed, for Sapir it was the basic characteristics of single languages that motivated grouping individual languages into morphological types. Sapir's famous passage describing the sense of this specific character of individual languages goes as follows:

It must be obvious to any one who has thought about the question [of the general form of a language] or who has felt something of the spirit of a foreign language that there is such a thing as a basic plan, a certain cut, to each language. This type or plan or structural "genius" of the language is something much more fundamental, much more pervasive, than any single feature of it that we can mention, nor can we gain an adequate idea of its nature by a mere recital of the sundry facts that make up the grammar of the language. (1921: 120)

Vilem Mathesius, a founding member of the Prague School, pursued this aspect of typological development. The practice, as exemplified by his work (Mathesius 1928), is called the "characterological" approach, as it seeks to delineate the characteristics of individual languages or a group of genetically related languages.

This individualizing approach to language typology (Greenberg 1974), which shares some underlying assumptions with the Humboldtian tradition, and which is still pursued in the anthropological tradition in America, must be kept apart from efforts to develop a typological framework in terms of a well-defined notion of types for comparative purposes. Especially to be avoided is the confusion between the practice of partial typology (see below) and linguistic characterology. As the quotation from Sapir given above says, a partial typological feature does not automatically lead to an understanding of the underlying deep-seated character of the language in question. Thus, contrary to the generally held intuition that ergative case-marking is a manifestation of some design of linguistic structure fundamentally different from that underlying the familiar nominative-accusative languages, no consistent, deep-seated character associated with ergative case-marking has emerged so far in spite of considerable efforts in recent years aimed at the discovery of some such correlation (see Plank (ed.) 1979 for the diversity of ergative phenomena).

Whereas language typologies in terms of types and its characterization aim at such goals as defining the whole of a language, the possibility of a single language is a dimension of technique. "agglutinative-isolating" — an utterance isolating

It is because of this that languages allowed that structural typology and to partial typology, in which certain classification and characterization fall into the practice of grammatical phenomena like relative clauses, passives, etc. Despite the fact that only the identification of clusters of languages plays the crucial role, the focus has shifted from the characterological type of languages to the

Although partial typology has constraints on specific languages, now, there are some reasons resonant with the tradition of comparing the overall grammatical structure. This approach, which in some ways is a logical practice, can be contrastive linguistics with the utility of languages with the utility of language teaching, the typological issues pertaining to grammars. The move from dissatisfaction with Hawkins (1986: 3):



principled deployment of several types side by side. A point of reference is a functional perspective of Prague School theory.

Terms of a set of properties also constitutes members of different typological classes. In the characteristics of single languages that are grouped into morphological types. In the sense of this specific character of individual languages:

One who has thought about the question [of language] or who has felt something of the spirit of a language, such as a basic plan, a certain cut, to the plan or structural "genius" of the language is a mental, much more pervasive, than any single linguistic feature, nor can we gain an adequate idea of its nature from a study of the sundry facts that make up the grammar of the language.

One member of the Prague School, pursued the development. The practice, as exemplified by the so-called the "characterological" approach, as characterized by the characteristics of individual languages or a group of languages.

Approach to language typology (Greenberg 1974), based on assumptions with the Humboldtian tradition in the anthropological tradition in America, efforts to develop a typological framework in terms of types for comparative purposes. Especially the confusion between the practice of partial typology and characterology. As the quotation from Sapir, a typological feature does not automatically indicate an underlying deep-seated character of the language, contrary to the generally held intuition that there is a manifestation of some design of linguistic structure from that underlying the familiar nominalistic, consistent, deep-seated character associated with the language has emerged so far in spite of considerable diversity at the discovery of some such correlation between the diversity of ergative phenomena).

Whereas language typology and the classification of the world's languages in terms of typological features imply classification of a language and its characterization as a whole, and while Sapir's and the Prague School's typology aim at such goals, Sapir already recognized the difficulty of classifying the whole of a language into a given type. He thus recognized the possibility of a single language belonging to two types defined by the dimension of technique. Polynesian languages, for example, are said to be "agglutinative-isolating", while Cambodian is characterized as "fusional-isolating" – an utter contradiction in the classical typology.

It is because of this kind of oft-observed mixed characterization that languages allowed that scholars began to turn away from the attempt at holistic typology and to pay increasing attention to the practice of partial typology, in which certain domains of grammar are targeted as the object of classification and characterization. Most contemporary typological studies fall into the practice of partial typology, where specific constructions and grammatical phenomena, such as word order, case-marking patterns, relative clauses, passives, causatives, are examined, typologized, and classified. Despite the fact that only a single domain is examined in partial typology, identification of clusters of properties and of their hierarchical organization plays the crucial role in this endeavour. But the focus of attention had shifted from the characterizations of individual languages or the specific type of languages to the drawing of cross-linguistic generalizations.

### Comparative Typology

Although partial typology, seeking cross-linguistic regularities and constraints on specific grammatical domains, is most widely practiced now, there are some recent resurgent moves that are perhaps, more consonant with the traditional typological approach in that they aim at comparing the overall grammatical structures of two or more languages. This approach, which in some respects harks back to Mathesius's characterological practice, can be said to be a branch of contrastive linguistics, but whereas contrastive linguistics has been concerned with comparison of languages with the utilitarian purpose of improving the methods of language teaching, the typological approach is more concerned with theoretical issues pertaining to universal grammar and its relation to specific grammars. The move for this unified typological comparison partly comes from dissatisfaction with the partial typological practice, as expressed by Hawkins (1986: 3):

At the same time this [partial typological] study... is probably missing important universal generalizations. It involves examination of a small number of variant linguistic properties within large numbers of languages... In each case, small pieces of language are plucked out from the overall grammar that contains them, and the range of attested variation is described, and universal generalizations, or truths, are proposed that are compatible with all and only the observable patterns. Obviously, the more such pieces of language we study, the more universal generalizations we gain. But it is not clear that we are making much progress towards understanding how the variants that an individual language selects in one area of grammar are determined by, or determine, the variants that it selects in another.

In contrast to partial typology, the comparative typology of specific languages compares a large number of variant properties in a small number of languages so as to identify the underlying principles that unify the contrastive features that distinguish the languages compared. The basic assumption, again, is familiar from the earlier assumption within typology that languages do not assemble their characteristic properties randomly; rather, language characteristics are connected in a hierarchical manner such that the presence of one characteristic may be responsible for the presence of others.

While Hawkins (1986) compares genetically related English and German without a specific theoretical formulation, more ambitious attempts at both theoretical and descriptive levels have been taking place.

The adoption of typological assumptions characterizes the significant shift in the orientation of Generative Grammar in the late 1970s and the early 1980s (see Chomsky 1981). Rather than seeking only abstract universals that are assumed to be basic to all human languages, Generative Grammar began to pay more serious attention to cross-linguistic variation. The new goal has become the uncovering of the set of universal principles (Universal Grammar or UG) and a unified account of the actual variant realizations of these principles in different languages. The new generative paradigm, known as the principles-and-parameters approach, hypothesizes abstract principles making up UG whose values are parameterized. Language Variation results from the different values that each language chooses in implementing the universal principles governing human language.

Whereas the principles-and-parameters approach, or any systematic comparison, appears to be more effectively practiced with respect to closely related languages, it has in fact had a greater impact on comparative studies

dealing with en  
languages or An  
volume, also att  
languages, Eng  
ties of the two l  
the presence/ab  
together and an  
ing differences  
initial; Japanese  
nese) of agreem

For a long t  
nanced differ  
features disting  
tures; (2) the f  
latter dealt with  
fined itself to th  
stract construct  
rameters appro  
remaining differ

Before we t  
issues concern  
ian ideal of beir  
basis of a single  
Language struc  
ties that can be c  
erty. Hawkins is  
tic generalizatio  
understanding  
language and how  
be more effectiv  
into an interrel  
domains may er  
St. Petersburg t  
relationships be  
ample between  
ives, and result  
"give" construc

al typological] study... is probably missing ns. It involves examination of a small num- es within large numbers of languages... In ge are plucked out from the overall gram- range of attested variation is described, and hs, are proposed that are compatible with ns. Obviously, the more such pieces of lan- al generalizations we gain. But it is not clear ss towards understanding how the variants cts in one area of grammar are determined at it selects in another.

y, the comparative typology of specific er of variant properties in a small num- the underlying principles that unify the ish the languages compared. The basic m the earlier assumption within typolo- their characteristic properties random- s are connected in a hierarchical man- characteristic may be responsible for the

res genetically related English and Ger- l formulation, more ambitious attempts e levels have been taking place. assumptions characterizes the significant tive Grammar in the late 1970s and the Rather than seeking only abstract univer- all human languages, Generative Gram- tentation to cross-linguistic variation. The ing of the set of universal principles (Uni- fied account of the actual variant realiza- ent languages. The new generative para- and-parameters approach, hypothesizes G whose values are parameterized. Lan- fferent values that each language chooses nciples governing human language. parameters approach, or any systematic ffectively practiced with respect to close- ad a greater impact on comparative studies

dealing with entirely unrelated languages such as English and Australian languages or American Indian languages (see Hale 1983). Fukui, in this volume, also attempts a typological comparison of two radically different languages, English and Japanese. A number of seemingly disparate properties of the two languages, such as the presence/absence of *wh*-movement, the presence/absence of expletives, the freedom of word order, are brought together and an attempt is made to attribute the differences to two underlying differences in the two languages: the head-parameter (English, head-initial; Japanese, head-final) and the presence (English)/absence (Japanese) of agreement-inducing functional elements, e.g. AGR.

For a long time typological studies and Generative Grammar countenanced different orientations and methodology: (1) the former sought features distinguishing languages, while the latter sought common features; (2) the former examined a large number of languages, while the latter dealt with a limited number of languages; and (3) the former confined itself to the actually observable features, while the latter posited abstract constructs rather freely. However, as the recent principles-and-parameters approach shows, the two fields are fast converging, though remaining differences exist (see next section).

Before we turn to the next topic, it is perhaps worth summarizing the issues concerning holistic versus partial typological practice. The Gabelentzian ideal of being able to construct the entire structure of a language on the basis of a single or even a handful of properties is perhaps impossible to attain. Language structures do not seem to consist of a simple aggregate of properties that can be drawn together by the presence of a certain fundamental property. Hawkins is quite right in saying that a simple collection of cross-linguistic generalizations over bits of language in isolation does not lead us to a deeper understanding of how each generalization is related to the rest of the language and how each language chooses those properties permitted. Thus, to be more effective, partial typology must organize its domains of investigation into an interrelated network, so that possible hierarchical structuring of the domains may emerge. Indeed, some such possibilities are in the offing in the St. Petersburg typological framework and elsewhere, where inter-structural relationships began to be recognized between different constructions, for example between causatives and transitive structures, between passives, statives, and resultatives, and between benefactive constructions and the basic "give" constructions (see Shibatani, forthcoming, on the last correlation).

The ultimate goal of typology and linguistics as a whole is to unravel the nature of linguistic properties: what are they, how are they selected and distributed, and how are they organized? The goal can be pursued by the methods of both partial typology and (mostly modest) holistic approaches of comparison of two or a small number of languages over several features. In fact, these two complementary methods are not different substantively, as the difference between them is largely a matter of degree.\*

*(From: Approaches to Language Typology Masayoshi Shibatani and Theodora Bynon. Approaches to Language Typology: A Conspectus)*

## 2. Грамматика немецкого в сравнении с европейскими языками

### Projektziele

**a) wissenschaftsintern:** Fokussierung, Vereinheitlichung der Kategorisierungen und der Terminologie

Die vorliegenden wissenschaftlichen Grammatiken des Deutschen, einschließlich der „Grammatik der deutschen Sprache“ (GDS) (vgl. Zifonun/Hoffmann/Strecker u. a. 1997) enthalten kaum explizite Angaben zur sprachtypologischen Einordnung des Deutschen. Der typologische Vergleich sollte aber – so zeigt die neuere Forschung – eine wichtige Dimension auch der einzelsprachlichen Grammatikographie sein. Die spezifischen Formen und Konstruktionen, mit denen eine Einzelsprache grammatische Funktionen realisiert, können hier vor dem Hintergrund der universalen Möglichkeiten und des Spektrums sprachlicher Variation abgehoben werden, ihre Eigenart und ihre charakteristische Kontur treten dadurch deutlicher und prägnanter hervor, als dies bei einer isolierten Betrachtungsweise überhaupt möglich ist. In den letzten Jahren wurde vor allem im Rahmen des EUROTYP-Projektes die typologische Erforschung der europäischen Sprachen erheblich vorangetrieben.

\* See the proceedings of the plenary Session on "Typology: Integral Typology versus Partial Typology" in the Proceedings of the fourteenth International Congress of Linguists (Akademie-Verlag, Berlin, 1990).

Dabei sind selbst in der sprachübergreifenden Beschreibung der deutschen Grammatik eine Gesamtdarstellung der typologischen Verortung des Deutschen, ist damit jedes Projekt schließ-

In methodischer Hinsicht ist der Herangehensweise gegenüber dem Gegenstandsbereich schärfer zu erkennen (siehe GDS), sondern charakterisiert wird. Dem Hintergrund der deutschen Grammatik abhebt.

Ein sekundärer Wert liegt in der sprachübergreifenden Kategorisierung und Begrifflichkeit, wie es in der deutschen Grammatik häufig festzustellen ist (vgl. König 1997). Die Kategorienbildung in der deutschen bzw. der Satzglieder (etwa mit Subjekt, Objekt, Prädikat, Kasus- und valenzgrammatische, Kasus- und valenzgrammatische, Kasus- und valenzgrammatische, Kasus- und valenzgrammatische Terminologie der Sprachen erschwert. Die deutschen und romanischen Sprachen unterscheiden sich. Daher ist die deutsche oder Französische Grammatik nicht zu sprechen, sondern die deutsche oder präpositionale Grammatik der Grundunterschiede der Kategorien schwach taktisch unterschieden. Subjekt und drei Kasus. Gegenüber der deutschen Herangehensweise zu sein dürfte, nur ein

---

# ИНТЕРАКТИВНАЯ ТИПОЛОГИЯ: НЕМЕЦКИЙ, АНГЛИЙСКИЙ, РУССКИЙ ЯЗЫКИ

**Проблемы, задания, тесты**

---

Автор-составитель О.А. Кострова

*Рекомендовано УМО по специальностям педагогического образования в качестве учебного пособия для студентов высших учебных заведений, обучающихся по специальности 033200 — иностранный язык*



Москва «Высшая школа» 2007