INACCESSIBILITY AND DEMOTIONAL
NOMINAL MARKING IN IRAQW*

Gerard M. Dalgish

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 par-
ticular 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 restric-
tions 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.[1]
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. ʔaniŋ ʔa   ʔinos lohis
         1sg   SLTR,pres 3sg   carry
         'I am carrying her'

     b. ʔaniŋ ʔinos ʔa[2]   lohis
         1sg   3sg   SLTR,fut carry
         'I will carry her'

These examples show that the word order type is relevant for the de-
termination of Tense, since the SLTR ʔa 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. ʔaniŋ ʔinos ʔa-na   lohis
         1sg   3sg   SLTR-past carry
         'I carried her'

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

[2]Whiteley [1953] lists ʔan for the future SLTR, but I did not
encounter this item in my research.

d. ʔaniŋ ɦawata ʔu   lohis
    lsg   man   SLTR carry
    'I will carry the/a man'

e. ʔaniŋ ɦawata ʔu--na   lohis
    lsg   man   SLTR-past carry
    'I carried the/a man'

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. ɦawata ʕameni ga--na   lohis
    man   woman   SLTR-past carry
    'the man carried the/a woman'

g. ɦawata naʕay gu--na   lohis
    man   child SLTR-past carry
    'the man carried the/a child'

These examples show SLTR agreement with the subject ɦawata and
with the feminine and masculine objects ʕameni and naʕay . 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,

---

[3]This 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   barwito?o-r   hanmis[4]   dir   ħawata
         1sg   SLTR   letter-DEM   give   to   man
         'I am giving the letter to the/a man'

     b. ?aniŋ   ?a   ⎧ barwito?o-r   ħawat--i ⎫ hanmis
         1sg   SLTR │ letter-DEM   man--IM   │ give
                       │   │
                       │ ħawat-i   barwito?o-r│
                       ⎩ man-IM   letter-DEM ⎭
         'I am giving the letter to the/a man'

     c. ?aniŋ   ?a   ⎧ barwito?o--ri │ ħawat-u   han is
         1sg   SLTR │ letter-IM   │ man-DEM   give
                       │   │
                       │ ħawat-u   │ barwito?o-ri
                       ⎩ man-DEM   ⎭ letter-IM
         'I am giving the man the/a letter'

Notice that once the preposition dir is deleted, either ħawat- or
barwito?o- 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. ʔaniŋ barwitoʔo ʔa hanis dir ħawata
      1sg letter   SLTR give to man
      'I will give the/a letter to the/a man'

   b. ʔaniŋ barwitoʔo ʔa ħawati-i hanis
      1sg letter   SLTR man-IM give
      'I will give the/a letter to the/a man'

   c. ʔaniŋ ħawata ʔu barwitoʔo--ri hanis
      1sg 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 ħawata . Again, sentences
without IM's would be ungrammatical, as are any of the following
logically possible permutations:

   d. *ʔaniŋ barwitoʔo-ri ʔa ħawata hanis
      1sg letter-IM   SLTR man   give

   e. *ʔaniŋ ħawat--i ʔu barwitoʔo hanis
      1sg man-IM   SLTR letter   give

   f. *ʔaniŋ ⎧ħawata   barwitoʔo-ri⎫ ʔa (or: ʔu) hanis
      1sg   ⎪man   letter-IM ⎪ SLTR (SLTR) give
           ⎨   ⎬
           ⎪barwitoʔo ħawat--i ⎪
           ⎩letter   man-IM   ⎭

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. ʔaniŋ naʕay ʔu mux ʔar ħara
      1sg child SLTR beat with stick
      'I will beat the/a child with the/a stick'

   b. ʔaniŋ naʕay ʔu ħart-ar mux
      1sg child SLTR stick-IM,instr beat
      'I will beat the/a child with the/a stick'

```
c. ?aniŋ   ħara   ?a    naʕa--r        mux
   1sg     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 ħara in (4c). Furthermore, the IM marker in these examples is phonologically similar to the instrumental preposition ʔar . 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)  ħawata  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. <u>One-object verbs</u>. We shall begin by using simple transitive
verbs, i.e. verbs with only one object. Consider the following:

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

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

(7) a. naʕay, ħawata gu   mux
       child   man   SLTR beat
       'the child, the man will beat'

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

(8)   ʔaniŋ barwitoʔo-r [kuŋ ta   goʔin] ʔana ʔoh
       1sg   letter-DEM [2sg REL,SLTR write] SLTR hold
       'I held the letter which you wrote'

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

    b. ħawata hee ʔa   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. <u>More-than-one object verbs</u>. 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. <u>Passives</u>. Let us first examine some PSV examples. For the
underlying constructions of SUBJ-OBJ-DATIVE/BENEFACTIVE-VERB, we
find that the OBJ, the Dative, or the Benefactive may be passivized:[5]

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

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

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

      b. dasi   kana   muruʃaima---ri   huurin ne ʃameni
          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   muruʃaima(---ri) hanis ne ʃameni
           girl-IM PSV,SLTR   food(---IM)   give   by woman

          *muruʃaima--ri kuna   ᴄasi(---ri) hanis ne ʃameni
           food--IM   PSV,SLTR   girl(-IM)   give   by woman

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

          *muruʃaima--ri kuna   dasi(--ri)   huurin ne ʃameni
           food-IM   PSV,SLTR   girl(--IM)   cook   by woman

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

---

[5]Future 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. ħara   kana   naʕa--r   mux   ne ʕameni
          stick   PSV,SLTR child-IM beat by woman
          'the stick was used to beat the child by the woman'

      b. naʕay   kuna   ħara--r   mux   ne ʕameni
          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. *ħara--r   kana   naʕay(/--r) mux   ne ʕameni
           stick-IM   PSV,SLTR child(--IM) beat by woman

          *naʕa---r   kuna   ħara(----r) mux   ne ʕameni
           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)   /ʕameni (SUBJ)--muruʕaima (OBJ)-- hanis (V) dir (PREP) dasi /
         woman   food   give   to   girl

  -->   *dasi kana   muruʕaima(---ri) hanis dir ----os   ne ʕameni
         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. <u>Topicalization</u>. 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. naʕay, ʕameni guna barwitoʔo-ri hanis
      child   woman   SLTR letter-IM   give
      'the child, the/a woman gave the/a letter to'

    b. naʕay, ʕameni barwitoʔo gana hanis dir---os
      child   woman   letter   SLTR give to-3sgPRO
      'the child, the/a woman gave the/a letter to her'

    c. barwitoʔo, ʕameni gana ʔinos--i[6] hanis
      letter   woman   SLTR 3sgPRO-IM give
      'the letter, the/a woman gave to him'

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

    b. muruʕaima, ʕameni ŋina kuŋ-gi huurin
      food   woman   SLTR 2sgM--IM cook
      'food, the/a woman cooked for you'

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

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

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

---

[6]The IM-suffixed form for 'child' is in fact naʕa-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 .

(17) b. ʕameni, ħawata dasi ga mux kitaŋ--os wa ale
      woman   man   girl SLTR beat behalf-3sgPRO behalf of
      'the woman, the/a man will beat the/a girl on behalf of her'

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

(18) a. ʔaniŋ ʕameni--r [na   muruʕaima-ri hanis] ʔana ʔoh
      1sg   woman-DEM [REL,SLTR food-IM   give] SLTR hold
      'I held the woman whom I gave food to'

    b. ʔaniŋ muruʕaima--r [na ʕameni---ri   hanis] ʔuna ʔoh
      1sg   food--DEM [REL,SLTR woman-IM   give] SLTR hold
      'I held the food which I gave to the/a woman'

(19) a. ʔaniŋ ħara [ʕameni ʔa   garma---r mux] ʔana ʔoh
      1sg   stick [woman SLTR boy-IM   beat] SLTR hold
      'I held the stick which the/a woman will beat the/a boy with'

    b. ʔaniŋ garm--o [ʕameni ʔi   ħara---r mux] ʔuna ʔoh
      1sg   boy--DEM [woman SLTR stick--IM beat] SLTR hold
      'I held the boy whom the/a woman will beat with the/a stick'

(20) ʔaniŋ ʕameni-r [ħawata dasi ga mux kitaŋ--os   wa   ale]
      1sg   woman-DEM [man   girl. SLTR beat behalf-3sgPRO.behalf of]
      ʔana ʔoh
      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, Rel-
ativization is sensitive to whether or not object NP's are suffixed by
the IM.

3.2.4. <u>WH-questions</u>. A fourth rule which is sensitive to the presence

of IM's is WH-Q Formation.[7] All objects can be questioned as in the
following:

(21) a. ?aniŋ gar na   ħawat---i hanis
          1sg   WH   SLTR man-IM   give
          'what did I give to the/a man?'

      b. ?aniŋ hee na   muruʕaima--ri hanis
          1sg   WH   SLTR food-IM   give
          'whom did I give food to?'

(22) a. ?aniŋ gar na   garma---r mux
          1sg   WH   SLTR boy--IM   beat
          'what did I beat the/a boy with?'

      b. ?aniŋ hee na   ħara---r mux
          1sg   WH   SLTR stick--IM beat
          'whom did I beat with the/a stick?'

(23)   ħawata 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. *?aniŋ gar(---i) na   ħawata hanis
          1sg   WH(--IM)   SLTR man   give

      d. *?aniŋ hee(---i) na   muruʕaima hanis
          1sg   WH(--IM)   SLTR food   give

3.2.5. <u>Summary</u>. 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. <u>Discussion</u>

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:

	after subject	SLTR agreement	victim of	
			PSV	TOP,REL,WH-Q
Unmarked	yes	yes	yes	yes
Prepositional	no	no	no	yes
IM-Suffixed	no	no	no	no

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 *de*moted.[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  barwito?o  ?a    hanis  dir  ħawata
         1sg    letter     SLTR  give   to   man
         'I will give the/a letter to the/a man'

(3)  c.  ?aniŋ  ħawata  ?u    barwito?o--ri  hanis
         1sɡ    man     SLTR  letter--IM     give
         'I will give the/a man the/a letter'
```

In (3c), the Unmarked Object ħawata , derived from the Prepositional
Object dir ħawata 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 pre-
vious Unmarked Object, in these cases, barwito?o , 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  barwito?o  ?a    hanis  dir  ħawata
         1sg    letter     SLTR  give   to   man
         'I will give the/a letter to the/a man'

(3)  b.  ?aniŋ  barwito?o  ?a    ħawat---i  hanis
         1sg    letter     SLTR  man--IM    give
         'I will give the/a letter to the/a man'
```

In (3a), the Prepositional Object ħawata may be Topicalized,
Relativized, WH-Questioned, but may not be Passivized or trigger
SLTR agreement. But if ħawata 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 with-
out 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 Rela-
tional account of the syntax of object NP's in Iraqw allows us to
state quite simply the conditions under which object NP's are suf-
fixed 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.

REFERENCES

Bradfield, M. 1977. "It, in Iraqw: an analysis of the object
    selector series of the Iraqw verb." *African Languages/Langues
    africaines* 3:1-45.

Dalgish, G. 1976. "Locative NP's, locative suffixes, and gram-
    matical relations." *Proceedings of the Second Annual Meeting
    of the Berkeley Linguistics Society*, pp. 139-48. Berkeley:
    Berkeley Linguistics Society.

Dalgish, G. 1976. "Personal pronouns, object markers, and syntactic
    evidence in Dho-Luo." *Studies in African Linguistics* 8:101-17.

Dalgish, G., and G. Sheintuch. 1977. "On the justification of language-
    specific sub-grammatical relations." *Studies in African
    Linguistics* 8:219-39.

Whiteley, W. 1953. *Studies in Iraqw, an Introduction*. East African
    Linguistic Studies, 1.

PAPERS FROM THE EIGHTH
CONFERENCE ON AFRICAN LINGUISTICS

University of California, Los Angeles, April 1-3, 1977

The following papers were presented in
the Working Group on Tone at the Eighth
Conference on African Linguistics.