1. Introduction

The collection of primary data in several less-known and under-documented Gur and Kwa languages (Niger-Congo) represented an integral part of the work undertaken by project B1. The project was conducting an inductive investigation on focus expressions (phase 1) and on the interaction between information structure and grammar (phase 2) on the empirical basis of data from 19 languages (Aja, Akan, Anii, Awutu-Efutu, Baatɔnum, Buli, Byali, Dagbani, Ditammarì, Ewe, Fon, Foodo, Gurene, Konkomba, Konni, Lelemi, Nateni, Waama, Yom), supported by data on three additional languages kindly provided by Kézié Koyenzi Lébikaza (Kabiye) and Klaus Beyer (Moore and Pana).

The aim of this chapter is to briefly outline the nature of a part of the collected data with illustrations from the Gur languages Buli, Kɔnni and Baatɔnum, followed by a chapter with data from the Gur and Kwa languages Yom, Aja, Anii and Foodo by Ines Fiedler. Together, both chapters document a small fraction of the data collections that fed the B1 corpus which was established between 2003–2009.

1 See http://www2.hu-berlin.de/gur_und_kwa_fokus.
2 I wish to thank all language consultants and colleagues for their kind cooperation and assistance and the German Research Foundation (DFG) for generously funding the research including the field trips involved. Some useful comments made by Markus Greif (project D2) helped to improve this chapter in the last stage.
2. Selection of QUIS Data for Comparative Goals

Project B1 was concerned with language-specific in-depth studies as well as with comparative goals, including language-typological and diachronic questions. Accordingly, attention was put on the establishment of a data basis that also suits comparative tasks. Most important for the cross-linguistic approach within the project was the Questionnaire on Information Structure (QUIS; Skopeteas et al. 2006), developed in project D2. In preparation of a final study of project B1 regarding the interaction of information-structural and language typology we have selected a nucleus of QUIS tasks to be conducted and prepared in each of the subject languages for comparison. The following two components from QUIS were chosen:

(a) A narrative sample from the Fairy Tale Task
(b) Selected entries from the Focus Translation Task

2.1 Fairy Tale (Topic and Focus in Coherent Discourse)

The Fairy Tale Task (Skopeteas et al. 2006: 149ff., condition A) allows first insights in the structuring of a discourse. The consultant is shown a picture series that sketches the basic stages and events of the story (figure 1) which is briefly outlined in the meta language. In the ideal completion of the task, a short narrative in the target languages is then retold with the help of the visual material as a text about unwitnessed events and in a folktale manner. The simplicity and brevity of the resulting narrative notwithstanding, it was hoped to achieve quasi-natural examples of characteristic narrative phrases and patterns for this widespread text type, such as (formalized) initial settings and presentations, and repetitive, suspense-building patterns with a climax on the third protagonist/event. The results varied to certain degree with respect to the

---

3 For a few languages the data from the Focus Translation Task has also been entered in the linguistic database ANNIS (see http://www.sfb632.uni-potsdam.de/d1/annis).
speaker’s ease and engagement concerning the somewhat playful task, but material illustrating the basic language-specific modes of encoding a planned (monologue) discourse and its structuring above the simple clause/sentence level was always provided. Such data allow us to cross-linguistically study devices for topic continuity and topic change which are pivotal for any discourse and can thus be expected to be reflected in grammar.

Figure 1: Fairy Tale (Tomatoes⁴) (Skopeteas et al. 2006: 151)

⁴ See Skopeteas et al. 2006: 149ff. for additional variations and a second version (Giant Tree) of this task.
2.2 Focus Translation Extract

As second component for the comparative basis we selected specific entries from a more controlled task, the focus translation (Skopeteas et al. 2006: 209ff.). Here we concentrate on dialogues which complement the data collected by the tale and which also help to minimize unwanted interferences from the metalanguage used as the translation basis. The mini-dialogues comprise question–answer pairs (wh- as well as yes/no-questions) as well as statement–reaction pairs and can be provided by one or two speakers in the elicitation session. For the speech sample of the (imaginary) second speaker (S2) it is preferably only a keyword that is offered rather than a complete sentence given in the metalanguage.\(^5\) There is ample evidence that this approach led to better results than a pure translation template and that speakers did indeed exploit the contextualizing first speaker’s speech for the information-structural configuration of the corresponding reply/reaction.

An interesting side effect was sometimes observed when the question-answer or statement-reaction pair was repeated (for instance, for recording). Some consultants occasionally adjusted the initial, contextualizing sentence according to the focus in the second sentence. Consider the following examples:

(1) S1: She ate the beans. S1: The woman hit Peter  
S2: [I] S2: [also pushed]

The information packaging of the first speaker’s sentence (S1) seldom provided a dedicated focus marking, but if it did, it concerned the object (here ‘the beans’ and ‘Peter’; 2a), in particular when the subject was encoded as given (pronoun or definite noun phrase). When repeated, the focus structure in the first sentence

\(^5\) The keywords are given in square brackets and contain always the focal element, though not necessarily exclusively. Additional material that helps the informant to form the reply is provided within the same bracket for the sake of simplicity.
was sometimes adjusted (2a’), resulting in sentence pairs (2a’/2b) that display only a lexical contrast in two information-structurally and morpho-syntactically parallel sentence constructions. Such secondary structural adjustments of S1 presented welcome corroborations for the validity of particular information-packaging forms in a given language.

(2) a. She ate (the beans)\(_{\text{FOC}}\)  a. The woman hit (Peter)\(_{\text{FOC}}\)
   a’. [She]\(_{\text{FOC}}\) ate the beans  a’. The woman [hit]\(_{\text{FOC}}\) Peter
   b. [I]\(_{\text{FOC}}\) ate them  b. She also [pushed]\(_{\text{FOC}}\) him

Out of the 189 Focus Translation Task entries a smaller number was chosen as basic language-internal set that can be implemented for comparison. Decisive for the selection\(^6\) was to get a maximum overview on the (topic) focus system on a minimally extensive data basis. The data selected to represent the language-specific basis for generalizations and illustrations thereof that can serve in cross-linguistic investigation are given in the following. They are clustered in four groups and include suggestions of criteria that may be relevant for the analysis of the entries, though other research questions and clusters according to language-specific needs are not excluded, of course.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;82-6&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is a book on the table.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;82-10&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What happened?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A child was born.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;82-20&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What happened?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[somebody jumped into water]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^6\) The focus translation entries are identified by their QUIS data numbers <82-xy>. 
Are there structural parallels in all three „all new“ cases (unrequested presentation in (6), requested in (10), (20))? Is (10) passively or actively encoded and different from (20)?

Group 2

<82-40> Who ate the beans?
[a woman]

<82-48> What did the woman eat?
[beans]

<82-66> What did the woman eat with?
[with a spoon]

<82-72> What did the woman do?
[ate beans]

<82-128> She ate the beans.
[I]

<82-136> The woman ate the black beans.
[not the black (beans), but the red (ones)]

<82-147> The woman ate the beans yesterday.
[the day before yesterday]

<82-188> The woman ate the beans.
 a) [yes (Ex: Yes, she did eat them.)]

<82-189> b) [no (Ex: No, she didn't eat them.)]
Compare the expression of different scope of foci and types of foci: What are the formal differences of the sentence structure in case of new information (40, 48, 66, 72), contrastive information (128, 136, 147) and confirmation resp. contradiction (188, 189)?

**Group 3**

<82-74> Is he bringing the table or is he sending it?

[is sending]

<82-163> The woman hit Peter.

[called]

<82-165> The woman has hit Peter.

[will hit]

<82-164> The woman has hit Peter.

[hasn’t yet]

<82-183> The woman hit Peter.

[she also pushed]

Compare predicate-centered focus types, i.e., on verb or predicative operator: selective lexical verb (74), constrastive lexical verb (163) or TAM\(^7\) (165), restrictive concerning TAM (164), expansive lexical verb (183).

**Group 4**

<82-140> The woman cooked the beans for him.

[not for him, but for us]

---

\(^7\) Tense-Aspect-Modality
The woman bought the beans for the children and the elders.
[only for the elders]

The woman cooked the beans for her child.
[for the elders too]

Compare contrastive (140), restrictive (170), and expansive (179) focus on the recipient (and additional focus particles) and parallels/distinctions between these focus expressions and those in group 2.

3. On the Presentation and Comparison of the Data

The main part of this paper contains the data from three Gur languages, Buli, Kɔnni and Baatɔnum (i.e., one version of the Fairy Tale Task and of the Focus Translation Task per language\(^8\) together with lists of information-structurally concerned publications prepared within the SFB. A paper with data from four further Gur and Kwa languages (Yom, Aja, Anii, Foodo) and a section concerning genetic and areal relations and our research by Ines Fiedler follows.

The presentation of the language-specific data follows orthographic conventions to some extent and for most data tone is marked in addition\(^9\). We largely follow the Leipzig Glossing Rules\(^{10}\) using a list of standard abbreviations slightly extended to our specific needs (see list at the end of this chapter). Digits which are not followed immediately by grammatical number indications (1SG etc.) refer to specific noun classes (alternative to the general abbreviation CL),

\(^8\) For documentary purposes the narrative sample is accompanied by the audio source, albeit for space reasons only provided as an mp3-file.

\(^9\) Note that tone can be subject to considerable modification due to tone spreading and the position of the tone bearing syllable within the phrase and it is the largely predictable surface tone that is indicated for Buli and Kɔnni.

following the numbering conventions of the Berlin–Bayreuth Gur projects (Miehe et al. 2007).11

The aim of these fieldnotes is to provide insights into the nature of the data dealt with in the investigation of information structure in Gur and Kwa by a selection of examples which illustrates the diversity in the expression of information structure among Gur and Kwa. A comparative analysis is not intended here. Such task would require much more background information on the languages involved than possible here and it would be incomplete without considering the complete range of language-specific alternative encodings and the exclusion of certain constructions in tasks such as the Focus Translation.

What the data provided in this chapter underlines is that even when we restrict the comparison to three genetically related languages such as Buli, Kɔnni and Baatɔnum which share several typological parallels, we face considerably diverse strategies in the expression of information structure. All three are tone languages and all three have a clause-initial subject in the pragmatically least marked (henceforth unmarked) clause. However, Baatɔnum differs from the two Oti-Volta languages by placing the object before the verb rather than behind it. Interestingly, the canonical preverbal object position in Baatɔnum seems less compatible with a focus interpretation of the object than the canonical postverbal object position in Buli and Kɔnni. In Baatɔnum, focal objects occur in a pragmatically marked fronted position (i.e., marked constituent order OSV

---

11 Recent research by the author suggests that the occurrence of nominal class affixes might be less mandatory and regular across nouns in some Gur languages than commonly assumed. This implies that certain suffix-reminiscent word-final segments are better not analysed as suffixes (or particular suffix allomorphes) themselves but rather as results of phonological stem adaptations. In the absence of certain noun class concords, nominal stems are compensatorily treated and some develop permanent assimilatory traits to the relatively frequently present concord morpheme. To avoid complexities regarding features that are not essential in this paper, the glossing in this chapter does not particularly reflect these distinctions and also glosses pure assimilatory traits with noun class numbers.
besides unmarked SOV). It is obviously only in such verb-distant position and not in the immediate proverbal position that the object can be targeted by phonological phrasing in Baatɔnum. The right edge of such a phrase is indicated by suffix -(C)a which also co-occurs with focal subjects and other sentence constituents. The more peripheral postverbal object position in Buli and Kɔnni, in contrast, is pragmatically less restricted and compatible with non-focal as well as focal objects, although the latter status can also be further formally underlined.

Apart from this Baatɔnum-specific requirement concerning the object, the Focus Translation Task also shows that the surface constituent order often remains unchanged despite different focus conditions. Important for the information-structural interpretation of a sentence in all three languages is not the constituent order alone. It is first of all the presence or absence of certain particles and morphological devices that accompany the canonical or the marked order. These elements are many and diverse across the languages and include, among others, the preverbal connective particle lē and postverbal particle kā in Buli and verb suffix/particle -na (allomorph -ne) and postverbal particle/verb suffix -wa (allomorph -wo) in Kɔnni. In sentences with the canonical order SVO, the mentioned morphemes are complementarily applied close to the verb (stem) and correlate with different focus readings. Consider the examples in (3) and (4), partly also taken from the Focus Translation Task (see also Fiedler et al. 2010: 250f.).
(3) Buli

a. Nípōōwá fɔb kā¹² wà=bìk.
   woman:DEF1 slap PTL  l=child:12
   The woman hit [her child]_{FOC}.

b. Márỳ àlè fɔb=wà.
   M. &:CON slap=OBJ1
   [Mary]_{FOC} hit him.

(4) Kūnni

a. ò=nígi-wá ò=búà.
   l=hit-PTL  l=child.1a
   She hit [her child]_{FOC}.

b. Márỳ nígi-nà=wà.
   M. hit-PTL=OBJ1
   [Mary]_{FOC} hit him.

Although the complementary morphological encoding correlates with different focus readings, the affixes and particles do not represent genuine “focus markers” that have the (primary) function to mark focus and attach to the focus constituent. As outlined elsewhere (Schwarz 2009, 2010, Fiedler et al. 2010), their primary task is to distinguish between categorical (3/4a) and thetic statements (3/4b), a distinction that provides different potential focus domains in which the subject is either explicitly included (thetic) or excluded (categorical) from the focus domain. The recognition of such indirect focus marking¹³ is

¹² Note that the surface tone of the particle kā can change to kā and kà (depending on the following environment) due to Low-Tone-Spreading.

¹³ The indirect focus marking analysis accounts for the occurrence of these affixes and particles in various environments that are not reconcilable with a focus interpretation.
relevant in cross-linguistic studies also involving languages with direct focus-marking tools in order to avoid comparison of “apples and pears”.

The narrative tasks in Buli, Kɔnni and Baatɔnum provided us with examples for the devices used to introduce major participants, to highlight particular participants and to chain important events of the story line. We face considerable differences across the languages again, for instance regarding the latter issue. Buli employs a clause-initial particle (tè) which functions as a clausal conjunction, namely of the narrative type ‘and (then)’ in the indicative, and of the consecutive type ‘so that’ in the subjunctive\(^\text{14}\). Different from a prototypical clausal conjunction, it cannot only follow a full clause, but also just a sentence constituent. Considering the whole range of its use (see also some examples in section 4 below), it can be concluded that it is a particular semantic/pragmatic configuration that is common to all tè-ocurrences (5). The particle occurs in the presence of two information units which are information-structurally and syntactically autonomous while semantically necessarily connected, the initial unit C1 (whether a clause constituent or a clause) being semantically indispensable, similar to a precondition, for the appropriate interpretation of the second unit C2.\(^\text{15}\)

\[(5) \quad \text{Semantically dependent C2:} \]
\[
[\text{clause or constituent}]_{C1} \quad [\text{tè clause}]_{C2}
\]

Kɔnni has an apparent cognate (tà), but employs it much less than Buli and favours particle dɪ which follows only nominal subjects in narrative contexts

\(^{14}\) The modal distinction is expressed by the grammatical tone of the verb (Schwarz 2007).

\(^{15}\) The analysis of the tè-marked-clause as an information-structurally (pragmatically) fairly autonomous, but semantically rather dependent clause can account for its occurrence with head-external (in contrast to head-internal) relative clauses and for its use in sentences with multiple (i.e., discontinuous) foci, for instance those containing a non-canonical fronted contrastive topic followed by a tè-clause with its own focal peak (Schwarz, ms 2008), among others.
(pronominal subjects in corresponding environments are tonally and partly segmentally marked). In Baatɔnum, we find a clausal conjunction mā in comparable sequences of the most decisive events. It is probably of language-external origin (from Hausa ìmmà ‘but’), but more research in this language is needed.

Leaving the comparative discussion for another occasion and summing up here, the comparative investigation will ideally not only identify existing distinctions in the formal expression of information structuring, but also try to establish the background (language contact, deviations in information-packaging principles, correlations with other grammatical features etc.) for such diversity across the languages. For the aim of this paper suffice it to conclude that a comparative approach to information structure on the basis of selected QUIS tasks has proven feasible and came up to a corpus full of interesting and often challenging data, as illustrated in sections 4-6 of this chapter for Buli, Kɔnni and Baatɔnum and in the following chapter by Ines Fiedler for Yom, Aja, Anii and Foodo.

4. Buli

Buli is a Central Gur language (ISO 639-3 bwu) spoken by approximately 150,000 people (2003, see Lewis 2009) in northern Ghana. Together with its closest relative and neighbour Kɔnni, it forms the Buli/Kɔnni subgroup within the Oti-Volta branch (Naden 1989).

Information structure in Buli was dealt with in several talks and has resulted so far in the following publications (from studies undertaken in projects B1, B7, D2):


4.1 Tomatoes Fairy Tale in Buli\(^\text{16}\)

Audio: Tomatoes-Buli.mp3

(to play audio file move mouse into field)

\(^\text{16}\) This story version was recorded with Vida Azenaab (32 years, Gbedem-Buli variant) in Accra, July 2004, and Denis Pius Abasimi assisted concerning its transcription and translation.
A woman sent her first-born to go to the market to buy tomatoes.

and bring them to her to prepare soup.

When the boy went to the market,

he lost the way.

He lost the way,

he couldn’t buy the tomatoes.
à yāā pilim jām yèrī.
& then return come house.5
and returned home.

(4) àtè nipōōwá pilim a tòm
 &:CNJ woman:DEF1 return & send
And then the woman sent

wà=bí-kāāi nē pàà sāŋ = lá,
1=child-INDF12 CON reach follow=DET
her second born,

àtè wà=chè yābàná,
 &:CNJ 1=go market:DEF6
and he went,

wá mē chèŋ siūkú bè à jām
1 also go road:DEF15 lose & come
he also lost the way and came back,

àn dā tōmāntōsūkū tā jām-yā ʔ.
 &:NEG buy tomatoes:DEF15 have come-ASS %
he didn’t buy and bring the tomatoes,

(5) nipōōwá yāā tòm wà=bí-bāŋkā
woman:DEF1 then send 1=child-last:DEF12
The woman then sent her last born,
and when he went to the market

he found his way

and bought the tomatoes and brought them home,

and the woman was able to prepare soup with the tomatoes.

4.2 Focus Translation Extract in Buli

There is a book on the table.

---

This data was recorded, transcribed and translated with Peter Wangara Amoak (42 years, Sandem-Buli variant) in March 2005 in northern Ghana.

Note that some of the S[peaker]1 data are unusual for Buli main sentences, as they do not contain indications (such as provided by particles ká, kámá, connective lè, clausal conjunction lè and other means) regarding the information-structural organization of the sentence. It is likely that at least part of this uncommon lack of pragmatic information is a direct result of the translation task. The S[peak er]2 data are therefore in sum pragmatically more reliable.
<82-10> S1: ká bàà lë nè-yāā
PTL what CON do-ASS.Q
What happened?

S2: bà=bìg kà bíík.
2=give.birth PTL child.12
A child was born. (lit. They gave birth to a child.)

<82-20> S1: ká bààn lë nè-yāā.
PTL what:? CON do-ASS.Q
What happened?

S2: wāā lë ỵg lò niám pō.
INDF1 CON jump fall water.14 in
Somebody jumped into the water.

<82-40> S1: ká wàn lë nòbi tùànjáá.
PTL who CON eat bean:DEF6.Q
Who ate the beans?

S2: nípök ̣lë nòbi tùànjá.
woman.1 &:CON eat bean:DEF6
A woman ate the beans.

<82-48> S1: nípōówádë nòbi kā bààà.
woman:DEF1:DEM eat PTL what.Q
What did the woman eat?
S2: ɔ̀ = ŋɔ̀ bì kà túé.  
1=eat PTL bean.6  
She ate beans.

<82-66> S1: nípōowá pà kā bànn dē-à.  
woman:DEF1 take PTL what:? eat-Q  
What did the woman eat with?

S2: wà=dè lè kā dùisük.  
1=eat CON PTL spoon.15  
She ate with a spoon.

<82-72> S1: nípōowá nè kā sèè.  
woman:DEF1 do PTL how:Q  
What did the woman do?

S2: ɔ̀ = ŋɔ̀ bì kà túé.  
1=eat PTL bean.6  
She ate beans.

<82-74> S1: wà=tà tēbūlūkū á chiēn kāmā,  
1=have table:DEF15 IPFV come PTL:PTL  
Is he bringing  
yāā wā=tāá chiēn kāmā.  
ASS 1=have: IPFV go PTL:PTL  
or sending the table?
S2: wà = tàà chèŋ kámā.  
1=have:IPFV go PTL:PTL  
He is sending it.

<82-128> S1: ð = ḳòbì tùàŋá.  
1=eat bean:DEF6  
She ate the beans.

S2: ká mí lē ḳòbì.  
PTL 1 SG CON eat.ASS  
I ate them.

<82-136> S1: núpōowá ḳòbì kà tú-sóbtáŋá.  
woman:DEF1 eat PTL bean-black:21:DEF6  
The woman ate the black beans.

S2: à̀ayí, dāā tú-sóbtáŋá tè wà = ḳòbì ?,  
no NEG bean-black:21:DEF6 CNJ 1=eat %  
No, not the black beans,

ká tú-màntáŋá tè wà = ḳòb.  
PTL bean-red:21:DEF6 CNJ 1=eat  
but the red ones.

<82-140> S1: núpōowá dig tùàŋá àtè kà wá.  
woman:DEF1 cook bean:DEF6 &:BEN PTL 1  
The woman cooked the beans for him.
S2: ààyí, dāā wá  ?,
   no  NEG  l  %
No, not for him,

wà= dig  tè  kā  tàmā.
l=cook  BEN  PTL  lPL
she cooked for us.

<82-147> S1: nípōowá  njɔbì tùàŋá ká dìèmwā.
woman:DEF1  eat  bean: DEF6  PTL  yesterday:DEF1
The woman ate the beans yesterday.

S2: ààyí, ɔ̀= njɔb ká dāām-pà-tè-diēm.
no  l=eat  PTL  past-?-give-yesterday
No, she ate them the day before yesterday.

<82-163> S1: nípōowá  fɔbì ìpítày.
woman:DEF1  slap  &:Peter
The woman hit Peter.

S2: ààyí, wà= n fɔbì-wà  ?
   no  l=NEG  hit-OBJ1  %
No, she didn’t hit him,

wà= wù-wā  kámā.
l=call-OBJ1  PTL:PTL
she called him.
<82-164> S1: nípööwá fòbì àpfità.
woman:DEF1 slap &:Peter
The woman hit Peter.

S2: ààyí, wà=ñ dìëm fòbì-wà ?.
no l=NEG still/yet slap-OBJ1 %
No, she hasn’t hit him yet.

<82-165> S1: nípööwá fòbì àpfità kámà.
woman:DEF1 slap &:Peter PTL:PTL
The woman hit Peter.

S2: ààyí, wà=ñ dìëm fòbì-wà ?,
no l=NEG still/yet slap-OBJ1 %
No, she hasn’t hit him yet,

wà lè fòb-wà.
1 FUT slap-OBJ1
she will hit him.

<82-170> S1: nípööwá dà tùàną
woman:DEF1 buy bean:DEF6
The woman bought the beans

tè kà bíṣàną àlè níṣòmmà.
BEN PTL child:13:DEF6 &:CON elder:DEF2
for the children and the elders.
S2: ààyí, wà=dà tè kà nísòmmà niíní.
No 1=buy BEN PTL elder:DEF2 only
No, she bought them only for the elders.

S1: nípõówá dig tùàŋá
woman:DEF1 cook bean:DEF6
The woman cooked the beans
tè kà wà=biiká.
BEN PTL 1=child:DEF12
for her child.

S2: ààyí, wà=dig tè nísòmmà mě kámà.
no 1=cook BEN elder:DEF2 also PTL:PTL
She cooked them for the elders, too.

S1: nípõówá fòbì àpíitä.
woman:DEF1 slap &:Peter
The woman hit Peter.

S2: wà=tùsì-wā mě kámà.
1=push- OBJ1 also PTL:PTL
She also pushed him.

S1: nípõówá ṣòbì tùàŋá.
woman:DEF1 eat bean:DEF6
The woman ate the beans.
<82-189> S2a: ɔ̀ =ŋɔ̀ bì.
1=eat.ASS
She ate them.

S2b: ɔ̀ =n ŋɔ̀ bí-yà ?.
1=NEG eat-ASS %
She didn’t eat them.

5. Kɔɔnni

Kɔɔnni is a Central Gur language (ISO 639-3 kma) spoken by a small group (2003 around 3,800 people, Lewis 2009) in a remote area in northern Ghana. Together with its sister Buli, it forms the Buli/Kɔɔnni subgroup within the Oti-Volta branch (Naden 1989).

A series of talks as well as the following three publications prepared within the SFB 632 (projects B1, B7, D2) discuss information-structural devices in Kɔɔnni and in related languages:


5.1 Tomatoes Fairy Tale in Kɔnni

Audio: Tomatoes-Konni.mp3
(to play audio file move mouse into field)

(1) hɔgù wùnì àŋàŋ undì bállì bátàà bén-nè.
   woman.1 1:one COM 1=child.5 2:three be.LOC-PTL
   There is a woman and her three children.

(2) õ tún jà-kùùrí dé õ=gáá,
   1 send thing-old:DEF5 COMP 1=go.SBJV
   She sent the elder to go

   à gá dàà tòmàntòsí kẹjì, õ=dígí jètì.
   & go.SBJV buy tomatoes.12 come 1=cook.SBJV soup:21
   and buy tomatoes and come for her to cook soup.

(3) bòwá wá dì nàgì síé-gáàŋ, à gá,
   child:DEF1 PTL hit road?-different:N & go
   The child took a different road, and went,

   tà ké yé tòmàntòsìké tà yíŋŋí kẹjì.
   CNJ NEG see tomatoes:DEF12 CNJ return come
   and he didn’t get the tomatoes and came back.

---

18 Nasigri Salifu Mumuni (Barnabas) (28 years, Yikpabongo) provided this story (recorded in February 2005 in northern Ghana) and assisted in its transcription and translation.
After that,

ó tôn vúdo-diékè dí disí-nè buliéwó
1 sent person-INDF12 PTL follow-PTL 1:two:DEF1
she sent the person who is second

dí ò=gá ña, à kẹ́
COMP 1=go buy & come
to go, buy them and come.

(5) ò=dián ó gá nàgì sè-gàà,
1=also 1 go hit road-?different:N
He too, went and took a different road,

à gá, ò=ké yéyè,
& go 1=NEG see:PFV
he went and did not get them,

tà bí yín!njí kẹ́, ò=sún !dí chòòsì.
CNJ ? return come 1=heart :N PTL spoil
and returned coming back, she [mother] got sad

(6) kà kúàà chóng chúàà,
12 back:N ?pass
After that,
ú tòŋ bùà-biké cháàŋ,
₁ send child-small:12 ?pass
she sent the younger one,

dí ù=gá à dà tòmántòṣìké kèŋ.
COMP ₁=go & buy tomatoes:DEF₁₂ come
that he should go and buy the tomatoes and bring them.

(7) bùàwá dí gà dááɡì síé-víínìŋ,
child:DEF₁ PTL go pass road-good:N
The child went and passed a good road,

síé-!díékè dì gánà-nà mí=!wó,
road-INDF₁₂ PTL go:?IPFV-PTL there=DEF₁
the road that goes to that place,

à gà dà tòmántòṣìké kèŋ tííŋj.
& go buy tomatoes:DEF₁₂ come house:N
and went and bought the tomatoes and came home.

(8) ù=núŋ!wó sóŋ, dí fààsì ìlì lálì pám.
₁=mother:DEF₁ heart:N PTL ? get.cool very
His mother became very happy.
5.2 Focus Translation Extract

There is a book on the table.

What happened?

A child was born. (lit. They gave birth to a child.)

Somebody jumped into the water.

Who ate the beans?

---

19 The following data was recorded, transcribed and translated with Nasigri Salifu Mumuni (Barnabas) (28 years, from Yikpabongo) in February 2005 in northern Ghana.
A woman ate them.

What did the woman eat?

She ate beans.

What did the woman eat with?

She ate with a spoon.

What did the woman do?
S1: ʊ̀ = yà-wá tébùliké kíé míŋ,
1=have-PTL table:DEF15 come PTL
Is he bringing

yàà ʊ̀ = yà-ká gárà míŋ.
or 1=have-OBJ15 go:IPFV PTL
or sending the table?

S2: ʊ̀ = yàá gárà míŋ.
1=have go:IPFV PTL
He is sending it.

S1: ʊ̀ = ŋɔ̀ bí túó!hé míŋ.
1=eat bean:DEF6 PTL
She ate the beans.

S2: ààyí, dáá ʊ̀ = ŋòbì-ná, míng, ŋ = ŋòbì-ná=hà.
no NEG 1=eat-PTL 1SG 1SG=eat-PTL=OBJ6
No, she didn’t eat them, I ate them.

S1: hògòwá ŋòbì-nà tú-sóblàhà.
woman:DEF1 eat-PTL bean-black:6:DEF6
The woman ate the black beans.

S2: ʊ̀ = ká ŋòbì tú-sóblàhà,
1=NEG eat bean-black:6:DEF6
She didn’t eat the black beans,
She ate the red ones.

The woman cooked the beans for him.

She didn’t cook them for him,

she cooked them for us.

The woman ate the beans yesterday.

She didn’t eat them yesterday.

the day before yesterday she ate them.
The woman hit Peter.

No, she didn’t hit him,

she called him.

The woman has hit Peter.

No, she hasn’t hit him yet.

The woman has hit Peter.

No, she still intends to hit him.
S1: hàgòwá dà-wà túò
woman:DEF1 buy-PTL bean.6
The woman bought beans

à yì bèlbisí ánjáŋ ṣìŋkòrá.
& BEN child:13 COM elder.6
for the children and the elders.

S2: ààyí, ò = dá yì-wá ṣìŋkòráhá ṣííñàmá.
no 1=buy BEN-PTL elder:DEF6 only
No, she bought them only for the elders.

S1: hàgòwá dígí-wó túòhè, à yì ò = bóà.
woman:DEF1 cook-PTL bean:DEF6 & BEN 1=child.1
The woman cooked the beans for her child.

S2: dáá ò = bóá!wá ṣííñámá
NEG 1=child:DEF1 only
Not only for her child

ò = dígí túòhè à yì.
1=cook bean:DEF6 & BEN
she cooked the beans.

ò = dígí yì-wá ṣìŋkòráhá gbàŋ.
1=cook BEN-PTL elder:DEF6 also
She cooked them also for the elders.
The woman hit Peter.

She also pushed him.

The woman ate the beans.

Yes, she ate them.

No, she didn’t eat them.

6. Baatɔnum

The isolate Gur language Baatɔnum (ISO 639-3 bba) is spoken in northern Benin, in Nigeria and Togo by more than 500,000 people altogether (Lewis 2009).

Information structure in Baatɔnum so far has been discussed in unpublished manuscripts and talks (Schwarz, Anne, manuscript 2009; Schwarz, Anne, handout of a talk, Berlin 2010). The data base out of which the following
QUIS examples are taken has been established in cooperation with Sayane Gouroubéra (transcription and a first annotation and translation in French).

6.1 Tomatoes Fairy Tale in Baatonum

Audio: Tomatoes-Baatonum.mp3
(to play audio file move mouse into field)

(1) kùrò góo-wà wàà kà wí-n bìbù ìtā.
woman:1 INDF:1-PTL COP COM DEM1-POSS child:2 CL:three
There was a woman with her three children.

(2) ú kù tìmàatì kpée sàà
1 want 1.SBJV tomato:CL soup:CL cook
She wanted to cook tomato soup,
má ú wí-n bìi bē-n bù-küróó gōr-a.
CNJ 1 DEM1-POSS child:CL DEM.CL-POSS child-old:CL send-PTL
so she sent her eldest child.

(3) bìi wí ú swáà wōri
child:CL DEM1 1 road:CL fall
The child got on the road,
má u swáà tōr-a.
CNJ 1 road:CL miss-PTL
but he missed the correct road.

20 Recorded with Sayane Gouroubéra (29 years, from Parakou) in Coutonou, January 2008.
(4) yē-n  sɔ́,
   DEM.CL-POSS  in
Because of that,

ú wú-mā kà bīre gīrīru.
1 return-ALL with basket:CL empty:CL
he returned with an empty basket.

(5) mā kūrɔ̃  wí máā
   CNJ  woman:1  DEM1  ?again
The woman then

wí-n  bii  bē-n  yirūsèé  gōr-a.
   DEM1-POSS child:CL  DEM.CL-POSS second:?  send-PTL
sent her second child.

(6) wí-n  tī  swàà  wōri
   DEM1-POSS  ?self  road:CL  fall
He, too, got on the way,

mā  ú  swàà  tōr-a.
   CNJ 1  road:CL  miss-PTL
but missed the correct road.

(7) ú wú-mā kà bīre gīrīru wí-n tī.
   1 return-ALL  COM  basket:CL  empty  DEM1-POSS  ?self
He also returned with an empty basket.
(8) yè ƙùrọ wí kóò kó,
CL woman:1 DEM1 FUT do
What the woman was left to do,

bìi bẹn ðàŋkó wí ú tie mĩ,
child:CL DEM.CL-POSS last:1 ?DEM1 I retain PTL
the last child that was left,

wí-a ú gōr-a.
OBJ1-PTL I send-PTL
him, she sent.

(9) ðàŋkó wí swáà wōri,
last:1 DEM1 road:CL fall
The last one got on the road,

má ú swáà túb-a.
CNJ I road:CL recognize-PTL
and he found the correct road.

(10) ú wú-má yẹn sọ kà timāati.
1 return-ALL DEM.CL-POSS in(side) COM tomato:CL
Therefore, he returned with tomatoes.

(11) má kùrọ sīi wí-n timāati kpēe sá-wà.
CNJ woman:1 ? DEM1-POSS tomato:CL soup:CL cook-PTL
Then the woman prepared her tomato soup.
6.2 Focus Translation Extract in Baatɔnum\(^{21}\)

<82-6> tirerú  gár-a  yíí  tàabùru  wòll-į (mįį).

There is a book on the table.

<82-10> S1: m̀bā ń kū-a?
what  PTL  do-PTL

What happened?

S2: bà  bii  màrà-wa.
2  child:CL  give.birth-PTL(WA)

A child was born. (lit. They gave birth to a child.)

<82-20> S1: m̀bā ń kū-a?
what  PTL  do-PTL

What happened?

S2: góó  ú ním  wɔři-wà.
INDF:1 1  water:CL  fall-PTL(WA)

Somebody fell into the water.

---

\(^{21}\) The data presented here was recorded on the basis of a written focus translation with Sayane Gouroumbéra (29 years, from Parakou) in Coutonou, January 2008. In the course of recording, the appropriateness and felicity conditions for various further variants (including elliptic answers, morphosyntactically more or less marked sentence variants etc.) were discussed. These cannot be further considered within the frame of the present chapter, and the only variation indicated below concerns the optionality of certain sentence parts (placed in brackets), most often concerning pronominal concords that directly follow the nominal antecedent in subject function.
<82-40> S1: wā-rà, ú swíi yí dī?  
who-PTL 1 bean:CL DEM.CL eat  
Who ate the beans?

S2: kùrọ gōo-wà ú yì dī.  
woman:1 INDF:1-PTL 1 OBJ.CL eat  
A woman ate them.

<82-48> S1: mbā kùrọ wí ú dī?  
what woman:1 DEM1 1 eat  
What did the woman eat?

S2: swíi-yā ú dī.  
bean:CL-PTL 1 eat  
She ate beans.

<82-66> S1: mbā kùrọ wí ú kà dī?  
what woman:1 DEM1 1 COM eat  
With what did the woman eat?

S2: sībī-wa ú kà dī.  
spoon:CL -PTL 1 COM eat  
She ate with a spoon.

<82-72> S1: mbā kùrọ wí ú kū-a?  
what woman:1 DEM1 1 do-PTL  
What did the woman do?
S2: ú swiî dî-wà.
1 bean:CL eat-PTL
She ate beans.

<82-74> S1: ú kà tābùru gë wēē-wà
1 COM table: CL CL come-PTL
Has he brought

ngë ú gè móří-sía-m৯-wà?
? 1 OBJ.CL send-CAUS-PROG-PTL
or is he sending the table?

S2: ú gë móří-sía-m৯-wà.
1 OBJ.CL send-CAUS-PROG-PTL
He is sending it.

<82-128> S1: ú swiî yî dî.
1 bean:CL DEM.CL eat
She ate the beans.

S2: àāwó, nē-(n)a ná yî dî.
no 1SG-PTL 1SG OBJ.CL eat
No, she didn’t eat them, I ate them.

<82-136> S1: kūrọ wî ú swiî wọki yî dî.
woman: 1 DEM1 1 bean:CL black:CL DEM.CL eat
The woman ate the black beans.
S2: àáwó ň̀ swii wò̃ki yi u di,
    no NEG bean:CL black:CL DEM.CL 1 eat
She didn’t eat the black beans,

swèɛ yi-a.
red:CL DEM.CL-PTL
(she ate) the red ones.

<82-140> S1: kurɔ wi (u) swii yi swè
    woman:1 DEM1 1 bean:CL DEM.CL put.on.fire
The woman cooked the beans

wi-n sɔ̀.
DEM1-POSS in(side)
for him.

S2: nũ wi-n sɔ̀ (u yi swè),
    NEG DEM1-POSS in(side) 1 OBJ.CL put.on.fire
She didn’t cook them for him,

bẹ̀sɛ-n sɔ̀-na.
1PL-POSS in(side)-PTL
but for us.

<82-147> S1: kurɔ wi (u) swii di gía.
    woman:1 DEM1 1 bean:CL eat yesterday
The woman ate (the) beans yesterday.
The day before yesterday she ate them.

The woman hit Peter.

She called him.

No, she hasn’t hit him yet.

No, not yet, she will hit him.
The woman bought the beans.

No, she bought them only for the children.

The woman cooked the beans for her child.

She cooked them also.
for the elders, too.

<82-183>  S1:  kùrọ  wí  ú  Pičè  sò.
    woman:1 DEM1 l Pierre hit
    The woman hit Peter.

    S2:  u  (màà kpàm màà)  wì  bôrì-ya  (màà).
        l “also” OBJ1 push-PTL ?again
        She also pushed him.

<82-188>  S1:  kùrọ  wí  ú  swíi  yí  di-wa?
    woman:1 DEM1 l bean:CL DEM.CL eat-PTL(WA)
    Did the woman eat the beans?

<82-189>  S2a:  oo,  ú  yi  dì-wa.
    yes 1 CL eat-PTL(WA)
    Yes, she ate them.

    S2b:  àáwò  ü  n  yi  dí-i.
        no 1 NEG OBJ.CL eat-PTL
        No, she didn’t eat them.

**Glossing abbreviations**

1, 2, …  number of noun class  
1SG, 1PL  first person  
2SG, 2PL  second person  
3SG, 3PL  third person
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ALL</th>
<th>allative</th>
<th>OBJ</th>
<th>object</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ASS</td>
<td>assertive</td>
<td>PFV</td>
<td>perfective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEN</td>
<td>benefactive</td>
<td>PL</td>
<td>plural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAUS</td>
<td>causative</td>
<td>POSS</td>
<td>possessive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL</td>
<td>noun class</td>
<td>PROG</td>
<td>progressive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNJ</td>
<td>clausal conjunction</td>
<td>PTL</td>
<td>particle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM</td>
<td>comitative</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>question marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMP</td>
<td>complementizer</td>
<td>SBJV</td>
<td>subjunctive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON</td>
<td>connective particle</td>
<td>SG</td>
<td>singular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COP</td>
<td>copula</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>same subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEF</td>
<td>definite</td>
<td>&amp;</td>
<td>prosodic junctor (left edge)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEM</td>
<td>demonstrative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DET</td>
<td>determiner</td>
<td></td>
<td>intonational boundary (right edge)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOC</td>
<td>focus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUT</td>
<td>future</td>
<td>!</td>
<td>downstepped High tone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDF</td>
<td>indefinite</td>
<td></td>
<td>low, mid, high tone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPFV</td>
<td>imperfective</td>
<td></td>
<td>superhigh tone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOC</td>
<td>locative</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>gloss (to which ? is preposed) needs further</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>neuter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEG</td>
<td>negation, negative</td>
<td></td>
<td>verification</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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