Reported speech in Bezhta

© 2025   **Zaira M. Khalilova**

Institute of Linguistics, Russian Academy of Sciences, Moscow, Russia; zaira.khalilova@gmail.com

Abstract: The paper explores reported speech in Bezhta (< Nakh-Daghestanian). Bezhta reported speech typically consists of 1) a framing clause involving a verb of speech and 2) a quotation clause followed by a quotative particle. Other reporting strategies include presenting the reported speech either by simply juxtaposing the framing clause and the utterance being reported, i.e. without any quotative enclitic, or by attaching the quotative enclitic to the final element in the quotation clause, i.e. without the framing clause. A nominalization strategy can also be used. Bezhta allows indexical shift, which means that depending on context, an embedded indexical (e.g. the first person pronoun) can receive either an 'unshifted reading', where it is interpreted from the perspective of the speaker of the utterance, or a 'shifted reading', where it is interpreted from the perspective of the original speaker. The shifted reading is available only in finite complementation. The use of embedded reflexive pronouns makes the 'shifted reading' obligatory. Syntactically the reported speech construction differs from other types of complex sentence in Bezhta (featuring complementation, relativization or adverbial clauses), as reporting involves a finite embedded clause, whereas Bezhta subordinate clauses are mainly identified by the presence of a non-finite verb form as head of the construction. The reported speech construction is definitely distinct from one featuring a regular complement clause, as the former can involve finite verbs in the quotation clause, and reporting can be presented without any framing matrix verb but with the quotative enclitic only. The paper examines the synchronic functions and the grammaticalization source of the quotative enclitic.

Keywords: Bezhta, evidentiality, finiteness, Nakh-Daghestanian, quotative, reflexive, reported speech, Tsezic

Цитационная конструкция в бежтинском языке

Заира Маджидовна Халилова

Институт языкознания РАН, Москва, Россия; zaira.khalilova@gmail.com

Аннотация: В статье рассматриваются цитационные конструкции бежтинского языка (нахско-дагестанская семья). Стандартная цитационная конструкция состоит из авторской ремарки и собственно цитации, за которой следует показатель цитации. Другие способы оформления цитационной конструкции — простое соположение авторской ремарки и собственно цитации без показателя цитации или собственно цитация с показателем цитации без авторской ремарки. В бежтинском языке наблюдается индексальный сдвиг, при котором личные местоимения могут быть ориентированы как на говорящего, так и на автора цитации. Индексальная интерпретация возможна только в финитных цитационных конструкциях. При рефлексивных местоимениях индексальный сдвиг является обязательным. В синтаксическом плане цитационные конструкции отличаются от нефинитных зависимых конструкций (например, обстоятельственных, относительных предложений). Прежде всего, цитационные конструкции являются единственными

финитными зависимыми конструкциями в бежтинском языке. Цитационные конструкции, в отличие от нефинитных зависимых конструкций, могут быть неполными предложениями, т. е. не содержать главную предикацию. В работе рассматриваются функции цитационного показателя и степень его грамматикализации в сравнении с близкородственными цезскими языками.

Ключевые слова: бежтинский язык, косвенная речь, нахско-дагестанские языки, рефлексив, финитность, цезские языки, цитатив, эвиденциальность

1. Introduction

It has been observed that the well-known dichotomy between direct and indirect speech, which is common for Standard Average European (SAE) languages, is inapplicable in many languages [Aikhenvald 2008; Evans 2013; Nikitina, Bugaeva 2021]. One such language is Bezhta, a language belonging to the Tsezic group of the Nakh-Daghestanian (also called East Caucasian) family. There has been relatively little research conducted on reported speech in Nakh-Daghestanian languages. Recent studies have focused on languages such as Tsez [Polinsky 2015], Archi [Daniel 2015], Sanzhi Dargwa [Forker 2019], Aqusha Dargwa [Ganenkov 2023], and Tabasaran [Bogomolova 2023]. Comrie et al. [2010] present a general overview of reported speech in the Tsezic languages. This study is the first in-depth investigation of reported speech in Bezhta. The paper contributes to the general discussion on reported speech constructions using data from a less-described minority Nakh-Daghestanian language.

When describing reported speech in Bezhta, I use the established terminology found in Aikhenvald [2008], Culy [1994], etc. In example (1a), *Murad* is the **original speaker**, i.e. the author of the quote (*Murad* is a male name and serves as the main character in my elicited examples), and *the boy* is a participant of the quote. The clause containing a speech verb is called the **framing clause**, and the embedded clause consisting of the quote is the **quotation clause**, or the **reported utterance**. Sentence (1b) is an example of self-quotation, where the personal pronoun in the framing clause is both the **current speaker**, i.e. the person who produces the speech report, and the **original speaker** at the same time.

(1)   a. Murad said, 'The boy likes khinkal.'

       b. I said, 'I like khinkal.'

Bezhta reported speech constructions can involve ordinary quotation (with speech verbs), self-quotation (i.e. original speaker = current speaker), and quotation with an unknown source of evidence (i.e. hearsay evidential, see Section 3.2). The reported speech construction in Bezhta consists of the framing clause based on a speech verb and a quotation clause, often followed by the quotative enclitic *ƛo*, which is attached directly to the quotation. Other functions of this enclitics are discussed in Section 4. The most common speech verbs are *niso-* 'say, tell', *nisol-* 'ask', *-iqˀläše-* 'talk', *iƛe-* 'call, shout', *-ekˀ-* 'tell', *łazi -oː-* 'inform, warn', *čoq-* 'inform', *lalaƛo-* 'shout', *χabar m-eː-* 'tell a story', *gerda-* 'swear, scold', *morƛo-* 'scold', *qǟƛe-* 'shout', *jäže niƛ- / ƛˀodo -oχ-* 'promise', *harzi -oː-* 'ask, beg', *małzi -oː-* 'teach', *pˀärƛö-* 'chat', *hardizi -aq-* 'ask, beg', *χantoq-* 'ask, plead', *eвƛˀa -eⁿƛˀe-* 'ask', *amro -oː-* 'order'.

Reported speech constructions in Bezhta can involve not only speech verbs like *niso-* 'say', but also propositional attitude verbs like *urвezi -aq-* 'think', propositional attitude verbs like *gicˀ-* 'seem', direct perception verbs like *tuq-* 'hear', achievement verbs like *jakˀƛˀa -oⁿqˀ-* 'remember',

and some others. Thus, reporting includes not only speech reports, but also reporting one's own or someone else's thoughts and ideas. Reported thought constructions are treated together with reported speech constructions here.

The data in the paper are predominantly drawn from naturalistic folkloric text collections [Khalilov 2020], which include fairy tales, fiction, anecdotes and the like, and few elicited examples are used. The data represent the Bezhta proper dialect (i.e. the dialect of the village of Bezhta itself). The paper is organized as follows. Section 2 describes reporting strategies in Bezhta. Section 3 deals with deictic and anaphoric elements used in reported speech, including indexical shift and the behavior of reflexives. Section 4 treats the synchronic functions and the grammaticalization source of the quotative enclitic. Section 5, which describes the morphosyntactic status of the reported speech construction, sums up the paper.

2. Reporting strategies

Like some other complement-taking predicates in Bezhta, utterance predicates are able to use more than one complementation type. The distribution of the complementation types associated with verbs of speech does not depend on coreferentiality, but rather on whether the perspective of the original or the current speaker is taken, cf. Section 3.

The complement clauses of verbs of speech can be either finite or non-finite. Finite strategies include reported speech presented either by simply juxtaposing the framing clause and the utterance being reported, i.e. without any quotative enclitic, or by attaching the quotative enclitic to the final element in the quotation clause, the latter being the most common strategy. Another possibility for conveying reported speech is to use the quotative directly followed by the perfective converb of 'say'. Non-finite reporting is based on nominalization, which is a less common way to encode reported speech.

2.1. Reporting by juxtaposition (without a quotative)

The reported speech construction can be introduced without any marking, i.e. without the quotative marker. The speech reported in this way can consist of a simple statement in the indicative mood (2), but also a request (3), question, command, promise, threat, etc.

(2) *bečedab χalq'-ila niso-na gej wahli gisa Ø-eh-da,*
rich people-ERG say-CVB COP that(I) out I-let.out-COND

wahdo-la-s teli okko nic-ca.
that(III)-OBL-GEN1 much money(III) give-PRS

'The rich people said, "If you let him out, we will pay a lot of money."'

(3) *do holcoqa harzi j-oː-jo łina wodo niλ-a dil*
1SG.ERG 3SG.POSS beg IV-do-PST five day give-IMP 1SG.LAT

bado mäče m-iqo-cal.
another(III) place(III) III-get-UNTIL

'I begged him, "Give me five more days until I find a new place."'

In the reported speech construction without the quotative enclitic, the order of the framing clause and the quote is free.

(4) *mesed naː-λ'a-d j-iq'läše-š mi, wahgi j-ek'-ca hoło.*
honey where-SUP-Q II-talk-PRS 2SG.ABS this II-tell-PRS 3SG.ERG

'"Honey, where are you speaking from?" she says (this).'

2.2. Reporting with the quotative enclitic

The most common type of reported speech constructions consists of the framing clause and the quotation clause, followed by the quotative enclitic *ƛo*. Reported speech is mainly introduced by verbs of speech, which include *niso-* 'say, tell', *nisol-* 'ask' (5), *-iqʼläše-* 'talk', *-ekʼ-* 'tell', *łazi -oː-* 'inform' (6), and *lalaƛo-* 'shout', etc.

(5)   *sud   wahallijo   kuwaƛʼa   caːⁿ   gej=ƛo   nisol-ca   aboqa   öždi.*
     why   such   canyon.SUP   name   COP=QUOT   ask-PRS   father.POSS   son.ERG
     '"Why does the canyon have such a name?" the son asked his father.'

(6)   *hugiʔƛʼa=na   łazi   j-oː-s,   haχar   bejten-l-il   hadurłi   j-ow-a=ƛo*
     there=ADD   inform   IV-do-PRS   well   wedding-OBL-LAT   preparation(IV)   IV-do-IMP=QUOT
     niso-na.
     say-CVB
     'Then they inform them, "Well, get ready for the wedding!"'

The framing clause containing the speech verb may follow (5), precede (6) or interrupt the reported speech (7).

(7)   *naː-d   gej=ƛo   mähmä-hažijaw,   niso-s   munahal   čurijaw,*
     where-Q   COP=QUOT   Magomed-gadzhi   say-PRS   sin.PL   forgivable
     saʔdulla   abo,   naː-d   gej=ƛo.
     Saadulla   father.ERG   where-Q   COP=QUOT
     '"Where are you, Magomedgadzhi?" says father Saadulla (God forgive his sins), "Where are you?"'

Reporting is possible with propositional attitude verbs such as 'think' and 'seem'. The quotative enclitic, which mainly occurs in reported speech with verbs of speech and manipulative verbs, is also used to mark complement clauses of propositional attitude verbs (e.g. *urʁizi -aq-* 'think', *pikro boː-* 'think', *gicʼ-* 'seem'), the direct perception verb *tuq-* 'hear' (8), and the achievement verb *j-akʼƛʼa -oⁿqʼo-* 'remember' (9). Sentence (8) is an example of a hearsay evidential.

(8)   *tuq-na   zuqʼo-jo   dil,   itʼinaː   qʼaridłi   j-oⁿqʼo-da   j-uqʼo*
     hear-CVB   be-PST   1SG.LAT   small.PL   difficulty(IV)   IV-come-COND   IV-big
     j-iqʼe-š,   j-uqʼo   j-oⁿqʼo-da   itʼinaː   gäččö-zü   j-ega-s=ƛo.
     IV-know-PRS   IV-big   IV-come-COND   small.PL   COP.NEG.CVB-FOC   IV-see-PRS=QUOT
     'I have heard that if small problems come, they feel like big problems, but if big problems come, small problems do not matter.'

(9)   *dil   j-akʼƛʼa   j-oⁿqʼo-na   qʼurban   untila-qa   Ø-uʁo-na=ƛo   gic-ca.*
     1SG.LAT   IV-heart.SUP   IV-come-PST   Kurban(I)   disease.OBL-POSS   I-die-PST=QUOT   seem-CVB
     'I remembered that Kurban died from a disease.'

The quotation clause formed with propositional attitude verbs such as *kʼocʼola-* 'think', *pikro boː-* / *pikro baq-* 'think' is often accompanied by *gicʼ-* 'seem':

(10)   *kʼocʼola-na,   sud   hoƛoʔ   do   Ø-ec-al=ƛo   gicʼ-na   Ø-eⁿƛʼe-jo*
     think-CVB   why   here   1SG.ABS   I-stay-INF=QUOT   seem-CVB   I-go-PST
     šahar-li-ł-daː.
     town-OBL-INTER-DIR
     'Thinking, "Why I should stay here?", he went into town.'

(11)   *pikro   gej   hollos   hoⁿs   äjšät-ä-ʔ   gisdaː   hide-l   kal.kal*
     thought   COP   3PL.GEN1   one   Ayshat-OBL-IN   outside   REFL.PL-LAT   obstacles(III)

b-oh-cas   suk'o   gäʔä=ƛö   gic'-ijo.
III-do-PRS.PTCP person COP.NEG.PRS=QUOT seem-PST

'They thought that except for Ayshat, there was no one who could hinder them.'

The framing verb together with the quotation clause can make up one part of a more complex sentence. In example (12), the framing clause is itself embedded, and thus the speech verb appears in the contextual converb form *nisona*; in (13) the speech verb appears in the present tense form *nisos* in the matrix clause.

(12) **hini-zu**   *zuk'-ca*   *q'äm*   *holco,*   *äbdäl*   *do=ƛo*   *niso-na.*
      REFL.ERG-FOC hit-PRS   head   3SG.ERG stupid   1SG.ABS=QUOT say-CVB

      'He himself hits his head, saying, "I am stupid."'

(13) **hinqa**   *bałaj*   *ko:ʔ*   *j-oⁿq'o-ł,*   *holco*   *niso-s*   *zuhrat-i*   *ile*
      REFL.POSS sword(IV)   hand.IN   IV-get-ANTR 3SG.ERG say-PRS Zuhra-ERG 1PL.ABS

      b-ečä<bä>nne-jo=ƛo.
      HPL-leave<PL>-PST=QUOT

      'When he gets the sword in his hands, he says, "Zuhrat has left us."'

The reported utterance can be introduced without any speech verb, as it can easily be retrieved from the context. Reporting without speech verbs is often found in dialogues and conversations.

(14) *Ø-oⁿq'o-jo*   *abdurahmaⁿ*   *waccal.*
      I-come-PST   Abduraxman   cousin(I)

      'Cousin brother Abduraxman came.'

      sijo-d   *j-aq-ijo*   *jaccal=ƛo?*
      what-Q   IV-happen-PST   cousin(II)=QUOT
      'What's happened, cousin sister?' [he said]

2.3. Reporting with a speech verb and the perfective converb of 'say'

Another possibility is for the reported speech with the quotative *ƛo* to be directly followed by the perfective converb of *niso-* 'say', in addition to the verb of speech which occurs in the framing clause. The converb *nisona* does not add any semantic or syntactic value; it merely serves to indicate that the text is a quotation. It must always immediately follow the quotative particle. Such reported speech constructions are frequently used in narratives. In examples (15)–(17) the quotation clause is followed by the quotative enclitic and the perfective converb *nisona*.

(15) *haχar*   *sijo-d*   *dul*   *j-aq-ijo=ƛo*   *niso-na*   *nisol-ca*   *ijo-qa.*
      well   what-Q   2SG.LAT IV-happen-PST=QUOT say-CVB   ask-PRS   mother-POSS

      '"So what happened to you?" they ask their mother.'

(16) *hogco-qa*   *lalada-s=ƛo,*   *haχar*   *j-oⁿq'o-s*   *were*   *j-iƛ'-a=ƛo*
      3SG.OBL-POSS shout-PRS=REP   hey   NHPL-come-PRS beware   NHPL-kill-IMP=QUOT

      niso-na.
      say-CVB

      '(They) shout at him "Hey, they are coming, beware, kill them!"'

(17) *wahla:*   *ƛobaвak-ca*   *meχ,*   *iƛe-la-ba:-s*   *na:-d*   *j-aq-ijo=ƛo*
      so   become.noon-PRS   time   call-ANTIP-PL-PRS where-Q   II-happen-PST=QUOT

      niso-na.
      say-CVB

      'So it was getting dark, and they were calling out "Where have you ended up?"'

2.4. Nominalization

Another way to present reported speech is to use non-finite complementation with utterance predicates, as well as with propositional attitude, direct perception, and achievement verbs. Nominalization in Bezhta, traditionally known as masdar form with the suffix *-ɬi*, occurs with various types of complement-taking predicates including utterance predicates. Morphologically the masdar is a noun, but syntactically it is a verb as it retains all arguments in their regular cases. Here are some illustrative examples of the masdar strategy with predicates *niso-* 'say' (18), *χabar m-eː-* 'tell (a story)' (19), and *-ega-* 'see, dream' (20).

(18) *hogλo   zamal-laː-ʔ   äλäʔ   ädäm-läː-l   nis-al   nuc'-aʔa-s   zuq'oː,*
     3SG.OBL   time-PL.OBL-IN   village.IN   man-PL.OBL-LAT   say-INF   must-NEG-PRS   be.PST

     sijo   j-aq-ijo-ɬi=na;   *hide-l-zu   j-iq'e-š   zuq'oː.*
     what   IV-happen-PST.PTCP-MSD=ADD   REFL.PL.OBL-LAT-FOC   IV-know-PRS   be.PST

     'In the village, at that time, there was no need to inform others about what had occurred; they were aware of it themselves.'

(19) *bič'-li-λ'a   Ø-oⁿq'o-ɬ,   m-eː-š   χabar   niʁa   Ø-uʁojo-ɬi=na.*
     consciousness-OBL-SUP   I-come-ANTR   III-send-PRS   story(III)   how   I-die.PST.PTCP-MSD=ADD

     'When he regains consciousness, he tells how he died.'

(20) *miλaɬ-zu=na   Ø-ega-s   badlola   raλ'-li-λ'a-laλ'aː*
     sleep.INTER-FOC=ADD   I-see-PRS   other.OBL   earth-OBL-SUP-TRANSL

     sapar-li-ʔ   Ø-eⁿλ'e-cas-ɬi.
     journey-OBL-IN   I-go-PRS.PTCP-MSD

     'I dream that I travel to different lands.'

3. Reporting with deictic and anaphoric elements

All four reported speech strategies readily employ deictic and anaphoric elements in the reported clause. These elements can receive different interpretations, i.e. they can be considered from the perspective of either the original or the current speaker, or represent mixed speech.

Based on Evans [2013: 70], direct and indirect speech are distinguished as follows. Canonical direct speech reproduces the original speaker's words and thus includes all linguistic peculiarities of the original, presenting all deictically sensitive expressions from the perspective of the original speaker. Canonical indirect speech assimilates the material presented by the original speaker to the reporting speaker's perspective, abstracts away from all linguistic particularities of the original and replaces them with a stylistic representation consistent with the rest of the reporting speaker's stylistic choices; in canonical indirect speech, all deictically sensitive expressions are presented from the perspective of the reporting speaker.

However, languages with indexical shift, like Bezhta, do not always meet the criteria for direct or indirect speech in full. In the following sections, I will lay out the principles of reporting with indexical shift in Bezhta and discuss the notion of logophoricity.

3.1. Indexical shift

Deictic and anaphoric elements used in reported speech constructions in Bezhta demonstrate different interpretations. When reporting involves embedded first and second person pronouns, we

observe **indexical shift** in Bezhta. The phenomenon of indexical shift involves a situation where interpretation of embedded indexicals, i.e. first and second person pronouns, depends on an utterance event. The embedded indexicals can be interpreted either from the perspective of the original speaker (**shifted reading**) or that of the current speaker (**unshifted reading**). Central theoretical studies on this phenomenon are Schlenker [2003], Anand and Nevins [2004], and Deal [2020]. Currently, typological work on indexical shift is growing. Languages attested as showing indexical shift include some other Nakh-Daghestanian languages of the Caucasus: see the recent work of Bogomolova [2023] on Tabasaran, Ganenkov [2023] on Akusha Dargwa, and Polinsky [2015] on Tsez, a closely related sister language of Bezhta. The latter work on Tsez served as a model for this study, which is the first investigation of indexical shift in Bezhta. This study does not propose a formal analysis but is predominantly a descriptive treatment of the main properties of indexical shift found in Bezhta.

Consider the Bezhta example (21) below, with the first person pronoun in the reported clause. This sentence is ambiguous, as the embedded first person pronoun has two possible interpretations. The default reading is the 'shifted reading' whereby the first person pronoun refers to the original speaker *Murad*. This interpretation is always primary if no overriding context is given. If some such context is provided, the first person pronoun can refer instead to the current speaker.

(21) *Murad-i   niso-s   do   tabał-na   gej=ƛo.*
     Murad-ERG say-PRS 1SG.ABS be.tired-CVB COP=QUOT
     a. 'Murad says, "I am tired."'
     b. 'Murad says that I am tired.'

Indexical shift is possible with second person pronouns:

(22) *Murad-i   nisol-ca   aboqa   dul   naːna   si^n b-ega-ʔeš-di=ƛo.*
     Murad-ERG ask-PRS father.POSS 2SG.LAT anywhere bear(III) III-see-NEG.PST-Q=QUOT
     a. 'Murad asked the father, "Have you seen a bear anywhere?"'
     b. 'Murad asked the father$_i$ if he$_i$ had seen a bear anywhere.'

The interpretation of non-declarative aspects of speech such as imperatives, prohibitives, optatives, vocatives, questions, and exclamations/interjections can be shifted or unshifted. For instance, unlike in most Indo-European languages, where imperative forms are replaced by infinitives or subjunctives in the context of indirect speech, imperatives in the Tsezic languages are always reported without any formal change. In sentence (23) the embedded goal can be either the original or the current speaker, i.e. the meaning of *dil* 'for me' is either shifted or unshifted, as signalled in translation.

(23) *Murad-i   niso-s   b-ow-a   dil   χok'a=ƛo.*
     Murad-ERG say-PRS III-do-IMP 1SG.LAT khinkal(III)=QUOT
     'Murad$_i$ says to prepare khinkal for me$_{i/j}$.'

Bezhta exhibits the same characteristics as are commonly observed in languages with indexical shift [Deal 2020]. One of these properties is sensitivity to the structure of the embedded clause. In Bezhta as in, e.g., Tsez [Polinsky 2015], indexical shift is possible only in complements that are finite. Indexical shift occurs with three types of reported speech construction: reported speech formed without the quotative, reported speech formed with the quotative and reported speech formed with the quotative and the converb 'say'. The description of indexical shift in this paper is based on standard reported speech constructions formed using the quotative. In reported speech expressed by means of nominalization (cf. Section 2.4) indexical shift is not possible. Thus, structures with nominalization clearly correspond to indirect speech, which involves reporting from the current speaker's perspective. Sentences in (24) illustrate non-finite and finite reported clauses with the verb of speech *χabar m-eː-* 'to tell (a story)'.[1]

---

[1] In the collection of Bezhta texts, no instances are found of embedded first person pronouns within the nominalized complements of verbs of speech. However, elicited examples such as (24a) are perfectly fine.

(24) a. *Murad-i* *χabar* *m-eː-š* *nito* *do* *bazaj-ja-ʔ* **Ø-eⁿλ'e-jo-łi**.
Murad-ERG story(III) III-send-PRS when 1SG.ABS market-OBL-IN I-go-PST.PTCP-MSD
'Murad$_i$ tells the story about the time I$_{j/*i}$ went to the market.'

b. *Murad-i* *χabar* *m-eː-š* *nito* *do* *bazaj-ja-ʔ* **Ø-eⁿλ'e-jo=λo**.
Murad-ERG story(III) III-send-PRS when 1SG.ABS market-OBL-IN I-go-PST=QUOT
'Murad$_i$ tells the story about the time I$_{j/i}$ went to the market.'

The obvious general difference between finite and non-finite verb forms in Bezhta is that a finite verb heads a main clause and a non-finite verb heads a subordinate clause. However, there are structures where a verb form that typically heads a dependent clause can instead occur as the head of a main clause. This is an instance of a phenomenon that has been referred to as insubordination [Comrie et al. 2016]. In (25) the reported clause contains the irrealis subordinating conjunction, which normally occurs in the protasis of conditional clauses; here it heads a main clause. The given example has two possible interpretations, shifted and unshifted. Therefore, indexical shift is possible not only in finite complementation but in insubordination.

(25) *öždi* *niso-s* *do* *enekzi* *Ø-aq-eɗeš-q'odaː=λo*.
boy.ERG say-PRS 1SG.ABS listen I-become-NEG.PST-IRR=QUOT
'The boy$_i$ says, "If only I$_{i/j}$ had not listened!"'

Another phenomena of indexical shift is the Shift Together constraint, which says that either all embedded indexicals shift or none of them does [Deal 2020: 18]. Consider example (26), which is drawn from a fairy tale about the three sons of the khan. Here the current speaker (the narrator) tells how the youngest son, who is the original speaker, falls into a pit and finds himself in a strange place. In (26) there is no discrepancy between spatial and temporal deixis, i.e. the temporal adverb *hoλoʔ* 'here' and the two first person pronouns *dil* and *do* are both shifted and interpreted from the perspective of the original speaker.

(26) *wah,* **dil** *sijo-d* **hoλoʔ** *j-aq-ijo=λo* *niso-na* *gej* *it'ina-so-la*
oh 1SG.LAT what-Q here IV-happen-PST=QUOT say-CVB COP small.OBL-ATTR-OBL

is-t'i, *naː-d* **do** *Ø-oⁿq'o-jo=λo* *niso-na* *gej*.
brother-ERG where-Q 1SG.ABS I-come-PST=QUOT say-CVB COP
'"Oh, what has happened to me here?" said the younger brother, "Where have I come?"'

Indexical shift becomes obligatory in some contexts and under certain circumstances. In most narratives, such as fairy tales, anecdotes and the like, the indexicals always reflect the perspective of the original speaker, since in such stories the narrator does not usually talk about himself. Sentence (27) is taken from the same story about the khan's three sons. It illustrates the reporting of *wh*-questions and imperatives, and the retention of the first person pronoun referring to the original speaker, the youngest brother.

(27) *it'ina* *is-t'i* *niso-na* *gej* *naː-d* *miže* *woddiʔ* *m-e<ja>λ'e-š,*
small.OBL brother-ERG say-CVB COP where-Q 2PL.ABS day.IN HPL-go<PL>-PRS

nis-a *diː-qa=na=λo.*
say-IMP 1SG.OBL-POSS=ADD=QUOT
'The youngest brother asked, "Where do you go every day? Tell me as well!"'

The interpretation of embedded indexicals can also depend on the presence of agreement. Let us consider the following constructed example. Native speaker consultants immediately reject example (28a), as they consider it ungrammatical on the grounds that the embedded predicate should show feminine agreement because the embedded first person pronoun has a female referent (i.e. *kibba* 'the girl'), and they correct the example using a predicate featuring the gender II (feminine) prefix *j-* (28b). However, as soon as an appropriate context is given, informants recognize that example (28a) is in fact grammatical. If the current speaker in (28a) is male, only the unshifted reading is possible, whereas example (28b) allows both readings.

(28) a. *kibba   niso-s   do   **Ø-ek-na**   gej=ƛo.*
    girl.ERG say-PRS 1SG.ABS I-fall-CVB   COP=QUOT
    'The girl$_i$ says I (male)$_{j/*i}$ have fallen down.'

   b. *kibba   niso-s   do   **j-ek-na**   gej=ƛo.*
    girl.ERG say-PRS 1SG.ABS II-fall-CVB   COP=QUOT
    'The girl$_i$ says I(female)$_{i/j}$ have fallen down.'

So far, the data presented have demonstrated the use of embedded indexicals within one clause. Example (29) below demonstrates indexical shift across several complements. It illustrates the use of the first person singular, the first person plural, the second person pronouns and the demonstrative, which serves as a third person pronoun in Bezhta.

(29) [Aishat talks about what Saida said to her yesterday:]
   *Saida   huł   j-ek-ca   gih   **mi**=na   **iloʁoj**   q'ej   b-ec-al*
    Saida   yesterday II-say-PRS come(II).IMP 2SG.ABS=ADD 1PL.COMIT   down   HPL-sit-INF

   *kafeliʔ   m-eƛ'e-na   b-iqlä<bä>š-äl=ƛo,   ijo=na   žo=na   **do**=na,*
    café.IN   HPL-go-CVB HPL-talk<PL>-INF=QUOT mother=ADD thing=ADD 1SG.ABS=ADD

   *gih,   **holo**=na   j-oⁿqo-s.*
    come(II).IMP 3SG.ABS=ADD II-come-PRS
    'Yesterday Saida$_i$ said, "You$_j$ also come with us$_{i+j+k}$, (we) will go and sit at the café to talk, (our) mother$_k$ and others$_z$ and I$_{j/*i}$, (you) come, and she$_x$ will also come."'

This example comes from a dialogue between two female cousins, and features mixed reporting. The first part of the quotation [*gih mina iloʁoj q'ej becal kafeliʔ meƛ'ena biqläbäšäl-ƛo*] is reported from the perspective of the original speaker, Saida, who is inviting her sister Aishat for a get-together at the café; here the second person pronoun refers to the current speaker, while the first person plural pronoun refers to the current and original speakers together. This embedded utterance is closed off by the quotative *ƛo*. The next part [*ijona žona dona*] is reported from the perspective of the current speaker, Aishat, as the embedded first person singular pronoun refers to her. The next part [*gih*], which is an imperative form, is reproduced from the point of view of Saida, featuring direct reporting. The last part [*holona joⁿqos*] can be considered to be reporting from the perspective of either the current speaker or the original speaker, as the feminine third person pronoun refers to a new referent (their new sister-in-law). Third person pronouns or demonstratives do not refer to either speaker, but to a third person, i.e. to a new referent. Unlike the Shift Together constraint, the indexical shift does not occur at the level of the entire discourse, but is clause-bound [Polinsky 2015: 22]. This sentence is an illustrative example of what is known as **biperspectival** [Evans 2013: 67], referring to reported speech in which the perspective of the original speaker alternates with that of the current speaker.

Indexical interpretation is also available in reporting with *wh*-words. In (30a) the (in situ) *wh*-word *loʁoj* corresponds to the comitative phrase in the declarative embedded clause. Here we observe two readings, shifted and unshifted. In (30b) the *wh*-word is moved to the front of the matrix clause. The preference is for the unshifted reading, although the shifted interpretation is also permitted.

(30) a. *Ruslan-i   niso-s   do   ło-ʁoj   Ø-iqläše-š=ƛo?*
    Ruslan-ERG say-PRS 1SG.ERG who.OBL-COMIT   I-talk-PRS=QUOT
    'Who did Ruslan$_i$ say I$_{i/j}$ was talking to?'

   b. *ło-ʁoj   Ruslan-i   niso-s   do   Ø-iqläše-š=ƛo?*
    who.OBL-COMIT Ruslan-ERG say-PRS 1SG.ERG I-talk-PRS=QUOT
    'Who did Ruslan$_i$ say I$_{j/?i}$ was talking to?'

The use of reflexive pronouns in reported speech blocks the indexical interpretation, just like in Tsez [Polinsky 2015: 28]. Consider the following examples with the first person reflexive (31a) and the third person reflexive (31b).

(31)   a.   *kibba*   *niso-s*   **do-zu**   *j-ow-al*   *ken=ƛo.*
              girl.ERG   say-PRS   1SG.ABS-FOC   IV-do-INF   food(IV)=QUOT
              'The girl$_i$ said, "I$_{i/*j}$ (myself) will make the food."'

      b.   *kibba*   *niso-s*   **hini**   *j-ow-al*   *ken=ƛo.*
              girl.ERG   say-PRS   REFL.ERG   IV-do-INF   food(IV)=QUOT
              'The girl$_i$ said, "I$_{i/*j}$ (myself) will make the food."'

The reflexive pronoun used in reported speech refers back to the speaker of the original speech situation only, thus conveying the same reference relations as a first person pronoun. Thus, the simple reflexive pronoun (the 1st person and 3rd person reflexives) and the 1st person pronoun are used as alternatives encoding the original speaker. In Section 3.2, the behavior of reflexive pronouns in reported speech is discussed.

3.2. Anaphoric elements in reported speech

Bezhta has simple, reduplicated and intensified reflexive pronouns,[2] which differ in their anaphoric properties. The simple reflexive (and the intensified reflexive) can be bound in local and non-local domains, i.e. used in long-distance reflexivization, whereas the complex reflexives are always locally bound, i.e. bound in simple clauses [Comrie et al. 2014]. The discussion below is based solely on the simple reflexive and the intensified reflexive pronouns. In complex clauses, e.g. in complement clauses, the simple reflexive pronouns show coreference with a main clause referent. In examples (32) representing the complement clause, the embedded third person reflexive pronoun *hinis* 'REFL.GEN1' shows long-distance reflexivization, i.e. it is bound across the complement clause boundary referring to the main clause subject *Adil*.

(32)   *adil*   *Ø-uq'adoj*   *Ø-eⁿƛ'e-š*   *hinis*   *is*   *zoʁijas*   *nis-al.*
       Adil(I)   I-big.APUD   I-go-PRS   REFL.GEN1   brother   find.PST.PTCP.GEN1   say-INF
       'Adil$_i$ went to the head$_j$ (of the village) to tell (him) about his$_{i/*j}$ brother's finding.'

Just like in complex clauses, in reported speech construction the simple third person reflexive pronoun used in the quotation clause of reported speech constructions refers to a main clause referent, i.e. encodes the original speaker. The use of simple reflexive pronouns in logophoric function is attested in many Daghestanian languages, cf. [Testelets, Toldova 1998; Daniel 2015; Polinsky 2015; Forker 2019], etc. In the typological literature the use of reflexive pronouns in reported speech in logophoric function is considered as a diagnostic of semi-direct speech, a third type of reported speech positioned between direct and indirect speech. Semi-direct speech, which is found only with third person speech subjects ('s/he said that…'), involves incomplete person shift and the mixture of properties of direct and indirect speech [Aikhenvald 2008].

The simple reflexive pronoun encodes the original speaker and never the addressee, whereas the intensified reflexive pronoun can encode participants both inside and outside clause

---

[2] The 3rd person simple reflexive pronoun is *žü* 'REFL' in the singular and *žüwö:l* in the plural. The oblique forms are (suppletive) *hini* in the singular and *hide* in the plural. There are two types of reduplicated reflexive pronoun. One is based on the reduplication of an oblique form of the simple reflexive: the first part is an invariable form in the Genitive, *hinis* (SG) / *hides* (PL), and the second part is oblique *hini* / *hide* in the appropriate cases. The other reduplicated reflexive pronoun consists of an oblique form of the simple reflexive in the appropriate case followed by the simple reflexive in the Absolutive form, which varies for number only. The intensified reflexive is based on the simple reflexive in its oblique form *hini* / *hide* combined with the focus particle *-zu*. The simple first and second person reflexives are formed by attaching the focus particle *-zu* to the personal pronouns.

boundaries. The following elicited examples illustrate the use of simple and intensified reflexives respectively.

(33) a. *Murad-i*ᵢ *harzi j-oː-jo Muhamad-qa*ⱼ **hinƛ'a**ᵢ/*ⱼ *jak'o j-oq-ala=ƛo*
Murad-ERG ask IV-do-PST Muhamad-POSS REFL.SUP heart(IV) IV-come-OPT=QUOT

niso-na.
say-CVB

'Muradᵢ asked Muhamadⱼ to trust himᵢ/*ⱼ.'

b. *Murad-i*ᵢ *harzi j-oː-jo Muhamad-qa*ⱼ **hinƛ'a-zu**ⱼ/ᵢ *jak'o j-oq-ala=ƛo*
Murad-ERG ask IV-do-PST Muhamad-POSS REFL.SUP-FOC heart(IV) IV-come-OPT=QUOT

niso-na.
say-CVB

'Muradᵢ asked Muhamadⱼ to trust himᵢ/himselfⱼ.'

In reported speech personal reflexive pronouns function similarly to the third person pronouns, i.e. encode the original speaker. In the following example the personal reflexive *dozu* is coreferential to the main clause referent *p'awleli*.

(34) *Do dil j-üⁿq-äl žo j-iⁿzcalaʔ,* **do-zu** *čaqallil m-üq-äl*
1SG.ERG 1SG.LAT IV-eat-INF thing(IV) IV-search.SIM 1SG.ABS-FOC jackal.LAT III-eat-INF

m-iqo-jo=ƛo niso-na pikro b-oh-na gej p'awle-li.
III-get-PST=QUOT say-CVB thought(III) III-do-CVB COP cat-ERG

'The catᵢ said, "While Iᵢ was looking for something to eat, I myselfᵢ became a meal for the jackal."'

Sentence (35) exemplifies the use of deictic and anaphoric pronouns: the simple reflexive pronoun *žü* and the first person pronoun *dijela* both encode the original speaker *abo* 'father'. In instances when the indexicals and reflexives co-occur, this reading is the only possibility.

(35) *abo niso-s öždäː-qä,* **žü** *Ø-uʁo-na müʁättä,*
father.ERG say-PRS son.PL.OBL-POSS.ESS REFL I-die-CVB after

dijela *šünäƛ'ä b-eče=ƛo niso-na.*
1SG.GEN2 grave.SUP.ESS HPL-stay.IMP=QUOT say-CVB

'The fatherᵢ said to his sons that after heᵢ dies, you each stay near myᵢ grave.'

Example (36) illustrates the use of the simple reflexive, the first person pronoun, and multiple uses of the quotative particle, as well as the use of the deictic adverb. The deictic element *hoƛoʔ* 'here' in this example is interpreted from the original speaker's perspective and refers to the location in which the original utterance took place, viz. Turkey; the first person pronoun *dije* is also used from the perspective of the original speaker. The simple reflexive pronoun *žü* encodes the original speaker, who is referred to in the matrix clause by the third person pronoun *holco*.

(36) *holco nisos,* **dije** *ijo-abo zu<wa>q'o-jo=ƛo daʁistanƛilaʔas* **žü**
3SG.ERG say.PRS 1SG.GEN1 mother-father be<PL>-PST=QUOT Daghestan.IN.ABL REFL

Ø-aq-na=ƛo **hoƛoʔ,** *ijo-abo=na b-u<wa>ʁo-na Ø-uq'ƛi-na*
I-happen-CVB=QUOT here.IN.ESS mother-father=ADD HPL-die<PL>-CVB I-grow-CVB

gej=ƛo.
COP=QUOT

'He says, "My parents were from Daghestan, and I was born here (in Turkey), and when my parents died, I grew up alone."'

Thus, the simple reflexive pronoun is used in reported speech to refer back to the speaker of the original speech situation only, conveying the same reference relations as a first person pronoun. That is, the simple reflexive pronoun and the 1st person pronoun are used as alternatives encoding the original speaker.

1.3. Deictic elements in reported speech

In Bezhta reported speech there is usually no spatial and temporal shift of the kind required in canonical direct and indirect speech constructions in English and elsewhere; instead, the interpretation of adjuncts in reported speech depends on the interpretation of indexical pronouns. Consider the place adverbs *hoλoʔ* (proximal) and *hugidaː* (distal), which are derived from the corresponding proximal and distal demonstrative pronouns [Comrie et al. 2015b: 229]. Bezhta demonstrative pronouns show a three-way spatial distinction: close to the speaker, close to the hearer, and far from the speaker and the hearer. The proximal adverb *hoλoʔ* is derived from the demonstrative *hoλo* (close to the speaker), and the distal adverb *hugidaː* is derived from *hugi* (far from the speaker and the hearer). The reference point of these place adverbs is still ambiguous in (37a), as both adverbs can take the position of either the current or the original speaker. The ambiguity can be resolved, for example, when the long-distance reflexive is used in the reported clause. In this case, the only possible reading of the place adverbs is with indexical shift (37b).

(37) a. *abo*　　*niso-s*　　***do***　　*zuq'o-jo*　　*hoλoʔ*　／　*hugidaː.*
　　　　father.ERG　say-PRS　1SG.ABS　be-PST　　here　　　　　there
　　　　'The father$_i$ says, "I$_{i/j}$ was here/there."'

　　b. *abo*　　*niso-s*　　***žü***　　*zuq'o-jo*　　*hoλoʔ*　／　*hugidaː.*
　　　　father.ERG　say-PRS　REFL　　be-PST　　here　　　　there
　　　　'The father$_i$ says that he$_{i/*j}$ was here/there.'

4. Quotative, reportative and other functions of the enclitic *λo*

The enclitic *λo* has several functions. Its main function is to mark quotation in the context of speech verbs, propositional attitude verbs (e.g. *urʁizi -aq-* 'think', *pikro boː-* 'think'), a few verbs of knowledge and acquisition of knowledge (e.g. *-iq'-* 'learn, know'), and fearing verbs (*hic'o -ek-* 'fear').

Another of its functions is reportative. It is used to mark **hearsay evidential** value in narration, something often used in storytelling. Interestingly, in the West Tsezic languages the reportative and quotative enclitics are distinct (cf. Hinuq reportative *eλ*, quotative *λen*; Khwarshi reportative *λo*, quotative *λun/λin*; Tsez reportative *λax*, quotative *λin*), whereas in the East Tsezic the same enclitic is used in both quotative and reportative functions (Bezhta *λo*, Hunzib *λe*) [Khalilova 2011].

The system of evidentiality in the Tsezic languages shows a contrast between witnessed and unwitnessed events, which is expressed only in the past tense [Comrie, Polinsky 2007; Forker 2018; Khalilova 2011]. In the West Tsezic languages there is an equipollent evidential contrast between past witnessed and past unwitnessed forms. In the East Tsezic languages including Bezhta, meanwhile, the contrast is based on the distinction between the preterite (also called aorist), a morphologically simple past tense, and the perfect, which is a compound tense based on the perfective converb and the present tense copula. The witnessed/unwitnessed contrast is based on the distinction between visual and non-visual sources of information. In addition to these basic functions, the opposition of witnessed and unwitnessed forms has extended uses, first mentioned for Tsez in [Comrie, Polinsky 2007: 344]: "⟨…⟩ the contrast is used to report direct/indirect access to emotions, sensations, or beliefs. In this usage, past witnessed is normally associated with the first person, because it is the speaker who has direct access to his/her own feelings or knowledge. Past unwitnessed is used otherwise. This usage ⟨…⟩ is functionally

similar to that of the historic present". It is found in narratives, where the past witnessed regularly refers to events which the narrator did not in fact witness. In the following example (38), the enclitic *ło* functioning as a hearsay evidential is added to the finite verb in the past witnessed tense. The use of hearsay with a direct evidential is another way to express unwitnessed evidential value in Bezhta [Ibid.].

(38) a. *aqo   j-üⁿxöl-ijo=ło   kotakalda   biχzi   j-aq-al.*
       wife(II)   II-begin-PST=REP   very   be.anxious   II-become-INF
      'The wife started to become very anxious.'

   b. *sud=ło   niso-da   äli-s-so   nako-wa   j-ä<ä>ł'el-ca*
       why=QUOT   say-COND   Ali-GEN1-ATTR   melody-PL   NHPL-hit<PL>-PRS.PTCP
     zu<wa>q'o-na   gej.
     be<PL>-CVB   COP
     'If you ask why, (it's because) these were melodies played by Ali.'

(39) *hołło   gähijo   jal   j-eže-jo=ło.*
    3SG.ERG   be.PST.PTCP   hay(IV)   IV-take-PST=QUOT
   'She took all the hay.' [they say]

Since the quotative and the reportative (also called hearsay evidential) coincide in Bezhta, it is sometimes hard to tell whether we are dealing with the use of multiple quotative particles, or of one quotative and one reportative enclitic. In example (40), the enclitic *ło* occurs twice, in the middle and at the end of the quote; the latter definitely demonstrates the quotative usage, as it marks the end of the quote, but the former may indicate hearsay evidential value.

(40) *holco   niso-s   q'ac'c'o   b-ow-al=ło   ömrö,   žensalaʁa   müʁättä:*
    3SG.ERG   say-PRS   together   III-do-INF=QUOT/REP   life(III)   today.CMPR   back
   mi   dije   Ø-uq'o   is   gej=ło.
   2SG.ABS   1SG.GEN1   I-big   brother(I)   COP=QUOT
   'He says, "Let's live together, you are like my older brother nowadays."'

In example (41) the enclitic *ło*, in its quotative function, is followed by the speech verb *niso-* 'say' in the embedded clause, while in the main clause the finite verb is marked with the enclitic *ło* registering the hearsay function.

(41) *were   t'ut'-a:q'a=ło   niso-na   iłe-na   Ø-eⁿł'e-jo=ło   hugi   hoglodoj.*
    hey   shoot-PROH=QUOT   say-CVB   call-CVB   I-go-PST=REP   3SG.ABS   3PL.APUD
   'Shouting, "Wait, do not shoot", he went towards them.'

The enclitic *ło* can even attach to the speech verb *niso-* 'say', indicating a hearsay usage.

(42) *niso-l-lo=ło   hoglo   is-na:-qa   ha:ⁿ   sijo-d   j-aq-ijo,*
    say-CAUS-PST=REP   3PL.OBL   brother-OBL.PL-POSS   hey   what-Q   IV-happen-PST
   sud   j-aq-ijo=ło   niso-na?
   why   IV-happen-PST=QUOT   say-CVB
   'They asked those brothers, "What happened? Why did it happen?"'

The same element is obligatory in naming constructions, e.g. *his name is…*, *it is called…*, *to name*, and similar contexts:

(43) *hołłoł'a   äč'äräl=ło   niso-na   ca:ⁿ   gul-ca.*
    3PL.SUP   Adjara.people=QUOT   say-CVB   name   put-PRS
   'They are called the Adjara people.'

(44) *holcos   ca:ⁿ   zuq'o-jo   Mähämäd=ło   niso-na.*
    3SG.GEN1   name   be-PST   Muhamad=QUOT   say-CVB
   'His name was Muhammad.'

Enclitic *λo* is obligatorily used to introduce onomatopoeia.[3]

(45) *χemuχa:*   *b-oχ-eʔe-š*   *zaλi*   *b-ek-il-lo*   *χöχöcöj*
      root.PL   III-hold-NEG-PST.PTCP   wind.ERG   III-fall-CAUS-PST.PTCP   tree(III).CMPR

      dap'=λo   *q'e:*   *Ø-ek-ca*   *t'ahir.*
      dap=QUOT   down   I-fall-PRS   tagir

      'Like a tree without roots, which the wind made fall, Tagir fell with a crash.'

Bezhta uses secondary onomatopoeias, which are words derived from primary onomatopoeic elements referring to sounds. For example, Bezhta possesses a class of onomatopoeic verbs, e.g., *ʁäʔλö-* 'caw', *hicλo-* 'sneeze', *öhλö-* 'cough', *hik'λo-* 'hiccup', *hahλo-* 'yawn', which have a single S$_A$ argument in the Ergative and have arisen diachronically through the incorporation of an onomatopoeic element into the verb *iλe-* 'call' [Comrie at el. 2015a: 542]. Such verbs are based on onomatopoeic expressions covering natural sounds, i.e. those produced by humans and animals, whereas onomatopoeic expressions covering sounds made by artifacts and objects (as in the examples above) do not form unergative verbs. This is easily explained, as the speech verb *iλe-* 'call' allows only animate agents.

Identifying the grammaticalization source of the Bezhta quotative enclitic is not straightforward. All Tsezic languages have a cognate quotative particle, which comes from the grammaticalization of the perfective converb of the verb 'say'. In the closely related Tsezic language Khwarshi, the quotative enclitic *λun/λin* clearly derives from grammaticalization of the perfective converb of the verb *iλ-* 'say', *iλin/iλun* 'having said' [Khalilova 2011; 2021]. The Bezhta quotative *λo* might have originated from the verb *iλe-* 'call', though the perfective form of 'call' *iλena* and the aorist form *iλejo* do not look to be good candidates for reduction. In Hunzib, Bezhta's sister language, the quotative *λe* is presumably a shortened form of the stem of the verb *iλe-*, which in Hunzib means 'call' just as in Bezhta, but whose cognate in some other Tsezic languages means 'say'. Additionally, Hunzib has an alternative quotative *λen*, whose grammaticalization source is unclear: as van den Berg [1995: 134] notes, "it is difficult to say whether *λe.n* is made up of the quotation particle and the coordination particle (AND), a petrified verbal form with a past gerund ending, or the quotation particle and the incorporated first consonant of *nisən*, with which *λe* is usually found". The grammaticalization source of the reportative (hearsay) enclitic in West Tsezic is still to be investigated.

Another enclitic used in reporting is the interrogative enclitic *λona*, which is employed in embedded clauses. It is morphologically complex, as it consists of the quotative enclitic *λo* and the additive enclitic *na*. The enclitic *λona* has additional (epistemic) modal meanings of doubt, possibility, or hesitation, and is often used in the interrogative sense. The interrogative *λona* with verbs of speech indicates that the reported clause is alleged, i.e. the reported statement is false. The embedded interrogative with verbs of speech can have only the unshifted interpretation, i.e. the embedded indexicals can only refer to the current speaker.

(46) *Murad-i*   *niso-s*   *do*   *armija-li-ʔ*   *Ø-eⁿλ'e-na=λona.*
      Murad-ERG   say-PRS   1SG.ABS   army-OBL-IN   I-go-PST=INTERR

      'Murad$_i$ says as if I$_{j/*i}$ went to the army.'

The embedded interrogative *λona* also occurs with the other verbs, e.g. verbs of thought: *pikro b-aq-* 'think', *urʁizi -aq-* 'think', *k'oc'ola-* 'think'.

---

[3] Onomatopoeic expressions in Bezhta cover two main semantic fields: natural sounds and artifacts. Natural sounds are divided into those made by 1) humans: *hik'* 'hiccups', *q'ur* 'rumbling in the stomach', *χur* 'running nose', etc.'; and 2) animals: *wic'* 'squeak of a mouse', *χurr* 'purr of a cat', *wič* 'twittering of small birds', etc. Artifacts are sounds of striking and knocking, e.g. 1) sounds produced by motion: *dap'* 'sound of falling, thud', *q'ip'-q'op'* 'stomping', *qoc-* 'sound of heels, trot', and 2) others: *č'iq'-č'iq'* 'sound of cutting with scissors', *piq'*, *poq'* 'sound of boiling corn porridge', *č'iq'* 'click', *diq*, *däq* 'knock', *q'ip*, *q'öp'* 'knock', etc.

(47) *hugi ȫžö urʁizi Ø-aq-ca, naː-d že holo b-aq-ijo,*
that boy(I) think I-become-PRS where-Q now that III-happen-PST

*m-eλ'e-jo hogo λaplaʁe=**λona**.*
III-go-PST that frog(III)=INTERR

'The boy was wondering where now the frog had gone.'

(48) *hollo-s pikro zuq'o-na, žüwȫl nitona-zu wahliʔ b-aːq-ijaː*
3PL.OBL-GEN1 thought be-CVB REFL.PL always-FOC there HPL-become.PL-PST.PTCP.PL

*gej=**λona**.*
COP=INTERR

'They thought they were always there.'

5. Conclusion

Reported speech constructions are traditionally described as part of complementation. Complementation in Bezhta — like other kinds of subordination, including adverbial and relative constructions — involves the use of non-finite verb forms in the embedded clause [Comrie et al. 2016]. Unlike standard complementation, Bezhta reported speech constructions involve finite embedded clauses. Reported speech complementation shows a weak degree of syntactic subordination: for example, it can be based on mere juxtaposition of the main and the embedded reported clause, or the reported speech can be used in an independent declarative clause, i.e. without the matrix speech predicate.

The reported speech construction is thus definitely a distinct type of complex structure, as it shows some similarities with complementation but also differs from it in certain respects. Like some complement-taking verbs, verbs of speech use several complementation strategies. For verbs of speech, these strategies are finite complementation (Sections 2.1–2.3), non-finite complementation based on nominalization (Section 2.4) and insubordinate complementation (Section 3.1). The behavior of the reflexive pronouns in the reported speech construction is the same as in other complement clauses. In complex clauses and in reported speech constructions, simple reflexive pronouns are used to refer to a main clause referent. The simple 3rd person reflexive pronouns, which are used in logophoric function, encode the original speaker (Section 3.2).

The most distinctive feature of the reported speech construction is the use of finite predicates in embedded complement clauses. As mentioned above, reported speech is introduced not only by utterance predicates but also by some other predicates, including propositional attitude, direct perception and achievement verbs. Clauses embedded under these complement-taking predicates are finite as in reported speech. In the reported speech construction, the quotative enclitic regularly follows the embedded clause. However, the quotative enclitic does not function as a complementizer, since embedded finite clauses also occur without a quotation enclitic, cf. Section 2.1. The quotative enclitic is not a marker of direct speech either, but a marker of quotation in general.

The most common way of expressing reported speech in Bezhta is by means of the construction where the framing clause involves a verb of speech (utterance verb) and the reported utterance is followed by the quotative particle *λo*. It is also common for the reported speech marked with the quotative *λo* to be followed by the perfective converb of *niso-* 'say' along with a verb of speech in the framing clause. Reported speech may occur without a framing clause. Reporting in Bezhta can be introduced by predicates other than speech verbs. There are no restrictions on the position of the framing clause, i.e. it may precede, follow or interrupt the quote. Vocatives, interjections, questions, and non-indicative forms like the imperative, prohibitive, and optative are reported as in ordinary main clauses.

Bezhta reported speech allows indexical shift, i.e. any embedded indexicals can reflect the point of view of either the original speaker or the current speaker (Section 3.1). Indexical shift

is common only in finite complement clauses. In non-finite complementation, only the unshifted reading is possible. The shifted interpretation becomes obligatory with embedded reflexive pronouns. The simple 3rd person reflexive pronouns function as logophoric pronouns in reported speech, encoding the original speaker. That is, the logophoric pronouns in reported speech behave just like first person pronouns as they both refer to the original speaker.

The quotative marker in Bezhta has multiple functions: it is used to mark quotation in reported speech constructions, but also hearsay evidential value. In the closely related West Tsezic languages, the quotative enclitic is a grammaticalized form of the perfective converb of the speech verb 'say' [Khalilova 2009: 238]. However, the origin of the Bezhta quotative *ƛo* remains unclear.

ABBREVIATIONS

I, II, III, IV, V — genders (noun classes) I–V
ABL — ablative
ABS — absolutive
ADD — additive enclitic
ANTIP — antipassive
ANTR — anterior converb
APUD — apudessive, location 'near'
ATTR — attributive
CAUS — causative
COMIT — comitative
COND — conditional converb
COP — copula
CVB — converb
DIR — directive
ENCL — enclitic
ERG — ergative
FOC — focus marker
GEN — genitive
HPL — human plural
IMM — immediate converb
IMP — imperative
IN — inessive, location 'in, inside'
INCH — inchoative
INF — infinitive
INS — instrumental
INTER — interessive, location 'in (a dense mass)'

INTERR — interrogative
IRR — irrealis
LAT — lative
MSD — masdar
NEG — negation
NHPL — non-human plural
OBL — oblique
OPT — optative
PL — plural
POSS — possessive, location 'at'
PROH — prohibitive
PRS — present tense
PST — past tense
PTCP — participle
Q — question marker
QUOT — quotative
REFL — reflexive
REM.PST — remote past
REP — reportative enclitic
SG — singular
SIM — simultaneous converb
SUB — subessive, location 'under'
SUP — superessive, location 'on, above'
TRANSL — translative
UNTIL — temporal converb

REFERENCES

Aikhenvald 2008 — Aikhenvald A. Semi-direct speech: Manambu and beyond. *Language Sciences*, 2008, 30(4): 383–422.

Anand, Nevins 2004 — Anand P., Nevins A. Shifty operators in changing contexts. *Proceedings of SALT 14*, 2004: 20–37.

Bogomolova 2023 — Bogomolova N. Indexical shift in Tabasaran. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory*, 2023, 42: 1–52.

Comrie, Polinsky 2007 — Comrie B., Polinsky M. Evidentials in Tsez. *L'énonciation médiatisée II: Le traitement épistémologique de l'information, illustrations amérindiennes et caucasiennes.* Guentchéva Z., Landaburu J. (eds.). Louvain: Peeters, 2007, 335–350.

Comrie et al. 2010 — Comrie B., Khalilov M., Khalilova Z. Reported speech in the Tsezic languages: An overview. Talk at the *Workshop on Reported speech in East Caucasian languages*, Lyon, 22 September 2010.

Comrie et al. 2014 — Comrie B., Forker D., Khalilova Z. Alignment typology, reflexives, and reciprocals in Tsezic languages. *Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society*, 2014, 37: 32–51.

Comrie et al. 2015a — Comrie B., Khalilov M., Khalilova Z. Valency and valency classes in Bezhta. *Valency classes*. Malchukov A., Haspelmath M., Comrie B. (eds.). Berlin: de Gruyter Mouton, 2015, 541–570.

Comrie et al. 2015b — Comrie B., Khalilov M., Khalilova Z. *A grammar of Bezhta: Phonetics, morphology, word formation*. Leipzig; Makhachkala: ALEF, 2015.

Comrie et al. 2016 — Comrie B., Forker D., Khalilova Z. Insubordination in the Tsezic languages. *Insubordination.* Evans N., Watanabe H. (eds.). Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2016, 171–182.

Coulmas 1986 — Coulmas F. Reported speech: Some general issues. *Direct and indirect speech: A functional study*. Coulmas F. (ed.). New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 1986, 1–28.

Culy 1994 — Culy C. Aspects of logophoric marking. *Linguistics*, 1994, 32: 1055–1094.

Daniel 2015 — Daniel M. Logophoric reference in Archi. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 2015, 88: 202–219.

Deal 2020 — Deal A. R. *A theory of indexical shift: Meaning, grammar, and crosslinguistic variation*. Cambridge (MA): MIT Press, 2020.

Evans 2013 — Evans N. Some problems in the typology of quotation: A canonical approach. *Canonical morphology and syntax*. Brown D., Chumakina M., Corbett G. G. (eds.). Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, 2013, 66–98.

Forker 2018 — Forker D. Evidentiality in Nakh-Daghestanian languages. *The Oxford handbook of evidentiality*. Aikhenvald A. (ed.). Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, 2018, 490–509.

Forker 2019 — Forker D. Reported speech constructions in Sanzhi Dargwa and their extension to other areas of grammar. *Sprachwissenschaft*, 2019, 44: 171–199.

Ganenkov 2023 — Ganenkov D. Agreement shift in embedded reports. *Linguistic Inquiry*, 2023, 54(3): 547–570.

Khalilov 2020 — Khalilov M. Sh. *Na ustakh u bezhtintsev: legendy, predaniya, skazki i rasskazy* [Legends and tales of the Bezhta people]. Moscow: Institute of Linguistics, 2020.

Khalilova 2009 — Khalilova Z. *A grammar of Khwarshi*. Utrecht: LOT, 2009.

Khalilova 2011 — Khalilova Z. Evidentiality in Tsezic languages. *Linguistic Discovery*, 2011, 9(2): 30–48.

Khalilova 2021 — Khalilova Z. Grammatikalizatsiya glagolov rechi v nekotorykh tsezskikh yazykakh: narrativ i kvotativ [Grammaticalization of speech verbs in some Tsezic languages: Narrative and quotative]. *Vestnik Dagestanskogo naučnogo centra*, 2021, 82: 55–57.

Nikitina, Bugaeva 2021 — Nikitina T., Bugaeva A. Logophoric speech is not indirect: Towards a syntactic approach to reported speech constructions. *Linguistics*, 2021, 59(3): 609–633.

Polinsky 2015 — Polinsky M. Embedded finite complements, indexical shift, and binding in Tsez. *Languages of the Caucasus*, 2015, 1(1): 1–37.

Schlenker 2003 — Schlenker Ph. A plea for monsters. *Linguistics and Philosophy*, 2003, 26: 29–120.

Shklovsky, Sudo 2014 — Shklovsky K., Sudo Y. The syntax of monsters. *Linguistic Inquiry*, 2014, 45(3): 381–402.

Testelets, Toldova 1998 — Testelets Ya. G., Toldova S. Yu. Refleksivnye mestoimeniya v dagestanskikh yazykakh i tipologiya refleksiva [Reflexive pronouns in Daghestanian languages and the typology of reflexives]. *Voprosy Jazykoznanija*, 1998, 4: 35–57.

van den Berg 1995 — van den Berg H. *A grammar of Hunzib*. Munich: Lincom, 1995.