

<http://dx.doi.org/10.4314/gjl.v9i2.1>

LOCATIVE-SUBJECT ALTERNATION CONSTRUCTIONS IN KIWOSO

Aurelia Mallya

Abstract

Locative subject alternation constructions show variation within and across languages in terms of subject agreement pattern and the type of predicates involved. In Kiwoso, the preverbal locative DPs with and without locative morphology are best analysed as canonical subjects, as evidenced by the subject diagnostics, such as subject-verb agreement and its occurrence as a subject of passive verb and relative verb clauses. The examined examples demonstrate that the postverbal subject neither behaves like canonical subject nor shows features of canonical object in that it cannot passivize in alternation constructions or appear on the verb as an object marker (i.e., cannot be object marked). However, there is strong evidence to suggest that the preverbal locative (subject) DP in Kiwoso locative-subject alternation constructions is a grammatical subject. As in most languages, locative-subject constructions in Kiwoso serve a pragmatic-discourse function of presentational focus. The locative subject argument of the locative-subject alternation constructions is interpreted as a topic, whereas the postverbal thematic subject of these sentences is understood as focus. The postverbal subject provides information which is usually discourse new in relation to preverbal locative DPs. The data examined from Kiwoso challenges the view that formal and semantic locative inversions cannot co-exist in a single language.

Keywords: Morphosyntax, Bantu language, Kiwoso, locative inversion

1.0 Introduction

Bantu languages exhibit a great deal of morphosyntactic variation. A well attested domain of variation is locative inversion, particularly the so-called formal locative inversion (Bresnan & Kanerva 1989; Buell 2007). The formal locative inversion is an area which has been extensively studied from both typological and theoretical viewpoints across languages (see Bresnan & Kanerva 1989; Machobane 1995; Demuth

& Mmusi 1997; Zeller 2013, Guérois 2014; Marten & van de Wal 2015). In these constructions, the locative DP takes subject position, and the DP denoting logical subject occurs in the postverbal position.

It has also been established that locative inversion constructions vary considerably cross-linguistically in relation to the status of the preverbal locative DP and the predicate types that participate in these alternation constructions (see Marten & van de Wal 2015). This paper aims to contribute to the existing body of literature in this area by examining locative-subject alternation constructions, using fresh data from a less-known Bantu language, Kiwoso.

Kiwoso is an eastern Bantu language spoken predominantly in Kilimanjaro region, Tanzania. In the Languages of Tanzania Project conducted in 2009 (LoT 2009), it was reported that Kiwoso is spoken approximately by 81,000 people who are scattered in different districts of the Kilimanjaro region. The native speakers of Kiwoso are mainly found in Moshi (rural), Hai, Siha, and Moshi (town) districts. Maho (2009) classifies Kiwoso as one of the languages under zone E, code number 60 (Chagga group). Kiwoso is specifically coded as E621D (Maho 2009).

Although formal locative inversion has been widely researched, evidence suggests that studies on semantic locative inversion constructions in Bantu languages are scarce. On the one hand, formal locative inversion constructions and semantic locative inversion constructions are structurally similar in that both exhibit variations in terms of agreement morphology and thematic restrictions across Bantu languages (see Bresnan & Kanerva 1989; Demuth & Mmusi 1997; Marten et al 2007). On the other hand, the two constructions are different in that, in formal locative inversion, the locative subject argument is morphologically marked, while in the semantic locative inversion, the locative subject argument has no morphological marker (Buell 2012). The present paper aims to provide a unified analysis of formal and semantic locative inversion constructions by examining locative-subject alternation constructions in Kiwoso. It has been argued that the two types of alternations are significant in terms of information structure or pragmatic-discourse effect (Mallya 2016; Marten & Gibson 2016).

Buell (2007:108) postulates that formal and semantic locative inversion constructions are similar; hence they cannot co-exist in a single language. His conclusion is based on the similarities observed between Herero formal locative inversion and Zulu semantic locative inversion. Buell (2007:111) states that formal locative inversion and semantic locative inversion in Herero and Zulu, respectively, share four syntactic characteristics, namely word order, subject agreement that varies according to the preposed locative, ability to suppress an agent, and inability to suppress an unaccusative theme. Buell (2007:111) adds that Herero formal locative inversion and Zulu semantic locative inversion are also semantically similar in that the two

constructions denote impersonal reading when the agent is suppressed. Based on the five factors, Buell maintains that formal locative and semantic locative are equivalent, hence occupy the same slot in the locative inversion typology, thus cannot co-exist in a single language. The present paper seeks to contribute to the existing body of knowledge on the morphosyntactic and discourse-pragmatic interfaces of locative-subject alternation constructions, but most importantly, using fresh data from a less studied Bantu language, Kiwoso, to show the co-existence of the two variants.

Generally, locative-subject alternation constructions are the type of inversion constructions which encompass both formal and semantic locative inversions. In Bantu languages, locative-subject alternation constructions show two types of alternates, namely the alternate with subject argument taking locative morphology, and the other type with subject argument without locative morphology (see Guérois 2014; Mallya 2016). The former has been termed as the formal locative, while the latter has been referred to as semantic locative (Buell 2007).

This paper covers several aspects related to locative-subject alternation constructions in Kiwoso. Section 2 focuses on the general morphology and syntax of locative nouns in Bantu. Key aspects of locative inversion constructions are presented in section 2.1. In this part, properties of the preverbal locative subject and the postverbal thematic subject are highlighted. In order to prepare readers to follow discussions on locative-subject alternations presented in this paper, section 3 provides the morphosyntactic pattern of locative nouns in Kiwoso. This is followed by the core subject of this paper, which is the discussion on locative-subject alternations presented in section 4. In section 4, the status of the preverbal locative nouns and the postverbal DP in Kiwoso is unveiled. The class of verbs that participate in locative-subject alternation constructions in Kiwoso and the information structure of locative-subject alternation constructions is also presented in section 4. Section 5 provides the conclusion based on the data discussed in this paper.

2.0 Morphosyntactic properties of locative nouns in Bantu

This section presents a general overview of locative nouns in Bantu. Some key information on the morphology of locatives is highlighted to enable readers to easily follow the discussion on locative inversion in the next subsection, and the locative-subject alternation constructions (as presented in section 4), which is the core theme of the present paper.

Generally, locative marking in Bantu is part of the noun class system. There are three locative noun classes that have been reconstructed for Proto-Bantu, namely **pa*, referring to proximate or specific location, **ku-*, denoting distal or non-specific location, and **mu-*, referring to inside location. The three prefixes are assigned classes

16, 17 and 18, respectively. The three prefixes trigger agreement on verbs, as Bemba examples in (1) demonstrate (Marten 2010:3).

- (1) a. *Pà-ngándápà-lì àbà-nà*
16-9house 16-be 2-children
'There are children at home.'
- b. *Kú-ngándá kwà- lí-is- à áb-èni*
17-9house 17-RecPast- come- FV 2-guests
'Visitors have come to the house.'
- c. *Mù-ngándá mù-lé- ímb- á ábà-nà*
18-9house 18-PROGR-sing- FV 2-children
'The children are singing in the house.'

The existing evidence suggests that not all languages exhibit a three-way locative noun class prefix system on derived nouns. Languages such as Kiswahili use an invariant locative suffix *-ni* to derive locative nouns. However, the three-way distinction between classes 16-18 is still obtained on nominal modifiers and verb agreement in Kiswahili. Examples in (2) are illustrative (Carsten 1997:400).

- (2) a. *nyumba-ni kwangu ni ku-zuri*
9house-LOC 17myCOP 19good
'My place is nice.'
- b. *nyumba-ni mw-angu m-na- nukia*
9house-LOC 18-my PRES-smell good
'Inside my house smells good.'
- c. *nyumba-ni pa-ngu pa-na wa-tu wengi*
9house-LOC 16my 16be 2people 2many
'There are many people at my place.'

Furthermore, studies indicate that, in some other Bantu languages, both prefix and suffix are used together to derive locative nouns. For example, in siSwati, locative noun class 25 (*e-*) and the suffix *-(i)ni* are used jointly to derive locative nouns, as shown in (3) (Marten 2012:434).

- (3) *e- ndl- ini*
 25- house-LOC
 ‘At the house.’

Generally, a majority of Bantu languages exhibit prefixes, suffixes or both as a strategy for changing ordinary nouns into locatives. In many Bantu languages, agreement pattern is mostly marked by the locative prefixes regardless of the strategies employed to derive the locative nouns.

2.1 The general overview of locative inversion in Bantu

Before embarking on the discussion about locative-subject alternation constructions in Kiwoso, it is worth highlighting the general morphosyntactic properties of locative inversion constructions in Bantu. The discussion presented in this section is mainly based on the so-called formal locative inversion. This inversion type has been widely studied across Bantu languages compared to, for example, semantic locative inversion.

Generally, locative inversion is one of the grammatical changing relations constructions in Bantu. This inversion varies considerably across Bantu languages and even within individual languages. In locative inversion, a locative DP occurs in the preverbal position, whereas the thematic subject DP appears postverbally. A classical example from Chichewa is provided in (4) and (5) (Bresnan & Kanerva 1989:3).

- (4) a. *Chi- tsime chi-li ku-mu-dzi*
 7-well 7SM-be 17-3-village
 ‘The well is in the village.’
- b. *Ku-mu-dzi ku-li chi-tsime*
 17-3-village 17-be 7-well
 ‘In the village is a well.’
- (5) a. *A-lendo-wo a-na- bwer-a ku-mu-dzi*
 2-visitor-2those 2SM-REC PST- come-IND 17-3-village
 ‘Those visitors came to the village.’
- b. *Ku-mu-dzi ku-na- bwer-a'a-lendo-wo*
 17-3-village 17-REC PST- come-IND 2-visitor-2 those
 ‘To the village came those visitors.’

Example sentences in (4a) and (5a) alternate with (4b) and (5b), respectively. In the examples, on the one hand, the locative DP *kumudzi* ‘in the village’ in (4b) and (5b) precedes the verb and it triggers agreement on the verb. On the other hand, the logical subject DPs *chitsime* in (4b) and *alendowo* ‘those visitors’ in (5b) remain in the postverbal position. It is clear that locative inversion constructions in Bantu languages and cross-linguistically involve positional reordering of the subject and the locative DP, as demonstrated above. The present paper examines the properties of the locative DP with and without locative morphology, and the logical subject in postverbal position in Kiwoso locative-subject alternation constructions.

As it has been mentioned in the introduction, the status of the preverbal locative DP and the postverbal thematic subject is one of the key debates surrounding studies on locative inversion across Bantu languages. Evidence suggests that, in the majority of these languages, the locative DP is the subject in that it is involved in subject-verb agreement (see examples 4b and 5b), and it undergoes passivization and relativization. However, the thematic subject lacks object properties, as it cannot passivize (6) or be object marked (7) (i.e., an object marker appearing on the verb), as Chichewa examples demonstrate (Bresnan & Karneva 1989:14-15).

- (6) a. ***Ku-mu-dzi ku-na- bwer-a'a-lendo-wo***
 17-3-village 17-REC PST-come-IND 2-visitor-2 those=
 ‘To the village came those visitors.’
- b. * ***A-lendô-wo a-na- bwér-édw-á ndíku-mu-dzi***
 2-visitor-2those 2SM-REC.PST-come-PASS-IND by 17-3-village
 ‘The visitors were come by to the village.’
- (7) * ***Ku-mu-dzi ku-na- wá-bwér-a a-lendô-wo***
 17-3-village 17-REC-PST- 2OM-come-IND 2-visitor-2those
 ‘To the village came them, those visitors.’

It is generally accepted that preverbal locative DP is a grammatical subject in many Bantu languages, as Chichewa examples demonstrate. This is also the case in Kiwoso, as detailed in section 4. With regard to the properties of postverbal subject, it is also widely agreed that across Bantu languages it is neither the canonical subject nor typical object, as evidenced in the examples presented in this paper from Chichewa and Kiwoso. The following section highlights the morphosyntactic pattern of locative nouns in Kiwoso before getting on with locative-subject alternation constructions, the actual focus of the present paper.

3.0 Locative nouns in Kiwoso: an overview

Similar to many other Bantu languages, Kiwoso is characterized by a noun class system (see Mallya 2016 for an overview of Kiwoso noun classes). The nouns in the class system are distinguished from one another based on noun class prefixes which also determine agreement with modifiers, as (8) indicates. As mentioned in section 2, nominal classes in Bantu include the locative nouns which are traditionally assigned classes 16, 17, and 18. For the majority of Bantu languages, the prefixes of the respective classes control agreement with the locative nouns and that of other dependents, as demonstrated in section 2. Example sentences from Kiwoso are provided in (9).

- (8) a. *wa-na wa-le fik- a wa-ka-da- a muda*
 2-child 2- PST- arrive-FV 2- did- fetch-FV 9water
 ‘Children arrived and did fetch water.’
- b. *shi-liko shoose shi-le- dook- a*
 8-spoon 8all 8- PST-break- FV
 ‘All spoons broke.’

Although most of the Bantu languages exhibit the traditional locative classes (16-18), in some other Bantu languages, the locative system has changed in different ways. For example, locative nouns in Kiwoso are exclusively marked by the suffix *-(e)n*. However, agreement with other dependent elements of the locative nouns is marked invariantly by the locative class 17 prefix *ku-*. This is illustrated in (9).

- (9) a. *duk- en ko-ke ku-iho shi-ndo shi-fye*
 9shop-LOC 17-his/her 17-be 8-good 8-many
 ‘In his/her shop there is many things (products).’
- b. *n-nd- en ku- le- dem- o na wa-ka*
 9-field- LOC 17-PST-cultivate-Passive by 2-woman
 ‘In/at the field was cultivated by women.’

Unlike many Bantu languages, the locative prefix *ku-* in Kiwoso cannot be prefixed to ordinary nouns to reclassify them into locative nouns. Instead, ordinary nouns are reclassified into locatives by attaching the suffix *-(e)n-*, as shown in Table 1. Note that place names in Kiwoso are inherently locative in the sense that no specific morphology is required to derive locative interpretation, as Table 1 also indicates.

Table 1: Locative nouns in Kiwoso

underived noun	gloss	derived noun [+ (e)n]	Gloss	Inherent locatives [-(e)n]	gloss
<i>duka</i>	shop	<i>duken</i>	at/in the shop	<i>kinaange</i>	market
<i>ruko</i>	kitchen	<i>rukon</i>	in/at the kitchen	<i>shuule</i>	school
<i>nnda</i>	field	<i>nnden</i>	in/at the field	<i>Aruusa</i>	Arusha
<i>nungu</i>	pot	<i>nungun</i>	in the pot	<i>ntudu</i>	forest
<i>muda</i>	water	<i>muden</i>	in the water	<i>misa</i>	church
<i>ruwa</i>	pond	<i>ruwen</i>	in the pond	<i>mmba</i>	house

In summary, locative marking exhibits cross-linguistic differences. On the one hand, the majority of the Bantu languages employ prefixes of classes 16-18, which also trigger agreement on dependent element. On the other hand, there are few languages including Kiwoso that mark locative nouns through suffixes. For the languages that employ suffixes, one or all of the locative prefixes of classes 16-18 still occur(s) in the agreement system of the respective nouns, as is the case for Kiwoso in (9) and Kiswahili (see Carsten 1997:402). Section 4 examines the locative-subject alternations constructions in order to establish the status of the preverbal locative subject argument and the postverbal logical subject argument.

This paper employed qualitative methodology as it is based on characterizing native speakers' internalized linguistic knowledge that underlies their judgments on the (un)acceptability of sentences expressing locative-subject alternations in Kiwoso. To achieve this, I had to compile locative-subject alternation constructions in Kiswahili. The sentences were given to two native and competent speakers of Kiwoso to translate them into their language (i.e., Kiwoso). The translated sentences were then given to other four Kiwoso native speakers to give their judgments on the extent to which the sentences sound 'good' or 'bad' (acceptability judgements). Further information was obtained through written documents including Mallya (2016) and Kagaya and Olomy (2009). Examples from other languages used in this paper were taken from various sources and they are acknowledged accordingly.

4.0 Locative-subject alternation constructions in Kiwoso

As demonstrated in the introduction, the present paper offers a unified analysis of formal and semantic locative inversions constructions, which in this paper are compositionally referred to as locative-subject alternation constructions. Locative-

subject alternation constructions are widely attested in Bantu languages. The debate about these alternation constructions has revolved around several issues, namely the predicates that participate in the alternations, the status of locative DP as subject, the properties of inverted subject, and the discourse function of the constructions (see Bresnan & Kanerva 1989; Bresnan 1994).

In Bantu languages including Kiwoso, locative-subject alternation constructions involve two types of alternates. In the first variant, the subject argument appears with locative morphology (10a). In this type, the locative DPs that function as subject contain the locative suffix *(-e)n* and involve locative prefix *ku-* in the subject-verb agreement, as shown in (10a). In the second alternate, the locative subject argument is not morphologically marked by the locative suffix, thus the bare noun subject determines the subject agreement on verbs, as (10b) demonstrates (see also Guérois 2014; Marten & van de Wal 2015:17).

- (10) a. *duk- en ku- le- ch- a wa-ndu*
9shop-LOC 17- PST- come-FV 2-people
'At the shop visited people.'
- b. *duka lyi-le- ch- a wa-ndu*
9shop 9-PST- visit- FV 2-people
'The shop (is the place where) people visited.'

However, Marten and van de Wal (2015) point out that, in languages such as Zulu, siSwati, and Bemba, semantic locative inversion is impossible. They further argue that for the languages such as Kiswahili where both forms are present, the two constructions are pragmatically different. They maintain that, in the formal locative inversion constructions, the location is stressed, but the semantic locative inversion construction is mainly associated withthetic statements. The present paper examines the two forms of constructions in order to establish their characteristics in relation to the status of preverbal locative subject as well as their discourse-pragmatic function in Kiwoso.

As stated in the introduction, locative-subject alternation constructions in Kiwoso, as is the case in most Bantu languages, involve the reordering of the position of the subject DP and the locative DP which affects the agreement pattern on the verb. In these types of constructions, the preverbal position is occupied by the locative DP, whereas the theme DP occurs in the postverbal position, as shown in (11).

- (11) a. *wa-na wa- le- id- a duk- en*
 2-child 2SM-PST- enter-FV 9shop-LOC
 ‘Children entered into the shop.’
- b. *duk- en ku- le- id- a wa-na*
 9shop-LOC 17- PST-enter-FV 2-child
 ‘Into the shop entered children.’
- c.= *duka lyi- le- id- a wa-na*
 9shop 9SM-PST-enter-FV 2-child
 ‘The shop (is the place where) children entered.’

The sentences in (11b-c) are similar in terms of propositional content, but they are syntactically and discourse-pragmatically different. In (11a), an agent argument occurs in preverbal position, while the locative DP appears in the postverbal position. The order is reversed in (11b-c) in that the locative subject DP with locative morphology in (11b) and without locative morphology in (11c) occupies the subject position and exhibits the features typical of the subject. Such transposition is also manifested in the agreement properties. Examples indicate that, whereas in (11b) the verb agrees with the locative prefix *ku-*, in (11c), the verbs agree with the nominal class prefix of the respective noun in the subject position. In example (11a), the preverbal DP *wana* ‘children’ is understood as an agent argument of the construction, whereas the postverbal *duken* ‘in/at the shop’ is interpreted as locative complement. On the contrary, in (11b) and (11c), the preverbal subject arguments DPs with and without locative morphology, respectively, are grammatical subjects.

4.1 The status of locative DP in preverbal position

Studies show that the preverbal subject argument of locative-subject alternations constructions in the majority of Bantu languages exhibits subject properties (Bresnan & Kanerva 1989; Bresnan 1994; Demuth & Mmusi 1997; Marten & van der Wal 2014). This is evidenced in its ability to trigger agreement on the verb (12a) and occurrence in relative clause constructions (12b), as examples from Chichewa in (12) demonstrate.

- (12) a. *ku-mu-dzi ku-li chi-tsime*
 17-3-village 17-be 7-well
 ‘In the village is a well’ (Bresnan & Kanerva 1989:7)

- b. *n'pâ- ti [pa-méné p- á- im- á nkhandwe]?*
 COP16-Q 16-REL 16-REL-PRF-stand- IND 9fox
 'In which place is standing the fox?' (Bresnan 1994:94)

However, the available evidence suggests that within Bantu family, in languages such as Tswana and Sesotho, the preverbal DPs are syntactically topic rather than subject for the reason that the preverbal locative phrases in inversion constructions in Tswana and Sesotho do not trigger agreement between the locative phrases and the verb, instead locative phrases exhibit default agreement (Zerbian 2006, Marten 2011). Examples from Sesotho (Zerbian 2006:368) and Tswana (Demuth & Mmusi (1997:4) in (13a) and (13b), respectively, illustrate this.

- (13) a. *Mo-tse-ng go tla ba-eti*
 3-village- 17 come 2-visitor
 'To the village come visitors'
- b. *Fá-se-tlharé-ng gó-émé ba-simané*
 16-7-tree- LOC 17-stand.PERF 2-boy
 'At the tree are standing boys'

The properties of the preverbal locative DPs in Tswana and Sesotho prompted Zerbian (2006: 361) to argue strongly that the preposed locatives followed by class 17 agreement, as in the examples above, cannot be considered a case of locative inversion in which the preverbal locative functions as grammatical subject in the sentence, instead such sentences have to be considered impersonal (expletive) constructions with a preposed locative expression. The analysis of locative inversion as expletive is based on the absence of subject-verb agreement, which shows instead default agreement. These properties distinguish Tswana and Sesotho locative alternation constructions from the analysis presented in this paper and that in the majority of other Bantu languages, such as Chichewa (Bresnan & Kanerva 1989) and Cwabo (Guérois 2014).

The data in Kiwoso show that locative DP occupies subject position and passes various subjecthood diagnostics. For example, locative DP triggers subject-verb agreement (see examples in 11b-c). It also functions as the subject of passive sentences (14) and appears in relative verb clauses (15).

- (14) a. *duk- en ku- le- id- o na wa-na*
 9shop-LOC 17- PST- enter- Passive by 2-child
 'Into the shop was entered by the children.' (Intended: 'The shop was entered by the children.')

- b. *duka lyi-le- id- o na wa-na*
 9shop- 9SM-PST-enter-Passive by 2-child
 ‘The shop was entered by the children.’
- (15) a. *duk- en ko- id- a wa-na ku-dach-a*
 9shop-LOC 17-enter-FV 2-child 17-leak- FV
 ‘Into to the shop where children enter leaks.’
- b. *duka lya- id- a wa-na lyi-dach-a*
 9shop 9SM-enter-FV 2-child 17-leak-FV
 ‘The shop where children enter leaks.’

The data examined indicate that locative-subject alternation constructions in Kiwoso involve the reversal of grammatical relations in that the locative DP occurs in subject position, as evidenced in the agreement (11b-c), passive verb constructions (14) and relative verb clauses (15). Generally, these characteristics strongly confirm that the preverbal locative DPs in Kiwoso locative-subject inversion constructions are typical subjects. Similar results have been reported in many other Bantu languages, as shown in section 2.1.

4.2 The locative subject prefix as an expletive

The term expletive is a word that is syntactically significant but lacks semantic content. With regard to syntax, expletives are words which are characterized as dummy subjects (Khumalo 2010). Contrary to grammatical subjects, expletive subjects exhibit invariable agreement on the verb (see examples in 13). Demuth and Mmusi (1997) claim that languages that show more than one type of locative prefixes in subject-verb agreement are the only ones that can retain locative reference of the prefixes when the locative subject is dropped. These authors accentuate that, if a language has one productive locative prefix in agreement pattern, such a prefix lacks locative meaning, and it is thus interpreted as an expletive. Other scholars have supported this idea arguing that for Southern Bantu languages such as Swati (Marten 2010), Zulu (Buell 2012), Tswana and Southern Sotho (Creissels 2011) the invariable subject marker of class 17 *ku-* is mostly used as an expletive.

In this case, the locative nouns in the preverbal position in the southern Bantu languages, for instance Swati, cannot be interpreted as grammatical subjects (Marten 2010). According to Marten, the locative noun in the preverbal position is interpreted as an expletive just because of its inability to trigger agreement on verbs. Generally, in Southern Bantu languages, the locative prefix 17 *ku-* has lost its locative semantics and

most analysis indicates that such a prefix functions as expletive subject marker (Marten 2010; Buell 2012). The findings from the southern Bantu languages are contrary to many other Bantu languages including Kiwoso, as demonstrated in this paper.

Locative-subject alternation constructions examined in Kiwoso indicate that only one locative prefix (*ku-*) triggers agreement on verbs. The sentences examined attest that the prefix *ku-* in Kiwoso has locative reference contrary to the views of Demuth and Mmusi (1997) and the findings from other scholars for Southern Bantu languages, such as Swati (Marten 2010) and Zulu (Buell 2012). The findings establish further that the prefix *ku-* in Kiwoso is semantically significant in that it is used to denote a definite location which can be inferred from the context even when the location is not explicitly mentioned, as illustrated in the example sentences in (16).

- (16) a. *ku- le- ch- a wa-ndu (kinaange)*
 17-PST- come-FV 2-people(market)
 ‘There came people at the market.’
- b. *ku- le- damy-a wa-ka (ki-di- n)*
 17-PST-sit- FV 2-woman (7-chair-LOC)
 ‘There sat women (on the chair).’
- c. *ku- ka- a fuko (ma-rin-en)*
 17-live-FV 10moles (6-hole-LOC)
 ‘There live moles (in the holes).’

Example sentences in (16) show that the locative prefix *ku-* in Kiwoso has locative semantic content, thus it has subject argument interpretation rather than impersonal reading (the reading that lacks a grammatical subject). The locative subject prefix *ku-* in (16) is associated with an implicit locative subject that denotes location which is contextually determined and inferred from the shared interaction of interlocutors. Generally, in Kiwoso, the prefix is conceived as a locative argument denoting certain location. Based on the examined sentences, the findings demonstrate that there is no relationship between verbal markers inventories and the interpretation of locative prefixes, contrary to Demuth and Mmusi’s (1997) proposal. In Kiwoso, the locative prefix *ku-* appears as concord marker in the verbal morphology and in all other dependent elements. However, the prefix is not inflected in the derivation of locative nouns, as shown in this paper.

4.3 The status of the inverted subject

It is well known that in locative-subject alternation constructions across Bantu languages the preverbal locative can be omitted or postposed, but the postverbal logical subject cannot, and has to appear immediately after the verb (Bresnan & Kanerva 1989; Marten 2010). The locative-subject alternation constructions examined in Kiwoso demonstrate that, like the canonical object, the postverbal DP occupies object position. However, the data indicate that the postverbal DP in these constructions lack properties typical of canonical object. For example, in Kiwoso, the inverted subject cannot be used in passive verb constructions or be associated with an object agreement prefix, as exemplified in (17). These properties set the inverted subject apart from the prototypical object relation in Kiwoso.

- (17) a. * *wa-na wa- le- id- o duk- en*
 2-child 2SM-PST- enter- Passive 9shop-LOC
- b. * *duk- en ku- le- wa- id- a wa-na*
 9shop-LOC 17- PST-OM enter-FV 2-child

Considering the tests employed in the example sentences in (17) (i.e., passive verb constructions and object agreement prefix), it can be concluded that the postverbal thematic subject *wana* ‘children’ lack object properties regardless of the fact that it occupies the position typical of object relation. Similar results have been reported in several other Bantu languages, such as Chichewa (Bresnan & Kanerva 1989), Sesotho (Machabane 1995), and Cuwabo (Guérois 2014), to mention but a few.

Another test employed to establish the object status of the inverted subject is its position in relation to the verb. In Bantu languages including Kiwoso, any canonical object follows the verb; unlike subject argument, it can be omitted and can also be separated from the verb. Similar to other Bantu languages such as Chichewa (Bresnan & Kanerva 1989), Cuwabo (Guérois 2014) and Lubukusu (Diercks 2011), the inverted subject in locative-subject alternation constructions in Kiwoso lacks the aforementioned features in that it cannot be omitted or separated from the verb, as shown in (18) and (19), respectively.

- (18) a. *wa-na wa- le- lal- a ki-tar- en*
 2-child 2SM-PST-sleep-FV 7-bed-LOC
 ‘Children slept on the bed.’

- b. * *kitar- en ku- le- lal- a*
 7-bed-LOC 17-PST sleep-FV
 ‘*On the bed slept’
- c. * *kitara ki- le- lal- a*
 7-bed 7SM-PST-enter-FV
 ‘The bed (is the place where) slept.’
- (19) a. *kinaange ku- le- ch- a wa-ka*
 market 17- PST-come- FV 2-woman
 ‘At the market (there) came women.’
- b. * *ku- le- ch- a kinaange wa-ka*
 17- PST- come- FV market 2-woman
 ‘There came at the market women.’
- c. * *ku- le- end-a shuule wa-na*
 17- PST-go-FV school 2-child
 ‘There went to school children.’

The properties of postverbal logical subject exemplified in section 4.3 provide clear evidence that such an element shows the discourse-pragmatic meaning of being focused as part of the entire utterance, that is presentational focus. The same conclusion has been derived in several studies on locative inversion constructions in other Bantu languages, as examples from Chichewa (Bresnan & Kanerva 1989), Tswana (Demuth & Mmusi 1997), and Cuwabo (Guérois 2014) indicate.

In summary, this section has presented the morphosyntax of locative-subject alternation constructions in Kiwoso. The data examined demonstrate that Kiwoso exhibit two types of locative-subject alternations. One variant exhibits subject argument with locative morphology and the other one shows subject argument without locative morphology. The co-existence of the two inversion constructions in a single language has also been reported in Cuwabo (see Guérois 2014).

This paper has shown that the two alternations share similar but not identical interpretations, as section 4.5 clarifies. The sentences examined indicate that the locative DP in preverbal position exhibits properties of the canonical subject, but the postverbal DP lacks object characteristics. The following sub-section discusses thematic constraints of locative-subject alternations in Kiwoso.

4.4. Argument structure of the locative-subject alternation constructions

Evidence suggests that predicate types undergoing locative-subject alternations vary considerably across languages and even within a single language (Marten 2006; van der Wal & Marten 2015). However, Marten and van der Wal in particular argue that there is an implicational hierarchy with more marked forms of locative-subject suggesting the presence of more unmarked features. The following table (adopted from Marten and van de Wal 2015:15) summarizes the properties of locative-subject alternations in relation to predicate type restriction for a sample of Bantu languages. Note that information about Kiwoso has been added to illustrate the case in this language.

Table 2: Predicate restriction

Languages	Verbs that participate in locative-subject alternations							Source
	Unacc.	Unerg.	Trans.	Pass.ditr	Cop.	Pass.tr	Ditrans	
Chichewa	√	*	*	*	*	√	*	Bresnan & Kanerva (1989)
Tswana	√	√	*	√	√	√	*	Demuth & Mmusi (1997)
Otjiherero	√	√	√	√	√	√	*	Marten (2006)
Lubukusu	√	√	*	*	√	√	*	Diercks (2011)
Ndebele	√	√	√	*	√	√	*	Marten (2006)
Kiwoso	√	√	*	√	√	√	*	
Chiluba	*	*	*	*	√	√	*	Marten (2014)
Shona	√	*	*	*	√	√	*	Harford (1990)
Sesotho	√	√	*	√	√	√	√	Machabane (1995)
Digo	√	√	√	*	√	√	*	Diercks (2011)
Cuwabo	√	√	*	√	√	√	*	Guérois (2014)

The analysis done in relation to locative-subject alternation constructions in Kiwoso indicates that verbs undergoing alternations in this particular language are not homogenous. The findings demonstrate that the majority of verbs that participate in locative-subject alternation constructions in Kiwoso are intransitive verbs, particularly those denoting prototypical unaccusative properties. However, there is evidence that locative-subject alternation constructions in Kiwoso are not restricted to unaccusative verbs. It has been established that other semantic verb classes such as passive verbs (20), transitive, and passivized-ditransitive (21), as well as unergative (22) verbs can also undergo locative-subject alternation. This is exemplified in (20-22).

-
- (20) *nungu- n ku- le- kor- o kelya* *passive- transitive*
 9pot- LOC 17-PST-cook-PASS 7food
 ‘In the pot was cooked food.’
- (21) *sanduku-n ku-le- bhik-o ki-tabu* *passivized ditransitive*
 locker- LOC 17-PST-keep-PASS 7-book
 ‘In the locker was kept a book.’
- (22) *nnde- n ku- le- dem- o* *passive unergative*
 5field-LOC 17-PST-cultivate-PASS
 ‘In the field was cultivated.’

Generally, the data examined point out that ditransitive verbs cannot undergo locative-subject alternations in Kiwoso, as the ungrammaticality of the sentences in (23) demonstrates. This is common in the majority of Bantu languages, as Table 1 also indicates.

- (23) * *sanduku-n ku- le- surum- a kitabu* *ditransitive*
 locker- LOC 17-PST-hide- FV 7book
 ‘In the locker hid a book.’

The data from Kiwoso presented in this paper indicate that there is no relationship between agreement morphology and the thematic structure of the locative inversion constructions. This is because languages such as Tswana and Otjiherero are morphologically different from Kiwoso but closely related in terms of thematic restriction. In Tswana and Otjiherero, all the three locative prefixes are active, and they all trigger agreement on verbs (see Marten 2006). In Kiwoso, the locative prefixes are unproductive except for class 17 prefix *ku-*, which is exclusively used in agreement morphology. The examined data suggest further that the two factors, agreement morphology and thematic restriction, should be treated differently in the analysis of parameters of variations in Bantu locative inversion constructions in particular, and in locative-subject alternations sentences in general.

4.5 Information structure of locative-subject alternation constructions

Locative-subject alternation constructions are not used in free variation. Scholars have established that the two alternates are significant in terms of how information is structured (Marten & de van Wal 2015:13; Marten & Gibson 2016). For example, it has been ascertained that in many Bantu languages locative inversion constructions are

discourse-pragmatically significant in that the preverbal locative DP serves as a background topic or scene-setting topic, whilst the postverbal logical subject DP encodes focus and is basically associated with new information (Marten & de van Wal 2015:13; Marten & Gibson 2016).

In Kiwoso, locative-subject alternation constructions indicate different information packaging strategies of sentences that share similar semantic propositions. Information packaging constructions such as locative-subject alternation deviate from the basic word order, thus achieving a specific information structural effect in that in locative-subject alternation constructions the preverbal locative DP is a topic whereas the postverbal subject is a focus, as exemplified in (24).

- (24) a. *ki-tar-en ku- le- lal- a wa- na tubu*
 7-bed-LOC2- 17- PST-sleep-FV 2SM child *only*
 ‘On the bed slept children only.’ (Intended: ‘Only children slept on the bed.’)
- b. *nnde- n ku- le- dem- o soko tubu*
 5field-LOC 17-PST-cultivate-PASS 9beans only
 ‘In the field was cultivated beans only.’ (Intended: ‘Only beans were cultivated in the field’.)

In (24), the postverbal logical subjects *wana* ‘children’ and *soko* ‘beans’ modified by *tubu* ‘only’ are more focal and they indicate narrow focus which differs from presentational focus exemplified in (18), (19) and (20), among others. The locative subject arguments *kitaren* ‘on bed’ and *nnden* ‘in the field’ are more topical and involve old information that speakers assume to be familiar to the addressees at the time of the utterance. Generally, in locative-subject alternation, the preverbal locative argument as subject is topicalized, whereas the postverbal argument DP is focalized, denoting new information expressed by the sentence topic. The data examined in this paper attest that, in addition to its presentational focus function, locative-subject alternation constructions can be used in contrastive focus, as (25-26) exemplify.

- (25) a. *wa-na wa- le- end-a shuule che misa- n*
 2-child 2SM-PST-go- FV 9school not 9church-NEG
 ‘Children went to school not to church.’
- b. *wa-na wa- le- end-a shuule che wa-ka- n*
 2-child 2SM-PST-go- FV 9school not 2-woman-NEG
 ‘Children went to school not women.’

- (26) a. *shuule ku- le- end-a wa-na che wa-ka- n*
 9school 17-PST- go-FV 2-child not 2-woman-NEG
 ‘To school went children not women.’
- b. **shuule ku- le- end-a wa-na che misa- n*
 9school 17- PST-go-FV 2-child not 9church-NEG
 ‘*To school went children not to church.’

Examples in (25) and (26a) illustrate that, on the one hand, in the canonical sentences (with agent/theme subject argument) both the agent/theme and the location arguments can receive contrastive focus. On the other hand, in the goal/location subject argument alternate, only the agent/theme argument can be focused. Locative subject DPs cannot receive contrastive focus, as the ungrammaticality of the sentence in (23b) indicates.

5.0 Conclusion

The findings presented in this paper suggest that both formal and semantic locative inversions constructions co-exist in Kiwoso. The paper has demonstrated that, as in many other Bantu languages, locative-subject alternation construction with or without locative morphology is not used in free variation in Kiwoso. It has been established that the two alternates share similar semantic proposition, but they indicate information packaging strategies of sentences. The data examined show that, pragmatically, locative-subject alternation sentences are used in presentational focus in that the preverbal locative DP is interpreted as a topic, hence sets the scene in which the postverbal DP, which is regarded as the focus of the sentence, appears.

The data presented in this paper show that, contrary to other Bantu languages, particularly the southern Bantu, the locative prefix *ku-* in Kiwoso, which is used in agreement morphology, contains semantic content referring to a location in the discourse context. It has been attested that the locative content of the prefix *ku-* is available even when the location is not mentioned, as the example sentences presented in this paper demonstrate.

In relation to the predicate types that participate in alternation constructions, the findings give evidence that all unaccusative verbs alternate in Kiwoso. However, other semantic verb classes including transitives and ditransitives do not undergo locative-subject alternations, as demonstrated in Table 2.

Abbreviations

DP	Determiner phrase
FV	Final vowel
LOC	Locative
SM (1, 2 etc)	Subject marker class 1, 2 etc.,
NEG	Negation
OM	Object marker
PASS	Passive
PST	Past
* ..	Unacceptable sentence
√	Acceptable construction
1, 2, 3	Number for noun classes 1, 2 ...

References

- Bresnan, Joan and Jonni Kanerva. 1989. "Locative inversion in Chichewa: A case study of factorization in grammar." *Linguistic Inquiry* 20 (1):1-50.
- Bresnan, Joan. 1994. "Locative inversion and the architecture of universal grammar." *Language* 70 (1):72-131.
- Buell, Leston. 2007. "Semantic and formal locatives: Implications for the Bantu locative inversion typology." *SOAS Working Papers in Linguistics* 15:105-120.
- Buell, Leston. 2012. "Class 17 as a non-locative noun class in Zulu." *Journal of African Languages and Linguistics* 33:1-35.
- Carstens, Vick. 1997. "Empty nouns in Bantu locatives." *Linguistic Review* 14:361-410.
- 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." *African Languages and Linguistics* 18:1-19.
- Diercks, Michael. 2011. "The morphosyntax of Lubukusu locative inversion and the parameterization of Agree." *Lingua* 121 (5):702-720.
- Guérois, Rozzen. 2014. "Locative inversion in Cuwabo." *ZAS Papers in Linguistics* 57:49-71.
- Harford, Carolyn. 1990. "Locative inversion in Chishon." In *Current Approaches to African Linguistics*, edited by J. Hutchison & V. Manfred, 137-280. Dordrecht: Foris.

- Kagaya, Ryohei. and Olomi Rogati. 2009. *A Kiwoso Vocabulary*. Tokyo: Research Institute for Languages and Culture of Asia and Africa (ILCAA), Tokyo University of Foreign Studies.
- Khumalo, Langa. 2010. "Passive, locative inversion in Ndebele and the unaccusative hypothesis." *South African Journal of African Languages* 30 (1):22-34.
- Languages of Tanzania Project (LoT). 2009. *Atlasi ya Lugha za Tanzania*. Dar es Salaam: Dar es Salaam University Press.
- Machobane, Malillo. 1995. "The Sesotho locative constructions." *African Languages and Linguistics* 16:115-136.
- Maho, Jouni. 2009. NUGL Online: *The online version of the New Updated Guthrie List, a referential classification of the Bantu languages*. Consulted online on June 2019 at <http://goto.glocalnet.net/maho/papers/nuglonline.pdf>.
- Mallya, Aurelia. 2016. Argument realization, causation and event semantics in Kiwoso. Unpublished Doctoral thesis, Stellenbosch University, South Africa.
- Marten, Lutz. 2006. "Locative inversion in Otjiherero: More on morphosyntactic variation in Bantu." *ZAS Papers in Linguistics* 43:97-122.
- Marten, Lutz. 2010. "The Great siSwati Locative Shift." In *Continuity and change in grammar*, edited by Anne Breitbarth, Christopher Lucas, Sheila Watts and David Willis, 249-267. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Marten, Lutz. 2011. "Information structure and agreement: Subjects and subject markers in Swahili and Herero." *Lingua* 121 (5):787-804.
- Marten, Lutz. 2012. "Agreement in locative phrases in Luganda." In *Proceedings of the 6th World Congress of African Linguistics*, edited by Matthias Brenzinger and Anne-Maria Fehnedts, 433-443. Cologne: Rüdiger Köppe.
- Marten, Lutz. 2014. "The preverbal position(s) in Bantu inversion constructions: Theoretical and comparative considerations." *ZAS Papers in Linguistics* 57:136-159.
- Marten, Lutz. and Hannah Gibson. 2016. "Structure building and thematic constraints in Bantu inversion constructions." *Journal of Linguistics* 52 (3):565-607.
- Marten, Lutz. and Jenneke. van der Wal. 2015. "A typology of Bantu subject inversion." *Linguistic Variation* 14 (2):318-368.
- Marten, Lutz. Nancy Kula and Nhlanhla Thwala. 2007. "Parameters of morphosyntactic variation in Bantu." *Transactions of the Philological Society* 105:253-338.
- Zeller, Jochen. 2013. "Locative inversion in Bantu and predication." *Linguistics* 51 (6):1107-1146.
- Zerbian, Sabine. 2006. "Inversion structures in Northern Sotho." *Southern African Linguistics and Applied Language Studies* 24 (3):361-376.