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SUMMARY

Since Dirr’s 1928 survey of 35 Caucasian languages, the morphosyntactic alignment pattern in which the subject of intransitive verbs (O) are marked in one common way, and the object of transitive verbs (A); numerous descriptions of languages exhibiting ergative alignment to some extent have emerged over the course of the twentieth century (Verbeke 2013 on Indo-Aryan; Haig 2008 on Iranian; Grinevald and Peake 2012 on Mayan; Paul and Travis 2006 on Austronesian; to name but a few), but insufficient attention has been paid to the phenomenon of syntactical ergativity, displayed by a small subset of ergative languages, in which various coreferentiality constraints apply in complex sentences (e.g. constraints against S-A-coreference in co- or subordination, or against relativisation of ergative arguments). Maria Polinsky’s monograph ‘Deconstructing Ergativity: Two Types of Ergative Languages and Their Features’ seeks to rectify this neglect in suggesting a new and systematic aetiology of syntactical ergativity: based on a set of diagnostic syntactic comparisons, it proposes that all languages exhibiting syntactic ergativity employ prepositional phrases (PP) as ergative subjects, contrasting with other morphologically ergative languages which have determiner phrase (DP) subjects. The contrast between DP-ergative and PP-ergative languages is explored in some depth, both theoretically in a transformational framework and by means of copious examples from, inter alia, Niuean, Samoan, Chuckhi, Q’anjob’al, Archi, Avar, and Circassian; more than a third of the book is dedicated to a detailed discussion of two paradigm languages, Tongan (PP-ergative) and Tsez (DP-ergative).

The first part of the book establishes the necessary theoretical background and hypotheses for this investigation, the latter of which are then tested against corpus data. In the introduction (Chapter 1), ergative alignment and its manifestations in the languages of the world are discussed with a view to their syntactic peculiarities. Here, syntactically ergative languages are narrowly defined as the subset of morphologically ergative languages in which the ergative argument cannot undergo A-bar movement (e.g. in relativisation, wh-questions, or topicalisation) with a gap, whereas absolute arguments may. Forgoing a discussion of languages like Dyirbal, whose status as syntactically ergative is disputed, Polinsky sets out to provide a principled syntactic analysis and differentiation of ergative languages based on their constraints on A-bar movement. In this process, a number of other potential correlations between types of ergativity and other syntactic properties are proposed (see below, ch. 6). A brief appendix outlines strategies used by syntactically ergative languages to overcome this constraint, discussing, among others, antipassives, resumption of the moved argument, and nominalisation.

The specific reasoning for a differentiation between DP- and PP-ergative languages is presented in Chapter 2. Owing to the diachronic origins of many ergative patterns in passive or possessive constructions, many transitive agents find expression in PPs. In syntactically ergative languages, some characteristics of these agentive PPs are maintained despite reanalysis or loss of an overt adposition; most prominent among these characteristics is the constraint against subextraction of the agent out of a PP in A-bar movement. Consequently, while the ergative is analysed as a structural case in DP-ergative languages, assigned by a functional head in vP (or higher), it is proposed that PP-ergative languages have an inherent ergative case in the external argument position of transitive verbs. Licensing here occurs in the (potentially silent) adposition ergative case. Syntactic ergativity is, therefore, expected in ergative
languages in which adposition stranding or pied-piping does not occur. Not all PP-ergative languages exhibit the latter constraint, however, making PP-ergative arguments a necessary but not sufficient for syntactic ergativity.

The similarities between PPs and ergative subjects in syntactically ergative languages form the core of this argument; to corroborate this point, Chapter 3 details the diagnostic criteria according to which both syntagmata must be compared to establish a correlation, and in which they differ from DPs. Polinsky’s findings show that PPs in subject position are inaccessible to A-movement, cannot serve as pivots for clefts, tails of control chains, or binders for anaphora or depictives; where A-bar movement is permitted, resumptive pronouns are required at the extraction site. This negative definition, largely by lack of abilities or functionality, contrasts with the characteristics of DPs, which are not subject to such restrictions.

These qualities of PPs are tested against the evidence from syntactically ergative languages in Chapter 4 in order to show that an analysis of ergative agents as PPs is indeed appropriate. The specific cause of syntactic ergativity, it is argued, results from a constraint against stranding and pied-piping of non-overt (or null) prepositional heads; syntactic ergativity may but need not obtain, depending on restrictions on PPs in general. The permissibility of pied-piping PPs in particular is dependent on the phonological nature of the operator; the data and analysis presented suggest that a syntactically ergative language has to be a) morphologically ergative, and b) either lack an overt adposition licensing the ergative or, failing this, lack the ability to pied-pipe PPs.

A further concomitant characteristic of PP-ergative agents, namely their inability to bind anaphors and to occur in raising or control structures, is discussed in Chapter 5. True raising and control in these languages are either limited to intransitive embedded clauses (with absolutive subjects), or do not exist at all; syntactically similar patterns do, however, occur. As far as binding is concerned, dedicated anaphors do not seem to appear in this type of ergative languages; their function is fulfilled either by reinforced pronouns, or through reflexive or reciprocal marking on the verb itself. With this evidence, Polinsky concludes that ergative subjects in a subset of morphologically ergative languages allow for the latter’s analysis as PP-agents.

While the discussion in the previous chapters focussed on arguing for a differentiation between DP- and PP-ergative languages, Chapter 6 illustrates further consequences of operating with PP-ergative agents as regards word order, expletive subjects, and non-canonical subjects. Statistics suggest that there may be a non-trivial correlation between verb-initial languages and syntactic ergativity; Polinsky tentatively hypothesises that the raising of the ergative PP may be the result of its failure to otherwise satisfy subjecthood conditions (as per the extended projection principle). A brief discussion of expletive subjects offers the conclusion that their absence is expected in verb-initial syntactically ergative languages, but cannot make further predictions about other language types or specific correlations to the PP-nature of ergative agents; a similar caveat applies to the prediction about the absence of non-canonical subjects in these languages.

By way of contrast with the main topic of the argument thus far, Chapter 7 presents the flip-side of ergative languages: those with DP-ergatives. Distinguished most distinctly by their lack of syntactical ergativity, the languages cited here (among which Georgian, Walpiri, and Hindi/Urdu) show all the features lacking in PP-ergative languages, including (but not limited to) the extraction of the ergative agent with a gap (rather than a resumptive pronoun), the ability to bind anaphors, license depictives, float quantifiers, have discontinuous core arguments, and to be the controllee in control patterns.

While both DP- and PP-ergative languages can have different origins, it is possible for PP-ergatives...
to be reanalysed, and for the language to change subsequently into the DP-ergative type; such
diachronic developments and other questions regarding the relationships between ergative
language types are discussed in Chapter 8. Niuean, a syntactically ergative Tongan (see Chapter 10), is disc reanalysis of the ergative adposition as a case marker obvious in the ability of ergative agents to undergo A-
such as anaphor binding, however, have not yet been of Adyghe, a Caucasian language, which has progress resumption of ergative arguments in relative clauses ergative status. The conclusions drawn from these lan change does not happen all at once, and that the prep been lost, either through sound change or reanalysis,

Before proceeding to give a closer overview of two pa alternatives to her explanation of syntactical ergativity dichotomy. Her approach, it is argued, is preferable to freezing (Wexler and Culicover 1980), phase-based (C being relatively theory-neutral and requiring the fewe approach, suggesting that structures imposing a heavy; tentatively rejected; experimental data on the acquisit supposedly resource intensive and thus dispreferred too few to be authoritative.

The two long chapters, which form Part 2 of the mono Tongan, representing PP-ergative language (Chapter (Chapter 11). In both instances, an introduction to the of the language is given. In the case of Tongan, Polinsky detail the manifestations of all the characteristics of P noted that only in two cases do ergative and absolutive to be associated with subject clitics, and to be express that, apart from the A-bar movement of absolutes, t Tongan.

Tsez, presented in a more concise fashion, shows all t subject to the restrictions imposed on languages of th structures discussed in previous chapters is exemplifi e.g. as concerns the nature of Tsez clause structure.

EVALUATION

Polinsky provides a new and systematic approach to (attractively simple categories, clearly defined and em set of relevant languages to back up the suggestions n DP-ergative languages proposed is essentially theory observations awaiting further testing.

As such, this monograph will be of interest to anyone syntactical ergativity, and to typologists in general. Ce interest to historical linguists. The analytical methods languages may further be relevant for linguists working and Caucasian languages.

The book’s overall goal, that is to provide a principlex and to outline the structural diversity of ergative lang
the survey’s purposed limitation to a small number of syntactic ergativity (both given above), the proposed notion of PP-ergativens will require further testing. While the core argument, viz. the existence of two types of ergative languages, is presented clearly, consistently, and with great attention to detail, the fact that PP-ergatives are defined largely negatively by the absence of specific characteristics—as admitted by Polinsky (p. 56)—raises the question whether the similarities between certain ergative agents and PPs are sufficient for an unambiguous definition of the language group and how languages transitioning from one to the other ought to be classified. Similarly, a brief discussion of languages such as Dyirbal, which have been explicitly excluded from initial consideration owing to debates about their status as ergative languages, and their place in this theory, might have helped to either corroborate or show issues with the classification.

To appreciate the book’s argument and presentation in their entirety, a thorough grounding in (and acceptance of) transformational grammar is advantageous, since analyses rely strongly on the tenets propounded and terminology used therein. Although of the topics discussed, a less theoretically inclined audience may have appreciated more descriptive analyses at the side of theoretical considerations. In particular, some readers may take issue with the use and proposal of phonologically zero or non-overt elements, e.g. prepositional heads or operators mentioned (esp. Chapter 4). None unfamiliar to the reader are explained and referenced comprehensible, even when expressed in framework-specific terms.

As far as the structure of the overall argument is concerned, some choices may be rather surprising. For instance, a discussion of previous approaches to and explanations of syntactic ergativity is provided only in Chapter 9; it may have served as a smoother point of departure than the immediate proposal of a new theory. The proposal itself (Chapter 2) is arrived at somewhat abruptly, with too little context, and mainly on the basis of theoretical considerations; an initial presentation of the data used in chs. 4 and 5 would introduce the reader to the issues arising more naturally, as well as advocating a data-driven approach to linguistic analysis. In spite of these choices, the book shows great internal coherence and, with the caveats mentioned, a clear line of argumentation.

The detailed discussion of Tongan (Chapter 10), which takes up almost a third of the monograph, lacks focus in places; it provides too much information specific to the language discussed, but only partly relevant to the discussion of ergativity. The section on deriving Tongan clause structure (10.3), for example, explores the issue of word order, termed a secondary correlate of some PP-ergative languages in Chapter 6, in more detail than necessary here; similarly, a briefer discussion of raising-like structures in Tongan would not have diminished the argument’s force.

Polinsky’s proposal will have to stand the test not of time but rather of new data; her approach is appealing and will provide both theoretical and historical linguists as well as researchers working on specific languages with a new theory to explore. Especially the insights gained from applying the proposed criteria to supposedly syntactical languages not included in the present definition, and to those languages in the process of alignment change should reveal whether the latter are indeed sufficient.
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