Prefaces

Maria Koptjevskaja-Tamm

Introduction from the new Editor: *Linguistic Typology* today and tomorrow

<https://doi.org/10.1515/lingty-2018-0007>

It is a great honour and privilege to be nominated and elected as the Editor of *Linguistic Typology*, the flagship journal of the Association for Linguistic Typology. To feel the trust and support of this wonderful research community is truly inspiring and encouraging, but also means a great responsibility towards all these people and the field in general. Fortunately, I am surrounded, supported and assisted by the superb crew of nine Associate Editors and the Assistant Editor Angela Terrill, all of them top researchers representing a broad range of expertise, but also amazingly wise, efficient and warm.

It is also an extreme honour, responsibility and challenge to take over the editorship of *LT* after Frans Plank, who founded (and *insisted* on founding) both the journal and the association and then led the journal for 21 years (cf. Hyman & Koptjevskaja-Tamm [eds.] 2017 for Frans Plank's role in the history of ALT and *LT*). Together with his Associate Editors Frans set a course for the journal by providing the following definition in the first issue of *Linguistic Typology* (1997: 1(1))

Linguistic Typology publishes original research on the diversity of languages and on the patterns of variation within this universe. The essence of typology lies in structural traits – ranging from sound and grammar to lexicon and discourse – that could vary independently from language to language but actually do vary together, setting limits to cross-linguistic variation and defining the groundplans on which languages are constructed. The discovery and the explanation of such interdependencies and the informed discussion of results and methods in typology are the subject matter of this journal.

Frans created a unique, warm, collaborative atmosphere among the members of the Editorial Board and always ensured that the issues of *LT* made their regular appearance, filled with high-quality publications, no matter the circumstances. I was lucky to be part of this process as a member of the Editorial Board for 12 years (2006–2017); I had also witnessed and even contributed to the birth of

both ALT and *LT*, as a participant in the pan-European programme EuroTyp that had provided the impetus for both, and as one of the founding members of ALT.¹

But twenty-one years is a long time, and these years have seen an explosive growth of interest in and awareness of linguistic diversity and unity, with papers on cross-linguistic variation and typology making regular appearances in different linguistic journals and at many conferences. The time is therefore ripe to evaluate and perhaps re-evaluate the position of *LT* on several issues, in particular in the light of the very illuminating replies to the survey of ALT members, run in 2013 and containing several questions of direct relevance for the journal. We not only need to make the journal even more relevant to the members of the ALT community, but we also need to enhance the dialogue with theoretical linguists, anthropologists, psychologists, etc. The rest of this preface focuses on the currently most important changes and challenges identified and discussed by the Editorial Board and myself. These are issues pertaining to access, mission of the journal, article formats, recognition and visibility of contributors to the field, as well as challenges related to various biases in the publication.

Let's begin with the topic of access, which has become a central question in research and publication. First of all, starting from this issue, we are going to introduce “the editor's choice” model whereby the editor chooses one or possibly two articles per issue for free access – free to read online. “The editor's choice” for this particular issue is “Predicative reduplication: Functions, their relationships and iconicities” by Yuèyuán Lǐ and Dan Ponsford.

I would also like to draw attention to De Gruyter's generous repository policy, which allows authors the use of the final published version of an article for self-archiving and/or archiving in an institutional repository (on a non-profit server) 12 months after publication. The authors may also download an offprint of the article as a PDF document and send 30 copies of the article to colleagues.²

And finally *Linguistic Typology* implements the Hybrid Open Access model,³ meaning that authors of journal articles have the option of making their accepted articles freely accessible on degruyter.com. Importantly, a number of institutions have agreements with De Gruyter on Open Access publication discounts – please check the web page⁴ to see if your institution is eligible.

Moving further on to the content of the journal, the modified mission statement of the journal and article formats are listed below.⁵

¹ <http://www.linguistic-typology.org/ALTstatutes.pdf>

² <https://www.degruyter.com/dg/page/repository-policy>

³ <https://www.degruyter.com/page/560>

⁴ <https://www.degruyter.com/page/1089>

⁵ cf. <https://www.degruyter.com/view/j/lity>

Aims and scope

Linguistic Typology provides a forum for all work of relevance to the study of linguistic typology and cross-linguistic variation. It welcomes work taking a typological perspective on all domains of the structure of spoken and signed languages, including historical change, language processing, and sociolinguistics. Diverse descriptive and theoretical frameworks are welcomed so long as they have a clear bearing on the study of cross-linguistic variation. We welcome cross-disciplinary approaches to the study of linguistic diversity, as well as work dealing with just one or a few languages, as long as it is typologically informed and typologically and theoretically relevant.

Article formats

- Research articles
- Target articles with peer commentary (if you have an idea for one, contact the Editor)
- Special issues (if you have an idea for a special issue, contact the Editor)
- Debates (contact the Editor)
- Language profiles, family portraits and areal surveys
- Review articles (reviewing two or more books, or a whole subject area)
- Book reviews
- Methodological contributions (e.g. reports on and reviews of toolkits, databases, software, collections of texts and corpora, archival collections resulting from fieldwork etc.). These should include a discussion of how/why the material is of typological relevance.
- Squibs (very short and often humorous pieces on a very specific topic intended to encourage debate)

Contact the Editor if you have an idea that is not represented here

Below I comment on some of the article formats.

Language profiles, family portraits and area surveys constitute an important genre that emphasizes the connection between typology and description/documentation. *LT* has earlier published several excellent examples of such work, e.g. Quesada (1999), Evans (2000), François (2005), Epps (2008) and Yager & Burenhult (2017). These articles give a profile of the language(s) in typological perspective, with particular attention to the points of greatest typological interest. The genre provides therefore an additional impetus for field workers and

researchers involved in language description/documentation to dwell on the marvels of ‘their’ languages and to relate them to a broader cross-linguistic picture of the world’s languages. We don’t have any particular guidelines for such works, but invite prospective authors to use their own creativity in bringing out what is most interesting and unusual in the languages or families they are describing.

Linguistic Typology has a long tradition of vibrant discussions and *debates*. These often start as *commentaries* to a manuscript submitted to the journal and selected as a *target article* by the Editorial Board. Some of the most noteworthy examples include the debate on creoles as a structural type in *LT* 5(2–3), in response to McWhorter (2001), commentaries to Maslova’s (2000) paper “A dynamic approach to the verification of distributional universals” in *LT* 4(3), the debate on languages without word classes in *LT* 9(3), in response to Evans & Osada (2005) or the debate on mirativity in *LT* 16(3) triggered by Hill (2012). In other cases the debates were initiated by the Editorial Board in response to work published elsewhere, with the monumental *LT* 15(2) devoted to two different debates – the debate on the correlations between phoneme inventory size, population size and dispersal, in response to Atkinson (2011), and the debate on word-order universals, in response to Dunn, Greenhill, Levinson & Gray (2011). A number of debates and discussions were initiated by the Editorial Board in response to discussions on the LingTyp list⁶ or simply because the issues were judged to be of central importance for the field. Some of these include the debates on replicability in typology in *LT* 10(1), on language particular vs. universal categories vs. comparative concepts in *LT* 20(2) and on the relevance of typology in *LT* 20(3).

Keeping this high level of discussion and debate is, of course, one of the foremost priorities of the journal. We will also further expand on this in at least two ways. First, in addition to the suggestions coming from the Editorial Board, we invite other researchers to submit suggestions for target articles and debates. Second, we also welcome suggestions for *special issues* of the journal. In both cases we are particularly interested in enhancing the connection between *LT* and the ALT meetings, which always pride themselves on numerous excellent and challenging talks, sessions and workshops. A word of caution is in place though: given the growing popularity of special issues in most journals, the Editorial Board will be very selective at the proposal stage. In any case, we are already anticipating several interesting discussions stemming from the breathtaking 12th ALT meeting in Canberra in December 2017.

⁶ <http://www.linguistic-typology.org/newsletter.html>

One of the most important, timely and critically-constructive discussions in *Linguistic Typology* appeared in *LT* 13(1) and focused on the World Atlas of Language Structures (WALS).⁷ The discussion in *LT* encompassed eight different articles focusing on the entire WALS concept, on its coverage of individual features, languages, families, areas, on its relation to comparable work and on its further applications (e.g., for language classification and for linguistic education).

WALS' scale and significance, both for the field of typology and cross-linguistic variation, and vastly extending to others, is difficult to overestimate. But it is of course not the only database of importance for the field. The last two decades have seen an explosion of databases and other resources, many of which directly address issues of cross-linguistic variation, stem from careful work on language documentation and language description etc. and are of great value and interest for researchers in our field(s). It is all the more unfortunate that the information about such resources is scattered across a multitude of different places, making even the most accessible – in theory – resources unknown and in practice inaccessible for numerous potential users.

Linguistic Typology is therefore introducing a (partly) new genre of *methodological contributions* focusing on toolkits, databases, software, collection of texts and corpora, archival collections resulting from fieldwork, and other resources. We are envisaging two different groups of contributions – *reports* and *reviews*, both subject to normal review procedure. For *reports* we are welcoming those who create resources to write about them themselves – for instance, to describe the resource (the database, the toolkit, the archival collection and the like) and its aims, how to use it, what it assumes, etc. These should include a discussion of how/why the material is of typological relevance. We are also welcoming critical *reviews* of existing resources – for instance, results of experiments run on a particular database, comments on its possibilities, achievements, limitations, shortcomings and suggestions for improvement.

There are multiple potential benefits of such publications. First, articles on resources, accompanied by generous supplementary materials and links to publicly accessible repositories or archives, will be a huge service to typology and to linguistics in general in broadening the circle of those who may use these resources. But there is an additional advantage for those who create them. There is by now a broad recognition of the essential problem that databases, corpora, software, and other resources may not be recognized in the promotion and tenure process, in grant applications and in other career-building activities,

7 <http://wals.info>

given the current emphasis on peer-reviewed publications in indexed journals. *LT* reports on resources, written by their creators, will therefore be a step to ensure due acknowledgement of the gigantic work that underpins them.

Due acknowledgement of the contribution by different people involved in the development of science is of course a major concern, not least when it comes to publications. Current praxis seems to be very different in different disciplines, including even different sub-disciplines within linguistics. For some of us alphabetic author order is the default and deviations from this order means that the authors' contribution is not equal. But what happens if the author whose name starts with *A* has nonetheless done much more than the author whose name starts with *T*? For others the order is defined according to the rules, e.g. conventions like those commonly used in biomedical sciences (the first author is the PhD student for whom this publication is a part of their compilation thesis, the last author is the PI who has found the money for the project without necessarily having being involved in the research itself, etc.). Since there is no real consensus here there is of course a high risk that the "real" role of the different authors can be misjudged and even misused. Whom to include as co-author is again different: should the supervisors be included as co-authors in their students' publications? Many of us may feel uneasy here, both as supervisors and as students, but for some journals the supervisor's name is perceived as a quality guarantee and is therefore required. And then there are other people involved – student assistants, informants, technicians?

Some fields, e.g. medicine, have tried to formulate fairly explicit recommendations concerning authorship (cf. those by the International Committee of Medical Journal Editors⁸). As noted by the UK Academy of Medical Sciences,⁹ "team science" is becoming increasingly common across all fields of research. Teams spanning different specialties/disciplines and geographical centres are often needed to tackle contemporary research questions in biomedical science. It is therefore important to enable researchers to gain maximum benefit from their participation in 'team science'. However, current recognition frameworks do not always adequately capture or celebrate individuals' contributions to 'team science' projects. There are also voices requiring that all journals should have a policy delineating authorship which would clearly define and communicate

8 <http://www.icmje.org/recommendations/browse/roles-and-responsibilities/defining-the-role-of-authors-and-contributors.html>

9 <https://acmedsci.ac.uk/policy/policy-projects/team-science>

authorship criteria to researchers, “indicate unethical authorship practices, clarify the order of authors at an early stage” etc.¹⁰

As a first step in this direction we are now asking the authors to provide a statement on the contribution of each of the authors in co-authored works – and, if possible, clarify the reason for their order.

There is also a growing awareness of the need for better data citation practice across linguistics. The position paper by Berez-Kroeker et al. (2018) is based on the experience and views of 41 participants representing a broad range of linguistic subfields and provides the motivation for the Austin Principles for Data Citation in Linguistics.¹¹ The need for better data citation is, of course, particularly acute in a field focusing on cross-linguistic variation, where a large portion of research is based on the data collected by other people. We hope to return to this issue in the near future.

At this point I want to raise a few further issues that are especially close to my heart. First of all, I would like to draw attention to the striking gender imbalance in most of the earlier discussions and debates in *LT*. Although the preponderance of males among the discussants in most scientific debates will certainly not come as a surprise to anyone, I was nevertheless genuinely amazed by the magnitude of this imbalance when taking a closer look at the *LT* pages. Here are some examples of recent debates:

Issue	Debate	M	F
5(2–3)	Creoles as a structural type	14	1
4(3)*	“A dynamic approach to the verification of distributional universals”	3	1
9(3)	“Mundari: the myth of a language without word classes”	6	0
10(1)**	Replicability in typology	9	3
15(1)**	Correlations between phoneme inventory size, population size and dispersal	7	3
15(2)	Word-order universals	19	0
20(2)	Language particular vs. universal categories vs. comparative concepts	9	1
20(3)	The relevance of typology	14	3

Notes: *the target article by a female researcher.

**a female associate editor responsible for the issue.

10 <http://blogs.lse.ac.uk/impactofsocialsciences/2018/01/30/all-journals-should-have-a-policy-defining-authorship-heres-what-to-include/>

11 www.linguisticsdatacitation.org

The scale of the gender imbalance is conspicuous, particularly in a field where the gender distribution among the practitioners is itself relatively balanced and which can boast many outstanding female researchers (including the majority of the winners of the Joseph Greenberg and Georg von der Gabelentz prizes). The gender balance of the Editorial Board for *LT* is also fairly good.

There are many different reasons for the skewed gender representation in the debates, and I restrain from both speculating and moralizing, especially since I myself often remain silent in debates, which is almost always a matter of my own choice. But I would like to see the increasing participation of female researchers in *LT* discussions and debates as an important task both for the Editorial Board – and for the research community. Among other things, we should be more active in inviting and encouraging female researchers to participate in future debates. One possibility would be to issue open calls for debates, which could lead to more diversity in the pool of respondents.

Another issue concerns the pronunciation of the researchers' names. In his book *The Linguistics Student's Handbook* Laurie Bauer (2007) has a whole chapter called "Linguists' names". It opens with the following sentence: "It can sometimes be difficult to know how to pronounce the names of individual linguists, and this can be awkward, especially if you are presenting a seminar or conference paper" (Bauer 2007: 147).

How many of us will not recognize this situation? My qualified guess would be that all of us regularly experience situations when we want to/need to refer to someone without any clear clue on how to pronounce the name. Many of us are also usual "victims", having names that people regularly mispronounce or even avoid. As well, it is quite embarrassing to mispronounce others' names and to hear your own name being constantly mispronounced. But it suffices to sit through an hour of students' presentation to get an idea of how avoidance strategies work in the long run. My linguistics students at Stockholm University will often say something like "I have read a paper by those two Polish female linguists whose names I will not even try to pronounce and another paper by John Smith. The two Polish ladies state that ..., to which Smith responds by ...". By the end of the presentation everyone has heard "Smith" many times and will both remember his name, recognize it the next time they hear it and will get more and more confirmation that he is known in the field. The two Polish researchers will simply remain anonymous.

In other words, the names that get mentioned (because they are easier to pronounce) wind up sticking in people's mind, while the others won't, which may lead to undesired, undeserved and unintended biases in the visibility and recognition of researchers.

Bauer (2007: 147) begins his chapter by saying “giving pronunciations raises a number of questions: for non-English names, should a pronunciation in English be given, or a pronunciation in the source language? Should we use the version the linguists themselves use, or should we use a standard version frequently heard?”. He even gives a list of 56 linguists’ names, which, admittedly, is a “matter of personal judgement”. I am flattered to be listed there, together with Jan Baudouin de Courtenay, Joan Bybee, Claude Hagège, Louis Hjelmslev, William Labov, André Martinet, Marianne Mithun, Anna Siewierska, Anna Wierzbicka (I am even considering attaching the list to my CV!) – but not even Laurie Bauer got it completely correct. And in fact, it is not easy to know that “Koptjevskaja” is the Swedish rendition of my Russian family name “Копчевская”, while “Tamm” is my Swedish husband’s family name, all in all resulting in [kɔpˈtʃɛfskaja ˈtam].

There is nothing difficult here, no odd sounds at all, but it is the relation between the spelling and the pronunciation that is obscure, and the same goes for many other people. In fact, very few people are safe, but the problem is particularly severe for researchers originating from non-English speaking countries.

Given all this, *Linguistic Typology* is now adding the IPA transcription of the contributors’ names as an obligatory component. We are also asking people from the non-Latin-spelling communities if they want to indicate that spelling as well. We leave it open for the authors to decide on the details of the transcription, e.g., whether they want to suggest a “modified” anglicized version or a more native one – it is a matter of their own comfort. I would in fact encourage other journals to follow this praxis and I would urge ALT to add the transcription of the researchers’ names to the information about its members. We are, after all, linguists and should be able to write and read IPA transcriptions, to adapt “foreign” phonetics to our own linguistic systems – and to show due respect to our colleagues by being able to name them properly.¹²

This brings us to the final matter I want to raise here – the issue of a significant, not to say huge, geographic bias in the contributions published by the journal. Authors from Africa, Asia and South America are almost totally missing, with occasional and very rare exceptions. Given that these are the areas with the highest linguistic diversity this is of course all the more distressing. But even Europe is represented quite unevenly. This skewing is not representative of

¹² We are also adding the IPA transcription of the language names – in those cases where the contribution focuses on one or a few languages.

the languages we are studying, not of the research level and not even of the ALT membership and the participants in the ALT conferences. There are of course many different reasons for such biases, but one is particularly relevant when it comes to publishing, namely, *the challenge of writing a journal paper in Academic English*. An impressive share (or perhaps even the majority) of linguists involved in research on typology and cross-linguistic variation have English as their L2, L3 and even L4. Already giving a conference presentation in your L2, L3 or L4 is a challenge, but writing a scientific paper is much worse. It's a matter of time (writing in one's non-native language is often slower); it's a matter of a prolonged struggle with words, grammar, discourse structure, style; it's a matter of feeling cognitively and mentally restricted, not being able to express yourself, your own personality etc. As linguists we all know this, don't we? We also know that the emergence of English as scientific lingua franca is a recent phenomenon and a result of an interplay of many different factors, external to the language itself and having nothing to do with the intellectual abilities of its native speakers. But researchers with English as their native tongue do find themselves in an advantageous position in academic publishing without having asked for this and often unaware of this. In addition to time, effort and other limitations, writing scientific English is a huge financial matter for non-native speakers. This is the case even in my department in Sweden, with its high level of proficiency in English, where English is omnipresent at the universities and where the PhD students regularly visit English speaking countries.

As a result, many researchers in our field never get a proper chance to publish their research in *Linguistic Typology* – or in other international linguistic journals. Many give up at an early stage, especially if there is a vibrant scientific community speaking one's own language, e.g. Russian or French. This puts them in a disadvantageous position in the academic world with its emphasis on publications in international journals. But it is also a huge loss for the scientific community who cannot access the research published in languages that most of their members will not be able to read. These are important aspects of the complex issue of access to research and publication.

I believe that the Association for Linguistic Typology, whose primary focus is on linguistic diversity, should take this challenge seriously and try to come up with practical measures for ensuring that also linguists with a weaker English language background can make their way to *Linguistic Typology* – or to other English speaking academic fora.

But for now – read Frans Plank's delightful envoi and enjoy this issue of *Linguistic Typology* and remember that the journal is for you – not only as

readers, but also as writers, reviewers, and people whose opinions matter! So, we at the Editorial Board are very much looking towards your submissions, your assistance and feedback.

Maria Koptjevskaja-Tamm
Editor of *LT*, 2018

References

- Atkinson, Quentin. 2011. Phonemic diversity supports a serial founder effect model of language expansion from Africa. *Science* 332. 346–349.
- Bauer, Laurie. 2007. *The Linguistics Student's Handbook*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Berez-Kroeker, Andrea L., Lauren Gawne, Susan Smythe Kung, Barbara F. Kelly, Tyler Heston, Gary Holton, Peter Pulsifer, David I. Beaver, Shobhana Chelliah, Stanley Dubinsky, Richard P. Meier, Nick Thieberger, Keren Rice & Anthony C. Woodbury. 2018. Reproducible research in linguistics: A position statement on data citation and attribution in our field. *Linguistics* 56(1). 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.1515/ling-2017-0032>.
- Dunn, Michael, Simon Greenhill, Stephen Levinson & Russell Gray. 2011. Evolved structure of language shows lineage-specific trends in word-order universals. *Nature* 473(7345). 79–82.
- Epps, Patience. 2008. Hup's typological treasures: Description and explanation in the study of an Amazonian language. *Linguistic Typology* 12(2). 169–193.
- Evans, Nicholas. 2000. Iwaidjan, a very un-Australian language family. *Linguistic Typology* 4(1). 91–142.
- Evans, Nicholas & Toshiki Osada. 2005. Mundari: The myth of a language without word classes. *Linguistic Typology* 9(3). 351–390.
- François, Alex. 2005. A typological overview of Mwotlap, an Oceanic language of Vanuatu. *Linguistic Typology* 9(1). 115–146.
- Hill, Nathan. 2012. Mirativity doesn't exist: *hdug* in Lhasa Tibetan and other suspects. *Linguistic Typology* 16(3). 389–433.
- Hyman, Larry & Maria Koptjevskaja-Tamm (eds.). 2017. The unabashed typologist: A Frans Plank Schubertiade. 21st anniversary issue of *Linguistic Typology* in honor of Frans Plank. *Linguistic Typology* 21. 1–8.
- Maslova, Elena. 2000. A dynamic approach to the verification of distributional universals. *Linguistic Typology* 4(3). 307–333.
- McWhorter, John. 2001. The world's simplest grammars are creole grammars. *Linguistic Typology* 5(2–3). 125–166.
- Quesada, J. Diego. 1999. Chibchan, with special reference to participant-highlighting. *Linguistic Typology* 3(2). 209–257.
- Yager, Joanne & Niclas Burenhult. 2017. Jedek: A newly discovered Aslian variety of Malaysia. *Linguistic Typology* 21(3). 493–545.

LT Editors Frans Plank and Maria Koptjevskaja-Tamm
de Gruyter Mouton, Berlin, October 2017.