

Addaiyan Journal of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences

© Addaiyan International Publishers

(An international Publisher of Research & Academic Resources)

Journal Homepage: <https://aipublisher.org/projects/ajahss/>

ISSN: 2581-8783 (Online)

DOI: 10.36099/ajahss.3.8.5

The pragmatic and textual dimensions of French in Côte d'Ivoire: functions of ke in colloquial conversation**Adama Drabo**

PhD in General Linguistics (University of Bayreuth)

Corresponding Author*

Adama Drabo

Article History

Received: 15.08.2021

Accepted: 25.08.2021

Published: 31.08.2021



Abstract: By focusing on discourse markers, this article aims to show that the appropriation of French in Côte d'Ivoire is manifested from a pragmatic-textual perspective. It contributes to the extension of the tradition of work already done on French in this country. I argue that ke as a morpheme borrowed from African languages is a marker of intensification with different communicative values in Ivorian French. My analysis is based on a corpus of spontaneous oral data and on interactional approaches developed in the framework of contact linguistics.

Keywords: *discourse markers, appropriation of French, Ivorian French, contact linguistics, a pragmatic-textual perspective*

1. INTRODUCTION

The appropriation of French as a second language by African speakers has favoured the emergence of endogenous norms with particularities at the phonetic-phonological, lexical, morphological, syntactic, pragmatic, and textual level (Drabo 2019). However, research on this last aspect is still at an embryonic stage (Drescher 2018). In the case of Côte d'Ivoire, with its complex linguistic landscape made up of some sixty languages, it is French that serves today as both vehicular and vernacular (Kouadio 2007; Boutin 2014). While these phonetic, lexical, and morpho-syntactic particularities have already been the subject of numerous studies, it is not the case for the pragmatic and textual aspects. Enunciative phenomena, textual genres, and discourse markers (DMs) of Ivorian French, to mention only those, have been largely ignored.

Generally, DMs contribute to the organization and coherence of discourse, to its anchoring in the context, and to the coordination of turns of talk (Schiffrin 1996, 315). Some have modal values and express affective and/or epistemic attitudes (Drescher, 2018). As a functional class, DMs are formally heterogeneous and include adverbs, conjunctions, prepositions, interjections, etc. In a language contact situation, they are often subject to borrowing. From a theoretical point of view, this paper is situated at the crossroads of variational pragmatics, a recent branch of linguistics that emerged out of the interest in

the pragmatics of variation, and contact linguistics (Drescher 2014). According to this approach, DMs are borrowed not because of the pre-eminence of the mother tongue (L1) over the second language (L2) or vice versa, as the proponents of grammaticalization stipulate, but more surely for their pragmatic and textual values (Matras 2007; Drescher 2014). To achieve my goal, I will start from a general presentation of DMs in the literature (2) while focusing on language contact and studies related to *ke*. Then, in 3, I will analyse *ke* from an empirical base consisting of colloquial conversations in order to identify its different communicative values. Finally, a synthesis will conclude this study (4).

2. Overview of the literature on DMs

The theoretical proposals of Gülich's (1970) pioneering work on the “Makrosyntax der Gliederungssignale im gesprochenen Französisch” led to the development of research on DMs. The publication of the renowned works of Ducrot & al. (1980), Roulet & al. (1985), and Schiffrin (1987) not only increased the interest of researchers in the topic but also created the opportunity for a diversification around the general framework of the study. Drescher & Frank-Job (2006, 7) point out that work on DMs is situated at the intersection of different research fields. However, despite this special attention from researchers, there is a lack of consensus, especially when it comes to determining whether a particular word belongs to the category of DMs.

The lack of consensus on the general framework for the study of DMs has made it a linguistic class with blurred boundaries, and furthermore subject to fluctuation in its names, which constitute subcategories in the literature. However, without claiming to be exhaustive, a review of the literature has revealed several names for DMs. Thus, depending on the DMs chosen, the objectives and the theoretical positioning of the authors, we distinguish: “mots du discours” (Ducrot & al., 1980), “connecteurs pragmatiques” (Roulet & al, 1985), “organisateurs textuels” (Adam 1990), “opérateurs” (generally opposed to connectors: Anscombe & Ducrot, 1983 ; Rossari 2016), “marqueurs de structuration de la conversation” (Auchlin 1981), “marqueurs de reformulation paraphrastiques” (Gülich & Kotschi, 1983), “ponctuants” (Vincent, 1993), “particles” (enunciative or discursive) (Fernandez, 1994, Mosegaard-Hansen, 1998, and others), “discourse markers” (Schiffrin, 1996 ; Paillard & Ngân, 2012; Drescher & Frank-Job, 2006; Dostie & Pusch, 2007; Blakemore 2006), “marqueurs métalinguistiques” (Cadiot et al. 1985), or even “petits mots du discours” (Bruxelles & Traverso, 2001), “pragmatic markers” (Fraser 1999), etc. Despite these terminological discrepancies, DMs seem to have something in common. Auer & Maschler (2016) argue that they fulfil almost universal pragmatic functions. As a result, they remain highly sensitive to the phenomenon of language contact.

2.1 DMs and language contact

Transfers of DMs from one language to another are motivated differently and vary according to the approaches adopted by researchers. Proponents of the structural approach argue that the peripheral posture of DMs at the syntactic level makes them easily integrable units in languages. Brody (1987) contends that the detachable dual nature (grammatical and lexical) of DMs allows them to be borrowed. De Rooij & Vincent (2000), from discourse and cognitive perspective, consider that the preference for second language DMs in bilingual discourse is related to their discourse abstract meaning, but he also recognizes their status as a syntactically peripheral element. Those who take the variationist perspective

claim that the transfer of DMs should be interpreted in terms of the prestige associated with them since they come from a language that is attractive to speakers of another language. Thus, according to Poplack (1980) (cited by Matras 2000, 513), the use of English DMs by Spanish and English bilinguals who are less proficient in English confers social prestige on the discourse: as easy-to-integrate linguistic elements, they will be the preferred emblematic switches. This same motivation is found in Brody (1987), who argues that in Mayan-Spanish discourse, the borrowing of Spanish grammatical words is an attempt to structurally imitate Spanish as a prestigious language. Clyne (2003), working on corpora of trilinguals in Australia, exploits the results of cross-cultural pragmatics. His examination of the data from his corpora leads to the conclusion that the use of DMs will depend on individual styles of expression, needs, and functional specialisation of the languages. While the systems of German and Dutch DMs, on the one hand, and English DMs, on the other, show structural and functional differences, they also reflect different types of communicative behaviour. However, the aim of our study is neither to compare systems of languages in contact nor to propose a historical perspective. Therefore, the above-mentioned frameworks are not suitable for my analysis, and it is necessary to consider a pragmatic-textual approach concerning the transfer of DMs.

Matras' (2007) and Drescher's (2014, 2018) approaches to language contact contrast with Thomason & Kaufman's (1988) claim that social and sociolinguistic aspects are relevant but secondary. This theoretical hierarchy is reconsidered by Matras (2000, 2007), for whom sociolinguistic factors are essential to the understanding of language phenomena. Matras assumes that language is a continuum of uses rather than a system. Thus, he refocuses the contact-induced switch on speech production, i.e. on the goals of language processing and communication. In this approach, the multilingual speaker is the locus of repertoires: whole repertoires or specific parts of them are associated with particular social activities and are governed by the normative attitudes of the speaker's community. Matras' aim is to propose a universal model of linguistic switching that is not independent of specific social circumstances. Thus, building on the work of Prince (1988) in the context of language contact, Matras' (2000, 2007) approach departs from that of Thomason & Kaufman (1988). Indeed, Prince reveals, in the synthesis of his study, the possibility of borrowing at the pragmatic level by specifying that the discourse function is borrowed and not the syntactic structure. This hypothesis is confirmed by Matras. The research of the latter proves that DMs are among the first to be borrowed because of their functional status. Thus, for Matras, borrowing is not conditioned by direction or linguistic competence but rather by communicative and interactive needs. This implies not only the existence of a transfer at the pragmatic and textual level but also requires a revision of the "dichotomous relationship between interference and borrowing" (Drescher 2014). Thus, Matras favours the hypothesis of simultaneous access to two languages of bilinguals.

By the automatic choice of language in which DMs are verbalized, bilinguals unconsciously reduce the cognitive load operating on them during the interaction. Matras' argument for a cognitive trigger for reversed DMs is based on the impression that there is a separation in the mental compartmentalisation of language processing operations between tasks that might be loosely defined as 'speaking' and 'directing'. He postulates a mental separation between the operations of thinking to speak and monitoring and directing (Slobin 1996). The latter operation, which is the most complex, is accomplished by using DMs.

According to Matras, the bilingual aims to reduce the heavier cognitive load associated with monitoring and directing, thus eliminating the choice between the two systems available to perform this operation. This cognitive motivation is so strong that it will sometimes override the social constraints of communication and conversation. To understand the meaning of change and the link between synchronic variation and diachronic replacement, Matras proposes the concept of “dominant pragmatic language” which refers to the language towards which a speaker directs maximum mental effort in given linguistic interactions. This language is the system that is the target of the ‘fusion’ around DMs. My analyses of *ke* will be conducted in the light of the approaches of Matras (2007) and Drescher (2014, 2018).

2.2 Previous studies on *ke*

Although the item *ke* has been superficially described in Bambara and Dioula, scholars of these two languages have assigned it the role of an exclamatory particle used to express the “nuance d’impatience” (Bailleul 2000), to reinforce the truth (Bailleul 2000, Dumestre 2011), and to attract attention (Dumestre 2011). In French, *ke* is briefly described by the IFA team (2004) as having a value of emphasis. The genuine studies devoted to the functioning of this item as a DM are those of Abolou (2010) and Diao-Klaeger (2018). Depending on the hypotheses locating the origin of *ke*, these researchers have different views. While Diao-Klaeger (2018) places it in the large family of Manding languages, Abolou (2010) postulates for its belonging to Ivorian languages such as Bété, Dioula, and Baoulé. Since the latter belong to three different ethnolinguistic groupings (Kru, Manding, and Kwa), Abolou's (2010) hypothesis seems a little less precise than that of Diao-Klaeger (2018). According to the latter, if *ke* is found in languages outside the continuum of Manding dialects, it is precisely because it would have undergone a similar process of transfer as its passage into French. Without entering the debate on the origin of this morpheme, we share the coherence of her argument, especially since, in the sphere of local languages, Dioula remains the most widely used lingua franca in Côte d'Ivoire. This is not in terms of native speakers, but because it is used as lingua franca in most of the large areas such as markets and bus stations, where all the social and ethnic strata of the country meet. Its influence on other local languages is therefore evident. Although both authors recognise *ke* as a DM, Abolou (2010) assigns it a testimonial and hierarchical functions in the discourse, while Diao-Klaeger (2018) considers that *ke*'s function consists of intensifying warnings, threats, or reproaches. Their work is not unanimous either around the origin of the DM *ke* or around its functions. What is the reason for this functional differentiation? Is it because of the different varieties of French or the epistemological frameworks chosen for the different analyses, or the nature of the data?

If it seems logical to place the study of borrowed DMs in the general framework of language contact, their analysis in the single sense of meaning-conveying mechanisms from the source language to the host language, as Abolou (2010) has done, would however risk obscuring some of their functions. Clearly, Abolou's (2010) aim was to account for the truth reinforcement that *ke* seems to play in source languages. The concern for the transfer of meaning from source languages to French obliged Abolou (2010) to restrict the search for the functions of *ke* only to the level of assertive utterances. In addition to the narrowness of the empirical base, which considers only a few examples, his analyses could also be criticised for not taking into account occurrences in wider contexts of appearance. Similarly, Diao-Klaeger's (2018) analysis seems restrictive in several respects. The author's neglect of the discursive dimension has probably obscured the function of discourse hierarchy in terms of theme/rheme mentioned

by Abolou (2010). Diao-Klaeger (2018) emphasizes the relationship between *ke* and the illocutionary values of the statements it is attached to. But, through her examples, she only focuses on reproaches, threats, or warnings. Yet, considering our own data, I noticed the presence of *ke* in other circumstances different from these. The relevance of the present study will be revealed in the consideration of other functions of *ke*.

3. Analysis of *ke* in the data

The analysis of a corpus of spontaneous oral interactions of Ivorian French will allow us to further nuance the pragmatic-discursive values of *ke* and, in general, to illustrate the originality of African French on the pragmatic-discursive level. These are conversations between members of the same family or between friends collected by audio recording. In total, 120 occurrences of *ke* were selected for this study. The analysis takes into account the different sequential contexts of *ke* (initiative or reactive position) as well as its place in the turn of talk (median or final). Most occurrences of *ke* are found at the end of the turn, while occurrences in the middle are less frequent. No occurrences of *ke* are observed at the beginning of a turn. A systematization of all the selected occurrences allowed me to identify different communicative values of *ke*.

3.1 *ke* at the end of an assertive utterance: evidence marker.

In general, assertive utterances engage the speaker's responsibility (to varying degrees) for the truth, as they express propositions in order to represent how things are in the world (Searle 1962). The examples where *ke* appears at the end of assertive utterances are the most numerous in our data. The following examples present its mode of appearance in these utterances.

Example 1

- 1 V il a pris non?
he took, didn't he?
- 2 U il a pris *ke*
He took ke

Example 2

- 1 L donc il l'a reçu ?
so he received it?
- 2 M il a eu *ke*
he received it ke

Example 3

- 1 A et puis il paraît qu'elle s'est mariée
and then it seems she got married
- 2 F oui *ke*
yes ke

In reactive turns of talk, *ke* appears only in affirmative contexts. These reactions correspond to the response of a question (examples 1 and 2) or an assumption that requires clarification (example 3).

However, an examination of the turns of talk (initiative turns) that led to the different reactions involving *ke* reveal a common feature: they all carry a truth (propositional content) to which the speaker seeks confirmation from the hearer. In the first two examples, it is a question clearly formulated with the intention of seeking confirmation. This is perceived in (1) by the presence of the DM *non* (Abolou 2010), which is a marker for seeking approval, and the DM *donc* in (2). The DM *donc* and the interrogative intonation at the end of the turn of talk reflect that despite the fact that the speaker has an idea about the situation (necessarily prior), he is seeking confirmation of his statement. In (3), line 1, this is an assumption stated for the purpose of possible verification. The speaker's lack of confidence can be seen in the expression “it seems”.

In all these examples, *ke* is postposed to the reiteration of the truth contained in the previous utterances. While in (1) and (2) we have a word-for-word restatement of this truth, in (3), *ke* is preceded by the adverb of approval *oui*. The latter is an equivalent elliptical proposition of the truth contained in the previous speech. To this extent, the facts are presented to the hearer in the sense of a restoration¹ of his or her belief universe (“univers de croyance” Abolou 2010). In assertive utterances, *ke* has a cognitive value that consists in linking two propositional contents: that of the host utterance and its equivalent previously expressed by the hearer. The DM *ke* marks the evidence of a previously expressed truth. This shows proof of its intensifying character and also gives it a function similar to an indexical device providing coherence between an utterance and its surrounding context (Schiffrin 1996).

3.2 *ke* at the end of a query: supplication marker

In my data, the DM *ke* is often postposed to requests as shown in examples 4, 5, and 6. These examples reveal ‘negotiations’ in the sense of Kerbrat-Orecchioni (1984, 237)²

Example 4

- | | | |
|---|----|---|
| 1 | FA | pardon mets l'enfant là au dos (.)
<i>Please put this child on your back</i> |
| 2 | | elle a sommeil
<i>she is sleepy</i> |
| 3 | BI | elle va pas dormir ho
<i>she won't sleep ho</i> |
| 4 | FA | il faut la prendre
<i>you must take her</i> |
| 5 | | (---) |
| 6 | FA | attache-la au dos <i>ke</i>
<i>tie her on your back ke</i> |
| 7 | BI | elle est trop gâtée
<i>she is too spoiled</i> |

¹ Instead, Abolou (2010) speaks of ‘réaménagement’ which in our view seems much broader and less precise. We prefer the term restoration in that the value of *ke* is referred to the co-validation of the belief universe rather than a change in it.

² According to Kerbrat-Orecchioni, a conversation is negotiated when it starts, “surgissent certains conflits, divergences, tiraillements entre les interactants, [...] et que ceux-ci tentent de résoudre au moins partiellement les conflits en question [...]” (1984, 237).

Example 5

- 1 FA accompagne-moi chez le coiffeur
accompany me to the hairdresser
- 2 BI tchè (.) je suis fatigué hein
tchè (.) I'm tired hein
- 3 FA eh pardon san:³
eh please san:
- 4 BI (murmures)
(murmuring)
- 5 FA allons-y *ke*
let's go ke
- 6 BI mais on dure pas là-bas hein
but we don't last there hein

Example 6

- 1 OU attrape ça je viens
catch this I'm coming
- 2 SA tu vas où?
where are you going?
- 3 OU je m'en vais au grand marché
I am going to the main market
- 4 tiens ça san: tiens *ke*
hold it san: hold ke
- 5 SA si tu viens pas vite tu vas pas venir me trouver hein
if you don't come quickly you won't find me hein

In 4, we have a situation where a mother (FA) asks her older sister (BI) to carry her baby so that the latter can fall asleep. The request is first formulated by FA as a prayer with the presence of the marker *pardon* (cf. Drescher 2018) in line 1. The prayer can be explained here by the fact that, in the contract binding FA to BI (respect of the birth right), BI is entitled to refuse the request. Hence, it is the formulation of a less 'brutal' request. FA rephrases the same request in line 6. This reflects the speaker's insistence, thus giving the statement a pleading tone. Referring to the contract between the two participants, we can say that the request can only be successful in such circumstances if it is formulated gently. Therefore, like *pardon*, the DM *ke* appears as a mitigator of the threat that could lead to the fulfilment or success of the request.

In (5), requests and oppositions alternate. The sequence starts with a request in the form of an order addressed by FA to BI. Faced with the latter's resistance, FA reformulates her request, which takes the form of prayer in line 3 with the presence of the marker *san:* expressing the idea of supplication in Doula. Despite this, BI continues to resist. This new resistance is manifested in whispers (line 4). The request is

³ This expression expresses supplication in local languages.

reformulated again in line 5. If the negotiation initiated by the speaker FA is successful (line 6), it is thanks to her insistence and supplication. The DM *ke* appears as a supplication marker in the same way as *san*:

Similar to the previous examples, the negotiation starts in (6) with a request from the speaker OU. SA does not at first obey to this request. This can be seen from his question (line 2) which demands a justification from OU (line 3). After justifying himself, the latter rephrases his request (line 4: *tiens ça san: tiens ke*) in the form of a “Diskurszwilling [twin speech]” (Diao-Klaeger 2018, 110).

In all these examples, *ke* closes repeated requests. It also appears in repetition contexts with *pardon* or *san*; hence its interpretation as an intensifying DM of the illocutionary act it closes.

3.3 *ke* at the end of an order: annoyance marker

ke also appears at the end of orders as we can see in examples 7 and 8:

Example 7

- 1 IS faut te lever pour laver les habits là hein
you have to get up to wash the clothes there hein
- 2 SO (xxxxx)
- 3 IS ne m'énervé pas hein
don't make me angry hein
- 4 IS (-- LEVE-toi *ke*
STAND UP ke
- 5 SO ah maman toujours toujours c'est moi seule qui lave
ah mum always always it's only me who washes
- 6 aujourd'hui-là moi je suis fatiguée *de*
today I am tired de
- 7 IS si tu te lèves pas là tu vas voir
if you don't get up now you'll see

Example 8

- 1 SA Eh toi-là (.) quitte devant moi
Eh you (.) leave in front of me
- 2 tu n'es pas transparente
you are not transparent
- 3 (--)
- 4 SA QUITTE devant moi *ke*
LEAVE in front of me ke
- 5 ZA (xxx)

In (7), it is a mother (IS) who orders her daughter (SO) to do the laundry. In (8), SA (mother) orders ZA (son), who seems to be blocking her view, to change his posture. While in (8), line 1 the order is perceived using the imperative and the interpellation “Eh toi-là”, in (7), line 1, it is marked by the imperative

doubled with the marker *hein*. However, both in (7), line 4, and in (8), line 4, the DM *ke* closes imperative utterances whose beginning is marked by an emphasis. These statements reiterate the previously expressed speech act, and manifest through the accentuation of the intonation, the expression of the authority of the speakers IS and SA over their respective hearers SA and ZA. In this context, *ke* expresses the speaker's annoyance at the execution of his order.

3.4 *ke* at the end of an interrogative: marker of reproach reinforcement

Reproach, in the general sense, consists in representing to someone something untoward or reprehensible for which he or she is held responsible. The analysis of the data revealed the presence of occurrences of *ke* in this category of speech act, as we can see in the following examples.

Example 9

- 1 FO toi-là (.) malgré tout ce qu'on t'a dit là tu es sorti **ke** (-) hein ?
You there (.) despite everything we told you, you went out ke (-) hein?
- 2 OU je suis pas sorti de
I didn't go out de
- 3 FO mensonge (.)
lie

Example 10

- 1 OL maman (.) c'est lui qui a mangé
mum (.) he's the one who has eaten
- 2 FI c'est à cause de ça tu l'as frappé **ke** (-) hein ?
that's why you hit him ke (-) hein?
- 3 OL moi je l'ai pas touché de
I didn't touch him de
- 4 FI MENTEUR
LIAR

Example 11

- 1 MA tu t'es pas encore lavé **ke** (-)
you haven't had your bath yet ke (-)
- 3 je viens te trouver là-bas
I'm coming to find you there
- 4 VA man/ l'eau n'est pas encore bien chaude ho
mum/ the water is not yet very hot ho

The common feature of these examples is that the reproaches are indirectly carried out by interrogations. The latter fall under the heading of problematic structures which are intermediate cases between question and assertion (Kerbrat-Orecchioni 1991, 99). They are statements that are formally interrogative structures, but whose content is nevertheless partially asserted (1991, 99). Renchon (1969) interprets the DM *hein* in his work on the syntax of interrogation as being part of the exponents that mark total interrogation. For him, these are total interrogations with rhetorical value which have completely lost all interrogative characteristics and whose interrogative valence has been concentrated in exponents. For

Renchon (1969), terms such as *hein, n'est ce pas*, etc., correspond to exponents because of their similarity to the exponent by which mathematicians give a given quantity its real value (1969, 120). In (9) and (10), the value of *hein* is displayed as equivalent to that of the statements that *ke* closes. However, in all examples (9), (10), and (11), the facts and their unfortunate or blameworthy consequences are presented by the speaker as known *a priori* by the hearer. This can be clearly seen in the formulation of the reproach itself: in (9) with “malgré tout ce qu'on t'a dit”, in (11) with 'encore' and in (10) the situation is simply presented by the speaker as not deserving of the action of hitting. In all these examples, the DM *ke* has an inferential function, which refers to a prior belief universe, that the speaker is convinced he/she shares with his/her hearers. As a result, the latter is called a “liar” as soon as he claims to be alien to the universe in question (examples 9, line 3 and 10, line 4). It turns out that the DM *ke* closes an act that underlines the speaker's previous belief in examples (9), (10), and (11). The role of *ke* at this level is to relate the illocutionary act of the utterance it closes (reproach) to the prior belief universe that corresponds to the action of hitting and its consequences, hence its intensifying character.

3. 5 *ke* within detached syntactic constructions

The examination of my data revealed the presence of *ke* within particular syntactic configurations called by Pop (2001, 258) “constructions détachées”. According to Pop, they are indicators of a transformation from a grammatical function to a discursive function. The examples (12), (13), and (14) illustrate *ke* within this type of syntax.

Example 12

- 1 LI mariam *ke* (-) les gens là sont bien de
mariam ke (-) these people are good de
- 2 MA ahi?
- 3 LI ou bien toi tu vois pas ?
or you, you don't see?
- 4 MA je comprends rien de
I don't understand anything de

Example 13

- 1 AM fatou *ke* (-) tout ça là est de sa faute
fatou ke (-) all this is her fault
- 2 FA comment ça?
how so?
- 3 AM elle aime trop l'argent
she loves money too much

Example 14

- 1 AL travail là *ke* (-) c'est pas clair
this work ke (-) it is too difficult
- 2 AS comment ça?
how so?

In (12) and (13), *ke* is connected to a nominal apostrophe whose main function is to signal to others its position as a direct interlocutor. In these examples, the nominal apostrophe actualizes an interpellation. If this act allows us to discern the interlocutor because of its conative value, *ke* serves to preserve the communication by ensuring the continuity of the discourse. The need to capture and maintain attention could be justified in (12) by the presence of the DM *de* whose function is to reorient the interlocutor's belief universe (Drabo 2019). In examples (12) and (13), *ke* takes the emphatic and intonative values of the nominal apostrophe. These same prosodic contours are found according to Riegel & al. (1994, 426) in syntactic configurations such as left dislocations (dislocations à gauche). Indeed, an examination of example (14) shows that *ke* appears at the intersection of two quite distinct parts. The first one, not very informative, is located on the left (theme) while the second one, located on the right, constitutes the proper informative part (rheme). Grevisse & Goosse (1993) describe this structure as follows: “un terme est mis en évidence au début [...], et un pronom personnel ou démonstratif occupe la place normale de ce terme” (1993, 564). In this structure, the more or less informative character is formulated in terms of the degree of communicative dynamism. The elements of the utterance carry a varying degree and thus contribute differently to the development of communication. The deletion of *ke* in (14) does not change the hierarchical structure of the discourse. However, being part of the first intonational group, i.e. the detached element with emphasis, *ke* acquires with this element a function of emphasis.

4. Conclusion

It turned out in this analysis that the DM *ke* only appears in the medial and final positions of turns of talk. *ke* is an intensification marker with distinct communicative values. In the medial position, it acquires emphatic and intonational values through detached syntactic constructions. At the end of an utterance, the DM *ke* is closely related to speech acts such as assertives, requests, orders, reproaches, and interpellations: it reiterates or reinforces the illocutionary act contained in the utterance. Thus, when it is an assertive, it has a testimonial value with evidence value, when it appears at the end of a request, the statement acquires a supplicatory value. When it is an order, it marks annoyance. In an interrogation, it intensifies a reproach. In detached syntactic configurations, *ke* is linked to the nominal apostrophe or the theme of a left dislocation. In this case, *ke* does not contribute to the structuration of the discourse but it takes the emphatic value of the nominal apostrophe. In these positions, it is either assimilated to the DM 'non' (Abolou, 2010), or to a “pragmatic indicator of a desire for a strong relationship, to hook or capture the interlocutor” (Malandain 1983, 87). Thus, *ke* is used when the topic of the exchange requires particular concentration or the understanding of an explanation, demonstration or planning (André 2006, 380). It also serves to assure the continuity of the discourse. Through its status as a borrowed item and its different communicative values, *ke* contributes to the appropriation of French in Côte d'Ivoire. Speakers make use of *ke* for its pragmatic and textual values.

REFERENCE.

1. Abolou, Camille Roger (2010). “Des marqueurs KE et NON en français populaire d'Abidjan : stratégies discursives et modélisations”. *Le français en Afrique* 25: 325–342.
2. Adam, Jean-Michel (1990). *Éléments de linguistique textuelle : théorie et pratique de l'analyse textuelle*. Bruxelles: Editions Mardaga.

3. André, Virginie (2006). *Construction collaborative du discours au sein de réunions de travail en entreprise : de l'analyse micro-linguistique à l'analyse socio-interactionnelle*. [Online], consulté le 24 mars 2021. URL: <https://hal.univ-lorraine.fr/tel-01776616>. Thèse de doctorat, Université Nancy 2.
4. Auchlin, Antoine (1981a). "Mais heu, pis bon, ben alors voilà, quoi ! Marqueurs de structuration de la conversation et complétude". *Cahiers de linguistique française* 2: 141–159.
5. Auer, Peter et Yael Maschler (2016). "The family of NU and NÅ across the languages of Europe and beyond: Structure, function, and history". In Peter Auer et Yael Maschler (eds.): *NU / NÅ. A family of discourse markers across the languages of Europe and beyond*: 1–47. Berlin / Boston: de Gruyter.
6. Auer, Peter et Yael Maschler (éds., 2016). *NU / NÅ. A family of discourse markers across the languages of Europe and beyond*. Berlin / Boston: de Gruyter.
7. Beeching, Kate (2007). "La co-variation des marqueurs discursifs bon, c'est-à-dire, enfin, hein, quand même, quoi et si vous voulez : une question d'identité ?". *Langue française* 154: 78–93.
8. Blakemore, Diane (2006). "Discourse markers". In Laurence R. Horn et Gregory Ward (eds.), *The handbook of pragmatics*: 221–240. Malden: Blackwell.
9. Boukari, Oumarou (2017). "Côte d'Ivoire et Burkina Faso". In Ursula Reutner (ed.), *Manuel des francophonies*: 476–507. Berlin: de Gruyter.
10. Boutin, Béatrice Akissi (2014). "Décrire le français en relation aux langues en contact. L'exemple du dioula et du baoulé en Côte d'Ivoire". *Journal of Language Contact* 7.1: 36–61.
11. Brody, Jill (1987). "Particles borrowed from Spanish as discourse markers in Mayan languages". *Anthropological linguistics* 29.4: 507–521.
12. Bruxelles, Sylvie et Véronique Traverso (2001). "Ben : apport de la description d'un 'petit mot' du discours à l'étude des polylogues". *Marges linguistiques* 2: 38–55.
13. Clyne, Michael (2003). "When the discourse of hatred becomes respectable – does the linguist have a responsibility?". *Australian review of applied linguistics* 26.1: 1–5.
14. Diao-Klaeger, Sabine (2018). *Diskursmarker. Eine Studie zum gesprochenen Französisch in Burkina Faso*. Tübingen: Stauffenburg.
15. Dictionnaire bambara-français (²2000), éd. par Charles Bailleul. Bamako: Donniya.
16. Dictionnaire bambara-français (³2007), éd. par Charles Bailleul. Bamako: Donniya.
17. Dictionnaire bambara-français: suivi d'un index abrégé français-bambara (2011), éd. par Gérard Dumestre. Paris: Karthala.
18. Dostie, Gaétane et Claus D. Pusch (2007). "Présentation. Les marqueurs discursifs. Sens et variation". *Langue française* 154: 3–12.
19. Drabo, Adama (2019). "Usages du marqueur dE dans le français en Côte d'Ivoire". *Revue Roumaine d'Études Francophones* 9–10: 75–94.
20. Drescher, Martina (2014). "La dimension pragmatique-discursive du français en contact : L'exemple des consultations à la radio camerounaise". *Journal of Language Contact* 7.1: 62–92.

21. Drescher, Martina (2018). "Entre routine conversationnelle et marqueur de discours : les usages de pardon dans certains français africains". *SHS Web of Conferences* 46, 02005. [online], URL: https://www.shs-conferences.org/articles/shsconf/pdf/2018/07/shsconf_cmlf2018_02005.pdf.
22. Drescher, Martina et Barbara Frank-Job (eds., 2006). *Les marqueurs discursifs dans les langues romanes : approches théoriques et méthodologiques*. Frankfurt a. M.: Peter Lang.
23. Ducrot, Oswald, Danièle Bourcier et Sylvie Bruxelles (1980). *Les mots du discours*. Paris: Editions de minuit.
24. Fraser, Bruce (1999). "What are discourse markers?". *Journal of pragmatics* 31.7: 931–952.
25. Grevisse, Maurice et André Goosse (³1993). *Le Bon usage : grammaire française*. Paris: Duculot.
26. Gülich, Elisabeth (1970). *Makrosyntax der Gliederungssignale im gesprochenen Französisch*. München: Fink
27. Gülich, Elisabeth et Thomas Kotschi (1983). "Les marqueurs de la reformulation paraphrastique". In Jacques Moeschler (ed.), *Connecteurs pragmatiques et structure du discours. Actes du 2ème Colloque de Pragmatique de Genève (7-9 mars 1983)*. *Cahiers de Linguistique Française Genève* 5: 305–351.
28. *Inventaire des particularités lexicales du français en Afrique noire* (2004), éd. par Equipe du projet IFA (AELIA). Paris: AUPELF.
29. Kerbrat-Orecchioni, Catherine (1984). "Les négociations conversationnelles". *Verbum* 7.2–3: 223–243.
30. Kerbrat-Orecchioni, Catherine (1991). "L'acte de question et l'acte d'assertion : opposition discrète ou continuum ?". In Catherine Kerbrat-Orecchioni (éd.), *La Question*: 87–111. Lyon: Presses Universitaires Lyon.
31. Kouadio N'Guessan, Jérémie (2007). "Le français : langue coloniale ou langue ivoirienne ?". *Hérodote* 126.3: 69–85.
32. Malandain, Jean-Louis (1983). "Il faut bien faire avec des bribes, hein !". *Le français dans le Monde* 176: 84–99.
33. Matras, Yaron (2000). "Fusion and the cognitive basis for bilingual discourse markers". *The International Journal of Bilingualism* 4.4: 505–528.
34. Matras, Yaron (2007). "The borrowability of structural categories". In Yaron Matras et Jeanette Sakel (eds.), *Grammatical Borrowing in Cross-Linguistic Perspective*: 31–74. Berlin / New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
35. Mosegaard Hansen, Maj-Britt (1998). *The function of discourse particles: a study with special reference to spoken standard French*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
36. Paillard, Denis et Thi Ngân Vu (2012). *Inventaire raisonné des marqueurs discursifs du français. Description, Comparaison, Didactique*. Hanoi: Presse de l'Université Nationale de Hanoi.
37. Pop, Liana (2001). "Le détachement dans le groupe nominal : l'hypothèse de la conversion pragmatique". In Dany Amiot, Walter de Mulder et Nelly Flaux (eds.), *Le Syntagme nominal : syntaxe et sémantique* : 125–136. Arras: Artois Presses Université.

38. Poplack, Shana (1988). "Contrasting patterns of code-switching in two communities". In Monica Heller (ed.), *Codeswitching. Anthropological and Sociolinguistic Perspectives*: 215–244. Berlin / Boston: Mouton de Gruyter.
39. Prince, Ellen F. (1988). "On pragmatic change: The borrowing of discourse functions". *Journal of Pragmatics* 12: 505–518.
40. Renchon, Hector (1969). *Etudes de syntaxe descriptive. 2. La syntaxe de l'interrogation* (Vol. 2). Bruxelles: Palais des Académies.
41. Riegel, Martin, Jean-Christophe Pellat et René Rioul (1994). *Grammaire méthodique du français*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.
42. Rooij de, Vincent A. (2000). "French discourse markers in Shaba Swahili conversations". *International Journal of Bilingualism* 4.4: 447–466.
43. Rossari, Corinne (2016). "L'approbation dans un dialogue devient-elle une concession dans un monologue ? Etude de *certes, en effet, effectivement, d'accord, OK*". In Laure Sarda, Denis Vigier et Bernard Combettes (eds.), *Connexion et indexation. Ces liens qui tissent le texte*: 209–222. Lyon: ENS Éditions.
44. Roulet, Eddy, Antoine Auchlin, Jacques Moeschler, Christian Rubattel et Marianne Schelling (eds., 1985). *L'articulation du discours en français contemporain*. Berne / New York: Peter Lang.
45. Roulet, Eddy, Antoine Auchlin, Jacques Moeschler, Christian Rubattel et Marianne Schelling (eds., 1991). *L'articulation du discours en français contemporain*. Berne / New York: Peter Lang.
46. Schiffrin, Deborah (2003). "Linguistics and history: Oral history as discourse". In Deborah Tannen (ed.), *Linguistics, language, and the real world. Discourse and beyond*: 84–113. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.
47. Schiffrin, Deborah (1996). *Discourse markers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
48. Searle, John R. (1962). "Meaning and speech acts". *The philosophical review* 71.4: 423–432.
49. Slobin, Dan I. (1996). "From 'thought and language' to 'thinking for speaking'". In John Joseph Gumperz et Stephen C. Levinson (eds.), *Rethinking linguistic relativity*: 70–96. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
50. Thomason, Sarah Grey et Terrence Kaufman (1988). *Language Contact, creolization, and genetic linguistics*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
51. Vincent, Diane (1993). *Les ponctuations de la langue et autres mots du discours*. Québec: Nuit Blanche.