

.Research Article

The Prohibitive Injunction In Kabiye

Pali Tchaa

L'injonction Prohibitive En Kabiye¹

Université De Kara, Togo¹

Email: Paliest@Gmail.Com

Abstract:

Research on the Kabiye language has already explored, to some extent, the injunction in the chapters that deal with the verb. Nevertheless, it remains relative to postulate that the ambiguity of the intercurrent amalgam between the expression of the negation and that of prohibition is clearly removed since the terminology used in French language ("négation à l'impératif", "formes négatives de l'impératif et du jussif", Etc.) still bears clues to the survival of this vagueness. However, in Kabiye, the enunciative operation of injunction is carried by the imperative and jussive modes with a conative scope which results from the injunctive behavior of the speaker. Prohibition is not, in that language, an avatar of the expression of an inadequacy, but a result of the injunction when it becomes deterrent or suspensive. It is introduced by the morpheme taa- /BB/ and can be nuanced or even reinforced with absolute adverbs depending on the intention to act on the co-announcer that the speaker has assigned to himself.

Keywords: Prohibition, Injunction, Negation, Gur, Kabiye

Résumé

La description du kabiye a déjà abordé quelque peu l'injonction dans les chapitres réservés au verbe. Néanmoins, il demeure relatif de postuler que l'équivoque de l'amalgame intercurrent entre l'expression de la négation et celle la prohibition est nettement levé tant la terminologie usitée (« négation à l'impératif », « formes négatives de l'impératif et du jussif », etc.) porte encore des indices de la survivance de ce flou. Or, en kabiye, l'opération énonciative de l'injonction est prise en compte par les modes impératif et jussif à portée incitative mue par le comportement injonctif du locuteur. La prohibition est dans cette langue, non un avatar de l'assertion exprimant une opération spécifique à une langue: assertion, questioning and injunction. The present

Inadéquation, mais une résultante de l'injonction quand celle-ci devient dissuasive ou suspensive, bref une interdiction. Elle est introduite par le morphème taa-/BB/ et peut être nuancée, voire renforcée au moyen d'adverbes absolutifs selon l'intention d'agir sur le co-énonciateur que s'est assigné le locuteur.

Mots clés : prohibition, injonction négation, gur, kabiye.

exhortation, prayer, assertion (the way of expressing adequacy or inadequacy), etc. are often used. These are embedded in one or other of the enunciative borrowed from Kabiye, the language of Eastern Gurunsi in Togo, focuses on the particularity of prohibition in the injunctive contribution, whose analytical data are operation known under the other name of

Introduction

In any communication, the speaker aims, among other things, to affect the physical, moral or

psychological integrity of the recipient. In order to act through the content of the message on the interlocutor, modalities such as order,

questioning, "imperative operation". Indeed, in the injunction, as in the case of other enunciative operations such as assertion, which may be positive or negative depending on whether it expresses an adequacy or an inadequacy, there is an alternative of a "stimulating" expression in the form of an incitement to take action and an expression, for its part, which is repulsive in the form of a more or less formal prohibition. This second facet of the injunctive operation, the purpose of which is to prohibit, prevent, defend or interrupt the carrying out of a trial, the very face that has a deterrent purpose, is prohibition. Our interest in the problem of prohibition stems, on the one hand, from the amalgam which is often made between denial and prohibition and, on the other hand, from the need to systematically identify and describe the mechanisms for implementing the prohibitive enunciation in Kabiye. The following questions will be of particular interest as we move forward in the analysis: (1) what properties make it possible to characterize prohibition in the context of the enunciative operation of the injunction? What typology can be established of prohibition in Kabiye? (3) Is prohibition always explicitly expressed in discourse? This study is carried out in a descriptive approach that uses field data to highlight the mechanisms of implementation of prohibition in Kabiye from the general framework of the injunction. It draws inspiration from Creissels (2006a) in the conceptualization of the injunctive sentence and Searle (1972) for the determination of prohibitive undertones. The data on which this study is based are collected from native speakers of Kabiye in Kara, Togo.

1. The Injunction: Some Properties In Kabiye:

The injunction is used in the expression of the intimation. It is presented as an incitement by the speaker to the interlocutor to perform an action, to act according to the content of the message. In previous studies by Searle (1979, 1990: 358-360), the injunction is an independent category in the list of its (five) illocutionary acts. Its properties are defined by its illocutionary purpose, which consists

in pushing the interlocutor to carry out a future action. The speaker tries to get things done. The essential defining element is this illocutionary aim of the injunctive act: to try to make the world conform to the propositional content. The injunctive act expresses the speaker's desires, will and intention. The conditions of sincerity are therefore the wishes, desires and will of the speaker (Minh, 2015). To achieve its illocutionary goal, the injunctive utterance necessarily carries the will of the speaker, whose desires and wishes it expresses in the form of various orders in terms of constraints: the order may be of a more modest (invitation, proposal or suggestion), ... vigorous (insistence or prayer) or peremptory (order, authorization or command). The different degrees of injunctive expression correspond to illocutionary acts that Searle (1990: 359-360) associates with the verbs to order, command, ask, require, pray, solicit, beg, as well as to permit, advise, invite, etc. (Minh, 2015). In the present study, the injunction is perceived through the injunctive statement, the prohibitive type of which is circumscribed by the preaching in Kabiye as a particularity to be explained. In order to do so, we first present an overview of the injunctive relief statement in Kabiye.

1.1. The Injunctive Relief Statement:

It concerns all language production in a situation of communication and corresponds to "an enunciative modality by which the speaker expresses his will to obtain a certain behavior from the addressee, and tends to make him realize the propositional content of his utterance"¹ (Bréüs 2002: 51). It always appears, on the part of the speaker, what Charaudeau (1983: 60) calls "injunctive behaviour"², which implies modalities such as ordering, prohibiting, suggesting, warning, etc., as giving the speaker the status of absolute authority and the co-enunciator the status of submission (Desnica, 2016: 260-261) or an obligation to

¹This is my own translation of the author's words: "une modalité énonciative par laquelle le locuteur exprime sa volonté d'obtenir du destinataire un certain comportement, et tend à lui faire réaliser le contenu propositionnel de son énoncé" (Bréüs, 2002 : 51).

²« le comportement injonctif » (Charaudeau, 1983 : 60)

Pali T'chaa/ The Prohibitive Injunction In Kabɩye

perform. Thus, among the statements below, (1a) and (2a) are injunctive in the strict sense of the term since the order is directly respondent to the imperative. The same applies to statements (3a) and (4a) which, loaded with prohibitive content introduced by the morphemes -taa- (3a) and -ŋ- (4a) in the pre-verbal environment, are injunctive, because of the implicitly injunctive scope of their predicates. Furthermore, in (5a)

the nonverbal statement míníwó caḍaý which is an explicit order for a gourd whose content (the drink) is worth a hundred francs is also injunctive, as is the volitional use of the adverb ʒasam "quick (done)!" (6) and the pronoun ñε "you!" (7). These are directive acts. In contrast, statements (1b), (2b), (3b), (4b) and (5b) are mere assertions, which are the most important evidentiary acts.

(1a)	celt-			m̄	kalíhonoó				
	hand over.IMPER.2Sg			1Sg	pen				
	Put the feather back in my hand!								
(1b)	ŋ-	celt-		m	kalíhonoó				
	2Sg	put back.Prft		1Sg	pen				
	You handed me the feather.								
(2a)	yaa				nɔndɔwɔ				
	ring.IMPER.2Sg				horn				
	Sound the horn!								
(2b)	pa-	yá			nɔndɔwɔ				
	3Pl	put back.Prft			horn				
	They have blown the horn / The horn has been blown.								
(3a)	mán-	taa-	na		mí-	i	máŋgo	yó	
	1Sg	PRHB	see.Imprf		2Pl	DMC	mango tree	on	
	Don't let me see you on the mango tree!								
(3b)	man-	ta-	na		mí-	i	máŋgo	yó	
	1Sg	NEG	see.Imprf		2Pl	DMC	mango tree	on	
	I don't see you on the mango tree!								
(4a)	ŋ-	ŋ-	ʒíkɩɣ		kóye	ŋdí	yooo	tt-	kóo
	2Sg	PRHB	snack.Imprf		medicin e	2sg.cl5	Interj	3sg.cl	kill.Imprf
	You won't taste this product, will you! It kills.								
(4b)	ŋ-		ʒíkɩɣ		kóye	ŋdí	yó	tt-	kóo
	2Sg		snack.Imprf		medicin e	2sg.cl5	Interj	3sg.cl	kill.Imprf
(5a)	míníwó		caḍaý						
	one hundred		gourd						
	The gourd of a hundred francs!								
(5b)	míníwó		caḍaý		yokáa				
	one hundred		gourd		break.Prft				
	The hundred franc gourd is broken.								

1. ʃasamquick.Interj Quickly
(done)!
2. ñéyou.Interj You!

Of the above statements, the injunctive scope is direct in (1a), (2a), (3a), and (4a) and

some extent, especially because of their appellative (Bühler, 1934) or conative (Jakobson, 1963) function, in (6) and (7)). Smith (2007) considers that the expeditious field, which involves interjections, and the deictic field (or deictic procedures) are "directly" involved in language activity, to varying degrees, but in such a concrete way that it is possible to see in their use an intention on the part of the enunciator to act on the enunciatee. The interjections thus establish a direct link ("direktenDraht", [...]) between the enunciator and the enunciatee by relying on an expeditious procedure whose appellative character recalls the appellative function in Bühler (1934) and the conative function in Jakobson (1963). The link between form and function is close in the sense that expedited procedures are self-sufficient, that is to say that their implementation dispenses with recourse to other linguistic means and syntactic integration (Smith, 2007: 79). In contrast, the injunctive nature of the utterance (5a) is a derivation of the underlying direct act of language generated by the context. Moreover, it should be noted that the injunction is usually accompanied by an imperative. This is at least what emerges, for example, from Dubois (2007: 250), who observes that the imperative is one of the forms of injunctive relief, from Fontaine (2012: 417), who speaks of the "injunctive imperative" as if there were an imperative mode that differs from the injunctive type, or from Nicole (2018: 139), who reserves the description of the injunction only to an exclusive interest in the imperative. Dufeu's (2000) comment on the semantic vagueness of the imperative signifier in the linguistic tradition should also not be overlooked: D'autres, sans nier la diversité des réalisations formelles de l'injonction, maintiennent malgré tout l'équivalence sémantique commode que semble livrer l'étymologie, en parlant de l'impératif comme de l'expression « privilégiée » de l'injonction : on peut comprendre ainsi l'étude particulière de L.

Wainstein sur L'expression du commandement dans le français actuel³, ou encore l'article d'H. Lewicka sur « La modalité de la phrase et l'emploi des modes en français »⁴, qui évoque l'expression de la modalité volitive comme la « fonction primaire » de l'impératif (Dufeu, 2000 : 12)⁵. In the present study, any statement of a directive nature is considered injunctive, representing, as Oyharçabal (2000) states, "informally the act of speech corresponding to the expression of an order, regardless of the person supposed to carry it out: the speaker or a group including the speaker but not the enunciator (imperative), one or more third parties (jussive), or even the enunciator possibly associated with the speaker and/or one or more third parties."⁴. Thus, the injunctive utterance subjects the verb to the TAM⁶ constraints of imperative and jussive.

1.2 Imperative Mode In Kabiye

In Kabiye, the imperative mode is characterized as being able to present a perfective or imperfect

³Wainstein, 1950. The note is from the author himself (Dufeu, 2000, note 11). I translate the words of the author whose original utterance is as follows: "de manière informelle l'acte de discours correspondant à l'expression d'un ordre quelle que soit la personne supposée accomplir celui-ci : l'allocutaire ou un groupe incluant celui-ci mais pas l'énonciateur (impératif), un ou des tiers (jussif), voire l'énonciateur associé éventuellement à l'allocutaire et/ou à un ou des tiers."

⁴Lewicka (1973: 381). The note is from the author himself (Dufeu, 2000, note 12).

⁵ My own translation of this point of view is as follows: "Others, without denying the diversity of the formal realizations of the injunction, nevertheless maintain the convenient semantic equivalence that the etymology seems to deliver, by speaking of the imperative as the "privileged" expression of the injunction: this is how one can understand the particular study of L. Wainstein's particular study on "L'expression du commandement dans le français actuel", or H. Lewicka's article on "La modalité de la phrase et l'emploi des modes en français", which evokes the expression of the volitive modality as the "primary function" of the imperative."

⁶ Tense, Aspect and Mode (TAM).

form (Kassan, 1987: 59-64) and described in relation to the jussive (LébiKaza, 1999: 345-347). Even if the definitions proposed (id, 345) as a prelude to their descriptions seem more or less confused, LébiKaza establishes details on the expression of the two modes: "L'impératif est le mode de l'injonction, de l'ordre formel. Les formes de l'impératif n'existent qu'à la deuxième personne du singulier...Le jussif est le mode de l'injonction et du souhait. La marque du jussif est un ton haut sans support segmental"⁷ LébiKaza's confusion in the definition of the imperative and the jussive results on the one hand from the vagueness created (inadvertently (?)) through the expressive imprecision he shows, in particular when he indicates that with the jussive mode, one can give an order or make a wish to the first, 2nd or 3rd person in the singular or plural, including persons not participating in the communication or when it is not decisive from a descriptive point of view with expressions such as "...mode of the injunction, of the formal order" and "...mode of the injunction and of the wish", the difference in terms of content being non-existent. Nevertheless, the fact of considering the imperative and the jussive as modes of expression of the injunction is very remarkable in linguistic description when we know that most authors neither venture to define it nor to adapt it to the specificity of the language described. On the other hand, it also remains to be understood why LébiKaza (1999) chose to consider as strictly imperative only injunctive statements in the second person singular, whereas Kassan (1996: 299) implies the first person plural⁸. It is not a trivial question why the second person singular and not the plural, especially since the latter also expresses the formal order ((8b)-(9b)) in the same way as the first ((8a)-(9a)).

(8 a)	má	
-------	----	--

⁷ My own translation of this point of view is as follows: "Imperative is the mode of the injunction, of the formal order. The forms of the imperative exist only in the second person singular...Jussive is the mode of injunction and wish. The mark of the jussive is a high tone with no segmental support".

⁸ In this study, it is shown that the first person plural is only attested to in the jussive mode (see Section 1.3., *infra*).

	write.2Sg.IMPE R		
	Write!		
(8 b)	é-	má	
	2pl	write.IMPE R	
	Write!		
(9 a)	só	lím	
	wash.2sg.IMPE R	water	
	Wash up!		
(9 b)	é-	só	lím
	2pl	wash.IMP ER	water
	Wash up!		

Moreover, as it can be seen in statements (8b) and (9b), the high tone of the second person pronoun is not only in the jussive mode, if at least it is accepted that both statements are imperative. And we can take our curiosity a step further to show that even in the indicative, in an assertive ((10a), (10b)) or interrogative ((11a), (11b)) operation, whether it expresses an adequacy ((10a), (11a)) or an inadequacy ((10b), (11b)) with a second person plural pronoun as its subject, the second person pronoun always has a high tone that is characteristic of it and not in the jussive mode.

(10a)	ε-	wóbá	nómówo		
	2pl	go.Prft	travel		
	You have travelled.				
(10 b)	ε-	tí-	wólo	nomowo	
	2pl	NEG	go.Imprf	travel	
	You have not travelled.				
(11a)	é-	kpáy		haláa	na
	2pl	take.Prft		wome n	Interr
	Have you taken wives? / Are you married?				
(11 b)	é-	té-	kpáy	haláa	kée
	2S g	NEG	take.Imp ft	wome n	Int err
	Didn't you take women? / Didn't you get married?				

Other works, (Kpézou, 2019), following Ernst (1994), and especially LébiKaza (1999) for

Kabiye, have favored the direct order addressed to a single person, the second person singular, as a mark of the imperative in Kabiye. Ernst (1994), for the Kakɔ, indicates in fact that "the forms of other persons, namely the 1st 2nd and 3rd person plural, as well as the 1st and 3rd person singular, belong to a second category which we call injunctive"⁹ (Ernst, 1994: 4). To avoid falling into dead-end speculation, it is indeed essential, in order to define the imperative object, to characterize what distinguishes it from nearby signifying objects. Therefore, the present study is based on linguistic data from the productions of native speakers, as it aims at theorization of a satisfactory level of descriptive adequacy. To this end, we fully endorse the characterization of the imperative made by Dufeu (2000): Le mode impératif n'a pas vocation à fournir une indication à propos d'un sujet (implicite). Sa fonction propre est d'instituer l'interlocuteur comme agent nécessaire du procès. Dans cette opération linguistique d'imposition du procès, et d'institution de l'interlocuteur comme sujet, le verbe impératif, qui n'est pas un prédicat, n'indique pas de programme chronologique. La nécessité d'obtempérer est immédiate, orientée vers un avenir indéfini. Elle apparaît avec l'énoncé même, sans représentation construite du temps. A la modalité de prédication, de laquelle relèvent les modes subjonctif et indicatif, nous avons donc opposé une autre modalité, de laquelle relève le mode impératif, et que nous avons proposé de baptiser « institution » (Dufeu, 2000 : 466)¹⁰.

⁹ This is my own translation of the author's words: "Les formes des autres personnes, à savoir la 1^{ère}, la 2^{ème} et la 3^{ème} personne du pluriel, ainsi que la 1^{ère} et la 3^{ème} personne du singulier font partie d'une deuxième catégorie que nous appelons injonctif" (Ernst, 1994 : 4).

¹⁰ My own translation of this point of view is as follows: "The imperative mode is not intended to provide an (implicit) indication about a subject. Its proper function is to establish the interlocutor as the necessary agent of the trial. In this linguistic operation of imposition of the process, and of institution of the interlocutor as subject, the imperative verb, which is not a predicate, does not indicate a chronological program. The need to obey is immediate, oriented towards an indefinite future. It appears with the statement itself, without a constructed representation of time. To the preaching modality, which includes the subjunctive and indicative modes, we have therefore opposed another modality, which includes the imperative

mode, and which we have proposed to call "institution"¹¹. (Dufeu, 2000: 466). It follows that the imperative mode is operative only insofar as the trial is imposed on the interlocutor, whether singular or plural, instituted as a subject who must comply immediately. It therefore becomes possible to adopt the logic that distinguishes the imperative form (as is the case with Oyharçabal (2000), among others), that which corresponds to the second person, as is the case in Basque¹¹, from other forms. Thus, the forms of the imperative vary according to whether the verb is actualized in the utterance with the modality "institution"¹² (Dufeu, 2000: 466) or with other values in addition.

The Institution Modality:

The trial intimates a direct order to a third party to the second person without any additional indication whose semantic value would nuance its realization or interpretation.

(12)	kalt		tákay					
		read.2sg.IMPER	aý					
			paper					
			Read the paper!					
(13)	tuɲɪ		ma-	wáyí				
		follow.2sg.IMPER	1Sg	behind.Postp				
			Follow me! / Come after me!					
(14)	é-	lékɪ	mí-	nési		póɲ	t	
		2pl	introduce.IMPER	2Pl.O	hands	hole	a	
						s	á	
							i	
							n	
							.	
							P	
							o	
							s	
							t	
							p	
			Put your hands in the holes!					
(15)	é-	púzi	míɲ	ne	m	ná		
		2sg	switchon.IMPER	fire	and	á-		
					1	see.Aor		
					S			

mode, and which we have proposed to call "institution"¹¹. (Dufeu, 2000: 466).

¹¹ Some examples: egizu 'do it'. cf. Oyharçabal (2000:2); EramanNazak 'Take me away' or EramanNazu 'Take us away'. cf. Oyharçabal (2000:7).

¹²A priori, the imperative mode has the function of instituting the enunciatee as the necessary agent of the trial. The "institution" mode is therefore intrinsic to it. And these are the forms in which verbs are presented with the institution modality that Lébikaza (1999:347ff) calls "Les formes simples de l'impératif".

					g	1.
Light the fire and I'll see!						

Adversarial value

When another value (continuative, expectative, adversative (LébiKaza, 1999)) is associated with the 'institution' modality, the process remains in imperative mode, but with an additional semantic nuance.

The adversarial modality of the imperative expresses an unconditionality: the enunciatee must perform whatever condition prevails or opposes the action envisaged. It is introduced by the morpheme tu- /BB/.

1. Continuing value The trial must continue.

(16) yókó-ɔ telá yém yɔbi
 break.2Sg.IMPER-
 CONT monkey.loaves for.no.reason carefree
 Continue to break the monkey loaves
 carelessly!

(20 a)	tu-		lem		
	Advs		dry.2Sg.IMPER		
	Dries all the same!				
(20 b)	tu-		quú		
	Advs		sow.2Sg.IMPER		
	Sow all the same!				
(21 a)	é	tu	kuóm		mlá
	-	-			
	2P	Adv	harvest.2Sg.IMPE		sorghu
	l	s	R		m
	Harvest the sorghum all the same!				
(21 b)	é	tu	pu		
	-	-	sí		
	2P	Adv	back.2Sg.IMPER		
	l	s			
	Come back anyway!				

(17)	é-	dóŋ	ɛzi	í-	ɪ-	niý	yó
	2	walk.IMP	such	2	NE	hea	D
	Pl	ER-	as	Pl	G	r.I	M
		CONT				mp	C
						rf	
	Keep walking as if you can't hear!						

Expected value

The order is directed to the addressee to act pending an explicitly expressed hypothetical action ((18b)-(19b)) or not ((18a)-(19a)). The expectant imperative is assumed by the morpheme tí- of tonal scheme HH.

1.3. The jussif

The previous section has tried to show how difficult it is to distinguish, in many descriptions, between the imperative and the jussive. Of course, variations in content may depend on contexts or language types since, as Italia (2005: 197), for example, shows, depending on the age and educational level of Gabonese pupils, jussive is confused with imperative in their reported discourse because, she says, the internal jussive modality is translated into the imperative mode. It is also normal to take into consideration the fact that situations do not present themselves in the same light from one language to another. Bentolila (1998) examines the issue with the case of Amharic, a very illustrative example: Jussif et impératif sont très proches l'un de l'autre, au point qu'on a pu parler de "jussif-impératif". Tous deux servent à exprimer l'injonction ; l'impératif pour la 2è personne [...] le jussif pour les autres personnes [...] Malgré cette proximité formelle et sémantique du jussif

(18a)	tí-	háiyí			
	Expec	cultivate.2Sg.IMPER			
	Cultivated in the meantime!				
(18b)	tí-	háiyí	né	haláa	
	Expec	cultivate.2Sg.IMPER	and	women	
	Cultivated while waiting for the women to bring the meal!				
(19 a)	é	tí-	ñówó		
	2Pl	Expec	drink.2Sg.IMPER		
		c			
	Drink while you wait!				
(19 b)	é	tí-	ñówó	né	nánd
	2Pl	Expec	drink.2Sg.IMPER	and	meat
		c			
	Drink while waiting for the meat to be cooked!				

et de l'impératif en amharique, nous préférons poser deux unités car le jussif est susceptible d'apparaître en énoncé interrogatif alors que l'impératif y est exclu.¹³(Bentolila, 1998: 173). Moreover, both the jussive and the imperative express the injunction in Kabiye. In the context of this description, it is retained that the jussive is characteristic of prescriptions, requirements and wishes. But what are its intrinsic properties? Lébiakaza (1999: 347) highlights the boundaries of this mode, but says no more beyond that: "Le jussif est proche du subjonctif, sans lui être identique. Nous avons évité le terme "subjonctif" parce qu'il recouvre des formes qui ne s'emploient pas seulement dans les énoncés exprimant une injonction ou un souhait"¹⁴. For my part, I consider the jussive to be governed by syntactic and semantic properties. Indeed, the jussive utterance is basically a verbal utterance with a left-selected argument which is a pronoun whose presence is obligatory even in the presence of a nominal phrase to which it refers ((22a)-(25a)). It is therefore updated, as in ((22b)-(25b)), with the system of substitute pronouns (Pali, 2015b: 296-297).

(22 a)	háy	ké-	kpézi
	dog	3Sg.cl7	bark.Aor
	The dog, let it bark!		
(22 b)	ké-	kpézi	
	3Sg.cl7	bark.A or	
	Let it bark!		
(23 a)	háráa	pó-	koo

¹³This is my own translation of the author's words: "Jussive and imperative are very close to each other, to the point that we could speak of "jussive-imperial". Both serve to express the injunction; the imperative for the second person [...] the jussive for the other persons [...] Despite this formal and semantic proximity of the jussive and the imperative in Amharic, we prefer to use two units because the jussive is likely to appear in an interrogative utterance whereas the imperative is excluded".

¹⁴"The jussive is quite close to the subjunctive, without being identical to it. We have avoided the term 'subjunctive' because it covers forms that are not only used in statements expressing an injunction or a wish".

	growers	3Sg.cl3	bark.Aor		
	Farmers, let them come!				
(23 b)	pó-	koo			
	3Pl.cl2	come.A or			
	Let them come!				
(24 a)	tóŋ	é-	ñoo	e-	núm
	bees	3Sg.cl1	drink.Go ld	3Pl.Poss	oil
	Bees, let them drink their honey				
(24 b)	é-	ñoo	e-	núm	
	3Sg.cl1	bark.A or	3Pl.Poss	oil	
	Let them drink their honey				
(25 a)	piya	sí-	wélesi		
	children	3Sg.cl7	listen.A or		
	Children, let them listen!				
(25 b)	sí-	wélesi			
	3Sg.cl7	listen.A or			
	Let them listen!				

On the other hand, with personal pronouns, the jussive statement has some syntactic features. It is a dependent proposition which expresses the wish or the injunction (of the enunciator) whereas it carries the injunctive content which explicitly expresses the reaction expected from the addressee. The first proposition is the one that Lébiakaza (1999: 346) called the introductory proposition, which he reduced to the following sentence: po-weése "It is necessary that ". But the utterances ((26a)-(26c)) show that Kabiye attests to other introductory propositions, depending on the verb chosen to preach according to the injunction or wish of the enunciator.

(26a)	pu-	wéé	se	mán-	sij
	3sg	be	that	1Sg	be.standing.Aor
	I have to stand.				
(26b)	haló	ñújaa	se	mán-	sij

Pali Tchaa/ The Prohibitive Injunction In Kabiye

	woman	require.Prft	that	1Sg	be.standing.Aor	27f*	é-	saṅ
	The woman demanded that I stay up.)		
(26c)	pɔ-	pɔzaá	se	mán-	síṅ		2Pl	wash.hands
	3sg	ask.Prft	that	1Sg	be.standing.Aor		Ungrammatical construction	
	It requires me to stand.							

What the above statements have in common is that the proposals, pɔ-wéése "It is necessary that", haló ñiṅaase "The woman demanded that" and pɔ-pɔzaáase "It demands that", play the same role in (26a), (26b) and (26c) to the extent that they can switch to the same position. Similarly, they all carry an injunction addressed to a third party, here má(ń)- (1Sg), the enunciator himself. Moreover, the introductory proposal is not always mandatory. It is necessarily expressed when the subject is a first person pronoun, a second person pronoun in the singular or a second person pronoun in the plural.

From a pragmatic point of view, the ungrammaticality of (27d*) and (27e*) depends on the communication situation. Indeed, if these statements take the form of assertive enunciative operations, their ungrammaticality would be recorded. On the other hand, in an interrogative operation, the said statements are not only attested as such as interrogative injunctions ((27g), (27h)), but they may also be formally marked by interrogatories such as yáawé ((27i), (27j)), na ((27k), (27l)). On the other hand, the statement (27f*) does not fit in isolation (without the introductory proposition) in an interrogative context and does not actualize itself as an injunction with the interrogative words. Does it depend on a particularity, a restriction (?), on the pronoun of the second person plural in the jussive? It is too early to provide a sufficiently well-equipped explanation. What can be said at this stage is that in the interrogative form of the jussive (see (27m), (27n)) of the statement (27f), the subject pronoun é- designates the third person singular (3Sg). The jussive interrogative form is not attested with the second person plural ((27o*)¹⁵, (27p*)).

(27a)	p ɔ -	wéé	se	mán-	saṅ
	3 s g	be	that	1Sg	wash.hands
	I need to wash my hands.				
(27b)	p ɔ -	wéé	se	ń-	saṅ
	3 s g	be	that	2Sg	wash.hands
	You need to wash your hands.				
(27c)	p ɔ -	wéé	se	ε-	saṅ
	3 s g	be	that	2Pl	wash.hands
	You need to wash your hands.				
(27d*)	mán-	saṅ			
	1Sg	wash.hands			
	Ungrammatical construction				
(27e*)	ń-	saṅ			
	2Sg	wash.hands			
	Ungrammatical construction				

(27g)	mán-	saṅ	
	1Sg	wash.hands	
	Do I have to wash my hands?		
(27h)	ń-	saṅ	
	2Sg	wash.hands	
	Do you have to wash your hands?		
(27i)	mán-	saṅ	yáaw é
	1Sg	wash.hands	Inter
	Do I have to wash my hands?		
(27j)	ń-	saṅ	yáaw é
	2Sg	wash.hands	Inter

¹⁵In (27o*) as in (27p*), ungrammaticality is created by the pronoun of the second person plural (2Pl) which does not fit with the interrogative operation of the jussive unlike the pronoun of the third person singular (see (27m) and (27n)).

Pali Tchaa/ The Prohibitive Injunction In Kabiye

	Do you have to wash your hands?		
(27k)	mán-	saŋ	na
	1Sg	wash.hands	Inter
	Do I have to wash my hands?		
(27l)	ń-	saŋ	na
	2Sg	wash.hands	Inter
	Do you have to wash your hands?		
(27m)	é-	saŋ	yáaw é
	3Sg	wash.hands	Inter
	Does he need to wash his hands?		
(27n)	é-	saŋ	na
	3Sg	wash.hands	Inter
	Does he need to wash his hands?		
(27o*)	é-	saŋ	yáaw é
	2Pl	wash your hands	Inter
	Ungrammatical construction		
(27p*)	ε-	saŋ	na
	2Pl	wash your hands	Inter

Apart from the above-mentioned pronouns (1Sg, 2Sg, 2Pl) which require the presence of the introductory proposal, this is optional with the third person singular, the first and the third person plural.

(28 a)	tí-	ña	é	s	ó		
	1Pl	respe ct. Aor	G	o	d		
	Respect God! / Let us respect God!						
(28 b)	pɔ-	wéé	s	dí-	ña	ε	s
	3sg	be	t	h	a	t	1Pl
							respect.Aor God
	We must respect God.						
(29 a)	é-	yele	n	ú	l		

			ú	n			
	3Sg	leave	c	h	e	a	t
			i	n	g		
	Let him stop cheating!						
(29 b)	pɔ-	wéé	s	é-	y	e	l
			e		e		
						múl	úm
	3sg	be	t	h	a	t	3Sg
						leav e.A	or
						cheating	
	He has to stop cheating.						
(30 a)	pɔ-	sɔ	k	p	a	m	l
			á				
						m	b
						ó	
	3sg	gri nd. Aor	t	h	a	t	3Sg
	Grind the sprouted sorghum this way!						
(30 b)	pɔ-	wéé	s	p	sɔ	k	p
			e	ó		á	m
			-				á
							m
							b
	3sg	be	t	h	a	t	3
							S
							grind. Aor
							sprout ed sorgh um
							t
							h
							i
							s
							·
							w
							a
							y
	It's time to grind the sprouted sorghum in this way! / It's time to grind the sprouted sorghum.						

Like the imperative, the jussive can express diverse values in the statement. To do this, the Kabiye language uses specific morphemes: tí- for the immediate (31), tu- for the adversative (32),

of the second person plural of the imperative (see, for example, the high tone of the pronoun in utterances (19a), (19b), (21a), (21b) under 1.2.1, supra). We conclude that this high tone is not specific to the jussive, but it represents in Kabiye a property of the second person plural in its generality. Moreover, another property of the injunction is that it can be combined with other enunciative operations, such as interrogation (rightly referred to in this section in (27g)-ss, supra). Indeed, interrogation can be incorporated in a statement in the 2nd person singular (35) or plural (36) imperative with the interrogative word *yááwé* or *yááwée* as in the jussive as illustrated in the examples (27g-n), supra).

(35)	ɬ-	lɔŋ	yááwée	
	walk.2Sg-IMPER	fast	Inter	
	Walk fast, don't you?			
(36)	é-	ñay	pána	yááwé
	2Pl.IMPER	burn	effort	Inter
	Outdo yourself, what else?			

But the injunction that uses persuasive incitement with the affirmative forms of the imperative and the jussive (LébiKaza, id: 347), also flirts with the expressive modality, not of inadequacy as negation does, but of prohibition whose incitement is dissuasive. In the expression of prohibition, properties appear that describe it as injunctive, whether its modality is imperative or jussive. Beyond this general perception, prohibition proceeds, in Kabiye, from a diversity of means of expression whose characterization requires attention in a more or less independent section such as the following.

2. Prohibition:

Prohibition is a deterrent injunction as it aims to prohibit a trial that has not started or to interrupt a trial in progress (François, 2003:336-ss). In Kabiye, prohibition is clearly distinguished from denial by its morphosyntactic and semantic properties. Indeed, for the enunciator, the modal subject of aim (the one from whom the prohibition emanates), prohibiting does not consist in denying a trial, i.e. in making a negative aim, but in doing everything possible to avoid it in the situation of communication:

Le Prohibitif neutralise les nuances que l'on trouve avec l'injonction positive ... En me plaçant dans la situation de référence Sit_R, je présente un événement P comme devant être évité. Cette visée modale est focale dans mon énoncé, i.e. n'est pas présupposée. Ce faisant, j'effectue un acte illocutoire d'interdiction²⁰ (François, 2003:337). The morpheme of the prohibitive is *taa-* ((36a)-(36b)) distinct from the morpheme of negation which is *ta-*. Beyond the use of distinct morphemes, negation does not occur in the enunciative operation of the injunction. It is only actualized in the assertion (37a) and in the interrogation (37b).

(36a)	taa-	kóo	dɔŋ	
	Proh	shout.Aor	strong	
	Don't shout loudly!			
(36b)	taa-		yɔɔdt	
	Proh		talk.Aor	
	Don't talk!			
(37a)	haláa	ta-	páa	
	women	NEG	dance	
	The women did not dance.			
(37b)	hást	te-	kpezí	kée
	dogs	NEG	bark	Inter
	Didn't the dogs bark?			

It thus emerges that Kabiye language distinguishes between prohibition and negation, and this allows us to question the expressions used until then in descriptions to designate prohibition in Kabiye: “formes négatives de l’impératif et du jussif” (‘negative forms of the imperative and the jussive’) LébiKaza (1999); “négation à l’impératif” (‘negation to the imperative’) Kassan (1987), Péré-Kéwézima (2010), Roberts (2013). We would like to recall that what is called into question in these descriptions is the confusion in the designation of the phenomenon described by the use of the term ‘negation’ or the simultaneous use (in the same

²⁰ This is my own translation of the author's words: “The Prohibitive neutralizes the nuances found with the positive injunction ... By placing myself in the Sit_R reference situation, I present an event P as one that should be avoided. This modal aim is focal in my statement, i.e. it is not presupposed. In doing so, I perform an illocutionary act of prohibition”.

study) of the terms 'negation' and 'prohibition' to designate the same phenomenon of prohibition when each is expressed in discourse by a distinct morpheme.

2.1. Formal Expression Of Prohibition:

The prohibitive injunction is expressed in one sentence by the prohibitive morpheme taa-/BB/"...do not..." The purpose of the latter is to modify the modality of the simple intimation that corresponds to a request to do something in order to transform it into a request not to do something (Pali, 2011:448). Thus, the prohibitive turns out to be a propositional operator aimed exclusively at preventing or interrupting the carrying out of a trial. For this reason, it only relates to sentences whose aspect is supposed to be unfulfilled (already in the process of being fulfilled or whose fulfilment is considered hypothetical). The role of the prohibitive morpheme taa- is to annihilate the aspectual content of the unfulfilled by imposing that of the aorist whose role is to inhibit the visualization of the action he is reporting on: La fonction d'un aoriste est, en inhibant la visualisation mentale de l'action exprimée, d'accélérer la progression de la narration : les actions sont perçues comme réduites à leur mention, quel que soit par ailleurs le luxe de détails dont peut être entourée une forme verbale d'aoriste dans cette narration [...] Le domaine exclusif de l'aoriste est celui de l'actuel, du temps déterminé à vif dans le vif du temps physique universel et continuant d'y adhérer complètement [...] ²¹(Durin, 1993 : 44).

In Kabiye, the verb of the prohibitive proposition is therefore in principle an aorist verb (cf. (36a) and (36b) under 2, supra and ((38a)-(38b), infra) imposed by the presence of

the prohibitive morpheme taa-, which is actualized in the pre-verbal environment according to the following structure proposed by Lé bikaza (1999) and taken up by Kpezou (2019): (Topic-)-PROH.taa/BB/-Verbe.Aor (-Object).

(38 a)	taa-	tɔɔ	ná	míŋ		
	Proh	eat.Gol d	with	fire		
	Don't eat hot!					
(38 b)	é -	taa-	héyi	wé-	é	natóy σ
	2 P l	Proh	tell.A or	3Pl. Ost	DMC	someti ng
	Don't tell them anything!					

The basic form of the prohibitive utterance described in this way may be subject to syntactic and semantic nuances driven by modalities that can accommodate the prohibitive morpheme taa-. This is part of the mechanisms of expression of the various modalities in the injunction as we have observed with the different values of the imperative (under 1.1., supra) and the jussive (under 1.2., supra).

2.1.1. Continuative Prohibition:

In Prohibition, the continuative is syntactically indicated by the unfulfilled aspect of the verb, unlike the aorist, which is actualized in the naked prohibitive form, i.e. that which excludes any other syntactic or semantic modality. The continuative prohibition, as illustrated below ((39)-(41)), prohibits the continuation of an action already observed in the addressee or warns him/her against a possible action that could be continuously realized.

(39)	ñé-	táá	é -	ta a-	w í y	yé m- yé m			
	2S g	in	3Sg	Proh	h u r t	free of charge			

²¹This is my own translation of the author's words: "The function of an *aorist* is, by inhibiting the mental visualization of the action expressed, to accelerate the progression of the narrative: the actions are perceived as reduced to their mention, whatever moreover the luxury of detail which may surround a verbal form of aorist in this narration [...]. The exclusive domain of the *aorist* is that of the *present*, of time determined in the heat of universal physical time and continuing to adhere completely to it [...]"

It often happens that the process of a proposal remains so implicit that its deduction is only possible thanks to the communication situation. These are acts of indirect language, (Searle, 1972). In this case, the imperative, injunctive or deterrent characteristics and the prohibitive morpheme are of no use. The interlocutor has to explore the communicative situation, the co-text, the prosody, the syntax but also his intuitive knowledge of the language, "the speaker's intuition²³" (Chomsky, 1957) for the decoding of the intimative content implied. Thus, all forms of linguistic expression (positive or negative assertion, interrogation, imperative, etc.) can be used to express opposition to the carrying out of a trial. The statement may appear to be a simple assertion (48a), a mandatory injunction (49a), therefore not prohibitive at first sight, a non-verbal construction (an interjection (50a), an address term such as a proper noun (51a), a pronoun (51b), etc.), or a non-verbal construction (an interjection (50b), a pronoun (51c), etc.).

(48a)	sɔn ɔ́	í-	í-	púziy	mí ŋ
	toda y	2Pl	NE G	switch on.Imprf	fire
	Today, you don't light the fire.				

In an irenic context, the statement (48a) can be interpreted as a simple negation of the intention to light the fire, probably also a challenge. On the other hand, in an agonizing relationship, for example as a result of misconduct by the enunciators, the content of the statement may prove to be a prohibition against lighting a fire. Such a connotation corresponds to the following direct prohibitive injunction:

(48a)	sɔn ɔ́	í-	taa -	púzi	mí ŋ
	toda y	2Pl	Pro h	switch on.Aor	fire
	Today, don't light the fire.				

Similarly, the statement (49a), which appears to

be an injunction combining the imperative and the jussive, is a prohibition addressed to the enunciatee to dissuade him from going to the place envisaged. It is therefore a peremptory prohibitive message (cf. 2.1.2., supra). The enunciator could just have produced, instead of (49a), the statement (49b) below. Moreover, (49c), which seems to be an imperative that grants a favor, an authorization to the speaker, is just as much as (49b) a prohibition to eat anything, hence a prohibition.

(49a)	wolo	ŋ-	gɔ́	m-	máyná-	m
	Go.2 Sg.I MPE R	2Sg	come .Aor	1Sg	find.Ao r	1Sg .O
	Go (and) you will see when you come back!					
(49b)	taa-	tí-	wobú			
	Proh	Inten s	go.Aor			
	Don't even go there! / Don't even dare go there!					
(49c)	tɔɔ		putɪŋ ge	ne		
	Eating IMPER.2Sg		all	Inter j		
	Eat it all, okay? / Watch out if you eat it all!					

In certain discursive contexts where the interlocutors have the same awareness of the communication situation, an interjection is enough for a speaker to instigate a prohibitive injunction to the addressee. The injunctive modality is based on the incentive function of the interjection, whose prohibitive value results from the context that the speaker wishes to see modified. Interjections ((50a)-(50c)) are semantically equivalent to a cease-and-desist prohibition (see 2.1.3., supra).

(50a) háyiyáwó
cautionary note
(50b)ŋŋŋŋ
Impairment
(50c)ŋŋŋŋ
Disapproval

²³The intuition of the speaking subject resides in "[...] the ability of the speaking subject, who has internalized the grammar of a language, to make judgments about the grammaticality and acceptability of statements made in that language" Dubois et al (2007: 257).

A final aspect of contextual prohibition concerns the address, the evocation of which in an agonizing context can be prohibitive since it indicates to the designated enunciatee that his or her act (already performed, in progress or about to be performed) is prohibited. Pali (2015a:191) rightly shows that "Verbal interaction, whatever its relational dimension, is the framework in which the term address is actualized as the key to the pragmatic reinforcement of the utterance". Also, a simple pronoun, especially a second person pronoun in the singular (ñé 'you' (51a)) or plural (mí'you' (51b)) or a person's proper noun (51c-d) said in an interjectiveway (which is glossed here by an exclamation mark) can have a prohibitive contextual scope. In this context, even the proper name is addressed directly to a direct interlocutor.

(51a)	ñε
	you!
(51b)	mɪ
	You!
(51c)	samá
	Sama!
(51d)	kɔ́ndó

2.2. The Strengthening Of Prohibition

The level of expression of the prohibition can be accentuated and the content of the prohibitive statement can be made firmer. The use of specific adverbs helps to clarify the extent to which the defense, the prohibition, is resolutely unconditional. The so-called absolute adverbs (or "morphemes that can be described as absolute" (Kpezou, 2019), notably káwɔ/HH/ (52a)-(53a), ɖa /B/ (52b)-(53b) and kpa/B/ (52c)-(53c), are updated in the prohibitive utterance in co-presence with the prohibition morpheme. Their semantic content is the same ("not at all" ("never")) so that they are substitutable for each other in the same statement. Syntactically, the prohibitive morpheme precedes the verb, while the absolute adverb always appears at the beginning of the utterance.

(52 a)	taa-	kósu	εyó	káwó	
	Pro h	lift.Aor	perso n	never	

	Never lift a person up! / Never save a (struggling) person!						
(52 b)	taa-	kósu		εyó	ɖa		
	Pro h	lift.Aor		perso n	never		
	Never lift a person up! / Never save a (struggling) person!						
(52 c)	taa-	kósu		εyó	kpa		
	Pro h	lift.Aor		perso n	never		
	Never lift a person up! / Never save a (struggling) person!						
(53 a)	ʎí-	taa-	ñáyzi	law	ɔ	mí	káwɔ
	1Pl	Pro h	fire.A or	forest	DMC	fir e	never
	Let's never set fire to the forest!						
(53 b)	ʎɪ	taa-	ñáyzi	lakɔ-	ɔ	mí	ɖa
	1Pl	Pro h	fire.Ao r	bus h	DM C	fir e	never
	Let's never set fire to the forest!						
(53 c)	ʎɪ	taa-	ñáyzi	lakɔ-	ɔ	mí	kpa
	1Pl	Pro h	fire.Ao r	bus h	DM C	fir e	never
	Let's never set fire to the forest!						

Conclusion:

The objective of this study has been to describe the means of expression of the prohibitive injunction in Kabiye. The aim has been to show that in Kabiye, the prohibitive statement is strictly distinguished from the negative statement by the morphosyntactic means which participate in their implementation. In other words, prohibition is not a negative injunction. It has followed that prohibition is a priori an imperative or jussive injunctive modality. It is actualized by the insertion in the pre-verbal context of the prohibitive morpheme taa- /BB/. This morpheme is different from the negation morpheme ta-/B/. According to the different semantic nuances sought by the speaker, prohibition can be expectant, continuative, ceasing or preemptory. These ranges are expressed by the addition of other significant units to the prohibitive

morpheme, which are inserted between the prohibitive morpheme and the verb. At the morphosyntactic level, the mode of expression of prohibition is the aorist. Moreover, in addition to the explicit expression formally marked by the morpheme *taa-*, prohibition can be implicitly expressed, without the presence of the prohibitive morpheme, through an assertion, an address term, an exclamation, etc. The interpretation of such statements as prohibitive requires the context of their production to be taken into account.

Référence :

1. BENTOLILA, F., 1998. Systèmes verbaux. Peters, Louvain-La-Neuve.
2. BREÛS, V., 2002. Pragmatique et syntaxe de l'injonction : Les échanges oraux réglementaires des militaires français. In: *L'Information Grammaticale*, N. 93, 2002, 51-52.
3. CHARAUDEAU, P., 1983. Langage et Discours - Éléments de sémio linguistique, Paris, Hachette.
4. BÜHLER, K., 1934. Sprachtheorie, Jena, Fischer.
5. CHARAUDEAU, P., 1983. Langage et discours - Éléments de sociolinguistique, Paris, Hachette Université - Coll Langue, Linguistique, Communication
6. CHOMSKY, N., 1957. Syntactique structures, The Hague/Paris: Mouton.
7. COSTAOUEC, D. & GUERIN F., 2007. Syntaxe fonctionnelle. Théorie et exercices. Rennes, Presses Universitaire de Rennes.
8. CREISSELS, D., 2006a. Syntaxe générale, une introduction typologique 1. Paris, Lavoisier.
9. DESNICA, M., 2016. Étude énonciative et discursive des énoncés anglais dans la presse féminine française, thèse de doctorat, Université Paris-Est / Université de Zagreb.
10. DUBOIS, J. & al., 2007. Grand dictionnaire de linguistique & Sciences du langage, Paris, Larousse.
11. DURIN, J., 1993. L'aoriste (comme narratif) et l'aspect perfectif. In: *Revue des études slaves*, tome 65, fascicule 1, 41-56
12. EHLICH, K., 1986. Die Entwicklung von Kommunikationstypologien und die Formbestimmtheit des sprachlichen Handelns. In: W. Kallmeyer, (Hg.) *Kommunikationstypologie. Handlungsmuster, Textsorten, Situationstypen*. Düsseldorf: Schwann, 47-72.
13. ERNST U., 1994. Impératif et injonction en kakə. Yaoundé, Société Internationale de Linguistique.
14. FONTAINE, J., 2012. Inscriptio des formes verbales injonctives dans la syntaxe du discours en russe contemporain, in *Revue des études slaves*, tome 83, fascicule 2-3, 2012. La lettre et l'esprit : entre langue et culture. Études à la mémoire de Jean Breuillard, 417-427
15. FRANÇOIS, A., 2003. La sémantique du prédicat en mwotlap (Vanuatu). Paris, Peeters Leuven.
16. ITALIA, M. 2005. Variation en fonction de l'âge et du niveau de scolarité dans le français oral de locuteurs gabonais : la question du discours rapporté, in Katja Ploog, Blandine Rui (Ed.) *Appropriation du français en contexte multilingue : Éléments sociolinguistiques pour une réflexion didactique à propos de situations africaines*. Actes du colloque « Situation de plurilinguisme et enseignement du français en Afrique », Besançon, 16-17 novembre 2003. 191-208.
17. JAKOBSON, R., 1963. Essais de linguistique générale, vol. I et II, Paris, Minuit.
18. KASSAN, B., 1987. La morphologie du verbe kabiyè. Les temps simples. Mémoire de Maîtrise en Linguistique, Université du Bénin, Lomé., Togo.
19. KASSAN, B., 1996. Système verbal et énonciation en kabiyé (Togo), Thèse de Doctorat Nouveau Régime, Université Paris 3 Sorbonne-Nouvelle.
20. KPEZOU, E., 2019. Négation et prohibition en kabiyè, Mémoire de Master 2 en Linguistique descriptive, Kara, Université de Kara.
21. LEBIKAZA, K. K., 1999. Grammaire kabiyè: une analyse systématique. Köln, Rüdiger Köppe Verlag.
22. MARTINET, A., 2005. Éléments de linguistique générale. Paris, Armand Colin.
23. MINH, C. N., 2015. Les injonctifs

- averbaux (sans verbe conjugué). D'une approche en langue à une analyse de corpus, in Corela [En ligne], HS-16 | 2015, mis en ligne le 04 juin 2015, consulté le 19 avril 2019. URL : <http://journals.openedition.org/corela/3759> ; DOI : 10.4000/corela.3759.
23. NICOLE, J., 2018. Grammaire du nawdm, SIL e-Books 69, Dallas, Texas, SIL International.
24. PALI, T., 2011. Description systématique de la langue miyobé (Togo-Bénin), Thèse de Doctorat Unique en Cotutelle Internationale, Université Michel de Montaigne Bordeaux 3 Université de Lomé.
25. PALI, T., 2015a. Types de formes nominales d'adresse et de parenté et contextes à plaisanterie en kabiye, dans Relations a plaisanterie et développement endogène de l'Afrique, Kodjona KADANGA, Essohanam BATCHANA (éds.), Presses de l'IRES-RDEC, 179-195.
26. PALI, T., 2015b. Pronom anaphorique et coréférence en kabiye, in Quelle contribution des universités au développement en Afrique ? Volume II, Actes du colloque scientifique international de l'université de Kara, 12-16 mai 2014, Paris, L'Harmattan, 291-309.
27. PERE-KEWEZIMA, K. E., 2010. The negation morphemes in Kabiye: structure and semantic nuance in Studies in the languages of the Volta Bassin VI. Linguistics Département, University of Ghana, Legon, 11-28.
28. ROBERTS, D., 2002. Les classes tonales du verbe en Kabiye, Mémoire de maîtrise, Institut de Linguistique et de Phonétique Générales et Appliquées, Université de la Sorbonne Nouvelle – Paris III Relu et corrigé le 15 mars 2012
29. ROBERTS, D., 2013. Parlons Kabiye, Paris, Harmattan.
30. SEARLE, J. 1972. Les actes de langage : essai de philosophie du langage, Paris : Hermann.
31. SEARLE, J. 1979. Expression and meaning: Studies in the theory of speech acts. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University.
32. SEARLE, J., 1990. Intentionality. New York: Cambridge University Press.
33. SMITH, A., 2007. L'expression de la fonction phatique en français et en allemand : du concept de phaticité au pilotage du coénonciateur à l'aide des expressions phatiques. Thèse de Doctorat Nouveau Régime de Langues, Littératures et Civilisations Germaniques et Scandinaves, Université de Nancy 2.