Abstract
The Balochi conjunction of general subordination, $ki$, sometimes introduces complement clauses that report speeches. Barjasteh Delforooz (2010a: 224) suggested that, when so used, $ki$ “has a highlighting function. … The marked speeches push the story forward to its goal.” The current paper argues that, in fact, $ki$ highlights not the speech itself, but its consequences. When $ki$ precedes a reported question, for example, the answer is more important than the question. The presence of $ki$ may also indicate that the words in a speech were not said on a particular occasion, but represent the substance of what someone else said or used to say, is to say or could have said. In other words, $ki$ is a “linguistic indicator of interpretive use” (Blass 1990: 104; Farrell 2005: 1).1 The paper ends by discussing how the above motivations for using $ki$ before a reported speech in Balochi can be reconciled.2
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1. Introduction3

$Ki$ in Balochi is a “conjunction of general subordination” (Barjasteh Delforooz 2010a: 16) found in adverbial, relative and complement clauses (sec. 2). This paper concentrates on its presence before complement clauses and, in particular, those that report a speech.

Roberts (2009: 295, 300) claims for Persian that the “clause linkage marker” $ke$ “is used primarily in spoken texts to give prominence to speeches that the author considers important to the story”. In the pre-defence version of his dissertation, Barjasteh Delforooz (ibid.: 224) likewise suggested that, when introducing a direct speech, Balochi $ki$ “has a highlighting function. … The marked speeches push the story forward to its goal.”

---

1 Sadly, when I presented this paper, I was unaware that Farrell had already asserted that “$ki$ may be broadly analysed in all its uses as introducing a representation of another representation – a thought, utterance or state of affairs that could possibly be entertained” (2005: 17). The uses Farrell considered include $ki$ as a relative and subordination marker; in compounds; as a comparative; introducing purposes, results and reasons; as a temporal marker; in both positive and negative disjunctions; and in connection with indirect and direct quotations (ibid.: 3–15).

2 The conclusions of this paper are based on the texts found in Appendix 2 of Barjasteh Delforooz 2010b (pp. 287–392). To ensure that the paper covers all the major uses of $ki$, every instance in texts XM ($\text{Xarmizz}a$ ‘Melon’ – pp. 288–295) and MG ($\text{Hazrat-i Mūsā u gušnagēn bandag} ‘\text{Moses and the Starving Man}’$ – pp. 296–304) has been cited. Reference is also made to texts BP ($\text{Baxtay padā} ‘\text{Seeking the Fortune}’$ – pp. 305–320), BU ($\text{Pīrēn balāč u uštir} ‘\text{The Old Baloch and the camel}’$ – pp. 359–367), KH ($\text{Khudānīzār Khān} ‘\text{Khudanizar Khan}’$ – pp. 328–337) and PJ ($\text{Pīr Jangī} 3 ‘\text{Pir Jangi}’$ – pp. 321–327).

3 A shorter version of this paper was presented at the 4th International Conference on Iranian Linguistics (ICIL 4), Uppsala University, Sweden in June 2011. Barjasteh Delforooz classifies Balochi of Sistan “as belonging to the Sarhaddī subdialect of the Raxšānī or Western group of Balochi dialects”. It “belongs to the so-called north-western group of Iranian languages” and is mainly spoken in Iranian and Afghani Sistan (2010a: 18–20).
However, further research suggested that, when ki introduces a reported speech in Balochi, it is the consequences of the speech that are highlighted, rather than the speech itself. In particular, “when a question is answered, the answer is usually more important than the question, which is why the effect of marking a question with ki is to highlight the answer” (Barjasteh Delforooz 2010b: 227 – see sec. 4 for examples). Furthermore, ki may introduce a speech, not to highlight anything, but to indicate that its words represent the substance of what one or more people said, are to say or could have said, as opposed to having been uttered on a particular occasion (ibid.: 229).

Like Farrell (2005), this paper argues that the reason that ki can have such diverse effects is that it is an “indicator of interpretive use” (Blass 1990: 104). This means that, when it introduces a reported speech, the speech is to be understood not as a description of what was said on a particular occasion, but rather as a representation of an utterance or thought (see sec. 3).

2. Ki as a conjunction of general subordination

Subordinate clauses can be divided into three basic types, adverbial, relative, and complement (see Whaley 1997: 247), and ki is found in all three in Balochi. This section briefly illustrates its typical use in the three types.

2.1. Adverbial clauses subordinated by ki

In adverbial clauses, ki most often occurs at the beginning of the clause, unless it is of time, in which case it immediately precedes the subordinated verb or verb phrase, following the subject, if present.

When the clause is post-nuclear, it is usually of reason or result (if realis) or purpose (if irrealis) (Barjasteh Delforooz 2010b: 200), though other relations are also found. In (1), the subordinated clause (1b) gives a reason for the event of the main clause (1a).

(1)a
nām=ay
gurā
galaw-ā
išt-ant
xarmizza
name=PC.3s
then
melon-O
leave.PST-3p
xarmizza
b
ki
mizzag=ay
aval
xar
burt
SUB
taste=PC.3s
first
donkey
take.PST.3s

Then they named the melon ‘xarmizza’, since it was a donkey that tasted it first. (XM 109–110)4

When the clause is pre-nuclear, it is usually of time, though other relations are also found. In (2), the subordinated clause (2a) gives the time for the event of the main clause (2b–c).

(2)a
bādišā
ki
ēši-rā
dišt
king
SUB
DEM-O
see.PST.3s
b
zung
understand.PST.3s

4 See also XM 74–75 (reason), MG 61–62 (result) and KH 111 ((8b) below) (purpose).
When the king saw him, he understood that (he was) a person from another country. (BP 27–29)5

What is noteworthy for the present paper is that, whether pre-nuclear or post-nuclear, the information in adverbial clauses that are subordinated with \textit{ki} can easily be related to information that has recently been stated in the discourse. Thus, in (1), the hearers already know that it was a donkey that first ate the melons (XM 83–87). Likewise, in (2), the hearers already know that the traveller has arrived in a country whose king is out hunting (BP 24–26).

2.2. Relative clauses subordinated by \textit{ki}

Relative clauses are commonly divided into two types: restrictive and non-restrictive. Restrictive (identifying) relative clauses serve to delimit the potential referents (Comrie 1989: 138). In such clauses in Balochi, \textit{ki} occurs immediately after the head NP that it modifies. In (3), the head NP is \textit{har yazāu har mēwagē} ‘every kind of food and fruit’, and the relative clause \textit{ki dīst} limits the referent to that ‘which he saw’.

\begin{equation}
\text{am} = \text{ē} \quad \text{har} \quad \text{yazā} = \text{u} \quad \text{har} \quad \text{mēwag} = \text{ē} \\
\text{EMP} = \text{DEM} \quad \text{each} \quad \text{food} = \text{and} \quad \text{each} \quad \text{fruit} = \text{IND} \\
\text{ki} \quad \text{dīst} \quad \text{zū} = \text{u} \quad \text{wārt} \\
\text{SUB} \quad \text{see.PST.3s} \quad \text{buy.PST.3s=and} \quad \text{eat.PST.3s}
\end{equation}

He bought and ate every kind of food and fruit which he saw. (MG 58–60)6

Non-restrictive relative clauses serve “merely to give the hearer an added piece of information about an already identified entity, but not to identify that entity” (ibid.). Such clauses in Balochi begin with \textit{ki}, rather than placing it after the head NP. In (4), for instance, the head NP is \textit{yakk tīri baryē} ‘a light post’ (4a), and the relative clause of (4b) gives additional information about it.

\begin{equation}
\text{ē} \quad \text{bādiśā} \quad \text{bi} = \text{m} = \text{ē} \quad \text{wat-ī} \quad \text{šār-ay} \\
\text{DEM} \quad \text{king} \quad \text{in} = \text{EMP} = \text{DEM} \quad \text{RFL-GEN} \quad \text{town-GEN} \\
\text{wasat-(t)ā} \quad \text{yakk} \quad \text{tūr} = \text{i} \quad \text{bary} = \text{ē} \quad \text{dāšt} \\
\text{middle-OBL} \quad \text{one} \quad \text{pole} = \text{IZ} \quad \text{electricity} = \text{IND} \quad \text{have.PST.3s}
\end{equation}

\begin{equation}
\text{ki} \quad \text{harčī} \quad \text{am} = \text{ē} \quad \text{tilēpunān-ī} \quad \text{śīm} = \text{at-ant} \\
\text{SUB} \quad \text{whatever} \quad \text{EMP} = \text{DEM} \quad \text{telephones-GEN} \quad \text{wire} = \text{COP.PST-3p} \\
\text{bī} \quad \text{am} = \text{ēśī} \quad \text{wasl} = \text{at-ant} \\
\text{to} \quad \text{EMP} = \text{DEM.OBL} \quad \text{connected} = \text{COP.PST-3p}
\end{equation}

This king had a light post in the centre of his town, to which were connected whatever phone wires there were. (XM 3–5)

\textsuperscript{5} See also XM 7, 31, 36, 50, 55, 92, 106; MG 9, 45 (reason). See BP 106–107 for a complement following \textit{zānt} ‘understand, know’ that is not introduced with \textit{ki}.

\textsuperscript{6} See also XM 6, MG 90.
(5b) is different, as *ki* introduces the presupposition (established information – see (5a)) in the equivalent of an “it-cleft structure” (Levinsohn 2011a: 65).

(5a) ‘Finally, he became the (biggest) trader of the world, the trader of the entire world.’

(5b) FOCUS presupposition

\[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{marg na(y)-āt} \\
\text{death NEG-come.PST.3s}
\end{array}
\quad
\begin{array}{l}
\text{ki} \\
\text{SUB}
\end{array}
\quad
\begin{array}{l}
tajfār būt \\
\text{trader become.PST.3s}
\end{array}
\]

(It was through) death not coming (contrary to expectation)\(^7\) that he became a trader. (MG 94–97)

2.3. Complement clauses subordinated by *ki*

In complement clauses, *ki* typically introduces the complement, as in (2c) above and (6).

(6) \(b(y)-ā\) \(ki\) \(ē\) \(rang\) \(ēš-ī\) \(mās\) \(ē\)

\[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{SBJ-come.PRS} \\
\text{SUB}
\end{array}
\quad
\begin{array}{l}
\text{ki} \\
\text{DEM}
\end{array}
\quad
\begin{array}{l}
\text{ē} \\
\text{manner}
\end{array}
\quad
\begin{array}{l}
\text{rang} \\
\text{DEM-GEN}
\end{array}
\quad
\begin{array}{l}
\text{ēš-ī} \\
\text{mother}
\end{array}
\quad
\begin{array}{l}
\text{mās} \\
\text{DEM}
\end{array}
\quad
\begin{array}{l}
\text{ē}
\end{array}
\]

It happened that its mother was strangled in this way and… (XM 59)\(^8\)

When the complement is a reported speech, however, the default is for *ki* to be absent (see (7) below), so its presence before a reported speech is noteworthy. The following sections discuss the pragmatic effects of introducing a reported speech with *ki*.

3. *Ki* as an indicator of interpretive use

In Levinsohn (2011a: 115), it is argued that a number of languages exhibit what may be termed a marker of interpretive use:

When a speech is reported directly, it usually purports to describe a state of affairs – what was said on a particular occasion (a “descriptive use” – Sperber and Wilson 1986: 224–31). However, some reported speeches do not inform the reader of what was said so much as represent an utterance or thought that resembles it.

Some languages have “an explicit linguistic indicator of interpretive use” (Blass 1990: 104) whose function is to indicate that the speech concerned is not describing what was said on a particular occasion, but rather represents an utterance or thought [as illustrated below]. Such markers are often found in speech orienters. A variety of circumstances motivate the presence of interpretive use markers.

I now argue that Balochi *ki* is such an interpretive use marker and discuss some factors that motivate its presence.

When *ki* does not introduce a reported speech, then the sentence concerned pur-

\(^7\) This *ki* may be a “proclitic” (Hosseini, this volume) that indicates contrastive emphasis.

\(^8\) See also MG 107, 114. In MG 72 (\(\text{man šapī ki mir-īn [I tonight SUB die.PRS-1s]}\) ‘(It is sure) that I will die tonight’), *ki* appears to introduce a complement (mir-īn), even though no orienter is present.
ports to describe what was said on a particular occasion. So, in (7), by not using *ki*, the storyteller implies that, on a particular occasion, someone said to the king, “Lord king, it is a dragon”.

(7)  
\[
gušt \ bādšā \ sāib \ aždiyā=(y)ē  
\]
\( \text{say.PST.3s} \text{ king} \text{ master} \text{ dragon=IND} \)

He said, “Lord king, it is a dragon”. (XM 15–16)

One of the reasons for introducing a reported speech with *ki* is to indicate that the words that follow were NOT said on a particular occasion.\(^9\) In (8c), for instance, the words that follow *ki* are not a report of what Sabzo said on some occasion. Rather, they are hypothetical, representing what she might have said, had Khudanizar Khan not given her a generous dowry.\(^10\)

(8)  
\[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{a \ } \text{jam}=ē \\
\text{collection=PC.3s}  \\
\text{ku}  \\
\text{do.PST.3s}  \\
\text{b \ } \text{ki} \text{11}  \\
\text{yānē}  \\
\text{Sabzo}  \\
\text{PROH-say.PRS-3s}  \\
\text{c \ } \text{xudānizar}  \\
\text{Khan}  \\
\text{PROH-do.3s}  \\
\text{d \ } \text{mard}=ē  \\
\text{give.PST.3s}  \\
\end{array}
\]

He collected them (almost 200 sheep and 100 camels) in order for Sabzo not to say, not to think in her heart, “Khudanizar Khan married me off to a lowly man”. (KH 110–113)

Similarly, what follows *ki* in (9d, f) is not a report of what Pirakk said on a specific occasion. Rather, it gives the substance of what he said a number of times, as the imperfectives (9c, e) imply.

(9)  
\[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{a \ } \text{būt}=u  \\
\text{become.PST.3s}  \\
\text{mardum}=ē  \\
\text{and person=IND}  \\
\text{b \ } \text{ki}  \\
\text{bi pīrakk-ay}  \\
\text{SUB SBJ-come.PST.SBJ.3s}  \\
\text{gīs-ā}  \\
\text{to Pirakk-GEN house-OBL}  \\
\text{c \ } \text{xudānizar}  \\
\text{kiss}=a  \\
\text{Khan story=IMPF}  \\
\text{kurt}  \\
\text{do.PST.3s}  \\
\text{d \ } \text{ki}  \\
\text{pa(m)=man}  \\
\text{SUB Khan for=me DEM}  \\
\text{ē}  \\
\text{rang}  \\
\text{kurt}=u  \\
\text{manner do.PST.3s=and}  \\
\end{array}
\]

9 Although this subset of examples of *ki* can be viewed as functioning as a “non-first hand” or “reported” evidential whose information has been “inferred from indirect evidence” (Aikhenvald 2004: 28, 1), the Relevance-Theoretic approach of this paper enables it to be described in terms of a single function (see Blass 1990: 259 on treating “hearsay” particles as “interpretive use markers”). As Farrell (2005: 17) observes, “Balochi ki is used in a wide variety of constructions. What is needed is an analysis that, if possible, will capture all of the varied uses under one function.”

10 *Ki* also tends to be used to introduce a message that the addressee is asked to pass on to someone else. This is probably because, at this stage, it is hypothetical. See MG 5–6.

11 The *ki* in (8b) introduces a subordinate clause of purpose (see footnote 4).
It so happened that, whenever someone came to Pirakk’s house, he used to talk so much about Khudanizar: “Khudanizar did this kind of thing for me”; and then he would turn (to his wife): “Sabzo, Khudanizar did this kind of thing, didn’t he?” (KH 125–131)

When a well-known folktale is related, it is not usually thought of as something that was told on one particular occasion, so it is natural that ki should introduce it, as in (10b) (the present is used in (10a)):

(10a)  guš-īt
      say.PRS-3s

b  ki  yag bādišā=(y)ē=at
     SUB one king=IND=COP.PST.3s

They say that there was a king. (XM 1–2)

Ki may also introduce the substance of a whole conversation, as in (11b). It is most unlikely that three thieves would chorus together, “Let’s go and steal from the king’s treasury!” Rather, this speech represents what they decided after a discussion.

(11a)  say duzz irāda kurt-at-ant
      three thief desire do.PST-COP.PST-3p

b  ki  b-rav-an bādišā-ay xazānag-ā b-jan-an
     SUB SBJ-go.PRS-1p king-GEN treasury-O SBJ-hit.PRS-1p

Three thieves had taken a decision: “Let’s go and steal from the king’s treasury”. (PJ 60–62)

4. Ki and grounding

I argued in section 3 that one of the reasons for introducing a reported speech with ki was to indicate that the words that follow were NOT said on a particular occasion. I now turn to passages in which speeches introduced with ki are backgrounded in relation to what follows.

I first return to extracts (10) and (11) above, as they provide evidence that the use of ki to introduce a reported speech does not highlight the speech concerned (contrast the claim by Roberts (2009: 300) for Persian that the comparable marker “ke is used primarily in spoken texts to give prominence to speeches that the author considers is important to the story”).

In (10b), the copula indicates that the information concerned is of a background nature, as far as the theme line of the narrative is concerned (Levinsohn 2011a: 68), even though it is introduced with ki.
In (11a), a pluperfect (translated ‘had taken a decision’) introduces the speech. Pluperfects are associated with backgrounding in narrative, as they are used for events that take place prior to the theme-line events (ibid.: 70). So the reported speech of (11b) is backgrounded with respect to what follows (the later decision of the thieves to pour a lap of gold into the very grave where the hero of the story is hiding – PJ 64–67).

Further evidence that ki does not highlight the speech that it introduces is that, when it precedes a reported question, the answer (which is not introduced with ki) is more important than the question. Such is the case in (12).12

(12) question gušt=ī  
ki  
pīramard bābā

say.PST.3s=PC.3s SUB old.man father

ē  
DEM what=CO.PPRS.3p

ANSWER  gušt=ī  
ē  
bēxī  
jwān-ēn  
čīz=ant

say.PST.3s=PC.3s DEM entirely good-ATTR thing=CO.PPRS.3p

man=um  
wārt-a

l=also eat.PST-PP

ē  
ar-ā=um  
dāt-a=un=ō

DEM donkey-O=also give.PST-PP=CO.PPRS.1s=and

šumā=um  
bōr-it

you=also SBJ.eat.PRS-2p

He said, “Dear old man, what are these?” He said, “These are very good things. I’ve eaten them and also given them to this donkey. You should eat them, too.” (XM 93–99)

A similar pattern is sometimes found when a reported “proposal” is followed by “its non-speech execution” (ibid.: 111). The effect of introducing the proposal with ki is to background it in relation to its non-speech execution. This is seen in (13).13

(13) proposal gušt=ī  
ki  
b-ra...

say.PST=PC.3s SUB SBJ.go.PPRS

(God) said: “Go (and tell that poor fellow…)”

EXECUTION His Holiness Moses came and gave God’s message to the fellow… (MG 14-24)

12 In the Xarmizza (XM) folktale, which concerns the discovery that melons are good to eat, three reported questions are introduced with ki, all of them asked by the king. The first leads to the discovery that a dragon has come to ask for help (12–16) and the second to the carpenter receiving a strange seed as a reward for helping the dragon (29–54). After someone sows the seeds, feeds the fruit to his donkey and, eventually, tries it himself (68–91), the third of the king’s questions (12) leads him being persuaded to try the fruit, which results in it being called Xar-mizza (‘donkey-tasted’) (95–111 – see (1) above).

13 See also MG 29–38. In XM 12–13 (bāḍīšā dēm dāt yakk=ē=rā  ki  ē  čī(r)ē [king face give.PST.3s one=IND=O SUB DEM what=IND] ‘The king sent someone [to check] who it is’), no speech verb is used to introduce the proposal, but the presence of ki again backgrounds this event in relation to its execution (14–16).
Cross-linguistically, indicators of interpretive use often introduce indirect speech (*ibid.*: 116), as it frequently communicates only the substance of the original communication (*ibid.*: 106), and indirect reporting is associated with backgrounding (Lowe and Hurlimann 2002: 75). Reported speeches in Balochi that are introduced with *ki* are not classified as indirect, since they retain first and second person pronominal references. Nevertheless, they tend to behave like indirect speeches as far as grounding is concerned. Given that one cross-linguistic way of highlighting an event is to background the one that immediately precedes it (Levinsohn 2011a: 79), I conclude that if the effect of using *ki* to introduce a reported question is to thereby highlight the answer, this is consistent with it being an indicator of interpretive use.

5. Further evidence that *ki* is an indicator of interpretive use

One reason for using an interpretive use marker is to signal that what follows relates back to and interprets something in the immediate context. So, for example, when a demonstrative is used cataphorically to point forward to and highlight what follows, it is cross-linguistically normal to introduce what follows with such a marker. Such is the case in (14): ‘that which I ate at once’ relates back to and interprets *amēš* ‘this’.

(14) \[ mnī rōzī am=ēš=\textsc{int} \ ki \ man yakk-war-ā \]
  my ration EMP=DEM=COP.PRS.3s SUB I one-time-ADVZ
  wārt-un
  eat.PST-1s

My ration is this: that which I ate at one go. (MG 67–68)

Similarly, in (15), the material following *ki* relates back to and interprets *allāay payyāmān* ‘God’s message’.

(15)\[
\text{a} \quad \text{allā-ay payyāmān-ā pa bandag-ā dāt}
\]
  God-GEN messages-O for servant-OBL give.PST.3s

\[
\text{b} \quad \text{ki ay bandag tī rabb ē rang gušt}
\]
  SUB oh servant your God DEM way say.PST.3s

He gave God’s message to the fellow: “Oh fellow, your God said like this…” (MG 24–25)

See also KH 58–59, in which the material following *ki* relates back to and interprets *kasam wā* ‘took an oath’.15

Extract (16) indicates the most significant points in the second half of a folktale about a camel that has become so exhausted from neglect and ill-treatment that it “laid down its neck to die” (BU 13–14). What is noteworthy is that *ki* introduces the

---

14 See also MG 77–78. In BU 55–56, the material following *ki* relates back to and interprets *ančō* ‘such’. PJ 3–8 (with *ančēn sawt...* ‘such a voice’) is similar.

15 See also BP 21–22 (interpreting *sōf kan* ‘pose a question’). In (11) above, it could be argued that the material following *ki* relates back to and interprets *irāda kurt-at-ant* ‘had taken a decision’.
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culminating speech by the camel (16b), which would be consistent with the claim by Roberts (2009: 300) for Persian that ke gives prominence to the speeches it introduces. However, it is clear from the content of the camel’s speech that it is a direct response to its owner’s request for forgiveness (16a). As such, the presence of ki can be understood as an overt indication that the reply relates to and interprets the owner’s request (see further below).16

(16)a The Baloch nomad told the camel, “I have come to my senses now and now I know that [ki] I have been unjust to you. … I want that [ki] you forgive me before you die, forgive me and do not take my negligence into consideration…” (BU 27–49)

b Then this camel, by the order of God the Almighty, turned its face and, in the very agony of death, began to speak and said to its owner ki “It doesn’t matter. … If you have loaded me up with heavy loads, I will also forgive you. … I will forgive whatever you have done to me. But I will not forgive one thing, I will not forgive it until doomsday; that is this, that [ki] you didn’t understand anything of my lawful and clean flesh… But one deed of yours I will not forgive, that [ki] … you tied my rein to the tail of a crop-tailed donkey and made the donkey my leader and made the donkey my way-guide. This deed I will not forgive.” (BU 50–105)

6. Conclusion

This paper has argued that, when introducing a reported speech or other complement, the subordinating conjunction ki functions as an “an explicit linguistic indicator of interpretive use” (Blass 1990: 104). In the majority of examples, its sole function is to indicate that the following speech is to be understood not as a description of what has been said on a particular occasion, but rather as a representation of an utterance or thought. In some passages, however, the pragmatic effect of introducing the speech with ki has been to background the question or proposal concerned, thereby highlighting the following answer or execution of the proposal. And, in one passage, ki has introduced the culminating speech of a folktale, to indicate explicitly that the speech relates to and interprets the previous speech.

This paper has not addressed the possibility that ki is a marker of interpretive use, not only when introducing a reported speech, but also in other constructions. Fortunately, Farrell has already addressed this issue. He concludes, “ki may be broadly analysed in all its uses as introducing a representation of another representation – a thought, utterance or state of affairs that could possibly be entertained” (2005: 17).

16 The following observation about the Koiné Greek interpretive use marker hoti applies equally to the way ki is used in (16b): “When hoti introduces direct speech in Luke-Acts, it not only indicates that the speech concerned “interprets” what has already been said …; it also seems to mark that speech as the culmination of a narrative unit or sub-unit” (Levinsohn 2011b: 266).
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Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1s/3s</td>
<td>1st/3rd person singular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1p/2p/3p</td>
<td>1st/2nd/3rd person plural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&amp;</td>
<td>associative connective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADVZ</td>
<td>adverbializer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATTR</td>
<td>attributive form of an adjective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COP</td>
<td>predicate copula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEM</td>
<td>demonstrative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMP</td>
<td>emphatic particle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN</td>
<td>genitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMPF</td>
<td>imperfective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IND</td>
<td>indefinite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IZ</td>
<td><em>izafa</em> construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEG</td>
<td>negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP</td>
<td>noun phrase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>object</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBL</td>
<td>oblique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC</td>
<td>pronominal clitic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP</td>
<td>past participle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRS</td>
<td>present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PST</td>
<td>past</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBJ</td>
<td>subjunctive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUB</td>
<td>conjunction of general subordination (<em>ki</em>)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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