

The Interface between Discourse Analysis and Rhetorical Analysis

An Application to the Narratives of Luke

I. DISCOURSE ANALYSIS AS A BRANCH OF LINGUISTICS

INTRODUCTION

In this study, I would like to explore the possibilities for interaction between rhetorical analysis and discourse analysis, and the mutual benefits that such interaction between the disciplines might bring. It will be useful to begin by outlining the principal features of discourse analysis as a branch of linguistic science, before going on to look at some specific aspects as they apply to Hellenistic Greek, the language of the New Testament.

Discourse analysis is an approach to the functioning of languages that is as rigorous and as objective as traditional grammar. It emerged in several countries as a distinct approach in the 1960s and 1970s, drawing on insights of earlier linguistic studies. It is important to note that, despite some shared concerns, it is not a method of literary criticism, nor is it one possible, optional approach to a text among others that will eventually go out of fashion as it is replaced by another new discovery.

From a theoretical point of view, there is a variety of different schools and methods among discourse analysts, which sometimes focus more specifically on one aspect more than others. I propose here to avoid the theoretical discussions, which can be as complex and abstract as in any other branch of linguistics, in order to show the practical consequences of the approach. There are in any case certain interests and features that characterize all schools of discourse analysis. They all share the same essential perspective, and are based on the notion that:

les énoncés ne se présentent pas comme des phrases ou des suites de phrases mais comme des textes. Or un texte est un mode d'organisation spécifique qu'il faut étudier comme tel en le rapportant aux conditions dans lesquelles il est produit. Considérer la structure d'un texte en le rapportant à ses conditions de production, c'est l'envisager comme discours¹.

¹ M. GRAWITZ, *Méthode des Sciences Sociales IV*, Paris 1976, 2000¹¹, 345.

Language in Use

«Discourse», then, refers to any portion of unified language communication, whether it be in spoken or written form. All discourse analysis deals with language production that actually exists, and describes what is happening in specific instances rather than prescribing what ought to happen according to previously identified rules; it is thus concerned with «language in use» and with identifying systems within it².

Language as Communication

Any utterance, even if it can be reduced to a subject, verb and object, carries a message that goes beyond the simple words. As well as containing information of some kind, it serves to make communication. This implies at least two people, the one who speaks (whether orally or in writing) and the one who hears (whether aurally or in reading). The overall purpose of language as a vehicle of communication is an irresistible truth to which discourse analysts are very sensitive, in comparison with non-discourse oriented linguistics which views language more as a system in isolation. Seeing language as communication is especially important for biblical scholars who sometimes tend to view the biblical documents as having been written in a vacuum, without the intention to communicate.

Language in Context

Furthermore, utterances are not viewed in isolation but as belonging to a wider unit of communication, the «discourse». In order to grasp their intended meaning, account must be taken of the fact that any given discourse is produced as an act of communication within a certain context. On the one hand, this means the textual context, the surrounding discourse with its internal features of structure and form. On the other, it means the real-life context, the surrounding circumstances, the people involved in the communication, the thought processes, social conventions, and so on; in this sense, it belongs to the domain of pragmatics³.

² For a helpful introduction to the systemic-functional theory of linguistics, see C. MATTHIESSEN – K. TERUYA – M. LAM, ed., *Key Terms in Systemic Functional Linguistics*, New York 2010.

³ Pragmatics as an approach to language came into its own in the 1970s. The central tenets are clearly and sensitively presented in J.A. THOMAS, *Meaning in Interaction: An Introduction to Pragmatics*, Harlow UK 1995. See also <http://www.teachit.co.uk/armoore/lang/pragmatics.htm> (last accessed 31.10.2014).

Language as Form

In its study of form, discourse analysis looks at language above the sentence. Unlike traditional grammar, which can be said to take the sentence as the basic unit, discourse analysis looks not only at the sentence and its components but also at the larger units that group sentences together in an organized structure of paragraphs and chapters, for example, up to the level of the whole discourse. From a study of the formal features of a particular language, its aim is to elucidate the principles that govern the way discourse is constructed. It examines how the boundaries between various units are signalled and what are the features that distinguish one level from another. Discourse analysis is similarly concerned with the ways in which the units relate to each other, how they are ordered, and how they hold together to create a unified discourse. It looks for lexical or syntactical patterns and considers the factors by which they are established. It seeks to identify the elements that are central to the main idea of the discourse, and to establish how they are distinguished from the peripheral elements.

That is not to say that the constituents of a sentence never form part of the studies of discourse analysts. On the contrary, elements within the sentence are sometimes a central preoccupation, but they are viewed within the context of larger spans of discourse with the purpose of seeing how they are controlled by factors that operate on a level above the sentence or how, conversely, they influence portions of text beyond the sentence.

Languages in their Own Right

The principles of discourse analysis are common to all languages, and can be applied to a study of the features of each. However, the systems of the different languages are peculiar to each. This means that a crucial factor to be taken into account is that each language has its own way of building discourse. The similarities that may exist between languages are unpredictable and by no means regular. This is true at the micro level as well as at the macro level. The way a traditional fairy story is told in French, for example, is subtly different from the way the same story is told in English. There is, among other things, variation in how the drama of the story is prepared for, how it is signalled, and how its resolution is presented. Such differences depend to some extent on cultural background and can be at least partly explained by the real world in which the story is told. But there appear to be, in addition, inherent properties of each language that also condition such features⁴. The implication of this for structural analysis is that it is critical to work from the original language of the text rather than a translation.

⁴ This is the view of some who could be called «moderate functionalists» who recognize that not all properties of a language have to be functionally explained; see W. LABOV, «The Over-estimation of Functionalism», in R. DIRVEN – V. FRIED, ed., *Functionalism in Linguistics*, Amsterdam 1987, 311-332.

This review of commonly found characteristics of discourse analysis as a linguistic approach illustrates how, in comparison with traditional grammar, it comes to be referred to as «deep grammar», as opposed to the «surface grammar» of the more familiar approach.

It should not be thought that discourse analysis envisages the discourse features of a language as consciously acquired. On the contrary, their acquisition by the native speaker is regarded as being as natural and thorough as that of any features of surface grammar. The difficulty for the New Testament analyst is that there are no native speakers to consult in order to test or refine conclusions, which is nevertheless partially offset by the number of Greek manuscripts available as well as a range of authors from different linguistic backgrounds.

II. VARIABLE ELEMENTS OF HELLENISTIC GREEK

Let us turn to consider some specific features of the language of the New Testament to see aspects of the language that are affected by the principles of discourse analysis. I will start by explaining how I became aware of discourse analysis, as a practical illustration of the process of moving from reading texts using «surface» grammar to reading them within the framework of «deep» grammar.

1. VARIATION AMONG MANUSCRIPTS

My own personal journey of discovery began in the 1980s when I was working on the text of Acts, which is subject to a high degree of variation among the manuscripts. My particular concern was to compare the Greek text found in the edition of Greek New Testament that was, and still is, used as the standard reference text by exegetes and also translators, that of Nestle-Aland (N-A)⁵, with that of Codex Bezae (D05)⁶.

⁵ B. ALAND – K. ALAND – *al.*, ed., *Novum Testamentum Graece*, Stuttgart 2013²⁸. The same text is reproduced in *The Greek New Testament*, Stuttgart 1993⁴. Although the editors set out to re-create the earliest NT text from an eclectic range of manuscripts, in reality the text of Acts (and indeed, the Gospels) largely reproduces a manuscript considered *a priori* to be the best, namely Codex Vaticanus (B03). A tiny selection of the readings of D05 is presented in the critical apparatus of N-A, which allows neither a comprehensive idea of the text overall nor of the complexity of the variation.

⁶ Codex Bezae is a bilingual Greek-Latin uncial copied in around 400CE. It contains the four Gospels, and most of Acts. For a thorough external study of the manuscript, see D.C. PARKER, *Codex Bezae. An Early Christian Manuscript and its Text*, Cambridge 1994. Further observations may be found in the collection of papers from the 1994 colloquium on Codex Bezae: D.C. PARKER – C.-B. AMPHOUX, ed., *Codex Bezae. Studies from the Lunel Colloquium June 1994*, Leiden 1996. The application of discourse analysis to the question of the textual criticism of Acts was published by J. READ-HEIMERDINGER, *The Bezan Text of Acts. A Contribution of Discourse Analysis to Textual Criticism*, Sheffield 2002; it serves as a general introduction to the usefulness of discourse analysis for exegesis.

Apart from the difference in length between the two texts,⁷ my attention was caught by two categories of variation, representing almost half of the total variation, despite their apparent lack of interest at first glance. Specifically, 37% of the variation belongs to the category of «alternative material», usually discarded by textual critics as insignificant because, for example, it involves synonymous words or phrases, or grammatically equivalent forms and constructions. If any significance is attributed to them, they are regarded as simply a matter of scribal custom, or are attributed to carelessness or ignorance. A similar attitude is found with regard to the category of word order variation, which accounts for 7% of the overall variation between D05 and B03 in Acts⁸.

Of the grammatical features affected by variation, some can be explained by differences in meaning — this is notably the case when the tense or person of verbs, for example, is involved — but such instances only arise occasionally and irregularly. What is striking, however, is that most of the features affected involved words and forms that look practically interchangeable, with no obvious difference in meaning, and yet they recur on almost every page. They include the following categories to which reference will be made in the analysis of texts in Section 6 below⁹.

Sentence connectives

By sentence connectives is meant the links between sentences, so chiefly conjunctions (for example, *δέ* and *καί*, both with the possible meaning of «and») but also other linking devices such as a time expression («after that») or even asyndeton, the absence of any linking word or phrase. To all intents and purposes, the meaning is not altered by the variation.

Participle versus Finite Verb

Variation between a verb in finite form as opposed to participial form is common, again without any change in meaning. The question, as always, is why were changes made by a scribe copying the text or, as is more likely since these changes apparently took place at a early date, an editor who adapted the text for a particular audience.

⁷ The D05 text of Acts is popularly reputed to be characterised chiefly by its greater length, and indeed some 40% of the total variation turns out to be material absent from B03, though this is offset to some extent by the 16% of material present in B03 but absent from D05.

⁸ The results are presented in detail in J. READ-HEIMERDINGER, «The “Long” and the “Short” Texts of Acts», *Revista Catalana de Teologia* 22 (1997), 245-61.

⁹ Two further important categories not dealt with in the following list include the use of the article, especially before proper nouns, which varies considerably among manuscripts; and the variation in the use of prepositions before a noun in the appropriate case versus the use of case of the declined noun alone to express the meaning of the preposition. (e.g., *πρὸς αὐτόν* or *αὐτῷ* to introduce the addressee after a verb of speaking). To all intents and purposes, the two forms are identical in meaning but discourse analysis reveals that they express the relationship between the speaker and addressee. See J. READ-HEIMERDINGER, *The Bezan Text* (cf. nt. 6).

Word Order

This third category is widespread but generally ignored. Sometimes it is the order of words within a noun phrase that is affected (for example, adjective and noun); at other times, it is the order of words within a clause, or within an entire sentence (for example, verb, subject and object). It is very rare (two occurrences in Luke's Gospel and two in Acts) that a whole sentence is transposed from one place to another. More than single words changing place, it can also be a matter of nominal phrases being in different places (for example, a prepositional phrase before or after the direct object of a verb). For this reason, it is more accurate to speak of changes in constituent order, rather than word order.

2. VARIATION WITHIN A SINGLE BOOK

It is obvious, but nevertheless important to note here, that the kind of variation described above also occurs within the firm text of Acts, in other words in those parts of the book where there is no variation among the manuscripts. Indeed, it can be easily observed that even at places where the manuscripts agree, Luke sometimes uses *δέ* and at other times *καί* to mean «and»; his use of the article before proper names is everything but consistent; *πρὸς αὐτόν* and *αὐτῷ* occur within the same passage, changing from one sentence to the next; he readily alternates between relating actions to each other with participles and with finite verbs; and the order of words in phrases or sentences is notoriously variable, with the order of verb and subject or noun and adjective, for example, changing apparently at random.

According to the traditional manuals of Greek grammar, there is no clear or certain explanation for these aspects of the language. Grammarians note, in a tone ranging from mild amusement to exasperation, that such matters are not subject to rules: thus for instance, word order is «free», the article with proper names is optional, conjunctions can be used interchangeably¹⁰. They are said to vary according to a writer's style or desire to avoid repetition, or they are simply seen as matters of indifference. Textual critics in turn ascribe the variation among the manuscripts to a scribe's personal habit, or local custom, carelessness or indeed capriciousness. This is where Discourse Analysis steps in.

¹⁰ It is worth noting that some of the older grammar books of New Testament Greek do attempt to identify reasons for variation by a single author on matters that are not subject to grammatical rules in the usual sense. One of the best from this point of view is G.B. WINER, *A Treatise on the Grammar of New Testament Greek: Regarded as a Sure Basis for New Testament Exegesis*, tr. M. Stuart – E. Robinson, Andover 1825, repr. Eugene OR 2001; Ger. orig. *Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Sprachidioms*, 1822.

III. THE CONCERNS OF DISCOURSE ANALYSIS

Working on the text of Acts in the mid 1980s, I had the good fortune to meet a group of linguists working with discourse analysis. They were beginning to apply for the first time the broad concepts and principles to an analysis of the New Testament documents. And to my surprise and delight, they were talking about precisely the features that I had identified as subject to particular variation. Since that time, I have worked both with them and their successors and also independently, on pursuing research into the application of discourse analysis to the text of the New Testament. The goal has not just been linguistic, for the sake of acquiring a better understanding of Hellenistic Greek, but more especially exegetical, for the sake of achieving a greater depth of understanding of the meaning of New Testament books written in it.

Discourse analysis of New Testament Greek arose initially from the awareness of Bible translators that even though they translated the Greek accurately into receptor languages, the point of some stories such as parables, or of arguments in the epistles, for example, were not understood, or were misunderstood. Having resolved problems of vocabulary and of concepts, they came to realise that the very way that the Greek text told the story or expounded a logical argument was unfamiliar to those who heard it in translation — the organisation of the elements and the flow of reasoning were unfamiliar. This led then to in-depth and on-going study not only of receptor languages but, more significantly for our purpose, of New Testament Greek using the tools of discourse analysis.

FOUR IMPORTANT FEATURES OF GREEK DISCOURSE

The results of these studies are available in comprehensive manuals as well as in individual studies.¹¹ Summarising them would be akin to writing a summary of a well-known grammar such as that of Blass-Debrunner.¹² More realistic for us now is to focus on certain aspects that will be important for considering the impact of discourse analysis on the identification of narrative structures. Further comment on other features pointed out in Section 2 above will be made in the analysis of texts in Section 5.

¹¹ For a straightforward introduction to discourse analysis of New Testament Greek, see S.E. RUNGE, *Discourse Grammar of the New Testament: A Practical Introduction for Teaching and Exegesis*, Peabody, Mass. 2010). More technical but with a wealth of practical examples and exercises is S.H. LEVINSOHN, *Discourse Features of New Testament Greek*, Dallas 2002². See also J. READ-HEIMERDINGER, *The Bezan Text* (cf. nt. 6).

¹² F.W. BLASS – A. DEBRUNNER, *Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*, tr. R. FUNK, Chicago 1961²; Ger. original, *Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Griechisch*, Göttingen 1896.

The Book as a Unit

Any approach to the discourse analysis of a New Testament text takes as the largest unit the entire written document, whether it be a gospel or a letter, for example. In the case of Luke's writings, it could be argued that his two volumes should be taken as the largest unit since there are structural patterns as well as other connections that bind them together as inter-dependent and cohesive writings.

Within a narrative text, portions of direct speech are regarded as units distinct from the narrative itself, forming as it were mini discourses that are independent of the mainline story. For the purposes of structural analysis, it is recognized that the speeches have their own inner organization, which is not conditioned formally by that of the wider structure and does not impact either upon the structure of this larger framework. In the structural analysis of a passage, they are therefore set to one side.

The Sentence

At the other end of the spectrum, the sentence is considered to be the smallest unit of discourse. By sentence is meant the main, finite verb (i.e. that can stand alone) and all associated clauses and phrases. This definition results in a somewhat smaller unit than what is normally regarded as a sentence in English, for example, where main verbs joined together with a conjunction such as «and» are considered to be part of the same sentence. The reason for the more restricted definition of the sentence in the New Testament is that in Hellenistic Greek, unlike English, it is extremely rare for main verbs not to be connected to preceding ones (or indeed, anticipating future ones) without a conjunction. This is especially so in narrative. On this basis, the sentence is thus the smallest unit of structure to which a text can be reduced.

Within this unit based on the main verb, there can be a hierarchy of propositions, encoded in one of four ways. At their most simple, these can be stated thus (the literal English translation is given for each example taken from Lk. 9.51-56):

- i) a subordinate finite verb
⁵³καὶ οὐκ ἔδεξαντο αὐτόν, ὅτι τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ ἦν πορευόμενον...
 and they did not welcome him, because his face was journeying...
- ii) a participle
^{52b}καὶ πορευθέντες εἰσήλθον...
 and as they journeyed they entered...
- iii) an infinitive
^{51b}αὐτὸς τὸ πρόσωπον ἐστήρισεν τοῦ πορεύεσθαι...
 he turned his face to journey...
- iv) a nominal phrase (with or without a preposition)
⁵²καὶ ἀπέστειλεν ἀγγέλους πρὸ προσώπου αὐτοῦ
 and he sent messengers before his face

Each of these forms may have further dependent clusters attached to them, all belonging to one and the same sentence. The choice to encode propositions in one way or another is made by the speaker, according to his or her intentions. Now, it is axiomatic in discourse analysis that «choice implies meaning»¹³ and as a consequence of that principle, the particular choice made at any given point is seen as significant; however unconscious it may be, the speaker's decision is meaningful and purposeful. For example, the use of a participle rather than a finite verb causes the information it conveys to be «downgraded» in relation to the finite verb on which it depends; the distinct information expressed by the two verbal forms cannot be treated as of equal status, though both may be of prime importance to the meaning intended to be communicated.

Sentence Connectives

Given the fundamental significance of the sentence in Hellenistic Greek, the ways that they are joined is an integral means to communicate their relationship one to another. In a narrative, the choice of conjunction allows the speaker to indicate the role played by each action (main verb) in the unfolding of the story. Detailed and attentive study of the role played by the various conjunctions employed by Luke, beginning with the most obvious examples and applying the lessons learnt from those to more ambiguous occurrences, has allowed some clear conclusions to be drawn concerning their respective use.

The principal narrative conjunctions in Luke's writings are *δέ* and *καί*¹⁴. An illustration will help to distinguish their respective force: if the sentences are imagined as separate pieces of rope, then *δέ* ties them together with a knot, a visible join; *καί*, on the other hand, joins them more discreetly, by splicing the strands of the rope to create a hardly visible join. Translated into narrative terms, a sentence linked with *δέ* brings some kind of distinctively new into the story — this is frequently a new development in the action, a step that moves the story on; or it could be a parenthetical aside, which is essential information for the understanding of what follows. In contrast, *καί* presents the new action as on an equal footing with what has gone before.¹⁵ The distinction, it should be carefully noted, is not an objective, absolute one, but one that depends purely on the point of view of Luke as the narrator, expressing how he wishes to organise his story and how he chooses to present it to his hearer.

¹³ This essential principle is developed in M.A.K. HALLIDAY, «Introduction: On the “Architecture” of Human Language», in J. WEBSTER ed., *On Language and Linguistics. The Collected Works of M.A.K. Halliday* III, London – New York 2003, 1-32.

¹⁴ Interestingly, the other evangelists do not use the conjunctions in quite the same way; for example, Matthew uses *τότε* as a conjunction, which is found in Acts but not Luke's Gospel; Mark makes much more frequent use of *καί* than either Matthew or Luke; John, on the other hand, is alone in using *οὐν* as equivalent to Luke's use of *δέ* and asyndeton as equivalent of *καί*.

¹⁵ Other connectives can be aligned with either *δέ* or *καί*, the former indicating some kind of disjunction (e.g. *γάρ*, *οὐν*) and the others indicating continuity (notably *τε*).

The function of $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ to introduce something new is of critical importance for identifying structure, for it commonly is found at the beginning of a narrative unit. In Acts, this is true of units at whatever level of the structural hierarchy, while in the Gospel of Luke it is only consistently true of units at the higher level. Questions of structural hierarchy are discussed in Sections IV and V below.

The significance of conjunctions in Greek as signposts to both the narrative and logical connections between sentences is not characteristic of all languages. In particular, languages such as English, French, Spanish and Italian typically do not use conjunctions between every sentence, meaning that in translation they are frequently redundant and often a rendering for them should not be sought.

Word order

Two corresponding concepts are key with respect to word order or, as was pointed out above, more properly constituent order. The first is that of the «default» order, the order that is the norm. In narrative, the default order of sentence constituents is found to be that the verb is placed first. Other default patterns can be observed for the rest of the sentence constituents but for our purposes it is sufficient to record this as a notable characteristic.

When the default order is disrupted, the order is correspondingly referred to as «marked». Marked order implies that the narrator wishes to signal something of particular interest in the development of the story. Typically, the order at the level of the sentence is disrupted by placing a constituent before the verb, at the front of the sentence. In simplified terms, there are two discernible purposes for such «fore-fronting»:

i) As the narrative moves into a new phase with, for example, a change of place, or time, or person, the new *frame of reference* for the succeeding narrative is highlighted by being placed at the front of the sentence, before the verb. This is how Luke indicates a division in his narrative, marking the «point of departure» of a new section or episode by providing the framework for what will follow.

ii) An alternative purpose is to *focus* on an element (a character, for example, or some other aspect of the story other than the main line of events/actions), highlighting it by placing it at the front of the sentence. When fore-fronting is used for this purpose, there is not usually any other accompanying change, but rather it takes place within the same frame of reference, so it is easily distinguished from fore-fronting as a device for signalling a division in the narrative.

At other places within the sentence, word or constituent order is also significant and follows predictable patterns which, when disrupted, typically highlight for a variety of possible reasons the constituent moved to the left of its default position, a device referred to as «fronting». In other words, Greek word order is indeed «free» but its freedom has a purpose: it allows the speaker to underline sentence constituents that are particularly salient, a device that serves among other things to structure the telling of a story or the development of an argument.

Attention will be drawn to some further instances of word order flexibility in the study of sample passages below.

IV. STRUCTURAL ANALYSIS OF LUKE'S WORK

1. *THE CHOICE OF GREEK TEXT*

A recent edition of Luke's twofold work was published by myself in collaboration with Josep Rius-Camps, taking the Greek text of Codex Bezae (D05) set out with a facing translation, first in Catalan and later in Spanish and then English¹⁶. In this edition, we have provided a hierarchical structural analysis in which we apply the principles of discourse analysis. The perspective of discourse analysis, which works on texts that actually exist, required that a manuscript was used rather than the somewhat more accessible text of the current Greek New Testament, the N-A edition. As indicated above (Section 1), this is an eclectic edition, constructed on a selection of manuscripts from among which the readings have been selected as authentic without applying the criteria of discourse analysis. Indeed, at the time of compiling the edition, discourse analysis of Hellenistic Greek was in its infancy (adolescence, at least) and little attention was being paid to it by textual critics or exegetes.¹⁷ As a result, from the point of view of discourse analysis, the N-A text cannot be used as a reliable reflection of what a NT author may have actually written. That said, as was pointed out above (Section II), in Luke's Gospel it is largely Codex Vaticanus (B03) that is adopted by N-A; in the Book of Acts, considerable use is also made of variant readings of Codex Sinaiticus (ⲛ01). The decision to take Codex Bezae in preference to Codex Vaticanus for our new edition of Luke's entire work was made partly for reasons to do with the theological coherence of Luke's work in this manuscript, but also for the linguistic coherence, which became increasingly apparent as it emerged from the application of discourse analysis.

However, the purpose here is not to develop the arguments for the earlier date of Codex Bezae but simply to note the importance of the text used for analysis. For the illustrations of the application of discourse analysis that follows in Section V, the customary N-A text will be used, with the caveat that the accuracy of the analysis may be affected by its eclectic nature.

¹⁶ J. RIUS-CAMPS – J. READ-HEIMERDINGER, ed., *Luke's Demonstration to Theophilus: The Gospel and the Acts of the Apostles according to Codex Bezae*; tr. from the Greek with H. DUNN, London 2012.

¹⁷ The choice of the printed text in N-A²⁸ follows with little alteration that of N-A²⁷ (1994). Textual critics continue to apply the older principles of eclecticism appealing, for example, to the frequency of the occurrence of such particles as δέ or καί in the firm text of an author to determine his «habitual style» and judging variant readings accordingly.

2. THEMATIC AND VERBAL CRITERIA FOR STRUCTURAL PATTERNS

The starting point for the structural analysis of Luke's two volumes published in the recent edition was the earlier work carried out by Josep Rius-Camps, initially prepared for adult catechism from 1980 onwards and later presented in published form in Catalan and Spanish¹⁸. He had divided the Gospel and Acts into «sections» and sub-divided those sections into a series of smaller passages that he called «sequences»; these in turn he sometimes divided further into «episodes». Working from the Greek text¹⁹, his criteria for identifying boundaries between the various levels of the narrative was thematic, taking a change of place or of character or topic, for instance, as an indication of a new block of narrative. He then noted the frequently recurring patterns in the arrangement of the material, at each of the levels from the largest to the smallest. These finely balanced hierarchical patterns, which emerged from the verbal and thematic links between the components, were seen to be almost invariably constructed around a centre, with the two parts on either side mirroring each other, in one of three ways: concentric (AB/C\B'A'), symmetrical (AB//B'A') or parallel (AB//A'B'). In some instances, particularly in introductory and concluding episodes a linear pattern (ABC) was also found.

During the years of working on his structural analyses of Luke's work, he remained unaware of similar work being carried on elsewhere²⁰; other scholars for their part were apparently ignorant of that of Rius-Camps, perhaps because he published chiefly in Catalan. Since we have been working in collaboration (from 1994) and publishing in English, his earlier analysis has been revised and refined by the application of the criteria of discourse analysis²¹. Indeed, Rius-Camps had made his analyses on the basis of themes and vocabulary, not being familiar with the significance of the newer linguistic studies of discourse analysts.

¹⁸ See, e.g., on Luke's Gospel, J. RIUS-CAMPS, «Lc 10,25-18,30: Una perfecta estructura concèntrica dins la Secció del Viatge (9,51-19, 46)», *Revista Catalana de Teologia* 8 (1983) 283-358; Estructura i funció significativa del tercer cicle o Secció de les Recognicions (Lc 6,12-9,50), *Revista Catalana de Teologia* 9 (1984) 269-329.

¹⁹ The earliest work of Rius-Camps was based on the N-A²⁶ edition of the Greek New Testament. After discovering the coherent theological message of the book of Acts in Codex Bezae, where the apostles, including Paul, are presented as disciples who only gradually come to terms with the radical nature of the teaching of Jesus with regard to their Jewish traditions and expectations, he made a comparison of this text with that of N-A for his 4-volume commentary on Acts: *Comentari als Fets dels Apòstols*, 4 vol., Barcelona 1991, 1993, 1995, 2000.

²⁰ The similarity of the concepts applied by Rius-Camps and those used in the rhetorical analysis of Roland Meynet is striking; see most recently R. MEYNET, *L'Évangile de Luc*, Paris 2011³.

²¹ With reference to Acts, see J. RIUS-CAMPS – J. READ-HEIMERDINGER, *The Message of Acts in Codex Bezae: A Comparison with the Alexandrian Tradition*. 4 vol.; London 2004, 2005, 2007, 2009.

V. THE APPLICATION OF DISCOURSE ANALYSIS TO STRUCTURAL ANALYSIS

1. *LOWEST LEVEL BOUNDARIES*

The first task in tackling the structural analysis of a New Testament document using a discourse analysis approach is to identify the smallest units of which the text is composed, namely the sentences as defined above in Section III. In working on the writings of Luke, we have called these units «elements». In order to be able to visually represent the distinct elements of the narrative with maximum clarity, it is helpful to set each element out on a new line, highlighting the sentence connective (generally conjunctions). In cases of asyndeton, some marker such as Ø (zero) can be inserted at the beginning of the line. Any portions of direct speech are not included in this breakdown since, as was explained above (Section III), these constitute separate discourses that do not belong to the main story line but have to be analysed independently; the ellipsis sign (...) can be used to indicate their position in the narrative. Three examples of texts from Luke's Gospel divided into elements in this way are set out in the Appendix.

2. *HIGHER LEVEL BOUNDARIES*

The next step is to identify the boundaries at the higher levels, the markers that group the elements into discrete units. In the writing of Luke, there are at least three, sometimes four levels within the level of each book (elements – episodes – sequences – sections – book). Depending on the particular discourse being analysed, it is at times helpful to work from the lower levels up, and at others from a higher level down; sometimes, it is best to start with a rough higher level division which is refined as the lower levels emerge from more detailed study. Within the space limitations of this short paper, the question of how to distinguish between the different structural levels of the hierarchical organisation will be left to one side, in order to concentrate on the matter of identifying boundaries between units at the various levels. Suffice it here to note that from the point of view of content, «sections» are characterised by a unity of overarching theme.

For the purposes of demonstrating how aspects of discourse analysis serve as criteria for discerning boundaries, some specific examples will be considered. The passage that includes Jesus' move from Nazareth to Capernaum at the beginning of his ministry (Lk. 4.23-32, see Appendix) illustrates how the consideration of the formal features of discourse analysis causes a division made principally on the grounds of theme to be modified. The starting point of the extract at 4.23 has been made somewhat arbitrarily in the middle of a unit in order to provide some context, both linguistic and narrative.

The Greek New Testament (and most translations)²² makes a paragraph division after 4.30, corresponding to the change of location from Nazareth to Capernaum. Several things, however, concur to indicate that this is not the division intended by the writer: i) the conjunction is καί; ii) the main verb κατήλθεν («he went down») is in first position after the conjunction; iii) the subject (Jesus) is the same as that of the previous sentence. This combination of factors is strongly indicative of continuity and tells against this sentence being the start of a new unit. The following sentence of v. 31b begins καὶ ἦν διδάσκων and thus displays the same three characteristics, and despite the change of subject in the following sentence of v. 32, the verb is still in first position.

In contrast, the previous sentence at v. 30 has markers of discontinuity: i) the conjunction is δέ; ii) the main verb ἐπορεύετο («he went away») is not in first position but has been displaced by the fore-fronting of a) the emphatic pronoun αὐτός; and b) the prepositional phrase διελθὼν διὰ μέσου αὐτῶν («passing through the midst of them»); iii) the main verb is in the imperfect tense, anticipating the more specific aorist verb κατήλθεν of the following sentence.

The focus of the sentence of 4.30 is, indeed, not Jesus' escape from the people in the synagogue but the continuation of his journey despite their attempts to kill him. The escape, expressed in a subordinate participial clause, is downplayed in comparison with the pursuit of his journey. The drama is saved for later, when there will be no divine intervention to save Jesus from death²³. Thus, Luke marks the boundary between the Nazareth incident and the scenes in Capernaum with the continuation of Jesus' journey (ἐπορεύετο), which leads without a break into his arrival at Capernaum, his teaching there and the admiration of those who heard his teaching.

3. STRUCTURAL PATTERNS

Once the elements of a passage have been separated and the boundaries of a unit have been determined, the analytical process can move on to observing the structural pattern into which the elements fall. It needs to be emphasized at this point that discourse analysis studies of the New Testament have not generally been interested in this feature for it is not primarily a linguistic concern. And yet, building on the foundation of a discourse analytical study of a document, it can be seen that structural patterns are reproduced at all levels of Luke's writings, with the sections reflecting or echoing each other, the sequences doing likewise within each section, and the episodes within each sequence constantly recreating and consolidating the structural framework of the story. At the lowest level, the

²² The same division is made on the basis of the rhetorical analysis of Meynet (*L'Évangile de Luc* [cf. nt. 20], 215-227).

²³ On these grounds I take issue with the thesis of B.W. LONGENECKER, *Hearing the Silence. Jesus on the Edge and God in the Gap – Luke 4 in Narrative Perspective*, Eugene, Or. 2012, in which he contends that Lk. 4.30 marks a mysterious, dramatic climax of magnificent proportions.

elements within an episode repeat over and over again the twofold nature of these structures with their central focus.

Luke 9.51-56

The passage of Lk. 9.51-56 illustrates an episode built around a single centre. There are strong boundary markers at 9.51, which serve as signposts that there begins here a new section — one that has as its theme the onset of Jesus' journey to Jerusalem and that goes through to 10.37²⁴. The first marker is the construction ἐγένετο δέ, which recurs regularly in Luke's Gospel at the point where there is a development in the narrative, albeit with greater frequency in the D05 text²⁵. There follows a series of fronted constituents that precede the main verb ἐστήρισεν («he set»): the time expression encoded as a nominal infinitive (ἐν τῷ συμπληροῦσθαι τὰς ἡμέρας τῆς ἀναλήψεως αὐτοῦ, «when the time had come for his ascension»), the subject doubly underlined with the adverbial καί (not translated) and the emphatic pronoun αὐτός («he»), and finally the object of the main verb, τὸ πρόσωπον («[his] face»).

The first chunk of text in this section extends to v. 57, where a genitive infinitive clause (πορευομένων αὐτῶν, «As they journeyed») and the locational phrase (ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ, «on the way») precedes the main verb (εἶπεν, «said») with a new subject (τις, «someone»), thus marking a new sequence boundary where the overall theme of the section continues. Following the opening element of the sequence 9.51-56, there are six more elements before the next boundary, making seven in all. Given the odd number, two patterns can be envisaged, either linear or concentric. In fact, the central element here, the refusal of the Samaritans to welcome Jesus (v. 53), presents a turning point in the unfolding of the sequence, and is thus noted as the centre [d]. The three elements that follow it show what happened as a result: the disciples' reaction leading to Jesus' rebuke and concluding with the continuation of the journey. Small letters are used to designate elements as structural components, in this case presenting the pattern a b c d c' b' a'²⁶.

It may be noticed how throughout the first half the conjunction καί is used with the main verb immediately following, except at v. 52b where the participle πορευθέντες is placed before the verb; this fronting is an interesting example of word order displacement as a means to underline the participial verb which of itself does not add anything new to the narrative but its placing draws attention

²⁴ At 10.38, a new section begins in D05 with the same section marker as is found at 9.51, ἐγένετο δέ; this goes through to 11.27 where ἐγένετο δέ is found in all manuscripts.

²⁵ ἐγένετο δέ occurs at the beginning of 15 sections out of the 20 we identify in Luke's Gospel D05. Likewise, the construction καί ἐγένετο is often found at the boundary of lower level divisions, again more frequently in D05 (e.g. at 9.57 D05).

²⁶ In the D05 text, there is another element at 9.55b, causing there to be a total of eight instead of seven elements, with a double centre d/d', giving a structure that reflects the narrative development in a more satisfactory way.

to the theme of Jesus' journey to Jerusalem, first mentioned in v. 51, and taken up again in vv. 53, 56²⁷.

The second half of the episode begins with δέ and a fore-fronted participial ἰδόντες («When [they] saw») with the subject, the disciples, specified. All this is before the main verb εἶπαν («they said»), of which James and John are named as the particular subject. The fact that the presence of the disciples in the scene is already implicit means that this fronting does not mark a «point of departure» but rather the disciples are fronted in order to bring them into the spotlight and distinguish them from other participants on the scene. The use of the conjunction δέ marks this new development in the narrative. The multiple function of δέ is illustrated by its use in the following sentence at v. 55 where it marks a rupture as Jesus, in discord with the disciples' words, turns to rebuke them. This then leads on without further ado (καί) to the continuation of the journey with the whole group implied by the plural of the final verb ἐπορεύθησαν («they journeyed»).

Luke 24.13-35

A second passage that will help to illustrate the way that discourse analysis serves to identify boundaries is that of Lk. 24.13-35. On our analysis of the Gospel, this is the second sequence (B) of the final section (XX), which has the overall theme of the resurrection (24.1-53). According to the criteria of discourse analysis, it falls into four episodes (A B B' A'), all part of the story of the disciples' meeting with Jesus on the road to «Emmaus»²⁸.

The opening of the sequence is marked in the N-A text²⁹ with the presentative phrase, καὶ ἰδοὺ («And behold» [lit.]), followed by the subject (δύο ἐξ αὐτῶν, «two of them») and a time phrase (ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ, «on the same day») before the periphrastic verb (ἦσαν πορευόμενοι, «were journeying»)³⁰. A second sentence, linked with καί, completes the setting of the scene in this introductory episode, giving a linear pattern of a b.

²⁷ A participle typically downgrades the importance of a verb in relation to the finite verb on which it depends. In discourse terms, when it is placed after the finite verb it provides additional information; and when it is found before, its function is rather to present the circumstances of the finite verb (S.H. LEVINSOHN, *Discourse Features* [cf. nt. 11], 181-190).

²⁸ Comparison may be made with the rhetorical analysis of Meynet (*L'Évangile de Luc* [cf. nt. 20], 931-984). Significantly, he identifies a major break at 24.33b which, reading as it does καί + main verb, contravenes several of the principles described above by which discourse analysis recognizes boundary markers.

²⁹ The sequence has considerable differences in the manuscript tradition, which cause the narrative to convey different messages; see J. READ-HEIMERDINGER, «“Qu'y a-t-il dans un nom?” (*Roméo et Juliette*, II, ii). L'importance du nom du village dans Lc 24,13-35», in Y. Bourquin – al., ed., *Écritures et Réécritures*, Leuven 2012, 595-612.

³⁰ Study of periphrastic verbs from a discourse perspective demonstrates that their force is not to underline the durative aspect but rather to draw attention to the very verb itself, here the idea of «journeying» (cf. the same verb with the same device at 9.53).

The next episode, B-B, begins with *καὶ ἐγένετο*, a phrase Luke sometimes uses to move his story on to a new event within a larger portion of the narrative, here the sequence. The fronting of the setting (the talking and discussing of the two disciples), as well as the new subject (Jesus) and a participle (*ἐγγίσας*, «drew near»), all before the main verb (*συνεπορεύετο*, «began journeying with them»), confirms that this sentence is intended to mark a boundary in the narrative, namely the transition between the introductory setting and the arrival of a new character who forms the frame of reference for the following development. The fresh unit extends throughout the discussion between Jesus and the disciples, up to the next occurrence of *καὶ ἐγένετο* at v. 30. There are 13 elements, which revolve around the long lament of the disciples, [g] vv. 19b-24.

The majority of the sentences in episode B-B (vv. 15-29) are linked with *καὶ* and begin with the main verb. The exceptions fall into two kinds — those sentences linked with *δέ* and those that have a constituent before the main verb. The first occurrence of *δέ* introduces a parenthetical comment («their eyes were kept from recognizing him»), in which the subject is highlighted by being fronted; the rupture in the narrative line justifies use of *δέ*, which typically presents a parenthesis that looks forward, inviting the hearer to bear the information of the aside in mind as the story progresses³¹.

The use of *δέ* at v. 17a marks a development as Jesus speaks to the disciples. Their response at v. 18 and again at v.19b likewise is joined to Jesus' questions with *δέ*, which is Luke's usual way of presenting a conversation of the type «question–answer» which evolves according to expectation. In contrast, Jesus' question at v. 18 is not an expected response to Cleopas' expression of surprise, and as such is introduced with *καί*. Note, too, how a similar thing happens at v. 25, where Jesus speaks following the disciples' account but again in an unexpected way. Whenever a default pattern is broken — as here, where *δέ* is the default conjunction to connect elements of a true dialogue — then attention is drawn to the part of the discourse that uses an unexpected feature.

The marked word order, where a constituent other than the main verb begins the sentence, is accounted for on each occasion in this episode by its being in focus: the change of speaker at vv. 19b and 25; the underlining of the scriptural evidence for what Jesus says at v. 27 (already alluded to in his words, v. 26); the distinction of Jesus from the group at v. 29.

Moving on to the third episode, B-B', this corresponds to the previous one in that Jesus who had come on the scene but was hitherto unrecognized now makes himself known and disappears. There are six elements here, which fall into a clear symmetrical pattern, with the opening of the disciples eyes, [c] v. 31a, corresponding to their recognizing Jesus, [c'] v. 31b; the events leading up to the revelation and devolving from it are on either side of this twofold centre. *δέ* at v.

³¹ In this sense, parenthetical *δέ* contrasts with *γάρ*, which ties the sentence it introduces back to the preceding discourse rather than forwards (S.H. LEVINSOHN, *Discourse Features* [cf. nt. 11], 91-93).

31a marks the new development that brings about a change in the direction of the story. The breaking of the bread (κλάσας) is brought into the spotlight by being expressed as a participle before the main verb in v. 30b; and at v. 31c, the disappearance of Jesus is highlighted with the fore-fronting of the subject and the predicative adjective before the main verb.

A final episode brings the sequence to a close, as the disciples get up and return to the religious centre of Jerusalem. Their change of activity (ἀναστάντες, «they rose»)³² together with the time specification (αὐτῇ τῇ ὥρᾳ, «that same hour») provides the new frame of reference for the concluding elements of the sequence, placed as they are before the main verb. The three elements are conjoined with καί; the outer elements of the pattern a b a' refer to the disciples, with the central element relaying news of the group they found in Jerusalem.

VI. THE CONTRIBUTION OF DISCOURSE ANALYSIS AS A TOOL FOR RHETORICAL ANALYSIS

As a grammar of language, discourse analysis is as indispensable to the study of New Testament documents as is traditional grammar. In view of its concern with language above the level of the sentence it has a great deal to say about the organisation of a text, the hierarchical levels and their relationship to one another. Its foundational principle of treating language as communication between a speaker and a hearer further indicates that the means a New Testament author employs to convey his message to his addressee(s) are at the forefront of any consideration of the devices available to a Hellenistic Greek speaker for the enhancement of his or her communication. And the importance accorded to the context in which communication is made means that the impact of the real-life situation on the formation of the writing receives due attention. On a general level, then, it seems plain that discourse analysis could be expected to enhance any attempt to discern the rhetorical nature of a New Testament text.

From a more formal point of view, discourse analysis provides objective criteria for identifying the boundaries within a discourse. Working from a study of actual texts, and recognizing different practices in different authors, principles have been elucidated that allow the writer's intended divisions to be identified with a measure of clarity and precision that are derived from the application of objective criteria. That said, while comments are sometimes made in passing by discourse analysts with regard to features that identify levels of division as being lower or higher level, little has been done to apply the approach of discourse analysis to working out how to distinguish the successive layers beyond «low» and «high». That is an area where further research is still needed.

³² The verb ἀνίστημι, frequently rendered with a fronted participle in Luke's writing, often indicates a change of attitude as much as a change of physical position, cf., e.g., Acts 8.26, 27; 9.6 (see J. RIUS-CAMPS – J. READ-HEIMERDINGER, *The Message of Acts II* [cf. nt. 21], 155).

The definition of the lowest unit of written discourse as the sentence, with its main verb and associated clauses and phrases, is valuable for isolating the distinct utterances that combine to form the basis of the overall structure of a book. It has not been the concern of discourse analysts, however, to discern any particular patterns formed by these sentences within a larger unit. The identification of rhetorical patterns is another application of discourse analysis that requires more concentrated work in conjunction with other scholars.

On the other hand, bringing to bear on the rhetorical analysis principles of discourse analysis also illuminates some significant differences in the particular arrangements and patterns that are identified. I suggest that the two systems are complementary in the following way: the components of discourse analysis are akin to the skeleton of a model to be dressed by a fashion designer. The skeleton is foundational, its limbs and articulations all being essential components arranged according to a fixed and invariable structure, although they do indeed have some freedom and flexibility of movement. This skeleton represents, however, only the bare bones, which require dressing in order to express fully the designer's intentions and to communicate a message through the model. The clothes with which the model is dressed are more strictly the concern of rhetorical analysis, though of course the skeletal framework is of integral importance.

A complicating factor is the issue of the uncertainty of the New Testament Greek text. In the earliest manuscripts, the divisions between the various levels of the narrative, as well as the structural patterns, are much easier to discern and are much more regular than in the text of the N-A eclectic Greek edition. This suggests that when the autographs were adapted in transmission to new communities, alterations were made to the very structure of the documents. The implications of this situation for rhetorical analysis need to be addressed.

Meanwhile, I would urge that a broader task, and one that evokes less controversy, is to extend and develop the understanding of New Testament writings brought by the approach of discourse analysis among biblical scholars working in a diversity of fields, including exegesis and homiletics, and not forgetting rhetorical analysis.

APPENDIX OF TEXTS

Lk. 4.23-32

²³**καὶ** εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτούς...

²⁴εἶπεν δέ...

²⁸**καὶ** ἐπλήσθησαν πάντες θυμοῦ ἐν τῇ συναγωγῇ ἀκούοντες ταῦτα,

^{29a}**καὶ** ἀναστάντες ἐξέβαλον αὐτὸν ἔξω τῆς πόλεως,

^{29b}**καὶ** ἤγαγον αὐτὸν ἕως ὀφρύος τοῦ ὄρους ἐφ' οὗ ἡ πόλις ὠκοδόμητο αὐτῶν, ὥστε κατακρημνίσαι αὐτόν:

³⁰αὐτὸς δὲ διελθὼν διὰ μέσου αὐτῶν ἐπορεύετο

^{31a}**καὶ** κατήλθεν εἰς Καφαρναοὺμ πόλιν τῆς Γαλιλαίας.

^{31b}**καὶ** ἦν διδάσκων αὐτοὺς ἐν τοῖς σάββασιν:

³²**καὶ** ἐξεπλήσσοντο ἐπὶ τῇ διδαχῇ αὐτοῦ, ὅτι ἐν ἐξουσίᾳ ἦν ὁ λόγος αὐτοῦ.

Lk. 9.51-56

[a] ⁵¹Ἐγένετο δὲ ἐν τῷ συμπληροῦσθαι τὰς ἡμέρας τῆς ἀναλήμψεως αὐτοῦ καὶ αὐτὸς τὸ πρόσωπον ἐστήρισεν τοῦ πορευέσθαι εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ,

[b] ^{52a}**καὶ** ἀπέστειλεν ἀγγέλους πρὸ προσώπου αὐτοῦ.

[c] ^{52b}**καὶ** πορευθέντες εἰσήλθον εἰς κώμην Σαμαριτῶν, ὡς ἐτοιμάσαι αὐτῶ

[d] ⁵³**καὶ** οὐκ ἐδέξαντο αὐτόν, ὅτι τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ ἦν πορευόμενον εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ.

[c'] ⁵⁴ἰδόντες δὲ οἱ μαθηταὶ Ἰάκωβος καὶ Ἰωάννης εἶπαν...

[b'] ⁵⁵στραφεῖς δὲ ἐπετίμησεν αὐτοῖς

[a'] ⁵⁶**καὶ** ἐπορεύθησαν εἰς ἑτέραν κώμην.

Lk 24.13-35

B-A

[a] ¹³**Καὶ ἰδοὺ** δύο ἐξ αὐτῶν ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἦσαν πορευόμενοι εἰς κώμην ἀπέχουσαν σταδίους ἐξήκοντα ἀπὸ Ἱερουσαλήμ, ἡ ὄνομα Ἐμμαοῦς,

[b] ¹⁴**καὶ** αὐτοὶ ὠμίλουν πρὸς ἀλλήλους περὶ πάντων τῶν συμβεβηκότων τούτων.

B-B

[a] ¹⁵**καὶ** ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ ὀμιλεῖν αὐτοὺς καὶ συζητεῖν καὶ αὐτὸς Ἰησοῦς ἐγγίσας συνεπορεύετο αὐτοῖς,

[b] (¹⁶οἱ δὲ ὀφθαλμοὶ αὐτῶν ἐκρατοῦντο τοῦ μὴ ἐπιγνῶναι αὐτόν.)

[c] ^{17a}εἶπεν δὲ πρὸς αὐτούς...

[d] ^{17b}**καὶ** ἐστάθησαν σκυθρωποί.

[e] ¹⁸ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ εἰς ὄνοματι Κλεοπᾶς εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτόν...

[f] ^{19a}**καὶ** εἶπεν αὐτοῖς...

[g] ^{19b}οἱ δὲ εἶπαν αὐτῶ...

[f'] ²⁵**καὶ** αὐτὸς εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτούς...

[e'] ²⁷**καὶ** ἀρξάμενος ἀπὸ Μωϋσέως καὶ ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν προφητῶν διερμήνευσεν αὐτοῖς ἐν πάσαις ταῖς γραφαῖς τὰ περὶ ἐαυτοῦ.

[d'] ^{28a}**Καὶ** ἤγγισαν εἰς τὴν κώμην οὗ ἐπορεύοντο,

[c'] ^{28b}**καὶ** αὐτὸς προσεποιήσατο πορρώτερον πορεύεσθαι.

[b'] ^{29a}**καὶ** παρεβιάσαντο αὐτὸν λέγοντες...

[a'] ^{29b}**καὶ** εἰσῆλθεν τοῦ μείναι σὺν αὐτοῖς.

B-B'

[a] ^{30a}**καὶ** ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ κατακλιθῆναι αὐτὸν μετ' αὐτῶν λαβῶν τὸν ἄρτον εὐλόγησεν

[b] ^{30b}**καὶ** κλάσας ἐπέδιδου αὐτοῖς:

[c] ^{31a}αὐτῶν δὲ διηνοίχθησαν οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ

[c'] ^{31b}**καὶ** ἐπέγνωσαν αὐτόν:

[b'] ^{31c}**καὶ** αὐτὸς ἄφαντος ἐγένετο ἀπ' αὐτῶν.

[a'] ³²**καὶ** εἶπαν πρὸς ἀλλήλους...

B-A'

[a] ^{33a}**καὶ** ἀναστάντες αὐτῇ τῇ ὥρᾳ ὑπέστρεψαν εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ,

[b] ^{33b}**καὶ** εὗρον ἠθροισμένους τοὺς ἑνδεκα καὶ τοὺς σὺν αὐτοῖς,

³⁴λέγοντας ὅτι ὄντως ἠγέρθη ὁ κύριος καὶ ὤφθη Σίμωνι.

[a'] ³⁵**καὶ** αὐτοὶ ἐξηγοῦντο τὰ ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ καὶ ὡς ἐγνώσθη αὐτοῖς ἐν τῇ κλάσει τοῦ ἄρτου.

1 Drovers, Ffaldybrenin
SA19 8QB Llanwrda
Wales (United Kingdom)

Jenny READ-HEIMERDINGER

ABSTRACT

The paper begins by presenting the principles of Discourse Analysis as a linguistic discipline which, unlike traditional grammar, is concerned with the use of language above the level of the sentence. Its particular application to New Testament Greek will be shown by considering specific texts from the Gospel of Luke. These will be analysed by highlighting the features identified by discourse analysis — such things as the links between sentences, the devices used for the tracking of participants, the significance of word order, the use of the article — taking care to apply objective and tested criteria to their interpretation. The importance of the language patterns and choices for the author's communication of his purpose and intended meaning will be considered, demonstrating their importance for exegesis. Some comparison will be made with the results obtained by a rhetorical analysis of the same passages in order to suggest how each of the two approaches contributes a particular perspective while combining to complement and inform one another.

Keywords: discourse analysis, rhetorical analysis, New Testament Greek, Gospel of Luke, Acts of the Apostles, authorial purpose, literary structure, exegesis

RIASSUNTO

Vengono presentati all'inizio i principi dell'Analisi del Discorso (*Discourse Analysis*) come disciplina linguistica che, a differenza della grammatica tradizionale, concerne l'uso del linguaggio al di sopra del livello della frase. La sua particolare applicazione al Nuovo Testamento greco verrà mostrata considerando alcuni testi specifici del Vangelo di Luca. Questi saranno analizzati, mettendo in evidenza le caratteristiche individuate dall'Analisi del Discorso — come i legami tra le frasi, i dispositivi utilizzati per il monitoraggio dei partecipanti, il significato dell'ordine delle parole, l'uso dell'articolo — avendo cura di applicare criteri oggettivi e verificati per la loro interpretazione. Sarà considerata l'importanza dei modelli linguistici e delle scelte fatte dall'autore per comunicare il suo scopo e il significato che intende, dimostrando la loro importanza per l'esegesi. Qualche confronto sarà fatto con i risultati ottenuti da un'analisi retorica degli stessi passi per suggerire come ciascuno dei due approcci presenta una prospettiva particolare che unisce e arricchisce l'un l'altro.

Parole chiave: analisi del discorso, analisi retorica, Nuovo Testamento greco, Vangelo di Luca, Atti degli apostoli, scopo autoriale, struttura letteraria, esegesi