REVIEW OF CRISTOFARO & ZÚÑIGA (EDS.) (2018), *TYPOLOGICAL HIERARCHIES IN SYNCHRONY AND DIACHRONY*

EYSTEIN DAHL
Goethe-Universität, Frankfurt a.M.

1 INTRODUCTION

Since Silverstein's (1976: 113) introduction of the notion of hierarchy of 'inherent lexical content', typological hierarchies have developed into one of the most powerful descriptive tools in functional linguistics. Therefore, a volume with the explicit goal of exploring 'in what ways diachronic evidence can further our understanding of one of the most important patterns investigated in functional-typological research, typological hierarchies' (p. 5) is most welcome. The present anthology contains twelve original and intriguing chapters dealing with different dimensions of hierarchically based explanations, and an introductory chapter by the editors that summarizes the state of the art and the specific contributions of each of the chapters in an excellent and pellucid manner.

As emphasized in the introduction, there is a fundamental tension between synchronically oriented explanations based on typological hierarchies and different types of diachronic evidence. Much work within the functional-typological tradition is based on the assumption that language use shapes language patterns. A corollary of this view is that patterns recurring across languages are the result of analogous diachronic processes. Accordingly, for a feature to count as an explanatory factor in synchronic perspective, it is necessary to demonstrate that it plays a role in diachrony. As it turns out, however, there has been a strong trend in diachronically oriented typology to

focus upon macro-level geographical and genealogical distribution patterns and their interaction with more general cross-linguistic principles that are independent of geography and linguistic affiliation. In contrast, the micro-level origins, source constructions, diachronic processes and grammaticalization patterns have received less attention within this field of research. Although the various contributions collected in this volume deal with different empirical and thematic issues, their main common focus is on the relationship between diachronic data and typological hierarchies. The relation between the apparent hierarchical distribution of some synchronic feature and its historical source tends to be indirect. Specifically, the rise of a given marker in a given morphosyntactic context is often the result of grammaticalization with local scope. It is therefore unclear to what extent typological hierarchies can be invoked as an explanatory factor in diachronic processes, even if a convincing case could be made for the claim that language-specific analogical extension sometimes appears to follow hierarchical patterns. The present volume represents an important contribution to the field of diachronic typology, and the remainder of this review briefly summarizes some of the main points made in each of the chapters, without, however, any claim to doing full justice to them.

In the first thematic chapter 'Evolutionary Phonology and the life cycle of voiceless sonorants', Juliette Blevins examines the distribution of contrastively voiceless sonorant consonants and contrastively voiceless vowels across languages, tracing their historical sources. She notes (p. 48) that 'phonological contrasts between voiceless sonorant consonants and their voiced counterparts may be five to ten times more common than those between voiceless vowels and their voiced counterparts.' Moreover, there is a relatively strong tendency for contrastively voiceless sonorant consonants to cluster in certain geographically restricted areas, for example along the American Northwest Coast. Here, such phonemes are found in languages belonging to no fewer than five linguistic families, including Eskimo-Aleut, Athabaskan, Klamath-Modoc, Pomoan and the language isolate Takelma. Contrastively voiceless sonorant consonants seemingly may derive from two kinds of phonetic contexts, namely cases where a sonorant is coarticulated with an immediately preceding or following sound involving devoicing or at phrase boundaries involving devoicing (cf. pp. 40-41). Examples of the former type are found in a number of Tibetan languages (notably Mngaris and Sbathang), examples of the latter appear in West Chadic (notably Angas/Ngas). Although the evidence for phonologically voiceless vowels and, consequently, their origin is considerably harder to come by, Blevins convincingly demonstrates that they may originate from the same two sources. On

her approach, the relative paucity of contrastively voiceless vowels *vis-à-vis* contrastively voiceless sonorants across languages finds an explanation in the following facts. First, in a situation where a voiceless vowel originates from a vowel coarticulated with an immediately adjacent voiceless sound, a new source of voiced coarticulated clusters is needed in the exact same phonological context in order for the voiceless vowel to be interpreted as contrastive. Taken together, this diachronic scenario presupposes a rather complex interplay of causal factors that would not be expected to occur frequently across languages. Second, in a situation where a voiceless vowel arises via final devoicing, the voiceless vowel may develop into a phoneme, but given the fact that such vowels have a weak or (close to) imperceptible pronunciation, one might expect them not to be diachronically persistent. Blevins' contribution illustrates how Evolutionary Phonology represents a very useful framework for exploring the diachronic origins and persistence of phonemes that are rare or marginal in natural languages.

The second chapter, 'The Obligatory Coding Principle in diachronic perspective' by Denis Creissels explores the diachronic interaction between consistently accusative or ergative argument coding patterns, on the one hand, and characteristic patterns of grammatical change that may alter or violate consistent patterns, or trigger the spread of non-canonical argument realization patterns. The Obligatory Coding Principle 'is a constraint according to which all verbal predicative constructions in a given language must include a nominal term showing a particular type of coding' (p. 73). On Creissels' approach, accusative and ergative alignment morphology represent two instantiations of this principle, accusative alignment selecting A and ergative alignment selecting P as the morphosyntactically privileged argument. Furthermore, he notes (p. 74) that default argument coding constructions often alternate with other construction types, typically showing one canonically coded argument and an omitted or obliquely coded argument. Examples of such constructions include passives, anticausatives/resultatives and antipassives, categories tending to have a relatively low discourse frequency compared with the default coding constructions in the same language. One type of alignment shift involves the reanalysis of such construction types as default, which results in a higher relative frequency, that is, markedness reversal. Another common mechanism of alignment change involves the rise of new Tense/Aspect/Mood categories via grammaticalization. Common examples involve the reanalysis of resultatives as perfects or of progressives involving nominalization into general imperfectives, which both may result in split alignment unless being regularized or readjusted via analogy from the default argument realization pattern, as the Obligatory Coding Principle

would make one expect. Creissels notes (p. 93) that 'there is no need to look for direct semantic/functional explanations of the fact that just a few TAM-driven alignment variations are well attested, while others are marginal or not attested at all. (...) Given the strong tendency to eliminate the violations of the Obligatory Coding Principle resulting from the grammaticalization of TAM, the only TAM-driven alignment variations that have a relatively good chance to surface again and again in different languages are those likely to result from particularly common grammaticalization paths.' A third type of grammatical shift involves the conventionalization of A or P ellipsis. The effects of this mechanism upon alignment typology are most clearly visible when some construction shows conventionalized A ellipsis in languages with predominantly accusative alignment typology or P ellipsis in languages with predominantly ergative alignment typology. A fourth and final type of change discussed by Creissels is represented by univerbation of light verb compounds, characteristically involving suppression of the P argument. In languages showing predominantly accusative alignment, this change does not visibly affect the alignment system; in cases where the language has predominantly ergative alignment, on the other hand, the lack of an expressed P results in a violation of the Obligatory Coding Principle. To summarize, Creissels' contribution to this volume represents a welcome new analysis of problems within diachronic alignment typology within an innovative framework that has considerable descriptive and explanatory power.

Marianne Mithun's contribution 'Deconstructing teleology' explores to what extent typological hierarchies can be shown to influence the shaping of languages. Her study is based on the development of number marking in Iroquoian, Differential Head Marking in Siouan and Iroquoian, and alignment splits resulting from the reanalysis of instruments in Coosan languages Hanis and Miluk, and from the reanalysis of passives in Siuslaw. Comparative-historical reconstruction indicates that Proto-Northern-Iroquoian had a prefixed dual marker in the first and singular persons, but no such marker in the third person. However, the Northern Iroquoian language Tuscarora-Nottoway has secondarily developed a prefixed marker for distinguishing dual number in the third person, which is cognate to a verbal prefix with a variety of functions in the Iroquoian languages, including change of state, change of position and 'two-ness'. On the other hand, Lake Iroquoian, another language belonging to Northern Iroquoian, has secondarily acquired dual number marking with third person animates. However, in this case this is the result of analogical extension of the marker used in the first and second person. Mithun notes (p. 115) that the fact that both of these languages show converging innovations in this domain

may be taken to suggest that implicational hierarchies play a role in the development of grammar. As regards Differential Head Marking, on the other hand, she observes (p. 117) that Siouan has pronominal verbal prefixes for first and second persons, but no such marker for third persons. She also draws attention to the fact that Northern Iroquoian languages generally have pronominal prefixes on verbs indexing core arguments, including animate and inanimate third person prefixes, but that inanimate suffixes are omitted when other arguments are present. While these distribution patterns clearly reflect a propensity towards selecting speech act participants as discourse topic, this fact does not warrant the conclusion that the Referential/Topicality/Animacy/Empathy Hierarchy directly influences the shaping of argument realization morphosyntax according to Mithun (p. 119). Similar observations apply to alignment splits resulting from the reanalysis of instruments, which typically involve inanimate referents. This would straightforwardly explain why ergative morphosyntax tends to appear at the right end of the Referential/Topicality/Animacy/Empathy Hierarchy. However, this does not imply that this hierarchy is the original motivator for person-based alignment splits, as rightly noted by Mithun (p. 120). As regards alignment splits resulting from the reanalysis of passives, the cases discussed in this chapter clearly involve a complex series of interrelated developments with separate motivations, and the hierarchy under scrutiny does not seem to be a primary motivation. Mithun concludes (p. 125) that 'language change that consists of a single step, like the development of a number category, might be teleological in the sense that it can reflect frequent speaker choices. (...) But changes that involve multiple steps are rarely directly teleological: each step is motivated on its own.' Her analysis of the data provides strong evidence in favor of the view that hierarchies do not play a role in the development of grammatical patterns. On the other hand, however, there is evidence that hierarchies may determine the direction of analogical extension within a given morphosyntactic domain.

Spike Gildea and Joana Jansen's article 'The development of referential hierarchy effects in Sahaptian' provides an intriguing overview of the complex patterns of hierarchical alignment in main clauses shown by the languages belonging to this linguistic family. Drawing on previous work (e.g. Gildea & Zúñiga 2016), the authors note that hierarchical effects are most clearly present in the interaction between Speech Act Participants (SAP), i.e. first and second person, on the one hand, and third person, on the other. In transitive situations, one may distinguish four types of interaction, namely a 'local' scenario, where an SAP A acts on an SAP O, a 'nonlocal' scenario, where a third person acts on a third person, a 'mixed direct' scenario, where an SAP

acts on a third person, and a 'mixed inverse' scenario, where a third person acts on an SAP. Hierarchical alignment refers to situations where a given language has several main clause types, the selection of which depending on the scenarios just defined. The authors make extensive use of these scenarios in their description of Sahaptian languages and in their reconstruction of Proto-Sahaptian, with detailed discussion of a large amount of primary data from the languages under scrutiny. A particularly intriguing dimension of their analytical model worth drawing attention to is summarized in Section 2.2 'Aligning the morphemes and constructions'. This part of the paper provides a detailed outline of the complex interaction between personal indexation and case marking in construction patterns relating to the four above scenarios, summarized in Figure 3 (p. 147). The empirical wealth of this paper makes it difficult to do even partial justice to its many original observations and conclusions. However, as noted by the authors themselves, the data explored in this paper show that hierarchical patterns in Sahaptian derive from a multitude of source constructions and via different diachronic development paths, and that if 'there is a single universal hierarchy that somehow motivates all these changes, it must be as messy as the changes themselves (p. 185).'

In the fifth chapter of the volume 'Diachrony and the referential hierarchy in Old Irish', Aaron Griffith takes a fresh look at the so-called *notae augentes* in Old Irish, a group of clitics appearing in a restricted number of well-defined syntactic contexts. However, Griffith restricts his attention to the use of *notae augentes* to express verbal arguments. The philological tradition has adopted the assumption that they might be used in emphasis of any verbal argument. As it turns out, however, their appearance is determined by the relative prominence of a given argument on the person/animacy scale, in the sense that they must agree with the highest-ranked argument. Moreover, only one clitic belonging to this class can appear with a given verb, a fact Griffith relates (p. 196) to their different source constructions, which include pronouns, deictic markers and an adjective meaning 'same, equal'. While the development from full pronoun to pronominal is straightforward, and the development from deictic marker to personal pronoun can hardly count as unexpected, the development from a lexical adjective 'same, equal' is striking and difficult to explain, as also noted by the author (p. 199, fn. 9). Turning to a brief discussion of the function of the *notae augentes*, Griffith suggests in line with the philological tradition that their function was to provide 'additional emphasis' (p. 200) and notes that a given sentence could contain more than one such clitic, third person forms also being used to mark discourse topics. This last fact might be taken to motivate the use and eventual integration of

the adjective 'same, equal' into this set of clitics, as he points out (p. 200). On the diachronic analysis presented in this paper, the restriction that only one *notae* clitic can be associated with a given verb form derives directly from the more general restriction that the deictics ultimately underlying these forms may be assumed to yield conflicting deictic values when appearing together (p. 201). Furthermore, Griffith makes the plausible claim that the Old Irish data are indicative of hierarchical alignment, and suggests that the ranking of SAPs above third person reflects the fact that the *notae* do not co-occur with NPs or relative pronouns, so that they will always be available for SAPs, but not always with third person referents. As regards the SAPs, however, Griffith demonstrates (p. 208) that the *notae* tend to select first person over second person, even if this tendency is more apparent in the singular than in the plural. He connects their relative preference for the first person to their function as markers of discourse topics, noting that first person is more topic-worthy than other referents.

Antoine Guillaume's contribution 'From ergative case-marking to hierarchical agreement. A reconstruction of the argument-marking system of Reyesano (Takanan, Bolivia)' focuses on first and second person verbal prefixes in Reyesano, where we find a hierarchical alignment pattern reflecting the hierarchy 2>1>3, and the absence of an ergative case marking system in this language. Reyesano belongs to the Takanan family, and Guillaume suggests (p. 219) that both of the mentioned features represent innovations unique to Reyesano rather than archaisms stemming from a prehistoric stage shared with other related languages. On his analysis, the verbal first and second person markers derive from independent SAP pronouns in second position, eventually becoming clitics and, subsequently, person markers. A likely trigger for these developments is language contact, speakers of Reyesano being forcibly included in Jesuit missions/reductions together with speakers of languages belonging to other linguistic families (e.g. Mojeño, Cayubaba, Canichana, Movima) that have either SAP verbal prefixes or SAP verbal proclitics. While an explanation along such lines may be convincing and point to a secondary development of verbal indexation in this language, the argument for the loss of ergative case marking may strike one as slightly less compelling. Guillaume argues (pp. 233–234) that Reyesano according to the internal classification of the languages in the Takanan family belongs to the Takanik branch, where the other members (Araona, Cavineña, Ese Ejja and Tacana) all show ergative case marking seemingly reflecting the same source construction. His argument is based on the hypothesis that Proto-Takanan possessed an ergative morpheme, which was partially lost in Tacana, where there is optional ergative marking, and completely lost

in Reyesano. Under his approach, the optional ergative marking system in Tacana reflects a first stage in the gradual loss of the ergative case, which has been completed in Reyesano. However, the author does not provide comparative evidence from Takanan languages outside the Takanik branch for the reconstruction of the ergative marker. One might therefore be tempted to point out that the exact opposite development, from non-ergative to ergative, is equally possible, and that Tacana, on such an analysis, reflects an early stage in the development of ergative case marking in this branch.

In Chapter 7 'The direction(s) of analogical change in direct/inverse systems', Guillaume Jacques and Anton Antonov explore the development of the so-called conjunct order in Algonquian languages. It represents one of five sets of inflectional paradigms that can be reconstructed for Proto-Algonquian, which in most of the present-day members of this linguistic family have been reduced to three: the independent, the conjunct and the imperative orders. Forms subsumed under the conjunct order mainly appear in subordinate clause contexts, while independent order forms generally occur in main clauses. The paper is based on four case studies, where the authors examine the complex systems of conjunct endings in Plains Cree, Nishnaabemwim, Mi'gmaq and Arapaho. Drawing on the reconstructed paradigm of conjunct endings in Proto-Algonquian, their key goal is to trace the analogical patterns leading to the innovative paradigms in the languages under scrutiny. Proto-Algonquian had an alignment system based on tripartite, accusative and neutral patterns with a direct/inverse system in the non-local scenarios ($3 \rightarrow 3'$, $3' \rightarrow 3$), which in the course of time has given rise to systems partly based on a more widespread direct/inverse opposition. From their presentation and analysis of the data, it is clear that the analogical processes represent independent developments in the four languages and that they follow rather different patterns, which, intriguingly, results in systems with similar structure.[1] Based on their analysis of the comparative and historical data from the four Algonquian languages, the authors propose the following generalizations concerning the directionality of analogy (p. 284): 'First, analogy operates from $3' \rightarrow 3$ to $3 \rightarrow$ SAP and from $3 \rightarrow 3'$ to all SAP$\rightarrow$3 forms (...). Second, analogy can apply from SAP$\rightarrow$3 forms to $3 \rightarrow$ SAP and local forms (...). Third, analogy first applies to plural SAP forms before influencing singular SAP forms, both in the case of $3 \rightarrow$ SAP and SAP$\rightarrow$3 paradigms (...). Fourth, analogy first applies to $3 \rightarrow$ SAP before affecting SAP$\rightarrow$3 forms. There appears to be no hierarchy between $3 \rightarrow$ SAP

---

1 Although this is not explicitly stated anywhere in the paper, the spread of direct/inverse as a grammatically relevant distinction in the conjunct order may be speculated to have been partly motivated by the fact that this distinction played a central role in the independent order paradigm (cf. e.g. Pentland 1999).

and local forms as to their sensitivity to analogy.' An important point arising from these findings is that the hierarchical alignment systems in the Algonquian languages represent the outcome of diverse analogical processes that do not seem to be determined by any clear person hierarchy. Thus, this paper confirms the approach to typological hierarchies taken in the present volume, as convenient post-hoc descriptive devices rather than an explanatory model. To conclude: the present work represents a pioneering study of the analogical processes leading to hierarchical alignment, and one might expect that its tentative conclusions will engender fruitful and critical scientific debate.

Chapter 8 'Are the Tupi-Guarani hierarchical indexing systems really motivated by the person hierarchy?' by Françoise Rose deals with similar data in a genealogically and geographically different context. Among the language groups of South America, the Tupí-Guaraní branch of the Tupí family stands out as one of the most comprehensively described and best understood, having been formally studied for more than 400 years. The hierarchical indexing system of Tupí-Guaraní is often taken to instantiate the hierarchical order 1 > 2 > 3, a property more or less established in the pertinent literature (cf., for instance, Payne 1994). Rose convincingly shows that an analysis along these lines is far too simplistic as it fails to capture the full range of constellations attested across the languages of the Tupí-Guaraní branch. The paper examines three types of pertinent counterevidence, portmanteau morphemes for the $1 \rightarrow 2$ constellation, systematic indexation of P and systematic indexation of A, all of which are attested in the group of languages under scrutiny. More specifically, Kamaiurá represents one example of a language employing portmanteau markers, namely the prefixes *oro-* and *opo-*. The prefix *oro-* indicates that the first argument (A) is first person, and the second argument (P) is second person singular, while the prefix *opo-* surfaces in situations where the first argument (A) is first person, and the second argument (P) is second person plural. Rose rightly points out that such cases provide no clear hierarchical relation between first and second person, given that the portmanteau morphemes encode particular constellations of first and second persons, without giving preference to either of them. Related points concern indexation in languages such as Guajá and Jopara, where all local configurations index P, and in languages such as Emérillon and Wayampi, where A is the target of indexation in such configurations. Accordingly, Rose claims that there is no reason to postulate any type of hierarchy in local configurations in the Tupí-Guaraní languages. These findings have important repercussions for the reconstruction of the diachronic dimension of hierarchical alignment in this branch. Previous

work, such as Jensen (1998: 565), assumes that the hierarchical systems in the Tupí-Guaraní languages have developed from an erstwhile ergative-absolutive system, and that hierarchical relations have played a central part in this development. The traditional reconstruction of the Tupí-Guaraní indexation system involves two person index slots in three constellations, SAP → 3, 3 →3 and 1 → 2pl, with the order A-P-V, and in these cases no hierarchical organization seems to be needed, as Rose rightly points out. Indeed, careful scrutiny reveals that the reconstructed indexing system might as well be described in terms of a hierarchy P > A rather than one based on the SAP participants, except for mixed scenarios. According to Rose, the hierarchical indexing of the SAP > 3 type is easily explainable as the outcome of a grammaticalization of pronominal paradigms with no form for the third person, something which would result in a situation where only the SAP pronouns surfaced as prefixes. To conclude, this chapter makes a strong case against the claim that the hierarchy 1 > 2 > 3 has strong explanatory potential in the synchronic and diachronic analysis of the indexation system of the Tupí-Guaraní languages.

In Chapter 9 'Incipient hierarchical alignment in four Central Salish languages from the Proto-Salish middle' Zalmai ʔəswəli Zahir presents a fine historical-comparative study of the argument realization patterns in the Central Salish languages Squamish, Halkomelem, Klallam and Lushootseed. The paper focuses upon verbal constructions characterized by markers deriving from the Proto-Salish middle marker *m, and one of two transitivizers, *t and *nəw, the former implying control and the latter limited control. The constructions under scrutiny are V-TR, V-MID and V-TR-MID. He notes (p. 310) that while the V-TR construction is uncontroversial, the classification of the V-TR-MID construction is somewhat less straightforward. Some scholars (e.g. Gerdts & Hukari 2006, Montler 2010) take the V-TR-MID construction to represent a passive category in Halkomelem and Klallam, while others (e.g. Hess 1993) regard this construction as an active, transitive P-promoting clause type. On the other hand, the antipassive status of the V-MID construction seems to be taken for granted. Zahir discusses the various constructions and their complex interaction with pronouns, pronominal clitics and full noun phrases, showing that the V-TR construction instantiates a neutral case marking pattern, while the (antipassive) V-MID construction has an unmarked A and a marked P, and the V-TR-MID construction has an unmarked P and a marked A. Neither of the verbal constructions shows hierarchical alignment, but Zahir argues that in combination a system emerges where the distribution of the verbal constructions across the LOCAL, DIRECT, NONLOCAL and INVERSE domains is indicative of an emerging person-based hierarchical

system. Specifically, he notes a number of important tendencies across the four Central Languages that the V-ᴛʀ construction is the only available one in configurations with an SAP A and SAP P, a fact which, on his analysis, speaks against a classification of the V-ᴛʀ construction as a passive. In cases where there is a third person A and a SAP P, on the other hand, the V-ᴍɪᴅ construction is unacceptable, reflecting a more general ban on oblique marking of SAP arguments. In contrast, both the originally active V-ᴛʀ and the originally passive V-ᴛʀ-ᴍɪᴅ constructions are available; however, Zahir observes that the text frequency of the V-ᴛʀ-ᴍɪᴅ construction is higher than one would expect if it were a passive. In Lushootseed, for instance, it is attested in 9 out of 31 inverse cases in his corpus, that is, 29%, which is higher than the 15–20% he would expect a passive to make out.[2] In the other languages, the V-ᴛʀ-ᴍɪᴅ construction has almost (Squamish, Halkomelem) or fully (Klallam) replaced the V-ᴛʀ construction with inverse configurations, being obligatory in cases where a third person A acts on a second person P Squamish and Halkomelem, and in all cases where a third person A acts on a SAP P in Klallam. These facts show that the V-ᴛʀ-ᴍɪᴅ construction, although originating from a passive construction, no longer represents a passive construction in the four Central Salish languages under scrutiny, having developed into a more general unmarked transitive patientive (or ergative) voice construction.[3] Intriguingly, however, this very same construction is unacceptable in configurations with a SAP A and a third person P, which Zahir links to the general ban on oblique case marking on SAP arguments, mentioned above. The two other constructions, V-ᴛʀ and V-ᴍɪᴅ, are available but show significant differences in relative text frequency, V-ᴛʀ being predominant and V-ᴍɪᴅ being rather infrequent, only occurring in 5-6% of the cases with a direct configuration. This fact corroborates an antipassive analysis of the V-ᴍɪᴅ construction, at least in the direct domain. As regards the nonlocal domain, all three constructions occur, V-ᴛʀ being the unmarked choice in most cases. However, Zahir notes that there are some restrictions on its occurrence, namely that in Halkomelem, the A argument must be animate, the V-ᴛʀ-ᴍɪᴅ construction being the only option with inanimate As, and that in Squamish and Klallam, the V-ᴛʀ only appears with the NP order VAP. To

---

2 In fact, there appears to be some inconsistency here, because on p. 328 Zahir mentions that the use of the V-ᴛʀ-ᴍɪᴅ construction is over 30%, while the numbers in Table 11 on p. 337 amount to 29%. However, this has little or no impact on the general claim of the paper – that the V-ᴛʀ-ᴍɪᴅ construction does not represent a passive construction.

3 At this point, it should be emphasized that the hypothesis that ergative alignment patterns may arise from passive constructions remains controversial (cf. the papers in Dahl & Stroński 2016 and Casaretto, Dimmendaal, Hellwig, Reinöhl & Schneider-Blum 2020 for some recent perspectives on this issue.)

conclude, the comparative data presented in this paper provide a nice illustration of the complex interrelations that may arise between different verbal constructions and different configurations of arguments. Moreover, they also demonstrate how grammaticalization of a given argument realization pattern sometimes has rather restricted scope, essentially appearing in only some of the configurational domains.

Scott DeLancey's contribution 'Deictic and sociopragmatic effects in Tibeto-Burman SAP indexation' takes as its point of departure the fact that it is impossible to establish a cross-linguistically robust ranking between the speech act participants, even though their ranking *vis-à-vis* third person is consistent both within and across languages. Several Tibeto-Burman languages show hierarchical indexation, but, as DeLancey demonstrates, the relative ranking of SAP-participants in local configurations is anything but consistent across the languages under scrutiny. The study focuses upon languages belonging to four subgroups of Tibeto-Burman, Rgyalrongic, Northern Naga, Kiranti and Nungish, which all represent well-established clades.[4] DeLancey observes (p. 352) that the three existing approaches to hierarchical phenomena, based on markedness, deixis and topicality, all fail to provide a sufficient explanation for the lack of consistent ranking of the SAPs across languages, or more precisely, they make predictions that do not hold. In contrast, the account offered in the present contribution emphasizes the impact of avoidance strategies for SAP reference, which, according to the author 'are persistent sources of new paradigmatic forms in TB' (p. 353). This is, amongst other things, reflected in the fact that it is necessary to reconstruct two distinct 2nd person verb forms for Proto-Tibeto-Burman. One, which derives from a pronominal source construction and shares its syntagmatic position with the other indexation markers with analogous origins, and a second one with a less immediately clear origin, which DeLancey takes to reflect a 'sociopragmatically motivated substitute for the regular form' (p. 353). He also observes (p. 353) that there is some evidence for a third indexation marker of the 2nd person, the origin of which lies in an irrealis construction. More generally, there is, according to DeLancey (p. 355), a tendency across the Tibeto-Burman languages to maintain the SAP > 3 hierarchy by regularly innovating syntagmatic patterns that favor this ranking. This includes the emergence of new inverse marking, which demonstrably has developed out of different source constructions. Another recurring tendency is to develop unique and often non-transparent marking of the local configuration 1→2 and at the same time employ the same

---

4 DeLancey notes (p. 347) that the internal classification of the Tibeto-Burman languages remains controversial.

form for the configurations 2→1 and 3→1, usually by analogical extension of the 2→1 marker. A last important tendency is the use of passive or impersonal constructions in the 2→1 configuration, which, together with the tendency to extend the marking of this configuration to the 3→1 configuration, in many cases essentially involves impersonal marking of forms with a first person P argument. DeLancey (p. 366ff.) draws attention to the important, though rarely emphasized fact that the assumption that 1st and 2nd person are simply two referents on a par with 3rd person may be fallacious or at least imprecise. The SAPs have very different discourse properties than NPs and anaphoric pronouns, their function being indexical rather than referential. He rightly points out (p. 367) that most studies of topic continuity and related issues are based on studies of 'allophoric' referents in narrative discourse, which also forms the basis of claims concerning the discourse properties of SAPs. Since SAPs, in particular 2nd person, only very rarely co-occur in narrative discourse, it is dubious, to say the least, whether the insights gleaned from such studies have any relevance for understanding the properties associated with 1st and, perhaps especially, 2nd person marking. In other words, the SAPs and their 3rd person counterparts are anchored in different realms of discourse, and it is just this difference which motivates the universal ranking SAP > 3. On the other hand, the specific rankings between the SAPs reflect choices among different strategies that highlight or avoid particular perspectives on the speech situation and the social context in which it takes place. Here, the recurrent tendencies in Tibeto-Burman to develop a unique marking for the 1→2 constellation and to have a non-unique marking for the 2→1 constellation are cases in point. According to DeLancey (p. 370) these empirical facts indicate that 'languages conspire to emphasize reference to the addressee in 1→2 events, and eliminate any such reference in 2→1.' To conclude, the paper makes a strong case for the claim that sociopragmatics represents a fruitful and largely untapped approach to hierarchical alignment patterns.

Chapter 11 'Morphosyntactic coding of proper names and its implications for the Animacy Hierarchy' by Johannes Helmbrecht, Lukas Denk, Sarah Thanner and Ilenia Tonetti is a concise and critical study of the coding of proper names in cross-linguistic perspective, with particular emphasis on how proper names relate to other types of pronouns and nouns. The paper sets out with a short overview of the many grammatical phenomena where Animacy-related properties may explain behavioral differences between different types of referential expressions. They note (p. 378) that the Animacy hierarchy as usually defined involves three overlapping semantic dimensions, namely person (1/2 > 3), definiteness (pronoun > proper name < common

noun) and animacy in a strict sense (human > animate > inanimate (common nouns)). Most versions of the hierarchy place proper names and, in many cases, also kinship terms between personal pronouns and common nouns, but this is only very rarely supported by empirical evidence, and thus is a hypothesis rather than an empirical generalization, as rightly pointed out by the authors (p. 379). The authors derive a number of empirical predictions from this assumption, notably that one should find cutoff points in systems with alignment split directly to the right and left of proper names at the hierarchy and that proper names should alternately pattern with (groups of) pronouns and with (subclasses of) nouns. Moreover, proper names, being situated at the very middle of the Animacy hierarchy, tend to show tripartite marking in languages with split alignment systems but one would nonetheless expect there to be cutoff points to the right and to the left of proper names. Drawing on a sample of ca. 30 split-ergative languages from different regions and 7 languages with hierarchical marking, the paper explores these predictions, concluding that the evidence for postulating proper names and/or kinship terms as a separate referential category on the Animacy hierarchy is at best extremely weak. Judging from the data presented in this paper, proper names and kinship terms strongly tend to show the same morphosyntactic behavior as other nouns. However, in two of the languages included in the survey, Arabana and Yidin^y, proper names seem to pattern with some personal pronouns, and, interestingly, these patterns involve tripartite marking interacting with optional accusative-marking in Yidin^y (p. 386). The investigation has also identified a number of split marking patterns that run counter to the predictions of the Animacy hierarchy, mostly involving proper names and personal pronouns, thus adding to a growing body of evidence that the Animacy hierarchy has probabilistic rather than absolute predictive power. Intriguingly, the authors mention the coding properties in Tlahuitoltepec Mixe, a language with hierarchical alignment, as a morphosyntactic system where proper names are ranked higher than human and animate common nouns, and lower than personal pronouns. To conclude, this paper represents an important pilot study of the relative ranking of proper names on the Animacy hierarchy. Its most central findings are that the evidence for assuming that proper names represent a cross-linguistically well-defined type of NP is weak and that, consequently, the Animacy hierarchy as traditionally conceptualized may be in need of revision.

Chapter 12 'Generic person marking in Japhug and other Gyalrong languages' by Guillaume Jacques gives an overview of a number of morphosyntactic peculiarities characteristic of Gyalrong languages, with par-

ticular focus upon Japhug, Tshobdun and Situ. Section 2 outlines some of the pertinent morphosyntactic features of Japhug, including an overview of the non-past transitive and intransitive verbal paradigms, and the subtle interaction between hierarchical alignment and inverse verb morphology. As regards generic marking, Jacques (p. 408) mentions five strategies for expressing indefinite referents, namely argument demoting voice alternations, agent-preserving lability, indefinite pronouns, plural suffixes on the verb and specific generic markers (*kɯ-* and *wɣ-*), which are the main focus of the following discussion. The marker *kɯ-* denotes generic human S or P arguments, transitive verbs being barred from carrying any further A marking, which is third person and definite. Importantly, however, forms characterized by the generic markers can appear with an expressed generic (S or P) argument, typically expressed by a general noun or a generic pronoun; however, Jacques (p. 412) notes that a verb can only have one generic argument. Japhug also has a number of nominalization prefixes, one of which is identical with the generic marker marker *kɯ-*, which Jacques (p. 415) quite plausibly takes to be historically related with the latter. After a brief outline of the systems of generic person marking and nominalization in Tshobdun and Situ, the chapter provides a historical sketch of the prehistorical developments that have led to the different systems attested in the modern languages. These involve four grammaticalization patterns, nominalizer (core arguments) to generic person (neutral), generic person (neutral) + inverse to generic person (P), inverse to generic person (A) and generic person (neutral) + SAP person marker to portmanteau local scenario affix. As Jacques himself (p. 422) points out, the first and fourth patterns are well known, while the second and third have not been identified previously.

In this review, I hope to have shown that the present volume is an immensely important contribution to linguistic typology as well as to functionally oriented traditions in linguistics. One may anticipate that its many valuable contributions will have considerable impact on future discussions pertaining to hierarchies, not least concerning the many intriguing problems connected with hierarchical alignment, and their role in linguistic description and theory.

References

Casaretto, Antje, Gerrit J. Dimmendaal, Birgit Hellwig, Uta Reinöhl & Gertrud Schneider-Blum. 2020. Roots of ergativity in Africa (and beyond). *Studies in African Linguistics* 49. 111–140.

Cristofaro, Sonia & Fernando Zúñiga (eds.). 2018. *Typological hierarchies in synchrony and diachrony*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Dahl, Eystein & Krzysztof Stroński (eds.). 2016. *Indo-Aryan ergativity in typological and diachronic perspective*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Gerdts, Donna B. & Thomas E. Hukari. 2006. The Halkomelem middle: A complex network of constructions. *Anthropological Linguistics* 48. 44–81.

Gildea, Spike & Fernando Zúñiga. 2016. Referential hierarchies: A new look at some historical and typological patterns. *Linguistics* 54. 483–529.

Hess, Thom. 1993. A schema for the presentation of Lushootseed verb stems. In Anthony Mattina & Timothy Montler (eds.), *American Indian linguistics and ethnography in honor of Laurence C. Thomas*, 113–127. Missoula, MT: Linguistics Laboratory, University of Montana.

Jensen, Cheryl. 1998. Comparative Tupí-Guaraní morphosyntax. In Desmond Derbyshire & Geoffrey Pullum (eds.), *Handbook of Amazonian languages*, vol. 4, 490–603. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Montler, Timothy. 2010. *A double passive construction in Klallam*. Bellingham, WA: Whatcom Museum.

Pentland, David H. 1999. The morphology of the Algonquian independent order. In David H. Pentland (ed.), *Papers of the Thirtieth Algonquian Conference*, Winnipeg: University of Manitoba.

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

Eystein Dahl
Institut für Empirische Sprachwissenschaft
Goethe-Universität, Frankfurt a.M.
Senckenberganlage 31
60325 Frankfurt a.M.
Germany
eystein.dahl@uit.no
Dahl@em.uni-frankfurt.de