

## LOROPHORIC STRATEGY IN SAN-MAKA

*Elena Perekhval'skaya*

Institute of Linguistic Studies RAS  
elenap96@gmail.com

**Abstract:** The article deals with strategies of coding the participants of communication in reporting discourse in San-Maka (Eastern Mande < Mande < Niger-Congo). San-Maka demonstrates an interesting case wherein 3<sup>rd</sup> person Sg and Pl pronouns, combined with an emphatic marker *sé*, are used in a logophoric function. However, this construction is not fully grammaticalized. The combination of the pronouns with the emphatic marker acts in a logophoric function in specific reported speech contexts in the presence of the quotative particle *mà ~ m̀ ~ m'* which occupies the leftmost position of the clause. Different possible interpretations of this strategy are shown, followed by a conclusion about the ongoing formation of the logophoric strategy in San-Maka and the grammaticalization of pronouns with the marker *sé* into a specialized logophoric pronoun series.

**Key words:** reported speech, logophoric strategy, Mande, cluster San / Samo, San-Maka

## ЛОГОФОРИЧЕСКАЯ СТРАТЕГИЯ В ЯЗЫКЕ САН-МАКА

*Е.В. Перехвальская*

Институт лингвистических исследований РАН  
elenap96@gmail.com

**Резюме:** В статье рассматриваются стратегии кодирования участников коммуникации при передаче цитированной речи в языке сан-мака (< восточные манде < манде < нигер-конго). Сан-мака демонстрирует интересный случай, когда местоимения третьего лица ед. и мн. числа в сочетании с эмфатическим показателем *sé* используются как логофорические. Однако эта конструкция не полностью грамматизирована. Сочетание местоимений 3 лица с эмфатическим показателем

используются как логофорические только в контексте передачи цитированной речи в присутствии цитативной частицы *mā ~ mǎ ~ m'*, которая занимает в предложении крайнюю левую позицию. Продемонстрированы различные интерпретации этой стратегии, после чего делается вывод о формировании в языке сан-мака логофорической стратегии передачи цитированной речи, а также о грамматикализации эмфатических местоимений 3 лица в специализированную серию логофорических местоимений.

**Ключевые слова:** репортативная речь, логофорическая стратегия, языки манде, восточные манде, кластер сан/само, язык сан-мака

## 1. Introduction

Reported speech binds two communicative situations: a real one and a reported one – that which is being described –, therefore there are two pairs of locutors: real speaker/listener and reported speaker/listener.<sup>1</sup> In order to avoid a potential conflict in reference, languages use certain rules to code the participants of the two communicative situations: a real and a reported one. In many European languages there are two main strategies of coding participants of the two communicative situations: *direct* and *indirect* speech. Their fundamental difference is, in fact, specific coding of the participants of the situations. Consider Misha Knyazev's definition: "In indirect speech constructions, the choice of pronouns is made by parameters of the external communicative situation" (Knyazev 2016: 74). It should be noted that different strategies of coding the reported speech do not fit into a linear quantitative continuum where where *direct* and *indirect* speech would be the extreme points between which other types would be located. (Nikitina & Bugaeva 2020). Nicholas Evans writes on this topic:

"The typology of quoted speech has long been a disorderly and unsatisfying area because of the huge number of ways that languages can deviate from the traditional ideals of 'direct' and 'indirect' speech.

---

<sup>1</sup> As there is no generally accepted terms I will use the terms: *real* and *reported* speaker and listener (Nikitina 2012a); and external (real) and internal (reported) communicative situation (Knyazev 2016).

This has generated a profusion of terms for non-canonical types – semi-direct, semi-indirect, quasi-direct and so on – which do not correlate well with the many intermediate categories. Perhaps worse is the fact that typological research on quoted speech has generally been rather unclear about what ‘true’ indirect speech would look like” (Evans 2013: 67).

Apart from *direct* and *indirect* speech, two other strategies of coding participants are cross-linguistically rather widespread. These are the logophoric strategy and the indexal shift strategy. The logophoric strategy, in the canonical case, uses special logophoric pronouns which are coreferent with the reported speaker (Aikhenvald 2007; Nikitina 2012b). The indexal shift strategy is characterized by the presence of syntactic subordination and, at the same time, by the internal reference of pronouns, at least pronouns coreferential with the reported speaker. (Shklovsky & Sudo 2014; Knyazev 2016; 2019). The logophoric strategy is typical for languages of the West Africa (Nikitina 2012a).<sup>2</sup>

## 2. Reported speech in San-Maka

### 2.1. San-Maka: general facts, sources of the data, orthography

San-Maka (< Eastern Mande < Mande < Niger-Kongo) is spoken in northwest Burkina Faso, in the Nayala province. Dialectal differences are quite noticeable in San-Maka, and varieties differ rather significantly. The present article deals with the variety spoken in Toma, the administrative center of the province.

The research is based on the following data:

- field materials collected in 2016–2017 in Toma, Burkina-Faso,
- linguistic articles by Moïse Paré (Paré 1998; 1999) and Suzanne Platiel (Platiel 1974),

---

<sup>2</sup> Ainu presents a rare example of logophoric strategy in Asia (Nikitina & Bugaeva 2018).

- folklore texts published by Platiel (Platiel 1984),
  - booklets in San-Maka made by the SIL and the Biblical Society.
- Most of these data are based on the Toma variety of San-Maka.

It should be noted that each type of source uses its own writing system.

The official spelling designed by SIL has been used in the San-French dictionary, literacy books, nutrition brochures, and other SIL publications, as well as in the translation of the full text of the Bible. The same writing system is taught to liquidators of illiteracy and other enthusiasts of writing in their native language. The important peculiarity of this spelling system is the incomplete designation of tonal differences.

There are three functionally meaningful level tones in San-Maka: low, medium, and high. In the official orthography they are marked as follows:

High tone	<i>á</i> (acute);
Middle tone	<i>a</i> (no diacritic sign);
Low tone	<i>à</i> (grave).

However, tonal characteristics are indicated in the official writing system only in cases of possible misunderstandings: *màn* [màŋ] ‘thing’ ~ *man* [māŋ] ‘presentative copula, Pl’; *mù* [mí] ‘head’ ~ *mii* [mī] ‘drink.IPFV’; *ñ* [ŋ] ‘they (3Pl)’ ~ *n* [ŋ] ‘you (2Sg)’.

In the official writing system the letter “n” at the end of a word or used independently marks the phoneme [ŋ]; while nasalization is marked by a tilde,<sup>3</sup> cf.: *sàn* [sàŋ] ‘character’ ~ *sõ* [sõ̃] ‘alone’ ~ *sõ* [sõ̃] ‘three’; *tán* [táŋ] ‘ground’ ~ *tan* [tāŋ] ‘there is’ ~ *tã* [tã̃] ‘to close’.

In the texts published by Platiel the spelling of words is rather inconsistent both in their segmental and suprasegmental representations (cf. variants *BólÉÉ* ~ *BólÉê* ~ *Bòléê* ‘Bolé (personal name); *dõÈÈ* ~ *dõÈè* ‘to know.IPFV’. A consistent phonemic notation of San-Maka words is found in the articles of Moïse Paré, thus, I use his writing system, with exceptions made for examples taken from the Bible translation.

---

<sup>3</sup> The nasalization characterizes the whole foot but is shown only on the second vowel.

## 2.2. An overview of reported speech in San-Maka

Most often, the reported speech transmission in San-Maka is characterized by the following type of reference: the reported listener is coded by the 2Sg personal pronoun  $\bar{a}n$  /  $\bar{a}j$ , according to the internal communicative situation (similar to *direct speech* of European languages); the reported speaker is marked by the pronoun  $\bar{a}s\acute{e}$  (3Sg +  $s\acute{e}$ ) according to the external communicative situation (as in *indirect speech*), consider (1).

- (1)  $Y\bar{a}\bar{a}$   $S\acute{E}\acute{E}$   $t\bar{o}nt\bar{o}r\bar{a}$   $k\bar{e}$   $\bar{a}j$   $\bar{a}j$   $t\bar{o}\bar{a}$ :  
 then Sien youth this IPFV REFL exclaim.IPFV  
 $M\bar{a}$   $\bar{a}j$   $b\bar{a}$   $k\bar{o}j$   $b\bar{o}\bar{e}$   $\bar{a}j$   $d\bar{a}$   
 that 2SG IPFV.NEG marry become-IPFV 2SG put-PRF  
 $\bar{a}-s\acute{e}$   $\bar{l}\bar{i}$   $w\bar{a}-\bar{a}?$   
 3SG-EMPH near NEG-Q  
 ‘Then the youth from Sien exclaimed: “Won’t **you** marry and (**you**) live with **me**?”.’

This strategy could be described as mixed “external-internal”. At first glance, we are dealing with a variant of the indexal shift strategy. However, consider the following example of an indexal shift strategy typical for Chuvash (< Turkic) (2).

- (2) Poshkart variety of Chuvash (Knyazev 2019: 9)  
 $Boris$  [ $san-ba$   $\acute{e}c\bar{l}-e-p$ ]  $te-ze$  ( $kala-r^j-e$ )  
 Boris 2SG-INST work-NPST-1SG say-SIM.CVB say-PST-3SG  
 ‘Boris said that **he** will work with **you** [real listener].’

In (2), the the 2 person pronoun refers to the real listener, while the 1 person suffix points to the reported speaker (lit. ‘Boris said that **I** will work with you’). This is a typical case of of the indexal shift strategy.

The strategy used by San-Maka is, in a way, opposite of what was shown for Poshkart Chuvash. The reported speaker is coded by

the 1Sg suffix in Chuvash and by the 3Sg pronoun in San-Maka; it appears as if Chuvash would use the *direct* speech model and San-Maka would use the model of the *indirect* speech. At the same time, San-Maka codes the reported listener by the 2Sg pronoun  $\bar{\alpha}\eta$  /  $\bar{\eta}$  (as in *direct* speech). This strategy of coding participants of the reported situation in San-Maka cannot be classified as a variant of indexal shift. It is closer to a logophoric strategy which combines the use of special logophoric pronouns marking the reported speaker with 2nd person pronouns which mark the reported listener (von Roncador 1988: 290–293; Stirling 1993: 256–257). It has to be concluded that San-Maka demonstrates a case when the pronouns of 3 person combined with the emphatic marker *sé* are used as logophoric.

### 2.3. Emphatic marker *sé*

The morpheme *sé* is generally regarded as an emphatic marker: “Cette catégorie de déterminants est surtout utilisée avec les pronoms personnels, et quand elle est employée pour déterminer un nominal, il s’agit le plus souvent de nomineau qualifiant des êtres humains, ou très exceptionnellement des animaux [This category of determinants is mostly used with personal pronouns, and when it is used to determine a nominal, it is most often a qualifying nominee for human beings, or very exceptionally animals]” (Platiel 1974: 507).

It can combine with all personal pronouns:

Sg	Pl
<i>māsé</i>	<i>wōséh<sup>4</sup></i>
<i>ḡséh</i>	<i>kāséh</i>
<i>àséh</i>	<i>ḡséh</i>

It is used for emphasis; consider examples (3)–(5).

---

<sup>4</sup> The plural marker is *-η* / *-nA* / *-Aη*, the specific form and tonal characteristics of which are determined by the context.

- (3) *Mā-sé*      *bīē*      *wā*  
 1SG-EMPH    IPFV.NEG    NEG  
 ‘It is not me.’
- (4) *Ī-śé*      *īj*      *wōē*      *māā?*  
 2SG-EMPH    IPFV    go.IPFV    where  
 ‘And you, where are you going?’
- (5) *Wō-śé-ŋ*      *ná*      *bōō\_dā*      *nē*  
 1PL-EMPH-PL    PRF    speak.PRF    to.3SG  
 ‘As for us, we spoke to him.’

The marker *śé* is also used in topicalization constructions; if a personal pronoun is topicalized, it is repeated *in situ* (Paré 1998: 82) (6).

- (6) *Mā-śé*      *nē,*      *á*      *mā*      *jē*  
 1SG-EMPH    COP    3SG/H    1SG    see.PRF  
 ‘As for me, he saw me (yesterday).’

Consider the usage of the marker *śé* with a noun (7).

- (7) *Dōŋādū-śé*      *dō*      *à*      *dīj*      *āŋ*      *tó\_kō*      *bōō*      *kē*      *wā...*  
 elephant-EMPH    also    3SG    same    PRF.NEG    listen    word    this    neg  
 ‘**Even the elephant**, without knowing the reasons [for this war]...’

The marker *śé* is widely used in reported speech. When used in the quote, it always refers to the speaker (8).

- (8) (*á*      *tōŋ*      *pē*      *gū*      *nī:*) “*Mà à*      *īj*      *sàŋ*      *kóé*  
 3SG.PRF    then    say.PRF    man    in    that    3SG    IPFV    play    make.IPFV  
*ká*      *à-śé*      *ní,*      *mà*      *à*      *wó*      *jà*      *pēló*”  
 COM    3SG.EMPH    to    that    3SG    for/H    finish.PRF    today  
 ‘(She said to her husband:) “Are you playing with me? Today you are finished (Lit. “If he was playing with her? Today he is finished”).’

In (8), pronouns *à* and *àsé* in the quote may refer to both participants of the situation: the reported speaker and listener (a wife and a husband), thus the question begs, “Who was playing with whom?”. In San, pronouns do not have a category of gender, therefore the reference may be unclear. Emphatic pronouns are used in order to evade a referential conflict. In (8), the use of the marker *sé* in the comitative frame construction *ká àsé ní*, indicates the reported speaker (the wife). In both clauses the subject coded by the pronoun of the 3Sg *à* is the reported listener (the husband).

It is worth noting that in (8) the reported speech is constructed with a consistent external reference similar to the traditional “indirect speech”. More often, the “mixed” strategy is used; see example (1).

### 3. The logophoric strategy in San-Maka

In San-Maka, the strategy of coding participants in a reported situation is close to the logophoric strategy; the role of logophoric pronouns is played by 3 person emphatic pronouns, consider (9).

- (9) *M' əŋ nɛ ʒŋ à-sɛ ā nɛ lɛ dɛ nɛ!*  
 that 2SG PCOP 2SG/H 3SG-EMPH POSS child ART kill.PRF 3SG.POSTP  
 ‘It was **you**, **you** killed **my** son with it.’

In (9), the reported listener is coded by the 2Sg personal pronoun *əŋ/ŋ* (according to the internal communicative situation); the speaker is marked by the 3Sg pronoun *àsé*: *àsɛ ā nɛ* ‘my son’ (according to the external communicative situation). This corresponds to the logophoric strategy.

However, here I wish to raise some possible objections: the examples presented thus far can be analyzed in the following way: emphatic pronouns are used in their primary function, as emphatic, and the strategy used by San Maka can be analyzed as a variant of *indirect speech*. This point of view may be supported by the analysis of those cases where only the reported speaker(s) is anaphorically cited, cf. (10)–(11).

- (10) *Māā*      *dī*      *pé*      *mà*      *à-sé*      *ḡ*      *dīē*  
 1SG.POSS      father      say      that      3SG-EMPH      IPFV      FUT.PROX  
*wōé*      *dōḡ*      *bīē*  
 go.IPFV      bush      tomorrow  
 ‘My father said that he he will go to the bush tomorrow.’
- (11) *ḡ*      *ná*      *dāà*      *pē*      *wō*      *nē*,      *mà*      *ḡ-sé-ḡ*  
 3PL      PRF      come.PRF      say      1PL      to      that      3PL-EMPH-PL  
*màḡ*      *wōé*      *pīē*  
 PRF.PL      go.IPFV      home  
 ‘They came to tell us that they are going home.’

Cases like (10) and (11) can be analyzed as “indirect speech” where *àsé* and *ḡséḡ* are only used for emphasis. However, there are certain features that do not match with proprieties of “indirect speech”.

### 3.1. Characteristics of logophoric strategy

Tatiana Nikitina and Anna Bugaeva (2018; 2020) pointed out the following features characteristic of the logophoric strategy apart from the usage of specific logophoric pronouns:

- logophoric speech is not associated with any ordering restrictions: reported speech can precede or follow the clause that describes the reported speech event, and it can even be interrupted by that clause,
- logophoric speech need not be licensed by any specific predicate,
- logophoric speech may contain extrasentential elements: interjections and terms of address.

In San-Maka the strategy used for coding reported speech fully meets these requirements.

Absence of ordering restrictions can be shown as follows. First, the logophoric strategy in San-Maka can be used in independent quotes (12) which is not typical for indirect speech.

- (12) *Ǿ́, bɛ́ ǎŋ dáà ŋ-sé-ŋ pɛ̀ɛ̀, mà à-sé*  
 oh! when 2SG/H come.PRF 3PL-EMPH-PL home that 3SG.EMPH  
*á bōɛ̀ là à kɔ̀ ŋ lɛ̀*  
 3SG.PRF be.able.IPFV on 3SG close 2SG on  
 ‘Oh, if you came to **us**, **I** would accept to follow **you**.’

In (12) both references to the reported speaker are coded by emphatic pronouns: singular (*àsé*) and plural (*ŋséŋ*).<sup>5</sup>

Second, the logophoric strategy is also used in dialogues (13).

- (13) – *Mà ǎǎ-ǎǎ mà wɔ̀à-nā-á-bāà ŋ bɛ́ à-sé*  
 that ah-ah that what.purpose 2SG IPFV.PROG 3SG-EMPH  
*kúú!*  
 catch.IPFV  
 – *mà à-sé ŋ gɛ̀ɛ̀ dɛ̀á lī!*  
 that 3SG-EMPH IPFV look midget for  
 ‘– Eh! Eh! Why are you catching me?  
 – I am looking for a midget!’

Examples (12) and (13) also illustrate the ability of the logophoric strategy to include extrasentential elements like interjections.

Unlike indirect speech, which licenses a strict number of possible predicates able to introduce other person’s speech, the logophoric strategy uses the whole variety of predicates which code the reported event; consider (14).

<sup>5</sup> Note, that *àsé* is repeated by the ordinary 3Sg pronoun *á* with the high tone (see also (15)). This is the rule when the emphatic/logophoric pronoun is the subject of the sentence. These details of logophoric strategy in San-Maka needs further investigation.

- (14) (*nē kè dó tóŋ yòò:*) *M'à-sē dó*  
 child this also then rise.up.PRF that.3SG-EMPH too  
*á rē wōē gēē kā wùù lè lí!*  
 IPFV FUT go.IPFV look.IPFV 2PL millet ART for  
 ‘(The boy rose up in his turn:) “Me too, I will go to look for  
 your millet!”.’

It shows that the discussed strategy shares typical properties of logophoric speech.

### 3.2. Level of grammaticalization

The presented constructions are not fully grammaticalized. When used with locutors, the marker *sé* keeps its emphatic meaning. Consider the following examples:

- (15) *Ī kú lè, ĩ nā tóŋ nōŋ dà nēné-ĭ*  
 3PL chief ART 3PL PF then question put.PRF child-DIM  
*lè là: “Mà wàá nā bāà jàà) tá kĭĭ*  
 ART on that what? FOC become.PRF scar IPFV write.IPFV  
*ĭ-sé gānàà kēnēŋ*  
 2SG-EMPH on like.that  
 ‘The Mossi chief asked the girl: “How did it happen that (the  
 scarification) is written on **you** like that?”’

In (15) the surprise of the Mossi chief who has seen marks (scarification) made onto the San girl’s body is highlighted by the emphatic *sé*, as well as by the usage of the full form of the postposition *gānàà* ‘on’ (its short form is an encliticized *-à*). Here, *sé* retains its primary emphatic meaning.

Also consider examples (3)–(6) presented above. They illustrate the emphatic usage of the marker *sé*. However, the examples (3)–(6)<sup>6</sup>

<sup>6</sup> In examples (3) and (6), *mā* at the beginning of the sentence is the 1Sg pronoun ‘I, me’.

differ drastically from other examples presented. These utterances are not instances of reported speech. In oral San-Maka, reported speech is marked by the particle *mà/mà/m'* in the leftmost position. It codes quotes introduced by a reported event ('he said...'), independant quotes, or dialogue replicaes. In cases when other person's speech is rather long and consists of several utterances, *mà/mà/m'* may be repeated; see example (16). Consequently, the following conclusion should be made: 3 person pronouns with the marker *sé* are used as logophoric only in reported speech contexts, which formally is introduced by the opening marker *mà*.

The grade of grammaticalization of the construction *mà* + 3Sg/Pl-*sé* is, in fact, rather high, and emphatic pronouns are used very consistently, cf. (16).

- (16) *Mà à-sé ā lō nē à-sé lī; à nē*  
 that 3SG-EMPH POSS wife COP 3SG-EMPH on 3SG child  
*yū wā. Bē.lē.nē à-sé á ān pēnpélèn*  
 give.birth NEG that.is.why 3SG-EMPH 3SG/H IPFV wandering  
*dēē. Yū wé à-sé á rē dóe lō lē'a,*  
 come.IPFV eye enter 3SG.EMPH IPFV FUT arrive woman at.edge  
*kēon lā, à-sé ā rē dóe à-à wā, mà*  
 house on 3SG-EMPH IPFV.NEG FUT arrive.IPFV 3SG.near NEG that  
*à-sé ā dōjē wā, bē kéd kēe, bē.lē.nē*  
 3SG-EMPH PFV.NEG know.IPFV NEG this house here.is that.is.way  
*à-sé sōò á ān pēnpélèn dēē!*  
 3SG.EMPH go.out.PRF 3SG/H IPFV wandering come.IPFV  
 'It is **my** wife (who made problems) for **me**: she does not give birth... That's why **I**'m wandering around. Do you see, if, when **I** come back, **I** will find her, or if **I** will not find (her) at home, **I** do not know; so that's why **I** left home and wander aimlessly!'

It should be noted, however, that in the text of the new translation of the Bible, which was made relatively recently (Bible 2013), the construction *mà ... à-sé* is not used: the reported speech is not introduced

by the particle *mà*, and the emphatic pronouns of the 3rd person are not used in a logophoric function. Consider the following examples (17)–(18) selected at random.

- (17) *Yesu tón pɛ ñ nɛ: Ka Lawa a kion kɛ*  
 Jesus then say 3PL to you(pl) god POSS house this  
*wuru, mase n wusii ma dɔ leawaa*  
 destroy 1SG.EMPH IPFV move.back.IPFV that build day  
*sɔɔ gɔɔ nɛ*  
 three inside in  
 ‘Jesus answered them, “Destroy this temple, and I will raise it again in three days”.’ (John 2; 19).

- (18) *Á pɛ nɛ: Mĩnaa, wɔ-sɛ-n tá doẽ,*  
 3SG/H say 3SG.to chef 1PL-EMPH-PL IPFV know.IPFV  
*wáa Lawa na á n dia mà n da*  
 all.together God FOC 3SG/H 2SG send that 2SG come  
*wɔ daraa*  
 1PL teach  
 ‘He [came to Jesus at night and] said, “Rabbi, **we** know that you are a teacher who has come from God”.’ [lit: “God sent you so that you would come to teach **us**.”] (John 3; 2)

The analysis of the Bible translation shows that although 1st person pronouns are used in reference to the reported speaker(s), there is a clear tendency to use the emphatic forms of these pronouns.

The coding of reported speech in booklets made by SIL is often inconsistent, cf. examples (19)–(20) taken from the same booklet (Goe 2004).

- (19) *Á yòð lón gòrɔ́ á ñ lē dè:*  
 3SG/H rise.up.PRF up already 3SG/H REFL mouth say.PRF  
 ‘*Mà à-sé tá à binyəə dǒǒ!*’  
 that 3SG-EMPH IPFV 3SG answer know.IPFV  
 ‘At last he stood up and said, “I know the answer!”.’



### Abbreviations

1, 2, 3 – 1, 2, 3 person	L – low tone
ART – article	NEG – negation
COM – comitative	NMLZ – nominalized form
COP – copula	NPST – non-past
DIM – diminutive	PCOP – presentational copula
EMPH – emphatic marker	PL – plural
EQUAT – equative postposition	POSS – possessive preposition
FOC – focalizator	POST – postposition
FUT – future	PRF – perfective
FUT.PROX – nearest future	PROG – progressive
H – high tone	Q – question marker
IPFV – imperfective	SG – singular

### References

- Aikhenvald, Alexandra. 2007. Semi-direct speech: Manambu and beyond. *Language Science* 30. 383–422.
- Bible 2013. *Lawa a boo sonbore. La Bible en San*. Ouagadougou: Alliance biblique du Burkina Faso.
- Evans, Nicholas. 2013. Some problems in the typology of quotation: A canonical approach. In Brown, Dunstan & Chumakina, Marina & Corbett, Greville G. (eds.), *Canonical morphology and syntax*, 66–98. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Goe 2004. *Goe lanka koolaa màn-bii boo. Le léopard et la Tortue en langue San*. Ouagadougou: SIL.
- Knyazev, Mikhail. 2016. Complementizers in Kalmyk. In Boye, Kasper & Kehayov, Petar (eds.), *Complementizer semantics in European languages*, 665–690. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Knyazev, Mikhail. 2019. Two SAY-complementizers in Poshkart Chuvash: Subject-orientation, logophoricity and indexical shift under verbs of hearing. In Bondarenko, Tatiana & Davis, Colin & Colley, Justin & Privoznov, Dmitry (eds.), *Proceedings of the 14<sup>th</sup> Workshop on Altaic Formal Linguistics (WAFL14)*, 129–136. Cambridge, MA: MIT. (MIT Working Papers in Linguistics 90.)

- Nikitina, Tatiana & Bugaeva, Anna. 2018. The syntax of logophoric speech. Toward a structural approach to the direct-indirect continuum. Presented at the Conference “Syntax of the World’s languages VIII”, September 3–5 2018, Paris.
- Nikitina, Tatiana & Bugaeva, Anna. 2020. Logophoric speech is not indirect: Towards a syntactic approach to reported speech constructions. *Linguistics* (forthcoming).
- Nikitina, Tatiana. 2012a. Logophoric discourse and first person reporting in Wan (West Africa). *Anthropological Linguistics* 54(3). 280–301.
- Nikitina, Tatiana. 2012b. When linguists and speakers do not agree: The endangered grammar of verbal art in West Africa. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 28(2). 197–220.
- Paré, Moïse. 1998. *L’énoncé verbal en san (parler de Yaba)*. Ouagadougou: Université de Ouagadougou. (Mémoire de maîtrise.)
- Paré, Moïse. 1999. *Derivation, composition et syntagmes nominaux en san (parler de Yaba)*. Ouagadougou: Université d’Ouagadougou. 1999. (Rapport de D.E.A.)
- Platiel, Susanne. 1974. *Description du parler samo de Toma, Haute-Volta. Phonologie, syntaxe*. Paris: Université de Paris V – René Descartes. (Thèse pour le doctorat d’Etat.)
- Platiel, Susanne. 1984. *La fille volage et autres contes du pays san*. Paris: Armand Colin. (Classiques africains 21.)
- Shklovsky, Kirill & Sudo, Yasutada. 2014. The syntax of monsters. *Linguistic Inquiry* 45(3). 381–402.
- Stirling, Lesley. 1993. *Switch-reference and discourse representation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- von Roncador, Manfred. 1988. *Zwischen direkter und indirekter Rede: Nichtwörtliche direkte Rede, erlebte Rede, logophorische Konstruktionen und Verwandtes*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.