This paper is a description of Iraqw syntax and a characterization of a particular nominal suffix which appears to signal syntactic inaccessibility to certain rules. It will be proposed that this suffix signals inaccessibility that is the result of a demotion in grammatical relation of the particular object NP's under consideration. That is, the suffix signals both relational demotion and a concomitant syntactic inaccessibility.

0. Introduction

The paper will begin with a short description of some basic aspects of Iraqw syntax relevant to this discussion. Then, more complicated two-object verb paradigms are discussed. After this, various syntactic rules will be shown to operate on certain object NP's, and the restrictions on these rules will be discussed. The paper concludes with a characterization of a certain nominal suffix which signals relational demotion and syntactic inaccessibility.

1. Background Information

Iraqw is spoken in Mbulu Region in Tanzania and has been tentatively classified as Southern Cushitic. Neutral word order is SOV. The verb may be marked for first person singular subject and, in some cases for masculine and feminine second and third person singular subject. There are tonal distinctions for third singular masculine and feminine subject forms of the verb, but tone is not indicated here. Nouns have singular and plural forms, and some demonstrative elements are suffixes.

The outstanding feature of Iraqw syntax is the complicated system
of elements called "selectors" by Whiteley [1953]. These usually appear pre-verbally (under conditions to be discussed) and may mark person, number, gender, and case of various verbal arguments, as well as such diverse features as Relative Clause Formation (REL), Passive (PSV), tense, mood, Question (Q) Formation, and others. In the examples of this paper, the selectors (SLTR's) will fall into two types: (a) those appearing after the subject but before the first object and (b) those appearing after the first object. Schematically then, the two types are:

(a) Subject - SLTR - Object - Verb
(b) Subject - Object - SLTR - Verb

Examples of the two types are given below:

(1) a. ?aniŋ ?a ?inos lohis
   lsg SLTR, pres 3sg carry
   'I am carrying her'

b. ?aniŋ ?inos ?a² lohis
   lsg 3sg SLTR, fut carry
   'I will carry her'

These examples show that the word order type is relevant for the determination of Tense, since the SLTR ?a appears in both sentences. Consider these additional examples showing the function of the SLTR's (or part of a SLTR) in masculine/feminine agreement:

c. ?aniŋ ?inos ?a-na lohis
   lsg 3sg SLTR-past carry
   'I carried her'

Maghway of the University of Dar es Salaam are very gratefully acknowledged. This research was supported by a grant from the Research and Publications Committee of the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences of the University of Dar es Salaam. I would also like to gratefully acknowledge the efforts of the late Professor I. Richardson, former head of the Department of Foreign Languages and Linguistics at the University of Dar es Salaam, in getting the Research Proposal funded. Symbols have roughly their IPA equivalents, except that i is phonetically ɪ, e is ɛ, o is ɔ, and u is ʊ.

1See Bradfield [1977] for a list of the features of the SLTR's.

2Whiteley [1953] lists ?an for the future SLTR, but I did not encounter this item in my research.
These examples lead to the following generalizations applicable to the pattern of SLTR agreement in this paper:

"The SLTR agrees in gender and number with the NP immediately preceding."

It should also be pointed out that the SLTR varies with respect to the subject as well (even when absent):

f. Rawata ñameni ga--na lohis
   man    woman   SLTR-past carry
   'the man carried the/a woman'

g. Rawata na¿ay gu--na lohis
   man    child    SLTR-past     carry
   'the man carried the/a child'

These examples show SLTR agreement with the subject Rawata and with the feminine and masculine objects ñameni and na¿ay. Thus, SLTR's agree with subjects, and will agree with objects when the SLTR's directly precede said objects.

This paper will be primarily concerned with an investigation of a nominal suffixal morpheme which I will call an "inaccessibility marker" (IM). In my reading of the published accounts of Iraqw, I can find no reference to this element, nor to its syntactic function. Its basic shape is probably /-(C)i/ with non-high tone,3 and the phonetic form of the consonant is probably determined by the preceding stem-final segment, but I am not at this time prepared to state exact phonological details. But the impact of this element on the syntax of the language is considerable. It will be shown that any non-subject NP marked with the IM may not be Topicalized, Passivized, Relativized, Relativized, Relativized,

---

3This element is not to be confused with a sometimes segmentally identical demonstrative (DEM) morpheme, also at times /-Ci/, but with distinctly high tone.
or WH-Questioned; nor may this IM-marked NP appear in a position
to govern SLTR agreement. It appears that prepositional objects
and underlyingly direct objects may, under appropriate conditions,
be suffixed with this element. In later sections we shall return
to discuss the relevance of this for the notion of "demotion" in
Relational Grammar.

2. Word-Order Permutations and the IM

The following examples illustrate the various permutations in
types (a) and (b) word order, in sentences with the verbs allowing
more than one object complement.

(2)  a. ?aniŋ ?a  barwitoʔo-r  hanmis
     lsg  SLTR  letter-DEM  give  to  man
     'I am giving the letter to the/a man'
     b. ?aniŋ ?a  {barwitoʔo-r  hawat--i}  hanmis
        lsg  SLTR  letter-DEM  man--IM  give
        {hawat--i  barwitoʔo-r
         man-IM  letter-DEM}
        'I am giving the letter to the/a man'
     c. ?aniŋ ?a  {barwitoʔo--ri
        lsg  SLTR  letter-IM  man-DEM  give
         hawat--u
         hawat--u  barwitoʔo--ri
         man-DEM  letter-IM
     'I am giving the man the/a letter'

Notice that once the preposition dir is deleted, either hawat- or
barwitoʔo- must appear with the IM. Sentences without such IM's
are ungrammatical. Note that either unmarked or IM-marked NP's may
appear immediately before the verb in these type (a) sentences.

In the following type (b) sentences involving the future tense,
the SLTR agrees with the object, but as we shall see, with only one
object:

---

4 The element hanmis varies with hanis 'give' in that the
former appears in present tense, while the latter in past and
future examples. Also attested is harmis for the same item,
indicating some dialectal variation.
(3) a. ɣaniŋ barwitoʔo ?a hanis dir hawata
   lsg letter SLTR give to man
   'I will give the/a letter to the/a man'

b. ɣaniŋ barwitoʔo ?a hawati-ʔi hanis
   lsg letter SLTR man-IM give
   'I will give the/a letter to the/a man'

c. ɣaniŋ hawata ?u barwitoʔo-ʔi hanis
   lsg man SLTR letter-IM give
   'I will give the/a man the/a letter'

Compare the SLTR's in (3b) and (3c). In the former, the SLTR
agrees with the feminine barwitoʔo, while in the latter, the
SLTR is masculine in agreement with hawata. Again, sentences
without IM's would be ungrammatical, as are any of the following
logically possible permutations:

d. *ɣaniŋ barwitoʔo-ʔi ?a hawata hanis
   lsg letter-IM SLTR man give

  e. *ɣaniŋ hawat-ʔi ?u barwitoʔo hanis
   lsg man-IM SLTR letter give

  f. *ɣaniŋ \{ hawata barwitoʔo-ʔi \}
     \{ man letter-IM \}
     ?a (or: ?u) hanis
     SLTR (SLTR) give

These examples illustrate that the SLTR may never agree with an IM-
marked NP. Since, as has already been pointed out, SLTR agreement is
always with the immediately preceding NP, it follows that an IM-
marked NP may never be followed by a SLTR. SLTR agreement will always
be with NP's without the IM.

Further examples involve instrumental objects:

(4) a. ɣaniŋ naʃay ?u mux ?ar hara
   lsg child SLTR beat with stick
   'I will beat the/a child with the/a stick'

b. ɣaniŋ naʃay ?u ḥart-ar mux
   lsg child SLTR stick-IM,instr beat
   'I will beat the/a child with the/a stick'
c. ?aniŋ hara ʔa naʕa--r mux
  lsg stick SLTR child-IM,instr beat
  'I will beat with the/a stick the/a child'

Note that SLTR agreement is with naʕay in (4a-b), but with hara in (4c). Furthermore, the IM marker in these examples is phonologically similar to the instrumental preposition ʕar. It would appear that in these examples, the marker which I have labelled "IM,instr" has indeed a double function: it serves to mark the feature of instrumentality, and, as we shall see, behaves exactly like the /Ci/ IM, in that nouns marked with either of these elements will have similar accessibility restrictions.

Another prepositional expression involving the elements kitangw ... wa ale meaning 'on ... behalf of' does not show an alternation with the IM:

(5) hawata dasi ga mux kitangw ʕameni--r wa ale
    man girl SLTR beat on woman-DEM behalf
    'the man will beat the girl on behalf of the woman'

The examples of this section show the basic word order and SLTR agreement patterns with verbs having more than one object and the effects of a promotion rule which might loosely be called a dative movement rule, but more properly should be labelled a non-direct-object movement rule. A wider range of word-order permutations are possible in the type (a) word order examples (cf. (2a-3)) than in type (b) examples (cf. above), but this is due to the fact that type (b) structures involve SLTR agreement with objects, while type (a) never does. Type (b) examples, or sentences presumed to be derived from type (b) structures with SLTR agreement for underlying or derived objects, will be the focus of the remainder of this paper.

3. Inaccessibility Marker and Syntactic Rules

In the following examples, it will be useful to distinguish among a number of types of objects, as these are victims of various rules. The objects examined here will be semantic direct, indirect (benefactive or dative) and instrumental, as well as the prepositional
'on X's behalf' structure seen above in (5). We will attempt to have these objects become victims of the rules of PSV, TOP, WH-Q, and REL.

3.1. One-object verbs. We shall begin by using simple transitive verbs, i.e. verbs with only one object. Consider the following:

(6) a. ḥawata kuna mux ne baba
    man PSV,SLTR beat by father
    'the man was beaten by father'

   b. dasi kanamux ne baba
    girl PSV,SLTR beat by father
    'the girl was beaten by father'

(7) a. naːay, ḥawata gu mux
    child man SLTR beat
    'the child, the man will beat'

   b. dasi, ḥawata ga mux
    girl man SLTR beat
    'the girl, the man will beat'

(8) ḥaniŋ barwitow–o–r [kuŋ ta goʔin] ḥana ḥoh
    lsg letter-DEM [2sg REL,SLTR write] SLTR hold
    'I held the letter which you wrote'

(9) a. ḥawata gar ?a mux
    man WH SLTR beat
    'what did the man beat?'

   b. ḥawata hee ?a mux
    man WH SLTR beat
    'whom did the man beat?'

In examples (6-7), the SLTR's agree with the fronted noun. In (8-9), the SLTR's are invariable for these objects. The examples have been kept simple for the purposes of the discussion, but it should be pointed out that there are numerous additional complications which are beyond the scope of this paper and hence not mentioned. These do not, however, affect the point of the discussion.

3.2. More-than-one object verbs. We are now in a position to examine
more complicated examples with verbs taking more than one object.
We shall be particularly interested in the behavior of those nouns suffixed with the IM in the examples below.

3.2.1. Passives. Let us first examine some PSV examples. For the underlying constructions of SUBJ-OBJ-DATIVE/BENEF active-VERB, we find that the OBJ, the Dative, or the Benefactive may be passivized:

(10) a. muruśaima kuna dasi--ri hanis ne ʕameni
food PSV,SLTR girl-IM give by woman
'food was given to the/a girl by the/a woman'

b. dasi kana muruśaima---ri hanis ne ʕameni
girl PSV,SLTR food-IM give by woman
'the/a girl was given food by the/a woman'

(11) a. muruśaima kuna dasi--ri huurin ne ʕameni
food PSV,SLTR girl-IM cook by woman
'food was cooked for the/a girl by the/a woman'

b. dasi kana muruśaima---ri huurin ne ʕameni
girl PSV,SLTR food--IM cook by woman
'the/a girl was cooked food for by the/a woman'

However, if we attempt to passivize the object NP's with IM's, the sentences are ungrammatical. Consider the presumably related (10-11c) examples below:

(10) c. *dasi-ri kana muruśaima(---ri) hanis ne ʕameni
girl-IM PSV,SLTR food(---IM) give by woman
*muruśaima---ri kuna dasi(---ri) hanis ne ʕameni
food--IM PSV,SLTR girl(-IM) give by woman

(11) c. *dasi--ri kana muruśaima(---ri) huurin ne ʕameni
girl-IM PSV,SLTR food(--IM) cook by woman
*muruśaima---ri kuna dasi(--ri) huurin ne ʕameni
food--IM PSV,SLTR girl(--IM) cook by woman

The parenthesized IM's are included in the above examples to show that

5Future researchers checking these data should be very careful to distinguish the IM morphemes from the Demonstratives mentioned in footnote 3.
ungrammaticality results whether or not the second NP is IM-marked.

Passivizing an instrumental object or the direct object is possible:

(12) a. ʰara kana naʰa--r mux ne ʰameni
    stick PSV,SLTR child-IM beat by woman
    'the stick was used to beat the child by the woman'

b. naʰay kuna ʰara--r mux ne ʰameni
    child PSV,SLTR stick-IM beat by woman
    'the child was beaten with a stick by a woman'

But again, if we were to attempt to passivize either object NP marked with the IM, the sentences are ungrammatical:

(12) c. *ʰara--r kana naʰa(/--r) mux ne ʰameni
    stick-IM PSV,SLTR child(---IM) beat by woman

    *naʰa--r kuna ʰara(----r) mux ne ʰameni
    child-IM PSV,SLTR stick(---IM) beat by woman

In all of the preceding examples, SLTR agreement with particular derived subject NP's is correct, and cannot be the cause of ungrammaticality when it occurs. Clearly, then the presence of the IM's in (10c, 11c, 12c) is the crucial factor.

It appears that prepositional objects may not be directly passivized. Thus, from a structure like the following, the prepositional object is moved, but the result is ungrammatical:

(13) /ʰameni (SUBJ)--muruʰaima (OBJ)-- hanis (V) dir (PREP) dasi /
    woman food give to girl

    --> *dasi kana muruʰaima(---ri) hanis dir ----os ne ʰameni
    girl PSV,SLTR food(---IM) give to(--3sgPRO) by woman

Iraqw does not allow preposition-stranding, which could be the cause of the ungrammaticality. To allow for this, a pronominal suffix -os is added to the preposition dir in parentheses, but the result was unanimously judged as extremely clumsy. We conclude then that passivization may not apply to prepositional objects, unless these objects are promoted to some other (as yet undefined) status prior to PSV.
To summarize, direct and indirect objects and instrumental objects may be passivized, but prepositional objects and IM-marked objects may not.

3.2.2. **Topicalization.** The rule of TOP is another rule which is sensitive to the presence of an IM on the victim object NP's. This rule can move all objects except those marked with IM's:

(14) a. naʃay, ʃameni guna barwito?o-ri hanis
    child woman SLTR letter-IM give
    'the child, the/a woman gave the/a letter to'

    b. naʃay, ʃameni barwito?o gana hanis dir---os
    child woman letter SLTR give to-3sgPRO
    'the child, the/a woman gave the/a letter to her'

    c. barwito?o, ʃameni gana ʔinos--i6 hanis
    letter woman SLTR 3sgPRO-IM give
    'the letter, the/a woman gave to him'

(15) a. kuŋ, ʃameni ʔuna muruʃaima--ri huurin
    2sg.M woman SLTR food-IM cook
    'you, the/a woman cooked food for'

    b. muruʃaima, ʃameni ʔina kuŋ-gi huurin
    food woman SLTR 2sgM--IM
    'food, the/a woman cooked for you'

(16) a. naʃay, ʔaniŋ ʔu hara-r mux
    child 1sg SLTR stick-IM beat
    'the child, I will beat with the/a stick'

    b. ʔara, ʔaniŋ ʔa naʃa---r mux
    stick 1sg SLTR child-IM beat
    'the stick, I will beat the/a child with'

(17) a. dasi, hawata ga mux kitaŋ ʃameni wa ale
    girl man SLTR beat behalf woman behalf of
    'the girl, the/a man will beat on behalf of the/a woman'

---

6The IM-suffixed form for 'child' is in fact naʃa-y , which is too similar to the non-IM-suffixed form to be an effective example. Therefore I have substituted the IM-marked form for 'him', ʔinos--i, which very clearly alternates with the non-suffixed form ʔinos.
If in examples (14-17) an IM were to appear on the topicalized NP, the sentences would be ungrammatical. Thus, it appears that all types of objects may be topicalized, but no objects with the IM may undergo this rule.

3.2.3. Relativization. Relativization, too, is sensitive to the appearance of IM's on objects. Object NP's may be relativized as in the following:

(18) a. ?aniQ ʕameni--r [na muruʕaima-ri hanis] ?ana ?oh
    lsg woman-DEM REL,SLTR food-IM give SLTR hold
    'I held the woman whom I gave food to'

b. ?aniQ muruʕaima--r [na ʕameni---ri hanis] ?una ?oh
    lsg food--DEM REL,SLTR woman-IM give SLTR hold
    'I held the food which I gave to the/a woman'

    lsg stick [woman SLTR boy-IM beat] SLTR hold
    'I held the stick which the/a woman will beat the/a boy with'

b. ?aniQ garm--o [ʕameni ʔi hara--r mux] ?una ?oh
    lsg boy-DEM [woman SLTR stick--IM beat] SLTR hold
    'I held the boy whom the/a woman will beat with the/a stick'

(20) ?aniQ ʕameni--r [hawata dasi ga mux kitaŋ--os wa ale]
    lsg woman-DEM [man girl SLTR beat behalf-3sgPRO behalf of]
    ?ana ?oh SLTR hold
    'I held the woman on whose behalf the/a man will beat the/a girl'

But once again, if we were to attempt to relativize an object NP which was marked with the IM, the results would be ungrammatical. Thus, Relativization is sensitive to whether or not object NP's are suffixed by the IM.

3.2.4. WH-questions. A fourth rule which is sensitive to the presence
of IM's is WH-Q Formation. All objects can be questioned as in the following:

(21) a. ?anĩŋ gar na ḥawat---i hanis
    lsg WH SLTR man-IM give
    'what did I give to the/a man?'

    b. ?anĩŋ hee na muruḵaima--ri hanis
    lsg WH SLTR food-IM give
    'whom did I give food to?'

(22) a. ?anĩŋ gar na garma---r mux
    lsg WH SLTR boy--IM beat
    'what did I beat the/a boy with?'

    b. ?anĩŋ hee na ḥara---r mux
    lsg WH SLTR stick--IM beat
    'whom did I beat with the/a stick?'

(23) ḥawata dasi ga mux kitaŋ hee
    man girl SLTR beat behalf WH
    'the/a man will beat the/a girl on behalf of whom?'

But if we attempt to question an object NP with an IM, the results are ungrammatical. One example is given, similar to (21a-b):

(21) c. *?anĩŋ gar(---i) na ḥawata hanis
    lsg WH(--IM) SLTR man give

    d. *?anĩŋ hee(---i) na muruḵaima hanis
    lsg WH(--IM) SLTR food give

3.2.5. Summary. By now the point is clear that most objects are accessible to the rules of PSV,TOP,REL, and WH-Q, whereas object NP's of any underlying relation surfacing with the IM marker must not be victims of these rules.

4. Discussion

The various types of object seem to divide themselves into

---

7 WH-Q Formation also involves a relativization strategy like the following: thing/person REL SUBJ (OBJ) VERB is WH. Since this essentially duplicates the REL data, it is not included here.
several groups in Iraqw in terms of morphology and syntactic behavior. The first group, let us call them Unmarked Objects, may in type (b) structures appear directly after the subject, govern SLTR agreement (cf. sentences (3-4)), and may be victims of the syntactic rules of PSV,TOP,REL, and Wh-Q.

A second group would be Prepositional Object NP's. These may not appear directly after the subject, do not trigger SLTR agreement, and may appear after the verb. These elements may be victims of all of the syntactic rules described above except PSV.

The third group of objects are those marked with IM's. Recall that we are restricting our discussion to type (b) structures. IM-marked Objects may not appear directly after the subject, do not and must not trigger SLTR agreement, and may not be victims of any of the syntactic rules discussed above.

Thus, we have a sliding scale of object types, which we may summarize as in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>after subject</th>
<th>SLTR agreement</th>
<th>victim of</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unmarked</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepositional</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IM-Suffixed</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I would now like to discuss an analysis of this data with an approach based on Relational Grammar. It has long been noted that relational (syntactic) promotion, accessibility to syntactic rules, and focus are inter-related features, and the correlation has been reasonably well established. What is being proposed here for Iraqw is that there is a particular morpheme, the IM suffix, which is transformationally attached to those object NP's which have been relationally demoted.\(^8\) Coupled with relational demotion is syntactic inaccessibility for that relation,

\(^8\)Cf. Dalgish [1976] and Dalgish and Sheintuch [1977] for a discussion of transformational verbal marking when Locative Objects have gone "up" the Relational Hierarchy.
and a corresponding inability to focus on that item. Within our hierarchy of Object types, Unmarked Objects are at the top of the scale, IM-marked Objects at the bottom, and Prepositional Objects somewhere in between.

Let us consider some concrete examples within this Relational-Demotional approach. Assuming that alternations of object types as in (3a-c) and (4a-c) are related, we can characterize these relations in terms of Relational promotion and demotion. Consider examples in which certain Prepositional Objects (those with dir and ?ar as the prepositions) may become Unmarked Objects:

(3) a. ?aniŋ barwitoŋ ʔa hanis dir hawata
    lsg. letter SLTR give to man
    'I will give the/a letter to the/a man'

(3) c. ?aniŋ hawata ʔu barwitoŋ-ri hanis
    lsg. man SLTR letter--IM give
    'I will give the/a man the/a letter'

In (3c), the Unmarked Object hawata, derived from the Prepositional Object dir hawata in (3a), has been promoted and appears after the subject, governs SLTR agreement, and may be the victim of PSV, TOP, REL, and WH-Q. These are properties that as a Prepositional Object it did not possess. The promotion of the Prepositional Object to Unmarked Object status will result in the demotion by usurpation of the previous Unmarked Object, in these cases, barwitoŋ, which then becomes transformationally suffixed by the IM. As a demoted NP, it is less accessible to syntactic rules and consequently "out of focus".

A case in which only demotion takes place is illustrated by the following sentences:

(3) a. ?aniŋ barwitoŋ ʔa hanis dir hawata
    lsg. letter SLTR give to man
    'I will give the/a letter to the/a man'

(3) b. ?aniŋ barwitoŋ ʔa hawat---i hanis
    lsg. letter SLTR man--IM give
    'I will give the/a letter to the/a man'
In (3a), the Prepositional Object *hawata* may be Topicalized, Relativized, WH-Questioned, but may not be Passivized or trigger SLTR agreement. But if *hawata* is moved to the left of the verb, it loses its Prepositional Object status, and may not be the victim of any of these syntactic processes. The IM-morpheme, it is claimed, signals this Relational demotion. Examples like these show that it is possible for Relational demotion to take place without necessarily involving usurpation in promotion processes (cf. Dalgish [1977] for evidence from Dho-Luo indicating essentially similar findings).

To summarize, then, the relational demotion undergone by either the (underlyingly) Unmarked Object or the Prepositional Object NP is signalled by the appearance of the IM morpheme. This analysis can easily be extended to other examples in this paper. This Relational account of the syntax of object NP's in Iraqw allows us to state quite simply the conditions under which object NP's are suffixed by the IM morpheme, namely, whenever an object undergoes a Relational demotion. We may view the restricted syntactic behavior (inaccessibility) of such suffixed NP's as a consequence of this demotion.
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