

## IAV effects in Southern Bantu

Hlumela Mkabile (UFS) and Kristina Riedel (UFS)

Many Bantu languages require wh-words which question constituents that originate in the postverbal field (including objects, post-verbal subjects and most types of adjuncts) to appear in the position immediately after the verb (IAV) in non-cleft questions. IAV effects have been described for the Southern Bantu languages Zulu (Nguni S42, Buell 2005; 2006; 2009; 2011) and Northern Sotho (Sotho-Tswana S32, Zerbian 2006a; 2006b) but not for other Southern Bantu languages. Languages differ in terms of whether a particular kind of wh-item must appear in IAV position or if this is optional and some Bantu have no IAV effects. We discuss IAV effects across two groups of Southern Bantu languages: Nguni and Sotho-Tswana. We show systematic differences across and within the two subgroups and argue that two different types of IAV effects are found in Southern Bantu.

For example, Zulu requires the adjunct wh-word item ‘when’ to appear in IAV position and the object to be object-marked (1). In Sesotho, wh-direct objects can appear in IAV (2) without object-marking for the indirect object, unlike in Zulu which requires both for direct object questions.

- (1) a. \* U-theng-e ingubo entsha **nini**?  
2S-buy-PERF 9.dress 9.new when  
b. U-yi-theng-e **nini** ingubo entsha?  
2S-9-buy-PERF when 9.dress 9.new  
‘When did you buy a new dress?’ (Zulu, Buell 2009: 166)
- (2) a. Mpho o-phehetse **eng** ba-na?  
1a.Mpho SM1-cook.APPL.PFV what 2-child  
‘What did Mpho cook for the children?’ (Sesotho, Mokoaleli & Riedel & Furumoto 2021:420)  
b. Mpho o-phehetse ba-na **eng**?  
1a.Mpho SM1-cook.APPL.PFV 2-child what  
‘What did Mpho cook for the children?’ (Sesotho, own data)

Sesotho allows adjunct wh-items to appear in IAV but this requires object marking for any relevant objects. This suggests that Sesotho IAV effects are the result to two different syntactic processes: right dislocation of objects for adjunct questions and scrambling for object wh-words.

In this presentation we analyse IAV effects for different wh-elements across Nguni and Sotho-Tswana and discuss the implications of this data on the syntactic analysis of IAV effects across Southern Bantu and for Bantu languages more broadly.

### References

- Buell, Leston C. 2005. *Issues in Zulu Verbal Morphosyntax*. UCLA dissertation.
- Buell, Leston C. 2006. The Zulu conjoint/disjoint verb alternation: focus or constituency? *ZAS Papers in Linguistics* 43. 9–30.
- Buell, Leston C. 2009. Evaluating the immediate postverbal position as a focus position in Zulu. In *Selected Proceedings of the 38th Annual Conference on African Linguistics*, 166–172. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Press.
- Buell, Leston C. 2011. Zulu ngani ‘why’: Postverbal and yet in CP. *Lingua* 121(5). 805–821. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lingua.2010.11.004>
- Mokoaleli, Maseanakoena & Riedel, Kristina & Furumoto, Makoto. 2021. Sesotho (S33). In Seunghun Lee & Yuko Abe & Daisuke Shinagawa (eds.), *Descriptive materials of morphosyntactic microvariation in Bantu vol. 2: A microparametric survey of morphosyntactic microvariation in Southern Bantu languages*, 387–425. Tokyo: Institute for the Study of Languages and Cultures of Asia and Africa (ILCAA).
- Zerbian, Sabine. 2006a. *Expression of information structure in the Bantu language Northern Sotho*. Humboldt University dissertation.
- Zerbian, Sabine. 2006b. Questions in Northern Sotho. *ZAS Papers in Linguistics* 43. 257–280.