

Editor's foreword

One of the most unpleasant trends of contemporary linguistics is negativism toward use of typological methods in comparative historical linguistics. The most notable point is that even opponents of so called megalocomparison usually pay completely insufficient attention to structural level of language. Typology is considered as 'glass beads game' or as 'store of curiosities' but not as powerful tool, while conclusions about genetic relationship of languages are made with use of different lexicostatistical 'hoodoo'. Lexicostatistical 'hoodoos' are based on 'artist sees so' principle and allows different scholars to make completely different conclusions about same material. The weirdest issue is that nobody is actually confused by such situation.

Any language is structure first of all, but not a heap of lexemes, since main function of language is to structure reality, to rubricate it, so structural level is the main and basic level of language and should also be basic point in any linguistic researches, and especially in researches about genetic affiliation of certain languages.

Also I am to note that due attention paid to typology in the field of comparative linguistics can potentially inspire progress in the field of cultural anthropology and in the field of history. Language as well as culture is ordered pair of the following type: $\langle A; \Omega \rangle$ where A is set of grammatical meanings/ideas/memes and Ω is set of distributions. Cultures should be described same way as languages, i.e.: they should be represented as sets of memes accompanied by corresponding 'grammars', and history should be nothing, but just diachrony of cultural anthropology.