

[Review of:] **Mohammad Dabir-Moghaddam. *Typology of Iranian languages***. 2nd edn. Tehran: SAMT, 2023. xl+1152 pp. ISBN: 9786000231392.

Roohollah Mofidi

Ruhr-Universität Bochum (Bochum, Germany);
Roohollah.Mofidi@edu.ruhr-uni-bochum.de;
ORCID: 0000-0002-9966-0580

For citation: Mofidi R. [Review of:] Mohammad Dabir-Moghaddam. Typology of Iranian languages. 2nd edn. Tehran: SAMT, 2023. *Indo-Iranian Languages*. 2026. 2(1). P. 198–211.

DOI: 10.30842/30346800.2026.2.1.9

Рухолла Мофиди

Пурский университет в Бохуме (Бохум, Германия);
Roohollah.Mofidi@edu.ruhr-uni-bochum.de;
ORCID: 0000-0002-9966-0580

Для цитирования: Mofidi R. [Review of:] Mohammad Dabir-Moghaddam. Typology of Iranian languages. 2nd edn. Tehran: SAMT, 2023. *Indo-Iranian Languages*. 2026. 2(1). P. 198–211.

DOI: 10.30842/30346800.2026.2.1.9

“Typology of Iranian Languages” (xl+1152 pages, organized into 15 chapters) is a substantial contribution that presents data and analyses of 12 Modern West Iranian languages (including Balochi, Davani, Larestani, Talyshi, Vafsi, Kurdish, Hawrami, Laki, Delvari, Naini, Shahmirzadi, and Tati) in typological comparison with Persian (encompassing Old, Middle, and New Persian). The book addresses two major issues in these languages, namely word order (or constituent order) and agreement (or indexing), as well as case-marking in those languages that have

grammaticalized it. The original data derive from a 50-page questionnaire that has been designed by the author to collect the required information regarding the morphological and syntactic features of the investigated languages, while it also included sections on phonetic, phonological, and lexical characteristics, along with certain discourse structures. For each language (or for each investigated variety of the languages), most commonly two native speakers answered the questions of the questionnaire in elicitation sessions, and the sessions were recorded and transcribed by the author. The transcribed data were subsequently checked with the speakers in several in-person sessions. In addition, the author draws on the authentic published examples and texts from these languages.

The first major issue in the book, i.e. **word order**, is discussed based on 24 structural features adopted from Dryer [1992] and the updated database website of this paper (p. 108).¹ These features have been examined for each of the 12 investigated languages, as well as Old, Middle, and New Persian, presenting the results in tables in each chapter. These tables compare the attested patterns of the Iranian languages with the languages of the same area, i.e. Eurasia, and then, with the languages of the world, therefore, providing two distinct tables for each language. In the concluding chapter of the book, the author summarizes the position of Iranian languages among the languages of Eurasia in a table (p. 1075), presented here as Table 1. It suggests that Persian, Balochi, Davani, Larestani, Vafsi, Kurdish, Hawrami, Laki, Delvari, and Naini have grammaticalized higher correlation with the strong VO languages concerning the typological features of word order. This means that these Iranian languages have grammaticalized more word order features characteristic of strong VO languages, such as prepositions (i.e. the sequence of P+NP) and postmodifying nominal dependents (i.e. N+Genitive). Among these languages, Kurdish and Laki are more correlated with the strong VO order. In contrast, Talyshi, Shahmirzadi, and Tati exhibit more tendency towards strong OV languages, which may be exemplified by features such as postpositions (i.e. NP+P) and premodifying nominal dependents (i.e. Genitive+N). The author concludes that New Iranian languages are basically in an **intermediate** position between the prototypical strong VO and prototypical strong OV languages.

¹ I could not find any citation for this website in the book.

Table 1. New Iranian languages compared to the languages of Eurasia²

Language	Correlation with strong OV order	Correlation with strong VO order
Persian	12	17
Balochi	14 (Arbaban), 15 (Balochan)	19 (Arbaban), 19 (Balochan)
Davani	12	17
Larestani	12	16
Talyshi	17 (Anbaranbala ³)	16 (Anbaranbala)
Vafsi	14	17
Kurdish	12 (Banei, Sanandaji), 11 (Kalhori, Kermashani)	18 (Banei, Sanandaji), 16 (Kalhori), 17 (Kermashani)
Hawrami	13	17
Laki	11	17
Delvari	12	16
Naini	12	16
Shahmirzadi	17	16
Tati	16 (Chali/Shali in Takestan)	15 (Chali/Shali in Takestan)

Furthermore, the author presents a table (p. 1076) to compare the typological characteristics of New Iranian languages with the languages of the world. These findings confirm the correlations proposed by the above Table 1, with a difference in the status of Tati. This language is situated precisely between the two OV and VO languages, in contrast to its tendency towards OV languages in Table 1. On the other hand, a number of the investigated languages, namely Balochi, Talyshi, Vafsi, Shahmirzadi, and Tati, exhibit higher correlation with the weak verb-final languages in the Eurasian region. Nonetheless, the generalization is that all of the Iranian languages listed in Table 1 have grammaticalized a lot of VO features. This means that **all of these languages have a strong verb-middle (VO) tendency**. Moreover, none of these languages have grammaticalized a larger number of the weak VO order features than the strong VO order features. These

² The cells of the table provide the number of grammaticalized features, and the parentheses indicate the particular language varieties that have been investigated.

³ This village is located in the Gilan province (Iran), near the border of the Republic of Azerbaijan.

conclusions based on the areal samples in Eurasia are also verified when the investigated languages are compared to the languages of the world.

The above discussion is complemented with a list of 15 shared and 9 unshared word order features among the investigated Iranian languages, presented below as Table 2 (combining two original tables on pp. 1080–1081).

Table 2. The list of shared and unshared features of word order among New Iranian languages

Shared features	Head noun & Relative clause, Verb & Manner adverb, Copula & Complement, <i>xastan</i> [and equivalent verbs] & Subordinate clause verb, Demonstrative & Noun, Quantity adverb [=Intensifier] & Adjective, Question particle <i>aya</i> (if it exists) & Complement sentence, Subordinator/Conjunctive of adverbial clause & Complement clause, ⁴ Verb & Subject, Number & Noun, Main verb & Auxiliary verb(s) of ‘ability’, Complementizer (if it exists) & Subordinate clause, ⁵ Wh-movement, Object & Verb, Negative affix & Verbal root
Unshared features	Adposition type, Noun & Genitive, Adjective & Standard of comparison, Verb & Adpositional phrase, Noun & Adjective, Main verb & Tense-aspect auxiliary verb, Determiner & Noun, Tense-aspect affix & Verbal root, Noun & Possessive free morpheme

Subsequently, the author refers to two theoretical implications of the reported word order statistics. As the first implication, he contends that these data-driven and empirical pieces of evidence are incompatible with the binary and parametric approach of formalist theories, as they failed to provide an explanation for the characteristics of word order in the New Iranian languages. The second implication is that typological characteristics of New Iranian languages demonstrate that the **intermediate type** exists as a distinct type of word order as well, and this type should not be regarded merely as a temporary and transitional stage between the stages of being head-initial and head-final languages. In order to substantiate this claim, the author turns to word order characteristics of Old and Middle

⁴ E.g., Persian *haengam-i ke u raest* (time-INDF that (s)he go.PST.3SG) ‘when (s)he went’ (p. 115).

⁵ E.g., Persian *maen mi-dan-aem ke [u daersxan aest]* (I IPFV-know-1SG that (s)he studious be.PRS.3SG) ‘I know that (s)he is studious’ (p. 116).

Persian. Table 3 combines the original tables (pp. 122, 125) and the accompanying explanation regarding the issue.

Table 3. The features of word order in Old and Middle Persian

	Old Persian	Middle Persian
Features of OV type	2 features: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SOV • Complement & Copula 	2 features: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SOV • Complement & Copula
Features of VO type	5 features: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 18 prepositions; 2 pre-/postpositions;⁶ 2 postpositions • Head noun & Relative clause • Subordinator & Complement • Complementizer & Subordinate clause • <i>xastan</i> & Subordinate clause verb 	3 features: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Head noun & Relative clause • Subordinator & Complement • Complementizer & Subordinate clause
Shared features of OV & VO types	4 features: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Genitive & Noun, Noun & Genitive (with <i>hya</i> between them) • Demonstrative & Noun • Number & Noun • Adjective & Noun, Noun & Adjective (with <i>hya</i> between them) 	5 features: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Genitive & Noun, Noun & Genitive (with \bar{i} between them) • 24 prepositions, many of them used as postpositions as well; 1 postposition; 4 circumpositions⁷ • Demonstrative & Noun • Number & Noun • Adjective & Noun, Noun & Adjective (with \bar{i} between them)

⁶ In Old Persian, *patiy* and \bar{a} were prepositions that were employed as postpositions as well.

⁷ The comparison of Adposition & Noun order in Old and Contemporary Persian reveals further typological shift from the OV to VO type, since, as noted by the author (p. 122), the two Old Persian postpositions have reduced to one (i.e. *ra*) and the two

From these generalizations about Old and Middle Persian in relation to his aforementioned characterization of New Persian, the author concludes that **Persian has not ever been a totally head-initial or head-final language throughout its documented history, i.e. in the Old, Middle, and New periods.** Rather, this language has always exhibited intermediate typological characteristics, i.e. mixed features, regarding word order. I infer from the author's discussion that he does not reject the transitional analysis entirely. Instead, he emphasizes the observation that, in a diachronic perspective, Persian has always had, and still has, both the OV- and VO-type behavior, which is in contradiction to the parametric analysis of languages. The main question is that "if we were to interpret those intermediate and mixed features as signs of a change in the word order (which is of course undoubtedly the case),⁸ how can this gradual and slow change be explained by the positive or negative values of parameters? In other words, based on a parametric perspective, which has [only] two positive and negative values, can the transition stage between two types last for more than 2500 years?"⁹ (p. 1087). The author concludes from the discussion that the intermediate/mixed type should be viewed as a distinct type, considering this finding a significant theoretical achievement for typology (as an approach in linguistic studies) by the typological investigation of word order in Iranian languages.

At this point of the discussion, the author poses a question: how has the intermediate/mixed type developed, and which factors contribute to its emergence? He refers to a number of analyses from previous publications, which address this issue. An important study that he introduces in the rel-

Old Persian pre-/postpositions have vanished entirely. Moreover, the author describes the occurrence of pre-/postpositions and circumpositional phrases in Classical Persian (pp. 126–127), whose disappearance is evidently in line with the aforementioned further shift towards the VO type. However, an issue that still needs to be addressed is the stronger OV tendency of Middle and Classical Persian regarding the Adposition & Noun order in comparison to Old Persian, as partly evidenced by Table 3. This initial shift towards the OV type and the subsequent shift towards the VO type do not signify a unidirectional typological change, necessitating an explanation.

⁸This parenthetical phrasing is rather ambiguous. A more explicit statement from the author would be desirable whether or not he believes in an ongoing process of transition in the word order typology of Persian, both diachronically and synchronically (in Contemporary Persian).

⁹Translated into English by the reviewer.

evant section is Friedrich [1975], which analyses different tendencies in the word order of Old Avestan (i.e. Gatha) and Late Avestan. According to this study, Old Avestan had an SOV word order together with prepositions, and as a consequence of a typological change documented by Late Avestan texts, the frequency of verb-middle variables increased in this language, while the verb remained in the sentence-final position.¹⁰ Friedrich [Ibid.] argues that this typological change was triggered by Akkadian, Aramaic, and Greek, assuming it to be an instance of language contact and syntactic borrowing, which has resulted in areal linguistic convergence, i.e. **Sprachbund**.¹¹ Furthermore, Dabir-Moghaddam refers to Hickey's [2002] analysis of the typological behavior of Irish (with VSO word order and post-modifier adjectives and genitives), along with the proposed hypothesis in other studies regarding the impact of Atlantic languages (particularly the Semitic ones)¹² as the substrate layer on Irish as the superstratum. Dabir-Moghaddam's inference is that Hickey emphasizes the role of language-internal structural variation in the situations of language contact. According to this inference, every language features various structural choices and possibilities that might become the dominant choice due to the influence of other languages. In other words, in a contact situation, the frequency of marked structures may increase, so that they transform into unmarked structures, and conversely, earlier unmarked structures may become marked. This means that language-internal and language-external factors may both contribute to a particular change (p. 95).

Based on the above-mentioned reports of the mixed word order in certain languages, Dabir-Moghaddam's own analysis is that Elamite had

¹⁰ It seems that the author uses the term "verb-middle variables" to refer to the features of VO type, such as P+NP and N+Genitive. In many Iranian languages, these head-initial features are attested in several types of phrases (e.g., NP and PP), while the verb phrase encompasses the sequence of object+verb, which is a head-final feature.

¹¹ According to Friedrich [1975], Akkadian had similar uncommon and non-homogeneous typological features at the same time period as Avestan.

¹² Hickey [2002] adopts the term "Atlantic languages" from Vennemann (possibly [1994]), who believes that this language family is genetically related to the Afroasiatic family, particularly Semitic languages. Vennemann refers to the substrate layer as "a Semitic language" (p. 1093). However, upon reviewing the literature on this topic, we notice that "the substratum hypothesis" for Celtic languages is controversial. The critics of this hypothesis propose typological explanations for the structural similarities of Celtic and Semitic (cf. [Hewitt 2009] for the proponents and critics of the substratum hypothesis).

a very considerable impact in making the Iranian languages mixed and non-homogeneous typologically. Prior to the arrival of Iranian-speaking peoples in the late second millennium BC, Elamite was spoken by the native populations of parts of the land that would later be called “Iran”. These natives, being suppressed by the Achaemenids (as evidenced in some Achaemenids’ inscriptions that blame the Elamites’ religious beliefs), eventually abandoned their language and became speakers of Old Persian. Nonetheless, despite this language shift, Elamite as the substrate exerted influence on Old Persian syntax, which copied certain Elamite structures. As stated in [Hawkins 1983], Elamite was an SOV and postpositional language, with adjectives and genitives appearing after nouns. Dabir-Moghaddam does not advance the discussion to address the origin of the mixed typology in Elamite, though mentions of the mixed typology of Akkadian in other sections of the book may serve as a reference point for further discussion. Apparently, an extensive examination is still necessary to ascertain the reasons behind the mixed typological behavior of Elamite and to determine if any word order variation is evidenced in the extant Elamite texts, which could have potentially been influenced by language contact between Elamite and other languages. In other words, it is possible that the mixed word order of Elamite had in turn been produced by contact relations between this language and ones that already featured a mixed word order or those with consistent word order characteristics that clashed with that of Elamite.

The second major issue in the book is the **agreement systems** of the 12 investigated languages. The author has demonstrated that, among these languages, only Persian, Shahmirzadi, the Balochi of Zabol (i.e. Sistani Balochi), certain varieties of Southern Kurdish (including Kalthori Kurdish and Kermanshahi/Kermashani Kurdish) are consistently **nominative-accusative** in their agreement system. He adds Lori, Gilaki, and Mazandarani to this list as well, which have not been examined in the book.¹³ The other investigated New Iranian languages, namely the Balochi of Iranshahr, Davani, Larestani, Talyshi, Vafsi, Central Kurdish (Sanandaji

¹³ He reports to have collected and analyzed data on the word order and agreement features in these three languages that will be published later. Additionally, the data from three other New Iranian languages, namely Joshaghani (spoken near Kashan), Raji (from the Central Province in Iran), and Minabi (in the Hormozgan Province), have been collected by the author by means of the same questionnaire (p. 1102).

and Banei), Hawrami, Laki, Delvari, Naini, and Tati, have a **split agreement system**. In this group, for the S-arguments (i.e. subjects of intransitive verbs) in both present and past tenses and the A-arguments (i.e. subjects of transitive verbs) in the present tense, agreement suffixes appear on the verb, reflecting the person and number of the subject. In other words, in these contexts, all of the subjects, i.e. A and S, are treated identically with regard to agreement, which represents a nominative-accusative agreement system. In contrast, in the past tense, the A-argument is indexed by means of pronominal clitics used as oblique markers. In summary, all languages within the split agreement group exhibit a **non-nominative-accusative** agreement system for transitive verbs in the past tense, contrasting with their nominative-accusative agreement system for transitive verbs in the present tense and for all of intransitive verbs. The term “non-nominative-accusative” is a cover term for at least three systems, namely **ergative-absolutive**, **tripartite**, and **bipartite**.¹⁴

The author’s descriptions and generalizations throughout the book address the details of the above-mentioned agreement systems. According to these accounts, the split system languages have grammaticalized one or more of the following types for their transitive verbs in the past tense: 1) ergative-absolutive, with S and P grouped together vs. A; 2) tripartite, with S, P, and A grouped separately; and 3) bipartite, with A and P grouped together vs. S.¹⁵ The author reminds that the term “bipartite” is proposed by him in this contribution, while Comrie [1978] refrains from suggesting a label for this type¹⁶ due to its non-existence or its attestation solely in the last phases of a transition from the ergative-absolutive alignment to the nominative-accusative. In the bipartite type, both A and P are indexed by oblique clitics, hence called “double oblique system” by Payne [1980]. A good example of the this type is provided by the Kurdish of Sanandaj,

¹⁴ Dabir-Moghaddam (p. 41) asserts that the majority of New Iranian languages have been “inaccurately” or “conveniently” called ergative languages, citing his 2012 paper: “[I]t will be an oversimplification to label any tense-sensitive Iranian language as Split-Ergative” [Dabir-Moghaddam 2012: 69].

¹⁵ The distinction between these three types is closely related to the phenomena of object-marking and object-indexing by case and agreement markers, respectively. These two phenomena have been examined in detail by Dabir-Moghaddam.

¹⁶ Dabir-Moghaddam notes that Comrie [2016] called this type “horizontal alignment” in his account of case-marking in the Iranian language Roshani (spoken in Pamir).

in which the relevant structure is very productive and frequent, displaying no sign of a transition stage.¹⁷ This observation is particularly in contradiction with Comrie's assumption about this type, and also challenges Croft's [2003] analysis, who argues that the unattested status of this type is due to its contradiction with the **semantic map connectivity hypothesis**.¹⁸ Dabir-Moghaddam assumes the attestation of this type to be an important accomplishment achieved by the studies of Iranian languages. Moreover, he identifies another consequence of the concurrent attestation of more than one agreement system within a language. He posits that this observation may necessitate adjustments to our comprehension of "the real type" of languages, in addition to providing us with a better grasp of the typological changes in the history of Persian.¹⁹

As a general statement about all of the New Iranian languages spoken in Iran, the author posits that the agreement system is a fundamental mechanism in the syntax of these languages. However, some of them have

¹⁷Based on the Kurdish data from his investigation and the previous studies, the author identifies four distinct varieties of this language that lack mutual intelligibility with each other: 1) Kurmanji Kurdish (from the Southern Kurdish branch), with split case-marking (nominative-accusative vs. ergative-absolutive), lacking clitic agreement system; 2) the Kurdish of Suleimaniyeh (from the Central Kurdish branch), with split agreement system (nominative-accusative vs. non-nominative-accusative, the latter including bipartite, tripartite, and ergative-absolutive alignments), lacking any case-marking; 3) the Kurdish of Sanandaj (from the Central Kurdish branch), with split agreement system (nominative-accusative vs. non-nominative-accusative, the latter including bipartite, tripartite, and ergative-absolutive alignments), lacking any case-marking; and 4) Southern Kurdish (including Kalthori, Kermashani, and Ilami), with nominative-accusative agreement system, lacking any case-marking.

¹⁸According to this analysis, "[t]he conceptual categories defined by S, A and P are points in the conceptual space. (...) they are regions in conceptual space that represent each participant role cluster. The links between S and A and S and P represent linguistically motivated links between those conceptual categories. (...) The one unattested type is the one in which one category subsumes A and P, and another S. This type would violate the Semantic Map Connectivity Hypothesis with respect to the conceptual space (...) because there is no direct link between A and P" [Croft 2003: 144–146]; also cf. Dabir-Moghaddam (pp. 732–733).

¹⁹For instance, Dabir-Moghaddam (pp. 130–135) refers to a significant morphological change that accompanied word order changes in Persian throughout its history. He presents seven arguments in support of the idea that Persian experienced a shift from an inflectional language to an analytical one during its transition from the Old to Middle period, and this tendency continued into the Classical period as well.

grammaticalized a case-marking mechanism as well, such as Kurmanji Kurdish,²⁰ the Talyshi of the Anbaranbala village (from the Northern branch), and the Tati of Chal. Kurmanji has split case-marking, i.e. nominative-accusative and ergative-absolutive, while it has lost clitic agreement markers, and it uses person-number suffixes in its agreement system. Dabir-Moghaddam's section on this variety is very brief, primarily summarizing previous studies such as [Haig 1998] and [Mackenzie 1961], though in a three-page footnote he presents a description of case and agreement in the Kurmanji of Bojnurd, Khorasan (pp. 726–731). Moreover, the investigated variety of Talyshi resembles Kurmanji in having split case-marking. It features nominative-accusative marking in the present tense and ergative-absolutive marking in the past tense. Similarly, the split case-marking is attested in the Tati of Chal, with a nominative-accusative system in the present tense but a tripartite one in the past. In addition to the aforementioned languages, the author has observed three ways of case-marking in Vafsi, namely 1) a morpheme that marks the oblique case, distinguishing it from the zero-marked direct case, while simultaneously conveying gender information through fused allomorphs, 2) free-standing person-number pronouns for distinguishing direct and oblique cases, and 3) two interrogative words for the same case distinction.

Finally, two further considerations in relation to the issue of agreement-marking have been addressed in detail:

The first one is the structural distribution of pronominal clitics that index the A-argument in the past tense. The author proposes three syntactic domains for these elements in New Iranian languages: 1) the entire clause (known as “Wackernagel's Law”), as evidenced in Davani and Delvari, where the clitic occupies the second position; 2) the verb phrase, as observed in the majority of the languages examined, including the Balochi of Iran-shahr, Vafsi, the Central Kurdish (Sanandaji and Banej), Hawrami, Laki, Naini, Talyshi (Anbaranbala), and Tati, where the clitic is hosted by the first constituent of the verb phrase; and 3) the verb (along with the preceding prepositional phrase, if present in the verbal expression), as in Larestani, where the agreement markers are procliticized to the verb or its prepositional phrase.

²⁰ The author reports that he has not attested case-marking in the Kurdish varieties Banej, Sanandaji, Kalthori, and Kermashani (p. 688).

Furthermore, the author correctly highlights the flexibility of pronominal clitics in selecting their hosts, referring to them as “floating” elements (p. 1106). For example, in each syntactic domain, the clitic may attach to a constituent other than the first one due to specific reasons. The author posits that, in the structures containing scrambled elements, the **preposed** constituent in each domain will host the subject agreement clitic, though pragmatic or information structure considerations may relocate the clitic to alternative hosts that are not positioned initially in the structure. In other words, the floating of clitics is a mechanism that allows for the selection of a host other than the initial one inside a pertinent syntactic domain in order to turn an unmarked structure into a marked one.²¹

The second final consideration regarding agreement is the development of ergative alignment in Middle Iranian languages. After providing a detailed review of five hypotheses about the origin of this structure from prior studies (cf. also [Dabir-Moghaddam 2018: 12–20]), the author presents his own explanation concerning this controversial issue. He argues that in Old Persian there was a stative construction denoting the core concept of ‘to exist’, with an oblique/non-canonical subject, and this construction was productively used with the participial forms of transitive verbs as a result of an **analogical extension**. In this analogy process, the feature of having a particular type of subject (i.e. oblique/non-canonical subject) was extended from a stative construction to a large class of participles. These participles shared the feature of [+stative] with the original stative construction due to being essentially adjectives. Therefore, the author assumes that Old Persian had split case-marking and agreement systems,²² with the ergative-absolutive alignment being restricted to the participial forms of transitive verbs, contrasting with the nominative-absolutive alignment of the finite past tense forms of transitive verbs.²³ This means that

²¹ It can be added to the author’s explanation that, in some marked instances, the preposed element may occupy a peripheral structural position, placed outside the pertinent syntactic domain.

²² Dabir-Moghaddam (pp. 220–221) views Yaghnobi and its split case-marking and agreement systems as contemporary evidence for how these split systems functioned in Old Persian.

²³ My inference is that the author assigns the nominative-accusative alignment to the entire verbal system, except transitive participles; however, this is not explicitly stated by him.

the ergative construction already existed in Old Persian, and it emerged as an epiphenomenal consequence of an extension process. Subsequently, in the transition from the Old to Middle period, the transitive participial forms (i.e. the forms ending in *-ta*) were reanalyzed as past tense stems, and this reanalysis accounts for the restriction of ergative construction to the past tense in the Middle period. Furthermore, the fact that the ergative construction has been documented in both West and East Iranian languages of the Middle period reinforces the hypothesis that the previously described stative construction also existed in Old Iranian or Proto-Iranian. The author concludes that the emergence of ergative construction in Iranian languages has been a language-internal change.

In an overview, Dabir-Moghaddam's study advances the application of typological methods and categorizations to Iranian languages, contributing to both our knowledge of these languages and theoretical issues of typology. These are the primary benefits of this contribution. In addition, the discussions throughout the book facilitate predictions regarding specific aspects of potential changes in Iranian languages, especially at junctures where the author highlights their structural disparities with Persian, the prestigious dominant language. However, the data collected by him apparently date back to 15 to 25 years ago, with an average of two speakers participating in the interviews for each language or variety. Further fieldwork data with increased participation of native speakers may uncover more details and characteristics of Iranian languages concerning case, agreement, and word order, particularly the intermediate structures and contact-induced changes in these systems. Moreover, the results obtained by Dabir-Moghaddam and other studies in this field can be represented on regional maps, aiming to reveal possible contact relationships among the New Iranian languages and with non-Iranian languages that are currently or were historically spoken in each region. These maps may provide insights into the diachronic patterns of change in relation to the regions and the degree of isolation and conservatism experienced by each language throughout its history.

Abbreviations

INDF — indefinite; IPFV — imperfective; PRS — present tense; PST — past tense; SG — singular.

References

- Comrie 1978 — B. Comrie. Ergativity. W. P. Lehmann (ed.). *Syntactic typology: Studies in the phenomenology of language*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1978. P. 329–394.
- Comrie 2016 — B. Comrie. Ergativity in Iranian languages: A typological perspective. J. Ghomeshi, C. Jahani, A. Lenepveu-Hotz (eds.). *Further topics in Iranian linguistics. Proceedings of the 5th International Conference on Iranian Linguistics, held in Bamberg on 24–26 August 2013*. Paris: Association pour l'avancement des études iraniennes, 2016. P. 37–53.
- Croft 2003 — W. Croft. *Typology and universals*. 2nd edn. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003. DOI: 10.1017/CBO9780511840579.
- Dabir-Moghaddam 2012 — M. Dabir-Moghaddam. Linguistic typology: An Iranian perspective. *Journal of Universal Language*. 2012. Vol. 13. No. 1. P. 31–70. DOI: 10.22425/jul.2012.13.1.31.
- Dabir-Moghaddam 2018 — M. Dabir-Moghaddam. Non-canonical subject construction in endangered Iranian languages: Further investigation into the debates on the genesis of ergativity. S. Gholami (ed.). *Endangered Iranian languages*. Wiesbaden: Ludwig Reichert Verlag, 2018. P. 9–40.
- Dryer 1992 — M. Dryer. The Greenbergian word order correlations. *Language*. 1992. Vol. 68. P. 81–138.
- Friedrich 1975 — P. Friedrich. *Proto-Indo-European syntax: The order of meaningful elements*. Butte: Montana College of Mineral Science and Technology, 1975.
- Haig 1998 — G. Haig. On the interaction of morphological and syntactic ergativity: Lessons from Kurdish. *Lingua*. 1998. Vol. 105. P. 149–173. DOI: 10.1016/S0024-3841(98)00014-X.
- Hawkins 1983 — J. A. Hawkins. *Word order universals*. New York: Academic Press, 1983.
- Hewitt 2009 — S. Hewitt. The question of a Hamito-Semitic substratum in Insular Celtic. *Language and Linguistics Compass*. 2009. Vol. 3. No. 4. P. 972–995. DOI: 10.1111/j.1749-818x.2009.00141.x.
- Hickey 2002 — R. Hickey. Internal and external forces again: Changes in word order in Old English and Old Irish. *Language Sciences*. 2002. Vol. 24. P. 261–283. DOI: 10.1016/S0388-0001(01)00033-X.
- Mackenzie 1961 — D. N. Mackenzie. The origins of Kurdish. *Transactions of the Philological Society*. 1961. Vol. 60. Iss. 1. P. 68–86.
- Payne 1980 — J. R. Payne. The decay of ergativity in Pamir languages. *Lingua*. 1980. Vol. 57. P. 147–186. DOI: 10.1016/0024-3841(80)90005-4.
- Vennemann 1994 — T. Vennemann. Linguistic reconstruction in the context of European prehistory. *Transactions of the Philological Society*. 1994. Vol. 92. No. 2. P. 215–284. DOI: 10.1111/j.1467-968x.1994.tb00432.x.