



## African Languages and Linguistics - N2

Nicolas Quint, Paulette Roulon-Doko, Loïc-Michel Perrin

► **To cite this version:**

Nicolas Quint, Paulette Roulon-Doko, Loïc-Michel Perrin. African Languages and Linguistics - N2. Quint Nicolas; Roulon-Doko Paulette; Perrin Loïc Michel. France. Lambert-Lucas, pp.150, 2016, 978-2-35935-181-1. <[http://www.lambert-lucas.com/IMG/pdf/lla2\\_faiopenaccess.pdf](http://www.lambert-lucas.com/IMG/pdf/lla2_faiopenaccess.pdf)>. <halshs-01482252>

**HAL Id: halshs-01482252**

**<https://halshs.archives-ouvertes.fr/halshs-01482252>**

Submitted on 8 Mar 2017

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

# #02

Jun 2016



# ILLA

Linguistique  
et Langues  
Africaines



- \_ Additive Coordination, Comitative Adjunction, and Associative Plural in Tswana
- \_ The Locative System in Cuwabo and Makuwa
- \_ Question Formation in ||Gana
- \_ La liaison tonale en shingazidja septentrional
- \_ Comptes-rendus / Book Reviews



ISSN 2429-2230  
ISBN 978-2-35935-181-1 20 €



Lambert-Lucas

# LLA

Linguistique  
et Langues  
Africaines



## #02

Juin 2016

- 
1. Additive Coordination, Comitative Adjunction, and Associative Plural in Tswana (*Denis Creissels*) **11**
  2. The Locative System in Cuwabo and Makhuwa (P30 Bantu Languages) (*Rozenn Guérois*) **43**
  3. Question Formation in ||Gana, a Khoesan Language (*Rose Letsholar*) **77**
  4. La liaison tonale en shingazidja septentrional (*Cédric Patin*) **95**
- 

### Comptes-rendus / Book Reviews

- Aliou Mohamadou, *Le Verbe en peul : Formes et valeurs en pulaar du Fuuta-Tooro* (2<sup>e</sup> édition)  
par Viktoria Apel **117**
- Michka Sachnne, *Grammaire du yorùbá standard (Nigéria)*  
par Nicolas Aubry **121**
- Anne Storch, *A Grammar of Luwo: An Anthropological Approach*  
par Noam Faust **125**
- Wilhelm J. G. Möhlig, *Atlas of Kamba Dialects (Kenya Bantu E.55). Phonological and Lexical Comparison*  
par Lolke J. van der Veen **131**
- Jacques Rongier, *Dictionnaire éwé-français*  
par Kofi Yakpo **135**

Photo de couverture : Nicolas Quint : Vannier fabriquant un panier avec des nervures de rônier, village de Djifanghor, Sénégal, 2011.

Couverture : Jean-Irénée Cuin

Production et diffusion : Éditions Lambert-Lucas

# LLA

---

Linguistique  
et Langues  
Africaines

---



**International Journal edited by  
Revue internationale éditée par le LLACAN  
(UMR 8135 CNRS / INALCO / PRES Sorbonne Paris Cité)**

**# 2 – 2016**

**Diffusion**

Éditions Lambert-Lucas  
4 rue d'Isly - 87000 LIMOGES (France)  
Tél 05 55 77 12 36  
Fax 05 87 84 00 11  
Por 06 44 78 30 73

**Cette revue est en accès libre, sans barrière mobile,**  
téléchargeable sur le site des éditions Lambert-Lucas

n° 1, juin 2015 :

<http://www.lambert-lucas.com/linguistique-et-langues-africaines>

n° 2, juin 2016 :

<http://www.lambert-lucas.com/linguistiques-langues-africaines-2>

*Pour des exemplaires sur papier,  
merci d'écrire à [lla.ll@free.fr](mailto:lla.ll@free.fr)*

### **Comité scientifique**

Emilio BONVINI (LLACAN, CNRS), Denis CREISSELS (DDL, Université Lyon 2), Claude HAGÈGE (EPHE), Bernd HEINE (University of Cologne), Larry HYMAN (University of California - Berkeley), Sambieni KOFFI (Université d'Abomey-Calavi), Jérémie KOUADIO (Université d'Abidjan), Friederike LÜPKE (SOAS, University of London), Gudrun MIEHE (University of Bayreuth), Maarten MOUS (Leiden University), Papa Alioune NDAO (Université Cheick Anta Diop de Dakar), Margarida PETERS (Universidade de São Paulo), Thilo SCHADEBERG (Leiden University), John MCWHORTER (Columbia University).

### **Comité de rédaction**

Nicolas AUBRY (LLACAN, INaLCO), Mélanie BOURLET (LLACAN, INaLCO), Pascal BOYELDIEU (LLACAN, CNRS), Gwenaëlle FABRE (LLL, Université d'Orléans), Maximilien GUÉRIN (LLACAN, Université Paris 3), Sophie MANUS (DDL, Université Lyon 2), Aliou MOHAMADOU (LLACAN, INaLCO), Sylvester OSU (LLL, Université de Tours), Yvonne TREIS (LLACAN, CNRS), Marie-Claude SIMEONE-SENELLE (LLACAN, CNRS), Valentin VYDRIN (LLACAN, INaLCO).

### **Rédaction**

Paulette ROULON-DOKO (LLACAN, CNRS), Nicolas QUINT (LLACAN, CNRS), Loïc-Michel PERRIN (LLACAN, INaLCO).

### **Administration**

Jeanne ZERNER

### **Directeur de la publication**

Mark VAN DE VELDE

**Contact**

LLACAN (UMR 8135, campus du CNRS)

7, rue Guy-Môquet

94801 VILLEJUIF Cedex - France

<http://llacan.vjf.cnrs.fr/lla>

[llafrique@cnrs.fr](mailto:llafrique@cnrs.fr)

**Consignes de soumission**

<http://llacan.vjf.cnrs.fr/lla>

**Comptes-rendus**

Les ouvrages sont à adresser à

Maximilien Guérin ([maximilien.guerin@cnrs.fr](mailto:maximilien.guerin@cnrs.fr))

(s/c de Loïc-Michel Perrin et Nicolas Quint)

LLACAN (UMR 8135, campus du CNRS)

7, rue Guy-Môquet

94801 VILLEJUIF Cedex - France

## Sommaire

1. Additive Coordination, Comitative Adjunction,  
and Associative Plural in Tswana ..... 11  
Denis CREISSELS
2. The Locative System in Cuwabo and Makhuwa  
(P30 Bantu Languages) ..... 43  
Rozenn GUÉROIS
3. Question Formation in !Gana, a Khoesan Language ..... 77  
Rose M. LETSHOLOR
4. La liaison tonale en shingazidja septentrional ..... 95  
Cédric PATIN

### Comptes-rendus de lecture / Book Review

- Aliou Mohamadou :  
*Le Verbe en peul : Formes et valeurs en pulaar du Fuuta-Tooro*  
(2<sup>e</sup> édition) ..... 117  
par Viktoria APEL
- Michka Sachnine :  
*Grammaire du yorùbá standard (Nigéria)*..... 121  
par Nicolas AUBRY
- Anne Storch :  
*A Grammar of Luwo: An Anthropological Approach* ..... 125  
par Noam FAUST
- Wilhelm J. G. Möhlig :  
*Atlas of Kamba Dialects (Kenya Bantu E.55).*  
*Phonological and Lexical Comparison* ..... 131  
par Lolke J. VAN DER VEEN
- Jacques Rongier :  
*Dictionnaire éwé-français* ..... 135  
par Kofi YAKPO

## **The locative system in Cuwabo and Makhuwa (P30 Bantu languages)**

Rozenn GUÉROIS

### **Abstract**

This article presents the locative morphosyntax of Cuwabo and Makhuwa (Bantu, North Mozambique), in a comparative perspective with a sample of other Bantu languages. The analysis is based on a number of parameters assessing the existence of the three historical locative affixes (classes 16 to 18) in both nominal and verbal morphology, the question of agreement in modified locative phrases, the existence of locative inversion constructions, the development of an expletive subject marker, etc. Through this comparative analysis, this paper has two main aims: first it provides evidence of morphosyntactic micro-variation among Cuwabo and Makhuwa, which are genetically related; second it shows how the two languages relate to the wider panorama of Bantu languages, by locating them along the continuum between typical locative systems (e.g. in Bemba, Kagulu) and reorganized locative systems (e.g. in Swati).

### **Keywords**

locative system, marking and agreement, parametric and comparative approach, Cuwabo, Makhuwa, Bantu

### **Résumé**

Cet article présente le système locatif du cuwabo et du makhuwa (bantou, Mozambique du Nord), dans une perspective comparative et sur la base d'un échantillon de langues bantoues. Les analyses proposées sont fondées sur divers paramètres prenant notamment en compte l'existence des trois affixes locatifs historiques (classes 16 à 18) au sein de la morphologie nominale et verbale, la question des paradigmes d'accord commandés par les noms locatifs dans le syntagme nominal, l'existence de

constructions locatives inversées, le développement d'une marque de sujet explétif, etc. Au travers de cette étude comparative, cet article répond à deux objectifs principaux : il met tout d'abord en évidence la micro-variation morphosyntaxique existant entre le cuwabo et le makhuwa, deux langues génétiquement apparentées ; par ailleurs, il montre comment ces deux langues s'inscrivent dans le cadre plus large des langues bantoues, notamment en les situant sur le continuum qui existe entre des systèmes locatifs typiques (p. ex. en bemba et en kagulu) et des systèmes locatifs restructurés (p. ex. en swati).

### **Mots clés**

système locatif, marquage et accord, approche paramétrique et comparative, cuwabo, makhuwa, bantou

### **Acknowledgements**

I wish to acknowledge and warmly thank a number of fellow linguists for sharing their thoughts with me: Denis Creissels, Lutz Marten, Nicolas Quint, Nancy Kula, Peter Nichols and Aïcha Belkadi. I am also very grateful to the two anonymous reviewers of this paper for their helpful comments and suggestions on earlier versions thereof. I am fully responsible for all errors that may remain. Part of the research reported here was supported by a Leverhulme grant on Morphosyntactic variation in Bantu languages, which is hereby gratefully acknowledged.

---

### **Introduction**

Cuwabo and Makhuwa are two major Bantu languages spoken in North Mozambique by 834,073 and 5,279,818 speakers, respectively (*Instituto Nacional de Estadísticas* 2007). Under Guthrie's classification of Bantu (1948), followed by Maho (2009), the two languages belong to the P30 Makhuwa group. Although Guthrie's classification draws primarily on geography rather than on history or genetics, the two languages do share a number of innovations, such as the denasalization of the Proto-Bantu prenasalized clusters \*mb, \*nd, and \*ng, which support the hypothesis of common ancestry. In this paper, I present and compare the locative morphosyntax of the two languages. The analysis is based on several parameters, such as the existence of the three historical locative affixes in both nominal and verbal morphology, the question of agreement in modified locative phrases, the existence of locative inversion constructions, the development of an expletive subject marker, etc. Through this comparative analysis, this paper aims to provide evidence of morphosyntactic variation among these two genetically related languages. It will be shown

that, despite some common backgrounds, the locative systems of the two P30 languages have evolved in different ways. In parallel, I will also try to show how Cuwabo and Makhuwa relate to the wider Bantu system, and try to locate them along the continuum between typical locative systems (e.g. in Bemba, Kagulu) and reorganized locative systems (e.g. in Swati).

This paper is organized in sections which present different aspects of the locative system in Bantu. Locative nominal morphology is first treated in Section 1; in Section 2, the question of agreement of dependent nominals within the noun phrase is assessed; section 3 explores locative marking on verbs; Section 4 and Section 5 describe two syntactic constructions involving the locative system, locative relatives and locative inversion, respectively. A summary is presented in Section 6. For each section, before discussing Cuwabo and Makhuwa data, I start by framing the main different patterns found in Bantu. My purpose is not to present an exhaustive inventory, but rather to highlight the existing variation among Bantu locative systems, so as to better understand the position of P30 languages within Bantu.<sup>1</sup>

The Cuwabo data presented here stem from Guérois (2014, 2015), which is based on fieldwork conducted around Quelimane. Makhuwa data are extracted from van der Wal's descriptive work (2009) on Makhuwa-Enahara, mainly spoken on the Ilha de Mozambique. Since a systematic annotation of these references would be too cumbersome, I chose not to indicate them in the core of this paper. With respect to the Bantu picture, I recurrently resorted to Marten's works (2006, 2010, 2012), who depicted the locative system, or at least certain aspects of it, in Herero, Ganda, Bemba and Swati.

## 1. Locative nominal morphology

### 1.1 Variation in Bantu locative marking

Locative systems constitute an interesting case of cross-linguistic variation within the Bantu domain. The most common pattern involves the three reconstructed locative prefixes from class 16 \***pà-**, class 17 \***ku-**, and class 18 \***mù-**, which precede either the original noun class prefix, as illustrated in Kagulu (1), Bemba (2), and Ngangela (3), or the

---

1. The following abbreviations are used (numbers in glosses refer to agreement classes, and high tones are represented with an acute accent, whereas low tones are unmarked): APPL applicative AUG augment CAUS causative CE counterexpectational CJ conjoint CL class COM comitative CON connective COP copula DEM demonstrative DJ disjoint EFF effective EXT extension FOC focus FUT future FV final vowel H high tone H1D first high tone deletion HAB habitual HYP hypothetical IDEO ideophone INF infinitive INTER interjection IPFV imperfective LOC locative NAR narrative NEG negative OM object marker PASS passive PB Proto-Bantu PERS persistent PFV perfective p.c. personal communication PL plural PLUR pluractional POSS possessive PRO pronoun PROG progressive PRS present PTG Portuguese REC.PST recent past REF referential REFL reflexive REL relative REM.FUT remote future SBJ subjunctive SG singular SIT situative SM subject marker

augment, if still attested in the language, as in Herero (4). The use of the three historical classes is the only option for locative marking in these languages.

- |     |  |                            |
|-----|--|----------------------------|
| (1) | Kagulu (G12, Tanzania)   | (Petzell 2008: 34)         |
|     | <b>ha</b> -mu-gunda <b>ku</b> -mu-gunda <b>mu</b> -mu-gunda          |                            |
|     | <b>16</b> -3-farm <b>17</b> -3-farm <b>18</b> -3-farm                |                            |
|     | ‘by the farm’      ‘to(wards) the farm’      ‘in/on the farm’        |                            |
| (2) | Bemba (M42, Zambia)  | (Marten 2012: 433)         |
|     | <b>pà</b> -n-gándá <b>kú</b> -n-gándá <b>mù</b> -n-gándá             |                            |
|     | <b>16</b> -9-house <b>17</b> -9-house <b>18</b> -9-house             |                            |
|     | ‘at a/the house’      ‘to(wards) a/the house’      ‘in a/the house’  |                            |
| (3) | Ngangela (K12b, Angola)  | (Maniacky 2003: 32)        |
|     | <b>ha</b> -ci-táánta <b>kú</b> -n-jivo <b>mu</b> -mu-θéénge          |                            |
|     | <b>16</b> -7-market <b>17</b> -9-house <b>18</b> -3-forest           |                            |
|     | ‘by the farm’      ‘to(wards) the house’      ‘in the forest’        |                            |
| (4) | Herero (R30, Namibia)  | (Möhlig & Kavari 2008: 89) |
|     | pondjúwó      kondjúwó      mondjúwó                                 |                            |
|     | <b>pu</b> -o-n-djúwó <b>ku</b> -o-n-djúwó <b>mu</b> -o-n-djúwó       |                            |
|     | <b>16</b> -AUG-9-house <b>17</b> -AUG-9-house <b>18</b> -AUG-9-house |                            |
|     | ‘at a/the house’      ‘to(wards) a/the house’      ‘in a/the house’  |                            |

Another prefix with the shape **e-** (class 25) has a locative meaning in Bantu. This pattern, mostly attested in JE10 Nyoro-Ganda languages, S40 Nguni languages, and certain Northwestern languages from zones A, B, and C (Grégoire 1975: 170-184), does not necessarily constitute the sole strategy for locative marking in these languages. For instance, in Ganda (5), class 25 prefix **e-** (conventionally glossed as ‘LOC’ through this chapter) co-exists with class 17 prefix **ku-**, whereas classes 16 and 18 are no longer attested.

- |     |   |                    |
|-----|---|--------------------|
| (5) | Ganda (JE15, Uganda)                        | (Marten 2012: 434) |
| a.  | <b>e</b> -Kampala      b. <b>ku</b> -ky-alo |                    |
|     | LOC-Kampala <b>17</b> -7-village            |                    |
|     | ‘in Kampala’      ‘at the village’          |                    |

Marten (2010: 254) reports the same morphological co-existence of class 25 prefix **e-** and class 17 noun prefix **ku-** in Swati, with e.g. **e-sitolo** ‘at the shop’ and **ku-bafana** ‘to/at the boys’, respectively. However, in this case it is likely that the prefix **ku-** in Swati is not a direct reflex of Proto-Bantu class 17 noun prefix \***kù-**, but rather the reflex of **kúdí** ‘où est’ (lit. ‘where is’), as argued by Grégoire (1975: 98), not only for Swati, but for Southern Bantu in general. This reflex **ku-** (or **χú-** in Tswana), endowed with an underlying H tone, was originally<sup>2</sup> used as a substitute

2. Synchronically, this prefix acquired a wider range of uses. For instance, it applies to noun modifiers which are in a position to receive locative marking, as can be seen with the demonstrative forms in (74) for Swati and (75) for Zulu.

to class 17 noun prefix when applied to augmentless nouns, and consequently to prefixless nouns in classes 1a/2a, in order to express ‘next to, at’ (French ‘chez’). This explains why this prefix in S languages is mostly attested in front of class 1a/2a nouns (e.g. Swati **kumake** ‘at my mother’s place’, Grégoire 1975: 97), and by extension in front of class 1/2 nouns, as seen above in Swati with **ku-bafana** ‘to/at the boys’. Another strong support to Grégoire’s analysis comes from Creissels (2011, this volume), who claims that the locative prefix **χó-** in Tswana cannot be associated with Proto-Bantu class 17 **\*kù-**, on account of their tonal divergence. Tswana tonology has the advantage of being very consistent with Bantu tonal reconstructions. High-toned **χó-** can thus confidently be interpreted as the reflex of the form **kúdí** mentioned above. Tone association rules are not as straightforward in Nguni languages (Swati and Zulu) as in Tswana, and underlying H tones are subject to tone shift processes. As a result, the underlying H locative prefix **ku-** does not bear a H tone on the surface, which leads to its being commonly confused with the historical class 17 noun prefix. Hence Swati example **ku-bafana** ‘to/at the boys’ should probably be glossed as a locative prefix as in (6b), rather than as a class 17 noun prefix, as in Ganda (5b). Unfortunately, to the best of my knowledge, this question has never been discussed in the literature on Nguni tonology.

- (6) Swati (S43, Swaziland) (Marten 2010: 254, my glosses)
- |                    |                      |
|--------------------|----------------------|
| a. <b>e-sitolo</b> | b. <b>ku-ba-fana</b> |
| LOC-shop           | LOC-2-boy            |
| ‘at the shop’      | ‘to/at the boys’     |

Note however that a reflex of Proto-Bantu class 17 noun prefix **\*kù-** is observable as a residual form in a few Swati nouns shown in (7b), which evolved to adverbial functions. The same is true with class 16 (7a) and class 18 (7c) noun prefixes, which have also lexicalized.

- (7) Lexicalized locative class prefixes in Swati (Grégoire 1975: 96-99)
- |   |                     |
|---|---------------------|
| a. from PB class 16 noun prefix <b>*pà-</b> |                     |
| phandle                                     | ‘outside’           |
| phansi, phasi                               | ‘on the ground’     |
| b. from PB class 17 noun prefix <b>*kù-</b> |                     |
| kusihlwa                                    | ‘in the evening’    |
| kudze                                       | ‘far’               |
| kudvute                                     | ‘near’              |
| c. from PB class 18 noun prefix <b>*mù-</b> |                     |
| msheya                                      | ‘on the other side’ |
| m(u)shiya loyi/lowa                         | ‘on this/that side’ |

Another pattern involves the locative suffix **-(i)ni** (or a related form), excluding any locative prefixation. The origin of this suffix is obscure, although Samson and Schadeberg (1994) consider it to be the gramma-

ticalized form of **\*-ini** ‘liver’. It is widespread in Eastern Bantu languages (8), where it is assumed to have originated, but is also well attested in Southern Bantu (9). See Grégoire (1975: 185-204) for a survey of this suffix across Bantu, and Güldemann (1999: 51-52) for an analysis of its semantic development.

- (8) Swahili (G40, Tanzania, Kenya) (Grégoire 1975: 192)  
 nyumba-**ni**  
 house-LOC  
 ‘at/to/in the house’
- Kikuyu (E51, Kenya) (Mugane 1997: 33)  
 mū-twe-**inĩ**  
 3-head-LOC  
 ‘by/on the head’
- (9) Tswana (S30, Botswana, South Africa) (Creissels 2011: 37)  
 nòkè-**ṅ**  
 9.river-LOC  
 ‘at/to/in the river’
- Swati (Marten 2010: 254)  
 e-n-dl-**ini** (< indlu ‘house’)  
 LOC-9-house-LOC  
 ‘at/to/in the house’

Note that the locative suffix **-ini** in Swati often appears in addition to the locative prefix **e-** seen above in (6b), but its distribution seems unpredictable. This contrasts with Tswana locative **-ṅ**, whose suffixation systematically occurs on nouns from every class except 1a/2a,<sup>3</sup> in which case the locative prefix **χó-** is used, as in (10). As a result, the locative prefix **χó-** and the locative suffix **-ṅ** have a complementary distribution in Tswana.

- (10) Tswana (Creissels 2011: 37)  
 kì-tsw-à                    **χó**-màlómè  
 SM1SG-come-FV        LOC-(CL1)uncle.1SG  
 ‘I am coming from my uncle’s’

The innovated suffix **-(i)ni** is normally complementary to the historical locative prefixes, i.e. a language does in principle not exhibit both markers on a same lexical item. As a result, Eastern and Southern Bantu languages are overall divided into two sets as far as locative marking is concerned: in the first set, locative phrases are formed by (extra-)prefixation (**\*pa-**, **\*ku-**, **\*mu-**), as shown from (1) to (4) above; in the second set, the suffix **-(i)ni** (or variant) functions as the only locative marker, as seen in (8) and (9),<sup>4</sup> except for Swati, which in this context

3. Unless the class 1a (singular) noun refers to a non-human entity (see Creissels 2011).

4. In S languages, this is true for nouns other than those selecting a reflex of **\*kúdí** as their locative marker, as seen e.g. in (10).

requires the locative prefix **e-**.

Finally, in many North-western Bantu languages, there is no productive locative marking, and prepositions are used instead. For instance, in Mongo (11), the preposition **ndá** preceding a noun is normally used to express location in general terms.

- (11) Mongo (C60, Dem. Rep. of Congo) (Hulstaert 1966: 178)
- |            |        |                  |
|------------|--------|------------------|
| <b>nd'</b> | étáfe  | 'on the branch'  |
| <b>ndá</b> | loulú  | 'in the bedroom' |
| <b>ndá</b> | ntsína | 'at the basis'   |

In Bafia (12), **bí** 'on, in' and **á** 'at, to' constitute the two main locative prepositions.

- (12) Bafia (A50, Cameroon) (Guarisma 2000: 49, 106, 94)
- |    |   |           |                |
|----|---|-----------|----------------|
| a. | à-dĩṅì                                  | <b>bí</b> | 'c-ó?          |
|    | SM1-enter in                            | 7-forest  |                |
|    | 'he enters in the forest'               |           |                |
| b. | à-tà?                                   | tàm       | <b>bí</b> n-tó |
|    | SM1-wear                                | 1a.hat    | on 3-head      |
|    | 'he wears/is wearing a hat on the head' |           |                |
| c. | bì-á-kè-í                               | <b>á</b>  | fy-ēē          |
|    | SM1PL-REC.PST-go-EFF                    | to        | 13-market      |
|    | 'we went to the market'                 |           |                |

In Duala, there is only one preposition **o** to express the different locative (and temporal) meanings, as seen in (13). Although Gaskin treats **o** as a preposition, it looks like a reflex of the historical class 17, synchronically used as a default locative marker.

- (13) Duala (A24, Cameroon) (Gaskin 1927: 27-30, my glosses)
- |    |   |            |             |              |            |          |
|----|---|------------|-------------|--------------|------------|----------|
| a. | na-ma-sele                                      | dá,        | to          | na-ma-la     | <b>ó</b>   | mu-ndi   |
|    | SM1SG-PRS-begin                                 | eat        | then        | SM1SG-PRS-go | LOC        | 3-town   |
|    | 'I eat first, then go to town'                  |            |             |              |            |          |
| b. | <b>o</b>  | bu-lu      | ba          | kiele        | na-ta      | <b>o</b> |
|    | LOC   | 14-night   | 14.CON      | yesterday    | SM1SG-was  | LOC      |
|    | n-dab'am  | na         | mu-kala     | mo           |            |          |
|    | 9-house.POSS.1SG                                | with       | 1-white.man | ?            |            |          |
|    | 'last night I was in my house with a white man' |            |             |              |            |          |
| c. | di-ta   | di-senga   | mu-mban     | <b>o'</b>    | bo-ko      |          |
|    | SM1PL-was                                       | SM1PL-hear | 3-noise     | LOC          | 14-outside |          |
|    | 'we heard a movement outside'                   |            |             |              |            |          |

### 1.2 Double marking in P30

As already seen above, a very productive way of forming locative expressions in Bantu languages is by prefixing a locative noun class to already existing nouns. This is the case in both Cuwabo and Makhuwa, which have retained the 3 historical locative prefixes in classes 16, 17 and 18.



Makhuwa		
<b>wa-kisírwa</b>	<b>o-ṅ-tékó-ni</b>	<b>m-ma-átsí-ni</b>
<b>16-island</b>	<b>17-3-work-LOC</b>	<b>18-6-water-LOC</b>
‘on the island’	‘at work’	‘in the water’

In Cuwabo, noun class prefix deletion in case of locative prefixation is much more exceptional and seems restricted to a few words in class 9 –compare (18a) and (18b)–, and in class 5 –compare (19a) and (19b).

## (18) Class 9

a. <b>é-lôbo</b> ‘thing’	b. <b>e-lábo</b> ‘country’
→ <b>ó-lôbo</b>	→ <b>mu-e-lábô-ni</b> (mwiiIábôni)
17-thing	18-9-country-LOC
‘to the thing’	‘in the country’ (in society)

## (19) Class 5

a. <b>ṅ-ttólo</b> ‘well’	/	<b>ṅ-céla</b> ‘well’	b. <b>ṅ-ttúku</b> ‘(tree) stump’
→ <b>va-ttólô-ni</b>		→ <b>va-célâ-ni</b>	→ <b>o-ṅ-ttúkû-ni</b>
16-old.well-LOC		16-well-LOC	17-5-stump-LOC
‘at the old/dry well’		‘at the well’	‘to the (tree) stump’

So far, we only have examined the left-periphery of the locative derivational process, which involves the prefixation of either **va-**, **o-** or **mu-**. However, a second aspect of locative derivation must be taken into account in both Cuwabo and Makhuwa, namely the suffixation of the locative suffix **-ni**. In Section 1.1, it was argued that, for a given lexical item, locative prefixation (with classes 16, 17 or 18) and locative suffixation (with **-(i)ni** or a variant form) were mutually exclusive. Interestingly, Cuwabo and Makhuwa constitute an exception to this complementary distribution, since both a locative prefix and a locative suffix do co-occur in most locative expressions, as evidenced in the different examples provided so far, and further illustrated in (20).

(20) Cuwabo	<b>o-ma-básá-ni</b>	Makhuwa	<b>o-ṅ-tékô-ni</b>
	<b>17-6-work-LOC</b>		<b>17-3-work-LOC</b>
	‘at work’		‘at work’

From a comparative perspective, this double locative marking, a feature shared by all P30 languages, is very unusual in Bantu.<sup>7</sup> The uniqueness of this double-marking presumably results from a contact situation. Whereas the three historical locative classes may be regarded as an inherited feature among P30,<sup>8</sup> the addition of the locative suffix must have occurred under the influence of Swahili, for which suffixation is the only available locative pattern. Three factors support this hypothesis:

7. This double locative marking is however reminiscent of Swati, where certain locative nouns systematically appear with the locative suffix **-ini** in addition to the locative prefix (in class 25).

8. The three historical locative classes are also attested in the neighbouring languages, i.e. the P20 Yao group, the N30 Cewa-Nyanja group, and the N40 Senga-Sena group, but in all these groups, the locative classes are the only devices used to mark locative.

first, the existence of lexicalized expressions involving one of the three locative noun class morphemes (and no locative suffix), as illustrated in (21), attests that locative prefixes have long been present in Cuwabo and Makhuwa.<sup>9</sup>

(21)	Cuwabo		Makhuwa
	<b>v</b> atí	‘down, on the ground’	<b>v</b> athí ‘down, on the ground’
	<b>v</b> ákûvi	‘near’	<b>o</b> tulú ‘heaven, sky, above’
	<b>o</b> váno	‘nw’	<b>ó</b> ta ‘outside’
	<b>m</b> waári	‘inside, into’	<b>m</b> pááni ‘inside’

Second, the fact that the suffix **-ni** is not systematically added to all nouns (including Portuguese loans) in both Cuwabo (22) and Makhuwa (23) suggests that locative suffixation occurred at a later stage. The absence of **-ni** for names of towns or countries furthers points toward the locative suffix not being entirely generalized (yet).

(22) Cuwabo

with *-ni*

<b>va</b> -ó-sálú- <b>ni</b>	16-14-thread-LOC	‘on the thread’
<b>va</b> -mú-rí- <b>ni</b>	16-3-tree-LOC	‘on the tree’
<b>m</b> -baárúku- <b>ni</b>	18-9a.boat-LOC	‘in the boat’ (< ptg <i>barco</i> )
<b>o</b> -mu-yérê- <b>ni</b>	17-3-tree.sp-LOC	‘to the tree’
<b>o</b> -ṅ-ttúkû- <b>ni</b>	17-5-stump-LOC	‘on the stump’
<b>o</b> -ma-básâ- <b>ni</b>	17-6-work-LOC	‘at work’
<b>m</b> -má-ánjé- <b>ni</b>	18-6-water-LOC	‘in the water’
<b>mu</b> -kásháwú- <b>ni</b>	18-9a.box-LOC	‘in the box’ (< ptg <i>caixa/caixão</i> )
<b>mu</b> -e-lábô- <b>ni</b>	18-9-society-LOC	‘in the society’
<b>mu</b> -dhi-ójâ- <b>ni</b>	18-10-food-LOC	‘in the food’
<b>mu</b> -o-éddâ- <b>ni</b>	18-14-path-LOC	‘on the path’
<b>m</b> -mú-rúdda- <b>ni</b>	18-3-village-LOC	‘in the village’

without *-ni*

9. The locative suffix **-ni** appears nevertheless in the two following frozen locative expressions: **owáani** ‘at home (birth place)’ in Cuwabo, and **vakhaani-vakhaani** ‘slowly’ in Makhuwa.

<b>va-takúlu</b>	16-9a.home	‘at home’
<b>ó-má-ttíyu</b>	16-6-night	‘at night’
<b>o-mú-ndda</b>	17-3-field	‘to the field’
<b>o-íko/mu-íko</b>	17-river	‘to the river’
<b>o-kobéla</b>	17-9a.bank	‘to the bank’
<b>ó-lóbo</b>	17-thing	‘to the thing’
<b>m̄-bára</b>	18-9a.sea	‘in the sea’
<b>mu-ttémba</b>	18-9a.village	‘in the village’
<b>mu-díla</b>	18-9a.way	‘on the way’
<i>Place names:</i>		
<b>o-Cuwábo</b>	17-Quelimane	‘to Quelimane’ (city name)
<b>o-Mokúba</b>	17-Mocuba	‘to Mocuba’ (id.)
<b>m̄-Makúzi</b>	18-Macuse	‘in Macuse’ (id.)

## (23) Makuwa

with *-ni*

<b>wa-sufáá-ni</b>	16-couch-LOC	‘on the sofa’ (< ptg <i>sofá</i> )
<b>wa-rattá-ni</b>	16-lagoon-LOC	‘at the lagoon’
<b>mwi-ŋ-rúpâ-ni</b>	18-3-bag-LOC	‘in the bag’
<b>wa-ŋ-thálf-ni</b>	16-3-tree-LOC	‘to the tree’
<b>wa-khaámâ-ni</b>	16-bed-LOC	‘to bed’ (< ptg <i>cama</i> )
<b>wa-fééshta-ni</b>	16-party-LOC	‘at the party’ (< ptg <i>feira</i> )
<b>o-ŋ-tékô-ni</b>	17-3-work-LOC	‘at work’
<b>m̄-phírô-ni</b>	18-path-LOC	‘on the path’
<b>m̄-paráákha-ni</b>	18-booth-LOC	‘in the booth’ (< ptg <i>barraca</i> )
<b>m̄-ma-átsi-ni</b>	18-6-water-LOC	‘in the water’
<b>ŋ-kaláwá-ni</b>	18-boat-LOC	‘in the boat’
<b>ŋ-karáfâ-ni</b>	18-jar-LOC	‘in the bottle’ (< ptg <i>garrafa</i> )

without *-ni*

<b>wa-kisírwa</b>	16-island	‘on the island’
<b>wa-nkhóra</b>	16-door	‘at the door’
<b>o-puúsu</b>	17-well	‘to the well’ (< ptg <i>poço</i> )
<b>o-patsári</b>	17-market	‘at the market’
<b>o-sitáti</b>	17-city	‘in town’ (< ptg <i>cidade</i> )
<b>o-khattéya</b>	17-prison	‘in jail’ (< ptg <i>cadeia</i> )
<b>m̄-piróthi</b>	18-veranda	‘in the veranda’
<b>m̄-parása</b>	18-fortress	‘in the fortress’ (< ptg <i>praça</i> )
<b>ŋ-kwaártu</b>	18-room	‘in the room’ (< ptg <i>quarto</i> )
<b>ŋ-loóca</b>	18-shop	‘in the shop’ (< ptg <i>loja</i> )

*Place names:*

<b>wa-Ámpúla</b>	16-Nampula	‘in Nampula’
<b>o-Nakhála</b>	17-Nacala	‘to Nacala’
<b>o-Maláwi</b>	17-Malawi	‘to Malawi’

Third, no noun in P30 languages can bear the locative suffix without any locative prefix. This means that Cuwabo or Makhuwa borrowed the (productive) suffix. This pattern is different from other North Mozambican languages like Koti (24) and Makwe (25), which have in their lexicon a few nouns with a non-productive suffix **-ni**.

- (24) Koti (P311, N.Mozambique) (Schadeberg & Mucanheia 2000: 44)
- |            |           |               |                        |
|------------|-----------|---------------|------------------------|
| kaxikázini | ‘north’   | (cf. kaxikázi | ‘wind from the north’) |
| kusini     | ‘south’   | (cf. kuusi    | ‘wind from the south’) |
| pephoni    | ‘heaven’  | (cf. peepho   | ‘good deeds’)          |
| pinkuni    | ‘heaven’  | (cf. pinku    | ‘sky’)                 |
| motthoni   | ‘hell’    | (cf. moottho  | ‘fire’)                |
| phwaani    | ‘seaside’ | (cf. ovwa     | ‘to ebb’)              |
- (25) Makwe (G402, North Mozambique) (Devos 2008: 68)
- |                    |                       |
|--------------------|-----------------------|
| luwááni (cl.11)    | ‘courtyard’           |
| coóoni (cl.7)      | ‘toilet’              |
| mwáani (cl.9)      | ‘coast’               |
| sokóoni (cl.9/10a) | ‘market’              |
| kilimáani (cl.7)   | ‘higher part of town’ |
| pepóoni (cl.9)     | ‘sky’                 |

Whilst locative nouns in Koti are prefixless, in Makwe, the addition of a locative prefix is possible with several of the nouns listed above. It is very likely that Makwe and Koti borrowed (probably from Swahili) the word as a whole, not the suffix, hence its lack of productivity. In Cuwabo and Makhuwa, in addition to locative prefixation, **-ni** suffixation has become obligatory with certain nouns, while in a few cases, it remains optional. This is seen in Cuwabo with the noun **pápóoro** ‘boat’ (from Portuguese *vapor*), for which both locative forms (with or without **-ni**) are attested, as shown in (26). The same happens with the Makhuwa noun **mátta** ‘field’, as illustrated in (27).

- (26) Cuwabo
- |                      |            |    |                        |                   |
|----------------------|------------|----|------------------------|-------------------|
| <b>mu-papóoro-ni</b> | ńpúle      | OR | ńpúle                  | <b>mu-pápóoro</b> |
| 18-1a.boat-LOC       | 18.DEM.III |    | 18.DEM.III             | 18-1a.boat        |
| ‘into that boat’     |            |    | ‘in there in the boat’ |                   |
- (27) Makhuwa
- |                   |    |                |
|-------------------|----|----------------|
| <b>ṁ-máttá-ni</b> | OR | <b>ṁ-mátta</b> |
| 18-field-LOC      |    | 18-field       |
| ‘in the field’    |    | ‘in the field’ |

The conditioning for this apparent variability is difficult to account for. The semantic load of the derived words may play a role in determining the addition of the locative suffix: a word inherently locative may not be required to carry more locative information, and vice versa. Another lead would consist in tracking the different pragmatic situations in which the locative phrases occur, so that some dynamic considerations may also possibly be taken into account. These are research directions to be further explored.

## 2. Agreement of dependent nominals

In addition to the locative morphology of nouns, the question of agreement with locative nouns is also very interesting from a cross-linguistic point of view. The question that arises then is whether dependent nominals such as possessives, demonstratives, connectives, etc., show agreement with the original noun class, the locative noun class, or both.

### 2.1 In Bantu

In many Bantu languages, locative nouns are analyzed as being part of the noun class system, in which case locative morphology is projected on the dependent constituents, as illustrated in Bemba (28) and in Chewa (29).

(28) Bemba (Kula 2012: 436 and p.c.)

- a. **pà-mù-shí** **pà-lyá**  
16-3-village 16-DEM  
'at that village'
- b. **kú-mù-shí** **kù-lyá**  
17-3-village 17-DEM  
'to that village'
- c. **mù-mù-shí** **mù-lyá**  
18-3-village 18-DEM  
'in that village'

(29) Chewa (N31, Malawi/Zambia/Mozambique) (Mchombo 2004: 5-7)

- a. **pa-m-pando** **pa-ánga**  
16-3-chair 16-POSS1SG  
'on my chair'
- b. **ku-mu-dzi** **kw-ánu**  
17-3-village 17-POSS.2SG  
'at your village'

This agreement may be referred to as 'outer' agreement (Marten 2012), as it takes place with the added locative prefix and not with the inherent noun class prefix. In the languages which have lost the three historical locative class prefixes in nominal morphology and use instead the suffix -(i)ni, the three-way distinction may still be obtained on modifiers. This is usually the case in languages from zone G (Grégoire 1975: 69), such as Bondei, as illustrated in (30).

(30) Bondei (G24, North-East Tanzania) (Grégoire 1975: 69)

- a. **nyumba-ni** **ha-ngu**  
9.house-LOC 16-POSS.1SG  
'at my house'
- b. **nyumba-ni** **kwa-ngu**  
9.house-LOC 17-POSS.1SG  
'to my house'

- c. nyumba-**ni**            **mwa**-ngu  
 9.house-LOC        **18**-POSS.1SG  
 ‘in my house’

In contrast, in Swati, locative nouns have been analyzed as being no longer part of the noun class system, but rather as heading prepositional phrases (Marten 2010). As a result, the modifier does not display locative agreement, but ‘inner’ agreement with the inherent noun class prefix.

- (31) Swati (Marten 2010: 257)
- |           |            |   |                     |            |
|-----------|------------|---|---------------------|------------|
| ba-fana   | b-ami      | → | ku- <b>ba</b> -fana | b-ami      |
| 2-boy     | 2-POSS.1SG |   | LOC-2-boy           | 2-POSS.1SG |
| ‘my boys’ |            |   | ‘at my boys’        |            |

Between these two edges of the spectrum, there are intermediate systems which allow both outer and inner agreement on the modifiers. It is the case in Ganda, as illustrated in (32) with possessive modifiers. These two different patterns in Ganda are analyzed by Marten (2012) through two different syntactic configurations, in which “inner agreement signals a local relationship with the head of the noun phrase, while outer agreement signals a local relationship with the head of the locative phrase” (Marten 2012: 439). Thus in (32b) the possessive is restricted to the noun **kyalo** ‘village’, whereas in (32a), it applies to the entire locative phrase. This variation seems to lead to slightly interpretative differences, seemingly associated with emphasis (see Marten 2012 for further details).

- (32) Ganda (Grégoire 1975: 82)
- |                                      |                                    |
|--------------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| a. Outer agreement                   | b. Inner agreement                 |
| <b>ku</b> -bbalaza <b>kw</b> -ange   | ku- <b>ky</b> -alo <b>ky</b> -ange |
| <b>17</b> -9.courtyard <b>17</b> -my | <b>17</b> -7-village <b>7</b> -my  |
| ‘on my courtyard’                    | ‘at my village’                    |

Kagulu is another language in which modifiers can take either the locative agreement (33a) or the inherent noun class prefixes (33b).

- (33) Kagulu (Petzell 2008: 75)
- |  |  |
|--|--|
| a. <b>mu</b> -ḡ-keka <b>mu</b> -dodogi | <b>mu</b> -kaya <b>u</b> - <b>mw</b> -ako      |
| <b>18</b> -3-mat <b>18</b> -small      | <b>18</b> -9.house    AUG- <b>18</b> -POSS.2SG |
| ‘on the small mat’                     | ‘in your house’                                |
| b. <b>mu</b> -ḡ-gunda <b>u</b> -no     | <b>mu</b> -kaya <b>y</b> -ako                  |
| <b>18</b> -3-farm <b>3</b> -DEM        | <b>18</b> -9.house <b>9</b> -POSS.2SG          |
| ‘on this farm’                         | ‘in your house’                                |

In Ngangela connective constructions headed by a locative expression, agreement may be either outer (34a) or in class 5<sup>10</sup> (34b).

10. More research is needed on this unexpected use of class 5, e.g. does the language recur to class 5 only in the case of non-locative agreement with a locative noun?

- (34) Ngangela (Maniacky 2003: 171, my glosses)
- |                    |   |
|--------------------|---|
| a. Outer agreement | b. Class 5 agreement                                      |
| <b>ku-mu-kúlo</b>  | <b>wá-njivo</b> <b>ku-lú-twe</b> <b>lyá-njivo</b>         |
| <b>17-3-side</b>   | <b>17.CON-house</b> <b>17-11-front</b> <b>5.CON-house</b> |
| ‘along the house’  | ‘in front of the house’                                   |

The two possible patterns found in Kagulu and Ngangela above, seem to occur without any apparent conditioning for their distribution, although further research on this question would be desirable for comparative purposes with Ganda (32).

## 2.2 In P30

Regarding Cuwabo and Makhuwa, in most cases, the modifier agrees with the locative noun class, and not the inherent class of the noun. This outer agreement is illustrated with the possessives (35-36), the demonstratives (37-38), and the adjectives (39).

- (35) Cuwabo
- |                                       |
|---------------------------------------|
| a. <b>va-tákúlu</b> <b>vá-awa</b>     |
| <b>16-9a.house</b> <b>16-POSS.3PL</b> |
| ‘at their home’                       |
| b. <b>o-sogólró</b> <b>o-aye</b>      |
| <b>17-front</b> <b>17-POSS.3SG</b>    |
| ‘in front of her’                     |
| c. <b>m̄-má-tákulu</b> <b>mú-áwa</b>  |
| <b>18-6-home</b> <b>18-POSS.3PL</b>   |
| ‘in their houses’                     |
- (36) Makhuwa
- |   |
|---|
| a. <b>wa-peétó</b> <b>w-áwe</b>           |
| <b>16-chest</b> <b>16-POSS.3SG</b>        |
| ‘towards his chest’                       |
| b. <b>wa-puwá-ní</b> <b>w-áú</b>          |
| <b>16-compound-LOC</b> <b>16-POSS.2SG</b> |
| ‘in your garden’                          |
| c. <b>o-wány’</b> <b>áka</b>              |
| <b>17-home</b> <b>17.POSS.1SG</b>         |
| ‘at my home’                              |
- (37) Cuwabo
- |                                     |
|-------------------------------------|
| a. <b>va-tákúlu</b> <b>á-pa</b>     |
| <b>16-9a.house</b> <b>16-DEM.I</b>  |
| ‘at this house’                     |
| b. <b>o-ttolo-ni</b> <b>ó-kó</b>    |
| <b>17-well=LOC</b> <b>17-DEM.II</b> |
| ‘at that well’                      |

## (38) Makhuwa

- a. **wa-ŋ-tháli-ní vá**  
**16-3-tree-LOC 16.DEM.I**  
 ‘at this tree’
- b. **o-Nghípiti ŋno**  
**17-Ilha 17.DEM.I**  
 ‘on (this) Ilha<sup>11</sup>’
- c. **ŋ-karáfá-ni mwe**  
**18-jar-LOC 18.DEM.III**  
 ‘in that jar’

(39) Cuwabo<sup>12</sup>

- a. **o-láb-a vógó va-déréétú**  
 INF-work-FV **16.place 16-good**  
 ‘work in a good place’
- b. ... [a-á-lígi **va-déréétú**]<sub>REL</sub>  
 SM2-PST.IPFV-be.HAB **16-good**  
 ‘...who were in a comfortable place’ (lit. ‘[in] somewhere-nice’)

In all these cases, the locative morpheme functions as the head of the locative phrase in terms of agreement.

Regarding locative nouns embedded in connective constructions, Makhuwa also respects outer agreement, as shown in (40).

## (40) Makhuwa

- a. **wa-ŋ-khóra-ní wa e-núpa**  
**16-3-door-LOC 16.CON 9-house**  
 ‘at the door of the house’
- b. **m̄-ma-parara-ni ma e-sikatta**  
**18-6-side-LOC 18.CON 9-stairs**  
 ‘on the side of the stairs’

However, the situation is a bit more complex in Cuwabo, where the distinction is made between unique agreement and inner agreement. Unique<sup>13</sup> locative agreement on connectives occurs when the locative form of the head noun carries inherently the locative prefix, i.e. in the case of primary or underived locative nouns, which have no counterpart in another noun class, as in (41).

## (41) Cuwabo

- a. **vaárí va e-íkó**  
**16.middle 16.CON 9-river**  
 ‘at the middle of the river’

11. *Ilha* is the name of an island in Mozambique.

12. No similar example was found in Makhuwa-Enahara.

13. In (39), the locative agreement with connectives cannot really be referred to as outer locative agreement as there is no inner prefix to agree with.

- b. **odhúlú wa mu-yére**  
**17.top 17.CON 3-tree.sp**  
 ‘to the top of the *muyére* tree’
- c. **mwaárí mwa má-ttádda**  
**18.inside 18.CON 6-lake**  
 ‘inside the lakes’ (elic.)
- d. **ṛbá mwa ṛ-mááni**  
**18.home 18.CON 1-my.mother**  
 ‘into my mother’s house’

However, in connective constructions headed by derivational locative phrases, i.e. made of a locative pre-prefix, a noun class prefix and a stem, the connective relator does not agree with the locative class, but with the inherent noun class of the head constituent (42).

(42) Cuwabo

- a. **o-mí-zéréré-ni dha ddímíngu**  
**17-4-ceremony-LOC 4.CON 9a.Sunday**  
 ‘at Sunday’s ceremony’
- b. **mu-sidádi ya o-Maputo**  
**18-9a.city 9.CON 17-Maputo**  
 ‘in the city of Maputo’

In these examples, the locative markers can be reanalyzed as prepositions (or prepositional proclitics). This unusual behaviour is reminiscent of Ganda (32) and Kagulu (33), which display outer as well as inner agreement, but with no apparent morphological conditioning as in Cuwabo. It is also similar to Swati (31), except that in Swati, such a reanalysis is systematic.

Note that **vatákúlu** ‘at home’ constitutes an exception to examples in (42). Since this noun phrase is built upon class 9a **tákúlu**, an inner agreement in class 9 is expected. But instead, it functions as an inherent locative noun, thus implying locative agreement, as shown in (43).

(43) Cuwabo

- va-tákúlu va á-báabe**  
**16-9a.house 16.CON 2-parent**  
 ‘at the parents’ house’

This may indicate that **vatákúlu** has achieved the final step of locative derivation, and must synchronically be considered as an inherent locative noun, rather than a derived locative noun. The fact that the basic stem **tákúlu** ‘home, household’ is rarely attested in my data would support this hypothesis.

### 3. Locative verbal marking

Locative morphology is not only found in the nominal domain: it also occurs in the verbal domain, through both subject and object agreement morphology.

#### 3.1 In Bantu

Bantu languages which are characterized by the historical three-way distinction of their locative nominal morphology normally have corresponding locative marking on their verb forms. Examples from Kagulu, Chewa and Ngangela are provided below.

- (44) Kagulu (Petzell 2008: 75)  
**ku-m-lomo ku-fimb-a ku-gati**  
 17-3-mouth SM17-swell-FV 17-inside  
 ‘the mouth has swollen inside’

- (45) Chewa (Mchombo 2004: 5)  
**ku-mu-dzi kw-ánu kú-ma-sangaláts-á a-lěndo**  
 17-3-village 17-POSS2SG SM17-HAB-please-FV 2-visitor  
 ‘your village pleases visitors’

- (46) Ngangela (Maniacky 2003: 35, my glosses)
- ho nji-liku-koθ-á ha-túmbal-a**  
 16.place 1SG-PRS.PROG-sleep-FV SM16.EFF-be.clean-FV  
 ‘the place where I sleep is clean’
  - kwinti lyá-njivó kwa-túmbal-a**  
 17.ground 5.CON-9-house SM17.EFF-be.clean-FV  
 ‘the ground of the house is clean’
  - mwilú mu-liku-ðivál-a**  
 18.sky SM18-PRS.PROG-darken-FV  
 ‘the sky gets darkened’

In languages which have lost one or two of the three locative prefixes in the nominal domain, the corresponding agreement morphology on the verb tends to be reduced to the actual number of locative prefixes still attested with nouns. Kikuyu, which productively forms locative nouns by the suffixation of **-ini** (see section 1.1), also has one nominal stem **-ndũ** ‘place’ which takes class 16 prefix when it is a specific place, and class 17 prefix for a more general place, e.g. a locality or a district (Barlow 1960: 26). Both these nouns trigger locative agreement in classes 16 and 17 on every depending constituent, including subject marking on verbs, as illustrated in (47).

- (47) Kikuyu (E51, Kenya) (Githiora, p.c.)
- ha-ndũ ha-aha ha-rend-a kũ-rĩm-w-o**  
 16-place 16-DEM.I SM16-want-FV 15-cultivate-PASS-FV  
 ‘this (specific) place wants/needs to be cultivated’

- b. **kū-ndū**      **gū-ūkū**      **kū-rend-a**      **kū-rīm-w-o**  
 17-place      17-DEM.I      SM17-want-FV      15-cultivate-PASS-FV  
 ‘this (general) place wants/needs to be cultivated’

Finally, Southern Bantu languages have an invariable subject marker of class 17 **ku-**, which is used in most cases as the default or expletive subject marker<sup>14</sup>. This is first illustrated with Swati. In (48a), the preverbal locative noun **endlini** combines a double locative marking **e...-ini**. In (48b), the preverbal locative noun **phandle** is built upon a class 16 prefix which has since then lexicalized. Unlike Kagulu, Chewa and Ngangela illustrated above, the preverbal position of these locative noun phrases does not confer them the status of grammatical subjects: in no case does the verb show agreement with the head noun, i.e. in class 25 and in class 16, respectively. Instead, an expletive class 17 subject prefix is used, suggesting that these constructions are better analyzed as impersonal constructions in the same way as (48c). The preverbal locative assumes the function of a frame setting adjunct. It is thus syntactically peripheral.

(48) Swati (Marten 2010: 255-256, 262)

- a. **e-n-dl-ini**      **ku-ya-shish-a**  
 LOC(25)-9-house-LOC      SM17-PRS-be.hot-FV  
 ‘in the house it is hot’
- b. **phandle**      **ku-ya-bandz-a**  
 16.outside      SM17-PRS-be.cold-FV  
 ‘outside it is cold’
- c. **ku-ne-kudla**      **e-dladla-ini**  
 SM17-POSS.COP-food      LOC-kitchen-LOC  
 ‘there is food in the kitchen’

The expletive use of class 17 is widely attested in Southern Bantu. Other examples are provided for Tswana (49) and for Southern Sotho (50).

(49) Tswana (Creissels 2011: 49/42)

- a. Mo mafatsheng a mangwe go a berekwa  
 mó      mà-fátshí-ŋ      á      mà-ŋwí      χó-à-bérék-w-à  
 there<sub>3</sub>      6-country-LOC      6.CON      6-other      SM17-DJ-work-PASS-FV  
 ‘In the other countries people work’ (lit. ‘there is worked’)

14. Note that there are still a few class 17 nouns, such as χù-lò ‘place’ in Tswana, which trigger class 17 agreement on the verb, as illustrated in the two following examples (a) and (b), kindly provided by Denis Creissels (p.c.).

- a. *Golo ga go itsiwe.*  
 χù-lò      χà-χó-ìts-ì-w-ì  
 17-place      NEG-SM17-know-PASS-FV  
 ‘The place is not known.’
- b. *Ke a go itse.*  
 kì-à-χó-ìts-ì  
 SM1SG-DJ-OM17-know-FV  
 ‘I know it (the place).’

b. Go opela basadi.

χó-ópél-á      bà-sádi  
 SM17-sing-FV    2-woman  
 ‘There are women singing.’ (lit. ‘there sing women’)

(50) Southern Sotho      (Machobane 1995:122, quoted in Creissels 2011: 48)

Táfolé-ng      hó-i-pény-ets-a      fééla.  
 (9)table-LOC    SM17-REFL-shine-APPL-FV    only  
 ‘The table shines on its own.’  
 (lit. ‘On [the top of] the table shines on its own’)

Note that class 17 locative marker **ku-** is also recurrently used as an expletive marker in languages characterized by a more typical locative system, such as Bemba or Swahili (Marten 2010: 256). However, this development from locative semantics to an expletive function, analyzed as a grammaticalization path (Heine and Kuteva 2002), has reached a further stage in Southern Bantu languages, since class 17 subject prefix has lost its locative meaning and specialized toward an expletive function (Marten 2010, Buell 2012).

Verbs in typical Bantu languages may also host locative object markers, either in the form of prefixes, as in Smbaa (51), Makwe (52), and Chewa (53), or enclitics, as in Haya (54).

(51) Smbaa (G23, North Tanzania)      (Riedel 2007: 200)  
 ŋ-za-**ha**-chi-m-nhk-a      Stella ki-tabu    ha-ja  
 SM1SG-PFV.DJ-**OM16**-OM7-OM1-give-fv    Stella 7-book    16-DEM  
 ‘I gave Stella a book there’

(52) Makwe      (Devos 2008: 64)  
 pakayá páake| ŋnapamaáya|  
 pa-kaya      pa-ake      ni-na-**pa**-may-a  
 16-9.town    16-POSS1    SM1SG-PRS.IPFV-**OM16**-know-FV  
 ‘her/his home, I know where it is’

(53) Chewa      (Alsina & Mchombo 1993: 42)  
 a-lénje    a-ku-**pá**-lúk-ir-á      mí-kêka (pa-m-chénga)  
 2-hunter    SM2-PRS-**OM16**-weave-APPL-FV    4-mat    16-3-sand  
 ‘the hunters are weaving mats on it, the beach’

(54) Haya (JE22, North-West Tanzania)      (Rubanza 1988: 117, my glosses)  
 tu-lika-gi-mu-ba-chumb-il-il-a = **mu**<sup>15</sup>  
 SM1PL-REM.FUT-OM9-OM1-OM2-cook-APPL-APPL-FV=**LOC18**  
 ‘We will cook him in it [the pot] on their behalf.’

In Bemba, both locative prefixes (55a) and locative enclitics (55b) are possible. The second marker seems to be obligatorily required when the

15. As an anonymous reviewer observed, if OM9 **-gi-** is considered to refer to ‘the pot’ in which the food will be cooked, it could be inferred that the locative enclitic is not really an object suffix, but that it adds a locative semantic component to the sentence. At any rate, more information on the context would be needed here to fully account for the use of the locative enclitic in this example.

locative phrase (here **mungânda** ‘in the house’) is dislocated to the left-periphery. The absence of =**mó** in (55b) would lead to ungrammaticality. Also, the enclitic =**mó** cannot be substituted by the class 18 object marker **-mu-**, as shown in (55c).

(55) Bemba

- a. n-âli-pà-món-à (Marten et al. 2007: 291)  
SM1SG-PST-**OM16**-see-FV  
‘I saw it (i.e. that place there)’
- b. mu-ŋ-gânda bá-âlí-séndam-a = **mó** (ku mu-mbúulu)  
18-9-house SM2-PST-sleep-FV=**LOC18** by 3-wild.dog  
‘In the house the dog slept there.’  
(‘The house was slept in by the dog.’) (Kula & Marten 2010: 126)
- c. \*mu-n-gânda bá-âlí-**mu**-séndam-a (ku mu-mbúulu)  
18-9-house SM2-PST-**OM18**-sleep-FV by 3-wild.dog  
Intended: ‘In the house the dog slept there.’ (Nancy Kula, p.c.)

However, in a certain number of Bantu languages (*e.g.* in Lozi, Ciruri and Chasu, see Marten *et al.* 2007), the slot for object marking has been restricted to non-locative noun class constituents, thus excluding classes 16 to 18. This process of locative marking reduction obtains in Swati, whose verbal morphology only tolerates non-locative objects, as shown in example (56). In (56a), both speaker and listener are aware that a dog (**inja**, class 10) is being referred to through the class 10 object marker. The right-dislocated topic noun **inja** can thus be interpreted as an afterthought. The sentence is grammatical and makes perfect sense within a context involving the discussion of a dog. However, the equivalent construction with a locative noun phrase is ungrammatical, as shown in (56b), where **ngakubona** has no locative meaning. Instead, **-ku-**<sup>16</sup> can only be interpreted here as a second person singular object marker. The postverbal locative noun phrase **eThekwini** ‘in/at Durban’ is considered as an adjunct, and not as an afterthought.

(56) Swati

- a. ng-a-**yi**-bon-a kahle (in-ja) (Marten 2010: 261)  
SM1SG-PST-**OM10**-see-FV well 10-dog  
‘I saw it well, the dog’
- b. ng-a-**ku**-bon-a (e-Thekw-ini) (Peter Nichols, p.c.)  
i) SM1SG-PST-**\*OM17**-see-FV LOC-Durban-LOC  
Intended: ‘I saw there (Durban)’  
ii) SM1SG-PST-**OM2SG**-see-FV LOC-Durban-LOC  
‘I saw you (in Durban)’

16. For an illustration of the locative use of **ku** in Swati, see above (6) and (7).



- b. ka-**va**-gaa-j-úw-e  
 NEG-SM16-HYP-eat-PASS-PFV  
 ‘there would be no food at home’

The role of locative subject agreement markers will be further discussed in Section 4, together with relative constructions, and Section 5, which discusses locative inversion constructions.

Regarding object prefixing on the verb, in both Cuwabo and Makhuwa, it is restricted to class 1 and class 2<sup>17</sup>. This situation contrasts with typical Bantu systems, in which object agreement is possible with every noun class, including locative classes. As a result, locative object prefixes do not exist in P30 languages.

However, in Cuwabo, there are three resumptive locative enclitics, =**vo** (class 16), =**wo** (class 17), and =**mo** (class 18). These locative clitics are very frequent in the language. They can pronominalize a locative argument which has previously been mentioned, and thus function as anaphoric locative objects, as shown in (61).

- (61) o-Maputo ddi-ni-ó-zíw-a = **wo**  
 17-Maputo SM1SG-IPFV.DJ-INF-know-FV=LOC17  
 ‘Maputo, I know it’, lit.: ‘In Maputo, I know it there’

But most often, the locative enclitics assume a function of anaphoric locative adjunct, i.e. they refer to semantic locatives. For instance, in (62), the class 18 enclitic =**mo** refers to **mba** ‘inside, at home’.

- (62) o-hí-vólów-a [mba,] o-hi-fúgúl-a = **mo**<sub>i</sub>  
 SM1-PFV.DJ-enter-FV 18.inside SM1-PFV.DJ-open-FV=LOC18  
 níngá de koštúmi  
 as always  
 ‘he entered the house, he opened in there as always’

Because of this anaphoric function, the locative enclitics cannot co-occur with an in situ locative phrase (unless the locative phrase is right-dislocated and thus interpreted as an afterthought).

- (63) \*á-léddo a-hí-dh-á = **mo** mu-mú-rúdda = ni  
 2-guest SM2-PFV.DJ-come-FV=LOC18 18-3-village=LOC  
 \*‘the guests arrived into the village’

They obligatorily appear when the locative phrase is dislocated to the left-periphery, which is reminiscent of Bemba, illustrated above in (55b).

- (64) [va-ttóló = ní] ma-ánjé a-hí-ínjív-â = **vo**  
 16-well=LOC 6-water SM6-PFV.DJ-abound-FV=LOC16  
 ‘in the well, there is a lot of water (there)’

However, they are prohibited in locative inversion constructions (see Section 5 below). This is in fact expected, since the headed locative

17. These class 1/2 object prefixes are best considered agreement markers rather than pronouns.

expression assumes a subject position and thus triggers subject agreement on the verb.

- (65) \**[o-ttóló = ni ókúle] o-hi-kálá = wo fólóóri*  
 17-well=LOC 17.DEM.III SM17-PFV.DJ-be=LOC17 9a.flower  
 \*lit.: ‘at that well there is (there) a flower’

#### 4. Locative relatives

##### 4.1 In Bantu

In typical locative systems, it is expected that locative phrases are relativized in the same way as non-locative phrases. Consider for instance relative constructions in Makwe and in Kagulu. In Makwe, non-subject relatives are built upon the connective particle **-a-** in verbal pre-initial position. This connective particle is preceded by the relevant noun class prefix, which is co-indexed with the antecedent noun phrase, as can be seen in (66a). The same strategy is used to form locative relatives in (66b). In both examples, the subject always controls the agreement on the verb, and occupies a post-verbal position, when overtly expressed, as in (66b).

- (66) Makwe (Devos 2008: 394-396)

- a. *vi<sub>i</sub>-ínu | vy<sub>i</sub>-á-á-yúm-íte |*  
**8-thing 8-CON-SM1-buy-PRS.PFV.REL**  
 ‘the things that s/he has bought’
- b. *kunyéenje | kajípee | jing’úunde |*  
**ku<sub>i</sub>-nyenje ku<sub>i</sub>-a-ji<sub>k</sub>-p-a-ile ji<sub>k</sub>-ng’unde**  
**17-side 17-CON-SM10-give-FV-PRS.PFV.REL 10-bean**  
 ‘at the side where the beans grow’

Non-subject relatives in Kagulu are marked by a referential marker **-o-** preceded by an initial prefix, which also agrees with the head noun phrase. This strategy is shared by both object relatives (67a) and locative relatives (67b).

- (67) Kagulu (Petzell 2008: 189, my glosses)

- a. *isimbeyu sochikuhanda*  
*i-si<sub>i</sub>-mbeyu si<sub>i</sub>-o-chi-ku-hand-a*  
**AUG-10-seed 10-REF-SM1PL-PRS-plant-FV**  
 ‘the seeds which we are planting’
- b. *kugati no kodyekigwe*  
**ku<sub>i</sub>-gati no ku<sub>i</sub>-o-di-wek-igw-e**  
**17-there COP 17-REF-SM5-be.put-PASS-PFV**  
 ‘there where it (cl.5) was put’

Again, Swati differs from the regular patterns just discussed. Swati locative relatives are marked by an invariable relative marker **la-** prefixed to a locative formative **-pho**, considered as a derived form of class 16





examples from Bemba (73), Herero (74), and Makwe (75), which represent regular locative systems.

(73) Bemba (Marten *et al.* 2007: 277)

- a. **kú**-mwèsù      **kwà**-lí-ìs-à      áb-èni  
 17-home.our      SM17-REC.PST-come-FV 2-guest  
 ‘Visitors have come to our home’
- b. **mw**-ì-bálá      **mù**-lè-lím-à      áb-èni  
 18-5-field SM18-PROG-cultivate-FV 2-guest  
 ‘Visitors are farming the field’

(74) Herero (Marten 2006: 113)

- a. **pò**-ndjúwó      **p**-á-rár-á      é-rúngá  
 16-9.house SM16-PST-sleep-FV 5-thief  
 ‘A/the thief slept at the house’ (lit.: ‘at the house slept a/the thief’)
- b. **kò**-mù-tí      **kw**-á-pósé      òzó-ndjimá  
 17-3-tree SM17-PST-make.noise 10-baboon  
 ‘The baboons made noise in the tree’  
 (lit.: ‘in the tree made noise (the) baboons’)
- c. **mò**-ndùndú      **mw**-á-váz-éw-á      ómu-àtjé  
 18-9.mountain SM18-PST-find-PASS-FV 1-child  
 ‘A/the child was found on the mountain’  
 (lit.: ‘on the mountain was found a/the child’)

(75) Makwe (Devos 2008: 69-70)

- a. pacilóonda| paníúuma| uwííla|  
**pa**<sub>i</sub>-ci-londa      **pa**<sub>i</sub>-ni-um-a      u-wila  
 16-7-wound SM16-PRS.PFV-come.out-FV 11-pus  
 ‘There is pus coming out of the wound.’
- b. kukáaya| kuuyá| kupatikene átáali|  
**ku**<sub>i</sub>-kaya      ku-ya      **ku**<sub>i</sub>-patiken-e      atali  
 17-9.town 17.DEM.III SM17-occur-PRS.PFV 9.danger  
 ‘In that town something dangerous happened.’
- c. ñnyúumba| munkúingílá méedi|  
**mu**<sub>i</sub>-nyumba      **mu**<sub>i</sub>-nku-ingil-a      ma-edi  
 18-9.house SM18-PROG-enter-FV 6-water  
 ‘There is water entering the house.’

Among Bantuist scholars, such reversed constructions are known as the locative inversion construction. Syntactically, locative nouns behave like other nouns, and function as subjects of verbs. Locative inversion is common across Bantu and has been reconstructed for Proto-Bantu. But again, Swati and other Southern languages do not conform to the typical Bantu picture. In these languages, clause initial locative noun phrases do not function as subjects, but rather as topics which set the frame. As a result, impersonal constructions are obtained, whereby the subject marker

slot is invariably filled by the default/expletive class 17 prefix, already discussed in section 3.1. The absence of locative inversion constructions is first illustrated with Swati (76) and Zulu (77). Note that in the second example, the locative prefix **ku-** attached to the demonstrative pronoun **-lezi** is syntactically neutral, i.e. it does not trigger any agreement. It is attached to any adnominal modifying a locative noun, and assumes a mere locative function in the same way as the suffix **-ini** found on nouns.

(76) Swati (Marten 2010: 262)

ku-le-ti-ndlu      ku-hlal-a      (khona)      ba-ntfu      la-ba-dzala  
 LOC-DEM-10-house      SM17-stay-FV      there      2-people      REL-2-old  
 ‘In these houses (there) live elderly people.’

(77) Zulu (Buell 2007: 113)

ku-lezi      zi-ndlu      ku-hlal-a      (khona)      aba-ntu      aba-dala  
 LOC-10these      10-house      SM17-stay-FV      there      2-people      2-old  
 ‘In these houses live old people.’

Tswana further illustrates the use of impersonal constructions in the same context. Following Creissels’ analysis (2011, this volume), **fá** in (78a), **kó** in (78b) and **mó** in (78c) are the reflexes of the Bantu demonstratives of classes 16, 17 and 18. Subject to some grammaticalization process, they evolved towards a status of prepositions, no longer involved in class agreement, hence their being glossed as ‘there<sub>1</sub>’, ‘there<sub>2</sub>’ and ‘there<sub>3</sub>’ (see Creissels 2011 for a more detailed discussion). In other words, they should be considered as locative deictic adverbs found at the left margin of locative expressions, rather than locative noun class prefixes as e.g. Demuth and Mmusi (1997) stated. Similarly to Nguni languages above, these preverbal locative noun phrases occupy a topic position at the left periphery of the clause; hence, no agreement applies.

(78) Tswana (Demuth & Mmusi 1997, tran. and glossed by Creissels 2011: 44)

a. Fa setlhareng go eme basimane.

fá      sí-tʰàrí-ŋ      χó-ém-í      bà-símàní  
 there<sub>1</sub>      7-tree-LOC      SM17-stand(PFV)-FV      2-boy  
 ‘By the tree stand the boys.’

b. Ko Maung go tlaa ya rona mariga.

kó      màúŋ      χó-tláá-j-à      róná      màríχà  
 there<sub>2</sub>      Maung      SM17-FUT-go-FV 1PL      winter  
 ‘To Maung we shall go in winter.’

c. Mo lefatsheng go fula dikgomo.

mó      ñ-fátshí-ŋ      χó-fúl-á      dí-qʰòmó  
 there<sub>3</sub>      5-country-LOC      SM17-graze-FV      10-cow  
 ‘In the country are grazing the cattle.’

Semantic locative inversion whereby the fronted expression denoting a place or a space does not bear any locative morphology, is attested in these three Southern languages. See Marten (2010) for Swati, Buell

(2007) for Zulu, and Demuth and Mmusi (1997) and Creissels (2011) for Tswana.

## 5.2 In P30

Unlike relative constructions, the question of locative inversion constitutes a big divide between P30 languages. Whereas this syntactic construction is fully productive in Cuwabo (79), it is considered ungrammatical in Makhuwa (80).

(79) Cuwabo<sup>19</sup>

- a. **va**<sub>i</sub>-ttóló-ní      **vâ**<sub>i</sub>-mel-ilé      foloóri  
 16-well-LOC      SM16-blossom-PFV.CJ      9a.flower.H1D  
 ‘At the well a flower blossomed.’
- b. **o**<sub>i</sub>-ttólo-ni      ó-kúle      **o**<sub>i</sub>-hi-kála      fúlóóri  
 17-well-LOC      17-DEM.III      SM17-PFV.DJ-be      9a.flower  
 ‘At that well, there is a flower.’
- c. **m̂**-púle      **mu**<sub>i</sub>-bara      **mu**<sub>i</sub>-hi-kálá      mw-áná-e-námá  
 18-DEM.III      18-9a.sea      SM18-PFV.DJ-be      1-child-9-animal  
 ‘There in the sea, there is an animal.’<sup>20</sup>

(80) Makhuwa

- a. \***wa**-kisírwá      **wa**-náá-phíy-á      a-létto  
 16-island      SM16-PRS.DJ-arrive-FV      2-guest  
 Intended: ‘on the island arrive guests’
- b. **wa**-kisírwá      **a**<sub>i</sub>-náá-phíy-á      **a**<sub>i</sub>-létto  
 16-island      SM2-PRS.DJ-arrive-FV      2-guest  
 ‘On the island, arrive guests.’

As can be seen in (80a), there is no agreement between the verb and the preposed locative adjunct, i.e. Makhuwa cannot use locative subject agreement in verb-subject constructions. Instead, the subject marker agrees with the postverbal logical subject: aletto ‘guests’ as in (80b).

The same happens in (81a), where the subject marker on the verb cannot agree with a subjectivised locative argument of a passive verb.

(81) Makhuwa

- a. \***m̂**-poótíí-ní      **n̂**-núú-hél-íy-á      e-phepéle  
 18-jar-LOC      SM18-PFV.PERS-put-PASS-FV      9-fly  
 Intended: ‘in the jar was put a fly’

19. See Guérois (2014) for a detailed analysis of locative inversion constructions in Cuwabo.

20. The literal meaning of the gloss corresponding to the name ‘animal’ is ‘child animal’. In fact, in Cuwabo, the diminutive **mwáná** ‘child’ is also used to express the fact that the following entity is a member of a given semantic class or group. In this example (extracted from a narrative), the animal referred to is a big animal, namely a dugong (i.e. a member of the species ‘dugong’, NOT a ‘baby dugong’ or a ‘small dugong’).

- b. e-phepélé      e-núú-hél-íy-á      m-poótlí-ni  
 9-fly            SM9-PFV.PERS-put-PASS-FV 18-jar-LOC  
 ‘The fly was put in the jar.’

As in the Southern languages discussed above, the locative NP preceding the verb in Makhuwa cannot be considered as a core constituent. It should rather be analyzed as a frame setting adjunct (van der Wal 2009). However, unlike Southern Bantu languages, which in this context make use of the default class 17 prefix, the subject marker on the Makhuwa verb agrees with the postverbal subject, as already shown in (80b) above, and further illustrated in the ditransitive construction in (82).

- (82) Makhuwa  
 o-patsári      aa-hí-thúm’                      e-kútté      ñ-tthu  
 17-market      SM1.PST-PFV.DJ-buy      10-bean      1-person  
 ‘Someone bought beans at the market.’

### Summary

Throughout this paper, I have tried to show the extent to which Bantu languages can vary with respect to locative morphosyntax, with special attention to P30 languages, i.e. Cuwabo and Makhuwa. Table 2 resumes each parameter under examination in this paper, and compares the two Mozambican languages with two other Bantu languages located on the opposite edges of the locative system continuum in Bantu, i.e. Bemba and Swati. Bemba, on the leftmost column presents a typical Bantu locative system, which is fully part of the noun class system. In other words, locative nouns are essentially like other nouns in terms of morphology, agreement and syntactic behaviour. On the other hand, Swati, on the rightmost column, displays a re-analyzed locative system, in which preverbal locative phrases<sup>21</sup> are no longer coded as nouns but as prepositional phrases, which function as adjuncts rather than as arguments (see Marten 2010 for a detailed analysis of this ‘great locative shift’).

Morphologically, the locative system of both Cuwabo and Makhuwa is still part of the noun class system, i.e. locatives are overall coded as nouns. This is seen in Table 2 with the presence of the three historical nominal locative prefixes (parameter 1); the locative agreement on modifiers (parameter 6), with exception of the case of the non-locative agreement on the connective in Cuwabo; and the presence of the three locative subject markers (parameter 7).

21. While this is indeed the case that preverbal locative noun phrases in Southern Bantu languages are no longer core constituents of the sentence, there are still other contexts where the same locative noun phrases occur in argument positions, e.g. as the complement of an applicative verb.

*Table 2. Locative systems in Bemba (Bem.), Cuwabo (Cuw.), Makhuwa (Mak.) and Swati (Swa.)*

	Parameters	Bem.	Cuw.	Mak.	Swa.
1	Presence of three nominal locative prefixes	yes	yes	yes	no
2	Presence of class 25 locative prefix	no	no	no	yes
3	Presence of the locative suffix <b>-ni</b>	no	yes	yes	yes
4	Presence of both LOC. prefix (cl.16-18) + suffix <b>-ni</b>	no	yes	yes	no
5	Presence of both LOC. prefix <b>e-</b> (cl.25) + suffix <b>-ni</b>	no	no	no	yes
6	Locative agreement on modifiers	yes	yes/no	yes	no
7	Presence of three locative subject prefixes	yes	yes	yes	no
8	Presence of three locative object prefixes	yes	no	no	no
9	Presence of three locative enclitics	yes	yes	no	no
10	Identical relative marking strategy for locatives	yes	yes	yes	no
11	Agreeing locative marker in relatives	yes	yes	yes	no
12	Existence of formal locative inversion	yes	yes	no	no

A feature shared by the two languages, but otherwise rarely attested in Bantu, is the double-locative marking on nouns, involving both a locative prefix (**\*pà-**, **\*kù-**, **\*mù-**) and the locative suffix **-(i)ni** (parameter 4). In addition, both languages display a quite restricted object marking on the verb, which excludes all noun classes except classes 1/2, which means that this restriction does not apply to locative marking only. However, Cuwabo differs from Makhuwa in exhibiting three locative object enclitics (class 16 = **vo**, class 17 = **wo**, and class 18 = **mo**). In this respect, Cuwabo is closer to the prototypical Bantu locative systems (parameter 9).

From a morphosyntactic point of view, Cuwabo and Makhuwa are typically Bantu as far as relative constructions are concerned: first, relative marking strategy for locatives is not different from the other classes (parameter 10), and second, locative agreement is respected (parameter 11). However, the absence (and ungrammaticality) of locative

inversion constructions in Makhuwa (parameter 12) makes it deviate heavily from Cuwabo and other Bantu languages with a regular locative system.

To conclude, Cuwabo and Makhuwa present each in their own way intermediate stages of development from the Proto-Bantu locative system. On the continuum between a purely locative noun class system (such as Bemba) and a more prepositional locative system (such as Swati), it was shown that Cuwabo has retained more features from the Proto-Bantu locative system than Makhuwa. It remains to be seen whether the differences observed between the two languages are due to a divergence process (in which case Makhuwa would be more innovative), or other factors, such as language contact. A comparative study involving the locative systems of other North-Mozambican languages would be needed to shed further light on these results.

## References

- Alsina, Alex & Sam A. Mchombo. 1993. Object asymmetries and the Chichewa applicative construction. In Mchombo, Sam A. (ed.) *Theoretical aspects of Bantu grammar*. Stanford: CSLI (Center for the Study of Language and Information), 17-45.
- Barlow, A. Ruffell. 1960. *Studies in Kikuyu grammar and idiom*. Printed for the Foreign Mission Committee of the Church of Scotland by W. Blackwood.
- Buell, Leston C., 2012. Class 17 as a non-locative noun class in Zulu. *Journal of African Languages and Linguistics* 33: 1-35.
- Buell, Leston C. 2007. Semantic and formal locatives: Implications for the Bantu locative inversion typology. *SOAS Working Papers in Linguistics* 15: 105-120.
- Creissels, Denis. 2011. Tswana locatives and their status in the inversion construction. *Africana Linguistica* 17: 33-52.
- Demuth, Katherine and Sheila Mmusi. 1997. Presentational focus and thematic structure in comparative Bantu. *Journal of African Languages and Linguistics* 18: 1-19.
- Grégoire, Claire. 1975. *Les locatifs en bantou*. Tervuren: Musée royal de l'Afrique Centrale.
- Guérois, Rozenn. 2014. Locative inversion in Cuwabo. *ZAS Papers in Linguistics* 57: 49-71.
- Guérois, Rozenn. 2015. *A grammar of Cuwabo (Mozambique, Bantu P34)* [PhD dissertation]. Lyon: University of Lyon 2.
- Güldemann, Tom. 1999. Head-initial meets head-final: nominal suffixes in Eastern and Southern Bantu from a historical perspective. *Studies in African Linguistics* 28(1): 49-91.
- Guthrie, Malcolm. 1948. *The classification of the Bantu languages*. London: Oxford University Press.

- Hulstaert, Gustave. 1966. *Grammaire du Lomongo*. Troisième partie: Syntaxe. Tervuren: Musée royal de l'Afrique Centrale.
- Kula, Nancy C. 2012. Nominal compounding and associative phrases in Bemba. In Brenzinger, M. & A.-M. Fehn (eds.). *Proceedings of the 6th World Congress of African Linguistics (Cologne 2009)*. Cologne: Rüdiger Köppe, 431-441.
- Kula, Nancy C. and Lutz Marten. 2010. Argument structure and agency in Bemba passives. In Karsten Legère and Christina Thornell (eds.) *Bantu Languages: Analyses, Description and Theory (East African Languages and Dialects)*. Cologne: Rüdiger Köppe: 115-130.
- Maho, Jouni Filip. 2009. NUGL Online: The online version of the New Updated Guthrie List, a referential classification of the Bantu languages. Consulted online on November 2015 at <http://goto.glocalnet.net/mahopapers/nuglonline.pdf>
- Marten, Lutz. 2006. Locative Inversion in Otjiherero: more on morpho-syntactic variation in Bantu. *ZAS Papers in Linguistics* 43: 97-122.
- Marten, Lutz. 2010. Great siSwati Locative Shift. In Breitbarth *et al.* *Continuity and change in Grammar*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Marten, Lutz. 2012. Agreement in locative phrases in Luganda. In Brenzinger, M. & A.-M. Fehn (eds.), *Proceedings of the 6th World Congress of African Linguistics (Cologne 2009)*. Cologne: Rüdiger Köppe, 433-443.
- Marten, Lutz, Nancy C. Kula, & Nhlanhla Thwala. 2007. Parameters of morphosyntactic variation in Bantu. *Transactions of the Philological Society* 105(3): 253-338.
- Mchombo, Sam A. 2004. *The syntax of Chichewa*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mugane, John M. 1997. *A Paradigmatic Grammar of Gikūyū*. Stanford: CSLI (Center for the Study of Language and Information) publications.
- Petzell, Malin. 2008. *The Kagulu language of Tanzania: Grammar, Texts and Vocabulary*. Cologne: Rüdiger Köppe.
- Rubanza, Yunus I. 1988. *Linear Order in Haya Verbal Morphology: Theoretical Implications* [PhD. thesis]. Chicago: Michigan State University.
- Samson, Ridder & Thilo Schadeberg. 1994. Kiinimacho cha mahali: kiambishi tamati cha mahali -ni. *Afrikanistische Arbeitspapiere* 37: 127-138.
- Van der Wal, Jenneke. 2009. *Word order and information structure in Makhuwa-Enahara* [PhD dissertation]. Utrecht: LOT (Landelijke Onderzoekschool Taalwetenschap) Publication.