Frans Plank

The Founding Editor's envoi: A rose by any other name ...

<https://doi.org/10.1515/lingty-2018-0001>

Or would it not? Has *LT*, short for *Linguistic Typology*, been mistitled? Is the journal's name misleading or mystifying, sending prospective authors elsewhere and deterring rather than enticing the reading public, yearning though it is to be enlightened? 'Tis but thy name that is my enemy?

As it is, the name consists of a relational adjective modifying a noun, and the construction is not wildly non-compositional. Perhaps regrettably, one sense of *linguist*, that which continues to be uppermost on the mind of the English-speaking man and woman in the street, is not saliently retained in *linguistic(s)*, hence not in syntactic constructions that it enters, either.

Like for instance *morphology*, *typology* has a variety of uses, hence the advisability of subjectively modifying it by *linguistic* to forestall confusion. *LT* is not about the types and anti-types of the Old and New Testament and of biblically-inspired historians; nor is it an outlet for personality psychologists and old-school criminologists, Jungian psychoanalysts, racial anthropologists, Goethean natural philosophers, artifact-classifying archaeologists, or typographers. Hopeful authors can't say they haven't been warned when they are returned submissions whose otherwise promising abstracts read like this one:

The concepts 'typological process' and 'morphological period' have received surprisingly little empirical substantiation despite their familiarity to many urban morphologists. They are examined here in two contrasting cultural areas – England and the Shanghai area, China – over the period from the mid-19th century to the late-20th century. Sequences of ordinary residential building types are recognized in the two areas. Periods characterized by different types and connections between those types are identified. The areas are different in both their building types and their periodizations but commonalities in their processes of change, including those related to the spread of Western fashions, are found. Many more comparative studies, including between contrasting cultural areas, are needed.

This paper is for *E&P*, short for *Environment and Planning*, subseries B: *Analytics and City Science*, not for *LT*. Submitting to (linguistic) *Morphology* or (linguistic)

Frans Plank [frans plank], Somerville College, University of Oxford, Oxford OX2 6HD, UK,
E-mail: frans.plank@ling-phil.ox.ac.uk

Diachronica, diachronic urban morphologists or indeed typomorphologists would equally be knocking at the wrong doors.

Within linguistics, the term *typology* and what it rigidly designates have come to be well established. No, it's not a typo for *topology* and it really is not *hypology*, creation of Neogrammarian carelessness or mischief. Surely, it's not wholly unproblematic; but what is? One sometimes reads that typology is about classifying languages into "types", but this is too literally-minded. As for centuries practised by typologists *avant et devant la lettre*, typology is a research programme (i) for charting linguistic diversity, to the fullest extent possible, and (ii) for identifying the influences that shape it and determining where diversity reflects unity or falls into systematic patterns or is (linguistically) random. "Language type" is an expendable concept, being definable through implicational connections between elementary variables. So, perhaps, are "languages", with small *l*'s: for purposes of making sense of typological findings, along the lines of both (i) and (ii), the preferable points of reference are widely recognised to be speech-act-performing individuals over their life-spans, with their mental and physical possibilities and limitations relevant for lexicon-and-grammar formation, and populations, homogeneous or heterogeneous, isolated or in contact, over their generational histories.

Now, when this journal was to be christened some 21 years ago, modifier and modified could plausibly have been reversed: *LT* could have seen the light of day as *TL*, *Typological Linguistics*, journal of an ATL instead of ALT. (There would have been a kind of precedent: for a companion book series, launched in 1982, the epithet *typological* had simply been added to the journal's name, *Studies in Language*.) The message then would have been that it was against the backdrop of linguistics in its entirety – its theories, methods, subareas, all kinds of linguistic questions and ways of pursuing them that are state of the art in the discipline – that the typological programme was to be boosted in this journal. *Linguistic* wouldn't just name the *differentia specifica* for distinguishing the assorted enterprises that come under the rubric of typology: promoted to headhood, linguistics would be the *genus*.

Over the more than twenty years that the journal has now been around, linguistics as a discipline has become typologically aware and astute as never before. These days, unlike as late as in the 1960s and 70s, small *l* languages are rarely dealt with in splendid isolation or against the background of a lofty universalism. There are few current periodicals which don't regularly carry contributions with *typology* in their titles, and when your job is (as mine long was) to see *LT*'s pages filled not only with quests for truth and beauty, but also with some promise of impact, you sometimes envy their allure. A typological spirit has worked its way from the margins to the centre of linguistics, and no longer wants special nurture and protection in out-of-the-way reservations.

Looking at it from the T angle again, the head in our chosen name, one expects the devising or refining of typological methodology, the fashioning of novel typological approaches, and the chores of working out what exactly “se tient” (because not all does) to be top of the agenda — and this was what was typically showcased in *LT*, often yielding results that would gain wider currency later (if not always acknowledged). What one would hope, encouraged by the modifier *L*, is that all this reflects and is indeed helped along by improvements of linguistic analysis and theory. Not infrequently, however, one finds authors regretting and readers complaining that “thick” description and analytic depth could not but be sacrificed when embarking on large-scale typological comparison. Had *LT* been *TL*, *L* constraints would perhaps have ranked higher however challenging the circumstances.

The journal that I, for one, would most enjoy reading is one living up to the highest expectations of both name permutations, *LT* and *TL*. Typology can’t thrive on below-par linguistics, and linguistics would be ill-advised not to subsume and assimilate whatever typology at its best can offer.

There is a lot of linguistic typology and typological linguistics yet to be done — encouraged and chaperoned by the authority of experience as naturally embodied by a scholarly journal. I wish the new editor and her crew well in battling on the *L* and *T* fronts, amidst the joy of passing on to an appreciative and discerning readership what imaginative and knowledgeable, bold and conscientious researchers, newcomers as well as old hands, are going to entrust to the journal for dissemination.

Frans Plank
Founding Editor of *LT*