25 February 1980

Topicalization and Passive in Palauan

by

Richard C. Waters

I. Introduction

Palauan (the language of the Palau Islands in the Pacific) contains an often used process which has been described as passive. This paper presents a series of arguments indicating that this process is not passive, but rather topicalization. (In order to avoid confusion, the process will be referred by the neutral name "NP preposing" below.) The arguments are based on data found in Josephs' excellent reference text on Palauan [Josephs 1975] and on the judgments of three native speakers: Serelina Mersai, Beketel Elbelau, and Ruthy Aitaro. The three sentences in the example below illustrate the process of NP preposing, and another highly productive process in Palauan which is called "subject shifting" by Josephs.[1]

Droteo was hitting boys.
1) a. A Droteo a milęngęlebęd ęr a rębuik.
Droteo was hitting the boys.

Boys it-they was hitting them Droteo.
b. A rębuik a <u>lu</u>lęngęlebęd ęr <u>tir</u> a Droteo.
The boys were being hit by Droteo.
(NP preposed version of (a))

It was hitting boys Droteo.
c. Ng milęngęlebęd ęr a rębuik a Droteo.
Droteo was hitting the boys.
(subject shifted version of (a))

Palauan orthography is based on english orthography. Except for the letter "ę" (which represents a shwa) they use a subset of the English alphabet representing similar sounds. It should be noted that "ch" represents a glottal stop, and "ng" represents a velar nasal. There is no dictionary for Palauan and as a result there is considerable variability in spelling between speakers. This paper follows the spelling in Josephs' book.

Palauan nouns are divided into two categories: human and nonhuman. There are only two markings which can be attached to nouns: first, a noun can be marked as possessed; second, human (but not non-human) nouns can take a prefix "rę" indicating pluralness. In general, every noun used in a Palauan sentence must be preceded by the word "a".

Palauan has a set of pronouns (known as "emphatic" see Section III) which can appear anywhere

---

1. Each of the examples in this paper follows the same format. The second line is a Palauan sentence written in Palauan orthography. The third line is a free translation of the sentence into English. If the Palauan sentence is either ungrammatical or fails to have the meaning indicated by the English translation then it is prefixed with a "*". If the informants did not agree in their judgments on the sentence then it is prefixed with a "?". A "%" is used to indicate that the sentence is hypothesized as an underlying structure, but that it is not grammatical as it stands.

The first line of each example is a literal, phrase by phrase, translation of the Palauan sentence. It explicitly represents the pronominal and verbal agreement markings in the sentence. It is possible to follow the arguments presented here based on the literal translations in the examples.

Underlining is used in order to highlight the key features of an example. The form "{X}" is used to indicate that X is optional, and that the sentence is judged the same way whether or not it is present. The form "{X/Y/Z}" is used to indicate alternatives, and that the sentence is judged the same way no matter which one is present.

a noun can appear and like nouns never take case markings. If a pronoun is agreed with by some other constituent of the same sentence, then it is obligatorily deleted unless it is in initial position. Thus, if the NP "a Droteo" in the examples above were a pronoun, it would be deleted in sentences (b-c) since it is agreed with. The pronoun "tir" in sentence (b) is not deleted, since though it agrees with "rɐbuik", nothing agrees with it.

It should be noted that Palauan does not have the same agreement classes as english. In particular, it makes no distinction between third person singular male, female, and non-human all three of which are glossed as "it".

Each Palauan verb can be either: transitive or intransitive, perfective or imperfective, and active or stative. Verbs are marked for tense, and transitive perfective verbs take a suffix agreeing with their direct object (see Section IV). There are two kinds of pronouns: "non-emphatic" (see Section III) and "hypothetical" (see Section VI) which act essentially like subject agreement prefixes on verbs. In general, every verb which is not preceded by a non-emphatic pronoun must be preceded by the word "a".

Palauan has a generalized preposition "ɐr" (translated as "to", "in", "at", "on", "from", "for", "by", etc.) which is used to introduce a variety of verbal dependents including human and singular direct objects of imperfective verbs (as in the example above), indirect objects, locative phrases, temporal phrases, and by phrases. The word "ɐl" (see Section VIII) is used to introduce a variety of dependent clauses including sentential objects, relative clauses, and clauses used to express the comitative relation.

Two Hypotheses Concerning NP Preposing

Comparison of sentences (a) and (b) above reveals that when going from the first to the second, the direct object moves to initial position, a pronominal copy of the direct object appears after the verb, the subject moves to the end of the sentence, and the verb is marked with a prefix (a hypothetical pronoun) agreeing with the original subject. Comparison of sentences (a) and (c) reveals that when going from the first to the second, the subject moves to the end leaving a non-emphatic pronoun agreeing with it at the beginning. This paper discusses two hypotheses about the relationships between the sentences above.

Both hypotheses assume the same basic theory of how a sentence is produced. First, an underlying structure is obtained. Second, "cyclical" transformations (such as passive and relativization) are applied to the underlying structure on a clause by clause basis starting with the most deeply embedded clauses first. Once this is done, agreement is triggered based on the grammatical relations in the sentence. (Several arguments are given below which show that in Palauan agreement is not triggered by the grammatical relations in the underlying structure, but rather by those created by transformations.) Third, "post-cyclical" processes (such as topicalization and the constraints controlling surface word order) are applied in order to determine the final surface sentence. The two hypotheses explain the sentences above as follows:

> Passive Hypothesis: The word order in Palauan is [subject, verb, direct object, indirect object, followed by other dependents]. Sentence (b) is derived from sentence (a) by the process of NP preposing which is the passive transformation. When this transformation is applied, the preposed NP becomes the new subject, and a pronominal copy is left in its old position. The old subject becomes a by phrase which appears at the end of the sentence. A hypothetical pronoun prefix on the verb agreeing with the old subject is used to mark the application of passive. Any non-subject pronoun which

is agreed with is obligatorily deleted.

Sentence (c) is derived from (a) by the process of subject shifting which is unrelated to NP preposing. Subject shifting moves the subject to the end of the sentence leaving a non-emphatic pronominal copy in subject position.

Topicalization Hypothesis: The word order in Palauan is [topic, verb, direct object, indirect object, followed by other dependents including the subject]. The fundamental sentence above is (c) not (a). Both NP preposing and subject shifting are the result of topicalization. Sentence (a) is derived from (c) by topicalizing the subject. Sentence (b) is derived from (c) by topicalizing the direct object. The process of topicalization does not alter any grammatical relations. (Therefore in (a), (b), and (c) "a rębuik" is the direct object and "a Droteo" is the subject.) When an NP is topicalized, a pronominal copy of it appears in its accustomed place. This pronoun is obligatorily deleted if something agrees with it.

The verb agrees with the subject. When there is no topic (as in (c)) then this agreement is expressed via a non-emphatic pronoun. When there is a topic which is not the subject (as in (b)) (or part of a compound subject), the non-emphatic pronoun attaches (if possible) to the verb as a hypothetical pronoun prefix. When (as is most often the case) the subject (as in (a)) (or part of a compound subject) is the topic, then the non-emphatic pronoun agreeing with the subject is suppressed unless its presence is required by some other process. Any non-topicalized pronoun which is agreed with is obligatorily deleted. (Note that the pronominal copy of a subject is always deleted since the verb agrees with it.)

Both of these hypotheses are consistent with the example. The passive hypothesis seems to be generally accepted. It is clearly stated in Josephs' book, and is supported by the fact that sentences like (b) are customarily translated into passive English sentences. However, looking more deeply at NP preposing and the way it interacts with other grammatical processes shows that the passive hypothesis must become a great deal more complicated and ad hoc in order to be consistent with the facts, and that the topicalization hypothesis accounts for a wider range of data.

Outline of the Argument

Consider some of the contrasting predictions made by the two hypotheses. The passive hypothesis predicts that NP preposing should have the accessibility characteristics of passive (i.e. it should apply to direct objects and perhaps indirect objects, but not parts of a compound subject, or parts of dependent clauses). Further, NP preposing is a cyclical transformation which creates a new subject, and therefore it should be able to feed processes operating on subjects. In addition, it predicts that both the original subject and the preposed NP should no longer have the grammatical relations they used to have in the sentence, and that therefore it should be possible to see NP preposing bleed other transformations which could otherwise have applied to them. The hypothesis claims that subject shifting is a separate process applicable to subjects.

In contrast, the topicalization hypothesis predicts that NP preposing should have the accessibility characteristics of topicalization (i.e. it should operate on a wide variety of NPs including parts of the subject and parts of dependent clauses). Further, NP preposing is a post-cyclical rule and does not change any of the basic grammatical relations in a sentence and therefore it should neither feed nor bleed other transformations. The topicalization hypothesis unifies NP preposing and subject shifting into one process.

The following sections present a variety of grammatical processes which can be used to test these predictions, and other aspects of the two hypotheses. Palauan has strict requirements on word order. These have been used as an argument for the passive hypothesis. Section II shows

that the word order facts are actually neutral with regard to the two hypotheses.

If, as predicted by the passive hypothesis, subject shifting is a separate process applicable to subjects, it should be possible to apply it to the subjects which the passive hypothesis predicts are created by NP preposing. Section III shows that this is not the case.

Section IV uses an argument based on those verbs which agree with their direct objects in order to show that when a direct object is NP preposed, the verb still agrees with it as the direct object. The dative transformation is used to show that it cannot be said that a verb agrees solely with its initial direct object.

Section V presents a construct which Josephs refers to as ergative verbs. It then presents a series of subarguments which argue that the ergative form is actually the result of a passive transformation. (This paper refers to this transformation as ergation in order to avoid confusion with the passive hypothesis.) The central argument supporting the claim that ergation is a transformation is based on the fact that it can be fed by the causative clause union transformation. If ergation is a passive transformation, then the passive hypothesis is complicated by the fact that it has to contain two different passive transformations while the topicalization hypothesis has to contain only one such transformation (ergation).

In any event, the mere fact that ergation is a transformation can be used as part of many of the arguments against the passive hypothesis. For example, the passive hypothesis might try to avoid the difficulties caused by the fact that NP preposing does not feed subject shifting by claiming that subject shifting applies only to initial subjects, and not to subjects created by transformations. This proposal is refuted by the fact that subject shifting can be applied to the subjects created by ergation.

Section VI investigates two situations other than NP preposing (negative sentences and conditional sentences) where hypothetical pronouns appear. In both of these constructs, the hypothetical pronoun agrees with the subject. This conflicts with the passive hypothesis where the hypothetical pronoun created by NP preposing does not agree with the subject supposedly created by NP preposing, but rather with the old subject. Ergation is used to show that the hypothetical pronoun does not agree only with initial subjects. The section also shows that NP preposing can occur in negative and conditional sentences, but that even though these processes trigger agreement with the subject, they cannot be fed by NP preposing. The last part of the section offers data in support of the implicit claim made by the topicalization hypothesis that the hypothetical and non-emphatic pronouns are closely related.

Sections VII-X present four processes (questions, subject controlled equi NP deletion, object controlled equi NP deletion, and the comitative relation) which are conditioned by the subject. In each case it can be seen that these processes can be fed by ergation, but that in contradiction to the predictions of the passive hypothesis, they cannot be fed by NP preposing.

Section XI shows that as predicted by the topicalizations hypothesis, NP preposing is applicable in a very wide range of situations including parts of the subject and parts of dependent clauses. The passive hypothesis would be hard put to account for all these as applications of the passive transformation.

Section XII discusses relativization which has been used as an argument in favor of the passive hypothesis. The section shows that the facts are actually neutral between the two hypotheses.

In summary, the paper presents a large amount of data (all of which is consistent with the topicalization hypothesis) arguing against the passive hypothesis, and refutes each of the arguments

which have been used to support the passive hypothesis.

II. Word Order

The word order in Palauan is relatively rigid. The data below shows that given a sentence with a subject, direct object, and a verb which is not marked with either a non-emphatic or a hypothetical pronoun, the only possible word order is subject, verb, and then direct object.

Toki was eating fish.
2) a. A Toki a milęnga ęr a ngikęl.
Toki was eating the fish.
(the order [S V O])

Toki fish was eating.
b. *A Toki ęr a ngikęl a milęnga.
Toki was eating the fish.
(the order [S O V])

Was eating Toki fish.
c. * A milęnga a Toki ęr a ngikęl.
Toki was eating the fish.
(the order [V S O])

Was eating fish Toki.
d. * A milęnga ęr a ngikęl a Toki.
Toki was eating the fish.
(the order [V O S])

Fish Toki was eating.
e. *Ęr a ngikęl a Toki a milęnga.
Toki was eating the fish.
(the order [O S V])

Fish Was eating Toki.
f. *Ęr a ngikęl a milęnga a Toki.
Toki was eating the fish.
(the order [O V S])

Only sentence (a) means "Toki was eating the fish". The only sentence other than (a) which has any meaning at all is (d) which means "the one who was eating the fish is Toki". The subsection on "equational sentences" below shows that this sentence is unrelated to sentence (a).

The next four sentences show that a locative phrase like "ęr a blil a Droteo":"at Droteo's house" must go after the subject, verb, and object in a sentence which has a verb that is not marked with either a non-emphatic or hypothetical pronoun.

Toki was eating fish at house of Droteo.
3) a. A Toki a milęnga ęr a ngikęl ęr a blil a Droteo.
Toki was eating the fish at Droteo's house.

At house of Droteo Toki was eating fish.
b. * Ęr a blil a Droteo a Toki a milęnga ęr a ngikęl.
Toki was eating the fish at Droteo's house.

Toki at house of Droteo was eating fish.
c. *A Toki er a blil a Droteo a milęnga er a ngikęl.
Toki was eating the fish at Droteo's house.

Toki was eating at house of Droteo fish.
d. *A Toki a milęnga er a blil a Droteo er a ngikęl.
Toki was eating the fish at Droteo's house.

The next two sentences show that it is preferable for a temporal phrase like "er a kęsus":"last night" to precede a locative phrase, but that both orders are possible.

Toki was eating fish at house of Droteo last night.
4) a. A Toki a milęnga er a ngikęl er a blil a Droteo er a kęsus.
Toki was eating the fish at Droteo's house last night.

Toki was eating fish last night at house of Droteo.
b. A Toki a milęnga er a ngikęl er a kęsus er a blil a Droteo.
Toki was eating the fish last night at Droteo's house.
(this order is preferred over the order in (a))

The data above shows that in a sentence where the verb is not marked with either a non-emphatic or hypothetical pronoun, the word order is [subject, verb, direct object, followed by other dependents]. Both of the hypotheses are consistent with this fact. The Passive hypothesis asserts that this is always the word order in Palauan. The topicalization hypothesis claims that the word order in Palauan is [topic, verb, direct object, followed by other dependents including any non-topicalized subject]. It accounts for the data above by claiming that the only time the verb in a sentence appears without either a non-emphatic or hypothetical pronoun is when part of the subject has been topicalized and therefore appears in initial position.

Equational Sentences

In palauan, the verb "to be" does not appear on the surface if it is in the present tense. This leads to "equational sentences" which appear to be of the form "NP NP".

Droteo teacher.
5) a. A Droteo a sensei.
Droteo is a teacher.

I doctor.
b. Ak toktang.
I am a doctor.

That there is actually a verb in these sentences can be seen when they are put in the past or future tense.

Droteo was teacher.
6) a. A Droteo a mle sensei.
Droteo was a teacher.

I will be doctor.
b. Ak mo toktang.
I will be a doctor.

There are equational sentences of the form (S NP2) where the subject of the sentential subject is correferent with NP2 and has been deleted.

Was eating fish Toki.
7) a. A milęnga ęr a ngikęl a Toki.
The one who was eating the fish is Toki.
(this is sentence (2.d) above)

Hit it_S Toki teacher.
b. A chillębędii a Toki a sensei.
The one who hit Toki is the teacher.

These look like simple sentences with the word order [verb, direct object, subject]. However, they contrast in meaning with the corresponding simple sentences with word order [subject, verb, direct object] because they imply that NP2 is the only one doing the action.

Toki was eating fish.
8) a. A Toki a milęnga ęr a ngikęl.
Toki was eating the fish (maybe other people were too).
(this is sentence (2.a) above).

Teacher hit it_S Toki.
b. A sensei a chillębędii a Toki.
The teacher hit Toki (maybe other people did too).

Some speakers do not feel that the equational sentences have this restricted meaning. However, the presence of the top level verb can be seen when the sentence is in other than the simple present.

Was eating fish was Toki.
9) a. A milęnga ęr a ngikęl a mlę Toki.
The one who was eating the fish was Toki.

Hit it_S Toki will be teacher.
b. A cholębędii a Toki a mo sensei.
The one who hits Toki will be the teacher.

III. Subject Shifting

Palauan has three kinds of pronouns: emphatic, non-emphatic, and hypothetical. The hypothetical pronouns are discussed in Section VI. The others are given in the table below. These pronouns correspond to seven agreement categories. The basic features are person, number, and humanness. Palauan does not recognize gender. The literal translations in this paper use words based on english pronouns as glosses for Palauan pronouns and agreement affixes. However, since English does not recognize the same agreement categories as Palauan, these words have nonstandard meanings. The only agreement category which is exactly the same as English is first person singular which is glossed as "I". "We" is used as a gloss for first person plural inclusive while "we_X" is used for first person plural exclusive. "You" is used for second person singular while "youall" is used for second person plural. "It" is used for third person singular and for third person plural non-human, while "they" is used for the human plural.

agreement category gloss	I	we	we$_x$	you	youall	it	they
emphatic pronoun	ngak	kid	kęman	kau	kęmiu	ngii	tir
non-emphatic pronoun	ak	kędę	aki	kę	kom	ng	tę

The emphatic pronouns can appear anywhere a noun can appear. Like nouns they are never marked for case. Unlike nouns, they are never preceded by "a". A pronoun is obligatorily deleted if it is agreed with, unless it is in initial position. A pronoun can be agreed with by an affix on a verb or noun, or by a pronominal copy of itself which has been left by some transformation.

Non-emphatic pronouns only appear before VPs where they replace the "a" which would normally precede the VP. In a simple sentence, a pronominal subject can either be expressed as an emphatic or a non-emphatic pronoun (see (e) and (f) below). The names "emphatic" and "non-emphatic" are derived from the fact that the choice of an emphatic pronoun implies extra emphasis on the subject.

The primary use of non-emphatic pronouns is in subject shifted sentences where no NP precedes the verb in the sentence. In this situation a non-emphatic pronoun appears before the verb which agrees with the subject NP. (Note that if the subject is an (emphatic) pronoun, it will be deleted since it is agreed with by the non-emphatic pronoun.) The non-emphatic pronoun acts like a subject agreement prefix on the verb. However, adverbs and auxiliaries can come between the pronoun and the verb, and the pronoun cannot appear if the subject NP precedes the verb (except in certain special situations such as questions (see Section VII)).

The following sentences illustrate subject shifting and argue that the subject must appear after the direct object. Note that the topicalization hypothesis nicely explains the relationship between (e) and (f) by saying that an emphatic pronoun is used if and only if the subject is topicalized.

People ate it$_S$ fish last night.
10) a. A ręchad a killii a ngikęl ęr a kęsus.
The people ate the fish last night.

They ate it$_S$ fish last night people.
b. Tę killii a ngikęl ęr a kęsus a ręchad.
The people ate the fish last night.
(subject shifted version of (a))

They ate it$_S$ fish people last night.
c. Tę killii a ngikęl a ręchad ęr a kęsus.
The people ate the fish last night.
(This word order is preferred over the one in (b))

They ate it$_S$ people fish last night.
d. * Tę killii a ręchad a ngikęl ęr a kęsus.
The people ate the fish last night.
(This word order is not acceptable)

I ate it$_S$ fish last night.
e. Ngak a killii a ngikęl ęr a kęsus.
I ate the fish last night.
(a pronominal subject)

I ate it_S fish last night.
f. Ak killii a ngikęl ęr a kęsus.
I ate the fish last night.
(the pronominal subject shifted and deleted)

The next example shows that the pronoun preceding the verb must be non-emphatic and must agree with the subject. (Note that equational sentences with sentential subjects look just like subject shifted sentences except that there are no non-emphatic pronouns. The previous section argues that these sentences are an unrelated phenomenon.)

It ate it_S fish Toki last night.
11) a. *Ngii a killii a ngikęl a Toki ęr a kęsus.
Toki ate the fish last night.
(This shows that an emphatic pronoun is not acceptable)

{I/we/we_X/you/youall/it} ate it_S fish people last night.
b. * {Ak/kędę/aki/kę/kom/ng} killii a ngikęl a ręchad ęr a kęsus.
The people ate the fish last night.
(The non-emphatic pronoun must agree with the subject as in (c) above)

It ate it_S fish Toki last night.
c. Ng killii a ngikęl a Toki ęr a kęsus.
Toki ate the fish last night.
(This shows singular agreement)

Subject shifting cannot be applied to a direct object.

Toki ate it_S {/it/it} last night fish.
h. *A Toki a killii {/ng/ngii} ęr a kęsus a ngikęl.
Toki ate the fish last night.

In the passive hypothesis, a separate process of subject shifting has to be postulated. This transformation moves the subject to the end, leaving a non-emphatic pronominal trace. Under the topicalization hypothesis there does not need to be a process of subject shifting. Rather, the non-subject shifted sentences above are derived from the more basic subject shifted ones by topicalizing the subject. The non-emphatic pronouns are a manifestation of verb subject agreement which is suppressed when the subject is topicalized.

Subject shifting After NP Preposing

Under the passive hypothesis, it is natural to ask whether subject shifting can be applied to the subject which the passive hypothesis claims is produced by NP preposing. The data below shows that it cannot.

People were eating fish at beach.
12) a. A ręchad a milęnga ęr a ngikęl ęr a kędęra.
The people were eating the fish at the beach.

Fish it-they were eating it people at beach.
b. A ngikęl a lulnga ęr ngii a ręchad ęr a kędęra.
The fish was being eaten by the people at the beach.
(NP preposed version of (a))

It it-they were eating it people at beach fish.
c. * Ng lulnga ęr ngii a ręchad ęr a kędęra a ngikęl.
The fish was being eaten by the people at the beach.
("a ngikęl" cannot be subject shifted)

It-they were eating it people at beach fish.
c'. A lulnga ęr ngii a ręchad ęr a kędęra a ngikęl.
The thing which the people were eating at the beach is the fish.
("a ngikęl" can appear at the end with no pronominal copy)

It-they were eating it people at beach was fish.
c". A lulnga ęr ngii a ręchad ęr a kędęra a mle ngikęl.
The thing which the people were eating at the beach was the fish.
((c') and (c") are equational sentences)

Fish it-they were eating it they at beach people.
d. *A ngikęl a lulnga ęr ngii tir ęr a kędęra a ręchad.
The fish was being eaten by the people on the beach.
(the original subject cannot be subject shifted)

Sentence (c) shows that the NP which was preposed in (b) cannot then be postposed by subject shifting. If no non-emphatic pronoun is used (as in (c')) then the sentence is grammatical. However, (c') does not have the same meaning as (b). Further, if (c') is put in the past tense (as in (c")) it can be seen that it is an equational sentence unrelated to (a). Sentence (d) shows that the original subject cannot be subject shifted after NP preposing.

Under the passive hypothesis, (d) is expected since the subject of (a) is no longer the subject of (b). However, there is no good explanation for why (c) is unacceptable. The passive hypothesis might try to claim that subject shifting only applies to the initial subject of a sentence. However, as shown by the fact that subject shifting can occur after ergation (see Section V), this is not true. As a result, the passive hypothesis would have to claim that, unlike other processes creating subjects, NP preposing simply does not feed subject shifting.

The topicalization hypothesis is in agreement with the data because it does not claim that NP preposing creates a new subject, and because it claims that there is no process of subject shifting in any case. Rather subject shifting is merely the result of not topicalizing the subject. This is why the topicalization hypothesis is not in conflict with (d). In (b) the subject is already not topicalized and it cannot be any more untopicalized.

IV. Object Agreement

In palauan, all and only perfective transitive verbs take a suffix agreeing with their direct object (see the table below). The agreement suffixes divide third person into three agreement categories rather than just two. "It_s" corresponds to third person singular male, female, or non-human. "It_p" corresponds to third person plural non-human. As before "them" corresponds to third person plural human.

agreement category gloss	me	us	us_x	you	youall	it_s	it_p	them
agreement suffix	-ak	-id	-ęman	-au	-ęmiu	-ii	-	-tęrir

The following data shows that the suffix must agree with the direct object.

People hit it_S boy.

13) a. A ręchad a chillębędii a buik.
The people hit the boy.
(here the suffix agrees with the singular object)

People hit {me/us/us_X/you/youall/it_P/them} boy.

b. *A ręchad a chillębęd{ak/id/ęman/au/ęmiu//ęterir} a buik.
The people hit the boy.
(no other suffix is acceptable)

Boy hit them people.

c. A buik chillębędęterir a ręchad.
The boy hit the people.
(this shows plural agreement)

Given only the data above, it is not possible to tell whether the agreement between verb and direct object is triggered by the initial direct object before transformations are applied, or by the final direct object which results after transformations have been applied. The next group of sentences presents the phenomenon of dative movement in palauan in order to show that no hypothesis can claim that perfective verbs agree only with their initial direct objects.

I gave it_S present.

14) a. Ak milsa a present.
I gave a present (to someone).
(this shows agreement (which is irregular) with a singular object)

I gave it_S present to boys.

b. ? Ak milsa a present ęr a rębuik.
I gave a present to the boys.
(speakers differ on whether this is a good sentence)

I gave them boys present.

c. Ak milsterir a rębuik a present.
I gave the boys a present.
(this shows plural agreement with the direct object after dative)

I gave it_S boys present.

d. * Ak milsa a rębuik a present.
I gave the boys a present.
(singular agreement is no longer possible)

I gave them present to boys.

e. *Ak milsterir a present ęr a rębuik.
I gave a present to the boys.
(similarly plural agreement is not possible before dative)

Sentence (b) is questionable for some speakers because they feel that dative movement is obligatory. However, the main point is clear. Sentences (c) and (d) show that the verb agrees with the non-initial direct object created by dative.

The data below shows that if NP preposing preposes the direct object in a sentence with a perfective transitive verb, the verb continues to agree with the NP which is preposed.

Boy it-they hit it$_S$ people.
15) a. A buik a lęchillębędii a ręchad.
The boy was hit by the people.
(the verb agrees with "a buik")

Boy it-they hit {me/us/us$_X$/you/youall/it$_P$/them} people.
b. *A buik a lęchillębęd{ak/id/ęman/au/ęmiu//ętęrir} a ręchad.
The boy was hit by the people.
(no other suffix will do)

I it-they hit me people.
c. Ngak a lęchillębędak a ręchad.
I was hit by the people.
(this shows agreement with a first person object)

The topicalization hypothesis need only claim that transitive perfective verbs agree with their direct objects, since topicalizing something does not stop it from being a direct object. On the other hand, under the passive hypothesis there is no direct object in (a) or (c). It could claim that agreement is with the most recent direct object. Dative movement shows that agreement is not triggered by initial direct objects.

V. Ergative Verbs

Palauan has both transitive and intransitive verbs. In addition, a given verb can be an action verb (such as "kma":"eat" and "milil":"be playing") or a state verb (such as "męduenge":"know" and "smechęr":"be sick"). Most transitive verbs have two forms: one imperfective (such as "męnga":"be eating" and "męngęlebęd":"be hitting") and one perfective (such as "kma":"eat" and "cholebęd":"hit"). (Note that the present tense of a perfective verb carries a connotation of an imminent future action.) Most transitive active verbs have a form (such as "męka":"get eaten" and "męchęlebęd":"get hit") which Josephs calls the "ergative" form.

The three forms of a transitive action verb are morphologically related. In the most common pattern, a verb marker prefix ("m(ę)" or "o") is added to a stem (which is often a noun) yielding the ergative form of the verb. If an imperfective marker ("l", "ng", or "m") is added between the verb marker and the stem, deleting the first consonant of the stem, the result is the imperfective form of the verb. If instead the verb marker is moved to after the initial consonant of the stem, the result is the perfective form of the verb. It should be noted that extensive phonetic change often obscures this pattern.

			get eaten	be eating	eat
16)	a.	%ka	męka	męnga	kma
		a whip	get hit	be hitting	hit
	b.	chęlebęd	męchęlebęd	męngęlebęd	cholebęd

The past tense of action verbs is formed with an affix. If the verb marker is "m{ę}" then "{i}l" is inserted after the "m" in the verb marker. If the verb marker is "o", it is replaced by "ul{ę}". For example:

		got eaten	was eating	ate
17)	a.	milęka	milęnga	kila

The past tense of state verbs (and loan word verbs which do not have a verb marker) is formed with the auxiliary "mle":"was". Similarly the future tense of all verbs is formed with the auxiliary "mo":"go". There are other auxiliaries that function in a similar way.

		was sick	failed	will be eating
18)	a.	mle smechęr	mle fail	mo męnga

Two Hypotheses Concerning Ergative Verbs

The following example illustrates the use of ergative verbs, and the close correspondence in meaning between a transitive verb and the ergative verb derived from the same stem.

Someone hit me.
19) a. Knungtechang chillębędak.
Someone hit me.

I got hit.
a'. Ak milęchęlebęd.
I got hit.

I got hit by woman.
a" Ak milęchęlebęd {ęr a rędil}.
I got hit {by the woman}.

Someone fed it_s Toki.
b. Knungtechang milękęlii a Toki.
Someone fed Toki.

Toki got fed.
b'. A Toki a miluka.
Toki got fed.

Toki got fed by woman.
b". A Toki a miluka ęr a rędil.
Toki got fed by the woman.

An ergative clause can contain a by phrase introduced by "ęr". However, there is considerable regional variation in the acceptability of these by phrases. Speakers from the island of Peleliu (for example Beketel Elbelau) think that they are in general good. Speakers from the main island of Koror (for example Serelina Mersai) think that they are in general bad. An exception to this is the verb "muka":"get fed" with which all of the informants thought a by phrase was acceptable. In this paper, the by phrases after other verbs will be put in brackets (as in (a") above) to indicate that they were not acceptable to the informant from Koror, though the sentences were acceptable without them.

Consider the following two hypotheses about the relationship between the primed and unprimed sentences above:

Independent-Ergative Hypothesis: The primed sentences are not derived from the unprimed sentences. The ergative verbs have distinct (though semantically and morphologically related) underlying forms from their transitive counterparts. They are intransitive verbs, which for some speakers can take an additional dependent, the by phrase.

Passive-Ergative Hypothesis: The primed sentences are derived from the unprimed sentences by a transformation (here called "ergation"). Ergation is the passive transformation. It can be applied to sentences containing a variety of different active transitive verbs. As a result of its application, the verb is put in the ergative form, the old direct object becomes the subject, and the old subject becomes a by phrase. With some speakers and some verbs, the by phrase is obligatorily deleted.

The independent-ergative hypothesis is put forward by Josephs in his book. The two hypotheses make the same predictions about the surface structure of a sentence like (a"). Namely that "a ngikęl" is the subject and that "ęr a rędil" is a by phrase.

There are two crucial areas where the hypotheses differ. First, the passive-ergative hypothesis predicts that corresponding to each ergative sentence, there should be a transitive sentence with essentially the same meaning. Going deeper, any phenomenon which is sensitive to the meaning of a verb (such as selectional restrictions) should operate in an analogous way with an ergative verb and its transitive counterpart. The fact that this does indeed seem to be the case argues against the independent-ergative hypothesis because, that hypothesis is missing a generalization when it claims that any similarities between an ergative verb and a transitive one are accidental.

The most important difference between the two hypotheses is that the passive-ergative hypothesis claims that ergation is a transformation and therefore it should be possible for it to be fed by other transformations. Under the independent-ergative hypothesis this is not possible. The next subsection introduces a transformation (causative clause union) which creates verbs and direct objects which can feed ergation.

Causative Clause Union

In Palauan, sentences with causative verbs are assumed to have a two level underlying structure with a sentential direct object (as in (a) below). However, this structure never appears on the surface because the causative clause union transformation is obligatorily applied. Causative clause union, especially with intransitive lower verbs, is very productive in palauan. The resulting causative verb (which is a combination of various causative prefixes with the stem of the lower verb) has imperfective, perfective, and ergative forms.

When causative clause union occurs with an intransitive lower verb, the lower verb ("mękar" in the example) is converted into a causative verb based on the same stem (here "olękar"). The lower subject becomes the direct object of the resulting sentence. Sentence (c) shows the perfective form of the causative verb agreeing with the resulting direct object.

Woman child is awake.
20) a. %A rędil a CAUSE [a ngalęk a mękar].
The woman is causing the child to be awake

Woman is waking child.
b. A rędil a olękar ęr a ngalęk.
The woman is waking the child.

Woman woke up it$_S$ child.
c. A rędil a ulękęrngii a ngalęk.
The woman woke up the child.

The next group of sentences shows causative clause union with a transitive lower verb. The subject of the lower clause ends up as the direct object of the resulting causative verb. (In analogy

with other languages one would expect that this is the result of a two stage process where causative clause union causes the lower subject to become the indirect object of the resulting sentence and causes the lower direct object to become the resulting direct object. Then obligatory dative movement is applied so that the lower subject ends up as the resulting direct object. Whether or not this is the case is irrelevant to the arguments presented here.)

Woman children are eating fish.
21) a. %A rędil a CAUSE [a ręngalęk a męnga ęr a ngikęl].
The woman is causing the children to eat the fish.

Woman is feeding children fish.
b. A rędil a omęka ęr a rengalęk ęr a ngikęl.
The woman is feeding the children fish.

Woman is feeding fish children.
c. *A rędil a omęka {ęr} a ngikęl {ęr} a rengalęk.
The woman is feeding fish to the children.
(this shows that dative movement is obligatory here)

Woman fed them children fish.
d. A rędil a milękęlterir a rengalęk ęr a ngikęl.
The woman fed the children fish.
(this shows agreement of the causative verb with the resulting direct object)

Ergation After Causative Clause Union

Consider the following examples of a verb in the (a) sentences becoming a causative verb in the (b) sentences and then an ergative causative verb in the (c) sentences.

Toki boys are dirty.
22) a. %A Toki a CAUSE [a rębuik a kikiongęl].
Toki is causing the boys to be dirty.

Toki is dirtying boys.
b. A Toki a omękikiongęl ęr a rębuik.
Toki is dirtying the boys.

Boys are getting dirtied by Toki.
c. A rębuik a mukkikiongęl {ęr a Toki}.
The boys are getting dirtied {by Toki}.

Toki dog is eating.
23) a. %A Toki a CAUSE [a bilis a męnga].
Toki is causing the dog to eat.

Toki is feeding dog.
b. A Toki a omęka ęr a bilis.
Toki is feeding the dog.

Dog is getting fed by Toki.
c. A bilis a muka ęr a Toki.
The dog is getting fed by Toki.

This data is predicted by the passive-ergative hypothesis which expects that causative clause union will be able to feed ergation. This correctly predicts the meaning of the (c) sentences, and the

final grammatical relations of the NPs involved. In particular, that the subject of the (a) sentences becomes the subject of the (c) sentences.

Under the independent-ergative hypothesis, the (c) sentences are not related to the (b) sentences and the ergative causative verbs (such as "mukkikiongęl) are not related to their causative counterparts (such as "omękikiongęl"). This misses the generalizations involved. For instance, it cannot explain why there are ergative causative verbs corresponding only to those (non-ergative non-causative) verbs which have causative forms.

A more serious difficulty is that under the independent-ergative hypothesis, it is does not seem possible to use causative clause union in the derivation of the (c) sentences in any way. For example, the (c) sentences cannot be derived from an underlying structure (such as a" below) which is analogous to the (a) sentences above except that the lower verb is in the ergative form. This is true because the lower subject would not become the subject of the result as in (c), and because "kikiongęl" is an intransitive verb, and does not have an ergative counterpart.

One could postulate an underlying ergative-causative structure which has a sentential subject as in (a") below. However, this requires the creation of a second causative clause union transformation which applies to it creating the causative form and making lower subject into the upper subject.

Toki something is getting eaten by the dog.
24) a'. %A Toki a CAUSE [a męka ęr a bilis].
Toki is causing something to be getting eaten by the dog.

The dog is eating by Toki.
a". %[A bilis a męnga] a GET-CAUSED ęr a Toki.
That the dog is eating is getting caused by Toki.

In summary, accepting the independent-ergative hypothesis not only misses generalizations involving the ergative forms themselves, but forces the abandonment of the generalizations captured by causative clause union with regard to ergative causative verbs because it implies that these verbs are not created by clause union. As a result, it is preferable to accept the passive-ergative hypothesis.

Ergation and NP preposing

Returning to the main topic of this paper, the fact that ergation is a passive transformation argues against the passive hypothesis about NP preposing in two ways. First, the passive hypothesis has to be extended to contain two quite different passive transformations: NP preposing and ergation. Second, the ergation transformation can be used as part of the other arguments against the passive hypothesis by showing that the processes which are not fed by NP preposing are fed by ergation and therefore that these processes are not sensitive only to initial subjects.

Subject Shifting After Ergation

The following data shows that subject shifting (if it is in fact a transformation) can apply after ergation. The subject created by ergation is moved to the end as in (b) and (d). Sentences (b-d) show that the non-emphatic pronoun must agree with the subject created by ergation, rather than with the original subject before ergation. As a result, it is not possible to claim that subject shifting is applicable only to initial subjects. Therefore, the passive hypothesis cannot use this claim in order to try and explain why NP preposing does not feed subject shifting (see Section III).

People got fed by Toki.
25) a. A rẹchad a miluka ẹr a Toki.
The People got fed by Toki.

They got fed by Toki people.
b. Tẹ miluka ẹr a Toki a rẹchad.
The people got fed by Toki.

{I/we/we$_x$/you/youall/it} got fed by Toki people.
c. *{Ak/kẹdẹ/aki/kẹ/kom/ng} miluka ẹr a Toki a rẹchad.
The people got fed by Toki.
(the pronoun must agree with the subject)

It got fed by Toki person.
d. Ng miluka ẹr a Toki a chad.
The person get fed by Toki.
(this shows singular agreement)

VI. Hypothetical Pronouns

Hypothetical pronouns (shown in the table below) usually appear as prefixes on verbs. The agreement classes they correspond to do not subcatagorize second person or third person for number. "You{all}" will be used to gloss second person in general while "it-they" will be used for the third person.

agreement category gloss	I	we	we$_x$	you{all}	it-they
hypothetical pronoun	ku-	do-	kimo-	mo-	lo-

When a verb has a hypothetical pronoun prefix, it is said to be in the hypothetical form. There are a variety of grammatical situations other than NP preposing where this form is required (such as negative sentences and a type of conditional sentence). The name "hypothetical" is derived from the fact that these situations refer to actions which have not actually happened.

When prefixed to verbs, the hypothetical pronouns act like subject agreement prefixes. If the VP is composed of several auxiliaries as well as the main verb, then the hypothetical pronoun is prefixed to each of the auxiliaries as well as the main verb.

The hypothetical pronouns show a considerable amount of phonetic change. The table above, lists only the most common form of each pronoun. Phonetic change also often occurs to the verb a hypothetical pronoun is prefixed to. In particular, if a transitive verb begins with a verb marker, this marker is usually deleted when a hypothetical pronoun is prefixed to it.

Negation

Palauan has a verb "diak" (past "dimlak") which is used to indicate negation. Josephs theorizes that negative sentences are derived from an underlying structure like (a) thru obligatory subject shifting. (Under the topicalization hypothesis this would be explained by saying that the (sentential) subject of diak cannot be topicalized.)

The lower clause in a negative sentence like (b) below is restricted in several ways. The lower subject must be at the end and the lower verb must be in the hypothetical form, must be untensed, and must not be preceded by the word "a". Under the topicalization hypothesis this would be explained by saying that the lower clause is also untopicalized, and that the presence of "diak"

causes the expected non-emphatic pronoun to become attached to the verb as a hypothetical prefix. The passive hypothesis merely states that negative sentences require the hypothetical form.

In the context of this section, the key feature is that the hypothetical pronoun must agree with the subject of the lower clause (as shown by (b-d)). If the lower subject is pronominal (as in (b)), it is deleted since the hypothetical pronoun agrees with it. If it is not pronominal, it appears at the end of the lower clause (as in (e)).

I am hitting Toki is false.
26) a. %[Ak mŋgŋlebŋd ŋr a Toki] a diak.
That I am hitting Toki is not true.

It is false I am hitting Toki.
b. Ng diak kungŋlebŋd ŋr a Toki.
I am not hitting Toki. (It is not true that I am hitting Toki.)

It is false {we/we$_x$/you{all}/it-they/} are hitting Toki.
c. * Ng diak {do/kimo/mo/lo/mŋ}ngŋlebŋd ŋr a Toki.
I am not hitting Toki.
(other hypothetical forms and non-hypothetical form are no good)

It is false you{all} are hitting Toki.
d. Ng diak mongŋlebŋd ŋr a Toki.
You are not hitting Toki.
(this shows second person agreement)

It is false it-they are hitting you people.
e. Ng diak longŋlebŋd ŋr kau a rŋchad.
The people are not hitting you.
(a non-pronominal lower subject goes at the end)

Negative sentences often appear in a form where the lower subject is at the beginning of the whole sentence (see the data below). (It is not clear whether this is due to topicalization, or to subject to subject raising or both. Nor does it matter in the context of this argument.) In any event, the data below shows that even when the lower subject is at the beginning of the sentence, the hypothetical pronoun must agree with it.

I is false I am hitting Toki.
b'. Ngak a diak kungŋlebŋd ŋr a Toki.
I am not hitting Toki.

I is false {we/we$_x$/you{all}/it-they/} are hitting Toki.
c'. *Ngak a diak {do/kimo/mo/lo/mŋ}ngŋlebŋd ŋr a Toki.
I am not hitting Toki.
(other hypothetical forms and non-hypothetical form or no good)

You is false you{all} are hitting Toki.
d'. Kau a diak mongŋlebŋd ŋr a Toki.
You are not hitting Toki.
(this shows second person agreement)

Looking at negative ergative sentences shows that the hypothetical form triggered by negation agrees with the subject created by ergation. As a result it is not possible to claim that the hypothetical form agrees with the initial subject.

I was false I got fed by Toki.
27) a. Ngak a dimlak kumuka ər a Toki.
I did not get fed by Toki.
(the hypothetical form agrees with "ngak" not "Toki")

I was false {we/we$_x$/you{all}/it-they/} got fed by Toki.
b. *Ngak a dimlak {do/kimo/mo/lə/}muka ər a Toki.
I did not get fed by Toki.
(other hypothetical forms and the non-hypothetical form are no good)

You was false you{all} got fed by Toki.
c. Kau a dimlak momuka ər a Toki.
You did not get fed by Toki.
(this shows second person agreement)

The topicalization hypothesis is consistent with the above data in that it claims that the hypothetical form always agrees with the subject of the clause it is in. The passive hypothesis, on the other hand, claims that the hypothetical form triggered by NP preposing agrees with the old subject rather than with the new subject. As a result, it would have to claim that this was in fact not actually the same hypothetical form.

Under the passive hypothesis, if NP preposing could be applied before the process that creates the hypothetical form in negative sentences then you might expect to see sentences like (b) below where the hypothetical form created by the earlier application of NP preposing in (a) is overridden by the hypothetical form created by the negation and therefore exhibits agreement with the subject created by NP preposing. If (b) was a good sentence, it would be a strong argument in favor of the passive hypothesis. The fact that (b) is not a good sentence has to be explained by saying either that NP preposing cannot be applied before the process that creates the hypothetical form in negative sentences, or that the overriding of hypothetical forms does not occur.

Toki I am hitting it was false.
28) a. %[A Toki kungəlebəd ər ngii] a dimlak.
That toki is being hit by me was not true.
(an NP preposed underlying structure)

Toki was false it-they is hitting it {by me}.
b. *A Toki a dimlak longəlebəd ər ngii {ngak}.
Toki was not being hit by me.
(the hypothetical form cannot agree with "a Toki")

Toki was false I am hitting it.
c. A Toki a dimlak kungəlebəd ər ngii.
Toki was not being hit by me.
(the hypothetical form agrees with original subject)

The fact that (c) is a good sentence is predicted by the topicalization hypothesis. There is no change in the hypothetical form of the lower verb because topicalization has no effect on other grammatical relations. (Note "dimlak" is not in the hypothetical form because part of the subject has been topicalized (see the last part of Section XI.) In the passive hypothesis (c) can be explained by saying that NP preposing can occur after the process creating the hypothetical form in negation. (As discussed in Section XI, from the point of view of the passive hypothesis it is surprising that NP preposing can be applied to an NP in an embedded clause.)

Conditional Sentences

A basic conditional sentence in palauan is formed by using the pattern "a lsękum S1 e S2" which means "if S1 then S2". The two clauses are normal in appearance.

If Toki is hitting me then I will tell it$_S$ Droteo.
29) a. A lsękum a Toki a męngęlebęd ęr ngak e ak subędii a Droteo.
If Toki hits me I will tell Droteo.

This can be transformed into an equivalent sentence lacking "a lsękum" in which S1 is in the hypothetical form and still carrying tense information. (For some reason, this transformation yields marginal sentences if the verb in S1 is transitive perfective.) As with negation, the resulting hypothetical form must agree with the subject of the clause.

It-they are hitting me Toki then I will tell it$_S$ Droteo.
30) a. A longęlebęd ęr ngak a Toki e ak subędii a Droteo.
If Toki hits me I will tell Droteo.
(the hypothetical pronoun agrees with the subject which may come at the end)

Toki it-they are hitting me then I will tell it$_S$ Droteo.
b. A Toki a longęlebęd ęr ngak e ak subędii a Droteo.
If Toki hits me I will tell Droteo.
(The subject may also come at the beginning)

{I/we/we$_X$/you{all}/} are hitting me Toki then I will tell it$_S$ Droteo.
c. *A {ku/do/kimo/mo/mę}ngęlebęd ęr ngak a Toki e ak subędii a Droteo.
If Toki hits me I will tell Droteo.
(other hypothetical forms and the non-hypothetical form are no good)

You{all} were hitting me then I told it$_S$ Droteo.
d. A mulngęlebęd ęr ngak e ak silębędii a Droteo.
If you had been hitting me, I would have told Droteo.
(this is an example of second person agreement in the past tense)

Ergative conditional sentences show that the hypothetical form created in conditionals agrees with subjects created by transformations, rather than initial subjects.

If I get fed by Toki then I will tell it$_S$ Droteo.
31) a. A lsękum ak muka ęr a Toki e ak subędii a Droteo.
If I get fed by Toki I will tell Droteo.

I get fed by Toki then I will tell it$_S$ Droteo.
b. A kumuka ęr a Toki e ak subędii a Droteo.
If I get fed by Toki I will tell Droteo.

{We/we$_X$/you{all}/it-they/} get fed by Toki then I tell it$_S$ Droteo.
c. * A {do/kimo/mo/lę/}muka ęr a Toki e ak subędii a Droteo.
If I get fed by Toki I will tell Droteo.
(other forms (including "lę-" which agrees with "a Toki") will not work)

You{all} get fed by Toki then I will tell it$_S$ Droteo.
d. A momuka ęr a Toki e ak subędii a Droteo.
If you get fed by Toki I will tell Droteo.
(this shows second person agreement)

The fact that the hypothetical form in conditional sentences always agrees with the subject of the clause argues against the passive hypothesis in the same way that the fact that the hypothetical form triggered by negation always agrees with the subject does. Paralleling the argument for negation, the data below shows that though they can occur together, NP preposing cannot feed the process which creates conditional sentences without "a lsękum". If (b) were a good sentence it would be an argument in favor of the passive hypothesis, however, it is not.

If boy I am hitting it then they will tell it$_S$ Droteo.
32) a. %A lsękum a buik a kungęlebęd ęr ngii e tę subędii a Droteo.
If the boy is hit by me they will tell Droteo.
(an NP preposed underlying structure)

Boy it is hitting it then they will tell it$_S$ Droteo.
b. *A buik a longęlebęd ęr ngii e tę subędii a Droteo.
If the boy is hit by me they will tell Droteo.
(the hypothetical form cannot agree with "a buik")

Boy I am hitting it then they will tell it$_S$ Droteo.
c. A buik a kungęlebęd ęr ngii e tę subędii a Droteo.
If the boy is hit by me they will tell Droteo.
(the hypothetical form agrees with the original subject)

Non-Emphatic and Hypothetical Pronouns

The topicalization hypothesis claims that when something other than the subject is topicalized, the non-emphatic pronoun agreeing with the subject attaches to the verb becoming a hypothetical pronoun. The passive hypothesis makes no claims about the relationship between these two kinds of pronouns. This subsection presents evidence that the hypothetical pronouns are indeed clitic forms of the non-emphatic ones.

The fact that hypothetical pronouns are not simply verbal agreement prefixes, is demonstrated by the fact that when an equational sentence is negated, there is no surface verb in the lower clause, and the hypothetical pronoun attaches to the NP which is the object of the equational sentence.

Droteo teacher.
33) a. A Droteo a sensei.
Droteo is a teacher.

Droteo is false it-they teacher.
a'. A Droteo a diak lsensei.
Droteo is not a teacher.

I Droteo.
b. Ngak a Droteo.
I am Droteo.

I is false I Droteo.
b'. Ngak a diak kDroteo.
I am not Droteo.

Hit it_s Toki teacher.
c. A chillębędii a Toki a sensei.
The one who hit Toki is the teacher.

Hit it_s Toki is false it-they teacher.
c'. A chillębędii a Toki a diak lsensei.
The one who hit Toki is not the teacher.

The close relationship between the hypothetical and non-emphatic pronouns is revealed by the fact that some verbs (which vary from speaker to speaker) do not allow the hypothetical pronouns to become attached. In this situation, they can be seen in a free form. Two such verbs are "męduch" and "ngęsuii". Sentences (a) and (b) below show a negative sentence with a pronominal subject "PRO" using each verb. The accompanying table shows the pronominal forms (according to one speaker) which are acceptable (in place of "PRO") in these sentences along with the normal non-emphatic and hypothetical pronouns for comparison.

It is false PRO know how to is dressing boy
34) a. Ng diak PRO męduch ęl obail ęr a buik.
PRO does not know how to dress the boy.

It is false PRO is helping it_s boy.
b. Ng diak PRO ngęsuii a buik.
PRO is not helping the boy.

gloss	I	we	we_x	you	youall	it	they
non-emphatic	ak	kędę	aki	kę	kom	ng	tę
"męduch"	_	kędę	ki	{kę,mo-}	{kom,mo-}	lę	lę
"ngęsuii"	_	{kędę,do-}	kim	{?kę,mo-}	{kom,mo-}	{lę,lo-}	{?lę,lo-}
hypothetical	ku-	do-	kimo-	mo-	mo-	lo-	lo-

Sometimes the verbs take hypothetical pronouns, and sometimes they take modified non-emphatic pronouns. Often, there is more than one acceptable form. In the third person they take "lę" rather than "ng" or "tę". For first person singular they take no pronoun at all (with NP preposing they take "ak"). This data gives the definite feeling that there is a continuity between non-emphatic pronouns and hypothetical pronouns.

VII. Questions

In "whether", "where", and "when" questions, a non-emphatic pronoun agreeing with the subject must appear before the verb. This happens even when the subject also precedes the verb. As in english, a characteristic intonation pattern accompanies a question. Both this pattern and the non-emphatic pronoun are required for a good question.

People were eating fish.
35) a. A ręchad a milęnga ęr a ngikęl.
The people were eating the fish.

People were eating fish?
b. *A ręchad a milęnga ęr a ngikęl?
Were the people eating the fish?
(without the non-emphatic pronoun you cannot have a question)

People they were eating fish?
c. A ręchad tę milęnga ęr a ngikęl?
Were the people eating the fish?

People they were eating fish.
d. *A ręchad tę milęnga ęr a ngikęl.
The people were eating the fish.
(with the non-emphatic pronoun you cannot have a statement)

The next sentences show that the non-emphatic pronoun must agree with the subject. Sentences (c) and (d) show that the pronoun agrees with the subject created by ergation, and therefore not just with initial subjects.

People {I/we/we$_x$/you/youall/it} was eating fish?
36) a. *A ręchad {ak/kędę/aki/kę/kom/ng} milęnga ęr a ngikęl?
Were the people eating the fish?
(non-agreeing pronouns are not acceptable)

I I was eating it fish?
b. Ngak ak milęnga ęr a ngikęl?
Was I eating the fish?
(this shows agreement with a first person subject)

People they got fed by Toki?
c. A ręchad tę miluka ęr a Toki?
Did the people get fed by Toki?
(The pronoun agrees with the subject created by ergation)

People {I/we/we$_x$/you/youall/it} get fed by Toki?
d. *A ręchad {ak/kędę/aki/kę/kom/ng} muka ęr a Toki?
Did the people get fed by Toki?
(other pronouns will not work)

A question can be formed in conjunction with subject shifting. In this situation the declarative sentence also contains a non-emphatic pronoun and is differentiated from the question only by intonation.

They were eating fish people?
37) a. Tę milęnga ęr a ngikęl a ręchad?
Were the people eating the fish?

They were eating fish people.
b. Tę milęnga ęr a ngikęl a ręchad.
The people were eating the fish.

The data presented so far does not differentiate between the two hypotheses. Under the passive hypothesis, the process of forming a question creates a non-emphatic pronoun agreeing with the not necessarily initial subject. Under the topicalization hypothesis, the fact that a sentence is a question prevents the non-emphatic pronoun which is normally present in non-topicalized sentences from being deleted or changed into a hypothetical prefix when the subject is topicalized as in the questions in the beginning of this section.

If NP preposing is a passive transformation you would expect it to be able to feed the process of question formation yielding a question like (b) below. However, this is not the case.

Fish it-they was eating it people.
38) a. A ngikęl a lulnga ęr ngii a ręchad.
The fish was being eaten by the people.
(an NP preposed sentence)

Fish it it-they was eating it people?
b. *A ngikęl ng lulnga ęr ngii a ręchad?
Was the fish being eaten by the people?
(the question predicted by the passive hypothesis)

Fish they were eating it people?
c. A ngikęl tę milęnga ęr ngii a ręchad?
Was the fish being eaten by the people?
(this the actual question corresponding to (a))

Fish it was eating it people?
d. *A ngikęl ng milęnga ęr ngii a ręchad?
Was the fish being eaten by the people?
(agreement with "a ngikęl" is not possible even without the hypothetical form)

Fish it-they were eating it people?
e. ?A ngikęl a lulnga ęr ngii a ręchad?
Was the fish being eaten by the people?
(marginally acceptable to some)

People I was hitting them?
f. A ręchad ak milęngęlebęd ęr tir?
Were the people being hit by me?
(this shows agreement with a first person initial subject)

As with negation and conditional, the fact that (b) is not a good sentence conflicts with the expectations of the passive hypothesis. Further the passive hypothesis has no explanation for the agreement seen in sentences (c-f). It predicts that if NP preposing occurs first, then you should get (b) and if question formation occurs first you should get (d) or (e). You should never have sentences like (c, and f) where agreement is with the original subject before preposing. The topicalization hypothesis predicts that (b) should be bad, and the agreement seen in (c-f).

Both theories predict that (e) should be a correct sentence rather than (c). The both have to be extended by the statement that question formation inhibits the use of the hypothetical form.

VIII. Subject Controlled Equi

In Palauan most dependent clauses (such as sentential objects see the example below) are introduced by the word "ęl". These clauses have the general form "ęl clause". There is always an NP in the clause which is correferent with an NP outside of the clause. Usually the lower NP is the first NP in the clause, and is deleted. An "a" never follows "ęl". As a result, an ęl clause usually begins with "ęl" immediately preceding the verb of the clause. Special verbs in the lower clause are used to represent special verbal dependents such as the comitative relation (see Section X).

In palauan, subject controlled equi can apply with a small number of verbs including "męlaşęm":"try" and "męduch":"know how to". Starting with structures, presumably like (a) below, subject controlled equi can apply to delete the lower subject if it is correferent with the upper subject, to yield (b). Sentence (c) shows that in a structure similar to (a), where the lower direct

object is correferent with the upper subject, it is not possible to apply equi deleting the lower direct object. Sentence (d) shows an example using the verb "męduch".

Toki tried Toki is feeding me .
39) a. %A Toki a millaşem [a Toki a omęka ęr ngak].
Toki tried [Toki is feeding me].

Toki tried is feeding me.
b. A Toki a millaşem ęl _ omęka ęr ngak.
Toki tried to feed me.
(a correferent lower subject can be deleted)

I tried Toki is feeding.
c. *Ngak a millaşem ęl Toki a omęka {ęr} .
I tried to get fed by Toki.
(a correferent lower direct object cannot be deleted)

I know how to am dressing children.
d. Ak męduch ęl omail ęr a ręngalęk.
I know how to dress the children.

Consider the structure in (a) below where the lower verb is in the ergative form. Sentences (b) and (c) show that subject controlled equi can apply to the lower subject and not to the by phrase. This shows that equi is not restricted to applying only to initial subjects.

I tried I get fed by Toki .
40) a. %Ngak a millaşem [Ngak a muka ęr a Toki].
I tried [I get fed by Toki].

I tried get fed by Toki.
b. Ngak a millaşem ęl _ muka ęr a Toki.
I tried to get fed by Toki.
(subject can be deleted)

Toki tried I get fed.
c. *A Toki a millaşem ęl ngak a muka {ęr} .
Toki tried to have me get fed by him.
(by phrase cannot be deleted)

Children know how to get dressed by me.
d. A ręngalęk a męduch ęl obail {ęr ngak}.
The children know how to get dressed {by me}.

Under the passive hypothesis you would expect that NP preposing could feed equi in order to produce sentences like (b) below from an intermediate structure like (a) where NP preposing has occurred in the lower clause. This is not the case. Note that the passive hypothesis cannot explain why (c) is a good sentence. If NP preposing is occurring first, then equi is being applied to delete an NP which is no longer the subject. Note that under the passive hypothesis NP preposing cannot occur after equi in order to yield (c) since they are both cyclic rules, and the equi must occur on a later cycle. Under the topicalization hypothesis, NP preposing does not interfere with equi since it does not change grammatical relations. Equi applies deleting the lower subject. Quite separate form that, the lower direct object is made the topic of the lower clause.

I tried I it-they are feeding me Toki .
41) a. %Ngak a millaşem [ngak a lomęka ęr ngak a Toki].
I tried [I am being fed by Toki].

I tried it-they are feeding me Toki.
b. *Ngak a millaşem ęl _ lomęka ęr ngak a Toki.
I tried to be fed by Toki.
("ngak" cannot be deleted)

Toki tried I it-they are feeding me.
c. A Toki a millaşem ęl ngak a lomęka ęr ngak _.
Toki tried to feed me.
("ngak" can be NP preposed while "a Toki" is deleted)

I know how to children I am dressing them.
d. Ak męduch ęl rengalęk a kumail ęr tir.
I know how to dress the children.

IX. Object Controlled Equi

This section presents an argument exactly analogous to the last section. Object controlled equi operates in a fashion very similar to subject controlled equi. It can apply with a small number of verbs including "oldurech":"tell" and "olengeseu":"help". Starting from structures presumably like (a) below, equi can apply to delete a lower subject which is correferent with the upper direct object, as in (b). Sentence (c) shows that equi cannot delete lower direct objects which are correferent with upper direct objects. Sentence (d) shows an example using the verb "olengeseu".

I will tell it$_S$ Toki Toki go be feeding boys.
42) a. %Ak oderchii a Toki [a Toki a mo omęka ęr a rębuik].
I will tell Toki [Toki go be feeding the boys].

I will tell it$_S$ Toki go be feeding boys.
b. Ak oderchii a Toki ęl _ mo omęka ęr a rębuik.
I will tell Toki to go feed the boys.
(a correferent lower subject can be deleted)

I will tell them boys Toki go be feeding.
c. *Ak oderchęterir a rębuik ęl Toki a mo omęka {ęr}.
I will tell the boys to go be fed by Toki.
(a correferent lower direct object cannot be deleted)

I helped it$_S$ Toki is dressing children.
d. Ak ngilsuii a Toki ęl omail ęr a rengalęk.
I helped Toki to dress the children.

The following data shows that object controlled equi can apply to the subject produced by ergation, but not to the by phrase.

I will tell them boys boys go get fed by Toki.
43) a. %Ak oderchęterir a rębuik [a rębuik a mo muka ęr a Toki].
I will tell the boys [the boys go get fed by Toki].

I will tell them boys go get fed by Toki.
b. Ak oderchęterir a rębuik el _ mo muka er a Toki.
I will tell the boys to go get fed by Toki.
("a rębuik" can be deleted)

I will tell it$_S$ Toki boys go get fed.
c. *Ak oderchii a Toki el rębuik mo muka {er}.
I will tell Toki to go feed the boys.
("a Toki" cannot be deleted)

I helped them children get dressed by Toki.
d. Ak ngilsuterir a rengalęk el obail {er a Toki}.
I helped the children get dressed by Toki.

Just as with subject controlled equi, the following shows that as predicted by the topicalization hypothesis and in contradiction to the passive hypothesis, though they can occur together, NP preposing neither feeds nor bleeds subject controlled equi.

I will tell them boys boys it-they go be feeding them Toki.
44) a. %Ak oderchęterir a rębuik [a rębuik a lębo lomęka er tir a Toki].
I will tell the boys [the boys will go be fed by Toki].

I will tell them boys it-they go be feeding them Toki.
b. *Ak oderchęterir a rębuik el _ lębo lomęka er tir a Toki.
I will tell the boys to go be fed by Toki.
("a rębuik" cannot be deleted)

I will tell it$_S$ Toki boys it-they go be feeding them.
c. Ak oderchii a Toki el rębuik a lębo lomęka er tir _.
I will tell Toki to go feed the boys.
("a rębuik" can be preposed while "Toki" is deleted)

I helped it$_S$ Toki children is dressing them.
d. Ak ngilsuii a Toki el rengalęk a lomail er tir.
I helped Toki to dress the children.

X. Accompaniment Clauses

Most nouns can take a suffix which indicates that they are possessed. This suffix (see the table below) agrees with the possessor which usually follows the noun. The addition of the possessor suffix often causes phonetic change in the noun, and there is considerable variation from the basic suffix forms in the table.

agreement category gloss	I	we	we$_x$	you	youall	it	they
possessor suffix	-ek	-ed	-am	-em	-iu	-el	-ir

animal animal of its Droteo animal of mine animal of its
45) charm chermel a Droteo chermek chermel
(note that pronominal possessors are deleted)

Palauan has a verb "obengkel":"be together with it" which is unusual in that it takes tense markings like a verb, but agrees with its object like a possessed noun.

I was together with it Toki.
46) a. Ak ulębęngkel a Toki.
I was with Toki.

I was together with you.
b. Ak ulębęngkem.
I was with you.

The comitative relation is expressed by using this verb in a dependent clause introduced by "ęl" ("ęl obęngkel NP"). It is a particular fact of Palauan that this can only be interpreted as meaning that the subject of the main clause is accompanied by the NP in the lower clause. This is a general characteristic of dependent clauses of this type in Palauan. The comitative was chosen as an example.

Droteo is feeding me Together with it Toki.
47) a. A Droteo a omęka ęr ngak ęl obęngkel a Toki.
Droteo is feeding me together with Toki.
(meaning: Droteo and Toki are feeding me)

Droteo is feeding me Together with it Toki.
b. *A Droteo a omęka ęr ngak ęl obęngkel a Toki.
Droteo is feeding me together with Toki.
(meaning: Droteo is feeding me and Toki)

The following example shows that the subject produced by ergation is interpreted as accompanied by the NP in the accompaniment clause, and that therefore the comitative relation is not only sensitive to initial subjects.

I got fed by Droteo together with it Toki.
48) a. Ngak a miluka ęr a Droteo ęl obęngkel a Toki.
I got fed by Droteo together with Toki.
(meaning: Toki and I were fed by Droteo)

I got fed by Droteo together with it Toki.
b. *Ngak a miluka ęr a Droteo ęl obęngkel a Toki.
I got fed by Droteo together with Toki.
(meaning: Droteo and Toki fed me)

The data below shows that with regard to the interpretation of a comitative clause, the NP which was the subject before NP preposing still acts like the subject, and the NP which is preposed does not act like the subject. This is predicted by the topicalization hypothesis, but contradicts the passive hypothesis.

I it-they are feeding me Droteo together with it Toki.
49) a. Ngak a lomęka ęr ngak a Droteo ęl obęngkel a Toki.
I am being fed by Droteo together with Toki.
(meaning: Droteo and Toki are feeding me)

I it-they are feeding me Droteo together with it Toki.
b. *Ngak a lomęka ęr ngak a Droteo ęl obęngkel a Toki.
I am being fed by Droteo together with Toki.
(meaning: Droteo is feeding me and Toki)

XI. The Wide Ranging Applicability of NP Preposing

In the examples above, NP preposing has only been used to prepose direct objects. The passive hypothesis predicts that NP preposing should be quite restricted in what it can apply to; perhaps limited to direct and indirect objects as in the first two examples below.

Droteo was hitting boys.
50) a. A Droteo a milęngęlebęd ęr a rębuik.
Droteo was hitting the boys.

Boys it-they was hitting them Droteo.
a'. A rębuik a lulęngęlebęd ęr tir a Droteo.
The boys were being hit by Droteo.
(the direct object has been preposed)

Toki bought book for boys.
b. A Toki a milęchęrar a hong ęr a rębuik.
Toki bought a book for the boys.

Boys it-they bought book for them Toki.
b'. A rębuik a lulęchęrar a hong ęr tir a Toki.
The boys were bought a book for by Toki.
(an indirect object has been preposed)

In actuality, NP preposing can be applied to a variety of other verbal dependents.

I was hitting you in house.
c. Ak milęngęlebęd ęr kau ęr a blai.
I was hitting you in the house.

House I was hitting you in it.
c'. A blai a kulngęlebęd ęr kau ęr ngii.
The house I was hitting you in.
(from a locative)

I was hitting you on Saturday.
d. Ak milęngęlebęd ęr kau ęr a sabado.
I was hitting you on Saturday.

Saturday I was hitting you on it.
d'. A sabado a kulngęlebęd ęr kau ęr ngii.
Saturday I was hitting you on.
(from a temporal phrase)

I was hitting Toki together with it Droteo.
e. Ak milęngęlebęd ęr a Toki ęl obęngkel a Droteo.
I was hitting Toki together with Droteo.

Droteo I was hitting Toki together with it.
e'. A Droteo kulngęlebęd ęr a Toki ęl obęngkel .
Droteo I was hitting Toki together with.
(from a comitative)

Toki read it$_S$ book for boys.
f. A Toki a chiliuii a hong ęl mora a rębuik.
Toki read a book for the boys.

Boys it-they read it$_S$ book Toki for them.
f'. A rębuik a lęiliuii a hong a Toki ęl mora tir.
The boys were read a book for by toki.
(from a benefactive)

I was hitting you at what place?
g. Ak męngęlebęd ęr kau ęr ker?
Where was I hitting you?

What place I was hitting you at it?
g'. Ker a kulngęlebęd ęr kau ęr ngii?
Where was I hitting you?
(a question word is preposed)

It is particularly interesting that the by phrase in an ergative sentence can be preposed. It is difficult for the passive hypothesis to claim that NP preposing is restoring "rędil" as the subject of (h') after ergation converted it from a subject to a by phrase in (h).

I am getting fed by woman.
h. Ak muka ęr a rędil.
I am getting fed by the woman.

Woman I am getting fed by it.
h'. A rędil a kumuka ęr ngii.
I am getting fed by the woman.
(from a by phrase)

NP Preposing From Dependent Clauses

It is also possible for NP preposing to apply to NPs in embedded clauses. This is expected under the topicalization hypothesis, and very uncharacteristic of a passive transformation.

I tried is feeding boys.
51) a. Ak millaşem ęl omęka ęr a rębuik.
I tried to feed the boys.

Boys I tried is feeding them.
a'. A rębuik a kullaşem ęl omęka ęr tir.
I tried to feed the boys.
(the object of a sentential object is preposed)

I tried tell it$_S$ Toki help you is dressing Droteo.
b. Ak millaşem ęl odęrchii a Toki ęl olęngęseu ęr kau ęl omail ęr a Droteo.
I tried to tell Toki to help you dress Droteo.

Droteo I tried tell it$_S$ Toki help you is dressing it.
b'. A Droteo a kullaşem ęl odęrchii a Toki ęl olęngęseu ęr kau ęl omail ęr ngii.
I tried to tell Toki to help you dress Droteo.
(the object from 3 clauses down is preposed)

Note that in both cases, only the top level verb is put into the hypothetical form. This shows

that the hypothetical form is used because the preposed NP precedes the verb, not because the preposed NP is a dependent of the verb.

NP Preposing Part of a Composite Direct Object

If the direct object of a verb has a composite structure then parts of this structure can be preposed. The examples below show this happening with possessional structures and with coordinate structures.

I am hitting hand of it Droteo.
52) a. Ak mengelebed er a chimal a Droteo.
I am hitting Droteo's hand.

Droteo I am hitting hand of it.
a'. A Droteo a kungelebed er a chimal _.
Droteo, I am hitting his hand.
(the possessor in the object is preposed)

I am hitting Droteo and Toki.
b. Ak mengelebed er a Droteo me a Toki.
I am hitting Droteo and Toki.

Droteo I am hitting it and Toki.
b'. A Droteo a kungelebed er ngii me a Toki.
Droteo, I am hitting him and Toki.
(part of a coordinate object is preposed)

NP Preposing Part of a Composite Subject

It is particularly interesting that part of a composite subject can be preposed, leaving the rest of the subject at the end of the sentence. This is particularly difficult to explain as a passive transformation.

Hand of it Droteo hurts.
53) a. A chimal a Droteo a meringel.
Droteo's hand hurts.

Droteo hurts hand of it.
a'. A Droteo a meringel a chimal _.
Droteo, his hand hurts.
(the possessor in the subject is preposed)

Droteo and Toki are friends.
b. A Droteo me a Toki a kausechelei.
Droteo and Toki are friends.

Droteo are friends it and Toki.
b'. A Droteo a kausechelei ngii me a Toki.
Droteo, he and Toki are friends.
(part of a coordinate subject is preposed)

The sentences where part of the subject is preposed differ from the other examples above in that the verb is not put in the hypothetical form. The atypical behavior of subjects in this regard is unpleasant for both theories. The topicalization hypothesis, merely stipulates that (except in

conditional sentences and questions) the hypothetical verb form is usually suppressed if the subject or part of the subject is preposed.

A similar statement could be used to account for this under the passive hypothesis. Josephs chose to account for this data by proposing that preposing part of a subject is controlled by an entirely separate transformation unrelated to NP preposing. The following data shows that there are situations where the hypothetical form is required even though part of the subject has been preposed. This shows that the two preposing transformations are at the least very closely related. As a result, it is probably better to unify them as is done in the topicalization hypothesis.

Children of it Toki ate it_S fish.
54) a. A rengelekel a Toki a killii a ngikel.
Toki's children ate the fish.

Toki it-they ate it_S fish children of it.
a'. A Toki a lekillii a ngikel a rengelekel _.
Toki, her children ate the fish.
(hypothetical form is used even though part of the subject is preposed)

Droteo and Toki ate it_S fish.
b. A Droteo me a Toki killii a ngikel.
Droteo and Toki ate the fish.

Droteo it-they ate it fish it and Toki.
b'. A Droteo a lekillii a ngikel ngii me a Toki.
Droteo, he and Toki ate the fish.
(hypothetical form is used even though part of the subject is preposed)

If the underlying structure of a negative sentence contains a sentential subject as proposed in Section VI, then the example below shows NP preposing out of a composite subject which is a dependent clause.

It was false I am hitting Toki.
55) a. Ng dimlak kungelebed er a Toki.
I was not hitting Toki. (It was not true that I was hitting Toki.)

Toki was false I am hitting it.
a'. A Toki a dimlak kungelebed er ngii.
Toki was not being hit by me.
(the object of the negated sentence is preposed)

Note that "dimlak" is not in its hypothetical form. This is consistent with the data above.

Taken together, the data in this section shows that NP preposing is applicable in a very wide range of situations. This is to be expected of a topicalization transformation, but is very unexpected in a passive transformation.

XII. Relativization

In Palauan an NP containing a relative clause has the following form "NP el S1". During relativization, starting with an underlying structure presumably like (a), the NP in S1 corresponding to the head NP is deleted.

I saw boy who boy was eating fish.
56) a. %Ak ulęmes ęr a buik ęl [a buik a milęnga ęr a ngikęl.
I saw the boy who [the boy was eating the fish].

I saw boy who was eating fish.
b. Ak ulęmes ęr a buik ęl _ milęnga ęr a ngikęl.
I saw the boy who was eating the fish.
("buik" has been relativized)

Masaharu who was hitting Toki told it_S Droteo.
c. A Masaharu ęl _ milęngęlebęd ęr a Toki a silębędii a Droteo.
Masaharu who was hitting Toki told Droteo.
(another example)

The literature in general, and Josephs in particular, claim that only the subject of the dependent clause can undergo relativization and be deleted. This is used as the basis for an argument for the passive hypothesis. This argument stems from the fact that the primed sentences below (which presumably come from underlying structures like the unprimed sentences) are good sentences. If relativization only applies to subjects, then the subject preposing applied in the underlying structures must have made the preposed NPs into subjects.

However, the informants consulted in this study did not feel that only subjects could relativize. They felt that in many situations, something other than the subject could be relativized as long as a pronominal copy of it was left (which is deleted if it is agreed with). (The pronominal copy was not required by some speakers in some instances.) The relativization of non-subjects is illustrated in the doubly primed sentences below.

The fact that a sentence like (a") is good refutes the argument in favor of the passive hypothesis. If relativization can occur in (a") with a non subject, then it can occur in (a') with a non-subject. It is true that sentences like (a') are in general more acceptable than sentences like (a"). This is explained under the topicalization hypothesis by saying that it is preferable for the relativized NP to be the topic of the relative clause.

Toki who Toki it-they was hitting it Masaharu told it_S Droteo.
57) a. %A Toki ęl [a Toki a lulęngęlebęd ęr ngii a Masaharu] a silębędii a Droteo.
Toki who [Toki was being hit by Masaharu] told Droteo.
(NP preposing in the inner clause)

Toki who it-they was hitting it Masaharu told it_S Droteo.
a'. A Toki ęl _ lulęngęlebęd ęr ngii a Masaharu a silębędii a Droteo.
Toki who Masaharu was hitting told Droteo.
(here an object is preposed and relativized)

Toki who Masaharu was hitting it told it_S Droteo.
a". A Toki ęl Masaharu a milęngęlebęd ęr ngii a silębędii a Droteo.
Toki who Masaharu was hitting told Droteo.
(here the object is directly relativized)

House that house it-they was hitting Toki in it Masaharu burned down.
b. %A blai ęl [a blai a lulęngęlebęd ęr a Toki ęr ngii a Masaharu] a milseseb.
The house that [the house Masaharu was hitting Toki in] burned down.
(NP preposing in the inner clause)

House that it-they was hitting Toki in it Masaharu burned down.
b'. A blai el _ lulengelebed er a Toki er ngii a Masaharu a milseseb.
The house that Masaharu was hitting Toki in burned down.
(here the locative is preposed and relativized)

House that Masaharu was hitting Toki in it burned down.
b". A blai el Masaharu a milengelebed er a Toki er ngii a milseseb.
The house that Masaharu was hitting Toki in burned down.
(here the locative is directly relativized)

Masaharu who Masaharu it-they hit it_S Toki told it_S Droteo.
c. %A Masaharu el [a Masaharu a lechillebedii _ a Toki] a silebedii a Droteo.
Masaharu who [Masaharu was hit by Toki] told Droteo.

Masaharu who it-they hit it_S Toki told it_S Droteo.
c'. A Masaharu el _ lechillebedii _ a Toki a silebedii a Droteo.
Masaharu who was hit by Toki told Droteo.

Masaharu who Toki hit it_S told it_S Droteo.
c". A Masaharu el Toki a chillebedii _ a silebedii a Droteo.
Masaharu who Toki hit told Droteo.

I saw house that house it-they was eating fish in it boy.
d. %Ak ulemes er a blai el [a blai a lulnga er a ngikel er ngii a buik].
I saw the house that [the house the boy was eating the fish in].

I saw house that it-they was eating fish in it boy.
d'. Ak ulemes er a blai el _ lulnga er a ngikel er ngii a buik .
I saw the house that the boy was eating the fish in.

I saw house that boy was eating fish in it.
d". Ak ulemes er a blai el buik a milenga er a ngikel er ngii.
I saw the house that the boy was eating the fish in.

XIII. Conclusion

The sections above present the following basic facts:

1) An NP which is NP preposed does not act like a subject in any context. It does not trigger the agreement of non-emphatic pronouns (in subject shifted sentences or questions) or hypothetical pronouns (in negative or conditional sentences). It does not alter the interpretation of a comitative clause. It cannot feed the processes of subject shifting, question formation, subject controlled equi, or object control equi.

   The preposed NP does appear in initial position, however, the claim of the passive hypothesis that the word order in Paluaun is [subject, verb, object] is inherently no more plausible than the claim of the topicalization hypothesis that the word order is [topic, verb, object, subject]. The preposed NP can undergo relativization, however as the data in Section XII showed relativization is not restricted to subjects.

2) The subject which is displaced when NP preposing occurs continues to act like a subject in all situations. It does trigger the agreement of non-emphatic and hypothetical pronouns. It is still referenced in the interpretation of an accompaniment clause. It still can feed question formation, subject controlled equi, and object controlled equi.

3) If the preposed NP is a direct object, it continues to trigger verb object agreement as if it still was the direct object.

4) It is not possible to explain any of the facts above by claiming that the processes are sensitive to initial subjects or initial direct objects. Rather, the passive hypothesis has to be extended in an ad hoc way in order to explain away the expected interactions.

5) NP preposing has the wide ranging applicability expected of topicalization, rather than the restricted applicability expected of a passive transformation.

6) Through the topicalization hypothesis, it is possible to unify the processes of NP preposing, subject shifting, and preposing part of a subject into a single transformation.

Given these facts, it can be seen that the generalizations which the passive hypothesis tries to capture are not true in Palauan. In contrast, the generalizations which the topicalization hypothesis tries to capture are true. As a result, the topicalization hypothesis is a better description of the processes of NP preposing and subject shifting in Palauan.

Acknowledgments

The author would like to the acknowledge the invaluable assistance of the three informants: Serelina Mersai, Beketel Elbelau, and Ruthy Aitaro. In addition, it would not have been possible to write this paper without the help of Lewis Josephs' excellent reference work. His book is particularly useful because it contains a great deal of actual data. Lastly, David Perlmutter was very helpful throughout the process of writing this paper.

References

Josephs, Lewis S., [1975] Palauan Reference Grammar, University Press of Hawaii, Honolulu, 1975.